



The Grace Proclamator and Promulgator

“To testify the gospel of the grace of God.” Acts 20:24

PUBLISHED AS A MISSION PROJECT OF PILGRIMS HOPE BAPTIST CHURCH

Vol. XV, No. 3

March 1, 1999

Page

THE STUBBORNNESS OF BIBLICAL FACTS

By Wayne Camp

TEXT: *John 10:35 . . . the scripture cannot be broken.*

Matthew 24:35 Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

2 Timothy 2:9 Wherein I suffer trouble, as an evil doer, even unto bonds; but the word of God is not bound.

INTRO: I have read a three verses that set forth the word of God as absolutely certain to be fulfilled. Many more could be read but these will suffice as a foundation for this message.

I recall sitting around the radio when a boy and listening to Dragnet and then, later, watching the same program on TV. A cliché that Sargent Friday often used was, "Just the facts, Ma'am, just the facts." This week I received a bulletin from an old friend in which he had a message on the subject, ***The Stubbornness of Facts***. Amazingly, the next morning I turned on the radio as I was going to pick up some supplies for the paper and a gentleman on the radio started talking about how stubborn facts can be.

I was further amazed the same afternoon, when I heard one of the floor managers in the impeachment trial, talking about a finding of facts. Several of the senators do not want a resolution on the finding of facts in the case because they know that would put them in a very awkward position if they vote against finding the President guilty and removing him

from office. Senator Robert Byrd admitted that the President had perjured himself and that he was guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors but said he should not be removed because the economy is so good and the majority of the American people do not want him removed.

My message has nothing to do with that issue, but it illustrates the truth of the thesis set forth in my subject, ***The Stubbornness of Biblical Facts***.

If you believe that the Bible is truly the Word of God, and if you believe it is an all-sufficient rule of faith and practice, and if you believe it can furnish us unto all good works, there are some biblical facts that may give you a great deal of trouble unless you totally submit to the final and all-sufficient authority of the Scriptures. There are facts that the Bible does set forth that may trouble you. There is also the fact that the Bible does not contain certain things that may trouble you. And I warn you, Biblical facts can be stubborn things. You can deny them, but the next time you open your Bible they are still there. You may gainsay them but they will still be there. You may take the penknife to them but they will still be there.

And, of those things you may believe that are not found in Scripture, you may insert, interject, and eisegete them into a passage today, but they will vanish more quickly than the vapor rising from the spout of a teakettle. No amount of interpretive contortions can keep them there. They may be there in your mind but another reading your Bible with an unprejudiced and

THE GRACE PROCLAIMATOR AND PROMULGATOR (USPS #000476) is published monthly (subscription free) by the authority of Pilgrims Hope Baptist Church, 3084 Woodrow, Memphis, TN 38127. Periodical postage paid at Memphis, TN 38101.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE GRACE PROCLAIMATOR AND PROMULGATOR, 3084 Woodrow, Memphis, TN 38127

COPYING PRIVILEGES

Any articles or messages in this paper may be copied and used as the reader sees fit unless otherwise specified before or after the article or message. Our desire is to disseminate the gospel of grace as widely as possible.

EDITOR'S ADDRESS, PHONE NUMBERS AND E-MAIL ADDRESSES

The editor, Eld. Wayne Camp, may be reached at the address given above, or at his home address. His home address is: 2065 Tompkins Lane, Millington, TN 38053-5107.

Church Phone at Home: (901) 876-5015

Church Phone: (901) 357-0215.

E-mail address: RWcamp@cris.com

Visit our Home Pages on the Internet

<http://www.concentric.net/~Rwcamp/>

<http://gpp.camps-computer.com/>

Note: An answering machine is on both numbers. They will answer on the fourth ring. We do not monitor our calls before answering.

PLANNING TO MOVE? If at all possible, please notify us three weeks in advance of your change of address so that we may keep your paper coming. It costs us 50 cents to get your new address from the Postal Service and that may take long enough that two papers are returned at a cost of \$1.00 before we get the correction. This will mean you miss one or two papers. Your help in saving us this expense will be appreciated.

IF YOU ARE IN MEMPHIS we invite you to attend our services:

Bible Study 10:00 A. M. Sunday

Worship Service 11:00 A. M. Sunday

Evening Service 5:00 P. M. Sunday

Mid-Week Service 7:00 P. M. Wednesday

You Are Welcome!

spiritually enlightened mind would never see them.

