

**CATABAPTISM IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN  
AMERICA**



**Rev. Dr. Francis Nigel Lee  
Professor-Emeritus of Queensland Presbyterian Theological  
College**

**CATABAPTISM IN THE PCA**  
**by Rev. Professor-Emeritus Dr. F.N. Lee**

**(Excerpted from Dr. Lee's 1990 S.T.D. dissertation "Rebaptism Impossible!")**

Baptismal advice to Western Carolina Presbytery at the 1982 PCA .....	p. 3
Baptismal advice sought by Grace Presbytery at 1982 PCA .....	p. 5
1983 secession from the PCA of the 1984 antirebaptist RPCUS .....	p. 5
1983f: the catabaptist controversy within the PCA 'Baptisms Committee' .....	p. 6
Lee's 1983 article on unrepeatability of circumcision and baptism .....	p. 7
Dr. Thompson circulates extracts from Lee within the PCA's Baptism Committee .....	p. 9
Dr. Thompson's own 1984 <i>Opus</i> against catabaptism .....	p. 10
Lee cited in Dr. Thompson's anticatabaptistic <i>Opus</i> .....	p. 11
Dr. Bogue's January 20th 1984 catabaptist response to Dr. Thompson .....	p. 12
Dr. Thompson's January 25th 1984 anticatabaptist response to Dr. Bogue .....	p. 13
Dr. Thompson's January 26th 1984 letter to Dr. Lee .....	p. 14
Dr. Lee's February 11th 1984 letter to Dr. Thompson .....	p. 15
Lee's February 11th 1984 statements on 'the true church' .....	p. 16
Dr. Thompson's 1984 anticatabaptist <i>Draft Minority Report</i> .....	p. 18
Dr. Lee's soon reply to the February 1984 <i>Draft Minority Report</i> .....	p. 21
Dr. Lee's further response in May 1984 to the <i>Draft Minority Report</i> .....	p. 22
The <i>Majority Report</i> of the PCA's Baptism Committee .....	p. 24
The baptismal (in)action of the 1984-87 PCA General Assemblies on the <i>Report</i> .....	p. 25
The 1987 aftermath of the undecisive 1987 PCA General Assembly .....	p. 26
What should have been decided at the 1987 PCA General Assembly .....	p. 27
Lee's 21st December 1987 letter to the editor of <i>Journey</i> (Rev. Richard Knodel) .....	p. 28
Dr. Lee's 1990 article <i>Calvinism versus Catabaptism</i> .....	p. 30
Dr. Carl Bogue's 1990 <i>Letter to Dr. Lee</i> and enclosures .....	p. 32
Dr. Lee's October 1990 <i>Letter to Dr. Bogue</i> .....	p. 33
The invalidity of Mormon water-rites .....	p. 34
Mormon water-rites 'invalid' (continued) .....	p. 36
Mormon water-rites 'invalid' (resumed) .....	p. 37
Mormon water-rites 'invalid' (concluded) .....	p. 39
The invalidity of Unitarian water-rites .....	p. 40
The validity of irregular (justificatory?) 'S.D.A. baptisms' .....	p. 42
The validity of irregular (justificatory?) 'Campbellite baptisms' .....	p. 44
Conclusion: 'once triunely baptized, always baptized!' .....	p. 46
Summary: Calvinism accepts 'Romish' baptism and rejects catabaptism .....	p. 47
Postscript: baptism in the future 'Church of the Triune God' .....	p. 49
ENDNOTES .....	p. 52
ABOUT THE AUTHOR .....	p. 59

The PCA (Presbyterian Church in America) is this present writer's former denomination. Before the 1982 merger with the anticatabaptist RPCUS, the larger PCA was a mixture of knowledgeable anticatabaptistic orthodox Calvinians, catabaptistic Neo-Thornwellians, baptismally indifferent Quasi-Independents, and assorted Crypto-Baptists openly tolerating if not covertly supporting the rebaptizing overseas of both Catholics and Protestants by non-denominational submersionistic and antipaidobaptistic missionary societies preying on PCA contributions.

In 1982, the anticatabaptist Reformed Presbyterian Church Evangelical Synod merged itself out of existence into the larger Presbyterian Church in America (PCA). This considerable RPCES influx strengthened the anticatabaptists within the PCA -- even though the quality of its eschatological and soteriological contributions remains questionable.

Because this present writer was an anticatabaptistic orthodox Calvinian PCA Minister of the Word and Sacraments right down until his 1981 appointment as Professor of Systematic Theology at the Queensland Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, he is still particularly concerned about ongoing events in his old denomination in the USA. But quite apart from this -- baptismal developments within the influential American PCA from 1982 onward, also demand that they be noted in a dissertation such as this.

### **Baptismal advice to Western Carolina Presbytery at the 1982 PCA**

At the 1982 General Assembly of the PCA, some truly excellent advice was given on a very vexing practical question. For the General Assembly had been asked by the Western Carolina Presbytery: "May baptism properly be administered to individuals who have been 'christened' or baptized in infancy, when it had been apparent that neither parent was a believer?"<sup>644</sup>

To this question, the response proposed at the 1982 General Assembly, recorded in its *Minutes*, rightly remonstrated: "No. Baptism is but once administered to any person (*WCF* 28:7). Baptism [is to be] with water, in the Name of the Triune God, by [the] most significant manner possible." *Westminster Confession of Faith* 28:2,3,6.

The General Assembly then went on to supply the following good 'Grounds' for the above advice. Among other things, it rightly remarked:<sup>644</sup> "The question of re-baptism has been of concern to believers since the time of the Early Church, when believers fell away from the faith during persecution and later returned to the faith. Questions were even raised concerning the validity of a baptism performed by a Minister who later fell away from the faith.

"To the desire of individuals seeking re-baptism, the Church has historically responded that only one administration of baptism is appropriate. Historically, the Church has not

re-baptized those who have fallen away; been excommunicated; and subsequently have sought re-admission to the Church....

"Their former baptism was not invalidated by their later falling away, necessitating re-baptism.... Neither can the baptism of their children be invalidated. If one or both parents professed faith in Jesus Christ and were members in good standing within the Visible Church, then the administration of baptism to their infant children was perfectly appropriate -- as valid as their own baptism. If they were not professing believers and were not members in good standing within the Visible Church, then they would have no right to baptism for themselves or their children....

"If however they were professing Members of the Visible Church at the time of the administration of their children's baptism, then the baptism was valid -- both for themselves and for their children.... Subsequent events could not invalidate the baptism so as to necessitate a new and subsequent baptism -- for themselves or their children....

"In Acts chapter 19...it is clear from the context that the disciples referred to...were not disciples of Jesus Christ. They were not professing Christians. They had not been baptized in the Name of Jesus, but in **John's baptism**.

"These disciples were ill-informed disciples of John the Baptist, people who did not even know of the Holy Spirit. They clearly did not know the Gospel of Christ. For the Apostle has to explain it to them.

"Having heard now of Christ, they were indeed baptized. But it was not a second Christian baptism. It was their first and only Christian baptism.... There are no Scriptural examples of people being baptized twice in the Name of Jesus.

"There is another passage which has bearing on this issue. In Acts chapter 8, we read that Simon Magus professed faith in Christ and was baptized. Subsequently, Peter uncovered Simon's true spiritual condition and warned him: 'Thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent!' Simon was apparently affected by this warning and apparently repented, saying to Peter: 'Pray ye to the Lord for me, that none of these things which ye have spoken come upon me!'

"Here, then, is an explicit case of the baptism of a man later discovered to be unconverted. Peter's counsel to him is not: 'You need to be re-baptized!' but rather: 'You need to repent!' What Simon Magus needed, was not another external baptism - - but...repentance, conversion....

"Baptism is but once to be administered to any one person (*WCF* 28:7). If a professing believer desires to improve his baptism (as indeed all believers should), the means of improving it is not re-baptism but rather seeking with all our heart to live up to the engagement to belong wholly to the Lord which our baptism signifies (see *LC* 167)."

### **Baptismal advice sought by Grace Presbytery at 1982 PCA**

Notwithstanding the above excellent advice given by the 1982 General Assembly, there was now to be more catabaptistic baptismal disagreement in the PCA than ever before. For Western Carolinas Presbytery had asked the 1982 PCA General Assembly for advice not just about the previously mentioned question, but also about two other baptismal questions (irrelevant to this present dissertation).

In addition, also Grace Presbytery had asked the 1982 PCA General Assembly for advice about four different baptismal problems. Three of those problems are indeed relevant to this present study.

Thus confronted with no less than seven baptismal questions, the 1982 General Assembly now set up a special Committee to Study the Validity of Certain Baptisms. The Committee was mandated thereafter to report back to a subsequent General Assembly on all seven of the above questions.

The answer to one of these seven questions had already been proposed to the 1982 General Assembly itself (see above).<sup>645</sup> Only three of the other six questions -- the first, second and third questions raised by Grace Presbytery -- are relevant to our own present dissertation.

Here is Grace Presbytery's first question:<sup>646</sup> "Are the recipients of so-called baptism by a religious body which claimed the sacraments as a part of a process of justification (as in the case of Roman Catholic, Church of Christ, or Lutheran churches), proper recipients of Christian baptism?"

Here are Grace Presbytery's further questions:<sup>647</sup> "Are those who were presented by unbelieving parents for so-called infant baptism proper recipients of Christian baptism? Are those baptized as adults or older children (it is understood that these persons were not professing believers at the time they presented themselves for baptism) proper recipients of Christian baptism?"

### **1983 secession from the PCA of the 1984 antirebaptist RPCUS**

The PCA was soon facing many new tensions, including some of a non-baptismal nature. In 1983, there was a secession of confessionalists from the newly-enlarged PCA. [In 1984, these secessionists constituted themselves as the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States (RPCUS) -- in 1990 renamed the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the Americas (RPCA).]

Prior to the secession, its leader -- Rev. Dr. Joseph C. Morecraft III -- noted the catabaptist practices of baptistic missionaries in South America who routinely rebaptize all Ex-Romanists. Morecraft rightly, and often, condemned this rebaptism

of protestantized Ex-Romanists. He did so in many conversations with this present writer.<sup>648</sup> It is presumed that, on this point, the RPCUS-RPCA is still confessional -- and therefore officially anticatabaptist.

### **1983f: the catabaptist controversy within the PCA 'Baptisms Committee'**

We now return to the development of a fresh baptismal controversy, from 1983 onward, within the 'Committee on the Validity of Certain Baptisms' appointed by the PCA at its 1982 General Assembly. This time, it concerned not only the validity of infantly baptized children of unbelieving Protestants, but also (as in prior times) *inter alia* the rebaptizability of presbyterianized Ex-Romish and other ritualists.

Our own involvement in this new controversy of our old denomination in the USA, commenced in December 1983. For it was then that Dr. John G. Thompson -- on the Session of the PCA in Kingsport, Tennessee -- wrote to us for advice. He and others -- including Dr. C.W. Bogue and Dr. G.W. Knight III<sup>649</sup> -- had been appointed by the 1982 PCA General Assembly to serve on its previously mentioned Committee on the Validity of Certain Baptisms.

During 1983 there was an interchange of opinions on the above baptismal matters between Drs. Thompson, Bogue and Knight.<sup>650</sup> Dr. Thompson<sup>651</sup> soon drew attention to the irregular yet valid and unrepeatable circumcisions administered by Zipporah and received by Josiah and Hezekiah. Exodus 4:24-26; Second Chronicles 28:1-2,27; 29:1-2; 32:33; 33:1-25; 24:1-2.

Pursuant to the Question by Grace Presbytery, now submitted to the Committee, Dr. Bogue had stressed the issue of Rome's heretical view of justification.<sup>652</sup> Dr. Knight was concerned chiefly with the best methodology for the Committee to follow procedurally.<sup>653</sup> In addition, Dr. Bogue<sup>654</sup> and Dr. Knight<sup>655</sup> both seem to have thought that Rome's formulations at Trent anent baptism and anent justification might indeed be germane to the matter of the validity of baptisms subsequently administered by Romanists.

