

**HYPER-CALVINISM**

**IS IT TRUE**

**BY**

**STANLEY C. PHILLIPS**

**2000**

### **ANDREW FULLER- A Baptist: 1782**

"There is such a fulness in the satisfaction (Atonement) of Christ, as is sufficient for the whole world, were the whole world to believe in Him."

### **“SAINT” THOMAS AQUINAS- A Roman Catholic: 1277:**

"For the sake of brevity we have restricted ourselves to the statements of St. Thomas that reveal most pointedly his answers to the ultimate questions about predestination and reprobation. But we must recognize that he tried to lessen the apparent harshness of this doctrine in many ways. For example, he held that Christ's "redemption was *sufficient* for all, though it was *efficacious* for the elect only." In fact, he so tried to modify some of the implications of his doctrine that, . . . he at times sacrificed consistency for this purpose."

Quotation from: Predestination, Grace, And freewill, by Dan M. John Farrelly, O.S.B., St. Anselm's Abby, Washington, D.C.,USA, The Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland (1964), page 121.

"Mr. Fuller takes repentance and faith out of the covenant of grace, and puts them under the law, in the sense he makes them *man's duty*, and not gifts of grace." History Of The Church Of God, by Sylvester Hassell, page 310.

"Baptists took faith and repentance from behind regeneration, and put them in front of it; thus making

them *sacraments*.” Pastor James Manning, Southern Baptist Calvinist, October 1997.

## FOREWORD

Friends and critics alike have recommended that this work should not be as candid as the first editions. The writer has, to a great degree, softened his comments; nevertheless, it is necessary to make sure error is exposed and therefore some faint-hearted person will doubtless still take the work as being too harsh, particularly if they identify themselves with the Fullerite evangelicals. It is needful to point out, first, that the primary audience for this work is sovereign grace believers in the United States who believe in the sovereignty of the eternal Godhead - including the exclusive work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration preparatory to any benefits of the Gospel of grace. It is not primarily suited for an international audience, where English religious terms may connote different definitions than those used in the USA; nor is it designed as a *theological treatise* to exhibit intellectual exegesis useful for academicians. Hopefully, it is more useful for the humble unassuming child of God who feels a need occasionally to defend the church's doctrine against those who use academic euphemisms against them. In the final analysis, the writer is attempting to *defend* our churches of long standing, of false or misunderstood doctrinal positions - this should be kept in mind as one reads the contents of this book. There is a disclaimer we wish to make in this Introduction. We have earnestly tried to make the book as generic as we could without compromising the precious truth our heart has been given to rejoice in. We do not believe salvation is exclusively in the membership of Hyper-calvinistic churches; nor do we believe it is in the hands of men in any wise. We have been unable to prevent the book from sounding provincial, primarily because these precious truths are hardly embraced by any other fellowship of churches to our knowledge. It is impossible to defend these truths separate and apart from our own belief-system. So, as you read the book, please do not conclude that we exclude any believer in free and

sovereign grace. We rejoice in the knowledge that God has a people in scattered among every kindred, tongue, tribe and nation; and He alone knows the individuals, numbers and locations of them all. May it be His will to reveal to the reader even greater things that glorify Him than this poor writer has yet received. "*The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal: the Lord knoweth them that are His.*"- We don't.

The expected audience, as a people, has refused to utilize many modern terms which were once in vogue when their definitions were accepted as "good English." They reject the modern American term "*Gospel offer*", even though it was an acceptable term used by their forefathers prior to the revisions of Andrew Fuller and company after 1782. They understand the word "offer" to mean "*held forth in the Gospel*," as their forefathers, in 1795, explained it, and cannot now use such a misleading term (See Appendix B: on Revision of The Catechism) They believe the *Gospel* is inclusive of the full work of the eternal Godhead in the salvation of elect sinners; not segments of loose-jointed Scriptures used to produce spiritual life in totally depraved and dead sinners. They seldom use the term "saving faith," although they understand what their forefathers, such as John Gill, meant by it. Since the Fullerite revision of Biblical terms is now used, in that the *ACT of faith* is thought to be saving, they prefer to insist that Christ's faith born in the *new creature* within is a better term because Christ Himself is the Savior of sinners. Nor do they accept the modern definition of "evangelism," or "evangelical." They prefer the term "*itinerate*", or "*itinerancy*," for by that definition their ministers propagated the Gospel of redeeming grace everywhere, long, long before any mission movement or *missionary society* was ever formed. They accept the recommendation of their forefathers, in 1792, to wit:

"16. Queries from the church at Great Valley: Are the words *bishop* and *elder* of the same meaning in the writings of the

apostles? Yes. This association, therefore, recommend that the terms pastors, bishop and elders, as used in our Confession of Faith, be *adopted*." (Philadelphia Baptist Association, 1792, page 283: Also: "Elders Patten, Clingan and Vaughan, agree to travel for three months in the ensuing year about Juniata and the West Branch of Susquehanna, to preach the Gospel to the destitute. (*ibid.*) The churches of the association financially helped, as did the hearers. (There are no longer in the Church the apostolic offices of *Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists*.)

The author does not confuse the word "*responsibility*" with the word "*accountability*." Two very capable men, David Engelsma (Protestant Reform Church) and George Ella (English/German author), used the terms interchangeably, - which is all right in the context of their dispute - but this people believe in the Sovereignty of God and the *accountability* of man. However, in no wise can they accept that man is able to *act without guidance or superior authority; or being the source or cause of something; nor capable of making moral or rational decisions on one's own, and therefore answerable only to himself* - all of which are covered by the definition of the word "*responsibility*" in the United States. (See: Chapter on Sovereignty of God and Human Accountability.) In the past, John Gill and others used the term correctly in those pre-Fuller times. Today, writers in the United States set forth a contradiction between *sovereignty* and *responsibility*, and insist that all men must accept both views, or they become some kind of heretic. If Hyper-calvinists are some kind of "heretic," at least they are logically *consistent* "heretics"! But also sound Biblical believers.

The first recorded false doctrine preached on earth was the doctrine of the *free moral agency of man*, and it was preached by the Serpent to our mother Eve. "*Thou shalt not surely die,*" said he. "*Thou will become as God, knowing good and evil.*" As God: A free moral Being! In other words, "You will no longer be in subjection to God and accountable to Him. You

will become as He, knowing both good and evil and fully *responsible* for your own conduct! You will no longer be answerable to Him." She believed the lie, embraced it fully, and acted upon it. And to this day her offspring are deluded by that old Serpent into believing they are *free and moral and agents*, and boast in their *responsibility*. Worse, they ridicule those who know that their will is not free, and that they are not moral agents of anyone, and own that they are fully *accountable* to God for their own deportment.

The second recorded false doctrine was preached the same day, on the same occasion, but by Adam instead of the Devil. His doctrine was that *God is the Author of Sin*. "*The woman THOU GAVE TO BE WITH ME gave to me, and I did eat.*" No remorse, no repentance, and a most reluctant confession, if it can be called such. "It is your fault, God. You indirectly made me to do it. You are the author of my sin." These two doctrines are imbedded within their offspring to this day. If one says, "I believe in Predestination", almost every Pelagian or Neo-Calvinist will immediately and spontaneously respond: "Oh, you don't believe in the responsibility of man, do you?" Or, "Oh, you make God the Author of Sin." The latter response may also be had from many Hyper-calvinists as well. And today, some are likely to say: "You are a Hyper-calvinist!" Or, "You are an antinomian!" or something worse. This whole subject will be covered in-depth in Chapter Ten.

When modern definitions replace biblical ones, the Church must be exceedingly aware of the danger of adopting the innovations, for Satan's primary design is to thereby deceive the unwary. In time, the new definitions will lead to new innovations based upon them; and those who adhere to the biblical definition and consequent practices will be scorned and vilified as "old fogies," "antinomians," "hard-shells," and any other *euphemism* thought appropriate by the innovators. Everything in this book is proof of this assertion.

One of the greatest differences between the evangelical

Calvinists and those whom they deride as "Hyper-calvinists," is the evangelical Calvinists believe Arminians and Pelagians are otherwise sound "*Christians*," and refer to them as *their brothers and sisters*. The Hyper-calvinists believe that as long as one is unconverted from his natural freewill state by the operation of the Spirit of God, and converted to the free grace of God by the Gospel of the grace of God, there is insufficient evidence to consider such as a "Christian," or a "brother or sister." This is not to say that they consign them to hell - that is not their desire, for by their own experience they understand that before that gracious divine call out of darkness, they, too, were "*vessels of wrath even as others*." Arminians and Pelagians are as much in need of the Gospel as any other "heathen" or pagan - all of whom are "freewillers." Calvinists would do well to "evangelize" their Arminian or Pelagian "brothers and sisters." Another difference is that the Hyper-calvinists believe the salvation wrought out by Christ is ***an already accomplished and completed salvation***; whereas the Calvinists and Arminians believe that the *plan of salvation* is already designed, the blank places for the elect's name are to be filled out when they believe the plan applies to them. Finally, let it be noted that when God is pleased to use a scholar, He will raise one up and give him life and light, a gracious experience, and send him forth to defend the honor of His Word by preaching Christ's finished work. Such were men as Paul, Luther, Calvin, Owens, Goodwin, Gill, Huntington, Philpot, Beebe, Trott, Dudley, Johnson, Smoot and a host of others too numerous to list here. At present, there is a need evident in modern religions for such men, and God has and will raise men up to present the free grace of God according to their gifts and abilities so long as the Church's need for these benefits are still on earth. The writer does not agree with all that any of these men taught - although he agrees more with Gill, Beebe, Johnson, Dudley, Trott and Smoot - but he does respect such men in their efforts as George Ella, Randalls, Robbins (deceased) and others now defending



the truth of free grace experimentally believed.

The writer recommends that the reader use the Appendix and Glossary provided. Most are historical documents or articles and definitions related to the historic Christian faith as held forth by Strict, Particular and Old School Baptists in early America. In our use of the word "*Hyper-calvinists*," standard we use for these people are particularly those in the United States among Baptists. In England, we think of many Strict and Particular Baptists and in the United States the Protestant Reformed Churches. However, we wish to be clear that we are not using the term derogatively, but as a synonym for historical Christianity; nor do we speak for these whose doctrine we agree is Biblical. They can speak much better for themselves. There are vast differences in beliefs among the various groups of Pelagians Evangelicals; so too, there are differences among these people holding to the historical Christian faith called Hyper-calvinists. We must begin somewhere, so we begin with historical Christianity as the standard for "Hyper-calvinism."

## INTRODUCTION

There has been much written on Calvinism, Arminianism, and Pelagianism over the past century. Little or nothing, *definitively*, has been written on "Hyper-calvinism," yet the term is utilized repeatedly by each of the above groups as a *euphemism* against a large number of Calvinistic and consistent believers. This work is a *definitive*, as well as an *offensive* presentation of "**Hyper-calvinism**," by one who is not ashamed to be scorned as such. Up front, the writer will state that he, nor the people he defends, care to be called "Calvinists" or "Hyper-calvinists," and **these terms** are seldom used by them in reference to themselves or the faith in which they believe so ardently. What others deem to call "*Hyper-calvinism*" is called "**Christianity**" by those who are taught by the Spirit these

precious truths; and those believing these truths consider any works, or partial works systems, as Antichristianity. Nevertheless, it is necessary to use such terms, since this work is written in the framework of a theological debate.

The most often expressed fallacious charges made against the doctrinal position called "*Hyper-calvinism*" are as follows:

1. Hyper-calvinists are anti-evangelical -
2. Hyper-calvinists do not believe in preaching the Gospel-
3. Hyper-calvinists do not believe in preaching the Gospel to sinners-
4. Hyper-calvinists do not believe in duty-faith -
5. Hyper-calvinists do not believe in soul-winning -
6. Hyper-calvinists are *antinomianians*-
7. Hyper-calvinists do not believe in human responsibility-
8. Hyper-calvinists believe babies go to hell "not a span long."-
9. Hyper-calvinists believe that "when God gets ready to save someone, He will do it without any help from you or me"-
10. Hyper-calvinist are "Hardshells"-
11. Some Unique Beliefs of American Hyper-calvinists-

The above are the points this work will defend or controvert. To the writer's knowledge, no one in this century has attempted to answer the Hyper-calvinists' adversaries *specifically* and *consistently* on all these euphemisms. If the reader completes this book and understands what Hyper-calvinists believe, then its *definitive* purpose has been successful. If a reader is a Neo-Calvinist (Hypo-calvinist), Arminian, or a Pelagian, and completes the book without being challenged, the *offensive* design of this work failed miserably! While it is desired that the work be edifying and instructive to a quickened sinner whose trust is in God alone; nevertheless, it will not be gentle and apathetic

relative to contemporary antichristian doctrines. Thus, the writer must forewarn the reader that at times the roughness of the *offensive* purpose may be offending to some sensitive readers; but the author feels it is necessary to *contrast* issues in dispute. Regrettably, such a definitive work cannot ignore *opposing* view-points. We request the reader to bear with the discomforts felt to be useful at times.

***Definition of terms as used by this writer in this work:***

**Calvinism:** "The religious doctrine of the Christian faith, as articulated first, by Jesus, Paul, and other Apostles; by the Protestant Reformers of the Sixteenth Century, especially emphasized by John Calvin and the early Reformers, holding to salvation of the elect by God's grace through "faith alone;" Or, "The system of faith holding that salvation is all of God's free grace, and not of any of the works of man." More specifically, Calvinism has often been summarized in five major doctrinal theses. (1) The total depravity and inability of man to cooperate in his own salvation - **T**; (2) Unconditional election and predestination of the elect unto salvation - **U**; (3) Limited Atonement or particular redemption of all the elect of God when Christ died - **L**; Irresistible grace or effectual calling of all the redeemed elect - **I**; Perseverance and preservation of all the elect through grace to eternal happiness - **P**; or, often referred to as "The **TULIP DOCTRINE**."

**Hyper-calvinism:** "A system of belief which embraces Calvinism, and extends the Reformation further toward New Testament Christianity than the Sixteenth Century reforms were able to achieve; especially in church governance and Gospel ordinances. The unique distinction between Hyper--calvinism and Calvinism is that the Hyper-calvinists believe that Christ **saved** (past tense) all His elect by His sacrificial

atonement; that the Holy Spirit gives spiritual life, by the implantation of the "incorruptible seed," the living word of God, **without human instrumentality**; and that the Gospel is a **publication** of glad tidings, rather than an *invitation* to all men, both elect and reprobates, to "accept Christ as their Savior"; and that the application of this salvation is by the Holy Spirit exclusively, when He brings "*life and immortality to light by the Gospel*;" and that this Gospel is to be preached by God-called and qualified ministers to *whomsoever God is pleased to send them*." Hyper-calvinism is basically the "Calvinism" of the historic Particular Baptists' faith prior to the rise of Andrew Fuller's "Neo-Calvinism" (Hypo-calvinism) revision in 1782.

In the southern States of the United States, Hyper-calvinism is more frequently termed "Hardshellism." "Hardshellism" is a term derived from the Nineteenth Century Particular Baptists' debates with the followers of Andrew Fuller's school of "new divinity", when Hyper-calvinists insisted that "He **shall** save His people from their sins," "They **shall** hear His voice," "They **shall** follow Him," and "They **shall** all be taught of the Lord," etc. The Fullerites called these "those **hard shall**." Eventually, Noah Webster included the phrase "hard shall" in the dictionary as "Hardshell". If one looked this word up in the dictionary, he would be rather surprised!

Among the rank and file of the citizenry, "Hyper-calvinism" is seldom used. The term "Hardshell" embraces anyone holding to *Holy Spirit* begetting, or quickening to life *without human instrumentality*, rather than Gospel, decisional, or baptismal regeneration. It is applied to any of the numerous Old School Baptists and Presbyterian groups which hold to the Sovereignty of God. In fact, some Missionary Baptists are classified as "Hardshells," for rejecting Gospel regeneration.

**Neo-Calvinism:** "Another name for "Hypo-calvinism". "A religious system closely related to Calvinism, with strong tenets of Arminianism and Pelagianism intermixed." They are *revisionist Calvinists*, following elements of the teachings of Andrew Fuller, a Particular Baptist minister in England, who in 1782 began to advocate that Christ's atonement, was *general* and redemption was *particular*. That is, that Christ's atonement was *sufficient* for the salvation of all mankind; but *efficient* for the elect only; that Christ's atonement did not save anyone, but merely put all mankind, both elect and reprobates, in a *saveable state* where the *influences of the Gospel* could reach them. The introduction of Fullerism among Baptists produced a separation in that people between the Hyper-calvinists of the "Old School" of divinity, and the Neo-Calvinists of the "New School" of divinity, between 1813 and 1845\*. The "New School" called their "free offer system" "Missionary," or "Evangelical." The position of this work is that it is neither missionary, nor "evangelical."

**Arminianism:** "An opposing system of religion to Calvinism, developed in 1608 by James Jacobus Arminius, a Dutch theologian in the Reform Church. Arminius modified the "Five Points of Calvinism" at Dort, in such a way as to deny them, and made the atonement of Christ *in general* for all mankind; taught that the elect could fall from grace and finally be lost." Today, there are few, if any, Arminians left in the United States. The whole crew has down-graded into a paganistic form of Pelagianism or, Absolute Freewillism.

**Freewillism:** "Any number of religions that deify the will of man, advocating that the human will is freely motivating, and the determinate cause of salvation."

**Pelagianism:** "A system of religion promoted by the Third Century Catholic heretic, Pelagius, which denied original sin,

the total depravity of man, unconditional election and predestination, and based salvation on the 'freewill' of man. (Does this sound familiar?) It is the commonly accepted religious faith of all Antichristian denominations in Western society. Basically, it is the corner-stone of the Antichrist. The Modern form of Pelagianism developed directly out of Andrew Fuller's Neo-calvinism. Pelagianism is another name for Freewillism; or '*natural religion*' based upon a mental decision for salvation in the absence of an effectual call by the Spirit and the **finished salvation** of Christ by His shed-blood of Calvary. It is best described as a "*system of easy-decisionism*," or "decisional regeneration."

**Without apology, this is a Hyper-calvinistic presentation.** The author can find no just reason to be ashamed of the peculiar distinction of New Testament Christianity, merely because the carnal mind cannot receive it. It is the original faith of the Particular, or Old School Baptists in the United States. Being somewhat simplistic, the term "Hyper-calvinism," is given various definitions, but the prefix "hyper," means "going beyond," "extreme," or "above." This is exactly what those ridiculed as "Hyper-calvinists" must do to be consistent with the New Testament faith. John Calvin was a highly useful and gifted servant of God, and it is noteworthy that he pressed the Reformation closer to New Testament Christianity than did Martin Luther. They, with other faithful men, were **predestinarians to the man**, and their reformation almost destroyed the tyrannical power of superstitious Rome; and freed the minds and spirits of men in Western Europe, setting the stage for the liberating Renaissance Age. It is not to disparage the usefulness or truthfulness of John Calvin, nor of Calvinism that this work is offered to the public; but to inform interested people that there is a Biblical position which extends the Reformation "beyond," or "above," that of John

Calvin in the Sixteenth Century. Calvin never set himself up to be the Vicar of Christ, or Protestant Pope; nor did his own followers esteem him as such. Most had enough of popery! He was a faithful minister of the Gospel of Christ according to the light given him, and his ministration helped to produce a reformation. **Hyper-calvinists are those who have continued basically upon those cardinal Christian principles advocated by Christ, Paul, James, Peter, John and Jude, as well as John Calvin, yet, being smaller in number than Calvinists and Lutherans, were able to press the reforms much closer to the New Testament model than the larger bodies of "Christians."**

Hyper-calvinists, as a people, have willingly been outside the mainstream of Protestant Christianity since the rise of the Arminian "evangelical movement" of the Nineteenth Century. The evangelical movement's emphasis on humanism, scholasticism, theological evolution, and the social Gospel, marked it as a philosophical Liberalism repugnant to Hyper-calvinists, who by divine quickening grace are rather reactionary, being bound by a "*Thus saith the Lord*" for all they believe and practice in religious devotion. Not only are the Hyper-calvinists' reforms "beyond" Calvinism in church governance and Gospel ordinances, but also in its historical development. The best known contribution of the Hyper-calvinists is the **mode of baptism**, by immersion, or dipping under water, of believers of sufficient age as to articulate their experience of grace to a church. For this specific cause, they were severely persecuted by other bodies of "Christians" in former ages; but in the end, won that theological debate. Also, among Baptists, the Fullerites' movement coincided with other massive world movements and trends; whereas the Hyper-calvinists institutions remain more static. To notice but few of these trends:

During the Colonial Period, the various colonies were each *independent* of each other, each answering to the Crown; yet,

they were *interdependent* in trade and commerce. So, too, during this period, the churches were *independent* of each other, yet *interdependent* with each other, and answerable to their King, the Lord Jesus.

With the formation of a weak national Confederation government, where the States no longer answered to the Crown, but were loosely joined to each other; so, too, the churches began freeing themselves from the authority of God over them, modifying their doctrines and practices, and forming themselves into loose "*corresponding orders*" or "fellowships".

With the formation of the strong "Federal" union, nationally, the Fullerite "Evangelicals" began to form State and National Conventions- that is, **Federal** religious organizations.

Following the War for Southern Independence, the National government moved into a period of *Imperialism*, and the Fullerites developed a World Baptists Alliance and foreign missionary societies to complement the imperial age.

Simultaneous with the rise of socialist societies, beginning just prior to 1800, and reaching their international union in 1918; the Fullerite "Evangelical" movement among Baptists (also formed on May 14, 1814) became "Ultra-Liberal" and also tyrannical. Just as the world follows trends, so too do the "evangelicals." They are, as a people, "*toss to and fro by every wind of doctrine*" and novelty. The second article of their Articles of Faith is the same as that of the Hyper-calvinists groups of Baptists. "We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the Word of God and the "**only rule of faith and practice.**" Obviously, they no longer are bound by the Word of God for *either* their faith *or* their practice.

On the other hand, Hyper-calvinists' church structure is still as simple as it was in the Colonial period. They have no modern extra-scriptural auxiliaries, programs, or financial institutions. They are not financial institutions, seldom take up collections, and never hire personale. Their primary and exclusive emphasis is on the "foolishness of preaching to save



*them that believe.*" It is their experience that the "preaching of the Gospel" edifies the inner spiritual man, (new man, or new creature) and is instrumental in cleansing one's conscience from daily defilement in his walk and conversation. The central focus of their devotion is the sermon; through which the minister teaches, admonishes, and rebukes with all long-suffering and gentleness when either of these are called for within congregations.

In presenting this work, a comparison of the two major religions of mankind will be given first. Following, a presentation of Calvinism, Neo and Hyper-calvinism will compare and contrast their positions; to whom the Gospel is to be preached; duty-faith-unto-salvation; soul-winning; anti-nomianism; Spurgeonism (a term coined by Ian Murray) ; and the full and complete redemption of God's people by the sacrifice of Christ. The uniqueness of Hyper-calvinists will end the discussion in Chapter Ten and the conclusion.

May it please God that some quickened and sensible sinner finds joy and peace with the contemplation that salvation is **finished**, and by our glorious Savior, Jesus Christ.

## **(A) - INTRODUCTION OF HERESY AND ITS REACTION**

The founder of the *Modern Missionary Movement* among Baptists, Mr. Andrew Fuller, wrote the following to a close friend boasting of the change among the Baptists that he had introduced:

**"When I first published my treatise on the nature of faith, and the duty of all men who hear the gospel to believe it, the Christian profession had sunk into contempt amongst us; inasmuch that had matters gone on but a few years longer, the Baptists would have become a perfect dunghill in society."**- Andrew

Fuller.

It is well to ask, after over two centuries of his new development, whether Andrew Fuller *transformed*, *reformed*, or ***deformed*** his people and hastened their apostasy? Surely, no *Free Grace believer* can believe that the large Evangelical denominations today are as morally upright and doctrinally sound as they were prior to dragging naturally depraved members into their congregations. The most practical outcome of Fuller/Spurgeon's "*free offer decisionism*" system has been a moral catastrophe to religion, morals, and society!

The time period in which Fuller wrote was that of the giants among Baptists and Independents. These were the days of such men as John Gill, John Brine, Abraham Booth, Tobias Crisp, and the unsurpassed Methodists, William Huntington and James Harvey! Dr. Booth ably answered Fuller's charge, and so did William Rushton. Mr. Rushton's reply was very appropriate:

"Strong and pointed language indeed!" he said of the above quote. "Yet it must really be confessed that this was in a great measure the case. The truth is, that the principles maintained at that time by the Baptists, were such as to render them odious to the public. They never could maintain those principles inviolably, and at the same time be generally esteemed a respectable body by professing Christians. They were distinctly forewarned by the Lord Himself, that they should be hated of all men for His sake; that if they kept His words the world would hate them, even as it hated Him. If the doctrine He taught caused the Master of the house to be despised and rejected of men: if, for the same cause, the apostles were esteemed as the filth of the world, "the off scouring of all things," what right had these Baptists to complain, if,

while holding in their measure the same truth, their professions become contemptible, and their churches considered a perfect dunghill in society? Complain! No, it was the *highest honor* they were capable of in this life. If to them it was given on the behalf of Christ, not only to believe in Him, but also to suffer for His sake, they ought to have rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for His name. And I doubt not many of them did."

Dr. John Gill, when declaring his determination to go on preaching a *free and finished salvation* in the face of all opposition, adds, "I am not afraid of the reproaches of men; I have been inured [to make used to something undesirable, esp. by prolonged subjection.] to these things from my youth upward, but none of these things move me."

As the above can be said of Hyper-calvinists in Gill's day, so it can yet be said of them in this day. The motives for the Fullerites' attack then, remain the same to this day. Ishmael, the son of the bondwoman persecuted Isaac, the son of the free woman. Natural religionists still despise the spiritual religion of Jesus. It was the Fullerite revisionists - the Neo-calvinists - who attempted to stigmatize those who then preached a *full, free and accomplished salvation* as "Hyper-calvinists," claiming that they (the Neo-calvinists) themselves were the "true Calvinists." Today, in the current "battle for Gospel preaching," (Using Ian Murray's language,) it is yet the Fullerite Neo-calvinists who hurl the euphemism "hyper-calvinism" at Christians! In fact, they charge everyone who disagrees with their own specific views as "Hyper-calvinists" - even those who are not! But Calvin, to this writer's research, never held that Christ died equally for the reprobates as for the elect! Nor that the eternal God "wanted to save all men"! He certainly did not hold to "the universal love of God for all mankind;" let alone that God merely put all mankind in a *savable state* where the Gospel

influence could reach them all! Can anyone who has read any of Calvin's works conclude he had so lost his mind? Calvin was a great thinker, and knowledgeable of the Scriptures, and being thus, he would have been mystified by such a theory of mutual contradictions! His mind was too great to stoop to the simplistic irrational arguments of today's Neo-calvinists – arguments so simplistic they appear downright silly, or imbecilic. The truth is, the Particular Baptists prior to Andrew Fuller's novel evangelical (so-called) system were what Neo-calvinists now called "Hyper-calvinists." And they have, without a break in continuity, remained so to this day! We said "so-caled," because those they charge with Hyper-calvinism in a derogative manner were far more "evangelical" in the Biblical propagation of the Gospel than Andrew Fuller, William Carey, William Stroughton or Luther Rice. The proof "is in the pudding:" See the large number of Strict and Particular Baptists in England and the Predestinarian Old School Baptists in America, which remain the only bodies today still contending for the Gospel of Christ. [We exclude all Arminians simply because what they preach is in no wise the Gospel of salvation by the finished work of Christ.]

Again, it was the Fullerite, or Neo-calvinist faction among Baptists, who changed their denominational name to "Missionary," and/or "Evangelical", and introduced the then unheard of innovations to make their new-found "free offer system" *operative*. Thus, by modifying their doctrine to accommodate the "*world of the ungodly that perish*," they also had to modify their *practices* to fit the novel system. In short, they apostatized the "*faith once delivered to the saints*," necessitating the abandoning the New Testament order of the Gospel. They quickly inaugurated a steady stream of very creative gimmicks to "save souls" that Christ had not saved; build personality cults around persons with high-sounding titles; collect money, money, and more money, as one serious appeal: "Would you give a bowl of rice to save a soul?" Then,

instead of asking you to send a package of rice, they asked that you send money for them to buy the package of rice! (The Baptists Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions had to quietly place Luther Rice in a position where he could not get his sticky fingers in the till! It was too embarrassing to their noble cause! – see the comments by David Benedict on page \_\_\_\_\_) And,



they built larger and larger organizations, and sub-divisions thereof, under their centralized control. Such were the first organizational principles of Rome. It worked for them! Why not for the "evangelicals", or Missionaries?

These Nineteenth Century Neo-calvinists rapidly became Arminians; and just as quickly these Arminians became Freewillers. From about 1800 to 1850, they were Neo-Calvinist revisionists. Between 1850 and 1880, they were more Arminian than Neo-Calvinists. Between 1880's and 1900 they were full-fledged Pelagians (believers in salvation by the freewill of dead alien sinners). To be unkind, but truthful, they really ceased being "Christians" at all. They are a relatively modern religion today. Look at their brief development:

The first Arminian sermon preached among the Baptists in the South was preached by Reuben Ross, in 1820, at Port Royal, Tennessee. A committee of ministers was sent to talk to him, and he converted them to freewillism! In his Biography, J. M. Pendleton wrote that Ross said he wanted to purchase John Gill's Body Of Divinity, but that it cost too much. So, instead, he purchased Andrew Fuller's "*Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation*." He bought the book of lesser value and procured a religion of no value for quickened sinners! (See Chapter Ten).

Reuben Ross had migrated west from the Kehukee Baptists Association in North Carolina. His uncle was a minister in that body. Reuben converted his uncle to Arminianism, and Martin Ross introduced Arminianism into that body just at the time the Fullerites were attempting to

introduced their *mission auxiliaries* in that body. The two novelties, introduced together, alerted those faithful brethren that Arminianism was at the root of Fuller's Neo-Calvinism. In 1825, the two movements were introduced, and in 1826-1827, the Kehukee Baptist Association withdrew all fellowship and communion from the Neo-Calvinists, following the example set by Baptists in Illinois and other places. This action alerted American Baptists everywhere that a flood of heresies was sweeping the continent, producing a frenzy of excitement all over the frontier. [There were frequent schemes of men, women, children, foaming at the mouth, barking up trees as dogs, rolling on the ground in fits, and every known heresy of religion being articulated.] Between 1832 and 1845, the Great Baptists' Separation took place. The Hyper-calvinists rid themselves of the leaven; and the Neo-calvinists were cut loose to drift into the dismal abyss of Pelagianism. Today, Freewillism, or salvation by magical incantations of half-quoted passages of Scriptures, is the basis of their "easy-decisionism" and "decisional regeneration."

Now the Battle for Gospel preaching (as Ian Murray called it) was begun in earnest. The Neo-calvinists quickly learned that the ignorant masses did not take well to sound doctrine, so they toned the doctrines down to make them acceptable enough to the carnal, or natural mind. "*Means and measures*" became the conditions of acceptance with God, and all were exhorted to go to work for the Lord, using these "means and measures" to save lost and dying souls. But it was never enough! The process continued downward into the abyss of infidelity to this day, and the Scripture was fulfilled:

*"For the time will come when they will not endure **sound doctrine**; but after their own **lusts** shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" (II Tim. 4:3,4.)*

They wanted very much to "win the **world** to Christ." . . and they did win it to their "churches!" But this *world* was a world born **freewill**, and as they were, so they remained - "**freewill**." That is, in an **unconverted** religious state. The world joined the church while the so-called churches joined the world. The former distinctions between the two were erased.

The New School developed psychological methods which were proven to be successful on **natural** men in their unconverted natural state; and they filled their societies with what they term - "carnal Christians." Can one imagine anyone begging a child of God to "**Let** Jesus be your Lord, now that you have **let** Him come into your heart"! Yet these ministers feel it necessary to so address those they have coerced into their assemblies. Think about it - why?

By the secular movement known as the "Progressive Era," humanism and altruism had gained the foothold in former Neo-calvinists circles, and what Charles Spurgeon referred to as "*the Down-Grade*" (reference to railroad beds down very steep mountain slopes whereby run-a-way trains were sometimes affected,) produced a run-a-way theology among New School Baptists! The Old School Baptists continued to preach the Gospel of the free grace of God and a finished salvation, and left the New School still drifting. "*Leave them alone,*" they said, as Jesus did, "*they be blind leaders of the blind; and if the blind lead the blind they both shall fall into the ditch.*"

The former Neo-calvinists, now Pelagian freewillers, "preached another Gospel," or one Paul called a "perverted gospel" – (Galatians 1:7 and 11 Cor. 11:4). Among them the truth of free grace was now altogether **gone**: no longer to be heard in the vast number of so-called "Evangelical" societies. Here and there a few Calvinists would rise up and preach the Gospel, but it was never popular, and they were ridiculed. Often, they were driven out of their denominations and entered the ranks of the Hyper-calvinist churches. This was particularly

true during the period ending the "Down-Grade" issue in the 1880's. Many Hyper-calvinists' churches date from 1885 to - 1905, as large numbers of *Free Grace believers* left the Evangelical groups, and opened fellowship with the Old School groups. The largest number of "free grace" churches among Baptists has always been the Hyper-calvinist churches. Not only so, but they have never drifted into Arminianism or Pelagianism, and then back to Calvinism. Most present-day "Calvinist" churches can date their constitution after 1950. They sometimes follow a preacher out of a denomination into an independent and Calvinistic position, and then rapidly lose their former vigor and go back into Freewillism, or a modified "four-point" Calvinism holding to the universal love of God for all mankind. Once back home, they remained steadfastly what they were! They come and go, as waves dashing upon the shores of time. Today they are here, and tomorrow they are gone.

## **(B) - TWO RELIGIONS: NATURAL AND SPIRITUAL**

The above historical sketch reveals two very distinct religions. In fact, they represent the only *two types* of religions known to the race of Man. The rest of this chapter is devoted to an examination of natural religion, which saves none of its devotees; and revealed religion, which concerns all the saved children of God. To the reader, this presentation should be carefully reflected on and examined.

First, before the creation of the earth, or the formation of the first man, the Eternal Godhead, in counsel with itself, scanned their own eternal Mind, or Decree, and selected one person from the whole race of man to be formed, and joined that single man, the seed of Abraham, of the family of David, and the son of Mary, and united him in an interstitial union with the Eternal Godhead - the God-Man, the Person of the Christ in the Godhead, and simultaneously elected all His seed, **in seed-**



**substance** to be His body and bride, that He might be the Head of His body, the Church. By this **eternal and vital union**, the Father in the Godhead became the "Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," and the Son in the Godhead became the "only begotten of God," while at the same time, they are Co-Eternal and Co-Equal; that is: One in an Interstial Union. The Father "*chose His people in Him (Christ) before the foundation of the world.*" Christ is very God, and very Man: the God-Man that He might lay down His life for His seed, and raise it up again. "*Behold My Servant, whom I uphold; Mine Elect, in whom My soul delighteth; I have put My Spirit upon Him: He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles ... I the Lord have called Thee in righteousness, and will hold Thine hand, and will keep Thee, and give Thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles.*" (Isaiah 42:1,6). And, "*My **substance** was not hid from Thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see **My substance**, yet being unperfect; and in Thy book all **My members** were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as **yet there was none of them.***" (Psalm 139:15,16) And, again, "*According as He hath chosen us IN HIM before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love.*" (Eph. 1:4) Once and again, these elect, or chosen ones, are referred to as "**His seed**", for they were chosen IN HIM, and the Life they receive later in regeneration is "**eternal** Life," for it was **in Him** before their creation in Adam's seed. "*When Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see **His seed**, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.*" (Isaiah 53:10,11. See also Isaiah 1:4; 14:20; Isaiah 6:13; 45:25; 54:3; 61:9; Romans 4:16; 9:8; Galatians 3:16; I Peter 1:23; and I John 3:9)

Those that were *not chosen* in Christ in the morn of eternity are also referred to a seed. They are the "**seed of evil doers.**" (Isaiah 1:4; 14:20). "Jesus said of them: "*Ye are of your*

*father the devil and the deeds of your father ye will do."* This is not to say that they are non-religious. Man by nature is religious through and through. He was formed that way. But religion and salvation are entirely two different things. There is vastly more religion than there is salvation!

The two religions can be characterized in this way by contrast: One is natural and the other spiritual. One is of *free grace*, while the other is *free will*. One is *simple*, and the other very *elaborate and ritualistic*. One is *true*, and the other a *delusion*. One is *by revelation* by the Spirit, and the other is *by education and indoctrination*. One is *of God*, and the other is "*doctrines of devils*." One is *from heaven*, and the other is of the *earth*. One embraces an *elect and chosen people* redeemed by the blood of Christ, and the other embraces the *reprobate seed of the wicked*. One is by *grace only* and the other by *works or some mixture of grace and works* which is ineffectual.

These two religions show up in the very first family on earth. One was Abel's religion and the other was Cain's religion. Both these religions have simultaneous origins in Adam's first offspring; and they will each culminate, eventually, into the "Perfect Man," Jesus Christ in glory; and the "Man of Sin" in damnation. So let us examine these ancient religions.

Adam's first son tilled the earth. He was a farmer, or husbandman, making his living by the sweat of his brow. His name was Cain. (In Hebrew, his name means "to procure," to be "fixed in place," - or not a pilgrim - "to own," and "to strike," as with a lance violently). Cain's name is fully consistent with the modern Pelagian or freewill religion today.

His second son was Abel. He was a gentle shepherd, and even this early he typified Christ, the Lamb of God, for He was an innocent substitute for guilty sinners. (His name in the Hebrew means "emptiness.") His name is characteristic of the humility and spiritual poverty found in all God's regenerate children when they are made to seek for

righteousness in themselves; or in their efforts, to justify themselves before a just and holy God. They are completely empty of any righteousness of their own making.

"*Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord.*" Here is Cain's religion: (1) He thought it would please the Lord God for him to present the works of his own hands as an offering for his sins. That was perfectly logical to him. What could be wrong with that? That is salvation *by works*. Work is what a man *does*. That, too, is the doctrine of our modern-day Pelagian freewill religion.

"There can't possibly be anything wrong with that. You are supposed to!" It was the underlying principle of Cain's devotion. (2) On a somewhat more positive side, Cain had a higher principled religion than is often found today. That is, he at least recognized that he must make an offering to the Lord. Today, many believe that God must offer Jesus to the sinner to accept or reject. The Scripture teaches that the "lesser is blest of the better." (Hebrews 7:7). Modern freewillers also teach that the *dead, lifeless* sinner (the lesser) must *give* his corrupt heart to Jesus, (the better). Invariably they teach that one "must accept Christ as his Savior;" when in reality, the sinner needs *to be accepted* in the Beloved! (Ephesians 1:6.) As it is written, "*To the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made us accepted in the Beloved.*" Man, in himself, is totally unacceptable in his own corrupt and condemned nature. (3) Cain's offering was of the earth. Man's religion, antecedently, to regeneration, based on his own works is as himself: "Of the earth, earthy." (I Corinthians 15:48.)

Notice the results of Cain's work-based religion: (a) Cain believed in making an offering of his own *devising*. Modern religions freely "invent" anything they please with which to worship God. If it sounds like a "good idea," that is the only justification needed to introduce it. It is immaterial to them whether God has commanded it, forbidden it, or said nothing at all about it! (b) Cain showed some natural remorse over his sin

(Gen.4:13-14.), which indicates an understanding of its sinfulness. Modern natural religion accepts remorse, or a pretended remorse, as being the same as repentance. (c) God "*had no respect unto Cain nor his offering.*" One can almost hear: "That ain't fair!" "God is not a respecter of persons!" (d) He was given over to judgment, which judgment resulted in the murder of his brother. He hated his brother only because his brother's religion was accepted and his was not. By instinctive nature false religionists always despise free *grace* believers. It is as Paul stated: "*But as then he that was born of the flesh, persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now.*" (Galatians 4:29.)

Cain's co-religionists of today arrogantly charge God with unfairness if He has respect for Abel and Abel's offering, and those of that ancient faith. But let such reply against God and His clear declaration in His revealed Word. (Galatians 4:4.) Their enmity does not in the least change God nor His inspired Word. Needless to say, Cain's religion, which is embraced perhaps by as high as 99.9% of all present-day religious societies, is in a thriving condition. And well it should be. For the time has already come when "*men will not endure sound doctrine;*" when "*knowledge shall increase, and the love of many wax cold,*" for the inspired Word is now fulfilled in that regard. The doctrine of Cain's freewill, work-mongering religion, will invariably appeal to men who are by nature born "freewillers" and it can be accepted by them naturally without a conversion experience. They just "make a decision" and remain what they were before: **freewillers!**

The other religion- that of Abel is a "*free grace*" religion; as opposed to the "freewill" religion of Cain. Abel, the gentle shepherd, also "*brought of the firstling of his flock and the fat thereof*" (If Cain, the oldest son, did not know to do this, then how did Abel acquire such an understanding? Surely it had to have been revealed to him!) "*And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering.*" (Genesis 4:4) In examining the

religion of Abel, one discovers: (a) He believed it was necessary for him to make a blood-offering; - a sinless substitute for his own guilty and sin-laden soul. Right here, Hyper-calvinists are made to understand that Christ was a **true substitute**, bearing the sins of His people in Himself, and thus putting them away then - not when one is given to believe it! They understand that in every respect what is due to the guilty sinner is afflicted upon the innocent Substitute fully, and that the justice of God is completely satisfied, and the guilty sinner fully atoned for and thereby **already legally saved**. In other words, the imputation of Abel's sins upon the head of the innocent Sacrificial Victim put the Victim to death, even though it was Abel who had sinned. His offering prefigured the most vital aspect of the Gospel of Christ. Take away all external aspects of the Christian's hope, but let this stand, and salvation is secured to such guilty sinners as are covered by that blood-offering. Hence, **Christ, not the messengers, is the sin-bearer for the sins of all His elect seed**. Their sins were imputed to Him, and He died really for them; in return, His own righteousness is imputed to these *redeemed sinners*, and they are actually made righteous and eternally saved thereby. **This transaction was accomplished and completed about two-thousand years ago ...** not when they hear about it, and believe that it is so.

(b) Abel's religion was not of the earth as Cain's; nor was it of works, as was Cain's. Only by revelation could he have so accurately prefigured the glorious redemption by the shed-blood of Christ for His elect people. Abel trusted for his salvation in a blood-offering which testified to the truth that *"without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin."* (Hebrews 9:22) And, *"Now where remission of these (sins) is, there is no more an offering for sin."* (Hebrews 10:18). At this point, notice a basic difference between Neo-calvinists and Hyper-calvinists among Baptists: The Neo-calvinists ignore the **remission of sins** by Christ's shed blood. They wrongly

attribute remission to natural **faith and repentance**, *i.e.*, "If you will repent and believe, God will put away your sins." Hyper-calvinists recognize that all the sins of God's redeemed people **were remitted by, and at the time of, the "shedding of blood."** It was at His ascension to His Father's right hand that He sprinkled the heavenly altar with His blood and secured the elects' full and eternal redemption. These sins now atoned for will not be remitted when one is regenerated, or when they are given faith, or when repentance is granted to them; and certainly will not be by a mental decision to join a religious society! Their sins were remitted **when Christ died for them**. That is what the Gospel message is all about! Not in order to make it so; but because it is so! It was then that God's people were actually, legally, sanctified. *"Then said He, Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God. He taketh away the first (legal sacrifices), that He may establish the second by the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once."* And by this sacrifice, or this offering, Paul clearly says: *"He hath (already now) perfected for ever them that are sanctified."* (Hebrews 10:14.) How needful it is that a poor, quickened, sinner, grasp this truth of a **finished salvation**. It is by faith in this gracious work of the blessed Savior that one finds rest from all his legal labors under the curse of a broken law.

*"By faith (not by "belief," or moral suasion) Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was (not would become) righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh."* (Hebrews 11: 4.) Notice that it was not by faith that he *obtained* "righteousness," which view is held by many Neo-calvinists. Rather, by faith he obtained a witness that he was righteous. This latter view is held by the Hyper-calvinists. Their salvation and their righteousness is not conditioned on the works or beliefs of the creature, as was Cain's. Salvation is of God exclusively, based solely on His everlasting and immutable

loving kindness toward His Son and those ***in Him***.

Abel's religion is the historical Christian faith, in that it is founded on the same principle as Calvinism. It is the truth of God's revealed Word. Whereas before, it was noted that Cain's freewillism thrives today, it must be admitted that Abel's religion is not popular, and never has been. Perhaps world-wide, less than .01% of so-called "Christians" believe Abel's free grace religion. But this is no hindrance to one called by grace, and "made willing in the day" of Christ's power. (Psa. 110:5.) Salvation is not voluntary; it was done! Christ atoned for the sins of His people before any of them, since that generation in the first century, were ever born. Such as are redeemed, are made to suffer all things for Christ's name and cause. And, it should be this way. If Calvinists and Hyper-calvinists, along with the apostles of the Lamb, are correct relative to the doctrine of election - which election was before the world began - then the number of those chosen and redeemed is definitely set. (Eph. 1:1-6). The Southern Baptists' first Articles of Faith said: "neither can that number be increased or diminished." {Georgia Baptists Association, 1792, adopted by the SBC in 1845). Thus for every one which goes on to be with the Lord, there is one less left here on earth. This process has been going on since the days of "righteous Abel." Cain's crew must continue to **increase** until the "man of sin be revealed;" and Abel's must **decrease** until the "fullness of Christ" be gathered in. It cannot be otherwise, for God is not now still electing people to salvation; nor is Christ yet to die again for more. At some point in time the Lord's question will be answered: *"Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?"* (Luke 18:8.) In Abraham's day, there were but few, and he seemed not to complain: *"The Lord did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the **fewest of all people**; but because the Lord loved **you**, and because He would keep the oath which He had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord*

*brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage*" (Deut. 7:5.) This was equally true in Noah's day when only eight souls were saved from the flood. Again, in the dark days of Israel's apostasy, and again in the end of their dispensation, Paul records: "*God hath not cast away His people which He foreknew. Wot ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed Thy prophets, and digged down Thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? "I have **reserved** unto Myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace."* (Rom. 11:2) A "remnant" is a "handful" which is left. Of the seven thousand throughout Israel, that number was but "a few." Christianity, that is, Hyper-calvinism, is the true religion of our Creator God. . . the ancient religion of Abel. The freewill religion of Cain's is only a natural religion, and as an instrument of acceptable worship, a false religion. Pelagianism "is the theological doctrine propounded by Pelagius, a British or Irish Monk, and condemned as heresy in a.d. 416; included in its tenets a denial of original sin and an affirmation of man's ability to be righteous by the exercise of free will." (The American Heritage Dictionary, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1976). In time, the Roman Antichrist issued an "anathema" against anyone **denying freewill**. In 1711, Rome began to grant indulgences to priests who would enter Protestant churches to turn them to freewill. As one can see by comparing Andrew Fuller's statement with that of the Catholic theologian, St. Thomas Aquinas's (inside front cover), the founder of the mission movement had adopted the doctrine of Rome. There can be no doubt by any free grace believer that freewillism is a cardinal principle of Antichrist, or "mystery Babylon." That is not so clear to freewill believers. While most religions are clearly on one



side or the other - free grace or freewill; most "evangelicals" have attempted to create a hybrid religion by mixing grace and works together. For instance, there are five cardinal principles of Calvinism: total depravity, unconditional election and predestination, limited atonement, irresistible grace, and perseverance and preservation (TULIP). Evangelicals reject all the first four, yet illogically hold to preservation! This, in the absence of the other four, and perseverance, developed into a very libertarian form of *antinomianism* ... the very thing they falsely charge against the Hyper-calvinists! Their religious societies are filled and running over with all kinds of immoral abominations, but they all "know they are saved and heaven bound!" What is Biblically taught as being "of grace," they make even that a part of their works system. According to them, a gift is something you have to "accept"! Of course, if you did not receive it, it cannot be a "gift." The Lord Jesus Christ is called "the gift of God," but these "Evangelicals", and even many Neo-calvinists, never talk of "receiving Christ," but only "accepting" Him, thereby making the experience of grace a creature-merited work. Let us contrast works and grace sharply:

- Belief is something you **do**. -
- Repentance is something you **do**. -
- Joining a church is something you **do**. -
- Making a decision is something you **do**. -
- Working for the Lord is something you **do**. -

Now, if the above acts are **done in order to** become "Christians," or children of God, then such a system is most clearly an attempt to be saved by works ... or Cain's natural system. It is designed to manufacture children of God by some form of human instrumentality in the hands of professional hirelings. However, it cannot produce quickened and regenerate children of God. For one to be a member of John Doe's family,

he has to be begotten by John Doe and **born into John Doe's family**. God has to do His own begetting if any are to be His children. Almost no present-day "Christian" believes experimental salvation commences with a birth! Nevertheless, God needs no midwives or pediatricians to convey spiritual life to one of His! In opposition to all the above acts of men in a works system, there is a system of salvation by **free grace**. Please now consider the following:

- If regeneration is an exclusive act of the Holy Spirit; it is by **grace**-
- If faith is a "gift" of God and the "fruit of the Spirit," it is by **grace** -
- If repentance is worked by "godly sorrow," and by the convicting of the Holy Spirit; it is by **grace** --
- If "The Lord adds to the church daily such as should be saved;" it is by **grace** -
- If "It is God who worketh *in you* both to will and to do of His good pleasure;" it is by **grace** -

All the above things the Scripture teaches, and they are all **by grace**. This is salvation by grace, and grace alone, or Hypercalvinism. It is Abel's free grace religion. God does the work; God does the saving. It is the application of an **accomplished** and **completed salvation**. God has the glory!

Where above it is stated that Pelagians "have attempted to create a hybrid religion" by mixing works and grace, it is only a feeble attempt, doomed to failure. Works and grace are *mutually exclusive* principles. They can no more be mixed than fire and ice. When Paul pointed out that "*at this present time also, there is a remnant according to the election of grace,*" quoted above, he continued his argument, saying: "*And if by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace: otherwise work is no more work. What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for;*

but the. Election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded. . ."

One cannot help but wonder what a Freewiller thinks as he reads such Scriptures. It surely says the election obtained it, and it says the *rest did not*! Since the Freewill Pelagian does not believe in election, then he has to be the one that is blinded. There is no escaping the Scriptural conclusion. "*According as it is written, GOD hath given them the spirit of slumber*" - The same apathy found in religion today - The text says that God did this to them. "Eyes that they should *not* see, and ears that they *should not* hear unto this day." (Romans 11:6-8.) Again, one must wonder how the Freewillers deals with God doing this to them. Where is that "For God so love every one of Adams race" in this text? So then, this hybrid system, in the final Biblical analysis is still "salvation by works," or Cain's religion. The sad part of this is that millions who "know absolutely that they are saved" are dreadfully deceived by that wicked system; and are actually as lost in sin as they ever were before making their mental decisions. If they have no spiritual desire or love for the Truth of free grace; then this void identifies them in such a dreadful situation. To wit, "*God shall send them strong delusion*" - that is exactly what it says, too! And nothing is a stronger delusion than naturally blind freewill; "that they *should believe a lie*" Oh, My! Does the Bible say that God would do this that they should actually believe a lie? Oh, No! Oh, Yes. That is exactly what it says, but does anyone really care? They don't seem to be much concerned about it, because they can't believe it! "If it is true," they think, "it doesn't apply to me." They are not so concerned as to get a concordance down and look up the words "elect", "election," "the called," "predestinated," "ordained," "foreordained," etc. But why does God do this - it seems so strange? Paul answers: "*That they all might be DAMNED who believe not the TRUTH but had pleasure in unrighteousness.*" (II Thess 2: 10-14.) So much for God "wanting everyone to get saved"! No wonder the Lord said: "Take care how you hear!" The Israelites did not obtain

salvation by the mixture of creature-works and grace; nor shall Evangelicals. As then, so now, "*the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.*" Many who read this have never paid any attention to this passage, and most ministers are totally unable to fit it into their humanistic theology. But, dear reader, if this verse is true - and we contend that the Bible is- this is as serious as death itself! It is important that men make the effort to understand it even in nature, to know the Truth. Even if only a head-knowledge, it is far more God-honoring than presenting a little frustrated God who can't do His own will unless the ungodly reprobate "**lets Him.**" Cain's religion is dangerous! It has brought severe judgment against nations that fear not the Lord.

But the Freewiller will respond with: "But the Bible says, 'choose you this day whom you will serve.'" This is a perfect illustration of the ministers twisting the truth by half-Scriptures, and taking them out of context, and then misapplying them falsely. Let's look at this method, with this Scripture. The closest the Bible comes to such a statement is in Joshua 24:15, but it teaches the very opposite to what they intend to convey. Notice it. "*Now therefore fear the Lord, and serve Him in sincerity and in truth: and put away the **gods** which your fathers served on the other side of the flood, and in Egypt; and serve ye the Lord.*" Now notice this very carefully: "*And if it seems **evil for you** to serve THE LORD, choose you this day whom ye will serve.*" So the choice is only given to such as believe that it is evil to serve the Lord. But look even more closely at the choice given to such: "*whether **the gods** which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood or **the gods** of the Amorites in whose land ye dwell.*" There is the strong evidence of the spiritual blindness of the Evangelicals! They pick a phrase completely out of its context, and build a theory around the phrase. In doing so, they force their misunderstanding of the Scriptures to make them contradict our blessed Lord, merely to sustain their "free offer" system.

Clearly the choice here is between two sets of pagan gods; one is as good as another!

"A Hyper-calvinist will never convince me that sinners can't "accept Jesus"! says one. Probably not! One would be surprised if he did. But it is still the truth of the Scriptures. The only text in the Bible where a derivative of "accept" is used relative to salvation is in Ephesians 1:6 and it is a text Freewillers must absolutely stay away from! *"Having predestinated US"*- Oh, No! "Predestination is not in the Bible. I believe the Bible, but I sure don't believe that!" The rest of that verse is: *"Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself; according to the good pleasure of His own will to the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made **US ACCEPTED** in the Beloved."* One might be surprised that, as Joshua 24:15 above, this too teaches exactly the opposite of what Freewill Pelagians think! Not only has *"blindness in part is happened to Israel,"* the same darkness spread over the Neo-calvinists and swept them into spiritual blindness. The text continues: *"until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in."* (Romans 11:25.) The spiritual blindness which overwhelms modern religion possibly indicates this "fullness" is near at hand or past already. Paul's most endearing letters were addressed to the Ephesians and the Thessalonians. In both epistles, he very clearly taught the system of Abel's religion, or Calvinism - true Christianity, if you please. In Ephesians, he wrote: *"according as He hath chosen US in Him before the foundation of the world that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love,"* and proceeds into predestination and then particular redemption. In Thessalonians, he wrote: *"Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God."* Now, how did he know that God had chosen them? His answer: *"For our Gospel came not unto you **in word only** but also in power and in the Holy Ghost and in much assurance."* (1 Thessalonians 1:4-5.) When he warned them of the coming of the Man of Sin, he comforted them with: *"But we are bound to give thanks always*

*to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning **chosen you** to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and the belief of the truth; whereunto He called you by our Gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ "* (II Thessalonians 2:13-14) Again, one must wonder what a Freewiller thinks when (or, if) he reads such passages. Divine election and particular redemption are the principles underlying Abel's religion of *free grace*.

Shortly before Andrew Fuller introduced this first step in modern Baptists' apostasy, Dr. John Gill observed the climate of religion among this people, and forewarned of their dreadful departure; which departure was very immanent. Writing in the "Watchman's Answer: What of The Night?" he wrote:

"Of late years there has been a very visible decline and the night is coming on; which we are entering into; the shadows of the evening are stretching out apace upon us, and the signs of the eventide are very manifest and will shortly appear yet more and more: coldness and indifference in spiritual things, a want of affection to God, Christ, His People, truth and ordinances, may easily be observed; the first love is left, iniquity abounds, and the love of many waxes cold; and it will wax yet colder, and will issue in a general forsaking of assembling together; and in an entire neglect of ministers of the Gospel; when such who have been professors themselves will be shy of them, and carefully shun them."

The conditions were ripe for the Great Apostasy foretold by all the apostles. Here enters Andrew Fuller with Cain's religion, under the cloak of "Particular" Baptists, to inaugurate a totally new religion on earth, one which had never before appeared among men . . . "evangelism," or "missionism," (humanism) to meet the need of prophesy.

Hear him: "There is such a fullness in the satisfaction of Christ," Fuller wrote, "as is *sufficient* for the *whole world*, were the whole world to believe in Him." What a strange doctrine is this! There is a *sufficiency* in the satisfaction, *which has already saved all for whom He died!* The atonement, he said, is sufficient for the whole world but is insufficient **to save anyone at all** without their consent! Little did this blind guide know that it was quite too late to add the "world that lieth in wickedness" to that number of *redeemed people!* He was not a sound Baptist to begin with! He and his followers ridiculed "Hypers" for "limiting the atonement." And then he does the same, by adding: "at least where the Gospel is preached." According to this theory, *the atonement has not yet been made;* or if it has, *it did not atone!* Yet, the Scriptures everywhere declare it has been. Fuller's "atonement" cannot atone unless you believe that it can! The whole world of evangelical Pelagians fall for such! According to this doctrine, Christ is not a *Redeemer, quite yet* – but He will be if sinners will cooperate! Otherwise He failed! And according to the present-day Fullerites, He is still *trying*, but the world population is growing faster than He can get them saved! He gave His life a ransom, yet ransomed no one at all! He "reconciled us unto God," but we are not yet reconciled! He justified us by His blood, but we are not justified until we *accept* Him! Evangelicals, Neo-calvinists, and Pelagians are apparently ignorant of the work of Christ.

To make matters worse, Mr. Fuller, attempting to deceive his Hyper-calvinist brethren, adds that the atonement was *efficient* for the *elect only*, "at least to where the Gospel is preached." Interestingly, today, Evangelicals and do not even believe in election and predestination! Yet nowhere in the New Testament does the Scripture present the atonement, or satisfaction for sin, for all mankind. The very thought is preposterous, seeing that millions of souls from the days of Adam to the cross were already in hell when He died!

As Calvinists and Neo-calvinists within many of the "Evangelical" societies come to the knowledge of free grace, it would be advisable for them to look carefully at the origins of their denominations' apostasy. Beyond successful contradiction, the very first step in their "Down-Grade" (as Spurgeon called it) was a denial of Christ's finished and completed salvation of His elect people. Once this was denied, the logical step to follow was to save those Christ had failed to redeem. To do this, Calvinism became a mere "*plan* of salvation" competing with other humanly devised plans; and seeing that Calvinism is hated by the natural man, the other "plans" quickly won out. At this point, Christianity ceased to be "Christian" and became Antichristian.

The preached word *cannot* regenerate. Life *must* come from *life of like kind*. Louis Pasteur (1822-1895) put the death-knell to the medieval doctrine of spontaneous generation in the field of biology. In reality, the apostles of the Lamb put the death-knell to that same doctrine in the spiritual realm in the first century. Let the history of the Modern Evangelical Movement, or "benevolent (so-called) movement" be a warning to Neo-calvinists not to reinvent it in their reforms today. Truly, "**Salvation is of the Lord**" and always has been! - Jonah 3.9.

## CHAPTER TWO:

### CALVINISM, NEO-CALVINISM AND HYPER-CALVINISM

It is not intended that this chapter cover the above groups in-depth. Anyone interested in a serious study of *Calvinism* can find very good materials on the subject by the Reformers, Puritans, and present-day Calvinists. One of the best sources is ***The Sovereignty***



**of God**, by A.W. Pink. (There are two publishers, one extracted as much *sovereignty* from it as possible, creating a worthless deception on the subject, and one is unedited. The unedited edition can be had from Baker Book House, P.O. Box 6287, Grand Rapids, MI 49516-6287, 1997 edition. For a reader desiring God-honoring books on **Free and Sovereign Grace doctrine**, Gospel Missions, P. O. Box 318, Choteau, MT 59422 offers the best source of Calvinistic literature in America. No one can endorse all materials in every book, but across the board, Gospel Missions has the best stock of sound literature available from England and America. One may write them for their book list. Another very good source of *Calvinism* from the Reformed viewpoint can be had from the Protestant Reformed Church, 4949 Ivanrest, Granville, MI 49418. *Neo-Calvinistic* literature can be found under the title of "Calvinism," by any Evangelical Publisher.

Strictly speaking, Evangelical Calvinism is not *Calvinism*, but a watered down derivative of it, usually mixed with a strong dose of Arminianism or Pelagianism. Those who hold to the pre-Andrew Fuller (1782) Christian doctrines are termed *Hyper-Calvinists*. Because they do not utilize organized Evangelical business enterprises to publish the Gospel, they are falsely accused of being non-evangelical: hence, *hypers*, or *hardshells*, etc. The best sources of literature by these faithful writers are: The Remnant Publications, P.O. Box 1004 Hawkins, TX 75765-1004; who have published seven volumes of the *Editorials of Gilbert Beebe*. These volumes are from 480 pages to 768 pages each, and was listed for \$20.00 or \$30.00 a volume. At times "The Predestinarian Publisher," 1159 County Road 420, Quitman, MS 39355, releases limited editions of sovereign grace titles; and Elder Leroy Rhode's Website, <http://mountzionpbc.org/> is a good on-line source of very

good literature that is very hard to find elsewhere – mostly antique free grace books.

As you read this book, it will become obvious that the author does not recommend, or endorse, all the views covered in these publications above. But they are informative for any interested enquirer after the Truth of the historic Christian faith. It is also pointed out, that the above do not necessarily endorse the views set forth **in this book**; and indeed, **most would not**. Each of these speaks for themselves and a disclaimer by them is understandable.

One of the *five points of Calvinism*, or as those called Hyper-Calvinists would say, *Six Principles of Grace*, stands on a pragmatic and Biblical view of human nature as formed by God and as *fallen in Adam*. That is, **the eternal vital union of Christ with His body, the church** [The emphasis in this doctrine is the eternality of Eternal Unconditional Election]; the **total depravity and inability** of man by nature to save, or help to save himself. Man is mortal; therefore he is *not spiritual* by his first birth, in spite of people foolishly referring to art as spiritual! To be *spiritual* one must be begotten by one who is a Spirit, [of “like kind”,] and be born from above *spiritually*. When God made Adam, He made him a *creature* adapted to the *natural* habitat created for him. He gave to man nostrils to breathe the air created for him. Man was given a digestive system to eat the meats and herbs created for him. He was made upright and given an anatomy capable of supporting him in an upright position. In short, Man was not made an angel or a “spiritual” being! He was *made of the earth: earthy*.” He was never an immortal being. This alone is sufficient to establish the fact that God's eternal purpose was that *mortal man* should die! He did just that! I’ll leave it to you to determine how sin entered into the world and death by sin; seeing that it is written that “*By man sin entered into the world.*” If I told you, the reaction

would be prejudicial to the further examination of this book's contents!

The point we wish to make here is that man, as he was created, was created a *natural* being as all other animals, other than that he was a *rational creature* with higher mental and physical attributes. But there is no Scripture, to our knowledge, which suggest that man is a spiritual, or an angelic creature by nature. Thus, man is **not** a spiritual being in fellowship with his Maker. He was created in God's image, as a ***figure of Him that was to come***. From his loins, he would seminally produce his generations, and of many in those generations, some will be born "*vessels of mercy, afore prepared unto glory*," (Romans 9:23) as "*earthen vessels*" in which the elect seed of Christ [*"this treasure"*] will be given habitation in divine quickening (II Cor. 4:7). Such of Adam's offspring thus blessed to be recipients of the children of God, will all be given the Spirit of adoption, (Romans 8:23) whereby they cry Abba Father, and these will at the resurrection, **receive the adoption of sons**, (Romans 8:23) and together with their new creature, or spiritual man, be raised unto glory. Others not selected to be vessels for this heavenly treasure, are "*vessels of wrath fitted to destruction*;" (Romans 9:22) and will perish because of sins they have done in the body.

God gave man a help-meet, woman, and commanded them to "replenish the earth," which also forecast their future fall; for without the lust of the flesh Adam could not, and did not, procreate until after his disobedience. God said to Adam, of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, "*Thou shalt not eat thereof*;" and, "*In the day thou eatest thereof; thou shalt surely die*:" Notice that the Lord God did *not* say, "If thou eatest," but "*in the day thou eatest*." Again, Adam was created, made, and formed to die! If one still doubts this thesis, then consider that Christ is called "*the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*." (Rev.

13:8.) Christ being provided as the *first Elect* (Isa. 42:1) and the *sacrificial Lamb* for His seed chosen in Him this early (Isa. 53:10), clearly declares that the "*determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God*" (Acts 2:23) was for Him to die for His people, who would be, in time, "*dead in trespasses and sins.*" Paul says that for Him to die, "*then were we all dead!*" Again, this is proven by the fact that Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel were "*gathered together for to do whatsoever Thy hand and Thy counsel determined before to be done*" (Acts 4:28.) It is contrary to intelligent reasoning to deny that it was God's *will* and purpose that the *mortal* creature, Adam, was *made to die!* Calvinists understand that natural mortal man is not a spiritual creature; that he is totally depraved in all his faculties (including his "will") from his fall in Adam; that man is physically born "*dead in trespasses and sins.*" (Eph. 2:1.) The fall of Adam and all those seminally **in Him** changed his, and their, relationship with their Maker. However, he remained under the "primal law" of his Creator. This did not change. This "First and greatest commandment" - not Moses' Law - the race has ever been in subjection. (See Chapter Five, "Duty- Faith- Unto-Salvation," and "Appendix A:" on Antinomianism.)

It is well, then, to ask: "What *effect* did Adam's disobedience have on all his offspring, or the specie of Man?" Of his sons and daughters throughout all ages of time, from that fall, it is written: " *There is none righteous, no, NOT ONE.*" (Rom. 3:10) In his carnal nature, "*There is none that understandeth,*" spiritual things, in spite of their natural reasoning ability in natural things. This, the first catastrophic disease to invade man's body, sapped all the created fellowship with God and righteousness out of him, leaving him void of any righteousness and ability in spiritual things. Strangely, with self-righteous religion abounding, the inspired record still remains that: "*there is*

*none that seeketh after God.*" Other motives, deep within the fallen creature, are at play in all that proselytizing activity in which he is engaged. It feeds something *natural* within the fallen nature of man. With all kinds of social works, in and out of religious establishments - from "Christian Life Centers," (gymnasiums), "Promise-Keepers," programs, sectarian hospitals, martial arts for Jesus, bumper stickers, entertainments, *et.al.*, *"there is none that doeth good, **no not one.**"* The only truly "good work" is one commanded of God and worked out by the Holy Spirit within the believer. Most things "Christians" do as "good things" are unauthorized by God in His Word, and as such, are *"without faith;"* and *"whatsoever is without faith is sin."* Without divine authorization and faith, it can only be sin. And the rank dullness and careless apathy relative to true righteousness and truth is crowned by: *"There is no fear of God before their eyes."* (Romans 3:10-18.) This feverish listlessness, - blind lethargic state regarding the truth of God's Word - is an effect of the violent degeneration resulting from Adam's fall. It remains innate within his offspring. Adam's fall devastated the race of Man in *all his faculties!* So badly, few can focus their attention retrospectively in self-examination long enough to see if *"they are in the faith"* or not. If a doubt eases into consciousness, which might threaten the comfort of the delusional state, the carnal mind quickly compartmentalizes it. It's gone, almost as swiftly as it arose. Only God, by the Holy Spirit, can sustain that doubt long enough sufficiently to free the man from his bondage; for he cannot of himself be aware of the dire extent of his malady. Doctors of Divinity are of no use to treat this ailment. The man is, unless brought sovereignly to the truth by God's omnipotent power, in bondage to natural religion- a religion which is of his own imagination. Man's terminal illness is evident the very day a child is born. He is born naturally a *freewiller* in stark rebellion against God and parents. Listen to his screaming tempor and red-faced wrath.

Even if natural religion is pressed upon him, he will *remain* as he was - an ardent *freewiller* all his life long. And unless freed by the regenerating life-giving conversion by the Holy Spirit, *He will die as he was born: an unchanged freewiller*. This is sad, but alas! It is the condition of natural fallen Man. That is the reason that the loving-kindness of God provided a Savior. Those precious souls who have been made to acknowledge their devastated nature and to flee to the crucified Savior as a refuge have always found Him ready to forgive and pardon their sins, based upon the finished work of Christ in their behalf, and His righteousness imputed to them by the love and grace of God. They know what they are in nature, and this is their hearts' sincere confession: that they are the chief of sinners!

As David complained to God when brave old Nathan the prophet confronted him in regard to Bathsheba: "*Behold! I was shapened in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.*" (Psalm 51:4.) He recognized what he was by nature. He agreed with the observation God made of man prior to, and after the flood. Before the flood, the Lord God "*saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that **every imagination** of the thoughts of his heart was evil and that continually.*" (Genesis 5:5.) And God destroyed "*the world of the ungodly*" by water. (Note that this "world" cannot be the "world" of John 3:16.) Did the near extermination of fallen man modify his nature? No, it did not effect any change at all in the terminal illness of man's depraved will. Nothing will ever **change** the nature of natural man except the **resurrection of the body**! Immediately after the flood, God again said of Man: "*for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth* (infancy). (Genesis 8:21) The illness is unabated. The flood was not intended as a remedy; it was a judgment! David again noted: "*The wicked are estranged from the womb, they go astray **as soon as they be born**, speaking lies.*" (Psalm 58:3.) The very highest faculty of fallen man is his conscience, and the Scripture says of such who believe not the

truth speak *"lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared as with a hot iron;"* (I Timothy 4:2.) *"even their conscience is defiled."* This is God's pronouncement of the *best* that is in fallen man. If this is said of this faculty, what might be said of the rest: the "heart", which is the seat of affection and the "will" that natural men worships? How often the Evangelicals, or Missionaries, call upon dead alien sinners to "give" their "heart to God"? They never warn the sinner that the "heart" they are called upon to donate is *dreadfully wicked!* Who would knowingly offer such filth to His Maker? *"The heart is deceitful ABOVE ALL THINGS, and desperately WICKED: who can know it?"* (Jeremiah 17:9.) That, dear reader, is what ministers now want sinners to "offer" to their god. Pretty bad stuff, isn't it? Man's "will" is an interstitial part of his depraved and rebellious being. It is not separate, apart, nor above his wicked heart. It is lower than his conscience. It is unfit to offer to Jesus. Man by nature is utterly helpless to bring about a change within his own constitution from being what the Bible describes, to a righteous being. He cannot change himself from a dead, wicked, sinner to a living, righteous, saint. A cow may as well fly through the air, or a tree run about the forest freely, as for this natural fallen being to change his own inborn nature. *"Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spot? Then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do EVIL."* (Jeremiah 13:26.) It is clear that if the first two propositions are impossible - and they are; then the last one is too. All of the natural, mental, decisionism possible, (for whatever base and unknown reasons lurking within natural man,) will not change his true condition. He needs an applied salvation! It is a fact, *"there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not."* (Ecclesiastes 7:20.) Dear reader, believe it! Natural man is in a terrible condition, and his fallen disease is such, he is unable to even suspect it. He rests under a "strong delusion." He can believe a lie told to him easier than a truth. He merrily goes to destruction, finding ways to justify himself; *"but not before*

God." Just think, man's "will": it is within his *corrupt being*; and a dominate part of it. By it he freely sins. By it he denies God without even considering that he is doing so. By it he disobeys God. By it he hates God's ways, His Truth and secretly, God's people. There is nothing so noble about that thing! It is like his heart, "*desperately wicked*." Even the apostle said: "*The will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good, I find not*." (Romans 8:18.) And preachers call upon that same confused, helpless and deceived "will" in sinners for their decision to "get saved." Surely, if a man ever had a toothache he ought to know his "will" isn't free! But, that is a part of the symptoms of Adam's deluded and terminal illness: a confused and befuddled state of mind; an inability to think clearly; a delusion; a reluctance to examine himself for fear of what he might find. But he will, as all others, die. To a quickened child of God, after striving furiously against his willful sinfulness, it is truly glad tidings in the Gospel that "*Thy people shall be willing in the day of Thy power*," as promised in the Covenant of Grace made with Christ as recorded in Psalm 110:5. It is God that makes him willing, or else he never would be. If the above discussion is still insufficient to demonstrate the truth of the Christian, or Calvinists' understanding of the **total** depravity of fallen man; and man's need for God Himself to save him; then we add this. "*Levi also, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham; for he was yet **in the loins** of his father (great grandfather) 'when Melchisedec met him'*" (Hebrews 7:9-10.) This is known legally as a "principle of vicarious representation," or a principle of "federalism." Abraham, in God's view, is the *federal head* of all the Hebrew tribes, because genetically, they were all seminally **in him** when he paid the tithe; so too, Adam is the federal head of the whole race of man, for genetically, they were all **in him** when he (and they in him) disobeyed. "*Wherefore, as by one man (i.e., Adam) sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon **all men**, for all have sinned*," in Adam (Romans 5:12.) "*For by one man's*



*disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One (Christ) many be made righteous"* (Romans 5:19.) Again, *"As in Adam all die" ...* (1 Corinthians 15:22). We finalize the point: Adam was created to die; and die he did; and all his offspring are dead to all things spiritual the very day they are born in his generations. It is here, in a state of death and alienation that God's *free grace* finds the blessed objects of His *mercy*. They are more than merely "sick," as presented by Pelagian freewillers; but they **are dead!** In their corrupt flesh they can only *"mind the things of the flesh."* Their only functioning mind is their fallen natural degenerated carnal mind; as contrasted with a spiritual mind in one who has been born *spiritually* from above. *"For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritual minded is life and peace"* (Romans 8:5, 6.) When the Holy Spirit revealed the stupor, or deadness, of the carnal mind of man, He showed its true condition: *"Because the carnal mind is enmity (the source or root for becoming an enemy) against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then, they that are in the flesh **cannot** please God"* (Romans 8:7-8.) So, to make a point here: Can any natural man "please God"? That is a legitimate question. This text denies it. If he, before divine quickening, "gave his heart to Jesus," would this please God? The text denies it. In fact, if he could repent or believe, before experiencing the new birth, would even this please God? *"So then they that are in the flesh **cannot** please God"*. The answer is "No!" Here, then, is the death-knell of all "free offers" to natural sinful men! They cannot do *spiritually*, what preachers tell them to do naturally and benefit spiritually therefrom. All such carnal acts are counterfeits of the real *gifts* the children of God receive in divine quickening, and every child of God is grateful that it was God *"Who hath begun a good work in you"* and *"shall perform it unto the day of Jesus Christ"* (Philippines 1:6.) This is ascribing praise to Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.

So it becomes clear that the first thing in order to the experience of salvation is "*ye must be born again,*" spiritually. Christ did not say "born all over again." God is a Spirit, and all life is derived from a pre-existing life form of "like kind," or parentage. Therefore being "born again," in a spiritual state of existence, one must be "born of God," or "from above," from a spiritual life source. This is necessary in order to have a "spiritual mind" ready and able to "discern spiritual things" (I Corinthians 2: 14-15). The new birth is in fact a "**birth**" - **not a decision**. It is not a mental act. It is a being *begotten* "from above." No man can beget himself! To be a child of God, it is obvious one must be born of God! Being born of a preacher's words will not do it. If it did, the convert would only be the son of the preacher! The man must be born of God by the Spirit of God before he can discern *spiritual things* (I Corinthians 2:10-14.) It is this baneful condition that prevents natural man - the freewill man - from ever entering into the clear instructions of the Scriptures in the doctrine of **sovereign grace**. At this revealed truth all Arminians stumbled; and present-day Pelagians follow suit. In reality, they are by Adam's disease blinded to this, even, their own sad condition. Jesus said: "*Ye must be born again,*" but never told Nicodemus how. The reason seems clear to a Hyper-calvinist. He said, "*Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*" (John 3:3.) He was not giving Nicodemus instruction as to how to "be saved," but what spiritual condition was necessary for one to "see" or "enter" the kingdom of God. If one is "born again" he will both see and enter the kingdom of God in the last day. If he is not, he can neither see it, nor enter into it. That spiritual state comes about because "*it is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak* (Jesus – not the preacher) *unto you, they are spirit and they are Life.*" No mortal man's words are life or spirit. We must point out here, that Jesus did not intend to say "ye must be born *all over again.*" The natural man is not born twice; he is

born of the flesh but once. The new birth is of the Spirit and produces a *spiritual birth* within the natural man. The confusion resulting from a lack of understanding on this very point has produced many a false entrapment – doctrinal apostasy.

Where, then, might Hyper-calvinism fit in this most fundamental Christian issue? Clearly the above is called "*Calvinism*." The Hyper-calvinists question just how dead is "*dead*." Some Calvinists and most all Neo-calvinists give lip-service to the *total depravity* and inability of man. But their proselytizing zeal over-runs their consistency, and their "free offer" conditionalism makes them belie their confession. They see nothing inconsistent with begging unquickened, or "dead," sinners to come to Christ as their "duty." Dead men cannot function in the realm in which they are dead. Hyper-calvinists consider the unquickened individual too dead to cooperate and help the Spirit to regenerate himself. They are certain that the Holy Spirit will "*quicken whom He will*," (John 6:63) and this will be all for whom Christ died. He will give the elect, redeemed and saved children of God life, spiritual ears, eyes, and hearts to perceive the Gospel of Christ and rejoice therein. Pelagians and Neo-calvinists seem to hold that the dead sinners must take the first step in "their salvation." It is clear that they do not know that Christ has already redeemed His elect and saved them with an everlasting salvation. They often exhort their listeners to take the first step and promise them that God will meet you half-way! Hyper-calvinists believe that legally, before the justice of God, all the elect have already been "saved" judicially ("*no charge can be made against one of God's elect*" - Romans 8:33.), but not experimentally. In the experimental application of salvation, the Holy Spirit *works first* in bringing those redeemed to spiritual life and immortality; and then, and only then, can the Gospel, be of benefit to them. Again, "When I was saved," is not an

expression one ever hears among Hyper-calvinists in the United States. They might say "When I came to the knowledge of grace," or, "When I was given to believe," or "When I received a hope in Jesus," *etc.* but they cannot Scripturally equate "being saved" with regeneration or conversion. These are different terms and different experiences. To illustrate: No doubt Peter was a child of God. Yet, to him the Lord said: "*When thou are converted, strengthen thy brethren.*" "Salvation" is an all inclusive concept of the whole work of salvation from eternal union with and in Christ, through election before time, to eternal glory. It is not the point of a person's so-called "decision" or commitment to a religious cause; nor is it when one is given faith to believe that it is so.

When a Neo-calvinist leaves his profession on the total depravity and inability of man, and shifts to an anthropocentric application of his doctrine, he suggests that the Holy Spirit has nothing to do with regeneration. He basically denies the cardinal doctrine of the Christian faith and of Calvinism. To such, man isn't "*dead in trespasses and sins.*" (Ephesians 2:1.) A little sick, maybe, but certainly not *totally* incapacitated. At least they can waddle down an aisle and "give their (corrupted) heart to Jesus!" In fact, some actually teach that natural man still has a "spark of divinity in him;" while others teach that natural man has a residual "faith" which he can activate to "accept Christ and be saved." In order to give a "free offer," Neo-calvinists as well as Pelagians must do so on the *assumption* that natural, unregenerate man **can do** something *spiritual*. The truth of the matter is that he can't. He is dead in that sphere of existence! They sometimes reply, "But his inability does not negate his 'duty' to do so." We will write more about this supposed "duty" in Chapter Five on the Duty-Faith-Unto-Salvation issue.

The traditional, or classical, Calvinists believe that the Holy Spirit uses the preached or written Word as instruments in the quickening process. Some believe the Gospel regenerates. A very small group believes that baptism regenerates. Arminians believe a man's mental decision regenerates. Neo-calvinists seem to believe that any small portion of Bible passages will, with the Spirit's application, regenerate. Others explain that the internal call to salvation is by the Gospel to regenerates. This writer cannot comprehend that position and will not elaborate on it. (It is expressed in the publications of the Protestant Reform Church.)

The position of the Hyper-calvinists, is that a child is conceived in this world totally dead to spiritual things; unable to want, or will, his own salvation because his *"carnal mind is enmity towards God,"* that he *"loves darkness rather than light, because his deeds are evil."* (John 3:19.); *"the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they (spiritual things) are foolishness unto him: (such as eternal vital union, election, predestination and a finished salvation) neither can he know them, because they (the spiritual things) are spiritually discerned."* (I Corinthians 2:14) Hyper-calvinists believe the unregenerate sinner to be so dead that he *cannot* will to come to Christ savingly. (*"Ye cannot come unto Me that ye may have life"*); so dead that they *cannot* come; (*"No man can come unto Me"*- John 6:44, 65); so dead that they *"cannot see the kingdom of God;"* (John 3:3;) and being unable to see it, they *"cannot enter the kingdom of heaven."* (John 3:5). Hyper-calvinists are faulted by some Neo-calvinists and Pelagians for denying that the Gospel brings *life* and *immortality* to dead sinners; yet the Scripture is plain: That God saved and called His people according to His own purpose and grace in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world; *"but is now made **manifest** by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ who hath (already) abolished death and hath brought life and immortality **to light***

*through the Gospel.*" (2 Timothy 1:9-10.) That is what the Scripture teaches the purpose of the Gospel is. It makes this life and immortality, and this purpose and grace *manifest*. It brings it "to light" to a quickened sinner. For this reason, the Gospel is *glad tidings*, or "good news;" a message of the accomplishment of Christ and His finished work for poor and afflicted sinners mourning over their corrupt condition. The very definition of the word "Gospel" shows what it is, as well as what it is not. If salvation is not an accomplished fact for all that Christ suffered and died, it cannot be good news to one disabled and ruined by sin and death. It is not a magical incantation to be used by priests and preachers to do what only God can do, *i.e.*, beget to spiritual life. "*It is the Spirit that quickeneth.*" The principles of Freewillers and Neo-calvinists relative to the Gospel are very much as Simon Magnus, who requested of Peter, "Saying, Give me also *this power*, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost" (Acts 8:19). It certainly sounds the same! They say, in effect, "Give us the power, that unto whomsoever we quote John 3:16, he may receive the Holy Ghost." That their appeals produce church members no one can deny; but that it produces *spiritual life* in those members the Scripture denies.

"How then," says a Pelagian or a Neo-calvinist, "can Hyper-calvinists get around James 1:18, "*Of His own will begat He us with the Word of truth,*" or I Peter 1:23, where it says: "*Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God.*"? Hyper-calvinists accept both texts exactly **as written** for what they actually say. The Neo-calvinists and Pelagians are the ones who fail to pay close attention to these texts, and fail to "rightly divide the word of truth." For instance, in James, the Hyper-calvinists read it as written "*Of HIS own will,*" (not the preacher's) or God's sovereign immutable will, "*He begat US with the Word of truth*" (not man's words; certainly not misquoted half Scriptures). That "Word" by which He becomes

our *Father* when He *speaks* to sinners, saying “*LIVE! and they live!*” All clear thinking men will acknowledge that whoever *begets* a child is that child's father. Paul referred to the moment of his own calling, saying: “*When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb.*” “When” indicates an appointed or certain day for a sinner's reception of salvation, or the time he is to be quickened. As written: “*None eye pitied thee, to do any of these unto thee, to have compassion on thee; but thou was cast out in the open field, to the loathing of thy person, in the day that thou wast born. And when I passed by thee and saw thee polluted in thine own blood, I said unto thee LIVE; yea, I said unto you, when thou wast in thy blood, LIVE! I have caused thee to multiply,*” etc., “*Now when I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold, it was the time of LOVE; and I spread My skirt (imputed righteousness) over thee, and covered thy nakedness, yea I swear unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord God, and THOU BECAME MINE! then washed I thee with water, yea, I thoroughly washed away thy blood from thee, and I anointed thee with oil. I clothed thee. . .*” (Ezekiel 15:5-10.) Can there be any question that no high-powered “evangelist” could do **any** of the above for a poor and needy sinner? That Word “LIVE” spoken by the eternal Son of God, - the Word that was in the beginning with God, and was God- did the begetting, or quickening to spiritual life, and that without human instrumentality! No man's feeble mutterings of John 3:16 will do it. God alone is the saints' Heavenly *Father*: not a priest, or preacher, or soul-winner. They may be able to **beg** them with the Gospel, but they cannot **beget** them with the Gospel or with any other gimmick. **Begetting, not begging** is what a sinner needs for salvation!

The text in I Peter is equally clear: “*Being born again, not of corruptible seed*” (such as men's!) “*But of incorruptible by the WORD of God (not of men “about” the “word of God”) which liveth and abideth for ever.*” Now, any reasonable man should

know that the sermon preached by a preacher never "lives and abides for ever." They are most often forgotten as soon as spoken! Really, they are seldom heard through their entirety when preached. Spiritual life and salvation had best be on a better foundation than that! And it is. God's living, begetting Word, is Christ, the "eternal Logos." *"But the Word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the Word which by the Gospel is preached unto you."* It is perfectly clear that the "word" in this verse must be different from the "Gospel" in the same verse! Otherwise it is meaningless.

The Gospel of grace is the good news, or glad tidings, or the message about the "incorruptible" begetting Word "which lives and abides for ever." A Calvinist stands rather dumb-founded when he hears a simple-minded freewiller deny the most plain texts on election and predestination, or limited atonement. "How can an otherwise intelligent creature be so blind," he wonders as he shakes his head in amazement. The Hyper-calvinists stand equally amazed, that a Neo-calvinist can be so close, and in a blink, miss this most important truth! The Hyper-calvinists strongly believe in the absolute sovereignty of the Eternal Godhead. All three subsistences in the Eternal Godhead are co-equal and One. The Father is sovereign in all His work. He purposed, proposed in council together to unite Jesus, the son of Mary to the Eternal Godhead in a manner whereby they two became One Person, the God-Man; and simultaneously chose a body and bride for the Chosen Head, and gave these elect members to Him as His seed, which in time would be counted to Him for His generation (Psalm 22:30) and would serve Him, and for which He would suffer, bleed and die (Isaiah 53:10). The Father asked not for, nor needed any help from His creatures. The Son is equally sovereign over all His work, and that work was the full and complete salvation of His body and bride given to Him by the Father from eternity. He asked not for, nor needed any help from His creatures; and now



that He has already saved them by His suffering and death, it is too late to help Him save them! Not only so, no one knows which ones are His, but the *"foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are His."* (2 Timothy 2:19.) The Holy Spirit is equally sovereign over all His work; and His work is to *"quicken whom He will,"* and bring them all into spiritual life and experiences. These are the same as the Father elected and the Son redeemed; and the Spirit will guide them into all truth. It is in His department that ministers are called, qualified, and directed *"to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"* and the *"other sheep that are not of this fold."* He is to open the hearts, eyes, and ears, of the elect to be attendant upon the hearing of the Word; and to the great surprise of every reader that has followed this discussion, He is the One who selects the instruments *He will use in the chosen, redeemed and now quickened sinner's, conversion!* **Only there** will Hyper-calvinists place **human instrumentality**, and even that subservient to the Holy Spirit. Man is *never* in the driver's seat! He asked not for, nor needs any help from His creatures in bringing the elect and redeemed their covenant blessings. For the *Godhead* to be a simple Being, as He is, all three Subsistences must be *equal* in all their attributes. He is not dependent at all on His Gospel ministers; they are dependent upon Him. They are but creatures, and have no power to beget children in someone else's name and family. It is this "evil;" this persuasion of the **sovereignty of the Holy Spirit**; which Neo-calvinists charge against the Hyper-calvinists! But it is the Scriptural and logical position. Christ *is the Savior of sinners; not the preachers!* On the doctrine of unconditional election and predestination, the Hyper-calvinists agree with the Supralapsarian Calvinists. They both believe that the elect were *chosen IN Christ* before the world began as Paul repeatedly taught: *"According as He hath chosen us IN HIM."* (Ephesians 1:4). The emphasis is the **"in Him"**. This distinguishes their position from those

who believe that God chose His people *IN Adam* before the foundation of the world, or the "Sublapsarian" position. To clarify: The supralapsarian (supra - "above"; lapse - "the fall") is that without considering the elect as being in Adam, God made choice of some of them "in Christ" His First Elect. This was in eternal vital union of Christ with them. The sublapsarian (sub-"below"; lapse - "the fall") position is that God foresaw Adam's fall, and then quickly elected some of his fallen race to salvation. There is, of course, a third position- that both are true. But the Scripture favors the first view. They are repeatedly said to be viewed *"IN Him: IN Christ: and "with Christ."* The view that God chose Christ as Head and the elect as His body antecedent to the decree of Adam's fall is expressed by Paul in Romans 9:10-20. Without considering the works, or behavior of unborn twins, and to make it clear that God did not condition His election on any foreseen merit or goodness, God said to Rebecca that: *"For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth; It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated."* This is very clear. This choice was such that all the elect stood actually ***in*** Christ in seed substance, and were represented in their *federal Head*, Christ, from all eternity; while all the rest stood condemned in their fallen natural head, Adam, from all eternity in God's eternal and immutable, or unchangeable decree. The statement: *"Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated,"* is a perfect axiom. Thoughtless Pelagians deny the force of the axiom by saying that God did not really hate Esau. He just did not love him as much as He did Jacob! This being an axiom, it would then also be true that God did not hate Jacob as much as He hated Esau! But Paul is making a point, drawing upon Biblical ground to apply the Scripture he did. To change the axiom is to defeat his argument. He quoted the prophet Malachi, who wrote: *"Thus saith the Lord, I have loved you. Yet*

*ye say, Wherein hast Thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: Yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness."* (Malachi 1:2-3.) God's judgment on Edom was proof of His hatred of Esau. In fact, not only did God hate Esau, but the Scripture says: "*Thou hatest all workers of iniquity.*" (Psalm 5:5.) How often one hears "evangelists" say: "God doesn't hate the sinner. He just hates his sins." That is not so at all. One cannot separate the sins from the sinner. Sinners sin because they are sinners. This text says He hates the workers of iniquity. That is as clear as it needs to be. In addition to this, God hates even the worship of apostates! He said: "*I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer to Me burnt offerings? and your meat offerings? I will **not** accept them: neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts.*" (Amos 5:21-22.) For such who depart the faith, even their "praise bands," or songs, God hates! It is certain that it is as wrong to sing a lie as to preach or tell a lie; and even worse, to go before God with falsehoods on your tongue. "*Take thou away from Me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols.*" (Amos 5:23.) So much, then, of God loving Esau and everyone else in the "whole wide world." As Christ prayed, hear Him: "*I pray **not** for the world, but for them which Thou hast given Me, for they are Thine.*" (John 17:9.) Surely, if Christ loved everyone and "wanted" to save everyone, He would have made intercession for all mankind, for He said again, "*My Father heareth Me always.*" But He did not pray for them; yet He did pray for those His Father gave Him in the covenant of grace.

The Hyper-calvinists are not severely censured by true supralapsarian Calvinists; but the followers of Andrew Fuller's so-called "evangelical Calvinists" (whom we refer to as "Neo-calvinists: they are not Biblically "evangelicals.") are extremely severe. Having an inferior complex for being "apostates", their

writings against the historical Hyper-calvinistic Baptists have a bitterness- a vindictiveness - that borders on hatred. It is for that reason this book title is **“Hyper-calvinism: . . Is It the Truth?”** Consider it. Is it the truth? The early issue was relative to the *purpose* of Gospel preaching; but in time, the Fullerites ceased to preach the Gospel at all as they turned to “*another Gospel*” (2 Corinthians 11:4.) They ceased to preach what God, Father, Son and Spirit did in the work of salvation and merely exhorted their hearers to believe in Jesus - without presenting anything of substance for them *to believe* relative to Jesus. In the “battle for Gospel preaching,” (as Mr. Murray called it) the Fullerites, or the proselytizing groups lost, and have fled the field in disarray! They left their swords, (the King James Bible, or Received Text) in their haste! They are now defenseless as they labor and dispute and argue which version of the Bible is true. The world has full control of their religious societies now. The world pays their salaries, and they dare not preach the Gospel of the grace of God! If they did, they would quickly be unemployed! They very well know this to be true!

The severity of the attacks on Hyper-calvinism dates back to the historical rise of "benevolent societies (so-called)." [In all the early Old School Baptists associational minutes, they always stated it this way: "benevolent societies (*so-called*)" indicating that they did not agree that these societies were really "benevolent"] Most denominations in England and the United States splintered; and all kinds of isms and schisms arose. When Fuller first set forth his heresy, there were Congregationalists (Puritans), Particular Baptists, General Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Catholics, Dutch Reform, German Baptists, the newly arrived Methodists and Quakers in America, plus a few others. Within three decades of that movement, all kinds of "evangelical" religious societies came in as a flood; and all the above splintered. The two great world movement oozed up out of the

Bottomless Pit simultaneously: Socialist societies, labor unions, utopians and Fullerite societies. Little by little the socialist societies kept combining until they formed the International; and finally, World Communism (Comintern). The same development was taking place in Fullerite societies. The same pattern was used by both. Splinter, multiply, unite, divide, multiply, and unite - ever enlarging itself; always infiltrating others, dividing, and uniting. The current attempt to unite Evangelical Calvinists with Papal Rome because the Neo-calvinists think they both now agree on the doctrine of *justification* is an indication of the direction of these movement yet today.

The Modern Missionary Movement led to a world antichristian movement. Evangelism is the greatest adversary of Christian doctrine; whether in the hands of Arab Moslems; Catholic Crusaders, the Inquisition or Evangelical Calvinists. None of them can stand the purity of the doctrine of Christ. It took eighteen hundred years for Christian morality to reach its zenith, and Fullerism destroyed it in less than thirty years! When the Neo-calvinists had achieved their end, they turned to Arminianism, and quickly to Pelagianism. They self-destructed. The proselytizing movement was found throughout most major denominations, but the people called *Baptists* embraced it most greedily.

John Gill, accused by many of "originating" Hyper-calvinism (overlooking Tobias Crisp and others), had written in his Body Of Divinity, of a spiritual reign of Christ which would commence when Rome lost its political power. The treaty ending the War of 1812 also ended Rome's political power over the nations of Europe. In 1812, a small group of Fullerites, led by Dr. Rogers and Dr. Wm. Stroughton, gained control of the Philadelphia Baptist Association. They

picked it, they confessed, because it was the "oldest and best known in America." In 1813, minutes of Baptists' associations throughout the States were collected. And the 1814 minutes of each report letters from the Baptist Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions asking for help to "evangelize the world." The Philadelphia Association had begun to support the English missionaries from the beginning, but opposed the "free offer system". Separate Baptists, Regular Baptists, United Baptists, Particular Baptists, General Baptists, Six Principle Baptists, German Baptists, and Seventh-Day Baptists **were all invited to join** in the effort. Many of them did; and even more did not! The Triennial Convention was formed in May, 1814, and met every three years, which gave its managers control during the off years. It was, in other words, a "catholic" or "umbrella" organization, made up of many different "orders" of Baptists. In 1845, this National organization split over slavery. The Southern body of Fullerite Neo-calvinists or "Missionaries" formed a National Convention in the Confederate States known as the Southern Baptist Convention. It adopted the strong Calvinistic creed of the Georgia Baptists' Association of 1792 affirming they believed in election and predestination and limited atonement. [This Abstract of Principles is the best stated and soundest of all Baptists' Articles of Faith in America.]

Outside of the national Conventions of Fullerite Baptists, many "evangelical Calvinists" organized other fellowships: American Baptist Association (ABA) , Missionary Baptist Association (MBA) , Baptist Missionary Association (BMA) , General Association of Regular Baptists (GARB), Eastern District Primitive Baptists, to mention but a few. In their origins, they had been Particular Baptists. They still cling to their Articles of Faith which are Calvinist, but today they oppose their own doctrinal statements. For some

strange reason, they will not modify them; but they still print them with their annual Associational Minutes. They came, in time, to fully accept Fuller's view that "Christ's atonement was sufficient for the salvation of the whole world, were the whole world to believe." But they left forever his other view: "That the atonement was efficient for the elect only." With that departure, they left Neo-calvinism; briefly stopped and visited Arminianism; and soon took their leave of them and have homesteaded in the absolute freewillism of Pelagianism. For all practical purposes, Calvinism and Neo-calvinism were now **dead** and abandoned among all the large bodies of proselytizing denominations. Also, today, one can no longer find anyone embracing the doctrines of Arminianism. Pelagianism reigns supreme among the will-worshippers.

But there never was a time when God has cut them **all off**. Every decade or so, there are a few ministers, and sometimes churches, which are brought to the truth of Free Grace. Repeatedly, a pattern can be seen. Such ministers follow one of three "outs" set before them. Some "*come out from among them and be ye separate*" (2 Corinthians 6:17.) Others stay in the Pelagian system as long as they can "stomach it", only to get "*thrown out*." Still others, hireling ministers, merely "*sell out*" for their salaries and retirement funds. These tone the truth down to soup by removing the "meat" of the Gospel and sacrifice the free grace believers among them, who must go elsewhere to be fed wholesome Gospel food. The strangest thing about these Calvinists or Neo-calvinists is: **instead of fighting the Pelagians, they build straw men of Hyper-calvinists to throw their darts at!** As the Calminian, Charles Haddon Spurgeon, they love Arminians, but hate "Hypers."

Large numbers of the original Baptists in the United States were, and some yet are, Hyper-calvinists. They followed, and still follow, the New Testament pattern in true evangelism.

(Proselytizing and evangelizing are **not** *the same thing*! Modern "evangelism" is a misnomer - it is blatant "proselytizing.") The Hyper-calvinists never utilized man-made institutions to improve on God's Word. They never turned to the world of the ungodly for financial support or for church members. Finding no "free offer" - not even once - in the Scripture, they give none. To them, the true Gospel is *a proclamation, or publication of "glad-tidings"* to quickened, or regenerated sinners. It is a message of what great things Christ accomplished in their behalf by His sufferings for their sins. They know that God *never "tries"* to save anyone, let alone every one! They worship a God that "wants" nothing, for He has all things. Man "wants," God "will." Hyper-calvinists do not "offer" "*the children's bread to dogs*" or to strangers to the covenant; nor do they promise the *children's inheritance* to those outside the family of God. They are careful to obey the Lord to "*not cast their pearls before swine.*" They do not "*compass sea and land to make one proselyte*" for the Lord told His disciples that when this was done, the convert was "*twofold more the child of hell.*" (Matthew 23:15). This is far more serious than Neo-calvinists consider! Such practices fill religious societies with dead hypocrites; it gives the "church"(if it was such) to the world of the ungodly.

Hyper-calvinists welcome all that God in His sovereign Providence delivers to their assemblies, and preach indiscriminately to all. Only the Lord can know "*them that are His.*" They understand that the "*Gospel is the savor of life unto life to them that believe; and a savor of death unto death to them that perish;*" and for this cause ministers are to preach the same message to all their hearers alike; and leave the results where they are: in the hand of Almighty God! God is certainly capable of applying knowledge of salvation to those that Christ saved.



The most fundamental difference between Hyper-calvinists and the Neo-calvinists is the Hyper-calvinists believe that when Christ came under the law, He did in fact and in deed **redeem all** that the Father gave Him. He fulfilled the demands of the law and imputed that righteousness to those for whom He died. When He died, He did in fact legally save all His people. When He had completed His Father's will for the elects' salvation, He ascended to His Father's throne. There He now is their very High Priest, making intercession for them day and night. From there on the throne of His glory, He sends the blessed Spirit to quicken those He redeemed and saved; and the Holy Spirit directs all affairs to that great end, and to the glory of God. This includes calling, qualifying, and directing His ministers to those He quickens, for their comfort, edification, conversion, and instruction. He guides them into all truth experimentally. If one wishes to know what Hyper-calvinists believe, it is best to **ask a Hyper-calvinist**, rather than their enemies.

In closing this chapter, we raise the question included in the title of this book: "Hyper-calvinism: Is it the truth?" It is of little or no consequence if the above is called "Calvinism," "Hyper-calvinism," "Hard-shellism," "Christianity," or just "Rubbish." The real question is "What say the Scriptures?" What is not true in the above chapter? What is true in the above? If it is true, that, and only that, is important. Does it ascribe **all** of the glory of salvation to God alone, and none to man? If it can pass this test, then call it whatever one likes, but rejoice in it. For it is a sweet and precious truth to all such who have known the power and dominion of sin, and the sovereign love and deliverance of Christ by free grace only. May God's grace be magnified!

## CHAPTER THREE:

### HYPER-CALVINISM AND EVANGELISM

Many individuals, when they are confronted with an “anti-missionary” treatise, assume that Hyper-calvinists are averse to the preaching of the Gospel, and they often say so. One should consider, that prior to 1782, among the people called “Baptists,” there were **no mission societies** of any kind. “Missionism” was totally unknown among Baptists and most Protestants. Catholics, Moravians, and here and there some Congregationalists were beginning to dabble in that form of propagating the Gospel. But in general, the preaching of the Gospel was directed solely by the Holy Spirit directing His called-ministers to go wheresoever He was pleased to send them. And He sent them frequently far away from home, civil society, and seemingly in an unorganized haphazard manner. But the Gospel was preached, it spread, was believed on in the world, and churches spread throughout the earth, and in America, all along the colonial States and the opening frontiers to the West. Asmundh’s Register for the Baptists, of 1792, reported over 12,000 converts in a very brief period of time, and this was **twenty years before a mission society** was formed in America. Among the Congregationists, David Branard’s work among the Native Americans (Indians) is *today* called “mission work,” but in his day, he was merely doing what all ministers were also doing: Preaching the Gospel where God led him to! No big deal then! How insidious that humanist principle has become!

Pelagian freewillers often claim that "Hyper-calvinists" or "Hardshells" do not "believe in preaching of the Gospel." Can one believe that our moderns make claim that Gilbert Beebe did

not, when in fact he devoted his entire life preaching it in its clarity and purity? We find him in New York, in Ontario, Canada, in Pennsylvania, in Ohio, in Kentucky frequently on the frontier, all over Virginia and North Carolina, in Georgia, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, and yet his enemies are so rash as to claim he not only was not preaching the Gospel, but **did not believe in doing it!** So too, did men as John P. Johnson, Thomas P. Dudley, Samuel Trott, R. C. Leachman, William Smoot, Gabriel Conkling, Philander Hartman, and a host of others too numerous to cite. How bold are the enemies of Truth! If judged on the Biblical definition of the "Gospel," as a "message of glad tidings," the Hyper-calvinists come closer to the mark than any other group. Those who view the Gospel as a "free offer," usually spend all their time "freely offerings," and seldom bother to spend the time necessary to preach "the Gospel." Neo-calvinists often write that "Hyper-calvinists do not believe in preaching the Gospel **to sinners.**" If the Gospel is "glad tidings" of what Christ has done *for sinners* by His sacrificial life and death, then they stand almost alone to-day in preaching it to anyone! Both the Pelagians and Neo-calvinists present their so-called Gospel as nothing more than a glorified *plan of salvation!* And, it is often presented as a very ineffectual plan, which achieves nothing without the consent of the dead and lifeless sinner. Far too often, the Neo-calvinists present a watered-down version of "Calvinism" coupled with the "free offer system to reprobates" which Andrew Fuller borrowed from Rome.

The definition of "evangelism" as used by Neo-calvinists and Pelagians, and illustrated by their modern practices, is nowhere to be found in the New Testament. The sad thing is, they really do not care that it is unscriptural. This type of so-called "evangelism" is nothing less than Judaic proselytizing, except on a more exaggerated scale. It is "the acts of making converts, usually from one religion to another". The false

premise for these proselytizing activities of the "Evangelicals" will be examined more carefully and contrasted with the New Testament methods as used by the disciples and present-day Hyper-calvinists in later chapters.

Of all the false charges and misrepresentations cast against Hyper-calvinists, the most common charge is that "Hyper-calvinists are "anti-evangelical." There is not a single article available in print on the subject of Hyper-calvinism that honestly and correctly presents their views. In fact, their views are most often presented by individuals who have never attended a Hyper-calvinist meeting; never explored the subject *with them*; nor ever even attempted to be unbiased in their presentation. One can never find a Neo-calvinist who makes any attempt to explain why Hyper-calvinists object to the modern method of proselytizing. They *assume* that only modern "Evangelicals" can be correct in the novel methods and principles of proselytizing as it has evolved from Andrew Fuller's somewhat primitive introduction in 1780's. Neo-Calvinists are vain deceivers, simply put!

The reader should not consider this next statement to be the central thrust of this chapter, but we will insert it here. The very fact that the words "missions" and "missionary," are terms derived from the Latin, rather than the Greek text, is sufficient for a Protestant or a Baptist to reject it. Rome developed missionism, often at the point of the sword! The Greek word "*apostolos*," is a delegate, an ambassador, a commissioner, a messenger, or one sent forth. "*Apostello*" is to set apart, send out, set (at liberty). In none of these meanings can one find a principle for proselytizing. The missionism or "evangelism" of Rome was very Machiavellian. "The end justified the means." By bribery, deceit, the sword, the rack, crusades, rewards, infant sprinkling, indulgences, interdicts, and superstitious sacraments, they **made** (literally) converts. So-called

"Evangelicals" today are just as Machiavellian, with violence excepted, perhaps. Embarrassment, ice cream for child "decisionism", youth crusades, scare tactics, secular type entertainment, emotional appeals to the flesh, and gimmicks galore are used. Why object to these? They are directed to the **carnal nature** of people; or the "outer man," - **the flesh**. They cannot affect salvation! Simply put, modern "evangelism" is not Biblical! It is *not evangelism*, whatever else it might be called. It is based entirely on a very false and deceitful premise: that decisionism produces conversion, and that conversion produces regeneration. In short, decisionism produces salvation! It considers these unwarranted methods useful, or even necessary, for one "to get saved" who otherwise would go to hell, in spite of Christ's precious atonement and eternal redemption of His people! So, in every way it is morally and Biblically wrong! Its purpose is wrong, for it is used "to save souls," when all things are to be done "to the praise of the glory of His grace." (Eph. 1:6) The methods developed and refined are wrong. "*Who hast required this of thy hand?*" can be asked of them in the Judgment. The methods are carnal and unscriptural. The effects are wrong: they are intended to "convert" a decider-for-Christ and thus regenerate him. It only deceives him into believing he is saved and safe because he *did something*, rather than giving the glory to Christ. It is a system of delusion called "salvation" by works, which is fully condemned by Christianity. It is **new** and in a system of religion based upon the immutable counsel of God two thousand years old, anything *new* has to be wrong! That is, it is unauthorized by the canon of Scripture.

It is not sufficient to merely be against an error. It is best to present a better view and one fully sustained by the New Testament model. It is the view Hyper-calvinists believe to be warranted by the Word of God, and which was the method used prior to Andrew Fuller and that novel system. Since both

Pelagians and Neo-calvinists have considered themselves well informed on Hyper-calvinists' views; and since they have convinced the public that Hyper-calvinists do not believe in preaching the Gospel "to sinners," it is better that a Hyper-calvinist speak to the point; and prove that the older and better way is yet true evangelism - not proselytizing.

There were **no mission** institutions among Baptists prior to the Haystack Kid's Prayer-meeting in Kittering, England in 1792. These over-zealous disciples of Andrew Fuller's novelty pressed so hard for sending the Arminian "Gospel" to the East, that Fuller, William Carey, and others formed the first mission society among Baptists on October 2, 1792. Any clear-thinking reader should realize that some other method of Gospel publication must have been in place prior to Oct. 2, 1792! William Carey and his fellows is said to have "prayed down a **spirit of missionism** from heaven." Where was that "Spirit" before the Haystack meetings? We are exhorted to "*try the spirits,*" and we are taught that "*by their fruits ye shall know them.*" This modern religion's principles cannot stand that examination. This is eighteen hundred years **too late** to be considered Scriptural! When these "Missionaries" arrived in India, guess what? There were Christians there to meet them! One seldom hears of that! They had the Gospel of Thomas long before the Missionaries arrived! Two years earlier, John Aspsund had printed his Register Of The Baptist Denomination In North America, which listed all Baptist churches in the new Republic; the dates of their constitution, number and names of their ministers, number of members, the State, territory, and county of their location, and, most significantly, what *doctrinal persuasion* they each held. In 1790, all States in the Union had numerous churches; and doctrinally, **ninety-three percent** stated that they were of the *Calvinists' persuasion*! Only **seven percent** were *Arminian*, and **NONE WERE PELAGIAN**! **Not one** of them was **established by a "missionary"**; none had ever

been a "mission station," and ALL had been planted by individuals gathering together to worship or by itinerate or established ministers! In 1790, ALL ministers of the Gospel felt bound by their calling to *preach the Gospel freely to others than their own churches*. Baptists' churches expected this of their ministers. This is evident by their ordination charge "to preach wheresoever God in His providence cast your lot." As it is written in the Book of Acts, "They went everywhere preaching the Word." The very fact that the overwhelming number of ministers and churches were *Calvinists*, clearly demonstrates that *the **Gospel was being preached to sinners*** by these Hyper-calvinist ministers. [Hyper-calvinists, in the sense that (1) they were "Baptists," going beyond John Calvin; and (2) they did not utilize what is today termed "missionism." And (3) they believed in Holy Spirit regeneration of all the elect for whom Christ died! They certainly were not preaching **freewillism** as a "Gospel"!]

The only form of the word for "evangelist" used in the Scripture is "euaggelistes," which means "a preacher of the Gospel." It is derived from the Greek word "euaggelizo," which means "to announce good news." Itinerate preaching by Hyper-calvinists is exactly this, and this only! It is the *announcement*, or *publication* of salvation by Christ's atoning death. That, dear reader **is the Gospel**- not "a free offer." It is a finished salvation for the chief of sinners. And it is preached by Hyper-calvinists *to sinners*. Notice here what is **not** "evangelism": proselytizing, pressing for decisions, indoctrinating, giving "free offers," "bribing deciders-for-Christ", "raising your hands if you are a Christian," and gimmicks, more gimmicks, and gimmicks galore! None of these things can be "announcing good news;" none are "preaching the Gospel."

We will illustrate this from a personal point. When this writer was seeking those who believed the truth of free grace,

he visited a great number of churches that claimed to believe in election and a limited predestination. Most often, knowing the visitor was a Pelagian Southern Baptist, they preached what the Gospel *was not*, and what it *could not do*. The writer discovered early that one could spend a life-time preaching what the Gospel **is not**; and never get around to preaching what it is! He wanted to hear the Gospel preached! As ministers of Christ, or may we say, If they are ministers of Christ, their calling is *to preach the Gospel* ... not other worthless things! Too few are now preaching *the Gospel*, so there is plenty of elbow room for one who is burdened to preach it! It may sound terrible, but getting someone to "make a decision" has nothing to do with preaching the Gospel; or for acquiring salvation. I coach my pet cat into making decisions every day: I am not stupid enough to think I saved a cat's soul! The time would be better used preaching the Gospel. There is not one single example in the New Testament of one **making a decision**; nor one giving a "free offer". If such had anything to do with salvation, Christ, the apostles and others would have been doing it!

So the title of this chapter: "Hyper-calvinists and Evangelism" is an appropriate one. If it had been titled "Pelagian and Evangelism" it would not; for those ministers harping on "evangelism" are *not practicing it themselves!* They have a proselytizing system which they wish to pawn off as "evangelism." If a Neo-calvinist is not preaching the good news that Christ has saved His people, that minister is not preaching the Gospel. Hyper-calvinists are preaching it; and they are preaching it "to sinners." They are most likely the only group that is!

The so-called "Evangelicals" have one primary goal: make a name for themselves by their "soul-winning" skills. If a minister cannot get new members during a so-called "revival,"



the religious society which employed him has wasted their money. They want more members, not necessarily more "believers." It would be alright if they were their kind of "believers," but if they were free grace believers, they would be trouble-makers. Members are more likely to pay "tithes" and/or give "offerings." These revenues are necessary for the religious-business enterprise. It cannot continue without these. The most popular "evangelists", or proselyters, are those with the most successful skills in decision-making; and they are in high demand. Some do not even bother to serve churches, but make their living hawking Jesus. Basically, then, modern so-called "evangelism" is an economic device, rather than a spiritual one. Spirituality has nothing to do with its motivation. The ministers and "evangelists" are hirelings; and as Jesus declared, they "*care not for the sheep.*" They weep and mourn publicly over the "*lost world,*" but never much over the "*sheep.*" Whatever this religion is, it is a far cry from Biblical Christianity. It is alien to "*the faith of God's elect,*" (Titus 1:1.), and obnoxious to any called saint. The Pagans of old at least *feared* their gods and demons, believing that they were all powerful. But these so-called "evangelists" today, following their missionary craft, have sunk to the lowest levels of deceit. "God," they say, "can't save you unless **you let** Him." How can this benefit, or be of any comfort, to a sensible sinner? If Christ failed on the staros (tree); if He can't now save you without you "letting Him;" if He can't work repentance in one; nor give him faith; if He is now powerless to save him; how, pray tell, can one believe He can come through on the *resurrection day*? Perhaps the trumpet shall sound, and no one arises! What kind of comfort can one have in a helpless god? The one only true and living God is worthy to be praised. But this god, the "another Jesus" of whom Paul wrote, (II Corinthians 11:4) is depicted with such inherent weakness and flawed attributes that he is unworthy to be praised. Rather, he is to be pitied. Perhaps that is why those who decide for him do not give him much credit or praise. The

best he gets out of them is the interrupting phrase: "Praise the Lord!" during a sermon, which of course, is not praising anyone. To truly praise the Lord, one must set forth the gracious attributes and works of one who is God. Not merely saying the phrase, "Praise God!" but actually doing it.