CONSIDER FIRST SOME STUBBORN FACTS ABOUT THE UNIVERSALITY OF SIN IN MAN

There is the undeniable fact that all men, with the exception of the man Christ Jesus, have sinned and are sinners. Paul leaves no room for equivocation. ***Romans 5:12 Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.*** There are

absolutely no exceptions and I make no apology for using that well-known verse in chapter 3. ***Romans 3:23 For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.***

It is a stubborn biblical fact that both Jew and Gentile alike are sinners. ***Romans 3:9 What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin.***

It is a stubborn fact of God's word that all men are under sin. ***Galatians 3:22 But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.***

Let us also consider the stubborn facts about the debilitating effects of sin, especially as it has to do with the sinners ability. It is a stubborn biblical fact that man, in his natural state, cannot be subject to the law of God. ***Romans 8:7 Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.*** It is a stubborn fact of Scripture than a man in his natural state cannot please God. ***Romans 8:8 So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.*** It is a stubborn fact of Scripture that a man cannot, of his own will and motivation, come to Christ. ***John 6:44 No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. John 6:65 And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.*** No man in his natural, unregenerate state can truly hear the word. ***John 8:43 Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word.*** No man in his natural, unregenerate state can truly believe on Christ. ***John 12:37-40 But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: 38 That the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? 39 Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, 40 He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened***

(SEE ***Stubbornness*** con't. P. 9, Rt. Col.)

IN WHAT SENSE ARE WE BAPTIZED INTO THE CHURCH?

PART III

By Wayne Camp

1 Corinthians 12:13 *For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.*

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW

Since I did not include this continuing article in the February issue of the paper, I want to quickly review what we have covered thus far and continue to set forth what others have said on the subject.

In the first article, I showed that one is baptized into the church in the same sense in which he is baptized into Christ and into the death of Christ. I gave the parallel construction of several verses that show that to be true. I repeat them again. Please forgive this lengthy quote from the December, 1998, article.

I said that one is baptized into the body in the same sense that he is baptized into Christ, into Moses, into the death of Christ, etc. A comparison of the following Scriptures makes that very clear.

1. **1 Corinthians 12:13** *For by one Spirit are we all baptized into (EIS) one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.*
2. **Galatians 3:27** *For as many of you as have been baptized into (EIS) Christ have put on Christ.*
3. **Romans 6:3** *Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into (EIS) Jesus Christ were baptized into (EIS) his death?*
4. **Romans 6:4** *Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into (EIS) death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.*
5. **Acts 8:16** *(For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in (EIS) the name of the Lord Jesus.)*
6. **Acts 10:48** *And he commanded them to be baptized in (EIS) the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days.*
7. **Acts 19:5** *When they heard this, they were baptized in (EIS) the name of the Lord Jesus.*
8. **1 Corinthians 1:13** *Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in (EIS) the name of Paul?*
9. **1 Corinthians 1:15** *Lest any should say that I had baptized in (EIS) mine own name.*
10. **Matthew 28:19** *Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in (EIS) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*
11. **1 Corinthians 10:2** *And were all baptized unto (EIS) Moses in the cloud and in the sea.*

Note the parallel nature of these statements.

1. *"baptized into (EIS) one body" (1 Cor. 12:13).*
2. *"baptized into (EIS) Christ" (Gal. 3:27).*
3. *"baptized into (EIS) Jesus Christ" (Rom. 6:3).*
4. *"baptized into (EIS) his death" (Rom. 6:3).*
5. *"baptism into (EIS) death" (Rom. 6:4).*
6. *"baptized in [into] (EIS) the name of the Lord." (Acts 8:16).*
7. *"baptized in [into] (EIS) the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts 19:5).*
8. *"baptized in [into] (EIS) the name of Paul." (1 Cor. 1:13).*
9. *"baptized in [into] (EIS) mine own name." (1 Cor. 1:15).*
10. *"baptizing them in [into] (EIS) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (Mat. 28:18-20).*
11. *"baptized unto [into] (EIS) Moses in the cloud and in the sea." (1 Cor. 10:2).*

Now, consider the expression, *"baptized into"* in the Greek in each of the instances above.

1. *εβαπτισθημ εις (1 Cor. 12:13).*
2. *εβαπτισθητε εις (Gal. 3:27).*
3. *εβαπτισθημεν εις (Rom. 6:3).*
4. *εβαπτισθημεν εις (Rom. 6:3).*
5. *βαπτισματος εις (Rom. 6:4).*
6. *βεβαπτισμενοι εις (Acts 8:16).*

7. βαπτισθησαν εις (Acts 19:5).
8. βαπτισθητε εις (I Cor. 1:13).
9. βαπτισα εις (I Cor. 1:15).
10. βαπτιζοντες εις (Mat. 28:19).
11. βαπτισαντο εις (I Cor. 10:2).

Consider also the tense of baptize in the first four instances where it is a verb. In the fifth instance above it is a noun.