On November 23rd 1983, Dr. Thompson wrote to Dr. Lee in Australia to ask for his opinion regarding the validity of baptisms administered specifically by the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>656</sup> Here, in our own following treatment of this controversy, we shall be as short as possible.

Few new arguments for catabaptism were now being advanced in the American PCA -- beyond those already dealt with by us in the pages above in connection with previous baptismal debates. By the latter, we mean: the debates in Europe, between Calvin on the one hand and both the Anabaptists and Trent's Romanists on the other; the debates in America, between Hodge and Thornwell; and the debates in Australia, between the PCA and the PRC (and also the PCEA).

In his November 23rd 1983 *Letter to Lee* (this present writer), Dr. Thompson lamented that "the PCA continues to plunge towards an even broader evangelicalism than before." He then raised the matter of the baptismal opinions of some within the PCA General Assembly's Committee on the Validity of Certain Baptisms.

Dr. Lee responded to Dr. Thompson late in 1983 with a personal letter.<sup>657</sup> There he states: "The PCA needs to be reminded that Rome is a Church in ruins, not a mosque or a synagogue.... Anabaptists and Antinomians are more lethal than Classic Romanists."

### **Lee's 1983 article on unrepeatability of circumcision and baptism**

In Australia, Dr. Lee then wrote his article *The Unrepeatability of Circumcision and of Baptism as its Replacement*.<sup>658</sup> Before the end of 1983, he sent it to Dr. Thompson in the U.S.A.

In Dr. Lee's article, he said *-inter alia* -- that "even the great Baptist Rev. Dr. Augustus Hopkins Strong rightly tells us in his *Systematic Theology*:<sup>659</sup> ' In respect of not being repeated, baptism is unlike the Lord's Supper.... Rebaptism, in the case of unstable Christians, tends to bring reproach upon the ordinance itself.' Cf. too: Exodus 4:24-26; 20:5-6; Psalm 105:6-10; Isaiah 59:20-21; Romans 11:16,25-29; Ephesians 4:4-6; Hebrews 6:2-6.

"Both before and after the 1545 Council of Trent, Calvin rightly opposed the thoroughly anti-Scriptural 'heresy' of catabaptism. For catabaptism -- whether by wildcat anabaptistic immersionists, or by deranged catabaptists (alias paidorebaptistic resprinklers of validly baptized Ex-Romanists or Ex-Lutherans or even Ex-Presbyterians) -- was rightly reprehended.

"It was regarded by Calvin and by every single one of the Reformational and Post-Reformational Calvinistic *Confessions*, as a slight against triune baptism. Implicitly, it was also to be regarded as an insult against the 'Ontological' Trinity and the Triune God Himself -- as well as being inimical to all truly Biblical ecumenicity.

"For there is no such thing as 'papal baptism' or 'baptist baptism' or 'presbyterian baptism' -- but only triune baptism administered by unworthy administrators. Such 'unworthies' include the Pope, Billy Graham, the Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly, and Martin Luther. Such also include all other (saved or unsaved) baptizers. They are all unworthy [though indeed in varying degrees]. For every human priest or sinful preacher is (to a greater or lesser extent) -- shabby before a sin-hating God!

"Most Calvinists even in the United States (*e.g.* Hodge, Hoeksema, Boice *etc.*) have to this very day held firmly to the anti-catabaptist faith once and for all delivered to the saints. All Classic Presbyterians ancient and modern -- in almost every other country of the world except the United States -- have always done so, and still do so.

"It is a matter for rejoicing that the recently republished Thornwell is again being read for his undoubted excellence in almost all fields except that of baptism. Yet it is an awful tragedy indeed that his maverick catabaptism is again being promoted by those who uncritically venerate even his baptismal aberrations. At this very point, they too fall into the ancient and schismatic and grievous error of catabaptism....

"Praise God for the excellencies of Thornwell! But let him hang his hoary head in shame for his shocking anticovenantal and anti-Calvinistic statement (*Collected Writings* IV:348) that even the covenantal seed are to be regarded as 'enemies of God' until 'they come to Him' -- and for his shocking departure (*ib.* III:283*f*) from orthodox historic Calvinism toward great catabaptist error!

"The historic post-Trent Calvinistic position (of the modern Reformed Ecumenical Synod *etc.*), is rightly given in the 1562 *Belgic Confession* article 34: 'We believe that every man who is earnestly desirous to obtain life eternal, ought to be baptized with this [one and] only baptism, without ever repeating the same, since we cannot be born twice. We detest the error of the Anabaptists who are not content with the one only baptism they have once received and moreover condemn the baptism of the infants of believers....

"How tragic that some modern 'Presbyterians' have enormous problems recognizing the validity of admittedly irregular Roman Catholic paidobaptist sprinkling, but uncritically have no problems at all co-operating with even more irregular baptistic immersionists who hate and detest the precious covenant theology which the early Calvinists bled and died to uphold. *O mores, o tempora!*

"The true visible Historic Christian Church of all the ages -- as distinct from heretical or schismatic sects -- has always recognized the validity of triune baptism, even when administered by various overly-rigoristic schismatic groups such as separatistic Novatianists and Donatists.

"Similarly, today too, true Presbyterians should most certainly recognize the irregular but valid triune baptisms of overly-rigoristic schismatics -- such as those of assorted fundamentalistic Baptists, of catabaptistic Thornwellian paidobaptists, and also of overly-ritualist trinitarian groups such as Romanists and Episcopalians....

"For truly confessional Presbyterians pay more than just lip service to the *Westminster Standards*. Solemnly do the latter declare: 'Neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it.... The sacrament of baptism is but once to be administered to any person' [including the Romanist previously baptized by a priest]. *Westminster Confession* 27:3 & 28:7 and *Larger Catechism* 177.

"Furthermore, baptism is not to 'be dispensed by any but by a Minister of the Word lawfully ordained' -- as distinct from a Ruling Elder, or a Plymouth Brethren layman, or a Modernistic Presbyterian Lady-Minister, or an unordained Baptist working



through some non-denominational missionary society. *Westminster Confession* 27:4 & 28:2 and *Larger Catechism* 176.

However, even baptisms irregularly performed by the latter -- are valid. So too are baptisms validly performed by male Romish priests -- and even by Pentecostalist homosexual TV Evangelists. Such should never be repeated in more orthodox circles later. See *Westminster Confession* 27:3 and 28:5 (citing Romans 2:28f & Exodus 4:24-26).

"Let us then go forth and lead the millions of irregularly but validly baptized Romanists of South America to the Triune God of their baptism! Let us not, with Thornwell and the whole gang of non-denominational rebaptizing missionary societies) antagonize them -- and lose them for the Gospel -- instead of winning them for the very Christ to Whom their baptism points!"

### **Dr. Thompson circulates extracts from Lee within the PCA's Baptism Committee**

Soon after receiving<sup>660</sup> the above material from Lee, on January 16th 1984 Dr. Thompson sent<sup>661</sup> many of his own extracts therefrom to his fellow members on the PCA Committee on the Validity of Certain Baptisms. As Dr. Thompson wrote to Dr. Lee on January 26th 1984, "I decided that I was duty-bound to try once more, even if inadequately, to convince the other members of the Baptism Committee (Catabaptistic) that their views were (1) not Confessional or Biblical and (2) [not] self-consistent. I took the liberty to 'borrow' freely from the material you had previously sent me. I have enclosed a copy of the packet I sent to each member."

Dr. Thompson's above-mentioned "packet" he had mailed to the other members of the Committee on January 16th 1984, itself consisted of three items. These were: his January 16th 1984 *Letter to the Committee*;<sup>661</sup> his January 1984 *Opus* against catabaptism;<sup>662</sup> and a copy of the anticatabaptist *Report adopted by the 1981 General Synod of the RPCES*<sup>663</sup> shortly before it had merged itself out of existence into the PCA in 1982.

In his January 16th 1984 *Letter to the Committee*, Dr. Thompson -- who was raised in Brazil -- helpfully declares:<sup>664</sup> "At one time I was most emphatically of the view that Roman Catholic baptism was not only irregular, but invalid. This arose naturally from my Brazilian upbringing and its associated indoctrination by American-trained Brazilian pastors and teachers. Most of the missionaries in northeast Brazil were and had been Southern Presbyterians [from the USA]....

"The point I would like to reiterate to the Committee is precisely that of making the distinction between validity and regularity (or, irregularity). Though other Reformed confessions have made similar statements, those of the *WCF*, especially 27:3 and 28:6-7, are clear.... If the cited illustrations of Zipporah, of Josiah and Hezekiah, and perhaps Simon Magus (see attached copy of pg. 100 of the Minutes of the 10th G.A.

[of the 1982 PCA] for the information under 'grounds') have no weight in swaying your opinion by the enlightening power of the Holy Spirit -- then I can say nothing further. As the watchman on the wall, I will have discharged my responsibility to you, and, by *Minority Report*, to the Assembly....

"My view with regard to the statement on justification, is that it is not germane to the issue at hand. The RC view on baptism was not changed by Trent, nor is justification the only reason the Committee majority would cite to justify its view that RC baptism is invalid. Therefore, this statement is functionally irrelevant to the Committee's work."

[The above-mentioned "statement on justification" apparently refers to the first question from Grace Presbytery passed on by the 1982 General Assembly to the PCA Committee on the Validity of Certain Baptisms for study. Grace Presbytery had asked: "Are the recipients of so-called baptism by a religious body which claimed the sacraments as a part of a process of justification (as in the case of Roman Catholic, Church of Christ, or Lutheran churches), proper recipients of Christian baptism?"]<sup>665</sup>

### **Dr. Thompson's own 1984 *Opus* against catabaptism**

Dr. Thompson's own 1984 *Opus* against catabaptism is full of wisdom. There, he declares:<sup>666</sup> "In preceding Committee discussions, the matter of Calvin's view on [against] rebaptism and its relation to Trent and the RC church has perhaps not been viewed in proper historical context....

First let me set forth a few thoughts on validity versus regularity of baptism.... I need not establish the sacramental identity between baptism and circumcision. In Exodus 4 we see God starting to kill Moses for his deliberate omission of the circumcising of his second son. To prevent the Lord from slaying Moses, his wife Zipporah (a Midianitess herself) quickly administered the sacrament. This was highly irregular. Cf. Genesis 17:23 & 21:4 *etc.* Yet it was regarded by God as valid. For immediately, the Lord's wrath was turned away.

"Please note that Calvin in his *Commentary on Exodus* 4:25 (post-Trent 1563) comments...'that the ceremony thus rashly performed, pleased God.... Although it [the circumcision] was improper..., it is...approved'.... If the unordained female Midianitess Zipporah's highly irregular circumcision of Moses' son was valid -- how much more so, felt Calvin, are the less irregular baptisms performed by the ordained male priests of the Church of Rome!"

Dr. Thompson next cites Calvin's *Institutes* IV:16:9,20f. He then points out<sup>667</sup> that Dr. Calvin himself "was baptized only once; in infancy; in the RC Church; and never again. His wife Idelette, baptized...in an Anabaptist sect in Holland, was never rebaptized by sprinkling -- after her conversion to the Reformed faith and then her marriage to Calvin. Before someone calls out 'pre-Trent behavior' -- let me continue with a [1559] quotation from the delightful Calvin:

"As in ancient times..., so in the present day [please note, a post-Trent day]..., we deny not to the Papists those vestiges of a church which the Lord has allowed to remain among them.... The covenant of the Lord continued there [among the impious Israelites], and His faith could not be obliterated by their perfidy. Nor could circumcision be so profaned by their impure hands as not still to be a true sign and sacrament of His covenant....

"So, having deposited his covenant in Gaul, Italy, Germany, Spain and England, when these countries were oppressed by the tyranny of the [papal] antichrist, He, in order that His covenant might remain inviolable, first preserved baptism there as an evidence of the covenant -- baptism which, consecrated by His lips, retains its power in spite of human depravity....' *Institutes*, again post-Trent, 1559 edition, IV:2:11)."