Only Calvinists and Hyper-calvinists can truly praise God, and this they do faithfully by "*telling of His wondrous works*," and not by trying to add someone's name to the Lamb's Book of Life. Our God does not, as theirs, have to wait to see who are His! Their names are *already written* in the Book of Life and have been from eternity! This eternality of Eternal Election is the doctrine of eternal vital union of the elect IN Christ their Head and they as His body – the Church. Jesus told His disciples not to rejoice because the devils were subject to them, but because "*their names are written in heaven*." How long had they been recorded there? "*And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him (the dragon), whose names **are not** written in the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the *foundation of the world*."* (Revelation 12:8). If one replies that the text merely says that Christ was slain from the foundation of the world, let it be noted that "*the beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition: and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, **whose names were not written in the Book of Life from the foundation of the world***." (Revelation 17:8). It is as a man on television said recently: "Preachers are the laziest bunch of people around." This is their supposed profession, and **their ignorance is appalling**. One thing is certain from the Scriptures: If one's name is **not already** written in the Book of Life, that person is left out of the covenant of grace. Going down an aisle will not now put it there. It is far too late for that now! In a small town in this country all social functions in schools, hospitals, sports, etc., are dominated by one collection of Evangelical religious institutions. Many hold doctoral degrees and can be assumed

intelligent. When one enters the hospital there, they will shortly be given a small pamphlet in which is a paragraph referred to as a "Prayer." The paragraph is drawn from no Biblical passage: it is merely a paragraph written by some member of this Evangelical enterprise. The pamphlet tells the poor sick and perhaps scared and worried patient that if he will merely read that paragraph or prayer, he will be saved and go to heaven, for once he is saved he can never be lost again. We find that pamphlet by the bedsides and in the bathrooms and in the entrance of the United States Post Office. This form of "Evangelism" is no kin to Christianity at all: It is purely superstition.

Practices such as mentioned above are considered by modern Pelagians and Neo-calvinists as "evangelism." They purport to be instrumental in saving souls. The Hyper-calvinists challenge this assumption on two levels: First, who can say these souls are the ones numbered with those that Christ redeemed? They may only have been "converted" and became "*two-fold more a child of hell than they were*," as Jesus said. Many of them may well be deluded into "*believing a lie that they all might be damned*," as Paul wrote (II Thessalonians 2:11). Second, where is there any Biblical justification for such *carnal entertainment* for "evangelism"? Is this activity what Paul meant when he told Timothy to "*do the work of an evangelist*"? Hardly! It is rooted and grounded in the natural depravity of man, and nowhere sanctioned in the Word of God. But, the Neo-calvinists warn: "Watch out for those Hyper-calvinists! They will destroy this 'evangelical zeal'." It may not be Scriptural, but who cares? "If only one soul is saved thereby, it is worth it." Of course, not "one soul" can be proved to have been saved by it! It is much easier to prove thaty multitudes are deluded by it, "*that they all might be damned who hold the truth in unrighteousness*." And if this can be said by Paul, what must we say for those that do not "hold the Truth" at all?

Prior to the organization of the first *mission society* by Particular Baptists, itinerate ministers covered the colonial and early frontiers in America preaching the Gospel of the free grace of God, and depending upon the Holy Spirit's preparatory work going before them. It is a pity so few today are familiar with the historical period called the Great Awakening (1720 – 1760) No one can read Isaac Backus' history of New England Baptists, covering especially the period of the Great Awakening, and not fully grasp the **sovereign work of the Holy Spirit** without the instrumentality of preachers in communities all over the frontier *where the Gospel was NOT preached*. Testimony after testimony are given by both individuals in isolated areas, and whole communities being regenerated and converted; and calls went out all over the frontier for the help of ministers to organize them into churches. That dear reader is our greatest heritage outside of the work of Christ. It should not be faulted, or denied, merely to prove later innovations in doctrine and practice. After the Peace of 1760, the Western Frontiers were opened to settlement. By 1800 there was more Hyper-calvinistic Gospel ministers in Kentucky than in the older states of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Delaware and North Carolina combined! Yet the Fullerite Evangelicals were hiring preachers to infiltrate these churches and lead them into the “benevolent societies” and “mission systems.” Today, the only Gospel preachers in Kentucky are Hyper-calvinists ministers!

To look at only a few documentary proofs: "4. *The letters and minutes of the Association at Warren, Charleston, Ketockton, and Georgia, containing agreeable accounts, were read. Their numbers are, Warren, 3,451 (members), Charleston, 966, Ketockton, 935, Georgia, 223.*" (Philadelphia Baptist Association Minutes, **1786**, Page 217.) Now watch the following, keeping that date in mind: "*In a postscript, Brother (John) Leland informs us, that about twelve hundred*

*persons have been baptized, and added to their churches, within about **two** years." and, "5. A letter from the Warren Association was read, and their messenger, Brother (James) Manning, entered into a particular detail of the progress of the Gospel in various parts of New England. Brother William Wood, of Kentucky, did the same with respect to the interest of religion in that place: and some of the brethren present gave us the like intelligence from Redstone Association and Georgia Association. By all which, we were made to rejoice in the prosperity of Zion throughout this continent: and encouraged to believe that the purity of the doctrines and ordinances of the Gospel of Christ, are prevailing more and more." (Philadelphia Baptist Association Minute, 1787, page 227, 228.) May the writer ask, What is going on here that so thrilled the hearts of these pre-Fuller Particular Baptists? Is this the work of missionaries, evangelists, or that of the Holy Spirit? The reader knows the answer. Let us look at the results of His work:*

Above, the Georgia Association in **1786** had only **223** members, but in **1790**- only four years later, it had **2700**! The Philadelphia had **2755**, and grew to **4100**, in the same period of time. That is in **four** years! The Philadelphia Association published a chart of all her corresponding associations in North America in 1790, and gave the total membership at **60,970**! (Ibid. page 269.) And still, no *missionaries* and *evangelists* on the scene! Only "Hyper-calvinistic" method of itinerate propagating the Gospel of the free and sovereign grace of God!

We find, the following in the **1800** Minute: "18. Whereas, the church of Philadelphia have presented a query, on the propriety of forming a plan for establishing a missionary society. This Association, taking the matter into consideration, think it would be most advisable to invite the General Committee of Virginia and different Associations on the continent, to unite with us in laying a plan for **forming a missionary society**, and

establishing a fund for its support, and for employing missionaries among the natives of our continent." (Philadelphia Association, Minutes, 1800, page 350.) The following year, the former custom of writing a circular letter on the Confession Of Faith was set aside, and the *first missionary circular letter in America was written*. (*ibid.*, 1801.) In 1803, their own minutes print the total number of Baptists in Kentucky to be **12,072**. (*Ibid.* page 372.) Again, in the **absence** of these "evangelists" and "missionaries," how did they grow so rapidly? Hyper-calvinists do not believe in evangelism! How in the name of **common sense can any Fullerite explain such success?** To better this, at the Great Baptists' Separation, the Old School Hyper-calvinistic Baptists numbered **65,000**! This figure only includes those who *reported* their numbers. Many Old School Baptists do not believe in "*numbering Israel*" as David did, for His people belong to Him, and He was the one who paid the ransom for them. Yet they out numbered the Missionaries. It is the author's candid observation that with such a great and heavenly sent Holy Spirit revival, which laid the very foundation of true Christianity in this new "Nation under God," the Fullerites committed a great offense against the blessed Lord of Glory. They designed, and attempted to carry out a plan to *subvert* His glorious work to their own **control and direction**, and then they **took the credit** for all the souls **He saved** and called **to themselves**. And they do it to this very day. They boast in their *numbers*, as if that is important. They cannot admit that Hyper-calvinists merely proclaiming the Gospel of Christ is sufficient, or that the Holy Spirit is sovereign in His own work of calling the elect to a knowledge of Christ; nor able or willing to send His own called and qualified ministers to preach His Word to the lost.

In return for this offense, it seems to this writer that God "gave them over" to their own will. He withdrew the very Gospel they thought could be used to manufacture members for

themselves from among His people and raise money, wealth and power to themselves, and He quickly **gave them up** to spiritual blindness. That Pelagians are in thick darkness all Christians realize, and Calvinists know this took place; but the Fullerites that were swept into Pelagianism have no understanding of their departure. In providence, the historical documents which demonstrate this "down grade" are too often buried in the Library basements of Fullerite Institutions, and hid from the public's view. Too few are interested in extended historical research using primary resource materials to verify their opinions or understanding, but rely exclusively on biased Fullerite Baptists' historians. (Incidentally, while Baptists' universities often restrict their archives, the State Archives are always very cooperative and helpful. This is particularly true of the Indiana Historical Archives in Indianapolis. To them, and those Southern Baptists' libraries willing to allow the perusal of their documents, we are grateful for many helpful hours in those old documents.)

It is unreasonable to charge "Hyper-calvinists" with being "non-evangelical," if by the term "non-evangelical" one means they refuse to preach the Gospel of free and sovereign grace wherever the Lord cast their lot. They are a tireless and faithful People in giving themselves up to the Lord and one another in the propagation of the Gospel of free grace. Their ministers travel hundreds of miles to serve churches and preach the Gospel with financial reward. None have a salary from religious institutions. Their supposed "wickedness" is that they refuse to join *extra-church organizations* and *submitting their gifts to the control and direction of puny men*. These puny men show no evidence of any experimental knowledge of grace within their souls; but wish to direct preachers to their worldly constitutes.

Our forefathers, prior to Andrew Fuller and his *efficiency/sufficiency* oxymoron, all evangelized exactly as one

finds in the New Testament. Pastors serving churches, would leave the church in the care of an associate or a deacon, and travel throughout other regions preaching the Gospel of a finished salvation in Christ Jesus. They, as a rule, felt it a part of their calling to do so; and their church members expected them so to do. Their love for the souls of God's elect motivated their itinerate journeys, and God attended them with great success ... far more so than by these modern methods. "**Go ye therefore**, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world, Amen." We note, that the Great Commission above, does NOT say, "**Send ye therefore** . . . . ." Matthews 28:19-20.

## CHAPTER FOUR:

### A FINISHED, COMPLETED SALVATION

Many references have been made in the previous chapters to a full, completed, and finished (or accomplished) salvation. The oldest group of Hyper-calvinists in North America - the Predestinarian Old School Baptists - has stood unwavering on this premise from the beginning of Baptists arrival on these shores during the early colonial period. This premise has been the fundamental basis of their constant opposition to all the *innovations* in religious doctrines and practices introduced by the followers of Andrew Fuller, first, and other Means Baptists since. To them, the "Gospel" includes the full doctrinal and experimental aspects of Christianity - not merely a sinner's accountability to God. But the freewill heresies which flowed swiftly from Fuller's "sufficiency of Christ's death for all mankind," and all the innovations which accompanied that



false premise is fundamental to the unscriptural foundation of modern "evangelical's" gutting the Gospel of its power. If Christ achieved all that the New Testament declares that He did, there remains nothing more to be done than the calling of the chosen elect to life and immortality; and this is done by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit. (This work includes the calling, qualifying, and directing of the Gospel ministry, as well as His direct work in regeneration, conversion, and the elects' travel.) It is the message of the full Gospel, and the work of God-called and directed ministers to proclaim this **completed salvation** to those (1) that He has preserved in Christ's seed substance, eternally elected, particularly redeemed, ransomed, atoned, reconciled, and saved, and (2) to declare this to all men "*wheresoever God sends them*" for the pronouncement of the just condemnation of the wicked. "*Men love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil; neither will they come to the light lest their deeds be made manifest.*" This chapter is devoted to this most fundamental foundation of the historic Christian faith. It is now almost uniquely the doctrine of Hyper-calvinism.

When Charles Spurgeon wrote that "Salvation is all of grace, which means, free, gratis, for nothing," he still had reservations that something else was necessary for the sinner to do to help God finish what Christ had begun, but had failed to accomplish. Or, as he wrote: "It is not my intent to make any requirement at your hands; but I come in God's name, to bring you a free gift, which it shall be to your present and eternal joy to receive." (At least he did not say "accept"!) Little did he know, it seems, that Christ had already brought that free gift - Himself. But Mr. Spurgeon was not really quite honest with his reader. He did set a requirement on his reader "to receive it," by which he and his present-day Neo-calvinists mean, to "accept it." To make a contrast between what the Neo-calvinists and the Hyper-calvinists believe respecting

salvation by "free grace," the writer will draw upon a personal experience from his long-passed youth:

Two young ministers in 1954, left the Bowen Baptist Association in southwest Georgia, and entered Mercer University at Macon, Georgia, a sectarian Baptist school. At the time, Mercer was an ultra-liberal Missionary Baptist university (SBC). It tolerated the teaching that Jesus was the bastard son of a German soldier stationed near Nazareth; that the New Testament, as Dr. McMannus said, was composed of forged documents; and that the early Christians copied the Egyptians in teaching a resurrection of the dead. Under pressure from the Registrar and Dean of Men, the Calvinist student was forced to drop out, thereafter entering a secular educational program. The other student graduated from Mercer and entered Crosier Theological Seminary (Rochester) in New York. Years later the two met again in Tallahassee, Florida. In the doctrinal discussion that followed, in many things they seemed in close proximity. They both believed in an election of grace. Both believed in predestination, but one was "absolute" and the other "limited" – according to the seminar graduate, just some major events were predetermined. They believed that Christ ransomed the elect; that He died for the "sheep," and the sheep would all ultimately be saved and enter heaven and immortal glory. But, said the Crosier graduate, they have to "let" God save them. "You just said that He had redeemed them all," said the Calvinist. "He did," the Crosier graduate said, "but they will not be saved unless they believe, and they can't believe unless they hear, and they can't hear unless someone preaches the Gospel to them." This writer could never grasp what kind of logic this was, until years later when he read Andrew Fuller. According to that position, all that Christ actually did was to put all mankind into a "*savable state*;" but He actually saved no one at all! He just delegated that work to preachers to do for

Him since He was to be crucified and could not complete His mission! The Bible nowhere sustains such a view. According to the doctor, all this work of Christ was merely a glorious "*plan of salvation*." To him, it was an impeccable plan, and no one should neglect such a glorious "offer" of salvation. But it was left completely up to preachers and sinners to make it effectual. He could not grasp the reality that Christ is *the Savior of sinners*! It is strange that those who first began to teach that the blood of Christ "was *sufficient for the whole world, but efficient for the elect only*" have now arrived at the logical position that the best possible "plan of salvation" devised by infinite Wisdom, Almighty power, immutable counsel, and eternal love is *insufficient to save anyone!* "*A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*"! No wonder one sometimes can see bumper stickers on cars that read: "Pity God!" or "Give God a chance."

When our blessed Lord was on the holy mount with three of His disciples, they saw Him transfigured, and found Him talking to Moses, representing the law, and Elias, representing the prophets, and overheard them speaking "*Of His decease which He should ACCOMPLISH at Jerusalem*" - thus, an *accomplished work*, finished and completed was there discussed. Specifically, what was it that our Lord was to *accomplish* at *Jerusalem* by His decease? One thing is certain, whatever it was, it was done then and **at JERUSALEM** and *By Him* - nowhere else nor at any other place, or by any one else is meant. This is confirmed by the Scripture, for it is recorded of Him, "*all things now being accomplished that the Scripture might be FULFILLED*, He saith, "*I thirst*." That was spoken on the Cross. Reflect, dear reader, upon this passage. Is this really true? How can these Scriptures and these events fit a salvation not yet accomplished at some future day some two thousand years later IF one walked down an aisle and took a preacher by his hand? It is certain that one of three positions is true: either

the Hyper-calvinists are correct receiving these Scriptures "as written," or they are wrong, and all other religions correct in denying them; or both could be wrong. But they cannot both be right! So which is it? Did He succeed or did He fail?

Our Lord specifically stated what His work was, and what the successful accomplishment would be. *"ALL that the Father GIVETH ME shall come to Me and him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out. For I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but THE WILL of HIM THAT SENT ME."* Is that not clear enough? What, then, was this "will of His Father"? *"And this is the Father's WILL which hath sent Me, that of ALL which He hath GIVEN ME I should lose NOTHING"* (John 6: 37,38.) Before completing that verse, look at this portion. He came to do the will of His Father. The question here is: Did He do it, or did He fail? Isn't that a fair question to be drawn from this text so far? And, what is your answer? "Yes," or "No," or "but ... " Andrew Fuller and company does not know what the Father's will was for His Son's suffering and death. But what was His will? *"That I should lose nothing, but raise it up the last day."* (John 6:36-40.) What is this we hear from all quarters today? "The world is perishing! Help us save them! God loves them all, Christ died for them all, but you must do your part or they will all go to hell, and their blood will be upon your hands!" What is it that you can do to help? Why of course – give them money. But they will not be that honest. Instead, you can give to us the money to give to the Lord. You best beware of scams. Everyone and his brother these days are after your pocket book, and so-called preachers are not behind the lot! If they are after your money, it is certain they are a Balaamite – a preacher for heir. Is that consistent with the above Scripture? Is there anything in that passage that couples the success of our Lord's propitiation to the *collection of tithes and offerings*? Isn't two thousand years too late to collect money to "help the Lord" save His people?

Does the text plead for financial help or evangelistic fervor to save His people from their sins? Hardly! Hyper-calvinists believe exactly what these Scriptures teach. He *"should raise it up again at the last day."* (John 6:37-39.) The preceding verse reads: *"Ye also have seen Me, and believed not"* So our Lord came into this world for a **purpose**. He went to Calvary to **accomplish** that **purpose** and when that **purpose** was **accomplished**, He said, **"I thirst,"** and after the Scripture was fulfilled, He said: **"It IS FINISHED."** Again, dear reader, is this true? If it is "finished," can anyone tell us what is left to be done? After He declared that will of His Father was accomplished, He said, *"Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit"* following which *"He gave up the Ghost."* That is a *finished, accomplished and completed salvation*. That is what the Scriptures teach. All that Christ came to do, **He did!** *"He shall save His people from their sins;"* (Matthew 1:23.) And **He did!** Not one single jot or tittle necessary for the elect's salvation was left incomplete, or unaccomplished. Salvation is fully and completely *"of the Lord"* (Jonah 2:9.) If it were not so, of what comfort could it be for a totally depraved and spiritually helpless, yet quickened sinner? It is this: a perfect and completed salvation, which *IS the Gospel of Jesus Christ*. One believing it, or not believing it, cannot change the fact. It is a fact of history. It is an historical event which will never be repeated. All for whom Christ died shall *"be raised up in the last day"* to everlasting happiness; all others will not, cannot, and desire not to be saved *"from sin."* The writer is aware of the thoughts of those who believe they should proselyte all mankind: "Are you saying that the elect will be saved even if they never hear the gospel?" That is a legitimate question. We answer: "All the elect are **already** legally or judicially **saved**, and how they are saved **is the Gospel**." Will they all then hear the Gospel? All that God is pleased to save will at some point "hear the Gospel" as taught above – not necessarily that so-called "gospel" of decisional salvation. Decisional salvation is all

in man's hands, and man has a good reputation of **failures!** It may be the elect will hear the Gospel as did Abraham, or the thief on the cross, or infants in Bethlehem. But we highly question whether very much "*Gospel*" is being preached today by modern-day professional evangelicals. If such are preaching the Gospel, they need to return home and start here all over again. The likelihood that they are preaching it overseas is questionable, seeing what they are exposed to at home! Precious little is being preached in the United States. None of us have any objection to ministers going forth and preaching ***the Gospel*** anywhere in the world. We reject the anti-Christian organizations directing ministries "to save" **those Christ has already saved**. (See Appendix B: ~ Black Rock Address, 1832..)

As we enter into those various things that Christ did for His people, the reader will often think: "But what about faith? Are we justified by grace through faith?" In brief, the answer is "Yes." But the *understanding* of what that "*faith*" is may be very different from what other religions present. Just to illustrate in passing: One may walk down an aisle, give his hand to a preacher, be baptized, and often thereafter declare that he "knows he is saved and heaven-bound!" He will call that "faith." A Hyper-calvinist will express his religious experience: "I have a hope in Christ." When asked, "Are you saved?" Almost to the man or woman, they will reply: "I have a hope that I am." The Scripture says: "*We are saved by hope: but hope that is SEEN is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that **we see not**, then do we with patience wait for it.*" (Rom. 8:25-25.) Such a man or woman is by necessity made to walk *by faith*; whereas the one who "knows he is saved and heaven-bound" based upon his *decisionism* is not *walking by faith*, but by a "know-so-salvation" which might very well be based upon what he did for himself. If such is the case, then his "faith" is nothing more than a "false hope." Seldom, if ever, do modern preachers even mention this "fruit of the Spirit."

They will talk endlessly about "faith," and "love", but "being without hope" they can't very well preach upon it, now, can they? What most refer to as "faith" is at best called "moral suasion." It is walking by *sight*; not by faith.

Here is Charles H. Spurgeon on the subject of "faith." Watch it closely. "Faith is chosen again, because it touches the springs of action." (This isn't true.) "I wonder whether I shall be wrong if I say that we never do anything except through faith of some sort. If I walk across my study it is because I believe my legs will carry me." (We doubt he gave it a thought!) "A man eats because he believes in *the necessity of food*;" (Again, I doubt many give it such a thought,) he goes to business because he believes in the value of money; he accepts a check because he believes that the bank will honor it. Columbus discovered America because he believed that there was another continent (sic) beyond the ocean; and the Pilgrim fathers colonized it because they believed that God would be with them on those rocky shores. Most grand deeds have been born of faith." (Ibid. page 61.) We underlined the word "believe(s)" in each of the above. Mr. Spurgeon made the same mistake all modern Evangelicals yet make: he equated "believing something" with "saving faith." He may not have had in mind the Scripture that says "*the devils believe and tremble*." Even Mr. Spurgeon would deny that devils are saved!

Now this type of "faith", *i.e.*, believing about things, suits well salvation by duty-faith. However, the discussion on this subject will be about a different kind of "faith." Not just a natural or intellectual believing about things. But one which is a "**fruit** of the Spirit," which must of necessity follow a birth by the Spirit; and this faith is a *gift* of God. The faith of which we speak is not, as Spurgeon believed, what "unites us with the life of God." Hyper-calvinists understand that it is *eternal life* given to one by the Holy Spirit in regeneration which had

experimentally "united the child of God to the life of God." Indeed, it **is** the "life of God" in a regenerate soul. It is somewhat surprising that Mr. Spurgeon should be so shallow on what he called "saving faith." This was his **specialty**! But he knew too little about it - much like a cabbage farmer piloting an airliner!

Paul, in writing of faith in that great chapter on the topic (Hebrews 11) said: *"Now faith is the **substance** of things hoped for? the **evidence** of things not seen, "* He again describes it : *"For by grace are ye saved through (not "by") faith, and that not of yourselves: It is the **gift of God**"* (Ephesians 2:8.) Again, he clarifies it more when he wrote: *"But the FRUIT of the SPIRIT is love, Joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, FAITH, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law."* (Galatians 5:22-23.)

That true evangelical faith is the fruit of the Holy Spirit and a free gift of God's grace is undeniable by a Christian. Hyper-calvinists deny that faith is merely "believing" about something, or anything. In fact, they will deny that *believing* that Christ has already saved His people from their sins; that He has made the atonement, *etc.*, is *faith*. Unregenerate people can believe just about anything anyone forceful enough can convince them of, including the bare historical truth. Brutus assassinated Caesar; Judas betrayed Christ - both are true and both are believed by natural men. That faith, which is a fruit of the indwelling Spirit, is a gift of God given to the believer for his edification and peace, and it is given. Notice: *"For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God UNTO SALVATION to everyone that BELIEVETH; (not unregenerate unbelievers, for such have not the Spirit, and cannot have His fruit); to the Jew first, and also the Greek. For therein (the Gospel is the antecedent here) is the righteousness of God REVEALED from faith to*



*faith: as it is written; the just shall live by faith,"* (Romans 1:16-17.) It would be very difficult to believe any reprobate; (or even an elect without the indwelling Spirit,) could profit by this kind of "faith," for it is revealed from faith, the indwelling faith of Christ, to the gift of faith given to the believer. But this faith is an operative gift. It is the grace which God increases or decreases for the spiritual exercise of His believing children. Being a fruit of the Spirit, it must follow quickening by the Spirit, and all God's quickened elect will be given this, and all other fruits of the Spirit. We can rightfully say that this faith is that which is evidenced by the act of faith. But it flows forth from the **faith of Christ** within the regenerate soul which is part and parcel with the new creature created in Christ Jesus in regeneration.

Abraham, who never heard an ordained Gospel minister believed the Gospel. So how did he hear it? He heard "good news," or had "glad tidings", of things pertaining to his salvation by the imputed righteousness of Christ, and was *given* faith to believe it. *"How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him (not "on" Him) of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent? (That is, sent of God) ... so then **faith** (not "life") cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God."* (Romans 10:16-17.) Again, faith is born within the new creature within a regenerate child of God, as John wrote: *"For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, **even your faith.**"* (John 5:4.) Unless this faith is ***in*** a man, it cannot "come forth by hearing," and this hearing is not just an external hearing, but one which is by Christ, the Living Word.

But laying aside the subject of "faith" for the next several pages, we will publish what Christ has done in the salvation of

His chosen people. We will return to the subject of faith later in this chapter. May the reader keep in mind that it is not designing a "plan of salvation" of which we write; but a presentation of salvation itself.

In the worship services of Hyper-calvinists churches in the United States, one of the most frequently called for hymns, throughout this nation, is entitled: "Jesus Is Our Great Salvation." It is hymn number 205 in the English' Gadsby's Collection used by the Gospel Standard Strict Baptists churches, and hymn number 172 in the Lloyd Collection in the United States. The words express the faith of Hyper-calvinists relative to the finished work of Christ:

“Jesus is our great salvation

Worthy of our best esteem

He hath saved His favorite nation

Join to sing aloud to Him;

He hath saved us, *He hath saved us,*

Christ alone could us redeem.

last verse:

Free election, known by calling,

Is a privilege divine

Saints are kept from final falling;

*All the glory Lord be Thine;*

All the glory, Lord, is Thine!

This is the point of doctrine the Neo-calvinists have not grasped. As stated in another popular song among the household of faith, "It Is Finished."

"Salvation through our *dying Lamb*

*Is finished and complete*

He paid what'er His people owed,

*And canceled all their debt.*

He sends His Spirit from above

Our nature to renew;

Displays His power, reveals His love,

Gives life and comfort too."

The Lloyd Hymnal was first printed in 1832, and the Gadsby Collection shortly thereafter. These hymns are not new. They express what our ancient forefathers believed. They, as Hyper-calvinists today, believed that it was as wrong to sing a lie as to preach or tell one. So what they sung is a good measure of what they believed and loved.

Many years ago, Arthur W. Pinks wrote a small booklet entitled: Four-Fold Salvation. He presented salvation, not as when one has a quickening experience, or as Pelagians, "got saved," but as a total salvation involving all that is done and experienced in that one great salvation. In his presentation, he included that aspect of salvation which is past: election, redemption, *etc.*; that which is present: regeneration and

conversion; and that which is future: the salvation from the presence of sin, *etc.* His lesson was that salvation is one integral whole. God purposed salvation; the Son purchased salvation; and the Holy Spirit applies that salvation. The elect were saved in that sanctification whereby they were set aside in eternity as vessels of honor, and preserved in Christ Jesus in seed substance; they were saved in that work whereby they were redeemed unto God, and thus from the dominion of sin; they are now saved from the pleasure of sin by the indwelling Spirit of God; and they shall finally be saved from the very presence of sin when they are forever removed from its present temptations and warfare in the saints' glorification. He helped clarify in the minds of multitudes the many ways "*salvation*" is expressed in the Scriptures. Alas, too few, are aware of this unity in the work of the Eternal Godhead within the elect family of God. An understanding of "*salvation*" will forever destroy the effect of the "*free offer system.*" The work of Christ on the cross is the "*means*" of salvation.

Another aspect of the *one completed* salvation is its application by the Holy Spirit. That aspect of salvation is the giving of *eternal life* to an elect and redeemed soul. It is expressed as a "*quickenings*," a "*being born again*," (not in the sense of Pelagians, which is something contingent on the one "*getting saved*," nor as some Calvinists, the one born the first time of the flesh is born all over again a second time by the Spirit;) but a "*being born from above*." It is referred to as a "*new creature*," "*life and immortality*," or just "*eternal life*." It is a work of the Spirit of God without human assistance. Those who experience it, are "*begotten of God*," are "*born of God*." God is the progenitor – not the preacher! Such are said by Peter not to be "*born of corruptible seed*," which is the case if begotten by any man. John made this clear in John 1:12, "*which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor the will of man, but of God*." One cannot be more clear and specific than this! But

Peter continued, saying, "*Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible (seed), by the word of God. . .*" And just in case some Pelagian thinks this is the preached or written word, the Holy Ghost clarifies what He means, saying, "*which liveth and abideth forever.*" Paul makes it clear that this incorruptible seed is "Christ"- (Galatians 3:16.) Most importantly, this new birth is based upon the finished work of Christ and applied only to those the Father gave Him: for whom He redeemed, reconciled, justified, and saved by His blood. In other words, the Holy Spirit applies this salvation after the fact of their being saved by the Son. Nor is there any obstacle in the way of His applying it to the ones already saved by Christ's atoning death. He will never make a mistake and apply it to one not elected nor redeemed. And equally so, He will not fail to apply it to **all** those Christ saved by His blessed work. The application of this salvation is necessary. It is an integral part of the full salvation of all the elect. First, The Father gave the elect to Christ as Mediator for Him to redeem and save. Second, the Son did just that; and what a great and glorious work that was, too! Third, the Holy Spirit begins that experimental application of salvation with a spiritual preparation within the child of God. Nothing spiritual can be understood in the absence of a spiritual being. The natural man cannot "*receive the things of the Spirit of God,*" so the elect, while dead in trespasses and sin, are as much in darkness as the reprobates. In that state, there is no difference. They, too, are referred to as "*vessels of wrath even as others.*" But praises to God, they will not continue in that state and condition! Just as the sacrifice of Christ in taking away the sins of God's elect was preparatory *externally* to making them holy; so too, in that preparatory *internal* work, the Holy Spirit brings to life and salvation in a *quickenning, or begetting* work. This life and immortality begins the warfare within the child of God, even though at first he is still in darkness as to what Christ has done for his

poor soul. This quickening work will culminate eventually in the new *birth*. Unlike Neo-calvinists and Pelagians, the Hyper-calvinists do *not make the new birth, faith, and repentance* simultaneous to, or conditions for, life and salvation. Life must precede all these gracious works within the soul, and it is through this Life that the Holy Spirit directs those experiences. These are *separate* works of the Spirit. John the Baptist "*shall be great in the sight of the Lord and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; He shall be **filled with the Holy Ghost**, from his mother's womb.*" (Luke 1:15.) " ... *when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost.*" She said: ". . . *the babe leaped in my womb **with joy**.*" (Luke 1:41, 44.) This *begetting* unto spiritual life is a sovereign, unassisted, work of the Holy Spirit without human instrumentally. God needs no midwives or obstetricians; He does that alone, just as one's father did when he beget his child by its mother! It is a necessary experience within one *in order to* faith and repentance, which will certainly follow it as the experience of grace proceeds. How much later? Hyper-calvinists believe it to be variable or unique to each child of grace. It is at "the appointed time." That work of the Spirit creates a *spiritual man within* the *natural* man. This enables the one born of God to now discern spiritual things, where before he could not understand them. With this sight, a warfare between the flesh and the spirit begins; and the gift of faith born in the new man, and the work of Godly sorrow, come into evidence. Both are of the Holy Spirit. These are some of the many things that "*accompany salvation.*" It is here that the Gospel shines the brightest. It is the Gospel, as we will show, that brings this "life and immortality" **to light** within the believer's understanding. To such a person prepared of God, the Gospel is certainly "glad tidings"!

It is here at this point of experience, that the Pelagians

and Fullerite Neo-calvinists talk about "being saved," or, "I got saved," or "We saved hundreds," etc. They counterfeit these blessings of the Spirit with the natural works of the creature. But that is *not* where salvation commenced. As J. M. Pendleton remarked, "Can there be a regenerate unbeliever?" Surely there can be, and it is often the case: "*Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief.*" Can there be an unregenerate believer?" He asked. We answer, Surely there are: "*The devils believe, and tremble,*" and such were Simon Magnus, Judas Iscariot, and multitude of thousands dragged, scared, begged, and bribed to join religious institutions today.

Salvation is "*from sin*" from the "*penalty of sin*;" from the "*power and dominion of sin*;" from the "*pleasure of sin*;" and eventually from the very "*presence of sin*." It is at death and in the bodily resurrection of the saints the elect are actually fully saved from the presence of sin. Until then, they do not "know they are saved and heaven bound." They will know that when *they are actually heaven bound!* All of this together - and much more, is salvation. At no point is it man's work! The order of this is, in part, expressed by Paul: "*For He is our peace, who hath made both one,*" (the circumcision, or Jews, and the uncircumcision, the Gentiles) "*and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that He might reconcile both unto God in one body on the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were far off, and to them that are nigh.*" (Ephesians 2:14-17.) This reconciliation, in the sense in which the apostle used it, is already accomplished, and according to him, it was accomplished "*on the cross.*" Is this true? It certainly appears so, for again he wrote: "*And you, that were sometimes alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet NOW HATH HE RECONCILED.*" (Colossians 1:21.) And

again, while in His flesh: *"Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people."* (Hebrews 2:17.) So, in a legal sense, reconciliation between God and the elect sinner has already been made. It is only upon this finished reconciliation that Gospel ministers, as ambassadors of Christ, can "beseech" sinners to be reconciled to God. It is certain, that if Christ has not reconciled them, they could not themselves do anything that would make satisfaction for their offenses! Christ has already established peace through the blood of the cross two thousand years ago. He is not going to do this again, for the next time He appears, it will *"be without sin unto salvation."* In all three texts above it is most clearly stated that Christ has already reconciled His people; and one of them named the place and the time He did so: *"on the cross."* Here, then, is a finished, completed, and accomplished reconciliation! A most God-honoring doctrine! What a terrible price was paid to reconcile sinners! No preacher, evangelist, or soul-winner could have accomplished such a gracious work! The preparatory work was by the Spirit within the child of God, and the reconciliation by Christ on the cross, are "means" of salvation of which our forefathers often wrote.

A notable part of reconciliation is the propitiation of our sins. Can anyone insist that propitiation is incomplete until one believes? Not likely. The word means "to appease divine wrath; and expiate sin; to render satisfaction." Interestingly, the text most often used to overthrow the doctrine of propitiation, is the very one which establishes it. Those who look at the text and see the "sins of the whole world" overlook the meaning of the word "propitiation" altogether. They would not themselves apply "propitiation" to every son of Adam's fallen race! That would be universalism, which they reject - rightly so. Let us examine it,



and establish this doctrine. *"He is the propitiation for our sins; and not only ours, but also the sins of the whole world."* (1 John 2:2.) Recall our previous discussion of "the whole world." Which "whole world" does John intend here; The world of the righteous or the "world of the ungodly"? But for now, let us examine "propitiation."

If Christ "appeased divine wrath," "made satisfaction," and "expiated the sins" of all mankind, then they are all saved. If this is so, the "evangelists" and "soul winners" are out of work! (Oh yes, If He has propitiated the sins of the elect, they are also out of business!) The question to raise here is: Did Christ, in fact, propitiate the sins of everyone? Obviously, He did not. It is hardly imaginable that the rankest freewiller would be foolish enough to argue that point. Some were already in hell when He did that work; and many more arrive there daily. But, the writer does not wish to dodge the phrase: "for the sins of the whole world," lest some reader make a point of it. Christ asked of a man *"Should he gain the whole world and lose his own soul."* (Matt. 16:26.) Is this the "whole world" whose sins have been expiated, put away, and for which the wrath of God has been appeased? Hardly! He spoke of the Gospel which would be preached "in the whole world." John used this statement here, and in 1 John 5:19, when he wrote of "the *whole world lieth in wickedness.*" Has He put their sins away, and appeased the wrath of God against them? John used the same expression again in Revelations 12:9 and none dare claim these were the objects of His redeeming love! *"And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him."* When John says, "We are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness," it is conclusively true that there are two different people under consideration: The "We who are of God," and the "whole world" that lieth in wickedness. In our text here, John

speaks of Christ being the propitiation for the sins of believers then presents, as well as those for whom Christ died everywhere, in all nations, in every place, and in every age. No! He cannot be the propitiation for the sins of any who will eventually "be turned into hell." The text says that He is (not-*will become*) the "*propitiation for our sins.*" (I John 4:10.) - not "for ***their*** sins."

So, Christ has already "reconciled" His people and that was "on the cross." Here we find that He is the "propitiation" for our sins too. Let us next look at "redemption." Is this something done, or left to be done? Is it something that is of God, or is it left up to ministers, "evangelists," and "soul-winners" to do? What saith the scripture?

The words "redemption" and "ransom" are similar in effects. Both are words associated with setting someone free from bondage. They differ in a very important way. Redemption has to do with slaves, or "bond servants." Ransom has to do with captivity, as in a kidnapping, or seizure. No one can "redeem" anyone, or anything, that is not legally his. If you have a savings bond, and wish to redeem it, the banker will first check and see if it is truly yours. If one stole it, and tried to redeem it, they would fail to be able to do so. If the reader had been in my American History class in high school, and on a twenty question true or false test, had answered "true" to a question: "Did Abraham Lincoln free the slaves by his emancipation proclamation?" The reader would have been penalized five points! They did not belong to Abraham Lincoln! They were freed by the Thirteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. The emancipation proclamation applied only to the States "still in rebellion" where he had no power; and was not applied to Union States where he might have had some influence. Abraham Lincoln had nothing to do with the freeing of the Confederate slaves: he was assassinated before the

Thirteenth Amendment was ratified, which did *legally* set the slaves free.

Now, American history lesson over! It is reasonable to consider that there probably were slaves that did not get their freedom immediately after the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment, due to wickedness of former slave-holders, or lack of communication. Nevertheless, they were as *legally* free as they would have been if they had heard about it, and sent away from the plantation! Hearing about it, or not hearing about it, had nothing to do with the legal fact: They were no longer slaves!

It is just as reasonable to imagine that a freedman having no experience with being free, could not have grasped the concept of "freedom" when he first heard of it. He might have heard it used many times, in many different ways, before the concept developed in his mind. It is also reasonable, that when a freedman grasped the concept that he was no longer a slave that it was (unless he was a Hyper-calvinist) the greatest and most joyful news he ever heard! He may well have wept and shouted for joy!

Finally, while Mr. Lincoln could not free any slaves (He had none), they were born in the United States, and according to the ancient and historical principle of *jus soli*, they were citizens of these United States, and thus the United States *could* legally, and did, free them all!

Maybe the above gets the main features of "redemption" across. Christ redeemed His people two thousand years ago, and they are free, and He could legally do so, because the Creator God had "given" them to Him. "*Thine they were, and Thou hast given them Me.*" (John 17:6). Some of them may have

never heard about it yet, some haven't been able to believe it yet, even when told; and some have wept and shouted upon the belief of it tendered to their once benighted soul! And, no preacher, no messenger, no soul-winner, **freed** a one of them! They belong to the Lord. He has ever called them "My people." It was Christ, "*Who gave "Himself for us that He might redeem US from all iniquity and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."* (Titus 2:14.)

Peter, to insist upon a holy walk and conversation, reminded the saints, saying: "*forasmuch as ye know that ye were not (past tense) redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, but redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as a Lamb without blemish and without spot,*" (1Pet. 1:18, 19.) Again, as you can see they are already redeemed and that by the blood of Christ which was shed two thousand years ago. If you believe the above, you are very near, if not altogether, a Hyper-calvinist!

It should be apparent to spiritually enlightened souls that to give a "free offer of salvation" to all, when the redemption is already made, and that "**for us**" is to demonstrate a degree of spiritual blindness, as well as an irrational mind. This redemption is called an "eternal redemption," and it is already accomplished "on the cross." To give a free offer to anyone who was not included in that finished redemption, is to "*cast pearls before swine,*" or to "*give the children's bread to dogs,*" as our Lord said.

So we see that God's people are already "reconciled" by the death of His Son; that He is the "propitiation" for **their** sins already; and that He has already redeemed them to God "*out of every nation, tongue, tribe and people.*" (Revelation 4:11). Can any reader declare that Christ has not done this work His

Father sent Him to do? He said that He did, and that He finished it! Who will dispute the suffering Savior? Are these things necessary for the salvation of His people? Who did these things? Christ or preachers? We hope we made the point clear enough. Together, these, and more, are "means" of salvation.

A "ransom" is designed to set a *lawfully* free man free of *illegal* captivity. An example of this is when England, under King John, taxed the population to raise a ransom to free Richard "the Lion-hearted" from the dungeon in Italy where he had been incarcerated for this ransom. Another is when Charles Lindberg's child was kidnapped and held for ransom. Both a "ransom" and "redemption" is a price paid to free the captive. Now, may we ask: Did Christ pay a price to ransom "all mankind", or to "ransom His people who were held in bondage by sin and Satan"? Which are *actually* "ransomed"? The answer to that last question should establish the doctrine we discuss next.

When one considers what the Scriptures teach about a ransom, one can also see that it is already done. A ransom *releases* the captive *legally*. Those elect who "*are led captive by sin and Satan*" and in their earlier experience of grace while under the law, are freed from sin's enslaving power. They are translated from Satan's kingdom of darkness into the glorious kingdom of God by Christ setting up that kingdom within them. It is on the basis of this ransom that this translation occurs and He, in their experience becomes their "Lord and King." The children of the kingdom full well know who is their Lord and King. They recognize that God is sovereign - an *absolute Monarch*. They are brought into subjection to Him by free and sovereign grace.

Since the subject relative to "ransom for many," and "ransom for all," has already been discussed, we leave this

precious work of Christ with this emphasis here: "If Christ has *ransomed* anyone, that one is already ransomed; and that one is freed from the *condemnation* of sin. And since Christ "*gave His blood for the ransom*," it, too, is already an accomplished aspect of their salvation. They have already been judicially saved; they have been reconciled; they have the blood of Christ for the propitiation of their sins; they are already redeemed; and they have already been ransomed. Well might we, as Paul, conclude the subject of "ransom" and "redemption" with a word of finality: "*Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in ONCE into the holy place, having **OBTAINED** eternal redemption for us.*" (Heb. 9:12.) Is this true? Did He do what Paul here credits Him having done? Is it something left to be done when one believes it? "*And for this cause He IS the mediator of the New Testament that by mean of His death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.*" And, "*So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; (not for everybody) and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation.*" (Heb. 9:15,28.) Can language be any more specific? This is a finished salvation. It is the salvation that the Holy Spirit gives to the elect sinner at divine quickening.

One of the great offices the dear Savior holds is that of a Mediator, and there is but "*one Mediator between God and man.*" A mediator is a "go-between;" an internunciator; a reconciler. He is the one who must be able to put hands upon *both* parties in an offense. As the Son of God in the Godhead, His Father "*heareth Him always*" and as the Son of Man in His humanity, "*He is the perfect captain of our salvation, able to be touched by our infirmities.*" Christ is the Mediator of a "*better testament.*" (Heb. 8:6) As a Mediator, His office is to stand between the offended Justice of God, on the one hand, and the vile offender on the other, and to make intercession for the elect

sinner, and reconcile him to God, thus making peace. That work, and that peace, was accomplished on the cross in His suffering as the substitute for the elect sinners, and by that gracious work, in that office, He opened the way for the internal work of the Holy Spirit at the time of their quickening and new birth. This work is already done. It too, is finished on earth, and He sits at the right hand of God now making intercession for the saints according to the will of God. Christ's work as a Mediator is another "means" of salvation.

Another great office of Christ which was necessary for the accomplishment of salvation was that of a Surety. Sin incurs a *debt*, for "*the wages of sin is death.*" We agree with Jonathan Edwards's point that one sin against an infinite God is an infinite transgression, and deserves an infinite penalty. This is one reason it took an infinite Being to pay the debt for infinite transgressions. What, pray tell, can a sinner do to put away his sin? How can he pay an infinite debt? He cannot do it, for he has nothing with which to pay it but more sins, iniquities, and transgressions! Here, then, is the beauty of this doctrine: Whereas the sinner cannot, in Christ he has a Surety who can! And did! (Past tense.) "*By so much more was Jesus made a Surety of a better testament*" (Heb. 7:22.) It is understood that students today are seldom taught legal expressions, but one that is an adult should know what a "surety" is. A man stands in need of money. To go into debt without anything with which to pay, the creditor accepts assurance for the payment from another person. This other person is the **surety** for that man's obligation. In case the debtor fails to pay, the creditor demands of the *surety* the payment for the debt. The debtor is free from the obligation to the creditor, and cannot now pay the debt. If he wishes to make payment later, he must make it to the surety. Here is the blessed point we make: God will not twice demand the payment due the elect sinner's debt, first at the hand of the dear Surety, and then again at the hand of the

debtor to grace! The very fact that Christ has paid the debt forever releases the redeemed children of God from the penalty of their sins! As a bankrupt debtor, the poor sinner cannot pay, and his Surety forfeits, and paid the debt for him. Now that the debt is paid by Christ, it is canceled: "Paid in Full." Christ stood, in the eternal covenant as the "surety for the debts owed due to the sins of the elect," and when Justice called in the debt, Christ paid it in full. Justice will not require its payment again at the judgment. This too, *is a finished work!* There is no way that when one believes, or when they "let go and let god have his way," or read the "Roman-road Plan of Salvation," etc., can pay a single debt sin has made to the justice of God. It is already paid! It is one vital aspect of that finished and accomplished salvation worked by Christ in His substitutionary death. This, too, is a "means of salvation".

When the Lord was about to finish His course here below, He instituted the "communion" with His close ones and washed their feet. At that occasion, He took the cup of wine and said: *"Drink ye all of it: For this is My blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the REMISSION of their sins."* (Matt. 26:28.) The word "testament" here means "a disposition," as in the sense of a *"bequest."* It is how one disposes of his earthly possessions at death. This refers to Christ's "last will and testament" to **His children**. This concept centers upon the *"inheritance."* An inheritance is a *family bequest*. It is not made for strangers, or other people's families. This is for God's elect family and none others. They are *"predestinated to an inheritance."* Hence, this blood of the new testament - an allusion to a legal signature to a will - is in the context of this family's affairs. His children inherit, each their own portion according to His will. This blood of the will was shed for *many*; for His heirs are "many." Certainly it could not be for all mankind! In the text, the word "for" is in the Greek, "eis," which can mean "because of" the *remission of their sins.*" This surely



proves several important facts. (1) Their sins are already remitted by the shedding of His blood about two thousand years ago. (2) Those whose sins were then remitted are numbered in His family, as heirs, and are "*no longer strangers and aliens to the commonwealth of Israel.*" (Ephesians 2:12.) (3) They only, by the ties of this family kinship, all being begotten and born of one Father, receive the predestinated inheritance because they have been "*predestinated unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His WILL.*" (Eph. 1:5.)

This being so, it is a finished and accomplished action, because the testament is in force upon the "death of the testator," - Christ. "*For where a testament is, there must be also of necessity the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead; otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.*" (Heb. 9:16-17.) Paul makes the same connection as Christ did between the testament and the remission of sins. It should be noted that "remission of sins" is not upon the act of faith, repentance, confession, and baptism. It is by the shed blood of Christ alone. Let us go to the testimony of the Word and prove this important point. "*Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover He sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood there is no remission.*" (Heb. 9:22.)

Again, the point is emphasized: This is a finished, accomplished, and successful work of Christ while He was here in His flesh. Believing, repenting, confessing, and being baptized are not the *procuring causes* for the remission of sins. The shedding of His blood two thousand years ago *purged the sins* of all for whom He died, and at the same time it remitted those sins. Peter's encouragement for baptism was upon the

consideration of their sins having been remitted. Paul was baptized, figuratively "*washing away his sins.*" It was only a figure, for "*baptism even now doth save us, not with the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but an answer of a good conscience before God.*" What God's People *do* by faith, repentance, and baptism, is in this *figure*. They react outwardly to an inward testimony of the Spirit, who testifies of the finished work of Christ and the remission of their sins thereby. His People, being already saved by His death, judicially, (where the penalties of the broken law cannot touch them) embrace this work by faith, believing the promises of God. Both the purpose, and the scope, and the effects of Christ's death are in harmony. For those the Father gave to Him in election, and these same ones for whom He died and remitted their sins by His blood, are the very ones the Spirit quickens. The work of Christ in the remitting of their sins is another "means" of salvation. Christ is the Savior of Sinners.

All the "free offers" of the so-called "Evangelicals" while proselytizing the world cannot in anywise add a single *stranger* to God's elect family. He cannot regenerate, or "beget" a one of them to spiritual life. As Daniel prophesied, so shall it be: "*But the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever and ever.*" (Dan. 7:18.) Jesus admonished His true evangelists not to rejoice because devils were subject to them, but to rejoice that their names were written in heaven; and to those on His right hand in the judgment, He shall say: "*Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for YOU from the foundation of the world.*" (Matt. 25:34.) As one should know, "from the foundation of the world" was a very long time ago- even eternally! And that is how long that the kingdom has been prepared for God's elect people to possess. It never was for the "world of the ungodly." The preparation of this kingdom to house the heirs of God and joint-heirs of Christ was also a "means" of salvation.

The work of Christ in the justification of sinners is a vital aspect of salvation, and it too, is a completed work. Let us consider it as we also cover the promised discussion of faith.

Christ is said to be "*the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.*" (Rom. 3:26.) When one considers that the Scripture says "*as many as were ordained to eternal life believed,*" these are the same ones that are given faith to believe, (Acts 13:48), then it is clear that Christ has already successfully finished the work of justifying them "*by His Blood,*" (Rom. 5:9 and Rom. 3:24,) through His redemption. It is to such as are "justified by His blood" and "redemption", and only to such is justifying faith given. And, remember, this faith is a **gift** of God which is not given to all men alike. Those that are justified by His blood are those who are "*justified by the faith of Christ.*" Please do not read over that without reflection. This text says they are justified by the "faith of Christ;" not the faith of the believer. "*It is GOD that justifieth.*" (Rom. 8:33.) The reader will need to clear his mind of commonly accepted "evangelical" jargon to follow this concept. The term "justified by faith," as a procuring of salvation for a "decider-for-Christ" has been greatly overworked. This is not to say that we are not, in one sense, "justified by faith." But care must be taken to stay with the Scriptures. The "justification by faith" in the elect's experience can only be possible as a result of Christ having already fulfilled the obligations of the law for them and having remitted their sins. He put those sins "as far as the east is from the west." He did not put them as far as the "north is from the south"! That distance is much less than the "east is from the west." And He promised, "*their sins and iniquity will I remember no more.*" Can you not see why those called "Hyper-calvinists" insist that salvation by our precious Lord is fully accomplished, completed, and finished? It is upon this successful and sufficient atonement that the believer is led into the "*rest that remaineth for the people of God.*" That salvation

was, as our Lord discussed with Moses and Elias on the mount, "accomplished by His death AT Jerusalem." (Luke 9:31.) This would be accomplished by His death at Jerusalem, not when they believed it AT a "revival meeting." As the apostle taught, "*Much more then, being NOW JUSTIFIED by His blood, we shall be. saved from wrath through Him."* (Rom. 5:9.) "Oh, that men would praise the Lord" and "tell of His wondrous works."

It is easy to understand that after years and years of hearing nothing else but "plans of salvation," - this one, or that one, maybe this one, etc., how one would have difficulty in grasping a salvation fully predicated on the glorious accomplishment of our Redeemer God. But to merely substitute "Calvinism", "Fullerism," "Spurgeonism," or "Campbellism," or other "sacraments" is to miss the whole focus of what Christ came to do, and in fact did do, by free and sovereign grace! Justification by the blood of Christ is a "means" of salvation. It, too, is finished and complete.

"Faith" as we will present it next, is also a "means" of salvation. Obviously, after presenting all the above, the reader should guess that we will not be predicating salvation on that "faith" of which Charles Spurgeon, or Pelagians, speak about. "*By grace are you saved through faith, and that* (faith-the antecedent) *is not of yourselves; it is the GIFT of God.*" (Eph. 2:5) Faith in what? That "Jesus will save you *if* you will *let Him?*" Whatever that "letting" is, it certainly is not *faith!* - Faith in believing that "joining a religious society, in some way or other will save you?" That is not "the faith of God's elect." (Titus 1:1.) As seen previously in Spurgeon's definition of "faith," there is something the religious world calls "faith" which is only "moral suasion." It is a counterfeit which many suppose is true "faith," which deceives them and lures them into complacency and apathy relative to their standing before God. That "faith" is thought to be

believing about something. One walking across the room is not "faith," nor is "faith" necessary to do it. *"All men hath not faith,"* but many of them walk across rooms every day! Not only so, but one can have an explicit trust in what they believe, even when what they believe is manifestly false. This past year, (1998) a goodly number of "believers" in something, killed themselves to catch a ride on a space ship they thought was hiding behind a comet! Was that the "saving faith" of the Scripture? No! It was a kind of "suasion" found in natural man, and possessed in common with all mankind. It is the kind that "evangelists" use to get followers. It works, too, in doing that! But it is *not* that faith *"of the operation of God,"* nor does it have any effect on salvation. The devils believe, having that kind of faith, and they tremble before it. Both fallen man and fallen angels possess this kind of "faith," or "moral suasion."

The Hyper-calvinists understand that there are various degrees of faith; and that there is more than one kind of faith taught in the Scripture. First, there is a variable faith, sometimes "great faith," and at other times a "little faith," which is the *fruit of the Spirit* and is *"dealt to every man the measure of faith."* (Rom. 12:3.) God is the author, originator, sustainer, and disposer of this faith. *"By grace are ye saved through faith, . . . and that is the gift of God"* (Eph. 2:8), and being *"not of yourselves,"* it is not that faith in moral suasion of which the unregenerate speak. They fully claim that everyone has that "faith," and can exercise it at will. So it can't be this faith. By a "measure", this faith of which we hold is given as it is needed according to God's sovereign judgment and disposition. He can increase it, or decrease it as He pleases, and every child of God has experienced both of these variations. *"Lord, I believe; help Thou my unbelief."*

This variable, measured *gift* of faith is a *"fruit of the Spirit."* (Gal. 5:22.) It is not found in natural man. For there

to be "fruits of the Spirit," there must of necessity be the *presence* of the *indwelling Spirit*. Therefore, this faith of which we write cannot *precede the work of the Spirit* in quickening to life, but it is in *consequence* of it within the believers. And more importantly, it is an *evidence* of such a work. "*Without faith it is impossible to please God*". For a poor doubting soul, mourning over a lack of evidence of his sonship, this faith is of utmost comfort: "*Verily; verily; I say unto you, He that believeth on Me HATH everlasting life.*" (John 6:47.) It is that kind of faith of which the New Testament abundantly speaks.

Some Calvinists might object to the following discussion, but it is of sufficient importance to present here. That is, there is a *justifying faith*, which is expressed in Scripture different from the previous one. It is not *variable*. It is never increased or decreased. It never changes and it never fails. It is a constant. And for it to be *justifying*, all should wish it to be. The faith that justifies a sinner by the *imputed righteousness of Christ* is referred to in Scripture as the "*faith of Christ*," or, the "*Faith of God*." This is *not our* faith, but His. Nor is it the variable faith which is given as a "fruit of the Spirit." It is this "faith" which is a "means" of salvation. It is that faith which is born of God and which overcometh the world. It is that faith that hears and embraces the Word of God, and finds peace and comfort in believing. Let us see it in another light:

The righteousness of God without the law is found in *Christ*. As the apostle stated it: "*Even the righteousness of God which is by the faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe.*" (Rom. 3:22.) Now this "faith of Jesus Christ" is clearly a "justifying faith" for all who believe in Him. This faith of Jesus Christ is interstitially connected to that "faith of the operation of God," so that a believer having the one also has the other. The blessed aspect of it is that it does not waver, nor

cannot fail. It does not vary from experience to experience. It is connected to the eternal vital union of Christ with His body, the church. And it is a vital part of that full and completely finished salvation that Christ accomplished at Jerusalem for His people. That "faith of God" justifies because it is in Christ, who "is our life." Again, it is His faith *within* His people in whom He dwells. It is imparted in the new birth, when the seed of Christ is begotten in one, bringing him life and immortality. It is this life and immortality that is *brought to light* by the Gospel. Since only Christ "hath immortality," for them to possess it can only be if Christ be in them.

The following falls short of what the writer would wish to use to better the reader's understanding of this subject, but it may be useful. A doctor tells a patient that he needs more protein in his system, and advises him of what foods are rich in that substance. The protein is *in* the food and upon the consumption of that food, the protein is *in the patient*. The protein is not derived from the man, but from the food within the man. So, too, the indwelling of "Christ in you the hope of glory" in eternal vital (living) union with a believer, gives to that believer all things that are *IN Christ*. This includes "the faith of Christ." The subject of eternal vital union is seldom mentioned today, but in the past it was often the subject of ministerial discourses. Today, Hyper-calvinists still believe and preach the doctrine of eternal vital union, of which "justifying faith of Christ" is central. The believer is *justified by the imputed righteousness of Christ*, and the "faith of Jesus Christ" in that believer is "*accounted unto him for righteousness*." If salvation were withheld until one believed, divine quickening would *follow faith*; but the Scripture clearly places life before faith. This faith, implanted in the new creature in the begetting to spiritual life is the grace given whereby there is produced in a quickened sinner a "coming to Christ." One can not "come to Christ" unless he first believes

that He is, and this faith is a revelation to the soul, of Christ, and upon the hearing of the Gospel, this faith embraces Christ. It is operative in leading one to sanctification of the truth.

Mr. Murray, in his *Spurgeon vs. Hyper-calvinism*, makes a negative remark about a Strict Baptist in England to the effect that "at least he did not talk of imputed sanctification." He said no more on the subject, but his attitude was apparent. Mr. Murray is ignorant of the Scripture about "sanctification"! Christ called Paul and commissioned him to preach the Gospel, in the which he was commanded " ... *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 an inheritance among them which are **SANCTIFIED by faith that is in ME.***" (Acts 26:18.) If that is not imputed sanctification by the faith of Christ, then righteousness, which is by the faith of Christ is not imputed either! Both are of the same source! Not only is justification by the faith of Christ, and is imputed; so too, in one sense is sanctification. "Sanctification" is the setting aside of something, or someone, exclusively for a holy use. **The eternal vital union of Christ with His seed in Him is truly "sanctification," because all God's people are already so set apart for His glory.** Upon the foundation of Christ's finished work, the Holy Spirit sanctifies the elect by that divine call to life and immortality. As Paul wrote: "*But of Him are ye IN Christ Jesus, (vital union) who of God is made unto US wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.*" (I Cor. 1:30.) To be able to render praise to God, it is helpful to understand those things that are "of God."

When Paul counted all things as dung, that he might win Christ, he wrote: "*And be found IN Him (vital union), not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is*



*through the faith **of** Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."* (Phil. 3:9.) The beauty of this doctrine lies in the security of the believer that it affords. So often a child of God may, through manifold temptations, spiritual darkness, or an increased feeling of sinfulness have doubts of his "calling and election;" which presents to him a sore trial of his faith. Sometimes faith is strong and at other times it is evidenced only by the grace of hope. And sometimes it appears to be missing altogether. But blessed be the God of all grace, that faith by which the dear Savior laid His head in the grave, full well knowing His body would not see corruption, or his soul remain in hell, is *in the believer* where Christ dwells by faith, and he is justified by faith on the promise of God. That *justifying faith of Christ* is as surely a free gift as anything else can be. Paul spoke of it in this manner: "*Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law*" (nor by a plan of salvation either!) "*but by the faith of Jesus Christ even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law, shall no flesh be justified.*" (Gal. 2:16.) This justifying faith is an interstitial aspect of the believer's vital union with Christ. This justifying faith, being in Christ, is a "means" of salvation.

Now, since eternal vital union is almost never heard of in modern Christianity, it is appropriate to briefly touch on it here, since the "faith of Christ" and some other aspects of it are important to the view of a completed salvation. We will merely summarize it by pointing out what it is that a believer has *in* Christ. "*For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth **in*** (not: about ) *Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*" (John 3:16.) Notice carefully the next verse: "*He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.*" (John 3:36) Here we have an expression of "everlasting" life. But in John 3:15, notice

this difference: *"That whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have eternal life."* What, then, is the difference between "everlasting" and "eternal" life? Eternal has no beginning and it has no end. Everlasting commences with the implanting of eternal life, in Holy Spirit quickening, and last forever after. That eternal life that each child of God receives has always existed in God for the believer; and by the eternal counsel of God was always his. In a point in time, his eternal life in Christ is communicated to him in nature by the quickening to life and immortality, and this immortality in him is united in the oneness with Christ in a vital, or living, union. For only Christ *"hath immortality dwelling in the light, which no man can approach"*. In that living union, the eternal life is everlasting, and shall never end; nor can the believer ever be severed from this union with Christ. Christ *"is in him the hope of glory,"* and he is a *"partaker of the divine nature"* in his spiritual inner man. He is in Christ even as Christ is in him. Christ is the object of this gift of faith, and thus the "substance of things hoped for." And Christ in him is the evidence of things not seen. It is the faith **of** Christ in him that justifies a redeemed sinner. Christ is the *federal Head, as well as the actual Head*, of all His elect people, who, in union with Him by that eternal life, make up the fullness of His body, the Church.

Now consider the unity of all that Christ has done, and by His uniting them in union with Himself, all that He has done is accounted to them as what they, too, *have done*. First, consider His birth: *"Shall a nation be born in a day?"* Yet, the entire family of God, the Zion of God, was IN Christ Jesus the day He was born, and they in Him are accounted as also having been born that day. Again, on the eighth day after Jesus was born, according to the law, He was circumcised. (Matt. 2:21.) Also, of those in Him, it is recorded: *"In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands? in putting off the body of sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ."* (Col.

2:11) That word, "with," above carries a specific meaning. In the Greek, it is "soon": meaning, in union, together, in complement". This word "with" carries that binding union everywhere it is used in the New Testament, which is very profound! The principle of this union is taught throughout the New Testament in much that Christ did. The Lord was immersed by John in Jordan. (Matt. 3:15.) And, we are *"Buried with Him in baptism? wherein also ye are risen WITH Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead."* (Col. 2:12.) Christ died, was buried and quickened again from the dead. Note: *"And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together WITH Him having (past tense) forgiven you all trespasses."* (Col. 2:13.) Even His obedience is accounted to His people as their obedience as well: *"For by one man's disobedience (Adam's) many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one (Christ's) shall many be made righteous."* (Rom. 5:19.) This too, is a "means" of grace, and a finished work.

When our forefathers wrote of the "means of grace," or the "means of salvation," the above are the *means* that they had reference to. Then Andrew Fuller and his followers came along, they began to talk about the "means of salvation" also. But their "means" were not what Christ had done. To them, the "Gospel" was a means; "free offers" were means; "tracts" were means; "protracted meetings" ("revivals") were means; "theological schools" were means; "tithing" was means; and the "means" have never ceased to multiply to this day! Praise bands, praise stomping, karate-for-Jesus, Crusades for Christ, Youth evangelism, Singles fellowship, Gay harvests, busing ministry, youth ministry, music ministry, televangelism, - just make up the rest of the list yourself. If they don't now exist, they will as soon as someone thinks of it! But: the full, finished, complete and accomplished salvation of all God's elect is a present-tense salvation. It is not conditional on the creatures'

puny efforts. The faith **of** Christ, the eternal vital union, and the personal union of the whole household of faith, testify to the full salvation of the "general assembly, the Church of the Firstborn, whose names are written in heaven."

There is a tendency within all men by their nature to view things in a timely, segmented, and chronological order. Our brain functions best that way in natural things. But in dealing with spiritual and eternal matters, God is of one mind, immutable, and unchangeable. He does not ponder and plan things out as man. With God, all of salvation stands firm. On the timely hills, plains, and valleys, however, we as creatures experience salvation in a chronological order, and view it as such. Christ has already **saved** all He will ever save, and they are even now as safe as if they were all already glorified. But let us stress, that the work of the Holy Spirit in effectual calling to life and immortality; the calling and directing of the Gospel ministry; the preaching, hearing, and believing of the Gospel: the conversion of the elect in repentance and faith, and the continuous working in them both to will and to do of His good pleasure will invariably follow Christ's redemptive work until the fullness of Christ and the ultimate and certain glorification of the General Assembly the Church of the Firstborn whose names are written in heaven is fully manifest. None of this is left precariously in the hands of man ... not even the preaching of the Gospel, for it is by His sovereign providence the elect are given the ministry of the sovereign grace of God. Ministers are God's gift to His people for their edification and peace through the knowledge of their glorious Savior Jesus Christ. And these ministers, willingly or not; knowingly or not; will preach the Gospel exactly when and where and to whom God pleases.

"Who hath delivered us from the power

of darkness, and hath translated

us into the kingdom of His Son:

In whom we have redemption

through His blood,

even the forgiveness

of sins." - Col. 1:13.

## **CHAPTER FIVE:**

### **DUTY-FAITH-UNTO-SALVATION**

Sometimes one finds a definition of Hyper-calvinism which includes: "Those who do not believe in *duty-faith*." As it is thus stated, it is not true. One must give more serious thought to the issue in this controversy. The Hyper-calvinists have both a Biblical and logical foundation for their viewpoint, and merely to brush the issue away in this manner is to cut short the intellectual honesty the issue deserves. Before proceeding, it should be pointed out that both "faith" and "repentance" are the *fruit* of the spiritual life within a believer, rather than a conditional cause of that new birth. Both are "gifts" which follow spiritual quickening (begetting) and issue forth from that experience. They are "New Covenant" blessings, and are in no way associated with Adam's covenant. The Hyper-calvinists remain consistent with that Biblical truth relative to one's "duty." Faith, repentance, nor duty will produce spiritual life in a dead sinner. For this discussion, that is a "given." Far too often, when this issue is discussed, those who believe that spiritual life must come before any of its effects, are charged with "hyper-calvinism," "hardshellism," "bench sitters," or "do-nothings." These terms are euphemisms: that is, derogatory terms designed to discredit the person holding this precious truth, and thereby prevent anyone from having an open mind

in regard to their views. In this way, they do not have to defend their own weak and illogical views. A stereotypical appellation - one of the twelve techniques of propaganda, - prevents the mind from rational reflection. In reality, whatever the discussion, it is a cheap shot by unprincipled men. Assuming the reader is still with us, the above euphemism has not completely prevented the mind from following the issues we are defending. One would hope these subjects will be thoughtfully studied, and then approved or disapproved upon their own Scriptural merit.

Before going into this discussion, it will be helpful to put aside the basic *misinformation* often used on this topic. That is, that the Hyper-calvinists do not believe that reprobates are under law to God. They, as well as the elect, are under law to the Creator. It is a *legal* duty for all mankind to keep the first and great commandment to "*Love the Lord thy God and thy neighbor as thyself.*" The reprobate must, imperatively, be in subjection to God, for if not he would be a free moral agent and as such could not be accountable to God. If this was so, there would be no basis for the judgment of God against them. So this is NOT the issue here. The issue is whether the reprobate can be *saved* by their sporadic obedience on the one hand, and duty bound to embrace the covenant blessings given to the elect on the other, such as faith and evangelical repentance. Stop and reflect on that a moment before proceeding with this presentation.

What, then, is the controversy relative to duty faith? Andrew Fuller and his proponents believed that "It is the *duty* of all who hear the Gospel to believe the *Gospel* and if they believed it, it would save their souls." That is the source of the controversy! The Hyper-calvinists might word it differently in order to drive the point home in this way: "Duty-Faith men believe the non-elect should believe that God loved them, and

died for *their sins also*." That will usually make one focus on the issue better than the first. Another way the controversy is sometimes framed is: "Evangelicals believe that Christ's atoning sacrifice was so great, and the personage of Christ so superlative, that His blood was *sufficient* to answer the justice of God for the sins of all mankind." That one sounds more lofty but the issue remains untouched.

Keep in mind that Andrew Fuller was writing his "The Gospel Worthy Of All Acceptation" in 1782. As pointed out in another place, only eight years later, Asplund's "Baptist Register In North America" showed that **93%** of all Baptists in North America were *CALVINISTS*! Most were, in fact, what is now called "Hyper-calvinists." In 1782, there was no "Evangelical Movement"! New Testament methods for the proclamation of the Gospel prevailed everywhere the sovereignty of God was proclaimed - by all denominations in North America. This was when Truth reigned supreme. Only a meager **7 %** of Baptists in North America were Arminians and **none** were as yet Pelagians. Until 1820, no church of any denomination in America had a Sunday School; none had any men's groups or "Dorcas Societies;" none had youth groups; none had "vacation Bible schools;" and among all Baptists groups, none had any instrumental music. What a change Andrew Fuller made to "get the world of the ungodly saved." This "world" needed carnal entertainment, for they had no interest in the Gospel. Today, almost no Arminians remain, and the overwhelming number of Baptists is Pelagian in doctrine, faith, and practice and their practices are **all** unscriptural. [By "*Pelagian*" we mean people holding to the **absolute freewill** of all mankind.] In 1782, other than a small group of "General Baptists" [Today known mostly as the Freewill Baptist denomination], Baptists held to *particular redemption*, and were called *Particular Baptists*. Andrew Fuller was numbered among the Particular Baptists. He was a traitor to the cause they

loved! This writer believes he has fairly stated this issue, and the historical setting in which it was first initiated.

But the issue has come to life again. Some writers have attacked the Church' position by print, while others have accessed the Internet. The charges are stale and moldy, and no Biblical evidence is presented to defend the position that Christ died for the whole human race; or that God has enjoined the reprobates to believe to the saving of their souls. So, for this cause, this writer has set about to enliven the discussion by presenting the Biblical position relative to duty *faith*. A primary consideration should be that duties and obligations under the law *covenant* pertain only to the **parties of that covenant**; and the blessings and privileges of the New *Covenant*, or "Covenant of Grace," (such as faith and repentance) pertain **only to the parties of that covenant**. This is Scriptural as well as reasonable. Before divine quickening, the elect are by nature under the same law covenant as all Adam's race. With spiritual quickening, a new creature is formed *within* the elect "*vessel afore prepared unto glory*," and they partake of the blessings of the grace covenant. But without that spiritual begetting, (which is produced by the Holy Spirit based upon Christ's work of redemption,) there could be no grace covenant blessings. You may sign a conditional sales contract with Ford Motor Company that stipulates that upon the payment of a set amount of money, the automobile becomes yours. Both parties agree. Under no circumstances is a total stranger to that contract, whose signature is not affixed to it, required by any law to make the payment to Ford. Likewise, a law entered into by God through Moses with the nation-state of **Israel**, cannot be binding upon those not under that law; nor are those under **that law** bound to perform the duties and obligations of the **Covenant of Grace**. Only the people of that covenant are recipients of the blessings and privileges of the grace covenant.



Again, here is the basic issue of the controversy: The followers of Andrew Fuller's doctrine make it an **obligation** to Adam's *non-elect* offspring, to come under the blessings and privileges of Christ's covenant with His blessed Father. (Even the elect cannot do that! The covenant of grace is not made with them. It was made with their covenant Head! He alone is required to keep the conditions of that covenant ... AND HE DID!)

So, the Neo-calvinists - the followers of Andrew Fuller's doctrines - ignore the Biblical doctrine of both *reprobation* and *election*. They will not face this honest question: "Does God demand that the *reprobates* for whom Christ did not *die*, and who are those "*fitted to destruction*" (Rom. 9:22), who are not *redeemed*, and hence are not saved by the active and passive obedience of Christ; - does He require **them** to believe that **Christ died for them** anyway? And if they do not believe it, will He **for this unbelief** send them to hell? Watch it! We are not saying He will not "*turn the wicked into hell*". He will. But will it be **because** they did not **believe a lie** a false prophet tried to convince them was true? Simply stated: Does God require the non-elect to believe that Christ died for *their* sins, when He **did not**? And will God send such to hell for this unbelief in a lie? Again, must the non-elect refuse to believe a lie to be true *in order* to be damned? If they did believe this lie, could they now join that number saved by Christ in His suffering and death two thousand years ago? If so, are such then *non-elect*? It will be difficult for some, but we hope the reader can think this one through. We understand that Pelagians cannot comprehend the issue of this controversy, for they haven't found election in their modern Bibles. But one should reasonably expect a Calvinist to grasp the issue set forth herein, for he does know that election is amply taught throughout the Old and the New Testaments; and He knows that Christ died for *His elect people*. His mind is not challenged

on this point. He is challenged relative to the "*sufficiency of the death of Christ for **all mankind***;" including the non-elect. The view that the "Gospel" is "an invitation" is grounded upon this false premise: that Christ's death was sufficient for the salvation of reprobates. Is it true? And, if so, is the Gospel then an "invitation?" Now that is clearly a just and honest challenge. Merely casting it off by saying "Hyper-calvinists do not believe in duty-faith," answers nothing at all! The issue will not go away that easily. Let's face it - it has been over two hundred and thirty years now since that issue first arose. It has been answered over and over again. It still has not "gone away"! We press it again: Can the reprobates believe that Christ died for them, and in this manner squeeze into God's elect family through the back window? Come, now: "*Let us reason together.*" If you feel you must answer "No, they cannot," then you just joined the hated Hyper-calvinists! If you said, "Yes, if they would only believe," you just denied the effectual work of Christ; God's sovereignty; His wisdom; His foreknowledge; His immutability - just to mention a few of His attributes and works! You can't have it both ways as Fuller, Spurgeon, Pendleton, Packer, and Murray all thought they could. It is either one way or the other: there is not a third position possible. Consider:

The Calvinists, Neo-calvinists, and the Hyper-calvinists all believe in *unconditional election* of a definite number of people; which election was in Christ before the world began (Eph. 1:4-6.) They all say that Christ came to "*save His people from their sins.*" (Matthew 1:21.) One should be able to see why a follower of Fuller's doctrine would not want to discuss, or even think about, this issue for it is *THE ACHILLES HEEL* of their type of "evangelism," or proselytizing. And they instinctively know this. This is one divinely revealed truth they are scared of. It will destroy all their carnal works; burn down their play castles; and have them walk through the ashes of their own carnal

religious works. They dare not bring the subject up and dwell on it. It is much easier to exclaim: "That is Hyper-calvinism!" They do *know*, and readily affirm, that the Scripture teaches that Christ did not die for the goats! It is in all their publications. They will not ask, nor entertain the question: "Are these goats to believe that they are sheep?" Will believing that they are sheep change their status from that of a goat to a sheep? Can the reprobate believe that he is an elect and make it so? And, will God send Christ back to die for those converted-goats that are persuaded that they are really sheep? Will He send the ungodly to hell because they do not believe that He died for them- which **is** the truth. Pelagians have no problem here. Their problem is with how God can justly punish Christ for the sins of all mankind and still send most of them to hell for whom Christ died. But the Neo-calvinists have a serious problem here with their doctrine and subsequent practice. Their doctrine and practice are mutually exclusively inconsistent. The above is the basic underlying issue of the debate on **duty-faith**.

At the beginning of this chapter we said: "as stated," the duty-faith charge against Hyper-calvinists is "false." Please do not take that to mean that they agree with the Fullerite Neo-calvinists. If the statement was re-stated, that "Hyper-calvinists do not believe in *duty-faith-**unto-salvation***," the statement would be correct, and the controversy set in its true light. The truth is, Hyper-calvinists have no objection to one believing that all of Adam's offspring owe to God *all obligations and duties that Adam owed to his Creator God* and that their *inability to believe or perform acceptable meritorious works*, does not in any way negate their obligations to do so. Adam, and his offspring **yet in his loins**, changed - God did not! Their inability only aggravates their condemnation yet the more, for they are willing and active transgressors. They love sin, and would not under any

circumstances give it up. This is demonstrated daily by the walk and conversation of millions of "Evangelical church members," equally with the unbelievers. They made their decision to accept Christ but made no decision to walk by His commandments, believe and defend His doctrine and follow the acceptable pattern of His worship and order!

Andrew Fuller qualified his statement on duty-faith, saying that it was the duty of all men "where the Gospel is preached" to believe and repent. Paul certainly did not qualify it this way. He wrote: *"For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made? even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imagination? and their foolish heart was darkened."* (Romans 1:20.) That text still describes present-day "Evangelicals" adequately, as well as all the world's religions. The whole first chapter of Romans is to this purpose: that the heathen, the ungodly, and the Sodomites are *without excuse!* And surely any who have a Bible and deny the doctrine of grace are without excuse as well. It is a terribly thick darkness of the mind of modern man that prevents them from seeing God's sovereignty. And the darkness grows thicker daily. Even the ancient Pagans believed their gods were sovereign! And they feared them in awe.

It is the *"unto-salvation"* where Hyper-calvinists disagree with the Neo-calvinists on duty-faith. It is unreasonable and unbiblical to believe that the non-elect could be eternally saved if they did believe. Scripturally, it is proven by the facts that *"the devils also believe, and tremble,"* (James 2:19) but surely not "unto salvation." The devil that possessed the young damsel that irritated Paul, following him and crying loudly, *"These men are the servants of the most High God, which*

*show unto us the way of salvation,*" (A pretty good testimony, isn't it?) to whom *"Paul being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her."* And *"he came out the same hour"*. (Acts 16:16), No doubt, this devil certainly believed! There might be someone who would argue that this devil was a child of God; but most readers would know better. Are we to believe this spirit was saved by believing the truth he spoke? The devils Christ cast out of the man which then ran a herd of swine down into the sea and drowned, said: *"Art Thou come to torment us before the time."* They believed who He was. Was their belief "unto salvation"? If the devils, for whom Christ did **not** die are not saved by believing on Him, upon what ground can it be maintained that *reprobates for whom Christ did not die* are duty bound "to believe unto salvation"? It cannot, to them, be a moral duty of a son of Adam to claim the gifts and privileges of a son of God. *"Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,"* primarily because that which is born of the flesh is not an heir of immortal glory.

Mr. Fuller's rationale for his "free offer" novelty was to be able "to give an honest invitation to sinners." Instead of abandoning the so-called "free offer" to those already redeemed, ransomed, and reconciled elect, he extended it to "all men." Then he claimed that these "all men" were duty-bound to believe "unto salvation." But, can this be an "*honest invitation*"? Here is John Doe, for whom Christ died and saved. Here is Don Juan, for whom Christ did **not** die, **nor** save. What honest invitation can one give simultaneously to both? The answer is obvious. Here is the Neo-calvinists' dilemma. They can't be *honest* and tell Don Juan that Christ loved him and gave His life for him, and "wants" him to believe it! Because it just is **not so**, and his own Calvinistic doctrine teaches that it is not true, and in secret, his conscience tells him it is not! Yet, he will be the loudest heard screaming: "That's Hyper-calvinism!"

Again, it cannot be a moral duty for Don Juan to believe a lie! The implication of this turns "evangelism" as practiced today on its head! And God forbid that ruination! Call it "Hyper-calvinism," but the issue is real. It cannot just "go away." All the Neo-calvinists' sand-castles of duty-faith and glorying in the flesh must crumble to dust before this issue. With modern type proselytizing, Pelagians are safe. Their own stated goal is "win the world for Christ." This, proselytizing can do that fairly successfully. It cannot put anyone into the covenant of grace, but it can build up a religious society's membership roll; and who can not be totally mystified at how willing they are to part with so great amount of their hard earned dollars! But the Neo-calvinist has knowledge of divine election, and according to his own profession, this election is not *conditioned on foreseen faith or good works*. Being yet unable to escape the clutches of Fullerism, he draws along his ignorance of New Testament practice of publishing the Gospel, believing wrongly that the Gospel is "an invitation for one to get saved." He is truly afraid that if he is reformed, he will "fall into the pitfalls of Hyper-calvinism, or Hardshellism." And he would! Not being *compelled by the Spirit* to preach the Gospel for its rightful purpose, he fears he will stay at home and make shipwreck his faith and noble "*duty*." "What," he may think, "a horrible end must surely await a Hyper-calvinist!"

Really, what do Neo-calvinists think motivates the Hyper-calvinists to travel hundreds of miles each week preaching a message, without any stipulated salary or monetary reward, and without any design at all to make children of God out of goats? They can't admit that it might be that "they are called of God to preach the Gospel," or that a "*dispensation of the Gospel is committed*" to them. (Corinthians 9:17.) As one Neo-calvinist minister said to this writer once, "If I believed what you believe I would never preach a lick again in my life!" Well, if one is called

of God he will preach wherever God opens a "door of utterance" for him. (Acts 2:4; Col. 4:3.)

Relative to duty-faith, Hyper-calvinists believe it is the *duty of all of Adam's offspring to believe the record of the Word of God*, because that was required of Adam when they had their subsistence in him. Their fall in Adam did not relieve them of any creature obligation they owed to Him. Receiving daily benefits from Him for their creature supply and comfort only condemn them the more. But, Hyper-calvinists *do not believe* the non-elect are in any wise *duty-bound* to believe that Christ loved them, died for them, and desired their salvation. They understand from the Scripture that this is not so. There can be no moral obligation put upon them to believe anything that *is not true*.

This is one reason the Fullerite school of Neo-calvinists are so quick to scream "Hyper-calvinism!" at those who steadfastly practice Gospel preaching according to the New Testament model. If one would search the writings of historical Particular Baptists, as well as other sound Calvinists - such as John Gill, John Brine, Alexander Booth, J.C. Philpot - among Baptists, and William Huntington, John Knox, John Calvin, and Gordon Clark, among Calvinists, they would find that nowhere did these men believe it was the duty of reprobates to believe that Christ died for them.

It appears evident that one of two explanations can account for the popularity of Fuller's duty-faith novelty. (1) Most Neo-calvinists have never read anything he wrote, or, (2) having attempted to, could not understand what he was trying to say. The latter is understandable. He was a horribly complicated writer to read behind. He changed the common meanings of almost every important word he used! An intelligent

person cannot read Fuller without realizing the man was dancing around the truth in illogical, dualistic jargon. From the first extremely difficult paragraph, one realizes this man is full of deceit. People can communicate better than this when they are not trying to hide what they believe. One view is all that is needed to show his deceit. He believed in a "*general*" atonement and a "*particular*" redemption, which two views are **mutually incongruent**. Now, tell me dear reader, did this man know what an "atonement," or "redemption," is? Of course not! The man was ignorant of Bible doctrines or, highly deceitful, or both. His followers were, and are, deceived by this vain deceiver. The above is illogical! Any intelligent person can recognize those terms, as used, are an oxymoron - mutually exclusive. When put into the spiritual realm, it is mere deception. Calvinism clearly teaches, and always has, that **Christ died only for the elect**. And that is the *only Biblical* position. This immediately raises the most serious question relative to all the unscriptural innovations and institutions based upon that fanciful deception. The bare naked truth is: just as *the doctrine* is unscriptural and carnal; so too, are all *those practices founded on that delusive doctrine*. Both the doctrine and the practices are designed to appeal to the Adamic flesh! To be consistent, those so-called "evangelical" gimmicks, tricks, appeals, and organizations born of that doctrine must be rejected with that doctrine. "Evangelicals" understand this, and this is one reason they cling tenaciously to that illogical belief in duty-faith-unto-salvation of reprobates. They don't want to give up their favorite gimmicks. They have become excessively addicted to them; both for getting deciders and financing their auxiliaries. No doubt, the *duty-faith principle* led the New School, or "missionary" Baptists to drag, scare, beg, plead, pull, threaten, bribe, and trick emotionally aroused hearers - adults and children - into "doing their duty." And they explained this duty to be that God demands that they "give



their heart to Jesus" (which is nowhere taught in the Bible), to "accept Christ as their Savior," (again, not one verse in the Bible teaches such), to "get saved or go to hell," - as if Christ has not yet saved His people from their sins, *etc.* The real thing the "evangelists" or "mission pastor" wants is for them to "join the church." Whether said or not, they leave it to be understood that "joining the church" is synonymous with "salvation." Many so-called "Christians" actually believe that if a person is not a member of a religious society - usually their own- that they are lost and doomed to hell. This too, is not taught in the Bible! But it helps to get deciders-for-Christ. "Doing their duty" has been translated into joining "evangelical churches" which helped to develop a massive super-church; which in turn clearly became very *anti-Christian*. This "duty" to "accept Christ" is today so commonly accepted that few will even give a second thought to a *reexamination* of it in the light of the New Testament witness. Pressing the false concept of duty-faith, they have filled America's religious institutions with individuals having never had an experience of grace. Indeed, today, few even know what an experience of grace consist of, and therefore see no vital need for it. A "simple decision" is all they need. As they say, "A simply act of faith,"[Baxterianism] is all that is required. The so-called "evangelicals" - the proselyters - wanted to "win the *world* to Christ," and not knowing which "world" Christ died for, they went after the wrong one - "the world of the ungodly." This world did not want to go to hell, nor did they want to forsake sin. They would take advantage of this so gracious an offer: "have their cake and eat it too". So, they did the most sensible thing. They did what the preachers said was their "duty," and both this world and the proselyters felt pretty good about the deal!

But the "*unto salvation*" became a mockery. At first they appealed to sinners to "receive" Christ as their Savior; which if

He was not "given," they could not do. Then they were exhorted to "accept" Christ as their Savior. Of course, if He was not "offered to them" they could not accept or reject Him either. Finally, decisionism pure and simple took over, which is not even in the ball-park with salvation by the life and death of Christ. Christ's salvation is a **finished redemption**, or a **completed salvation**. What Fuller and his followers failed to understand was that Christ has already successfully saved all He will ever save. It is quite too late to get others into that redeemed number! If he had understood what the Gospel is there would have been no need for his duty-faith-unto salvation scheme to begin with. And so too, if Neo-calvinists today know what the Gospel is, there would be no controversy now. If Fuller and his modern followers knew what the Gospel is, they would not have thought it was needful to "give an honest [rather, a very dishonest] invitation to all men alike." God is not *embarrassed* by ministers not inviting the damned to salvation. His Justice is as impeccable as Himself, and is as immutable as Himself. Fuller's small initial "step for man has become a giant leap for mankind," - borrowing an appropriate slogan from Neal Armstrong on the lunar landing. But in what direction, and at what cost! The "world of the ungodly" has the so-called "Church" under their control now; and decent Christians must either stay at home and read their Bible or seek what few places remain - at great distances usually - where the Gospel of the free grace of God is preached in power and demonstration of the Spirit. For these few souls, their issue is not duty-faith. It is *"how can two walk together except they be agreed?"* *"What fellowship has Christ with Beliel?"* Since the "world of the ungodly" is the most numerous in the so-called "Church," how is it possible for the modern "church" to get rid of these pests? They can't . . . and morally should not try to. They got exactly what they wanted! And the "world of the ungodly" pays dearly out of their own funds for the power they have usurped. It would not be right to deprive them of what they have paid so

dearly for.

The Calvinists and the Neo-calvinists in these so-called "churches" today have but three "outs" available to them. They can, as the poor and afflicted children of God throughout the ages have done, "*come out of her, O My people*" and this is a terrible cost to the outward, or fleshly man. Or, (2) they can get *thrown* out, which in the end, if they are true believers, will be done whether they want to leave or not. Afterwards, they will rejoice in their persecutions for their Master's cause. Or, (3) they can "sell out" as many, many have done throughout the Christian era. It is certain that a true Calvinist cannot commune with Pelagians very long before his quickened conscience will stop him dead in his track. In America, Neo-calvinists leaders within the large bodies of Baptists prefer the latter view: "sell out." The motive for fighting the Hyper-calvinists is the desire to keep the Calvinists within these bodies from bolting out for conscience sake. They have the deceptive dream that if Calvinists remain within the false "church", they can retake it from the "world of the ungodly." That is only a delusion. It can never be done! Luther never reformed the Catholic Church! He came out! And so did the Reformers that stood with him. A major result of the "Down-grade" among evangelicals in the 1880's was the establishment of a goodly number of Predestinarian Old School Baptist churches. The strong believers could not stay with the "down-graders" and flooded the ranks of sound, consistent churches.

Duty-faith is very much with Hyper-calvinists as "freewill" was for Martin Luther. At the time Luther nailed his thesis on the Wittenberg chapel door, and for the next four years, there was very little difference between him and the Pope. But in his fifth year, Luther understood that the sinister force of evil under-girding the power of Rome was their doctrine of "Freewill". He attacked the power of Rome at its most

fundamental core: "freewill". With the publication of Luther's "*Bondage of the Will*," Rome's death-grip over the conscience of believers staggered; and after wars, murders, crusades, *etc.*, it never had a full recovery. When these Calvinists and Neo-calvinists realize that the subtle power of Pelagianism is their *duty-faith* error; they will have arrived at the point Luther had attained which brought reformation to Europe. Duty-faith and the whole *support system* must fall before Christianity. Then the churches may be free to become a moral, spiritual, and righteous force in this nation. And at this present time, the *only* national trend which gives any hope of reformation is found with the revival of Hyper-calvinism and Calvinism. We do not include Neo-calvinism, because its inconsistency is such it will either move to Calvinism or Hyper-calvinism, or slide back into the Pelagian darkness where their hearts are inclined. Neo-calvinists, or Fullerism, cannot perpetuate itself. It never has! Duty-faith and Calvinism has never co-existed long together. If one believes he can be a Calvinist, and hold to Pelagian's duty-faith, he deceives himself. His doctrine is not sound enough; nor clear enough, for him to be called a "Calvinist." No church has yet held to duty-faith-unto-salvation and remained Calvinistic. That kind of marriage alliance of convenience is doomed to failure.

Neo-calvinists understand that *duty-faith-unto-salvation* is their great *motivator*. Without a love for the truth, only **duty** remains to put vigor into their type of proselytizing. It is too scary to them to fully return to the New Testament pattern. To do so would remove "the arm of flesh" upon which they trust, and they would be forced to "walk by faith." Duty-faith keeps the decision-making machine running smoothly. Take that away, and their "churches" will decline. They know this. No,

rather, the Church, as "*chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world*," (Ephesians 1:4), will remain the same; but the "world of the ungodly" in the so-called "churches" will decrease. When, or if, this occurs, the "church" (if any are yet found there,) among them will be strengthened and bring back the honor and respect it had before the world became its spokespersons, leaders, and innovators, albeit, much, much smaller!

"But, even if they are not spiritual children of God, they do finance the church, support it, and are real active in it. We could not do without them." Perhaps: they are only doing what is due *them*. Having been coerced into joining it, and having paid for the privilege of running the "church," they should be able to promote their fleshly and social entertainment, build as large a gym as they need to attract carnal "Christians" from other so-called churches, to their own. They perhaps have more right to it now than the children of God! But if that is the case, the *children of God* must come out of it, and meet elsewhere and let the "world of the ungodly" have its own! It has its own worldly ministers already. But if one *loves the truth* known as Calvinism, Hyper-calvinism, or Christianity, *duty-faith-unto-salvation* **must be abandoned**. And *all* built upon it **must be discarded** as well; and *all defense* of this antichristian system must be put to rest in silence. Duty-faith-unto-salvation is the bane of Calvinism, for it is founded on the carnality of the flesh - pure *freewillism*.

The General Baptists [now known in most places as the Freewill Baptists denomination in the United States], believing in a *general atonement*, and very much ignorant of Scriptures, was founded in 1608 in England. Of the two groups of Baptists, the General Baptists is the oldest. Yet, in 1790, as pointed out, **93%** of all Baptists in America were Calvinists. The General Baptists, advocating freewillism, had a good head-start! If *duty-faith-unto-salvation* is so needful today, why was it so

*unsuccessful* among Baptists before the beginning of the Great Apostasy following the Great Awakening and the Frontier Revivals? Why did *particular* redemption have such a strong footing before Andrew Fuller's revision and duty-faith mission? There may be many reasons, but one could be that the overwhelming number first pulled, dragged, begged, and scared into joining "churches" during the Great Awakening (1720'S to 1760'S) by the *emotionalism* then, were not God's children in the main. It might be possible. We are sure that by the time of the Frontier Revivals of the early 1800's, the doctrinal foundation of most Baptists' churches were relatively weak; and from this weakness sprang the "Holy-Roller" schism; Campbellian Restoration movement; Mormonism; Pelagian Methodism; and many other "isms". All one has to do to confirm this observation is to look at the great number of "denominations" in America and the dates of their establishment. It was a period of enormous emotionalism. Methodism, Fullerism, Mormonism, Adventism, Campbellianism, Socinianism, *etc.*, to name but a few, were formed in the early Frontier period. It was the duty-faith-*unto-salvation* movement which drove the separating wedge between Hyper-calvinists' churches and the duty-faith religious societies. If a congregation does not *LOVE the Truth of free grace*, then that congregation is filled with unregenerate *nominal believers* - or, "deciders-for-Christ." They can be "socially good" people - and most are - but lack the experience needful to understand and rejoice in God's salvation of poor and afflicted sinners. Fuller's proselytizing movement was introduced in the 1790'S and it produced the whole so-called collection of "evangelical Calvinistic" denominations which split off from the Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalian societies. As is evident, they did not long remain "evangelical *Calvinists*" - just "Evangelicals"!

On the basis of their belief in duty-faith-*unto-salvation*

and their unwarranted gimmicks of "offering" the "*children's bread to dogs*," both the Neo-calvinist and Pelagian writers often charge that Hyper-calvinists do not believe in "preaching the Gospel" to anyone but the elect. This charge is made generally by all parties today. It presupposes an extra-ordinary spiritual gift given to Hyper-calvinists, similar to that in the Apostolic age: to be able to clearly discern the elect from the non-elect! However, Hyper-calvinists do not possess such a gift. They cannot tell one person from another as to whether their names are written in the Book of Life of the Lamb, or not. [True, there are a number of self-righteous souls under that banner busy condemning others to hell as though they have a copy of that blessed Book.] So the charge has to be rather ridiculous! It is true that Hyper-calvinists do not press duty-faith-unto-salvation on their hearers - because they do not accept that premise to begin with. Rather, out of thousands of good and gracious reasons for a child of redeeming grace to render praise to, adore, obey, and follow Jesus, duty-faith is a very bad *motive*! "Lord, I really don't have time to serve you right now, but the preacher is right - it is my duty - so I will as I am able!" "Pastor, I have all kinds of bills, and my wages are not much. I can't contribute to the support of the Gospel; but it is my duty, so here are a couple of two-bits!" "Preacher, you said if I gave to the Lord, He would bless me a hundred fold. It is my duty to give, and I surely need to be blessed with more, so I'm going to start tithing." (That seems as a discount bargain-basement religion; somewhat as investing in the stock market!) For some ministers, as long as it brings in members and money, it is worth it. But **duty** is a very cheap and degrading motive for worshipping God.

The critic will say: "None of the above has anything to do with the real *issue of duty-faith*. The real issue is: Do the non-elect have a duty to serve God?" The Hyper-calvinists quickly

answer emphatically: "Yes." But that is **not** the *issue*! The real issue is whether the non-elect must believe and repent as a duty-unto-salvation! And the Hyper-calvinists answer just as emphatically: "No! In no wise!" Salvation is not conditional. It is a **gift** of free grace. The non-elect *cannot savingly believe* for true faith is a "fruit of the Spirit" (Galatians 5:22) and a "gift." - Did you read that? - It is "a **gift** of God." (Ephesians 2:8). This "fruit" or "gift" accompanies conversion and cannot be the conditional cause of salvation nor of the spiritual birth. Salvation was finished by Christ in His atonement. Conversely, to suppose the elect will be lost unless they respond out of "duty" is equally contrary to sound doctrine. Those who are secured by the atonement of Christ will be called, quickened, and converted; and as Missionary Baptists' Articles of Faith state: "good works are the **fruit of faith** and **follow after justification**." Too sadly, most no longer even know what their forefathers wrote as to what their "church" was founded upon. In fact, most don't care!

We will deal, in the remaining section of this chapter, with the subject in three aspects. (1) That Hyper-calvinists do not believe it is their "duty" to invite all men to accept Christ; (2) They do not believe it is the "duty" of all men to "accept Christ." And, (3) the reason Hyper-calvinists reject *duty-faith-UNTO SALVATION*. In this way we will have covered the full issue of this controversy as ***we*** comprehend it.

The charge that Hyper-calvinists do not believe it is their duty to preach the Gospel can be a short rebuttal. **They preach it.** They preach it everywhere they are sent. They preach it without charge. They come nearer preaching *the Gospel* than any other group in America! Then the critic says, "Maybe, but they do not believe in preaching it **“to sinners.”**" This is a very strange charge indeed, coming from either Calvinists or Neo-calvinists! Both of these two groups claim to believe in the "total



depravity and total inability of natural man in spiritual things." They both teach that "God chose the elect in Christ before the foundation of the world;" (Ephesians 1:4) that Christ came in "the stead of His elect people to suffer and die for their sins;" that "He came under the law to redeem them that were under the law from the curse due them as transgressors;" that He "took their sins by imputation upon Himself, nailing them to the tree;" and "imputed His own righteousness to them as their own;" and that He "saved them with an everlasting and secure salvation;" and that in time, He sends His Holy Spirit to quicken them to life and immortality. And some of them believe that God "calls, qualifies, and directs His messengers of grace to each with the Gospel of free grace," and "attends their ministry by the Holy Spirit to effect the elects' conversion to faith and repentance." Some even understand that good works are the fruit of faith, and these are worked by the Spirit "*who works in them both to will and to do of His good pleasure,*" and has "*wrought all their works in them.*" They believe that this salvation is so secure, that none for whom Christ redeemed and saved will fall away and finally be lost; that there will be a resurrection of the dead which will radically change and transport all the elect family to heaven and immortal glory.

Now, that is a *sketch* of what all three groups believe and preach. Hyper-calvinists, Calvinists, and Neo-calvinists claim that this is, in substance, **the Gospel**. Yet the Neo-calvinists will charge that the Hyper-calvinists do "not preach the Gospel," merely because they do not *freely offer it to the reprobates* whether they can believe it or not! If Hyper-calvinists are not preaching the Gospel, then neither is the Neo-calvinists and Calvinists! Has the reader ever heard, just once, that "Pelagians, or Freewillers, do not believe in preaching the Gospel to sinners"? Or, "Southern Baptists do not believe in preaching the Gospel to sinners"? Neither group does, but Calvinists,

Neo-calvinists, and Hyper-calvinists do! They certainly are not *preaching the **same** "Gospel," or the **same** Jesus.* (2 Corinthians 11:4.) The Pelagian freewiller could more *consistently* lay the charge, because they do not believe any of the above is the Gospel. This writer cannot say what they believe "the Gospel" is, for they never describe it other than John 3:16, taken out of context. That seems to be it. But coming from Calvinists and Neo-calvinists, it is very strange. Incidentally, Neo-calvinists are the ones **who most often** make these wild, absurd and foolish charges. And the truth is Neo-calvinists do not know anything that the Hyper-calvinists believe! But they do know what Pelagians believe; what their Southern Baptists co-workers believe! Do they attack "Freewillism"? **Never!** They just copy one another from Fullerite literature; and are too lazy to search out what Hyper-calvinists do, in fact, believe. They really use it to deflect the charge from themselves to a "straw-man," in order to throw their hearers off guard. "What I'm preaching is not hyper-calvinism. Hyper-calvinists believe thus and so, but I believe *etc.*"

On the charge that Hyper-calvinists do not believe it is the duty for all mankind to believe that Christ died for many of them, the statement itself is most reasonable! "But," they often add, "the Hyper-calvinists do not believe in preaching the gospel to the non-elect, or to sinners." Pray tell! Who else is out there to preach it to but sinners? The Hyper-calvinists are very quick to let one know that they believe that it is specifically designed **only** for sinners! Jesus said: "*I came **not** to call the righteous, **but sinners** to repentance.*" Every convert to Hyper-calvinism confesses that he is yet a sinner; yes, even the "chief of sinners". They frequently express agony that they are in a warfare between the flesh and the spirit within. The difference, in this issue, is, that Hyper-calvinists have a *definition* of what constitutes a "sinner" which is unlike that of the rest of the religious world. And this difference relates directly to the duty--

faith-unto-salvation issue.

The greater part of the religious world places themselves in a class which they describe as "Christians". By "Christians," they seem to be agreed among themselves that it includes everyone who makes a "decision-for-Christ" and joins a religious society. All others are, they believe, "sinners." So they have two classifications: The "saved" and the "lost", or sinners.

Hyper-calvinists describe a "sinner" as one who *feelingly knows* that he is a sinner; an elect of God who has been taught by the Spirit what he is in Adam's nature; and can discern between that which is his outward man of the flesh and the inner man, or the new creature born within; and groans over the consequent conflict. To them, all of God's quickened elect are, and will *remain* (until changed in the resurrection), *sinners as long as they are in this corporeal body*, in the which, they "groan to be delivered" in the resurrection at the last day. All of the non-elect are Scripturally referred to as "*the wicked which shall be turned into hell,*" and this is called "*the world of the ungodly which perish,*" and hence, are reprobates. And these reprobates have not had their sins atoned for, and shall die in them, and perish because of their love, and commission of, sins; and this justly so.

The above two paragraphs draw the lines upon which both groups base their beliefs in duty-*faith-unto-salvation*. The reader now may be better prepared to comprehend why Hyper-calvinists reject duty-*faith-unto-salvation*. The duty-*faith-unto-salvation* men hold that all mankind are qualified as "sinners for whom Christ died;" the elect as well as those already in hell when Christ died, and the "wicked" that will be turned into hell. The Hyper-calvinists understand that there are living evidences present in such souls as are quickened to divine life by the Holy Spirit (but

not yet brought to a feeling of peace, pardon, and reconciliation by Christ through the gift of faith.) Without those marks, there can be no reason to conclude that they are born again. Nor do they believe that "making a decision" and "joining a religious society", "giving their corrupt heart to Jesus" being "baptized," etc. will beget a spiritual life in them.

Believing that a true Church is composed only of spiritually born members, the Hyper-calvinists do not encourage men wholesale to "join the church and 'get saved'," believing that it is "*the Lord that adds to the church daily such as should be saved.*" But, in the proclamation of the Gospel, they make no effort to single one person out from the others. "Men have entertained angels unawares," and they are to treat all as if they are God's people - and they are: either as elected in Christ, or as created by God - they and their disposition is His business. They all hear the same message, and its central theme is that "Christ died effectually for sinners," and brought in an "everlasting righteousness" which is imputed to believers as their own. That "Christ loved His people with an everlasting love, and it is with lovingkindness that He draws them to Himself." (Jeremiah 30:3); That "He delights in mercy" and is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto Him by faith. In short, **they preach grace, amazing grace, free grace, and sovereign grace!** No sermon is preached in such a way that one can conclude that salvation - any aspect of it - is by creature effort or merit! Every thought is brought into subjection before the sovereign will and free grace of God in Christ Jesus. This is the central theme one finds in **all** Hyper-calvinists' meetings in the United States.

The minister preaches the Gospel of free grace alike to all present; but Christ calls those that are "laboring" and "heavy-

laden" under a load of *felt sins*; or is cast down in their souls, longing "for a hope of eternal life," (Titus 1:2) with the "pangs of hell" felt within them, to come unto Him *for rest*. For all such as these, He is "*willing and able to save to the uttermost them that come unto Him by faith.*" That is **not** a **universal** call! He is the One who *give that faith* as a fruit of the *Spirit*, thus enabling them to believe. There is no sane person that can say that He does this to and for all men alike. It is not an observable fact! There is no way for a Gospel minister to create a clean heart in anyone, or a convicted mind, or give one a new heart. Nor can an individual do these things for himself. All a Gospel minister can do is to preach the Gospel of the free grace of God. That is all he is called to do, and to baptize and teach all such as are given faith to believe. It is God exclusively who makes that Gospel "glad tidings" within the heart of a hearer. It is hard to conceive how a Neo-calvinist can truly believe in free grace, and not know the joy a believer receives each and every time God applies it to his soul; or not to know that a true believer can go many days, weeks, or months, and not have one glad tidings to stir within his bosom a joy in the Gospel! If one believes in a duty-faith-unto-salvation, it is hard to conceive such a one has any knowledge of a work of grace within the soul of a man. If they did, they could not fault the Hyper-calvinist for "waiting on the Lord" to apply His Gospel to the hearts and minds of His people. In this manner, the Hyper-calvinists need not "offer salvation" to anyone - let alone to "all mankind!" If the preacher cannot **give** salvation to *someone*, he has no business **offering** it to *anyone*! Let alone, to *everyone*. That is dishonest. The Gospel of the grace of God is designed to reach the situation of each quickened, burdened soul, who feels a need for that salvation which Christ provided by His atoning and redemptive work. Merely because Hyper-calvinists limit exhortations to those bearing the *evidences* of spiritual life, and exhorts such to believe in the faithful promises of God in the Gospel, is no good

reason for Neo-calvinists (or anyone else) to deride them falsely in euphemisms. It is the "duty-faith-unto-salvation" men who are ignorant of the scope of the atoning work of Christ! (See Chapter eight.)

The rest of this chapter is devoted specifically to a defense of the Hyper-calvinists' objections to Mr. Fuller's false doctrine. Historically, *duty-faith-unto-salvation* had its rise among Particular Baptists in Andrew Fuller's humanistic (or effeminate) form of Calvinism, which attempted to "make God's universal invitation to sinners" an "honest invitation." Keep in mind that there is no evidence in the Scripture of any "invitations", let alone *universal* invitations. Thus, in its *first* introduction, it was applied towards making New Covenant, or *Gospel* precepts to be the duty of all men under the Adamic covenant "to believe, repent, and embrace the New Covenant blessings" as obligations laid upon those outside of the Gospel kingdom. And, it supposed that the failure of the Adamic offspring to *comply* with the blessings, as conditional terms, to be **the cause** of their just condemnation. One can read a great deal about "Christ dying for all the sins of all mankind, except the *sin of unbelief*." The Bible makes no such limitation. It teaches that He "died for **all our sins**." The duty-faith men add the exception, "the sin of unbelief," because they have a witness in their own natural minds that sins unatoned for is the only thing that can bring a man into condemnation, judgment and hell. They know if they stay with the Scripture - *all sin* - then no man could go to hell for who Christ died. And they believe that He died for **all men**! The very fact that they feel constrained to add "except the sin of unbelief," is a testimony that they full well know they have a contradiction in their own doctrine! There is no Biblical support for such a premise, since nowhere can a text be cited that Christ died only for **some** of the sins of all men, leaving **all men** with **some** sins

for which they must die! If such were the case, we would all have an insurmountable problem to find an answer for these unatoned sins. Christ will not die again for such sins. Either He finished His work of redemption, atonement, and reconciliation on the cross, or He did not. If not, we are certainly all doomed to perish for these unatoned sins: none could be saved!

Today, duty-faith-unto-salvation has evolved into absolute freewillism, and this established on a system of works as devious as Rome ever invented. It denies the *effectual* working of the indwelling Spirit within the saint. It leads to a self-righteous "knowing I'm saved and bound for glory" arrogance. Every decider-for-Christ knows that he walked down the aisle and "gave his heart to Jesus." So long as his natural memory of that decision remains, there is no reason left to "*give all diligence to make their calling and election sure.*" (II Peter 1:10.) And if by some means he is cast into doubt, the Fullerite ministers will tell him that he is lost and doomed for hell, unless he try the same *unsuccessful decision* again. For fear of being castigated by his brethren, he pushes the doubts out of his mind, and continues to boast in his "know-so-salvation." He did his duty! The ministers would rather see duty working in them than to see the effects of grace working effectually in them. Duty, at least would appear, to supply that unity of purpose in the world within the "church" which is lacking vital godliness from a higher motive of love and adoration. But whatever the motive, duty-faith-unto-salvation is a carnal substitute for the gracious and humbling worship of God with a heart full of adoration and love.

Those who oppose this view of duty-faith-unto-salvation do so on the basis of the revelation of God respecting salvation by grace alone, and the just condemnation of the wicked. Those who believe in eternal vital union and unconditional election are aware that if some of Adam's offspring were chosen in

Christ before the foundation of the world, then some others were not. They believe that Christ died for all the sins of these elect, and thus *judicially* saved (past tense) them from condemnation. Unlike the Neo-calvinists, who believe Calvinism to be a superlative *plan of salvation* to be accepted or rejected, as other humanly devised plans, the Hyper-calvinists believe that it is an actual *completed salvation in and by the sacrifice of Christ*. They do not believe that He shed His precious blood for the sins of those He eternally decreed and foreordained to condemnation (Jude 4.) Having given the non-elect "over to a reprobate mind," (Romans 1:28,) having "given them up," (Romans 1:26) having made them "fitted to destruction;" (Romans 9:22) and "sent them strong delusions that they should believe a lie that they all might be damned," (2 Thessalonians 2:12-13), and "appointed them to destruction," (2 Thessalonians 5:9 and Jude 4), then why should any sensible person believe that Christ should suffer even more, so preachers could "offer" these reprobates "an honest invitation?" When one considers how much larger the number of these "children of disobedience", or "children of the bondwoman" is than those of the "little flock," the "children of the free woman," – [which is said to be the "fewest of all people" – "not numbered among the nations"] – then the additional and useless sufferings of Christ would truly be great. Such a view can only "*count His blood an unholy thing*." (Hebrews 10:29.) Again, duty-faith-unto-salvation for this vast number of complacent, wicked reprobates is a totally foolish heresy. . . and useless altogether, seeing none of them was saved by Christ's atoning sacrifice and yet have a deep and abiding love for their sins, nor do they desire to be saved **from sin**; maybe saved ***in*** *their sins*; but certainly not **from** them.

When Neo-calvinists and Freewillers are made to face the above objections, they immediately charge Hyper-calvinists with being "anti-evangelical," "anti-mission,"



"antinomian," "hard-shells," "bench sitters," "anti-means," or "Hyper-calvinists." In that way they do not have to defend their own ridiculous, unbiblical and illogical theory. They think that a Bible believer ought to be ashamed of being a Hyper-calvinist! One is not! But one would be ashamed of being an ignoramus! By what authority should one allow an Andrew Fuller, or a Charles Haddon Spurgeon, to define an "*antinomian*," seeing that their present-day off-shoots are the worst brand of loose-livers the world of religion has ever seen? A righteous person does not want to be classified with these so-called "Christians."

Hyper-calvinists are often asked by duty-faith men: "Do you believe in preaching the Gospel to sinners?" So general is this false charge! Hyper-calvinists, or "Hardshell" ministers fully believe in preaching the *Gospel of what Christ HAS DONE* and this indiscriminately to *all manner of men* wherever, and to whomever God directs them. In fact, if their churches found them preaching "*another Gospel*," which Paul said was "perverted" their churches would censure them promptly! But they can find no divine authority to "*offer*" grace to graceless characters or professors, or to promise grace covenant blessing indiscriminately to all men, for God has not given, nor applied these blessings promiscuously. And they certainly can't *give* what they *offer*! The application of the Gospel promise is strictly God's own exclusive work. And He never makes a mistake! It must be this way, Biblically, for He has never given anyone insight into the Lamb's Book of Life. Since He wrote their names therein "*before the foundation of the world*," He surely "*knows them that are His*." But no proselyter does.

In the parable of the hundred sheep, our Lord went into the wilderness "to seek *and to save that sheep* that was lost," and finding it, He laid it on His shoulder and took it home. But

He *left* the greater portion, the "ninety and nine *just* persons," which felt no need for repentance in the *wilderness*." (Luke 15:3-7) By His own testimony, He "*came not to call the righteous; But sinners to repentance*." (Matthew 9:13) Are ministers of the Gospel required to call those whom their Master *refused* to call? Can one make a case for that? Are Christ's servants greater than their Lord? Are they required to "offer" salvation to those of whom Christ said: "I *pray NOT FOR THE WORLD*"? (John 17: 9) If Christ knew the goats "could not believe," why in heaven's name can Neo-calvinist ministers think they can? And importantly, how can they think they *ought* to "invite" them to?

Of equal importance, are self-righteous souls who "need no repentance," (which is a "gift", Acts 11:18) obligated to repent and believe "unto salvation" in the absence of a felt-need to do so? One can find no such Scriptural injunction. If God has not enjoined this "duty" on the non-elect, then by what authority are they "duty-bound to repent and believe unto salvation?"

That they are bound to *repent and turn from idols* and false religions and false gods, and cease their blasphemous freewill *deification* of themselves, Hyper-calvinists will not dispute. That it is required of them; yea, commanded of them, is clearly set forth in the Scripture. But that this repentance is "*unto salvation*," they deny. For if it is, salvation is by works and not by grace, which the Bible clearly denies. Our Lord said: "*Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city*." (Matthew 10:15) And "*whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in Me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea*." (Mark 9:42.) If it is *more tolerable* for one than another; or *better* for one than another; surely it can be agreed that it is better and

will be more tolerable for one reprobate that lives a moral life than for one who does not. It is to men's benefit for them to behave themselves; but this behavior cannot be a meritorious condition *unto salvation*. It isn't for the elect, so it cannot be for the reprobates. Salvation remains as it is: "*By GRACE are you saved through faith, and that (faith) not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.*" (Ephesians 2:7). To promise, or "offer" life and immortality as a consequence of repenting and believing is unscriptural; for both are "gifts" given to the quickened, or living child of God.

The called and qualified ministers of God are to preach the exceeding sinfulness of sin; the severity of God's judgments; the terrors of His impeccable law; the justice of God equally with the mercies of God; describe the blessings of grace; and to call upon men everywhere to repent and believe in Christ. But they must not, yea, they dare not attempt to extend the law, or the Gospel beyond the limits set by God Himself. Read after "Hyper-calvinists" (so-called) as William Huntington, John Gill, John Brine, and William Gadsby, John Gadsby, *et. al.*, and one will find the greatest examples of faithful preaching; yet unimportant Neo-calvinists, as Spurgeon and Ian Murray, find fault with such merely because these men knew not to "offer" a *finished and completed salvation* to reprobates! See how itchy the ministers of this "world" are to get their fellow "worldlings" into the so-called "church"? The world has its ministers. They are in it together! It is well to keep in mind that ". . . *we are unto God (not man) a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved and to them that perish: to the one we are the savor of death unto death; and to the other the savor of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things? For we are not as many which corrupt the Word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.*" (2 Corinthians 2:15-17)

The condemnation of the wicked rests upon a deeper

foundation than *unbelief*. A man cannot help not believing in something he despises and can't comprehend. To the world "*it is not given to believe on Christ.*" Paul went to great extent to prove that the condemnation of the wicked rested upon the first Adam's *disobedience* and the imputation of his transgression upon those in his loins. For he wrote: "*Wherefore? As by one man (Adam) sin entered into the world and death by sin: and so death passed upon ALL MEN, for all have sinned. (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed where there is no law.) Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses (prior to the law), even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression? who is the **figure** of Him that was to come.*" (Romans 5:12-14.) What then, were those multitudes of individuals required to believe? They were neither under the law nor the Gospel! Or, what commandments were they enjoined to perform, from Adam to Moses? That period embraced many millions without the Gospel. Yet, *sin was in the world* and the consequence of sin - death reigned even then. Were they required to repent and believe unto salvation? If so, by what law are they so required? Was it by the Gospel? You know the answer to that.