1. Baptized—First aorist passive indicative of **baptizo**. (1 Cor. 12:13).
2. Baptized—First aorist passive indicative of **baptizo**. (Gal. 3:27).
3. Baptized—First aorist passive indicative of **baptizo**. (Rom. 6:3).
4. Baptized—First aorist passive indicative of **baptizo**. (Rom. 6:3).

This shows that the expression "**baptized into**" is used in the same sense in each of these expressions. "**Baptized into one body**" in I Cor. 12:13 is to be understood in the same sense as "**baptized into Christ**" in Gal. 3:27. "**Baptized into one body**" in I Cor. 12:13 is to be understood in the same sense as "**baptized into Jesus Christ**" in Rom. 6:3. "**Baptized into one body**" in I Cor. 12:13 is to be understood in the same sense as "**baptized into his death**" in Rom. 6:3. In each case it refers to relationship, not location. If, based on I Cor. 12:13, we say that baptism is the "**DOOR**" into the church, we should also be willing to say that baptism is the "**DOOR**" into Christ, is the "**DOOR**" into his death, was the "**DOOR**" into Moses for Israel, and was the "**DOOR**" into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Mat. 28:18-20).

Is there not enough parallelism here to establish that fact that being baptized into the one body (1 Cor. 12:13) is in the same sense as being baptized into Christ (Gal. 3:27)? Is not the construction so nearly alike that being baptized into the one body (1 Cor. 12:13) is in the same sense as being baptized into Jesus Christ and in the same sense as being baptized into his death (Rom. 6:3)?

If language means anything, it is in the same sense that we are baptized into Christ that we are baptized into his body. In the same sense that we are baptized into his death we are baptized into his body. The verb **baptized** is the same each time except for slight ending changes and in exactly the same tense, and **eis** is exactly the same in each of the Scriptures. The word **eis** (**εις**), as used in these verses signifies **relationship**. The Israelites were baptized into (**eis**) Moses in the cloud and in the sea.

1 Corinthians 10:2 And were all baptized unto (εβαπτισαντο εις) Moses in the cloud and in the sea.

Concerning this last verse another has written in a message called **Baptized Into One Body**,

In I Corinthians 10 Paul relates how "all" the Israelites "were baptized unto Moses" (v. 2) "and did all drink of the some spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ" (V. 4). In I Corinthians Paul says the same about New Testament Christians.¹

In this same article, this same writer was commenting on I Cor. 12:13 and paralleled the verse with Gal. 3:27. He said,

To be baptized into the body of Christ was the same as being baptized into Christ. (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27).²

In the article in December, 1998, I pointed out that there was no question that J. R. Graves held that baptism was and is the door to the church.

In the article in December, 1998, I also pointed out that **AS FAR AS I HAVE BEEN ABLE TO ASCERTAIN** J. M. Pendleton did not hold strictly to the idea that baptism is the door to the church. I said,

J. M. Pendleton, as far as I have been able to ascertain, held that it was a **prerequisite** to church membership.

I did not try to misrepresent Pendleton. I do not have all that he wrote on the subject and I searched what I had and that was the reason I purposely used the precautionary language, **"AS FAR AS I HAVE BEEN ABLE TO ASCERTAIN."**

I based my statement in part on the fact that Pendleton held that baptism was a **prerequisite** to church membership and he also held that faith in Christ was a prerequisite to church membership. Though salvation is a prerequisite to church membership, it does not follow that one who is saved will become a church member. It does not follow that one who is saved will be baptized. There are those who hold that position but **not this writer**. I have heard it said that "if one is truly saved he will be baptized and join a Sovereign Grace Landmark Baptist Church."

Although Jesus had already established his church, I find no record that Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathaea, nor the thief who was saved on the cross were ever baptized or church members.

Another statement made by Pendleton also influenced my statement. He wrote,

And as churches in all ages must be formed after the apostolic model, it follows that where penitent, regenerate, baptized believers in Christ are found, there are scriptural materials for a church.³

I also set forth that A. C. Dayton differed somewhat with Graves and Pendleton. He held that one is baptized into the visible kingdom of Christ and then received into the church. There is no doubt that this was his position when one reads his book, *Alien Immersion*, from which I quoted him.

A casual reading of a statement by Dayton found on page 150, Vol. II of Theodosia Ernest might cause one to believe that Dayton believed baptism was and is the door to the church. In that place he wrote,

But it is just as true that no one can be a church member who has not been baptized, as though baptism were itself the door of entrance into the Church.

A C. Dayton was no slouch with the English language. And, in the light of other things he said, it is clear that he did not hold that baptism is the door to the church. Please note this clause from this quote, "as though baptism were itself the door of entrance into the Church." The **"were"** in this statement gives us the clue that Dayton was making a statement that was contrary to the facts, as he saw them. The grammatical rule dealing with **"As if"** and **"As though"** clauses is as follows.