Dr. Thompson next<sup>668</sup> cites at length from Calvin's "post-Trent 1559 edition of the *Institutes* IV:15:16-17" (*q.v.*). Then Dr. Thompson states:<sup>669</sup> "See also, therefore, Romans 6:1-4."

Dr. Thompson then goes on<sup>670</sup> to cite "another quotation from a post-Trent writing of Calvin's, [his] *Appendix to the Tract on the True Method of Reforming the Church*. 'As to the children of Papists, the answer is easy [in answer to a question posed by one of Calvin's opponents regarding validity].... Taking it for granted that they were validly<sup>+++</sup> baptized, I agree with him'....

### **Lee cited in Dr. Thompson's anticatabaptistic Opus**

Continues Dr. Thompson: "F.N. Lee's comment on this term ['validly'],<sup>+++</sup> is as follows: 'By saying that the Romanists have been "validly baptized," Calvin does not mean that they should have been baptized, and still less that they would have been baptized if they had been presented for baptism in a truly Reformed church rather than presented to a Romish priest. Calvin only means that their Romish baptism, once administered, is valid and unrepeatable as far as Calvin is concerned.

"Because that baptism, however irregular, was still performed in the Name of the one true Triune God. That this was exactly Calvin's view of the entire matter, is apparent when consideration is given to the following data'....

"In his *Letters to Socinus* [the Unitarian -- F.N.L.],<sup>671</sup> Calvin wrote of the Romish Church that 'however much stained with many pollutions, baptism nevertheless keeps its validity -- seeing that it was nevertheless administered with the intention of making the children of believers recipients of the sign of acceptance according to the command of Christ. Even if only a cognizance of the divine institution remains, that baptism is not to be pronounced invalid.... For it matters not to me whether he who performs the baptism is a diabolical man or even the devil.'"

Here, continues Thompson,<sup>672</sup> "F.N.L." remarks that "'even if the devil were able to baptize, he would have to do so not in his own perfidious name but only in the fully

trustworthy Name of God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.... On the other hand, Dr. Calvin himself would not sanction nor perform the administration of irregular baptisms.... Neither should we....

"The highly irregular circumcision performed by the woman Zipporah on her own child was valid, and therefore unrepeatable (Exodus 4:25-26).... Highly irregular baptisms performed today by so-called women preachers should also be considered valid and therefore unrepeatable.

"Nevertheless, this solitary example [in Exodus 4:25f] should never be adduced as a ground for advocating the permissibility (as opposed to the validity) of baptisms performed by woman preachers in modernistic churches. Cf. Calvin's *Institutes* IV:15:22. For, as Calvin wrote to the Ministers of Mompelgard: 'If the authorities try to establish the practice of baptism by women -- this must be resisted even unto blood!'"<sup>673</sup> Unquote Rev. Prof. Dr. F.N. Lee.

Dr. Thompson next refers<sup>674</sup> to Calvin's *Letter to Farel* -- anent the baptizability in the Reformed Church of the infant children of unrepentant romanized Ex-Protestants, and also about the excommunicatability of such Members of the Reformed Church as would encourage such baptisms. Calvin there advised Farel not to baptize the baby of a Reformed Church woman who, upon the advice of her Reformed Church mother, had gone and married a Romanist -- even though the grandmother herself (but not her married daughter) was now willing to make the required baptismal promises. For firstly, the grandmother was not the legal guardian of that grandchild; and secondly, even if she was, she had not yet repented of her gross sin of encouraging her at that time unpregnant daughter to marry the Romanist.

Dr. Thompson then finally quotes<sup>675</sup> from "F.N. Lee" that: "modern catabaptists -- unbiblically rejecting the validity of post-Trent baptism in the R.C. Church -- need to understand that Trent did not change the R.C. doctrine of baptism.... Post-Trent Calvin still accepted irregular R.C. baptism as fully valid."

### **Dr. Bogue's January 20th 1984 catabaptist response to Dr. Thompson**

When Dr. Thompson's above-mentioned "packet" was received by his other Committee Members, the catabaptist Chairman, Dr. Bogue, immediately sent Dr. Thompson an informative reply on January 20th 1984. There, he is seen<sup>676</sup> to respond: "I have Nigel's *Declaration* in my file.... I just heard from him recently. Sure wish he were among us....

"Very quickly, I make one response to your *Opus*. Why won't you (or Nigel) speak to the issue? I agree with most of what you say, except it all pre-supposes a true Church! Exodus 4 is [= would be?] relevant, if Mr. and Mrs. Moses were not part of the true Church.

"Re: *Institutes* IV:15:16-17. I agree [with Calvin that] 'this confutes the error of the Donatists.' But the issue is not heretics within a true church, but representatives of no true church.

"Re: Lee on Catabaptists -- even if Trent did not change baptism (which I doubt), that is not the issue. The issue is, whether Rome is a part of the true church, or is apostate!

"Question 1: Is Rome a true church, officially teaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ? 2: Are the sacraments given to the church alone? 3: Would you really not approve baptizing one who was baptized a J.W. [Jehovah's witness] or Mormon?

"We must distinguish clearly on these issues, or we get nowhere. I want to ask Nigel the same thing re 1 & 2. You both imply 'yes' to 1 or 'no' to 2.

"One other complaint. If you are going to persuade the Committee that my assignment is irrelevant -- why didn't you do it before I spent all this time on it?

[Here Dr. Bogue is apparently referring to the assignment given him anent the validity of baptisms performed by those believing that baptism itself justifies.]<sup>677</sup>

Rev. Dr. Carl Bogue then closes his letter with his characteristic charity, graciousness, humility, and very good humour. He then tells Dr. Thompson - and, by implication, all who agree with the latter's Classic Calvinistic position against catabaptism:<sup>678</sup> "I must run, but will always consider you as a TR [a True Reformer or 'Truly Reformed'] in spite of this -- *i.e.*, you are an irregular TR, not an invalid one! In the Lamb, Carl."

### **Dr. Thompson's January 25th 1984 anticatabaptist response to Dr. Bogue**

On receipt of Dr. Bogue's January 20th 1984 letter, Dr. Thompson replied to it on January 25th.<sup>679</sup> He answers as follows<sup>680</sup> to the three questions Dr. Bogue had raised. (The following is all taken from Dr. Thompson's January 26th 1984 *Letter to Lee*.)

Dr. Bogue's Question 1: Is Rome a true church, officially teaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ? Here, Dr. Thompson answered: "No. Rome is apostate.... But that is not the central issue in any event."

Dr. Bogue's Question 2: Are the sacraments given to the church alone? Here, Dr. Thompson answered: "Yes.... But taken together with Answer to Question 3." [Very soon hereafter, Dr. Thompson informed Dr. Lee: 'Of course, I pointed out to him [Dr. Bogue] that his Questions 1 & 2 were superfluous, in that I had already answered them in the course of discussing the material in my 'packet.']

Dr. Bogue's Question 3: Would you really not approve baptizing one who was baptized a J.W. [Jehovah's witness] or Mormon? This, of course, is certainly not the easiest query to digest! Nevertheless, Dr. Thompson here gave an appropriate answer.

Responded Dr. Thompson: "A baptism may be valid, even if irregular. Therefore we must wrestle with what constitutes the essence (*sine qua non*) of baptism, and what additional *criteria* [or rules] determine its regular and proper or due nature....

"Validity is established by these.... A) Performed with the purpose of complying with and obeying the command of Christ (or of Jehovah God in the Old Testament, comprehending the Second Person also). B) With water (not sand, leaves, imaginary substance, *etc.* C) In the Triune Name of the God, Jehovah Elohim: Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

"Regularity is established by (at least) two additional *criteria* which, however, do not, if absent, invalidate the sacrament: a) by one duly authorized, an ordained Minister of the Gospel of Christ; b) within the bounds of the professing Visible (Bogue: 'True') Church of Christ.

"Examples...cited to Bogue to illustrate the fact that the [various last-mentioned] items...are not determinative of validity but of regularity: 1, Zipporah; 2, circumcisions by apostate priests of apostate Israel were not to be repeated (how difficult!) when revivals came (Josiah & Hezekiah); 3, baptisms by woman-preachers in the apostate PCUSA are valid, though highly improper and irregular...; [so too] 4, 'Roman Catholic' baptism of Calvin, Anabaptist baptism of Idelette, Campbellite baptism, Arminian baptism, UPUSA baptism, Cumberland Presbyterian Church baptism *etc.*

"In sum, the validity of baptism must be considered separate from propriety or regularity. Three *criteria*...exist for validity.... There are at least two *criteria* of regularity."

### **Dr. Thompson's January 26th 1984 letter to Dr. Lee**

The next day, January 26th 1984, Dr. Thompson wrote a letter to Dr. Lee in Australia. Together with the letter, he enclosed photocopies of: 1, the anticatabaptist *Report* adopted by the 1981 General Synod of the RPCUS; 2, the anticatabaptist *Answer* given at the 1982 General Assembly of the PCA to the Question from Western Carolinas Presbytery; 3, Dr. Thompson's January 19th 1984 *Letter to the Committee on the Validity of Certain Baptisms*; 4, Dr. Thompson's very own January 19th 1984 *Opus* against catabaptism; and 5, Dr. Bogue's January 20th 1984 *Letter to Dr. Thompson* (responding to 1-4 above).<sup>681</sup>

In his *Letter to Lee* of January 26th 1984, Dr. Thompson related the above train of events. He then added: "I received yesterday a reply from Bogue. I like him! See, attached also, a copy of his letter [item 5 above]. In brief, I answered him as follows."<sup>682</sup> [Here Dr. Thompson related to Dr. Lee the contents of the former's *Letter to Dr. Bogue* January 25th 1984, as previous related in this dissertation.]<sup>683</sup>

Dr. Thompson then made a request to Dr. Lee. Urged the former:<sup>684</sup> "What I need, if you would have additional comments, is a critique [of Dr. Thompson's answers to Dr.

Bogue], or more ammunition...which you may suggest.... In the meantime, I am preparing the *Draft of a Minority Report* -- to accompany the *Majority Report* of the Committee, for the General Assembly of the PCA.

We cite one last item in Dr. Thompson's January 26th 1984 *Letter to Lee*. This item will later be seen to have quite some relevance -- in the light of Rev. Dr. Bogue's subsequent *Letter to Lee* of September 27th 1990 together with its enclosures.

Prior to his translation to Australia at the end of 1980, Dr. Lee had himself been a Member of Dr. Thompson's own presbytery (Westminster, Tennessee). Wrote Dr. Thompson to Dr. Lee on January 26th 1984: "Our Presbytery's Overture to the [PCA General] Assembly, to concur in our declaration of apostasy by the PCUSA, will not be adopted, I predict -- probably by a 1/2 margin."

### **Dr. Lee's February 11th 1984 letter to Dr. Thompson**

Dr. Thompson's *Letter to Lee* January 26th 1984 and the accompanying "packet" reached Dr. Lee in Australia on February 11th 1984. On that very date, he immediately despatched the requested information to Dr. Thompson -- by discussing *seriatim* Dr. Bogue's January 20th 1984 *Letter to Dr. J.G. Thompson*.<sup>685</sup>

Dr. Bogue had challenged Dr. Thompson:<sup>686</sup> "Why don't you (or Nigel) speak to the issue? I agree with most of what you say, except it all presupposes a true church!" Dr. Lee now responded:<sup>687</sup> "Thompson-Lee do not presuppose any really true church. *Westminster Confession* 25:5!"

[Compare too earlier in the *Westminster Confession*: "The Visible Church...is also catholick or universal.... This catholick church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less visible. And particular churches which are members thereof are more or less pure -- according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and publick worship performed more or less purely in them.