It has been said it was by "the moral law," or a "higher law," and for years this writer as a Pelagian believed it too. But the Bible is silent here. It speaks of no other law before the Torah. There is no record of another law being given from Adam to Abraham, or of one from Abraham to Moses' receiving the law. Granted that Abraham kept the principles of the Torah before it was delivered on Mt. Sinai; we do find a covenant made with Abraham; in the which circumcision was commanded him and his seed as a token of that covenant; but we read of no other such covenant being given to other nations. What of the law given through Moses, to Israel? There is no record that shows it was equally given by God to any other nation. Hence, one may rightly inquire: "What *legal duties and*

*obligations* were required of other people where that law or covenant was not given? In so far as God ruled over all, and death reigned over all, they had to have been in subjection to the law in Adam, and hence, under the Adamic covenant, and obligated to Him as their Creator God. Otherwise death would have no claim upon them. One of their greatest offenses was idolatry, for they rebelled against their Creator, "*neither were they thankful*" (Romans 1.)

If one should reply, "But today, the law and the Gospel has been given." This is true - but still the question stands: "*To whom are they given?*" The law was given to Israel. Was the Gospel kingdom also given to them as in the flesh? Jesus' answer is "No." He said relative to Israel in His first advent when the disciples inquired why He spoke in parables to the Jews, " ... *Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath.* " (Matthew 13:11) One understands that the disciples were the ones "*who hath*" and would be given more; and the non-elect Jews were the ones who "*hath not*" and the blessings of the law, which they did have, would be "*taken from them.*" And they were in 69-70 A.D. with the fall of Jerusalem to General Titus' Roman legions.

What then does natural man in his natural state have enjoined upon him to perform? The Hyper-calvinists' answer is: "Whatever God enjoins upon him in providence, in the light of nature, or reason, or directly by the word of commandment." And this is done *individually*, not collectively, seeing that as a people the world of the ungodly has no family covenant as Abraham had; nor Gospel promises as God's elect people have. The Biblical record

abounds with instances to prove that God commands individuals, in various ways, to do things. We will select an instance familiar with Bible students to illustrate and clarify the position we are defending.

The Zidonians were not Jews, nor under the law of Moses. They were Phoenicians. God spoke to Elijah the Tishbite, saying, "Arise, get thee to Zarephath which belongeth to Zidon, and dwell there: behold, I *have COMMANDED* a *widow woman there to sustain thee.*" (I Kings 17:9.) Now, the Lord commanded this Gentile woman to do *something*, which according to nature she could not do! That is, she could not feed the prophet, for she had but enough meal for one more loaf of bread to feed herself and son. She could not *fulfill her obligation!* Does this *inability* negate her accountability to obey God and feed the prophet? Of course not! The performance of this command was totally out of her creature power. Her "*accountability*" unto God (not "responsibility" - she had someone superior to her. She was not "free.") could only be accomplished by *free unmerited grace!* What duties and obligations did she now have? Did she have any by Israel's law? No! Did she have any by the Gospel of Christ? No! What then? To feed the prophet *as God commanded her.* That, and only that, was her duty to perform. It is an observation that according to human nature, with only one loaf of bread and a child to feed, that common reasoning would allow her to disobey God. But she obeyed without protest! Was she, a Gentile, an elect child of God? Probably; Jesus used her as an illustration of His sovereign election (Luke 4:26.) And, in this case, God Himself directly provided the meal - and thus her ability. She was enabled by a miracle of God's Providence, to feed the prophet, her son, and herself. Even with God's elect today, He must "*make them willing in the day of His power,*" (Psalm 110:2) and "*work in them both to will and to do of His good pleasure,*" or they will never be able to obey Him! Can

Hyper-calvinists, as the Neo-calvinists and Pelagians freewillers extrapolate from this command that "the whole world is duty-bound to feed Israel's prophets, and if they would, they would also be fed"? In no wise.

Do we need to speak at length of Abram whom God called, saying, *"Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee"*? (Gen. 12:1) What divine law in Ur of the Chaldees was he under? What covenant obligations and duties did he rest under at the time of this call? Paul answers saying: *"for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision."* (Romans 4:9-13). *"And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect."* (Galatians 3:17). And so then, Abraham who was justified *before Christ came was justified by faith* in a covenant that was confirmed before God in Christ *BEFORE THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD!* If you haven't noticed, that is free grace! What then were Abraham's covenant *duties* and *obligations*? Only to believe God relative to His promises! But, were "the whole world of all mankind" duty-bound to believe God would call them out of Ur and bless their seed in whom all nations of the earth would be blessed? Not likely! Were any *others* required to receive the sign of a covenant by being circumcised and have their male offspring circumcised on the eighth day? Of course not! Then why should Neo-calvinists insist that the world of the ungodly is duty-bound to repent and believe unto salvation, when only God's elect people are recipients of the blessings of the everlasting covenant? It sounds rather ridiculous in this light, doesn't it?

The Neo-calvinists most often used Paul's sermon at Mar's

Hill as their proof-text for duty-faith-unto-salvation. But is this so? This text is the best to clarify most precisely what Hypercalvinists believe on this issue. Let us look at it closely:

Athens was a Gentile city-state. Paul visited it and saw *their idolatries*, and even an altar with the inscription: "To the Unknown God." This text is supposed by the Fullerite "Evangelicals" to be the bastion of the duty-faith-unto-salvation texts. But let us look first at Acts 17:22-31, paying attention both to what it says and what it **does not** say. In the text, one finds both a very broad application and a specifically limited one "unto salvation." We read of God who *hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth? and hath determined the times before APPOINTED? and the bounds of their habitation.*" (verse 26.) We see a *limited* application in the next verse, which says, "*that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and seek Him? though He be not far from every one of us.*" (verse 27.) See the limitation? "while" He is near "every one of us," only those that *feel after* Him might seek and find Him. But it includes no others.

Now notice the *broad* application: "*Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God (in Adam's covenant) we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device. And the times of this ignorance (seen in idolatries) God winked at: but now commandeth all men every where to repent: because He hath appointed a day, in which He will judge the WORLD in righteousness by that Man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men in that He hath raise Him from the dead.*" (verses 29-31.) Of what *repentance* is the apostle speaking? Is it repentance unto salvation, which is a gift and fruit of the Holy Spirit *not given* to "all men everywhere;" or that kind of repentance Nineveh demonstrated under the preaching of Jonah? What is



Paul's subject? *Idolatry!* What stirred Paul's spirit to speak of repentance? *Idolatry.* "Now while Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit was stirred in him, when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry." (verse 16). What was the "ignorance that God once winked" at? Certainly it was not *covenant transgressions*, for the Athenians were under no covenant! It was idolatries. Finally, did Paul command that they believe in Christ unto salvation? *Not a word!* Yet, what was the effect of the message? "*And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked; and others said, we will hear thee again of this matter ... however certain men clave unto him and believed.*" And so it is to this very day.

Why did these "certain men" believe? It "is a gift of God!" One can often find all three sorts of people mentioned here today under a Gospel message. Those who believe are those "who haply feel *after Him, and find Him.*" But notice that the apostle pressed *no duty-faith* on any present to believe that Christ died for them all; nor did he give a "free offer invitation," to a single one of them! A modern proselyter surely would not have missed this golden opportunity to get a few more deciders-for-Christ! Paul preached and behaved consistently with what he knew by experience, i.e., that salvation is exclusively of the Lord, and not of the preacher or the hearer! Since Paul was called, qualified, and sent of God and was moved "in his spirit" by their idolatries, those who *believed not were duty-bound* by the Adamic covenant obligations, to repent of their idolatries, and *for this* stubborn support of their false gods will be condemned in that judgment of which Paul had preached to them. But for them to believe that Christ died for them, (which if never called and born of the Spirit, He did not) was not an obligation pressed upon them by Paul. They were obligated to believe the record that God "*hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He hath*

ORDAINED." And this, Pelagians today do not believe! They were to believe the record that "*He hath raised Him from the dead.*" But one searches in vain for any new covenant promise given to those "that believed not." There were no new covenant promises held out to such that would "hear him another day," and hence no new covenant *obligations* were laid on them.

Somewhat off the present subject, we will make this note: One of the greatest universally witnessed miracles on earth, was when both the Eastern Roman, or Byzantine Emperor, and the Western, or Roman Emperor, having combined the full forces of both governments to exterminate the Christians, *resigned* on the same day; and quickly the whole world represented by them destroyed their idols *en masse*. That was this kind of repentance!

In spite of the fact that Paul gave no "free offer appeals," no "invitations," or "opportunities for making a decision," did he not *preach the Gospel* to sinners? That he was Hyper-calvinistic on this occasion, none can successfully deny. He *did* preach the Gospel to *sinners*, and *some believed*, "*among the which was Dionysius the Areopagite* (a member of the city-council, or "church") *and a woman named Damaris? and others with them.*" (verse 34.) Did Paul preach the Gospel indiscriminately to all manner of men present? Yes, the same message fell upon all ears alike, even "*to some who mocked,*" to others who procrastinated, and to *certain men* and women who believed. Dear Reader, this is precisely what Hyper-calvinists believe and practice!

There has been raised above the question of what law *natural men* are under, and what *covenant obligations* were duty-bound upon them to perform? Let us consider that question in another light. Having pointed out that individually they are under whatever commandment God

gives to them, directly, or in conscience, or by the light of nature, they are *accountable* (we did not say "responsible") to God as their Creator God because of their being His creation. The apostle says that *"for as many as have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; (for not the hearers of the law are just before God but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law do by nature the things contained in the law these, having not the law are a law unto themselves: which shew the work of the law written in their hearts; their conscience also bearing witness; and their thoughts the mean while accusing or excusing one another); in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men's hearts by Jesus Christ according to my Gospel."* (Romans 2:12-16.) That appears to be an adequate explanation of God's dealings with "the world of the ungodly." This is Paul's own discussion about the *obligations* of the world that the Neo-calvinists are trying to "win to Christ" with their "universal free offer" of salvation. Notice that Paul did *not even hint* of any universal "free offers." If such a theory was true, this is the most appropriate place in the New Testament to find it!

So there is a *work of the law* found among the Gentiles who "have not the law." It is this "work of the law," rather than the supposed duty-faith-unto-salvation, which the spiritual Israelites delight in by effectual grace. Paul labored with the Jewish believers in Rome over circumcision and again reaches for proof among the Gentile believers among them, saying, *"And shall not circumcision which is by nature, if it fulfill the law judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision doest transgress the law? For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."* (Romans 2:27-29.)

There are, therefore, Jews resting legally under a covenant law to whom the law is dead. There are Gentiles who have no law-covenant. There are both Jews and Gentiles who have the "work of the law" written in their hearts. It is in this that one finds the mark, or sign, or evidence, of a spiritual circumcision, which is their comfort and joy; for it is the work that the letter of the law could never perform. Duty-faith has *nothing to do with salvation*.

Now, wherever this "work of the law" is found, there is of necessity a *law giver*. Where God gives a law, there is a *covenant*. Where there is a covenant, there are covenant *obligations*. Where there are covenant obligations, there are *parties to that covenant*, and these obligations extend *only* to the parties of that covenant. Is the following example a covenant for those who by grace believe? Let the reader judge: "*For finding fault with them, He saith, Behold the days come saith the Lord when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with that of Judah: not according to the covenant (a covenant of works) that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt: because they continued not in My covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord ...*" (Hebrew 8:8-10.) Paul applies this covenant promise to the "spiritual Israel", i.e., the believers. Please note the stipulations of this new covenant with Christians. Consider here, first, an objection: It is argued by duty-faith men that this new covenant is to be made with the modern Israeli in some millennium yet to come (hyper-dispensationalism). Why, then, does Paul, writing to a *Gentile* church apply it to them? "*Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law*" (what "law"? It must have been a law the elect were under, both Jews and Gentiles alike), "*being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree: that the*

*blessings of Abraham might come unto the Gentiles through Jesus Christ: that He might receive (not, "accept") the promise of the Spirit through faith. Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant" (and this covenant was not), "yet if it be confirmed no man disannulled, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his Seed were the promises made. He saith not; And to seeds, as of many; but as of one? And to **thy Seed which is Christ**. And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before **IN** CHRIST, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect. (Galatians 3:13-17). This covenant has two parties: the Father and His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. Such as are **IN** Christ [in seed substance] are *recipients* of the blessings of this covenant. They are a party in this covenant only by virtue of *being in eternal vital union "in Him."* Now this covenant, the New Covenant, embraces Gentile elect; and Israel in this text is "spiritual Israel," rather than national Israel. As a covenant, it has *covenant obligations* only on the parties in this covenant. Are they duty-faith-obligations? Absolutely not! Rather to the very contrary.*

Whatever obligations, or duties, as are found in this covenant are enjoined upon the *parties thereof*, throughout the whole world, and to every "creature" *concerned in this covenant*, and none others. So let us search out these covenant obligations and see if "all mankind" is duty-bound to their articles. There are two parties in this covenant. "I WILL PUT MY LAWS INTO THEIR MINDS, AND (I WILL) WRITE THEM IN THEIR HEARTS: AND I WILL BE to them a God ... " There is the first party. Here is the second: "*and THEY SHALL BE TO ME A PEOPLE.*" Notice, the party of the second part is not required to DO ANY THING! They are "recipients" of the blessing of this covenant only. Now

watch what they are "to do": *"And they shall NOT TEACH every man his neighbor and every man his brother Saying, Know the Lord."* Duty-faith men are totally in rebellion to this covenant provision. Are we correct? Don't they do exactly what the recipients of this covenant are commanded **not to do**? Why not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother to "know the Lord"? *"For they shall ALL KNOW ME, from the least to the greatest."* Now this is a blessing rather than a "duty" to be performed. And this covenant adds the most superlative of all blessings, saying, "for I will be *merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.*" (Hebrews 8:10-12.) Where, then, does one find any duty-faith obligations to believe and repent *in order to* receive these blessings? And by what stretch of the imagination can one apply this to all mankind, or the "world of the ungodly"?

Look again at the provisions of this covenant. On God's part, He will be responsible (not "accountable!") for putting His laws in their minds; writing His laws in their hearts; being a great God to them; having mercy on their unrighteousness; and not remembering their sins and iniquity any more. Isn't that a precious promise to sensible sinners? So great a love is this to such unlovable creatures! Now look at their *accountability* in this covenant: They are to *refrain* from teaching every man, his neighbor and every man his brother "to know the Lord." As one can see, this is not a "works covenant." Proselyters violate it daily, and actually think that they are supposed to! This covenant is purely "**free grace**." Now talk about the duties and obligations of reprobates in regard to this covenant: Our Lord said: *"So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our **duty to do.**"* Where is that perfect man that has done "all things" commanded of him? Until one does all the commandments and then *goes beyond* them to do more,

such *have **not** done their duty!* If one were to achieve such perfection in the flesh and then went beyond the commandments of God, it can then be asked of him, "*Who hath required this of thy hand?*" It would be sin. So, what *duties* do the "world of the ungodly" have in this covenant? None! By now one should be able to see the folly of the theory of "duty-faith-unto-salvation."

In the provisions of this covenant, God is the principle actor. He is to give His people, as recipients of this covenant, life and salvation; He will work a change of condition in them in the second birth and conversion; and He will be their God; a *sovereign, independent ruler over them*. This is not a "plan of salvation;" it is a divine unalterable promise. If He has mercy on one, and never again remembers his sins and iniquities any more; then that person *IS SAVED, AND HE IS Safe*. It is a *finished salvation* rather than a "proposed salvation." In that covenant, there is not one word about duty- faith for anyone; let alone for "all mankind." In fact, it is excluded altogether!

The advocates of duty-faith connect this supposed duty with their unbiblical "free offer of salvation" decision-making scheme. Granted, there is an ineffectual general call in the Gospel, wherever the Gospel goes. To those "condemned already," it is a "*savor of death unto death*." To those that are given faith to believe, it is a "*savor of life unto life*." And duty has nothing to do with either! "Duty" is a low and base reason to worship our God. He deserves our highest praise, most ardent love, and deepest and purest devotion, and that from the highest and purest of motives - asking nothing in return! As stated earlier, surely there are thousands of higher motives to serve our adorable God than selfish "duty." Nor has God ever encouraged such a mean and detestable motive for one to call upon His Name.

In summation, Hyper-calvinists recognize that it is the duty of all men to keep the moral obligations placed upon Adam, and all his offspring *in* him in his seed. We cite but one in this summary. In the garden of God, Adam was given a help-meet, and commanded to "*cleave unto his wife.*" And the "*twain was one flesh.*" This yet is the duty of Adam's race. But one should compare apples with apples. These obligations are not of saving benefit. Only the "*blood of Christ cleanest us from all sins.*" Salvation is by free grace alone. The Hyper-calvinists deny the theory of Andrew Fuller, that the ungodly reprobates have a duty to believe that God loves them, and that Christ died in vain for them. They are amazed at such a contradiction that "the blood of Christ *is sufficient* for the salvation of the whole world, if the whole world would believe," and then that His blood is *insufficient* for anyone's salvation unless they decide to allow it to be! What foolishness! That argument is not true. Christ died specifically for each and every sin of each and every elect soul given to Him by His Father. He did NOT SUFFER for a single sin of a single one of the reprobates; and no matter how precious His blood - which is precious beyond calculation - nevertheless, His suffering and death does not extend to a single soul who will spend eternity in hell! - **DEI GRATIA!**

What Scriptural problems exist with the views presented in this chapter?

Are duty-faith-unto-salvation men correct in their theory that reprobates should believe that Christ loved them and died equally for their sins as for the sins of His people?

In short: Do the Hyper-Calvinists have a biblical foundation for their viewpoint?



What are the points with which you agree?

With what points do you disagree?

All in all, on a scale of 1 to 10, at what percentage do you agree with the Hyper-Calvinistic viewpoint?

If you agreed more with the Hyper-Calvinist's views above, should you be ashamed to be labeled a "*Hyper-Calvinist*"?

## CHAPTER SIX

### HYPER-CALVINISM AND SOUL-WINNING

Those that follow the duty-faith-unto-salvation scheme, and believe that God "earnestly wants" all men to believe, both elect and reprobates alike, also believe that every "Christian" is required to be a "personal soul-winner." Mormons and Jehovah Witnesses are good examples of this position, but Evangelicals attempt to motivate their followers to button-hole everyone they meet demanding an answer to "Are you a Christian?" What Scripture they base this view on is not apparent. With them, of course, they probably don't feel any need for a Scriptural authority for much of what they do. However, these same individuals are quick to charge those they like to term as "Hyper-calvinists," or "Hardshells," of not believing in soul-winning, and warn their listeners and readers to beware of them. In fact, one-hundred and fifty years after a Hyper-calvinist writer dies, these Neo-calvinist proselyters **still bedevil them**. Can any living, breathing soul imagine anyone attacking William Huntington as one who did not believe in "preaching the Gospel to sinners"! He was far more successful than any Evangelical today! Yet, Ian Murray pounced upon that

precious minister! Ian! 'Tis a pity he is less than half the Gospel minister the "Coal-heaver" was!

When the Pharisees said that Jesus cast out devils by the prince of devils, Christ taught His disciples that such prejudicing people against the Spirit's gracious work in an attempt to discredit His work was the "unpardonable sin." One can see no reason for one attacking these sound and faithful free grace ministers except to prejudice their readers against the truth they taught. Today, following the re-publication of Huntington's, John Gill's, and Tobias Crisp's works, Mr. Murray - that great champion of Spurgeon's Neo-calvinism - can find no good in these works to print in the "*Banner of Truth*." Rather he attacks these blessed saints' belief that God's sovereign grace and tender mercy, His infinite wisdom and power, was sufficient to redeem His people from their sins. Such attacks are wholly uncalled for, and only a hatred for the truth of free grace can be the answer for the motive why it is done. Worse, Mr. Murray likes to claim he is a "Calvinist!"

Certain it is that Hyper-calvinists do not believe in proselytizing in the way these Neo-calvinists called "soul-winning." It too, is a modern invention to support the Fullerite scheme of "winning the world of the ungodly to Christ." But, the Hyper-calvinists still go by their forefathers' belief that "The Scripture of the Old and New Testament is the word of God and the "only rule of faith and *practice*." Finding no such practice in the Scripture and knowing that it is contrary to the "*faith once delivered to the saints*," they call the whole scheme into question. All they find in the Holy Scripture relative to personal witnessing is a simple: "*Go home to thy house and tell them what God has done for you.*" They have not found the common practice of "soul-winning", where total strangers, button-hole other total strangers, asking them "Are you a Christian?" and then pressing upon them a "decision for

Christ." The Neo-Calvinists believe that experimental salvation is a direct result of "*decisionism*;" whereas the Hyper-Calvinists believe it is the result of a spiritual "*birth*." Hyper-calvinists have no confidence at all on "Christianity" based upon a mental decision. They do not believe the new birth is a "*mindset*." They believe that one must be quickened (made alive) by the Spirit, and this work is not dependent upon, nor aided by, a "decision" of the carnal mind. The only result of this type of proselytizing seem to be the enlisting of more hypocrites into modern religious institutions. The sad carnal state of all these religions is a stark witness against mental, or decision-made, commitment to "Christianity."

Hyper-calvinists know from the Scriptures that the human "*heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked*," (Jeremiah 17:9) and they find it repulsive for one to suggest to anyone that they should offer that filthy thing to the Lord. It is much better to believe that God has "*given them a heart to believe*" for they, not God, are in need of a new heart to serve Him. To offer to God one's corrupt heart would be as the Jews offering the blood of swine to God. (Isaiah 66:3). Perhaps the point is made, that this method of "soul-winning" is unwarranted by the Scriptures.

The saints should "*let their speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt that they may know how ye ought to answer every man*," (Colosians 4:6,) or as Peter wrote, "*For so is the will of God that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men*," and, "*But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that **asketh you** for a reason of the **hope** that is in you with meekness and fear*," (I Peter 3:15).

Is it contrary to sound judgment to assume that before an

"answer" is given, there must be first a "question" asked? Do Calvinists believe that "*The preparation of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue is from the Lord*" (Proverbs 16:1.) We realize that hardly anyone believes the above text, and if one does, he is a Calvinist; but do Neo-calvinists "soul-winners" believe this? Hardly! The providential path for the application of the finished work of Christ to each of His blood-bought redeemed children is in His hands. He certainly will reach them all. Our God is not a distraught failure!

This being so, God's quickened elect will inquire diligently of the way of salvation through discussions and observations with any of whom they have confidence, and the saints are to always be ready to relate their own experience in grace to such that ask of them. In this manner, the *righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith*," as it is written, the "*just shall live by faith*." That is as *personal* as witnessing can be. It is an interchange of the common salvation; edifying to both the seeker and the one providing comfort. It is not so *personal*, when a total stranger suddenly shocks a stranger whose mind or heart is interested in salvation. These zealots frequently confront Hyper-calvinists with that "Are you a Christian" assault; who thinks, and sometimes says, "Whose business is it any way? If I'm not, what do you think you or I can do about it? Can either of us quicken anyone?" Now Pelagians believe they can, because they have no idea what the new birth is. But a Calvinist is supposed to know that "*it is of God, that you believe in Me*." Such "soul-winners" as these fall into the category with those of whom Paul charged with "*having a zeal without knowledge*." It is to be feared that the overwhelming number of these not-so-personal "soul-winners" today are in just such a condition. One cannot find a single one of them that even suspects how Christ saved His people; nor what He accomplished on the cross. They are all, to the

man or woman, ignorant of the way of eternal salvation. For a person who themselves merely made a *natural decision* about an *historical Christ* without an experience of grace, to "witness for Christ," is a *"false witness."* His own experience is void of the knowledge of Christ's finished salvation and how He *"saved them that believe."* If such had an experience of grace themselves they would know full well that it was not by a natural decision of their carnal mind, nor by the efforts of another. They would know that those *"which were born, not of blood, nor of the **will of the flesh**, nor of the **will of man**, but **of God**,"* are God's people, and those that are "Christians" by *decisionism* are man-made. *"Let God be true, and every man a liar".*

The way that Hyper-calvinists discuss their own experiences of grace together, while others keenly listen and raise questions of them, provide a true witness of the vital work of grace within the soul. Even before conversion, in this way of New Testament witnessing, the one seeking knowledge of salvation is being firmly established in many aspects of the revealed faith. He finds that others have a warfare within their being as they relate the power of indwelling sin and the power of delivering grace. They learn that others have a witness within of the same conflicts they are bearing. They will learn of the eternal union of Christ as the Head of His church, with those chosen in Him from eternity, election, predestination, the sovereignty of God over all things, the love of God, vital union by the new birth and eternal redemption. They will hear of imputed righteousness by others who trust only in this for their standing before God. They will find interest in the eternal justification of believers in His body, the church; and the dual natures the regenerate believer has; of Gospel Truth and Gospel order. Christ is honored by such intimate sharing of His dealings within His people. Nor is this type of witnessing based upon that shameful belief that our Sovereign God "wants"

everyone to witness; nor everyone to "get saved." This latter view, so much a part of the not-so-personal "soul-winning" technique, degrades the most Sovereign God. Again, our God does not "want," - men "want;" but God's "will" is done. No one "tries" to do things that they can do. They just do it. They "try" to do the things that they can't do. They "tried to." God never "tries," nor has He ever "tried" to do anything! He "*does His own will in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay His hand, or say unto Him, What doest Thou?*" (Daniel 4:11). Witnessing for Christ is never an effort on God's part to get something done, which otherwise would never be done! God is *GOD!*

When the Pelagians or Neo-calvinists "offer salvation" to all their hearers equally, they represent God as a total failure for most of the world. This ignores the actual fact of Christ's **completed work in salvation**. The "soul-winners'" whole motivation is based upon this ignorance. Paul wrote of an indisputable and faithful saying, that Christ's purpose in coming was "to save *sinner*s." The angelic message confirms the same: "*for she shall bring forth a son,*" and she did! "*and thou shalt call His name Jesus,*" and they did, just as the angel predicted; "*for He shall save His people from their sins.*" (Matt.1:21.) Now either He did, or both the angel and the apostle were wrong! Hyper-calvinists say that He did! Pelagians, Neo-calvinists, and maybe a few Calvinists, and all "soul-winners" dispute Paul and the angel. They say that He didn't! One must be true: either He did, or He didn't. If He did, then He is not now *trying* to get it done. If He couldn't, or didn't, who in this world could possibly do it? If He didn't, then in what sense can it be truthfully said that He is the *Redeemer*? Did He, or did He not *ransom* anyone? If He failed to "*do His Father's will,*" then He did not *reconcile* His people by His blood. If He didn't, then He did not *justify* any "*by His blood,*" or any of the other blessings the

Scriptures teach that He did for His people to "*sanctify them FOREVER.*" All these things He did *judicially*, in actually saving them legally **by His own work**. In true witnessing for Christ, such things are *ascribed to Christ* in behalf of all such who feel a need for forgiveness. This gives Him all the glory; whereas the "soul-winners" who predicate one's salvation on decisionism they initiated rob God of His glory and ascribe it to the creature. The quickened child of God has a felt-need, due to the burden of sin pressed upon him by the indwelling life and immortality placed in him, in his quickening experience. The Spirit has designed this to bring him to peace, comfort, evangelical reconciliation, and conversion. There can be no true peace or comfort in believing that one's own decision, or a man's witness did this work. The peace and comfort comes from realizing that it cannot be of the flesh, but in the power of God. Again, by this God-honoring witnessing, man is abased and God is glorified.

If a Calvinist preaches the *finished work of Christ for the elect only*, he is a "Hyper-calvinist" by definition. It is the position of this writer that *only such* preaches that Christ is *THE Savior of sinners*. All others actually preach that man is the savior of sinners. The Hyper-calvinists understand that the *redeemed elect* are the ones, and the only ones, that the Holy Spirit quickens to life and immortality in divine quickening; and they are the very same ones who are the objects of the effectual call by the Spirit under the Gospel to conversion. The "soul-winners" work at cross-purposes with the Spirit's divine calling when they press decisionism on the "world of the ungodly." They ignorantly produce hell-bound Christians; the goats among the sheep, the tares among the wheat; the foolish virgins among the wise; the dead fish in the Gospel net; those that the King will place on His left hand and say unto them, "*Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.*"- (Matthew 25: 41.) These

are the *decision-made* "Christians."

Paul explained the application of salvation in this wise: "*Who HATH saved*" us (past tense, and prior to effectual calling) *and called us with a holy calling, not according to OUR WORKS* (and certainly not the "soul-winner's" works), *but according to HIS OWN purpose and grace which was GIVEN US* (not "offered" to us) *in Christ Jesus before the world began.*" Now, in this text the apostle has placed salvation before calling with a holy calling. This "holy calling" is not the Gospel call, as some might believe. It is the *effectual call* of the Holy Spirit who speaks *life* into the soul. Now notice what follows: "*But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ Who hath abolished death and hath brought life and immortality to LIGHT through the Gospel: whereunto I am appointed a preacher and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles.*" (II Timothy 1:9-11). We will have occasion under other headings to use this text. For now, notice it carefully. Many young Calvinists coming out of Pelagianism are predisposed to miss-read it. They have a mind-set from years in freewillism that the Gospel bring **life**. Hyper-calvinists believe, preach, and apply the message of salvation in the specific order given in this text. Others do not. Instead, they make all that Christ achieved by His active and passive obedience contingent on the work of the ministry; and this, two-thousand years after Christ did that glorious and gracious work. In their scheme, Christ's work is not finished until freewillers, ministers, proselyters, and "soul-winners" put the finishing touch to it! Even with such sound and consistent groups as traditional Calvinists, too often one find this anthropocentricity necessary to crown the Lord's work with success.

If the gospel is *glad tidings* about something, then the Hyper-calvinists are the ones actually preaching the Gospel



consistently. It certainly is not "glad tidings" to preach that Christ only put man into a "*savable state*" as Fuller and J. M. Pendleton wrote. It is certainly more God-honoring to teach that He actually saved them while He was about doing His Father's will! Is He going to use the preachers to awake the dead in the resurrection? Are these "soul-winners" going to be around to knock on the tombs "inviting" the dead to arise? That makes as much sense as to believe they are **now doing it!** What work is the most crucial: the new birth or the resurrection? Surely the new birth! All mankind will be resurrected, but only the elect are born again. The Hyper-calvinists believe that He *actually did* what the Scriptures teach that He did. They see no good reason to believe otherwise. They do not believe that He will come back and try again to see if He can be more successful and get some of the "world of the ungodly" into His heavenly kingdom. The truth is the ungodly really do not want to go there anyway. They just don't want to go to that other place! One can only spiritually believe something *that is true*; otherwise one must believe it when it is false in order to make it true! Pelagians and Neo-calvinists "soul-winning" are unsound.

In conclusion, it may be useful to critique the most common expressions one hears from "soul-winners" and point out why they are so God-dishonoring. Some are very insulting to the Majesty of His Person and demeaning to any concept of "God" as God. First, "God *wants* you to do thus and so." A sister in a Hyper-calvinist church always read Billy Graham's short advice column. One day she commented, "Billy Graham has the most "wanting" god there is! His god is always "wanting" something he can't get, or can't do." That is a good summary of the use of this word when applied to the *Almighty* God. Let Pelagians have their "wanting" god; but Calvinists should use sound and consistent words. "*For every beast of the forest are Mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all*

*the fowls of the mountains: and the wild beasts of the field are Mine. If I were hungry I would not tell thee: for the world is Mine, and the fullness thereof.*" (Psalm 50: 10-12). That is what is wrong with that word "want." God is Sovereign, Almighty and Independent. The God of the Calvinists stands in need of nothing! He does not "want." This is a deficiency found in man – not in God.

Another expression we hear is, "Have you *given your heart to Jesus?*" How is this possible? Worse, why in the world would anyone want to offer that rotten thing to the thrice Holy God! "*The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked: who can know it?*" The "soul-winner" needs to be begging God to give him a clean heart instead.

"Are you a Christian?" We heard recently, and frequently, that a certain national president of the United States was "a born again evangelical" Christian. [That gives religion a bad name!] Interestingly, we know of no Hyper-calvinist that will ever say "Yes, I'm a 'Christian.'" This may be shocking to the readers, but they have a good reason for their answer. The above is one. To say that you are a "Christian" is to say that you are "Christ-like." Hyper-calvinists have such an exalted view of Christ, and such an intimate knowledge of themselves, that they dare not compare themselves with Him. Again, their exalted view of His Personage is so great they cannot bring themselves to compare Him to themselves either! Another reason pertains to their view of salvation. They believe the term "salvation" is all inclusive of the full and complete redemption of both soul and body in the resurrection, and the final stage of this salvation is not until their future glorification. Therefore, they do not say "I am saved." There are three great gifts of God that every believer possesses: "Faith, Hope, and Charity." They are "begotten again unto a LIVELY HOPE by the resurrection of Jesus Christ;" and believe that Christ dwells in His people:

"*Christ in you the Hope of Glory.*" Thus their answer is "I believe I have a hope in Christ." Or as Paul wrote, "*We are saved by HOPE, but hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why does he yet hope for.*" (Romans 8:24.) It is sad that too few people know that verse is in the Bible! The child of God is called to "walk by faith," and hope is faith in its most basic exercise. A "know-so-salvation" is not walking by "faith." It is walking by sight. Worse, it is based upon carnal deception in almost all cases. There is no humility in boasting that one is a "Christian," and the deception is so great in the Pelagian "world of the ungodly," that no one should want to be associated with those too ready to call themselves "Christians." "Christians" of this sort, give Christ a very bad image in the eyes of those not Christians.

As one can see, there is a vast difference between those who believe that salvation is *incomplete*, and those who believe it is *finished*; between those who believe it is of works, or a mixture of works and grace; and those who believe it is all of *grace*; and between those who are "*tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine*," and those who are enabled to believe in the finished work of Christ.

But let every reader understand that the Hyper-calvinists do believe in *witnessing to those that ask* of their experience in grace. It is true that they do not consider themselves as "soul-winners," believing that Christ is the Wisdom of God, and "*He that **winneth souls is wise.***" (Proverbs 11:30.) Only Christ can, and did, do that for "*The fruit of the righteous is a tree of righteousness and He that winneth souls is wise.*" Fullerites used that text to promote their *insufficiency* of Christ's atonement to save His people. Hyper-calvinists do not believe that God "needs" them. They see no justification in believing that the Great Creator God of the whole universe would merely put man in a *savable*

*state* for other men to take credit for their salvation; when it is just as easy for Him to save them Himself. Hyper-calvinists believe that Jesus Christ is the SAVIOR OF Sinners! Hyper-calvinism - Is it the Truth? What say you?

\*\*\*\*\*

WHY MIGHT JOHN GILL WRITE: "To win them is to teach them, for the word has signification of teaching doctrine (See chapter 4:2)"?

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### HYPER-CALVINISM AND ANTINOMIANISM

Andrew Fuller, Charles Spurgeon, J.M. Pendleton, and Ian Murray, to name but a few Neo-calvinists, threw the term "*antinomian*" at every sound Calvinist they knew; primarily to discredit the effects of the Gospel of Christ as preached by true Christians. It was such enemies of the truth of free *grace* that effectively nailed the terms "Hyper-calvinists," "Hardshells," "Anti-means" and "Anti-evangelicals", on the faithful defenders of the historic Christian faith. In time, it became apparent by the excessive carnality of their own followers that they, rather than the free grace ministers, were the real "*antinomians*." Recall the definition of "antinomianism"?

To refresh the readers' memory: The Greek word for "law" is "*nomos*." The prefix "anti" means "*against*." Thus, the *simple* definition is that an *antinomian* is someone who is *against the law*. In theology, then, it is anyone against the *law of God*; any who live "lawlessly." [Some more sophisticated individuals may object to the simplicity of this definition. However, it is as accurate as theirs might be, and far less complicated as some.]

Hyper-calvinists reading this would certainly be surprised, for they know that "*the law is just, holy, and good.*" They know how often it is that they "*meditate on the law both day and night.*" But let us face it: anyone who will preach lies will tell them as well. These so-called "Evangelicals" are saying that the Hyper-calvinists, or Hardshells, who do not believe that Christ died for everyone to give them an equal "chance" to "get saved" by keeping the law, or making decisions, are therefore "against the law of God."

A dictionary definition is: "*Antinomian*: n. Theo. A member of a Christian sect holding that ***faith alone*** is necessary to salvation." (The. American Heritage Dictionary, 1976; Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.) How about that! Isn't that about the same as the definition of "Calvinism," in chapter One? Didn't Fuller, Spurgeon, Pendleton, and Murray *claim* that they were "*Calvinists*"? And did they not also believe that faith is *necessary unto salvation*? Anyone who has read our defense in the former chapters should know that Hyper-calvinists do not make faith, repentance, or dead works conditions to salvation! Rather, these things are the ***fruits*** of salvation, and "gifts" of God. Hence, Hyper-calvinists are further from Antinomianism than their accusers! They believe salvation is by the sacrifice of Christ, and experimentally a ***birth***; not a decision!

Considering these definitions as stated, it were such men as Fuller, Spurgeon, and Murray who are the ***true antinomians***; for they *did not* believe in, nor respect, the law of God. Their insistence that faith and repentance, which are grace covenant blessings, were duty-bound under the Law of Moses, was, and is, a terrible abuse of both the law and the Gospel. If "*the letter of the law killeth, but the Spirit giveth life,*" then offering "faith and repentance" as *conditions* nullify the killing effects of the law. And it is very evident that this has happened throughout the religious world. Such misapplication of the

law coupled with the "easy-decisionism" of Fullerism, has created religious societies "*filled with all manner of abominations.*" (Revelation 17:4-5.) Some others define an *Antinomian* as "one who is opposed to keeping the law on the basis that salvation is by grace only." Whichever of these definitions are used, those who charge Hyper-calvinists with believing such are greatly *ignorant* of what the Hyper-calvinists really believe. Worse, they concoct these false allegations without any basis in fact, and then make no effort to double-check to see if they came close to their target. Of all groups of religions in America, those called "Hyper-calvinists" live the most God-honoring lives and are the most rigid in moral and church discipline; while those who charge them with being *against the law* seem too often not concerned about behaving consistently with it themselves. So let us examine this issue more closely.

Look at the first definition: "An Antinomian is one that believes that *faith alone* is necessary to salvation." That sounds to a Hyper-calvinists that "faith" is a "condition" to salvation. It also is the great contribution of Martin Luther to the Reformation! If salvation precedes "faith," then it **cannot be necessary** "*unto* salvation." Unless this writer is uninformed, that definition is closer to the Protestantism of Martin Luther than anyone else. It seems to him that it is exactly what Murray, Spurgeon, and Evangelicals believe! Consider this: Hyper-calvinists believe that salvation **was procured** by the active life and passive work of Christ **during His first advent**. If this is so, then *nothing done by, or experienced by the sinner can be a condition to attain this salvation*. It is just *not true that Hyper-calvinists are Antinomians* by this definition! On this count, the charge is false. They hold that the active and passive obedience of Christ **is their salvation**, and faith is given to the saved, and this faith looks to the faith of Christ and His blessed work for its

imputed righteousness. Without imputed righteousness, one is not saved! Since these Neo-calvinists also sometimes charge Hyper-calvinists with believing that "babies go to hell, not a span long" (Bailey, *American Heritage History*), it should be pointed out that the Neo-Calvinists are the ones in danger of teaching such! For it is clear, that if "faith alone" is *necessary to salvation*" then infants certainly cannot "believe unto salvation!" Their doctrine - not Hyper-calvinists', would place "infants in hell, not a span long!" Hyper-calvinists believe Christ has **already saved His people** with an everlasting salvation; and who is to say whether it embraces "all" infants, "some" infants, or "no" infants? It is the persuasion of this writer that since one-hundred percent of the children "*two years old and under*" that Herod had murdered in Bethlehem were saved ("*and will come again from the land of the enemy,*" (Jeremiah 31:15-17), then there is hope that all elect infants dying in infancy are saved, and that by the same work which saved adult elect! But the Scriptures are not addressed to infants, but to believing adults!

The second definition above reads: "One who believes the law is abolished and all are now under grace." Again, that is totally contrary to both the Scriptures and the belief of Hyper-calvinists. Jesus said: "*I came not to destroy the law, but that the law be fulfilled.*" It certainly is not abolished. Every quickened child of God has an internal witness that the law of God is "*holy, just, and good.*" They understand by personal experience that they "*would not have known sin except by the law.*" As Paul wrote, so they experience: "*I would not have known lust had the law not said Thou shalt not covet.*" It is "*by the law*" that there is "*knowledge of sin.*" It is the law which is the "*schoolmaster unto Christ,*" and of all people, Hyper-calvinists grasp the real utility of the law's perfect work. It, under the application of the Spirit, brought to them the knowledge of their awful

sinfulness and ruin. They are taught its value by a gracious experience deep within their souls. By these definitions, they are not in any wise *Antinomians*. But guess who are! The "Evangelicals," whose lives are not directed by the strict standard of primitive Christianity! Since Ian Murray is still alive, he knows how loose and ungodly so-called "Christians" are. He may be ashamed of them ... he ought to be, since he loves judging Hyper-calvinists as Antinomians!

In that same definition, the phrase "and all are under grace," the Hyper-calvinists do not believe a word of it! How can a graceless sinner be under grace? They hear it said over and over in Pelagian churches. They hear graceless individuals proclaim "but we are not under the law today, we are under grace." Nothing can be further from the truth! All lifeless sinners are, as in Adam, under the law of the Creator God, and will remain under that law until called by grace or death to judgment. And if and when called by grace, they are **under law to Christ**. In reality, the Spirit establishes the law within their hearts upon the new birth experience. Simply put: If one is not under any law, that one is independent, sovereign, and cannot possibly sin, "*for sin is the transgression of the law.*" It is the transgressions of the law by which they shall be judged. Those Pelagians and Neo-calvinists numbered with the "foolish virgins;" the "tares sown among the wheat;" the "bad fish" in the Gospel net; the "goats" set on the left, *etc.*, are *all still under the law*. They are obligated to keep it in its original purity as given to them in Adam's loins; and because of his and their violations of it, are yet under its curse. If that view is *antinomianism*, then, and only then, are Hyper-calvinists such!

The third part of the definition says that Hyper-calvinists "oppose the law on the basis that salvation is by grace." There certainly is no "opposition to the law" by Hyper-calvinists. It was the law that Christ came under in order to "*redeem us*"



from the "*curse of the law*." Grace does not free us from the law of Christ; rather it establishes His law over and in us. It is by free grace that the "law is *written in their hearts*," by the Spirit of God. In that manner He establishes His kingdom, and they become the subjects of His kingdom; and Christ "*is King in Zion*." Hyper-calvinists understand the purpose of the law in its killing power, and the need for its fulfillment by Christ as their righteousness. It is this righteousness which is imputed to them. But they differ with the Fullerites of the past; and present-day Neo-calvinists on what that law is for. Hyper-calvinists do not believe that the Law of Moses is a rule of life for believers. They believe the rule of life for the believer is the Holy Spirit and the spiritual law that He established in their hearts, minds, and souls. That is a new covenant promise and blessed provision.

Above we used this qualification: "They differ with the Fullerites of the past." Why? The Fullerites of Andrew Fullers' days were "legalists," and insisted upon the law as *a rule of life*. Fullerite Neo-calvinists today, make no pretense at all in keeping the law for any reason! They think it is abolished altogether. Decisionism and freewill "choice" has taken the place of the law as a rule of life of "deciders-for Christ."

Of all the Baptist family, it is the Hyper-calvinists, or Old School Baptists, who alone have remained Nomians. All other factions of Fullerites are now very *antinomian*. None of them consistently and continually proclaim the law, or Torah, as a rule of conduct. And this is one of the main sources of the problems facing them and this society. In spite of the majority of Americans claiming to be "Christians;" (decision-made, of course) in the impeachment process of the President of the United States, a Fullerite "Evangelical" Baptist, as high as 76% of people polled agreed that he sinned, yet approved of him "because it was only adultery!" Throughout his presidency, he

attended "church," and made sure the cameras pictured him holding his Bible with extra-large book-markers visible. We do not accuse all Fullerites of approving of his conduct; but the legacy of Fullerism and their neglect of preaching the commandments, and lack of discipline over their members has corrupted the morals of the nation. The membership of the President's church is obligated by the Gospel order to censure him; but they do not believe they should "judge another." Paul said, *"Is the law sin? God forbid! Nay, I had not have known sin, but by the law."* (Romans 7:7) Again he wrote: *"for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life."* (II Corinthians 6:6.) If Paul, who was schooled in the law, "a Hebrew of the Hebrews," as *"touching the law blameless,"* can say this, then it is according to sound doctrine to declare that: "Without the law, ministers cannot know sin." And many don't. "Without the law, their congregation cannot know sin." And this is one problem of nominal "Christians." "Without the law, our children cannot know sin" etc. the neglect by Pelagian and Neo-calvinist *antinomians* is a serious problem for the modern "Church"!

By the preaching of the law, (not as a rule of life, but as a rule of *conduct* when sanctified by the Spirit,) is *"the knowledge of sin."* And without a very sharp, quickened, felt, and terrified view of one's condition, a soul can never appreciate the degree of the sufferings of our Blessed Redeemer! Hyper-calvinists insist that there is no law, or *plan of salvation*, nor "Roman-road" series of Bible verses, that can **give life or justify a sinner**. That all Adam's offspring shall be judged by that one standard of equity given to all mankind **in** Adam; and that standard, in a weakened form, is evident in every man's conscience to this day. They do, by nature, know what is right and wrong, and accuse and excuse one another accordingly.

Those that teach that all mankind is now under grace, when most are graceless, are the true *Antinomians*, and they are **not** the Hyper-calvinists! If one examines closely the fruits of the Fullerites' views, whereby they base salvation on a mere mental decision, and once this decision is made, the decider is "once saved, and always saved" thereafter; and that they are not under a law to anyone; they should see *antinomianism* clearly demonstrated. It then becomes apparent why so-called "Christians'" lives are so shameful.

The present-day superstition relative to how a sinner can be just before God is as great as it was when Martin Luther nailed his Thesis on the chapel door. These proselytizing *antinomian* "Evangelicals" actually believe that quoting John 3:16 or some other combination of half texts, can, under certain conditions of the human will, produce divine life in a dead sinner. A professor at Mercer University at Macon, Georgia said: "The Holy Spirit finished His work with the canonization of the New Testament, and is no longer in the world." When a shocked, theological student asked: "How then is one born again?" his reply was: "By the Word of God." This same professor, Dr. McMannus, informed the students that the Scriptures were "forged documents," and Christians borrowed their doctrine of the resurrection and life after death from the Egyptians. A student concluded that this Professor advocated that regeneration was by preaching forged Egyptian documents! In any wise, he did not know that regeneration essential to experimental salvation was by a **spiritual birth!** Nor did he know that salvation, all of it, was secured by Christ two thousand years ago! Mercer is a Fullerite "Evangelical" university! The great "scheduled revivals" (so-called) are Fullerite enlistment drives designed to "regenerate" sinners, and do anything else necessary, to build up the membership of religious institutions. If only Fuller could have had foreknowledge!

(See APPENDIX: A : Antinomianism , by Samual Trott, 1839.)

Question: After reading Trott's article on "Antinomianism," and the above chapter, would you conclude that Hyper-Calvinists are Antinomians?

Who might be really true Antinomians today?

\*\*\*\*\*

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### HYPER-CALVINISM VS. FULLER/SPURGEONISM

One of the greatest and most precious works of Christ was His suffering and death to satisfy the justice of God on behalf of those He loved that they might not suffer the penalties due their sins, iniquities, and transgressions. This "satisfaction" for the broken law of God is called "**the atonement.**" The Particular Baptists of England and the Particular and Old School Baptists of the United States have always believed in "*limited atonement,*" or "*Particular Redemption.*" Plainly written, they have always believed that the Lord Jesus Christ suffered and died for the sins of a *particular people*, the elect, which stood "*hid in Christ in God,*" eternally in seed-substance, and that His *atonement was limited* to them only. This is exactly what the Scriptures teach. It is rather fool-hearted to say that Christ died for the *goats*, when He made it clear that He "***laid down His life for His sheep;***" or, that He died for those for whom He prayed to His Father, "*I pray NOT for the WORLD, but for those Thou hast given Me out of the world*" (John 17:9.)

The apostle, in the only place in the New Testament where the word "atonement" is used, said: "*And not only so, but **we** also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we **have NOW received*** (not, "accepted," and it is in the past tense.) **the**

**atonement.**" (Romans 5:11). Before proceeding, note the word "*now*". The Hyper-calvinists, as one might have realized, believe this as it is stated. The atonement is not something preachers will help Him do in this time period. Note also, the word "received." In the English of 1611, the words "receive" and "accept" have distinctive meanings. A "gift" is *given* and *received*. If it is never "received," then it was not given. It was only "offered". If something is "offered:" it may be *accepted* or *rejected*. To illustrate: "To as many as *received Him*, to them ***gave*** He power to become the sons of God." (John 1:12.) In this case, He was the "gift of God" and they had "received" Him internally. They did not "accept" Him because He was not "offered" to them. Christ is God's "gift" to His people. He is never "offered" to any *man*. But He was *offered* to His Father as a sacrifice for the sins of His people, and the Father was well pleased. Look at the text more closely. "We," the believers "*joy in God*." They must have heard "glad tidings"! Why? It is through our Lord Jesus Christ, whom "we **have received**" something ***given***. And that something was the *atonement*. They have *now* received this free gift of God. They already, now, have received it. They are not going to receive it when they hear about it; or when they believe it; yet let alone when they mentally decide to "accept" it. Is this the truth? Test it. Has everyone of Adam's race *received* this *gift*? Unless you are a Universalist, you cannot answer "Yes." The apparent truth is that most have not! "*We received the atonement*." The "we" clearly shows it to be a *limited* atonement, for "we" is a personal pronoun. It is limited to the people represented by this personal pronoun "we" in this text. It is a *particular* redemption, because of the "we" in particular, who are *redeemed* thereby does not include "*all*". One may do what one will; he cannot give this atonement to the "*world of the ungodly*." That world may, and some do, join religious societies believing that Christ's death was "for everybody;" but they cannot *receive* something that is *not given* to them. The "evangelist" or "soul-winner" may *offer* the

"*children's bread to dogs*," (Matthew 7:6) and the "*dogs that are without*" (Revelation 22:15) may attempt to *accept* his most generous *offer*, but since it is not his to offer, it avails nothing as far as salvation is concerned until God *gives* it and the sinner *receives* it. And this is evident in the lives of those who nominally "accept Christ as their personal Helper" and "got saved." It is evident, abundantly evident, that it does not work. If it did, their lives and conversations would be much different. All this seems simple enough, but highly intelligent minds have stumbled on it. Truly, it "*is hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes*."

This writer recently listened to a Mormon theologian (Philosopher) on Joe Smith and the Atonement. He was not surprised to hear that Joe believed the atonement was for all mankind. He had heard this all his life. But he was surprised to hear the atonement was for all animal life on earth. Keenely listening now, he was even greater surprised that the atonement reached to the angelic creatures around the throne of God. But this was nothing compared to his shock in hearing that the atonement covered the devils in hell! Boy, you talk about **universal atonement** ! It became obvious that Peep-Stone Joe had no idea what the word "*atonement*" meant. But neither did the Arminians, nor do the present-day Pelagians and "four-point" Calvinists! Jesus said, "***I lay down my life for My sheep.***" He also said of others, "***Ye are not My sheep.***" Hence, the atonement is limited and it is particular.

Before going into this subject further, it would be well to show how very gifted believers can err, and still be led into the sweetness of the truth over time. Perhaps the greatest and best known twentieth century Calvinist writer was Arthur W. Pink. None in this century can come close to him on his presentation of the "*Sovereignty of God*," and his "*Satisfaction of Christ*." Both books show his leanings toward

Fullerism, yet at the same time show his magnificent growth in grace and knowledge as his studies in the Scriptures progressed. In "*Letters From Spartenburg:1917-1920*;" [published by Richard P. Belcher, 215 Spartan Drive, Columbia, SC 29212- Richbarry Press, P.O. Box 302, Columbia, SC 29202.] written when Mr. Pink was thirty-three to thirty-six years old, we read this:

"It is necessary to use the second term, *sufficient* in order to fully enforce the sinner's accountability. On the cross Christ did a work which has made it, abstractly or hypothetically possible for God to redeem whosoever He pleases. There a sacrifice was offered which was infinite in value, hence, "sufficient" to redeem the *entire world* had God so pleased." -That is St. Thomas Aquinas (Catholic) and Andrew Fuller's (1782) heresy. Yet watch Mr. Pink:

In this, and following letters, He is clearly a Fullerite of the original cloth, holding to particular redemption and general atonement. But even this early, he was constantly in prayer, and having others in prayer for him, that he would be able to present the truth of God's grace. And God apparently heard his humble plea. The above quotation was written even as he was led into the sweetness of the truth as he was finishing his masterpiece: "*The Sovereignty of God*," and as he was working on his Studies in Scriptures in the "*Gleanings In Genesis*" series. This latter is riddled with hyper-dispensationalism, which was also greatly modified over time. In later years and with greater advantage of Scriptural knowledge and revelation, he wrote the following, which is close to the position of this writer:

"The *design* of **Christ's satisfaction** as made known in Scripture reveals its *scope* .... It is because a right view of *this point* is absolutely essential, if God is to be honored and

Christ is to be glorified by us therein. The *enmity of the Serpent* against the Seed of the woman has been inveterate throughout the ages, and perhaps at no *other point* has he so persistently attacked the glory of Christ. While it is impossible for Satan to either undo the **finished work** of the Savior, or to *destroy* any of its fruits, yet he is permitted to *misrepresent* it, and nowhere has his subtlety been more exercised and manifested than in the means employed here. His very attempts to *discredit* the satisfaction of Christ has been made under the *guise of magnifying it*, and that is why he has succeeded in getting many men reputed as "orthodox" to **do some of his foul work for him.**" . . . "Which seems to have the greater tendency to *exalt* Christ: to say that He died because He desired and sought to *make possible* the salvation of *all mankind* or to say that He died only for God's elect, the "little flock"? Which seems to display the more His compassion for sinners? Which seems to bring out the more the value of His blood: to say that it avails only for a "few"? Or, to say that its merits are so infinite that every member of Adam's race would be redeemed did he or she but put their trust in it? The very fact that every one of us would answer the question in the *wrong way* until we are *taught aright* from Scripture, not only evidences the *worthlessness* of carnal reasoning upon spiritual things, but also shows to what a terrible extent our minds have been *poisoned* by the venom of the Serpent. If it can be clearly shown that, in *reality*, the wider view *dishonors* Christ, then the consummate guile and malice of the Devil therein should be plainly apparent." "The fact is that those who advocate the *scheme of general redemption* are so far from magnifying the grace of God, that they, really, *degrade both Divine grace and Christ's sacrifice.*" ("Satisfaction of Christ," Bible Truth Depot, Swengel, Pa., pages 241 & 243.) What a transition of doctrine! Would to God all readers could be so blessed.



Here Mr. Pink is solidly on Biblical ground. This is not Fullerism! In fact, it is what Neo-calvinists charge as being "Hyper-calvinism." Granted, Mr. Pink will not go as far as Hyper-calvinists, but on this point they are agreed. In his "*Satisfaction of Christ*," he still maintained that the atonement did not mean "*at-one-ment*," which it certainly does, for by that satisfaction sin was removed and the elect sinners reconciled to God by Christ *IN WHOM* they have their subsistence as the "Body of Christ." It is possible he changed in latter years, for one blessed characteristic of Mr. Pink was that he was never satisfied to become "settled on the lees," as Moab! (Jeremiah 48:11.).

This book will be rather *sharp* with Mr. Spurgeon because of a dishonoring duality in his preaching. Unlike Pink, he never became clearer in his views. "Calvinism" to him was only another view-point of Christianity, maybe *more conservative* than Arminianism, but to him, both seem to have been viewed as the "truth." It appeared to him just another equally contending "plan of salvation." He most frequently advocated a general atonement when attempting to get "decisions." Then he sometimes denied it outright! It is not evident that he was ever really settled on one point or the other, but at least once he stumbled on the subject and got it right: He wrote,

"Many divines say that Christ did something when He died that enabled God to be just and yet the Justifier of the ungodly. What that *something* is they do not tell us. They believe in an atonement made for everybody; but then, *their* atonement is just this: that Judas was atoned for as much as Peter, that the damned in hell were as much an object of Jesus Christ's satisfaction as the saved in heaven. Though they do not say it in proper words they must mean that, in the case of multitudes *Christ died in vain*, for they say He died *for all* and yet so *ineffectual* was His dying for them, that many were

*damned afterwards.* Now, such an atonement I *despise* - I reject it. I had rather believe a *limited atonement that is efficacious for all for whom it was intended*, than a universal atonement that is not *sufficient for anybody* except the will of man be joined with it. Why, my brethren, if we were only so far atoned for by the death of Christ that anyone of us might *afterwards save himself*, Christ's atonement were not worth a farthing, for there is no man of us able to save *himself*- no, not under the Gospel." (C.H.Spurgeon on Isaiah 53:10.) That quotation is true; it is Hyper-calvinism at its best!

As Mr. Pink said: " ... it is the office of the Holy Spirit to *GIVE saving faith to everyone of those for whose sins Christ atoned.*" (ibid. page 245.) All the above truth, those people charged with "Hyper-calvinism" believe, except the one point: that the Hyper-calvinists believe all the elect are **already "judicially" saved**. For Mr. Spurgeon, this was one of his better days.

The quotations above illustrate the fact that one can be long in error, yet be brought to a more clear view of salvation by grace. A child of God does "*grow in grace and knowledge of the truth.*" For our Neo-calvinist readers, it is one design of this work to present the most consistent doctrine of the Christian faith, and to point out the glaring inconsistencies of Fullerism. If one is called of God, he *will grow* in grace. However, our next example is one where an "orthodox" Baptist lost his sight, and followed Fuller into doctrinal ruin. This, too, is possible, as we shall show. Invariably this happens when ministers become impatient with the Lord's work of "*adding to the Church daily such as should be saved.*" By nature, man just cannot leave matters in God's hand and time! This impatience is the source of most departures from the Christian faith.

J. M. Pendleton, the well known American Baptist leader,

published his "Christian Doctrines," in 1878, during the "*down-grade period*" in America. He first stated the doctrine so well that no Calvinist or Hyper-calvinist would have taken issue with him. Notice this first part of his statement on the atonement:

"What is it? It is the expiation of sin by the satisfaction rendered to the law and justice of God, through the obedience and death of Christ. I know of no better definition than this." (ibid., page 223.) That is very good, Mr. Pendleton! That is Christian and Baptists' doctrine! But watch how he *improves* on this definition, of which he says: "I know of no better definition than this":

"As to the *sufficiency* of the provisions of the atonement for the salvation of the *world*, there can be no doubt, and there need be no controversy. If as has been shown, the value of the atonement arises chiefly from the dignity of Christ's person [which it does not-SCP]. . . it is a grand impertinence to attempt to limit its *sufficiency*. . . **It places the world in a *savable state*.** It makes salvation an *attainable object*. That is, *all men* in consequence of the atonement occupy a position where *saving influences will reach them*." (ibid. page 242.)

Unfortunately, the man was not a rational thinker. Every thought in the second part of his statement contradicts everything in his first part! If he put the two thoughts together in his reasoning, he cannot but proclaim the universal salvation and the extinguishing of the fires of hell! Gilbert Beebe once wrote: "It must be good to be a doctor!"

Look at the word he used in his first part: "*expiation*." That word means "to make atonement; the act of expiating". The word "atonement" means "*to exchange*;" i.e., "restoration to favor; to change mutually, to compound a difference; to

reconcile." To "expiate" sin is to put sin away and to reconcile the sinner to the offended party- in this place, to God. So, according to Mr. Pendleton's definition, which cannot be "stated better," the atonement was made to render satisfaction to the law and justice of God by our Lord; and this atonement "exchanged something mutually," "reconciling" someone back to God. In other words, Christ is our Substitute, and He exchanged His righteousness for our sins. This part is Biblically correct.

But, given over to spiritual blindness, the doctor sees no contradiction in the two parts of his statement. As Fuller before him, and his contemporary fellow proselyter, Mr. Spurgeon, Pendleton considered himself to be a "Calvinist," when in reality, he and they were much more Arminians. The above quotes prove that point. In this century, that position of Arminianism rapidly slid into freewill Pelagianism. Few, if any, Arminians now remain.

Following Fuller, Pendleton says that Christ *expiated* our sins; but they are *not yet* expiated! He *satisfied the law* for all mankind; but He is still very unsatisfied because most will perish! Christ's *atonement*, did not *atone* for anything or anyone! It merely put men in a "*savable state*" whereby *saving influences* can reach them. He did not say what these "saving influences" were; but whatever they are, they are more effectual than anything Christ has done for them! According to this doctrine, Christ did not save *us by His blood*; we have not now *received the atonement*, Christ is *not now the Savior*, and others must find some "saving influences" to reach our case! They have invented a truck load of these *saving influences* this past century! Baptism for the dead by their loved ones, indulgences by the Catholic society, limbo, purgatory, intercession for the living by the departed spirits of the dead, and such things as Christian swimming pools, tennis courts, little league base ball

for Christ, "Tee" ball, parties, singles clubs, revivals, choirs, brass bands, youth-for-Christ, vacation Bible schools, praise bands, praise stomping for Jesus, *etc.* But one has reason to question whether these "influences" are really "saving" or not. All these are predicated upon the belief that Christ miserably failed to accomplish His purpose for coming into the world. As pointed out earlier, this strange illogical and unscriptural theory is *not Calvinism* and never has been! Yet the followers of Fuller call themselves "Calvinists" and call Calvinists "Hyper-calvinists"! We hope that anyone reading this that follows the "evangelical and benevolent movement" and has come to an understanding of Calvinism will earnestly question the thesis upon which that Pelagian error was founded. Faithful Calvinists see no need whatsoever for a *non-savable* (so-called) *atonement*.

The very great High Priest of the "Evangelical Calvinists" is Charles H. Spurgeon. [Applaud, kneel, and weep for joy!] To them, he is the only divine authority for what is "supposed" to be Calvinism and what constitutes "Hyper-calvinism," and what unscriptural methods should be employed in "winning souls" to Christ for Calvinists! Arminians love him as much as Calvinists and even Pelagians bow before his grace! It is interesting that every "Calvinistic" sounding sermon he has preached has been gleamed from that enormous library of his freewill sermons, and selectively republished. No one has needed to selectively republish his freewill sermons. All one has to do is buy his "*Pulpit Sermons*" and that is what he will get! Spurgeon served the church that John Gill had served. It seems to this writer that Spurgeon felt that occasionally he had to throw a Calvinist bone to the few "Gillites" which still remained in that apostate congregation.

When one reads the sermons of Spurgeon, he can easily find the Arminian element underlying his basic concepts. Just to select one book at random as an illustration, we

picked up one which should be Calvinistic:

"*All of Grace*," (Moody Press.) Since Freewillers do not believe in free grace, this book must be Calvinistic. The title indicates that it is. That is the reason this writer bought it, and wasted his money! He thought it was a "sovereign grace book."

Here is the very first sentence in the little book: "The object of this book is the salvation of the reader." Wow! There it is! Spurgeon wasted no time getting to the core of his doctrine! That is his opening statement! Talk about ignorance of the way of salvation by Christ, this is a glaring instance! This book must be one of those "*saving influences*" Neo-calvinists talk about. Its implication is that Christ has not saved His people from their sins, but this little book can! According to this, He has failed! "And thou shalt call Him All-of-Grace, for it shall save the world of the ungodly from their sins." (Jude 15:110). Since apparently Christ was unable to "*save to the uttermost them that cometh to Him by faith*," this little book may do it. We must conclude that Spurgeon believed the readers of his little book were in Pendleton's "*savable state*." It seems clear, in that first statement, that salvation is not of the Lord, but is of proselyters. What Christ did was not effectual; but what this little book can do is! Maybe the little book will get better.

Second sentence: "He who spoke and wrote it will be greatly disappointed if it does not lead many to the Lord Jesus Christ." No. It did not get better! This little book may lead many to the Lord Jesus Christ that Christ was unable to call to repentance! Surely one would rather believe that their salvation, from start to finish, was of the Lord, than of a little lifeless book. To a Hyper-calvinist, this man, howsoever great and popular he was, did not know how or when God saved His elect people. In fact, it seems as if he did not believe that He had; or that He had an elect people either.

Mr. Spurgeon begged thousands down the aisles. He claimed to be a Calvinist. But today's Neo-calvinists have never learned the lesson that Spurgeon finally discovered. He had added thousands of "freewillers," dead sinners, to the Baptist Union in England. He saw many sliding into Socinianism (universalism) and became alarmed. He realized, too late, that Calvinism among the proselytizing Baptists was almost dead. He attempted to get the Baptist Union to write Calvinism into their constitution of union. When it finally came down to a vote, approximately five to six thousands of delegates and visitors voted it down with cheers, whistles, and a deafening roar of joyous applause. One informed Mr. Spurgeon that only seven delegates stood with him! It appeared a sad day he left the Baptist Union, and a very short time later, his health failed, and the great Compromiser, Charles Haddon Spurgeon died. His lasting legacy goes mostly unheeded today by Neo-calvinists. He warned Baptists of where they were drifting in his last series of articles on, what he titled, "**The Down Grade.**"

Interestingly, the Southern Baptists' State Baptist Convention of Kentucky wrote a letter to Spurgeon supporting him and his call to Calvinism. They did not know that in 1892, it was too late for them too. They also slipped onto the "**Down Grade**" into the abyss of freewill Pelagianism very shortly thereafter. The Down Grade swept throughout the Fullerite factions, and by 1900, the once Particular Baptists, had become Freewill Baptists. The first president of the Southern Baptist Convention preached his last sermon on Election and Predestination just before he died in **1886**. The revival of the Old School Baptists between 1886 and 1910 was due, in part, to the exodus of thousands of free grace believers out of the Fullerite churches; and these believers wanted no part of "conditionalism" any more.

Fuller and Spurgeon's "evangelical motive" was based upon what they thought about the atonement of Christ. The

**message was, and still is, that Christ wanted to save everybody;** and made the dreadful mistake of leaving it up to carnal minded preachers to do the most necessary part. It is noteworthy, that the three disciples that waited upon Him in the garden, while He prayed, "fell asleep." "Can you not watch and pray an hour?" And finally He said, "Sleep on."

In the Fuller/Spurgeon view that Christ' death was sufficient "for all men," the main blind spot in their understanding was what the Godhead had accomplished. They failed to believe that what the Godhead engaged in was according *"to His eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."* (Ephesians 3:11) The obtaining of an inheritance among the saints is *"predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will."* (Ephesians 1:11); and *"this is the will of God, even your sanctification."* All those who are called by the Holy Spirit to life and salvation are *"called according to His purpose."* (Romans 8:28.) The election of one person and not another, as in *"Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated"* is *"that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works (as the Neo-calvinists press upon their hearers), but of Him that calleth."* (Romans 9:11.)

We stated that this was their "blind spot," for they surely could not help but know what these verses said, they being educated, and considered "Calvinists." But God gave them over *"to blindness in part,"* that they *"could not see with their eyes, or hear with their ears, or perceive in their hearts, and be converted and healed."* To any sound man, it should be as evident as the noon-day sun on a cloudless day, that GOD never purposed to save all men; or all men would be saved; or else God is not GOD! It was not the eternal purpose of God to give all men "a chance to be saved," for salvation has never been "by chance," but "by grace." God does not play the casino! Surely the great Creator of the universe did not create man before He knew whether He could control him or not! He did not loose control of



His work. It still, daily, operates by Him by "*which all things consist*" (Colossians 1:17,) and is still "*upheld by the Word of His power.*" (Hebrews 1:3.)

At the time that Christ died for His people, those who had "*perished in the gainsaying of Korah;*" those who perished in the flood during the deluge of Noah's day; such as the rich man who did not give any help to poor Lazarus, Esau, and Balaam, to name but a few, were *already* in Hell. They certainly were not in a *savable state*? Nor could *saving influences* reach them there. Some very articulate men are not necessarily bright in spiritual things, for the "*natural man receiveth not of the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to them, neither can he know them for they are spiritually discerned.*" When given over by God to judicial blindness, it is impossible for them to comprehend the plainest declaration of truth thereafter. Jude put it this way: "*For there are certain men crept in unawares who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.*" (Jude 4) The Greek word for "Lord" in this text is "Kurios," which means "supreme in authority, *i.e.*, controller. (Strong's Concordance.) It is this characteristic of God that Fuller and his followers to this day deny to our God. They present Him as an ignorant, helpless, and defeated god out of one side of their mouth, and say they believe He is sovereign out of the other. Thus they proclaim "free grace or "freewill," as it best suits their particular needs at the time.

If one wonders how they could arrive at such a contradiction in doctrine, it should be noted that they based their views on a false premise. Their *prima facie* is that the Gospel is an invitation. This throws them completely off of the truth. They *assume* this without any Scriptural warrant, and even contrary to the very definition of the word Gospel. As highly educated as these men were, the only explanation which seems possible for their lack of understanding of the plain

meanings of words is that "God gave them up" to this "strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they might be damned, who hold not the truth" (2 Thessalonians 2:12.) They introduced among the Baptists, and the "evangelical groups" which thereafter splintered from them, the very sword Satan needed to destroy the purity and power of Christianity. The moral decay in Western society can be traced philosophically directly to this pernicious freewill theory that God loves everyone.

Watch J.M.Pendleton's conceptual development: "It is a fact," says he, (without any citation of scriptural support,) "that the Scriptures rest the general invitation of the Gospel upon the atonement of Christ." **Is this the truth? Of course not!** The scriptures nowhere speak of a "general invitation of the Gospel." "But," says he, "if there were not a sufficiency in the atonement for the salvation of sinners without distinction, how could the ambassadors of Christ beseech them (i.e., all men without exception) to be reconciled to God, and that from the consideration of His having now made sin for us, ("us" who? all mankind? Then the *pronoun* should be "*them*,") "*who knew no sin, that we* (what "*we*"? - all mankind? If so the pronoun should be "*they*." ) "*might be made the righteousness of God in Him.*" (Pendleton's quote from Fuller). How is it possible for all mankind to be made the "*righteousness of God*," unless their sins were imputed to Christ? And if they were, then in return, the righteousness of Christ would be imputed to the whole world. That is universal salvation as surely as Christ died! Now, Paul assures us in that very same text that "*Christ was made sin for us.*" When was He made sin for us? While He was here under the law fulfilling it in behalf of His people by imputation! **Not** when they were given faith to believe that it was true. He Himself knew no sin. Why did He do it at all? For the whole world to have a chance? Paul said why: "*That we might be made the righteousness of God IN HIM.*" Who then, in the final analysis, are actually made "righteous" by Christ's

keeping the law and dying for them, not imputing their sins to them; but imputing to them His righteousness? Was it the world of the ungodly? Impossible! The Scriptures teach it was done for those included in the "**US**," the "**WE**," - or the elect only. Whatever Christ did, **He did it while here in the flesh**. He does not do it when or after one hears the Gospel about it. The Gospel is not an invitation to anyone, the elect or the reprobates to accept or reject. It is the publication of glad tidings to those for whom He made righteous.

J. M. Pendleton particularly liked Mr. Fuller's analogy between fallen angels and fallen men:

"What would you think of the fallen angels being invited to be reconciled to God from the consideration of an atonement having been made to fallen men? You would say, 'It is inviting them to partake of a benefit which has no existence? the obtaining of which, therefore is naturally impossible.'" (That is the best consideration one can have for repudiating his doctrine. It seems he is opposing himself. But watch this twist:) "Upon the supposition of the atonement being insufficient for the salvation of any more than are actually saved, the non-elect, however, with respect to a being reconciled to God through it, are in the same state as the fallen angels; that is, the thing is not only morally, but naturally impossible ..."

(Perfectly stated, isn't it? That much is consistent and true. Now, here is the rest.) Watch this:

"But if there be an **objective fulness** in the atonement of Christ, sufficient for any number of sinners, were they to believe in Him, there is no other impossibility in the way of any man's salvation, to whom the Gospel comes at least, than arise from the state of his own mind." (Christian Doctrines, J.M. Pendleton, page 243.)

He did not see that his own twist would also include the fallen angels, devils, that surely believe. According to

Mr. Pendleton, they can't, but they can! The writer does not recall a mission board being established to evangelize the devils but if there can be any money to be made by it, don't be surprised if someone starts one!

Analyze his departure point above. "If there be an objective fulness in the atonement of Christ, sufficient for any number of sinners." See how he departed from "*particular*" redemption. He made the atonement a *generalized*, nebulous, something. His "if" is too large. **There isn't!** Christ "*laid down His life for His sheep*." He died specifically for the elect; if not, there was no need for election to begin with! Of course, his followers today deny that there was an eternal election. But, for Calvinists and Neo-calvinists readers, why should He elect any and then die for everybody? If He died for "every body," divine election is of no benefit whatsoever to anyone. Now Fuller and Pendleton both said that it was to give "*an honest invitation*." But it seems ridiculous for Christ to knowingly suffer for so many who would go to hell, merely to give hireling preachers grounds to give what they think is "*an honest invitation*" to the world of the ungodly. And just how *honest* is a *general* invitation to all?

This twisting is found on almost every page of Fuller's works. He takes words with standard meanings, and gives them new definitions, and then makes the Scriptures say exactly the opposite of what it says. Reading behind him one thinks, "How could this man deceive anyone?" Anyone he deceived *wanted* to be deceived! The sectarian schools that sprouted as mushrooms everywhere Fullerism went turned out such irrational men in great abundance. It is a remarkable testimony to the total depravity of the carnal mind! As stated in the question above, Andrew Fuller, J.M. Pendleton, Charles H. Spurgeon, and company believed salvation to be "a mental" act, - "of his own mind." Here, was a

cardinal departure from the Christian experience! Salvation is applied by a **birth**, not by a mental act! If one takes the false assumption that the Gospel is an *invitation*, and believes that Christ saved us from our sins, then Fuller's own argument is a perfect argument to use against his own teaching! It is as foolish as it is unscriptural, to "offer" salvation to *dead* men, and especially to reprobates. One could just as easily conclude that Christ died for fallen angels as well, for they too, are "sinners." No Calvinist and certainly no Hyper-calvinist can hold to Fuller's universalistic position consistently. It was this very position which was used by Satan to strengthen the Anti-christ by the invention of a "modern missionary movement," simultaneously with the international socialist movement. One, the political arm, was a "beast," while the other, the religious arm, was a "false prophet." (Think that one on out in light of Revelation!) Those two movements have brought the world to where it is today!

The large Calvinistic denomination known as the Reformed Church, embraced the same spirit of duplicity in claiming there was a "*common grace*," which did not regenerate, but was given to all men alike, both elect and reprobates. Without pursuing this, it is sufficient here to note that it resulted in a similar division among the Reformed bodies, and the one known as the Christian Reformed Church rapidly went into Mystery Babylon's heresy of Pelagianism; while, as the Old School Baptists in America and Gospel Standard churches in England, the smaller and sounder body, the Protestant Reformed Church remained supralapsarian Calvinists as were their forefathers. Among the Baptists, the ones holding to the "Old School" were termed "Hardshell" and "Hyper-calvinists." The Fullerites were often called "Freewillers," "Soft Shells," "Conditionalists" and "Limited" (at first, meaning "limited predestinarians"- they are no longer predestinarian at all). Among the Reformed bodies, the Neo-calvinists are often

referred to as "Arminians" or "Hypo-calvinists." In both camps, the ones modifying Calvinism to accommodate the world of the ungodly, plunged into the hell of heresy.

Notice Fuller's language in the next quotation. It rings familiar with all those present-day Neo-calvinist writers who try so hard to reconcile God's sovereignty with man's supposed "freewill;" or, God's sovereignty and the theory of "human responsibility." The Bible says nothing about "human responsibility," and the very word is contrary to Calvinism, Hyper-Calvinism and Baptists' doctrine. The doctrine teaches that in the spiritual realm, man is totally depraved and unable to save himself by his own will and effort. It, as "general atonement," and "invitations," is a false assumption. Fuller wrote: "I do not deny that there is difficulty in these statements, but it belongs to the general subject of reconciling the purposes of God with the agency of man." Fuller has a problem separating the things of God from the theories of men. Here he speaks of the purposes of God, as if He were a mere man. God *"is of one mind who can turn Him?"* He has but one eternal purpose. He has no "purposes"-plural. In all five places where the word purposes (plural) are used in the Bible, they refer to the "purposes" of men. Secondly, he speaks of man as an "agent." An agent as an "agent" is **not free**. He is bound by the will, policies, and dictates of the one responsible for him, under whom he serves as an "agent." A "free agent" is an oxymoron - mutually exclusive words; "free" and "agency" are mutually exclusive concepts. [Only in sports are there "free agents;" and who would expect this profession to be very well educated?] The Scriptures do not speak of agents. Rather, it speaks of "servants." And it speaks of two kinds: "servants of sin," and "servants of God," or "righteousness." *"He that committeth sin is a servant of sin."* Thus, he cannot be a "free agent." No slave is a free agent! He is bound. The whole force of Fullerite doctrine is based upon this false conception, that God made man a "free moral agent." The truth of scripture is that

man is not free, but "sold under sin." He is not moral, and this is obvious all around us. Every fiber of his being is immoral, i.e., "totally depraved." In no sense is man a "free agent;" or does he possess a "freedom" will. A will? Yes! Free? No! The will is an interstitial faculty of the corrupt natural man, and in itself, it too, is corrupt. "*Ye WILL NOT come to Me, that ye might have life.*" (John 6:40.) The greatest defender of Baptists doctrine in America against the rise of Fullerism was the Old School, or Particular Baptist minister, Elder Gilbert Beebe. [Much of his works are now available, and may be had from The Remnant Publications, P.O. 1004, Hawkins, Texas 75765] The following is quoted from him on this subject from an 1844 Editorial, Volume 1:

"Mr. Sands, of the Religious Herald, of Richmond, Virginia, has served up to his readers part of a sermon said to have been delivered in South Carolina by Wm. B. Johnson, D.D., in which the doctor professes to have proved clearly that man is a free agent, and at the same time that God is sovereign! The logic by which the doctor has attempted to prove both sides of this palpable paradox is this:

"In considering them separately, each may approve itself to every mind; but in attempting to reconcile them, serious difficulties may arise. From our inability to reconcile these two points, we may be tempted to reject the one at the expense of the other, or reject both."

Thus, although the learned doctor virtually admits that the two points are at antipodes with each other, yet he contends that they must be received and believed by those free agents who cannot reconcile them, and the way to do this thing is to believe them one at a time, as it is beyond our capacity to believe both at the same time.

The mode of proving that man is a free agent is as queer as that of disposing of the glaring inconsistency of his theory:

"Not free, what proof could they have given sincere,  
 Of true allegiance, constant faith and love,  
 Where only what they needs must do appeared  
 Not what they would; what praise could they  
 receive?

What pleasure I from such obedience paid,  
 When will and reason, (reason also is choice),  
 Useless and vain, of freedom both despoiled,  
 Made passive both, had served necessity, Not me."

Ergo, the doctor draws the conclusion that the world must be peopled with free agents, or absolute slaves; bound fast in the chain of Fate, of absolute incompetency to deliver himself from its iron mandate. What a fine thing it is to be a doctor! Truly these things are hidden from babes and sucklings, and revealed to doctors!"

Hereafter we will attempt to prove that such a thing as a free agent cannot possibly exist in heaven, earth, or hell. Angels, men, or devils, to be free, could not be accountable to God, nor to any other power, for their conduct; and if free, they are not amenable. Agents, when the term is applied to any created being or thing, signifies an actor for, or in reference to, another; he cannot be free and at the same time an agent." (Editorials of Gilbert Beebe, Jan. 1, 1844, Page 382).

"That man was created under law to his Creator is self-evident, and requires no argument to establish the fact; for if there were no law, there could be no transgression; and if no transgression, no guilt or penalty; but both are manifestly attached to all the human family in their relation to Adam. *"By the offense of one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death has passed on all men, for that all have sinned"* (Romans 5:12). That all men are subject to and under the sentence of death is declared in the Scriptures. *The sting of*



*death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law*" 1 Cor. 15:56). Therefore, as man could not be a sinner, nor a sufferer of legal penalty, if he were under no law, it follows as a certainty, that man was created under law to God. Whether that law was expressed or only implied, is not the question; but the certainty of its existence, and of its dominion over man. "*Until the law,*" (or Mosaic dispensation,) "*sin was in the world, and death reigned from Adam unto Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is a figure of Him that was to come.*"

From the above consideration it is certain that man was not, in his first estate, a "free agent;" but that he stood as a creature of God, subject to His will, pleasure and decree; amenable to God, and bound to abide His sovereign pleasure and order in all things. It is ridiculous to argue that man is free, if he is absolutely bound; and that man was bound by the law, and by the absolute and sovereign decrees of God his Maker, few, if any, will dare to deny.

An agent is an actor; and none can doubt that man is an actor: but if he is or was a free actor, or agent, he could not sin; or if free, he was under no restraint or obligation to God or man. The absurdity of those who contend that moral obligation and free agency are inseparable is abundantly manifest, for both cannot exit together, it is impossible. **That man acted according to his own inclination in the original transgression, and that all men voluntarily sin against God, we do not dispute;** but this admitted cannot change the position that a man that is bound is not free, and a man that is free is not bound.

As to the allegory of our correspondent, we are led to conclude that all allegories fail to fully elucidate the subject of the mystery of iniquity or the mystery of godliness. The claims of divine government were not annulled by man's apostasy from original innocence, or man would have become a free agent; but his circumstances are materially changed, and in his sins he is

fallen under the condemnation and wrath of that law under which he was created, and that law, which before only required him to continue in perfect and perpetual obedience, now pours out its curses upon his guilty head.

But the restoration of "the hoe," [referred to in the analogy mentioned] , or implements to work with, cannot qualify the transgressor for obedience to the law; for the soul that sins must die; the law holds the transgressor where he cannot put forth his hand and eat of the tree of life and live forever. But if man had retained his active purity and innocence, that could only have perpetuated his paradise, but it could not make him spiritual, nor fit him for heaven. The work of redemption does something more than to restore lost implements; it redeems from the law as well as from guilt, and redeems unto God; brings the redeemed under law to his Redeemer, and secures to him all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus his Lord." (Editorials, Volume 2, 1845, pages 587-588.)

Thus, bound under law originally, man was not then a free agent, and for the elect, bound to the law of Christ, he is still not a free agent. In both cases, he is a bond servant. He is either a "servant of sin" or a "servant of righteousness."

Following Fuller's position, Pendleton says, (without scriptural warrant,):

"Such is the extent of the atonement, that salvation is offered to all men; nor dare we question God's sincerity in making the offer."

One would be better persuaded if consistent Biblical support could be given for his philosophical opinion. But watch this next sentence:

"While the atoning merit of the blood of Christ is infinite, its saving efficacy is restricted to its application." (Ibid. page 245) Or, "We may therefore say of the atonement that it is so general (better: nebulous!) that all are saved who "come to God"

by Christ, (notice that he limited it here, too!) and so limited that none are saved who do not "come to God" through the Mediator, the "*man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all.*"

Interesting twisting! Christ did atone, but didn't; He gave Himself for a ransom for all, yet ransomed less than "all." To wit: He was a miserable failure, according to this scheme.

It is interesting, considering the time-period of these discussions on the extent of the atonement, how little Christians of that period understood the subject. Joseph Smith, the guru of Mormonism during that period, advocated a "universal atonement." However, his atonement went far further than Fuller's, Pendleton's or Spurgeons. When he said "universal," he meant universal! He taught that the atonement of Christ covered all man-kind, all angelic and demonic creatures, and even all animal creation! It is self-evident, that these views of the atonement were *insufficient for the salvation of those its advocates applied it to!*

This kind of double-talk is necessary for those **who do not know for whom Christ died**, or what He did for them when He died. They create a contradiction between the **extent** and **scope** of Christ's death. In other words, where Christ said: "*I lay down My life for the sheep,*" they must add without authority: "and for the goats, too!" Where He says, "*I pray not for the world,*" they must dispute Him, and say He intercedes for everyone. To them, God "wants" each and every man to be saved (scope), but that He will not apply it to anyone except those that "let Him" (extent). Again, whatever this strange paradoxical doctrine is, it is not Calvinism, nor even *Christianity*. It stands totally opposing Christianity; hence it can be nothing less than **Antichristian**.

Charles Spurgeon is the high priest of the present-day Neo-calvinist proselyters. But was he a "Calvinist"? Is his so-called "evangelism" true New Testament publication of the true Gospel of redeeming grace? As with all Pelagians, the true test

of their orthodoxy is what they do at the conclusion of their sermons. Do they wish to "sit in the temple of God professing themselves to be God," or leave the Gospel where it is: in God's hands. So, let us see how Mr. Spurgeon closes his *little book*. Turning to the last pages of All of Grace, we read:

"But, why should you refuse? If you do not desire the choice blessing, which I have brought to you, at least do me the justice to admit that the blame of your final doom will not lie at **my door**."

Here he shows clearly that he does not believe that Christ has redeemed, reconciled, ransomed, and saved His people – any of them!

He continues "When we two meet before the great white throne you will not be able to charge me with having idly used the attention which you were pleased to give me while you were reading my little book."

This is an outright denial of electing grace, eternal redemption by Christ, and salvation by grace. It is predicated upon what the readers do with his "little book." He continues:

"Do not refuse Jesus, His love, His blood, His salvation."

So, in spite of the Calvinistic title of his little book, it isn't "all of grace" at all! In fact, it is not "Grace at all!" If you can refuse it, it is not salvation. So what of His love? What kind of love would create a hell, and then damn to hell those He loves? If a man set his house on fire with his teenage son asleep in bed, who would think he loved his son, if he refused to awake him, or drag him forcefully out of the burning building, because he did not want to violate his son's "freedom of choice"? Let the reader be the judge. After Christ's suffering, bleeding, and dying, the Fullerites insist that all that He did was insufficient to save His people, and then write about the "sufficiency of Christ's atonement!"

Continuing with Spurgeon's "little book": "I beseech you, Do not turn away from your Redeemer!"

Now that is nothing short of ignorance! How can one refuse one's Redeemer? If a man went to hell, he certainly was not redeemed! One of the five points of Calvinism is "irresistible grace." No, Charles Haddon Spurgeon was not a Calvinist! He adds:

"O Soul, it may be now or never with you."

This is not even Christianity. Did Christ not do something? Those people who are charged with Hyper-calvinism are indeed thankful that "*Salvation is of the Lord*," (Jonah 3:9) and that God is Sovereign.

ALLELUIA: FOR THE LORD GOD OMNIPOTENT REIGNETH.

- Revelation 19:6

-

\*\*\*\*\*

## CHAPTER NINE

### **To Whom Is The Gospel Preached**

"To whom is the Gospel Preached" is another topic we have been asked to examine in the light of true Hyper-Calvinism. On this subject, the views of the Neo-calvinists of the Fullerite school and the Pelagians are in agreement. On this subject, the views of both of them are fully contrasted with those of the Hyper-calvinists. An oil driller surveys a geological formation in Indonesia. He sinks a well and brings in a "gusher." As one observed him in his work, he never saw the driller pump the oil into the well first, and then pump it back out! It was obvious that the oil was there long, long before he drilled the well. When Paul, an itinerate minister, as well as an apostle, went to Corinth, God told

him in a dream to fear not, *"for I have much people in this city."* They were His people, and in that particular place, before Paul arrived. How long had they been God's people? *"from before the foundation of the world,"* or *"before the world began'."* Perhaps the missionaries are not as observant. They actually believe that if they establish a mission in Indonesia, that they will save souls, who otherwise would perish ... in spite of the atonement and redemption of Christ! In other words, there is no oil until the driller finds it! Pelagians can't comprehend what Christ did on the cross! Hypercalvinists understand that Christ has already legally redeemed, ransomed, sanctified, and saved ALL His elect people; and are scattered throughout the world, having been *"redeemed to God by His blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation."* (Rev. 5:9). One design of their itinerancy is to preach the Gospel to the *"lost sheep of the house of Israel;"* the *"other sheep"* that Christ has, which are scattered abroad. If a soul in Indonesia is brought to a knowledge of the Lord's gracious work, that soul was there and redeemed, before the Gospel produced the effect of conversion. Paul, on his itinerary at Philippi found a widow there who worshipped God. Paul preached the Gospel indiscriminately to all gathered there, and it is reported of this particular woman: *"whose heart the Lord opened,"* that she attended unto the things which were spoken by Paul (Acts 16:14). Notice the following points: The widow was already a worshipper of God prior to her conversion. Paul had "assayed to go into Asia, but the Spirit forbid him." Instead, a vision directed him to where this particular redeemed child of God was, and God *"opened her heart"* to hear the Gospel of a finished salvation which embraced her own poor soul. She gladly received the Word, rejoicing, and was immersed, and her household was blessed to also be converted and brought to the knowledge of the truth. (We will say more about Lydia again later). Paul did not beget her. Christ, not Paul, saved her, and the Spirit called her, because she was saved. For, as it is

written: "*as many as were ordained to eternal life believed*" (Acts 13:48.) Paul had a promise: "*Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace. For I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee:* (as had so often happened in other cities) "*for I **have** much people in this city*" (Acts 18:910.) They were His people before Paul preached to them! To use the analogy, the "oil was in this geological formation" in Macedonia, if you will! That is the reason for itinerate preaching. God, who knows the hearts of all people, and "*knows them that are His,*" directs the Word where He pleases, and to those to whom He pleases. His Word is not as man's words. "*So shall (a "hard shall") My Word be that goeth forth out of My mouth: it shall **not** return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper whereto I send it*" (Isaiah 55:11.)

As to itinerancy versus proselytizing, the Scriptures teach the former, not the latter. The writer is almost certain, as to those actually preaching **the Gospel**, that there are far more that publish salvation, numerically, in the United States, than those who proselytize ("evangelize"). Again, as it is written: "*The Lord gave the Word: great was the company of those that published it.*" (Psalm 68:11.) Using the definition for "evangelism" the so-called "Evangelicals" (proselyters) use, it is true that the "Hyper-calvinists do not believe in evangelism," or, i.e., proselytizing. But they most surely believe in preaching THE Gospel; publishing it everywhere God in His sovereign Providence cast their lots. Seeing that He is sovereign, that is all anyone can do! Where is the man who can go beyond the boundaries set by God's eternal decree? Most who say they believe in evangelism only give a little money, stay at home and watch T.V., and hire someone else to go! So much for "evangelism." Itinerate publication of the Word is strictly in God's hand, rather than hired administrators, department chairmen of mission boards or committees. These administrators are called "directors," but in God's kingdom there can be found no such ministerial

office. It is Christ who administers His kingdom, and it is well that it is so, for:

*"The Lord of host hath sworn? Saying, Surely as I thought so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand"* (Isaiah 14:24.) Neo-calvinists claim to believe this. It would only be head-knowledge if one acted contrary to it, as to deny it. Again, Hyper-calvinists believe the Gospel is a proclamation to be published; whereas others believe that it is an invitation or "free offer" to be accepted or rejected at the whim of ungodly sinners. Hyper-calvinists follow the itinerancy of the New Testament model as closely as possible in those area which are truly apostolic. That is, the "apostles, prophets, and evangelists" had extra-ordinary gifts- the "gift of the Holy Ghost". These three gifts of the Holy Ghost carried specific signs, such as handling poisonous serpents and drinking toxin without harm, and lasted only during the initial inauguration of Christ's earthly kingdom. Pastor-teachers today do not possess these extra-ordinary gifts. Therefore, the New Testament model demonstrates both the practices of the apostolic offices as well as the offices of elders and deacons. An elder, or bishop, today, cannot see in the dark a jailer about to take his own life, as Paul did. He will not find his chains unloosed, gates opened, and angels freeing him from jail, as Peter did. He will not raise the dead, as the apostles did; nor accurately predict his future as the prophets did. But he can "go everywhere" that God in His providence sends him, *"preaching the Word of God."* Today, there are no Gospel "evangelists" in His Church. That office ceased with both the Apostolic and Prophetic offices. All the major Confessions of Faith of Baptists, Congregational and Presbyterian churches state that there are only two such offices in the church, and these are elders and deacons.

Paul and Barnabas, in their report to the church at Antioch in Cilicia, who sent them out, declared: *"For so hath the Lord commanded us, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles,*



*that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth. And when the Gentiles heard this (a proclamation of good news - not a "free offer"!) they were glad and glorified the Word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed. And the Word of the Lord was PUBLISHED throughout all the region" (Acts 13:47-48.) When the Lord discussed the signs of His coming, one of them was: "And the Gospel (not a freewill wish list) must be published among all nations" (Mark 13:10.)*

The Fullerites, both Neo-calvinists and Pelagian freewillers, believe the Gospel is a set of "free offers," made up of half verses, put together into certain formulas to be pressed upon all men to believe that Christ loved them, died for them, and want them to "get saved." This is wholly contrary to the doctrine of God's Almighty power, His eternality, the immutability (unchangeableness) of the eternal God; the decree of election and predestination; the eternal redemption of all for whom Christ died; and justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ, just to list but a few. In other words, it is an outright denial of Christianity itself.

If one is not "*loved with an everlasting love*" (and those God hates are not); redeemed by Christ's blood but not His sheep; nor justified by His imputed righteousness, tell us what kind of "free offer" can one extend to such? Shall a proselyter tell such that Christ died for him, if in fact He did not? Must he believe a lie in order to be "saved"? Again, what "free offer" can one make to such? What bargain can the proselyter strike with such a man? If he is persuaded to believe historically, or nominally, what is offered him in return? Salvation? Then there is no meaningful "election," nor atonement! There is no real value in "redemption"! And justification is meaningless! And to this point: Where is there a "free offer" anywhere in the New Testament record? Let us look at the one you probably *thought* of: "*For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off.*" That is as wide a door as it can be, isn't it? It

must mean "every body." You may think, "How can an Hyper-calvinist deny that this is a universal offer to all men?" If you thought this, it is because you are not looking at the whole verse! The rest of the quotation is: "*even as many as the Lord our God SHALL CALL.*" Bang! The wide-opened door just slammed quite shut! For the Neo-calvinists who believe in "Gospel regeneration" as a basis for their "free offer" system, this limitation in this verse, precedes their having "*gladly receiving his word and were baptized.*" It is the irresistible, or "effectual" call of the Holy Spirit to "life and immortality" which is referred to here. Otherwise, they could not have "gladly received" it, because of the natural enmity of the carnal mind.

The carnal mind "*is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be, so then they that are in the flesh CANNOT please God*" (Romans 8:7-8). But the people of God, once taught their awful condition in nature, and then hearing the joyful sound of an unconditional and complete salvation finished by Christ on the cross, do receive such a proclamation joyfully. There is no sweeter message on mortal tongue than salvation by the sovereign free grace of God! It is not the carnal, or natural, mind of man which is affected by the true Gospel of the grace of God. It is the spiritual mind, as Paul said, "*I have the mind of Christ.*" The "Gospel," as such, can only be "glad tidings" to such as quickened to life by the Spirit of God. If the word preached falls upon the deaf ears of the natural man, it is anything else but "glad tidings," for it is then the savor of "*death unto death to them that perish.*" For this sort of people, such a condemnation can not be a "free offer," but rather the contrary. Why else is it that men by nature hate the doctrine of the total depravity and inability of natural men in spiritual things? Why do they instantly reject the denial of a "freedom of will"? Again, they could not have "gladly received" the word, because of the natural bias and enmity of their own corrupt and fallen will. It is this, that raises the enmity of their natural, or carnal mind.

One may have thought of Acts 3:19: *"Repent ye therefore and be converted that your sins may be blotted out, when the time of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord."* This, too, sounds universal enough. But, as the above text, if it is interpreted as being universal, it is taken out of its context. Here is its context: *"Ye are the children of the prophets, and the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in Thy seed shall all the kindred of the earth be blessed. **Unto you**, first God, having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities"* (Verses 25,26.) Again, the proclamation extends only to those embraced in the covenant of grace, *i.e.*, the elect. Only the elect will be given "ears to hear," "eyes to see," and a "heart to perceive" and "be converted."

The application of the Gospel tidings must be, and is, identical to the persons redeemed by the blood of Christ. He certainly did not redeem, or die, for all mankind; or else all mankind are saved and safe. Throughout the Scriptures, the redemptive work of Christ is set forth for a particular people; that is, it is always limited. And this is to "My people," "Brethren beloved of the Lord," "My sheep," "a remnant according to the election of grace," *etc.*; always to His sheep as distinguished from those He referred to as goats. They are the "wise virgins?" rather than the "foolish virgins." They are the "wheat" rather than the "tares;" the "good fish;" rather than the "bad;" the "circumcision;" rather than the "concision," or the "dogs that are without. "

We are not here discussing the lofty doctrine of election and predestination. We assume the Neo-calvinists have, to some degree, a working knowledge of that great blessed and sublime truth; which truth is hid from the lost. (*"If our Gospel be hid, it is hid from the lost"* II Cor. 4:3.) Their inconsistency is with the **extent and timing of Christ's redemptive work** and its efficacy. It is here that they argue with the Hyper-calvinists

relative to the preaching of the Gospel. The question to be considered in this issue is: **"To whom is the Gospel to be preached?"** Who is it that can **benefit** by knowledge of it? For whom is it intended? To whom is it sent? Pelagians [Absolute Freewillers] and Neo-calvinists alike, claim it is intended as a **"free offer of salvation" for each and every offspring of Adam.** That is, it is for **all the reprobates** as well as **all the elect**; with the exception by Pelagians- they know nothing of election. They are so blinded they do not suspect that there is an elect people – unless it is the “Jews.” So, restated for them: they believe the Gospel is a free offer to everyone. Hyper-calvinists believe that God cannot make a mistake; nor fail in His eternal purpose; which specific purpose for the death of Christ was the salvation of His elect people, preserved in Christ in seed substance from eternity; and that the Gospel is directed specifically to those IN Christ whom He redeemed. Look at these positions:

- 1) The death of Christ was for everyone; so the Gospel is intended for everyone. That is the Pelagian position.
- 2) The death of Christ was for the elect specifically, but the Gospel is for everyone as an "honest invitation" to the reprobates. That is the Neo-calvinists' position.
- 3) The death of Christ was for the elect, and the Gospel is extended to all. That is the Calvinists' position.
- 4) The death of Christ was for the elect; it was successful in their salvation when He made the atonement, and they are already ransomed, redeemed, reconciled, and legally saved. The Gospel is a **publication, or proclamation, of this finished salvation to those that are saved.** Those Christ redeemed are scattered among all nations, hence the message is **to be preached wherever God in His providence sends His ministers.** This is the Hyper-calvinists' position.

Which, then, does the reader believe to be the Scriptural teaching? Is the reader a Pelagian? a Neo--

calvinist? a Calvinist? or a Hyper-calvinist? The above four positions delineates the major differences between the four groups. Most important, however, is: Which position is the truth of the Christian Scriptures? Very few Christians will deny that the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is a prophecy of Christ's first advent. In that book, Christ is introduced as God's first Elect in whom His soul delighted. He is revealed as His suffering servant, but particularly notice **for whom** He is suffering:

*"Surely He hath borne **our** griefs, and carried **our** sorrows: yet **we** did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted."* (Isaiah 53:4.) Pay close attention to the personal pronouns. They speak **for whom** Christ died; and **to whom** the Gospel is to be preached. The pronouns "their," "them," and "those" are never used. In other words, His work was not for all mankind. The "we," "us," and "our," refer to **the remnant according to the election of grace**, or those Paul referred to when he said Israel was blinded, but *"the election hath obtained it."* *"But He was wounded for **our** transgressions, He was bruised for **our** iniquities: the chastisement of **our** peace was upon Him; and with His stripes **we** are healed."* None of these can be applied to all mankind, or the non-elect. This is the reason our Hyper-calvinistic churches were once called *Particular Baptists*, because they believed in *"particular redemption."*

*"All **we** like sheep have gone astray; **we** have turned every one to his own ways; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." "... for the transgression of **My people** was He stricken."* *"He shall see the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied: by His knowledge shall My righteous Servant justify many, for He shall bear **their** iniquities,"* It was because "He hath poured out His soul unto death: and He was numbered with the transgressors; and He bare the sin of many and made intercession for the transgressors" that He died. Now, how can any educated man, let alone a man possessing the blessed Spirit, apply this to all mankind? *"If*

*their light be darkness, how great is their darkness?"* Christ asked. Before Christ saved any, it was declared that "He shall (one of those "hard shalls") save His People from their sins." (Matthew 1:21.) That is "particular redemption." By particular redemption, we mean that Christ's death was specifically designed to redeem each of the elect; or, those "chosen in Him from the foundation of the world" in particular. (Ephesians 1:4.) What we are saying expressed differently: Christ did not die "in general" with no particular persons in mind. This was the view of Andrew Fuller, J.M. Pendleton, and the early "Evangelicals." But it is not true. Scripture clearly teaches a particular, specific, and purposeful redemption. And it is called in Scripture "ETERNAL REDEMPTION" (Hebrews 9:12) and shows that it was **actually accomplished when Christ died**. It is not now left to be done for believers or deciders-for-Christ. *"But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered ONCE into the holy place, HAVING (already now!) OBTAINED (past tense) ETERNAL REDEMPTION for us."* (Hebrews 9:11-12.) Isn't that clearly the Hyper-calvinists' position stated? How can it be possible now, two thousand years after the fact, for anyone else to be covered by the blood of the atonement? No, He did not die "in general". That "*obtaining eternal redemption*" was "**for us.**" He died specifically for the sins of His people. It was the sins of these people, which were laid upon Him by imputation. It is too late to add more. And it is these particular people who have benefited from His death. This is because Christ, as a Substitute bore their sins for them, and hence they are free from the condemnation due to them for these sins. He really meant it when He said "*I lay down My life r. MY SHEEP.*" ( John 10:15.) Again, "*I am the good Shepherd: the good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep.*" (John 10:14.) It is hard to conceive how a

supposed "Bible believer" can deny Christ's own teachings on the purpose of His death. He surely ought to know for whom He died! As already pointed out, when Christ sent out the first (true) evangelists, He did not command them to "win the world" for Him. Quite to the contrary indeed! He told them, "*Go not into the way of the Gentiles and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not but go rather to the **lost sheep** of the house of Israel.*" (Matthew 10:5). Between that commandment, and the last commandment to go into all the world, one wonders how many thousands, or maybe even millions of Gentiles died without the gospel!

Is it not reasonable to believe that multitudes were dying between these two commandments? If one is going to claim "it ain't fair" not to give every body a "chance," then here is a good place to start! If He "wanted" (We speak foolishly in the language of Pelagians, Neocalvinists and Asdods here - God doesn't "want!" Man wants, God wills!) to save everyone, He should not have procrastinated so long! His command to preach the gospel must extend to the **same ones redeemed** by His atonement. The benefits of the atonement cannot reach **beyond the extent** of His **redemptive work**. There is no "good news," or "gospel" to the wicked rebels against God's dominion and power. Salvation is never "offered" to such. He did not love those who are fallen in Adam and unredeemed by Christ; for they were not given to Him by the Father. He did not suffer the penalty for the sins of those who are heirs of hell, or else they would not be the future inhabitants of that place! He justly left them in the delightful pleasures of sin; and they would not have it otherwise! If such were to go to heaven, that holy place would bore them eternally and still be a hell for them. He did not ransom them; did not redeem them; did not sanctify them; and consequently **He did not save them**. Being not saved judicially, the Holy Spirit will not quicken them; will not give them ears to hear, or eyes to see, nor hearts to perceive. He will not "*make them willing in the day of His power,*" as He does His

elect and redeemed people.” (Psalm 110:5.) Therefore, there can be no "honest invitation" to such; nor is there any promise of life or blessings extended to such in the gospel. As Jesus said: "They are condemned already." (John 3: 18.) And their condemnation, or judgment, is "*that they believe not.*" The closing chapter of the Holy Bible says: "*He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous? Let him be righteous still.*" Of course, many never read that far back into the Book, but if one finds the "whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely" in Revelation 22:17b, then they are without excuse. They should have found the text above in verse 11! Both groups, the unjust and the righteous; or the filthy and the holy, are **eternally fixed** in their states: One is to show God's eternal justice in His hatred of sin and unrighteousness, and the other to show the riches of His grace and mercy. Both testify to the glorious attributes of God. The gospel is to the one "*a savor of death unto death;*" and to the other "*a savor of life unto life.*" "*Behold the goodness and severity of God!*" He is not one for the wicked to play games with, and then demand equality with the saints! Interestingly, the Word of God forbids the **saints themselves to even pray for them**. While there is a command to "pray for all men," yet we read: "*There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it.*" (I John 5:16.) Again, "*Therefore pray not thou for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to Me: for I will not hear thee.*" (Jeremiah 7:16.) These are the nonelect, since the "all men" which the saints can, and ought to pray for are those for whom Christ makes intercession –i.e., His people – not the "all men".

Invariably, Christ's command to sinners is also within the scope of His atonement. As His death is limited to His sheep, so His commandment "to come" is limited to the same. Notice how Christ worded His command: "Come unto Me, all ye **that labor** and are **heavy laden** and I will give thee



rest." (Matthew 11:28.) Only such who are laboring under the Spirit's powerful convicting work are intended here. To "labor" is "to work." And only quickened sinners flee directly to the law, and begin to "work" for relief. This law is not a hiding-place. One cannot meet its just demands. Try as hard as he may to keep the law and find salvation, and what he finds is that it is a terrible task-master! He will, by experience, find that the law cannot deliver him nor make him "holy." Substituting man-made "plans of salvation," which are as truly legalism as the Mosaic Law (except without divine authority,) he may find temporary relief; but this too, will evaporate, and he is still left in a terrible need of peace, pardon and reconciliation. The harder he tries to be "holy", the worse he finds himself to be. As this law-work continues, the "exceeding sinfulness of sin" burdens him down under a heavy load of guilt and condemnation. Such an individual is truly "heavy laden", and in desperate need for the gospel rest. Such a person is spiritually alive, yet unconverted. As long as he is working for relief, he is not converted. Such an experience is a mark of God's quickened children. Just as in a natural birth, there is a struggle in the darkness of the womb to be delivered to the light; so too, in God's work within a sinner's soul, the living soul will struggle to be delivered. There is a reason for Jesus revealing this experience by referring it to as being born again," or "*born from above*." Before conversion, the regenerate child is alive, but in darkness and ignorance as to the way of his deliverance. In conversion, he has revealed in him the Lord Jesus Christ, and given a hope in Him for his salvation. It is the true gospel that brings this life and immortality within the soul **to light**, or **makes it manifest**. But this work of grace is not produced in all men alike. This is indisputable! Only the elect, who are saved by Christ's atoning sacrifice are blessed with this unspeakable gift of free and sovereign grace. The gospel has powerful influences on such a heavy-laden and laboring soul. It brings him to "rest" in Christ's finished salvation as the only

source for his righteousness. It is his rest: *"There is a rest that remains for the people of God."* (Hebrews 4:9.) Of the wicked, it is written: *"Unto whom I swear in my wrath that they should not enter into my rest."* (Psalm 125:11.) As you may see, there is no universal invitation, or "**free offer**" in this passage.

Consider two more passages which are often misquoted by the so-called "Evangelicals." In Matthew 20:28, *"Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and give (not, "offer") His life a ransom for many; (not, "everyone") and, "Who gave (again, not "offered") Himself a ransom for many to be testified in due time."* ( I Timothy 2:6.) Now, which is it? Did He ransom some; or did He ransom all? The Pelagians say "all!" If so, are "all" actually ransomed and thus *freed from the captivity* to sin and death? One would likely conclude that they are not - unless, of course, they are Socinian "universalists." But, that is exactly what a ransom is! Obviously, a "ransom" which does not ransom is not a ransom! See how blind a Pelagian can be! As one passage limits the ransom, and as misunderstood by Pelagians, the other is universal, the Freewillers have the Bible contradicting itself in one of the most important areas of its doctrine!

We know these passages are in harmony, and seeing that the Bible is the inspired Word of God, there can be no contradiction in it. There has to be, and is, a consistent way of viewing them in harmony with each other. In fact, there are two consistent ways of looking at these two texts together. *First*, consider the "ransom." That is the subject. We know what the word means. Even a Freewill preacher, reading about a "ransom paid for a kidnapped child knows what it is. He just goes blind in the pulpit! Simply put, a ransom is a sum paid for the release of a captive; and the captive goes free. It differs somewhat from redemption. Redemption is the release of a bond slave upon the payment by one who *has the right* of redemption. But they are also similar: If the captive does not go free, he was not "ransomed." If the slave does not go free, he

was not "redeemed." This is extremely important in understanding the sacrificial work of Christ. Alas! how careless are far too many ministers when they use the king's language! If Christ gave His life as a ransom for many, then "many" are ransomed and set free from the law of sin and death. And this is **indisputably true**. Some are! Hence, Calvinists and Hyper-calvinists alike conclude the atonement is limited, or, *i.e.*, "particular redemption:"

*Secondly*, "all" is an indefinite pronoun, and therefore is limited to those intended by its usage. So when we read that "*Christ gave His life a ransom for many,*" it is in the context of saving men. Hence, He ransomed many out of all mankind. Or, He gave His life for all of the many who are the objects of His mediation. When viewed in this way, the texts are perfectly consistent, and actually true. They conform to all the other aspects of Christ's redemptive work. The integrity of the inspired Word is honored. His death was for the elect only, as every where taught in the Scripture. He has already ransomed all of them! Isn't that a precious truth indeed? This is the subject of the gospel, and the joy of every delivered believer when this truth is sweetly tendered to his soul by faith. It is too precious to be neglected by Christian ministers. To neglect it, is to rob the Father's children of their bread. It is to cast the Children's bread to dogs!

Christ died for those whom He characterized as "sheep." But He also classified some as "goats." Sheep and goats are not the same specie; nor are the elect and the reprobates. They have very different characteristics. A goat is a curious creature. It will follow a stranger out of curiosity. A sheep isn't. A sheep knows and responds to the voice familiar to it. It is to a purpose that Christ makes this difference when speaking of "men." "*When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him? then He shall sit upon the throne of His glory: and before Him shall be gathered all nations; and He shall separate them one from another as a*

shepherd divides his sheep from goats: and He shall set the sheep on His right hand but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand (the "sheep") Come ye blessed of My Father ... " (the fact that they are sheep, and have always been sheep, proves that they are **already blessed** of His Father - not that they "will" or "might be" blessed if, but, maybe) *"inherit the kingdom prepared far you."* When was this kingdom prepared for them? He told them: **"from the foundation of the world."** It is strange that so many cannot see election in this text. One can talk about spiritual darkness; for this is it! We must conclude that the sheep have always been sheep, and were the objects of God's lovingkindness if the kingdom was prepared specifically for them before He created the world. This established the election of grace to glory, even if the word "elect" was never used. Look at the goats. They have no such standing in Christ. The eternality of divine election secured the sheep, for they were in actual seed substance IN Christ *"from the beginning."* The goats have always been goats. They had their standing in Adam's corrupt fleshly seed from the beginning of his fall. Just as long as the sheep have been sheep from Christ's Mediatorial beginning, so too, the goats have been goats from Adam's fallen beginning. The fact that the goats are separated from the sheep establishes the point that they have always been outside the eternal covenant, *"ordered in all things and sure."* A covenant of sovereign grace it is. **No "free offers" of salvation can change the goats into sheep**; nor prevent their separation at the last day. Is, then, the gospel preached to the elect sheep, or to the reprobate goats? To which can gospel promises pertain? Which can savingly benefit from the proclamation of the gospel? One might as well give a "free offer" to the fallen angels (devils) as to reprobate men! The results would be the same. Did Christ die for the devils too?

But in the actual preaching of the gospel, it is to be

preached positively, as if all God directs to hear it were, in fact, His sheep. No one knows the end of any soul; not even his own at times. It is not the ministers' business to make outlandish promises as if God was a frustrated defeated little Being. **He is not! He is the sovereign absolute ruler of the universe,** and nothing is too difficult for Him to do. Every person who attends a gospel service is there by His Providence, **for whatever end He has decreed.** In Christ's parables, the sheep and the goats are together until He separates them. The wheat and the tares are sown in the same field, and will remain together until the harvest at the end of the world. The good fish and the bad fish are in the gospel net together, and will be separated when the ship is docked. The five wise virgins and the five foolish are waiting together until the cry that the Bridegroom comes. The first judgment seems most clearly to involve *these sheep and goats* in their separation. Both had knowledge of Christ. It seems not to involve those who never heard or responded to the gospel. Rather, another judgment seems set for "*the rest of the dead.*" So in actual preaching, care must be taken not to go out on a limb and preach a lie to reprobates to get them into a religious society; nor discriminate among hearers. Just preach the gospel to all that God sovereignly directs to hear it. The results are His business. And as limited in knowledge as His creatures are, it is well that it is this way. There is no need to split theological hairs about why – **just do it!** The Hyper-calvinists do!

