

## APPENDIX A.

---

### PULPIT RECOGNITION.

Dr. John a Broadus, Professor of Theology in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., delivered the following statements to his class, upon pulpit affiliation, which have been kindly furnished us by Elder S.M. Province, of Brownsville, Tenn., an old student:

“Illustrating the adherence to principle which the apostle Paul showed in refusing to circumcise Titus, while in the case of Timothy, where no principle was involved, he allowed the rite to be performed, Dr. Broadus said: ‘A Baptist preacher may invite a Pedobaptist to preach for him, so long as **it is understood** that he does not thereby indorse the latter’s ordination – *i.e.*, when no principle is involved.’ I quote from my notes. In reply to the question of a student, the professor said substantially: ‘If I were to invite a Pedobaptist to preach in my pulpit, and should afterward learn that he construed the invitation into a recognition of his claim to be a properly ordained minister of a New Testament church, I should not only not repeat the invitation, but I would take pains to tell him **why** I did not.’ I quote from memory, but this is what he said in substance.”

It must be presumed that the answers of Dr. Stuart Robinson (O. S. P.) Louisville, Ky., and Dr. Charles Hodge, Princeton, N.J., forever determine this matter. Says Dr. Robinson:

“The idea of inviting one to preach in the character of a **layman seems to me a paradox.**”

Dr. Hodge says:

“When one minister asks another to exchange pulpits with him, **such invitation is, in fact, and is universally regarded, as an acknowledgment of the scriptural ordination of the man receiving the invitation...**

“No man, who believes himself to be a minister, can rightfully, expressly, or by implication, deny the validity of his ordination; and, therefore, if invited to lecture or speak in the character of a layman, he must decline.”

The *Texas Christian Advocate*, on being specially asked, answers thus:

“When one gentleman invites another to his house, receives him into his parlor, and seats him at this table, **he** recognizes him on terms of perfect **social equality**. So, when one Christian minister invites another to occupy his pulpit, **all who witness the courtesy thus extended regard it as a proclamation of perfect ministerial equality**. Only Christian ministers are invited to the pulpit. If, however, the one who gives the invitation is a Jesuit, and a hypocrite, who wishes to make a show of liberality he does not feel, and believe the brother he thus **pretends** to honor as a minister is only ‘an unbaptized religious teacher, without church membership or ecclesiastical authority of any sort,’ he should be treated as all hypocrites and pretenders deserve to be treated.”

The *Texas Presbyterian* indorses the same.

Rev. A. M. Poindexter, D. D., the most intellectual and logical man old Virginia ever produced wrote this:

“Now, if the bodies, to which reference has been made are not scriptural churches, their ministers can not be scripturally ordained ministers. The ordination can have no force or validity beyond that which is imparted by the body whose act it is; and, if that body is not a scriptural church, of course its ordination can not confer scriptural authority.

“In view of these considerations, it follows that scriptural churches should not recognize, in any way, these unscriptural organizations as scriptural—either by word or action, as to the bodies themselves, or their officers. The churches of Christ are to oppose all departures from the faith as delivered in the New Testament. They may not fraternize with, or connive at heresy. And the obligation thus resting on scriptural churches bears also upon every member and every officer of those churches. The whole body, and each individual, are called upon, by fidelity to Christ and the truth, to make a solemn, consistent and unceasing protest against fundamental error, whether relating to doctrine or to practice; and, in the case reviewed, both doctrine and practice are involved. No Baptist can, rightly or consistently, recognize a Pedobaptist church as a scriptural church, or a Pedobaptist minister as a scriptural minister.”

## APPENDIX B.

### NO CHURCH AT TROAS IN THE FIRST CENTURY.

“There is no evidence that he [Paul], or any other apostle, ever gathered a church there. On the contrary, there is **ample testimony** that, during the first century, no church is recognized as existing in this emporium, the seat of the ancient and classical Troy. The references in the New Testament to the labors of Paul evidently intimate that, when at Troas, he was only as at a point of transit, or brief sojourn for occasional preaching, while on his way to places where he had a destined mission. Thus, for example, in 2 Cor. ii: 12, Paul says: ‘When I came to Troas to preach Christ’s gospel, and a door was opened unto me of the Lord, I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother; but taking my leave of them, I went from thence to Macedonia.’ [The reader can see why he did not preach at Troas, and how a door was opened unto him into Macedonia, by reading Acts xvi, and Conybeare and Howson, vol. 2, chap. xvi.] However inviting this field of labor may have been, Paul had a definite purpose in going onward to another place.