"The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error.... The Pope of Rome...is that antichrist...that exalteth himself in the church.... It belongeth to synods...to determine controversies of faith..., which decrees and determinations, if consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission.... All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err; and many have erred!"]<sup>688</sup>

Dr. Bogue had further told Dr. Thompson:<sup>689</sup> "Exodus 4 is [= would be?] relevant, if Mr. and Mrs. Moses were not part of the true Church." To this, Dr. Lee now responded:<sup>690</sup> "Mr. & Mrs. Moses (Exodus 4:20-26) were part of a (sabbath-desecrating) Church" -- which was, however, a sabbath-desecrating Church as well as a sabbath-desecrating Church. "Cf. Exodus 5:4-5 & 7:25 & 16:4-28. So Exodus 4:24f, is germane."

Rev. Dr. Carl Bogue had then, as regards the relevance of Exodus 4:24f, told Dr. Thompson anent Calvin's *Institutes* (IV:15:16-17).<sup>691</sup> "This 'confutes the error of the Donatists.' But the issue is not heretics within a true church, but representatives of no true church."

To Dr. Bogue's first sentence above, Dr. Lee now responded:<sup>692</sup> "Bogue rightly says." To Dr. Bogue's second sentence above, Dr. Lee responded:<sup>692</sup> "Bogue wrongly says."

Dr. Lee then continued:<sup>692</sup> "Here Carl [Bogue] forgets that Donatists were not heretics within the 'true [visible] church,' but...sectarians outside of the mainline 'true [visible] church.' Calvin in *Institutes* (IV:15:16-17) compares Donatists to the Catabaptists of his own century. Cf. the later Catabaptist Thornwellians as to their Anabaptist doctrine -- but not, as to their ecclesiastical (or rather their denominational) location.

"If Calvin then condemned the Catabaptist's doctrine, then so should we Calvin-ists now -- even if some modern Catabaptists are still inside the 'true church'" = the PCA? Yet also "the 'true church'" and "even 'the purest churches under heaven' -- are still 'subject both to mixture AND to error.' *Westminster Confession* 25:5 & 31:4.

"Catabaptism is error -- whether found in the Southern Baptist Convention, in the 'Presbyopian' Church of America, or even in the 'Roming Cathartic' Church with the latter's wretched doctrine and occasional practice of 'conditional (re)baptism' of 'Ex-Protestant ex-heretics' converted to Rome.

"Let us, however, not stoop to Rome's conditional-(re)baptizing level -- and still less stoop to the level of the 'Snake River Baptists' who regard as valid only their own regular(?) immersions performed [specifically] in the rattler-infested Snake River of Idaho!"

Bogue next stated to Dr. Thompson:<sup>693</sup> "Re: Lee on catabaptists -- even if Trent did not change baptism (which I doubt), that is not the issue. The issue is, whether Rome is a part of the true church, or is apostate."

### **Lee's February 11th 1984 statements on 'the true church'**

To help clarify the situation anent the true church, Dr. Bogue had then asked Dr. Thompson three questions. "Question 1: Is Rome a true church, officially teaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ?"<sup>694</sup>

To this Lee now responded:<sup>695</sup> "Rome is not a pure church. It is a very impure church. But it is not a mosque or a synagogue of Satan. Calvin rightly says that Rome is a church in ruins -- yet with the vestiges of the church.

"Calvin's own language here is quite unexcellable:<sup>696</sup> 'In the present day, we deny not to the Papists those vestiges of a Church which the Lord has allowed to remain among them.... He...preserved baptism there...[so] that there should be other remains also to prevent the Church from utterly perishing....



"He did not suffer [the papal] antichrist to subvert His Church from its foundation..., but was pleased that amid the devastation, the edifice should remain -- though half in ruins. Therefore, while we are unwilling simply to concede the name of Church to the Papists, we do not deny that there are churches among them....

"Daniel and Paul foretold that antichrist would sit in the temple of God. Daniel 9:27; Second Thessalonians 2:4..... By placing his seat in the temple of God, it is intimated that his kingdom would not be such as to destroy the Name either of Christ or of His Church. Hence, then, it is obvious that we do not at all deny that churches remain under his tyranny; churches, however, which by sacrilegious impiety he has profaned....; churches where Christ lies half-buried...and the worship of God almost abolished....

"I call them churches, inasmuch as the Lord there wondrously preserves some remains of His people...and inasmuch as some symbols of the Church still remain...whose efficacy neither the craft of the devil nor human depravity can destroy.... On the other hand...., I say that the whole body [of Romanism], as well as every single assembly, want the form of a legitimate Church."

So then, according to both Calvin and the *Westminster Confession* (25:6), Rome is indeed a church. It is not a pure church, but a false church, a church defiled by the papal antichrist -- a church in ruins. However, it is not a non-church -- and certain not a synagogue of Satan.

Dr. Bogue's Question 2 to Dr. Thompson was:<sup>697</sup> "Are the sacraments given to the church alone?" To this Dr. Lee responded:<sup>698</sup> "Yes. But Christian 'sects' which are not 'pure' churches (like the PCA is 'pure'?!) -- tout varying degrees of error.

"Such include the errors of: 'baptismally regenerationistic' worse-than-Rome 'Church of Christ' Campbellites; baptismally consubstantiationistic Lutherans; baptismally seal-denying Zwinglians (infecting the old RPCEs and even the PCA); triple-immersing Pentecostals; once-only-dunking Baptists; *etc.*.... All of these administer somewhat irregular yet still valid baptisms (which should never be repeated)."

Are those baptized by Dr. Lee validly baptized -- inasmuch as Lee himself has only(!) the triune baptism which he received in the Church of Rome?

Were the catabaptist 1984 deliberations of the PCA General Assembly's Committee on the Validity of Certain Baptisms valid -- because 'defiled' by the presence of the anticatabaptist Dr. Thompson?

Was Calvin's own infant invalidly baptized -- because the baptizer Calvin was (according to catabaptists) himself never baptized, and because he was an inveterate opponent of the catabaptism of the 1984 PCA *Majority Report*?

Lee concluded on this point: "If Dr. Bogue and Co. are right -- were I a bogeyman or a Romish apostolic successionist, I would challenge the validity of their own baptism. Because of a baptismal irregularity somewhere along the way, in the long line of their ancestors!"<sup>698</sup>

Dr. Bogue's Question 3 to Dr. Thompson was:<sup>699</sup> "Would you really not approve baptizing one who was baptized a J.W. [Jehovah's witness] or Mormon?" To this, Lee responded to Dr. Thompson:<sup>700</sup> "Tell Carl [Dr. Bogue] unitarian/arian Jehovah's witnesses are only immersed without the audible formula of Matthew 28:19. Therefore they were never baptized.... Even if they were trinitarians -- a silent immersion is [still] not a baptism.

"Mormons are anti-trinitarian polytheists. As Van Tilian presuppositionalists and Ontological Trinitarians, we can only acknowledge as valid those baptized in the Name of the Ontological Trinity (compare *Westminster Confession* 2:1-3 & 10:4).

With horrendous humor, Dr. Lee then concluded: "According to Holy Scripture and the judgment of charity, we ourselves must regard as valid also the baptism of (very irregular) Anti-Van Tilian evidentialists like Bogue and Gerstner and Sproul. Or should we instead be demanding the (re?)baptism of such incorrigibly-misguided apologeticists?

"Your 'Rebaptismal Committee' insists/advises/permits the rebaptism of those already baptized by ordained male priests of the Romish communion -- and also by assorted 'priests' of Campbellite, High-Anglican or even Lutheran persuasion? Would your Committee then disadvise or prohibit the rebaptism of someone already baptized by an unordained Plymouth Brethren layman -- or by ordained lady 'Reverends' in the UPUSA [or even in the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of America]?" If so, why? If not, why not?

### **Dr. Thompson's 1984 anticatabaptist *Draft Minority Report***

On receipt of the above material from Lee, Dr. Thompson finalized his anticatabaptist *Draft Minority Report*. He sent a copy to Dr. Lee in Australia, who received it on February 22nd 1984.

Together with the *Draft Minority Report*, Dr. Thompson made one last request<sup>701</sup> to Dr. Lee: "Our Committee will meet soon (telephone conference call), so I need to get your '*imprimatur*' or critique, since I used (heavily) the material you sent me.... Thanks for all the helpful material you sent."

In his *Draft Minority Report* -- after a short 'Introduction' -- Dr. Thompson also gives a 'Brief Historical Comment.' There, he pointed out<sup>702</sup> that "almost without exception, all Reformed churches have held Roman Catholic baptism to be valid. "Since the time of Thornwell, [much of] American Presbyterianism has largely tended to regard Roman Catholic baptism as invalid. Prior to that time, however, most of

American Presbyterian was in harmony with other Reformed and Presbyterian bodies in this matter.” In "1981 the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church Evangelical Synod endorsed the validity of Roman Catholic baptism. In this, the Synod concurred with the vigorous dissent by Charles Hodge to the decision of the 1845 Assembly of the Presbyterian Church [USA] to declare Roman Catholic baptism invalid.

"This definitive dissent, *Validity of Romish Baptism*, appears in Hodge's *Church Polity*. Church history shows [and only since then that much of] American Presbyterianism [is] to be out of step with other Reformed and Presbyterian churches in this matter."

Dr. Thompson next deals:<sup>703</sup> with "Confessional and Biblical Considerations (Validity *versus* Regularity or Propriety)"; with the "Sign *versus* the Thing Signified"; and with "Consideration of Principles Illustrated in Exodus 4:24-26." Under the latter, Dr. Thompson cites from Calvin's *Commentary on Exodus* and from his *Institutes* -- to illustrate the difference between an irregular yet valid administration of the sacrament, and an invalid and unsuccessful attempt to baptize.

Dr. Thompson's next section, "The Council of Trent and the Question of Apostasy by the Church of Rome," reaches the heart of the matter. It highlights the difference between his own *Minority Report* and the other report -- the *Majority Report* -- soon to be submitted by the Committee.

Explains Dr. Thompson:<sup>704</sup> "It has been argued by some that Calvin and other Reformers were viewing a Roman Catholic Church not yet 'officially' or 'formally' apostatized, and therefore could countenance their baptism as valid though highly irregular. By extension then, they argue that until the Council of Trent, the Church of Rome was not apostate.... This [so they reason] is the same argument used by those today who refuse to recognize the blatant and flagrant departure from the faith by churches such as the PCUSA.

"The Council of Trent met several times over a period of years, beginning in 1545. [Yet] the bulk of the Council's work was completed well before 1559 -- the date of the edition of Calvin's *Institutes* quoted herein. Calvin and the Reformers were fully aware of the departure from the faith by the Roman Catholic Church. Their scathing condemnation of heresies and perversions are well documented. They certainly did not await the outcome of the Council of Trent before pronouncing the judgment of God upon that Church's apostasy.

"It is clear that they recognized, even as we should also, that Trent did not establish or constitute the apostasy of the Church of Rome. It simply codified and documented that apostasy from which the Reformers had previously removed themselves. Furthermore, the Council of Trent did not change the Roman Catholic doctrine of baptism from what it was before the Tridentine Council convened."

After then again quoting from Calvin's *Institutes* (IV:2:11), Dr. Thompson ends this section with his own summary statement: "The priests and the people of Israel turned from serving the Lord, unto idolatry and wantonness -- so that the Lord removed Himself from them.... But God is true unto His own oath, and His covenanted faithfulness is everlasting. Ezekiel 16:60ff."<sup>705</sup>

The next section of the *Draft Minority Report* deals with "God's Faithfulness and the Question of the Worthy Administrator." Here, Calvin's *Institutes* (IV:15:16-17) is again cited.<sup>706</sup>

Dr. John G. Thompson then comments: "To say that Calvin regarded Roman Catholic baptism (or certain other baptisms) as valid, is not to say that he thought that such baptisms should have been administered or that they were proper [alias 'regular'] baptisms. But it was his view that, once administered, the baptism was valid and unrepeatable -- even if highly irregular."