When Christ stated the purpose of His death, He said: "*For this is My blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sin.*" (Matthew 26:28.) That verse alone establishes the doctrine of **limited atonement**; for it is certain that all the sins of all men are **not remitted**. In John 10, Christ was very specific in stating for whom He would die: "*I am the good Shepherd: the good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep.*" (verse 11). "*I am the good Shepherd, and I know*

*My sheep, and am known of Mine. As the Father knoweth Me, even so I the Father and **I lay down My life for the sheep.**"* (verse 14.) Language cannot be more clearly stated than this. That He does not consider all men as His sheep is equally clear: "*But ye believe not.*" Why do they believe not? "*because **ye are not of My sheep**, as I said unto you, My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me. I give unto them (the "sheep") eternal life and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them (the "sheep") out of My hands.*" (verses 26-28). Again, can language be so clear? If one asked why men do not savingly believe, even though they may "make a decision for Christ," the Scriptural answer is here: "**They are not My sheep.**" A "decision" is insufficient to begat the Father's child! "*Ye must be born again.*"

An enlightened child of God reading this must wonder: "How clear must the Scripture be for natural men to see this? Surely this is 'spelling it out' as to a little child!" Others are as blind as Bartimaeus, and find an inbred repulsion within their very being against the sovereignty of God. As the Pharisees of old, said: "*We will not have this Man to reign over us.*" Our Lord raised a question here, and answered it for all ages to come: "*Why do you not understand My speech? Even because ye **cannot hear My Word.***" (John 8:43) And here is the difference between the sheep and the goats; the elect and the reprobate: "*He that is **of God** HEARTH God's words. Ye therefore hear them not because **ye are not of God.***" (John 8:43-47.) Again, surely this can be no more plainly stated! Those who have been called to a knowledge of His Son by free grace, and who love and discuss these precious truths with each other, and with those "*that are without*," full well know that there are two different "worlds" or "peoples" in Christendom. It is as evident as night and day. They have no problem understanding that the "world" in John 3:16 are the world of believers for whom Christ died, and the others are

found in that "world of the ungodly that shall perish" unless called out of it as they were. It is clear that the gospel is to be preached to God's people; to the foolish virgins, bad fish, and tares as well. But the people of God, the elect, are the exclusive objects of the gospel, because they are the exclusive objects of Christ's atonement. They alone had an eternal living union with and in Christ from the beginning of His mediation. The very reason the atonement is called the "satisfaction" of Christ Jesus is because *"He saw the travail of His soul and was satisfied."* He could never be satisfied if He loved all men, desired the salvation of all men, and was too weak or ignorant to deliver all men. In fact, it is rather common to hear Pelagian ministers describe Him as "bawling His eyeballs out" because He wants to save souls that will not "let" Him! A sign on a Brethren Church on Brookside Avenue in Indianapolis for years simply read: "Give God A Chance." Such a god should be pitied.

While Calvinists agree with Hyper-calvinists on the doctrine of unconditional election, [with Hyper-Calvinists embracing the *eternality* of that election] there are far more Pelagian Freewillers - the so-called "Evangelicals"- who have no understanding on the most fundamental rudiments of the English language and Biblical revelation when used in a religious context. They read John 3:16, and see nothing else in it but universal altruism: love, love, love. They never give the word "world" a second glance! It appears they could not preach (if such is preaching) if John 3:16 was not in the Bible. Yet, as often as they use it, they still cannot see it.

For a moment, look at just the one word "world" in the text. In the Greek, it is "Kosmos," or cosmos. It means an "orderly arrangement." Its second meaning is "decoration." It is from this word beauticians are schooled in "cosmetology." So, any "orderly arrangement" is a "world," and there are many different *worlds* in the Scripture. In

Noah's day, *"The world of the ungodly perished."* Was this the "world" of John 3:16? Since they "perished," it must not be. Or, *"He was in the world ..."* What "world" was Christ in before He was born of Mary? Is this the same world as in John 3:16? Probably not! *"And the world was made by Him. . ."* Since all things were made by Him, this probably was not the "world" of John 3:16. *"And the world knew Him not."* Perhaps this world was the world of the Jews, since it adds that *"He came unto His own, and own received Him not."* So, likely, only some of this "world" is included in the "world" of John 3:16. There is a world of believers, opposed to a *"world that lieth in wickedness."* Is this world the same as the world in this text: *"First I thank God through Jesus Christ for you all for your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world"*? These are probably two different "worlds too." One can also wonder if the "whole world" included the Native Americans, and if so, who preached the gospel to them during Paul's day? The writer is inclined to believe that this "whole world" is included in John 3:16, but that there are elect persons not included in this "whole world" who are included in John 3:16 also! Again, *"And.. .we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness."* (1 John 5:19). This is enough to drive a Pelagian Freewillier out of his wits! Here is a "whole world" which lieth in wickedness; and above another "whole world" where the faith of the Colossians was spoken of! Wonder which "whole world" is the "world" in John 3:16? Both can't be! Now Hyper-calvinists, and most Calvinists, agree that Christ actually took all the sins of all the elect away, bearing them in His own body on the tree; that He actually suffered the real and legal penalties due these sins, so that God will not charge the elect with them in the judgment. *"Who shall lay a charge against one of God's elect?"* (Romans 8:33). That is **limited atonement!**

This chapter deals with the question: **"To whom is the gospel preached?"** Enough has been said for a Biblical



foundation to support the answer to this question. We address the question because Neo-calvinists falsely charge (parrot the charge) that Hyper-calvinists do not believe in *preaching the gospel to sinners*. They formed this charge merely because Hyper-calvinists refused to give those "free offers" to the reprobates, telling them that God loved them, and "wanted" them to "be saved", or perhaps, "join a church and pay their tithes." It is possible! There is, obviously, another side to this subject of gospel preaching. Hyper-calvinists have a better reason than the above for their position. They are certain that their position is consistent with the gospel and the finished work of Christ. They are equally certain that the position of the Neo-calvinists and Pelagians is inconsistent and unscriptural **because they are ignoring the finished work of Christ**. So for once in the reader's life-time, here is a Hyper-calvinist defense of their actual position. Are you ready? Here it is:

The primary reason that the Hyper-calvinists do not give "free offers" of salvation to all men is because such "free offers" are contrary to both the Scripture and sound judgment. A secondary reason is because they do not want to encourage reprobates to join their churches. They understand that men by nature are religious. They agree that it is better that the reprobates give as much honor to God as they can, considering their totally depraved nature. They understand, that reprobates have a "need" for religion; nor would they wish to deprive the reprobates of this comfort. They would rather, that the reprobates, however, join *other religious institutions*; and in general, they have - by the millions! That is no problem with Hyper-calvinists. They support the ideal of freedom of religion as well as freedom from religion. They do not disturb others in their devotions. In the pulpit, they leave them alone. They do not button-hole any and try to mentally persuade them that they should come and join with them. In fact, they are glad that there are plenty of convenient places for Freewill believers to find satisfaction for their religious appetites. They are keenly

aware of the terrible confusion when reprobates are deceived into believing that "God loves everyone, wants to save every one, except the Hyper-calvinists among them!" Such a mixed multitude is absolute confusion!

The basis for the "free offer" system is Andrew Fuller's supposed *sufficiency* of the death of Christ for all men "were all men to believe." This unbridled view gave rise to the new so-called "evangelism," (proselytizing) which appealed to the unregenerate sinners to enter the "church." However, if there are some chosen to salvation, and some others "fitted" to destruction," (Romans 9:22), and there are, then they are not merely "left" in their sins; but as Paul said, "made fit" for destruction. If there are some '*redeemed **out of** every nation, kindred, tongue, and tribe;*' then many more are left **unredeemed in them**. Language dictates that this must be. And Scripture concurs. If Christ died for the sheep, He did not die for more than they. There is, in other words, an opposing doctrinal truth to divine election. It is divine reprobation, and is equally true. These reprobates include the "*wicked that are turned into hell,*" (Psalm 9:17), Judas "*who went to his own place,*" (Psalm 109: 6-19), Esau, the "*profane fornicator,*" who sought repentance "*and was not heard*" although he sought it with tears, (Hebrews 12:16), the *foolish virgins*, (Matthew 25:11), the "*bad fish*" caught by "evangelists" in their net (Matthew 23:15), the *tares* that will be burned in the harvest, and "*all nations that forget God.*" etc., Just as surely as God loves, He also hates. He is just as well as merciful, and is the "*justifier of him that believeth.*" He is "*angry with the wicked every day,*" and He justly assigns men to destruction, for no one deserves salvation. None of these did He uselessly shed His precious blood for, merely to give them a "chance," or give preachers a basis for an "honest invitation" to them. There can be no "honest invitation" to such to believe that Christ died for them **if in fact and deed He did not!**

When Christ called Simon and his brother, Andrew, He

said to them: "*Come ye after Me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.*" (Mark 1:17) That was the very beginning of gospel preaching. One finds no tricks, gimmicks, sob-stories, or "raise your hand if you are not a Christian," and other pressure tactics. All one can find is a **true, honest, and humble proclamation of the gospel**. In no case can one find a "free offer to all men," but on the very contrary, their ministry was limited to the "*lost sheep of the house of Israel.*" So, just how "universal" should the gospel message be? Has one ever gone fishing for **dead fish**, other than proselyters? Of what value is a dead fish in the gospel kingdom; other than to swell numbers and create carnal pride? All the bad fish that are persuaded to make their mental "decision for Christ," will, in the end, be cast out with the goats, tares, and foolish virgins. True Hypercalvinistic preaching is designed to catch **live fish**; and **as few dead ones as possible**. To the writer's knowledge, these churches are the only religious societies where a believer in the doctrine of *free and sovereign grace* can attend and not find Freewillers - unless they are visitors. Of equal interest, they have no Sunday Schools, Bible Schools, nor Seminaries to indoctrinate their hearers! If anyone has been taught of God that he is nothing and less than nothing; made to cry, "*Lord, have mercy on me, a sinner!*" and made to wait for deliverance at the door of mercy, then to such the gospel is a great benefit. "*For when we were without strength Christ died for the ungodly.*" (Romans 5:6.) Paul did not say, "When we were persuaded to come, but barely able to waddle down the aisle, Christ died for the decider."

According to their confessions, and that of the Hypercalvinists (The Baptists, Congregationalist Savoy, and Presbyterian Westminster Confessions of 1689), Christ has established two offices (not three or more) in a gospel church. In chapter 26, "Of The Church," paragraph 8: "A particular church, gathered and completely organized according to the mind of Christ, consist of officers and members; and the

officers appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the church (so called and gathered), for the peculiar administration of ordinances, and execution of power or duty, which He entrusts them with, or calls them to, to be continued to the end of the world? **are bishops or elders with deacons.**" (1689 edition). Nothing is said about the "apostles or evangelists" as church officers. Paragraph 9 gives the way these officers are to be installed in their office. It appears, that these ancient brethren understood that the offices of "apostles," "prophets," and "evangelists" were extraordinary offices, which carried with them extra-ordinary gifts, and which were removed with the establishment of the church in the first century. It is certain that proselyters do not have these extra-ordinary gifts today.

It is true that later the Philadelphia Association, as they moved into the broad way, appointed an "evangelist," Morgan Edwards, in 1771. But no gifts were given to him. They change it in 1773, to "a traveling minister," and elder John Gano agreed to serve. A traveling minister is an *itinerate minister*! It is also true that the Virginia Corresponding Committee appointed an "apostle," but that too, failed to yield satisfactory results, and it was abandoned. Neither of them was endued "*with power from on high*," or extra-ordinary gifts above that which was common among ministers. But throughout early history, itinerate preaching was the norm. In 1792, after Andrew Fuller, one finds recorded the following: "Elders Patten, Clingan, and Vaughan agree to travel for three months in the ensuing year, about Juniata and West Branch of Susquehanna, to preach the gospel to the destitute." Nothing is said about "evangelism"! The association helped with their expenses. The "mission movement" did not begin until 1813 in the United States. All the associations were often petitioned by destitute churches and groups, to allow their ministers to visit them, "at least once a year." [We wish to make a note

here, that associations are not scriptural, nor were they used by churches throughout the long history until 1700. They quickly gained a monopoly on ministers; and used them unlawfully to extend their own power over the churches. This is one reason for such appeals as cited above]. .

When one examines the purpose for the gospel ministry, it excludes the modern methods of proselytizing. The Word of God is not silent as to its purpose. "*And He gave some, apostles, and some, prophets, and some evangelists, and some, pastors-teachers*" and here is its purpose: "***for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.***" (Ephesians 4:11,12) There are many present-day offices not mentioned here, such as: Director of Missions, Tele-evangelists, Chairpersons, reverends, most reverends, most holy reverends, the reverend Mr., missionaries, fathers, rabbis, secretaries, treasurers, ministers of music, youth directors, Christian counselors, *et. al.* They are purely unwarranted carnal institutions in origin and alien in purpose to true Christianity. The purpose as stated above, has no function attempting "to win the world for Christ," nor even a "Christian crusade." No revival meetings, vacation Bible schools, Sunday Schools ... none of these are found in the Holy Bible, which is the ONLY RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE."

It is interesting that a Neo-calvinist writer complained that college professors, fellow pastors, and denominational workers label Calvinists as "hyper-calvinists." In the same paragraph, and three sentences below, the same writer (a Mr. Scruggs) says, "Hyper-calvinism is rigid and unevangelistic. It teaches that when God gets ready to save one of His elect He will do it without your help or mine. It is fatalism." Can you believe that? What kind of language is that! If the writer does not like college professors, fellow pastors, and

denominational workers branding **him** a "Hyper-calvinist," then he should be more considerate than this! At least he should find out what Hyper-calvinists believe before publishing such junk. Hyper-Calvinists believe all God's elect are saved by the sacrifice of Christ, **as of two thousand years ago!** First, Hyper-calvinists do not think that "God gets ready" to do anything! That is not their concept of an immutable God. Second, that writer might be horrified to find that Hyper-calvinists do not believe that God is going to get ready to save anyone! **He already has saved all He is going to save!** Third, the ancients who believed in Fate, believed that there was a force that even the gods could not overcome or resist. They called that force of *chance* "Fate". Hyper-calvinists are further from fatalism than any freewiller on earth! Their God is **absolutely sovereign, immutable, and all-powerful**. He cannot be subject to Fate or chance!

Now, on one point, the writer hit the ball correctly at a random. He did not know it, of course. Hyper-calvinists do believe that God saved His people **without "any help from you or me."** The Bible teaches that in clear unmistakable language. Here it is: *"I have trodden the winepress ALONE; and of the people there WAS NONE WITH ME: for I will tread them in Mine anger; and trample them in My fury and their blood shall be sprinkled upon My garments; and I will stain My raiment. For the day of vengeance is in Mine heart, the year of My redeemed is come. And I looked, and there was none to HELP"* (yours or mine, as the writer said) *"and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore MINE OWN ARM BROUGHT SALVATION UNTO Me; and My fury it upheld Me."* (Isaiah 63:3-5) That is one major difference between Hyper-calvinists and Neo-calvinists. They have a concept of a God that needs a great deal of help. The Hyper-calvinists' God did His work before they even knew it, and needed no help. One is a sovereign Almighty God, the other is not quite so. If that writer is using the popular definition of "evangelistic," that is,

"proselytizing," again he is correct: Hyper-calvinists love sinners too much to make them two-fold more a child of hell than they were, as Christ taught. They do not believe in proselytizing, but they surely do believe in the New Testament model for preaching the true Gospel to whomsoever God directs them. None of them stay at home and *send others!*

The pattern of New Testament preaching is the method used by Hyper-calvinists. Follow that pattern for a moment, keeping in mind that these are apostolic offices, not common to ministers today. Nevertheless, in so far as it is that used throughout the ages before Andrew Fuller, we will stress it here. The church at Antioch laid hands on Paul and Barnabas, whom God had called and sent them forth "*for the work whereunto I have called them.*" (Acts 13:4) There was no mission society, nor association of churches that sent them out, or directed them, nor hired them. In fact, there is no report that the church at Antioch gave them funds; although others churches later on did, as when Paul was a prisoner and unable to make tents. This, dear reader, is exactly the way Hyper-calvinists in the past, and to this day, go forth preaching the gospel. No difference at all! Paul and Barnabas went out exactly as the seventy had done, "*without scrip or purse.*" They went strictly by faith. Follow them, and observe them without preconceived missionary or proselytizing bias. Only Hyper-calvinists continue this model to this day. Their ministers are ordained by a presbytery and sent out "whithersoever God in His Providence cast your lot." At no point did Paul and Barnabas, nor Hyper-calvinists today, submit themselves to man; or to mission boards; to directors of missions, *etc.* They were servants of the Most High God, and to Him they answered. As one reads the Book of Acts, one will be reading precisely the habits of the Hyper-calvinists in the United States today. Their itinerate preaching is in an unbroken practice from the time of their first arrival on these shores in 1643. That "laying on of hands" was the only official act of the church at Antioch. They then

*"preached the Word of God in the synagogues of the Jews"* (Acts 13:5), at the Areopagus (city council meeting - Acts 17:19), and at Ephesus, they *"disputed daily in the school of one Tyrannus."* (Acts 19:9) The point is made, they preached **wherever God opened a door of utterance. They answered to no committee; received no directions from a board, nor even from the church at Antioch.** This was the time of the apostles, who remained at Jerusalem, and they did not take their directions from the apostles! They had no knowledge of associations, state conventions, national churches, or *"lords over God's heritage"* or "chains of correspondences." They answered to God only; received their commission from Him; and went where and to whom the Spirit directed them. Now, may we raise a question here? Were they "unevangelical Hyper-calvinists"? The Holy Spirit forbade them to go into Asia. So they didn't go! "Hyper-calvinists!" Was that fair to the people of Central Asia, or to Asia Minor? Lost souls were perishing there, too. Should not a mission board, or at least the First Baptist Church at Ephesus, divided them up, and sent Barnabas to Asia, and let Paul go on to Macedonia? According to those so-called "Evangelicals," these men were Hyper-calvinists, Anti-missionary, Anti-evangelical, Fatalists! It is certain, that not a one of the apostles *"went into all the world,"* and neither has a single one of the Neo-calvinist Fullerites today! There is no missionary or "evangelist" that has ever "preached the gospel to every creature."! What did these men do?

They went where the Spirit sent them, and when the Spirit sent them; and to those to whom the Spirit directed them to preach. No one interfered in this work. Really, can any present-day proselyter improve on the method these men used? When individuals expressed a desire to hear the gospel, it was preached to them; no one saying, "Nay." (Acts 13:7). They did not barge in uninvited, peddling a cheap religion door-to-door as a salesman marketing a product. They were not out hawking Jesus as a commercial venture. They were not making



merchandise of their religion. Electing grace was preached boldly without any hesitation or embarrassment (Acts 13:17). The law was rightly applied (Acts 13:17-21). The promises of God related (Acts 13:22). [Note: any "promise" implies a covenant agreement.] And the resurrection of Christ preached (Acts 13:23); baptism by immersion administered to believers only (Acts 13:24); the impaling of Christ exalted (Acts 13:28,37); the forgiveness of sins declared (Acts 13:38); justification by Christ's faith was insisted upon (Acts 13:39); and *"as many as were ordained to eternal believed."* (Acts 13:48) ... and none other; only live fish! That is a perfect description of Hypercalvinists' ministries. Proselytizing cannot hold a light to God's way! Again, there was not even a hint of mission boards, agents, committees, missionaries, or "free offers"! They did not live in this age of coupons and "freebies," or other sales gimmicks. So surely Paul and Barnabas were unevangelical! They were merely despised itinerate preachers, "doing the work of an evangelist" by the New Testament method.

Most Articles of Faith as recorded in church books along with their constitution and rules of decorum, say: "We believe the scripture of the Old and New Testament is the written Word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice." The so-called "evangelical," or proselytizing element cannot say that truthfully. Most all of what they practice is found in Jude, chapter 89, verse 91! The novelties invented in the name of "evangelism" were all unheard of among faithful churches for the first eighteen-hundred years; but the true church of God has always had an itinerate ministry. The constitution of gospel churches followed the ministry of the Word everywhere, so that long before Andrew Fuller and his "Modern Missionary Movement," churches were found throughout the world ... yes, even in India, China, Central Asia and Africa! When Paul *"assayed to go into Bithynia, the Spirit suffered him not."* Instead, he was by the same Spirit, directed to Macedonia, where a widow woman heard him

preach, and *"the Lord opened her heart."* The text says "**the Lord**" did this work. So she attended unto the things which were spoken by Paul and she was converted (Acts 16:14.) And believe it or not, but Paul actually baptized her without taking her all the way back to Antioch and asking the church's permission! Why? Because permission had already been granted by the laying on of hands when The Lord had separated them to this work! (Acts 16:15). She brought forth *"fruit unto God meet for repentance,"* (Acts 16:15) and Paul judged her faithful to the Lord and abode in her house - though she was a widow. That, dear reader, without any theological hair-splitting, is how those ancient Hyper-calvinists "evangelized" then, and that is how Hyper-calvinists publish the Word today. When it is done that way, it isn't "missionism," - it is New Testament Christianity in practice.

A pastor in Pennsylvania, and another in Podunk, Mississippi, serve their own churches. At times, they venture out to hold a revival meeting to pick up some extra cash, and give their "free offers" to get some decisions for Christ from the world. They are, according to their own definition, being "evangelical." They have exactly fifty-two Sundays and fifty-two Wednesday nights, and a couple of weeks thrown in for "revivals." A Hyper-calvinist in Delaware, and another in North Carolina also have fifty-two Sundays, fifty-two Saturdays, and both of their congregations expect them to preach away to destitute churches and requested appointments three-fourths of the time; traveling from Delaware to Texas; or North Carolina to Texas, or Canada, or anywhere gospel meetings are "wont to be had." The pastors in Pennsylvania, and Podunk, consider the Hyper-calvinists unevangelical, notwithstanding they travel further, and spend more time preaching the gospel to "regions beyond," than do themselves! So why do they called them "unevangelical?" Simply put, they are ignorant

of Hyper-calvinists and prejudiced against them. They know the Hyper-calvinists are preaching to call out the redeemed elect to a knowledge of their salvation by Jesus Christ; while their own "mission" is to "win the world to Christ." One is called to serve God and His people; the other has volunteered to serve the world. A more likely reason may be the pastors know they are the ones that have departed the faith once delivered to the saints, and if "Calvinistic," have found themselves trapped by that carnal system. In this case, they envy the Hyper-calvinists' freedom in Christ Jesus. If, on the other hand they are Pelagians, they resent them for believing in the sovereignty of God; which doctrine they hate. Whatever their reason, they find comfort in building a strawman called "Hyper-calvinism," and then attempting to discredit it.

If Hyper-calvinists are so anti-evangelical (in the New Testament manner), why do they still exist after two thousand years? Why are they the largest group preaching the five cardinal principles of grace, called "Calvinism"? They must still be doing something right! At least they are more successful in holding to the faith of God's elect than the dry doctrinal Neo-calvinists ministers. They and their churches come and go; revive in one place, and as soon as the minister leaves, drop back into freewillism from whence they sprang. Yet, the Hyper-calvinist churches remain on the doctrinal foundation of the Particular Baptists, and preach the same gospel that can be read in books, circular letters, and magazines two hundred to three hundred years ago! So, in spite of the animosity Neo-calvinists and Pelagian freewillers have towards them, they are far more stable in doctrine and New Testament practice than the so-called "evangelicals."

Hyper-calvinists' churches grow very slowly, if at all; for both ministers and members are content to "wait on the Lord," to "*add to the church daily such as should be saved*" experimentally. Neo-calvinists' churches grow a little faster,

because they are content with a net full of both good and bad fish. Some bad fish may help out financially, and the numbers posted on the board beside the pulpit looks better. Pelagian freewill churches grow as rag weeds. There is absolutely nothing in them on a sound Biblical foundation, and this is exactly as the world would have it to be. To them, "the more, the better!" Since both Neo-calvinists and Pelagians are "free offer" men, and both are trying to save souls Christ has not already saved, the Neo-calvinists would do well to take lessons from them. They have refined fatuity to a fine art!

There are but two "gospel" recorded in the New Testament. One is truly "glad tidings" to sensible sinners; and the other is a "perverted gospel which is not the gospel," according to Paul. (Gal. 1:7). The former is the "glad tidings of salvation," a message of what Christ has accomplished by His active and passive obedience for elect sinners. There are but two systems of religion: "Freewill" and "Free Grace." There are only two types of sacrifices: a "sacrifice to God," and a "sacrifice to devils." There are two kingdoms in this world: the "kingdom of light," and the "kingdom of darkness." The kingdom of God is a kingdom of light and revelation, publishing the gospel of free and sovereign grace through the merits and "sacrifice of Jesus Christ." The kingdom of darkness is that of natural freewillism, for its subjects "love darkness rather than light, neither will they come to the light, lest their deeds be reprov'd." God's kingdom is made up of such that have been called in vital union in Christ from eternity, born directly of God, called out, and translated, from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of light. Hence, those that are called out of freewillism into free grace, have quite an understanding of the kingdom from whence they came; but the children of the kingdom of darkness cannot "*discern the things of the children of God,*" nor of that kingdom. Everything about free grace is a mystery to them. It is incomprehensible to them, for they lack the experience necessary to understand the spiritual things of God.

That separating call "*Come out from among them, and be ye separate saith the Lord,*" is that His people should "*not be partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.*" (Revelation 18:4) Tell me, dear reader, Can this, too, be an aspect of true New Testament preaching of the Word? Could it not be also right to call Neo-calvinists and Pelagians out of Mystery Babylon? Is it not according to gospel order to, in so far as one is able, to turn a Freewiller away from his abominable self-will worship to the gospel of redeeming grace? Hyper-calvinists are heralds of the gospel, where ever God "*opens a door of utterance,*" and they are truly God's free men.

If one were to visit a Hyper-calvinist Church in America, and met a Pelagian freewiller there, that person would also be a visitor! For unless divine life is stirring in that poor soul, there is **absolutely nothing** in a Hyper-calvinist church to entertain his flesh! If he is born of God, among Baptists-at least, there is nowhere else to go. He will either be converted or he will leave! But for some strange reason, one can visit a Neo-calvinist church and find a goodly mixture of free grace and free will believers, with the free grace believers in the minority. To whom, then, is the gospel to be preached? According to Hyper-calvinists, **the gospel is to be preached to ALL to whom God in His providence and grace directs it!** It is to be proclaimed indiscriminately to all present. It is not one message for the elect, and another message for the reprobates. It is not one on "godly living" on Sunday morning, and a "five pointer" on Sunday night when only a few hard-core members are present. It is to be preached equally to all alike as if they were all God's elect. It is not designed to assure the wicked who know not God, and care less, that God loves them and that Christ died for them ... for such is not true. It- the gospel, is to be preached, rather than all that sociology, psychology, emotional counseling, parenting, politics, duty, duty, and more duty. It is to be preached in obedience to an internal divine call, and the one thus called has a dispensation of this gospel (not other

things) committed to him. He is to preach in such a way as to give all the glory to God and none to man. He is to "edify the saints," and build them up in the most holy faith; rather than pander to the ungodly. He is to preach to call out a "*people prepare of the Lord,*" and to call His people out of every false religion; every unscriptural practice; and every evil way. He is to build up the church in the unity of the faith, in the bonds of peace; to comfort experimentally poor and redeemed people; and to encourage internal discipline in those called to salvation to the rule of the gospel. It is not his task to make sheep out of goats; believers out of unregenerate natural religionists; build up a reputation as a great decider-maker; or introduce anything for divine worship not found in the Word of God. In short, his commission is not to build up Mystery Babylon in the guise of "Calvinism." And finally, it is not to find a way to vindicate God by attempting to give "an honest invitation" to reprobates to make God look good, kind, gentle, effeminate, and soft- a wimp! He is to be exalted on High, as the great and sovereign God of the whole earth. He needs no vindication! HE IS!

*"Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God.  
For our gospel came not unto you in word only,  
but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and  
in much assurance; as ye know what manner  
of men we were among you for your sake."*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **CHAPTER TEN**

### **THE DOCTRINAL "DOWNGRADE" PERIOD:**

### **THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD AND HUMAN**

## ACCOUNTABILITY

Another topic this writer was requested to address was the charge that Hyper-Calvinists do not believe in the responsibility of man. In order to adequately reply to this charge, we must first point out that “responsibility” and “accountability” are not synonyms. Hyper-Calvinists certainly, of all religions, believe in the *accountability of all mankind to their Maker-God*. Otherwise there would be no foundation for the judgments of God against sinners! The problem with this topic is that Neo-Calvinists attempt to harmonize God’s absolute Sovereignty over all things with their theory of freewillism. Truly such is an obvious contradiction! So we will attempt in this chapter to present the views of Hyper-Calvinists on this issue.

While the writer was mid-way in writing chapter nine of this book, he received a book-list from a dealer in Calvinistic materials. Glancing through it, he was surprised at a title, Spurgeonism vs. Hyper-calvinism. He immediately ordered it. Before it arrived, another book dealer sent a booklist, and it offered a title, Calvinism vs. Hyper-Spurgeonism. He immediately ordered it too. These two books, and Spurgeon's small booklet The Down-grade are highly recommended to anyone interested in this controversy and the various issues involved. In the Appendices, we give addresses and Websites from which one may obtain this information.

Ian Murray's Spurgeon vs. Hypercalvinism arrived first, and this writer found it an interesting, well-written Fullerite assault on the truth of free and sovereign grace. Mr. Murray seemed ready to sit at the foot-stool under the great Lord Charles H. Spurgeon's gilded throne, and his fawning adoration of this famous nineteenth century Master is glorious! Mr. Murray is a far better writer than this writer. However, Mr. Murray portrayed Mr. Spurgeon as a man who did not like *controversy*, and yet

reports that he frequently spoke against "Hyper-calvinism"! What did Spurgeon and Mr. Murray expect? Did they expect the Hyper-calvinists to just roll over and play dead! And why would Mr. Spurgeon, as well as Mr. Murray, spend time and effort attacking "Hyper-calvinism" rather than "Arminianism"? Both claimed to be "*Calvinists!*" Mr. Spurgeon could not very well make a good assault against Pelagianism, since it has developed among Evangelicals since his departure. But Mr. Murray could have made an excellent attack against this modern antichristian system and better served the cause of God and truth! Towards the end of his assault, he admits that Hyper-calvinism still exist today, and adds that a "renewed controversy on the subject" was not what was needed. What, in the name of common sense, does he expect? He attacks the very foundation of the historical Christian faith and does not want a *renewed controversy*! He is really begging those he attacks not to counter-attack, and if they do, they are the "*troublers in Israel*"! He is sweet, kind, and gentle - a "wise and prudent man." The Hyper-calvinists are the mean, cruel, heartless, and quarrelsome band! Nevertheless, his un-called for attack on William Huntington, Tobias Crisp, the Romaine brothers, John Gill and other great and sound writers **was surely meant to raise controversy**. He admits that Hyper-calvinism is not dead, so he must have known that someone among them would rise up to defend the cause of *sovereign grace*. He may not wish that there be any controversy while he assaults the Truth, but it is evident that better men than he will arise to defend the honor of God's Word!

Mr. Murray found able opponents immediately! With the sword of truth unsheathed, Mr. George Ella has answered him roundly in a most thorough analysis of Andrew Fuller's doctrines, titled: *LAW AND GOSPEL: THEOLOGY of ANDREW FULLER*, (GO Publications - See address of GO in Appendix, page 506.) Again, in his masterful biography on JOHN GILL, Mr.



Ella defends him from Murray's attacks, and again in another title: JAMES HERVEY: PREACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS, he is at his best! Mr. Ella has a keen understanding of the issues involved in the rise of Fuller's Neo-calvinism, and enhanced by his excellent research skills he has proven himself a capable defender of both the historical and doctrinal position of the so-called "Hyper-calvinists" of England. Mr. Ella is not a Strict Baptist, and therefore cannot be charged with denominational bias when defending the truth of free grace as held closely by the Gospel Standard in England and Old School Baptists of America. We highly recommend his works. In time, His works will be "Classics" among Calvinists. Another able defender quickly responded to Mr. Murray's attack also against the truth. Mr. A.G. Randalls (199 Seafeld Rd., Bournemouth BH6 SLL England) has published a series of booklets in defense of William Huntington (The "Coalheaver") and "shaves" Mr. Murray and the magazine he established as "*The Banner of Truth.*" (Sadly, it is not that anymore, if it ever was.) Others with him, as "Friends of William Huntington" are now publishing books and articles of Mr. Huntington and also of other Strict Gospel Standard Baptist churches of that Period.

Mr. Murray quotes a Fullerite who says that whenever there is a revival of Calvinism, the Hyper-calvinists rise up to oppose it. In reality, the exact opposite is the case. When John Gill's works were republished, Mr. Murray rose up to attack Mr. Gill! Now, Tobias Crisp's works are reprinted. You guessed it! Mr. Murray, a Neo-calvinist, went on the attack! Mr. Murray has too much to say and too little to do with Mr. Crisp! The works of William Huntington are republished. There in the forefront of the opposition is Mr. Murray! Satan is diligent in attacking any position that is God-honoring, and we fear Mr. Murray is his "free moral agent"!

The truth of why these Neo-calvinists attack the so-called

Hyper-calvinists rather than the Pelagians is obvious: A child of God regenerated among the Pelagians must answer the call: "*come out of her, O My people.*" Understandably, they bring some freewill baggage with them for awhile, usually the paradoxical view of human "responsibility" (rather than human accountability). With those Fullerite principles still intact, they can, for a time, find a "rest area" among the Neo-calvinists. Eventually, as they grow in grace and knowledge of the truth, the husk of Fullerism becomes of little nourishment to their famished souls, and they go where they can be fed. There they will quickly be branded "Hyper-calvinists," "Hardshells," "Mossybacks," and "Anti-s" *etc.* The Neo-calvinists will not attack Pelagians, because this is **where they proselytized to get their own followers!** They know they cannot get proselytes from Hyper-calvinists, because most often the Hyper-calvinist was once starving under the Neo-calvinists' ministry!

According to Mr. Murray, rather than controversy, he thought what was needed was "evidences that the doctrines of grace are **harmonious with true evangelistic** (sic) preaching." We must assume by his glowing report on Spurgeon, that Spurgeon's type of proselytizing is what Mr. Murray means by true evangelism. If so, how much evidence do the so-called "Evangelicals" need? Spurgeon died over a hundred years ago. But **where are the Calvinistic fruit of his labors?** *In the Pelagians' camp*, no less! They have all gone freewill in the United States! But Mr. Murray did not put much emphasis on Mr. Spurgeon's final grasp of his own type of proselytizing. One should read Spurgeon's "Down-Grade". We assume Mr. Murray had read it. Surely he knew that out of approximately six thousand delegates to the Baptists Union - many whom Spurgeon had persuaded to "close with Christ," only seven men [you read that right: seven!] stood with him for the restoration of Calvinism in the Baptists Union! While Spurgeon was busy proselytizing, the Freewillers stole, like termites, the whole

foundation from under his own feet. He was too busy warning people of the "extremes" of Socinianism on the one hand and Hyper-calvinism on the other! In the meantime, Arminians flooded the churches without his notice.

Mr. Spurgeon eventually came to see where the humanistic sensitivities were leading the "*wise and prudent*" ministers among the Baptist Union in the 1880's: straight into Socinianism. But who were the "Socinians"? They were those who denied the divinity of Christ, and believed all mankind would be ultimately saved! By Spurgeon's time, many of the General Baptists (Freewill in the U.S.) had become Socinian Universalists. Now, Spurgeon held to the divinity of the Son of God, but he also taught that Christ's death was **for all mankind**. In other words, he was **half-Socinian himself**! Those Baptists he opposed in the Down-Grade articles were being consistent with the most fundamental principles of Fuller/Spurgeonism. These principles led them into Universalism. We would note here, that the same *Down-Grade* or ecumenical progressivism in the United States was hard at work among Calvinistic groups here, including both Old School and Primitive, or Means Baptists. Their "Contest" was between 1886 and thereafter. [1886 to 1922 is a note-worthy period in the history of religion in the United States. The Down-Grade Contest among the Means and Predestinarian groups of Baptists led to a division and apostasy; the Reform Churches divided over the "*common grace*" heresy; and the Southern Baptists' Down-Grade took place upon the death of their first President, whose last sermon was on Eternal Election and Predestination. The year: **1886**. **1886** also found the Particulat Baptists of Kentucky dividing, and **1888** the Old School Baptists of Gilbert Beebe's affiliation also down-graded, with the rise of the ecumenical movement among them, and the consequent delution of the Old School doctrine. This division saw the rise of universalism and Arminian conditionalism coming to theforefront among them.]

Spurgeon fought the two suspected enemies of his so-

called "evangelism" ardently. Universalism certainly would destroy proselytizing, for it held that no one would be lost and go to hell. Without this fear of hell, it would be difficult to get decisions for Christ from natural religionists: decisional regeneration would totally fail! On the other hand, he fought Hyper-calvinism, too. If one believed that Christ **had already actually saved His people** from their sins, then there was no motivation for "decisionism." Mr. Spurgeon surely saw these opposite positions **a threat** to his type of ministry. He could never trust salvation in the hands of God, who adds *"to the church daily such as should be saved."* Since he did not believe God could, or would, do this, he felt that "Evangelicals" had to do it. He had nothing but praise for these "evangelicals" whether Calvinists or Arminians and the latter were the greater in number and multiplying as roaches!

By begging, dragging, and rational arguments, these Neo-calvinists made "Christian converts," filling the religious societies with lifeless professors. The answer to Mr. Murray's question, then, is this: **"No! Spurgeon-type proselytizing and true Calvinism cannot co-exist!"** The doctrine of grace is not harmonious or consistent with natural religion! It is as diametrically opposed to true Calvinism as the doctrine of the "responsibility of man" is with the "sovereignty of God." One or the other may be right, **but both cannot be true!**

With Thomas Aquinas, the Catholic theologian, Andrew Fuller, Charles H. Spurgeon, I.J. Packer, and Ian Murray all insist that one must believe in the contradictory theory of the *"Sovereignty of God and the Responsibility of man."* Just reading that should alert one that something is wrong here! Either God has freewill, or man has a freewill. Whichever has freewill is God! The other is not free! Can you imagine one God giving seven billion people a "freedom of will"? Mercy! That does not appear to be wise, let alone Infinite Wisdom!

It is needful, in discussing the issues between the so-called "Hyper-calvinism" and "Neo-calvinism," to cover this subject thoroughly. We will dogmatically assert that there can be no such thing as **God being Sovereign and His creatures having freedom of will**; or being "*free moral agents*." Mr. Fuller was good at inventing words and terms and redefining them at will. To create a fertile field in which to promote his new theory, he had to destroy the belief in the Sovereignty of God while pretending to believe in it. And this is a stroke of genius! They are, he claimed, an "antinomy." Notice how close that word comes to the word "antinomian:" which all the above men charge against Hyper-calvinists. (See Appendix A, "Antinomianism") What is the meaning of this word "Antinomy"? It is "An apparent contradiction between valid principles or conclusions that seem equally necessary and reasonable." (The American Heritage Dictionary, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1976.) Is then the above an "Antinomy"? The belief in the Sovereignty of God is a "valid principle" and is both "necessary and reasonable." But is the belief in the "responsibility of man" a "valid principle"? Not if the Sovereignty of God is! Is it "necessary"? It must not be, for thousands have not believed in it to any dire dysfunctional consequences. Is it "reasonable"? Quite the contrary! Why should one believe that a Sovereign God would so free a creature that it would be without any restraints and answerable to no higher authority than its own will? No, it is not reasonable! Therefore, it is not an "antinomy" by definition. The Hyper-calvinists in the United States can see no reason why they should accept both legs of this contradiction. They have existed from colonial times without believing it, and have continued relatively sane for the past two-hundred years. In fact, a Hyper-calvinist marvels at what kind of mentality it takes to accept both! They suspect that one *claiming* to do so does not really believe in the **Sovereignty of God at all**, but cannot find logic sufficient to deny it. As it is written: "*We will not have this Man to reign over us!*" (Luke

19:14.) Rather, for this Man to reign over His subjects, they must be "*accountable*" to Him, and walk in obedience to His Gospel commandments. (Notice, we said "*accountable*;" not "*responsible*!")

Neo-calvinists will accuse the writer of merely playing with words in our discussion here; but words are necessary to accurately communicate. The so-called "evangelical Calvinists" use the word "responsibility" in a position the Hyper-calvinists use the word "accountability." These are not synonymous words. "Responsibility is the ability to act without **guidance or superior authority**; being the source or cause of something; capable of making moral or rational decisions on one's own" (*Ibid.*) and therefore answerable to no one for his own behavior. By this definition man is not "*responsible*." "Accountability" means: "to **hold answerable**; to reckon, to give an account to a superior." Man is "accountable." But keep in mind that we are not merely replacing definitions here. Which does the Scripture teach? That man is "accountable," or that "man is responsible," *i.e.*, "to act without guidance, or superior authority"?

So the conclusion is rather shocking for a Calvinist coming out of Pelagianism with their baggage of freewill concepts to read THAT "MAN IS NOT A RESPONSIBLE CREATURE! NOR CAN HE EVER BE! He has Someone superior to himself to whom he must, and will, "give an account! He is not a free moral agent. Out of sixty-six Books in the Holy Bible, with over forty writers over a span of four thousand years, why would not such an important issue as "man's responsibility" have been, at least, mentioned? Maybe once? **It is not addressed in the holy volume at all!** Nor should it be surprising that it isn't. One would really find a contradiction in the Bible if it were anywhere between its covers. *Man has accountability; but he cannot be responsible!* But

even accountability **is not given any priority** in the Bible either! Look in your concordance and see what all you can find about the two words! You'll be utterly surprised at the deafening silence!

A servant, or an employee, is accountable to his master, or employer, in any assigned task agreeable to the laws, policies, or procedures which legally prevail. The master, or employer, is responsible for the accomplishment of his purpose. In natural things, an owner of a business may delegate "responsibility", but in the U.S., he will usually pay a higher salary, or other benefits, for that "*responsibility factor*." Nevertheless, it is only a *delegated responsibility* and can be revoked at the will of the owner. But, according to law, the owner is always responsible. That principle is behind the phrase: "The buck stops here!" (As President Truman once said.)

The closest thing to this subject found in the Bible is in Acts 19:40, when the town clerk of Ephesus said: "*For we are in danger to be called in question for this day's uproar, there being no cause whereby we may **give account** of this concourse.*" But that isn't very much, is it? Again, Paul said: "*So then every one of us shall **give account** for himself to God.*" (Rom. 14:12.) Again, ministers are to **give account**, as it is written: "*Obey them that have the rule over you~ and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls~ as they that must **give account** that they may do it with joy and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.*" (Hebrews 13:17.) Peter concludes this subject saying:

"Who shall **give account** to Him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead" (I Peter 4:5.) Now, these four texts exhaust the Scripture on this subject of "giving account." But not one single word in the Old or New Testament is found about "responsibility." For those believers whose faith is bound by the Scriptural revelation, this omission is important. It delineates

the Truth of man's relationship with God from the error of man's rebellion and usurpation of authority from God (we speak as a man). Man wants to be the **Sovereign** and make God accountable. That has ever been the nature of Adam's corrupt offspring.

In light of this omission, the only definition of "responsibility of man" seems to be: "It is man's response to God's ability." For Calvinists, it should be evident according to their own doctrine that man is totally depraved and has *no spiritual ability* within himself. Certainly he is not independent without a superior guidance or authority. So the above definition is as close as we can come to the **reality** of man's condition and his relationship to the Sovereign God. In each of the texts we cited above, the Greek word for "account" is "logos." Are you surprised? That is the same word used for Christ as the "Word"; it is the same used for "report", or to "tell," or to "speak", *etc.* This, then, does not nearly approximate "responsibility"! For fallen man to be "responsible," he must be a free, independent, simple being. And this he is **not!** He cannot independently breathe, speak, or even think! So that leaves the subject as it should be: consistent with *God's SOVEREIGNTY!* It is consistent, because the sovereign Creator remains sovereign, and all of His creatures are fully accountable to Him. They will all, without exception, give an account for every idle word they speak, and if such a small thing, then all greater things as well. Hyper-calvinists have always been the most strict, in their walk and conversation, for the Spirit has taught them that they are "accountable" unto God.

J. Packer, (who is reported now to favor the union between Roman Catholics and Evangelicals because, he thinks, they both agree on justification), wrote a small booklet titled: *Evangelism And The Sovereignty Of God*, in the which the first



sentence reads: "Always and everywhere the servants of Christ are under **orders to evangelize**, and I hope that what I shall say now will act as an incentive to this task." He cited no Scripture for this "order to evangelize" to such a broad extent; nor could he. But this is the focus of modern proselytizing. Fuller, Spurgeon, Sunday, Moody, Murray, Spurgeon, Graham, Robertson, *etc.*, push this "always and everywhere," whomever these "servants of God" are, have orders from someone to do it. There is surely a sense in which every regenerate child of God is a servant of God, but nowhere are all God's people "**ordered to evangelize**." The doctrine that all of God's people are prophets is first found in the 16th chapter of Numbers. Korah reared up a rebellion against Moses, saying: *"Ye take too much upon you; seeing all the congregation are, holy, EVERY ONE OF THEM, and the Lord is among them: wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?"* The result of this doctrine for Korah and his evangelists was: *"And the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up; and their houses; and all the men that appertained unto Korah; and their goods. They, and all that appertained to them; went down alive into the pit and the earth closed upon them: and **they perished** from among the congregation"* (verse 32,33.) The apostle Jude referred to this as *"the gainsaying of Core."* (verse, 11.) In the affairs of the ministration of God's service, *"No man taketh this honor unto himself; but he that is called of God. .."* and God does not call women to preach the gospel (I Timothy 2:11,12). Nor does He call children to preach the gospel. (I Timothy 3:6.) And, the greater part of the male adults are never called, qualified, and commissioned to preach the gospel. The view we present is not a novelty in Christianity: **there never was such a condition** where the servants of Christ "always and everywhere" were preaching the gospel of Christ! When Paul *"assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit **suffered them not**."* (Acts 16:7.) He was directed into Macedonia! Men that are called of God do not go *"everywhere."* They go wherever God in His sovereign

Providence cast their lot. They have no further accountability than to preach as they are directed of God. Furthermore, they are accountable to preach the Gospel [not humanism or decisionism] wherever God directs them, and "*Woe is me if I preach not the gospel of God*"! Invariably, as one studies the early history of the Church in the Acts of the Apostles, it was most usually persecution that instrumentally drove them abroad, where they went "*preaching the Word*." Traveling merchants, and itinerate ministers covered Europe long before 1792. In all the Book of Acts, there is no mention of any current methods: mission societies, evangelistic committees, members telling their ministers where they can, or cannot, go; to whom they are to preach, or not to preach; or what they are to preach. In other words, God's ministers **are HIS!** And they are answerable in all the above matters **only to HIM.** The contrary is the route by which the Antichristian Body had her origin: - men directing supposed ministers of God! Let it be clearly stressed, that so-called "Hyper-calvinists" in this country have nothing harsh to say against any God-called ministers going to "*regions beyond*" preaching the full gospel of Christ without human direction or control. Nor do they oppose anyone financially supporting them as the churches did Paul and others in the Book of Acts. It is something else altogether they oppose: the development of the antichristian system, which in time, is to draw the Evangelicals into the folds of Rome. It is by Biblical methods sound Gospel churches were planted in the Philippines, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. Not by organized institutions designed to "win the world that perishes" to the church.

But all this proselytizing is a mute issue if all they have to proselytize with is **deistic freewillism and human responsibility.** There is no gospel in that! It is only an anthropocentric religion. It is not "Calvinism," nor is it "Christianity." What is most often palmed off as "the Gospel," is heresy and antichristian. Only a precious little that is preached

by "Evangelicals" today comes close to being the gospel of Christ. And any Calvinist ought to know this is true. It is indisputable to one who understands "the **Gospel**"!

In a book such as this, the main objections to what is written herein will come from Neo-calvinists, in spite of the fact that the so-called "Hypers" are preaching what is called, theologically, "Calvinism." But hardly a word is spoken against the millions of Arminian and Pelagian Freewill books that disgrace the book stores all over the world. One could wonder why such is so? An interesting thought, isn't it?

\*\*\*\*\*

WHICH APPEARS THE MOST CONSISTENT: GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY AND HUMAN "RESPONSIBILITY", OR GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY AND HUMAN "ACCOUNTABILITY"? WHICH OF THE TWO REQUIRES THAT MAN BE A "FREE" "MORAL" "AGENT"? WHICH OF THE TWO REALLY RECOGNIZES THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD, AND THE TOTAL DEPRAVITY OF MAN WITH HIS ACCOUNTABILITY TO GOD?

## CHAPTER ELEVEN:

### SOME UNIQUE DOCTRINES OF HYPER-CALVINISTS

The following topics are not of necessity identified uniquely with "*Hyper-calvinists*," nor do all Hyper-calvinists hold to these following views. If one refers to "Predestinarian Old School Baptist" (POSB) there are three major identifying views very uniquely held to by these people. Few, other than some in England, held to these particular three doctrines: **(1)** The eternal living union of all the elect with and in Christ in seedsubstance - with stress on the ***eternal*** pre-existence of that eternal life undeveloped in Christ before the world began. This view stresses the *Eternality* of eternal election; **(2)** the origin, spiritual birth, and development of these elect in their

ordained time and place, as their eternal life is **added** to their Adamic, natural, or earthen vessel, or tabernacle, when they are quickened into life. In this new birth experience, the man born again is not changed biologically, physiologically, or into spirit. In other words, he is not “born all over again,” and **changed** from flesh to spirit. He is still a natural man. Rather, the eternal life preserved in Christ Jesus for him is **added** to him in the new birth, making him a dual person. His original nature is born of the **corruptible** seed of Adam and remains so until death; his new birth is of the **incorruptible** seed of Christ, the “*word of God that liveth and abideth forever.*” This doctrine is sometimes referred to as “the two man doctrine of the new birth.” We will expand on that subject below; **(3)** the absoluteness of predestination over all things without exception, to bring into existence these elect in their ordained time and boundaries, totally spiritual, and BEGOTTEN **IN** the “*vessel of mercy afore prepared unto glory,*” or the “*earthen vessel*” - We first present a summary article embracing eternal vital union and the two man doctrine of the new birth, which necessitates the absoluteness of predestination in order to save these redeemed elect in the resurrection of the last day.

### **1). Eternal Vital Union and (2) the New Birth Experience**

Christian writers throughout the ages have made reference to the doctrine of “Eternal Election and Predestination.” In general, they have emphasized divine election and predestination primarily because these points are most often contested by nominal “Christians.” In these articles, however, we are placing emphasis

upon the **eternality** of that eternal unconditional election.

Others before us have discovered a "principle of first mentioning" in the Bible. To wit, wherever a subject is *first* broached by the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures, the way it is introduced is often applicable in other places where the same is used. So it is with reference to a theme introduced in the first chapter of Genesis. More than any other principle emphasized therein, the notation that all species were created "*after its own **kind**,*" and have "**seed** within itself" is outstanding (Genesis 1: 11, 21, 24, 25, 29). The same is true of man, who was made in the likeness and image of God, and was, as Paul taught, a "**figure** of Him that was to come" (Romans 5: 14.) Not only so, then, is the modern theory of the evolution of the species proved heretical, but the relation of the first creature to all its offspring is faithfully demonstrated to be absolutely true of the record God has revealed in Genesis one. There never were any "missing links" between species and kinds; nor have believers ever supposed that there were. It is very noteworthy that consistent to this principle are the following revelations. *First*, God reveals the "**generations of Adam**," (plural- Genesis 5: 1), and the "**generation of Jesus Christ**," (singular- Matthew 1: 1). *Second*, the Holy Scriptures reveal both a "*first Adam*," (1 Corinthians 15:45,) and a second or "*last Adam*," (1 Corinthians 15:45). It is written that the first man Adam was "*made a living soul*," while the last Adam was "*made a quickening spirit*" (1 Corinthians 15:45). The first man "*is of the earth, earthy*:" the "*second man is Lord from heaven*." (1 Corinthians 15:47). We would alert the reader to the fact that as

the first man Adam was made of the earth, the record is given that *"As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy,"* that is, of **like kind** with their father Adam, and as he, has his seed of reproduction within himself. (1 Corinthians 15: 48). And of special note, such as are of the last Adam, who is Lord from heaven (Christ), *"such are they also that are heavenly."* (1 Corinthians 15:48). *Third*, the revelation includes a *"natural man,"* born of the first Adam (1 Corinthians 15:44,) and a full discussion of him is found throughout the Sacred text; and a *"spiritual man,"* born of God, (1 Corinthians 15: 44) whose characteristics are also fully presented in the holy pages. The inspired record speaks plainly of one that is born of the first Adam as being *"born of the flesh,"* (John 3: 6), and of those born of the Spirit of God, it is recorded that *"that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."* (John 3:6). So we see the first principle being maintained even in one's spiritual birth: *i.e.,* reproduced in **"like kind,** from a seed within Himself" (speaking of Christ.) *Fourth*, We read of the natural man, his body and all of its component parts and passions, referred to as *"our outward man,"* and we read together with that phrase, of an *"inward man,"* *"but though our **outward man** perish, yet the **inward man** is renewed day by day."* (II Corinthians 4: 16). In fact, the apostle clearly contrast these two men by saying, *"That ye put **off** the former conversation the **old man,** which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be **renewed** in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the **new man,** which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."* (Ephesians 4:22-24). Again, as "like begets like kind," hence the flesh can only produce flesh; and the spirit can only produce spirit; the animal

can only produce another animal of the *same kind*; and a plant of its *own kind*. This totally destroys Charles Darwin's fatal theory, and a Christian should expect it to overthrow atheism. But we are not discussing that false and non-scientific theory. Our subject is much more sublime.

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

It is the **life** that is in the **seed** that produces an offspring to perpetuate the specie. As surely as this is so of man in nature, so it must be of the spiritual seed that produces the children of God. A corrupt seed must produce a corrupt offspring; and an incorrupt seed must produce of like kind: an incorrupt offspring. And so we read of God's children, "*Being born again, not of **corruptible** seed,*" of which we certainly are in our first birth from the first man, Adam; "*but of **incorruptible** by the Word of God that liveth and abideth for ever.*" (1 Peter 1:23). We do not expect any to deny that whomever begat us into this world can only have been our father. If our father begat us by the implantation of his corrupt seed from Adam, then we surely must be "his children," and also corrupt by birth. Will any dispute this conclusion? Then we insist that the same is true of the *incorruptible seed* as well. For any of us to be children of God, we imperatively must be "**begotten of God.**" This truth leaves out the Arminian theory of "gospel regeneration," "decisional regeneration, or of "preacher made Christians." We have repeatedly pointed out that experimental salvation is **a birth**; not a decision! John clearly taught: "*Whosoever is **born of God** doth **not commit sin**; for His Seed remaineth in him: and he **cannot** sin because he is born of God.*" (I John 3:9). And "*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ **is born of God**: and every one that loveth Him that begat loveth him also that is begotten **of Him***" (I John 5: 1.) The implanted seed must be **alive** in order to produce an offspring. When God fashioned man, He then "*breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul.*" Ever afterwards, man has transmitted that same natural life from one generation to the next,



wave after wave down to this present day. So too, the incorruptible seed is also a living seed, and conveys *eternal* Life to all God's offspring. "*And this is the record, that God hath given to us **eternal life**, and **this life is in** the Son.*" (I John 5: 11). Notice where the actual life is found: Therefore the apostle can justly claim, as he did, "*He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son, hath not life.*" (I John 5: 12). In the fleshly birth the **living** sperm must impregnate a **living ovary**, or the attempted procreation will fail. [Note: Life does NOT begin at conception! Life began at Creation!]

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

again," does not mean "being born all over again." It simply means the man must experience a second birth, and this second birth is altogether different from his natural birth. His natural birth **put him into the human family** with all its cursed woes! And, he will ever be in that family, unchanged, biologically and physiologically the very same until the last heart-beat of that Adamic frame. But the second birth, produced by the "***incorruptible seed, the word of God that liveth and abideth forever,***" gave that natural man **eternal life**, and that life is in God's Eternal Son, and that experience puts **him into God's family**. That family - every member of it - is counted for a generation (singular), and is the completed body and bride of Christ of whom Christ is the Head and Husband, and they are "*members in particular*" set in that body in their rightful and ordained place.

If it is claimed, as it has been by some, that such a view as this means that God has not done anything for the body, we reply, "Are you completely unskilled in the Word! Every sin committed was done in the body! Every pain and groan of the suffering Savior was done because of the sins done *in the body*! The whole scheme of salvation is to deliver those children of God who reside in the corrupt natural and earthy bodies of Adam's race." In fact, our Lord, seeing that His children are partakers of this flesh and blood, "*He likewise partook of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them,*" (Hebrews 2: 14) - His children, His offspring, His seed, His generation, from that corrupt family, and translate them from that kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear

Son.

Dear reader, the entire church and family of God were chosen ***in*** Christ **before** the foundation of the world. (Ephesians 1: 1-6) The life they must have to reside in His glorious presence was *"hid in Christ in God"* (Colossians 3: 3,) in seed substance, waiting until the time of their procreation or development, first into the family of man, and then in His spiritual family by the second birth. All of the sufferings of Christ, and all His obedience was for His children's fleshly tabernacle, in the putting away of the results of their sinful fall in Adam and consequent works of wickedness in that evil family. In that gracious work, He put away sin, and its natural penalty, and only because they made up His bride, did He have relationship to them to legally incur their debt, and pay the full obligation of the transgressed law for each of them. We see this emphasized in Jude 1, "*. . . to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called.*" Again, "*Lord, Thou hast been **our dwelling place** in **all generations**. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.*" (Psalm 90: 1,2). They were all chosen ***in Him***, ***preserved in Him***, and had their dwelling place ***in seed substance in Him***, and so intimate was this relationship, that the Psalmists could say, "*In all **their** affliction **He** was afflicted, and the angel of His presence saved them: in His love and in His pity He redeemed them; because He **bare** [Hebrew "natal"] them, and carried them all the days of old.*" (Isaiah 63:9). And yet again, David speaking in personification of Christ, (David's son, or "Son of

David") says, "*My substance was not hid from Thee,*" ("preserved in Christ Jesus") "*when I was made in secret,*" ("before the world began"), "*and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth*" (in Adam's earthy corrupted frame). "*Thine eyes did see My substance, yet being unperfect;*" (before actual development) "*and in Thy book all My members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them. How precious also are Thy thoughts unto Me, O God! How great is the sum of them!*" (Psalm 139: 15-17).

It too, is assumed by some that those who believe there are two separate and distinct men in this tabernacle of flesh, that they see no need for a bodily resurrection of the dead. [This has been referred to as a "hollow man doctrine"]. However, the record is too clear to deny, that the man of the earth, earthy, the sinner man, is the **object of redemption**, and also the **object** of divine **adoption**. The spiritual man, who is born of incorruptible seed, cannot sin, and hence needs no adoption or redemption! It is the fleshly man, consisting of body, soul and spirit, the sinner, who must be adopted and redeemed. The Bride will be whole and complete in the day of her wedding. She will possess her real identity, and be herself, and not another, or a bodiless phantom - a puff of vapor. What she has waited in hope for will sweetly be her bliss in ages untold.

The Church in the aggregate is the Bride of Christ. While here below, she is waiting for the Bridegroom and must keep herself chaste. Church discipline helps, fellowship with one another strengthens the ties of matrimony, and finding one's

place and work within the visible church helps to develop and maintain that heavenly and spiritual bond. It is needful for every member and believer to assemble together to worship God and to encourage one another in the most holy faith. When our Little Zion meets, it is all of our privilege to take such a rare opportunity, and make the most we can out of it. We can hunt, fish, work, play, watch ball games, or whatever else Adam's offspring find more entertaining just about any time we please; but the appetite of the spiritual family of the last Adam is in the spiritual realm, and here it should not be neglected, and if so, it is to our own disadvantage.

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

*"Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the scepter of Thy kingdom is a right scepter. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows. All Thy garments smell of myrrh, and aloes, and cassia, out of the ivory palaces, whereby they have made Thee glad. The King's daughters were among Thy honorable*

*women: upon Thy right hand did stand the Queen in gold of Ophir. . . so shall the King greatly desire thy beauty: for He is thy Lord; and worship thou Him"* (Psalm 45:6-11). The text shows that the beauty of the Bride is seen in her purity, honor, and position at His right hand; as well as her devotion to Him as she worships her Beloved. Her being positioned at His right hand gives her preeminence over all others of His creation. His scepter - a figure of His **sovereignty** is ever near her, and she is enabled in that near position to forever bask in this most adorable attribute of Her Husband and Lord. The most superlative attribute the members of the body of Christ enjoy is His Sovereignty. As Jonathan Edwards once wrote: "Sovereignty I love to ascribe to my God, but formerly it was not so." Every quickened and experienced child of God meditates daily upon his great King and His sovereign rule over all things. To him, God is GOD! For His subjects, His word is to them the finality of their rule of behavior. What He says is true, *"Let God be true, and every man a liar."* (Romans 3: 4). She is referred to as the "King's daughter," because all her members are born of Him. *"The King's daughter is all glorious within: her clothing is of wrought gold. She shall be brought unto the King in raiments of needlework: the virgins her companions that follow her shall be brought unto Thee"* (verses 13-14.) The Bride is all glorious **within** due to the sanctification of the Spirit as well as the *"washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost,"* and her clothing is of wrought gold. Gold symbolizes "glory," and she possesses the same glory as Her Lord, and it is "wrought," by Him in His suffering to purify her by putting away her sins, and purging her from all unrighteousness. But when she is brought before her

Husband, she is adorned "*in raiment of needlework*," as seen in her being "His workmanship" and being ordained unto good works. She is not seen in her old nature, but in her new redeemed nature, having been now conformed into the image of her Lord. But with whom does He liken her? "*Who is she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army of banners? . . . Return, return, O Shulamite; return, return, that we may look upon thee. What will ye see in the Shulamite? As it were the company of two armies*" (Song of Solomon 6: 10, 13.) We see her as victorious in her warfare, flesh against spirit, and spirit against the flesh, mortifying the deeds of her body; we see her as a company of two armies, one of the earth, earthy; and the other of the Spirit, and spiritual. And through all her travel in grace, she was ever in war, the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh. But as the Bride, the Lamb's wife, we see her that has overcome, and by His power and grace triumphed gloriously over the dominion of sin and the law and self. Her rest has now begun. It is her joy now to be married to her Redeemer God and King of glory: "*Set me as a seal upon Thine heart, as a seal upon Thine arm: for love is strong as death; jealousy is cruel as the grave: "I am my Beloved's, and His desire is toward me"*" she can readily say. (Song 7: 10.)

Some interesting notes from the pages of Holy Writ. We find Christ reporting, that "The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old" . . . "*When He prepared the heavens, I was there: when He set a compass upon the face of the depth .... then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him: and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him; rejoicing in the habitable part of His earth; and My*

*delights were with the sons of men"* (Proverb 8: 22, 27, 30-31). In this passage, reference seems to be in a sense that is timeless. Before creation, He rejoiced before the Father, and had His delights with the sons of men." How may we understand such a concept? We may compare it with mothers and fathers anticipating their yet unborn children, making plans for them, knitting clothing, collecting provisions, setting aside educational funds, *etc.* In other words, in "seed substance," before they are brought forth. Surely God could do this much better, seeing His foreknowledge is infinite and His determinate counsel perfect, and His predestination infinite. Why would anyone think He could not "*see all His seed, prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord prosper in His hand*"? (Isaiah 53: 11).

Look at her again in His eternal view: "*My **substance** was not hid from Thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see **My substance**, yet being unperfect: and in Thy book all My members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them. How precious also are Thy thoughts unto Me, o God! How great is the sum of them!*" (Psalm 139: 15-17). Many of us see this as a personification of Christ and His body, the church and Bride, before any of them were formed, even "from the foundation of the world." The Son's Bride and offspring were chosen IN HIM before the foundation of the world. The beauty of the Bride, the Lamb's wife, is her **eternal oneness** with Him. Strangely, then, can we not discover an eternal union of Christ with His Bride from before the foundation of the world, or ever time existed? Is not the life of Christ that eternal life that He gives to each of His children? Is that



life not hid in Christ in God even this early? We believe so.

Look at the *"figure of Him that was to come," i.e.,* the first Adam. Upon his creation, his bride and all his seed of the race of man were seminally **in his loins**, yet undeveloped. The first brought forth from him was his wife, Eve. She was not a "seed" in him, but was "flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone." The twain were "one flesh." Upon her formation, the "seed substance" of the whole race of man was genetically, or seminally, in him; and in this regard when he transgressed and death was passed upon him, it naturally passed upon all that he was. This included all his posterity yet to be developed. Sin was imputed to all his offspring. They were there in him, yet undeveloped, and hence they did not sin after the similitude of his transgression. Yet they all suffer the same penalty in nature: they all die! Now, you and I were not sitting there in the fruit grove when Eve knocked the fruit out of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. But we were "in seed substance" there that fatal day!

*"Come hither, and I will show you the Bride, the Lamb's wife."* And where shall we turn to show you her "in seed substance" in Christ? Why, in our favorite New Testament passage! *"According as He hath chosen us **IN HIM** before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love."* (Ephesians 1: 4). Did you read the preceding verses? *"Who hath blessed us with **all spiritual blessing in heavenly places in Christ**"* (Ephesians 1:3). Now just how could He do that? He couldn't unless they were "**in Him**" "in heavenly

places" when they were so blessed. Where did you get the color of your eyes, your complexion, your temperament, *etc.*? You received them from your father's "seed" which had been transmitted through the generations from Adam. Much of your natural composition and disposition are genetically determined, and your DNA passes from one generation to the next with but slight changes over generations. That day that your mother Eve sunk her teeth into that luscious fruit, all of your inherited characteristics and traits were stored in Adam's seed within his loins.

So what of the "Bride, the Lamb's wife"? Was she not also blessed with all spiritual blessings that she would ever have "**in Christ**" *"before the foundation of the world"*? We suggest that the text says as much. Another text comes to mind: *"For we are His workmanship, **created IN Christ Jesus** unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them"* (Ephesians 2: 10). What does that text imply? First, that the saints were "created in Christ Jesus" with a specific design in purpose: "unto good works." May we assume that since these works were "before ordained," then they must fall out in time at both the right moments, and by the specified individuals. If it can be taught that Cyrus the Great would destroy Babylon over a hundred and fifty years before he was born, and the Lord both named him, and revealed much of his life and success, when he was yet in the loins of his great-grand-father; why may we not understand the sense in which this text describes the members of the body of Christ, His Bride, the Lamb's wife, before they were actually developed? It certainly does not confound this writer!

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

Adam's wife was a part of him and composed of all the same elements of which he was composed. So, too, Christ's Bride, the Lamb's wife, existed "in Him" from eternity in seed substance even as Adam's fleshly offspring were in him in seed substance; and as all God's creation *"whose seed is in itself,"* (Genesis 1:11.) *"And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a **living** soul; the last Adam was made a **quickening** spirit"* (I Corinthians 15:45.) Follow that figure a ways: When God breathed into Adam's nostril the breath of life, Adam became a "living" soul. Natural life resided in him and in his seed. In the procreation of each of Adam's generations (Genesis 5:1,) that "life" is conveyed by means of that seed; even so, the *figure* is upheld in the spiritual realm as well. Christ is **life**, and that eternal life **is in** God's Son. Everyone that has the Son has eternal life, and anyone without the Son has not (spiritual) life. As the

life of our natural flesh was in Adam from the beginning; so too, that eternal life that the elect are given in divine quickening was in Christ from everlasting. Therefore we cannot dismiss the obvious conclusion, that the Church and each member of His spiritual body have life which "*was hid in Christ in God*" from before the foundation of the world. The life the saints possess is in perpetual union with Christ from eternity; and that life will, somewhere in time, be communicated to them by the Spirit of God by way of an "*incorruptible seed*." This event is known in the Scriptures as "being born again," or, "born from above." The eternal life they receive in the new birth has been "*preserved in Christ's*" "*incorruptible seed*" until the appointed time for their second birth. [Jude 1; 1 Peter 1:21.]

Here is a good place to make a very important observation. In the beginning, when Eva was extracted from Adam, in the presence of Christ the Word of God, Adam said to Christ, "*This is now **bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man.***" According to Christ in Matthew 19, Christ said to Man, "*Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall **cleave to his wife: and they shall be one flesh.***" (Genesis 2:23). In Matthew 19, the Lord adds, "*What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.*" (Matthew 19: 6). Remember, we are presenting Adam as a "figure of Him who was to come."

## **ABSOLUTENESS OF PREDESTINATION**

(3). The absoluteness, or comprehensiveness of

predestination is necessary for God to bring all the necessary elements together to fulfill His eternal purpose in the salvation of His elect. "*All things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are the called according to His purpose.*" (Romans 8:28.) We will ignore those blind religionists that do not believe so. But it is absolutely certain that your mother and father could not have existed unless their father and mother met each other and procreated them. And, if that was not ordered in all things and sure, suppose your parents never met either? To deny that predestination is not all encompassing is foolishness. Why should any of His creatures even wish to dethrone Him from His universe? He is *their* glory, too! His predestination directs the course of all events to bring His children into existence and to salvation; or else the whole system of the universe would never have worked at all.

### **WASHING THE SAINT'S FEET**

In The Southern States Of The United States there are ways in which Hyper-calvinists in the southern United States differ with their northern and Europeans brethren. When the Scots left Ireland and came to the southern mountains, some of them practiced footwashing and held to the "feast of charity." Unlike the Welsh and English Baptists, they did not migrate over as church groups. They came individually, although in large numbers. Most were Reformed, or Presbyterians. But the Baptists desired to practice as they had before being driven out of Scotland into Ireland. They were few in number, but prevailed on many churches to allow them to practice these things. Obviously, these practices are not used as a test of fellowship with those churches which do not practice them; nor are they uniquely Hyper-calvinistic, since many that split off from them still practice them also. But since foot-washing is so

common in the southern United States among Old School Baptists, we present a discussion on it under this topic of miscellany.

The historical development of feet-washing has its origins in antiquity, but in the United States, it developed during the reforming period of early Baptists and some Puritans. The first association of churches which in time became known as "Baptists," was the hyper-calvinistic Philadelphia Association formed in 1707 in the Middle Colonies. As early as 1768, their annual minute recorded the following query:

"A letter from the church at Stratfield, in Connecticut, was received intimating a separation, on account of washing feet, and the Lord's Supper administered eveLY week."

A committee was sent to mediate between the parties in dispute. Again, in 1771, the subject was renewed. The record states:

"To a query from Dividing Creek, relative to washing the. saints feet, the following reply was made: This query being founded on John xiii. 1-17, can no otherwise be determined than by fixing the genuine sense of that Scripture, which to do is earnestly recommended." (Page 119.)

[It may be of interest here, that in this same session, the association appointed their first "evangelist," Morgan Edwards was elected. In 1773, this "evangelist" is called a "traveling minister," and he declined that office. John Gano was then appointed a "messenger to the churches" instead.]

While the Minutes do not reveal any official study of the subject of feet washing as recommended, they must have done so, for in 1792, it records:

"Query from the church at West Creek: Is the washing of feet a gospel ordinance? Answer: This association consider the washing of feet, as mentioned in the New Testament, only as a pattern of humility; nevertheless have no objection to those practising it who think it a duty." How old the practice is has been lost in antiquity. One learns from history that when the Catholic priest, Menno Simon (1496-1561) joined the fellowship of the Anciens after witnessing a Waldensian Anabaptist beheaded, found some congregations washing feet and some did not. (As one would guess, some of these churches are today called Mennonites after this convert. And in those churches, still, some do and some do not practice feet washing.) Those who practice "washing the saints' feet" most often observe it according to the pattern in John 13, immediately after the Lord's Supper; and both the Lord's Supper, or Communion, and feet washing follow the first meal, called the "feast of charity." The order is not set in stone, but most follow this pattern: The congregation meets and sing "cupella" and following the song service, the church services open with prayer, followed by the sermon. Conference may be held, and then the congregation has the first meal. After the which, the Communion with unleavened bread and pure grape wine is administered by the deacon(s) with appropriate charge by the minister; following which the deacons give pans of water to brothers and sisters, who in turn wash, either each other's feet, or "one another's feet" depending on the numerical situation. The feet washing is concluded usually without a prayer. Instead, they follow the pattern in John 13, where they sing a hymn and go out. Often, they salute one another and all in the congregation with an embrace, and go out. It is often a moving event when tears of joy and humility flow freely. At times, it is a dry formality. None desire it to be the latter, but it is not in their hands to bless or withhold the blessing.

Those that do not practice it in their own churches, can, if they so please, when visiting a church that does. It is not imposed on anyone, nor should it be. It is too precious to be used wrongfully. For those who do believe in practicing it, it is far more than "an example of humility." Many, in fact, will correct that statement, for nowhere in the scripture does the Lord say that is what it is. Most do not consider it "an ordinance," but "an example," but some do. Both agree that without doing it, it is an example of nothing. Their best stated reason is that the Lord said: *"If I your Lord and Master have washed your feet ye ought also to wash one another's feet."* If the Son of God Himself directly said "Ye ought to," who is that man that would say, "No, you ought not to? Who should one obey, God or man? And in those instances when the service is attended by the felt-presence of the Holy Spirit, they are effectually reminded of the Lord's words: *"If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."* Certainly, they agree, that a servant is not greater than his Master; and his Lord shed His blood to *wash* them from their filthiness. The then leads to a deeper discussion.

Some can see feet washing as connected with the finished atonement on the one hand, and the need for daily washing of the defilement of the way on the other. They allude back to the type in Exodus where the sacrifices were made, following this the priests washed in the Laver of Washing. When one observes the major instruments of the tabernacle and their use, a greater understanding may be achieved on gospel topics. So it is on this subject also. In Exodus 30, there is presented the brazen altar." Brass often speaks of "judgment". On that brazen altar, the bloody sacrifices were offered; which the Apostle in Hebrews makes clear that it speaks of the **sacrifice of Christ**. His sufferings, the flaying of His body, the sanctifying both inwardly and outwardly of His body for daily cleansing, and His death for His People are all pictured



here. The brazen altar of judgment was outside the tabernacle in the court.

Inside of the Holy of Holies, there was a golden altar, where the high priest went once a year, and on that altar he burned incense with coals of fire taken from the brazen altar without. Gold speaks of glory, and this burning of incense speaks of the intercession of Christ, who sits at the right hand of the Father making intercession for His people. The atonement - so precious to Particular and Old School Baptists - was made outside on the brazen altar. The two altars are connected, in that the coals from the altar of judgment are used for the burning of incense on the altar of intercession. In the gospel fulfillment, Christ finished the atonement in His sacrificial death; He now makes intercession "both day and night" before His Father's throne. Now, to the point:

Notice where the brazen laver (for washing) is located: right between the two altars! The washing followed the sacrifice, and the intercession followed the washing. God taught the Hebrews that death and blood were unclean. Many ceremonial washings were provided for the ceremonial cleansing of those who touched the dead, the bed-linen of the dead, running sores, or bloody issues. These things were defiling in spite of the sin-offerings made! Yet every priest ministering at the brazen altar constantly touched the dead and the blood. The laver, or fount of washing, was for this ceremonial cleansing of the defilement, even though the defilement took place in the service of God. And this washing was after the atonement was made, and before the burning of incense of intercession. In John 13, the Lord indicated that at that time, the disciples did not know what they did in that feet washing event, but promised that "*hereafter ye shall know.*" It is reasonable to conclude that they did, in fact,

know they just had their feet washed! That cannot be the meaning here. They did not then understand fully His coming suffering and death as the sacrificial "*Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.*" He told them that they were "*clean ever wit, save their feet,*" and they would eventually understand that as surely as there was a need for the *atonement*, there was likewise a need for daily washing of the defilement of the way, symbolized by the "feet" or walk and conversation.

Standing between the two altars was the laver. It was put there so that "*Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and their feet thereat.*" And this was after the bloody sacrifice representing the "*Lamb that taketh away the sin of the world.*" Why must they be washed? In the same sense as they must often be forgiven! On the tree, Christ prayed for their forgiveness, and the apostle says: "*In whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness.of sins ..*" (Colossians 1:14.) Yet, where is that child of God that does not, even yet, feel a keen need for forgiveness, and finds himself begging God to forgive him of his sins, iniquities, and trespasses? Even so, He has "*washed us in His blood,*" and the child of God is "*clean ever wit, save his feet.*" So in spite of the fact that their sins are forgiven them, and they are washed as "*white as snow,*" still there is a daily defilement in their pilgrim journey, by the filthy conversation of the wicked, their own carnality, the temptations of Satan and of the unbelievers, *etc.* As Christ told Peter at that occasion, "*He that is washed needed not save to wash his feet*" (John 13:10.)

Dear reader, the blessed Lord has already suffered, bled and died; already redeemed all His elect people with an "eternal redemption;" and they are both saved and safe. Yet, they do "touch dead bodies," daily while in social intercourse in their homes, businesses, and communities. They

experimentally feel unclean so often due to the prevailing corruption of the flesh found in their mortal bodies. Often their conversation with the unbelievers makes them feel defiled through and through. A death in the family can impose upon them a degrading blasphemous religious setting, which makes them virtually sick within, and they come away feeling polluted. The fount of washing followed the sacrifice for sin which brought them full and complete remission of sins, and freed them from the dire effects of them. Christ is now exalted higher than the kings of the earth, sitting on His Father's throne of glory, now making intercessions both day and night according to the will of God. Can't one rejoice in this! Yet, alas, what poor sinful mortals we remain while housed in the tabernacle of clay! In the precious work, He is our Great High Priest. The Lord's Supper is an ordinance which speaks of Christ's suffering - see His flayed flesh in the broken bread! - see His bleeding, represented in the wine, and His last will and testament to His family; see Him dying for our sins. But, Oh, my soul! See how undeserving we are of the least of His tender mercies!

In the order of events as recorded in John 13, we see, first, a general supper (known as the feast of charity) at which the unclean Judas was present. He dipped his sop in the bowl and did as Jesus told him; he went out and betrayed his "friend." When the Lord spoke "*Ye are not all clean,*" He referred to Judas who had now left the little band to betray Him. Next, after this first meal, the Lord broke the bread - a token of His suffering, broken body and the emblem of His oneness with them; and the cup of the New Testament, or "family bequest," by the shedding of His precious blood for them. Then, this second supper being ended, He laid aside his garment and washed their feet, as Aaron (His antitype) did before making intercession at the

golden altar of incense. All these are figures. But instead of all the elaborate ceremonies attached to the Old Covenant of the law; or the lengthy liturgies derived from pagan worship in so-called "Christianity," the Lord left a simple uncomplicated ordinance. It is given that the child of God remembers the source of all his blessings and salvation: the suffering Savior making the atonement for his sins. The ordinance is sacred. It does not belong to the world; nor do believers fault any for not observing it. It is for God's blood-bought people. It is fitting that the world of the ungodly and carnal professors ignore it. It is about the only thing in the Christian religion **they have not desecrated**. But for the children of hope, "*If ye know these things*, which words imply that they do, and others do not - He adds, "*Happy are ye if ye do them*." And that promise is often verified to them that do it. Almost all Hyper-calvinists' churches in the deep south of the United States wash feet as commanded by the Lord, saying that they "ought to." They feel a need for that daily washing of the defilement of their walk and conversation which it figures, and have found it as the Lord promised, a "happy" occasion to walk in obedience to their exalted Lord.

### **No Hired Ministry**

When Roger Williams established the colony of Rhode Island, he became its first governor, and he also helped to establish one of the two first Baptist churches in North America. He refused to accept a salary, both for the gubernatorial office he held as well as in the ministerial office. One of the earliest articles written in America on religion was in opposition to a *Hired Ministry* and it is available in many libraries today in Volume 1, *Annals of American History*. The reader may wish to study it.]

**Salaries and a hired Ministry.** An Internal Revenue

Service agent once exclaimed to this writer: "Do you expect the IRS to believe your churches take up no collections, hire ministers, or raise funds!" The answer given was: "No. We don't expect you too, but it is the truth!" He snapped: "You need to be audited!" And he was audited, all right! As we cover this topic, we need to point out that we have no objections to ways churches wish to show their love and affection to faithful ministers. It is not unscriptural for a church to have a settled ministry if they can afford one. While covering this part of the subject, keep in mind that by a "hired ministry," we are speaking of **professional career ministers** - not those that are called and qualified by our Lord. It is universally received by all these churches, and has been throughout their history that the office of an elder or bishop was not a salaried career. Roger Williams not only refused a salary from the first Baptist church in the colonies; but also refused a salary or any money for serving as the first governor of Rhode Island!

The reader should more carefully study this issue, for there is of necessity a balance between extremes relative to ministerial support. It is often abused on both ends of the spectrum; so care is called for in covering this topic.

First, presenting **exaggerated extremes**: Many ministers, having no divine call, nor employable skills, or too lazy to seek honorable labor enter into the ministry as a parasitic professional hireling. His gift of gab would make him a successful used car salesman; his humor, a stand-up comedian; his avarice, a professional con artist; and his love of sports, a good administrator. This is all that is needed to be a successful "evangelical" preacher! The nation is full of them! Of course, these are also the brunt of laymen's jokes. The hireling minister receives a delegation from a church searching for a pastor. They offer him a higher salary than he is presently

receiving. He tells his wife about the offer, saying, "I will be in my study praying about the matter. Why don't you be packing in the meantime!" This type of situation is so common that almost every denomination tell this joke about their ministers. Hireling ministers take an offer of a higher salary, higher status, or better perks to be an omen from the gods that they should relocate. Oh, yes, they will insist to the man that money had nothing to do with it. "God spoke to me in a dream and said, Go." *etc.* That is one exaggerated extreme.

The other? A Hyper-calvinist minister travels one hundred miles or more to preach the gospel of redeeming grace. For his "expenses," he ask for nothing, but he may receive five or ten dollars, or a slab of bacon. And the church which he services is well pleased that they do not have a hired minister! That is known in the New Testament as "covetousness," a unfaithful stewardship. That is the other exaggerated extreme.

The truth must be found somewhere other than in either of these positions. The word of God is much clearer on this subject than many suppose. The hireling minister is to be deplored; while the self-sacrificing minister is to be honored. But "honor" will not pay for the gasoline, oil, tires, insurance, and wear and tare of an automobile! In colonial and frontier times it would not feed his horse, or pay for a saddle. But the other side of this issue is: the faithful church is to be respected, while the covetous congregation should be ashamed! So let us take each side of this issue in-depth.

First, dealing with the **hireling ministers**, the Word of God says nothing commendable about them. "*They serve their own bellies.*" Paul observed in Romans 16:18. The beloved apostle, John, was severe on them: "*Woe unto them! They have gone the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward and perished in the gainsayings of Korah* (Revelation

1:11.) And then follows a terrible indictment of them as "*spots in your feasts of charity,*" etc. Peter also spoke of hired preachers in this tone: "*Which have forsaken the right way and gone astray following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness.*" (II Peter 2:15.) The sin of Balaam was two-fold: On the first, he was willing to curse God's elect people for the riches offered him by Balak the king; the other was, seeing that God would not let him curse them, he advised Balak to have the daughters of his tribe to seduce the men of Israel into committing fornication, knowing that God would not bless fornicators. It is still that way today: hireling ministers say very little in condemnation of fornication and adultery or other transgressions. The "gainsayings of Core" is also found connected with hireling ministers. If you are going to make your living on the fleece of the woolly goats, then you need people to fleece! Hence, proselytizing! Core's sin was to teach that "all God's people are prophets," or "Always and everywhere the servants of Christ are under orders to evangelize," as Mr. Murray put it, - and tithe, too! The doctrine of Korah! So hireling ministers are basically Balaamites. Keep in mind, we speak of the extremes.

Paul, whom God appointed a preacher of the Gentiles, set the example among the Gentiles, and his example was contrary to a hired ministry, even though he had the power of an apostle. "*Behold the third time I am ready to come to you; and I will not be burdensome to you; for I seek not yours, but you: for the children (his converts) ought not to lay up for the parents, (ministers), but the parents for the children. And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you; though the more abundantly I love you the less I am loved.*" (A dramatic truism!) (II Corinthians 12:14,15.) Please don't jump ahead of us here. We will come back to the other texts after covering this extreme.

"*Have I*", said he, "*committed an offense in abasing myself*"

*that ye might be exalted because I have preached to you the gospel of God freely.*" (Greek: 'dorean,' "gratuitously: for nought", II Corinthians 11:7.) *"I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service. And when I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man."* (II Corinthians 11:9a - we will deal with part b of the verse in its proper place.) He spoke of his "*labors, working with our own hands.*" (I Corinthians 4:4.) And again, he wrote: "*For ye remember, brethren, our labor and travail: for laboring night and day because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the gospel of God.*" (I Thessalonians 2:9.) When he gave charge to Timothy relative to the qualifications of the bishop, the bishop "*must not be given to wine, no strike; not greedy of filthy lucre.*" (I Tim. 3:3.) His condemnation of work-mongers of his day is as appropriate now as then: "*Whose mouths must be stopped who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake.*" (Titus 1:11.) His instruction to Titus relative to the ministers was: "*And let ours also learn to maintain good works for necessary uses, that they be not unfruitful*" (Titus 3:14.)

When one considers the snare that money binds upon men, it has no place in the spiritual realm. When a hired minister is brought to an experience of grace and knowledge of the truth of free grace, his salary becomes a stumbling stone. He is not free. A man that is hired is under moral and ethical obligations to his employer. If his employer wants him to preach a pro-tithing sermon, even though he knows that the "tithe belongs to Levi" and knows his church will not forward the tithe to the local Jewish rabbi, he is still obligated to fulfill his contractual agreement. If he is expected to hold a so-called "revival" and knows it is unwarranted by the Word of God, he must do it. If his employer wants a Santa Claus on the pagan holiday, guess who will be "Ho, Ho, Ho'ing" that night! If they want a gymnasium to exercise their spiritual muscles; you



guessed it. He will be raising the money to build it. If the Director of Missions receives a quota from Nashville as to how many souls are to be saved in the boundaries of his association, and assigns a reasonable number to him to save ... what shall he do? Where will he and his family go? How will they survive? He is hired, and he is trapped! This writer has been right here! There is nothing he can do but follow the scripture: "*Come out of her, O My people.*" And right here he will truly discover what it means to "*walk by faith*," for everything else is out of sight. Sadly, many Neo-calvinists are trapped in the Pelagian antichritian system, and one finds it strange that enslaved men will condemn the free. They will refer to God's free men as "Misers," "Mossybacks," "Hardshells," and "Hyper-calvinists." As one said recently: "I am fully persuaded that only God can make a Hyper-calvinist. Once you see what Christ has done, all the rest appears blindness." But this revealing grace of God which opens the elects' eyes and frees them from pitch darkness of freewillism is what snatches a hireling minister out of his sectarian employment to labor freely in the kingdom of God. That is one extreme.

Now, lest our reader concludes that our bias prevents us from observing the other side, we will next cover the opposite extreme, and conclude this section in the scriptural "middle."

The law says: "Thou shalt not covet." Coveteousness is a transgression of this law. It includes both desiring something which rightly belongs to another, as well as a stinginess which prevents one from rightly carrying his own share of an obligation. It is a felt lusting after mammon, which the Lord repeatedly said one could not worship God and mammon simultaneously. The children of God have a law written within their minds and hearts, which move them to liberality in the giving and distribution of goods over which God has made them "stewards." All their material goods, primarily belong to God,

and are put in trust in their hands. The Holy Spirit constantly exhorts them to this liberality under the Gospel, for this liberality is the best remedy for covetousness ... it will break its power over the child of God. The result is a joy and satisfaction in one's stewardship. Paul set the standard of this stewardship saying, *"But this I say, He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart (the seat of affection) so let him give; not grudgingly (which is covetousness), or of necessity (i.e., out of duty or compulsion) for God loveth a cheerful giver."* That, not a system of tithing, is the Scriptural principle for Gospel support (II Corinthians 9:7).

There was a fundamental principle given under the law, that is cited by two different passages in the New Testament for supporting the gospel ministry. In Deuteronomy 25:4, the law says: *"Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn."* Paul asked if God wrote this just for oxen! He wrote: *"Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock? Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doeth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sake?"* Now was it written for our sake, or the sake of the oxen. His answer: *"For our sake, no doubt, this is written: that he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope. If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap of your carnal things?"* (I Corinthians 9:9-12.) Can one imagine repeatedly "sowing the Word of God" in dry ground and it never producing any harvest in carnal things? No farmer would do so repeatedly. It would be extremely discouraging! That principle is plain enough: the minister of God, while not hired, is Scripturally supported by

the benefits given and received under his ministry. But watch this delicate balance: *"If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather? Nevertheless we have not used this power; but suffered all things, lest we should hinder the Gospel of Christ."* It was principally for this very cause that the first deacons were ordained in Acts 6. The distribution of goods to the poor became a hindrance to the preaching of the gospel and contention arose over the fair distribution of these goods. This put the ministry of the apostles in a bad light. Paul, basically, is saying much the same. Ministers cannot lust after the carnal goods of their hearers. It is best to suffer without than to say a word about it. Yet, the apostle places it in the volume of the New Testament for all true and conscientious believers to know. He argues his point from the Hebraic priesthood, saying, *"Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers of the altar? Even so hath the Lord ORDAINED that they which preach the gospel should live of the Gospel"* (1 Corinthians 9:9- 14.)

Paul was an itinerate minister, and so are most Hypercalvinist ministers. As he was supported, so are they. When he said he "robbed other churches" and "took wages of them," he referred to those faithful churches that time after time sent financial relief to him. It was never a constant supply, for often he hungered, but he had expenses to bear for the gospel's sake which either were supplied by those who loved the truth, or by the calluses on his own hands - for he was a tent-maker by trade. His travel was mostly by boats that ploughed the coastal regions of the Mediterranean Sea, for which transportation he must pay. After his imprisonment and until his death, he had to pay a private guard and rent a private house, both of which incurred expenses at a time when he could not be employed. But we should consider this: All of his extra expenses were for the **propagation of the gospel of the free grace of God**. It was

not for Paul's sake, or self-interest. He did not volunteer to be an apostle. "I will show him" the Lord told Ananias, "what he must suffer for My name's sake". His labor was only for the cause of God and the truth, and benefited the whole community of the saints everywhere. Before he was arrested and sent to Rome, he wrote to the Church at Rome, hoping to visit them, saying: " *Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you: for I trust to see you in my journey, and "be brought on my way thitherward if first I be somewhat filled with your company* " (Romans 15:25.) Again, to the Church of God at Corinth, he wrote: " *And it may be that I will abide, yea, and winter with you, that ye may bring me on my journey whithersoever I go*" (I Corinthians 16:6.) The same is recorded again later, " *And to pass by you into Macedonia, and to come again out of Macedonia unto you, and of you be brought on my way towards Judea.*" (II Corinthians 1:16.) One should be able with the above Scriptures to see how the propagation of the gospel was financed. This is precisely the way Hypercalvinists in the United States do it to this day. In fact, it is seldom that a church collects money except for the above purpose, or for the needy among them. Most, in supporting the gospel propagation do it privately, or individually. There is bashfulness about it, in that no one wants to appear to be "putting on," or supporting the cause as "men-pleasers" or to "be seen of men." They have a desire to follow the Lord who said they should not let their left hand know what their right hand does.

There were several churches in Macedonia, and they contributed to Paul's expenses often. " *Moreove~ brethren, we do you to wit of the grace (Greek: "charis: gift") of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; how that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality. For to their power I bear record, yea, and beyond their power they were willing of themselves; praying*

*us with much entreaty that we would receive the gift and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints." (II Corinthians 8:2-4.) At one time, only one church was helping him, and that was the church at Philippi, for he wrote: "Now ye Philippians know also, that in the beginning of the Gospel when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me concerning giving and receiving but ye only. For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto me of my necessity. Not that I desired a gift, but I desire for you that ye may abound to your account" (Philippians 4:15-17.)*

As one reads the above record, he is reading of the method the Hyper-calvinists follow in supporting the propagation of the gospel. The members and believers give to help defray the additional cost on the ministers in the publication of the gospel of the free grace of God; they help to off-set the cost of the ministers' social entertainment of guests. They understand that *the Church*, by calling and/or ordaining a minister has charged that minister to be "given to hospitality," (I Timothy 3:2) and be "a lover of hospitality," (Titus 1:8) and he is expected by them to do so. But they cannot expect him to do it all at his own expense, and that they be freed from the additional expense. Throughout the kingdom of God, lovers of the truth willingly and gladly "*take upon themselves the fellowship of the ministry*." Yet, they do not "hire" their preachers! Their ministers are members of their churches - not uninvolved "stay-short" preachers (as David Benedict called them) running from one church to another seeking higher salaries and benefits.

Since Hyper-calvinists do not drag, scare, coach, plead, and beg people to "join the church," the actual membership within a congregation is relatively small. Both the church and the congregation are the Lord's. However, the minister nor the church expect those in the congregation who have not been committed to the cause to support it out of any necessity. If

they wish to, it is greatly appreciated, and many do. But no minister would expect a small membership to financially support him. In fact, much of his financial remuneration comes from those in the congregation who love the truth of sovereign grace. Those who love the truth will, themselves, drive hundreds of miles to hear it; and these understand the financial aspects of traveling and entertaining guests. The writer serves churches five hundred miles apart, and in thirty years can recall only twice when he went at his own expense. What one small church cannot supply is cared for by others better blessed. Even the publication of books and literature and the distribution of good books to young believers are done with the help of others. The charge against Hyper-calvinists that they are "misers" is false. Merely because they reject the Mosaic law of tithing and the priesthood, does not mean they reject the New Testament method of propagating the gospel! This has been their position since the settlement of Rhode Island by three of their ministers: John Clarke, Roger Williams and Obadiah Holmes (1635). The following discussion on this subject dates from 1833, by Gilbert Beebe, and is selected from the Signs of The Time, May 8, Volume 1.

"We are fully aware that Christ has, through His apostles, enjoined the duty and privilege on His people, of communicating of their *worldly substance* as God has blessed them, to the support of those whom He has called into the ministry. The ministers of Christ are steward of the Word, as the saints who are benefited by their labors are stewards of their carnal things. It is the work of the minister to *preach the Word faithfully*, and it is the work and duty of his brethren to see that he is made comfortable in regard to temporal things. We see nothing improper in the ancient practice of our Baptist churches, when having chosen a pastor, without consulting the world, herself judging of his gifts and qualifications, and having settled him, to make the

necessary arrangement for his support. If the church thinks proper to open a subscription book in which every one who *feels willing* may annex to his name the amount he intends to give, by doing which the *burden becomes more equal among the members and non-professing friends as feel so disposed* may throw in their aid and thus reduce the burden of the church, we see no wrong in it." [However, in general, this method has been discontinued by almost all Old School Baptist churches in America. The author serves one church whose members agreed together to pay his expenses, each a set and equal amount. When one died, his daughter who was not a member continued the support. When she died, her daughter has continued the support although she, too, is not a member. That agreement has held for twenty years, and although the distance from his residence to that church and home is 480 miles, he has never had to go at his own expense!] He continues:

"A minister of Jesus should never be above laboring with his own hands, and we are persuaded that Christ's ministers are not; still when it is in the power of a church to relieve their minister from the cares of the world, that he may devote his time principally or wholly to the work, it is right they should do so. We know that the liberality of the churches in the support of the ministers of the gospel of Christ has not been extravagantly large."

As the greedy zeal of the Fullerites increased to the scandalous, the Old School party shied away of anything which might identify them with such excesses. Elder Beebe addressed this issue also: "It has been supposed by some of our readers that we are opposed to a minister receiving *financial remuneration* from the people of his charge, for his time and service in the gospel ministry; this error has probably grown out of their known *aversion* to the

missionary system. We wish to *correct* the wrong impression by giving a statement of our views on the subject.

"We wish in this, as in every other respect, the churches and preachers to *be conformed to the Word of God* and we believe the Word is as clear and pointed on this point as on any other involved in the relation existing between churches and preachers. The obligations devolving on preachers and churches towards each other are reciprocal, and both parties are viewed in the New Testament as stewards. *"For a bishop must be blameless as the stewards of God."* -Titus 1:7. *"Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God"* I Corinthians 4:1. And Peter writes to the elect to " *Use hospitality one to another, without grudging, as every man hath received the gift even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God*" - I Peter 4:9,10. Here we see that *both* the ministers and brethren are stewards and as stewards are servants who are entrusted with their Master's property, to deal it out according to His direction, so the minister of Jesus receives in trust the mysteries of God; these mysteries then they are bound to deal out or explain to the people of God, and this according to the *gift* which they have received of the Lord. Now this is the preacher's business: he must preach the Word, be instant in season, out of season, &c., and feed the flock of God which He hath purchased with His own blood; nor is he permitted to take thought for the morrow, what he shall eat, what he shall drink, or wherewithal he shall be clothed. This is not his concern; and if he should take thought, what can he do? He cannot add to his stature one cubit, or make one hair black or white; hence it is unnecessary for God's stewards or ministers to bargain with the mission boards or with the churches, by the day, month or year, to preach for a stipulated sum, and



hold them bound to raise for him just that amount. [In other words, no salaried or set amount.]

"As it has pleased the Lord to enjoin upon His ministers that they should "seek *first the kingdom of God and His righteousness*," and has given them assurance that all these things shall be added unto them, (Matthew 6:33) so He has also enjoined upon His Church to provide for those who labor in Word and doctrine. As stewards, they are entrusted with temporal things, and as they receive from the stewards of the Word of their spiritual things, they are required to administer to them of their temporal things. This requires *no bargaining* between the churches and preachers, for a stipulated sum of money or a given term of service; the church has a right to expect the labors of the minister of Christ, and the minister has a right to expect from his flock a competent support; neither are they to look for these things on the ground of *legal obligations* or *contract*, but from the nature of the relation which they stand in, one to another. No minister of Christ will refuse to do his best, and all that he can, to feed the flock of God, so we think no church or individual, in gospel order, will refuse to make their minister as comfortable as they themselves are ... "

"There was a time in the primitive church when the ministers of Christ could and did attend to the widows, but there also came another time when it was not meet that they should leave the preaching of the Word and serve tables, (Acts 6:1-4) and so it appears at the present moment, that the *few* who remain firm in the old track should be encouraged to *go among the scattered sheep and lambs*, and confirm them in the truth by preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ. Our object in writing on this subject is *not* to complain of any deficiency in the support of the Old School preachers - we hear none of them complain ... But we wish to correct the wrong

impression that we are opposed to the idea of ministers receiving from the churches a competent support, when such a support is afforded them in a Scriptural manner. We do not oppose it, but believe on the other hand that the obligation on the church to impart to the comfortable support of those whom God has thrust into His vineyard to labor, is His imperative as is that on the minister of Christ to preach the preaching which God bids him." (pages, 261-265.)

Paul gave two specific reasons for believers to support the gospel publication. He wrote: "*Not because I desired a gift; but I desire fruit that may abound to your account*" (Philippians 4:15-17) and, that the ministers "receive the gift", which by so doing, they take upon themselves "*the fellowship of the ministering to the saints*" (II Corinthians 8:2-4.)

This writer heard an elderly sister in a distant State say: "My father was an Old Baptist preacher. He preached for fifty years and never received a cent." She, and we, admired such dedication. But what a serious indictment against those believers among whom he labored! Such a situation is as unwarranted by the Word of God as any Sunday School, mission board, or a rock band for entertainment in churches! Covetousness is yet wrong. Where was the fruit of his labor after treading out the corn? If he was wealthy, they still had not taken on themselves the *fellowship of the ministering to the saints*, nor showed their love to him or gratitude to God for the gospel ministry He had provided them. Such ought not to be accepted as good "gospel order." It is unscriptural.

Is it therefore wrong for a church to financially support their pastor, so that he might give himself fully to the preaching of the gospel? Scripturally, the answer is "No, it is not wrong." Elder Beebe's discussion approves of it in so far

as there is no stipulated amount and legal obligations or bargaining involved. In Paul's discussion relative to the subject with the Corinthians, he implied that others did. *"Have we not power to lead about a sister; a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas? Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working? Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charge?"* The implication is strong, if not certain, that these "other apostles" may have had wives (Peter did, for he had a mother-in-law.) and did "forbear working", or secular employment. Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles, while others labored among the Jews who had customarily, by the law of tithing (which belonged to Levi) supported the Levitical priesthood. They that served in the tabernacle ate of the things offered on the altar. So where should a balance be drawn relative to ministerial support? That is the issue we now address.

If a congregation is large enough to maintain their pastor, and wish to do so, surely they have that right if a minister can be called. It is not disorderly to do so according to the Scripture. Experience amply demonstrates that utmost care and judgment must constantly be exercised in such cases. Such a church must have a faithful deacon, or deacons, grounded in the Word of God with a love of the truth and a love of the ministry; for they must be exceedingly careful not to impose any unwarranted duties, restrictions, nor liberties upon the minister. The minister is the "overseer" of the church and a "servant of God" to the church and kingdom of God; the deacon is the "servant of the church" of which he is a member. The minister must not take on the role behaviors of a hireling; nor must the church treat him in the reciprocal roles of a hireling. He and they must understand that he is a servant of the most High God and answerable to Him as his Lord and Master. At the same time, the minister must keep constantly in mind, too, that he is not to employ the roles attached to the status of

hirelings. He is to feed the flock of God wherever God opens a door of utterance, and this not for filthy lucre's sake. When, or if, the congregation becomes less able to support him, he should have the fortitude to seek secular employment; and resist the natural and carnal temptation to "shake the trees" to get more members! He must never forsake the truth that it is the *"Lord that adds daily to the church such as should be saved."* Too often when a church dwindles in membership, efforts are made to increase its membership. This is the beginning of the end of a sound gospel church! The church must keep ever in mind that the kingdom of God is not so provincial: God has a people to be fed that may not be near it. Her minister is free, when led of the Lord, to feed the flock wherever they graze.

The likelihood that Calvinists will need to be concerned about the above is almost nil. The time is past, when large gatherings of the elect are common. This is a day when there "are few that believe; and these sheep are scattered far apart. As the number of God's elect continue to pass on to be with the Lord, fewer and fewer of that number [which is definite and certain] remains here below. Hence both logic and Scripture teach that as *"knowledge increase [world-wide web!], the love of many will wax cold,"* and the number of the elect on earth will ever be diminishing. If a minister wants a crowd, he best not preach the truth of free grace - it will not draw a crowd of unregenerate goats! He should not fall into the same error as Charles H. Spurgeon. The huge crowds that pressed into the Tabernacle auditorium should have alerted him to the fact that something he was doing was dreadfully wrong. The truth has never been popular with the world! And so the Lord foretold: *"Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets."* (Luke 6:6.) Such a pastor must be extremely careful not to become so dependent upon the church for financial support that he cannot (1) preach the

truth, and (2) care for himself and family if necessary. He must ever be mindful that his circumstances can change in less than an hour! And that from the least expected quarters. Many false brethren, with feign love and fair speech, will destroy him and his effect in the gospel ministry as ardently as they formerly supported him. *"Be sober be vigilant; because your adversary the devil as a roaring lion) walketh about seeking whom he may devour."* (1 Peter 5:8) And he works through men.

The God-called and qualified minister is God's servant. He has no freewill; he is no "free agent;" he is an instrument, a tool, in God hand to be used in God's kingdom, for God's own purpose. The Hyper-calvinists ministers are charged to "Go forth and preach the gospel, administer the ordinances, and serve the churches wherever God in His Providence cast your lot." The members of the churches and believers in the congregations of the Lord ought ever be prayerful, that "God will open a door of utterance" for their ministers to preach the unsearchable riches of free and sovereign grace!

*"He which testifieth these things saith,*

*Surely I come quickly. Amen.*

*Even so, come, Lord Jesus"*

*-Rev. 22:20.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **CHAPTER TWELVE**

### **TWO DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES IN RELIGION**

There are two distinctive and opposing doctrinal systems of religion among the race of man. The natural religion of the carnal mind, which can be **taught and learned**: It is found in all religions and the most fundamental principle of it is the **will-worship of natural men**. This ancient natural religion is now the cardinal foundation of modern-day "Christianity." In nominal "Christianity," it is a decision-made works religion void of any spiritual light and revelation. It is the product of modern proselytizing using "easy-decisionism," hawked loudly by the self-styled "Evangelists". Its very popularity appeals to the flesh of natural men, and is in itself sufficient to warn a child of God to keep clear of it. It produces man-made "Christians." The fact that it is ever evolving, decade after decade, changing in doctrine and multiplying practices, and conforming to the ever degenerating social conditions it spawned by its own natural religious lust; and by its approving of all things contrary to righteousness, proves beyond any doubt that it is *not* the historical Christian faith. As it slides into Sodomite practices - which are now everywhere evident - and continual moral decline, it demonstrates clearly that it issued forth from Satan. It is Mystery Babylon, and it was most advanced by Andrew Fuller with his Roman Catholic doctrine of "freewillism" borrowed from "St." Thomas Aquinas. Clearly, the "Evangelicals," even if they call themselves "Calvinists," are no different from out-right Pelagian freewillers, if they emphasize man's abilities rather than God's effectual grace. Christ's imputed righteousness is the sinner's saving grace, and it is part and partial to the doctrine of free and sovereign grace. Men may believe many things, but if one does not have anything better to lean upon than his own ragged righteousness, that man has not yet been converted - Calvinist or no Calvinist; Baptist or no Baptist - the name has no saving merit.

Under the cloak of respectable "Calvinism," it still denies that Christ is the Savior of sinners. At best, if this form of

"Calvinism" insists that Christ's atonement was a failure, or contingent on the "evangelists" or the "sinner", then in reality they are no different than the Pelagians. It is as if seeing that He was not going to have time to finish what His Father sent Him to do, He quickly devised an ingenious plan whereby He would commission every man, woman, and child to "win the world" for Him after He was dead! This form of so-called "Calvinism" depends upon carnal men to actually do what the Son of God could not do! Such dishonors the Lamb of God, and makes mere men the "saviors" of the wicked. Classical Calvinists refer to the above form of so-called "Calvinism" as Hypo-calvinism. We refer to it as "Neo-calvinism." But whichever term is used, it is not Calvinism! They can brand the "Old Schoolers" as Hyper-calvinists," but it still does not make themselves Calvinists.

The **religion of Jesus is a revealed religion**, not only in the origin of Christianity, but also to each person to whom the truth is revealed. It is not attained by education, theology, family inheritance, or study and research. **It is received as an unction of the Holy One, and it needs not to be taught.** It is highly consistent with logic if this logic is grounded on anyone of the Five Cardinal Principles of Grace. It teaches that man is *totally depraved* and spiritually *dead* in trespasses and sins. If this is believed, then natural man can not "come to Me," as Jesus taught, "*except it be given to Him of My Father*," or "drawn" to Him by the Father. He cannot save himself, nor help someone else to save him. Being *totally depraved and dead* no "evangelist," pastor, soul-winner, "Christian" counselor, parent, or spouse can help his case. Christ alone must save him!

The Scripture clearly teaches that the Eternal Godhead chose, selected, or elected Jesus the son of Mary, of the family of Abraham and David to be interstitually united to the Son in the Godhead to be the God-Man, Savior, and Head of His

church, and at the same instance chose, or elected all that shall ever be in heaven and immortal glory “**in Him** before the foundation of the world.” (Eph. 1:5.) If one has this truth tenderly revealed to him, he cannot conclude otherwise than that Christ *died only for those given to Him by His Father!* or, unconditional election and predestination! The above being revealed to him, he must conclude that all the Father gave to His Son, and all His Son died for, will persevere in grace and ultimately be gloried with Christ in heaven and immortal glory without the loss of one. The blessed Lord thanked His Father that this was the case, saying to Him: *"I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the 'wise and prudent,' and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so Father: for so it seemed good in Thy sight,"* (Matthew 11:25-26.)

Within the boundaries of the "Five Points of Free Grace," there are many differing views of "Calvinism." The traditional Calvinists, which included the Reformed churches, Presbyterians, Particular Baptists (before Fuller), Puritan Congregationalists, and the English Calvinist Methodists, with a few others, held to the Five Points consistently. Some of the churches in the above group still hold to them today. But by far, the greater majority of these have plunged into the deepest abyss of will-worship. It is interesting, that all the "evangelical" fervor which destroyed Christianity came from the Calvinists' origin rather than those who were General Redemptionists as the Freewill Baptists in the U.S., or General Baptists in England. Equally, the original Arminian opponents to the Calvinist Refonnners were not so "evangelical!"

From time to time a revival of Calvinism takes place, and individuals reared among Pelagians break away from them and form new religious societies established upon the wormwood



foundation of Pelagian baptism and "church authority." [invariably most then begin to claim that they are the true original church!] Too often they break away before they are fully established in the faith, and some follow the heresy of Andrew Fuller. Their ultimate departure from Calvinism again follows the original path: Calvinism to Hypo or Neo-calvinism; a pause; Neo-calvinism to Arminianism; another pause; Arminianism to Pelagianism; a pause; Pelagianism to ecumenicalism; a pause; and into Rome. Finality!

Large numbers of these Neo-calvinists are ensnared in a laborious system. They must, imperatively must, build up a congregation large enough to financially support themselves with a contemporary life style without working for a living. Hence, they are attracted to Fuller's so-called "Evangelism." They immediately start: (1) dragging unregenerates into the society's membership to indoctrinate them into Calvinism and tithing, and (2) calling all Calvinists holding to New Testament propagation of the gospel "Hyper-calvinists," "Hardshells," "Misers," "Bench-sitters," and/or "Mossybacks." These two points mark the Neo-Calvinists. Most of them will also hold to "gospel regeneration," believing their quotation of Bible passages or portions of them become incantations which can produce the magical power they call "getting saved." Neo-Calvinists do not know what Christ accomplished on the cross; Or when He saved His people from their sins. They do not suspect that He has!

The Neo-calvinists, and even occasionally a Calvinist, will refer to those holding to the Five Points of Free Grace and New Testament practices as "Hyper-calvinists" in a derogatory way. The Hyper-calvinists hold that all that the Scripture teaches that Christ accomplished in His purpose and grace in His life and death, **He did in fact accomplish.** They stand somewhat unique as the ones who actually believe that Christ is the

Savior of sinners in an emphatic way. That He did in fact redeem His people; that He did in fact ransom them; that He did in fact save them from their sins. In addition, they believe and follow the belief that "The Scripture of the Old and New Testament is the written Word of God and the *only rule of faith and practice*." That may be "old fashioned" and "out of date," but they are serious about their belief in the divine inspiration of the Scripture. This leaves them less "wiggle room" to bring in every hair-brained guru, doctrine, and "good idea" that others seem so able to do! They are compelled by their faith to refrain from unscriptural innovations, carnal entertainment - they don't joke in the pulpit! - and proselytizing practices the so-called "evangelicals" embrace. They do not copy the worldly religions around them, either in doctrine or in practices.

They do not accept the proselytizing practices of the "evangelicals" because they cannot find them either in historical Christianity or the Bible. In fact, deep within their own experience, they are enabled to discern the difference between that which is of the flesh and that of the Spirit. They can detect the motives behind this proselytizing effort to be borne of deceitfulness, fleshly lusts and ignorance. Deceitfulness because they are "*sent strong delusions that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned.*" (II Thess. 2:11.) **The delusion is:** that the Lord did not save His people, and is helpless to save them without their cooperation. Or, that the Almighty God "needs help"! Fleshly lusts, because they feel in their carnal flesh a desire to triumph over another, or as Paul said of such, "*Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away: For of this sort (these evangelical deceivers) are they which creep into houses; and lead captive silly women laden with sins; led away by divers lusts, ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.*" (II Timothy 3:6,7.) To those who have that anointing of the Spirit of truth, it is obviously clear of whom the apostle here speaks.

Ignorance, because they cannot accept what the Scripture actually and plainly teaches that the Lord of Glory did in His substitutionary life and death actually accomplish.

The New Testament propagation of the gospel is the spreading of the good news of the accomplishments of the Lord Jesus Christ wherever God's people are "scattered" by persecution, mobility of jobs, and various migrations or emigrations. The simple walk and conversation of God's people, and their quiet invitations to friends and family to worship services are sufficient. They do not impose their religion on anyone; because they know how disgusting it is for a rabid Freewiller to attempt to cram it down their throats. They know full well that "**salvation is of the Lord**," (Jonah 3:9) and He has done His work and the Holy Spirit will invariably do His. By experience, they understand that anyone would really rather believe that the influence of the gospel upon their poor soul was of God, rather than of a fellow creature. Most of all, they understand that the gospel is good news to quickened sinners about what God has done for such; rather than what He will do if they "will let Him." They believe, as in their own case, that the application of the salvation worked out by Christ is the special office of the Holy Spirit. That faith is precious to them, so it is best left to be precious to others. They believe that the gospel is to be preached to everyone *God would have it preached*, and understand it has not been His good pleasure to have it preached to everyone on earth! It was not preached to millions who never knew of Abraham, Moses, and the prophets; or to millions who never heard of Christ; and knowing what the gospel is, it is not preached except in a very few places in Western society, including the United States! Almost no one today hears the gospel; few communities remain with a gospel ministry available to it; and that religion that is preached all over the land is most likely Antichristian to the core. They are predestinarians. They believe that God "does His will in the

armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay His hand or say unto Him, What doest Thou?" (Daniel 4:35.) If it was the sovereign will and eternal purpose of God for all mankind to "have a chance to be saved," He is certainly able to perform His will! He it is who "*worketh all things according to the counsel of His own will.*" The fact of history proves conclusively that such was not, nor is, the sovereign will of God. But for all sovereign grace believers of whatever stamp, they are persuaded that "*as many as was ORDAINED TO ETERNAL LIFE BELIEVE.*" (Acts 13:48.) So the commission of their ministers is as broad as, and as narrow as, the sovereign good will of God for them individually. They are to, and without fail, will preach the gospel to every single soul to whom they are sent.