**No proof exists that a church was formed at Troas during any part of the Apostolic Period, or during the first century. All the churches in that part of Asia Minor, then called Asia, are expressly named in the earlier church writers, or in the New Testament; and the seven churches to which the seven epistles in the Apocalypse were addressed, were all, we have reason to believe, which existed in that province when the Apocalypse was written (A. D. 68 or 96.)”**

“We have here also the explanation why John was divinely directed to address his epistles only to those seven churches named in the Apocalypse, and to none besides; and it is from the simple fact, that **no other churches were then existing in the province known as ‘Asia.’** The other five churches elsewhere mentioned in the Scriptures, or in ancient history, existed in this same province, **but not at the time of the writing of the Apocalypse**, when there were only ‘the seven churches in Asia.’ But Troas, which was the most northern bulwark or out post of this Asia, had no church, either before or after the date of John’s epistle.”—*From the Christian Review*, vol. 18, 1853.

An able advocate of a church at Troas urges the fact that it is known that there were other churches in Asia, though not mentioned by John, as the church at Colosse, Hierapolis, Miletus, Magnesia, and Tralles. The writer in the *Review* quotes Strobe and Eusebius in proof that during the reign of Nero, and before the visit of Paul, fourteen cities in proconsular Asia were destroyed by earthquakes in as many years, and that Colosse, Hierapolis, and Laodicea were among them,

but Laodicea alone was rebuilt before John wrote the apocalypse; and that, according to Ignatius, there were no churches organized at Tralles, Magnesia, and Miletus till a few years after. The evidence that there were seven, and only seven, churches existing in Asia when John wrote, is abridged and critically stated by Dr. Cummings, of London, in the lectures on the Seven Churches in Asia. This writer concludes:

“But even allowing the later period [96-100] for the date of John’s recognition of the **Asiatic** churches, it will be perceived that all the essentially important facts go to show, that both at the date of John’s epistles, as well as in the preceding and following parts of the first century, **there were no other churches in Asia but the seven which are addressed in John’s epistle**, and the other five authentically mentioned in sacred and contemporaneous history. We could carry this detail of specific evidence into many additional particulars, showing that **there could have been no organized and existing church at Troas during the period of the apostolic labors, when we have such conclusive evidence of what churches did exist, or did not exist, in that circle of Asiatic cities, of which Troas was the northern key and outpost.**

“The extent to which we have carried this investigation as to ‘the churches in Asia,’ is justified, not only by the intrinsic interest of the inquiry, but especially as furnishing **decisive proof that there never was any regularly formed church in Troas**; and, of course, the gathering of brethren there was only occasioned by the presence of Paul, while tarrying to meet the disciples, who then came together from many contiguous quarters.”

## APPENDIX C.

### THE BEAUTIES OF OPEN COMMUNION.

In all those communities and sections of the South, where Baptists are in a helpless and unaggressive state, Presbyterians and Methodists are generally engaged in the most deadly hostilities, and there is no open communion among them, and can but indicate the character of the warfare that has been waged in East and West Tennessee in my day.

Dr. Ross, formerly of Knoxville, Tennessee (now of Huntsville, Alabama), who has for forty years been regarded as the brightest star in the intellectual firmament of Presbyterianism in Tennessee, and whom his people **love**, and whose views touching Methodism they fully indorse, in the second volume of the “Calvinistic Magazine,” which he edited before the war, and wrote a series of articles against the unscripturalness of Methodist doctrine and its dangers as a system and church to true religion and to the state! From No. 8 I give this sample extract:

**“Methodism in this aspect (its worldly policy) as well as others, is a dangerous power to the piety and peace of the community.**

“The facts we have exhibited are startling. Methodism is a huge trading company. Its preachers have immense capital usurped from their people. They can constrain the people to submission by title deeds they hold for all the church real estate, and they may bind them by terrors of salvation, to buy and sell at their bidding. Thus they have the machinery, temporal and spiritual, to enlarge to overshadowing power, held by men, utterly irresponsible, dangerous to piety? Once more: Methodism cultivates the fanaticism of human nature, and the money-seeking and power-loving energies of fallen man, exactly as Rome has ever done. Is not this church, then, dangerous to the peace of the community? Who says this? Answer, All Christian denominations in the United States say this. Methodist writers themselves have said this. They themselves have written it, that the itinerary is rapidly tending to monarchy and Romanism in our country! Shall we fear Rome, and shall we not watch Methodism? Look! Roman Catholicism may be compared to some huge boa-constrictor serpent which, terribly scorched by the flames of a burning forest, has dragged its

bloated mass into our green fields. We gaze and assail, in alarm, the dying folds of the monster. But shall we cherish the young Anaconda which has crawled from the same den? Shall we destroy Rome and cherish Methodism?

“We solemnly call upon the thinking men of our land to understand this power, and speak out against it. We call to the pulpit, the bench, the bar. We call to the people. Look! You have been told that Romanism is like that wave rolling back to the ocean. Look! It is coming again from the abyss. Methodism is heaving up another wave of death. You see it in the distance – swelling and glittering in light. Wake up, and all is well.”