When an *as if* or *as though* clause expresses a condition contrary to fact, the verb in the clause requires special treatment, like that described in 1040.

She acts as if she were the only person who mattered. (But she isn't.)

He talks as if he knew the facts of the

situation. (But he doesn't.)

You act as if you hadn't a care in the world. (But you have.)⁴

A few years ago we might have said, Hillary acts as if she were President. (But she is not.)

Or, we might say,

But it is just as true that no one can be President of the United States who has not been inaugurated, as though inauguration were itself the door of entrance into the presidency. (But inauguration is not the door to the presidency.)

Or, we might say,

But it is just as true that no one can go to Heaven who has not believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, as though the act of believing on the Lord Jesus Christ were itself the door of entrance into Heaven. (But the act of believing is not the door of entrance into Heaven; the Lord Jesus Christ is the Door).

When Dayton, who used very precise grammar in his writing, said that it was "as though baptism were itself the door of entrance into the Church," he was clearly stating something that was contrary to what he considered to be true.

In fact, on the very same page (P. 150) that he makes this statement, Dayton also writes as follows. Dr. Thinkwell, who was not a Baptist, is represented by Dayton as saying to Mr. Courtney, who is representing the Baptists,

"Then you do not claim that baptism is the door of entrance into the *Church?*"

The Baptist, Mr. Courtney, is represented by Dayton as saying,

"Strictly speaking it is not, sir. It is the way of entrance into 'the visible *kingdom*;' and through the kingdom to the Church. No one can reach the Church, except through baptism; but every baptized believer is not a Church member. The eunuch was in the visible kingdom as soon as he was baptized; but he was not a member of any Church."

From this statement, it is obvious, unequivocally and irrefutably obvious that Dayton held that baptism placed one in the visible kingdom but not into any local congregation. He clearly declares that **"as soon**

as he was baptized" the eunuch was in the visible kingdom. But, in the same sentence he unequivocally declares, **"He was not a member of any Church."** Thus, it is obvious that when Dayton said that it is "as though baptism were itself the door of entrance into the Church" he was following the rule for setting forth something that he considered to be contrary to fact. His affirmation concerning the eunuch ("The eunuch was in the visible kingdom as soon as he was baptized; but he was not a member of any Church.") makes this utterly evident.

Again, on the same page, Theodosia is represented as asking the Baptist, Mr. Courtney,

"Excuse me, Mr. Courtney," said Theodosia; "but do not Baptists receive members into the Church by baptism?"

To this question, Mr. Courtney replies, "Certainly not, madam. They sometimes *think* they do . . ."

Nothing could be clearer than this. Mr. Courtney, in Dayton's story, is the main representative and champion of the Baptist ecclesiology. When asked, "Do not Baptists receive members into the Church by baptism?" Courtney promptly and unambiguously replies, "Certainly not, madam." How anyone could misunderstand that is a marvelous thing in my mind.

On page 176 of Volume II of **Theodosia Ernest** Dayton makes another statement which confirms that he did not hold that baptism is the door to the church. There he is discussing the succession of churches and I heartily "Amen!" what he has said on that matter. But, a portion of that statement harmonizes with the fact that he held that baptism did not make one a member of any local church, just as he said about the eunuch. On page 176 he wrote,

But these Churches must have been all formed upon the *same Scripture model*, and have been regular successors to each other. If we find at any time a *new* organization, with a *new constitution*, consisting of *different materials*, and governed by *different regulations* from the

original Church, as established by Christ, then we can readily understand that it is not His Church, but some new thing that has come in its place. We do not say that the model Church which was at Jerusalem, or any other of the Churches which were founded in apostolic times, has continued to the present time, but only *that there have always been Churches formed upon the same model*.

Dayton maintained that any church that succeeded the original church must be constituted in the same manner as that original church which was established by Jesus Christ. In fact, he held that any church not established on the pattern of the original church established by Christ was not a true church of Christ. Read this portion of his statement again.

If we find at any time a *new* organization, with a *new constitution*, consisting of *different materials*, and governed by *different regulations* from the original Church, as established by Christ, then we can readily understand that it is not His Church, but some new thing that has come in its place.

Let us now inquire into how the original church established by Christ was constituted. I believe most sound Baptists will agree that John the Baptist came preaching the gospel and baptizing penitent believers preparing the material out of which Jesus would form that original church. When Jesus began his public ministry, many (if not all) of these already saved and baptized believers were called out and constituted a church of the Lord Jesus Christ. The very fact that Dayton says that every church that truly succeeds the original church **must be constituted as was that first, original assembly** clearly shows that he believed baptism was not the door to the church.