The "evangelicals" believe that faith and repentance are sacraments which precede regeneration, and are magical incantations to produce it. Thus, they believe it to be the duty of the reprobates to hear and believe that Christ died for them as well as the elect; when in fact of the inspired Word, **He did not!** Since they must hear the Word in order to believe it; and believing it will produce divine life in them, then it must be preached to everyone. Of course, it is rather too late now, but this is not important to them. These "evangelicals" are caught in the illogical position of holding that the reprobate is required to believe a *lie* in order to make it true, and then damn the poor honest soul to hell for the *cause* of not believing the lie! If one believes that faith and repentance will produce spiritual life in a soul, that person is ignorant of the way of salvation himself. How then can such preach the gospel to other?

The Hyper-calvinists believe that Christ "*Hath obtained eternal redemption for us.*" That "*He laid down His life for the sheep.*" That "*He hath saved us and called us ... according to His own purpose and grace.*" That He "*hath sanctified us,*" and

*"hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."* The closing questions of this chapter then, are: Are these things TRUE? Did Christ do all that the Scripture declares that He did? Who believes that this is so?

May the grace, mercy, and peace of God rest and abide upon you.

## APPENDIX A

### ANTINOMIANISM EXAMINED AND ITS RELATION TO ARMINIANS SHOWN

By Samuel Trott, July 5, 1839

Brother Beebe: I received a letter a short time since, from Brother P. Meredith, in which he requested me also to give my views on the text, Job 28: 7,8, in reference to the enquiry *whether there is not a path which passes between the sand bars of Arminianism and the granite rocks of Antinomianism.*

Your answer to this enquiry as published under the Editorial Hed in No. 9 of present volume, he says is very explicit in reference to *Arminianism*, but not so full in reference to *Antinominianism* as he wished. He gives as a further reason for requesting my views, that he has lately heard, "that to be a thorough going Old School Baptist, one must believe that it is *not the duty of the unregenerate, to believe, repent, or pray.*" I

will therefore add my testimony to yours on this point. The one may strengthen the other.

I will first examine the subject of *Antinomianism* and see whether "*the path which no fowl knoweth, and the vulture's eye hath not seen*" can be a middle track between that and Arminianism. The signification of the term *Antinomianism* is, according to its etymology, *against law*, as shown by Brother Beebe; and the charge evidently intended to be fixed upon those to whom this term is applied by the world is that they are opposed to the law of God, or do it away by their doctrine. This charge, if the enemies of the Truth were admitted to be judges, would have been fixed upon the Master of the House, and upon those of His household in every age, from Paul down to Brother Meredith and myself, who preach a "***finished salvation***" in Christ. But I appeal from those *would be judges* to the Scriptures of Truth. I would stand at the judgment seat of Christ.

Those who anciently claimed to be disciples of Moses in distinction from Christ, evidently supposed that the letter of the Sinai laws, moral and ceremonial, together with the traditions of their fathers, constituted a **code of law** which supplanted the *original law under which man was created*; and that this was the standard by which man's acceptance with God, or rejection, was to be decided. Because Christ and His apostles preached a doctrine adverse to this Pharisaical law, they were denounced as "*opposers of the law of Moses*." The modern *Nomians* or legalists also understand the original law of God to have given place to a milder law, compounded of the letter of the Ten Commandments only and what they conceive to be certain requisitions and conditions of the "Gospel," and that this "gospel law" is the standard of righteousness, by which all men under the "gospel" are to be tried, and a want of conformity to it is the ground of condemnation; and according

to some; a personal conformity to it, is the ground of *justification*. But no individual who has been brought truly to love the law of God, can admit of its being supplanted by such a medley of human contrivances, and when it is opposed, either as a standard of right or as a yoke of bondage attempted to be put upon the neck of disciples of Christ, its opposers are at once denounced as **Antinomians**!

In making my appeal from these partial judges, I file the following answers to their fallacious charges: **1<sup>st</sup>**. That God in creating Adam a living soul, laid him, and his posterity in him under obligation to love the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his strength; and to love his neighbor as himself; that this constituted the **law of His creation**, and the eternal standard of right, which no apostasy of man could make void. **2<sup>nd</sup>**. That the revelation which God has made of His mind and will in the Scriptures, the **alone standard of Truth**, nowhere teaches that God has ever *abrogated this law of man's creation*, altered its requisitions, or abated its demands to suit the weakness of fallen man. This answer is sustained by Matthew 5: 17-20 and Romans 3:31. **3<sup>rd</sup>**. That the prohibition given to Adam in the garden not to eat of the forbidden tree, was designed as a test of his subjection to God and to the law of his creation; his transgressing this prohibition was therefore the just ground of his being condemned and his posterity in his loins to a state of total depravity or "*death in sin.*" And that the law of Ten Commands given from Sinai, in its general bearing upon all men, distinct from its special reference to Israel nationally, was **not designed** as a *covenant of works* and to lead men to depend on their obedience to it for their final acceptance with God, either Jews or Gentiles; but it "*was added because of transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made, &c.;*" (Galatians 3:19) it "*entered that the offence might abound.*" (Romans 5:20.) In a word, it was given in its spiritual import, in

the sense in which Paul says “*the law is spiritual, as a school master*” (Romans 7:14) to teach both Jews and Gentiles their entire depravity and guilt, and the impossibility of their being justified by the deeds of the law, and their need of just such a salvation as is revealed in Christ, a salvation from sin and sovereignly free.

Hence it is written “*We know that what things soever the law saith, it **saith to them that are under the law**, that every mounth may be stopped and all the world become guilty before God;*” and again, “*For by the law is the knowledge of sin.*” (Romans 3: 19,20.) Neither, I will add, was this law of Ten Commands given, in itself considered, to be a *rule of life*; it was designed to teach us what sin is, and its moral precepts are sanctioned by the New Testament as illustrating that which is a proper deportment toward God and toward man in a general and moral point of view. But a *rule of life* to be correct must be an exact measure of all that is required of us to perform. This law was not such to ancient Israel; other laws were given them, which they were required also to obey, and which were of course component parts of that rule by which their lives were to be squared, such as certain positive Institutions of a ceremonial nature, &c. Neither is it a perfect law to spiritual Israel; the life of a Christian as such, must be upon a broader scale than the letter of the Decalogue, in order to its being squared with the Gospel. Repentance toward God for his daily wandering of heart, and living daily by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and an establishment in the Truths of the Gospel must enter into the composition of a Christian’s lie or walk in order to his conformity to the Gospel standard; and these things are beyond the compass of the Ten Commands, “*For the law is not of faith, but the man that doeth them shall live in them.*” (Galatians 3:12.) There are also positive institutions belonging exclusively to the Gospel to be observed by the Christian if he would “*walk uprightly according to the Truth of the Gospel.*” Therefore the



legalists call us *Antinomians* for denying that the law as given to Israel is a *rule of life* to the disciples of Christ, we may well call them “**anti-gospelers**, or “*anti-new-testamenters*” for their attempts to make it a full rule to the Christian’s life. Thus much for our views concerning the much insisted upon notion thsat the law is a *rule of life* to the Christian, and I will now return to the further consideration of the answers I have filed.

[It may be noted that those chargings Hyper-Calvinists as Antinomians, do not themselves even remotely keep the law for any reason today, let alone as a “rule of life!”- SCP]

**1<sup>st</sup>.** Whilst these answers stand, and they must stand according to the standard of eternal Truth, it is evident that we are justified in opposing this law-of-conditions of which faith and repentance and various religious ceremonies, are the principle terms, being foisted into the place of that unchanging standard of right, the law under which man was created, as that by which man is to be judged before God. Consequently their charge against us of being *Antinomian* on this account will not stand, and, so long as it is written “*Whosoever offendeth in one point of the law is guilty of the whole,*” it must be evident that whoever sets up anything other than the spiritual or original law of God in its exceeding broadness as the standard by which man is to be tried before God, by which he is to be justified or condemned, opposes or makes void the law and *he is therefore an Antinomian* in the strict import of the word. The teaching that the law will accept of anything short of perfect obedience to the everlasting demands, or that it will of any substitution in the place of this perfect obedience, such as repenting and believing the Gospel and the like, is according to the above view of the subject *Antinomianism*.

Having thus shown what *Antinomianism* is, and the characters on whom the charge properly rests, I will briefly show its position in relation to *Arminianism* by a few questions.

**1<sup>st</sup>.** Who are they that are opposed to the enforcing the rigorous demands of the spiritual law of God? The unregenerate, whether professors or not; “*For the carnal mind is enmity against God, not subject to the law of God,*” &c. But unregenerate professors of Christianity more fully **act out** this opposition; they then **are the practical Antinomians**.

**2<sup>nd</sup>.** Who are they that are fond of the Arminian? Or the “do and live” system? The unregenerate universally; but those of them who profess religion, more openly avow this system. Hence the *Arminian* in heart is an *Antinomian* in heart, and the professed Arminian stands in his doctrine opposed to the unchangeable demands and rectitudes of the original law of God, and is therefore in truth an avowed *Antinomian*. Or thus: Those who make void the law of God by their traditions or systems must be *Antinomians*. What is Arminianism, but a system that teaches that men’s acceptance with God depends on certain conditions to be performed by them, short of a perfect obedience to the original law of God? Christ having according to some taken away the original law, and according to others, made an atonement for sin abstractly [general and universal atonement] considered, to make room for such conditions being accepted. Hence Arminianism and Antinomianism terminates at the same point, are two different names for the same system of opposition to the law of God. How then can the “*path which the vulture’s eye hath not seen*” pass between the two? There is no middle ground there.

But Brother Meredith is ready to ask, is there no system which opposes the obligations of the law of God, different from the systems of conditions? In answer I admit it has been said that there were those who held that the elect were never under the law, and that Christ never saw any sin in them &c. But such a sentiment would as completely do away redemption by Christ as it would the law. Besides this sentiment would be so

irrational, so contrary to that sense of accountability which men have, that I cannot think such a sentiment ever existed in the breasts of any who believe there is a God and admitted the authenticity of the Scriptures. The sentiment also that the elect as the “children of Adam” were actually justified from all demands of the law before time began, and were then, absolved from all charge of guilt, would, if carried out in its legitimate bearing, amount to an abrogation of the law in their behalf, and therefore be *Antinomianism*. But I know of none who contend for this sentiment that would admit of its being carried out to what I think its full implication; therefore, though they may be inconsistent, they are not Antinomians in the way they hold it. [Reference here is made to Daniel Parkers “two-seedism.”]

Consequently, my brother, we in vain look for the granite rock of Antinomianism (where the charge of Antinomianism is just as implying opposition to the law of God) so severed from the sandbars of Arminianism as to admit of the path or *way of holiness* passing between them. Indeed I may confidently ask, how would sandbars ever be found in the sea were there not granite rock or something like it to form an eddy or obstruct the passage of the drifting sand and cause it to become a deposit? And how could any conditional or Arminian system ever get foothold were there not enmity in the human breast to the government and law of God; an Antinomian principle latent there, that would overturn the sovereignty of God, and bring down His perfect law from its pure and holy demands, to a level with the capacity of depraved mortals to obey?

I will notice that *path which no fowl knoweth, that way of holiness* in which the child of grace is led. And my brother, if you have eyes to see, as I think you have, and do not suffer men to put their fingers or systems into them, I shall show you that this path as Brother Beebe stated, leads directly off, alike from the ground of Antinomianism and of Arminian opposition

to the Truth.

The very **first step** in which a person is led in the Christian life takes him off from that firm standing he before had on Arminian grounds; **regeneration being the implantation of the eternal life in the soul** which is love to God and His law. Sin, instead of holiness and the divine law, now becomes the object of his hatred. Long and hard may he struggle to regain a standing on Arminian ground, or in other words, to feel a confidence in his own doings, but in vain, every struggle but removes him farther from this confidence; he is led to an enlarged view of the law in its spirituality, sees it to be just and good, and his love to it makes him loath every thing that comes short of its righteous demands, as all his acts and thoughts do; and his confidence in his doings and exercises is therefore more and more destroyed. He finds himself at last without any standing, lying upon the absolute mercy of God, having no good prayers, repentance or reformation to hold on to, and feeling that if mercy does not hold him up he must in justice sink eternally. Hence, love and reverence for the law of God instead of making a person pleased with his own righteousness, and giving him a desire to be accepted with God on the ground of his own doings, lead him to throw aside his own doings and make him willing to be saved experimentally as a poor sinner; just in proportion therefore an *Antinomian* opposition to the law is eradicated from his mind altogether. Arminian confidence in creaturely performance is destroyed. Here is the mystery of the Christian's path that the *vulture's eye cannot see*; no person, not taught of God, can comprehend how that love and subjection to the law of God should cause one to loathe his own righteousness, nor how a person who relies entirely on the sovereign mercies of God in Christ for salvation, can be *zealous of good works*, without any motivation for merited rewards. Yet such is the case. The same love to the law which leads a person to renounce all human works as the

ground of his acceptance with God, makes him cling to and rely on the work of Christ for acceptance when that work in its *completion is once revealed* to him – a past tense salvation – as having been wrought for such poor sinners as he. The reason is that the one would degrade the law whilst the other perfectly honors it. Hence he *who rejoices in Christ Jesus, has no confidence in the flesh*; (Philippians 3:3) and he who with Paul can say “*I delight in the law of God after the inward man,*” would also with him say, “*not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the **faith of** Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith*” (Romans 7:22 & Philippians 3:9.)

I think from what has been shown that Brother Meredith will be satisfied that the Christian’s path which is “*as a shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day,*” cannot lead him in a middle way between **Antinomian** opposition to the law and **Arminian** love of human works, but that **it leaves both** in the background.

SIGNS of the Times: Volume 7 **(1839).**

**finis**





NOTE: We conclude this book at this point (Chapter 12). Chapter 13 begins a Documentary History of the Great Baptists' Separations. We collected the actual historical documents of both sides of the various divisions and produced them in chronological order. The early documents of letters from Roman governors to Ceasar relative to prosecution of Christian for being "Christians." The organization of the



Baptists Board of Foreign Missions in May, 14, 1814; the Thoughts on Missions by John Taylor of the Particular Baptists of Ky in 1818 and the Daniel Parker Address in 1820; the Kehukee Baptist Association Declaration in 1820; followed by the Miami Baptists Association's Convention and the Baltimore Convention and Address of 1835, the second Baltimore Convention's additions to the Black Rock Address in 1837; the organization of the Indiana Mission Society and Address; White Water Regular Baptist Objection to Missions in 1844; the Mississippi Plan for Missions and the opposition's "Reason and Appeals," of 1844.

We plan to print these in Hardcover as a historical Resource Book on Baptists Issues entitles "The Great Baptists' Schisms." If interested, please watch for the announcement of its availability. The Author and Editor.

## ***FINIS***

### **CHAPTER THIRTEEN**

#### **THE GREAT BAPTIST SEPARATION: 1813-1845**

The Particular Baptists (Regular & United) in America saw a large increase in membership during the Great Awakening. Many were added to their churches, while many more formed new churches, and other whole established Congregational, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian congregations embraced the Baptists' principle of "Believers' Baptism" and constituted themselves as "Baptists" churches. This latter group was referred to as "Separate Baptists" because they had separated from the

pedaebaptists denominations. Now, which "Baptist" church in the village is the "regular" Baptists? Hence, quickly, the term "Particular" was dropped, and the Particular Baptists were referred to as the "**Regular** Baptists." The Great Awakening in America divided all denominations, and created many newer ones. However, it was a predestinarian, or "Calvinistic" revival. Andrew Fuller and the "mission" system was not then in place. The type of gospel proclamation was by "**itinerate preaching**," which had prevailed from the Apostolic Age, and was highly successful. These churches did not have missions, Sunday Schools, instrumental music, choirs, cloyed singers, youth groups, men's brotherhoods, ball teams, tennis clubs, cake bakes, *etc.* They worshipped simply, dressed simply, held to the sovereignty of God, believed in particular redemption, required an experience of grace prior to immersion, trusted Christ's righteousness, and met by regular appointments monthly or bi-monthly, allowing time for their ministers to engage in itinerate preaching in other communities. They insisted upon Christian deportment and strict discipline. With the arrival of the Fullerite innovations after 1813, those holding to the above became known as the Old School Baptists. An "Old School" Baptist church may have had its origin in the Separate Baptists' movement or the earlier Particular Baptists settlement in North America. Almost all the Six Principle Baptists (Welsh) were, and remained, Old School. The latter were the first to withdraw from the Philadelphia Association as it slide into error, in 1794. (*ibid*, page 297.)

[Here we need to clarify something that many Calvinists discover. The Black Rock Address of 1832 does not deal with any *doctrinal disputes*. The **doctrinal issues** were dealt with in the later **Old School Baptist Convention in Baltimore in 1835**. (See page \_\_\_\_). The Address of 1832 deals

exclusively with these *innovations in practices*. Some wish to claim that this is because the "Old School" departed from the doctrines of Arminianism; *i.e.*, the Mission party was the original group of Baptists and were freewillers. But let us note, that doctrinally, only 7% of Baptists were General Baptists, or Arminians in 1792. This division was not among the General Baptists. It was among the Particular, or Regular Baptists. The reason the **Black Rock Address** did not deal with doctrine is that all these Particular, or Regular Baptists were Calvinistic in 1832. Arminianism had not yet gained a significant foot-hold prior to the 1850's among Baptists . It was during the Down-Grade between 1850 and 1890 that the Progressive Era destroyed Calvinism among the Mission, or New School Baptists and the Means (later Primitive Baptists). So the Black Rock Convention had no need, in 1832, to deal with the creeping Arminianism. It was too insignificant then. However it was already germinating that early and spread as wild mushrooms very quickly thereafter.]

The Particular, or Regular, Baptists holding to the "Old School" which existed prior to the rise of Fullerism and the "evangelical down-graders" (to borrow Spurgeon's phrase) became alarmed by all the unscriptural innovations being imposed on the Baptists' faith and community. In the late Colonial and early Frontier periods, Baptists churches had joined together into "associations" as "advisory committees" and fellowships. These "associations" in turn joined, and "corresponded" with each other; and these "chains of correspondences" had spread throughout the nation. Introduction of doctrinal, practical, or moral innovations in one church involved all the churches in that association. If sustained, that error now involves all the associations in the correspondening chains, and thus the whole Baptist denomination. The novel practices of the Fullerite faction

was as a match set to a stick of dynamite. The rupture was inevitable and severe. The whole system of associations and correspondences was unscriptural, and dangerous! Any infraction in doctrine or practice could spread as wildfire throughout the whole body of the denomination- and that is exactly what occurred. The practices of the mission faction after 1814 sparked the first division with the followers of Alexander Campbell in the 1820's with his "Christian Restoration Movement," which was an *ecumenical movement* to unite Christianity. It differed from the Baptists' ecumenical movement in that it crossed all lines of differences; whereas the Baptists' ecumenical movement's object was the unification of differing groups of Baptists. The Cambellian "Christian Restoration Movement" divided Presbyterian, Baptists, and Congregational churches, and produced the "United Church of Christ;" the "Churches of Christ", the "Christian Church," and the "Disciples of Christ", and others. Simultaneously, the Fullerites imbedded themselves into an associations, first in Philadelphia, and then in North Carolina and one in Tennessee. The movement was innoculus at first, and raised little opposition. However by 1818 the zealots among the Mission Movement became very sectarian and obnoxious, which attracted the attention of such men as John Taylor in Kentucky, Daniel Parker in Illinois, the Dudley elders in Kentucky, and Wilson Thompson in Ohio. By 1832, the polarization of the two groups occurred, and some way was felt necessary to stop the inroads of so many "benevolent institutions so-called" from disrupting the peace and tranquility of the Baptist denomination. As a result, the Great Baptists Separation would be next!

The initiation of that division was the constituting of the first *Mission Society* in America by the Fullerite New School Baptists, **in May of 1814**. In America, the initial

origin of Missionary Baptists commenced in 1814, and the founder of the Missionary Baptists was Andrew Fuller, of Kittering, England. In America, the founder was Willuam Stroughton, who took up the first collection for missions in Widow Wallis' home in Kittering to send William Carey to the East Indies Company in Calcutta. He arrived in Philadelphia, carrying a "Doctor's" degree which he did not have when he sailed from London. To commence this section of this book, we will first insert an *unabridged copy of the original* Minutes of the first Baptists' missionary society in America.

*[This historical document has long been missing, but after we commenced writing this book, it came up on E-Bay and we obtained this copy of it. Both Old and New School Baptists will find it of real interest. - Editor/Publisher.]*

*"Little Children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us, but they were mot of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not of us." (I John 2: 19, 20).*

## **PART II**

DOCUMENTS OF THE  
  
GREAT BAPTISTS' SEPARATION

IN AMERICA

Or

The OLD SCHOOL of Divinity

vs

The NEW SCHOOL of Divinity

1814 to 1845

Collected and Discussed

BOOK II

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page:</b>
Foreword . . . . .	1
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	3
1814- Proceeding of the Baptist Convention . . . . .	12
John F. Johnson's "Return to Indiana" . . . . .	69
1814- Minutes of the Miami Baptist Association, Ohio . . . . .	71
1819- Minutes of the Miami Baptist Association, Ohio . . . . .	72
1819- Elder John Taylor's "Thoughts on Missions" . . . . .	73
1820- Public ADDRESS to the Baptist Society, Daniel Parker. . . . .	117
1826- Kehukee Baptist Association DECLARATION . . . . .	158
1832- Black Rock ADDRESS . . . . .	159
1832-Prospectus of the SIGNS of the TIMES. . . . .	183
1837- Appendage to the Black Rock ADDRESS . . . . .	184
1834- The General Association of Baptists of Indiana. . . . .	188
1834- The White River Regular Baptist Association, Ind. . . . .	203
1835- Resolution of the Miami Baptist Association of Ohio . . . . .	222
1835- The Baltimore ADDRESS . . . . .	223
1844- Minutes of Mount Pisgah Baptist in Miss. . . . .	241
1844- Miss. Bethany Baptist Reasons and Appeals . . . . .	258
Conclusion . . . . .	261

## FOREWORD

The reader may find the Introduction to be rather strange, in that one purpose the author has in publishing these documents is to question *why* such a great and speedily- even *radical* - modification could take place in Christianity in such a brief period of time: from 1814 to 1845. What forces were in play that threw so many serious and respectable citizens into such an enthusiastic phrenzy of humanitarian and religious zealousness?

We must rule out the Great Awakening, 1720 – 1760, since this revival was Calvinistic, and did not ignite such a blaze of activity as seen following the Frontier Revivals, 1810-1825. Nor can we acclaim that the notion of a *general and/or universal atonement* triggered it; for the movement did not spring from the General Baptists who held to that view of the atonement, but from the Particular Baptists who were Calvinistic.

Hence, in analyzing this phenomena, we will briefly examine one of the earliest similar events in ancient history, in the Roman Empire in the second century. We will also notice the wildly democratic movement on the earlier American frontier and the enthusiasm for writing charters and constitutions by frontiersmen, as a contributing factor. We need to examine the change in how Christians viewed the atonement of Christ, for this modification is at the core of the evangelical aspects of the benevolent movement. And, obviously we need to look at the capitalistic profit motive – the pyramid scheme to raise money by enterprising religious folks as well.

We approach this examination using the tools of anthropology and sociology, only because these help to see an in-depth and gestalt view of modern religion more clearly. The subject is too complicated for a singular view.

## INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST CONTEST: 1814-1845



Throughout the history of religions of the world, and in all nations of antiquity, religion has served as a *static* in the culture of nations. In general, we can note that *religion* is the foundation of the *mores* of all cultures; *mores* set the people's views of what is right or wrong; good or evil; righteous or wicked – *i.e.*, *morals*. That which is approved is called *moral* while that which is disapproved are considered *taboo*. That which is considered *wrong, bad, or wicked* is said to be *taboo, or forbidden*. When the *mores* become slack and the *taboos* begin to take on acceptability, the principle leaders of *religion* and *morality* cause *laws* to be made to prevent or inhibit the continual erosion of the *mores*. Thus, indirectly, the origin of law is religion. Once the laws are inculcated into the culture, religion can play an ever weakening role. In fact, under some atheistic nations, religion is not allowed to play any further part in the culture.

For thousands of years, religion set the standard of right and wrong, and hence was a “*static* in society.” That is, religion prevented very little, if any, further development in the culture, and laws were more generalized. Each class or caste of subjects knew their “place” in society, and what “roles” (behavioral patterns) they were to abide by on any particular occasion or circumstance.

With the above consideration, viewing the rather slow modifications in religion and laws over thousands of years, perhaps the greatest upheaval in world culture was the sudden, unexpected, dramatic explosion of revolutionary change in religion, laws, and culture of Western Civilization. The most glaring case-study of this change is in the early frontier experience in America.

Anthropologists and Sociologists can spend a lifetime hypothesizing what broke down the *static force* in America's religion. There was introduced within the American frontier religion a *dynamic* which erupted suddenly all across the

frontier. It is most likely the greatest and most startling eruption in the history of the world; even surpassing the schism in the Church of Rome closing the medieval period, as Calvin, Luther, and the Protestant modified the Religious/Political system of the "Holy Roman Empire." [It was not very holy; it was much more Germanic; and politically, it was a confederacy rather than an *empire!* ]

It is intriguing to attempt to discover what *dynamic(s)* was (were) introduced into American religions to so suddenly burst forth in progressive, humanistic, sentimental emotions strong enough to totally destroy Christianity as formerly defined in Western culture. In 1790, ninety-three percent of religious devotees in America claimed to be Calvinistic. Strong taboos carried social stigmas throughout the communities, whether they were "saints or sinners." Churches enforced the mores drawn from "the Bible" upon all church members; and churches censored each other for laxity on church discipline. The "refined" gentle class – the respectable citizens, those "of good stock" and high "breeding" were watched closely for any breach of morality, and the "high-brows" were equally alert to the mischief of those who would commit taboos. The static in society was strong enough, that it will not be until 1840 that city fathers in New York thought they needed policemen!

We will first go to the antiquity of the Christian religion to show how the Romans had so endued the concept of criminality of Christians, which concept was a major *static* in Roman society. Then we will return to look at what might have been the *dynamic* which erupted across the American frontier. I copy two letters between Emperor Trajan, in A.D. 106 and the governor of Bithynia, Pliny. Historians almost universally acclaim both these men as the most enlightened in the history of Rome, and say that this period was the "happiest period" in the ancient empire. So, now, read the two letters, of these "best of rulers."

“C. Pliny to the Emperor Trajan, wishes health. Sire! It is customary with me to consult you upon every doubtful occasion; for where my own judgment hesitates, who is more competent to direct me than yourself, or to instruct me where uninformed? I never had occasion to be present at an examination of the Christians before I came into this province; I am therefore ignorant to what extent it is usual to inflict punishment, or urge prosecution. I have also hesitated whether there should not be some distinction made between the young and the old, the tender and the robust; whether pardon should not be offered to penitence, or whether the guilt of an avowed profession of Christianity can be expiated by the unequivocal retraction – whether the profession itself is to be regarded as a crime, however innocent in other respects the professor may be; or whether the crimes attached to name, must be proved before they are made liable to punishment.

“In the mean time, the method I have hitherto observed with the Christians, who have been accused as such, has been as follows. I interrogated them – Are you a Christian? If they avowed it, I put the same question a second, and a third time, threatening them with the punishment decreed by the law: if they still persisted, *I ordered them to be immediately executed: for of this I had no doubt, whatever was the nature of their religion, that such perverseness and inflexible obstinacy certainly deserved punishment.* Some that were infected with this madness, on account of their privilege as Roman citizens, I reserved to be sent to Rome, to be referred to your tribunal.

In the discussion of this matter, accusations multiplying, a diversion of cases occurred. A schedule of names was sent me by an unknown accuser: but when I cited the persons before me, many denied the fact that they were, or ever had been Christians; and they repeated after me an invocation of the gods, and of your image, which for this purpose I had ordered to be brought with the stature of the other deities. They performed sacred rites with wine and frankincense, and

execrated Christ; none of which things, I am assured, a real Christian can ever be compelled to do. These, therefore, I thought proper to discharge. Others, named by an informer, at first acknowledged themselves Christians, and then denied it, declaring that though they had been Christians, they had renounced their profession, some three years ago, others still longer, and some even twenty years ago. All these worshipped your image and the statues of the gods, and at the same time execrated Christ.

“And this was the account which they gave me of the nature of the religion they once had professed, whether it deserves the name of crime or error; namely, that they were accustomed on a stated day to assemble **before sun-rise, and to join together in singing hymns to Christ as a deity; binding themselves as with a solemn oath not to commit any kind of wickedness; to be guilty of theft, robbery, nor adultery; never to break a promise, or to keep back a deposit when called upon. Their worship being concluded, it was their custom to separate, and meet together again for a repast, promiscuous indeed, and without any distinction of rank or sex, but perfectly harmless; and even from this they desisted, since the publication of my edict, in which agreeably to your orders, I forbade any societies of that sort.**

“For further information, I thought it necessary, in order to come at the truth, **to put to the torture two females who were called deaconesses. But I could extort from them nothing except the acknowledgment of an excessive and depraved superstition; and, therefore, desisting from further investigation, I determined to consult you;** for the *number of culprits is so great as to call for the most serious deliberation.* Informations are pouring in against multitudes of every age, of all orders, and of both sexes, and more will be impeached; for the contagion of this superstition hath spread not only through cities, but villages also, and even reached the

farm houses. I am of opinion, nevertheless, that it may be checked, and the success of my endeavors hitherto forbids despondency; for the temples, once almost desolate, begin to be again frequented – the sacred solemnities which had for some time been intermitted, are now attended afresh; and the sacrificial victims, which once could scarcely find a purchaser, now obtain a brisk sale. Whence I infer, that many might be reclaimed, were the hope of pardon, on their repentance, absolutely confirmed.”

#### Emperor Trajan to Pliny

“My dear Pliny,

“You have done perfectly right, in managing as you have, the matters which relate to the impeachment of the Christians. No one general rule can be laid down which will apply to all cases. These people are not to be **hunted up by informers**; but if accused and convicted, **let the be executed**; yet with this restriction, **that any renounce t Christianity, and give proof of it by offering supplications to our gods, however suspicious their past conduct may have been, they shall be pardoned on their repentance.** But anonymous accusations should never be attended to, since it would be establishing a precedent of the worst kind, and altogether inconsistent with the maxims of my government.”

Neither of these “enlightened” rulers saw anything amiss in the law condemning one to death for the simple crime of “being a Christian.” Since the days of Nero, the consideration that embracing Christianity was a crime against the State had so imbedded in the culture of Rome, that this concept was a *static* in the Roman jurisdiction. Consider Pliny’s remarks. The number of Christians had grown so great, that schedules had to be arranged to process their interrogations and executions; the temples of the Roman gods had almost been totally

deserted, but there was some evidence of a revival of their use; and his description of their devotion was as harmless as one could desire. Yet, the mere fact that one embraced the religion of Jesus was sufficient for a liberal government to execute them in the most horrible manner – feed them to wild beast to entertain the masses!

What could have been their crime, when Rome was so liberal in embracing all the religions of their conquered provinces? From at least five hundred years before the birth of Christ, the Roman senate appointed one leader of one religion in Rome as the *Pontific Maximus*; who was the head of all the religions of the empire until his death. Upon his death, the head of a different religion was appointed Pontiff, *etc.*, each religion taking turns having their leaders appointed Pontiffs. Why not the Jews? Why not the Christian? They both had one common feature totally contrary to the public sentiments of Roman religions: they worshipped “one only true and living God;” and had nothing to do with the deities of Rome. Nothing infuriates religious devotees more than for it to be suggested that you, and only you, worship the true God, and your religion was the only true religion. That is still true in the nature of man! It has not changed in the past twenty-five hundred years!

Trajan’s and Pliny’s correspondence was about the year *a.d.* 106. This condition continued through ten consecutive persecutions, unto *a.d.* 300. It is said, that if Rome banished all Christians, the whole Empire would have been destroyed by their exodus; yet the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of both Eastern and Roman Empire, simultaneously brought to bear to exterminate this sectarian race was a total failure. The most the powers of Rome were concentrated upon their narrow-mindedness existence, the more they prospered! The world of devils, who so often spoke vocally at the Oracles of the Roman’s temples, finally was chained. One of the last, the Oracle of Delphi, seldom answered the queries put to him; and when asked, the last voice from the Oracle, reported by a

number of heathen historians, said: “*There is a Hebrew boy, who is king of the gods, who has commanded me to leave this house, and be gone to hell, and therefore you are to expect no more answers.*” [We understand the possibility that Roman Catholic translators could have tampered with the heathen historian script, but it is also likely to be so; for suddenly, Christian persecutions by Pagan Rome ceased.- SCP]

Satan was now faced with something wholly new to him. Christianity was becoming a *dynamic force* to topple the Pagan religions that had so long spilled the blood of the innocent followers of Jesus. Their temples were pulled down; their priests forbidden to practice their craft; and the pastor of the church at Rome was appointed Pontiff Maximus – the first time in Roman history that a sectarian religious leader won that prize. “Sectarian leader”? Well, no! Constantine merely ordered all religions to unite under his rule, and the various traditions, customs, statues, and pagan symbols were incorporated into the Constantine Church. The “Cross” Constantine reported to have seen, with the words, “By this thy shalt conquer,” was the pagan cross of Talmuz. It was first used by General Titus, when he crucified the leaders of the Jewish revolt in *a.d.* 68-70. Heretofore, the Christian symbol was a circle, with twelve petals, or leaves, within the circle, representing the Tree of Life. But now, Pagan Rome merely shifted to Papal Rome, and borrowed the system set up by the Caesars in *a.d.* 175. One single religion, with the emperor at its head, and the Pontiff the executor of religious affairs.

We do not suggest hereby that true Christianity was swallowed up by the new Rome – it was not. It remained sectarian, and in *a.d.* 330, was expelled from the Empire and the property assigned to State bishops. But, Christianity had so eroded the static forces of the Roman culture as to compel the greatest revolutionary adjustment in world history. Nominal Christianity had become the *dynamics* to bring about the destruction of the old order of Pagan Rome.

In order for any religion to be either a *static* in society to maintain the *status quo*, or a *dynamic* to force a change in the culture, it must be embraced by the general populous. The religion of Jesus can never be that influential, for inherent within itself are conflicting principles that prevent its acceptability by natural unregenerate men; it mandates exclusiveness – “*come out from among them and be ye separate,*” or even the simple “*Thou shalt not commit adultery,*” [using Jesus’ and His church’s definition of adultery,] – the monogamous or celibacy life-style it restricts its devotees to is totally unacceptable to natural man. One may as well have a Quaker government (pacifist) during an Indian assault, as to have a sectarian, exclusive, and pure religion being embraced by Adam’s race!

For Christianity to have achieved the level of compromise sufficient to become a dynamic under Constantine; we must need point out a division in Christianity as far back as *a.d. 149*. Following a severe period of persecution, the church found a period of relative peace. Many who had recanted, or apostatized during interrogation during the persecution, now re-entered the church. This did not set well with true believers who had borne the heat of the persecution. In *a.d. 149*, two presbyters in the Church at Rome were put forth to become the bishop of the church. Cornelius had apostatized and turned over Christian literature to the authorities to be burned; Novatius, had suffered for the cause of Christ. So many apostates had re-entered the church at Rome that they elected Cornelius as the bishop of the church. The Christians that desired the purity of the church separated from the apostates, and thereafter the apostate church increased in its acceptability with Rome; while the Novatians were persecuted both by Rome and by the corrupt party. It was the compromising corrupt party that became the *dynamic* in Roman society, for Constantine’s mother was of that party, and he made it the State religion of the Empire. The Puritan party, or *Cathari* was disfranchised.



Driven from the civilized parts of the Empire, they wandered through Europe, Asia and Africa; being called by many different names, but in general was known as *Anabaptists*, for they insisted upon the baptism of all coming from the corrupt party to their communion. They were *sectarian* – that hated word! That hated principle! That hated people! Uncompromising, *hardshells*, *Hyper-calvinists*!

These sectarians believed in baptism by immersion in a day that the dominant party of “Christians” poured or sprinkled infants, bringing them into their churches. We introduce two words here, and then move on: (1) *paedobaptists* – those who sprinkle or baptize infants; and (2) *Baptists* – those who baptize by immersion those that profess an experience of grace and faith in the Lord Jesus. Of the *Baptist group*, there are two major belief-systems: (1) *General Baptists* – those that believe that the atonement of Christ was “in general” (not specific) for all mankind; and (2) *Particular Baptists* – Those that believed that Christ’s atonement was for particular individuals chosen in Christ before the creation of the world – *i.e.*, - the elect, or sheep, only. The documents we produce are derived mostly from this latter group: the Particular Baptists.

## PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

# BAPTIST CONVENTION

FOR

## *MISSIONARY PURPOSES;*

HELD IN PHILADELPHIA,

IN MAY, 1814

=====  
PHILADELPHIA:

Printed for the Convention, by Ann Coles,

1814

## CONSTITUTION,

We, the delegates from Missionary Societies, and other religious Bodies of the Baptist denomination, in various parts of the United States, met in Convention, in the City of Philadelphia, for the purpose of carrying into effect the benevolent Intentions of our Constituents, by organizing a plan for eliciting, combining, and directing the Energies of the whole denomination in one sacred effort, for sending the glad tidings of Salvation to the Heathen, and to nations destitute of pure

Gospel-light, DO AGREE to the following Rules or fundamental Principles, viz.

I. That this body shall be styled “The General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America, for Foreign Missions.”

II. That a triennial Convention shall, hereafter, be held, consisting of Delegates, not exceeding two in number, from each of the several Missionary Societies, and other religious bodies of the Baptist Denomination, now existing, or which may hereafter be formed in the United States, and which shall each, regularly contribute to the general Missionary Fund, a sum, amounting, at least, to one hundred Dollars, *per annum*.

III. That for the necessary transaction and dispatch of business, during the recess of the said Convention, there shall be a Board of twenty-one Commissioners, who shall be members of the said Societies, Churches, or other religious bodies aforesaid, triennially appointed, by the said Convention, by ballot, to be called the “Baptist Board of Foreign Missions for the United States;” seven of whom shall be a quorum for the transaction of all business; and which Board shall continue in

## CONSTITUTION

office until successors be duly appointed; and shall have power to make and adopt by-laws for the government of the said Board, and for the furtherance of the general objects of the Institution.

III. That it shall be the duty of the Board, to employ Missionaries; and, if necessary, to take measures for the improvement of their qualifications; to fix on the Field of their Labours, and the compensation to be allowed them for their

services; to superintend their conduct, and dismiss them, should their services be disapproved; to publish accounts, from time to time, of the Board's Transactions, and an annual Address to the public; to call a special meeting of the Convention on any extraordinary occasion, and, in general, to conduct the executive part of the missionary concern.

- IV. That such persons only, as are in full communion with some regular Church of our Denomination, and who furnish satisfactory evidence of genuine Piety, good Talents, and fervent Zeal for the Redeemer's Cause, are to be employed as Missionaries.
- V. That the Board shall choose, by ballot, one President, two Vice-Presidents, a Treasurer, a corresponding, and a recording Secretary.
- VI. That the president, or in case of his absence or disability, the senior vice-president present, shall preside in all meetings of the Board, and when application shall be made in writing, by any two of its members, shall call a special meeting of the Board, giving due notice thereof.

## CONSTITUTION

- VII. That the treasurer shall receive and faithfully account for all the monies paid into the treasury, keep a regular account of receipts and disbursements, make a report thereof to the said Convention, whenever it shall be in session, and to the Board of Missions annually, and as often as by them required: He shall also, before he enters on the duties of his office, give competent security, to be approved by the Board, for the stock and funds that may be committed to his care.

- VIII. That the corresponding secretary shall maintain intercourse by letter with such individuals, societies, or public bodies, as the interest of the institution may require. Copies of all communications made by the particular direction of the Convention or Board, shall be by him handed to the recording secretary, for record and safe keeping.
- IX. That the recording secretary shall, *ex officio*, be the secretary of the Convention, unless some other be by them appointed in his stead. He shall attend all the meetings of the Board, and keep a fair record of all their proceedings, and of the transactions of the Convention.
- X. That in case of the death, resignation, or disability of any of its officers, or members, the Board shall have power to fill each vacancy.
- XI. That the said Convention shall have power, and in the interval of their meeting, the Board of Commissioners, on the recommendation of any one of the constituent bodies belonging to the Convention, shall also have power, to elect honorary

## CONSTITUTION

members of piety and distinguished liberality, who, on their election, shall be entitled to a seat, and to take part in the debates of the Convention: but it shall be understood that the right voting shall be confined to the delegates.

- XII. That in case any of the constituent bodies shall be unable to send representatives to the said Convention, they shall be permitted to vote by proxy, which proxy shall be appointed by writing.

- XIII. That any alterations which experience may dictate from time to time, may be made in these Articles, at the regular meeting of the Convention, by two thirds of the members present.

Richard Furman, *President*.

*Attest,*

Thomas Baldwin, *Secretary*.

## MINUTES

At a meeting of the Delegates from associated bodies of the Baptist denominations formed in various parts of the United States, for the purpose of diffusing evangelic light, through benighted regions of the earth, convened at Philadelphia on **Wednesday the 18<sup>th</sup> of May, 1814:**

1. Rev'd. Dr. Furman, of Charleston, S. C. was called to the Chair, who opened the meeting with an appropriate prayer, in which the feelings of all present appeared to

## MINUTES

2. be solemnly united. Rev'd. Dr. Baldwin, of Boston, was requested to officiate as Secretary. The delegates produced their testimonials, and their names were enrolled in the following order; geographical situation being kept in view.

Rev'd. Thomas Baldwin, D. D.

State of Massachusetts

Rev'd. Lucius Bolles, A. M.

“ “

Rev'd. Stephen Gano, A. M.

State of Rhode Island

Rev'd. John Williams,

State of New York

Mr. Thomas Hewitt,	“	“
Mr. Edward Probyn,	“	“
Mr. Nathaniel Smith,	“	“
Rev'd. Burgiss Allison, D. D.	State of New Jersey	
Rev'd. Richard Proudfoot,	“	“
Rev'd. Josiah Stratton,	“	“
Rev'd. Wm. Boswell	“	“
Rev'd. Henry Smalley, A. M.	State of New Jersey	
Mr. Matthew Randall,	“	“
Mr. John Sisty,	“	“
Mr. Stephen Ustick,	“	“
Rev'd. Wm. Rogers, D. D.,	State of Pennsylvania	
Rev'd. Henry Holcombe, D. D.,	“	“
Rev'd. Wm. Staughton, D. D.,	“	“
Rev'd. Wm. White, A. M.,	“	“
Rev'd. John P. Peckworth,	“	“
Rev'd. Horatio G. Jones, A. M.,	“	“
Rev'd. Silas Hough,	“	“
Rev'd. Joseph Mathias,	“	“
Rev'd. Daniel Dodge,	State of Delaware	
Rev'd. Lewis Richards,	State of Maryland	
Rev'. Thomas Brooke,	“	“
Rev'd. Obadiah B. Brown,*	District of Columbia	
Rev'd. Wm. Gilmore,*	“	“
Rev'd. Luther Rice, A. M.,	“	“
Rev'd. Robert B. Semple,	State of Virginia	
Rev'd. Jacob Grigg,	“	“
Rev'd. John Bryce,*	“	“
Rev'd. James A. Ranaldson	State of North Carolina	

## MINUTES

Rev'd. Richard Furman, D. D.,	State of South Carolina
Rev'd. Matthias B. Tallmadge	“
Rev'd. W. B. Johnson,	State of Georgia

\*Delegates to whose names an asterisk is affixed did not attend

3. Agreed that a meeting of solemn prayer be held in the house of worship of the 1<sup>st</sup>. Baptist church in this city, on Saturday evening next, to implore the direction and blessing of the Holy Spirit on our measures.

4. After free conversation on the *most eligible plan* for attaining the grand object this convention has in view, it was *resolved* that our brethren Baldwin, Bolles, Gano, Williams, Allison, Holcombe, Rogers, Staughton, Dodge, Richards, Rice, Semple, Ranaldson, Furman and Johnson, be a committee to prepare and report such a plan without delay.
5. Drs. Furman, Baldwin and Staughton, were requested to prepare an address on the subject of foreign missions and the general interests of the Baptist denomination, to be circulated among the constituents of this Convention and throughout the Union.
6. A committee was appointed consisting of Dr. Holcombe and Rev'd. Messrs. Gano and Rice, to collect and report information relative to the encouragement already afforded by Societies and Associations in behalf of Missionary Interests, and the prospects favourable to future supplies.

Dr. Holcombe prayed.

*Adjourned to 10 o'clock to-morrow.*

=====

Thursday, May 19<sup>th</sup> 1814:

*Met pursuant to adjournment*

Dr. Baldwin prayed.

7. The committee appointed to propose a plan of Concert, reported by their chairman, on which the Convention *resolved* itself into a committee of the whole, Dr. Gano in the Chair. Its articles were twice read and several points freely debated: after which the President resumed the chair. The committee reported progress and requested leave to sit again, which was granted.

Dr. Staughton prayed.

*Adjourned to 3 o'clock, P. M.*

=====

*Met agreeable to adjournment.*

Dr. Rogers prayed.



The ministering brethren present, but not delegated to this body were invited to take a part in the deliberations.

8. The Convention again went into a Committee of the whole, and the discussion of the constitution was resumed; when it was proposed and agreed to, that the Committee rise, and report to the Convention that it is their wish the plan already presented, should be dispensed with; that a Committee be appointed to draft another, and that Rev'd. Dr. Furman, Rev'd. Dr. Baldwin, Rev'd. Messrs. Gano, Semple, and White, be the Committee. With this request the Convention complied.

Prayer by Dr. Gano.

*Adjourned unto to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.*

=====

*Friday, May 20,*

*Met according to adjournment.*

Dr. Allison prayed.

9. The Committee on the Constitution reported a plan, which was read, but at so late an hour as to preclude discussion.

Rev'd. L. Richards prayed.

*Adjourned to half past 3 o'clock*

*Met pursuant to adjournment*

Rev. Mr. Johnson prayed.

10. The plan of a Constitution presented in the forenoon was again read, and being taken up article by article, was discussed, and adopted as far as the sixth article.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Semple.

*Adjourned to half past 8 o'clock to-morrow morning.*

=====

Saturday, May 21.

*Met agreeable to adjournment.*

Rev. Mr. Williams prayed.

11. Resumed the consideration of the remaining articles, which, with some amendments, were adopted – Agreed to postpone the second reading until the afternoon.

Rev. Mr. Montanye prayed.

*Adjourned to half past 3 o'clock.*

=====

*Met pursuant to adjournment.*

Rev. Mr. Bolles prayed.

12. Proceeded to a second reading of the Constitution. Some amendments were proposed to the 42th Article, which were agreed to. On a third reading, the important question was put by the President in the following words: "Shall this Constitution as

## MINUTES

13. now read be adopted, as the basis of union, and the rule of conduct to be observed by this Constitution and its Board of Commissioners?" The vote was unanimously passed in the affirmative, by the rising of the members.
14. *Resolved*, that the President be requested to furnish an Abstract of the sermon delivered by him on Wednesday evening last, for publication with these Minutes.

15. Agreed, that the members, in their individual capacity, furnish Rev. Mr. Rice with the names of Persons whom they conceive most eligible for members of the Board of Commissioners, with a view to assist the Convention in the choice about to be made.

Rev. Mr. Roger prayed.

*Adjourned to Monday 10 o'clock A.M.*

Monday May, 26.

*Met pursuant to adjournment.*

Rev. Mr. Ranaldson prayed.

16. *Resolved*, that the President, the Secretary, and the Rev. Dr. Staughton be a committee, to superintend the printing and distribution of the Constitution, the afore-mentioned Address, the Abstract of the opening Sermon, and the Minutes. To this Committee Dr. Holcombe was afterwards added.

17. *Resolved*, that the next meeting of this Convention shall be held in Philadelphia, on the first Wednesday in May, A. D. 1817.

Rev. Mr. Brook prayed.

*Adjourned to 4 o'clock, P. M.*

=====

*Met agreeably to adjournment.*

Rev. Dr. Baldwin prayed.

## MINUTES

18. *Resolved*, that an arrangement be made by the Board of Commissioners, about to be established, for the preaching of a sermon before the Convention on the evening of the first day of their next meeting, by the appointment of a suitable person to perform the Service, and of another to supply his place in case of failure; and that at least six months previous notice shall be given to the persons concerned – On which occasion, after the sermon, a collection shall be made in aid of the Missionary Fund.

Proceeded to elect the Board of Commissioners, agreeably to the Constitution; when the following persons were returned as duly elected.

Richard Furman, Wm. Rogers, Henry Holcombe, Wm. Staughton, Thomas Balwin, Burgiss Allison, James A. Ranaldson, Daniel Dodge, Obadiah Brown, John Williams, William White, John P. Peckworth, Wm. B. Johnson, Robert B. Semple, Stephen Gano, Lucius Bolles, Lewis Richards, Matthias B. Tallmadge, Jeremiah Vardeman, H. G. Jones, and William Moulder.

19. *Resolved*, that it be, and it is hereby recommended to the several Societies and public bodies in connection, to maintain constant and affectionate intercourse with the corresponding Secretary, communicating all information to him in their power, which may conduce to the interest of the whole.
20. *Resolved*, that the Recording Secretary be requested to insert first in the book, which shall contain the proceedings of the board, the minutes of the present Convention, and the Constitution.
21. Dr. Rogers, reported a donation of fifty dollars from a lady, intended to aid the designs of this Convention. He is requested to return her their grateful acknowledgments- Dr. Staughton also is requested to present the thanks of this body to Mr. T. Dobson, for the donation of a blank book for their records.

## MINUTES

Rev. Mr. White Prayed.

*Adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.*

=====

Tuesday, May 24

*Met agreeably to adjournment.*

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Proudfoot.

22. The President produced the sum of one hundred dollars, which had been placed in his hands by the Honorable Judge Tallmadge as a donation to the Mission Fund: for which the thanks of the Convention were returned to the worthy Donor.

23. The following Gentlemen were chosen Honorary Members of this body;

Robert Ralston, Esq. Philadelphia.

Hon. Jonas Galucia, Vermont.

Captain Benjamin Wickes, Philadelphia.

John Bolton, Esq. Savannah.

Rev. Thomas B. Montanye.\*

**[\*Stan's Note:** Thomas B. Montanye was a member of First New York Church in 1791, and a messenger to the Philadelphia Baptist Association. At the formation of the Warwick Baptist Association, Thomas Montanye was pastor of the Warwick Church. Although made an Honorary Member of the Baptist Convention in 1814, in time, he sided with the opposition, served the Southampton Old School Baptist Church, and his tombstone is in its cemetery today.

We find Stephen Gano active in the formation of the Board, but his father, John Gano, was the first moderator of the Elkhorn, later renamed Licking Association of Particular Baptists, and served an Old School Baptist church in her bounds.]

24. A letter was received through Rev. Dr. Rogers from Mr. W. W. Woodward, relative to the publication of Dr. Gill's Exposition of the Old Testament; the New Testament having been, by that Gentleman, already printed. This Convention recommend to the churches throughout the Union to give the publication their

#### MINUTES

united and liberal support. Dr. Rogers is requested to answer Mr. Woodward's communication.

25. Mr. Waldo of George Town, South Carolina, through the medium of Rev. Mr. Rice, offered conditionally, certain profits, for the use of this body, from the publication of his elementary works for the use of Schools, which have by good judges been pronounced truly valuable. The Convention entertain a lively sense of his benevolence, and request Mr. Rice, to write him on the subject.

26. A Committee consisting of Dr. Furman, Dr. Baldwin, and Dr. Staughton, were appointed to receive for safe-keeping such monies as have been transmitted from the several Societies, until placed in the hands of the treasurer elect.

26. The business of the Convention being closed, its session was dissolved by an Address from the President, followed by prayer and a benediction.

=====

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BAPTIST BOARD  
FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS.**

Tuesday, May 24<sup>th</sup>, 1814. ----12 o'clock

Met at the first Baptist Meeting-house Philadelphia: the following members present: Furman, Holcombe, Baldwin, Rogers, Allison, Gano, White, Ranaldson, Tallmadge, Richards, Staughton, Williams, Bolles, Johnson, Moulder.

1. Dr. Baldwin was called to the chair, Mr. Johnson was requested to act as secretary.
2. Proceeded to the election of officers, when Dr. Furman was chosen President; but he declined the office, on account of his great distance from the seat of the Board. Dr. Baldwin was then elected to

**MINUTES**

the Presidency. Dr. Holcombe was chosen first, and Dr. Rogers second Vice-President. Judge Tallmadge was elected Treasurer; but declining, on account of the delicate state of his health, Mr. John Cauldwell of New-York was chosen to that office.

Rev. Mr. Gano prayed.

*Adjourned to 3 o'clock, P. M.*

=====

*Met according to adjournment.*

Dr. Rogers prayed.

3. The board resumed the election of officers, when Dr. Staughton was chosen corresponding Secretary, and the Rev. Mr. White recording Secretary. A committee, consisting of Judge Tallmadge, Mr. Bolles and Mr. Johnson, was appointed to prepare certain by-laws for the government of the board.

*Adjourned to meet at the Baptist Meeting-house in Sansom-street, to-morrow morning, 10 o'clock.*

Wednesday, May 25<sup>th</sup>, 1814.

*The Board met according to adjournment*

Prayer by Dr. Holcombe.

Members Present:

Rev. Dr. Baldwin, Pres.	Rev. Dr. Furman	Ranaldson
Rev. Dr. Holcombe, V.P.	Rev. Dr. Allison	Bolles
Rev. Dr. Rogers, V.P.	Rev. Messrs. Johnson	
Rev. Dr. Staughton, C, S.		Peekworth
Rev. Mr. White, R. S.		Williams
		Gano

## MINUTES

1. Certain communications were made to the board by the Rev. Mr. Rice, containing remarks on field for Missionary labour; together with a statement of the monies he had received and expended on his journey to the southern states: on which *resolved* – That the Board possess a high sense of the zealous, disinterested and faithful services of their beloved brother, and feel a lively emotion of gratitude to the Lord, for the success with which his labours have been crowned, Ordered that the communication be published.
2. *Resolved*, That Mr. Rice be appointed, under the patronage of this board, as their Missionary, to continue his itinerant services, in these

United States, for a reasonable time; with a view to excite the public mind more generally, to engage in Missionary exertions; and to assist in originating Societies, or Institutions, for carrying the Missionary design into execution.

3. On motion, *Resolved*, That the Rev. Adoniram Judson, now in India, be considered as a Missionary, under the care and direction of this Board; of which he shall be informed without delay: That provision be made for the support of him and his family accordingly: and that one thousand dollars be transmitted to him by the first safe opportunity: That the Secretary of the Particular Baptist Society, for Missions in England, be informed of this transaction; and that this Board has assumed the pledge given by the Boston Mission Society, to pay any bills which may be drawn on them, in consequence of advances they may have made in favour of Mr. and Mrs. Judson.

4. *Resolved*, That our brother Judson be requested, for the present, to pursue his pious labours in such places as, in his judgment, may appear most promising; that he communicate his views of future permanent stations to this board, as early as he conveniently can.

3. *Resolved*, That the proceeding of the late Convention, and of this board be communicated to the Baptist Missionary Society in England, and to their Missionaries at Serampore, assuring them that it is the desire of this board to hold an affectionate intercourse with them, in the work of the Lord; that

## MINUTES

they will ever be grateful for any information which the extensive experience of their brethren may enable them to impart on the subject of fields for Missionary actions, &c. &c. and will derive joy from the reflection, that though in these transactions their respective seats of council be remote from each other, their hearts and aims are harmonious.

6. *Resolved*, That a suitable compensation be made to our brother Rice for his labours in origination Mission Societies, and that brethren Rogers, Holcombe and that Dr. Staughton be a committee to confer with him, and decide on the subject.

7. *Resolved*, That the treasurer of this board be requested to **give his bond to the President and his successor in office, with one sufficient**



**security in the penal sum of ten thousand dollars.** [bold print added by transcriber.]

8. *Resolved*, That the Treasurer take the advice of the Honorable Judge Tallmadge and John Withington, Esq. in cases which respect putting out surplus money, that may at any time be in the treasury.

9. *Resolved*, That a committee be appointed to enquire into the practicability of obtaining the incorporation of this board; and that the two vice-presidents and the Honorable Judge Moulder be that committee.

10. *Resolved*, The committee appointed for the purpose, having reported certain by-laws for the use of the board, they were taken into consideration, and the following agreed to.

1. This Board shall hold its first stated meeting on the first Monday in September; from which period, its meetings of this character shall be held quarterly.

2. All payments of money out of the treasury, shall be in pursuance of a resolution of this Board, and upon an order signed by the President, or, in case of his absence, by one of the Vice-Presidents.

4. Monies unappropriated, and not immediately wanted, shall not be suffered to lie dormant in the treasury; but shall be invested in some public stock, or let out on good security, so as to be rendering productive.

Rev. Dr. Baldwin prayed,

## **SERMON**

*And the Board adjourned.*

## **SUBSTANCE OF THE SERMON**

## **DELIVERED BEFORE THE CONVENTION,**

**On Wednesday, May 18, 1814.**

Matthew xxviii. 20, *“And lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world, Amen.”*

Astonishing as it may appear to men and angels, it is no less true – God deigns to visit man upon earth. He takes up His abode with him that is of an humble and contrite spirit: and the worshiping assemblies of His saints are assured by His word, that where but two or three are met in His name, He is in the midst of them.

Of this Truth, in all its reality and sacredness, even the saints of God themselves are often too insensible. When awakened in the sanctuary to a just sense of it, they are ready to exclaim with Jacob on his way to Padan-Aram, *“How awful is this place! Surely God is in this place, and I knew it not.”*

The words before us present this truth to our View in a new and engaging form, and were addressed by our Lord Jesus Christ to His Disciples, just before His ascension to glory; when He had passed through the dreadful scenes of His humiliation, had triumphed over Death, Hell and the Grave, and was about to take possession of His Throne in the Heavens. They, for the consolation and encouragement of His saints, give assurance that His gracious presence shall continue with His church; and are for these purposes annexed to the Commission by which He

## SERMON

has empowered His faithful Ministers to preach the Gospel, and administer New-Testament Ordinances in every age and nation, till Time shall be no more.

These Words, strongly marked with a note of attention, and delivered with peculiar Majesty in the form of a Declaration, have also, all the Force and Virtue of a Promise; pledging for its Accomplishment, the Power and Veracity of its Divine Author.

That the Promise was not confined to the Apostles and other immediate Disciples of our Lord, is evident: for these have

long since finished their holy course; but the Promise extends to the End of the World, and therefore must apply to the regular successors of those primitive Disciples.

In the illustration of the subject, let us consider-

*First*, What is contained in this gracious Declaration;

*Secondly*, Who are the persons particularly interested in it; and,

*Thirdly*, What are its implications.

We shall then, apply it to the circumstances of the present occasion.

*First*, The text declares, that the Redeemer's Presence is with His people, and shall abide with them continually.

His bodily Presence cannot be intended, for He has ascended to His Father; and the Heavens must receive, or retain Him, to the Time of the Restitution of all Things. Nor does it merely intend His natural Presence as God: for in this sense He is present with all His creatures; who in Him live, move and have their being. The Wicked, in this sense, are near to Him; while in respect of His Favour, and Communion with Him, they are afar off.

It must therefore mean His spiritual and gracious Presence. This includes **union with His people**; His Favour

## SERMON

toward them; and the co-operation of His Providence and Grace, for accomplishing, through their instrumentality, the **eternal counsels of His Mercy in the Salvation of men.**

He is with His Church as the Head is with its members; the shepherd with his flock; and the soul with the body it inhabits and animates. Saints are **one with Christ**: He is in them and they **in Him by a vital union**. They have received from Him the inestimable gift of His Spirit, as a Spirit of Adoption; as a Comforter to abide with them for ever, to guide

them into all Truth, and to seal them unto the Day of Redemption. He is with them as their Prophet, Priest and King.

The Direction of our Lord's Wisdom, as afforded to His People by His Spirit, Word, and Providence; His supporting, enlivening and comforting Grace, which infuses strength and courage into their Souls, enabling them to believe, hope, love, obey and suffer; and His protecting Care over them; to preserve them from the destroying power of their Enemies, the World, Sin and Hell, are all secured by this Promise. To which may be added, as an important meaning of the Text, the Operation of His efficient Power with them in Grace and Providence, to give Success to the Efforts of those who are engaged in His Service, for the promotion of His Kingdom; till the whole sacred scheme of His salvation is brought to a happy and grand result.

The Redeemer's Presence is *really* with His Saints at all Times; but not always *sensibly* to their apprehension. But when He lifts up the light of His countenance upon them, they realize it with joy, and with adoring gratitude. The Promise includes the Blessing considered in each of these views; but has respect to it in the first more especially.

*Secondly*, The persons particularly interested in this Promise. These are the willing subjects of Christ's Kingdom, or

## SERMON

subjects of Grace, and especially His faithful Ministers. In a more remote sense, the promise will apply to those who, having the Gospel sent to them, or placed within their reach, are disposed, like the noble Bereans, to receive it with candour and reverence.

1. Subjects of Grace, or regenerate souls: These are true members of the Christian Church. The Church, as a Body, a spiritual Family, has its little Children, as well as young Men and Fathers. Is it a Flock? Included in the number are the weak of

the Flock; the tender Lambs, and the diseased; who are, equally with the strong, objects of their Heavenly Shepherd's gracious care. The evidences of Grace in the heart are not confined to those who are rejoicing in God, and have assurances of Covenant-interest in His Favour, who are clear in their Views with respect to the Time and Manner of their Conversion. Regenerate souls may be in doubt and perplexity concerning this great subject, and uncertain with respect to its circumstances. In the latter there is great variety, in genuine Christian experience.

Unfeigned Repentance for sin, Faith in the Redeemer, Love to the Triune God, and subjection to His Government are the distinguishing characteristics of the real Christian. With these, all other gracious qualities are connected: Without them all our attainments are vain; however esteemed, ornamental, or splendid.

Repentance comprehends Conviction for sin, humble Confession of it, Godly Sorrow on account of its Evil, as it affronts God and injures His Creatures, and a hearty forsaking of it; which last, includes Denial of our Evil Appetites and Passions, and Watchfulness against Temptation. – Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, not only assents to the great Truths of Revelation respecting His proper Deity, Incarnation, Life, Death, Resurrection

## SERMON

Ascension and Glory, and His Ability to save; but embraces the Gospel Invitations and Promises, from a firm Persuasion of his willingness; actually relying upon Him, and renouncing every other Foundation of Hope and Confidence. Divine Love contemplates the transcendent Excellency of its Object, with Admiration and Desire; and is sweetly constrained to action by the Love of Christ. In its free and full exercise, it is associated with filial Confidence, Joy, Gratitude, and holy Zeal.

But frequently, while encumbered with Doubt and Fear, it can advance no further than to the state of Desire. Its intimate associates then, are Self-reproach and Godly-sorrow. – Subjection to the Divine Government consists in a sincere, deliberate surrender of the soul to God; active Obedience to His Commands, however self-denying; and Resignation to His providential Dispensations, however afflictive.

In forming a correct judgment on the gracious state of an individual, regard must be had to the reality, rather than to the degree of grace. Some are truly regenerate, whose diffidence and low thoughts of themselves would never allow them to claim the privileges, or take the comfort, which God has annexed to their true character: while others, pleased with themselves, and confident of their happy state, are, in reality, essentially defective – A settled choice and determination of the soul to be for God, is better than confidence – better than raptures.

2. Ministers interested in the Promise. These are godly men, who with Peter truly love their Lord; and with Paul are willing to spend and be spent, for the honour of His Name, the interests of His Kingdom, and the salvation of immortal souls. They are called by Christ to preach His Gospel, and have Gifts bestowed on them for their Work.

## SERMON

Necessity is laid upon them, and woe is unto them, if they preach not the Gospel. Such preach not themselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and themselves the servants of the Churches, and of immortal souls, for Jesus' sake. Their serious intention and honest endeavour are, to preach the Word of God unadulterated, as far as they are acquainted with its sacred meaning. . Not to please the Fancy, or delight the Ear; but to reach the Conscience, reform the Life and

improve the Heart; and thus to “Train Immortals for the Skies.”- To administer Divine Ordinances aright, in the manner God has appointed, and to the subjects He approves, is also their serious concern. Whatever Imperfections may cleave to Churches, Ministers, or Individuals, of the state and character here described, they must be considered as interested in their Saviour’s Promise: But the more they are conformed to Him in their Principles, Temper and Conduct – the more ardent in their Zeal, generous in their Intentions, and active in their Gospel-labours – the greater, in proportion, is their interest in the Promise; especially as it respects sensible enjoyment of their Lord’s presence, and final success in His Grace.

*Thirdly*, The Implications of the Text. They may be classified under two heads:

1. Those which concern the Character, Duty and Dependence of the Church, and

2. Those, which respect the Honour, Purpose and Grace of our Redeemer.

1. Of the Church, is implied, that it is a body of men, a holy society standing in special relation to the Son of God, as His Kingdom upon the earth; and consists of persons who, being called and fitted to His service, are used by Him as

## SERMON

honoured instruments for maintaining His Cause, and for displaying His Glory among mankind. They are living Stones in His spiritual Temple, and form a “Habitation for God through the Spirit.” “The Church is the Pillar and Ground of the Truth:” A monumental Pillar, erected to the honour of the Divine Majesty, on which are inscribed the Law of Righteousness, the Counsels of unerring Wisdom, and the Wonders of Redeeming Love.

2. Being advanced to this honourable station – appointed to this sacred use, saints have an arduous, interesting service to perform in the Cause of God: each has an important personal concern, in the improvement of his talent, and the advancement of his soul in the divine life; but as a member of the Church of Christ, and of the Human Family, he has a more extensive concern in whatever respects the increase of his Lord's Kingdom at large. To the interests of this Kingdom the weakest Christian may, through Grace, contribute; to do so, all are laid under indispensable obligations; and to excite our attention towards the great object, our Lord has taught us thus to pray, *"Thy Kingdom come."*

3. The Church's Weakness, and dependence on the Redeemer, are implied. Never should His saints forget those words, *"Without Me ye can do nothing."*– Who can master his own Corruptions, withstand the Frowns and Allurements of the World, and maintain a successful conflict with infernal spirits, those malignant, mighty powers of Darkness, but by the Power of Omnipotent Grace?

But if continual aid from Heaven be necessary to crown the Christian's efforts with success, while *"working out his own salvation with fear and trembling,"* how insufficient must all the exertions of merely human power be, in attempts to effect the

## SERMON

conversion of sinners, to maintain the Cause of Truth against the opposition of Earth and hell, and to conduct aright, the various, vast, sublime concerns of God's Church? The funds of Learning, mental Energies, powers of Eloquence, human Prudence, and incessant Labours must all prove abortive here, without the mighty Power and Grace of our Redeemer.– Well may we exclaim with the great Apostle to the Gentiles, *"Who is sufficient for these things!"*– But with Him, again, may each



faithful minister of the Gospel say, “*I can do all things through Christ who (sic) strengtheneth me!*”

2. Concerning Christ are implied.

1. His Divinity. Did He in enjoining the ordinance of Baptism assert His divine honours, and claim them as being equal with those of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost, while they are presented to our view as the united Objects of our Faith and Adoration; He now renews the claim, by promising to His militant Church universally, His gracious presence. Who but a divine – an infinite Person can be at once in heaven, and in all places on earth, where two or three are met together in His name: and with millions of individuals, in every age, who are found employed in His service? Could He have any regard to His veracity and sacred honour in thus promising, were He not in possession of infinite perfection? Verily, “*He is the brightness of the Father’s Glory, the express image of His Person, and in Him dwelleth the fullness of the Godhead bodily.*” True, by the assumption of our nature He is really Man; but in His divine nature He is as really God.

3. His determined purpose of accomplishing the great Design of His Mediatorial Kingdom; by bringing to their completion, the schemes of Providence and Grace, in the advancement of the Divine Glory. On this grand object the Redeemer’s heart had been set from eternity; when in the

## SERMON

counsels of peace on the subject of man’s Salvation, in the Covenant of Redemption, “Conceived at once, and signed without debate, in perfect union of the Eternal Mind,” He offered Himself, as a Surety and Sacrifice, for the salvation of His people. All the terrors attendant on His state of humiliation, even the bitter Death on the Cross, could not deter Him from prosecuting the great Design: and He will not leave His work

incomplete. *“The Top Stone shall be brought forth with shouting, crying Grace, Grace unto it!”*

3. The Condescension and Grace of our Divine Lord, are here implied.

What are men at best, that the exalted Son of God should be thus mindful of them? He knows also all the errors and infirmities of His people – their Unbelief, Ingratitude, Neglect, and Disobedience – their Pollutions of Heart and of Life; and His immaculate Purity is by these unspeakably offended; yet such is His Mercy, that He pities their Weakness, pardons their iniquities, and with Divine Constancy continues His Favour towards them. Still the Lord of Angels, the King of Glory abides with the unworthy Children of Men, hearing their prayers, affording them the aid of His Grace, and giving them consolation in the day of their Distress! While the Believer, convicted of his unworthy conduct towards his Lord, is constrained to reproach himself, and say to his soul, “Is this thy kindness to thy Friend?” How must he admire the Grace, and adore the Perfections of Him, who *“Is a Friend that cleaveth closer than a Brother!”*

## SERMON

### ***IMPROVEMENT.***

In the Improvement of the subject, our attention will be given principally to the Direction, Encouragement and Consolation which the Promise affords.

*First*, Let all our Endeavours to attain true Religion, and promote its Interests, whether we act as Individuals or as Churches, be made in humble dependence on the Grace of Christ; and under the direction of His word and Spirit. By Him alone, we find access to God and obtain heavenly Peace. “*Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life;*” “*no man cometh to the Father, but by Me;*” and He is the source of Divine Life to the Soul. As the Branch cannot bear Fruit, except it abide in the Vine, no more can we, except we abide in Him. This shows the importance of Faith – of that Faith in the Son of God, by which the saints live, and by which they derive their Blessings from His immense fullness. Faith must fix with reliance on what the Redeemer has already done for our Salvation, by His Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection, and Appearance before His Father’s Throne. But it must equally regard what He has promised to do, in the communication of Grace to His Church, for their Conservation, Prosperity, and ultimate Glorification. Is Christ with the Church; does He walk in the midst of the Golden Candlesticks; and are all transactions and services which are performed in His sanctuary brought under the particular notice of His eye; that eye which penetrates the very heart, observing every motive and every thought: how concerning should we then be to render Him our services in simplicity and holiness, with reverence and Godly fear? The Motive, in a religious view, is of the last importance. If Love to

## SERMON

Christ, and a Regard to His Glory do not influence our conduct, we are at best as “*Sounding Brass, and a tinkling Cymbal.*” We may labour much in the Gospel Ministry, have our minds zealously affected, and preach the doctrine of Truth; even those which are the most evangelical, and yet do all from wrong

motives. One real design may be to excel in the profession and character we have assumed without any just regard to the Redeemer's honour, and without sincere Love to Him. O! then, let us have a strict regard to our motives.

But this is not all: we must do His Will, and render Him the best of our services. Then are we His Disciples, when we do whatsoever He hath commanded us. And this is the proper Evidence of our Love. "*If ye love Me,*" said the Saviour, "*keep My Commandments.*"

*Secondly.* Here is ample encouragement for the humble Christian, and faithful Minister. The blessed Redeemer is with His people; and will not forsake them. He is a "*Wall of fire round about them, and the Glory in the midst of them.*" The gracious restraints, the sanctifying influence, and precious consolations of His Spirit, He will afford to them as individuals. He will also visit His assembled People, bless the Provisions of His House, own the Ordinances of His appointment, support and animate His Ministering Servants, and give success to their Ministrations, in the conversion of sinners, and in the edification of saints, even to their perfection in the divine life. Opposition to His Gospel, like the Great Mountain before Zerubbabel, in the prophetic Vision of Zachariah, shall give way, and become a Plain. Though the servants of God be called to preach His Gospel to those who may be compared to dry bones, divine influence, like breath from the four Winds of the

## SERMON

Heavens shall animate them. They shall arise and live, an exceeding great army; be enlisted under the banner of the Cross, and become courageous in the Cause of God. Stubborn Prejudices, perverse Passions, the influence of idolatrous, infidel Priests, Philosophers, and Rulers of the Earth; Ignorance and Error; Casts and Shasters; the Rage of Tyrants, and the

Power of Devils shall all yield to the Omnipotent Arm of Him who is the Captain of our Salvation. *“Though the Enemy come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him.”* *“If God be for us, who can be against us?”* Be courageous then, ye servants of the living God! Enlarge your expectations, let your hopes arise, and exert all your powers in the honourable, holy service of your Redeemer.

*Thirdly*, If the gracious Presence of Emmanuel be with His saints, and shall not be removed from them, what ineffable consolations are secured to the Church by this blessing! Hail happy Zion! Highly favoured City of our God! A never-failing source of Joy is opened to thee: thou shalt be watered with streams from the River of Life, which flows from the Throne of God and of the Lamb!

While we reflect on the great things God has already effected in the earth by means of the Gospel, and behold the state to which the Church is even now advanced under the care and protection of her gracious Head – comprehending Covenant-Blessings, Gospel Privileges, Gracious Influence and Gracious Experiences; numerous Members, ministerial Gifts, eminent Talents, the improvements of Science, Influence on civilized Nations, and the means of intercourse with the rest of the world; the laudable Zeal which operates in the breasts of thousands for the enlargement of Christ’s Kingdom, the Schemes adopted by men of an Apostolic Spirit for the diffusion

## SERMON

of Gospel-Light, and these going into successful operation under the smiles of a benignant Providence;- viewing these, it is natural to look forward with pleasing anticipation to those blessed days which Prophecy has made known, when the triumphs of the Cross shall extend to the remotest parts of the habitable globe; the knowledge of God cover the earth, as the

waters do the sea; and the kingdoms of the World become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; when Wars shall cease, the Revolutions of Empires terminate, Fraud and Oppression be banished from the earth, and Benevolence, Harmony and Love prevail.

Nor do our views terminate here; guided by the Light of Revelation, and inspired by the Christian's Hope, the Soul rushes forward, overleaps the narrow bounds of Time, and contemplates the second Advent of the Son of God; the transactions of Judgment, the Dissolution of the World, and the Consummation of the Saints in Heavenly Bliss. Then shall Pain, Sorrow, Death and Sin be known no more. The Redeemed of the Lord shall rest from all their toils, triumph over all their Enemies, be satisfied with the full enjoyment of Divine Love, see Christ as He is, and ever be with the Lord to behold His Glory.

In the intervening time, however, Conflicts are to be endured, Privations to be suffered, and arduous Services to be performed. But whether the saints be present or absent, on the land or the sea, among friends or enemies, the gracious Presence of the Redeemer will be with them; and in the enjoyment of this Blessing, they shall be – must be happy.

These Considerations stimulate to vigorous Exertions in the Cause of Christ, and apply with peculiar force to the circumstances of our present meeting. At the call of Divine Providence we are here assembled, to consult on measures the

## SERMON

most eligible, for sending the blessed Gospel to the Heathen, and to nations destitute of pure Gospel Light. Electrified, as it were, by the considerations which the united Voice of Scripture and Providence have presented to our minds, we have suddenly assembled, from almost every State in the American Union, to represent multitudes of our Christian friends, who feel with us;

to speak and act for them in this best of Causes. O! let us realize the importance of the Work, and be ready to act for God. Let Faith, Gratitude and Love unite their influence and call forth all the energies of our Souls on this momentous occasion. Millions are perishing in ignorance and sin, held in the chains of Idolatry and gross Superstition, under the power of Satan. The Nations are convulsed; and great events with respect to the Kingdom of Christ appear to be drawing near. Exertions of an extraordinary character have been made, and are now making by Christians of various denominations, both in Europe and America, for the propagation of the Gospel; by Missionary and Bible Societies, by Churches and pious Individuals. And to our brethren, the Missionaries at Serampore, the Lord has granted success, taking the subject in all its views, unparallel, since the days of the Apostles.- Happy, honored Carey, and thy worthy associates! How are ye blessed of God!- It becomes us to add, there are here servants of God ready to engage in the arduous, sacred Work; the language of whose souls, as individuals is, "Here am I, send me!" Many more, no doubt, will catch their spirit, and will with them be willing to risk their all in the Cause of the Blessed Redeemer.- Let, therefore, all the considerations we have urged from the word of God on this sublime subject be duly regarded, that they may concentrate their whole force upon the heart, and give an impulse to action, which through the Grace of the Redeemer, no difficulties can

## SERMON

retard, no oppositions withstand. Let the wise and good employ their counsels; the Ministers of Christ, who is qualified for the sacred service, offer himself for the Work; the man of wealth and generosity, who values the Glory of Emmanuel, and the Salvation of Souls more than gold, bring his treasures in proportion as God has bestowed on him; yea, let all, even the

pious widow, bring the mite that can he spared; and let all who fear and love God, unite in the Prayer of Faith before the Throne of Grace; and unceasingly say, “Thy Kingdom come!”- And O! let it never be forgotten, that the Son of God hath said, “Lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world.” Amen and Amen.

To The

## **BAPTIST BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS**

For the United States

*Beloved Fathers and Brethren,*

Having been engaged for a considerable time in missionary concerns, your condescension, I persuade myself, will indulge me the freedom of submitting a few facts and observations.

In relation to field of missionary labours, information is so fully in your possession already, that I need say but little. It being understood that in the recently renewed Charter of the English East India Company, provision, friendly to missionary operations, has been made, large countries, possessing many important stations for missionary labourers, became at once easily accessible to missionaries. I say *easily* accessible, because, even under the operations of the Charter previously to its late renewal, though difficulties were thrown in the way, still missionaries obtained access to numerous important places, and laboured with great effect, within the limits of the Company’s jurisdiction. **[Historical note:** Reference here is made to the East India Trading Company’s Charter from the British Crown – the same under which the English colonies were formed here in North America.-SCP] .

Besides the extensive regions under the jurisdiction of the Company, others of great importance and very animating



premise present themselves to view, and solicit regard. The Island of Ceylon, containing, it is estimated, a million and a half, or two millions of inhabitants, possesses, in addition to the importance of its own population, advantages of no small value, arising from its vicinity, and similarity of language, to the neighboring, extensive peninsula; and also from its affinities of language, and superstitions, with those of the Empire of Burmah.

The Isle of France, or Mauritius, offers to the missionaries another post of no inferior consideration, and which ought to be immediately occupied. One Chaplain, and five Roman Catholics priests, as far as I could learn when there, were the only preachers on the island. The services of the Chaplain appeared to be intended appropriately for the civil government and the soldiery.- The Catholic priests seemed to possess too little zeal, and the remnants of the Catholic superstition too little energy, or possession of the minds of the people, to oppose any formidable barrier to the promulgation, or success of the Gospel in that place. The island, indeed, holding a population of sixty-five thousand souls, may justly be considered as destitute, or very nearly destitute of all religion; and presents a proper, and by no means uninviting field of missionary labour. Bourbon, distant from Mauritius only a day's sail, contains fifty-six thousand inhabitants, equally destitute of religion, and religious advantages. The relation, also, of the Isle of France to

#### COMMUNICATION

the large, populous and utterly heathen island of Madagascar, attaches to it still greater weight in the missionary scale. Madagascar has been said to contain three or four millions of people. Mauritius is very probably the point from which these precious, but at present benighted souls, shall one day receive the word of life. And another consideration which ought not to be overlooked in estimating its value as a missionary station, is,

its intercourse with most parts of India, Africa, Europe, South America, and the United States; offering facilities of communication, always desirable and important between different missionary stations, and between missionaries and their patrons; not to insist on the salubrity (sic) of its atmosphere, and, in a word, the delightfulness of the island.

South America cannot be left out of the account in a missionary estimate. Some parts of that highly interesting country are, indeed, at present, in a revolutionary condition, adverse to missionary operations. In some of those provinces, however, which have achieved their independence, possibly consolidated, and that on the basis of a system sufficiently tolerant and liberal, to furnish some encouraging prospects to missionary efforts. In Brazil, things are in a state of tranquility; and the Catholic religion there has already lost so much of its fierceness and malignity as not only to allow toleration to Protestants, but liberty to build chapels for the purpose of publicly celebrating the worship of God in the protestant manner. This is established by explicit and solemn treaty. So that there seems at least some prospect that good might result from the residence of a prudent and judicious evangelist at St. Salvador, or at Rio Janeiro, under the character perhaps of chaplain to the protestants of the place, or in the capacity of schoolmaster. With suitable qualifications, he might probably, to advantage, get into the business of instructing. And if he

## COMMUNICATION

should be a vender of books perhaps it might be of service.- It is thought that the bible might be freely circulated.

In relation to the conduct of a mission, permit me to observe, that it cannot be necessary for any other, particularly in the regions of the east, to follow the same course with that pursued by the important mission at Serampore. The grand object of that establishment has been, and still is, the

*translation* of the Scriptures. And so extensive and successful have been its labours in this respect, that it becomes unnecessary, and would, indeed, be improper, for any other mission to direct its principal attention to the same great service. A mission now to be established, should fix itself in some important place, make itself master of the language and literature of the people, ultimately carry to very considerable correctness a translation of the scriptures into that language, and diffuse the effectual knowledge of the Gospel throughout the region in which such language is spoken. Such a mission might, indeed, become a parent establishment, and send out branches, not only to different places in the same nation, but to other nations, or to other people, speaking a different language. But each branch, occupying a station where a different language from that of the parent establishment is used, should pursue a course perfectly similar to that pursued by the parent establishment. And should it become necessary to introduce the printing business, which undoubtedly will be the case, this may be done at the parent establishment, and suffice for all its branches.

Having submitted these brief remarks, suffer me to advert, for a moment, to the course pursued by me since the adjustment of the sacred, enlarging, and highly responsible relations which lately existed between myself and "The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions." Previously to this adjustment, or rather *vote* of my former

#### COMMUNICATION

beloved and very highly respected patrons, *that they considered the relation between myself and them as having been dissolved*, so deep and serious were my impressions of the sacred nature, mutual obligation and responsibility of the relation, that I did not conceive that I was, by any means, at liberty to commit myself to any other patronage or employ. Immediately, however, after obtaining information of this vote, I hastened, with the

advice, and at the request of my brethren, to make the tour of the middle and southern States. But the success of this tour, in bringing about the formation of mission societies, it cannot be necessary to detail at large. In accounting to this Board, which I beg permission to do, for monies received by me while performing this service, as much of this detail will naturally come into view, as it can be of any importance to offer to your attention, in the present communication. As the point of responsibility, furnished by the Board, did not exist at the time of receiving the monies just mentioned, they were marked in my memorandum book, to be accounted for to the various mission societies, in whose vicinities respectively they were received. Thus, as marked to be accounted for, to

*“The Savannah Baptist Society for Foreign Missions,”*

I received,

Nov. 26, 1813.	By the hand of Rev. Mr. Villard, from a few persons at Mount-hope church, S. C.	-	\$ 6.25.3/4 c
“ 28, -	By a collection, during the session of The Savannah River Baptist Association, at the Union Church, Barnwell District, S. C.	-	54.68.1/4c
Dec. 14, 1813.	By a collection in St. Paul’s Church, Augusta, Georgia	- - - -	<u>61.50</u>
	Carried over	-	122.43.3/4c
Dec. 19, 1813.	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house In which Rev. Mr. Johnson statedly preaches, Savannah, Georgia	- - - -	52.00
“ 26, -	By a collection in the Baptist meeting, in which Rev. Mr. Screven statedly preaches, Sunbury, Ga.	-	31.50
“ 27, -	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house in		

COMMUNICATION

Which Rev. Mr. Sweet statedly preaches,

	Bryan county, Georgia	- - - -	36.37.1/2
Jan. 11, 1814	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house in Which Rev. Mr. Brantley statedly preaches, Beauford, S. C.	- - - -	71.75
	Of Miss Lydia Turner	- - - -	20.00
	Of a few other persons afterwards	- - - -	9.25= \$101.00

Total under the Savannah society - - - \$343.31.1/4

*"The Beauford District Baptist Society for Foreign Missions"*

Jan. 4, 1814. By a collection in the court-house in Coosawhatchie, S.C. 21.37.1/4c

*"The general Committee of Churches united in the Charleston Baptist Association."*

Nov.10, 1813	By the hand of Mr. Evans, the amount of collections Society-Hill, S.C. during the session of the Charleston Baptist Association - - - - -	71.00
Nov.16,	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house in Which Rev. Mr. Botsford statedly preaches, and A few dollars sent afterwards, Georgetown, S.C. -	30.31.1/4c
Dec.9,	By a collection in the chapel of "The South Carolina College," in which Rev. Dr. Montgomery, A Presbyterian minister statedly preaches, Columbia, S.C. - - - - -	76.56
Jan.14,1814	By donation of "The Wadmelow and Edisto Female Mite Society," Charleston, S.C. - - - - -	44.00
" 15,	By a collection in the 2d Presbyterian meeting- House in which Rev. Dr. Flinn statedly preaches, Charleston, S.. - - - - -	48.25
" 24,	By a collection in the First Presbyterian meeting- House, in which Rev. Mr. Leland statedly preaches, Charleston, S.C. - - - - -	<u>103.50</u>
	Carried over - - -	\$374.06.1/4c
	Brought over - - -	374.06.1/4c
Jan.25,1814	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house in Which Rev. Dr. Furman statedly preaches, Charleston, S.C. - - - - -	84.00
-	Of Mrs. Keith, widow of the late Rev. Dr. Keith -	5.00
30,	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house in Which Rev. Mr. Roberts statedly preaches, High Hills of Santee, S.C. - - - - -	30.56.1/4c
31,	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house in	

COMMUNICATIONS

	Which Rev. Mr. Pope statedly preaches, Camden,S.C.	10.18.3/4c
Feb.1,	Of Rev. Mr. Cook, Mount-Pisgah church, S.C.	1.00
2,	By a few individuals at Darlington court-house, S.C.	6.25
8,	Of Esqr. Ervin, Darlington court-house, S.C. -	2.00
	Of a friend to missions at the same place - -	<u>1.00</u>
	Total under the Gen. Com, &c,&c -	\$519,06.1/4c

*"The North Carolina Baptist Society for Foreign Missions."*

Feb.10,1814	Of Rev. Mr. Daniel, near Raleigh, N.C.	-	-	2.00
14,	By a collection in the chapel of the University of North-Carolina, Chapel-Hill, N. C.	-	-	23.82.1/2c
	Sent afterwards by Mrs. Pucket of the same place	-	-	1.00
	By A. W. Clopton of the same place, being the payment in advance of his first annual subscription to the N.C. B. S. for Foreign Missions	-	-	5.00
16,	By a collection in the State-house in which Rev. Mr. McPheters, a Presbyterian minister, statedly preaches, Raleigh, N.C.	-	-	21.00
	Sent afterwards by two or three persons of same	-	-	2.50
17,	By a few persons at a meeting at the Crossroads, near Raleigh, North-Carolina	-	-	<u>3.95</u>
Totals under the North-Carolina Society				\$ 59.27.1/2c

*"The Richmond Baptist Mission Society for propagating the Gospel in India and other Heathen Countries"*

Feb.20,1814	By a collection in the court-house in which Rev. Mr. Rice, a Presbyterian minister, statedly preaches, Petersburg, Va.	-	-	-	-	40.38.3/4c
	Of Rev. Mr. Rice himself	-	-	-	-	2.00
	Sent afterwards by a lady of the same place	-	-	-	-	<u>2.00</u>
Total under the Richmond Society				-	-	\$44.38.3/4c

*"the Fredricksburg Branch Society for Foreign Missions."*

Mar.6,1814	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house, Fredricksburg, Va.	-	-	-	-	71.51
	Afterwards of Dr. Hall of the same place	-	-	-	-	2.00
	Of the son of Dr. Hall	-	-	-	-	1.00
	Of Mr. Hedgeman, by the hand of Mr. Newby	-	-	-	-	<u>1.00</u>

## COMMUNICATIONS

Total under the Fredricksburg Society - \$75.51

*"The Washington Baptist Society for Foreign Missions."*

Mar.28,1814	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house in which Rev. Mr. Brown atatedly preaches, Washington, Dist. Of Cola.	-	23.16
	Also in the Baptist meeting-house at the Navy Yard, Washington, Dist. Of Cola.	-	12.57.1/2c
Apr.4,	By a collection in the Presbyterian meeting-house in Which Rev. Mr. Breckenridge statedly preaches,		

	Washington, District of Columbia	-	-	-	25.00
" 10,	By a collection in the Presbyterian meeting-house in which				
	Rev. Dr. Muir statedly preaches, Alexandria, D.C.	-	-		32.13.1/4c
	Also in the Baptist meeting-house in which Rev.				
	Mr. Moore statedly preaches, Alexandria, D.C.	-	-		<u>19.44</u>
	Total under the Washing Society	-			\$117.19.3/4

*"The Baltimore Baptist Missionary Society."*

May 4, 1814	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house in which				
	Rev. Mr. Richards statedly preaches, Baltimore, Md.	-			45.25
	Also in the Baptist meeting-house in which Rev. Mr.				
	Healey statedly preaches, Baltimore, Md.	-	-		<u>5.37.1/2c</u>
	Total under the Baltimore Society	-			\$50.62.1/2c

*The Delaware Branch Society for Foreign Missions."*

May 9, 1814	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house in which				
	Rev. Mr. Dodge statedly preaches, Wilmington, Delaware	-			<u>8.52</u>
	Total under all these Societies				\$1239.261/4c

**MY EXPENSES** while thus prosecuting the missionary design, for traveling, clothing, letters, paper, &c. &c. have been - - - - - \$332.103/4

For the purpose of defraying my expenses, particularly, I have received:

Oct. 15, 1813.	By the hand of Rev. Mr. Dodge, Wilmington, Delaware	-			1.621/2c
18,	From Rev. Dr. Staughton, by the hand of Rev. Mr. Brown,				
	on my way to the southward	-	-	-	50.00
Nov. 23,	Of Rev. Mr. Nichols, Coosawhatchie, S.C.	-	-	-	2.00
Dec. 27,	Of two or three blacks, Sunbury, Georgia*-	-	-	-	.25
April 14, 1814	By a collection in the Baptist meeting-house in which				
	Rev. Mr. Brown statedly preaches, Washington, D.C.	-			<u>16.00</u>
	Total appropriated by the donors for defraying my expenses-				\$69.891/2c

## COMMUNICATIONS

	Leaving a Balance of	-	-	-	-\$252.211/4c
	Which deducted from the amount of the above mentioned				
	sums, will leave in my hands a balance of	-	-	-	\$977.051/4c

But having received monies not specifically designated by the donors as intended for my expenses or for the mission, viz:

Dec. 29, 1813	Of Rev. Mr. Williams near Savannah, Georgia	-			10.00
	By the hand of the same from Miss Hills	-	-		5.00
30,	Of a lady, Savannah, Georgia-	-	-	-	8.00

Jan.30,1814	Of Mrs. Mc'Nair, High Hills of Santee, S.C.	-	-	5.00
31,	Of Mrs. Walker, near Mount-Pisgah Ch. S.C.	-	-	1.00
Feb.13,	Of Mr. Dismukes, near Pittsborough, N.C.	-	-	1.00
16,	Of a lady, by the hand of Rev. Mr. Daniel, near Raleigh, N.C.	-	-	1.00
Mar.29,	Of a lady in Washington, Dist. Of Cola.	-	-	1.00
Apr.12,	Of two blacks, Navy Yard, Washington, District of Colombia	-	-	.50
15,	Of a lady, Washington, District of Columbia	-	-	1.50
19,	Of a lady, Washington, District of Colombia	-	-	<u>1.00</u>
	This	-	-	\$35.00

Added to the amount before mentioned makes - - - \$1012.05<sup>1/2c</sup>

Which sum, I beg leave to put into the hands of this Board, by doing this, I conceive myself released from all farther responsibility to the before mentioned societies in relation to this money, because, being contributed to aid the very design, for whose advancement this Board has been instituted, it was minuted to the societies in whose vicinities respectively it was collected, merely because the present point of responsibility did not then exist.

---

\*I am not satisfied with simply mentioning this donation. These blacks were professors of religion. They had voluntarily rowed me several miles in a boat, when, instead of receiving compensation which I offered them for their services, they, understanding something of the nature of my business, gave me their willing contribution.- I thought of the widow's mite, and the Saviour's approbation.

Besides availing myself of the medium of your minutes, to account this to the respected missionary societies and to the generous individuals who have entrusted me with their donations in aid of missions, suffer me to beg your indulgence, to express, publicly through the same medium, my very grateful thanks for many personal favors.

Having remained a little more than a week at Society Hill, S.C., I had the pleasure of receiving,

## COMMUNICATIONS

Nov.10,1813	Of Esqr. Hanford, Society Hill, S.C.	-	-	10.00
11,	By the hand of Mr. Wilson, from a number of friends of the same place	-	-	67.25
	In other places, viz:			
Nov.16,1813	Of Mr. Waldo, Georgetown, S.C.	-	-	2.00
22,	Of Mr. Wm. Inglesby, Charleston, S.C.	-	-	5.00
Jan.4,1814	Of Mr. Jenkins Coosawhatchie, S.C.	-	-	10.00
10,	Of a lady, Beaufort, S.C.	-	-	5.00
25,	Of Deacon Adams, Charleston, S.C.	-	-	2.00



Feb.3,	Of Esqr. Erwin, Darlington court-house, S.C.	-	5.00
16,	Of Rev. Mr. Daniel, near Raliegh, N.C.	-	<u>1.00</u>
	Total	-	\$107.25

Jan. 1814	Of a Lady, Charleston, S.C. , a pair of gloves.
April 14,	Of Capt. Bester, Washington, Dist. Of Cola a pair of shoes.
May 4,	Of a Lady, Baltimore, Md. A pair of gloves

Having spent a Sabbath with Rev. Mr. Bolles of Salem, Mass. And preached in his place, I received,

Sept.26,1814	By the hand of Rev. Mr. Bolles	-	-	-	20.00
Nov.21,	Having supplied the Baptist church in Charleston one Sabbath, in the absence of Rev.Dr. Furman,- by the hand of Deacon Adams	-	-	-	25.00
Dec.29 ,	Having preached an evening lecture in the meeting-house of the coloured Baptist church, Savannah, Georgia,- from the pastor of that church, by the hand of Rev. Mr. Johnson	-	-	-	10.00
Jan.30,1814	Having spent part of a Sabbath with Rev. Mr. Roberts High Hills of Santee, S.C.	-	-	-	10.00
March 3,	After preaching an evening lecture in the Baptist meeting-house, Fredricksburg, Va.	-	-	-	5.37 1/2c
Nov.6, 1813	For a session sermon, at the opening of a Court, Marlborough, S.C. by the hand of				

Esqr. Hanford - - - - - \$13.00

Having, by the injury of a chaise, sustained a loss of \$65.00, my very worthy friend, Rev. Mr. Leland, Charleston, S. C. was pleased to set forward the following paper, viz.

“We the subscribers, impressed with a due sense of the disinterested benevolence which has induced the Rev. Mr. Rice to devote his time and talents to the great work of evangelizing

## COMMUNICATIONS

the heathen world, do cheerfully bestow the sums affixed to our names, partly to make up a severe pecuniary loss he has lately sustained, by the running away of a horse, and the breaking of a chaise, and partly to assist him in his excellent undertaking.”— in the result he put into my hands the liberal sum of - - - - - \$165.00

Having had the honour to preach before the Congress of the United States, Hon. Judge Brigham, one of the Hon. Members of Congress, was pleased to set forth the following paper, viz:

“We, the subscribers, members of Congress, agree to contribute and pay, for the use and benefit of the Rev. Mr. Rice, who preached in Congress Hall on the tenth instant, and who has recently returned from missionary services in India, the sum affixed on our names.- April 11, 1814”- The Hon. Judge himself collected and put into my hands - - - \$30.00  
Other Hon. Members afterwards - - - - 27.00

In addition to the above, I cannot but feel myself to be under grateful obligations, nor refrain from expressing my unfeigned thankfulness, to many individuals, for aid in traveling over portions of country in which I could not avail myself of conveyance by stage; for entertainment at several public houses free of expense; and for numberless instances of hospitality, attention, courtesy, politeness, and kindness. Indeed, the general countenance shewn to the important object of my tour, by the people in all places which I have visited, has inspired impressions and sentiments of a nature too grateful to be concealed, but which the power of language is too feeble to express!

With very great respect, and most affectionate consideration, permit me, beloved Fathers and Brethren, to subscribe myself,

Your humble servant, for the Gospel's sake,  
Luther Rice

Philadelphia, 25<sup>th</sup> May, 1814.

## REPORT

The Committee appointed to enquire into the number, state, and prospects of the Baptist Foreign Mission Societies, recently formed in the United States, begs leave to **Report**, That, from the attention bestowed upon this subject, your Committee has not been able to obtain such exact information as could be desired; but has had the satisfaction to learn, that not fewer than seventeen societies of this description are already in operation. Of these societies, such information as your committee has obtained, will be cheerfully submitted, beginning with the northern section of our country.

*“The Haverhill Society”*

Has transmitted very little information; but will cordially co-operate in the general design now going forward, and may furnish perhaps a hundred dollars annually to the general fund  
 - - - - - \$100.00

*“The Salem Bible-translation and Foreign Mission Society”*

Appears to have collected about \$500.00, and will probably be able to furnish at least \$200 annually to the general fund-\$200

## REPORT

*“The Baptist Society for propagating the Gospel in India and other Foreign parts”*

Have exerted a very laudable zeal and activity, collected already more than \$1250, and may undoubtedly furnish to the general fund at least four or five hundred dollars annually - \$450

*“The Baptist Missionary Society in Rhode Island”*

Has collected about \$200, and, with what may be expected from a Female Mite Society of the same place, will probably furnish at least two hundred dollars annually to the general fund - - - - - \$200

*“The New-York Baptist Society for Foreign Missions”*

We doubt not will aid the great object to a degree worthy the liberality of its wealthy subscribers. We persuade ourselves that at least four hundred dollars, we hope much more, may be expected from that society annually to the general fund - \$400

*“The New-York Baptist Female Society for the promoting Foreign Missions”*

Exhibits an example of such an admirable and praise-worthy character, as cannot fail of being imitated by the charitable Ladies of other cities. Though organized so recently as April last, the laudable exertions of this society have collected not less than \$70, and will, it is believed, be able to furnish perhaps \$150 annually, to the general fund - - - - - \$150

*“The Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of New-Jersey”*

Has been organized very recently. The President of this society says to your Committee, that “it is believed that the New-Jersey

REPORT

Society will annually furnish \$100. We are persuaded, however, that he has fixed on too low an estimate; nor can we deny ourselves the pleasure of anticipating a much larger amount from so respectable a source - - - - - \$100.00

*“The Philadelphia Baptist Society for Foreign Missions”*

Will doubtless answer the high expectations which the wealth and known liberality of this portion of our country cannot fail to create. The Secretary of this society states, that "Suscribers' names handed in to the Secretary of the Phila. F. M. Society, are 390 – all of whom are \$2 annually, except 3 of \$5, 3 of \$4, and 3 of \$3 annually." This society has collected already nearly \$500, and will furnish, we confidently expect, annually to the general fund, more than - - - - - \$1000.00

*"The Delaware Branch Society for Foreign Missions"*

Though very recently formed has more than forty annual subscribers, has collected about 40 dollars, and will be able to furnish, it is believed, at least, one hundred dollars annually to the general fund - - - - - \$100.00

*"The Baltimore Baptist Missionary Society"*

Has given by one of the delegates of that society the following statement, viz: "The mode of collecting subscriptions and donations in Baltimore, is by respectable citizens in each ward, who are authorized to go round on the errand; besides which, collections are made at the monthly prayer meetings. The citizens above mentioned not yet having gone round, we cannot say what will probably be the result in that respect, though we feel confident, from the known character of Baltimore, that it

## REPORT

will not be unimportant. Our annual subscriptions are two dollars each. The money we have on hand is upwards of \$100, but it is not forwarded, as we were ignorant of the proper receptacle."- We persuade ourselves this society will be able to furnish annually to the general fund, certainly not less than  
\$150.00

*“The Washington Baptist Society for Foreign Missions”*  
 Have collected \$70, has transmitted \$70 to the general fund,  
 and will probably furnish to this fund annually, more than  
 \$100.00

*“The Richmond Baptist Mission Society for propagating the  
 Gospel in India and other Heathen Countries”*  
 Has collected more than \$200, has transmitted \$200 to the  
 general fund, and will be able to furnish to this fund annually  
 two or three hundred, perhaps a much larger sum - \$250.00

*“The North-Carolina Baptist Society for Foreign Missions”*  
 has collected \$260, has transmitted to the general fund \$100,  
 and, it is hoped, may be able to furnish to this fund annually  
 not less than - - - - - \$500.00

*“The General Committee of Churches united in the Charleston  
 Baptist Association”*  
 Has entered into the missionary design with laudable zeal and  
 activity. The following interesting statement has been given, viz:  
 “The Baptist churches included in the Charleston Association,  
 S. C. have committed the missionary business to the hands of  
 their general committee, recommending the formation of  
 auxiliary societies, to be formed as convenience may direct,

## REPORT

within the bounds of their union. Several such societies it is  
 known are formed, and it is understood that others are forming,  
 or will be formed in the course of the present year; but a  
 regular account; either of their number, or the amount of their  
 contributions cannot be expected before November, when the

Association and Committee are to meet for the transaction of business.

The Charleston Society, perhaps, consists of about one hundred members, several have subscribed an annual contribution of five dollars. At the High Hills of Santee, head of Black River, and the Welsh Neck, it is known societies are formed: at the Congaree, Amelia Township, and Goose Creek, it is understood they are about to be formed."

From the known liberality of this important portion of our country, we cannot suffer ourselves to calculate on less than from three to five hundred dollars annually to the general fund \$400.00 besides what may be expected from "The Wadmalaw and Edisto Female Mite Society," perhaps annually - \$100.00

*"The Beaufort District Baptist Society for Foreign Missions"*  
has yet collected but little; but has an annual subscription of \$260 by fifty-one subscribers – one of \$50 – one of \$20 0- one of \$15 – several of \$10- and we may reasonably expect annually to the general fund, from this wealthy and liberal quarter, at least - - - - - \$300.00

*"The Savannah Baptist Society for Foreign Missions"*  
has collected \$456, has transmitted to the general fund 445, and will be able, it is believed, through the distinguished zeal,

## REPORT

activity and liberality of its members, to furnish to this fund annually about - - - - - \$1000.00

The delegate from this society, Rev. Mr. Johnson, has also transmitted to the general fund- - - - - \$9.62<sup>1/2c</sup>

which sum was collected by him in Orangeburgh, on his way to Philadelphia, to attend the Convention.

*The Kentucky Baptist Society for propagating the Gospel*" has collected more than \$100 already, and may be able to furnish to the general fund, perhaps two or three hundred dollars annually - - - - - \$250.00

Nor can we refrain from remarking, that the zeal of our brethren in the west, and the prospects in that quarter, give us great pleasure, and excite the happier anticipations of the extent to which the missionary spirit may yet diffuse itself through our country.

Besides the societies completely organized and in operation, something has been done towards the formation of one in Fredericksburg, Virginia, and we think it reasonable to express from that society, which we presume will go into operation soon, annually to the general fund not less than \$100.00.

Others we doubt not will yet be formed, uniting with those already in existence, in efforts to impart the benign influence of the Gospel to benighted nations.

From the foregoing imperfect sketch, it appears that the various mission societies mentioned, have collected already about \$4000.00 will probably be able to furnish annually to the general fund not less than - - - - - \$5850,00

## REPORT

And have transmitted to the general fund - - - \$824.62<sub>1/2c</sub>



accounted for by Rev. Luther Rice, monies received by him for missionary purposes - - - - - \$1274.62<sub>1/2</sub>

From which deducting travelling expenses &c. of Mr. Rice

a. \$262.21<sub>1/2</sub>

will leave - - - - - \$1836.67<sub>3/4c</sub>

But the committee appointed to consult relative to the compensation suitable to be allowed Mr. Rice for his services, have concluded to allow him the same as that allowed by "The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission," for similar services, viz. eight dollars a week. For 35 weeks, that is, from the last of Sept, 1813 to the last of May, 1814 - \$280.00

Which being deducted from the above, will leave in the general fund already - - - - - \$1556.67<sub>3/4</sub>

### ADDRESS

*The General Convention of the Baptist delegates for Missionary purposes, assembled in the meeting-house of the First Baptist church in Philadelphia, on Wednesday the 18<sup>th</sup> May, 1814; to their constitutes, the churches of Jesus Christ, the Ministers of the Gospel, and the friends of religion in general, present their Christian love and cordial wishes.*

*Beloved Brethren and Friends,*

In what manner and to what extent it has pleased the blessed God, of late, to direct the attention of many among us,

### ADDRESS

to the interests of the Redeemer's Kingdom, some of you are already sensible, and others will learn from the preceding pages. Under the smiles of a propitious Providence, a Convention has assembled in Philadelphia, consisting of

delegates from parts of our union, various and remote, to devise a plan, and enter into measures, for combining the efforts of our whole denomination, in behalf of the millions upon whom the light of evangelic truth has never shone. The result of their serious and affectionate consultations, you have an opportunity of perusing.

Unpromising and disastrous as the present state of our world may appear, the period is assuredly approaching, and we trust is not distant, when the scene shall be reversed: *“The crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.”* *“The meek shall inherit the earth, and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace.”* *“The glory of the Lord”* shall arise upon Zion. *“Mountains and hills shall break forth into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands.”* Our God will *“create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and His people a joy.”* *“The seed shall be prosperous, the vine shall give her fruit, the ground shall give her increase, and the heavens shall give their dew.”*

For this glorious period the church has long and anxiously been waiting. For this, thousands of the petitions of the saints have already been presented by the great Mediator before the eternal throne, and thousands more are continually ascending. It is a day of glory embraced in the tenor of the Covenant of promise, and which, as the reward of His conflict and sufferings, the Redeemer is expecting: a result, to which the revolutions of empire and the silent progress of time perpetually verge.

## ADDRESS

The agency by which whole nations shall be regenerated hereafter, is the same which takes one of a city and two of a family and brings them to Zion now. The universal, moral change, like the erection of the second temple, shall be effected,

*“not by might nor by power,”* but by the Spirit of the Lord. The promise is recorded, *“I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour My Spirit upon thy seed and My blessing upon thy offspring.”* But assurances of divine assistance were never designed to discourage human endeavours. They diminished not the zeal and the labours of Zerubbabel. Paul and Apollos well knew that the “increase” must be of God, but this animated, not retarded them in the services of planting and watering. In many of His mighty works it is the pleasure of Jehovah to act alone. Alone He planted the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth. He asks the aid of no created arm when He balances the clouds, directs the thunder or arranges the stars. Day and night, summer and winter, seed-time and harvest obey no voice but His. But for effecting the conversion of sinners, sanctifying their hearts and preparing them for the everlasting enjoyment of His presence in heaven, He usually acts through the medium of instruments. He has commissioned His ministers to *“go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.”* Treasures of grace are introduced into “earthen vessels.” Even the private Christian, as well as the pastor or the teacher, is permitted to enjoy the honour of being a *“fellow worker with God.”* The preaching of the everlasting Gospel *“unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, kindred, tongue and people,”* combined with the prayers and liberality of the churches, will usher in the day of Babylon’s destruction and the general triumphs of holiness and truth.

To considerations such as these professors of the Gospel have surely attached too little importance. They have looked for

#### ADDRESS

a harvest without a seed-time: or where the necessity of the labours of the spring has been admitted, content with seeing others in the field, they have themselves stood *“all the day idle.”* The industry, the privations, the successes of the missionaries

of Christ may have excited a languid and transient admiration, but ah! How few have ventured on their labours or imbibed their spirit? Who will pretend that the zeal of a Swartz or a Vanderkemp, of Marshman, Ward or the Careys has been excessive, beyond what the state of the heathen, the honour of Christ or the duty of the Christian demands? But, brethren, if theirs be correct, ours has been deplorably deficient. Shall their fervours for the divine honour exhibit a steady and sacred theme and ours slumber in ashes? Rather let us profit by their examples, and aspire to their usefulness and honour.

The Gospel of Christ, above every other system, originates and sustains a public spirit. *"None of us liveth unto himself, none of us dieth unto himself."* The design of the obedience and sufferings of Jesus recognizes none of those inferiour distinctions which divide man from man. The Gospel secures the salvation of a multitude *"which no man can number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues."* It presents a sovereign remedy for all the diseases which awakened sinners of every rank, and of every clime, feel and deplore. The Apostle of the Gentiles longed and toiled for the salvation of his countrymen, but he also travelled from province to province, from Jerusalem to Illyricum, publishing salvation through a Mediator's name. What advantages soever particular fields for missionary efforts may exhibit, the disciples of Jesus will contemplate the whole world as a scene demanding his sympathy and his prayers, his zeal and his contributions. Four hundred million of our fellow creatures spread over the countries of Hindostan, Siam, Tartary, China and its neighboring islands, various parts of Africa, America, and the

#### ADDRESS

isles of the Pacific Ocean are involved in the darkness of Paganism. Their idolatry is associated with customs, absurd, sanguinary and obscene, The female character is sunk in servility and wretchedness. Millions in Europe, Africa and Asia

are revering the Arabian imposter as a messenger from God, and the Koran as their guide to Paradise. Then million of our race are Jews, scattered throughout every nation, and are every where resting in their Law and rejecting the Messiah. In many sections of our globe, where Christianity is publicly professed, it has been so mixed with vain superstition, its doctrines so misinterpreted, its duties so mistaken, and the means by which it has been propagated and maintained, so repugnant to its pure and gentle spirit, that even Christendom itself presents scenes for pious exertion, which for ignorance and misery, are in heathen regions scarcely exceeded.

Who can contemplate the prospect our world presents without exclaiming “mine eye affected my heart?” The soul of a Tartar, or a Hindoo, of an Indian or a Mussulman is as wonderful a faculty, as immaterial and immortal as the soul of a Christian. It is as susceptible as his, of hope and fear, of ecstasy and anguish: but alas! It is dead in trespasses and sins, destitute of the light of revelation and in danger of eternal fire: *“for as many as have sinned without the law, shall perish also without the law.”* Were circumstances reversed; were we in moral darkness and the pagan world enjoying the light of life, self-love would instantly suggest to us the benevolent duties which it would become them to discharge. Those very duties are our own. The holy men who saw our fore-fathers prostrating themselves before the shrines of a Woden or a Thor, and who exhorted them to turn from idols to serve the living and the true God, have left us in their toils an example of duty and in their successes encouragement for our liveliest hopes.

## ADDRESS

Within the last few years, it has pleased the good spirit of our God to awaken in His churches a serious concern for the diffusion of the Saviour’s cause. Numerous, and in some instances large associations of Christians have been formed for

the propose: considerable sums of money have been collected; bibles and religious tracts are extensively and gratuitously circulating, and the hope which thousands cherish that the glory of the latter days is at hand, is as operative as it is joyous. The blessing which has succeeded the efforts of our denomination in India, demand our gratitude. In a few years, the word of life will probably be translated into all the languages of the East. The change of sentiment relative to the subject of baptism that has lately occurred in the minds of two respectable characters, who were sent out as Missionaries, by another denomination of our Christian brethren [reference here to Judson and Rice, Congregational ministers sent out by the Presbyterian Board for Foreign Missions- SCP], appears to have been of the Lord and designed as a means of exciting the attention of our churches to foreign Missions. The engagedness of these worthy brethren in the work of the Lord continues. They look to us for aid, are actually under our care, and have an undoubted claim to our united and firm support. One of them [Luther Rice] is about to travel through different parts of the Union with a view of increasing the number of Missionary establishments. We anticipate with pleasure, your zealous co-operation. The brevity of life, the value of immortal souls, the obligations under which divine mercy has laid us, our past inactivity, the facility with which the great work may be effected, the excellent tendency of the spirit of foreign Missions in multiplying Missions at home, the examples of other Christian persuasions, and the incalculable blessings that may follow our endeavours, form a body of motive which we hope will kindle in many of our youth an ardent desire to enter on Missionary services, and in you the

#### ADDRESS

holy resolution to minister of your abundance to all who shall go forth in the name of the Lord.

But, while we call your attention to the spread of evangelic truth, we would impress on your mind that many other and

most important advantages may arise to the interests of Christ among us from our acting as societies and on the more extended scale of a *Convention*, in delightful union. The independence of the churches, we trust will ever, among us, be steadfastly maintained; but with this, as they are entirely voluntary, the holy combinations we wish for, can never interfere. Is it not a fact that our churches are ignorant of each other to a lamentable degree? But for the labours of one or two individuals, it is probable that whole Associations might have assembled in different parts of our Union without being known or knowing that others existed. We have "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," why should our ignorance of each other continue? Why prevent us from uniting in one common effort for the glory of the Son of God? At the present Convention the sight of brethren who had never met each other before, and who a few months ago had never expected to meet on earth, afforded mutual and unutterable pleasure. It was as if the first interviews of heaven had been anticipated.

The efforts of the present Convention have been directed chiefly to the establishment of a foreign Mission; but, it is expected that when the general concert of their brethren and sufficient contributions to a common fund shall furnish them with proper instruction and adequate means, the promotion of the interests of the churches at home will enter into the deliberations of future meetings.

It is deeply to be regretted that no more attention is paid to the improvement of the minds of pious youth who are called to the Gospel ministry. While this is neglected the cause of God

## ADDRESS

must suffer. Within the last fifty years, by the diffusion of knowledge and attention to liberal science the state of society has become considerably elevated. It is certainly desirable the information of the minister of the sanctuary should increase in

an equal proportion. Other denominations are directing their attention with signal ardour to the instruction of their youth for this purpose. They are assisting them to peruse the sacred writings in their original languages, and supplying other aids for pulpit services, which, through the grace of the Holy Spirit may become eminently sanctified for the general good. While we avow our belief that a refined or liberal education is not an indispensable qualification for ministerial service, let us never lose sight of its real importance, but labour to help our young men by our contributions, by the origination of education Societies, and if possible, by a general theological seminary, where some at least, may obtain all the advantage, which learning and mature studies can afford, to qualify for acting the part of Men who are set for the defence of the Gospel.