Dr. Thompson then shows that "The Church Determines the Validity or Propriety of Baptisms." He then proceeds to list the "*Criteria of Validity and Criteria of Regularity*." Here it is shown that, to be valid, baptisms must be administered: in the Name of the Trinity; with water; and to those who or whose immediate parents profess faith in Christ. For a valid baptism also to be regular, it should be administered but once and for all; by a lawfully ordained Minister of the Gospel within a body bearing the marks of Christ's Church; and in the mode of sprinkling or pouring.<sup>707</sup>

In his next section on "The Burden of Investigating Previous Baptisms," Dr. Thompson discusses the weighty and sometimes difficult duty of evaluating the validity of previously administered purported baptisms. Here, he quotes from the Baptismal Report adopted by the General Synod of the RPCES in 1981.

He cites: "In those defective baptisms where the Gospel is detached from the ceremony -- if it was administered to one of God's elect...there is still something of meaning in that ceremony. All humans present may have been unregenerate, but God was also present and by His sacrament was reminding Himself (Genesis 9:16) of His promise.... God's covenant faithfulness rather than one's lack of faith is what...provide[s] that...the ceremony has true meaning."<sup>708</sup>

Finally, in its few closing "Recommendations," Dr. Thompson's *Draft Minority Report* lists the previously-mentioned *criteria* of baptismal validity and regularity.<sup>709</sup> In light thereof, the relevant Questions from Grace Presbytery and from Western Carolinas Presbytery are then answered as follows:

As to the question of whether the 'justificatory baptisms' of Rome, of the Church of Christ, or of Lutherans should be recognized -- "baptism is to be regarded as valid if the *criteria* for validity were satisfied, regardless of the intent or understanding of the administrator or administering church. As to whether baptism may properly be administered to individuals who have been 'christened' or baptized in infancy, when it

had subsequently become apparent that neither parent was a believer -- "if it can be established that the parents were professing believers [meaning that they professed to be believers] at the time of the baptism of the child, the baptism or 'christening' is to be regarded as valid."<sup>710</sup>

### **Dr. Lee's soon reply to the February 1984 Draft Minority Report**

To help strengthen the above *Draft Minority Report* as requested<sup>711</sup> by Dr. Thompson, Dr. Lee soon expressed his overall approval. However, as to his solicited "critique," Dr. Lee also observed it is not quite so (as alleged in the *Draft Minority Report*) that "church history shows American Presbyterianism to be out of step with other Reformed and Presbyterian churches in this matter" of desiring to (re)baptize Ex-Romanists.<sup>712</sup>

It is far rather the case that not American Presbyterianism but only Thornwell and his catabaptist associates were, as regards baptism, totally out of step with almost all Non-American Presbyterians in all places and at all times. Indeed, they still are. Nay more. The Thornwellians were and are also out of step -- baptismally -- with most American Presbyterians, too!

Certainly, all of the American catabaptists were and are out of step with the entirety of American Presbyterianism before 1845. They were and are also out of step even with most of the American 'Reformed' Churches (and with practically all Presbyterians and also all other Calvinists elsewhere throughout the world) -- since the beginning of the twentieth and right through to the very edge of the twenty-first century.

On the second question from Grace Presbytery, Professor Dr. Lee observed that the enquiry had been very unclearly and ambiguously formulated. Is the question: whether infants of professing unbelievers should themselves be baptized while infants? Alternatively, is the question: whether those rightly baptized in infancy as the children of parents who then claimed to be believers, should after themselves becoming Christ-professing adults be (re)baptized if their parents have recently admitted their own unbelief? Or is the question: whether those quite wrongly baptized in infancy as the children of parents who at that time admitted their own unbelief, should themselves be (re)baptized when adults? In all three of these different cases, the right answer is: no!

On the third question from Grace Presbytery, Dr. Lee again observed that this enquiry had been unclearly and ambiguously formulated. Is the question: whether older children or adults should be baptized without first being asked personally to profess their faith in Christ? Then, the answer is: no! Is the question: whether older children or adults who did not profess their faith before being baptized, should later be (re)baptized but only after personal profession of faith? Then the answer is: no (re)baptism, though profession of faith is now in order. Or is the question: whether older children or adults who were themselves unbelievers when baptized, should ever be rebaptized? Then the answer is: never! Throughout, however, all these baptizees should be urged to 'improve their baptism.' *Westminster Larger Catechism* 167.

Surely the general principle is very clear! Baptism should occur only after profession of alleged faith by the baptizee or his/her parents. Profession of faith is not necessarily possession of faith. For God alone knows man's heart. Even a 'faithless' baptism may never be repeated. For once baptized, always baptized -- and never to be rebaptized. Ephesians 4:4-6 & Hebrews 6:2-6. Yet all baptisms require life-long 'improvement.' Romans 6:1-13.

In the important section of the *Draft Minority Report* on "The Council of Trent and the Question of Apostasy by the Church of Rome,"<sup>713</sup> Dr. Lee observed that Rome's clear apostasy was by no means terminal. Nor was Rome's apostasy as dire as that of Old Testament Israel (especially in the time of Christ). Nor was Rome's apostasy as bad as that of the Anabaptists at the time of the Reformation -- thus Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and Knox.

Nor, also according to the renowned modern American Presbyterian Rev. Prof. Dr. John Gerstner.<sup>714</sup> For Rome's apostasy anything nearly as bad as that of the United Presbyterian Church USA, at the time of Gerstner's own exodus from that body in 1990.

#### **Dr. Lee's further response in May 1984 to the *Draft Minority Report***

Dr. Lee made a further (unsolicited) response to the *Draft Minority Report*. On May 23rd 1984, Dr. Lee wrote to Dr. Thompson to prove that Calvin did not regard Rome as so apostate that her baptisms should be labelled invalid -- and to show that the *Decrees of Trent* should not now modify our assessment of the validity of 'Romish baptisms.'

Dr. Lee there pointed out<sup>715</sup> that Calvin even approved some of the Tridentine teachings anent baptism. He also showed that Calvin certainly agreed with Trent as to what constitutes a valid baptism.

He also cited the 11th canon of Trent's 7th Session (on the sacraments in general), anent the intention of the baptizer at baptisms. He showed how Calvin responded that even "if some Epicurean, grinning at the whole performance, were to administer the Supper to me according to the command of Christ..., I would not doubt that the bread and the cup held forth by his hand are pledges to me of the body and blood of Christ."

Dr. Lee then cited the 12th canon of Trent's 7th Session (on the sacraments), on the validity of baptisms given by priests when in a state of mortal sin. He showed how Calvin replied to this: "AMEN!"

Calvin's response to Trent's next canon (13) on the sacraments, was: "The genuine rite of baptism is simple.... But under how many, and how various and discordant additions has this simplicity been buried? ... All the godly complain...that in baptism, more is made of the [oily] chrism, the taper, the salt, the spittle in fine -- than the

washing with water in which the whole perfection of baptism consists!" Yet Calvin's view here as to the validity of 'Romish baptism' is nonetheless, claimed Lee, utterly irreconcilable with the Thornwellian catabaptism which would invalidate it.

Dr. Lee next cited the 3rd canon of Trent's 7th Session (on baptism), claiming that "the Roman Church...is the mother and mistress of all Churches." He showed how Calvin here responded "that the whole doctrine of baptism as taught by them is partly mutilated, partly vicious" -- namely in its superadded parts. It is therefore valid and effective in its other and original parts -- which were still unerasable.

Prof. Dr. Lee further cited the 4th canon of Trent's 7th Session (on baptism), against the validity of baptisms administered by heretics. He showed how Calvin here responded that "what the Minister intends to do, is of little consequence to us." For "it suffices...to have been baptized in the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, whatever may have been the ignorance or impiety of those who administered baptism to us."

Dr. Francis Nigel Lee then cited the 11th through the 13th canons of Trent's 7th Session -- on the unrepeatability of baptism. Thundered Trent: "Whosoever shall say that true and duly conferred baptism is to be repeated to him who has denied the faith of Christ among [Moslem] infidels -- after he turns to repentance -- let him be *anathema!*" Professor Dr. Lee then showed how Calvin here responded: "I not unwillingly subscribe!"

Explained Lee: "In Calvin's 1547 (post-Tridentine!) *Appendix to the Tract on the True Method of Reforming the Church*, Calvin wrote that 'the children of Papists...are validly baptized.... They cease not to be the children of saints -- though it be necessary to go farther back for their origin. God does not stop at the first degree, but diffuses the promise of life to a thousand generations'....

"Perhaps most significant of all are Calvin's remarks in the 1551 *Dedication* of his *Commentaries on the First and Second Epistle of Peter* -- to Edward the Sixth, the King of England." Dr. Lee then here cited Calvin's words that "the Roman antichrist" alias "the pope himself is said to have summoned...that recent rabble at Trent.... It is easy to show how preposterous and perverted is the administration of the sacraments under the papacy.... The sacraments are adulterated....

"We disown the number seven, which they have presumptuously adopted. We prove that the Mass...is a disgraceful denial of the sacrifice of Christ." Unquote Calvin. Nowhere, however, does Calvin in this 1551 *Dedication* ever impugn the validity of baptism in the Romish Church -- even in this post-Tridentine phase of Rome's apostasy.

Dr. Lee concluded: "If the PCA repudiates post-Tridentine baptism in Romanism, the PCA collects the *anathema* not only of Rome/Trent but also of John Calvin. For Calvin at these points says 'AMEN!' to Trent and to Trent's *anathema*. Indeed, to Trent's doctrine against re-baptizing moslemized baptizees after their later de-

moslemization and 're-christianization' -- Calvin himself declares: ' I not unwillingly subscribe.' "

Lee then terminated his letter by asking Dr. Thompson: "Let me know whether the PCA collects its Calvin-Trent *anathema* at the General Assembly!" Dr. Thompson then finalized his *Minority Report*, and his catabaptist colleagues on the Committee did the same with their *Majority Report* (on the validity of certain baptisms) to the General Assembly of the PCA.

### **The Majority Report of the PCA's Baptism Committee**

Having himself lived in the yahoo Baptistocratic culture of America' s Dixie, Professor Dr. Lee could well understand the pressures against Calvinism from within the largely catabaptistic (and chiefly Southern) PCA.

How its 1984 Baptism Committee must have sensed the ' wisdom' of its conforming to Thornwell' s popular yet partisan departure from the Classic Calvinian doctrine of Biblical Baptism! Yet it is indeed immeasurably sad when professing Presbyterians prefer the idiosyncratic immersionisms of Anabaptism -- to the scriptural sprinklings even of Romanizers.

Predictably, the Committee was divided. Bogue and others regarded ' Roman Catholic baptism' as no baptism at all. To them, the later purported baptizings by Catabaptists of Ex-Romanists -- are not re-baptisms but only the very first valid baptisms ever received by the latter. Thus, from this catabaptist viewpoint -- Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and every other Protestant Reformer all went to their graves unbaptized. This is the ' Neo-Thornwellian' v iewpoint which was enshrined in the *Majority Report*.

**Specific errors** of the *Majority Report* (Appendix 0 in the 1984 General Assembly's Minutes pp. 405f), include the following.

First, it rejects the view of Calvin, where it denies that John the Baptist's baptisms truly constituted Christian Baptism. Were this catabaptistic view of Acts 19 correct, it would of course follow that neither Jesus nor His Apostles themselves ever received Christian Baptism. John 4:1f. However, the *Westminster Confession* (28:21<sup>f</sup> & 28:2<sup>i</sup> & 28:5<sup>n</sup>) and the *Larger Catechism* (63<sup>c</sup> & 165<sup>s</sup> & 177<sup>r</sup>) very clearly teaches that Johannine Baptism indeed is Christian Baptism.

Second, the *Majority Report* errs in claiming that except for the RPCES, American Presbyterian Churches have held baptisms performed in the Church of Rome to be invalid. It suppresses the fact that all American Presbyterian Churches before 1845, some since, and all American Reformed Churches, have always held to the validity of 'Romish' baptism -- as too has the Church of all ages in general and all of the Protestant Reformers and their Confessions of Faith in particular.