On Page 151, Dayton tells us of the general method by which one becomes a member of a local church. He writes,

In general, however, the application for baptism is regarded by both parties as an application for reception into the Church as a member, and the determination that he ought to be baptized is accompanied by a resolution to regard him as a member so soon as he shall have

been baptized; and he is, therefore, immediately upon his baptism a member, to all intents and purposes, even without any formal act of recognition.

This is very true. This is the way that the matter is generally handled among Landmark Baptists. It is the way we handle it at Pilgrims Hope Baptist Church. In fact, we baptized a man and his wife, Sunday, February 14, 1999. The previous Sunday evening they presented themselves on a profession of faith in Christ. They were received for baptism with the stipulation that after baptism they would be members of the church. This is the way we have handled baptism everywhere this editor has pastored. It is the way it will continue to be handled by this editor as long as he pastors. The general practice set forth here by Dayton does not contradict what he has said elsewhere. It does not contradict his painfully obvious statement concerning the Ethiopian eunuch.

The eunuch was in the visible kingdom as soon as he was baptized; but he was not a member of any Church.

What Dayton wrote in *Theodosia Ernest*, Vol. II, P. 151 does not contradict nor change what he wrote in *Alien Immersion*, P. 168. There he said,

But of whom is each Church to be composed? It must consist of those who are members of the *kingdom*, that is, of those who have believed and been baptized. When a person applies for *Church* membership with her, she inquires whether he is in the kingdom, if not, she must receive him into the kingdom by baptism before she can receive him into her special "ecclesia," or assembly, as a *Church* member. But if a sister Church has received him into the kingdom, she only asks to be certified of that fact. He must be in the *kingdom* before he can come into a *Church* within the *kingdom* [Sic].⁵

The more one reads after Dayton and honestly assesses what he has said, the more excruciatingly evident it becomes that this editor did not misrepresent Bro. Dayton on this matter.

In the January 1, 1999, issue of this paper, I quoted B. H. Carroll, an oft quoted Baptist concerning his interpretation of I Cor. 12:13.

Carroll and others are called Baptist giants in a Landmark Baptist publication called *The Biblical and Historical Faith of Baptists on God's Sovereignty*. Another Landmark publication by this Baptist giant is "*Baptized in the Spirit*". Still another Landmark publication is Carroll's definitive work called *Ecclesia—The Church*. I venture to say that nearly all Landmark Baptists of the last few years who have ever written anything on the nature of the church have quoted from this work by Carroll. I have seen him quoted in ABA papers, BMA papers, and Sovereign Grace Landmark Baptist papers. Yet, as I showed in the January 1999, issue, Bro. Carroll did not believe the baptism of I Cor. 12:13 was water baptism at all. Rather, he believed it was Holy Spirit baptism.

While I disagree vigorously with his position on this matter, I will not declare him a heretic for I too have quoted him often. Those who quote and publish his material must consider him a true Baptist, even a Baptist giant. Yet, he held a position on the matter we are discussing in these articles that was different to that of Graves, that of Pendleton, and that of Dayton, that of several others, and that of this editor.

In January I also quoted several other brethren showing that not all Baptists see eye to eye on this matter, but this did not divide their fellowship. I quoted Thomas Montanye of the Philadelphia Association in 1808. Most Landmark Baptists, with whom I am familiar, trace their lineage through the Philadelphia association. Mantanye, as I have shown, did not believe Baptism was the door to the church. I quoted several others who did hold that position.

Now, let us continue and examine the writings of other brethren.

ELD. T. P. SIMMONS

Bro. T. P. Simmons believed that baptism was the door to the church. Three times, at least, he makes that point in his *Study of Bible Doctrine*, a standard work among Sovereign Grace Landmark Baptists. He wrote,

Baptism, which is the immersion in water of a penitent believer in the name of the Trinity or of Christ upon proper authority and for the purpose of showing the believer's death to sin and

resurrection to walk in newness of life, was the initiatory rite of New Testament churches. None were received without this rite. Paul says that it is the mode by which believers are made a part of Christ's body, the church (I Cor. 12:13).⁶

Again, Bro. Simmons said,

Scriptural baptism is essential to a true church because it is the door into the church. Cf. I Cor. 12:13. Hence there can be no church without baptism. An organization that practices anything but immersion, or that does not hold to believers' baptism, or that baptizes people in order that they may be saved, surely is not recognized of Christ as one of His churches.⁷

Once more, according to Bro. Simmons,

This passage (I Cor. 12:13) means that being in or under the power of the Holy Spirit we were all brought by the Lord to baptism, and thus were made members of His body, the local church. Thus baptism is the ceremonial door into the church.⁸

There can be no doubt about the position of Bro. Simmons on this matter. He held that baptism is "the ceremonial door into the church."