Improvement of this nature will contribute to roll away from the churches the reproach of neglecting to support the ministry of the word. They will be unwilling to receive for nothing that which has cost their ministers much.

Finally brethren, “be ye steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.”

RICHARD FURMAN, *President.*

*Attest,* THOMAS BALDWIN, *Secretary.*



[Stan's notes on the above. We must keep in mind that those gathered for the establishment of this Convention had their own outlook and agenda. But we must not fail to appreciate the sincere and diligent labors of Baptists ministers prior to **May, 1814**. Notwithstanding the sincerity of the New School Baptists in setting up this Board for Foreign Missions, the truth is that previous to this time was a Great Awakening, thousands converted, hundreds of churches and associations of Baptist formed, and even as these gentlemen met, itinerant ministers were crisscrossing the Western Reserve on horseback, preaching the Gospel of free and sovereign grace in log cabin meeting houses, private homes, and anywhere else a "door of utterance" was opened to them. They did not need, utilize, or even think of themselves as "missionaries;" but as called servants of the Lord Jesus Christ. They refused any salaries and monetary remuneration for their services. *"Freely I received, freely I give unto you"* was their motto.

Because of the negative description presented relative to their slothfulness and inactivity, which is cited as one reason for the need of this Mission Board, we print the following article by Elder John F. Johnson, an active leader among frontier Baptists, and personal friend to Elders Wilson Thompson, John Leland, Gilbert Beebe, Thomas P. Dudley and other famous Frontier itinerant preachers.

Elder J. F. Johnson, we note, is not referring to the events recorded above, and such was further from his mind. This article was written by him as an explanation why he resigned the Warwick Church in the Warwick Baptist Association of New-York for only two years. The church was fearful that it would be difficult for them to obtain a pastor, seeing that Elder Johnson seemed to be "a stay-short" preacher, or there was something wrong with the Warwick Church. My point for printing it with the above document is to show how Baptist ministers **did** sound out the Gospel tidings "wherever God in His Providence cast their lot." And, for its interesting picture of how hungry the souls of quickened sinner were for the Gospel of their salvation. One bright thing in those early days was Churches, rather than associations, sent forth their ministers into the field of labor, and these churches expected their elders to venture out to other localities to preach wherever "the Lord cast their lot," or "opened a door of utterance for them. Sadly, in time, members looked to the associations rather than their own churches for this business, and associations gladly became their own kind of "mission society," but rather than send forth the elders, restricted their freedom, thus usurping the authority of both the church and Christ as head of His churches. This is during the Golden Day of American Baptists. I think you will enjoy this as much as I. – SCP].

## RETURN TO INDIANA

By

J. F. Johnson

“\*\*\* And first, the circumstances that caused the greater dissatisfaction on my part, was the fact of my laboring so little in the cause of my Master, compared with my former services in the West. It has been our custom since my acquaintance with the ministry here, to make frequent visits among the churches, and to have **daily appointments for weeks and even months.** During those perambulations I was not infrequently in the habit of speaking twice a day, as I passed from house to house, and from one church to another; and during these excursions I often witnessed a degree of enjoyment that I could not realize in my isolated situation from my brethren in the ministry [reference to his two-year service in Warwick-SCP], and those among whom we so extensively labored. True, we had many hardships to encounter in thus rambling through a country that was then new, and in many instances difficult to explore, but the joy that characterized our successive meetings offered an antidote for them all; and I have learned, brethren, that associations formed under circumstances where so many trials and joys were commingled, were not to be so abruptly broken up without producing their effect upon my mind. After the loss of my companion, in the spring of 1853, I was in the habit of making many of those tours through our Western counties, and although I often doubt the utility of my poor labors, yet it appears to me that if they were worth anything to anybody, my usefulness was much curtailed by being confined to one church [as in Warwick, SCP], and generally to one or two discourses a week. It therefore frequently occurred to me that I was too idle in the cause of Him who had done (as I hope) so much for me. This caused me much restlessness during the intervals of our weekly meetings in New York, my native imbecility to the contrary notwithstanding. It often occurs to me that I am worse than a worthless blank in the cause of my Master, but still in that case it would appear that if it was my privilege to labor at all, it was an indispensable one to spend and be spent in His service. The old text that used to lurk within and hang upon my

mind in my earlier days, “*You that make mention of the Lord keep not silence,*” – Isaiah 62:6, would make me occasional visits, but not of the most pleasant kind. Besides all this, the fact of my being of so little service and so considerable an expense to my friends there was a matter of no small annoyance to me. But again, it seemed necessary that I should have a part of my family with me there, and the separation from my children, and my absence from those I had left at home in the West, were not matters of agreeable considerations. In conclusion, it will appear from the preceding remarks, that I have named three particular reasons for leaving Warwick.” [“The Select Works of Elder John F. Johnson, Volume I, pages 208-209.]

It was, and yet is, a charge to all Old School elders in their ordination, that they are “to go whithersoever God in His Providence casts their lot.” And here in Mississippi among us, we are frequently exhorted that we should take advantage of every “open door” in which we are given “utterance to speak.” Yet, while serving churches hundreds of miles a part and preaching in private homes, union halls, and meeting-houses, we never once thought we was a “*missionary*” nor “*an evangelist*.” We consider, as our fore-fathers, that this is a common requirement of a called Gospel minister. And, of this supposed “duty” we consider one of the greatest liberties we have in Christ’s kingdom – **to GO**, with no one hindering, nor taking it upon themselves to say whither God would have me go, or where that “field of labor” was. That, we have always considered between God and the felt-inclination of my own mind and heart. We are rather sure, that such has always been the qualification of God’s own called ministers.

It must not be assumed that the Plan for the **Baptist Board for Foreign Missions** drew into its organization all Baptists. That was far from the case. In its first half-century it could boast of less than half of the Baptists in America. In its inception it was an ecumenical movement very similar to that which struck the Old School Baptists groups in the 1880’s. With the addition of the Domestic Missions, wherewith young recruits were planted in the bounds of associations and churches to direct them toward *mission support*, the Mission Movement gained acceleration, and by the 1880’s claimed the majority. Our particular interest in this movement at present is to present the **reasons urged by the opposition** against the modern movement. One of the first – only four years after its beginning, - is by the historian in the Licking Association of Particular Baptists in Kentucky, **Elder John Taylor**, a member of Little Huston Particular Baptist Church in **1815**. His “Thoughts” are much more from personal accounts than repetition of other writers.

I was unacquainted with this document until I posted an earlier Minute of the Licking Association of Particular Baptists of Ky., in which it was recommended to the churches. Upon enquiry, a librarian in Illinois sent me this copy. Why Elder S. Hassell did not mention it, or Elder Taylor, I know not. Since it has never been published with other documents of the **Great Baptist Separation**, you may find it quite interesting.

Taylor's document will follow that of the two by the Miami Regular Baptist Association of Ohio, because we are presenting them in chronological order. - Stanley Phillips.

### **1814 Minutes of the Miami Baptist Association of Ohio**

The Miami Association in Ohio was formed out of the Philadelphia Baptist Association in 1797, and is the oldest in the Northwest Territory. Its Minutes of 1814 is an example of the Minutes of Baptist associations all over the nation that year. It wrote: "The association received the Constitution of the "Baptist Missionary Society."

Order that their articles be printed with the Minutes this year, and do solicit the churches to take the matter *into serious consideration*" and raise money to be sent to the General Assembly at Philadelphia for the purpose of qualifying and sending preachers out to heathen lands to preach the gospel to them. Said Constitution contains a preamble and fourteen articles drawn up for the direction of said Society. It provides for a Tri-ennial Convention, consisting of other religious bodies of the Baptist denomination now existing in the United States, and which shall contribute regularly to the general missionary fund a sum amounting to at least \$100 *per annum*. It provides also, for a Board of twenty-one Commissioners, to be called the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions for the United States." [Taken from Dodd's, "Condensed History of the Miami Baptist Association, p. 10.]

### **1819 Minutes of the Miami Baptist Association in Ohio.**

“Item: In answer to the Sugar Creek Church, the Association advises the churches to **become a Board auxiliary to the Baptist Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions of Philadelphia.** A dun was presented by the Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions for money to aid in educating young men for the ministry **rejected.**” [ **Note** see page 223, for the reaction of the Miami Baptist Association against the Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions, in **1835.**]

## THOUGHTS ON MISSIONS

By

Elder John Taylor,

Minister of the Gospel, Frankfort, Kentucky, **1819.**

[ Elder John Taylor, frontier preacher, one of the earliest settlers near Bryan’s Station near Lexington, Ky. On May 28, 1785, Elder John Taylor and Lewis Craig established Great Crossing United Baptist Church. This was the same year that Ambrose Dudley became the first moderator of Bryan’s Station, and became moderator of the Elkhorn United Baptist Association. In 1808, the Elkhorn divided, and John Taylor, his close yoke-fellow Elder Joseph Redding, along with Elder Dudley and others, withdrew due to the Elkhorn’s lax discipline, and constituted the Licking Association of Particular Baptists of Kentucky, thus leaving the United Baptists to be carried into the coming mission movement, that commenced officially in May, 1814. John Taylor was one of the most widely known and respected frontier preachers in the formative years of Baptists in the Western Reserve. We find him in the Minutes of the Silver Creek Association in Indiana in 1820, where he presented a copy of the below “**Thoughts on Missions;**” and served on a committee to examine the request of Enon Church for admission into said association, and preached on Sunday. The 1844 Circular Letter of the White River Regular Baptist Association of Indiana made reference to John Taylor’s “Thoughts on Missions” for his description of Luther Rice.-SCP].

## PREFACE

Charity, I consider as the brightest ornament of the Christian character. Paul speaks of it more than any other divine writer. Indeed, he fills a whole chapter on that subject- 1 Corinthians 13<sup>th</sup> chapter – besides many other places in which

he encourages charity. He speaks of it as better than all gifts, and urges, "*let all your things be done in charity.*" The following Essay on Missions, is a thing lately done. If it is not done in charity, from the authority already cited, the author is blameworthy.

Perhaps the best definition of the word *charity*, is supreme love to God and good-will to men, by which both tables of the Law are fulfilled. Paul, who so much preached charity, practiced it himself in prayer to God for his greatest enemies, the Jews, and in giving food and drink to his enemies, when they were hungry or thirsty. Nor did he violate the heaven-born law of charity in the case of Elymas, the Sorcerer, who strove to turn away the deputy from the faith; or when he was dealing with the men, whom he styled "*false apostles, deceitful workers, who transformed themselves into the ministers of Christ.*" It may also be remembered, that those base men last named were of the same religion with Paul, as to *profession*. I have no rule by which I decide on myself in this important case: If I ever blame a man more than I pity him, I charge myself with lack of charity; for commiseration, is the offspring of charity. If I have said any thing apparently harsh in the following sheets, let it not be construed to lack of charity; for the missionaries have done me no personal harm. Indeed, flattery rather than otherwise has been their course towards me; so that I cannot possibly have animosity against them. When I began my first sheet on missions, it may be seen, it was on my birth day, and for apparent cause I expect to never see another; and should now change that part of the first sheet, but it may stand as it is, as a witness that I was conscientious in what I then wrote. For it would look strange not to be conscientious, when a man expected soon to stand in Heaven's great assize; the same conscientiousness has induced me to publish the following sheets, though invited to it by no man on earth.

My serious belief is, that religious society is much imposed on by American Missionaries, and that it is like to be an

**increasing evil.** Though it will be seen that my own mind is very fully made up, yet I cheerfully invite conviction on this head. – John Taylor, 1819.

This day, October 27<sup>th</sup>, 1819, I am sixty-seven years old. This being my birthday, it is probably from the appearance of things, that I shall not live to see another, and if it is the Lord's will, I have no objection; for there is very little in this poor world worth living for, and a great deal in the world worth dying for, so that to depart and be with Christ (and in His Father's house, where are many mansions) is far better, than what belongs to this world of sin. I now labor under bodily calamity, of which I expect never to recover, which is likely to grow into a speedy rage, and make quick work of mortality. "*Amen, O Lord*" – as for this I have long looked with pleasure and awful hope.

Perhaps it is more owing to constitutional make, than any uncommon evidence of religion, that I am not startled at the thought of death; For since my hope in Christ, which has been nearly forth-eight years, I know not that I have had a distressing tremor on that head. This I state as a fact, and not as a certain evidence that I am a religious man; for I make no doubt that many, and perhaps the best of people, "*are all their life long, through fear of death, subject to bondage.*"

But though on this subject I have had but little trouble, yet in many other cases, my trouble has been such, that with Job, Elijah and Jonah, I have been ready to pray for death, or with Paul say, "*without were fightings, within were fears.*"

Through my infirmity this year, I have only been to five Baptist associations; though I have been in the habit for many years of going to from six to eight of those great annual meetings, and found some considerable degree of pleasure at those councils. But I must agree, for a number of years past, many things attending these great councils, throw an awful shade over them; some of which I will name.

*First*, A number of the messengers are members of the Legislature of the state, and filling some of the highest offices in the commonwealth. But to the praise of a number of those great men, they seem **much more humble than many others of common rank, and who labor hard, and perhaps a year beforehand, to carry some favorite point**, and aim at *parliamentary exactness*, and with all the cunning of the bar; so that whether by hard working, or overwriting, or especially over-talking their opponent, they seem much to exult when the vote is carried on their side. Judge ye, is this from Heaven or of men?

But great as this evil may be in religious society, there is another in my belief **much greater**, though bearing the semblance, and innocence of a lamb, by which advantage is taken of many of our greatest men, and which has made a general sweep among Baptist associations, bearing all down before it. The deadly evil I have in view, is under the epithets or appellations **of Missionary Boards, Conventions, Societies, and Theological Schools, all bearing the appearance of great, though affected sanctity, as the mystery of iniquity did in the days of Paul**, when the *man of sin* was in embryo. Ten or twelve years ago, I obtained the use of two large *octavo* volumes of about a thousand pages, on the subject of Papal missions, in the great country of Paraguay, in the new settlements of the great river *Paraguay r.* in South America. This great mission was conducted by the Jesuits, and from their statements great miracles were wrought by them among the natives. And all this is credible with Papists, as they think that miracles are yet in their church. According to their tales, thousands of poor natives had been converted; for if they can only get them baptized (old or young), converting work is done. These holy Fathers gained such influence, power and wealth in Paraguay, that they at length held the King of Spain in defiance, and a heavy war ensued, and much bloodshed, before they could be driven out of that country.



Most of the Protestant societies, since the days of Luther and Calvin, have had propensities to send out missionaries, as stated in a large work of Adam Clark, lately published in America by Mr. Coles. This work contains about eleven hundred large *octavo* pages, including all the Protestant missions since the Reformation by Martin Luther. This work I have had patience to read through, and though there are some things interesting in the work, the greater part is so romantic, that except the reader has more of faith than is needful to make a Christian, he sickens at the imposition or insult offered to his understanding.

Perhaps the Moravians have manifested the greatest sincerity of any other society, both by the dangers they have encountered, and money they have spent. But the most respectable, and perhaps the most useful that Coles has published, is the English Baptist Mission to Calcutta, India, for there England has many subjects, and though the natives are but sparingly benefited as yet, their other subjects, and especially their soldiery, have been.

But, to be sure, nothing ever could be more preposterous than an American Mission to that part of the world, of which the American Baptists never would have thought, but for Luther Rice; and as this man is in a manner the life and soul of the American Missionary operations, it will not be improper to give some little history of him and his old colleague, Adoniram Judson.

About eight or ten years past (and previous to any Baptist Missionary Society in Kentucky,) two young men by the names of Mills and Schermorhorn, who emanated from the **same** school with Judson and Rice, being on a missionary tour from the Presbyterian Board of Missions in the East, by their direction, were to travel through the States of Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, the Natchez settlement and to New Orleans; and then return to the Board who sent them out, make a report by a faithful journal, of all the Missionary and Bible Societies they

had formed, all the money they had collected, their success in preaching, &c. From Cincinnati in the State of Ohio, their object was to travel down to Lexington in Kentucky. By an acquaintance of mine in Cincinnati, they were induced to travel sixty miles out of their way to see me, then living in the lower end of Gallatin County. The object of an interview with me, was to know the state of the Baptist society in Kentucky, and shape their course accordingly.

They were at my house about one day and night. They were respectable looking young men, well informed, and zealous in the cause in which they were employed. They gave me a full history of the ordination and mission of Messrs. Judson and Rice, and the mighty effect it had on the people of New England; and particularly this good effect, that *any poor ministers could scarcely get their bread before, but by stirring up the people in the mission cause, and getting them in the habit of giving their money, it was now cheerfully communicated by thousands, so that ministers who staid at home, were now richly supplied.*

Was all this Priestly art? Those young visitants of mine were very sociable, and among other freedoms asked me how I had got through the world, as they saw me then well settled and now old; which led to another question, What amount of supplies I had generally received from the people for my preaching? After having considered it very puny indeed, and in a friendly way blamed the badness of my policy; after finding that the Baptists in Kentucky were a great people (from the copies of Minutes I presented them of different associations, now about fifteen associations in the State and about that number of churches in an adjacent county – Shelby- they became quite impatient with my indolence, assuring me if I would only stir up the people to Missions and Bible Society matters, I should find great change in money affairs in favor of the preachers; urging by questions like this: Do you not know when the sponges are once opened, they will always run? Only,

said they, get the people in habit of giving their money for any religious use and they will continue to appropriate for all sacred purposes. I have no doubt these young men meant friendship to me, and to preachers in general. It is also probable from what my acquaintance had told them at Cincinnati they supposed my influence was greater among the Baptists than it really was.

Being in my own house, and these respectable young men being strangers, as also not of my own society, common modesty forbade my making as free as I should have been at another place and time. But surely it will not be thought uncharitable to say, that I did begin strongly to smell the New England Rat. It may be well remembered, that this Mills and Schermorhorn, were educated in the same school, sent on a mission from the same Board that Judson and Rice were, though to different parts of the world. Their being baptized at Calcutta is no evidence of their religious or political principles being **changed**, only in the use of much more water! We know not so much of Mr. Judson as we do of Mr. Rice. The most we know of the former, is from the letters of him and his wife. If we attend to the long, celebrated letter of Mrs. Judson, in the first report of the Board of Foreign Missions, in page 34, it would look as if her husband had the same taste for money that the horse leech has for blood. In the instance of the poor religious soldier in the Isle of France; this poor soldier from her own account, who had a family in the army, and his income but very sparingly supported them, paid eight dollars per month for several months together for the use of a room for Mrs. Judson to preach in. This poor soldier after all this, "gave us twenty dollars, and though he weeps much through religious affection when he departs with them at the Isle of France," yet these innocent missionaries bear away his twenty dollars, regardless of his family's wants; though they feel tender for the poor slaves at the same Island, wishing their house full of gold that they might emancipate them all.

Judson and Rice being baptized by the English Missionaries in Calcutta, and in place of *uniting with the English Baptist Mission* in that country, which would have seemed much more prudent, seemed to contemplate something much higher, and by which their names would be more aggrandized. At the Isle of France, Rice receives a furlough for two years, to return to America, and Judson speeds his way to Rangoon, to take possession of the great empire of Burmah. In process of time we find him there under the patronage of the American Baptist Board of Missions! He is now in high spirits, and full of faith, encouraging us to hope, that in twenty years, if we should live so long, we may possibly hear of his success in that country, and especially if the board would furnish him with that many thousand dollars, and as many fellow laborers, on the same terms as he will ask for, and the sterling cast desired by himself, and exemplified in the person of Mr. Hough.

In his letter to Mr. Rice, from Rangoon, 3<sup>rd</sup> Report, page 164 (he has now got Mr. Hough,) he urges his friend to great caution in the Missionaries he sends to him, stating their quality himself; "men," says he, "of an amiable, yielding temper, willing to take the lowest place, to be the least of all, (had Judson and Rice been of that cast, they would *not* have left Calcutta, but by direction from the English Mission.) "For," say he, "one wrong-headed, *conscientiously* obstinate fellow, would ruin us;" so that it seems a *conscientious man* does not suit Mr. Judson. He is to make no scruple of getting money by gift, any way he can, should it be from a poor soldier; however straitened his family may be, it is no odds. In the days of the Apostles, it was thought, all the men in the world could not overthrow the works of God. But *this* work being of men, Mr. Judson greatly fears "one wrong-headed fellow," and especially if he should be conscientious, could ruin them all. By "wrong-headed," he must mean writing in opposition against Mr. Judson's deep concerted scheme of self-aggrandizement, and getting money. However worthy his character may otherwise be, if he opposes this

mercenary plan of Priest craft, he doesn't deserve the name of "Christian" nor "Gospel minister," but *fellow*. Thus, Paul, by way of reproach, was called "fellow," as His Master before him had been. The men of whom we are speaking, are about antipodes with us, and it is about as far to get to them, as once round our earth, and in no national connection with us. What but vanity or "wrong headed" folly, could ever induce the American Baptists to thus tempt the Lord, their God, to work a miracle in the preservation of their mission in Burmah?

But Mr. Rice can almost work miracles, or like the Philosopher's stone, turn dross into gold, and money answers all things. If I ever accurately understood *why* Luther Rice left the Isle of France, and returned to America, it has escaped my recollection. But his movements are an explanation in its self. We will therefore *conjecture a little*. There can be but very little doubt, when Judson and Rice were baptized by the *English* Missionaries in Calcutta, that they would have cheerfully received them as fellow laborers in the field of Missions. Neither do we suppose, from the people who first sent them on a mission [The Presbyterian Board of Missions], they would also have had any aversion to the English government. But equality in labor, I apprehend, did not suit those aspiring gentlemen. Nothing short of a large empire would answer their ambitious views. Therefore, Rice receives his *furlough*, as Judson terms it, to return and seek his fortune among the American *Baptists*, [not Presbyterians] and succeeds, to be sure, far above his most sanguine expectation! He finds a people equally vain with himself, and if not superstitiously bent, by a few puffs blown up to the enthusiasm that perfectly answered his own purposes. They were the great machine, which by him as their agent, was soon brought into action all over the United States. Poor, half-witted Baptists, may Luther well say!

The first piece of policy with Luther and his Board (for I call them *his Board*), was to enlist all the Baptist associations in the United States, upward of a hundred as they since boast.

Their means for so doing was a Circular Letter published, a copy of which was sent by the trusty hand of their *agent*, Luther himself, or some understrapper of his; but much better executed when delivered by himself. [The collection of all these Baptist associations, with the names and addresses of their moderators and clerks was made in 1813. In 1814, almost every association in America recorded having received the letter, most of whom did not act upon it until it became more widely received- SCP.] The purport of this Circular Letter was, among other fine tales, craving a *correspondence with all the associations*. Surely no objecting voice was heard to the *correspondence!* All seemed hearty in exchange of compliments with these great people, while the meekness of a lamb, and the harmlessness of a dove, appeared in Luther himself with his bows and scrapes. But it was not hard to see, that he was a man of greater subtlety. The Savior directed his disciples to similar measures to gain souls to Himself, but Luther's object was to get *money*. With the Circular, was sent by the Board, their *first report on Missionary matters*, a pamphlet of near sixty pages, all of which was chiefly dictated by Luther Rice. Their *first* number was in the year **1815**, just three years since. The same year with all the above named lumber, Mr. Rice made his first appearance in Kentucky, at Elkhorn, or Licking Association, near Lexington. He got to the place on Saturday evening after meeting had adjourned, and though a year before, the association had decided that there should be no collection made on the Lord's Day, a few leading men encouraged Luther, in the prime part of the day to preach a *Missionary sermon, and make a collection*.

When Luther rose up, the assembly of thousands seemed stricken with his appearance. A tall, pale looking, well dressed young man, with all the solemn appearance of one who was engaged in the "work of the Lord," and perhaps he thought he was. He also being a stranger, every eye and ear was open; his text was "*Thy kingdom come.*" He spoke some handsome things about the kingdom of Christ; but every stroke he gave seemed

to mean m-o-n-e-y. For my own part, I was more amused with his ingenuity than edified by his discourse, and more astonished at his art in the close of it, than at any other time. He had the more pathos in his voice the nearer he came getting the money, and raising his arms as if he had some awfully pleasing vision, expressed without a hesitating doubt, that the angels were hovering over the assembly, and participating in our heavenly exercise, and just ready to take their leave, and bear the good tidings to heaven of what we were then about, in giving our money for the instruction and conversion of the poor heathen; and as if he had power to stop Gabriel's flight, in the most pathetic strain cried, "Stop angels, till you have witnessed the generosity of this assembly!" About this time, perhaps twenty men, previously appointed, moved through the assembly with their hats, and near two hundred dollars was collected. Though I admired the art of this well-taught Yankee, yet I considered him a modern Tetzal, and that the Pope's old orator of that name was equally innocent with Luther Rice, and his motive about the same! He was to get money by the sale of indulgences for the use of the Pope and Church. Luther Rice's motive was through sophistry and Yankee art, to get money for the Mission, of which himself was to have a part. Tetzal's great eloquence, and success in getting gold, alarmed first, Martin Luther, and afterwards, the chief of the states of Germany. Our Luther by his measures of cunning in the same art of Tetzal, may alarm all the American Baptists. Tetzal's operations were, when the Pope of Rome and the mother of Harlots were at their zenith. Luther Rice's movements bespeak the *man of sin* or men of sin in embryo; and Baptist associations too soon became the adopted daughters of the old mother of Harlots. Money and power were the signs of the times, when the "*mystery of iniquity*" began to work in the days of Paul. The same principle is plainly seen in the great Board of Missions in America, and Rice, their chief cook, as also in their mighty Convention.

Witness their *resolves* in their *first* Triennial meeting; their hateful flattery of each other; their fulsome public thanks to their officers while in session; as also no quantum of money can be too much to answer their purposes –

3<sup>rd</sup>. Report, 1<sup>st</sup> page: Money and power are two principle members of the old beast. That both these limbs are found in this *young* beast is obvious, and exemplified in the great solicitude of correspondence with all the Baptist associations. Power is *acquired* by connection with a hundred Associations, a fine nest egg of gold to answer their future ambition.

I consider these great men are verging close on an aristocracy, with an object to sap the foundation of Baptist republican government. The highest court Christ has fixed on earth, **is a worshipping congregation, called “a church.” An association is a creature of the churches**, whose power is only self-government while met together, and whose work, as to the churches, is to **settle differences if possible and that only by advice, without any kind of coercion**. But these men foolishly conclude, if they get the associations to correspond *with them*, they at once grasp the *whole society*, consisting of hundreds of thousands, and would fondly make *their advisory counsel* a great court of appeals to the society. But a Baptist association, from their native style (as *advisory counsel*) has no right to go into a *permanent correspondence with any set of men*, but by direction from the churches that send them as messengers, and especially such a motley tribe as the Board of Foreign Missions, or *their* committees, which consist of almost all characters of men. For my own part, I would full as soon be in religious correspondence with the Masonic friends, as this sanctimonious tribe.

Meek and lamb-like as Mr. Rice first appeared at Elkhorn association in Kentucky, a few years after he made a very different appearance at Dover Baptist Association, in Virginia; for being expected at the meeting on Sunday, he with others had been elected to preach on that day. He did not arrive till



about the time worship began. After being invited to the stage (stand, or pulpit), he took his seat beside Mr. Semple [This is the well-known historian of the Virginia Baptists- SCP], who privately informed him of the previous day's selection of Mr. Rice to preach, and after asking if Mr. Semple had appointed men to make a collection after he was done preaching, and being answered in the negative, he positively averred if he did not do it, he would not preach! "Perhaps," says Mr. Semple, "you mean, you will not preach us a Missionary Sermon, if I do not appoint them." He replied, "I will not preach at all, if you do not have the men ready for that purpose!" Rather than quarrel with the gentleman on the stage, Mr. Semple appointed the men, and himself one of them, and about ten others of the oldest and most respectable ministers (of that great body of more than forty churches) bore their own hats through the congregation, making the collection, to please his lordship. But all this was several years after Luther had been collecting thousands upon thousands, and his fame was very great. [The reader may be interested in knowing that this rude interruption of the Dover to make money for himself and the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions resulted in a number of churches withdrawing from the Dover, and establishing an Old School Baptist association in Virginia- SCP].

For my own part, I have never seen one of those Missionaries, but which like Daniel's "*little horn*," was more stout than his fellows (7<sup>th</sup>. Chapter, 8<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> verses). Whatever their preaching talents may be, they seem more stout than other preachers – STOUT in their own esteem; and though some of them have very moderate preaching capacities, they all seem stout – the approbation of the Great Board has made them stout, more stout than their fellows. Indeed, my own opinion is, from my acquaintance with some of those renowned men, that the Board itself is either weak in judgment about the qualifications for Gospel Ministers, or unfaithful in the choice of their men; for it seems not so much the question, What is your character or preaching talents, as Who will go for us – answer

our purpose to hook-wink the people, and get plenty of their money? If this be done, great plaudits ring forth to the four points of the earth, in their "*Latter Day Luminary*." [The periodical of the Missionaries.]

The very many modes, and artful measures of those great men to get money, are disgusting to common modesty. They begin with missionary societies; then they create a great board of different officers, and then select the most vigorous and artful agent they can find, to create more societies of different grades, as Female Societies, Cent Societies, Mite Societies, Children Societies, and even Negro Societies, both free and bond; besides the sale of books of kinds, and in some instances the sale of images. Every Missionary to a foreign country is authorized to follow all these same arts, as well as common begging to get money; so that no set of men ever yet seen on the earth manifest a greater thirst by these various modes of peddling to get money. Their shameful cravings are insatiable! How very different are the characters of those men from the ancient disciples of the cross of Christ; for they went forth taking **nothing from the Gentiles** – and all for the name's sake of Jesus Christ. 3<sup>rd</sup>. John, 7<sup>th</sup> verse. These men grasp all they can, from saints and sinners. In verse 8<sup>th</sup>, John exhorts Gaius to receive such Godly ministers, who preached without pay, By the same parity, all preachers who will not preach but for money, should be **rejected by all the Christian world – and held in contempt by all mankind**. Paul, in 20<sup>th</sup> chapter of Acts, 33<sup>rd</sup> and 34<sup>th</sup> verses, "coveted no man's silver or gold, or apparel." How unlike these men! Yea, holding up his hands he could say, "*Ye, yourselves know that these hands have wrought, and ministered to my necessities, and to them that were with me.*" How is it with these white-handed gentry, always stretched out for patrimony, and like the horse-leech, ever crying, "Give, Give! 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Thess. 3<sup>rd</sup> Chapter, 8<sup>th</sup> verse. Indeed, he glories in preaching the Gospel without charge. 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 9<sup>th</sup> chapter, 15<sup>th</sup> verse, and so on. Yea, he had rather die, than

do otherwise. [The New Testament refers to the hireling ministers as “followers of Balaam for reward.”-SCP].

But it seems as if these men would rather die if they did not get plenty of money. What a striking contrast! Are not these gentlemen on the side of Satan and his ministers, though striving to transform themselves as ministers of Christ? How bold the Devil is! And what but modern missionary brass, could ever induce these men to such shameful presumption?

Perhaps I might not use the freedom I do, but for two tours I have taken in the Missouri country within a year past. The marvelous tales, coming from that country, about the mission there, were some inducement to my enterprise. To read, or hear the Reports of J. M. Peck and Mr. James E. Welch, it would seem as if the whole country was almost a blank as to religion. [Mr. James E. Welch wrote a very approving biography of John Taylor, which may be reviewed on the Internet- SCP]. But the fact of the case contradicts their Reports. From their statements, one would think, there was not surely a preacher in the country that deserved the name, and hardly a church there that was in good order, whereas the fact is, there are three Baptist associations in the territory, and as many preachers, perhaps, as there are in Kentucky according to the number of the people, and many of them respectable. But it is probable these men think, that but few deserve the name of *preachers*, but *missionaries*. The first of these associations is from Cape Girardeau down and up the Mississippi R. to Meramec River, about twenty miles below St. Louis [Note: Elder Wilson Thompson served Bethel Church here after he left Kentucky, and until he left in April, **1811** to move near Cincinnati, and returning in December, **1811** to Bethel Church; it was here that he preached first on eternal vital union of Christ and His church before *faith* was ever given. Shortly after the Madrid Earthquake, the Frontier Revival reached Missouri in January, **1812** – before any mission society was heard of in these parts of the Western Reserve, which revival lasted well after August of **1812** at Bethel. In **1818** he established Mount Pleasant Church in the Miami Association at Post Town, in Ohio. Elder Thompson’s wife’s parents were in the Licking Particular Baptist Association of Ky. Thompson labored in Ohio until **1820**]; the country from the Merrimac River, taking in St. Louis, and up the Mississippi R. and Missouri rivers about sixty

miles from their junction, forms a second association; and the country about Boon's Lick, is a third association. All these associations contain perhaps twenty-five or thirty churches, and as many preachers. Yet, by these men, all is black; for when they baptize a few people at St. Louis, they suppose those waters were never before consecrated to that use from the creation of the world. When they write of the great space of country between St. Louis and Boon's Lick, they state it to the Board, as destitute, and needing preaching as much as the Empire of Burmah; when in truth, the same country, at the very time they wrote; was overspread by two Baptist associations, of which they had full knowledge.

What can be the object of all these false statements, but to prevail on the Board to keep them in their service in that place? A brother, Lewis Williams, informed me the church of which he was a member had existed many years, and the meeting-house was about twelve miles from St. Louis, and on the public road from that place to St. Charles; and though Williams was a respectable minister, and had been ordained a number of years, yet an older man by the name of Musick had long had the pastoral care of said church, and in which he had baptized a hundred members since its constitution, and all in these waters so sparingly used from Missionary accounts! A worthy old Baptist preacher, David Badgley, whom I saw baptized more than forty years ago in Virginia, and who has been preaching nearly that long, now lives in the State of Illinois, about fifteen miles this side of St. Louis, and near the road from Vincennes to that place. Badgley now lives in a very thick settlement, where are two Baptist churches of very considerable magnitude. Another respectable ordained minister lives three miles from Badgley. His name is Kinney; his character procured him a seat in their Convention to form their State constitution, and perhaps since in their legislature. There is a considerable association including the settlements between Badgley and Kinney, and to, and up and down the river against St. Louis.

Badgley about twenty years past settled on the river not far below St. Louis; his labors have been successful from the beginning of his preaching there, as well as in Virginia before he removed. A number of churches by his labors as well as others, have been raised not far from St. Louis. He told me himself, he began to baptize there twenty years ago. Of all this the Missionaries could not be ignorant, for they became acquainted personally with Badgley soon after they went to St. Louis, so that nothing can excuse the false statements of these vain young men, but the conclusion that nothing was valid except under the direction of the Board of Missions.\*

\*[ OBSERVATION BY SCP: What Elder Taylor is describing may be something we have noticed in researching these older Baptists' Minutes. To wit: Long before this, there was an obvious difference manifested among these Baptists, even while in the United Baptist fellowship. Prior to the rise of the New School of Divinity, large numbers – (almost all of the Philadelphia Associations') – ministers, used the appellation "The Reverend Mr."; while at the same period others used the appellation "Elder." There certainly was a fellowship within the United Baptists of a kind of people that did not hold the same sentiments with others. A good illustration: Elder Samuel Trott was a member of the Dry Run Particular Baptist Church in the Licking in 1819. He held fellowship with Elder Ambrose Dudley and preached in his home in 1820, and baptized Dudley' son, Thomas in 1820. He and Elder John Taylor were in the same association! Yet, in 1835, Samuel Trott is at Frying Pan Church in Virginia, and in all these groups' Minutes, their ministers are labeled "Elder," while at the same time, those that will be noticed in the formation of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions in 1814, to the man, used the appellation "the Reverend Mr." When the Great Baptist Separation took place, it seems that these two "kind" or "flavors" of Baptists went with their own kind. In other words, the **division in sentiment** was far **earlier** than the 1814-1832 **Great Baptist Separation**. How far back this can be traced I am unaware, having not the earlier resource material necessary to study it further. However, Elder Taylor is speaking of things only four years after the formation of the Board, and of things which preceded its organization by at least twenty years. It is possible, then, that the would-be Missionaries (in time) did not recognize the Gospel ordinances administered by the more conservative Regular and Particular Baptists. It is an unwritten cardinal principle of all "Baptists" that they are the true "Church of Christ" to the exclusion of all others bearing that or any other name!]

There is a boast of what they have done in St. Louis, in building a spacious meeting house, the dimensions of which, I

do not precisely recollect. I suppose it would hold a thousand people; underneath the whole is a story of stone for the purpose of storage; an L adjoining the house two stories high as a dwelling house for the Missionaries. It is said five thousand dollars have been appropriated and the house only covered in. It is thought three or four thousand more will finish it. The means used to procure money, so far as they have gone, would put any man to the blush, but a Missionary. We have some knowledge of this by James Welch's tour to Kentucky a year or two past; and the reader will be the more surprised when he is told, that the greatest number that attends to hear these men preach, is about one hundred. This I was an eye witness to. But it seems the ambition of these men was to vie with the Catholics, who have lately built a large brick meeting house.

The Illinois is the oldest association in that part of the world, at first taking in chiefly all the churches on both sides of the Mississippi River, and containing twelve churches. By their present Minutes, I find they existed in 1815, Bethel [Bethel Church was served by Elder Wilson Thompson-SCP] , taking in from Cape Girardeau to Meramec River, consisting of nine churches and eight ordained preachers. I find from their Minutes, they existed as an association in 1817. The Missouri association [This association was in affiliation with the Warwick, Delaware River, Licking, *etc.*, and was moderated in later years by Elder R. M. Thomas, formerly of the Mount Pleasant Regular Baptist of Ky.- SCP] existed as such in 1817, consisting of six churches and about as many ordained ministers, extending from Merrimac River to St. Louis, and upwards, sixty or seventy miles. The association at Boon's Lick was formed in July, 1818, with five churches, eight ordained preachers, and one licensed preacher. Thus we see how far truth is sacred to those Missionary men, speaking of a country as "an almost blank as to religion" which contains upwards of thirty Baptist churches and at least twenty-four ordained preachers; but more especially considering the terms of their own letters in the "*Luminary*" (the Mission periodical), declaring

that “from St. Louis to Boon’s Lick, a space of about two hundred miles, is as destitute,” or needs Missionary labor as “much as the Empire of Burmah,” when there were in that very space and time eleven churches, and about thirteen or fourteen ordained Baptist preachers. But we will make some allowance, as in their esteem none may be *preachers*, but those emanating from Dr. Staughton’s school, sent by the great Board of Missions; and no churches deserve the name “*Baptist*” except those set up by this renowned fraternity.

That Welch and Peck think but little of churches, except of their own creation, will appear from a few instances I will give: A worthy man who removed from Bourbon county, with his wife, both members of Cooper’s Run Church, and rented land for one year on the Missouri River, about twenty miles above St. Louis, met with one of the Missionaries soon after he removed, whom he knew in Kentucky; and after enquiring of the newcomer where he lived, and whether there were not more Baptists about him, after hearing there were another man and his wife, also on rented land, and perhaps two or three servants in the families, the young fop insisted he must come up to see him and constitute a church; and though the newcomer informed him that none of them would be there more than one year, as also that he was not in union with the United Baptists, and that there was another church very near to where he lived, and two ministers that he was very fond of; after all these statements the young lord insisted he must have a *church* there, until the newcomer repulsed him with contempt.

In the fall of 1818, a few members having removed to Missouri, and forbore for a time to join a church not very distant from them, the Missionaries hearing thereof, they ran with speed and constituted a church, including a number of the *members of a neighboring church*, without leave from said church. When this thing was complained of, the Missionaries insisted that it was all good order; so that to rob other churches to do *Missionaries service* was no wrong. Myself happened at

the place soon after this affair happened. About the time I was first at Missouri, there were eight or ten Baptists about the town of St. Charles that having a desire to become a church had held council, and called for aid and fixed on a time. The Missionaries hearing thereof, entreated those brethren, not to go into their establishment till they could be with them, and by that means got the time prolonged. Falling in company with a very respectable brother who informed me of this circumstance, having been well acquainted with him in Kentucky, I made free to ask him whether they could not become a church without the help of the Missionaries, as they had two worthy ministers living near them. His reply was, "O, yes, but the Missionaries will force themselves upon us!"

Why this mighty solicitude in these men to constitute churches? The motive is obvious. In the first place, these will be fine tales to write to the great Board; and secondly, every *church* thus set up by themselves, will be under their own immediate control. Suffice it to say, that in Missouri the Missionaries there pursue all the shameful measures to get money, that they do in other countries, though it is a new frontier country, many of the people are poor, and all of them straitened for necessities. It would be thought, being sent on the patrimony of the Board, that they would be sparing as to donations among the poor backwoods people; but even there it is like Judson with the poor soldier, "Give, Give." Their shameful trade of begging disgusts the people wherever they go. They will beg for money to print the Luminary; they will beg for money to build and finish their fine meeting-house, when half the churches in the country have no meeting-houses of any sort to worship God in; they will beg for money to educate young men in Dr. Staughton's Theological School, to make more Missionaries; they will beg for supplies in their own families, both for food and furniture; in short, their whole trade is begging.



It seems, J. M. Peck and James E. Welch appeared at St. Louis in the fall of 1817, too late to be at any of the associations that year; but in the Minutes of one of the associations, they published a kind of Manifesto, hailing them as the *messengers* of the Lord, telling them fine tales and promising them great things. I have the copy of Minutes for three of their associations for the year 1818. These great heralds made their appearance at all these great meetings; the Minutes show the methods taken to drill the associations up to Missionary measures, As Luther Rice has drilled the most of the American Baptist world; such as going into *correspondence* with the great Board of Missions, making *collections in the prime part* of the Lord's day, and even in setting the first Monday in every month, in solemn prayer to God for the success of *missions*. It is always to be understood, that one part at least of the success of missions, is the getting plenty of money.

The truth of the fact is, I scarcely ever met with an intelligent Baptist in Missouri, who, from the movements of these men, was not jealous of, or prejudiced against them; and the most of other men hold them in contempt, on account of their mighty cravings; so that I have but little hope of their being of much service in their present station; for the people in Missouri have as much sensibility, and can judge as accurately as in other places.

What a mighty noise is made in missionary writings about the sufferings and privations of their Missionaries, sent to distant countries! But I consider the chief of it to be pharisaical boast. To be sure, the Moravians in Greenland, and at the Cape of Good Hope, from their own account, were very perplexed, as also, some among the Indians of the north, when swallowed up in poor living, and dirt and lice. But what greater trouble is there in being at school in Rangoon, to learn a foreign language, than for a boy to be boarded from home, to learn Latin and Greek? In Rangoon, the pupils have correspondence with the

greatest men in the nation, the King not excepted; so that in future, should some “wrong-headed, conscience-bound fellow” ruin the Missionary affairs in Burmah, Mr. Judson may fill some high office in the Kingdom, and be a favorite in the King’s palace. What has been once, may be so again; and as to privations in the Missouri, our brethren there apprehend, that they have monopolized the whole country, so far as “Baptist society” goes, and are living in style, in the flourishing towns of St. Charles and St. Louis, without any very great appearance of self-denial, or abstemious living, or any other anxiety or trouble, than are seen in other gay gentlemen, except disappointment in not getting as much money as answers their extensive views. Their cravings are great!

How very little likeness there is between these high-minded men, and the ancient disciples, if we take Paul for one of them? From his own account, as also the witness of the Holy Ghost, in every city he entered, bonds and afflictions attended him. Wherever these men go, however, if they are not honored more than other preachers, they highly resent it. I could give other instances, but I forbear. Paul says we are the “*off-scouring of all things*,” in which he gloried. Very different with these gentlemen. - The Lord told Ananias at the time of Saul’s conversion, He would “*show him how great things he should suffer for His name’s sake*.” God said they should be great, and they were so, and continued more than thirty years before his head was cut off; though his distresses within and without, were great and long, he did not consider them so’ for he says, “*our light afflictions which are but for a moment, work for us, &c.*” Though all the world can see that these men suffer but little, yet what a racket is made among them about their great privations! Paul labored with his own hands to supply his own and the wants of them that were with him, as most preachers of the Gospel yet do. But these men (more shameless than the steward spoken of, who, when he could not dig was ashamed to *beg*), not being fond of digging, are not at all ashamed of

begging extensively, as observed before, and in this they please their masters (the great Board of Missions in Philadelphia) well. For it is well understood, that if a Missionary can beg enough to supply himself, he is not to draw on the public stock. This is one thing that so deeply disgraces them in their fields of labour. In the Missouri, I travelled six or seven hundred miles to and fro, in various directions, and but few where they had been, seemed to desire them to come again; so that from the whole, those men bear a greater likeness to the apostles that were against Paul, whom he called "*deceitful workers*," whose character was to love to take from the people. Hence, says Paul, if one of these men smite you on the face and take from you, you bear it all. And though the Lord says, "*It is more blessed to give than receive*," these men are of the very different opinion; for with them, the greater blessing is to receive.

Having gone through the Missouri, we will return to Kentucky, and take a little further view of Missionary movements there. In October, **1813**, a Missionary society was formed in Richmond, Virginia; in imitation of which a society of the same cast was formed at South Elkhorn in Kentucky, in February **1814**; [In this year, the writer was the moderator of Little Huston Particular Baptist Church in the Licking, formerly the Elkhorn.-SCP] but progressed but feebly till August 1815, when the great Luther Rice appeared at the Elkhorn Association, and like Tetzal in Germany [Johann Tetzal was a Popish priest employed to raise money by the sale of indulgence, or forgiveness of sins, to raise the gold necessary to build the Sistine Chapel (*Cappella Sistina*) in Rome, 1508-1512. Martin Luther's "Protestant Reformation" began as a result of Tetzal's visit to Wittenburgh, Germany, where Martin Luther served as the priest. "He is shearing my sheep!" Luther is said to have complained. Before printed money, gold and silver were the legal tender for trade, and by plastering this gold on the chapel ceiling and walls, forever took money out of circulation, which greatly injured the Merchant and ruling class in Europe. Hence Luther's success was mostly due to the economic disaster resultant to the removal of gold and silver from the economy.-SCP] gave life and wing to the Missionary cause through the whole State of Kentucky. His collections at the different associations

were immense; for he attended most of the Baptist councils in the State, and they uniformly, to gratify Luther, went into a correspondence with the great Board of Foreign Missions. Money was at a premium on the frontier. A collection took place as the thing of course, and especially if they first received the entering wedges (the first report of the great Board). This riveted the yoke which cannot be shaken off till that correspondence is dropped; and thanks to kind Providence, a number of the associations have found a way to get rid of it, though with much difficulty in some places.

Elkhorn association is perhaps stronger in the faith of Missions than any other in the State, which can be accounted for partly, because all the officers of the Kentucky Board belong to that body, and partly because the profits, some day, may be an ample reward. It was a little amusing to see the movements of the Elkhorn people, at their last conference. A small church at Mountain Island, of twenty-four members, had complained warmly against doing any Missionary business in the association, and appeared conscientious in their remonstrance. For satisfaction these cunning men refer them to their Minutes, which were one uniform essay on "*Missions*." Their long-winded Circular was chiefly on that subject, and is a flagrant insult on common sense; none but its own author ought ever to read it, or any other Missionary tale in *an association*. For the mournful and devotional tone, in which he reads all those tales, strikes you through with conviction, and draws involuntary tears from your eyes. It was this passed his Circular, for all was dumb with silence, though twenty-seven members voted against it being their Circular to the churches. Here is Missionary influence, with a witness! For my own part being only a corresponding member, I was also silent, concluding as the Savior directed, "*Let them alone – for they were blind leaders of the blind,*" and would not receive conviction till they all fell in the ditch together – which I think is not very distant. But to the credit of Elkhorn, they **did decide** that there should be no more

Sunday collections for Missionary purposes, which immediately drew forth another question from the author of the Circular which was agreed to; that hucksters of no kind should be allowed to come and traffic at associations; by which it would seem, that if Missionaries were not allowed to *peddle there*, none others should either! Poor hucksters! If Missionaries are stopped from vending their wares, your privilege is also gone.

And as our friend Luther is the principal hero of all Missionary affairs in America (at least among the Baptists), we should be much wanting in our respects to him, if he did not often pass in review before us. The first authentic account we have of him, is found in a letter from Doctor Holcombe of Philadelphia, to Samuel Ayers of Lexington, Ky. Said letter is published in 38<sup>th</sup> page of the *Gospel Herald*, and was in answer to a letter sent from South Elkhorn Church, and written by Ayers to Holcombe, on Missionary matters, the date of which was in 1813. At the reading of Ayers' letter, and in council held on it, Luther Rice was there, rejoicing at the good news that money could be got in Kentucky! In Holcombe's letter, he seems to speak of Judson and Rice, as "bright or worthy angels indeed." He states that these worthy men had been sent out on a *Mission* to the East by the Presbyterians; that they had changed their sentiments and become Baptists in Calcutta; that Judson had continued there, and that Luther Rice had returned to America with reasonable expectations of patronage from the *Baptists*, as a reward for his late conversion to their way of thinking. The professed object was to set up a Missionary Establishment, the Lord knows where; for none of them yet knew where it was to be, only somewhere about half round the earth from us. The marvelous event of Judson and Rice joining Baptists seems to have put Doctor Holcombe out of his senses. So wrapt up in his dear brother Rice, even to enthusiasm, he believes every thing he tells him. But from accounts, he has since come to a better mind and has a very different opinion of this same "brother Rice," than he had in the

beginning. This is what I look for with all the upright part of the Baptist world.

[Note: Reading the enthusiastic reports of Mr. Rice relative to the great hordes of heathen flocking to the Cross under Judson's missionary work, and then reading Judson's own account, some very stiff falsehoods were perpetrated upon the American public to "fleece the flock," as Luther called it. Mr. and Mrs. Judson set sail only five days after their wedding to a truly dangerous future and the Judson's arrived in Burma on July 13, **1813**, and did not hold a public worship service until **1819**. This was five years after the Baptist Board was constituted, in May, **1814**. In June, **1819** he baptized his first convert, and after twelve years, he had a membership of 18 converts. This is a far cry from the millions of heathens pushing to enter the Kingdom of God as pressed so hard and repeatedly by the agents of the Board. While false, it made good advertisement. However, I would note, that while Elder Taylor may be right relative to the ease domestic missionaries had on the American frontier, the same cannot be said of Adoniram Judson. He was a prisoner of war held by the Burmese, in a revolt against the British, for almost two years. The work of translating the Bible was preserved by Mrs. Judson in his imprisonment, and for almost two years his sufferings were life-threatening, cruel, harsh, and in no way less than some of the apostles of the Lamb had suffered. His wife was indeed a heroine of the cause and died shortly after his release. That he was not a sound Particular Baptist is evident, but nothing can mar his contribution to the cause he felt drawn to by his Master. -SCP.]

About twenty months after the writing of Holcombe's letter to Ayers, and after Rice had been appointed agent of the great Board of Foreign Missions, in a manner created by himself; and after ranging through many of the other States, he gave the Kentuckians an opportunity to be acquainted with him, as observed before' so that scarce a man who attends Baptist worship at all in Kentucky, has not seen Luther Rice or heard of his mighty fame, in making merchandise of the people through feign words, and from the strongest symptoms of covetousness – 2<sup>nd</sup> Peter, 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter and 3<sup>rd</sup> verse. It may be remembered, too, that Peter connects all these movements with false prophets in ancient times, and false teachers in our days. A false teacher always loves money, or popularity, or both, more than the religion he professes; and it becomes him, like Esau of old, to be a cunning hunter, and with all his bravadoes, to take care of Number One. At a meeting of the Board for Kentucky at

Silas M. Noel's, soon after the arrival of the young Indians in Kentucky, Luther Rice was present. For the purpose of immediate relief to the agent, who then had the Indians on his hands, [Reference is to the presentation of a group of Choctaw Indian males, who were to be students of a newly formed Baptist Choctaw Academy at Blue Spring, Ky.- SCP], a proposition was made for each member to pay in ten dollars. This was designed as an individual thing. Luther was among the first to pay down his ten dollars. Who could have thought, when the Board at Philadelphia had sent on five hundred dollars for the same kind of relief, to find Luther's ten dollars deducted from it! In how many instances cunning Luther has played the same kind of game is best known by himself. He seems very far from being one of those "wrong-headed, conscientious fellows" who according to Judson's estimation would soon ruin the Missionary cause. It is probable when Luther so generously paid down his ten dollars, that he designed it as a *bait* by which he might catch several tens, or use it as a trump card, by which he might catch a Jack, which would count one in his game; but expected to receive his ten dollars again, as he did. When the Savior found the disciples fishing, He said to them, "*hereafter you shall catch men.*" That Luther Rice would not be willing to catch men in the sense the Savior designed, I will not say; but that he had much rather catch a fish (as Peter did) with a *piece of money* in its mouth, I have no doubt. Indeed, I have some charity for Mr. Rice after all; for I have heard him exult that a Mrs. Stout of Lexington was converted under his preaching. If he is a good man, this was more to him that all the money he ever collected, or ever will. Perhaps some of the people are over severe against Mr. Rice, though I have not heard him charged with many vices. But two that I recollect have come to my ears. The first is the love of money; the second is his prodigious appetite at a table. In the first charge, it will be conceded that he manifests the greatest thirst for money of any man we ever saw, except men of the same fraternity. As to the second charge: Although I

heard a friend of his say, (and by the bye, a *missionary agent*) that he was the greatest glutton that ever was in Kentucky, I incline to be more favorable; for I have often been at the same table with Mr. Rice, and never observed any thing uncommon, except that in a jocular way, he inclined to take a cut from every dish on the table. But from accounts, his greatest performance at the table, is in the articles of coffee and tea. Being not much in the use of these articles, I am not as good a judge as others; but the ladies often make themselves merry on the number of dishes that he can go through. Some of them measure their cups after he is gone, to ascertain the number of quarts he has used at one session, and the most I have heard of, but little overgoes three quarts. Perhaps that is the highest, and two quarts is about the lowest. But they ought to remember Mr. Rice's extreme exertions. To ride four hundred miles in six days (which perhaps he often does) is great travelling, and will excite great appetite; but perhaps it might be well to curtail his appetite a little, to stop the mouths of gainsayers. But it is probable that poor Luther, after all his show and exertions, is not a very self-denied man, without which, none can be the disciples of Christ.

As to the Missionary Society in Kentucky and about Lexington, taking in their board and all, I consider it a poor little puny thing at best, and very weak in counsel, though a number of them are very sensible men. One of their members informed me, that the society consisted of about five hundred men, out of which, twelve officers are chosen annually. I have only been at two of their meetings; one has already been spoken of at Mt. Noel's, where Luther devoted his ten dollars; but afterwards take care that it should not be finally lost to him. The other was at the Big Spring in Woodford County, where only eleven men met to choose twelve officers. Their president is the highest officer in their Board. Gabriel Slaughter having filled that office by election for several years, some of the Scott members of this society being displeased with Slaughter's



national politics, were determined to oust him from his office as president; and for that purpose brought forward about fifteen young fellows, apparently of the looser sort, to join the society, and each paying his dollar down that day, entitled him to a vote, and by about one hour's caucusing in private, those young fellows brought forward their ballots, and to a man voted against Slaughter's appointment to office; but which poor Gabriel was shut out of his presidency in the Kentucky Board of Missions. What can a serious spectator think of all this political juggling in *religious* matters? Or is this one instance among many that missionary societies are but motley tribes, and with whom religious societies should have no correspondence? For "*what communion hath light with darkness, or what concord hath Christ with Belial?*"

Another bravado of the Kentucky Board, was the bringing a tribe of young Indians to this State from Missouri, as if they could not be educated to more advantage in their own village on Merrimac River, than here in Kentucky; and as to civilization, they were surrounded by white people where they came from. Lewis Rogers seems to be as civilized as those who brought him here; and though Luther Rice approves of the Kentucky Plan, it adds no credit to the measure; for with his old school fellows, Schermorhorn and Mills, as named before, this Priestly policy is the same. Only get the people in the habit of giving their money, no matter what it is for, and they will continue to give it for all other purposes. This Indian business is only another thirsty daughter of the horse-leech thirsting for blood, crying, "Give! Give!"- Proverbs 30<sup>th</sup> chapter, 15<sup>th</sup> verse. It is said of the horse-leech, that it is so thirsty for blood, when it sticks on the horse's legs, unless prevented, it will suck on till it bursts, and of course falls off and dies. I would willingly if possible, prevent these men from destruction, lest Judas-like (who loved money as well as they do) they should some way share his fate; for like the horse-leech, when he fell (from the gallows) he "*burst open and his bowels gushed out.*" I wish not to be censorious, for

some of my best friends are great zealots for those missionary movements.

I did signify in the early part of this essay, that part of the distresses of my old age, was the plan now set on foot by some of the Baptists, for patrimonial, theological education; and the object of all this is *to make preachers*, preachers of a certain grade, Missionary preachers. And this produces a new clue for begging or teasing the people for more money, with this pretext, we will make more preachers *for you*, as If Jesus Christ did not know how to make preachers for His own use among men. Though the plea is, the state of society calls for it, this is an old error, old as the days of Origen, and one of the first mediums to corrupt the religion of Jesus Christ. Was not the state of society, when Christ was on the earth, as to refinement, equal to what it is now? What kind of men did He make choice of, to bear His name to all the world? He went up into a mountain, and called to Him whom He would, and of them He ordained twelve apostles.- Mark 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter, 13<sup>th</sup> verse. In the 10<sup>th</sup> chapter of Luke, He sent other seventy, and told them to pray the Lord of the harvest to send more laborers into the harvest. What theological school did He apply to for any of all these? But now money is wanting to make preachers, and prayer is but little talked about for that purpose. The Savior asks no man's consent to be a Christian, and He prepares their minds by necessity, to preach the Gospel, money or no money; so that, "*Woe is me, if I preach not.*" When Jesus Christ would have a scholar in His harvest field, He calls whom He will, as Saul of Tarsus; but mostly uses those who were neither prophets nor the sons of one, as He did Amos. In the schools of the prophets, their pupils were called their sons; but their education was very different from what is aimed at now. It is said that Christ kept His disciples with Him three years before He sent them out to preach. If this was true, it was not to learn literature! Nothing is more absurd than to say, that a man cannot understand the Scriptures, but by a knowledge of the original languages in

which they were written! This is some of the doctrine of those *Theologians*, by which they would destroy our confidence in all translations, and directly take our Bible from us. This, to be sure, is much allied with the old man of sin, or the Mother of Harlots. This I have elsewhere called “hood-winking” the people. Nothing can offer a greater insult to the Baptists, than to beg of them money, and thereby send them a new race of preachers, such as they have not been used to. By what kind of preachers have the Baptist society risen to what they now are? In Kentucky, I suppose they are twenty-thousand now in number. From what theological school have any of their preachers come? Who among them have emanated from under Dr. Staughton of Philadelphia; with his likeness in their pockets or in their saddlebags for sale? But these great men would have us think that our homespun preachers have only been converting the vulgar part of the community; but by a more refined kind of preaching, the rich and wise will become converted. What a pity, that these great men cannot be of the same mind of Christ, who rejoiced in Spirit that these things “*were hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes;*” and with Paul, who says, “*not many mighty, wise or noble after the flesh, are called,*” and God delights to take the wise in their own craftiness, to destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent, which will be the fate of these money hungers, if I mistake not; for the people will find out their trick. But this new style of preachers is to be educated on patrimony. When they leave the school, they will of course be poor, and always be looking and holding out hands for patrimony. Their hands are too delicate either to make tents, or pick up a bundle of sticks, to make a fire to warm themselves as Paul did; and of course, must be the same kind of shameless beggars, that all Missionaries that I have seen, now are. For not knowing the worth of property by laboring for it, they will never think the people give them enough. I have taken some little notice of the horse-leech. It is said of that

creature, that it has a forked tongue, with two branches which are called its daughters, with both of which it sucks blood with great vigor. Thus Missionaries, with many strings to their bow, cry mightily for money. The wicked sons of Eli the Priest had a flesh hook of three teeth, by which they made a mighty rake in the cauldron while the flesh was boiling. The Missionaries have many hooks by which they rake the world for money.

I have said that Missionaries have but little knowledge of the worth of property; I will give an instance or two. About two years ago, James Welch came from St. Louis to Kentucky, on a begging tour. (This is not uncommon with Missionaries.) The object was the building of a needlessly great meeting house in the town of St. Louis (as taken notice of before). He could say to a man in Kentucky, in middling circumstances, "I shall think it very hard if you do not give me fifty dollars, to help pay for my meeting house," four hundred miles from where the man lived! In Elkhorn association, while Welch was there, a proposition was made to pay the clerk of the association for his services. Fifteen dollars was proposed, which was about three times as much as their clerks generally received for such services. Welch rose up, as I was told, and insisted that forty dollars was as small a sum as the clerk could do it for. I can never mention James Welch's name; but with great respect to his ancestors, and even to himself; for before he was a Missionary, he was esteemed a respectable young man; but he was with Doctor Staughton in Philadelphia a year or two on the patrimony plan, which produced such a change in that young man, that a number of his connections and friends were more fond to be in his company, by which we may judge of the corrupting tendency of this mighty scheme.

Though, as hinted before, a number of my best friends are some way connected with the Missionaries, I cannot think better of it than I do of the old pharisaical parade; when I examine it in all its branches, I see a great likeness. Silly admiration is very prevalent. To love greetings in the markets,

is very obvious. To love festivity and the chief rooms there is not out of sight. To be called of men, Rabbi or Reverend, and mingle much with the great, is very notorious. To make a great show of religion, with a design to devour widows; houses, and mites, is strongly suspected; a great hard-heartedness respecting a man's old helpless parents, or his heirs; but great assiduity to obtain a *corbin* or gift to Missionaries; half the estate is not too much. Money and power is the watch-word of the whole scheme; aiming at Lordship over God's heritage. They fancy that something is done for us, when they number Israel, and give us a statement of all the associations; perhaps a hundred and thirty churches total; perhaps upward of two thousand members; perhaps two hundred thousand: but all this is to show us how *great they are*, and what a mighty body of people belong to them; which claim is founded on the several associations agreeing to correspond with them; the tenor of which gives them a free hold all over the United States where Baptists are found; and that it is not unreasonable to ask their vassals for money wherever they find them. And hence their boast of two hundred thousand being in their interest both by their money and their prayers. But surely all this grows from being vainly puffed up by a fleshly mind, or great ignorance of Baptist government, which does *not* belong to associations, but to churches internally among themselves. Every preacher emanating from this great school talked of, I consider one link in the chain preparing for the Baptists; and when their own money prepares those chains, they will deserve to wear them. A little money paid annually, for any one of the five or six auxiliaries, somewhat pacifies Missionaries – because that is an *earnest* of subservience to them; but giving much money being the best evidence that a man is a “Christian” – Heaven is almost secured to them; as also an honorary seat in any of their councils, on paying one hundred dollars. But a little money is better than none, for the above reason. Hence among many of Mr. Rice's fine tales, one little favorite one is often told by

himself: of a poor woman, perhaps a widow, being much affected by Luther's statements of the poor suffering Hindoos, and becoming very desirous to pray for them, understood that she must not do it, till she first paid some money; and not being able to procure more than twenty-five cents, and giving it up with great pleasure, remarked at the time "I now have the liberty to pray for the poor heathen;" – [who never received the quarter] and it would seem Mr. Rice is of the same opinion, or he would not so often cite this circumstance.

### **John Taylor's Personal Experience illustrative of the Early Baptist Ministers**

I am fully persuaded of the great aptitude in us poor, imperfect mortals, to consider ourselves a *standard* of orthodoxy, and even in most of the transactions of life; all of which leads me to hesitate a little as to our Missionaries. I have expressed myself in the foregoing sheets, with all the plainness that I think one friend should speak to another. Perhaps some things may appear harsh; but I know, that for all the men that I have brought in review, I have a sympathizing friendship. It is probable they think they are doing right, though of their sincerity, I have strong doubt. Happy should I be hereafter to find myself mistaken and these men what I wish them to be, the faithful servants **of Christ**. But my great doubt concerning them arises, both from the Scriptures and all the examples therein and observation and experience I have had for near fifty years as a Baptist minister. That far back I remember what kind of men of the Baptist name in Virginia, were buffeted, imprisoned and counted the off-scouring of all things. [Elder Taylor was a personal friend to Elders Elijah Craig and Lewis Craig and John Shackleford, the "prisoners of the Lord" in the Fredericksburg jail, whose preaching converted Ambrose Dudley, who followed Elder Lewis Craig's "Traveling Church" to become the first pastor of Bryan's Station Church, and first moderator of both the Elkhorn and Licking associations, of which Elder Taylor was a member.-SCP] I personally recall their looks, their

labors, and their success. Though not willing to make myself a *standard*, I recollect that far back, the anxiety of my soul for the prosperity of Zion, and the good of my fellow man, so that I could not rest, day nor night, for years together; and of what little moment in that case money appeared to me; so that from my soul I could say, “*I seek not yours, but you.*” And in that case, I “*I coveted no man’s silver, gold or apparel;*” so that perhaps to a man, this temper attended **all** the Baptist preachers of that day. Myself began to preach at about twenty years of age, [about 1772] and about five months after I was baptized, by Elder James Ireland, a faithful servant of Jesus Christ. My previous opportunity and my capacities, in my own esteem, were very small, and they must have appeared small in the esteem of others; but the church to which I belonged, treated me with all the tenderness of a mother. Their preachers also treated me as a son; for the church had three other preachers, to wit: **James Ireland**, their pastor [James Ireland was one of the “Prisoners of the Lord,” arrested for preaching the Gospel and held in prison 1769-1770], **William Marshall**, [William Marshall was pastor of Flat Lick Particular Baptist Church in the Licking Particular Baptist Association in 1814- SCP] and the well known, laborious one of his day, Elder **Joseph Redding**. [Elder Redding withdrew from the Elkhorn along with Elder Ambrose Dudley to form the Licking Association of Particular Baptists, in 1808. SCP] With the latter I travelled the most. He being an older man than myself, he was to me as a father, though he seemed to acknowledge me as his *yoke-fellow*. We labored together in the wilds of Virginia about ten years before Kentucky came in vogue, to which place we both came in early times; and here he died a few years past. Our range of labor was from the Blue Ridge and Shenandoah River to the back of Virginia, on the branches of the Potomac and Ohio Rivers, a distance of about two hundred miles; and oft-times among the dangerous rage of savage fury; though this circumstance took us out of the way of Virginia persecution below the Blue Ridge [by Episcopal priests and Virginia Church/State officials -SCP] Neither of us was ever put in

prison, though at times, either beaten or driven from our meetings by wicked mobs. We oft-times travelled a whole day from one frontier settlement to another, through the rugged uncharted mountains without seeing a house, and our lives in danger every step we took, and when we could not reach a house, our lot was to camp in the woods. We went to many places where the Gospel had never sounded before, and so great was the effect, that oft-times, the cries of the people would drown our voices. We then hoped that many experienced conversion, and some churches were built up where the Lord's name **was not called on before**, but to blaspheme it. Both of us having been raised to hardships, nothing appeared hard to surmount. We therefore performed a number of these tours on foot.

I will describe one or two of them. In one instance Elder Redding had moved his family about forty miles from where I made my home. From his house about a week's meeting were appointed, and the distance about a hundred and fifty miles. When I got to Redding's my horse being young and he nothing to ride, but a mare with a young colt, we concluded to take the journey on foot. Our first meeting was twenty miles from his house. We started at sunrise, and met a large assembly in due time. As a rich reward of that day's labor, a number of people obtained a hope of conversion from that day's meeting. We had twenty miles to the next day's meeting, and eighteen miles afterwards to get to quarters. A number came the last eighteen miles to meet us. It did seem as if the Lord blessed this *foot tour* more than usual.

Another shorter tour we took on foot. I had staid all night at Redding's and there being neither stable nor pasture, we turned our horses into the woods. On the next morning the rain was violent, and though we turned out in it and searched diligently till near none o'clock, we could not find our horses, though they were belled. Then the council was, "What shall be done?" There was but little time to council; for the meeting was



fifteen miles distant, and a very mountainous way. It appeared to us awful to disappoint a meeting. The rain slackening a little, off we set. To make this fifteen miles in about three hours, something more than walking was needful. The rain set in afresh; we ran, we walked, we perspired and received the rain from above, till there was not a dry thread on us, and met about twenty people about half after twelve. I will leave the reader to judge whether this effort was not being "righteous over much;" for myself immediately took such a cough, with all the appearance of the whooping cough, that I did not get rid of it for a twelve month. Redding having a family did not always go with me on these dreary Alleghany tours, himself also having the care of a large church, lately built up about the head of the Potomac river; so that I often travelled these dreary, dangerous roads by myself; where frost-biting in winter, with snow knee deep, and often unbroken roads, with forty and fifty miles from one settlement to another, and danger of being scalped by the Indians in the summer, marked my way for a number of years. Though a great part of the people would have done anything for me, that they would have done for their own son or brother, their poverty forbade it. The poor things would now and then, make me some little presents of the best they had, that I thought in my conscience was more than my poor preaching deserved – which perhaps never amounted to fifty dollars per year, exclusive of the food myself and horse lived on, and my own food scarcely safe from putrefaction from want of salt; and from what habit, to this day salt food is disagreeable to me.

I know that I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not, when I say that I do not recollect that it ever occurred to me that I suffered hardship, neither should I name what I now do, only these Missionaries, high flyers – make such a noise about *their* privations, when the world knows how ill-founded these complaints are. What I have said of Elder Redding and myself, in some instances, is only a specimen of our *general* course, and was no singular thing among the Baptists' preachers in

those days. Were I asked whether such a school as Staughton's when I began to preach would not have been of great service to me, and were I to judge from what I have seen, I should say, that the damage done, would very much overgo the profit!

### **More On Missions**

When I closed my last sheet on *Missions*, I concluded to say no more on the subject, on paper; but having met with a worthy young Brother, who by the bye, was a great zealot for Missions and had in possession all the numbers of the "*Latter Day Luminary*," as it is called, he prevailed on me to give them a reading, assuredly concluding that their great light, would give conviction on that subject. I confess they have given me *some light*, but in a very different way from the brother's expectation; for poor as my opinion was before, of these high-minded self-flatterers, I never so fully took in their mighty *presumption*; and one thing among many others, is giving God Almighty an entirely new epithet, well adapted to *their* ambitious views! For our Maker long ago has given to Himself titles suited to His own divine character, as *Jah, Jehovah, I am that I am, God Almighty, The God of the Whole Earth, the God of Heaven, The God of Jacob and of Israel, The God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and of all His spiritual seed, &c., &c.

The lately manufactured epithet is, "The God of Missions." Vain men! Presumptuous mortals! So any appeal made to God in the future, must be under this *new title given Him*, "*The God of Missions*." Their lofty minds lead them to class *themselves* with the greatest characters that have ever been on earth; such as John "the Baptist," the immediate harbinger of Christ, and Jesus Christ Himself, whom they style "a Missionary!" His Scriptural titles, however, don't suit them so well.

In the different numbers of their mighty "*Luminary*," they take up the several apostles with their travels, all of which they

style “*Missionary* tours,” and the men themselves “*Missionaries!*” which favorite term of theirs, they seem to think an *improvement* on all the office titles given by Christ Himself to His own servants; which favorite term of theirs is borrowed from Old Mother Rome! And as they are beholden to the Mother of Harlots for this handsome phrase, it is to be hoped that our Missionaries will acknowledge their own old mother and the Jesuits of the same race as their brethren; and especially when from their own tales, they have done more in Paraguay and other countries, than our Missionaries can yet boast of. It may be remembered that these Paraguay men assumed great sanctity; therefore called themselves after the name of Jesus (Jesuits). What do our Missionaries say of themselves? It is a little amusing to read in the first section of the second number of the “*Luminary*,” the self encomiums there expressed on Missionaries. Scorn, or pity, or both, will soon be awakened in the reader except himself is run away with, by the delusion. Look at the comparisons made between themselves and ancient prophets: Though in some few things, ancient prophets overwent them, yet from the whole, Missionaries are much to be preferred; because, says page 66, prophecy was mingled with obscurity, but Missionary was clear and effulgent. The Lord pity the ignorance of foolish men! As to common Gospel ministers, the comparison can scarcely be made, page 60, for want of that heavenly fire hurled from the altar of heaven, such as occupies the bosom of a Missionary. The common minister is so phlegmatic, that he scarcely deserves the name of *minister*. A Missionary, says the same page, is an eminence of character, an apostolic inspiration, reserved for the days of Missions of the “latter days;” for if this heavenly fire, says the same page, was hurled into the hearts of common preachers, thousands would apply for license to go to foreign countries. But the heavenly fire boasted of, is suspected to be the love of money and fame. But the comparison is more fully exemplified in an apostle, says page 67; for an ancient apostle was a “*Missionary*,” and

Missionaries are modern apostles! Some little difference is agreed to; but where the ancient apostles had the advantage in one thing, the modern *apostle* has it in another; so that the page leaves the reader at a loss to know which was the greatest, the ancient apostles, or our modern strutting upstarts.

However much the thoughtful reader might be disposed to exercise patience and charity in the citation of the above pages of the second number of the "*Luminary*," I think his fortitude will be brought to a great trial when he comes to page 73, beginning under the head of A Vision. Whether this mighty dreamer had a vision like Balaam of old, with his eyes open, or whether like him he fell into a trance, or whether it was a real dream that this Missionary bigot had, through the whole like Balaam, he seems to boast that his eyes were open, and that he had great light, or the vision of God was on him. Surely this tale is worthy of the "*Luminary*," for it is all light as that book in its title page boasts to be; but let this dreamer remember, that with all the boast of his brother Balaam having his eyes open, the ass on which he rode while speechless, saw more than her master. Though the Lord in ancient times, made known His will in various ways, and often by dreams and visions while the canon of the Scripture was not yet completed, even then the dreamers were to be watched close; and though the sign of a dreaming prophet came to pass, yet if he gave any epithet, or idea of God that Himself had never revealed, that prophet was to be put to death; and though we have no desire for any man to suffer for differing from us in religious opinion, yet as this dreamer would turn us away to a new God, "The God of Missions," such Missionaries as rank themselves above other preachers of the Gospel of grace and call themselves *apostles*, together with such a *dreamer*, we will hold in contempt, with all his vision, and esteem him as a son of the mother of harlots, and his dreams as some of those "*lying wonders*" spoken of by Paul, by which the Man of Sin would deceive. He may amuse the followers of Swedenburg with his dreams, and the Shakers

with his visions; for very few of the Kentucky Baptists have any use for his merchandise; though by this happy knack of dreaming, he might hope the silver would jingle. Are these Missionaries blockheads, or knaves? Or do they think that the present generations of the earth are fools?

In some former sheet I have said something about the sale of pictures by the Missionaries. Since that, when travelling, I lodged at a private house, where the landlady give me a little history of Luther Rice, who called at her house, her husband being gone from home. His first sally was, "Madam I presume you do not know me." She replied, "I do not, sir." He than said, "I am Luther Rice, the Missionary preacher; I want my breakfast, and my horse fed with corn, oats and fodder." Perhaps Luther was excusable in this freedom, for it was a Baptist house, and the people in good circumstances. Having heard of Luther's great capacities in the coffee way, she hastened and made her pot full of between two or three quarts; she said it was always the greatest plenty for her large family; but it did suffice, by going to the bottom of the pot without cooking again. He then lamented her husband being from home; for he had expected to have borrowed a horse of him a month or so, and left his to be put in order; but had to bear the disappointment. After peeping a little about the house, and seeing nothing of that kind but a few pictures the young ladies had drawn, he remarked to the landlady, "Madam, your house will very well suit some handsome pictures I have with me." She replied, she could not tell without seeing them, concluding he had in mind to compliment her children with some play thing. Luther unlades his stuffed saddlebags. Soon after he drew them out, he began to state the usual prices of his pictures from ten dollars and down. After hearing their prices, though he urged their beauty and elegance, she declined taking any of the; after which he showed her a number of religious tracts, with their several prices, but she bought none of his merchandise. Poor

Luther had to bundle up and move off without getting any money there, and the lady now talks of his movements while there, with disgust and scorn; for she is a woman of good information, and conscientiously religious. What is to be thought of such Missionary Apostles, who affect more sanctity and dignity than other preachers, and yet remain an hour or two in a religious family without a word about *religion*, but shewing a manifest thirst to get a little money? But perhaps he thought it was religious enough, to offer to sell the lady some good pictures and good books.

I ask, do apostolic Missionaries appear to have more religion than other men? Or does their religion mainly lie in affecting to know more than other men? Then in place of being “modern apostles,” are they not modern Gnostics? And as they have almost by their superior knowledge found out the last ten tribes of Israel, is it not likely by their great knowledge, that they will soon find out where a number of apostles were martyred, that we know but little of their labors or death? And will not their relics be used as articles for merchandise among us? It is well known that those ancient heretics, called Gnostics, gave themselves that epithet, because they knew more than other Christians. It is also said that Simon Magus was at the head of them and the founder of the whole tribe, which was vastly numerous. As for Simon’s religion, we know how much it was connected with money – (Acts vii, 18-20) – and the severity of Peter’s reproof of him. Those who please may make the comparison between the ancient Gnostics and our present Missionaries. For my part, I think the likeness much greater than with the apostles, whose high rank they presume to claim to themselves. It may also be remembered, that this same old Simon, was a Baptist, or baptized by immersion on a profession of his faith; all of which did not secure him from the “*gall of bitterness, and the bonds of iniquity.*” Love of money, and love of power or fame, were the strong bonds by which his soul was held fast. Men bound by these strong cords, are

perhaps more to be pitied than blamed. Good Lord, correct all our mistakes. When men assume to themselves higher ground than others, they are, as a thing of course, taken more notice of than others. I have in the foregoing sheets been taking a survey of those high-minded men, and have narrated a long train of facts, collected, either from their own writings, the use of my own senses, or the testimony of others in which I confide; all of which I am alone responsible for, if called on. And as it is the watchword of American Baptist Missionaries, to attempt great things, look for great things; and as all new officers, I mean great ones in their own conceit, aim at some new regulations, we look for an attempt at great things by these new apostles. Indeed, we already have it before us; for in the tenth number of their great "*Luminary*," page 466, they are directing their young preachers how to preach in foreign countries, from Bishop Lowth's translation. Why not from our own translation? But this comes from their own apostolic infallibility. Every new Pope must make some new law as a test of his own infallibility. As they begin with Lowth's translation, is it not to be looked for, that they will soon give us a Bible of their own translation which will be equal to John Wesley's, from which he makes his notes on the New Testament? [Or Mr. Graham's, or the New International, or the next every five years revision or so? -SCP] Or at least equal in the Shaker's Bible? For they already dictate what kind of churches we shall have to support even a moderate preacher, same copy, page 477. The lowest sum fixed upon is six hundred dollars. To raise said sum, we must have from their direction, one hundred male members, either of merchants, mechanics or able bodied men to labor; and then a tax on each man of six dollars per annum, to raise the money. If there are more male members, the preacher must have more. I ask you, reader, whether this is not attempting great things among the Baptists? Should those apostles ever own themselves inferior to Paul, they will at least assume a stand as high as the seven sons of Sceva, spoken of in Acts 19<sup>th</sup> chapter, 14<sup>th</sup> verse – and will

attempt to cast out Devils in the name of Jesus whom Paul preached. And though I may be now called a Devil by these new apostles, for making as free with them as I have, I shall insist on it, that the Devil never did a better act in his life than to fall on, and drive these presumptuous men out of the house. My object is, if possible, to drive these presuming men out of Baptist associations; for there they crept in unawares, with no more right than the false brethren of whom Paul speaks; for they are a motley tribe at best, I wish it understood, once for all, that when I insinuate corruption among American Baptist Missionaries, I do but sparingly mean men of my own State; for I only think of three in all of Kentucky that I suspect, and I rather ascribe it to their weakness and vanity than to corruption – looking perhaps for a thank'e from these great men; or possibly they may look for some profits in future either in money or applause. A well wisher of poor deluded Missionaries, Elder John Taylor,

Franklin County, Kentucky, - **1819**

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

**ANNOTATION:** Almost ALL Missionary Baptists Historians state that (1) Daniel Parker founded the Primitive Baptists, and (2) that Daniel Parker was an illiterate preacher. Both statements are far from the truth. In fact, they are outright lies! **First**, we have already proven that there was a wide-spread and numerous collection of Baptist churches that totally rejected the New Divinity doctrine of Andrew Fuller and his Missionary societies, and hence, in no wise could Daniel Parker, in **1820**, be the founder of those Old School, Particular and Primitive Baptists that long **pre-existed** his ministry. Welsh Tract Church predates from **1701**, long before Parker was born!

**Second**, this ADDRESS, within itself, demonstrates clarity of mind, consistency of organization, and as equally grammatical construction as others



educated on the American frontier. When scanning this document through Word's Spell-Check, it is amazing how few errors are found. While we point this out for the reader's special attention, nevertheless, that is not the purpose of this insertion. The *message*, however presented by Elder Parker, is the **purpose** for **this document's presentation**.

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

## **THE PUBLIC ADDRESS**

By

Daniel Parker, 1820

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

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

chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise. . . . therefore, I will venture:

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

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

I make these remarks to lead our minds to the subject in hand, which is "**the principle and practice of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions.**" Not attending to this subject I

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

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

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

It is not my wish to cause any further distress among my brethren than now exists, but hope this short epistle may be a means in the hands of God to show them the great evil they are supporting; for the confidence I have in the religion of my brethren induces me to believe that if they could lay aside the

vices of their mind, and examine their zeal, they would find it was not according to the knowledge given in God's word. They would then come fairly to the Truth, and we could say, we are of one heart, one soul and one mind; how pleasant this would be. Now as the subject is of great magnitude on which the peace of Zion greatly depends, I hope my reader will not pass too hasty a judgment, but will read, consider, and compare with God's Word, then ask his heart whether these things be true or not. I now proceed to take up the subject.

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

1. That we are **opposed to the spread of the Gospel, among the heathen**. To this I answer, we are pleased with the spread and growth of *Emanuel's* kingdom throughout the world. But we wish it under His direction and government, and crown Him with the glory, which we believe is **not** the case in the mission plan.
2. We are charged with **opposing the translation of the Scriptures, and the education of the heathen**. To this I answer the charge is incorrect, for we oppose neither; but will help with heart and hand if it could be taken in a proper manner, and take the evils from it.
3. We are charged with **holding a tyrannical principle, inasmuch as we are not reconciled to our brethren in their giving their money to the mission system**, and the argument is that they have a right to do what they please with their own, and we would bind them down that they should not have liberty to bestow their money to the relief of any of their fellow mortals, whatever. To this I answer, as to the bestowing your money to relieve the needy in a point of moral duty, we believe is performing good works, and we truly wish such good works were more common among the Baptists. But as to a professor being

at liberty to do what he pleases with his own in all cases without being accountable to the Church, is a very absurd idea. I ask would you be willing that your brethren should gamble on his own money, or even lend it to a gambler for that purpose; or give it to the priest to forgive his sins, or to the worship of idols, or in many other cases too tedious to mention? I think the spirit of religion saith not willing. Just so if the mission system be an evil, and God has never required it at your hands to give the blessings He has bestowed on you to support an unscriptural plan that is repugnant to His Gospel government, then we are no tyrants; but have a right to deal with you as violators of the government of Christ.

4. It is said by some that the **Wabash Association had no right to interfere with the mission system in the way she did;** or did not understand what she was doing. To this I answer, the Wabash Association well understood what she was doing, and had an undoubted right to make head against the penetration of heterodox principles or disorderly practices among her. And if the mission principle and practice is not agreeable to the "law and the testimony", then it is to be deemed heterodox in principle and disorderly in practice. These charges, with many other similar ones are very improperly stated in order to weaken the confidence of the people in our objections against the mission system, and by this means practice fraud on the minds of the public, by unfair arguments, grounded on false charges. But I hope when the public are informed of the (Board's) intrigue, their prejudices will be broken that were against us and they will come fairly to the Truth and give due weight to our arguments.

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

We stand opposed to the **mission plan in every point and part where it interferes or is connected with the ministry**, either in depending on the Church to give them a call, or seminaries of learning to qualify them to preach, or an established fund for the preacher to look back upon a support, and when the Board assumes authority to appoint the fields of their labor, we believe they sin in attempting a work that **alone belongs to the Divine Being**. Consequently we are not reconciled to the unfruitful works of darkness but feel it our duty to reprove them; and as to the extravagant plan of translating the Bible and civilizing of the Indians, we could bear with it, if it was not under the sacred name of religion, but we believe as paper, types, and the labor of men, all cost money, and belong to the things of nature, that it should be conducted under the direction of moral government, and not at the expense of religion; and as to educating the heathen, we think it very improper for to establish missionary families securing the rights of flocks and herds, farms and incomes, all under the color of religion. It seems like making the sacred character of religion no greater than the merchandize of this world, and putting it in a long line of trade and traffic, when the colonization of the heathen ought to be conducted under the direction of our **civil government**, or a society formed for that express purpose, not under the character of any society of religion whatever. But we rejoice at all good that is done in translating the Bible, or educating the heathen, and are willing to give our aid in counsel, or money, provided it can be done and not dishonor the cause of religion. So you may see we are not opposers of the translating of the Bible, nor educating the heathen, but we think there could be a better way fallen on and not mingle matters of religion with the things of the world. But the object of missionary societies in respect to the ministry we are opposed to **in every point**, and our reasons will be more fully understood before we are done; so I shall go on to the third thing proposed, (Note, when I use the word “we,” I include

myself with the common objections of those who stand opposed to the mission plan,) which is to understand **what the Baptist Board intends to do from the face of their Constitution and prove it by their doctrine and practice.**

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

(Editor's note: The Baptist Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions **did** –in spite of denials- educate, train, hire, locate, and recruit ministers to be placed in established churches secretly, in associations to gain control of, and devise geographical plans for the placement of these recruits in advance of the rapid populating frontiers. For proof, read their missionary's autobiography –Ezra Fisher, a copy of which is in the Indiana Historical Archives, Indianapolis, Ind.)

Then by the title they bear, we understand a society formed for the purpose of sending the ministry to foreign parts. There is one thing now I wish to notice in the title they bear, where they claim their authority of the foreign ministry for the United States of America. This evidently proves they claim the government of the ministry and consequently arrests the government and authority Christ gave His Church; for the first

article of the Constitution cites them to the general missionary convention for the Baptist denomination in the United States of America, for foreign missions. Here they have claimed the Baptist name and authority, which the **Baptist union or government has never authorized them to do**, and in the 13<sup>th</sup> article claim the authority of domestic missions in **our own country**; but if we will notice the 4<sup>th</sup> article, we will find they do not only claim the power, but deem it their **duty to employ missionaries**, by which I understand *preachers*, and take measures if necessary, for the further improvement of their qualifications, and fix on the field of their labors; also on the compensation to be allowed them for their services. What are we to understand the Convention means in this article, or shall we say they did not understand the meaning of these words? No, they are men that understand the grammatical sense of these words. Well, shall we think they intended to impose them on us, thinking we would not know what they meant? I would fain hope not; but then why not the meaning of these words be freely acknowledged, for when they say to “employ missionaries,” do we not understand to “hire preachers”? Yes, we are obliged to understand that, especially when they have to agree on the “compensation” for their services, for if I get only one meal a day for my services, it is so far a part of the pay for my labor. Then I must be an hireling although I work for so little. Well, who has hired or employed me? The Board. Where will I get my pay? From the Board I look to for it, for they have employed me, and appointed the field of my labor. I am under their government and direction. Well, what has the Board got to pay a man for preaching? Are they better off than the “wise virgins”? Have they got any “oil to spare”? I trow not. Then it must be money or something of this world’s goods to pay me for preaching. I ask who has the right to appoint the fields of the labors of the preacher? certainly the authority that has employed him. Well then, the Board acts consistent with their principle, for they have employed preachers and sent them out,



and pay them for their labours, and to the Rev. Luther Rice, as high as eight dollars a week, besides his traveling expenses, so I hope the mission friends will no longer deny this truth, but defend the cause of their principle, or forsake its evil.

The principles of the Board are further understood by the 14<sup>th</sup> Article of their Constitution: In this article, as well as some others, it goes to prove they believe **education** essential to the gospel ministry, and their practice in the urgent resolutions entered into in their paper, the *Latter Day Luminary*, No. 5, pages 234-235, goes to prove the fact, for in those resolutions they have resolved to **divide America in three sections, and two men in each district appointed to receive contributions, and to attend to the business under the control of the Board.** Here we find the Baptist Board has urged us to **form auxiliary societies.** What is this great exertion for? It is stated to give pious young men education to *qualify them to preach.* This pointedly proves their principle is not only to **educate** preachers, but also to **hold the government** of the ministry **in their own hands.** Many other facts might be referred to, but this is sufficient to the point in hand. But there is one thing more observable in the mission principle that I think ought not to escape the notice of the Baptists; and that is, they prove to us by their writings that it is the business of the churches to impress on the minds of their “pious young men to preach the gospel,” or call them to the work; although they *say* in one place, it is the Holy Ghost that makes us able ministers of the new testament. But in this their Constitution they only claim gifts and grace to introduce them to the seminaries of learning. I ask, may not man possess all these and yet never be called of God to preach the gospel? And further, in urging the necessity of supplying the world with preachers, it appears their eye is on the churches to call them to the work of the ministry, which may be observed in the following remarks made by them in the *Latter Day Luminary*, No. 6, page 281. This remark is, “If Christian teachers are to be

sent forth, it is obvious that the Christian churches must send them." In the same number, page 284, they say, they take it for granted, that in all Christendom, there are not less than thirty thousand suitable young men, that might be called to this work. On page 285, they say it is granted that there are suitable men enough, if they were disposed to go, and the churches were able to send them to the work. On page 290, they say to the churches it belongs to move forward it is for them to implore the guidance and blessings of the Lord, it is for them to seek out and call forth the messengers of salvation, &c. Also, on the first page cited, they tell us, it is the duty of Christians to send forth preachers of the gospel, in such numbers as to furnish the means of instruction of the whole world. Many other similar passages might be referred to, but it is unnecessary, for these remarks evidently go to prove, to call or send forth preachers, they deem it the work and business of the church. I ask my Baptist brethren to realize this principle, and ask their Bible and their hearts, if they dare believe that God has ever called on the Christian world to look out, call, qualify and send out preachers of the gospel? Or has He reserved that work to Himself, and will fulfill it in His own time and way?

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

1. The Scripture they introduce to justify them in qualifying, sending out, and supporting the missionaries.
2. The evidence that justify them in their plan for collecting money in the manner they do, and keeping an established fund for that purpose.
3. The right of the titles and names of the officers in the mission system.

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

I shall in order to be short and well understood, plainly give my own views on the Scriptures, as I bring them in, as well as to show what the friends of the mission system aim to prove by them. I shall begin with Jonah's being sent to Nineveh: This part of the Scripture is introduced by the friends of the mission system to justify them in sending preachers to the heathen. This is the first account of a Hebrew teacher being sent to the Gentiles; this text is intended to justify the **missionary society** in sending out preachers. We will now examine and see if it will answer the purpose. We find this was a special act of God in sending Jonah to Nineveh, and that not by or through a *missionary society* and stands a very pointed evidence in my favor, and against themselves unless the mission society will say they are acting as God, in sending out preachers, and I hope this they will not say. Notice Jonah was not sent to a **seminary of learning** to prepare him to preach to the Gentiles, but was under the tuition and special order of his God, and was in no case under the order or direction of any body of men whatever; neither did he look back to a **society formed to raise money for his support**. So we find this text will not answer the missionary purpose but contracts guilt on their own heads; and whenever quoted by them, instead of justifying their

system, only proves they **assume the authority of God**. And the same may be said by every text they draft to answer their purpose; and instead of being angry as Jonah, (as some say we are in a gospel sense) we are hurt with our dear brethren for attempting a work that alone belongs to the great God; that it, **to employ preachers, qualify them and send them out, and fix on the field of their labours**. I now go on to the mission evidence.

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

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

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

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

chapters of II Chronicles, where we have the account of the collection of money for the purpose of rebuilding the temple or repairing the house of God.

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

I come now to the third point, that is to **say something about officers or titles of commission**; but as this is a matter of small amount, I shall say but little about it; but the same chapters referred to above, are brought in this case. But as the

collection of money falls when tried by these Scriptures, so all the titles or names of commissions will fall with it, but the Book of Daniel is referred to, to justify the title "President," which I conceive doth not only belong to national affairs but under the tyranny of a heathen king, and when professors of religion give way to the spirit of nature and are pleased with the names of honor from the world, it is time to say, "take care," for Israel following after the heathen idolatry was the cause of her captivity; so I leave the public now to judge, whether the principle and practice of the mission system, is proven and justified by these evidences or not, and pass on to the next point in hand, which is the Fifth.

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



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

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

The mission society seems in their constitution to claim the right to qualify pious young men, who have gifts and graces, by

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

I could quote many similar texts, and quote chapter and verse; but it would be more tedious and you can search them at your leisure, and I hope my readers will still remember that when he (Paul) came to preach to his brethren, that he did not come with the words of man's wisdom, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. Again, the wisdom of this world was foolishness with God, and if he sought to please man, he was not the servant of God; and he that is a friend to the world, is an enemy of God. So we see the apostles had not only no idea that the wisdom of this world qualified them to preach but seem to

stand opposed to such measures as well as some of us, and no wonder while they held their exalted vies of the grace of God, which taught them to look to the Great Giver for wisdom, and not to this world. And again when we apply to the world for wisdom, consider the contempt we throw on the wisdom that comes from above; observe whenever we apply to any source for help, it proves that we look at that as a superior source.

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

Here let me observe the preachers have no right to look back where they **came from**, for there is no account that the gospel ministers are supported from behind – for Paul calls it “**robbery,**” and confesses himself guilty of robbing other churches and taking wages from them to do service to the Corinthians Church, and **asks forgiveness for that wrong.** We

must say that wherever a preacher labors, **is the place for him to claim his support**, and he has no Scriptural authority to look anywhere else – for the plan of supporting preachers by contribution, is without the authority of the Bible, for the contribution the Scriptures speak of, and taking it from one place to another, was for “the relief of the poor saints” and ***not for the preachers***. For the preachers are supported as a **debt we owe the gospel**, and that where they preach, and not to be sent after them, and we cannot pay a debt we owe by a liberal gift – so the poor are relieved by an act of charity, and the preachers **supported as their just due**.

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

while the Scriptural plan is that God holds the internal government of the ministry by the internal impressions made by His Spirit, and has given the authority of the government of the ministry to His Church, to conduct the executive part of the ministry, in the external parts of the gospel to be performed agreeable to the government in His word; and God claims the right of looking out preachers and qualifying them by teaching of His Spirit, and that agreeable to His word, and of sending them out under the direction of His Spirit and government as above stated. He directs them into the field of their labor by His Spirit, whether to Jews or Gentiles, and compensates them with “well done thou good and faithful servant” – and the promises of the life that now is, and that which is to come.

When all other evidences fail to establish the mission principles, then its advocates will introduce **the zeal that attends the mission spirit for justification**. But, my dear brethren, if great and warm zeal is to justify the principle, then surely the worshippers of Juggernaut will claim the preference, while the Mahometans [Moslems –SCP] may lay in their plea, and the persecutors of the Church of Christ have much to hope, and King Saul’s zeal must be better than his command, for instead of his killing all the Amalekites, as God told him, he save some alive to sacrifice to the Lord. But Samuel told him to hearken was better than sacrifice, and to obey than the fat of rams – so let us fear lest our zeal leads us to do that which God hath not required at our hands, and it returns with curses on our heads like Israel when they wished to be like the rest of the nations of the earth, and prayed for a king, and God granted their prayers – gave them a king – pointed him out to them and instructed him what to do – and at the same time designed him to be a curse to his people. So I wish the mission friends to know that all their zeal, their prayers, their answers to their prayers, and their foregoing all the conflicts of life, even if they give themselves a sacrifice to the mission system, it will never justify the principle nor practice unless they have a “Thus saith

the word of the Lord" for it. For, we are commanded not to be wise above that which is written. We have to acknowledge, that the gospel has been conducted, directed and supported for nearly eighteen hundred years **without such a plan** as the Board has prescribed. I ask, is not the earth the Lord's now the same as it ever was? Yes, and let the churches do their duty and the thing can be done in a gospel like manner.

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

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

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

fund for a support, and depending on them to appoint them their field of labor.

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

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

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

And what seems strange and inconsistent is the mission system advocates often tell us it is a *free thing and with no compulsion*, and we are *at liberty without any censure or charge from them to act our pleasure* and they claim the same right to act in favor of the Plan. Strange indeed that we should be such base characters and still hold our seat in full fellowship, and



stranger still to hear them say that they are not hurt with us when we refuse to support the mission system! And still even more strange, if possible, to think we are so foolish as to rest contented under charges of such great magnitude! It must be owing to this one thing, the mission friends know they have no **Scriptural grounds to raise or support a charge against us**, as we believe and practice as we always have upon constitutional ground. And we have not left them but they have left us. As such we cannot say that our beloved brethren, leaving off the good old way and falling into error, do not hurt us. So I conclude that when we bring the principle and practice of the mission system to the word of God, the sure standard, it will not measure nor weigh with it. As such, we are bound to give it against the mission system, and bring in a verdict in favor of the Bible plan, for making and sending out preachers of the gospel.

I shall let these remarks suffice on this point, and pass on to the 6<sup>th</sup> head under consideration, which is to show the most **particular objections I have to the principles and practice of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions.**

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

Now dear brethren, as the mission system is bringing such distress in Zion, although I know you lay the blame of this distress on those who oppose the innovations of the mission plan, yet I as well know the cause is in you, and the time is come when we are compelled to submit to, or join in with, that which we believe in our very hearts to be contrary to the "faith of God's elect," and heinously wicked in its nature, or exhibits our charges against the principles and deny fellowship with the practice, so I hope you will pay close attention to my objections or charges, and give every remark due weight and not let

prejudice blind your minds nor hardness possess your hearts. And I hope you will not think these statements, because they are pointed and plain, comes from the harshness of spirit; but the sincerity of my heart as an accountable creature to God, and a lover of the appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ. And I request one thing more, and that is, not let the arguments lose their weight for the want of being decorated with the flowery language of the learned.

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

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

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

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

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

In order to be short, I shall notice all these points under one view. It is a soul reviving faith that is peculiar to the Baptists, and I believe denied by none that profess the Baptist faith (as such it saves me the trouble of being so very particular in my

evidence to prove my doctrine) that Christ did set up and establish His Church in this world upon that Rock that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. And the Spirit told Daniel that God should set up a kingdom which should never be overthrown and Paul calls it the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth; and Christ has evidently manifested His Kingly power and authority, and has given His law, the gospel government, to be observed and practiced by His Church, and sent His Holy Spirit to guide them into **all truth**, and bringing all things to their remembrance that He has said unto them; and has **never authorized** any man nor set of men (although they may have the wisdom of the wise or the tongue of an Angel) to alter His law or change the method of His government, that He gave His Church, nor arrest the authority He has given into their hands; no not from the Apostolic age of the world even until now. But by a proper and close attention, and a just execution of government, the blessed union of the Church, the body of Christ, is preserved and they are united together, and separated from the world even while they are in it. By this means the glory of God is manifested throughout His Church.

Now observe, when a body of men attempt to perform a work that a King has reserved to his own authority, it is evidently a rebellion against that King. Just so I view the mission society, in their attempts to seek out preachers, qualify them, send them out and appoint the field of their labors, they have most certainly rebelled against the authority of Christ, for we Baptists profess to believe, and we think upon Scriptural authority, that the internal work of the calling and sending out of preachers, is as evidently performed by the Spirit of God on the heart, as it is in calling the sinner from nature to grace. And now in the next place observe any society formed, undertaking a work, bearing title of the work of God performed in the name of the Church, and that society **not under the government of the Church** (whose title it bears) as to the

objects of its pursuits, is evidently a **rejection of the authority of the Church, or indirectly a rebellion against it.** Just so the Board is styled the “General Missionary Convention of the Baptist denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions;” still they **are not under the government of the Baptist union,** and let them do good or bad it is under the *name of the Baptists*, and we have no way to help ourselves, but must bear it, and **cannot call them to account by any authority we have given them or they have given us.** I know it is argued by some that the Board is under the government of the Baptist union, but this argument is false, for the membership of the Triennial Convention is composed of members from “missionary societies” and other “religious bodies” of the “Baptist” denomination; that is, if they bring a hundred dollars with them; if not, they have no seat. These members **do not possess even delegated authority** from the Baptist union to transact the mission business, but derive their powers from the missionary societies which are formed of various persons, believing and supporting a multitude of doctrines. We have no doubt but that these men may be accountable to the churches where their membership is, for their moral conduct; but as to the mission system, the churches have nothing to do with it.

The fact is, the mission society has formed a plan that requires a great deal of money to carry it into effect, and now calls on the churches for to help them get the money. But the counsel of the union is neither asked nor known in the mission plan; for I cannot think that wise men should be so ignorant as to think that asking the counsel of certain individuals, whom they thought would most favor their plan, was the proper method to get the voice of the union. And I now ask, when any person great or small gives themselves, as we hope, first to the Lord and then to us, by the will of God, **have they any right to act contrary to the common and constant faith and practice of that body of people, or that government which**

**they have subjected themselves to?** You are obliged to answer, "They have no such right." Well, I ask what have the mission society done, when neither **Scripture nor history** gives any account that the Baptist Church has ever taken this method to fill the world with preachers? Then I ask, where has the mission society gotten their power? Not from the Baptists' authority, nor from the authority of God's word, for that knows of no such a plan, and it has given no such authority. It is then **a practice without any legal authority, and has only originated amongst themselves**, and claim a power that alone belongs to Christ and His church, and consequently their work is in **disorder**. The preachers they send, the members they baptize and the churches they constitute **are all in a state of disorder**. And now if my statements is correct, which I am persuaded you cannot overthrow by the authority by the authority of the Scriptures, and the principle and practice of the Baptist Church, have we no cause of grief? Our beloved brethren have gone astray; they have sinned against the King of Zion; they have violated our government and thereby forfeited their right to the Baptist union, for they have left us; they have gone into these measures **without authority or consent**; while we believe and practice as the Baptists have generally done and walk in the good old apostolic path. Our brethren have left us; we have not left them; therefore we claim the constitutional grounds and in such cases the minority can exclude the majority. I now leave the remarks on this objection for the candid mind to ponder on, and pass on to the next objection.

My third objection is, **the mission society applies, under the character of religion, to the enemies of Christ for help, and therefore cast contempt on His dignity**. In this I wish to notice in a brief way the method of the mission society, in collecting money for the support of the gospel. We remember when Christ was in the world with His disciples, He gave them a very particular caution, and told them they were in the world, but they were not of the world, therefore the world would hate

them, but He let them know the world hated Him before it hated them. The whole scope of Scripture goes to prove that there is a pointed enmity in the world or carnal mind against Christ and consequently against His Church, because of their union or friendship with Him. And now the question is, has our blessed Lord become so weak, so poor, and so dependent, that He must apply to His enemies for help? O contemptible idea of Christ! We see the mission society opening the door and using every exertion to collect money from the world, and qualify men by the wisdom of the world for the purpose of accomplishing the work of salvation amongst the heathen, and causing the kingdom of Christ to more fully come. And again, not only mingling with the wicked of the world, but with other professions of religion which we believe are the daughters of the mother harlot, and consequently in their system of religion is in part of the anti-Christian spirit; and if so, in that part the enemy of Christ. What is the cause of wicked men giving their money for religious purposes? Is it because the spirit and plan of the mission system is more agreeable to the spirit and plan of nature? No doubt but there will be objections or denials to these charges. But I say these things are so, for the missionary societies formed auxiliary to the Board. Members of these societies obtain their seats and authority here by paying their money; and wicked men here have as great a right as any other by paying their money, and when my money gives me a seat in a religious counsel, I then say *money* is the cause of my fellowship, and it looks as though I had forgotten that the "*love of money is the root of all evil.*"

I fear that some of my Baptist brethren have forgotten this caution. Some may say that I stand opposed to education from the remarks I have made; [Editor's Note: Almost every Missionary Baptist historian –so-called, do in fact make this charge, as well as charge him of being "unlearned" as well] but I think education a great common blessing in its place. But when we worship the creature instead of the Creator, we sin, and

abuse the blessings bestowed on us. So I oppose the principle of education being an essential **qualification to the ministry**. It is evident that education makes a man a more **accomplished deceiver**, and he is better able to practice fraud on the minds of the people, and it has ever been the case and ever will, unless governed by the powers of divine graces; for it is evident that education has made manifest more bad men than it ever has good ones. So I think we had better leave it to God's work to call men of education when He would have such, than to undertake to make preachers by giving them education. It is true, where grace governs education, both meeting in one man, and that man is called by the effectual workings of God's Spirit, to the work of the ministry, he is better qualified to express or communicate his ideas. But he still labors under serious difficulty. The pride of his heart calls on him to tickle the ear or please the fancy of the learned part of his congregation; and to do that leaves the less educated part without information.

But this is like the spirit of the world, and like the old proverb, "God help the rich, the poor can beg." Let the learned part of the world be pleased and informed more and more, but the ignorant stay where they are. **So I say, if the "clergy" must have education to understand the grammatical sense of words, so the hearers ought to have the same understanding, lest a fraud should be practiced on them**, for through the false zeal and the advantage of education, the whole of the delusions and false ways are imposed on the world of mankind, and have caused thousands of God's dear children to seal their testimony of Christ with their own blood, when persecution has prevailed under the prejudice of education. Then no wonder when we Baptists dread its appearance, under the name of "religion" and draw the sword against it.

So I conclude that adopting such plans is aiming to make addition to God's word, and argues that the King of Zion was *imperfect* and did not know the best plan for qualifying, supporting and sending out preacher. I conceive the mission

plan cast this contempt on the dignity of Christ, while they rob God of His glory and make merchandise of the gospel.

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

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

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

No doubt some will laugh me to scorn and say I am like a timid horse in the lead, which starts at the shadow, when there is no danger, and frightens all the rest. [Editor: Is it not abundantly evident that Parker accurately picked up on the danger of the modern missionary movement?] I know there is no danger **now**, under our republican government, but how soon may this blessed liberty be snatched from us when so



much abused? And how soon may the time come when they that kill us will verily think they are doing God's service? And again I find the mission spirit is to go on to accomplish their object, whether they have the mind of Christ and His Church or not. And although they say "*when science would claim the preference, let it be rejected,*" I fear my brethren have not considered what manner of spirit they are of, for their conduct contradicts their words. My brethren, I have traveled through many parts, and I too often see that the mission spirit causes party feelings among the Baptists, and plans laid to weaken the hands of the opposers of the mission system and support their own designs, and the mission friends seem to rejoice in the Latter Day Luminary, while I feel as though the latter day darkness is approaching; for the world is at this time in as great a state of sin and rebellion against God, as perhaps it has ever been. Iniquity is abounding and the love of many waxing cold. My brethren can discern the face of the skies, but I fear they do not discern the signs of the times, for I fear that many are departing from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils and heaping to themselves teachers having itching ears, and the doctrine that is preached is the subject of the millennium. [Editor: The greatest moving cause of the Modern Missionary Movement was the belief of many that Christ was ready then to come and set up an earthly kingdom, commencing at the time the Pope of Rome lost his power over the political powers of western Europe; which event occurred in 1815. John Gill advocated this position in both his Commentaries and the Body Of Divinity. Baptists were very familiar with Gill's notion. It was wrong, but it helped to catapult the frenzy of that Movement.] I do not believe but that subject is too tedious for me to enter on at this time, but drop a hint that I discover the mission spirit has drawn too many of our preachers too far into the Arminian principle or method of preaching, and they have laid down the weapons of war against the prevailing errors of false systems, and **unite truth and**

**error together, and give false principles and practices more credit than the Bible authorizes them to do.** Brethren, try the spirits, for many false ones are gone out, and are crying “Lo! Here is Christ and Lo! There is Christ. But go ye not after them.” First, I discover my brethren of the mission system will sacrifice the government of the union and the feelings of their Brethren to accomplish their object, and it is evident in my view they are better supported by misled zeal and ambition than by the authority of the Bible. There is one thing more I must notice:

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

**countries** seeking opportunities of converting foreign Barbarians.

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

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

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

necessity of preserving the blessed union of the Church, by destroying the evil, and bring the good on principles it can live.

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

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

In the fifth place, I have endeavored to bring to light and shew the difference that exists between the principle and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clark County, Illinois, 1820.

## **KEHUKKEE BAPTIST DECLARATION, 1826**

### **ANNOTATION:**

Elder Rueben Ross had preached the first Arminian sermon among Baptists near Port Royal, Tennessee in 1817 (See Page 381). He had come from the Kehukee Baptist Association in North Carolina and settled in Tennessee. Over in the East, his brother, Martin Ross, also in the Kehukee Association had been preaching up missions from the commencement of the New Divinity Missionary Movement in 1805. He naturally supported the establishment of the Board of Foreign Missions in Philadelphia from 1814 to this time period, 1827. The first communication from the Board to the Kehukee was read in their 1815 session.

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

## **THE KEHUKKEE BAPTISTS DECLARATION**



“A paper purporting to be a Declaration of the Reformed Baptists in North Carolina, dated August 26, 1826, which was presented at the last Association, and referred to the churches to express in their letters to this Association their views with regard to it, came up for deliberation. Upon examination, it was found that most of the churches had given their opinions; and after an interchange of sentiments among the members of this body, it was agreed that we **discard all Missionary societies, Bible societies and Theological seminaries, and the practices heretofore resorted to for their support**, in begging money from the public; and if any persons should be among us, as agents of any of said societies, we hereafter discountenance them in those practices; and if under a character of a *minister of the gospel*, we will not invite them into our pulpits; believing these societies and institutions to be the inventions of men, and not warranted from the word of God. We further do **unanimously agree** that should any of the members of our churches join the **fraternity of Masons**, or, being members, continue to visit the lodges and parades, we will not invite them to preach in our pulpits, believing them to be guilty of such practices; and we declare non-fellowship with them and such practices.” [1827 MINUTES: Kehukee Baptist Association]

### THE BLACK ROCK ADDRESS, 1832

#### ANNOTATION:

The action of the Kehukee, the most well-known and largest of the Southern Associations of Baptists, had a profound and stunning effect on the mission advocates on the one hand, and the “Old Divinity” churches on the other. The “non-fellowship” declaration severed all mission societies, benevolent societies, socialists and anarchist societies, and secret societies connection to the Baptist Church. Unlike the Baptist Board of Foreign Mission, this action was done upon

the of *authority the local Baptists churches, acting officially in their own conferences*, and then communicating their will to the Kehukee Association of which they were affiliated. The Association merely voiced the decision of the churches. In the government of the Baptists churches, when such a non-fellowship declaration is officially declared, its immediate effect is to draw a line against other associations and churches found in that error non-fellowshipped. Thus, the most serious line had been drawn separating the Baptist Church from the alien influence.

The most important event following this was in the Middle States to the north of the Kehukee and south of the Philadelphia Associations. These associations were caught rather empathically “in the middle.” They could no longer remain on the sidelines of the issues. As the middle Associations gave deliberation as to what course they must pursue in 1828, 1829, 1830, plans were being drafted on both sides of the issues as to how to deal with the splinter. The Board was too vigorous in their combat, and exposed their real hostility to the Baptist union. The Old School divinity churches and associations were drawn closer together, and their hands strengthened. In 1831, the Baltimore Baptist Association, formed originally with churches from the Philadelphia and the Welsh churches, called for a Convention of messengers from associations to meet together with them at the Black Rock Meeting House, Baltimore, Maryland in **September, 1832. It is here that THE GREAT BAPTIST SEPARATION commenced.** Messengers from Associations and churches all over North America convened. Some of these associations had acted beforehand to purge out the auxiliaries of the Board from among them. The Country Line Baptist Association (formed in 1805) had already acted prior to September, 1832; the Wabash in Illinois had much earlier taken her stand. Below, we present the **original unabridged** copy of the Black Rock **ADDRESS**. There are many copies printed that were abbreviated. This contains the full text of this historical document. We have also added the 1837 Appendage to the ADDRESS following the Prospectus of the Signs below.

***THE BLACK ROCK ADDRESS***  
***September, 1832***  
 (unabridged)

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

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

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

Prayer by Elder Thomas Barton of Pennsylvania.

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

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

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

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

Prayer by Brother Trott.

Adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Saturday Morning, 9 o'clock

Met pursuant to adjournment.

Prayer by Brother Choat.

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

### **THE ADDRESS**

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

[\*In reference to the epithet “Old School,” which we have used as a discriminating term, we beg leave to say that we were led to adopt it from its having been applied to us by others; and that in our use of it we have reference to the school of Christ, in distinction from all other schools which have sprung up since the Apostles’ days.]

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

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

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

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

We commence with **Tract Societies**. These claim to be extensively useful. Tracts claim their thousands converted. They claim the prerogative of carrying the news of salvation into

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

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

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

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

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

Secondly, because such schools were never established by the Apostles; nor commanded by Christ. There were children in

the days of the apostles. The apostles possessed as great a desire for the salvation of souls, as much love to the cause of Christ, and knew as well what God would own for bringing persons to the knowledge of salvation, as any do at this day. We therefore must believe that if these schools were of God, we should find some account of them in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup>

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

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

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

---

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

benevolent institutions, worthy of the patronage of all the friends of civil liberty.