Third, the *Majority Report* reflects a slanted misrepresentation of the baptismal views of Calvin and of the *Westminster Standards*. It ignores the total baptismal teaching of Holy Scripture and the interpretation of the latter by every theologian of note before the 1845<sup>f</sup> catabaptist Thornwell.

And fourth, in condemning ‘Romish’ baptism (*sic*), it refuses to address the validity of other sacramentalistic or semi-sacramentalistic bodies such as the Lutherans and the Campbellites. Indeed, it barely mentions polytheistic Mormons and Unitarians (such as Jehovah witnesses), and makes no attempt to analyze their non-baptismal water rites in contradistinction to the trinitarian baptisms of Presbyterians, Romanists, Lutherans, and Campbellites.

The *Majority Report*, in this present writer' s opinion, abysmally failed to uphold the unrepeatable baptismal teaching of the *Westminster Confession* 28:7 and the *Westminster Larger Catechism* Q. 177 -- as rigorously required by strict subscriptionism. Far more serious yet, at this particular point -- and again in Dr. Lee' s opinion -- is the *Majority Report' s* clear disregard for the PCA' s Supreme Standard: the infallible Word of God. Exodus 4:24-26; Acts 8:12-23; Romans 6:3-13; Ephesians 4:4-6; Hebrews 6:1-6.

Predictably, the Baptism Committee approved the *Majority Report* as its own report to the General Assembly of the PCA. Thereupon Dr. Thompson proceeded to forward also his *Minority Report*.

### **The baptismal (in)action of the 1984-87 PCA General Assemblies on the Report**

In the 1984 Minutes of the PCA General Assembly (Journal page 116), “the Assembly voted that both the majority report and the minority report on the validity of certain baptisms be received as information and be made available to the local churches for their consideration as they seek to determine the validity for certain baptism.” In other words, congregationalistically different strokes for different folks. “The vote was 346 to 251.... A motion to dismiss the Committee with thanks was lost; the moderator declared the Committee to be continued. The Assembly paused to give praise to God with the singing of ‘Our God, Our Help in Ages Past’” - conveniently forgetting that all ages past till Thornwell regarded all triune baptisms as valid.

In the 1985 Minutes of the PCA General Assembly (page 107): “The Assembly adopted a procedural motion to postpone until the Fifteenth General Assembly all reports of *ad interim* committees except the one on the General Assembly.” Nothing definitive seems to have been decided even at the 1986 Assembly. But then, in the 1987 Minutes (page 162), a ‘minority’ view -- not recommending any firm position be taken on the issue -- prevailed. Hence, apparently, you may either accept the baptism of Rome as valid; or (re)baptize -- a decision that is Arminian and ‘free will-istic’ to its very core.

Specifically (15-74), the following 'decisions' were taken (after more than four years of almost fruitless 'deliberation'): "***Ad Interim Committee on Baptism***. The Assembly returned to the report of the Committee.... The *Minority Report's* recommendations [??? sic] were adopted as the substitute motion and then adopted....

1. That the Assembly receive both the *Committee* and the *Minority Reports*, commending them to the attention of its churches and lower courts as information. *Adopted*. 2. That the Assembly leave decisions in these matters to be made, on a case by case basis, by the lower courts, subject to normal review and control or judicial processes. *Adopted*. 3. That the Assembly discharge the Committee with thanks. *Adopted*."

So after being docketed for several years, both the *Majority Report* and the *Minority Report* were finally brought to the 15th General Assembly of the PCA in June 1987. There, the decision taken was undefinitive.

### **The 1987 aftermath of the undecisive 1987 PCA General Assembly**

A public report<sup>716</sup> on *News of the 15th General Assembly (PCA)* appeared in print -- in *Journey Magazine*. There, according to Rev. James Jones, Pastor of the Prince of Peace PCA (Snellville, Ga.) -- in the Deep South -- the final report of the "Committee on Baptism was finally heard and decided."

According to eye-witness Rev. James Jones, "the *Majority Report*, that Roman Catholic baptism is not true Christian baptism, and that persons who have been baptized in Roman Catholic churches should be baptized (or rebaptized, depending on your view), was not adopted. Instead, the *Minority Report*, which presents the position of John Calvin and Charles Hodge, that Roman Catholic baptism qualifies as valid baptism, though technically improper, was received. But it was also recommended that *both Reports* be used by Sessions to determine their practices."

One should conclude from this report that the General Assembly, although perhaps favouring the *Minority Report*, decided to "receive" both but to 'adopt' n either -- in view of *both reports* being "recommended" for use "by Sessions to determine their practices." Thus, against the Apostle Paul' Presbyterianism in Acts 16:5 -- where General Assembly decisions have binding power -- in the PCA, maverick Congregationalism (or at the very least 'Presbygationalism') rides again!

The Chairman of the PCA' s Committee on Baptism, Ohio' s Catabaptist, Rev. Dr. Carl Bogue of Faith Presbyterian Church of Akron -- not in the Deep South but in the ' Steep North' -- would, regrettingly, agree with our previous sentence. He would agree that the General Assembly did in fact receive both the *Majority Report* and the *Minority Report*. He would further agree that the General Assembly should have decided the issue one way or the other -- and that it should then have directed the congregations as to what to do. He would also agree that the General Assembly did not do this. Indeed, he would finally agree that the General Assembly' ' decision' ' is undefinitive.

For Dr. Bogue himself soon wrote to *Journey Magazine*:<sup>717</sup> "The action was: 'That the Assembly receive both the Committee and the Minority Reports, commending them to the attention of its churches and lower courts as information' (emphasis mine)."

Dr. Bogue goes on, with perhaps a little justification, to add that the previous *Journey Magazine* report on the 1987 General Assembly was [unintentionally!] "misleading, because it suggests a preference on the part of the Assembly for recognizing Roman Catholic baptism as valid Biblical baptism." That, however, is a matter of opinion - coming from one who alleges that Assembly did not adopt his own *Majority Report!*

Rather judgmentally, perhaps inaccurately, and probably subjectivistically, Dr. Bogue then adds: "It was the minority's conviction that the Assembly would not affirm the validity of Roman Catholic baptism, coupled with the knowledge of the PCA's practice of sweeping controversy under the rug, that led the minority to change its original recommendation of recognizing Roman Catholic baptism as valid to a substitute 'that the Assembly receive both...reports.' The *rationale* was: 'A half a loaf is better than no loaf.'"

Finally, clearly revealing his own catabaptism, Rev. Chairman Bogue concluded: "I am personally disappointed that the Assembly refused yet again to take a position as to the mind of the church on this issue, which is important in the practice of our churches. I am even more disturbed that your readers might wrongly think the PCA took a position which in fact she would be unwilling to take."

### **What should have been decided at the 1987 PCA General Assembly**

"...the mind of the church"! Yet should we not rather seek the mind of Christ -- than "the mind of the church"? For the mind of an uninformed church is simply the ecclesiocratic opinion of a mindless majority. How very different, however, were the theocratic proceedings at the first General Assembly of the Christian Church!

There, regarding a matter "of no small dissension," commissioners were sent "unto the apostles and elders about this question." Acts 15:2. There, representatives of the congregations in Syria, in Cilicia, in Galatia, in Phenicia, in Samaria and in Judea, all gathered together in Jerusalem. Acts 14:21 to 15:4, and Acts 15:41 to 16:7. There, "the apostles and elders came together for to consider the matter." Acts 15:6. There, Paul and Barnabas and Peter and James and others all gave their **informed** opinions. Acts 15:2-13. And there, above all, God's infallible **Sacred Scriptures** were consulted about the matter. Acts 15:15f.

"**Then** pleased it the apostles and elders." Acts 15:22. Then, "the apostles and elders **wrote**" to the Christians "in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia." Acts 15:23. For the General Assembly had **discerned** what "seemed good to **the Holy Ghost**." Acts 15:28. So, "Judas and Silas" (Acts 15:32) and "Paul also and Barnabas" (Acts 15:35) then "went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches." Acts 15:41. They "went through the cities, and delivered for to **keep** the **decrees** that had been **ordained**

by the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem. And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily." Acts 16:4-5.

The *Majority Report* brethren would no doubt agree with the above. Yet they should also admit that they clearly failed to catabaptize the PCA at its 1987 General Assembly.

Hopefully, baptismal orthodoxy will ultimately yet prevail in that denomination -- in spite of the unadopted yet received *Majority Report* wrongly alleging the invalidity of 'Romish baptism.' For the correct but unadopted *Minority Report* was also received. Indeed, both reports were then ordered transmitted to the Presbyteries and the Sessions, 'commending them to the attention of its churches and lower courts as information.'

### **Lee's 21st December 1987 letter to the editor of *Journey* (Rev. Richard Knodel)**

On reading Dr. Bogue's above *Letter to the Editor* in *Journey Magazine*, Dr. Lee from Australia immediately himself wrote a *Letter to the Editor* -- on December 21st 1987. In that letter, Lee indicated<sup>718</sup> that Dr. Bogue "is well aware of Calvin's condemnation (in *Institutes* IV:15:16-19 cf. IV:2:11f) anent the 'absurdities' of the 'Catabaptists who deny that we are duly baptized, because we were baptized in the papacy by wicked men and idolaters. Hence they furiously insist on Anabaptism' -- alias the rebaptism of Ex-Romanist Protestants like Luther and Calvin....

"Catabaptists within the 'Presbyterian Church in America' have previously postulated that Calvin wrote his 1536f *Institutes* before the 1545f Romish Council of Trent -- and that Calvin would not have maintained his anticatabaptism thereafter. Significantly, however, his anticatabaptism is still found in his last and definitive edition of the *Institutes* (of 1559).

"Indeed, even in his 1547f 'post-Trent' treatises -- such as his *Antidote to the Seventh Session of the Council of Trent* and his *True Method of Giving Peace to Christendom* and his *Appendix to the True Method of Reforming the Church* -- Calvin stoutly maintains his attacks against the heterodox Catabaptists."

Dr. Lee then further quoted, to the same effect, from Calvin's statement to the unitarian heretic Socinus that "it matters not...whether he who performs the [triune] baptism is a diabolical man or even the devil."<sup>719</sup> He quoted from Calvin's 6th September 1554 letter, to show that Calvin apparently preferred the administration of infant baptism even in the corrupt Romish Church -- to its non-administration among the infants of Anabaptists.<sup>720</sup> He also quoted<sup>721</sup> from Calvin's 1559f *French Confession* that "some trace of the Church is left in the papacy.... The virtue and substance of baptism remain" there, so that "those baptized in it do not need a second baptism."

Dr. Lee further cited from Calvin's 1563 statement (on behalf of the Pastors and Professors of Geneva) to the National Synod of the French Reformed Church that

"popish baptism is grounded upon the institution of Christ -- because the priests, perverse as they are and utterly corrupt, are yet the ordinary Ministers of that Church in which they tyrannically demean themselves."<sup>722</sup>

He also cited from Calvin's last work, his 1564 *Commentary on Ezekiel* (16:20-21). There, the dying Ex-Romish Reformer claimed that "our baptism does not need renewal -- because, although the devil has long reigned in the papacy, yet he could not altogether extinguish God's grace. Nay, a Church is among them!"

Lee then further cited from the declarations about Romish priests made by the French Reformed Synod of 1581. "Since authority to baptize belongs to them according to the order of the Romish Church, baptism administered by them is not to be repeated." He also cited the 1618<sup>f</sup> Synod of Dordt decision forbidding the baptizing of Ex-Romish Protestants formerly baptized in Romanism -- where "the form and substance of the rite have been retained."<sup>723</sup>

Concluded Lee: "I can well understand the pressures on Dr. Bogue -- as Chairman of the PCA's Baptism Committee -- to conform to Thornwell's popular yet partisan departure from the Classic Calvinian doctrine of Biblical Baptism.... Yet more serious, is the lapse of Dr. Bogue and his PCA *Majority Report* brethren from the maintenance of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* 28:7 and the *Westminster Larger Catechism* 177 -- which 'strict Confessionalism' rigorously requires. Indeed, far more serious still - - is their disregard, at this particular point, of the PCA's Supreme Standard: the infallible Word of God. See: Exodus 4:24-26; Romans 6:3-16; Ephesians 4:4-6; Hebrews 6:1-6.