ELD. HAROLD COOPER

I am not familiar with Bro. Cooper but found this quote in a reliable source.

A function of the church which is closely related to her responsibility to evangelize the world is that of baptizing those who have been saved (Matthew 28:19). Baptism is not essential to salvation, but it is an obligation of those who have been saved. By it the believer identifies himself with the Lord Jesus Christ, declaring his faith in Christ's death, burial, and resurrection (Romans 6:4). Baptism is a prerequisite to a believer's being admitted into the rights and privileges of a church of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Scriptures clearly teach that there is no church membership apart from baptism (Acts 2:41; Galatians 3:27; Romans 6:3, 4). Since it is God's will that He receive glory through the church (Ephesians 3:21), the importance of baptism becomes obvious.⁹

Note that Eld. Cooper says that baptism is a "prerequisite" for church membership. A prerequisite is "something that is necessary to an end or to the carrying out of a function."¹⁰ A prerequisite is something required beforehand. If, as Bro. Cooper asserts, baptism is a prerequisite to church membership it could not be the door to the church.

A little later on the same page, Eld. Cooper says that one of the qualifications of Scriptural baptism is "a scriptural *design*—the portrayal of the burial and resurrection of the Lord from the dead."¹¹

JOHN BUNYAN

There is much in the ecclesiology of John Bunyan with which I disagree. But, he is often held up as a Baptist and is often quoted by Landmark Baptists on other matters. His work, ***Come and Welcome to Jesus***, was a real blessing to me in the first years after I came to see the blessed doctrines of grace. Bunyan suffered much for what he believed. He is also the author of the monumental work called ***Pilgrims Progress***. Bunyan said of baptism,

" . . . Water baptism hath nothing to do in a Church as a church; it neither bringeth us into the Church, nor is any part of our worship when we come there. How, then, can the peace and unity of the Church depend upon water baptism?"¹² Many will not agree with Bunyan on this matter. In fact, ***I do not*** for I hold that baptism is a church ordinance. But, his statement serves the purpose of showing that Baptists have not been in agreement on this matter whether or not baptism is literally the door to the church.

J. B. JETER QUOTING ANDREW BROADDUS

I close this month's installment with this quote from Andrew Broaddus who is quoted by J. B. Jeter.

Baptism is a gospel ordinance, but not a church ordinance; it would seem, therefore, that a person, as a subject, or a possessor of the gospel faith, may, on that ground, claim the privilege of baptism. This ordinance, I readily admit, is

requisite to church-membership and church fellowship, and was designed, no doubt, with a view to the institution of the gospel church. Still, however, it does not follow, that the privilege of baptism must depend on church-membership.¹³

It seems from this statement that Andrew Broaddus did not hold that baptism is the door to the church. Since Jeter quoted him approvingly, he must have agreed with him.

¹ *Baptized Into One Body*, Milburn Cockrell, *The Berea Baptist Banner*, September 5, 1991, P. 165.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Baptist Church Manual*, J. M. Pendleton, P. 14

⁴ *The Gregg Reference Manual*, Fifth Edition, P. 187.

⁵ *Alien Baptism*, A. C. Dayton, P 168. This book was originally published in 1903 with the title *Pedobaptist and Campbellite Immersions*. It was republished in 1977 with the title *Alien Immersion*.

⁶ *A Systematic Study of Bible Doctrine*, T. P. Simmons, P. 355

⁷ *Ibid.*, P. 367

⁸ *Ibid.*, P. 370

⁹ *Believing Truth About the Church*, Harold Cooper, Baptist Publishing House, Texarkana, TX, P. 44

¹⁰ *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*

¹¹ *Op. Cit.* Cooper

¹² *The Complete Works of John Bunyan*, John Bunyan, Pp. 848ff., 855.)

¹³ *The Writings of Andrew Broaddus, with a Memoir*, J. B. Jeter quoting Andrew Broaddus, p. 435.)

"An ounce of fact is worth a ton of conjecture." J. M. Pendleton in *Did They Dip?*

Annual Bible Conference

Pilgrims Hope Baptist Church

3084 Woodrow · Memphis, TN 38127

October 1-3, 1999

Wayne Camp, Pastor

Phones: (901) 876-5015 or 357-0215

Please make your plans now to attend. We have had some great conferences in the past and anticipate this will be another. Speakers and theme to be announced

(STUBBORNNESS Con't. from P. 2)

their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them.