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

---

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



members have manifested a disposition to employ its powers for the subversion of our liberties. It is enough for us to say,

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

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

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

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

We will now call your attention to the subject of **Missions**. Previous to stating our objections to the mission *plans*, we will meet some of the false charges brought against us relative to this subject, by a simple and unequivocal declaration, that ***we do regard as of the first importance the command given of Christ, primarily to His Apostles, and through them to His***

***ministers in every age, to “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature,” and do feel an earnest desire to be found acting in obedience thereunto, as the Providence of God directs our way, and opens a door of utterance for us.*** We also believe it to be the duty of **individuals and churches to contribute to their abilities, for the support, not only of their own pastors, but also of those who “go preaching the gospel of Christ among the destitute.** But we at the same time contend, that we have no right **to depart** from the order that the Master Himself has seen fit to lay down, relative to the administration of the word. We therefore cannot fellowship the plans for spreading the gospel, generally adopted at this day, under the name of *Missions*; because we consider those plans throughout a subversion of the order marked out in the New Testament.

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

In Christ’s Kingdom, all His subjects are sons, and have equal rights, and an equal voice, as well in calling persons into

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

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

preacher who may come among them alone upon the authority of Christ and by the fellowship of the Church.

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

Brethren, we cheerfully acknowledge that there have been some honorable exceptions to the character we have here drawn of the modern missionary, and some societies have existed under the *name of* “*Mission Societies*” that were in some important points exceptions from the above drawn sketch; but on a general scale we believe we have given a correct view of the mission plans and operations, and of the effects which have resulted from them, and our hearts really sicken at this state of things. How can we therefore forbear to express our disapprobation of the system that has produced it?

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

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

---

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

1<sup>st</sup>. Because we believe that Christ possesses perfect knowledge of His own purpose, and of the proper instruments by which to accomplish them. If He has occasion for a man of science, He having *power over all flesh*, (John 17:2) will so order it that the individual shall obtain the requisite learning before He calls him in His service, as was the case with Saul of Tarsus, and many others since; and thus avoid subjecting Himself to the imputation of weakness. For should Christ call a man to labor in the gospel field who was unqualified for the work assigned him, it would manifest Him to be deficient in knowledge relative to the proper instruments to employ, or defective in power to provoke him.

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

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

As to **Theological Schools**, we shall at present content ourselves with saying that they are a reflection upon the faithfulness of the Holy Ghost, who is engaged according to the promise of the great Head of the Church to lead the disciples into all truth (John 16:13). Also, that in every age, from the

school at Alexandria down to this day, they have been a **real pest to the Church of Christ**. Of this we could produce abundant proof, did the limits of our address admit their insertion.

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

The plans of these meetings are equally as objectionable; for, in the first place, all doctrinal preaching, or in other words, all illustrations of God's salvation, are excluded professedly from

these meetings. Hence they would make believers of their converts without presenting any fixed truths to their minds to believe. Whereas God has “*chosen His people to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and **belief of the truth***” (II Thess. 2:13).

Secondly. The leaders of these meetings fix standards by which to decide of persons’ repentance and desire of salvation, which the Word of God nowhere warrants, such as *rising off their seats, coming to anxious seats, or going to a certain place, &c.* Whereas the New Testament has given us a standard from which we have no right to depart, *viz.*, that of “**bringing forth fruits meet for repentance**” (Matthew 3:8).

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

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

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

2<sup>nd</sup>. Because the motives we could have for conforming to the custom of holding these *newly invented meetings* are such as we think cannot bear the test. For we must be induced thus to conform to the reigning custom either in order to shun the reproach generally attached to those who will not conform to what is popular, or to try the experiment whether our holding a



four days' meeting will not induce the Holy Spirit to produce a revival among us commensurate with the strange fire kindled by others; or else we must be led to this plan from having imbibed the notion that the Holy Ghost is somehow so the creature of human feelings that He is led to regenerate persons by our getting their animal feelings excited; and therefore that in the same proportion as we can by any measure get the feelings of the people aroused, there will be a revival of religion. This latter motive can scarcely be supposed to have place with any who would not go the whole length of every popular measure. But – (1) We do not believe it becoming a follower of Jesus to seek an exemption from reproach by conforming to the schemes of men. (2) We believe the Holy Ghost to be too sacred a Being to be trifled with by trying experiments upon Him. And 3<sup>rd</sup>. We believe the Holy Ghost to be God. We would as soon expect that the Father would be induced to predestinate persons “*to the adoption of children*” (Ephesians 1:5) by their *feelings being excited*, and the Son be induced to redeem them, as that the Holy Ghost would be thus induced to *quicken them*. These *three* are *One*. The purpose of the Father, the redemption of the Son, and the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost, must run in perfect accordance, and commensurate one with the other.

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

There is, brethren, one radical difference between us, and those who advocate these various institutions that we have noticed, to which we wish to call your attention. It is this: they declare the *gospel* to be a *system of means*; these *means* it appears they believe to be of human contrivance; and they act accordingly. But we believe the gospel dispensation to embrace a system of faith and obedience, and we would act according to our belief. We believe, for instance, that the seasons of declension, of darkness, of persecution, &c., to which the Church of Christ is at times subject are designed by the Wise Disposer of all events; not for calling forth the inventive geniuses of men to remove the difficulties, but for trying the faith of God's people in His wisdom, power, and faithfulness to sustain His Church. On Him, therefore, would we repose our trust, and wait His hour of deliverance, rather than rely upon an arm of flesh. Or, we are called to the ministry, although we may feel our own insufficiency for the work as sensibly as do others, yet we would go forward in the path of duty marked out, believing that God is able to accomplish His purposes by such instruments as He chose; that He "*hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty, and base things, &c., hath God chosen, that no flesh should glory in His presence*" (I Cor. 1:27-29). Though we may not enjoy the satisfaction of seeing multitudes flocking to Jesus under our ministry, yet instead of going in to Hagar to accomplish the promises of God, or of resorting to any of the contrivances of men to make up the deficiency, we would still be content to "*preach the word,*" and would be "*instant in season and out of season,*" knowing it "*has pleased God,*" not by the wisdom of men, but by "*the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe*" (I Cor. 1:21). And that His "*word will not return unto Him void, but it shall accomplish that which He please, and prosper in the thing whereunto He sent it*" (Isa. 55:11). Faith in God, instead of leading us to contrive ways to help Him

accomplish His purposes, leads us to enquire what He hath “*required at our hands*,” and be satisfied with doing that as we find it pointed out in His word; for we know that His “*Counsel shall stand, and He will do all His pleasure*” (Isa. 46:10). Jesus says, “*ye believe in God, believe also in Me.*” Ye believe in the power of God to accomplish His purposes, however contrary things may appear to work to your expectations. So believe in My power to accomplish the great work of saving My people. In a word, as the dispensation of God by the hand of Moses, in bring Israel out of Egypt and leading them through the wilderness, was from first to last calculated to try Israel’s faith in God – so in the dispensation of God by His Son, in bringing His spiritual Israel to be a people to Himself.

There being, then, this radical difference between us and the patrons of these modern institutions, the question which has long since put forth, presents itself afresh for our consideration in all its force: “*Can two walk together except they be agreed?*” We believe that many who love our Lord Jesus Christ, are engaged in promoting those institutions which they acknowledge to be of modern origin; and they are promoting them too as *religious* institutions; whereas if they would reflect a little on the origin and nature of the Christian religion, they must be, like us, convinced that this religion must remain unchangeably the same at this day, as we find it delivered in the New Testament. Hence that anything, however highly esteemed it may be among men, which is not found in the New Testament, has no just claim to be acknowledged as belonging to the religion or the religious institutions of Christ.

With all who love our Lord Jesus Christ, in truth, and walk according to apostolic tradition, or gospel order we would gladly meet in church relation and engage with them in the worship and service of God as He Himself has ordered. But if they will persist in **bringing those institutions for which they can show us no example in the New Testament, into the churches or associations,** and in making them the order

thereof, we shall for conscience sake, be compelled to withdraw from the disorderly walk of such churches, associations, or individuals, that we may not suffer our names to pass as sanctioning those things for which we have no fellowship. And if persons who would **pass for preachers**, will come to us, bringing the messages of men, &c., a gospel which they have learned in the schools, instead of that gospel which Christ Himself commits unto His servants, and which is not learned of men, they must not be surprised that we cannot acknowledge them as “ministers of Christ.”

Now, brethren, addressing ourselves to you who profess to be, in principle, **Particular Baptists of the “Old School,”** but who are practicing such things as you have learned from a New School, it is for you to say, not us, whether we can longer walk in union with you. We regret, and so do you, to see brethren professing the same faith, serving apart. But if you will compel us either to sanction the traditions and inventions of men, as of religious obligations, or to separate from you, the sin lieth at your door. If you meet us in churches to attend **only to the order of Christ’s house** as laid down by Himself; and in associations, upon the ancient principles of Baptist associations, *i.e.*, as ***an associating of churches for keeping up a brotherly correspondence*** one with another, that they may strengthen each other in the good ways of the Lord; instead of turning the associations ***into a kind of legislative body***, formed for the purpose of contriving plans to help along the work of Christ, and for **imposing those contrivances** as burdens upon the churches, by *resolutions*, &c., as is the manner of some, we can still go with you in peace and fellowship.

Thus, brethren, our appeal is before you. Treat it with contempt if you can despise the cause for which we contend, *i.e.*, ***conformity to the Word of God***. But indulge us, we beseech you, so far at least, as at our request to sit down and carefully count the cost on both sides; and see whether this

shunning reproach by conforming to men's notions will not in the end be a much more expensive course than to meet reproach at once, by honoring Jesus as your only King, "*choosing rather to suffer afflictions with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season*" (Hebrews 11:25). And *rebellion, you know, is as the sin of witchcraft.*"

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Resolved*, That brethren Samuel Trott, Newark, New Castle Co., Del., William Gilmore, Leesburgh, Loudoun Co., Va., Thomas Poteet, Golden, Baltimore Co., Md., Edward Choat, Golden, Baltimore Co. Md., Thomas Barton, Strakers Ville, Pa., Gilbert Beebe, New Vernon, Orange Co., N.Y., Stephen W. Woolford, Washington City, D.C., Gabriel Conklin, Slate Hill, Orange Co., N.Y., be a Committee of Correspondence.

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

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

We desire at the close of our meeting to acknowledge the kind hand of God, which has been manifested in bringing us together, and permitting us to sit and consult together in

harmony and fellowship, and for the affectionate manner in which we have been received by our brethren and friends in this vicinity.

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

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

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

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

Preaching every evening during the meeting in various places,

We, the undersigned, do hereunto set our names, as cordially uniting in all the proceedings of this meeting. Signed,  
 Elder John Healy, Elder William Gilmore, Elder  
 Edward Choat  
 Elder Samuel Trott, Elder Thomas Poteet, Elder  
 Thomas Barton  
 Elder Edward J. Rees, Elder Gilbert Beebe, Elder Gabriel  
 Conklin  
 Elder Henry Moon, Elder William Wilson, Elder James B.  
 Bowden

Abraham Cole, Senator  
 Samuel Shawl  
 Luke Enson,  
 John Ensor  
 Richard English,  
 Joseph Perigoy  
 Joseph Mattem

Lewis R. Cole,  
 Shadrick Bond,  
 Edward Norwood,

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

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

- THE COMMITTEE

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

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

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

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

3. Eternal, Unconditional Election.

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



5. That the Atonement and Redemption of Jesus Christ are for the Elect only.
6. The Sovereign, Irresistible, and in all cases, Effectual work of the Holy Spirit, in Regeneration and Quickening the Elect of God.
7. The Final Preservation and Eternal Happiness of all the sons of God, by grace.
8. **The Resurrection of the dead, and Eternal Judgment,**
9. That the Church of Christ is composed **exclusively of Baptized Believers** – that to her are given able ministers of the New Testament; that the Scriptures are the only **divinely authorized Rule of Faith and Practice** for the saints of God.
10. That there is no connection between the Church and State, and as touching the proposition for a marriage between them, the Hon. R. M. Johnson, in his Report on the Sabbath Question, has expressed our faith.

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

---

## APPENDAGE TO THE BLACK ROCK ADDRESS

We have printed elsewhere herein the 1835 BALTIMORE ADDRESS, which was a sequence to the Black Rock Address of 1832. Another Meeting of Baptists, now beginning to be referred to as “Old School or Particular Baptists” was held in **1837**, and this body added more to the Black Rock Address than was originally in it. We print next the **Addition** to the Black Rock **Address** of the Third Baltimore Meeting of Old School Baptists.

### **The Black Rock ADDRESS Appendage of 1837**

Additional Remarks.- In offering this appendage to the ADDRESS declarative of our original stand on the ground of old school principles, it is proper *first* to remark, that in deciding on that stand in the first instance, we did not so much design thereby an entire separation from those who were professedly sound in the faith, though they might measurably, by their practices, sanction those anti-christian departures from that ancient order given from heaven, and transmitted down through the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, which were increasing to such an alarming extent among the Baptists, as to threaten an entire subversion of the ancient principles, as in the spirit of candor and moderation, to declare our entire and decided dissent from these modern innovations, upon the doctrine and order of the Gospel, no less than from these more ancient workings of the “man of sin;” also to assign plainly our reasons for this dissent from the popular current, and to admonish those with whom we had been connected in associations, &c. against further attempts to impose their new measures on us, that sooner than submit to their schemes, knowing them to be not of God, we would separate ourselves from their fellowship. Hence in coming toward the conclusion in our *Address*, we say of those whom we address as *Particular Baptists in principle*, that “If they meet us in churches, to attend only to the order of Christ’s house, as laid down by Himself in associations, upon the ancient principles of Baptist associations, &c. &c. we can still go on with them in peace and fellowship.” And as numbers of our Old School brethren, and most of us who signed that *Address*, have since united in passing resolutions declaring our entire separation as to religious connexion with those who patronize the new measures, and as some of those from whom we have separated, have talked more recently of arranging their associations upon the plan of free indulgence, to allow every

church and all individuals, to act their own pleasure, whether to promote or to let alone the new schemes, but not to bring the subject into their associations, that is, for their action upon it, it seems necessary that something by us should be said on this point, lest we, by some should be thought to have acted inconsistently with the declaration we had before made.

In the first place then, allow us to say that our *original Address* contained a candid declaration of the *reasons* why we were in conscience constrained to “*set up our banner,*” (and we trust we did it in the *name of our God,*) in opposition to the flood of human devices, which were flowing in upon us; that in it we decidedly condemned those innovations, with which we are at war; but then our appeal was in the spirit of moderation and Christian affection, made to the candor of those whom we addressed as *brethren*; and calculated, if they held Christian fellowship for us, to awaken their sympathies to dispose them to reflect seriously on the alienating course they had been pursuing, and to lead them to show more respect for our equal rights of conscience, than they had hitherto done. How was our appeal met? Let the columns of each and every one of their periodicals testify. These testify that it was met with the most uncandid [sic] cavils, and distortions of our views and expressed sentiments, and the most ill-natured reflections upon us and our stand. Notwithstanding this was enough to convince us that fire and water could as soon harmonize, as that we could continue in peaceable connexion with them, whilst we resisted a subjection to that heavy yoke which they seemed determined to place upon the whole Baptist denomination; still unwilling to be rash, or to break fellowship with those who we hoped were sound in the faith, we would fain have continued on without a formal separation, until we found that if we would continue in connexion even the more sound of the benevolent-effort men, we must, through them, extend tokens of fellowship, to the whole mass of corruption and error which is cloaked under the name of **Regular**

**Baptists**, that these persons, through their attachment to the popular societies, and that their partiality for their associations the most forward is patronizing those societies, would form a connecting link between us and them, keep up a correspondence between their associations and ours, and thus introduce their preachers however corrupt, into our connexion, and into our pulpits. [Note: We see in this statement that by this date, associational ties had become so entrenched in the Baptists' cognitive processes, as to mandate the exchange of pulpits and imposition of such, upon all in correspondence together. Hence, they no longer esteemed the independence of churches or associations to preach only such as they pleased to preach. They now looked upon the **associational chain of correspondence** as "the church," when in fact there were no Scriptural precedent for either. This same mind-set still exists in those churches bound together in *corresponding chains*, and is yet one of the most serious hindrances to peaceful fellowship of Baptists. Any local church has full authority to preach whomsoever they believe to be sound in the faith and order of the Gospel; or refuse to preach any that are not, or even if sound, not to do so if inconvenient for them.- SCP.] It is a fact publicly manifested, that many persons, who a few years since, held Fullerism in its most plausible form to be a system subversive of the very foundation of a Gospel hope, now extend their arms of fellowship and *good feeling*, so as to embrace those who preach that system in its most expansion of corruption as "*fellow-laborers*" in the great work of *evangelizing the world*.

Here is the grand gull in this proposed new divinity arrangement of certain associations, under the idea of compromise, and of leaving every church free to patronize, or not, the benevolent efforts, without making it a subject of enquiry in their associations a plan is laid which would connect together in *their* associations, and in *their* free correspondence every thing which, honestly or dishonestly, is ranked under the broad banner of **Regular, or United Baptists**.

From these considerations we think it clear, that our original Address, instead of opposing, requires us in order to be true to our stand therein taken, to seek to *disentangle* ourselves from *all those links* which would connect us with those unscriptural

measures which we oppose, by withdrawing our connexion, in things pertaining to religion, from all who patronize these measures. If in drawing this ***separating line***, we withhold expressions of fellowship from some brethren sound in the faith, we say as we said in our Address it would be "The sin lieth at their door; they, by their acts, imposing upon our continuing in fellowship with them, those concubines which we had declared we could not submit to.

May the blessed Lord give us straight feet, the face or feelings of a man, as well as the face of boldness of the lion, the patience of the ox, and the quick penetrating sight of the eagle, and may our faces, like those of the cherubim, be steadfastly set upon the mercy-seat. Farewell.

### **1834 - THE GENERAL ASSOCIATION OF BAPTISTS OF INDIANA**

The influence of Elder Daniel Parker, now of Illinois, was very strong in Indiana. He was somewhat a leader among the anti-benevolent movement; whereas Ezra Fisher, agent of the Baptist Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions to Indiana was the foremost missionary and benevolent force in Indiana. As instructed by the Board, Ezra Fisher removed from Corydon, the temporary State capitol, to Indianapolis, the planned future capitol, and attached himself to the Baptists there. He was highly successful in moving leading Baptists toward the Board's mission, and the result was the constitution of "the General Association of Baptists of Indiana," formed in 1833.

It's beginning was very weak, with delegates from only three churches and a Female Society. It appears that they gave everyone present a job! One of the churches, Blue River,

eventually was a leading “Means Baptist Church,” which in time became a “Primitive Baptist” body. We do not have the copy of that document, but housed in the Indiana State Library in Indianapolis is the 1834 document. We present it first, followed by the White River Regular Baptist Association’s objections.

## MINUTES

### **Of the 2d. Session of the General Association of Baptists Of Indiana, for the Purpose of Promoting the spread of the Gospel in the State, held in Franklin, Johnson County, In., the 3d, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> Days of Oct., 1834.**

Bro. Samuel Harding delivered the introductory sermon from 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 29, chapter and 5 verse.

The letters from Churches and Societies were read, and the names of the Delegates were enrolled:

From Aurora Church, Dearborn Co. – George Matthews.

“ Indianapolis Female Auxiliary Society – Ezra Fisher.

“ Blue River Church – Burgess Waggoner.

“ Franklin Church – Jefferson D. Jones.

The Association organized by appointing Br. Samuel Harding Moderator, Lewis Morgan Recording Secretary, Ezra Fisher Corresponding Secretary, Henry Bradley Treasurer, and John Foster, Treasurer *pro tem*.

Brethren S. Harding, L. Morgan, and Ezra S. Harding, Ezra Fisher, and B. Waggoner, were appointed to report on the state of Religion.

Brethren L. Morgan, G. Matthews and J. Foster were appointed a committee to report on the subject of Sunday Schools.

Adjourned till half past 4 P. M.

Bro. Fisher prayed.

P. M. Met pursuant to adjournment.

Moderator prayed.

Report of the Committee of arrangements was read and received.

Appointed the Committee of arrangement to nominate the Board of Trustees for the ensuing year.

The committee reported, and the following brethren were appointed: S. Harding, Moderator

L. Morgan, Recording Secretary

E. Fisher, Corresponding Secretary

H. Bradley, Treasurer.

James Jackson, C. Vickers, John Smither, Joel Blacklidge, J. L. Holman, G. Matthews, J. Foster, J. D. Jones, D. A. M. Morgan, J. V. A. Woods, Jos. Chambers, Wm. Rees, Asa Wright, Wm. G. Cole, David Fain, J. McCoy, Daniel Palmer, James Thomas, Thomas Hill, Jr., John Dickers, John Knight, Ezra Rogers, Wm. B. Ewing, Aaron Chamberlain, Joab Stout, Wm. Phelps, John Mason, J. L. Richmond, L. Hurlock, Garah Markland, Eliphlet Williams, H. J. Hall, Judge Noel, Migo Boaz, Elder A. Stark, and Leroy Mayfield.

Circular Letter was read and referred to the committee of arrangements.

Corresponding Secretary's report read and referred to the same committee.

Geo. Matthews, Ezra Fisher and L. Morgan, were appointed a committee to examine the constitution and report what amendments, if any, are necessary.

Adjourned.

Br. Markland prayed.

### *Saturday Morning*

Met at half past 10 o'clock.

Br. Matthews prayed.

The committee to whom was referred the subject of the alteration of the constitution, reported, and their report was adopted.

Voted to append to the 2d article of the constitution, the following clause: "and any brother of good standing in our denomination shall be entitled to membership by contributing one dollar to its fund."

Voted, to sp alter the 4<sup>th</sup> article that it shall read as follows: "The association shall meet annually in the month of October, at such time and place as it shall from time to time appoint."

Voted to print this constitution with the Minutes.

Voted to hear the report of the committee on the subject of Sunday Schools, which was read, adopted, and ordered to be printed.

Report of the committee on the state of Religion, was read, adopted, and ordered to be printed with the Minutes.

A sermon was then preached by Brother Ezra Fisher.

Adjourned till 2 o'clock P. M.

*2 o'clock P. M.*

Met- Moderator prayed.

The committee to whom was referred the Circular Letter, reported, and the Letter was adopted.

The committee appointed to audit the Treasurer's Report, submitted the following report:

"The Treasurer's Report has been carefully audited and your committee find it correct." [Note: It should have been an easy audit. The treasury had \$175.02; and the balance was \$91.97 .3/4c.]

Whereupon, the Report was read, adopted, and ordered to be printed in the Minutes.

The following brethren were appointed as delegates to the **Baptist Western Convention, to be held in Cincinnati the 5<sup>th</sup> of next November:**



George Matthews, Ezra Fisher, Samuel Harding, Lewis Morgan, James V. A. Woods, Reuben Coffee, Thomas Hill, jr., Jesse L. Holman and David Fain.

Also voted, that any other member of the General Association of Baptists of In, bearing a copy of our Minutes, shall be considered a delegate. [Note: Throughout this Minute, the abbreviation for "Indiana" is "Ia." I changed it to "Ind." because today "Ia." is the abbreviation for the State of Iowa -SCP]

On motion, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

*Resolved*, That in view of the merits of "*The Cross and Baptist Journal*," we will adopt it as our organ of religious communication, and that every Baptist Minister in the State be affectionately solicited to exert his influence in increasing its circulation. [Note: "The Cross," a Kentucky periodical, was united with the "Baptist Journal of the Mississippi Valley", in 1834, and printed in Cincinnati.]

Voted to take up a collection at the close of the second Sermon tomorrow.

Voted to hold the next session of the Association at Lawrenceburg, Dearborn County, Friday before the meeting of the Western Baptist Convention in 1835.

Appointed Br. E. Fisher to preach the introductory sermon, and Br. Lewis Morgan his alternate.

Appointed Br. James V. A. Woods to write the next Circular Letter.

Voted to print 1000 copies of the Minutes.

Appointed the Rec. and Cor. Secretaries to superintend the printing and distribution of the Minutes.

This Association then adjourned without delay.

Samuel Harding, *Moderator*.

Lewis Morgan, *Clerk*.

*Report of the Committee on the subject of Sunday Schools.*

The committee to whom was referred the subject of S.S. beg leave to report, that while we have occasion to regret that in some instances our **Churches oppose the cause of S. Schools, yet we greatly rejoice that through the instrumentality of our brethren a very considerable number of respectable schools are well sustained in the Churches.** We hope the time is not far distant when all our brethren, after an impartial and prayerful examination of this subject, will feel the importance of

uniting in one body for the promotion of the religious instruction of the children and youth of our land; therefore, your committee would recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That whereas we highly approve of the operations of the American Sunday School Union, we recommend to the churches of our denomination the organization of an *Indiana Baptist Sunday School Society*, auxiliary to the A. S. S. U. or on such other plan as may be best to promote the cause of Sunday Schools in this State.

L. Morgan, *Chairman*

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

*Report of the Committee on the state of Religion.*

Your committee on the state of Religion, would submit the following Report:

On reviewing the state of Religion in the Baptist Churches of Indiana, we feel warranted in saying, that although we deeply deplore the apathy in which a large portion of our Churches have long been paid; yet we do rejoice that the Great Head of the Church has visited many of our Churches the present year, in mercy, and has poured upon them the spirit of prayer and supplication, while sinners have been brought to bow at the foot-stool of sovereign mercy, and with devout and reverential affections to yield obedience to His laws.

The remark is highly applicable to a large portion of the churches in the Laughery Association, and to a number in the Indianapolis and Flat Rock Associations. And it is worthy of remark that in almost all those churches which have enjoyed Holy Spirit revivals the present year, the brethren are engaging in the noble work of sustaining the gospel among themselves and sending the same blessings to the destitute.

Samuel Harding, *Chairman*

*The Corresponding Secretary's Report.*

Dear Brethren- The present event reminds us that another year in the history of the General Association of Baptists of Indiana is past, and that its transactions are placed beyond our control, having been transferred from the scenes of time to be once more revealed in the opening of the books of eternity at the great day of accounts. And with this religious year some of the most devoted friends of this institution, have

terminated their pilgrimage and changed their station in Christ's Church below for a place in His upper temple. I allude particularly to our beloved brethren Rice McCoy and G. M. Daughters, whose holy lives will exert a salutary influence on the cause of their Redeemer while their bodies mingle with their kindred earth. But under circumstances like the present when the godly man ceaseth, it becomes us who are professedly Zion's watchmen, to gird up the loins of our minds, and to redouble our efforts for the accomplishment of the work in which they so devoutly toiled. And while we see our Elijahs falling. How important that their mantles may fall on our young Elijahs. How appropriate then is the exhortation of our blessed Master: "*Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that He would send forth laborers unto the harvest.*" And how important that the prayers of faith, strong faith, be offered, that these laborers be eminently men of God!

In consequence of several of our preachers not having yet reported, I shall be unable to give you a full account of the operations of this Association the past year.

Br. William Stansel has labored one month in the **bounds of the Union Association**, and preached twenty-eight sermons. He says in the close of his Report, that he finds some **instances of opposition** to the cause of missions, and promises to give more particulars hereafter. [In these Associations, those supporting the mission movement reproached their opposition as "Parkerites," and refer to Daniel Parker as "an unlearned" or "uneducated" minister. It may be noted, that these "domestic missionaries" were laboring within established churches and established associations to move them into re-constituting as "mission societies." Many members resented their intrusion, but most seemed helpless to stop it.-SCP.]

Br. Nathaniel Richmond has labored two months under the direction of your Board. The first on the Wabash, concerning which he gives us the following summary:

"I have rode 403 miles, preached thirty-three times, delivered two lectures, one of which was on the subject of Temperance, baptized three persons, assisted in the administration of the Lord's Supper once, and attended four church meetings."

The second month he labored principally in Hamilton and Madison counties. He closes his Report by saying, "I have preached forty-four sermons, assisted in the examination of four candidates which my brother baptized, visited a large number of families, assisted in the constitution of two churches. The Lord is evidently about to revive His work among us. Our meetings are crowded and solemn whether by day or by night."

Br. Reuben Coffee spent the month of February in laboring under the direction of your Board, principally in Clark and the adjacent counties. He spent his time in visiting the feeble churches, administering counsel to the scattered brethren who appeared like sheep without a shepherd, and preaching as often as circumstances would permit- During the month he rode 318 miles, preached twenty-eight times, and imparted religious instruction to a large number of all ages. Although he witnessed no revival, yet we trust that the seed sown will eventually bring forth fruit a hundred fold.

Br. Coffee received a second appointment for one month at the semi-annual meeting of the Board, and has fulfilled the appointment. He labored thirty-six days, attended two protracted meetings where God evidently owned the labor of the brethren present, in the conversion of precious souls.

Br. Mayfield labored during the month of November last principally in the vicinity of Bloomington, in which time he rode 300 miles, preached thirty-five sermons, baptized eight persons, and visited from house to house when it was practicable.

Br. Samuel Harding has labored as joint-agent of the American Baptist Home Mission Society and the General Association of Baptists of Indiana, more than six months; during which time he has explored a large portion of the north, middle and west parts of the State. He writes that "although he finds many whole counties almost entirely destitute of what may be called Baptist preaching, yet we have great reason to rejoice that the number of those who are willing to aid in the promotion of the preaching of the Gospel is daily increasing." He has assisted in the ordination of two promising young brethren to the work of the ministry, assisted in the constitution of the first Baptist Church in Lafayette, administered the Lord's Supper and assisted in the administration four times, attended eight protracted meetings, in which he spent more than forty days, attended four Associations, preached one hundred and six sermons, baptized eleven persons, organized two Sunday Schools, one Temperance Society of twenty-three members, and rode 1231 miles.

Now dear brethren, although these operations may appear like the day of small things, yet it is beyond our feeble powers to compute the amount of good which has been accomplished by the instrumentality of this Association the last year; and the full amount never can be known till it is disclosed in the eternal world. But when we reflect that by the instrumentality of this body, the Churches have received more than twelve month's labors of one man, that three hundred and seven sermons have

been preached, that twenty-two have been baptized, the Lord's Supper frequently administered, that three Churches have been constituted, two ministers have been ordained, that eight protracted meetings have been sustained to a great degree, a large number of Church meetings have been attended by the watchmen of Zion, that two Sunday Schools have been constituted and one Temperance Society organized; while hundreds of brethren have been comforted and built up in the most holy faith, thousands of the unconverted have been exhorted to flee from the wrath to come, and numbers have been induced to make their peace with God, who that prays for the glory of God in the conversion of the world can say that the work in which we are engaged is small or unimportant? Then let us not be weary in well doing, but let the success which has hitherto attended our labors urge us to more vigorous efforts in the service of the Lord., while the devout and fervent prayer of every heart shall be, "*Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?*" and the desire of every soul shall be to do the will of Him who hath purchased us at the price of His own blood.

### **Circular Letter**

#### *Of the General Association of Baptists of Indiana*

*Dear Brethren* – We hail the return of another anniversary of this Association, with mingled emotions:- Joyous in the thought of what has been accomplished through its instrumentality, in behalf of the cause of Christ – sorrowful, in view of the loss we sustain in the removal of some of our beloved brethren from this field of their labors, in the midst of life and usefulness. The preservation of our lives, the smiles on our labors, and the success that has attended our efforts, call for grateful hearts to the Author of all our mercies.

The causes have been specifically known which first led to the organization of this body, and have enlisted our concentrated desires and energies. Substantially the same causes, but enlarged, are demanding numerous friends, ardent zeal and increased efforts.

We are happy in addressing brethren of the same family, members of the same body, subjects of the same Kingdom, whose faith, and hopes and interests are one. Surely the

interests of the whole Baptist denomination throughout the world, are, or should be essentially the same. How important then, the Baptists of Indiana, see eye to eye. Numerous reasons might be given, why the same constraining influence should govern their feelings, judgments, efforts, and that influence, the love of Christ, bind heart to heart, so as to form one unbroken cord, that should vibrate through our whole Territory.

Nothing has ever been done effectually to advance the Redeemer's cause in the world, without union. In order to effectually action, it is necessary that a union of feeling be awaked, combined, and put forth. However ardent, if that feeling spring from love to God, and love to souls for Jesus' sake, it will be well directed, without danger of enthusiasm. And even this is justifiable on all subjects, and in any cause, but that of Christ's. There are many damp and frigid vapours, spread around the **fire of pure benevolence**. Shall we not increase the flame? Brethren, a large fire is not easily extinguished!

Destined as we are, to live among inhabitants coming out of different countries, nations, and states, with their pre-conceived opinions, habits, prejudices, and modes of thinking, it is impossible but that a variety of sentiments will long remain among us. What will most effectually tend to remedy this evil, should be made the subject of deep inquiry by all those who profess to know, and love the truth. Union of judgment in the friends of the Gospel, is that remedy, and we think it may, and ought to be had, by such as have drunk into the same spirit, especially on all those subjects in which we have common interest. In our humble opinion, nothing is doing so much injury to the Baptist cause in this State, as the lamentable want of the same mind, so often enjoined by the Apostles on the Churches. It is too visible that at this point, the enemy is coming in like a flood upon us; and those brethren in different parts of the State operate against each other while endeavoring to build up the same precious cause. Shall it be longer so? Nay,

if we inform ourselves and feel a willingness to be guided by the word and spirit of our Master.

That a union of effort is called for, will appear, if we consider the relation we sustain to Christ, His cause, and the four hundred thousand immortal souls of Indiana; and may we not add that almost countless number that shall swell her population, and be nourished by her fertile soil in coming time. We shall not be thought assuming too much when we say, that the relation we hold to our population is 12,000 to 100,000. What a responsible station! How large, how imperious the claim! From this relation, have they not a right to expect light, knowledge and a saving influence? Most surely they have. None who have impartially measured the moral condition of Indiana, but have confessed that by far the greatest proportion of her population are still in their sins, benighted in their understanding, perverse in their ways, alien from God, destitute of faith, deprived in a great degree of the light of science, and the light and influence of the Gospel of God. Does not this state of things call for holy, united, and untiring effort?

In what does the strength of the church lie? Evidently in the everlasting arm – the truth of God, her faith, holiness, union, talent, property; these should all be consecrated and brought to bear on the grand object and holy purposes for which we meet, deliberate, labor, pray.

Brethren, none of us are at liberty to live to ourselves, or call aught of what we possess, our own. We are Christ's – His purchased – His servants – His glory, if we live, and act, and die for Him. Could the feelings, judgments, and efforts of 12,000 of Baptists be brought to exert their influence on the cause of our Redeemer, and the interests of immortal souls, what might not be done for Indiana? O think of her rising population, her natural resources, her situation in the Union; count her sons, measure her influence, and then tell us what is not demanded of the denomination we represent?

The means, brethren, to bring our whole strength and moral power into operation, should be sought, as an object of high moment to our cause. Among the means best adapted to produce this desired effect, will be found in humility, forbearance, information, persevering effort, prayer, faith; all from pure motives to glorify God, promote the cause of Christ, and be instrumental of saving sinners. Under the influence of such motives, and the constant use of these means, with the blessing of the Great Head of the Church, we may confidently expect a glorious change; one, that will tend to advance the declarative glory of God, **and greatly enlarge the Redeemer's reign on the earth.**

## **CONSTITUTION**

### ***Of the General Association of Baptists in the State of Indiana***

Article 1. The object of this Association shall be to **unite the Baptists of Indiana** in some uniform plan, for promoting the prosperity of the Redeemer's kingdom within the bounds of the State, by a more general spread of the Gospel.

Article 2. This Association shall consist of delegates from such churches, societies, and associations, as shall annually contribute to its general funds; each church or society being entitled to one delegate, and each association to three; all of which delegates shall be **members of Regular Baptist Churches**, and their appointments shall be certified by the Church, society, or association by which they were delegated. And any brother in good standing in our denomination shall be



entitled to membership, by contributing one dollar to its funds.

[**Note:** This is, to me, rather strange for a State Association. Within Indiana, in the southern counties were settlements of Separate Baptists; in Southeast Indiana were located at this time United Baptist churches; and across from the Ohio R. were located Particular Baptists. Throughout the State were German Baptists. And, the **American Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions** included some of all these groups. Throughout the report, emphasis is made to **union** of Baptists, and yet membership here is restricted to only Regular Baptists – unless the appellative “Regular” is meant as an adjective, rather than a noun; but if an adjective, why capitalized?- SCP]

Article 3. The officers of the Association shall be a Board of Trustees, consisting of a Moderator, a Corresponding Secretary, a Recording Secretary, a Treasurer, and thirty-six Trustees,- who shall all be members in good standing of what are usually called Regular Baptist churches, and be elected by ballot at each annual meeting, and retain their office until their successors are elected.

Article 4. The Association shall meet annually in the month of October, at such time and place as it shall from time to time appoint.

Article 5. The Moderator shall preside at all the meetings of the Association. The Corresponding Secretary shall conduct the correspondence of the Association and of the Board, and report the same whenever required. The Recording Secretary shall keep a fair record of the proceedings of the Association and of the Board, in a book or books provided for that purpose, which shall be at all times open for inspection, and shall preserve all books and papers committed to his care. The Treasurer, who shall give bond and security to the Moderator for the time being, for the faithful performance of his duty, shall receive and pay out all moneys entrusted to the Association, and shall keep a regular account of all receipts and payments, specifying all the items and particulars of all moneys paid in or distributed; and whenever required by the Association or the Board, shall make a detailed report of his accounts duly authenticated, and his annual report to the Association shall be regularly published.

Article 6. It shall be the duty of the Board, five of whom shall constitute a quorum, in the recess of the Association, to transact all the business contemplated by the Association, and to make a detailed report of their proceedings at each annual meeting. They may meet as often as they deem it necessary, at such times and places as they may appoint, make their own bye-laws not inconsistent with this constitution, fill any vacancies in their own body, and make a full report of all their proceedings to each meeting of the Association.

Article 7. All moneys that may be donated to the Association, for the express purpose of promoting the preaching of the Gospel in any particular part of the State, or for the support of any particular minister within the terms of this constitution, shall be faithfully applied to the object designated by the donor's.

Article 8. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but by a written order from the Recording Secretary, under the direction of the Board.

Article 9. No person shall be employed to preach the gospel, who is not in good standing in some Regular Baptist Church which is known to be in the general connection, and in all such appointments respect shall be had to the scriptural qualifications of the ministers, without any special regard to their literary acquirements; and the compensation allowed such as are employed to preach shall be moderate, leaving them to look for their chief reward from a higher Source.

Article 10. No compensation shall be allowed to any of the officers of the Association; but all the funds that may be received, except so much as may be required to supply the Secretaries and Treasurer with books and paper, and to print the Minutes of the Association, and pay the postage of letters, shall be sacredly devoted to the support of the ministers who may be employed to preach the gospel.

Article 11. This Association shall never attempt to exercise any authority over any church or particular association:

Holding it as an incontrovertible principle that **each church is sovereign and independent, and fully authorized to manage its own internal concerns without being accountable to any earthly tribunal.** The Association shall never pretend to exercise any right to call any person to the ministry of the Gospel; nor shall it ever employ any to preach, but such as have been regularly ordained. **This article of this constitution shall forever remain unalterable.** In all other respects, this constitution may be amended at any annual meeting by three fourths of the members present.

[Within the bounds of Indianapolis, Indiana, a large association of Regular Baptists had existed from 1809, organized as the White River Regular Baptist Association. In 1844, the White River addressed the issue relative to missions and the benevolent movement. Below is their stated objections to the Modern Missionary Movement. It is more detailed than most, and incorporated in it some of Elder John Taylor's "Sheets."]

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

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

## **CIRCULAR LETTER**

Beloved Brethren,

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

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

The 17<sup>th</sup> century was an age of missionary promise. The 18<sup>th</sup> century began to fill that promise. The 19<sup>th</sup> is called the “age of missionary enterprise.” The **union of all Christians** for this object is to become universal, its presence has taken the rank of a **new power**. The Swiss in 1556 sent out a few missionaries, and in 1559 the king of Sweden sent out more. There were some few others, together with the Spaniards and Portuguese; all of which, however, were so far from the spirit of the New Testament, that we think it unnecessary to say anything positive about them,- (Great Com., Harris, by Baptist Advocate, Vol. 4: No. 10).

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

The Catholics have their missionaries now in almost all the world, in North and South America, in Canada, and nearly all Indian tribes, South and West, many millions of dollars have been and still are expended for the propagation of their faith. Now considering the difference between Catholics, Protestants, and Baptists, in doctrine and practice, is it not strange that

Protestants and Baptists (some of them) should be aping after Catholic fashions; but we are imitable beings, hence both have borrowed this system from their neighbors, and if there is any glory in it the Catholics are certainly entitled to it.

2<sup>nd</sup>. The Moravians in 1741, sent out their missionaries in Greenland, St. Croix, the Indians of North America, the slaves in the South, and elsewhere, but they being small in number are only appropriate between \$50,000 and \$100,000 yearly to the prosecution of their system. – (Buck's Dic. Enclp. Baptist Recorder, &c.)

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

4<sup>th</sup>, and lastly. American missions. Mr. Kirk, of England, says in reference to the connection between English and American missions, that Andrew Fuller and William Carey laid the foundation thereof in America. Mr. Harris says it was not until the inspiring accounts of Carey, Vanderkemp, and Buchanan became circulated that American piety became ***divinely awakened*** to its claims; with that awakening the names of Judson (An Arminian, Ed.) Rice (A Congregational

Arminian), Mills and others, stand vitally connected. On those ***youthful students*** the ***missionary spirit*** had eminently rested, and that while they were at school studying theology, they were accustomed to pour out their prayers behind a haystack which was near the college, and there behind this stack, they ***called down a missionary spirit from heaven which proved the glory of our country.*** (-Baptist Advocate, Vol. 2, No. 4). Question: If these young students called down this missionary spirit from heaven **was it ever in the Church of Christ before?**

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

Since 1810, there has come into existence, American Board for Missions, Baptist Home Missionary Society, Baptist Bible Society, American Sunday School Union with scores of tributary streams of "societies," American Temperance Societies with a vast variety of branches, American Tract Society with many limbs to the general stock, Penny Society, Mite Society, Doll Society, Pin-Cushion Society, fancy articles for religious fairs, Plain Dress Societies, &c., &c. A late missionary writer says there are of these societies attached to Baptist churches between 1,200 and 2,000 in the United States alone.

Again, The Baptists have two Institutions purely *theological*, to educate young men for the mission ministry, 5

Colleges, 12 Institutions of a mixed Liberal Arts character, (literary and theological). From these Institutions there are now turned off yearly a number of preachers who go out hunting wealthy churches, of which they have never contributed any labor in building up, expecting to get \$300, or \$500, or \$1,000 per year to preach to.- Chris. Intel, page 297. Of their preachers we will refer to one case only of ordination and sending out.

On the 11<sup>th</sup> of June, in Utica, N.Y., the Rev. J. Wade and his consort were set apart as missionaries to the Burman Empire, by a committee of the Board of Managers of the Baptist General Convention; sermon by Rev. N. Kindrick, from 2d Timothy – “*Therefore I endure all things, &c.*” Rev. A. Bennett led in offering up the Consecrating Prayer. Rev. D. Gascall gave Mr. Wade an appropriate charge, and Rev. J. W. Clark gave him the right hand of fellowship; with the charge that he should go to the heathen. Rev. J. M. Peck addressed Mrs. Wade, Rev. E. Galusha gave the right hand of fellowship, &c. Services were performed in Rev. Mr. Atkin’s meeting house, the day was fine, and a collection of \$86.23 was taken on the spot. Mr. Wade is a young man, he received his classical and theological education at Hamilton Seminary; Mrs. Wade is of a respectable family &c.

Now let us transpose the first four verses of Acts 13, *to-wit*: On the 11<sup>th</sup> of June, A. D. 44, Rev. S. Paul and J. Barnabas were set apart as missionaries to Seleucus and Cyprus, by a committee of the Board of Managers of the Baptist General Convention, met in the city of Antioch. Sermon on the occasion by Rev. S. Niger, from Isaiah, “*The Isles shall wait for His law.*” Rev. Lucius of Cyrene offered the Consecrating Prayer. Rev. Manean gave Rev. Paul and Rev. Barnabas an appropriate charge, and Rev. John Mark gave them the right hand of fellowship. Rev. Lucius concluded in prayer. Services were performed in Rev. S. Niger’s meeting house, the day was fine, and a collection of \$86.23 was taken on the spot. The Rev. S. Paul is a promising young man, a native of the city of Tarsus; he received his classical and theological education at the



theological seminary at Jerusalem under the professorship of Doctor Gamaliel, LLD.

Now, the imperishable motto of all true and real Baptists is the article placed at the head of this letter, “***The Scriptures are the infallible word of God and the only rule of our faith and practice.***” Now let us apply ***it*** to this same case: Acts, xiii: 1, 2, 3, and 4, read thus: “*Now there were in the church (not convention or society) that was at Antioch, certain Prophets and teachers, as Barnabas and Simeon, that were called Niger and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manean, which had been brought up with Herod the Tetrach and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them, and when they had fasted and prayed, and laid hands on them and sent them away, so they being **sent forth by the Holy Ghost**, (mark well, “by the Holy Ghost”) they departed unto Selucia, and from thence they sailed to Cyprus.*”

Now it seems to us that any one can see the vast difference between these preachers that God calls, qualifies and sends out, and those who are made by seminaries, conventions, boards, and societies. But now let us observe the difference of starting and being on a “*missionary tour.*” There is a great deal of money expended in outfits, horses and carriages, *etc.*, very much as ministers of State, money to carry them out and yearly pay after they get there. Mr. Robertson got \$840 per year; N’Chater, wife and two children, got \$900 per year.- Church Advocate, pp.22 and 23. Now this is only one example out of hundreds of cases. Let us examine one testimony on this point:

Paul, you were very laborious, successful, and in the present age you are represented as being a “great missionary preacher;” Yes sir, you are held up to view as a *model of missionaries*. Paul, how long were you preaching? About 30 years. Well, if you got \$900 per year, you made \$28,800. O! I never got so much! Why? were you not as influential, successful, respectable and laborious as our modern

missionaries? I will answer, just look in the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of 2d Corinthians, and you will see my response – how much I obtained, and what sort of pay it was. You will further see that I there laid down a discriminating line between true and false teachers, and yet these false teachers were suffered, though they brought these brethren into work-bondage, devoured them, took of them, (money, we suppose he meant,) exalted themselves, &c., and yet they were suffered gladly! But to the point: Well, in lieu of all this \$28,800, I was abundant in labors. *“In stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths often, of the Jews five times received one hundred and forty stripes save one, thrice I was beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a day and a night have I been in the deep, in journeying often, in perils by water, in perils by robbers by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathens, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in watching often, in hunger and thirst, in fasting often, in cold nakedness, &c.”* If it must needs glory I will glory in the things that concern my infirmities, I glory not in thousands of dollars, honor, popularity, ease or grandeur; no! nothing save in the cross of our Lord and Master, yet it was better for me to die than any should me of this glorying, for this I am willing to suffer the loss of all things and endure infirmities, reproaches, necessities, persecutions, stripes, and the loss of life itself, for the honor of the cross of the blessed Redeemer.

Here, then, is a strict compendium of Paul’s pay for preaching the Gospel of the grace of God that brings life and immortality to light and manifestation. Paul labored not only in Judea and Jerusalem, but almost everywhere – he sought to go where Christ **never has been preached**, and finally laid down his life for the honor of the Lord Jesus.

Come here, missionaries, here is a fair example of sufferings and of disinterestedness for the glory of God and the

salvation of the heathen. But to proceed: Those who get membership in some of the societies aforesaid, **buy it with money** – the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions is composed of Associations and other religious societies. An individual can obtain membership by paying \$100 yearly, and \$100 more entitles him to another vote (see their Constitution.) Again, \$1.00 per year entitles one to yearly membership in the Baptist Tract Society, \$10 at one time makes them members for life, \$35 makes them directors for life (2d Article Con.) Again, The Protestant Ch. Missionary Society, \$3 for yearly membership, \$30 for life membership, \$50 for Clergymen, and \$100 for any other person, makes them patrons for life. These two or three examples may stand to represent a great many others.

Again: The following is very general, \$100 is offered for two of the best tracts presented, 4 pages each, to be left to the decision of the managers of the Society. – Bapt. Adv. Vol. 4, No.11. Again: Another prize tract of \$250; twenty-seven writers start for the prize, but Mr.---- obtains it. Brethren, what do you call this under the mask of religion? We forebear to give it a name, although it has one. Again, There are a great many printing presses and hands to carry out this system, agents are sent out through all the length and breadth of the land, making collections of money even in this extremity of the Western world, they are going to and fro soliciting money or subscriptions and making thereby \$400 or \$500 for themselves yearly. Do you ask what are all these begging Societies formed for? What are these presses at? Why are all these agents employed? Or why such a great number of preachers, agents and colporteurs, scattered throughout the government? The *Advocate*, *Herald*, *Cross*, and all the missionary papers answer, "For the conversion of the world, - the whole world." Fishback, in his late essays, has made a neat calculation that with the energies of the church rightly employed, (that is the wealth and talents) the world can be converted in 34 years. A late missionary paper has the following: "Question – By what means

shall the existing generation be converted? Answer: By the preaching of the press and colporteurs. Colporteurs! Well, who are they? They are a set of men appointed to visit every family in a given assigned district, to sell tracts and make missionary impressions. He will visit about 5,000 families and sell 4,000 tracts per year.- Bapt. Adv. Vol, No.4. Now we cannot help but believe that the whole superstructure is based solely on money, for plain and obvious reasons; that if the money were taken away, the seminary doors would close, the press would grind to a stop, colporteurs would remain at home, the preacher's trumpet would no longer sound. Presidents, Vice Presidents, Managers, Secretaries, Auditors, Comptrollers, &c., would all come to an end, and cease forever; then, and not until then, will the Church of God have rest, peace and prosperity. She now seems to be under a heady cloud; yea, it is a dark and cloudy day; may the sun of righteousness arise with healing in His wings! Are we mistaken here? We think not!

We now inquire, when did religion stand most in need of this monied-facility? Now, when religion has got a fast hold on several of the strongest nations of the earth, and is made popular with most nations, and hath its thousands and ten thousands of strong advocates in every land; or, when it had but a few, poor, illiterate fishermen for its advocates, and who were held in utter contempt and derision, and treated as the off-scourgings of all things by every nation, kingdom, and empire then in the world? Why, everybody will say, this was the time to throw in our thousands and millions of dollars! We ask, was it done? Look into the chart below and then map the Apostolic career, and see whether there were thousands or even hundreds attached to the ministry of John the Baptist, Matthew, Mark, Paul, Peter or any of the prophets or apostles; you know there was not!

We proceed to show you that money is the hinge on which missionism turns, premising that the following amount is only a portion of what is yearly collected today to carry out the

system – though we could not get the last reports, which probably would have swelled the amount considerably. In B. C. Morse's sermon, delivered at Salem Association, he says the probable amount is two million and a half dollars, &c.

West. For. Mis. So., Chris. Int.	Eng. Bapt. So. . . . .	\$58,666
Vol. 8, No. 4 . . . . .	Am. S.S.U.Bap.Ad. . . . .	\$65,597
Am.Bap.So.Chr.Vol	Society for promoting	
8, No. 3 . . . . .	Chris. Knowledge, . . . . .	\$228,466
Lon.Miss.So., Miss	Moravian Missions . . . . .	\$50,000
Mag., p,47 . . . . .	London S.S.Union . . . . .	\$23,567
Eng.Ed.So,for pro-	Meth.Miss.So. expend	
Pagating the Gos., ann'l	for 1833 . . . . .	\$17,587
Income, Bos.Rec.. .	Irish Bapt.Society . . . . .	\$13,000
\$253,080	Church Fund Society.. . . .	\$ 4,000
Wesley Miss.Sop., do do	Book Soc.for rel.know. . . . .	\$ 5,560
So. Un. Brethren, . . . . .	West, Home (Meth) . . . . .	\$13,089
\$32,000	Bapt Home Mis.Soc., An	
Am.Tract Soc.Ms.mag	nual Report . . . . .	\$12,911
p. 189. . . . .	Am. Board of Com. For	
\$91,732	For.Miss.,last 11 months to	
Church Miss. Soc., Boston	up to July, 1842, . . . . .	\$300,000
Record,. . . . .		-----
\$146,884	Total:. . . . .	\$2,358,512
Brit.& For, Soc. Bos.		
Record, . . . . .		
\$460,884		
Bap.Tr.Soc.,Miss. Mag		
\$10,264		
Am.&For. B.So. . . . .		
\$38,714		
Lon. Tr.Soc. Bos. Rec.		
\$41,000		

Here then is \$2,358,512 annually. It is generally supposed that the Apostolic ministry from John the Baptist until St. John died at Ephesus, comprehended about 66 years. Now multiply the amount by the time, and it makes \$155,661,792, which would have been extended by the Apostles, had they proceeded on the same ground of the Modern Missionary Movement. It must be apparent to every one that money is the great impetus that gives life and motion to this novel system. Now in contradistinction to this system, the Apostle demonstrates that salvation is based sole on the sovereign grace of God and the finished atonement of Christ in the life, suffering, death, resurrection, ascension, and mediation, applied by the effectual, unfrustrable and sovereign influence of the Holy Ghost. Question – What goes with all these millions of dollars? If you will look in missionary papers you will see that it goes to

pay missionary preachers, professors of divinity, secretaries, &c., to the number of many thousands, all of whom are supported by the several streams that let into the general fountain, and the poor heathen who is the pretext of all this collection gets a very inconsiderable portion of it. Many preachers get from \$400 to \$1000 per year. Some professors have got, and perhaps will get, \$2,000 per year.- Chris.Adv. pg.72. It is said by the same Advocate that Mr. Cary, who is considered the Apostle of Missionism, part of his time got \$6,000 per year. **[Note:** I would not wish this statement to stand alone. To the credit of Mr. Cary, he paid every cent back to the British missionary society that they gave him, out of his own earnings from publication of his translations.- SCP] Question – Did John, Mark, Luke, Peter, Barnabas, or Paul, ever share such a silvery loaf as this?

Again: In Jamaica the mission system is based on what they call the “leader system;” one of these told Mr. Weston, who is a missionary, that he had baptized about 4,000 members, but that he did not know that any of them were Christians; each and all of them had their baptismal tickets, for which they have to pay 12 and ½ cents apiece. Mr. Reed upon his entrance upon this mission found a church of 900 members, and after due examination rejected all but 15. These “leaders” do all the work of conversion – the converts exchange tickets every four weeks, making 13 months per year, and the missionaries make thereby \$500 per month or \$6,500 per year, for which they do not account to the Board which sends them over. The plate, equipage, sumptuous fare, would astonish, &c. – See J. Weston’s Missionary Report from Jamaica, published in the Christian Reflector. This same writer says, “They riot on the price of the souls of their people, and then, wiping their mouths, say we have done no wickedness. Is this language too severe ? These vast sums are given by the poor unsuspecting people, with the confident expectation of gaining an admittance to heaven therewith. The missionaries know this – what then

can I say less?" These are *his words, verbatim*. [The reader can find reference to this "despised leader system of Baptists in Jamaica" on the internet.- SCP]

Again: The sending of the Gospel is said to be the great bone of contention, but it is not. It is the anti-Scriptural means employed to affect the end; and the means always changes the end. The word of God says, "**Go** ye *therefore*. . ." but the mission system is built almost entirely on "**Send** *ye, therefore*. . ." and that is the signal difference between the supporters and opponents of the modern missionary movement. The word of God is the infallible rule of our faith and our practice. The case of Peter is in point, for this is the first case on record, save Philip to the Eunuch. The sheet being let down from heaven, full of all manner of creeping things, four-footed beasts, &c. Peter began to scruple upon the subject, but the vision was repeated the second and third time, he became convinced of the necessity of the Gospel **going** to the heathen or Gentiles. Suppose Peter had said, I cannot go until I get an education and be **sent** out by some missionary board and get the promise of \$800 or \$900 to support me after I go? William Carey is said to have told Andrew Fuller, "I'll go if you promise to hold the rope for me," so great was his faith and powerful his call. Question – Whose plan was Peter to go by? Christ's as laid down in this vision and the general commission, or the modern missionary plan as developed in our time by schools, boards, societies, &c.? You are all forced to say "by Christ's, who had called, qualified and gave the vision to Peter." And if he had waited for money, or someone willing to hold the rope for him, or outfit him from some board or society, I ask you candidly would he not have been disobedient to the heavenly call, and censurable in the estimation of his brethren, as well as the church throughout the ages, and might have justly been charged with lucrative views, or that the cross of Christ was too heavy to be borne "*without money and without price*." Here, then, let every God-called preacher who thinks he has a divine

call from God to go to the heathen, across the frontier wilderness, follow the direction of Christ taking neither "*purse nor scrip*," as did Peter, the seventy evangelists, and Philip, etc., nothing doubting – for God has the hearts of all men in His hand, and the treasures of the world, and cattle of a thousand hills, are His; and He says, "*Lo, I am with you even unto the end of the world.*" Then will all men know that fame, honor, or money, is not the object; but the single glory of God and the conversion of His people. **Go** then and make it apparent that salvation is predicated not on money, or any other temporality, but on the sovereign power, grace and Spirit of Christ.

Again: Acts xi:19, "*And they that were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus and Antioch, preaching the word, &c.;*" and some of these were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which when they were come to Antioch spake unto the heathen, preaching the Lord Jesus. And all across these western wildernesses, churches have been planted in like manner, before a mission society was ever formed, and presently there are churches and ministers everywhere these missionaries travel – they lodge in the private homes of the saints! Question – What carried the Gospel to the heathen and Isles of the sea? Money or persecution? What has brought the Gospel to our land? Missionaries or believing migrants? You all know that in the former case it was persecution, and in ours, the westward migration. Then persecution was a secondary cause; and migration faired the same. Why? The Gospel was carried and preached to the heathen; and this the Apostles might have easily known from the directions of Christ, who said, "when they *persecute you* in one city flee into another." Now look at the case of Paul and Barnabas, in the 13<sup>th</sup> chapter of Acts. Look at all the Apostles, the seventy that Christ sent out, and indeed we might refer you to all the preachers for three hundred years after the Apostolic age closed. Look into Ecclesiastical history, and see if persecution did not carry the Gospel to the greater



parts of Asia, Europe, Africa, and by the same wing it flew to the American colonies as many were fleeing persecution by the Anglicans and Puritans in England. See the floods of wagon trains across the Wilderness Trail, and follow the footsteps of Virginia preachers into Kentucky and all points westward. Why is it said that “Kentucky is the graveyard of Virginia preachers”? Look at Roger Williams who had to flee from England on account of his religious sentiments, was the first who proclaimed in the colonies, that the kingdom of God was not of this world; and because of this was much persecuted, and at last took shelter in the little but notorious spot of ground called Rhode Island. What Board sent him through the icy snow? Yet, here he established the first *Baptist* church in the North American colonies, with twelve members, in 1630. Must we name James Ireland, Lewis Craig, Joseph Craig, Elijah Craig, Aaron Bledsoe, Jeremiah Moore, John Shackelford, to name but a few of our own? The same persecuting spirit was extant in Massachusetts, and especially so in Virginia; but as you are well acquainted with these times of persecution we need not speak particularly. Question – Was there any Boards of missionaries that sent the Gospel to the United States? Did any come to us? No, there was not a single one of these establishments or societies in the whole Protestant world! No, brethren, the kingdom of heaven was opened by John the Baptist about the year 30, and it progressed through the inhabitable earth up to the year 1792, before there was a missionary establishment formed among the Baptists, as you may plainly see by consulting Ecclesiastical history. It is a plain historical fact that the system of missions was established in 1792, making only 50 years ago in England and only 32 years ago in the United States. We ask, where was the glorious kingdom of the Redeemer from John the Baptists in the year 30, to Fuller and Carey in 1792? We answer, that if you will consult history you will easily see that it was not in its silvered slippers and respectable young men, but dyed in garments of

blood. We do not glory in persecution, although this is the instrument God has employed to both purify His church and spread His Gospel; but we do glory in the church being disenthralled from all the inventions of carnal men. The Lord said to Moses, "*See, said He, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the Mount.*" He was not permitted to form the architecture or building, according to the fashion of the neighboring nations around, but according to the Divine model revealed.

Brethren, whenever we become apeing after fashionable religion, then we shun the cross of Christ, and do not come under the character of the followers of Christ as laid down clearly in the written word. Here, then, let us turn over a leaf in the ministry, who are the preachers of the Gospel of the free grace of God.

1<sup>st</sup>. They are a chosen set of men, scattered through the different ages and nations of the world. When were they chosen? Why, in common with all God's people, "*before the world began,*" the God of our fathers hath chosen thee; "*He is a chosen vessel unto Me to bear My name before the Gentiles, and king and children of Israel.*" 2<sup>d</sup>. They are called by the grace of God, "*When it pleased God who called me by His grace, &c.*" and "*they that are with Him are called, and chosen, and faithful.*" 3<sup>d</sup>. Christ qualifies them without the aid of studying philosophy and theology in the schools. "*It is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven.*" Here, then, it is positively said to be a gift, - "*unto me this grace is given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, whereof I was made a minister according to the gift of the grace of God given to me by the effectual working of His power,*" 4<sup>th</sup>. "**Go** ye into the world and preach the gospel to every creature," as much as if He had said, preach what I have commanded; and what I have not, let it alone! Mark, the servant is not to transcend the law laid down in the commission. Go; don't stop for the directors of boards; don't stay for the promise of a salary

before you start – just “Go!” (In the late Conference of Virginia, they report a number of preachers ready to go, but there is no money in the treasury to **send** them; and hence they are idling.) The law of the great Lawgiver, Christ, says, “*Go, providing nether gold or silver, nor brass, in your purses, nor scrip for your journey; neither two coats, nor shoes nor staves.*” Now why all this direction? Simply because the laborer is worthy of his meat; but if he is not chosen, called, qualified, and faithful in the discharge of his ministry, he is certainly not worthy even of the bones.

Now, as it regards an experimental knowledge of this call from God, it is found to embrace the following considerations: 1<sup>st</sup>. An unceasing desire for the honor and glory of God. 2<sup>d</sup>. The experimental salvation of redeemed sinners. 3<sup>d</sup>. The harmony and glory and prosperity of the church of Christ. The man that is under these divine impressions goes forth trusting in the strength of Israel’s God, perfectly regardless of money, honor, or glory from men. The grand theme is the publication of the Gospel of the grace of God to wretched men, that God may be glorified in the manifest salvation of His redeemed people. This is one of the gifts of Christ to His church; and oh! How wonderfully blessed is that church who has a pure sound ministry; and how exceedingly cautious should churches be as it relates to the ministry, for surely a greater curse has never befallen the church than an oscillating, impure, unestablished, and unsound ministry. Then, brethren, how very particular you should be right at this very spot! The ministry, then, is given to the church to attend to her spiritual welfare; and there should be, and is, a reciprocity between the church and ministry – she should pay some attention to her preacher’s temporal wants; of his family; which duty is revealed in the following texts: “*Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teaches in all good things.*” “*If we have sown unto you spiritual things, it is a great matter if we shall reap your carnal things.*” “*Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn.*” “*The Lord has*

*ordained that those who preach the gospel should live of the Gospel.”*

Now, brethren, we should never suffer ourselves to be driven by a monied system so far as to neglect our duty to the ministry; can you ask a preacher to ride 14, 20, or 30 miles to attend to your spiritual welfare, once or twice a month through the hot prairies, or the cold, bleak and northern winds, and shut up the bowels of your liberal distribution? Good heaven, brethren, how will you account yourself to the Lord for this neglect and ingratitude in the communicating cheerfully of your carnal things to him who in his service to God is compelled by his Master to faithfully serve as a minister of Christ to you. But, say you, the preacher is as rich as I am, and he might as well work for me – he has as much time to preach as I have to hear. Well, let us try the case: Get your horse, and otherwise equip yourself to appear respectable, (for if the preacher is not so, you will be the first to pronounce him worse than an infidel,) pay your own expense, and go two or three days per week, and sometimes three or four weeks at a time, you would see your farm going to rack, your tools lost, your whole business transactions deranged, you would conclude this course of business would not suit you – quit you would! But stop, the preacher has to keep on. He is drafted into a service without a discharge! Well, say you, “let him go, but I must attend more closely to my temporal wants, or my family will come to want.” Well, what will become of your preacher and his family? But you say, “Our ministers do not preach for money!” Neither did Paul, but he depended upon the brethren at one place to provide him on his way to another. Brethren, can’t you see duty arising from these premises. And of much more importance, God has so commanded it of you. Surely the Lord has made it your duty, by His commandment, to communicate your carnal things to him that ministers to you spiritual things. No preacher has a right to make any demand upon you, but it is a duty that the Lord has made obligatory. Will you discharge it or

live in the neglect of it? Right upon this point many preachers have made shipwreck of faith, for some preachers cannot preach without the assurance of a stated support or salary – they have not the faith to do otherwise. But those preachers whom the Lord calls, as we have described, preach, money or no money, and are willing to trust God in His Providence, and His grace, or church. He will go, money or no, and would rather suffer want, than to beg or complain of his meager fair.

But again, it sometimes happens with the minister of the gospel of the grace of God that he is accosted in the following manner by a brother who has come to meeting in his carriage, with silver harness, dressed in his cloth, &c., “Oh, brother, come and preach for us; give me an appointment; we are so anxious to hear you preach.” Well, the preacher begins to complain; he would gladly do so if he could, but he is behind with his work, having been preaching so much from home, and is obliged to make up some money he owes, &c. This sort of reply hushes his brother to dumbness- off he sails in his carriage, or otherwise. Stop, let us read you a text: “*Charge them that are rich that they be rich in good works, ready to communicate, willing to distribute.*” Brethren, there is another matter that is detrimental to the feelings of your preacher: He has been laboring for you for years, perhaps, and you have paid little or no attention to him- but here comes along a fly-by-night stay-short preacher from a distance; perhaps an agent of some board, and your hearts, purses, and all are open to him, throwing in your five, ten, or twenty dollars for himself or some society. Is this not saying in plain terms that your own preacher will do for you when there is no other around? But we will give this man for two or three day’s labor more than we give you for three, five or seven year’s constant labor. Pause, pause, Brethren! Think of this course of proceeding. This very operation has resulted in removing some of the old veterans of Christ, who have born the burden and heat of the day, in other States from their churches, and substituted in their stead, a

dry, speculative, and scholastic ministry. There is a truth that is witnessed by most ministers, that is uncomely: “A *prophet is without honor, save in his own country.*”

Now, from the premises laid down, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1<sup>st</sup>. Although the church of Christ has been established about 1800 years, yet among Baptists the mission system is only about 50 years old in England, and 32 in the United States, consequently it is not founded in the word of God.

2d. There are many thousands of societies formed, as mushrooms, preachers, agents, colporteurs, presidents, vice presidents, auditors, secretaries, &c., employed whose very existence and character is not found in the word of God.

3d. That the system in all its dimensions is based on money, is a plain matter of fact, and it cannot exist without it.

And, 4<sup>th</sup>. The contrast briefly drawn between this new system and the one laid down in the sacred word of God, which is the infallible rule of both faith and practice is a contrast between a system of works and the other of grace; the one is not based upon faith, while the other is built upon it.

Yours, &c. &c.

### **1835 Resolution of the Miami Baptist Association In Ohio.**

**“Resolved,** That we lay the admission of Mt. Zion Church over until tomorrow at 10 o’clock, and before deciding with regard to the admission of said church the Association shall proceed to investigate the subject and declare her sentiments with regards to the **benevolent institutions of the day, so-**

**called.** On Saturday took up the benevolent institutions, which was introduced by the following preamble and resolution:

**Whereas**, There is a great excitement and division of sentiment in the **Baptist denomination relative to the benevolent institutions of the day, so-called, such as Sunday Schools, Bible, Missionary, Tract, and Temperance Societies, therefore, RESOLVED**, That this Association regard those said Societies and Institutions as having no authority, foundation, or support in the Sacred Scriptures, but we regard them as having their origin in and belonging to the world, and as such we have no fellowship for them as being of a *religious character*; but do not hereby declare non-fellowship with those brethren and churches who now advocate them.” -1835

### **Baltimore Address – 1835**

**[In the Colonial and Early Frontier periods, most “Baptists” churches wrote in their Articles of Faith: “We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God and the only rule of faith and practice.”**

In American political jurisprudence, there have always been some justices that believed in a “strict interpretation” of the United States’ Constitution; while others, as John Jay and John Marshall, believed in an “open or broad interpretation” of the same. So, too, in American religions, some believed in adhering strictly, as much as possible, to the letter and spirit of the Scriptures, while others took them as a moral guideline in their interpretations.

With the rise of the social benevolent movements in America, it was inevitable that these “social reformers” would eventually see the Christian benevolent spirit as a golden revenue to be tapped to support their social programs, and the best method of tapping this resource was by penetrating the various denominations of Christendom and redirecting their humanistic sympathies into their own channels of endeavor. Hence we see the rise of the “Social Gospel” and mass migration of works agents into all American denominations between 1780 and 1830’s.

While there were various “denunciations” of this amalgamation of worldly benevolence with religious benevolence in different parts of the country, by far, the most noticed was the **Black Rock Convention** in 1832, and its **Address**.

Since it is so well documented for church historians, I will only point out that the Black Rock Address dealt with the benevolent institutions that had, and were then, infiltrating Baptist churches. I do not present the same problems as they affected the other major American religions. But it is important to note that the Black Rockers did not address the *doctrinal issues* then becoming vogue among Baptists.

This leads me to the present transcription. Lesser known, even among the Old School Baptists, Regular Baptists, and the Primitive Baptists, is the **Baltimore Convention of 1835**. This **Address** delineated the *doctrinal sentiments* of the Old School Baptists, as they were now being named. (The views of Andrew Fuller in England which he borrowed from Saint Thomas Aquinas, was that "Christ's blood was sufficient for the salvation of the whole world, and efficient for the elect only," or as J. M. Pendleton stated it, "The atonement of Christ was sufficient for the whole world, should the whole world believe, at least where the Gospel has been preached." This novel view among Particular Baptists was considered a "New School of Divinity," as contrasted with the older view that the atonement of Christ had saved His people from their sins, eighteen hundred years ago. Thus, these "strict interpretationists" were called the "Old School of Divinity.") The **Baltimore Address** is the document stating the doctrine that uniquely identifies the *faith* of the Old School Baptists, as the **Black Rock Address** declares the *practice* of the Old School Baptists in America. The Address centers particularly upon the doctrine of the Absolute Predestination of all things, specifically upon the Sovereignty of the Triune Godhead- Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Baptists who hold to the contents of this **Baltimore Address** are "the Old School Baptists." As "Old School" Baptists, their main point of emphasis at this national convention was to express the distinctive doctrine that made them to differ from the New School of Divinity; and this distinctive point was the "Absolute predestination of all things by the Father, Son and Holy Spirit." The emphasis upon the absolute sovereignty of the Holy Spirit particularly separated them from those Calvinists that denied sovereignty to Him by insisting that "God Himself cannot save a sinner without the preaching of the word by men." It also is a distinctive point of difference with other "Old School" types of Baptists that deny the necessity of regeneration in experimental conversion to faith and repentance in this "time world." At this point in time, there were many who agreed with Andrew Fuller's new divinity doctrine, but did not approve of the uniting of the so-call "benevolent societies" with the church. These will later show up as "means and measures" Baptists, and in time will be swallowed up in the mergers of the "Time Salvationists," the "Conditionalists," and the "Means Baptists" as they evolved into the present-day "Primitive" Baptist movement following the Fulton, Ky. Convention of 1900. We hope you can appreciate this documentary presentation from the pages of our historical past.- SCP.]



### Proceedings of the Old School Meeting at Baltimore

Agreeable to appointment, the Brethren of the Old School, met with the Ebenezer Church in the City of Baltimore, on Monday the 18<sup>th</sup>- inst, Singing and prayer by Elder Thomas Poteet; after which Elder Samuel Trott of Va. was chosen Moderator, and Elder Eli Scott, of Md. Appointed Clerk.

2. The following Brethren on whose recommendation the present meeting had been appointed came forward and enrolled their names *viz*:

Elders,	Edward Choat of Md.
	Thomas Barton, Pa.
	Edmond J. Ries, Md.
	Wm. K. Robinson, Del.
	Jas. Round, Md.
	Gilbert Beebe, N.Y.
	Thomas Poteet, Md.
	Wm. Wilson, “
	S. W. Woolford, “
	Wm. Marven, Va.
	Samuel Trott, “
	Eli Scott, Md.
Brethren:	Isaac Chrisman, Va.
	Samuel Buck, “
	Luke Ensor, Md.
	John Ensor, “
	Herod Choat, “
	Wm. Selman, “
	Abram Cole, Sen, “
	David Lowe, “
	Edward Grist, “

On motion, *Resolved*, That such Brethren present as are in good standing – whose Christian and moral characters are unexceptionable, and who wish to unite with us in maintaining the ancient Faith and order of the Gospel as set forth in the Addresses published by the Old School Meeting at Black Rock and Pleasant Valley, be invited to enroll their names with us and take part with us in the deliberations of this meeting. Whereupon the following Elders and Brethren, after stating the peculiar dealings of God with them by which they were brought to renounce the

popular inventions of the present day, gave in their names as being heartily united with us, *viz*:

Elders, Hezekiah West, of Pa.  
 Ephraim Crocker, N.Y.  
 Hezekial Pettit, N.Y.  
 Theophalus Harris, Pa.  
 Samuel Nightinggole, Md.  
 Alfred Earle, N.Y.

Brethren: David Amos, Md.  
 Joseph Hughes, “  
 Maudly Eligan, “  
 Wm. H. Crawford, “  
 Britten Saunders, Va.

4. *Resolved*, That Brethren Trott, Barton, and Beebe, be appointed to prepare an address expressive of the views of this meeting touching the subject for which we have convened, and report the same to this meeting.

5. Adjourned wutil three o'clock P.M. Prayer by Bro. Round.

At 11 o'clock Brother Thomas Barton preached from Matthew ii, 6, “*And thou Bethlehem in the land of Juda, art not the least among the Princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a **governor**, that shall rule My people Israel.*”- Met at 3 o'clock P.M.; Prayer by Elder Harris. Received a letter from the Church at Elk Creek, Ohio, and a communication from Bro. Thomas O. Dudley of Ky., addressed to Bro. E. J. Reis. *Resolved*, That Brother Beebe be requested to publish the former and extracts from the latter in the *Signs of the Times*.

7. The Brethren appointed for that purpose reported as address – which follows these minutes – which being read and deliberately considered was **unanimously adopted**.

8. *Resolved*, That we recommend the appointment of an Old School Meeting in the vicinity of the Delaware Association, to be held on Thursday preceding the 1<sup>st</sup> Sunday in June, 1836, and that Brethren Barton and Robinson, designate the place and give seasonable notice through the *Signs of the Times*.

9. *Resolved*, That Brother Barton be requested to furnish in some suitable form for publication, the substance of his views on the subject dwelt upon by him in his discourse delivered before this meeting, as we believe that the same would be peculiarly interesting and edifying to our Brethren at large.

10. *Resolved*, That the Minutes and Address of this meeting be published in the *Signs of the Times*.

11. *Resolved*, That the thanks of this meeting be tendered to the Brethren and Citizens of Baltimore, for the kindness and hospitality shown us during this meeting, and that Bro. E. J. Reis be requested to present our grateful acknowledgments to the Pastor or Trustees of the Lutheran Church in this City,\* for their liberality in affording us the use of their Meetinghouse.

After some remarks and prayer by the Moderator, adjourned *sine die*.

Samuel Trott, *Moderator*  
Eli Scott, *Clerk* **1835**

**\*Note of explanation Affixed** is as follows: “The circumstances by which the Old School Meeting were cast upon the kindness of other denominations of professed Christians, for a suitable house for their meeting, were as follows: The Baltimore Baptist Association and the Old School Meeting upon the invitation of the Ebenezer Baptist Church of Baltimore, under the pastoral charge of Bro. E. J. Reis, appointed to meet with them in the Meetinghouse then occupied by them in Calvert Street; but during the past year a party of the professedly benevolent, but more properly the New School Baptists, bought the Meetinghouse in which the meetings by appointment were to have been held – having in view as they have boasted through the publick prints to deprive the Ebenezer Baptist Church of a place of worship, and to establish a *new interest* in Baltimore. Having been able by the power of money to accomplish this item of *their benevolence* they peremptorily refused the use of the house for the Baltimore Baptist Association, and the Old School Meeting.

While thus circumstanced the Lutherans and Presbyterians of the City of Baltimore, on whose liberality we had no claim, came forward and offered the use of their places of worship – which offer was of course accepted, and their kindness gratefully acknowledged by the Ebenezer Church, the Baltimore Association, and by the Old School Meeting. This specimen of modern *benevolence* on the part of the New-Light Baptists of Calvert Street, will undoubtedly be read and duly considered by the Citizens of Baltimore – while Old Fashioned Baptists may see the propriety of their Lord’s declaration that “*A man’s foes shall be those of his own household.*” [Stan’s note: The use of the term “New-Light” Baptists indicated that these were “Separate Baptists,” a group that was once Protestant until the Great Awakening.]

### **1835 - BALTIMORE ADDRESS**

*The Old School Baptists met in Baltimore, to their Brethren scattered abroad send greeting;*

*Beloved Brethren.* Having been permitted a number of us of the Old School once more to meet, and converse together on the consolations and the trials to which the Church of Christ, at this time of the prevalence of human devices, is subject, we would address to you a word for edification and encouragement.

We learn that some who, we thought a short time since, were with us, have gone after the favours of the world, and to that religion which the world approves. Others again we have heard from, who stand fast in the liberty of the Gospel, and manifest a determination to be separated from the multitude who make merchandise of religion.

Others there are who we believe know and love the Truth and Order of the Gospel, but who seem to prefer having their names numbered with those enlisted in support of that interest which has arisen in our country in opposition to Bible doctrine and order and which of course, can be nothing other than anti-christ, rather than expose themselves to the sneers and frowns of the popular order of religionists. We feel confident, Brethren, that we express the feelings of your hearts, when we say, we would be far from exchanging stands [pulpits] with such brethren, even in regard to present comfort. We know, it is true, that go where we will, we are looked upon in a very unfavorable light, as though we stood in opposition to all that is good, and that our names, when they have a place, or are referred to, in any of the periodicals of *polite religion*, stand associated with epithets of scorn and reproach. These things are, of course, crossing to nature. But then in our religious exercises and performances, we "*sit in heavenly places in Christ Jesus*," feeling that we act from authority and stand upon ground far above human device and human help. And when we meet together it is in union and sweet fellowship, as brethren of the

same family, having all the same, "*One Lord, one faith, one baptism,*" and the same one Rule of both faith and practice. We have some of us, in our connexion with Associations, known the unpleasant feelings occasioned by seeing our names go out in the Minutes, as component parts of those meetings by which Resolutions were past, and principles and actions sanctioned, which we conscientiously believed to be contrary to the spirit and order of the Gospel. On the other hand, we know the satisfaction felt in being enabled to take an honest, open stand, by manifesting publicly our determination to be in all things conformed to the *pattern showed in the mount*; to be recognized in religion, exclusively as the subjects of that *kingdom which is not of this world*, and to show our disapprobation of, and separation from those principles and practices, which the wisdom of the world has led men to superadd to the divinely revealed Truth and institution of our blessed Lord. We thus in experience upon this point have the advantage of those brethren of whom we now speak, and can from *experience*, conscientiously recommend this open *separating stand*, when taken with candor, and in the spirit of meekness and moderation, even with all its attendant exposure to sneers and scoffs, to revilings and persecutions, as being far preferable to that concealed, unstable course, by which men would shun reproach by disguising their true feelings and sentiments relative to the religious movement of the day.

Some of our brethren may be at a loss to know why a candid honest course such as we recommend should meet with such opposition from professors of religion, even though they differ from us in their views of the subject. The mystery we apprehend is this: In the stand we take we avow the principle, that as professed disciples of Christ, it is incumbent on us, in word, in heart and in life to acknowledge and to bow with reverence to the *distinct* as well as the united Sovereignty of the Great, mysterious Three in One who is the Almighty, and the only wise God and our Saviour; whereas the spirit of the world,

be it found in whom it may, is in direct hostility to this divine Sovereignty.

We will, Brethren, enlarge a little on this fundamental *point* in our *stand*.

**1<sup>st</sup>.** In reference to the **special sovereignty of God in the distinction of the Father:**

We *believe, & therefore we so speak*, that God exercises a special government over all His works, and over every event He permits to take place in His dominions; so that with Him there is no uncertainty, no fortuitousness, no action however sinful, which He has permitted to proceed from wicked men or devils, but what from the beginning was completely under the control of His will, and so governed as unerringly to accomplish the very object He designed, in His holy and glorious purpose, by its being permitted, either for the punishment of the wicked or for furthering the salvation of the righteous. We also believe and speak, that with God there is “*no variableness nor shadow of turning*,” no new knowledge of events, no new purpose or design, no change with Him of plan because of the intervention of unforeseen or uncontrolled events; in a word, that there is not “*a word in our tongue*,” nor an event that transpires, but what in eternity infinite wisdom so decided on it, as being for the greater good, as to mark its bounds, determine its results and prescribe the mode of its coming into existence, whether by the working of sin or by the operation of God, as the case may be; and the power and faithfulness of God was then pledged to the determining of it to its designed result. **This we call the predetermination**, or if you please, **the absolute predestination of all things**. You are not *unacquainted* Brethren, with the bitter invectives and reproaches, that the declaration of this doctrine calls forth from the fashionable religionists of the day. But we do rejoice, that we feel fully authorized by the revelation which God has made of Himself, unhesitatingly to believe and publish this glorious doctrine. For were it not so; in the first place; we could have no confidence in

the accomplishment of those prophecies which remain on record as yet not fulfilled, relative to the destruction of the *man of sin*, to the ultimate triumph of the Zion of God &c.- The future accomplishment of any extensive prophecy, necessarily involves in it, not only the existence of so many generations of men, but also the existence of so many individuals, the time and place of their being with their dispositions and actions, and the transpiring of so many circumstances connected with them, both sinful and otherwise, that unless the existence, the limits and bounds, and the destination of all these persons and events were unalterably decided on, some unpredetermined circumstance, and that perhaps trifling in itself might occur to change the whole course of events, and thus frustrate the eternal purpose of God as foretold in the prophecy.

In the second place; were we not inspired by the precious Volume of Divine Revelation with full confidence in the belief that **the predestination of God extends to and fixes all things**, we could not be certain that those promises which He has given for the comfort and support of His afflicted church and people might not be frustrated through the intervention of some wicked device of men or devils.

In the third place; convince us that events may take place in the world, not by the "*determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God*," but contrary to His mind and will, instead of feeling that composure of mind which results from being enabled to commit our way unto the Lord and to wait patiently for Him, we shall find in our experience ourselves in an awful dilemma under many of the trials we have to pass through, because we should not know whether they were events which had occurred contrary to the purpose and pleasure of God and over which He of course had no control, or whether they were such as God had the sovereign disposal of, and for deliverance from which, we might therefore with confidence look for Him. But Brethren through divine Mercy, we are not left in such straits; even in

those trials which we may know proceed from the malice of men or Satan: we may sing unto God according to Psalm xvii, 13,

“When men of spite against me join  
They are the sword, the hand is Thine.”

O that our hearts may more and more adore the loving kindness of the Lord, who has given us such ground of confidence in His government as being universal, unconditional, and infallible, determining with certainty the happy result of every event He permits to take place, and affording us the precious assurance if we be of those “*who are the called according to His purpose*,” that even the scoffs and reproaches of those who revile us for the belief of this precious doctrine, are among the “***All things which work together for our good***.”- Romans 8:28.

**2<sup>nd</sup>.** We pass to notice the **sovereignty of God in His distinctive existence as the Holy Spirit**. It is not so much to be wondered at, that those who would strip the Father of universal sovereignty in the government of the world, should aim to divest the Holy Spirit of that same sovereignty, which as God essentially belongs to Him. But let those who do so, account to God for it. If we have been made to differ from others in this particular, it comes from Him, the Spirit of Truth, who in the sovereign dispensations of His favors, as “*it seemeth good in His sight, hath revealed unto babes*” the knowledge of Himself as the Guide and Comforter of the redeemed whilst the “*wise and prudent*” are left ignorant of His operations. There are with the children of God seasons of peculiar despondency; Satan and the world assault on every hand, they feel more than ever the abominations of their hearts, the blindness of their minds, and their utter unworthiness of the least favour from God. In such seasons were we left ignorant of the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit in His gracious operations, left to view Him as that dependent Being, on the will and movements of men which



others represent Him to be, despair must ensure. But blessed be God for the testimony of His word and of our own experience, that so far from the Spirit's depending for His imparting of comfort, upon our first move toward Him, He, like the wind "*blowing where it listeth*," (John iii, 7) imparts to us, when we have wandered from Him, without our knowing from "*whither He goeth*," or whence the feeling comes, that preparation of heart necessary for receiving with joy His restoring light, by giving us to feel and to mourn over the baseness of our wanderings, "*helping our infirmities and making intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered*" (Romans viii, 26). Hence in the darkest hour, there is hope that our hearts will yet be softened, the darkness dispelled from our minds, and we be comforted. Again in reference to the agency of the Holy Spirit in the spread of the Gospel, we rejoice to believe that He has not to wait for parents to designate certain of their children for the ministry, nor for young men to dedicate themselves to this work before He can call them to it and impart the proper gifts. Neither has He to wait for colleges or schools to be got up and the persons to receive a training there, before the gifts He imparts will be efficacious or be brought into exercise. Hence were all the colleges in the land burned up, and all the gold and silver begged for their support sunk in the depths of the sea, we should still feel the assurance that the Lord would thrust into the field all the laborers He has use for, and, would impart to them just such qualifications as will be for their greatest usefulness in the work. How precious the consolation, to believe that an arm Sovereign, Gracious and Omnipotent sways all these things, dispensing the favours of God according to His will, in infinite wisdom and love; leaving no occasion, in the rolling on of the wheels of the Gospel chariot, for the people of God to seek help from the puny arm of men.

Once more in reference to the words taking effect, we do believe and rejoice to know that it is the sovereign and

independent province of the Holy Spirit to open the hearts of sinners to receive the word, and to give efficacy to the word of His grace. With what awful gloom must the accountability rest upon the minds of those preachers, who know their own insufficiency and short-comings, if they believed that the regeneration of sinners depended upon *their* faithfulness, industry or eloquence in preaching the word? Or what hope could such have of seeing the word profit them that heard, if it depended upon the individuals themselves to “open their hearts” to receive conviction of their own sinfulness? And Brethren, could you eat or sleep with composure, or attend to your regular business, if you believed that the salvation of the impenitent around you, depended upon *your* selecting them one by one, according to the order of the day, and praying fervently for the conversion of each until he was brought in? How precious and appropriate in this case, the text in Psalm cxxvii, 1,2? “*Except the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city the watchmen waketh but in vain. It is vain for you to rise up early to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows; for so He giveth His beloved sleep,*” or “*For surely He giveth, &c.*” Believing as we do in the sovereign and independent agency of the Holy Spirit in regenerating the individuals “*dead in trespasses and sins,*” and the certain effect of this *quickening* to draw out the soul in strong desires after God and the knowledge of His ways, and to open the heart to receive the word in the love of it with profit, whilst we look around upon the world lying in wickedness, and see them encompassed with so many unfavorable circumstances, we still feel the full assurance that **all the ransomed of the Lord will be effectually brought to the knowledge of the Truth as it is in Jesus.** But we can have no confidence in those “*conversions,*” which neither have nor acknowledge a God independent and sovereign for their “*Alpha*” and their “*Omega.*”

**3<sup>rd</sup>.** We now come to notice **the sovereignty of God as belonging to and exercised by Jesus as Mediator.**

The Divine sovereignty of Jesus as Mediator, permit us to remark at the onset, must stand or fall with the *independent and universal sovereignty of the Father and Holy Spirit*; for says Christ by the Prophet, “*Now the Lord God and His Spirit hath sent Me,*”- Isaiah xlviii, 16. If God had any competitor, to His absolute and sovereign disposal of *all events and things*, any other independent power, whether god, devil or sin, to contest the power and authority with Him; then He could not give to Jesus *all power in heaven and in earth*,” for He had it not to give! But if, as is the case, *all power* belongs to God, and sovereign and universal authority rests alone in the one Jehovah, then in delegating to Jesus as Mediator *all power* there is *nothing left that is not put under Him*, excepting Him who put all things under Him. Therefore He *must* and will “*reign till He hath put down **all** rule and **all** authority and power.*”- Hebrews ii, 8, and 1 Corinthians xv, 24, 28.

It is to us somewhat astonishing that men who have the Bible in their hands and who *professes* to be governed by its dictates; because Jesus once “*made Himself of no reputation and took upon Him the form of a servant &c,*” should still treat His authority as though He was nothing but a fellow mortal, and was not now “*seated at the right hand of the Majesty on high,*” yea, far less respect to His institutions, than is shown to the commands of many human potentates. Does this disrespect arise from any deficiency of glory in the ushering in of His kingdom into the world, any defect in the testimony given in His Divine authority? Certainly not. To be convinced of this, if we have eyes given us to see, we have but to open the Book and read.

Let us begin with Isaiah’s vision of the glorious majesty of Christ’s kingdom as handed down in prophecy. “*In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and His train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphim each one had six wings: with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did*

*fly. And one cried unto another and said: Holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory.*" Notice also the corroborating testimony of John, "*These things said Esaias when he saw His glory and spake of Him.*" Of whom was this spoken? Of that Jesus *on whom the Jews could not believe.*- See Isa. vi, 1,10; John xii, 39, 41. Turn again and read of the vision which Ezekiel had of *the glory of the Lord*, by the river of Chebar; read of the whirlwind and of the fire infolding itself, of the living creatures coming out of the midst thereof, sparkling like burnished brass, and who ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning, also of the wheel by the living creatures, being full of eyes, and having a ring whose height was dreadful, of the terrible crystal firmament over their heads, and of the sapphire throne above the firmament, and of the man upon the throne, as the appearance of fire and encircled as with a rainbow,- Ezekiel chapters i, x; then compare with it the corresponding illustration of this vision as found in Revelation chapters iv, v, from which it is evident it is a view which the Prophet had of the glory of the God-man Mediator and of the Gospel dispensation. After reading this, then say, if you have a mind sufficiently braced up with desperation to do it, that these displays of the glory of the exalted Jesus, were designed to embolden men to add to, to trifle with, to alter and to pervert the *instituted regulations* of His kingdom. But let us read further and notice the declarations of Scripture, direct to the point in view. "*Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him and gave Him a name which is above every name- that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth and that every tongue should confess that Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father,*"- Phil. ii, 9,11.

Let us contemplate for a moment the disciples of our Lord standing upon the *appointed mountain* in Galilee. What a reverential awe must have filled their breasts, whilst remembering the transfiguration of their Master on a former

occasion, and the voice from the *excellent glory*, saying, “*This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased, **hear ye Him,***” and having before them the ocular demonstration of His having been “*declared the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead*” and whilst He declared unto them the divine majesty with which He was clothed; saying, “*All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth,*” as He gave unto them their commission, “*to go and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to **observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;** and Lo I am with you &c.* Can you whilst contemplating the disciples as thus circumstanced, believe they were in a state of mind, to reason upon the fitness or unfitness of the ordinances thus established, to accomplish the object: designed, their suitableness to different times and places, or the propriety of changing or adding to them, or the order of observing them? No, there could have been but one sentiment, but one feeling possessed by their minds on the subject, and that was of an entire and reverential submission to the command as given, relying with holy confidence on the wisdom and power of Him who had instituted these ordinances, to accomplish by them the glorious results intended.

It is no wonder that we find during the whole ministry of these Apostles, a total absence of all Bible Societies, Sunday Schools, Tract Societies, Mission Societies, Theological Schools with all the multiplied machinery of this day for converting sinners & evangelizing the world, together with infant sprinkling, chrism, Mass, Convents, Nunneries, &c., the inventions of past ages. There was as much occasion for all these things in the Apostles days as now; but that holy reverence for the divine glory and majesty of their Lord, which inspired the Apostles’ breasts, would have deterred them from attempting any thing tending to derogate from His dignity, wisdom or faithfulness, by implying a want, a weakness or an

imperfection of any kind in the order and regulations of His kingdom; and their faith in His promised presence with them, precluded all necessity of any contrivances or device of theirs, to meet any emergency, or overcome any obstacle that might present itself to the eye of reason. Hence the unshaken confidence of the Apostles in the perfect suitableness of the Gospel ministry as instituted by the King of Zion, for the glorious object designed, although they knew that, then, as now, *“the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness.”* Says Paul: *“I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.”*

Brethren we will now turn your attention to the view which the Apostle takes of this subject and the conclusion he draws from it, as found in the 1<sup>st</sup> part of the 2d Chapter of Hebrews.

After giving a description of the glory of the Sonship of Christ and of His vast superiority in dignity over the angels, &c., he comes (Chapter ii, 1-3,) *“Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things we have heard lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast 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, &c. ?* Well ought we to weigh these expressions, before we depart from or add to the regulations laid down in the New Testament? If the Israelite was punished for a neglect of, or departure from any of the prescribed regulations of the Law, can it be expected that those who presume to alter and pervert the regulations of the New Testament will escape a punishment proportioned to the dignity of Him by whom the institution of His Church was established? Though the vengeance due to the preventers of the Gospel of our Lord and its institutions, seem to linger, it will certainly come at the appointed time in the complete destruction of every vestige of *the man of sin*. Moses’

shoes being of human contrivances for the protection of his feet, must *be put off, from off his feet*, (Exodus iii, 5,) when the Angel of the Lord appeared to him in the burning bush, because the “*place whereon thou standeth is holy ground.*” Presuming Brethren, to stand, as we do, upon Gospel ground, where the Lord Himself appears to us, in the antitype of that burning but unconsumed bush – the Gospel Church – ought not we to put off, from our Gospel *feet or religious walk*, every new plan and system in religion, as being of human contrivances for protecting men from the briars and thorns incidental to the Gospel path, and for making the walk more comfortable to the flesh; considering that the place whereon we stand is *holy ground*, having been sanctified by the presence of the Lord, going before, as the *Pattern and Leader of His people*? Rest assured that our walk should be with soft and cautious step and that if we have our feet shod it should be only with the “*preparation of the Gospel of peace.*” – Ephesians 6:15.

Though our pathway be rough and lead through the thorns of persecution, still we need not the help of human contrivance; we have an Arm Almighty, to lean upon, the “*balm of Gilead*” to heal our wounds, and before us in prospect, a glorious and assured triumph, and an immortal rest.

Brethren, could we but realize, at all times, the sure foundation which the doctrine of the absolute sovereignty of the Father, Word and Holy Ghost, reveals for our faith and hope to rest upon, we should feel that we had nothing to fear relative to ourselves or to the Church of Christ. How calmly could we then look upon the mighty efforts of puny man, to sink the Truth, overthrow the purposes of God, and establish their own dreams of religion. And with what patience should we then bear the reproaches they may do us the honor to heap upon us.

But may we not be left to suffer as *evil doers*. The Lord grant repentance to those who oppose the Truth, and us for the Truth’s sake; and grant that those of His children who have been lured by the glare of popularity, to a stand on the side of

opposition to the Truth and order of the Gospel, may see their error and come back to the pattern marked out in the New Testament. Brethren may the Lord grant you steadfastness and patience, faith and hope in exercise, and strength according to your day.

We remain your Brethren both in the afflictions and consolations of the Gospel.

[The Following is the first Minute showing the introduction of the Mission System in the churches in Central Mississippi. Other Baptist Associations in Mississippi had introduced the Mission System much earlier than the Mt. Pisgah. In fact, the Board of Foreign Missions had recommended Baptist churches to reconstitute themselves in to "Mission Societies," and combine these into State Conventions rather early. The Missionary Baptist State Convention had formed in 1820 with several associations reconstituting themselves into mission societies, and joining together in the State Convention.

However, there were large numbers of churches that did not so act, and several associations stood outside of the Mission System. Some of these in time became anti-missionary, objecting to *foreign* missions. Others objected to the whole innovation, and most of these, in time, will become "Primitive Baptists" associations. The following, Mount Pisgah, was one of the former. It did not enter the Mission System as set up by the State Baptist Convention, but developed a modified form of Missionary and benevolent association. It still remains in Mississippi, and Dr. N. L. Clarke – a "five point Calvinist", and member of Mt. Pisgah is the founder of Clarke College near Newton, Mississippi.

Many of the Associations in Mississippi have Articles of Faith. Those that entered the Mission System, in general, have articles very similar to that of the 1792 Georgia Baptist Association. The others utilize a form of Articles of Faith of the United Baptist Churches of Christ, which is rather brief. Of the copies of the Minutes of the Mount Pisgah Baptist



Association, none contain a published set of Articles of Faith, or Abstract of Principle. SCP]

MINUTES  
OF THE  
EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY  
OF THE  
MT. PISGAH BAPTIST ASSOCIATION  
HELD WITH  
LINE CREEK CHURCH, SCOTT COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI  
**On the 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> days of October, A. D. 1844**

**MINUTES**  
**OF THE**  
**MOUNT PISGAH BAPTIST ASSOCIATION**  
Line Creek Church

Scott County, Mississippi, Oct. 5, 1844.

The delegates from the different Churches composing the Mount Pisgah Baptist Association assembled this day, in their eighth annual meeting at Line Creek meeting house. A sermon, introductory, was delivered at the stand near the meeting house, to the delegates and congregation, by Elder James Merchant, from the 9<sup>th</sup> verse of the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of 2d Corinthians: *“For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be made rich.”*

On motion, Elder Cader Price was chosen Moderator *pro tem*; who, thereupon, opened the business of the Association by singing and prayer.

Letters from twenty-seven Churches were presented and read, the delegates names enrolled, and the statistics minuted. (See table of churches.)

The Association then proceeded to elect officers for the ensuing year, by ballot, which resulted in the election of John P. Martin, moderator, and John M. Chambers, clerk.

The Moderator, on taking the chair, made some appropriate remarks. The body being properly organized, the Powers of the Association and Rules of Decorum were read; visiting brethren were also invited to seats, by the Moderator.

A petitionary letter, for admission into this Union, was presented and read, from the First Baptist Church in Canton, Madison County; and, upon examination, being found orthodox in faith, were received into the fellowship of the Association.

Correspondence was received from the following sister Associations, their messengers invited to seats in this body:

Pearl River Association – Elders James Murray and Wyatt Hall, who presented a letter and minutes.

Union Association – Elder B. Whitfield and John W. Buie; no letter, a few minutes. Brother Whitfield made some statements in relation to the last session of the Association,

which were cordially received; who also announced the death of his colleague.

Choctaw Association- Elder B. L. Barnes; no letter or minutes. The other messengers of this body failed.

Leaf River Association – No correspondence.

Liberty Association – No correspondence. [Liberty Association is the Clarke County Baptist Association, affiliated with Mississippi Baptist Convention and Southern Baptists. The Mount Pisgah today is a “Missionary Baptist Association but not in the Mississippi Baptist Convention or Southern Baptist Convention. In 1832, the Liberty Baptist Association, convened at Buckatuna Baptist Church in Clarke County, declared non-fellowship with “Hardshells.” This is one of the earliest records we have seen using the word “Hardshell,” in reference to the anti-benevolent movement within Baptists’ churches.-SCP.]

*Resolved*, That this body discontinue correspondence with the Liberty and Leaf River Associations.

Appointments, to write letters to corresponding bodies, were made by the Moderator, and approved by the Association.

*To the Pearl River*- Elder James B. Gage, to write; and Elders William Denson and John P Martin, appointed messengers.

*To the Union*- Elder N. L. Clarke, to write; and Elders B. L. Barnes and Cader Price, messengers.

*To the Choctaw*- Elder B. L. Barnes, to write; and Elders N. L. Clarke and Shadrack Jones, messengers.

The following committees were appointed by the Moderator, to-wit:

*On Preaching* – Brethren James Merchant, chairman; Calvin Myers and Carman Myers.

*On arranging the order of the business of the Association* – Brethren William Denson, chairman; C. Price, B. L. Barnes, with the Moderator and Clerk.

*On Finance*- Brethren Gage, chairman; Clarke and Barrett.

Brother Eli Nichols, treasurer of the association, presented, through brother Taylor, his resignation as treasurer.

Thereupon, brother Thomas K. Green was appointed treasurer for the ensuing year.

The committee to arrange preaching, responded that brethren Murray, Barnes, Price and James, preach on Lord's Day, in the order of their names.

*Resolved*, That this Association organize, within her bounds, a **system of Domestic Itinerancy or Missions for the purpose of supplying her own constitution with the Gospel; and that a committee of seven be appointed to develop rules and regulations to govern the same.** Whereupon, the following brethren were appointed, to-wit – Shadrack Jones, chairman; Cader Price, B. L. Barnes, N. L. Clarke, J. Merchant, J. P. Martin and J. M. Chambers.

*Resolved*, That a committee of three be appointed to report upon the subject of **forming a Bible Society**, in the body of this Association; and, thereupon, the Moderator appointed brethren James B. Gage, chairman: James Murray and W. F. Barrett.

*Resolved*, That brother B. L. Barnes be requested to preach **a sermon on the subject of Missions**, on the Lord's Day, and that **a public collection be taken on that day, to aid in supplying the destitute portions of our Association with the Gospel.**

*Adjourned to Monday morning, 9 o'clock.* Prayer by bro. S. Jones.

## LORD'S DAY.

On this day, the brethren appointed to preach, performed the service, we trust to Divine acceptance, to a large and attentive congregation. Brother Murray founded his remarks on the 1<sup>st</sup> clause of the 30<sup>th</sup> verse of 31<sup>st</sup> chapter Jer.; "*but every one shall die for his own iniquity.*" Brother Barnes complied with

the request of the Association, and founded his remarks on these words: "*Go ye therefore and preach the Gospel to every creature.*" **After which, a collection was taken**, amounting to twenty dollars. Brother Price founded his remarks on the 1<sup>st</sup> Epistle of John, 5<sup>th</sup> chap., 1<sup>st</sup> verse. Brother Jones concluded the service by exhortation.

### **Monday, 9 o'clock, 7<sup>th</sup> October, 1844.**

The Association met pursuant to adjournment. Brother Wm. Denson led in prayer.

The committee, on arranging the order of business, reported; which was read, received and adopted.

Letters of correspondence, to three sister Associations, were presented, read, received and adopted.

Brother J. M. Chambers presented a Circular Letter, written on the constitution of a Church; which was read and adopted. (see Appendix A.)

Two of the committee, appointed at the last session of the Association, to examine into the condition of the Bethel Church, Scott County, made a report; which was read, received and adopted. (See Appendix B.)

Therefore, in order to carry into effect the object contemplated in said report, brethren W. F. Barrett and J. M. Chambers were appointed to visit the said Bethel Church.

The committee, to whom was referred the subject of organizing a Bible Society in the body of the Association, through their chairman, made a report, which was read, received and adopted. (See Appendix C.)

The committee on Finance, through their chairman, made a report, was read and adopted. (See Appendix D.)

The committee on Itinerancy, through their chairman, made a report, which was read and received; and **on motion to adopt, remarks were made by different brethren, several amendments made, and then adopted as amended.** (See Appendix E.)

Brother James B. Gage was requested to prepare the Circular Letter for our next Association.

Brother J. M. Chambers was appointed to preach the next Introductory Sermon, and brother A. Goss, be his alternate.

*Resolved*, That in view of the low state of health of elder A. Phillips, the Association suspend business for a time, and that prayer be made in his behalf; and, also, of other brethren detained from this Association by sickness.

Brother Clarke led in prayer.

*Resolved*, That the different *Union Meeting Districts* be revised – which was done – and that said revision be printed in these minutes. (See Appendix below.)

The Association then proceeded to arrange the Union Meetings, for the ensuing Associational year. In order to do which, more effectually recess was had of fifteen minutes:

[Note: Many large associations established Districts within the bounds of the associations. Oftentimes, which divisions occurred, the separation was according to this districts. In many cases during decline of associations, a single district remained to actually be “the association.”-SCP]

The *Union Meeting* of the First District, will be held on Friday before the fifth Lord’s Day in December, 1844, with the church at Jerusalem.

The *Union Meeting* of the Second District, will be held on Friday before the fifth Lord’s Day in March, 1845, with the church at Pinckney.

The *Union Meeting* of the Third District, will be held on Friday before the fifth Lord’s Day in June, 1845, with the church at Stein’s Creek.

The *Union Meeting* of the Fourth District, will be held on Friday before the fifth Lord's Day in August, 1845, with the church at Clear Creek.

*Resolved*, That the next session of this Association will be held with Bethel Church, in Newton County, commencing on Saturday before the first Lord's Day in October, 1845.

The request from Pleasant Hill Church, Newton County, asking of the body for advice, in the case of David Cook, senr., an excluded minister was considered; and after some deliberation, it was agreed that said church could pursue any course that she might deem proper and precede according to the order of the Gospel.

*Resolved*, **That this Association withdraw her fellowship from the following named churches, to-wit:- New Bethel, Edenburg; Pilgrim's Rest, Mount Pleasant and New Chappel, for having departed the compact of this Union.**

[Note: These churches protested the modern benevolent movement within the bounds of the Association, and accordingly withdrew. They drafted and issued a document of their "REASON AND APPEAL," which document is printed annually in the Minutes of the then newly established Bethany Baptist Association of Mississippi, which association yet convenes each October. [See REASONS AND APPEALS] printed next below.- SCP.]

In order to carry into effect the **object contemplated** [which was the design objected to by the opposition,] in the first article of the report of the committee on Itinerancy, the following named brethren were appointed by the Association, an "Executive Committee of Managers," to superintend that matter the ensuing Associational year:

*Of the 1<sup>st</sup>. Union Meeting District* – Isaac R. Bass, S. Jones and L.B. Bilbro.

*Of the 2<sup>d</sup>. Union Meeting District*- N. L. Clarke, J. Mallory and Jas. Thames.

*Of the 3<sup>d</sup>. Union Meeting District* – B. Aliston, Cader Price and William Purvis.

*Of the 4<sup>th</sup> Union Meeting District-* Jas. Merchant, Everet Lewis and W. Toler.

(The Moderator, Clerk and Treasurer of the Association are members of this Committee, by virtue of their office.)

After mature deliberation, on Motion, *Resolved*, That this Association send one minister to preach the Gospel, the ensuing Associational year, to the destitute in her bounds.

[Note: This is the origin of a permanent office in this and many other associations of what are termed "The Associational Missionary;" and in Mississippi Associations, his title is "The DOM;" or, "The Director of Missions." He is today the only permanent officer in mission-minded associations within this State and is the man whose favors it is to court, or not offend. He can be a loving caring man and/or a tyrant, according to his perception of the good of the association or his State's convention. Between associational meetings, his office runs the programs of the association. In general, he is a skilled professional parliamentarian.]

*Resolved*, That brother Alanson Goss be appointed to **ride as our Itinerant preacher**, agreeable to the last resolution; and that he be allowed the sum of one dollar and twenty-five cents per day, whilst actually engaged in the service of the Association; also, his expenses, in traveling to preach, if any should occur.

Brother Goss, after some reflection, informed the Association that he would endeavor to comply with the appointment that had been conferred upon him, to the best of his ability. According to request of several brethren, special prayer was offered, that the Great Head of the Church might own and bless the labors of bro. Goss, to the salvation of many precious souls.

A request was presented by brother J. M. Chambers, secretary of the Mount Pisgah Bible Society, in behalf of said society, asking the privilege to append to the Minutes of this association the Constitution of said society; stating also, that said society will pay the proportional part of the expenses in printing. Therefore,

*Resolved*, That said request be granted. (See Appendix G.)



*Resolved*, That the clerk superintend the printing and distribution of these Minutes, and receive fifteen dollars for his services.

*Resolved*, That the clerk be authorized to draw funds from the treasury, pay the postage on the Minutes, to the different churches of this Union. Brother J. M. Chambers presented and read a Circular Letter from brother J. M. Peck, corresponding secretary of the American Baptist Publication Society, in relation to the propriety and utility of this Association **forming within her body,\*** and raising a book fund, for the purpose of procuring standard religious books; who also accompanied the same with some remarks. After some consultation, it was considered impracticable at the present time.

[\* The churches of the "Old School" saw a threat in bringing society after society in an unending torrent from the world into the churches and their associations. It appeared to them, that anyone with a good idea to tap the resources of the churches and associations need only con the associations into organizing arms or branches "formed within her body," and thereafter have a continuous supply of monies. Almost all the opposing associations referred to these societies as "*the so-called benevolent institutions,*" or "*benevolent institutions so-called,*" or "*benevolent societies so-called.*" The present United Nations follows the same practice, by seating NGO's [non-government organizations) within her body; and the Mexican Revolution (1910) established such as her governing body, and the USSR followed their example in 1918; with Vietnam in 1949, etc. It works! -SCP].

*Resolved*, That the treasurer be authorized to destroy seven dollars and fifty cents of worthless bank notes, in his hands.

*Resolved*, That the best wishes of this Association be respectfully presented to this church and vicinity, for the hospitality manifested during the present Session.

*Resolved*, That we return thanks to **God for that peace and good feelings that has pervaded our body during this session.\***

Amount of funds sent by the Churches, for Associational purposes, is . . . . . \$90.00

Amount of funds sent by the Churches for Domestic Missions, is . . . . . \$42.00

The Moderator having announced that the business before the Association was finished: Therefore,

*Resolved*, That the Association do now adjourn, to meet at the Bethel Church, in Newton County, on Saturday before the first Lord's Day, October, a.d. 1845.

The Minutes were read, approved and signed, a hymn was sung, brother Jones led in prayer, and the Association adjourned.

John P. Martin, *Moderator*

John M. Chambers, *Clerk*.

[We have noticed throughout Baptists' association documents, in spite of strife, divisions, and commotions, the Associations always send out their report of their deliberations as "peaceful," "harmonious," *etc.* Below are proof to the contrary; yet the Mount Pisgah states they were "**peaceful and had good feelings to pervade!**" Sometimes truth is missing in the most surprising setting! – SCP].

## APPENDIX A,

### CIRCULAR LETTER

*The Ministers and Delegates of the Mount Pisgah Baptist Association to the Churches composing the same, say grace, mercy and truth abound with you.*

*Beloved Brethren:-* We would acknowledge the kind Providence of our Heavenly Father, in permitting us to assemble once more in an associate capacity, for the purpose of attending to the affairs of Christ's Kingdom.

And in addressing our Annual Circular to you, we shall invite your attention to the condition of the church; believing at the same time, that

there is no subject, which should more effectually claim our prayerful consideration.

It is a fact, conceded by all *true Christians*, that union and harmony was designed by the Great Head of the Church, to be observed by His followers and that Christ accordingly gave such directions to the church or kingdom when He established the same in the world. The prophecies, that were made previous to the advent of Jesus, declare to the same effect. One of them says, "*My undefiled is but one.*" Several other prophecies testify the same in essence. After our Savior had come and fulfilled the object of His mission [sic] He sent forth His Apostles to the world, [sic] established churches in different places, all of whom spoke to the same effect, and universally of the unity of the church. The Apostle Paul, in treating of this subject, says: "*There is but one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, and one baptism: one God and Father of us all.*" We conceive it entirely unnecessary to multiply quotations, upon this subject, whilst so much testimony is found recorded in the Scriptures.

In arranging the order of this spiritual Kingdom, founded in righteousness and holiness, there consequently arose, in the very existence and nature her constitution, laws (ordained by Christ) of an obligatory character. *First:* Of the duty that the church is under to God – *Secondly:* Of the duty that each member owes to another and to our fellowmen.

In regard to the duty that believers are under to God, He has required of them that they should love Him supremely above every other object, and they obey Him in all things with all their hearts. It is God's prerogative, as Creator, Preserver and Redeemer, to command, and man's pre-eminent duty to obey. Obedience becomes the disciples of Christ, and we are informed that by this medium, we are to be known. "*For by their works shall they know them:*" "*By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye love one another.*"- John 35<sup>th</sup> v; 13<sup>th</sup> chap.

In regard to the duty that is required of one disciple towards another, as toward our fellowman, we are taught, in the Scriptures, "*to love thy neighbor as ourselves;*" "*to pray for all men;*" "*to pray with and for each other;*" "*to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,*" and "*to cultivate brotherly love.*" One of the Apostles, in reasoning upon this subject, informs us, "*that we are all begotten by the same spirit,*" and that "*the eye cannot say to the foot, that there is no need of thee,*" but that all the members of the natural body are useful and that the body is not complete without all its members. He introduces this plain figure to illustrate to us

the close connection that exists between the different members of the church, as well as also, the love, union and harmony; that should characterize the whole body of Christ. Then, if each member be thus nearly related, should not this stimulate every true Christian to render obedience to all the divine command, whether relating to God or to our fellowman. The Apostles of our Lord Jesus, in executing their great commission, well understood all these matters – they endeavored to act universally upon these cardinal principles, not only towards each other, but also towards the different churches. Hence, in proof of this position, the great apostle to the Gentiles, had learned, that the brethren of the church at Corinth were somewhat divided; that some were for Paul, some for Apollos, some for Cephas, and some for Christ; He directed that such things should not be, “*now, I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no division among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together, in the same mind and in the same judgment.*”

Throughout the apostolic age, and even some time afterward, the churches continued to act upon the precepts of Christ. There were, however, some individuals during this period, who crept into the church to spy out their liberties that appertained to the same. Such were Hymeneas, Alexander, Philetas, Diotrephes and others. We, who live in this age, would do well to reflect upon the examples, that were made by the Apostles of such men, and the church of Christ, in this day, to act likewise under similar circumstances.

Through the zeal of the *Primitive Christians*, attended by the blessing of God upon their labors, (under the most unfavorable circumstances of an earthly character) the wheels of iron moved onward in their course, throughout the principal nations of the earth.

And the whole church of God, in our day, may learn an important lesson, by reference to the manner in which the *Primitive Christians* acted, in the discharge of the duty that they owed individually and collectively to God, to one another, and to their fellowman. The first step that was taken at Jerusalem, after the Gospel Church was organized, was in the consecration of all their earthly substance to the service of God, and to the advancement of His kingdom. The apostles and disciples of Christ, acting under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, well knew what things were required at their hands. The apostles, deacons, rich and poor saints, all shared alike, and lived upon the things thus consecrated, “*for they had all things common,*” and every man received as he had need.