Now let the reader imagine that he is attending a communion Sabbath’s service of Dr. Ross, and after exposing the unscriptural and **soul-destroying** doctrines of the Methodists, as he was wont to do, with a power and force that few men could command, he closes his sermon with the above periods. Coming down from the pulpit, and wiping the perspiration that stands in large hot drops from his brow, he benignly glances over his congregation, and lo, he sees the young anaconda, in tremulous coils, in the remote part of his congregation, and he commences, in dulcet tones, to woo it gently as a parent bird, and it a sucking dove, and charms it with the spell of a charmer, until it draws near to his communion table, and there he lovingly caresses and embraces it, in token of Christian and church fellowship,—calls it his own dear **brother**, and **feeds its snaky mouth with the bread and blood of the Lord’s Supper!!** He calls upon the Baptists present to come and embrace and cherish it; and when they decline he glares at them over his glasses, and pronounces their conduct as inconsistent, illiberal, and unchristian, for all should commune together!

The Sabbath ended, Dr. Ross sits down, in the calm of his office, dips his pen, and writes:

“We feel it our Christian and patriotic duty to warn the people against Methodism. It is destructive of the Christian religion in its doctrine, and as a religious system a dangerous power to the piety and peace of the community. We solemnly call upon the thinking men of our land to understand this power and speak out against it. We call to the pulpit, the bench, the bar. We call to the people. Look! You have been told that Romanism is like that wave rolling back to the ocean. Look! It is coming again from the abyss. Methodism is heaving up another wave of death. You see it in the distance, swelling and glittering in light. Wake up, and all is well.”

So we see this anaconda serpent of Methodism is nowhere safe from the deadly weapons of Dr. Ross, except under shelter of his communion table. There he loves, there he cherishes it, as a part of the very body of Christ. There he embraces it with tears of affection, inhales its snaky breath, and feeds it with the body and blood of Christ! We turn away from the scene with disgust and horror!

Now look at a companion scene. The next Sabbath is quarterly meeting, and is held in that same “Union House,” and the presiding elder is solemn and terrible. He has heard of Dr. Ross’s sermon, and by way of “tat,” he selects Wesley’s sermon on “Free Grace,” which Wesley aimed and delivered with terrible effect against predestination, as held and taught by Presbyterians. I copy a few sentences:

“This doctrine not only tends to **destroy** Christian holiness, happiness, and good works, but hath also a direct and manifest tendency to **overthrow** the whole Christian revelation. It represents our blessed Lord as a **hypocrite**, a deceiver of the people, a man void of common sincerity.”

He says the Presbyterians, by their doctrine and teaching, not only destroy Jesus Christ and the whole Christian system, but God himself!

“It destroys all his attributes at once; it overturns both his justice, mercy, and truth; yea, it represents the most holy God as worse than the devil, as more false, more cruel, and more unjust. This is the blasphemy for which I abhor the doctrine of predestination.”

And he closes by indorsing, with great emphasis, the sentiment attributed to Dr. H. Bledsoe: “I would prefer to worship a huge gorilla than the Presbyterian’s God.”

Before he leaves the pulpit, he announces the communion to be observed, and most affectionately invites Dr. Ross and his people, as well as the Baptists present to gather around the “sacramental board,” and thus show to an unbelieving world that we are all one—all hold and preach the same essential doctrines—fighting against the same enemy, and on “our pleasing march” to the same heaven.

Now if it is asked, why we present this language and these scenes, that resemble blasphemy and sacrilege more than any thing else, we answer, to prove to all men, that Baptists are at least consistent in the terms of their church communion, and that open communion among churches of opposing creeds is **contradictious** and **absurd**; and, if we may be allowed to use one scriptural word, though a hard one—hypocritical. There seems to be to us a tremendous discrepancy between the **preaching** and **writing** of open communionists, and their **addresses** at the communion table. When does Dr. Ross and all others tell the truth—when they write and preach against each other, or when they deliver their loving addresses at their communion tables?

If these facts are not sufficient to put a full end to open communion, then truth and reason and common sense are powerless to do it.

A Baptist Historical Resource  
Published by the Center for Theological Research  
at [www.BaptistTheology.org](http://www.BaptistTheology.org)

©2006 Transcription by Jennifer Faulk and Madison Grace

**Permissions:** The purpose of this material is to serve the churches. Please feel free to distribute as widely as possible. We ask that you maintain the integrity of the document and the author's wording by not making any alterations and by properly citing any secondary use of this transcription.

The Center for Theological Research  
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary  
Fort Worth, Texas  
Malcolm B. Yarnell, III, Director