"One wonders about Dr. Bogue's views regarding the validity of baptisms performed in the Episcopal Church, the Anglican Orthodox Church, the Seventh-day Adventist Church, the Assemblies of God, the 'Minister-less' Plymouth Brethren Groups -- or even in the bigger [and often more 'apostate'] Presbyterian denominations. It would be catastrophic indeed if the PCA were yet, officially: to espouse catabaptism; to embrace the rebaptistic heresies of the [Montanists and] the Novatianists and the Donatists; and finally to 'excommunicate' itself very 'cultically' from Confessionalism and Calvinism....

"Circumcision -- once administer (by whomsoever) -- was unrepeatable. So too is Christian baptism -- which Puritan Presbyterians profess replaces it!"

After many months, Dr. Lee's above-mentioned December 21st 1987 *Letter to the Editor of Journey Magazine* had still not been published there (or even acknowledged). So, in September 1990, Lee sent a copy thereof (together with a cover letter) straight to his friend Dr. Carl Bogue -- together with Dr. Lee's other 1990 article *Calvinism versus Catabaptism*.

### Dr. Lee's 1990 article *Calvinism versus Catabaptism*

In that paper *Calvinism versus Catabaptism*, Dr. Nigel Lee contrasted the two different baptismal positions of Calvinism and Catabaptism. There, he accuses<sup>724</sup> Catabaptism of falsely teaching "that Roman Catholicism is a totally pagan religion and not even a false part of the Christian Church at all. For Catabaptism regards alleged baptisms, although indeed performed in the Name of the Triune God, as being no baptism at all -- whenever performed by or under the direction of Rome.

"Accordingly, Catabaptists regards Romanists as unbaptized pagans -- so that all converts from Romanism are regarded as still needing baptism. Needless to say, Catabaptism is not principally Protestant at all. Principally, Catabaptism is sectarian -- and preponderantly Anti-Romish. *Per contra*, however, Mark 9:38-42 and Acts 13:14-49 *etc.*

"Catabaptism rightly opposes Romanism. Wrongly, however, it also opposes consistent Calvinism. Some inconsistent Catabaptists have preserved infant baptism, and actually call themselves not just Calvinists but sometimes even Presbyterians. The more consistent Catabaptists, however, have abandoned even that. Many of them then end up calling themselves 'Calvinist Baptists' -- a gross contradiction in terms.

"It is indeed true that most Catabaptists much admire the principles of Calvinism outside the area of baptism. It is also true that many Catabaptists would call themselves Calvinists, and indeed do believe in most of the principles of Calvinism. For the latter, consistent Calvinists are most grateful. Yet Catabaptists cannot ever become consistent Calvinists -- unless and until they have abandoned their Catabaptism.

"Absurdly, Catabaptists believe that Calvin was an inconsistent Calvin-ist -- in the area of baptism! Yet the truth is that it is the Catabaptists who -- at best! -- are only inconsistent Sub-Calvinists. At the time of the Protestant Reformation, the Catabaptists did not consider Calvin to be sufficiently Anti-Romish. John Calvin, in turn, considered the Catabaptists to be Sub-Protestant -- because unbiblical and sectarian, as regards their views on holy baptism.

"Thus, on the matter of baptism, the Catabaptists are quite irreconcilable with that greatest of all Calvinists -- the 1547f John Calvin himself. Catabaptism is also quite irreconcilable with those greatest of all Calvinistic documents -- the doctrinal standards of the 1647f renowned Westminster Assembly."

Rev. Dr. Lee then shows that the Counter-Reformation's *Council of Trent* finished setting forth the Romish doctrine of baptism at her Seventh Session in 1547. Calvin then responded in his *Antidote to Trent*, in which he fully upheld the essential validity and unrepeatability of 'Romish baptism' -- in spite of all its errors.<sup>725</sup>

After next quoting from Calvin's *Institutes* to the same effect, Dr. Nigel Lee shows<sup>726</sup> that also the *Westminster Standards* themselves uphold the same doctrine. He then goes on to demonstrate that sincere Catabaptists have no right to admit Christians like

Calvin (who were baptized by Rome in infancy but never rebaptized), to the Lord's Table. For Catabaptists consider those like Calvin to be unbaptized Christians. And unbaptized Christians (says Dr. Lee) may not be admitted to the Holy Supper. Exodus 12:48; Luke 2:21-41f & 22:1-20; Colossians 2:11f.

As Lee explains:<sup>727</sup> "Our *Westminster Standards* rightly recognize it to be a 'great sin' when those professing the faith but who are still 'ignorant' -- are 'admitted' to the Lord's table at 'the Lord's supper.' For they altogether rightly recognize that 'ignorant...persons...unworthy of the Lord's table...cannot...be admitted thereto.'<sup>728</sup>

"Even in respect of recalcitrant communicants -- Westminster rightly recognizes that 'the officers of the church are to proceed by admonition...from the Lord's supper for a season.' As strict subscriptionists to the *Westminster Standards* -- we should do likewise.

"Our *Westminster Standards* rightly recognize<sup>729</sup> that no uncircumcised person was allowed to eat the Passover [Exodus 12:48]. They rightly recognize that at Calvary, circumcision was replaced by baptism, and the Passover by the Lord's supper.<sup>730</sup> They rightly recognize that the bread and the wine should be given only 'to the communicants.'<sup>731</sup>

"Our *Westminster Standards* rightly recognize that such must first have been baptized - - and that a Christian Pastor needs to 'catechize' them '(Hebrews 5:12)<sup>732</sup> prior to their first communicating. For they rightly recognize that no unbaptized or uncatechized person should ever be admitted to the Lord's table. As strict subscriptionists to the *Westminster Standards* -- we should do likewise.

"Our *Westminster Standards* rightly recognize<sup>733</sup> that 'the ignorant...are not fit to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.' The Minister 'is in the Name of Christ...to warn all such as are ignorant...that they presume not to come to that holy table....' As strict subscriptionists to the *Westminster Standards* -- we too should do likewise.

"For our *Westminster Standards* quite rightly recognize that if baptism within the Roman Catholic Church were not a valid baptism -- it would then be a 'great sin' to admit Christians converted from Romanism to the Lord's Supper, before they first got themselves baptized. This would then mean that neither the anti-catabaptist Presbyterian Dr. John Calvin himself nor any other anti-catabaptist Protestant Christian could without "great sin" be welcomed at the Lord's Supper -- by a catabaptist Pastor or Session.

"For catabaptist Pastors and Sessions must necessarily deem the Presbyterian Dr. Calvin and other anti-catabaptist Protestant Christians, to be un-baptized. To be consistent, they must deem Calvin and his Calvinian Calvinists -- through their 'neglect' of 'this ordinance' -- to be guilty of a 'great sin' of omission,<sup>734</sup> or at the very least to be ignorant anent the holy sacrament.

"To be consistent, Catabaptists must further regard Calvin and his Calvinian Calvinists as being ignorant on these points. Consequently, they should bar them from the Lord's table in Catabaptist Congregations -- until the Calvinists get (re-)baptized.

"This is because, as the *Westminster Confession of Faith* rightly teaches us, 'such as are found to be ignorant or scandalous, notwithstanding their profession of the faith and desire to come to the Lord's Supper, may and ought to be kept from that sacrament..., until they receive instruction and manifest their reformation.'<sup>735</sup>

"For the 'ignorant' Calvin and his Calvinian Calvinists would then obviously first need to acquire 'ability' -- before being able to communicate.<sup>736</sup> Indeed, they could only do this -- by themselves, catabaptistically, either requesting or being required to submit to -- re-baptism! However, strict subscription to the *Westminster Standards* cannot accommodate Catabaptism -- within a truly confessional alias a consistently Presbyterian Church."

### **Dr. Carl Bogue's 1990 Letter to Dr. Lee and enclosures**

Dr. Carl Bogue responded to the above on September 27th 1990. His response consisted of a *Letter to Dr. Lee* of that date. He also enclosed his own article *Dr. John Gerstner Withdraws from the Presbyterian Church (USA)*, which had appeared in the *Christian Observer* on June 8th 1990. Here, we first deal with Dr. Bogue's letter.

In his September 1990 *Letter to Dr. Lee*, Dr. Bogue -- courteous and full of good humour as ever -- responded:<sup>737</sup> "Simply get General Lee writing against you! Why pick on poor little ole me.... Besides, if you would end your vacation in the land of sun and fun, you could persuade the [PCA] General Assembly to do what is right. Come home -- we miss you!

"You may be interested to know (or you may not), that in Dr. John Gerstner's concluding that the PCUSA is apostate, he does consistently view their baptism and ordination as invalid....

"We often speak of you and what your presence would do in this battle or that conflict. We do need some able warriors.... Though you would relegate me to a sect for believing that Rome is not a part of the true church, perhaps you will at least not disown me altogether -- since we did depose...[one] who came to espouse paedocommunion....

"One question about your paper [*Calvinism versus Catabaptism*]. I am not sure what you mean by the phrase "that *Catabaptism* is the false teaching that the Roman Catholic Church is a totally pagan religion and is "not even a false part of the Christian Church." Is a false part of the Christian Church a church or a non-church? Are Mormons, JWs [Jehovah witnesses], *etc.*, a false part of the Christian Church in the same way? Is Mormon baptism therefore valid?"



In Carl's accompanying article *Dr. John Gerstner Withdraws from the Presbyterian Church (USA)*,<sup>738</sup> Dr. Bogue wrote of his old Seminary Professor: "After fifty years of distinguished service in the Presbyterian Church (USA) and her predecessors, Dr. John H. Gerstner had no choice. For over two decades he labored tirelessly to keep what he viewed to be a sick church [PCUSA] from dying. Now, with deep personal sadness, he was convinced it fell to him to pronounce dead a once great church. Declaring his conviction that the denomination is apostate, Gerstner's only choice was to unilaterally withdraw from fellowship.

"Earlier in the year Dr. Gerstner began the process of affiliating with the Presbyterian Church in America. On May 5, Gerstner was examined by the [PCA] Presbytery of the Ascension.... At the same time, Gerstner did brand the [UPUSA] group far more corrupt than Rome was at the time of the Reformation....

"If the almost unanimous conclusion of the Reformers that 'the Roman Catholic Church was not merely an impure church but no true church at all...was a fair and sound judgment,' says Gerstner, then 'my appraisal of the PCUSA today is an understatement. The Roman Catholic non-church was *millennial* [= golden-aged?!] in comparison with the PCUSA today.'

"Gerstner consistently acknowledged that while the Presbyterian Church in America [PCA] had not officially made any such judgment about the group [the PCUSA], it was his personal conviction that, as with Rome, so with the Presbyterian Church (USA) [PCUSA] -- their sacraments and ordination would henceforth be invalid."

### **Dr. Lee's October 1990 Letter to Dr. Bogue**

Hopefully with the same courtesy and humour with which Dr. Carl Bogue had just written to him, Lee replied<sup>739</sup> to his friend on October 10th 1990: "Beloved brother 'Catabaptist Carl!' Lovely to know I'm missed, even in Ohio! News of Gerstner is electrifying. But surely he's not jumping out of the PCUSA fire into the PCA frypan, with Bogue now the [almost] sole 'token ethnic' Calvinist?"

"As the PCA careens downhill..., I trust you will not ask me to 'rebaptize' you [here] in Aussie.... I agree with Gerstner that the PCUSA is more apostate than pre-reformational Rome. But I fail to see how that 'papal pronouncement'*ipso facto* 'henceforth' invalidates PCUSA baptisms -- unless they have abandoned the trinitarian formula, of course!