This hearing is not the hearing of the audible sound of the message, for anyone with reasonable hearing could hear that and have a mental understanding of what is being said. It is often the case that while hearing the audible sound one is not truly hearing. ***Matthew 13:14-15 And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: 15 For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.***

This inability is reflected in a rhetorical question posed by God in Jeremiah. ***Jeremiah 13:23 Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil.***

THIS BRINGS BEFORE US THE STUBBORN FACT OF THE ABSOLUTE NECESSITY OF THE NEW BIRTH

Jesus was not just mouthing words when he declared the new birth to be absolutely essential. ***John 3:1-8 There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: 2 The same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. 3 Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. 4 Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? 5 Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of***

God. 6 That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. 7 Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. 8 The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.

One may be a respected religious leader, but without the new birth he will be unable to comprehend spiritual matters. We read earlier of those who hear with their ears but do not perceive what is being said in their hearts and Jesus says basically the same thing here. **John 3:3 Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.** Without this God-given ability to truly comprehend spiritual truth that is given to the sinner in the new birth, no man can enter the kingdom of God. **John 3:5 Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.**

The unregenerate state of Nicodemus is revealed in his questions. Though he was a great religious leader in Israel he did not have any comprehension of Jesus' words concerning the new birth. **John 3:10 Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?** The import and meaning of many Old Testament passages had not been comprehended by this man.

Solomon clearly sets forth the necessity of the new birth. **Proverbs 20:12 The hearing ear, and the seeing eye, the LORD hath made even both of them.** Even the saved must have a continual opening of our eyes if we are to comprehend God's truth. **Psalms 119:18 Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.**

The necessity of the new birth is clearly implied in the prophecy of Ezekiel. **Ezekiel 36:26-27 A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. 27 And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my**

judgments, and do them. Moses wrote of God circumcising the heart which I take as an indication of the necessity of the new birth. **Deuteronomy 30:6 And the LORD thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live.**

The unregenerate cannot be subject to the law of God. **Romans 8:7 Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.** In this verse from Deuteronomy God promises to do something to them that will fix that disability so that they can love the Lord. It is in the new birth that God opens the heart of the sinner so that he can give attendance to the word. **Acts 16:14 And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul.**

Yes, the stubborn biblical fact of the sinfulness of man makes the absolute necessity of the new birth. The bible insists upon its necessity. That is a stubborn biblical fact. (To be continued.)

Bouquets and Brickbats

WWW: In your article about how churches in the New Testament only met in one place, do you mean one city or one building?

There doesn't seem any indication that there were Jerusalem churches, just the church of Jerusalem. But you quote authors in your first article on "Will there be a Baptist Pope?" that say the Jerusalem church may have had up to 50,000 members. Could 50,000 members fit in one building? It talks about in Acts how 3000 were baptized in one day. Could 3000 fit into one building? And such large crowds would draw the authorities suspicions, and in times of persecution be near impossible.

So wouldn't the church then have to have met in several different places in the city? Like one church in that city, but a couple of different congregations making up that church (maybe something like one church in each quarter?).

Editor's Comments: There are countless places where many, even 50,000 or more have and

do assemble in one place. As for the day of Pentecost and the addition of 3,000, there is no doubt for we have Scripture which tells us that they were all in one place. **Acts 2:1 And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.** Peter is the one who preached the sermon and they were all in one place when the 3,000 were saved and added to the church. As to there being one church in Jerusalem which met in several separate assemblies, there is absolutely no evidence that this was the case. A church is an assembly, a local, visible assembly, and when it loses that distinction, it ceases to exist in the sense of the New Testament idea of a church. That is why I reject the concept of an international church with one assembly meeting in the United States (or other country) and another or other assemblies meeting in foreign countries. That is why I reject the novelty of a church being composed of two assemblies which meet in different parts of the city, state or nation. This is foreign to the New Testament concept of a church.

In his book, **Three Witnesses for the Baptists**, Page 93, Bro. Curtis Pugh makes the following and absolutely correct statement. "New Testament usage, secular usage and the Septuagint usage of the word "ecclesia" indicate it was only *and always used of an organized, congregating body of people in a given locality.*" This being true, as it is, the notion that the CHURCH at Jerusalem might have been composed of several assemblies meeting in different quarters of the city, will not stand. In this statement by Bro. Pugh, I draw the attention of the correspondent and all readers to three essentials facts found in the word **ecclesia**:

1. An ecclesia is **only and always** an organized body. There is no such thing as an ecclesia that is not organized. Organization is inherent in the word.
2. An ecclesia is **only and always** a congregating body; it must assemble together to be a church. Two or more groups of scripturally baptized believers regularly assembling in two or more places cannot be properly and scripturally called an ecclesia, or one church.
3. An ecclesia is **only and always** a body that congregates in a given locality; it is not a body that congregates in two or more given localities.