From this fund, the apostles were enabled to go into heathen countries and proclaim the unsearchable riches of Christ. [**Note: This application is false:** this fund was for the distribution to the saints IN JERUSALEM only; and the apostles did not dip into the till. Only the church at Jerusalem was thus situated, and they all knew of the coming events the Lord had told them of, that Jerusalem would be destroyed; and of what value would this property then be to them? Few Baptists have ever thought communism was the order of the Gospel Church, for if it were, the Church of God at Corinth, and the churches of Christ in Galatia, as well as the seven churches of Asia would have been thus “set in this order,” and they were not!- SCP.] After the apostles had established churches amongst the heathen, as at Antioch, Corinth, Philippi, Colosse, Thessalonica, Rome [ **Note:** at which places there is no record that the apostles established anything!] and other places, we observe, as is recorded in the Scriptures, that the churches sent contributions to the mother church at Jerusalem [Yes, for the destitute suffering saints during the persecutions- SCP] Hence, the church at Jerusalem appears to have been the centre of operation, to all the different churches, both Jew and Gentile, for a length of time, even until the overthrow and dispersion of the Jewish nation, by the emperor Titus, about thirty-odd years after the Day of Pentecost.

Brethren, we would not have you to understand from us, that we desire the members of the church at this day, to give every thing they have into a general or common-stock fund, as did the church at Jerusalem, but would beseech you to take the example of the Apostolic Gentile Church, (as we ourselves are Gentiles) for your guide.

And, what was their course of action? Let us refer your minds to the first part of the 16<sup>th</sup> chapter 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians. The apostle Paul says, “*Now concerning the collection for **the saints**, as I have given, order to the churches at Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week (Lord’s Day) let every one of you, lay by in store, as God has prospered him, that there be no gathering when I come. And when I come whomsoever shall approve by your letters, then will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem.*” And again, we would further refer you to the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> verses of the 6<sup>th</sup> chapter, 2d Corinthians, where the same apostle is exhorting the same church to her duty in this matter, he says, “*Now therefore perform the doing of it; that as there was a readiness to will, so there may be a performance also out of that which ye have. For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not.*” We would also refer you to the reading of the 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> chapters Corinthians; also, the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter of Philippians, together with all the *New Testament Scriptures*. And from a

careful investigation of the same, we are well assured, that you will learn what things the Lord has required at your hands.

And again, we would further refer you especially to the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> verses, 8<sup>th</sup> chapter 2d Corinthians, wherein the apostle has set forth to you the fact of a certain approved minister, having been selected by the church jointly, to travel and preach the Gospel. Hence, he says – *“And we have sent with him (Titus) the brother whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches. And not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us, with this grace: which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord, and declaration of your ready mind.”*

We have now referred your minds to the conduct of the different Gentile churches. And from that it is evident, first, that they operated and acted under apostolic sanction, and that by regular rule. Therefore, the apostles says, *“as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye “* (Corinthians,) that they were to lay by their earthly things, upon the first day of the week, as God prospered them, that there should be no gathering when he came. [Note: This, and other associations did not follow. Instead, they preached a “Missionary Sermon” on the “first day of the week,” and took up a collection after the sermon. Luther Rice always insisted that it be done that way.-SCP] Thus the fact appears conclusive, that each member of the church was to consecrate something of his earthly substance every week {????-) to the service of God and the advancement of His Kingdom, as the Lord in His goodness should prosper them. [Here again, a misapplication of the Scriptures: the collection was for the poor saints in Jerusalem; nor was it for “every week” but prior to Paul’s coming to them- SCP.] That the churches of Galatia had done likewise. Second, that there was a certain minister whose praise was in the Gospel throughout all the churches; who was also chosen by the churches to travel and preach the gospel. [Again, there is no hint that this man “preached the gospel.” He was to conduct the gift to Jerusalem.- SCP].

Beloved brethren, we profess to be a part of the church of Jesus Christ and above we have called your attention to the manner in which the Gentile churches operated, in raising contributions and sending out ministers to preach the gospel. How have we been acting? Where has been our zeal? Where has been our liberality? Where has been our regular rule of operation? Where is our minister chosen jointly by the churches to travel and preach the gospel? [Note: in most Baptist churches, it is called a “*presbytery*.”- SCP]. We would entreat you to seriously examine this subject, and contrast the conduct and action of the church in our day, with that of the apostolic churches. If we pretend to be the followers of Christ and His apostles, let us take the whole Scriptures for our guide, and imitate in our

church capacity, the action of the primitive church; that the nearer we approach to that rule and example, the more we **may confidently claim the blessings of Christ upon ourselves and the human race**. Therefore, let us have a regular rule of operation, not oppressive or coercive in its character, but in full accordance with apostolic example – of a willing ready mind, not grudgingly – as God prospers us, so let us do.

By reference to the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, in the apostolic age, we have abundant testimony that the action, which we have referred to before, was crowned and blessed by the Great Head of the Church. When at the same time, if we take into consideration, the situation and condition of the world at that time – the attitude which the different nations of the world occupied in direct opposition to the welfare of the church – that the kings, governors and rulers of the nations, arose up almost in mass, to oppose the heavenly principles which the church was propagating – that to become a Christian was contrary to the decrees of the Rulers, and that it very frequently resulted in imprisonment, stripes, dungeons, confiscation of property, and even death in its most ignominious form. Circumstances now, with us in this part of the globe, are entirely different. We are protected in every thing that we could possibly desire as Christians.

How are we acting in relation to the duty that we are under to God, to one another, and to our fellowman? How are we acting, in proportion to the blessings and privileges that we enjoy? Let our schisms, discords, divisions, luke-warmness, barrenness, and almost perfect indifference to the cause of religion, answer the questions.

God has promised to bless His people in the discharge of the duties, that He has required at their hands; [conditional time blessing??] and, on the contrary, He has declared, in effect, that they should receive His frown, and be beaten with many stripes. Therefore, brethren, by the help of God, let us all arise, as one man, to a thorough and active obedience, in all things, and so fulfill the law of Christ.

In reviewing the past history of the church, down to the present time, we see – as is authenticated by different Ecclesiastical writers, in sundry periods through which the church has passed – that great divisions commenced in the church about the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries. That during this period, and for sometime afterward, error after error was introduced into the church, through designing men, until true piety and holiness had almost left the church; that the traditions of men was absolutely regarded by the church as being almost, if not equal, to the scriptures of truth; that the true church, in the meantime, separated

herself from the main body of professing Christians, protesting against the usurpation and traditions of men. The woman (church) fled into the wilderness, according to the predictions of the scriptures, assumed different names, such as: Paulicians, Lollards, Picards, Cathari, Vaudios, Albigenses, Waldenses, Anabaptists, &c, &c., and during the long period of near one thousand years, labored under persecutions of the severe character. Divisions continued rising both in Asia and Europe, until the first part of the sixteenth century, when the Reformation commenced in the centre of Europe; which has continued to make great progress, even to the present day, and thereby has prevented in a measure, that rigid persecution, which had been enforced, by a relentless arm, throughout the dark ages – as they are so called.

Let us now examine the present state of the church of Christ, divisions, schisms and discord still abound; and consequently, we conceive that the *true spiritual church* of Jesus Christ is severed into a multitude of sects. Such a state of things should not exist – for Christ is not the author of confusion- and is in direct opposition to the express word of God.

Brethren, in reference to the fact last expressed, we are candidly of the opinion, that the *true spiritual church* of Jesus Christ is still, in a great degree in the wilderness; and that she is scattered abroad, in the different divisions and bodies of professing Christians; that many persons, who are attached to different denominations, will be saved; and, on the contrary, we are apprehensive many will be lost. Therefore, we conclude, that under view of the present state of affairs in the church, that it becomes all true Christians, of whatsoever name, to take the whole scriptures, invariably, as the man of their counsel, and as the only infallible rule of faith **and practice**. To cultivate a spirit of Christian love for one another; to drop what ever may be found, either in their faith or their practice, that does not correspond with the scriptures, and let the scriptures in all things, have the pre-eminence.

Upon a retrospective view of the scriptures, we anticipate a day (and that fast approaching) when **all of God's people will see eye to eye, and speak one and the same thing: when denominational names will be forgotten, when the walls of partition and standards of faith, that have been erected by men, will fall prostrate to the earth, and every true Christian will serve God in spirit and in truth.**

Then, brethren, let us cultivate a spirit of Christian kindness to all the disciples of Christ, and pray that God's will may be done on earth as it is in heaven.

All of which is respectfully submitted to your prayerful consideration.



John M. Chambers.

[We have left out the other Committee Appendixes for brevity. -SCP.]

## **MISSISSIPPI BAPTISTS' REASONS AND APPEALS 1844**

[In 1844, some of the churches composing the Mount Pisgah Baptist Association (above) in central Mississippi withdrew from that fellowship and formed the **Bethany Association**. [See above Minutes of the 1844 Session of the Mount Pisgah Baptist Association, page 177.] Both these associations still exist today. Some of the churches in the Mount Pisgah have united into a Southern Baptist affiliated association, while the Mount Pisgah remains a "missionary" association outside of the Mississippi Baptist State Convention. Those churches that withdrew from the Mount Pisgah and formed the Bethany Baptist Association were: New Bethel, Edinburg, Pilgrim's Rest, Mount Pleasant and New Chappel. *Sharon* Church in District 1, *Ebenezer* Church in District 2, and *Macedonia* in District 4, followed latter. The ***Reasons and Appeals of 1844*** is a fair example selected to show the stated reasons for these churches protest against the Modern Missionary Movement. The reader may note, that the next following Address of the White River Association in Indiana shows that in both North and South, on the frontiers, large numbers of churches ***did not approve of the innovations sweeping the nation in that decade*** and evident in the 1844 Session of the Mount Pisgah's Minutes above.]

### **REASON AND APPEAL**

"When in view of passing events, conscience points out the necessity of breaking asunder the bonds of union which have hitherto bound together those who profess to be of the same

sentiments, and to be governed by the same laws and rules, it becomes those who dissent or separate themselves from others to set forth their reasons for separation.

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

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

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

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

contingency, which is in direct violation of God's salvation, as revealed in His written and infallible Word, which He has given for ***the rule of our faith and practice***. (See Tenth Annual Report of Baptist Home Mission Society, April 26, 1842, page 18.)

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

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

**Minutes** of the Bethany Association of the

Old School faith and orthodox Order  
October, **1844**

### **CONCLUSION TO THE *FIRST CONTEST*: 1814-1845**

The documents we have exhibited demonstrate clearly several things: (1) the Benevolent Institutions that multiplied so rapidly after 1814 were (a) new to the American Baptists previous to that date; (b) and, hitherto Baptists were evangelical as itinerate ministers long before the rise of mission societies among them. This is indisputably proven by historical documentation. (2) The continual multiplying of Baptist churches and associations which rejected the instrumentality of benevolent and missionary societies demonstrate that such instruments were not necessary to the propagation of the Gospel of the grace of God. (3) Relative to the antiquity of, and Biblical foundation of Gospel expansion, the Old School and/or Particular Baptists hold the higher ground; the benevolent and mission system is proven to be a novelty of the Nineteenth Century.

To return to our Introductory questions, we note that this *dynamic force* introduced into the stable and peaceful expansion of Baptists churches in America was rapid, phrenzy, humanistic, and sentimental; but there were forces in America that made it possible to be ignited into such a blaze of activity.

- (1) The novelty of a democratic/republican government was refreshingly new to Americans, and they were very conscious that this was a new and exciting experience in self-governing. Following the adoption of the Federal Constitutions, the former colonies wrote constitutions to replace their charters; town and villages had to have meetings to write constitutions, wagon trains westward first drew up constitutions, and new settlements wrote constitutions. Each local church of every American denomination took up the writing of constitutions, articles of faith, and rules for decorum. Never in the history of the world had any people ever become so carried away at

drafting constitutions, by-laws, *etc.* We are speaking of hundreds of thousands in a brief period of time!

- (2) By 1820, the Industrial Age burst upon the American scene. Samuel Slater is well-known as the “Father of the American Factory System,” as President Andrew Jackson styled him. Few people know that he was the “Father of the Sunday School Movement” in America as well; that he established the first Sunday School in Elder David Benedict’s First Baptist Church of Pawtucket, R.I. in 1820 and did it catch on fire! Also immediately, every denomination wanted Sunday Schools, and many established “Sunday School Unions” to collect money for that end.

In America, the purpose-driven life-style was to find a novel way to make money! Capitalism was in vogue, and charlatans were ready at hand! If you had a good idea, a catchy theme, a humanistic appeal, you have a steady income.

- (3) By 1814, the success of benevolent societies spawned as great an outbreak of creating “societies” as “white man’s fever” in an Indian camp! If you can name it, someone invested it, and if anyone invented it, some one contributed to it. These societies followed in the wake of constitutional conventions, and religious establishing documents. Americans wanted to get out of the log cabin and do something! And in the void of other approved entertainment, sewing circles, barn-raising, hog-killing, social services were appealing.
- (4) The novelty of the new divinity was attraction, for it is in the nature of man to want something “new.” The doctrine held by the General Baptists was not in any sense “new.” It dated several years prior to John Spilsbury and his “Particular Baptist Church in England in 1633. John Smyth had established the General Baptist Church in England as early as 1609. Nothing novel about that doctrine.

But, Andrew Fuller pulled one out of a fourteenth century Catholic theology: “The atonement of Christ was *sufficient for all mankind; but efficient for the elect only.*” An admitted

contradiction of terms, but new! One could be a “Calvinist” and “an Arminian” at the same time! His “Calvinism” would delight in the atonement of Christ being for the elect only; but his “Arminianism” could be satisfied in viewing God as giving an *honest offer* of salvation to the reprobate. If the poor reprobate was too negligent to accept it, then God was fully just in sending the fool to hell. The novelty of the New Divinity was exciting, and thus, combined with the other forces at work in the new nation, nominal religion became a *dynamic* to destroy traditional religion altogether. In fact, yet today, if one wishes to turn someone away from any religious group, all he needs to do is accuse them of being “traditionalists.”

We hope you enjoy the above marked trail through the American Frontier experience, and observe the making of modern American religion. It may be interesting to know, that the *Sectarian Old Divinity, or Particular Baptists* still exist, as “the church in the wilderness,” hid from the glaring eyes of prejudice. It is sectarian in the sense we have presented it. It is predestinarian, believe fully that God is GOD Almighty.

### **DOCUMENTS AND COMMENTS ON THE SECOND GREAT BAPTIST CONTEST: 1845-1854.**

By 1845, the schism among Baptists in America over benevolent societies and missions was nearing completion. As someone once said: “In any division, never are all the sheep on one side and all the goats on the other.” So it was in this case.

The Old School party believed, basically, that Christ had already redeemed, ransomed, reconciled and saved all of His elect by His sacrificial work during His first advent; and the Gospel was the *glad tiding of this finished work*; or His salvation was an accomplished deed; that in this time world, the application of that salvation was principally the regenerative work of the Holy Spirit’s begetting the redeemed to spiritual birth by the implantation of spirit life and immortality; and, the conversion of these redeemed and regenerated elect

was by the spiritual hearing of the Gospel proclaimed by God called, qualified and sent ministers of Christ.

However, in the *first schism*, all of those who believed that Christ's work was to provide *means* and *instrumentality* to God called ministers to save the elect did not join in with the former group. Many of them still believed in means and instrumentalities in the salvation of the elect, but did not approve of the benevolent and mission *auxiliaries* attached to their churches. Hence a third position existed between the two major positions of the first separation. Some of these *means and measures* brethren were in the fellowship of the Old School Baptists, while large numbers remained outside of the two major groups of Baptists. Those within the ranks of the Old School were unable to conceive the doctrinal sentiments of the Old School divinity, and the fellowship was so precarious that a *second schism* was in the wing waiting to be triggered by some event. The second schism was preceded by a division in Indiana and Ohio over the "**Means vs. Anti-means**" issue in the Blue River Regular Baptist Association and its correspondents.

\*\*\*\* put here

The next impetus came in the bounds of the Licking Particular Baptist Association of Kentucky over the doctrinal position of the spiritual birth of God's children. Thomas P. Dudley, their moderator, presented his views on the "Christian Warfare," which position was the same as held by the Old School Baptists. In Virginia, Elder Samuel Trott also published an article supporting the same position: that no part of the Adamic man was the object of a spiritual birth; that the flesh could only produce after like kind – the flesh; and the Spirit could only produce after like kind – the spirit.

As a result of the articulation of this Truth, two ministers within the Licking Particular Baptists withdrew, with their churches: Elder G. M. Thompson, the son of Elder Wilson Thompson, and Elder William Conrad, pastor of Dry Ridge Particular Baptist Church near Williamstown, Kentucky. Particular grievous was Elder Thompson, who traveled throughout the states stirring up strife everywhere he could get an audience. This general dissatisfaction caused a restlessness that easily grew within the fellowship of Old School Baptists as many embraced fallacious reports.

The Second Contest erupted when an elder within the Ketockton Baptist Association in Virginia (Elder John Clark) accused the editor of the SIGNS of the Times and moderator of the Warwick Baptist Association of New-York and Elder Samuel Trott of the Virginia Corresponding Meeting of being "heretics," and "Arians." He cited the Circular Letter of the Warwick Baptist Association of 1852 as his source relative to the heresy and Arianism. [It was with several months of searching before we located that Circular, and we will present it unabridged at the end of his document below, to let the reader decide for himself if there is any

Arianism in it or not. SCP] The following Document is the principle source of the Second Contest. We point out that Elder Clark NEVER attended the Warwick Baptist Association while in session, and had only hearsay for his slanderous accusations about that session in 1852. In his accusations, he took parts of sentences out of context repeatedly; insisted upon his twists even when they denied his fallacious statements; claimed he had no animosity to any when the bitterness is overwhelmingly to the contrary; and the statements too horrendous to have ever expected reconciliation with his former affiliates. All that he really proved in his charges, is that he never did understand the doctrine of those with whom he had been connected; for clarity of their doctrine would have caused him to embrace, rather than reject, the doctrine of Truth. His maliciousness is self-evident throughout the following unabridged booklet. The evident feignness is hypocritical in the least, and serves as a “flag” of warning to any reader not to be caught off-guard. Clark quotes statements of one or more individuals, and then attaches them to his “heretics,” as if they agreed with everything published in their periodicals, and said in their pulpits. He apparently was unacquainted with their practice of long-standing that Circular Letters were written by a large committee, given a first public reading, and only if there were no objections, were they printed in their Minutes; if however, an objection was raised, the Circular was returned to the committee, revised, and given a “second public reading” before the whole assembled Association, and if no objections, ordered printed in the Minute. Merely because Elder Beebe, or Trott, or Leachman, etc., drafted the Circular does not mean that the writer was the sole author of it. Rather, it was published by “the Association” in the aggregate. Sadly, when the Warwick denied they ever wrote the sentiments charged against them, Clark insisted they did; in spite of the published Circular which proved him wrong. As you read the document, keep this in mind. We will follow it with Elder Trott’s Reply, and the 1852 Circular of the Warwick Association.

## **EXPOSURE OF HERESIES PROPAGATED BY SOME “OLD SCHOOL BAPTISTS.”**

**By**

Elder John Clark

### INTRODUCTION

*To the Christian Reader:*



The following work was not written to gratify any personal pique, for the author cherishes no animosity against any, but for the defense of the Gospel of Christ, and, (if the will of God be so;) for the deliverance of any of the Lord's Spiritual Israel who may be entangled in the anti-christian web of those who propagate the errors herein exposed, and are under their yoke of bondage, so that they may not be partaker of their sins, and ultimately receive of their plagues.

The author is not insensible to the natural feelings which arise under the repeated accusations which have been preferred against him and his brethren, of being false accusers, and of slanderously reporting of them that they have published doctrines which they affirm they never held; but he desires that God may keep him from their influences, and that he may be enabled, by the grace of God and, in the fear of the Lord, to bear a faithful testimony to the truth of God,- THE TRUTH AS IT IS IN JESUS ,- and to set down nothing against them, as diverse from that truth only what they have openly avowed, and published to the world as their sentiments.

To this no Christian, or reasonable man, can take any exception, as it is giving them credit for the undisguised expressions [Note: taken out of contexts-SCP] of their views; and the desire is, above all else, that the cause of Christ [as Clark sees it-SCP] may be promoted, and that God, in all things may be glorified.

If these results are accomplished, the author will be amply compensated for the unpleasant labor, which a sense of duty to Christ and his church, devolved upon him.

## CHAPTER FIRST

*To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ; grace be with you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.*

In the prosecution of the work indicated in the title page, and in the introduction, we deem it proper, as preliminary to

that end, to frame the *bill of indictment against them*, and then proceed to the proof.

We have charged them with propagating sentiments in relation to the Son of God, which are substantially those **held by Arius and his followers**; and also with unscriptural and heretical views concerning the Church of God, and the salvation of sinners.

**[Online Free Dictionary: “Arianism:** *Christian heresy that declared that Christ **is not truly divine but a created being**. According to the Alexandrian presbyter Arius (4<sup>th</sup> century), God alone is immutable and self-existent, and the **Son is not God but a creature with a beginning**. The (Roman Catholic) Council of Nicaea (AD 325) condemned Arius and declared the Son to be “of one substance with the Father.” Arianism had numerous defenders for the next 50 years but eventually collapsed when the Christian emperors of Rome Gratian and Theodosius assumed power. The First Council of Constantinople (381) approved the Nicene Creed and proscribed Arianism. The heresy continued among the Germanic tribes through the 7<sup>th</sup> century, and similar beliefs are held in the present day by the Jehovah’s Witnesses and by some adherents of Unitarianism.”***]**

This is the definition given by the Online Free Dictionary of Arianism. The Reader may compare what the Old School Baptists believe, and believed in 1852, with this definition, rather than John Clark’s homespun definition. The Council of Constantinople embraced the Catholic (and Protestant) view of a *Tri-personal Trinity held by Athanasius*; which view was enforced by the sword of the State in bloody persecution; which in itself makes the *Tri-personal Trinitarian* view highly suspect to Old School Baptists. But no one after reading only a few articles written by Beebe and/or Trott can deny that they were both

**Trinitarians!** Ignorance is not a justifiable excuse for slander or libel. – SCP]

First – That the Son of God, *as such*, the Life and Head of the Church, is a creature; that he is inferior to the Father, as the Father made him, or created him first of all his works, and created all other things by him as Solomon made the temple by Hiram. That there are three natures or existences in Christ, and that the mediatorial existence is a creation. [Note: Clark elsewhere objects to Beebe and Old School Baptists' doctrine of *Eternal* Vital Union of Christ and His body, the Church. How there can be an **eternal** vital union without the eternality of the Son, he is not intelligent enough to tackle! It seems it the contradiction never crossed his mind! - SCP.]

Second – That the sacrifice of Christ, as the son of Mary, as “*the man Christ Jesus*,” could avail no more than the sacrifice of Mary herself, as she was not capable of producing a nature any better than her own, and hence if Christ's *human* nature, or body, was a sacrifice for sin, Mary's body would have answered as well. [The statement is out of context – he ignores Beebe's, and all other Christian's view, that the Son of Mary was the incarnation of the Son of God; and if this was not so, then Mary could have been as much a sacrifice as a natural son, naturally conceived. SCP]

Third – That the Son of God, is not equal to and one with the Father, as there is a priority of existence with the Father.

[Note: Beebe and his close associates often quoted the Lord's statement to Philip, “*Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me Philip? he that hath seem Me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me?*” And “*I and the Father are one*,” and these same objectors were calling them names for so saying! “Consistency, Thou are a pearl!”- SCP]

Fourth – That Christ, the Head and Life of the Church and Mediator, was neither human nor divine, but a created existence.

Fifth – That when Christ, the Son of God and Head of the Church, was put to death, all the members were dead – there was not a living saint during the time he lay in the tomb.

Sixth – That sinners are not regenerated, or quickened by the Holy Ghost, but be a created, quickening spirit; and that there is no change in man in soul, body or spirit, in regeneration.

Seventh – That the Church was created in and simultaneous with Christ in eternity, which relationship of Christ and the Church is illustrated by the creation of Adam and his seed in him and that, consequently, the Church of Christ is not composed or made up of Adam's sinful posterity, for Christ no more came to earth after his seed than Adam went to heaven after his. And that Christ will not come the second time to this earth.

[**Note:** Having heard this charge repeated many times, I took aside the *Editorials of Gilbert Beebe*, and copied every article in those seven volumes published, in which he not only denied the charge, but wrote articles proving the second coming of Christ and judgment in the last day. The result: I printed a book an inch thick! And I found only one article which anyone could construe that Beebe did not believe in the second coming of Christ, and in it, he did not say so! It is sad that human nature is so corrupt, that the best of men would rather believe a lie once told, than the truth thundered a thousand fold! - SCP]

## **HYPER-CALVINISM DOES NOT MAKE GOD**

### **THE AUTHOR OF SIN**

A most common charge leveled against Hyper-calvinists is that they "make God the Author of Sin." We would be less than truthful if we said that no Hyper-calvinist did so; but the number of those that do are so small that perhaps none of our readers have ever met such. In general, however, the charge is absolutely false. In fact, the Hyper-calvinists' concept of God's sovereignty demands that man must be accountable to his Maker. The false charge is found in the twisted concept of Neo-calvinists, Arminians, and Pelagians. They, when they hear of God's decree being inclusive of all things and events,

immediately think that if this is so, then such a view would automatically affirm that since sin is in the world, that God would be the author of it. They use this natural logic to deny God's sovereignty altogether. So the charge is based upon their own concept, rather than upon Hyper-calvinists' views.

There are two interrelated topics associated with this subject. The first, that "Man is a free moral agent and responsible for his own behavior" is one of them. That topic has been discussed separately. The second is this one, that "God is the author of sin." These are so intertwined that both have been in the world together since the day that Adam fell into ruin. The first is clearly the doctrine of the devil. He said to Eve, "Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." (Gen. 3:5.) That is the first doctrine ever recorded on earth. It insinuates that they would break free from their need for accountability to God, and would become free moral agents, knowing what was best for themselves. They would, therefore, become "responsible creatures." That doctrine Eve readily embraced, and her offspring

to this day is still deceived by the big lie; for Satan "was a liar from the beginning."

The second doctrine was that "God is the Author of sin."

Immediately upon his fall, the unrepentant Adam. boldly faced his Maker, and declared in His very face: "The woman *whom THOU GA VEST TO BE WITH ME*, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat." (Gen.3:12.) It was saying in effect: "You made me do it!" Or, "If you had not given me that woman over there, I would not have sinned. So it is your fault, God!" He accused God.of indirectly making him to commit sin. Neither of these doctrines are associated with the Hyper-calvinists.

As important as this subject is, one should know that the Holy.Scripture is not silent on the origin of sins. But far too many men do exactly what they are commanded not to do, Le,: "*do not ERR, my beloved brethren.* " (James 1:16.) This command is in the very context that gives Divine light on this subject. It reads: "*Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, NEITHER TEMPTETH HE ANY MAN: But ~ J1l11J1 is tempted, when HE IS DRA JiVN AWAY OF HIS OJiVN LUST, AND ENTICED. (entrapped) Then when LUST HATH CONCEIVED, it BRINGETH FORTH SIN: and sin, when it is FINISHED, BRINGETH FORTH DEATH.*" (James 1:13-15.) Now kind reader, take the above and go back to Eden and apply it to Mother Eve. It is a perfect commentary on how sin entered into the world and death by sin. It is also exactly how each of us have sinned every time we have ever done so!

This writer is the author of every sin he has ever committed.

Not once has he ever felt that he was compelled to sin against his will by the eternal God. He is so certain the above is correct that he

often says: "We did *all the sinning*; and God did *all the saving*."

We have not denied hereby that "God has decreed all things whatsoever come to pass," and with our forefathers fully agree that He did so in such a way that He "is not the Author of sin," nor "does He have fellowship with any therein." He agrees with Dr. Gordon Clark, a former friend in Indianapolis, that "I am the author of this book, but God decreed that I write it, and determined every word I have written. But He is not the Author of it in the least. I am." It is "In Him we live and move and have our 'being.'" It is "By Him all things consist." We and all things else "are upheld by the Word of His power." But He is a free Being, and a moral Being. But we are not! He is responsible for the works of His hand, and no one else is, or can be. And all His creatures are accountable to Him now and ever have been and ever will be. Satan did NOT tell the truth! Though the whole world embrace with Mother Eve the desire to be a free moral agent, not one of them will God give up and exempt from His dominion and rule. God is still GOD!

*"Do not ERR~ my beloved brethren. ", (James 1: 16.)*



## HYPER-CALVINISM AND INFANT SALVATION

Proof-reading this book, the author noticed that the subject of Infant Salvation was not covered. It is here inserted in the Appendix.

The Holy Scripture does not address men as infants.

It deals with them as rational creatures. However, there are some things which can be said definitely about salvation as it is applied to infants. First, the scripture does declare that at least some infants dying in infancy are children of God. In Matthew 2: 16, *"Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceedingly wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and ill. all the. COast thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet saying, In Rama was there a voice heard,*

*lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not. ??*

When we compare this text with its original quotation in Jeremiah 31: 15, we find the following promise of life to

100% of these mutilated infants. *"Thus saith the Lord; A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation, and bitter weeping; Rahel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not Thus saith the Lord; Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord,' and tlr;: shall come again from the. 1a.D.d Df the.*

enemy. And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, thJJ.t thy children shall come againlfl theirQW1l

border." That,. dear reader, is infant salvation. At least in this case, *all* of these slain infants were elected and redeemed children of God and will be in the resurrection of the just.

There is recorded another child, still in his mother's womb, which leaped for joy, she being filled with the Holy Ghost. *"And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth*

*. heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost:" "Tor, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb Jar jJ:J;:. " (Luke 1:41.)*

The greatest point Hyper-Calvinists make of this issue is this: Since there is but one way of salvation, what ever that way is, it must save infants and adults alike. Only Hyper-Calvinists believe that Christ laid down His

life and then and there saved *all His elect people* by His sacrificial life and death. They believe that if one of these elect and redeemed children die in its mother's womb, it is of no consequence relative to its salvation. However, all Fullerites teach that one has to "make a decision", "give his heart to Jesus," "believe, repent, and/or be baptized," etc. in order to be saved. None of these things are infants capable of doing. So, if any teach that "infants go to hell not a span long", it is the Evangelicals! It certain is not the view of Hyper-Calvinists.

#### AMERICAN FULLERITE BAPTISTS FIRST DOWN-GRADE

David Benedict was quite an innovator. He was the first Missionary (Fullerite) historian in America. He wrote his first history of the Baptist Denomination and published it in 1813, the same year the Fullerites called for a Convention in Philadelphia to form a national mission board. He was the pastor of the Baptist Church at Pawtucket, R.I. where Samuel Slater (Whom Andrew Jackson called the "Father of American Industry") established the first Sunday School in America to keep his child-laborer from destroying his factory on Sundays. David Benedict was the first to form a choir in a Baptist Church; and the first to install a musical instrument in Baptists' worship ..

In 1848, he published his second History of the Baptists, in the which he distorted everything Baptists had ever done to make it appear "missionary." The complaint was so loud and severe, he promised to publish another book correcting his 1848 edition.

In 1855, he published his *Fifty Years Among Baptists*, covering the period from 1805 to 1855. Below is his discussion of the doctrinal modification by the Fullerite, or Missionary faction.

## David Benedict's History- 1855

NEW PRINCIPLES IN TRINITY: DOCTRINAL CREED OF TRINITY:  
BAPTISTS.-THE FULLER SYSTEM COMES INTO  
Vogue.-ON THE CHURCHES WHICH FOLLOWED.

FORTY YEARS AGO large bodies of our people were in a state of ferment and agitation, in consequence of some modifications of their old Calvinistic creed, as displayed in the writings of the late .Andrew Fuller, of Kettering, England. This famous man maintained that the atonement of Christ was general in its nature, but particular in its application, in opposition to our old divines, who held that Christ died for the elect only. He also made a distinction between the natural and moral inability of men.

Dr. John Gill, of London, was, in his day, one of the most distinguished divines among the English Baptists, and as he was a noted advocate for the old system of limited atonement, the terms " Gillites " and " Fullerites " were often applied to the parties in this discussion. Those who espoused the views of Mr. Fuller were denominated Arminians by the Gillite men, while they, in their turn, styled their opponents Hyper-Calvinists. Both parties claimed to be orthodox and evangelical. and differed but little on any other points except those which have been named. On Election, the Trinity, etc., they all agreed.

In the age when this discussion arose among the .American Baptists, as none of the modern subjects of agitation had been introduced into their churches, the speculative opinions thus briefly described, for a number of years were the occasion of unhappy debates

and contentious in many locations. .

Our old Baptist divines, especially those of British

descent, were generally strong Calvinists as to their doctrinal creed, and but few of them felt at liberty to call upon sinners in plain terms to repent and believe the gospel, on account of their inability to do so without divine assistance. They could preach the gospel before the unconverted, but rousing appeals to their consciences on the subject of their conversion did not constitute a part of their public addresses.

In expatiating on the strong points of their orthodox faith they sometimes ran Calvinism up to seed, and were accused by their opponents of Antinomian tendencies. In that age it was customary for many of our ministers to dwell much on the decrees and purposes of God, to dive deep, in their way, into the plans of Jehovah in eternity, and to bring to light, as they supposed, the hidden treasures of the gospel, which they, in an especial manner, were set to defend. In doing this they discoursed with as much connection.",

dence as if they were certain that they were not wise above what is written, but had given a true report of the secrets of the skies.

This extreme of orthodoxy has been followed by laxity and indifference.

The Philadelphia Confession of Faith, published in that city, in 1742, was the standard of most of the oldest Baptist churches in this country, especially in the middle and southern States. This Confession was copied mostly from one published by the Baptists in London, in 1689, and this again agreed in its doctrinal sentiments with the Westminster Confession.

The old Baptists in New England, although, for the most part, they held with their brethren elsewhere the doctrines of Depravity, Election, Divine Sovereignty, Final Perseverance, etc., yet they were not in the habit of enforcing them so strongly as were those in New York, Philadelphia, and further South.

That class of Baptists which arose out of the *Newlight* stir in New England, which, as I have before stated, sent colonies into all the southern States, and in the second generation, over the mountains into the West, were Calvinists of a still milder type. Indeed, their orthodoxy was often called in question by the old school party in Virginia, the Carolinas and Kentucky. These zealous reformers, in their public performances dwelt mostl von the subjects of Ohristian experience and practical religion, while the strait Calvinists labored much to explain and defend the strong points of their system.

The kind of preaching now much in vogue, at the period and among the people here had in view, would have been considered the quintessence of Arminianism, mere milk and water, instead of the strong meat of the gospel. Then, and with our orthodox Baptists, a sermon would have been accounted altogether defective which did not touch upon Election, Total Depravity, Final Perseverance, etc.

" Total depravity," said a good sister to her minister, "must be as true as the Bible. So I read and so I feel. But your new-fangled way of preaching goes to undermine it, and to make people much better than they are, and also to make them think they can do something for themselves. I know that I am totally depraved. I tell you, Elder --, this kind of preaching will never do. You take away my depravity and



you take away my all." **II** "O, no, my good sister," said the elder, **II** "I hope not i I think better of you than that; I think there would be something left still." With a heal'ty laugh on both sides the discussion closed.

In my early day the Associated Baptists were all professedly Calvinistic in their doctrinal sentiments. The term, however, was not agreeable to many, as they did not' subscribe to all the sentiments of John Calvin, but they submitted to it for distinction sake, and in contradistinction from those whose views were less orthodox on Predestination, etc. Beside the people of our Qlrder in the assoeciations, the Freewill and Seventh Day Baptists were then coming into notice, and they, with but few exceptions among the Sabbatarians, were decidedly opposed to some of the distinguishing doctrines of the Calvinistic creed. The Methodists, too, who often came in contact with the Baptists, and with whom I frequently associated in my early travels, were extremely severe in their feelings and comments on the orthodox faith, so far as Election, etc., were concerned. Some of their circuit riders of that age conducted as if they considered themselves predestinated to preach against Predestination. And some of our illiterate elders were about a match for them against the Wesleyan creed. And the cry of fatalism on the one hand, and of salvation by works on the other, was continually sounded by the parties.

I was often not a little surprised at the bitterness

of feeling which, in many cases, was displayed by the anti-Calvinists against the doctrine of Election, and of their readiness, in season and out of season, to assail it by reason and ridicule. Many could hardly be civil towards their opponents, who were silent all the while.

I well remember, to me, at the time, a very striking instance of this kind. A minister of another class of Baptists, but who had rendered me essential service in my historical pursuits, amused a large company in a public house, in which we happened to be at the time, and which company, also, happened to be of his own way of thinking, by repeating, evidently for my special benefit, some doggerel verses, the chorus of which was,

"Then fill up the glass, and count him an ass Who preaches up predestination."

But for many years past the asperity of feeling above described has been a good deal mollified, so that the differing men can meet together without taunting each other with their offensive creeds. On this subject I lately remarked to a Freewill Baptist minister, **II** Your side has been coming up, and ours has been going down, till the chasm between the two parties is by no means so great as formerly."

On the introduction of the Fuller system a very important change followed on the part of many of our ministers in their mode of addressing their unconverted hearers on the subjects of repentance and believing the gospel. Hitherto they would use circumlocution in their discourses on these matters, instead of direct appeals and exhortations to those whose conversion they desired. They would describe the lost condition of sinners and point out the duty of all men to repent and believe the gospel j

but beyond th~ their views

of consistency with the doctrine which ascribes the whole work of salvation to God alone, would not permit them to go. As a general thing, the discourses of that age were very dull and monotonous, and were greatly deficient in the pathos and fervor of that class of evangelical preachers who were not trammelled by such rigid rules in their theological creed. Church members then received much more attention from our public speakers, than those who stood without its pale. At times men of more than ordinary zeal would overleap the bounds of their restricted rules, but with studied caution in their use of terms j and I well remember with what ingenuity and dexterity this class of preachers would so manage their addresses to their unconverted hearers, as to discourse to them much in the style of reputed Arminians, and yet retain the substance of the stereotyped phraseology of their orthodox creed.

The Fuller system, which makes it consistent for all the heralds of the gospel to call upon men everywhere to repent, was well received by one class of our ministers, but not by the staunch defenders of the old theory of limited atonement. According to their views, all for whom Christ suffered and died would certainly be effectually called and saved. These **conflicting** opinions caused altercations of considerable severity for a time among the Baptists, who had hitherto been all united on the orthodox side. The Gillites maintained that the expositions of Fuller were

unsound, and would subvert the genuine gospel faith. If, said they, the atonement of Christ is general in its nature it must be so in its effects, as none of his sufferings will be in vain <sup>i</sup> and the doctrine of universal salvation will inevitably follow this dangerous creed. While the dispute went on, it was somewhat difficult for the Fullerites to pass muster, on the score of orthodoxy, with the old school party, or be on terms of entire cordiality with them. But so greatly has the standard of orthodoxy been lowered, even among those who are reputed orthodox, from former times, and so little attention do most of our church members of the present day pay to the doctrines which are advanced by their ministers, that this whole story will probably be new to most of them, except of the older class.

A few persons may now be found in most of our

congregations, who are so well informed, and who pay so much attention to the preaching they hear, that they are able to detect any unsoundness in the doctrines advanced; but this is not so generally the case with the great mass of our members as it was in a former age. At present, the modes and manners, and the eloquence of their ministers, engage more of the attention of our people, than their doctrinal expositions <sup>i</sup> and most of all, they look for those attractions which are pleasing to young people, and which will collect large assemblies, and enable them to compete with their neighbors in numbers and style. With this end in view, nothing that will sound harsh or unpleasant to very sensitive ears must come from the preachers; the old-fashioned doctrines of Predestination, Total Depravity, Divine Sovereignty, etc., if referred to at all, must be by way of circumlocution and impli-

cation. "Ever since he was settled with us," said one, " our minister has preached up election, and still never mentions it openly."

As a general thing, now, our people hear so little, in common conversation, in their every-day intercourse with each other, on doctrinal subjects, before, at the time, and after they become church members, and are so much accustomed to vague and indefinite references to them, that, different from former years, they have but little desire to hear them discussed. Indeed, many of them would sit very uneasy under discourses in which the primordial principles of the orthodox Baptist faith should be presented in the style of our sound old preachers of bygone years. As for themselves, some of them might bear this tolerably well, but they would be thinking of others and of the adverse remarks of outside hearers, and weaker members.

In the business of ordinations, how little scrutiny is made of candidates as to their belief in the strong points of our system, compared with ages past.

While our creed, like the thirty-nine Articles, remains the same, this moderating still goes OD, in theological training, in ministerial functions, and in public sentiment, and to what point of moderation we shall in time descend, it is difficult to foretell.

John Leland, although a Calvinist, was not one of the straitest class. Two grains of Arminianism, with

## David Benedict's History-<sup>18</sup>SS

three of Calvinism, he thought, would make a tolerably good compound.

An English statesman once said of his own church

,

ICWe have a Calvinistic creed, a Roman ritual, and

an Arminian clergy." This in time may apply to us, minus the ritual, in some cases.

Simultaneous to the doctrinal modification by the Fullerites, the proselytizing zeal accompanying this decay produced the *Modern Missionary Movement*. Below is David Benedict's discussion of the origin and. rise of the Missionary Baptists in North America.

JUDSON AND RICE BECOME BAPTISTS.-THB TRIENNIAL CONVENTION. -TEE MISSIONARY UNION.-RICE BECOMES AN AGENT.-Tu CoLUMBIAII' COLLEGE DIFFICULTIES ABOUT MISSIONARY MONEY.DEATH OJ' RICE.

ABOUT FORTY YEARS AGO the dormant energies of our denomination in this country began to be aroused in favor of some systematic efforts in favor of sending the gospel to the heathen. The cause of . this movement may be traced to the conversion of Adoniram Judson and Luther Rice to the sentiments

of the Baptists, while on their way to India. as missionaries, under the patronage of the Pedobaptists. This unexpected change in these two young men, as a matter of course, made no small stir in the Pedobaptist ranks, as might be naturally expected. Mr. Judson at the time of his baptism, in Calcutta, preached a sermon on the baptismal controversy, which was republished and widely circulated in this country. This became the subject of much comment among: his former associates, and laid the foundation of an extended controversy between the advocates and the opponents of the Baptist cause. A copy of the original Calcutta edition of this discourse is among my documents of this kind.

Mr. Rice soon returned to America to solicit pecuniary aid for assisting in establishing a Baptist mission in the East, and to select suitable persons for an undertaking to which the attention of the American Baptists was now directed in a sudden and unexpect;

ed manner.

Up to this time, this large and increasing body seemed to have had no idea that they had either the call or the ability to send out missionaries to foreign lands. The maximum of their doings thus far in the enterprise in which they have since so largely engaged at home and abroad, consisted in the support of a few feeble societies for the promotion of domestic missions.



It ought here to be mentioned, however, that amidst the general apathy and neglect of our people thus referred to, something had been done in a few locations in the early part of the foreign mission enterprise, in the following manner: the reports which frequently came to this country of the successful operations of our British brethren in India, under Carey, Marshman, Ward, and others, and particularly of their wonderful progress in the translating department, had excited a generous sympathy among a portion of our brethren in Boston, Salem, Philadelphia, and a few other places, which led them to make liberal collections for that age, in favor of their distant denominational friends. But still neither this portion of our community, nor any other, then contemplated the undertaking of sending out missionaries on their own account to the East, the West, or in any other direction. Nor as yet was it considered possible to adopt any feasible plan for commencing missionary operations amongst the numerous tribes of the American Indians. Dr. Carey, then in India, wrote to Dr. Baldwin, of Boston, on the subject, at an early period, and inquired why the American Baptists did not direct their attention towards the bringing of the aborigines of our western wilds under the influence of civilization and Christianity. Dr. Baldwin, in reply to his distant friend, named, among other things, the want of a written language among the red men, as one of the greatest impediments in the way of all attempts in their favor, and little did he, or any of his coworkers in the cause of benevolence, expect that in so short a time after this correspondence, this then immovable difficulty would be surmounted. Very remote, in

their view, was the period when the untamed and wandering red men of our distant and uncultivated forests would advance to the positions which they now occupy as an enlightened and Christian people.

*Mr. Rice becomes a successful Agent in the Foreign Mission Cause.*

Soon after his arrival from India, this zealous and laborious young man commenced the most successful agency, the circumstances under which he commenced it being considered, that was ever performed among the American Baptists. His native eloquence, his unusual affability of manners, and his untiring assiduity, made him at once a distinguished favorite with his new denominational friends, and secured for him unusual attention and respect from many who were, out of the pale of the Baptist communion. Young people, old people, and all people hailed his approach to their firesides and the pulpits of their churches, as a young apostle in the foreign mission cause, which was always on his lips, not only in his public addresses, but in public houses, in public conveyances, in the family circle, and wherever he traveled or sojourned. Being a man of a robust frame and of vigorous powers, both of body and mind, he was enabled to perform an unusual amount of labor in his new vocation. At that time, railroads were unknown, steamboats were comparatively few, and stagecoaches were costly and uncomfortable; and as his

business led him in all directions through the country, to be present at associations and public gatherings of all kinds, where he could tell his story and

make known his wants, he generally traveled in his own one-horse light conveyance, and he often astonished his brethren with the rapidity of his movements and the suddenness of his transitions from one place to another.

Mr. Rice, in his public performances, dwelt but little on sectarian matters, but the deplorable condition of the perishing heathen was his principal theme; and although he had resided but a short time in a heathen land, yet he had seen and heard enough while there, to impart a vividness to his descriptions of the darkness, wretchedness and cruelty of that land, far superior to those which are made from mere reports. It was expected at first, by himself and friends, that he would return to India after he had made arrangements for a regular and adequate support of a mission there, under the patronage of the Baptists in this country. This plan was always uppermost in all his public addresses and private conversations, and added greatly to their interest among the people wherever he went. He soon traversed the whole of the United States, and formed an acquaintance of great extent, and at an early day, by means of printed circulars, which were scattered broadcast over the land, and letters of his own writing, this industrious man opened a correspondence with all who had shown any sympathy for the cause in which he

was engaged. Soon societies of various kinds arose in all directions, for the promotion of this new undertaking, and thus a foundation was laid for the formation of

*The Old Baptist Triennial Convention.*

This body was organized in Philadelphia, in May, 1814, and under its direction aU Baptist affairs pertaining to foreign missions, for about thirty years, were managed, when the name of the body was ex.changed for that of the

*Amenean Baptist Missionary Union.*

This change was made in New York, in May, 1845.

This was a time of great trial and difficulty with the old Convention, which was seriously threatened with dissolution, on account of questions which for a number of years had been agitated in a very unpleasant manner. The perplexing discrepancies which arose between the northern and southern wings, of a body which was spread over aU the States, was the principal cause of the troubles here alluded to.

The Missionary Union came into being in a very amicable manner at first, but soon objections, from some quarters, were started against some parts of its constitution, as not conformable to Baptist principles and usages, and these objections still exist in the minds of many j and added to these, complaints from various quarters against the management of the men

at the missionary rooms have become loud and widespread, and now, March, 1857, very serious difficulties are apprehended at the approaching anniversary of this important Baptist institution.

*Mr. Rice connected other Objects with his Missionary Agency.*

These were two periodicals, and a college at Washington for Baptist use, with reference, in the first place, I believe, to fitting men for the missionary service.

In this place it may be proper to give a brief account of these three undertakings of Mr. Rice.

*The Latter Day Luminary* was in pamphlet form, and was continued six years. It was under the patronage of the General Convention, as the organ of that body, and for the first two years of its existence it was published in Philadelphia, when it was removed to Washington. Staughton, Allison, H. G. Jones and Rice constituted its publishing committee at first, but Rice was the life and soul of the concern. He calculated, when he undertook the work, that it would require about one fourth of his time.

*The Ooluhian Star* was in the newspaper form, and it is still alive in Georgia, under the name of the Christian Index. It was transferred to this State many years since by the late Dr. J. Mercer, the liberal and untiring helper of the foreign mission cause. While this paper was published in Washington, the place of its origin, among its editors in succession were J. D. Knowles, late of Newton, and Dr. Stow,

now of Boston.

But the *Columbian College*, now in a flourishing condition at Washington, D. C., was the greatest labor of Mr. Rice's life, and one which for many years involved him and his friends in much embarrassment and perplexity. "This institution," says Mr. Taylor in his memoir of its founder, "was never completed according to its original plan. All the buildings, in the language of the superintending committee, were intended to range with the cardinal points of the compass, and to exhibit the best possible view from every direction, combining economy, utility, convenience and magnificence."

Thus we see that Mr. Rice in a few years after he commenced his agency for the foreign cause, had his hands full of appendages to his main employment. Admitted that his projects were praiseworthy and promising, but many complained that they absorbed too large an amount of the funds which had been contributed for mission purposes only. As pecuniary embarrassments came on, much of the attention of the managers of one wing of the Convention was engaged in examining and setting right the alleged stretches of power in the diversion of funds by the other. Every new project had its advocates and opponents, and in some of the meetings, which I attended, it was about as much as those who had no cause, or other interests at stake could do, to calm the troubled waters, in which they found themselves most disagree-

bly involved. A number of the meetings now had in view were scenes of trial rather than enjoyment. The sacredness of missionary funds was always most strenuously insisted on by men on one side; and this doctrine was fully conceded by those on the other; and if at any time the treasury had been drawn upon for secondary objects, the explanation was, that it was in loans from the main department, in aid of those of minor importance, which were soon to be repaid by the commanding eloquence and herculean efforts of a hitherto most successful solicitor, in favor of his various undertakings, all of which promised well for the missionary cause and the Baptist community at large. New periodicals might be useful in their way, if they would support themselves, which was the doctrine of their friends; and a new institution for literary and theological training was greatly needed for a vast range of our country and its being located at the capital of the nation was considered a most auspicious arrangement, and all parts of Mr. Rice's complicated

machinery seemed to work well and to general satisfaction, until an empty treasury and unsatisfied demands upon it to an alarming amount stared the whole denomination in the face. Most of these demands were for the collegiate institution, and poor Rice, on account of his position and agency, had to bear the blame of his coadjutors and confederates. "It can not be concealed," says Taylor in his memoir, "that others who had the management of the institution greatly erred in allowing him to sustain so much of the burden incident to the erection of the buildings, the support of the faculty, and the payment of the debts. And at the time when a system of retrenchment had just been commenced; when vigorous efforts were about to be made by him especially to raise funds in the South for the entire extinguishment of the debt, such was the strong feeling against

him that he was called home and detained there for series of months in the investigation of his accounts.”

As the result of these investigations, which were made by a committee appointed for the purpose, a long report was drawn up, which is among my historical documents, which exhibits a heavy balance against Mr. Rice.

To this report is appended a certificate that it was unanimously accepted. Signed, B. S., *Secretary*.

\*\*\*\*\*

It should appear obvious that any religion which is as recent doctrinally, practically, and organizationally as the evangelical mission movement **cannot** be New Testament, or Apostolic Christianity. Its origin does not pre-date Mr. Andrew Fuller’s initiative in 1782. It is that many centuries and years too late to be the New Testament church in doctrine, practice and order.

***Finis***

### **HEIRSHIP AND ETERNAL, VITAL UNION.**

In reading an article in the Gospel Messenger for October, 1879, written by our esteemed brother, Elder T.J. Bazemore, one of the editors and publishers of that periodical, we are led to believe that he has misapprehended the views which are entertained by us, and by those generally who hold the doctrine of the eternal, vital union of Christ and the church, and also of



the true basis of the heirship of the sons of God. We do not design to inaugurate a controversy or unpleasant discussion; for widely as we may seem to disagree in our understanding of these subjects, we feel confident that a calm, dispassionate investigation will obviate our seeming discrepance of views.

If we had not on former occasions fully expressed our convictions on these two cardinal points of the doctrine of Christ, we would feel more hesitancy in entering upon a discussion of the subjects involved; but having frequently presented our views, which we presume brother Bazemore is aware of, we feel called upon to either retract or establish what we have stated, or at least to labor for a more full and clear understanding of each other. Let nothing however that we may write be construed so as to indicate any unfriendly feeling towards the publishers of the Messenger, both of whom we highly esteem and respect.

First. The heirship of the sons of God we have held to be exclusively founded upon their sonship in Christ Jesus, as made known to them by their spiritual birth, in which they receive, not the adoption, but the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry Abba, Father, [Rom.8:15;] for in verse 23 of the same chapter we are told that "we who have received the first fruits of the spirit groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." And in Eph.1:13,14, "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, [or were born again,] ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory. ¶ In this first chapter to the Ephesians the apostle speaks of our being predestinated to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself; and in the tenth verse he says, "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in

one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are in earth, even in him; in whom also we have received an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will; that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ. In whom ye also trusted &c." The reception of this spirit, by the new birth, is the earnest or certain assurance that the purchased possession [the people redeemed from the family of mankind, which is all the purchased possession of Christ that we have any knowledge of] shall be ultimately disrobed of mortality, and clothed with immortality, after they shall have been changed and fashioned like the glorious body of their risen and glorified Lord. For this adoption we are now waiting and groaning, but for it we are now sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.

If then we have rightly understood the Scriptures on the relationship of sons, that sonship develops a vital relationship to a parent in whom our spiritual vitality existed before it was made manifest by a birth. A birth is not the origin of life, either spiritual or natural; it is the bringing forth a life which existed in the parent before the birth. If life did not exist antecedently to the birth, it never could exist subsequently to the birth.

The apostle says, "For as many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God." And, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." The heirship is thus made to depend on the vital relationship of children; and as the heirship is a joint heirship with Christ, so also must the relationship on which the heirship is predicated be a joint relationship with Christ, for he himself is the life of all who are joint heirs with him. For the life of all the saints is hid with Christ in God. "When Christ who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col.1:3,4. If then

our spiritual life, sonship, and joint heirship is so identified with Christ, as the only begotten of the Father, that our life is hid with Christ in God, it is based on what we call ETERNAL, vital union, and not on the birth either of our flesh or spirit, which develops, but does not originate, the relationship and consequent joint heirship.

But brother Bazemore says, "There is a doctrine called eternal, vital union, which is in our view a strange and unscriptural doctrine;" and asks, "How can there be a vital union between the living and the dead? How can there be a vital union between that which is, and that which is not? In a state of nature the sinner is dead in sin, without eternal life, without spiritual vitality or motion; and how, then, can there be any actual, vital union between him and Christ while he is in that state of death and sin? Christ is life, a quickening Spirit; and how can there be any vital union between him and the sinner, while the sinner is dead in sin?"

We have never understood our brethren who hold and content for the scriptural doctrine of eternal, vital union, to hold that this sacred union of life was given to the children of God in the earthly Adam, nor that it eternally united the two natures of which the children of God are partakers while in the flesh, for neither before, nor after the new birth do we find any union, harmony or agreement between the flesh and the spirit, of which two natures they are partakers; for these are contrary the one to the other, causing a continual warfare in them until their final change shall come, or until death shall be swallowed up of life until God shall change our vile body, and fashion it like the glorious body of our risen Lord.

We shall not be likely to differ on the simple signification of the words - eternal, vital union. That which had its origin in God the Father, and was given to the body and members of

Christ before the world began, must be eternal; and that which the inspired word of God calls eternal life, must be vital; and that which joins in indissoluble relationship the Head and body of the church of God, we call union. Can this be what our esteemed brother calls philosophy and vain deceit, and of which he warns the saints to beware? Is this doctrine taught in the Bible, and by the spirit of divine inspiration, or is it only after the traditions of men, and after the rudiments of the world? Let us see. The apostle Paul says, "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life. " [Not through the earthly Adam, but] "through Jesus Christ our Lord." When did God give us this eternal life? Rom.6:23. If eternal life is a spiritual blessing, it was given us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, [not in Adam,] according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world.

Eph.1:3,4. The most solemnly attested record which the Bible contains, which is borne in heaven by the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, and witnessed in earth by the Spirit, the water and the blood, which all agree in one, is summed up by the inspired apostle John in these emphatic words, "And this is the record, that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." I John 5:7,8,11,12,20.

We learn then that the life which was given to the saints as members of the body of Christ, was with and proceeded from God the Father, and was given to them in Christ by the Father, and is, in the unrestricted meaning of the word, absolutely eternal life; not only everlasting, but eternal, without beginning or ending, not created, but begotten of God the Father, and

given to all the sons of God in Christ before the foundation of the world, and they all, in their spiritual relation to God in Christ, were sanctified or set apart by God the Father, preserved in Christ Jesus, and ultimately called by him; "Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling; not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." II Tim.1:9.

Some of our brethren have admitted that all this was true in purpose, but was not actually done in eternity, before the world began; but when God has said that all the spiritual blessings in heavenly places were given us in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world, it seems to us presumptuous to deny that this unspeakable gift involved an act or action of God. We hold that the gift was actually given us in Christ, and safely secured to us in him, just exactly as God has stated it in the words of inspired truth. Christ himself is the life - the eternal life of all his members, and God did actually love them with an everlasting love, and therefore with loving-kindness does he draw them; and no man can come unto Christ except the Father which sent him draw them.

Now let us inquire whether this eternal life or vitality which God has given us in Christ Jesus actually unites Christ, the Head, and his church, the body of Christ; and whether it is an eternal, or only a time union. We do not ask whether this vital union was manifested and experienced by any of us here in the flesh before the world began, for that is not claimed by any. Our life which was given us in the earthly Adam is not that life which is begotten of God, and given us in Christ Jesus before the world began; for if it was, then all mankind would be the children and heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ. But all the children of God are children and heirs of God by virtue of being begotten of the eternal Father, and recipients of eternal

life in Christ Jesus from everlasting. And of them, as the children of God in Christ, it is said, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he [Christ] also himself likewise took part of the same." - Heb.2:14. It was not their partaking of flesh and blood that constituted them children of God, any more than it was Christ's "also likewise [or in like manner] partaking of the same" that constituted him the Son of God. He was as perfectly the Son of God before he partook of flesh and blood, as he was after his assumption of flesh and blood; but his being made flesh, made of a woman, and made under the law, made him manifest as the Son of man, of the seed of David, after the flesh. As his Sonship of the Father was in no sense changed by his partaking of flesh and blood, so neither was the spiritual relationship of his members changed by their partaking of flesh and blood. But his coming in the flesh of which his children are partakers, brought him under the law which they in their earthly nature had transgressed. And thus we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, taking on him, not the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham; not to make him the Son of God, for that he had always been; but as his children in their earthly nature had sinned in the flesh, he took their nature on him, that he might suffer in the flesh, and under the law which they had transgressed, and redeem them unto God by the sacrifice of himself, and rise again from the dead for their justification.

Now, we ask brother Bazemore, if the law of God could have recognized in the blessed Jesus the right to redeem them from its stern, but just demands, if they were not his property before they sinned and fell in the earthly Adam?

Our Lord Jesus Christ, as the Son of God and life of his body, the church, is called the "only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth ... and of his fulness have all we received,

and grace for grace." John 1:14,16. In this chapter John testifies concerning him; "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men." And the same inspired apostle, as we have already shown, in his first epistle, first and fifth chapters, declares that this life which was and is in him, was with the Father, and was manifested, and that God hath given us [his children] eternal life, and this life which God hath given us is in his Son. Let this testimony be admitted, and we think no God-fearing man will deny that this eternal life is eternal vitality, or that this life is a unit. It is one undivided and indivisible life in its nature, because it is hid with Christ in God; and although it extends from the Head of the church to all the members, permeating the entire mystical body of Christ, it cannot be separated from him. For he that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life; consequently it is the unity of Christ the Head with the church as his body, and the fulness of him that filleth all in all. This union of life in Christ Jesus is what we understand our brethren to mean by the words - eternal, vital union; and if it is not so taught in the Scriptures, and in the experience of the saints, we confess that we have read our Bible for almost four score years to but little, if any profit. If it be only philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, then we have long rested upon a fallacious hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began.

We are not contending for an eternal, or even a time union, between the flesh and spirit of the children of God and heirs of glory, for such a union has not yet taken place in us. We find no harmony between our flesh and that spirit which we hope and trust we received when we were born of the Spirit; but

from that hour when Christ, who is our life, was revealed in us, we have felt most painfully and continuously the warring of our flesh against the spirit, and a law in our members warring against the law of our mind, bringing us into captivity to the law of sin which is in our members.

But can this doctrine of vital union of the Head and body of the church, which we have so sweetly enjoyed so many years, now that we are about to layoff our mortal tabernacle, be but a delusive phantom? Have we in melody of heart, in joyful and melting strains, joined with the poet in the delightful theme of his songs;

"Twixt Jesus and the chosen race,  
Subsists a bond of sovereign grace,  
That hell, with its infernal train,  
Can ne'er dissolve or rend in twain."

"In union with the Lamb;  
From condemnation free,  
The saints from everlasting were,  
And shall forever be.

In cov'nant from of old,  
The sons of God they were;  
The feeblest lamb in Jesus' fold,  
Was bless'd in Jesus there.



Its bonds shall never break,  
 Tho' earth's old columns bow;  
 The strong, the tempted, and the weak,  
 Are one in Jesus now."

And this oneness of vital relationship is in Jesus, not in the earthly nature, which has yet to be changed, and fashioned like Christ's glorious body. Adam, we are told, [Rom.s: 14,] is the figure of him that was to come. And if there had not been a union of natural life extending to his posterity, his transgression could not have involved them in the condemnation and death that by his offense passed upon all of his undeveloped race. "Therefore, as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; EVEN SO by the righteousness of One, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous." As in Adam, who is the figure of Christ, God made of one blood [or life] all the nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation, &c., [Acts 22:26,] so that eternal life which is begotten and born of God, which was given to the heirs of God in Christ their Head, is one life - a unit, and not a plurality of lives. It was given to them in the Son of God, as the same eternal life which was with the Father, and is the same in all the members of the body of Christ. It is in Christ, and it is Christ. He says, "I am the resurrection and the life." John 11:25. "I am the way, the truth, and the life." John 14:6. "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Gal.2:20. "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." Phil.1:21. "Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye

are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Co1.3:2-4.

These scriptures, if we rightly understand them, prove two important propositions; first, that our life which is in Christ Jesus is eternal life, or vitality; and secondly, that this eternal life, being in Christ as the Son of God, and with him hid in God from everlasting, is a unit of life; and Christ, who is our life, although living in all his members, is not divided. As there is but one Head of the church, so there is but one body belonging to that one Head. "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph-4:4-6. The apostle speaks of those who would beguile the saints, by "not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." Co1.2:19.

Our natural life, on which death has passed by reason of sin, was given us in that Adam which is of the earth, earthy; but our spiritual eternal life was given to us and securely preserved for us in that Adam which is the Lord from heaven. Our natural or earthly life began when man became a living soul; but our life which is in Christ Jesus is as ancient as eternity, for it is eternal life, and has its origin in God. Therefore that life which is born of the flesh is born of corruptible seed, and is mortal. But they who are the subjects of regeneration and the new birth, are born of God, of an incorruptible seed, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever; and they are a "chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people." And, "Now are they the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what they shall be; but we know that when he [Christ] shall appear they shall be like him;" for God has

predestinated those whom he did foreknow to be conformed to the image of his dear Son, that he may be the first-born among many brethren. I John 3:2; Rom.8:29. In the vital unity of this eternal life, between the Head and body of the church, Christ is not ashamed to call his members brethren; for in his Mediatorial relation to them he claims them as his body, his flesh, and his bones.

"Hail, sacred union, firm and strong, How great the grace! How sweet the song! That worms of earth should ever be,

One with incarnate Deity."

Again we will assure brother Bazemore, that notwithstanding the seeming difference in our views on the doctrine of the eternal, vital union of Christ and his body, the church, and the basis of the heirship of the saints, we esteem him as a beloved brother in Christ; and we have read many of his articles in the Gospel Messenger for the year past with pleasure, and this is the first we have noticed from his able pen from which we seriously dissent. And we hope and believe that on more mature consideration of the subject, he will greatly modify the doom to which he has [we think unintentionally] consigned us, together with a very large majority of the Old School or Primitive Baptists of our acquaintance, who hold the doctrine of eternal, vital union as the very foundation of our hope of that inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and which cannot fade away.

Elder Gilbert Beebe

Signs of the Times November 1, 1879 Vol 48.

There are two basic doctrinal systems of religion among the race of man. The natural religion of the carnal mind which can be taught and learned. It is found in all religions and the most fundamental principle of it is the will-worship of natural men. This ancient natural religion is now the cardinal foundation of modern-day "Christianity." In nominal "Christianity," it is a decisionmade works religion void of any spiritual light and revelation. It is the product of modern proselytizing using "easy-decisionism," hawked loudly by the self-sPjled "Evangelists". It's very popularity appeals to the flesh of natural man, and is in itself sufficient to warn a child of God to keep clear of it. It produces man-made christians.

The fact that it is ever evolving, decade after decade, changing in doctrine and multiplYing practices, and conforming to the ever degenerating social conditions it spawned by its own natural religious lust; and by its approving of all things contrary to righteousness, proves beyond any doubt that it is *nJl1* the historical Christian faith. As it slides into Sodomite practices - which is now everywhere evident - and continual moral decline, it demonstrates clearly that it issued forth from Satan. It is Mystery Babylon, and it was most advanced by Andrew Fuller with his Roman Catholic doctrine of "freewillism" borrowed from Thomas Aquinas. Clearly, the

"Evangelicals," even if they call themselves "Calvinists," are no different from out-right Pelagian freewillers, if they emphasize man's abilities rather than God's effectual grace. Christ's imputed righteousness is the sinner's saving grace, and it is part and partial to the doctrine of free and sovereign grace. Men may believe many things, but if one does not have anything better to lean upon than his own ragged righteousness, that man has not yet been converted - Calvinist or no Calvinist; Baptist or no Baptist - the name has no saving merit.

Under the cloak of respectable "Calvinism," it still

denies that Christ is the Savior of sinners. At best, if this form of "Calvinism" insist that Christ's atonement was a failure, or contingent on the "evangelists" or the "sinner", then in reality they are no different than the Pelagians. It is as if seeing that He was not going to have time to finish what His Father sent Him to do, He quickly devised an ingenious plan whereby He would commission every man, woman, and child to "win the world" for Him after He was dead! This form of so-called "Calvinism" dePends upon carnal men to actually do what the Son of God could not do! Such dishonors the Lamb of God, and makes mere men the "saviors" of the wicked. Classical Calvinists refer to the above form of so-called "Calvinism" as Hypocalvinism. We refer to it as "Nee-calvinism." But

whichever term is used, it is not Calvinism! They can brand the "Old Schoolers" as Hyper-calvinists," but it still does not make themselves Calvinists.

The religion of Jesus is a revealed religion, not only in the origin of Christianity, but also to each person to whom the truth is revealed. It is not attained by education, theology, family inheritance, or study and research. It is received as an unction of the Holy One, and it needs not to be taught. It is highly consistent with logic if this logic is grounded on anyone of the Five Cardinal Principles of Grace. It teaches that man is 1Q~depraved and spiritually *dead* in trespasses and sins. If this is believed, then natural man can not "come to Me," as Jesus taught, "except it be given to Him of My Father;" or "drawn" to Him by the Father. He cannot save himself, nor help someone else to save him. Being *totally depraved and dead* no "evangelist," pastor, soul-winner, "Christian" counselor, parent, or spouse can help his case. Christ alone must save him!

The scripture clearly teaches that the Eternal Godhead chose, selected, or elected Jesus the son of Mary, of the family of Abraham and David to be hypostatically united to the Son in the Godhead to be the God-Man, Savior, and Head of His church, and at the same instance chose, or elected all that shall ever be in heaven and

immortal glory *in Him* "before the foundation of the world." (Eph. 1:5.) If one has this truth tenderly revealed to him, he cannot conclude otherwise than that Christ *died only for those given to Him by His Father!* Or, unconditional election and predestination! The above being revealed to him, he must conclude that all the

Father gave to His Son, and all His Son died for, will persevere in grace and ultimately be gloried with Christ in heaven and immortal glory without the loss of one. The blessed Lord thanked His Father that this was the case, saying to Him: *"I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in Ill;! sight."*(Matt. 11:25-26.)

Within the boundaries of the "Five Points of Free Grace," there are many differing views of "Calvinism." The traditional Calvinists, which included the Reformed churcht'-s, Presbyterians, Particular Baptists (before Fuller), 2nd Puritan Congregationalists, and the English Calvinist Methodists, with a few others, held to the Five Points consistently. Some of the churches in the above group still hold to them today. But by far, the greater majority of these have plunged into the deepest abyss of will-worship. It is interesting, that all the "evangelical"

fervor which destroyed Christianity came from the Calvinists' origin rather than those who were General Redemptionists as the Freewill Baptists in the U.S., or General Baptists in England. Equally, the original Arminian opponents to the Calvinist Reformers were not so "evangelical!"

From time to time a revival of Calvinism takes place, and individuals reared among Pelagians break away from them and form new religious societies established upon the wormwood foundation of Pelagian baptism and "church authority." [invariably most then begin to claim that they are the true original church!] Too often they break away before they are fully established in the faith, and some follow the heresy of Andrew Fuller. Their ultimate departure from Calvinism again follows the original path: Calvinism to Hypo or Neo-calvinism; a

pause; Neo-calvinism to Arminianism; another pause; Arminianism to Pelagianism; a pause; Pelagianism to ecumenicalism; a pause; and into Rome. Finality!

Large numbers of these Neo-calvinists are ensnared in a laborious system. They must, imperatively must, build up a congregation large enough to financially support themselves with a contemporary life style without working for a living. Hence, they are attracted to Fuller's so-called "Evangelism." They immediately start: (1) dragging



unregenerates into the society's membership to indoctrinate them into Calvinism and tithing, and (2) calling all Calvinists holding to New Testament propagation of the gospel "Hyper-calvinists," "Hardshells," "Misers," "Bench-sitters," and/or "Mossybacks." These two points mark the Neo-Calvinists. Most of them will also hold to "gospel regeneration," believing their quotation of Bible passages as incantations produce a magical power they called "getting saved." Neo-Calvinists do not know what Christ accomplished on the cross. They do not suspect it!

The Neo-calvinists, and even occasionally a Calvinist, will refer to those holding to the Five Points of Free Grace and New Testament practices as "Hypercalvinists" in a derogatory way. The Hyper-calvinists hold that all that the Scripture teaches that Christ accomplished in His purpose and grace in His life and death, He did in fact accomplish. They stand somewhat unique as the ones who actually believe that Christ is the Savior of sinners in an emphatic way. That He did in fact redeem His people; that He did in fact ransom them; that He did save them from their sins. In addition, they believe and follow the belief that "The Scripture of the Old and New Testament is the written Word of God and the only rule of faith and practice." That may be "old fashioned"

and "out of date," but they are serious about their belief in the divine inspiration of the Scripture. This leaves them must less "wiggle room" to bring in every hair-brained guru, doctrine, and "good ideas" that others seem so able to do! They are compelled by their faith to refrain from unscriptural innovations, carnal entertainment - they don't joke in the pulpit! - and proselytizing practices the so-called "evangelicals" embrace. They do not copy the worldly religions around them, neither in doctrine or in practices.

They do not accept the proselytizing practices of the "evangelicals" because they cannot find them either in historical Christianity or the Bible. In fact, deep within their own experience, they are enabled to discern the difference between that which is of the flesh and that of the Spirit. They do detect the motives behind this proselytizing effort are borne of deceitfulness, fleshly lusts and ignorance. Deceitfulness because they are "sent strong delusions that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned." (II Thess. 2:11.) The delusion is that the Lord did not save His people, and is helpless to save them without their cooperation. Or, that the Almighty God "needs help"! Fleshly lusts, because they feel in their carnal flesh a desire to triumph over another, or as Paul said of such, *"Having a form of godliness, but denying the*

*power thereof: from such turn awa~ For of this SQIt (these evangelical deceivers) are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away by divershJsts., ever learning, and never able to come to the*

*knowledge of the truth."* (II Tim. 3:6,7.) To those who have that anointing of the Spirit of truth, it is obviously clear of whom the apostle here speaks. Ignorance, because they cannot accept what the Scripture actually and plainly teaches that the Lord of Glory did in His substitutionary life and death.

The New Testament propagation of the gospel is the spreading of the good news of the accomplishments of the Lord Jesus Christ wherever God's People are "scattered" by persecution, mobility of jobs, and various migrations or emigrations. The simple walk and conversation of God's people, and their quiet invitations to friends and family to worship services are sufficient. They do not impose their religion on anyone; because they know how disgusting it is for a rabid Freewiller to attempt to cram it down their throats. They know full well that "salvation is of the Lord," (Jonah 3:9) and He has done His work and the Holy Spirit will invariably do His. By experience, they understand that anyone would really rather believe that the influence of the gOSPel upon their poor soul was of God, rather than a fellow creature. Most of all, they understand that the

gospel is good news to quickened sinners about what God has done for such; rather than what He will do if they "Let Him. " They believe, as in their own case, that the application of the salvation worked out by Christ is the special office of the Holy Spirit. That faith is precious to them, so it is best left to be precious to others.

They believe that the gospel is to be preached *1*ℓ

everyone *God would have it preached* and understand it has not been His good pleasure to have it preached to everyone on earth! It was not preached to millions who never knew of Abraham, Moses, and the prophets; or to millions who never heard of Christ; and knowing what the gospel is, it is not preached except in a very few places in Western society, including the United States! Almost no one today hears the gospel; few communities remain with a gospel ministry; and that religion that is preached all over the land is most likely antichristian to the core. They are predestinarians. They believe that God "does His will in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay His hand or say unto Him, What doest Thou?" (Dan. 4:35.) If it was the sovereign will and eternal purpose of God for all mankind to "have a chance to be saved," He is certainly able to perform His will! He it is who "worketh all things according to the counsel of His own will." The fact of history proves conclusively that

such was not, nor is, the sovereign will of God. But for all sovereign grace believers of whatever stamp, they are persuaded that "as. many 1J.S. ..were ORDAINED IQ ETERNAL LIFE BELIEVE" (Acts 13:48.) So the commission of their ministers is as broad as, and as narrow as, the sovereign good will of God for them individually. They are to, and without fail will, preach the gospel to every single soul to whom they are sent.

The "evangelicals" believe that faith and repentance are sacraments which precede regeneration, and are magical incantations to produce it. Thus, they believe it to be the duty of the reprobates to hear and believe that Christ died for them as well as the elect; when in fact of the inspired Word, He did not! Since they must hear the Word in order to believe it; and believing it will produce divine life in them, then it must be preached to everyone. Of course, that is rather too late now, but this is not important to them. These "evangelicals" are caught in the illogical position of holding that the reprobate is required to believe a *lie* in order to make it irJN, and then damn the poor honest soul to hell for the cause of not believing the lie! If one believes that faith and repentance will produce spiritual life in a soul, that person is ignorant of the way of salvation himself. How then can such preach the gospel to other?

The Hyper-calvinists believe that Christ "Hath obtained eternal redemption for us." That "He laid down His life for the sheep." That "He hath saved us and called us ... according to His own purpose and grace." That He "hath sanctified us, " and "hath Perfected forever them

that are sanctified." The closing questions of this book then, are: Are these things TRUE? Did Christ do all that the Scripture declares that He did? Who believes that this is so?

May the grace, mercy, and peace of God rest and abide upon you,

Amen!

# ANTINOMIANISM EXAMINED AND ITS RELATION TO ARMINIANISM SHOWN By Samuel Trott, July 5, 1839

Brother Beebe: **I** received a letter a short time since, from Brother P. Meredith, in which he requests me also to give my views on the text, Job 28: 7,8, in reference to the enquiry *whether there is not a path which passes between the sand bars of Arminianism and the granite rocks of Antinomianism.*

Your answer to this enquiry as published under the editorial head in No. 9 of present volume, he says is very explicit in reference to Arminianism, but not so full in reference to Antinomianism as he wished. He gives as a further reason for requesting my views, that he has lately heard, "that to be a thorough going Old School Baptist, one must believe that it is not the duty of the unregenerate, to believe, repent, or pray." **I** will therefore add my testimony to yours on this point. The one may strengthen the other.

**I** will first examine the subject of Antinomianism and see whether "the path which no fowl knoweth, and the vulture's eye hath not seen" can be a middle track between that and Arminianism. The signification of the term *Antinomianism* is, according to its etymology, *against law*, as shown by Brother Beebe; and the charge evidently

intended to be fixed upon those to whom this term is applied is that they are opposed to the law of God, or do it away by their doctrine. This charge, if the enemies of the truth were admitted to be judges, would have been fixed upon the *Master of the house*, and *upon those of His household* in every age, from Paul down to Brother Meredith and myself, who preach a *FINISHED SALVATION* in Christ. But I appeal from those *would be* judges to the scriptures of truth. I would stand at the judgment seat of Christ.

Those who anciently claimed to be the disciples of Moses in distinction from Christ, evidently supposed that the letter of the Sinai laws, moral and ceremonial, together with the traditions of their fathers, constituted a code of law which supplanted the originall. *In 1! under which man* It's aeated; and that this was the standard by which man's acceptance with God, or rejection, was to be decided. Because Christ and His apostles preached a doctrine adverse to this Pharisaical law, they were denounced as *opposers* of the law of Moses. The modern *Nomians* or legalists also understand the original law of God to have given place to a milder law, compounded of the letter of the Ten Commandments and what they conceive to be certain requisitions and conditions of the gospel, and that this *gospel law* is the standard of righteousness, by which all men under the gospel are to be tried, and a want of conformity to it is the ground of condemnation; and according to some, a personal conformity to it, is the ground of justification. But no individual who has been brought truly to love the law of God, can admit of its being supplanted by such a medley of human contrivance, and when it is opposed, either as a standard of right or as a yoke of bondage attempted to be put upon the neck of disciples of Christ, its opposers are at



once denounced as Antinomians.

In making my appeal from these partial Judges, I file the following answers to their charge: 1st. That God in creating Adam a living soul, laid him, and his posterity in him, under obligation to love the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his strength; and to love his neighbor as himself; that this constituted the law of his creation, and the eternal standard of right, which no apostasy of man could make void. 2nd. That the revelation which God has made of His mind and will in the scriptures, the alone standard of truth, no where teaches that God has ever abrogated this law of man's creation, altered its requisitions, or abated its demands to suit the weakness of fallen man. This answer is sustained by Matt. 5:17-20 and Rom. 3:31. 3rd. That the prohibition given to Adam in the garden not to eat of the forbidden tree, was

designed as a test of his subjection to God and to the law of his creation; his transgressing this prohibition was therefore the just ground of his being condemned and his posterity in him to a state of depravity or *death in sin*. And that the law of Ten Commands given from Sinai, in its general bearing upon all men, distinct from its special reference to Israel nationally, was not designed as a *covenant of works* and to lead men to depend on their obedience to it for their final acceptance with God, either Jew or Gentiles; but it "was added because of transgression, till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made, &c.;" (Gal. 3:19) it "entered that the offence might abound." (Rom. 5:20.) In a word, it was given in its spiritual import, in the sense in which Paul

says *the law is spiritual*, (Rom. 7:14) as a schoolmaster to teach both Jews and Gentiles their entire depravity and guilt, and the impossibility of their being justified by the deeds of the law, and their need of just such a salvation as is revealed in Christ, a salvation from sin and sovereignly free.

Hence it is written, "We know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped. and all the world become guilty before God;" and again, "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." (Rom. 3:19,20.) Neither, **I** will add,

was this law of Ten Commands given, in itself considered, to be *a rule of life*; it was designed to teach us what sin is, and its moral precepts are sanctioned by the New Testament as illustrating that which is a proper deportment toward God and toward man in a general and moral point of view. But a *rule of life*, to be correct must be an exact measure of all that is required of us to perform. This law was not such to ancient Israel; other laws were given them, which they were required also to obey, and which were of course component parts of that rule by which their lives were to be squared, such as certain positive institutions of a ceremonial nature, &c. Neither is it a perfect rule to spiritual Israel; the life of a Christian as such, must be upon a broader scale than the letter of the Decalogue, in order to its being squared with the gospel. Repentance toward God for his daily wandering of heart, and living daily by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and an establishment in the truths of the gospel must enter into the composition of a Christian's life or walk in order to his conformity to the gospel standard; and these things are beyond the compass of the Ten Commands, "For the law is not of faith, but the man that doeth them shall live in them." (Gal. 3:12.) There are also positive institutions belonging exclusively to the gospel to

be observed by the Christian if he would "walk uprightly

according to the truth of the gospel." Therefore the legalists call us Antinomians for denying that the law is a rule of life to the disciples of Christ, we may well call them *anti-gospelers?* or *anti-new-testamenters* for their attempts to make it a full rule to the Christian's life. Thus much for our views concerning the much insisted upon notion that the law is *a rule of life* to the Christian, and I will now return to the further consideration of the answers I have filed.

1St. Whilst these answers stand, and they must stand according to the standard of .eternal truth, it is evident that we are justified in opposing this law-of-conditions of which faith and repentance and various religious ceremonies, are the principle terms, being foisted. into the place of that unchanging standard of right, the law under which man was created, as that by which man is to be judged before God, and consequently their charge against us of being *Antinomian* on this account will not stand. 2nd. So long as it is written "Whosoever offendeth in one point of the law is guilty of the whole," it must be evident that whoever sets up anything other than the spiritual or original law of God in its exceeding broadness as the standard by which man is to be tried before God, by which he is to be justified or condemned, opposes or makes void the law and *he is therefore an Antinomian* in the strict

import of the word. The teaching that the law will accept of anything short of perfect obedience to the everlasting demands, or that it will of any substitution in the place of this perfect obedience, such as repenting and believing the gospel and the like, is according to the above view of the subject *Antinomianism*.

Having thus shown what Antinomianism is, and the characters on whom the charge properly rests, I will briefly show its position in relation to Arminianism by a

few questions. 1st. Who are they that are opposed to the enforcing the rigorous demands of the spiritual law of God? The unregenerate, whether professors or not; "for the carnal mind is enmity against God, not subject to the law of God," &c. But unregenerate professors more fully act out this opposition; they then are the practical Antinomians. 2nd. Who are they that are fond of the Arminian, or the "do and live" system? The unregenerate universally; but those of them who profess religion, more openly avow this system. Hence the Arminian in heart is an Antinomian in heart, and the professed Arminian stands in his doctrine opposed to the unchangeable demands and rectitude of the original law of God, and is therefore in truth an avowed Antinomian. Or thus: Those who make void the law of God by their traditions or systems must be Antinomians. What is Arminianism, but

a system that teaches that men's acceptance with God depends on certain conditions to be performed by them, short of a Perfect obedience to the original law of God? Christ having according to some taken away the original law, and according to others, made an atonement for sin abstractly considered, to make room for such conditions being accepted. Hence Arminianism and Antinomianism terminates at the same point, are two different names for the same system of opposition to the law of God. How then can the "path which the vulture's eye hath not seen" pass between the two? There is no middle ground there. But Brother Meredith is ready to ask, is there no system which opposes the obligations of the law of God, different from the systems of conditions? In answer I admit it has been said that there were those who held that the elect were never under the law, and that God never saw any sin in them &c. But such a sentiment would as completely do away redemption by Christ as it would the law. Besides this sentiment would be so irrational, so contrary to that sense of accountability which men have, that I cannot think such a sentiment ever existed in the breasts of any who believe there is a God and admitted the authenticity of the scriptures. The sentiment also that the elect as the children of Adam were actually justified from all demands of the law before time began, and were then, absolved

from all charge of guilt, would, if carried out in its legitimate bearing, amount to an abrogation of the law in their behalf, and therefore be Antinomianism. But I know of none who contend for this sentiment that would admit of its being carried out to what I think its full implication; therefore, though they may be inconsistent, they are not Antinomians in the way they hold it. [Reference to Parker's Two-Seedism].

Consequently, my brother, we in vain look for the granite rock of Antinomianism (where the charge of antinomianism is just as implying opposition to the law of God) so severed from the sandbars of Arminianism as to admit of the path or *way of holiness* passing between them. Indeed I may confidently ask, how would sandbars ever be found in the sea were there not granite rock or something like it to form an eddy or obstruct the passage of the drifting sand and cause it to become a deposit? And how could any conditional or Arminian system ever get foothold were there not enmity in the human breast to the government and law of God; an Antinomian principle latent there, that would overturn the sovereignty of God, and bring down His perfect law from its pure and holy demands, to a level with the capacity of depraved mortals toobey?

I will notice that *path which no fowl knoweth~ that*

*way of holiness* in which the child of grace is led. And my brother, if you have eyes to see, as **I** think you have, and do not suffer men to put their fingers or systems into them, **I** shall show you that this path as Brother Beebe stated, leads directly off, alike from the ground of Antinomianism and of Arminian opposition to the truth.

The very first step in which a person is led in the Christian life takes him off from that firm standing he before had on Arminian ground; regeneration being the implantation of the life in the soul which is love to God and His law. Sin, instead of holiness and the divine law, now becomes the object of his hatred. Long and hard may he struggle to regain a standing on Arminian ground, or in other words, to feel a confidence in his own doings, but in vain, every struggle but removes him farther from this confidence; he is led to an enlarged view of the law in its spirituality, sees it to be holy, just and good, and his love to it makes him loathe every thing that comes short of its righteous demands, as all his acts and thoughts do; and his confidence in his doings and exercises is therefore more and more destroyed. He finds himself at last without any standing, lying upon the absolute mercy of God, having no good prayers, repentance or reformation to hold on to, and feeling that if mercy does not hold him up he must in justice sink eternally. Hence, love and reverence



for the law of God instead of making a person pleased with his own righteousness, and giving him a desire to be accepted with God on the ground of his own doings, lead him to throw aside his own doings and make him willing to be saved as a poor sinner; just in proportion therefore an Antinomian opposition to the law is ERADICATED from his mind. Arminian confidence in creaturely performance is destroyed. Here is the mystery of the Christian's path that the *vulture's eye cannot see*; no person, not taught of God, can comprehend how that love and subjection to the law of God should cause one to loathe his own righteousness, nor how a person who relies entirely on the mercy of God in Christ for salvation, can be *zealous of good works*. Yet such is the case. The same love

to the law which leads a person to renounce all human works as the ground of his acceptance with God, makes him cling to and rely on the work of Christ for acceptance when that work in its *completion is once revealed* to him as having been wrought for such poor sinners as he. The reason is that the one would degrade the law whilst the other perfectly honors it. Hence he *who rejoices in Christ Jesus, has no confidence in the flesh*; (Phil. 3:3) and he who with Paul can say *I delight in the law of God after the inward man*, would also with him say, *not have his own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is*

*through the faith of Christ the righteousness which is of God by faith.* (Rom. 7:22 & Phil. 3:9.)

I think from what has been shown that Brother Meredith will be satisfied that the Christian's path which is *as a shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day*, cannot lead him in a middle way between Antinomian opposition to the law and Arminian love of human works, but that it leaves both in the background.

*SIGNS of the TIMES*: Volume 7 (1839)

## **APPENDIX: C: 1819 - John Taylor's Personal Experience illustrative of the Early Baptist Ministers and problems**

**[John Taylor]** was a minister in the Licking Association of Particular Baptist of Kentucky, and a close associate with Lewis and Elijah Craig of the "Traveling Church", Ambrose Dudley, John Shackelford and those early settlers on the Western Frontier in **1785**. The first Mission Society was later constituted in **May, 1814**, in Philadelphia by Dr. Stroughton of Andrew Fuller's church in Kettering, England, and the wild frenzy that followed created a very disturbing atmosphere for all true believers holding to the New Testament doctrine of **sovereign, free grace**. **Taylor's** recorded observations of the rise and spread of the mission frenzy is antecedent to any other objectors to the movement. A little later, Daniel Parker raised his pen against the movement, and since he is the better known, received credit from the new party's historians as the founder of "Primitive Baptists." [Parker was never a "Primitive Baptist" – he and his church, Lamont Regular Baptist was a member of the Wabash Regular Baptist Association on the border of Indiana and Illinois!] The Kehukee Declaration in **Appendix B**, above, came still later, followed by the **Black Rock Address** in 1832 and the **Baltimore Addresses** in 1835 & 37.

Similar to the Kehukee report in the Tarborough, NC, newspaper, **John Talyor's** observations also give a feeling of the distress felt by Christians at that time period. It has often been the distressful history of the Christian Church when Freewill error is mixed with the Sovereign Grace foundation of Christianity. Only apostasy and shame ever resulted from such attempts. This is a rare "find" for this writer, since it does not appear in any History of Baptists on any side of the issues. SCP.]

---

**John Taylor wrote:** I am fully persuaded of the great aptitude in us poor, imperfect mortals, to consider ourselves a *standard* of orthodoxy, and even in most of the transactions of life; all of which leads me to hesitate a little as to our Missionaries. I have expressed myself in the foregoing sheets, with all the plainness that I think one friend should speak to another. Perhaps some things may appear harsh; but I know, that for all the men that I have brought in review, I have a sympathizing friendship. It is probable they think they are doing right, though of their sincerity, I have strong doubt. Happy should I be hereafter to find myself mistaken and these men what I wish them to be, the faithful servants **of Christ**. But my great doubt concerning them arises, both from the Scriptures and all the examples therein and observation and experience I have had for near fifty years as a Baptist minister. That far back I remember what kind of men of the Baptist name in Virginia, were buffeted, imprisoned and counted the off-scouring of all things. [Elder Taylor was a personal friend to Elders Elijah Craig and Lewis Craig and John Shackelford, the "prisoners of the Lord" in the Fredericksburg jail, whose preaching converted Ambrose Dudley, who followed Elder Lewis Craig's "Traveling Church" to become the first pastor of Bryan's Station Church, and first moderator of both the Elkhorn and Licking associations, of which Elder Taylor was a member.-SCP] I personally recall their looks, their labors, and their success. Though not willing to make myself a *standard*, I recollect that far back, the anxiety of my soul for the prosperity of Zion, and the good of my fellow man, so that I could not rest, day nor night, for years together;

and of what little moment in that case money appeared to me; so that from my soul I could say, “*I seek not yours, but you.*” And in that case, I “*I coveted no man’s silver, gold or apparel;*” so that perhaps to a man, this temper attended **all** the Baptist preachers of that day. Myself began to preach at about twenty years of age, [about 1772] and about five months after I was baptized, by Elder James Ireland, a faithful servant of Jesus Christ. My previous opportunity and my capacities, in my own esteem, were very small, and they must have appeared small in the esteem of others; but the church to which I belonged, treated me with all the tenderness of a mother. Their preachers also treated me as a son; for the church had three other preachers, to wit: **James Ireland**, their pastor [James Ireland was one of the “Prisoners of the Lord,” arrested for preaching the Gospel and held in prison 1769-1770], **William Marshall**, [William Marshall was pastor of Flat Lick Particular Baptist Church in the Licking Particular Baptist Association in 1814- SCP] and the well known, laborious one of his day, Elder **Joseph Redding**. [Elder Redding withdrew from the Elkhorn along with Elder Ambrose Dudley to form the Licking Association of Particular Baptists, in 1808. SCP] With the latter I travelled the most. He being an older man than myself, he was to me as a father, though he seemed to acknowledge me as his *yoke-fellow*. We labored together in the wilds of Virginia about ten years before Kentucky came in vogue, to which place we both came in early times; and here he died a few years past. Our range of labor was from the Blue Ridge and Shenandoah River to the back of Virginia, on the branches of the Potomac and Ohio Rivers, a distance of about two hundred miles; and oft-times among the dangerous rage of savage fury; though this circumstance took us out of the way of Virginia persecution below the Blue Ridge [by Episcopal priests and Virginia Church/State officials -SCP] Neither of us was ever put in prison, though at times, either beaten or driven from our meetings by wicked mobs. We oft-times travelled a whole day from one frontier settlement to another, through the rugged uncharted mountains without seeing a house, and our lives in

danger every step we took, and when we could not reach a house, our lot was to camp in the woods. We went to many places where the Gospel had never sounded before, and so great was the effect, that oft-times, the cries of the people would drown our voices. We then hoped that many experienced conversion, and some churches were built up where the Lord's name **was not called on before**, but to blaspheme it. Both of us having been raised to hardships, nothing appeared hard to surmount. We therefore performed a number of these tours on foot.

I will describe one or two of them. In one instance Elder Redding had moved his family about forty miles from where I made my home. From his house about a week's meeting were appointed, and the distance about a hundred and fifty miles. When I got to Redding's my horse being young and he nothing to ride, but a mare with a young colt, we concluded to take the journey on foot. Our first meeting was twenty miles from his house. We started at sunrise, and met a large assembly in due time. As a rich reward of that day's labor, a number of people obtained a hope of conversion from that day's meeting. We had twenty miles to the next day's meeting, and eighteen miles afterwards to get to quarters. A number came the last eighteen miles to meet us. It did seem as if the Lord blessed this *foot tour* more than usual.

Another shorter tour we took on foot. I had staid all night at Redding's and there being neither stable nor pasture, we turned our horses into the woods. On the next morning the rain was violent, and though we turned out in it and searched diligently till near none o'clock, we could not find our horses, though they were belled. Then the council was, "What shall be done?" There was but little time to council; for the meeting was fifteen miles distant, and a very mountainous way. It appeared to us awful to disappoint a meeting. The rain slackening a little,

off we set. To make this fifteen miles in about three hours, something more than walking was needful. The rain set in afresh; we ran, we walked, we perspired and received the rain from above, till there was not a dry thread on us, and met about twenty people about half after twelve. I will leave the reader to judge whether this effort was not being “righteous over much;” for myself immediately took such a cough, with all the appearance of the whooping cough, that I did not get rid of it for a twelve month. Redding having a family did not always go with me on these dreary Alleghany tours, himself also having the care of a large church, lately built up about the head of the Potomac river; so that I often travelled these dreary, dangerous roads by myself; where frost-biting in winter, with snow knee deep, and often unbroken roads, with forty and fifty miles from one settlement to another, and danger of being scalped by the Indians in the summer, marked my way for a number of years. Though a great part of the people would have done anything for me, that they would have done for their own son or brother, their poverty forbade it. The poor things would now and then, make me some little presents of the best they had, that I thought in my conscience was more than my poor preaching deserved – which perhaps never amounted to fifty dollars per year, exclusive of the food myself and horse lived on, and my own food scarcely safe from putrefaction from want of salt; and from what habit, to this day salt food is disagreeable to me.

I know that I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not, when I say that I do not recollect that it ever occurred to me that I suffered hardship, neither should I name what I now do, only these Missionaries, high flyers – make such a noise about *their* privations, when the world knows how ill-founded these complaints are. What I have said of Elder Redding and myself, in some instances, is only a specimen of our *general* course, and was no singular thing among the Baptists’ preachers in those days. Were I asked whether such a school as Staughton’s

when I began to preach would not have been of great service to me, and were I to judge from what I have seen, I should say, that the damage done, would very much overgo the profit!

## More On Missions

When I closed my last sheet on *Missions*, I concluded to say no more on the subject, on paper; but having met with a worthy young Brother, who by the bye, was a great zealot for Missions and had in possession all the numbers of the "*Latter Day Luminary*," as it is called, he prevailed on me to give them a reading, assuredly concluding that their great light, would give conviction on that subject. I confess they have given me *some light*, but in a very different way from the brother's expectation; for poor as my opinion was before, of these high-minded self-flatterers, I never so fully took in their mighty *presumption*; and one thing among many others, is giving God Almighty an entirely new epithet, well adapted to *their* ambitious views! For our Maker long ago has given to Himself titles suited to His own divine character, as *Jah, Jehovah, I am that I am, God Almighty, The God of the Whole Earth, the God of Heaven, The God of Jacob and of Israel, The God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and of all His spiritual seed, &c., &c.

The lately manufactured epithet is, "The God of Missions." Vain men! Presumptuous mortals! So any appeal made to God in the future, must be under this *new title given Him*, "*The God of Missions*." Their lofty minds lead them to class *themselves* with the greatest characters that have ever been on earth; such as John "the Baptist," the immediate harbinger of Christ, and Jesus Christ Himself, whom they style "a Missionary!" His Scriptural titles, however, don't suit them so well.

In the different numbers of their mighty "*Luminary*," they take up the several apostles with their travels, all of which they style "*Missionary* tours," and the men themselves "*Missionaries!*" which favorite term of theirs, they seem to think an *improvement* on all the office titles given by Christ Himself to His own servants; which favorite term of theirs is borrowed from Old Mother Rome! And as they are beholden to the Mother of Harlots for this handsome phrase, it is to be hoped that our Missionaries will acknowledge their own old mother and the Jesuits of the same race as their brethren; and especially when from their own tales, they have done more in Paraguay and other countries, than our Missionaries can yet boast of. It may be remembered that these Paraguay men assumed great sanctity; therefore called themselves after the name of Jesus (Jesuits). What do our Missionaries say of themselves? It is a little amusing to read in the first section of the second number of the "*Luminary*," the self encomiums there expressed on Missionaries. Scorn, or pity, or both, will soon be awakened in the reader except himself is run away with, by the delusion. Look at the comparisons made between themselves and ancient prophets: Though in some few things, ancient prophets overwent them, yet from the whole, Missionaries are much to be preferred; because, says page 66, prophecy was mingled with obscurity, but Missionary was clear and effulgent. The Lord pity the ignorance of foolish men! As to common Gospel ministers, the comparison can scarcely be made, page 60, for want of that heavenly fire hurled from the altar of heaven, such as occupies the bosom of a Missionary. The common minister is so phlegmatic, that he scarcely deserves the name of *minister*. A Missionary, says the same page, is an eminence of character, an apostolic inspiration, reserved for the days of Missions of the "latter days;" for if this heavenly fire, says the same page, was hurled into the hearts of common preachers, thousands would apply for license to go to foreign countries. But the heavenly fire boasted of, is suspected to be the love of money and fame. But



the comparison is more fully exemplified in an apostle, says page 67; for an ancient apostle was a "*Missionary*," and Missionaries are modern apostles! Some little difference is agreed to; but where the ancient apostles had the advantage in one thing, the modern *apostle* has it in another; so that the page leaves the reader at a loss to know which was the greatest, the ancient apostles, or our modern strutting upstarts.

However much the thoughtful reader might be disposed to exercise patience and charity in the citation of the above pages of the second number of the "*Luminary*," I think his fortitude will be brought to a great trial when he comes to page 73, beginning under the head of A Vision. Whether this mighty dreamer had a vision like Balaam of old, with his eyes open, or whether like him he fell into a trance, or whether it was a real dream that this Missionary bigot had, through the whole like Balaam, he seems to boast that his eyes were open, and that he had great light, or the vision of God was on him. Surely this tale is worthy of the "*Luminary*," for it is all light as that book in its title page boasts to be; but let this dreamer remember, that with all the boast of his brother Balaam having his eyes open, the ass on which he rode while speechless, saw more than her master. Though the Lord in ancient times, made known His will in various ways, and often by dreams and visions while the canon of the Scripture was not yet completed, even then the dreamers were to be watched close; and though the sign of a dreaming prophet came to pass, yet if he gave any epithet, or idea of God that Himself had never revealed, that prophet was to be put to death; and though we have no desire for any man to suffer for differing from us in religious opinion, yet as this dreamer would turn us away to a new God, "The God of Missions," such Missionaries as rank themselves above other preachers of the Gospel of grace and call themselves *apostles*, together with such a *dreamer*, we will hold in contempt, with all his vision, and esteem him as a son of the mother of harlots, and his dreams as some of those "*lying wonders*" spoken of by

Paul, by which the Man of Sin would deceive. He may amuse the followers of Swedenburg with his dreams, and the Shakers with his visions; for very few of the Kentucky Baptists have any use for his merchandise; though by this happy knack of dreaming, he might hope the silver would jingle. Are these Missionaries blockheads, or knaves? Or do they think that the present generations of the earth are fools?

In some former sheet I have said something about the sale of pictures by the Missionaries. Since that, when travelling, I lodged at a private house, where the landlady give me a little history of Luther Rice, who called at her house, her husband being gone from home. His first sally was, "Madam I presume you do not know me." She replied, "I do not, sir." He than said, "I am Luther Rice, the Missionary preacher; I want my breakfast, and my horse fed with corn, oats and fodder." Perhaps Luther was excusable in this freedom, for it was a Baptist house, and the people in good circumstances. Having heard of Luther's great capacities in the coffee way, she hastened and made her pot full of between two or three quarts; she said it was always the greatest plenty for her large family; but it did suffice, by going to the bottom of the pot without cooking again. He then lamented her husband being from home; for he had expected to have borrowed a horse of him a month or so, and left his to be put in order; but had to bear the disappointment. After peeping a little about the house, and seeing nothing of that kind but a few pictures the young ladies had drawn, he remarked to the landlady, "Madam, your house will very well suit some handsome pictures I have with me." She replied, she could not tell without seeing them, concluding he had in mind to compliment her children with some play thing. Luther unlades his stuffed saddlebags. Soon after he drew them out, he began to state the usual prices of his pictures from ten dollars and down. After hearing their prices, though he urged their beauty and elegance, she declined taking any of the; after which he showed her a number of religious tracts, with their

several prices, but she bought none of his merchandise. Poor Luther had to bundle up and move off without getting any money there, and the lady now talks of his movements while there, with disgust and scorn; for she is a woman of good information, and conscientiously religious. What is to be thought of such Missionary Apostles, who affect more sanctity and dignity than other preachers, and yet remain an hour or two in a religious family without a word about *religion*, but shewing a manifest thirst to get a little money? But perhaps he thought it was religious enough, to offer to sell the lady some good pictures and good books.

I ask, do apostolic Missionaries appear to have more religion than other men? Or does their religion mainly lie in affecting to know more than other men? Then in place of being “modern apostles,” are they not modern Gnostics? And as they have almost by their superior knowledge found out the last ten tribes of Israel, is it not likely by their great knowledge, that they will soon find out where a number of apostles were martyred, that we know but little of their labors or death? And will not their relics be used as articles for merchandise among us? It is well known that those ancient heretics, called Gnostics, gave themselves that epithet, because they knew more than other Christians. It is also said that Simon Magus was at the head of them and the founder of the whole tribe, which was vastly numerous. As for Simon’s religion, we know how much it was connected with money – (Acts vii, 18-20) – and the severity of Peter’s reproof of him. Those who please may make the comparison between the ancient Gnostics and our present Missionaries. For my part, I think the likeness much greater than with the apostles, whose high rank they presume to claim to themselves. It may also be remembered, that this same old Simon, was a Baptist, or baptized by immersion on a profession of his faith; all of which did not secure him from the “*gall of bitterness, and the bonds of iniquity.*” Love of money,

and love of power or fame, were the strong bonds by which his soul was held fast. Men bound by these strong cords, are perhaps more to be pitied than blamed. Good Lord, correct all our mistakes. When men assume to themselves higher ground than others, they are, as a thing of course, taken more notice of than others. I have in the foregoing sheets been taking a survey of those high-minded men, and have narrated a long train of facts, collected, either from their own writings, the use of my own senses, or the testimony of others in which I confide; all of which I am alone responsible for, if called on. And as it is the watchword of American Baptist Missionaries, to attempt great things, look for great things; and as all new officers, I mean great ones in their own conceit, aim at some new regulations, we look for an attempt at great things by these new apostles. Indeed, we already have it before us; for in the tenth number of their great "*Luminary*," page 466, they are directing their young preachers how to preach in foreign countries, from Bishop Lowth's translation. Why not from our own translation? But this comes from their own apostolic infallibility. Every new Pope must make some new law as a test of his own infallibility. As they begin with Lowth's translation, is it not to be looked for, that they will soon give us a Bible of their own translation which will be equal to John Wesley's, from which he makes his notes on the New Testament? [Or Mr. Graham's, or the New International, or the next every five years revision or so? -SCP] Or at least equal in the Shaker's Bible? For they already dictate what kind of churches we shall have to support even a moderate preacher, same copy, page 477. The lowest sum fixed upon is six hundred dollars. To raise said sum, we must have from their direction, one hundred male members, either of merchants, mechanics or able bodied men to labor; and then a tax on each man of six dollars per annum, to raise the money. If there are more male members, the preacher must have more. I ask you, reader, whether this is not attempting great things among the Baptists? Should those apostles ever own themselves inferior to Paul,

they will at least assume a stand as high as the seven sons of Sceva, spoken of in Acts 19<sup>th</sup> chapter, 14<sup>th</sup> verse – and will attempt to cast out Devils in the name of Jesus whom Paul preached. And though I may be now called a Devil by these new apostles, for making as free with them as I have, I shall insist on it, that the Devil never did a better act in his life than to fall on, and drive these presumptuous men out of the house. My object is, if possible, to drive these presuming men out of Baptist associations; for there they crept in unawares, with no more right than the false brethren of whom Paul speaks; for they are a motley tribe at best, I wish it understood, once for all, that when I insinuate corruption among American Baptist Missionaries, I do but sparingly mean men of my own State; for I only think of three in all of Kentucky that I suspect, and I rather ascribe it to their weakness and vanity than to corruption – looking perhaps for a thank'e from these great men; or possibly they may look for some profits in future either in money or applause. A well wisher of poor deluded Missionaries, Elder John Taylor,

Franklin County, Kentucky, - **1819**

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

**ANTINOMIANISM:** "n. *Theo.* A member of a Christian sect holding that *lrot11* alone is necessary to salvation." (The. American Heritaie Dictionary, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1985.)

The above definition is an American college dictionary view. Theologians will be rather mnused at it! It is almost a perfect description of the views of the whole "evangelical world" today, based upon "easy-decisionism." Just believe, and you are saved!

In early Baptists' history, those holding to salvation based upon the imputed righteousness of Christ, received by the indwelling faith of Christ, were charged with "antinomianism." Those who charged the Church thus, reasoned that if one believed in justification only by the imputed righteousness of Christ, such a person would live a lawless life of disobedience. To them, (mnong whom was John Wesley who charged John Gill of antinomianism) if duty was not pressed upon one, such would not perform good works; and if one trusted only in Christ's righteousness, duty was not necessary. All of which is theoretical nonsense.

A child of God in regeneration will be given faith (a gift of God and fruit of the indwelling Spirit) to trust only in Christ's righteousness, and deprecate any of his own making. The indwelling Spirit motivates, moves, and directs the regenerate elect to perform good work and walk worthy of the calling of God. "For it is God who worketh IN you both to will and to do of His good pleasure.

Of all present-day religious groups in America, the Old Schooler, or "Hypercalvinists," are the furthest from "antinomianism" of any group.

**CALVINISM:** "One who follows the religious doctrines of John Calvin, emphasizing the omnipotence of God and the salvation of the elect by God's grace alone." (Ibid) A Calvinist is anyone who believes that all mankind are born in sin, being totally depraved in their nature, and totally unable in the

flesh to save, or help to save themselves; That God chose a particular people to salvation before the foundation of the world, and predestinated them to salvation through the redemption which is by Christ Jesus; That Christ died particularly for these chosen people, and they only, That in time God by His Spirit will effectually call these elect and redeemed people to a knowledge of salvation; and That all those chosen, redeemed, and called people will ultimately be saved in immortal glory without the loss of one.

While that statement will cover all Calvinists, there are many finer points upon which they will disagree; hence the various euphemisms used to discredit one another, or to distinguish one from another.

**DOWN-GRADE:** A term coined by Charles Haddon Spurgeon in the 1880's which referred to the erosion of the doctrine of Christ from evangelism, and the slide from the free grace doctrine of Calvinism to the free will doctrines of Pelagianism and/or Universalism. It covers the period from approximately 1860 to 1890's when the "EvangelicalS abandoned the doctrines of the Christian faith because they were a hindrance to getting decisions for Christ.

**EVANGELICAL:** "Of, pertaining to, or being a Protestant group emphasizing the authority of the gospel and holding that salvation is from faith and grace rather than from good works and sacraments alone." (Ibid)

**EVANGELISM:** "The zealous preaching and dissemination of the gospel, as through missionary work. 2. Militant zeal for a cause." (Ibid).

As used in this work, "evangelical" has reference to the over-zealous pressing of mental decisions upon people to enlist them in a religious cause; in an earnest attempt to get all men "saved" and into a religious institution; an organizM system or philosophy of proselytizing, to "∴ 'compass land and sea" to get converts. (Matt. 23: 15 See "Itinerate" below.)

**FULLERISM:** "The doctrinal views, and consequent practices, of Andrew Fuller, a Particular Baptist minister who set forth a view that Christ

died sufficiently for the sins of the whole world, but efficiently for the elect only."

The first part of this view was quickly embraced by many Baptists and Protestants, to wit.: That Christ died for everyone, putting all men into a "savable" condition where the "effect of the gospel" could reach them. This immediately led to a humanistic zeal which fostered "missionism," on the one hand, and a total departure from the Christian doctrine (known as "Calvinism") of salvation by the redemptive work of Christ and justification by His imputed righteousness.

In brief: Fullerism is "missionism," "easy-decisionism," "enlistment campaigns" or membership drives, in lieu of preaching the gospel of Christ to sensible sinners, and waiting on the Lord to add to the church daily such as should be saved.

**HARDSHELL** (ISM): "A derogatory euphemism applied to anyone who stands firm on the doctrine of Holy Spirit regeneration".The term evolved from the early disputes between missionary/antimissionary groups of the 1830's~ when the Fulleritesoften exclaimed "Here you go with those hard shalls!" when the Old Schooler quoted such positive scriptures as "He SHALL save His people from their sins," or, "They SHALL follow Me,," etc. It entered the dictionary as: "Uncompromising confirme¢ unyielding on convicted principles." (Ibid)

**HYPER-CALVINISM:** "Over, above~ beyond" (*IbitL*) Another euphemism employed mostly by "evangelicals" and "Neo-calvinists" against anyone with more light and understanding than themselves. There is no definition possible for the term, for it depends entirely upon the viewpoint of the user. The Pelagian (see below) will call a moderate Calvinist a "Hyper-calvinist." The moderate Calvinist (one that holds only to eternal security, but rejects the other four points of Calvinism) will call a Neo-calvinist a "Hyper-calvinist." The Neo-calvinists will charge a Calvinist with "Hyper-calvinism." And the Calvinist will also charge other Calvinists with being a NHyper."



As used, therefore, in this work, "Hyper-calvinism" is that Calvinistic system of belief distinguished by (1) believing that God only can beget life in a dead sinner, (2) believing that Christ did in fact save all He will ever save when He died for His people; (3) believing that the term "gospel" is more than the mere quoting of selective halfpassages of scriptures, but is inclusive of the doctrine of grace and all that the Godhead has, is, and will do for the salvation of the elect. (4) and, believing that only God-called and qualified ministers are sent forth to preach the gospel; and "by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that BELIEVE." That, in this work, is "hyper-calvinism. "

**MISSIONISM:** The principle of *organized institutional* method of proselytizing, by establishing a religious-financial enterprise to propagate the gospel, or semi-gospel, message for the enlistment of individuals in religious institutions; most often designed to N<sub>save</sub> souls" which otherwise would not be saved. It is designed to "win the world," both elect and reprobate, to Christ. The term as used in this work is synonymous with "Fullerism."

**NEO-CALVINISM:** "New Calvinism." Neo-calvinism is a term for what Presbyterians refer to as "Hypo-calvinism." Neo-calvinism is another derivative of Fullerism. Fullerism may include both Anninianism and Pelagianism, but Neo-calvinism holds to a form of Calvinism which includes a "Weakened "five points of Calvinism." That is, the Neo-calvinist will say that he believes in the "total depravity and inability of man," yet insist that a totally depraved and enabled man can believe the gospel to be saved. He will state that he believes in irresistible grace, or effectual calling, but insist that man must cooperate with God in his salvation. He seems not to consider that good works are also the fruit of active and effectual grace, and thus will sometimes condition it on the will of the creature. The Neo-calvinist holds to the contradictory theories of God's *sovereignty* and man's *responsibility*, which view necessitates a view that man is *a free moral agent*, rather than a totally depraved and corrupt being.

**NEW SCHOOL BAPTISTS AND/OR PRESBYTERIANS:** The body of "evangelicals" which followed Andrew Fuller's doctrine, and introduced a host of novel institutions to carry out the Fullerite program for "winning the world to Christ" These innovations were *new* in 1800, and those who embraced them were "*of the new school of divinity.*"

**OLD SCHOOL BAPTISTS AND/OR PRESBYTERIANS:** "*n.* A group committed to traditional ideas or practices." (*ibid.*) Those bodies of believers who refused to modify their ancient form of worship to accommodate the new proselytizing zeal which followed Andrew Fullers revision of "Calvinism." They remain on the *old school of divinity*, with little change in practices of the ancient New Testament Church. Characteristic of the *old school* is their insistence that the Bible is the inspired Word of God and the *infallible rule of both faith. AND practice.* To them, this is of utmost importance - to be subject to their King, and walk by His commandments.

**PELAGIAN (ISM):** "*n.* The theological doctrine propounded by Pelagius, a British or Irish monk, and condemned as heresy by the Catholic Church in A.D. 416. Included in its tenets were denial of original sin and the affirmation of man's ability to be righteous by the exercise of free will." (*ibid.*) Pelagianism is the most acceptable doctrine of almost all modern religious institutions. Its principles are the foundation of almost all "evangelical" efforts. It is anti-christian in doctrine as originally embraced by Protestantism.

**SOCINIAN (ISM)** "*n.* An adherent of a 16th-century Italian sect holding unitarian, or universalistic, views, including denial of the divinity of Christ and universal salvation of mankind" (*ibid.*) Socinianism grew rapidly in the major religious "divinity" schools in the mid-1800's, and universal salvationism infiltrated most major "Evangelical" groups. In the mountain areas of the southern United States, Socinianism is called "No-Hell Hardshellism." Another form of it is the view of "Hell-Redemptionism," that although the wicked will go to hell, they will only be punished enough, but

will eventually be delivered out of hell; and thus all mankind will ultimately be saved. The underlying motivation for this view is basic to humanism.