Our correspondent will do well to keep in mind these three essential ideas inherent in the word ecclesia. Let me further point out that in those early days, though there was persecution, there is no biblical evidence that the churches assembled

secretly for preaching the word but it was done in the market place, etc. so that they could reach the most people. **Acts 3:11-12.**

These folks were not meeting in secret, but were observed for their boldness in openly declaring the gospel of Jesus Christ. **Acts 4:13; Acts 4:32-37.** Reading this passage, it appears they were all assembling together. There is no doubt they were busily witnessing from house to house but if you read carefully the first few chapters of Acts you will notice they were boldly meeting and proclaim the word of God. When Peter and John were released from prison by an angel, he commanded them to go into the temple and preach. **Acts 5:20-21**

The whole multitude of the disciples in Jerusalem were together when they chose the seven to serve the widows tables. **Acts 6:1-6** The suggestion by our correspondent that the church in Jerusalem was composed of several small assemblies meeting secretly out of the sight of the authorities for fear of persecution goes against the whole tenor of the first few chapters of Acts. The unity of this assembly is mentioned more than once. Their being in one place is mentioned more than once. These first few chapters of Acts do not at all support the conception which he suggested of one church in the city composed of two or more small churches. And, if there had been a small church in each quarter, the "churches of Jerusalem" would be the proper way to speak of them, not "the church at Jerusalem."

TEXAS: Editor's Note: We are rejoicing with Bro. Dan Cozart and Grace Baptist Church of Tyler, Texas. They are now meeting in their new church house. Bro. Dan writes,

Dear Brother in Christ, Rejoice with us! On Sunday, February 14, we met as a church for the first time in our new building. The attendance surpassed our expectation. Emotions ran high, many tears were shed, there was great rejoicing, and our gracious God was present.

It has been over two years ago that we left our former location. During that time we have been meeting in rented space. Now the wait is over and we are thrilled to have a place of our own.

Many of you have prayed for us during this time. Thank you so much for your love and concern. Listed below is our new mailing address, location and phone number. Please make note of it for future correspondence.

Grace Baptist Church
P.O. Box 8748
Tyler, Texas 75711

Phone: 903/561-7664

E-mail: dncozart@Ballistic.com

We will host the bi-monthly Grace Bible Conference on Tuesday, March 9. I hope you can attend.

Yours in His Grace, Dan W. Cozart

Ed. Note: Next month I will try to catch up on the publication of several letters for which there was not room this month.

PLANNING TO MOVE? If at all possible, please notify us three weeks in advance of your change of address so that we may keep your paper coming. It costs us 50 cents to get your new address from the Postal Service and that may take long enough that two papers are returned at a cost of \$1.00 before we get the correction. This will mean you miss one or two papers. Your help in saving us this expense will be appreciated

Postmaster: Please send address changes to:
The Grace Proclamator & Promulgator
3084 Woodrow St
Memphis, TN 38127
(USPS #000476)

Periodical Postage Paid
Memphis, TN
38101

Annual Bible Conference

Pilgrims Hope Baptist Church

3084 Woodrow · Memphis, TN 38127

October 1-3, 1999

Wayne Camp, Pastor

Phones: (901) 876-5015 or 357-0215

Please make your plans now to attend. We have had some great conferences in the past and anticipate this will be another. Speakers and theme to be announced.

Annual Sovereign Grace Bible Conference

Victory Baptist Church

9601 Blue Ridge Extension · Kansas City, MO 64134

August 3-5, 1999

Speakers and Subjects

Wayne Camp: Should Women Preach & The Preacher's Study

Cecil Fayard: The Preacher and Modern Theology & The Preacher and Lust

Joe Maldonado: How to Be a Good Pastor in God's Eyes & How to Be Instant Out of Season

Michael McCosky: The Preacher Enduring Hardness & The Preacher's Equipment

Royce Smith: A Bishop Must Be Blameless & The Preacher and Persecution

Kyle White: Exercising Oneself Unto Godliness & The Preacher as an Example of the Believer

Elder Laurence Justice, Pastor
Phone & Fax (816) 761-7184

Semi-Annual Bible Conference

Calvary Baptist Church

285 Whiskey Ridge Rd · Paris, TN

July 31, 1999

Elder David Hitt, Pastor (901) 644-3948

Faith Missionary Baptist Church

P. O. Box 212, 407 South Main Street
St. Joseph, Illinois 61873-0212
(217) 469-7344

Faith has scheduled a Baptist Christian fellowship meeting for 7:00 p.m. Friday, May 14, and 10:00 a.m. Saturday, May 15, with Brother Holmes Moore, pastor of Bible Baptist Church in St. Louis, Missouri, preaching from Daniel 9:24-27, Matthew 24, and Revelation 20. An early afternoon meal on Saturday is intended to conclude the meeting. We will be pleased to get to show you some Baptist Christian hospitality if you can attend.

Eld Jud Travis, Pastor