"Too, the godly Gerstner is surely mistaken in calling the late-mediaeval Western Church of Christ 'the Roman Catholic non-church.' What Reformers ever so stated? Certainly not Luther, Zwingli, Calvin or Knox! They stated Rome is not a true church; is indeed a false church; but never that Rome is a 'non-church.' "

Again, there is no question of Dr. Lee ever wanting to "relegate" Dr. Bogue "to a sect for believing that Rome is not a part of the true church." Dr. Bogue is tragically wrong in apparently thinking that Dr. Lee here disagrees with him. Dr. Lee does not.

Certainly "Rome is not a part of the true church." Rome is a huge part of the false church. Yet even a false church is not a synagogue or a mosque (which do not baptize). Instead, Rome is a false part of the Christian Church (which indeed baptizes). So Rome is an irregular but a valid part of the Christian Church Visible. And Rome's baptisms are irregular yet valid baptisms of the Christian Church Visible, rightly administered in the Name of the one true Triune God.

"Congrats on your excommunicating the paedocommunionist.... But when are you consistently going to excommunicate also the catabaptistic Pastor? We may not follow the Confession ONLY when it suits us!

"Re: your question. Rome is not just 'a false church' but also 'a false church': '*ecclesia falsa*.' See *Belgic Confession* 29; *Scots Confession* 16f; *Westminster Confession of Faith* 25. She is not '*sunagoga apostata*' -- though Unitarians [and Jehovah witnesses] and Mormons are. Read Romans 3:1-4, friend, and apply it to the catabaptist issue!

"Regards to the family. When are you coming here as Visiting Professor? How about it? 'General. Lee.'

"Encl.: Rowland S. Ward: *Baptism in Scripture and History*, Melbourne 1990, pp. 68-69, on Knox's anticatabaptism and the invalidity of the non-triune 'baptisms' of Jehovah witnesses & Mormons *etc.*"

Further to satisfy Dr. Bogue and those like him, we next need briefly but definitively to look at the water-rites of the Mormons, the Unitarians, the Jehovah's witnesses, the Seventh-day Adventists, and the Campbellites. Throughout, we now cite only from their own official documents.

### **The invalidity of Mormon water-rites**

According to the testimony of the Mormon leader Joseph Smith himself, it seems he believed that he himself saw two separate gods in 1820. Smith writes: "I saw two Personages whose brightness and glory defy all description, standing above me in the air. One of them spake unto me, calling me by name, and said pointing to the other -- *This is My Beloved Son. Hear Him!*"<sup>740</sup> As LeGrand Richards, a high-ranking modern Leader in the Mormon Council of the Twelve Apostles, alleges: "God the Eternal Father and his Son Jesus Christ appeared to Joseph Smith."<sup>741</sup>

Now these Mormon gods (unlike the one and only Triune God of Holy Scripture), are stated to have bodies and body parts. Indeed, LeGrand Richards insists<sup>742</sup> that "the great sin of the ages has been the worship of false gods... which *neither see nor hear*

*nor eat nor smell* (Deuteronomy 4:28).... Could the gods made by the hands of man -- taught and worshiped by the christian churches of the world at the time Joseph Smith received his glorious vision -- *see or hear or eat or smell?*"

For, continues Richards, as to "the strange gods of christendom, a few quotations will indicate the general beliefs in christendom during the early history of *The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*. The God of the Catholic Church was described as follows: 'Question: What is God? Answer: God is a Spirit.'"

LeGrand Richards continues: "Let us examine the description of the God of the Presbyterian Church: 'There is but one living and true God --Who is infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts or passions' [*Westminster Confession of Faith* 2:1]....

These descriptions of the 'Spirit-ual' God of the Catholic Church and of the Presbyterian Church, explains Richards, "are but typical examples of the gods worshiped by christian churches during the nineteenth century. Here are the gods that Moses told Israel they would encounter, as they were scattered among the nations -- gods 'which neither *see or hear or eat or smell*.' How could a god without body, parts or passions -- be expected either to see, hear, eat, or smell?"

Very clearly, to pagan Mormonism, the Spirit-ual God of Romanism is identical to the Spirit-ual God of Presbyterianism. Again very clearly, the God of Romanism and of Presbyterianism is rejected by Mormons -- because polytheistic Mormonism does not regard the Triune God as the god(s) of Mormonism. Especially is this seen, after Joseph Smith is alleged<sup>743</sup> to have discovered (in 1823) the golden plates containing the Book of Mormon. For, six years later, Smith and his co-religionist Oliver Cowdery submersed one another<sup>744</sup> -- with 'Mormon baptism.'

Remarks the modern Mormon Leader LeGrand Richards:<sup>745</sup> "Let us refer again to Joseph Smith's own story, in which he informs us that while he and Oliver Cowdery were engaged in translating the Book of Mormon, they went into the woods to inquire of the Lord respecting baptism for the remission of sins, which they found mentioned in the translation of the plates.... A messenger from heaven descended in a cloud of light, laid his hands upon their heads, conferred upon them the priesthood of Aaron, and then commanded them to go and be baptized.

"He gave directions that Joseph should baptize Oliver and that afterwards Oliver should baptize Joseph." Shades of the first American Baptists Roger Williams and Ezekiel Hollyman in 1639! (See above in our chapter VIII, at its notes 168 through 175.) [of Dr. Lee's full S.T.D. thesis].

Continues the Mormon Richards: "This messenger [to Smith and Cowdery] said that his name was John, the same that is called John the Baptist in the New Testament -- and that he acted under the direction of [the apostles] Peter, James and John.... These two young men baptized each other by immersion, for the remission of their sins, on May 15, 1829 -- presumably in the Susquehanna River."

### **Mormon water-rites 'invalid' (continued)**

In April 1830, Smith himself declared:<sup>746</sup> "No one can be received into the [Mormon] church of Christ, unless he has arrived unto the years of accountability before God, and is capable of repentance. Baptism is to be administered in the following manner, unto all those who repent.

"The person who is called of God and has authority from Jesus Christ to baptize, shall go down into the water with the person who has presented himself or herself for baptism, and shall say, calling him or her by name: 'Having been commissioned of Jesus Christ, I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.' Then shall he immerse him or her in the water, and come forth again out of the water."

The above comma after the word "Father" and the additional comma after the word "Son" and before the words "and of the Holy Ghost" -- are very important. For they show that, unlike the 'commaless'<sup>747</sup> trinitarian formula in all extant manuscripts of the Greek New Testament at the *locus classicus* Matthew 28:19 -- the Mormon 'baptism' is not trinitarian but polytheistic.

Moreover, unlike the Triune God of Scripture Who is not corporeal but Who is Spirit (John 4:24), the Mormon gods which Mormons misleadingly call 'Father' and 'Son' -- are not Spirit. Instead, the Mormons say these two gods of theirs: are corporeal; are separate from one another; and are both also separate from the third god Mormons misleadingly call 'Holy Ghost.' Indeed, this latter separate and different Mormon god which they call 'Holy Ghost' -- is also stated by Mormonism to be quite different qualitatively to the other two Mormon gods which they misleadingly call 'Father' and 'Son.' For this Mormon god called 'Holy Ghost' by the Mormons, they say is incorporeal.

Thus, Joseph Smith himself tells us: "The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's; the Son also; but the Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones, but is a personage of Spirit."<sup>748</sup> As Mormons regard having flesh and bones as the very essence of paramount godhood -- it is clear that the Holy Spirit could only achieve paramount godhood if and when he/it were to acquire flesh and bones.

Joseph Smith also testifies about a 'vision' of Jesus Christ he alleges he and (the Ex-Campbellite Mormon) Sidney Rigdon had received in 1832. According to Smith, "we saw him even on the right hand of God. And we heard the voice bearing record, that he is the only begotten of the Father -- that by him, and through him, and of him, the worlds are and were created, and the inhabitants thereof are begotten sons and daughters unto God."<sup>749</sup>

On this, Mormon Leader LeGrand Richards<sup>750</sup> remarks: "Note how this parallels Joseph Smith's first vision and the testimony of the Father at Jesus' baptism. The Father spoke of his Son -- two separate and distinct persons.... The Saviour..., his

Father, and the Holy Ghost, are three distinct personages.... Their oneness referred to in the scriptures is only[!] oneness of purpose and desire....

"The Holy Ghost is a male personage.... The Holy Ghost in his spirit body[!] has his assignment of responsibility as the third member of the Godhead.... The Holy Ghost is the medium through whom God and his Son Jesus Christ communicate with men."

After the death of Joseph Smith in 1844, the leadership of the Mormons was taken over by the 1801-77 Brigham Young.<sup>751</sup> According to Mormon Leader Legrand Richards,<sup>752</sup> Brigham Young said that during the (yet-future) millennium "we will have revelations to know our forefathers clear back to Father Adam and Mother Eve."<sup>753</sup>

According to Brigham Young himself:<sup>754</sup> "When the virgin Mary conceived the child Jesus, the Father had begotten him in his own likeness. He was NOT begotten by the Holy Ghost. And who was the Father? He was the first of the human family.... Jesus, our elder brother, was begotten in the flesh by the same character that was in the garden of Eden, and who is our Father in Heaven."

According to Ann Eliza Young, in her book *Wife Number Nineteen*,<sup>755</sup> Brigham Young taught that "Jesus Christ was a polygamist; Mary and Martha, the sisters of Lazarus, were his plural wives.... The bridal feast of Cana...was on the occasion of one of his own marriages."

The Mormons ran into many difficulties especially when trying to refine their pneumatology. Thus Joseph F. Smith, their sixth President, in 1902 differentiated between the operations: of the Spirit of God; the Spirit of Christ; and the Holy Spirit. Said President J.F. Smith:<sup>756</sup> "We often say the Spirit of God, when we mean the Holy Ghost. We likewise say the Holy Ghost, when we mean the Spirit of God."

"The Holy Ghost is a personage in the Godhead, and is not that which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. It is the Spirit of God which proceeds through Christ to the world, that enlightens every man that comes into the world." And Mormon Leader Legrand Richards himself added<sup>757</sup> in 1976, that the alleged ancient Hebrew leader in the *Book of Mormon* called "Nephi saw the Spirit of God rest upon a man whom we understand to be Columbus" -- the illustrious Roman Catholic navigator!

### **Mormon water-rites 'invalid' (resumed)**

The bizarre misunderstanding by the Mormons of the teachings of Trinitarian Christians, is clearly manifested in the anonymous but official 1973 Mormon publication *What the Mormons Think of Christ*. There, we read<sup>758</sup> about Jesus that "to accept him as the Son of God one must first believe in his Father as God and must believe that the Father is a personal being in whose image man is created -- knowledge that is not widely had among christians."

Trinitarian Christians are next subjected to severe castigation. "When God is believed to be impersonal[?], uncreated[!], incorporeal[!], incomprehensible[!], unknown[?], unknowable[?], a mystical three-in-one spirit[?] that fills immensity -- it is not possible to accept him as the literal Father of our Lord."<sup>759</sup>

In this official Mormon publication, we also encounter the Mormons' own confused polytheism: "Under the direction of the Father, Christ was and is the Creator of this earth and all things that are in it.... Christ is the Firstborn. Obviously, he did not have this distinction as pertaining to his birth into mortality. For many millions preceded him in birth upon this earth.

"But it must not be forgotten...that all men lived in a pre-existent estate before they were born into this world. All were born in pre-existence as the spirit-children of the Father. Christ was the Firstborn Spirit-Child, and from that day forward he has had, in all things, the preeminence....

"From the days of Adam, Christ has appeared to chosen prophets.... Salvation is in Christ. He is the Firstborn Spirit-Child of God the Eternal Father. He is the Creator of all things from the beginning.... He is the Son of God, literally, actually, as men are the sons of mortal parents."<sup>760</sup>

Here, Mormonism seems to be claiming exactly what some Mohammadans quite wrongly accuse Trinitarians of teaching. For the claim here seems to be that a corporeal god (called 'the Eternal Father') needed to have and did so have sexual intercourse with the young woman Mary (until then a virgin) -- in order to be able to reproduce a son who would then have a really human body.

Our concern about the Mormon understanding of the Holy Trinity, and Christian baptism in His Name, increases further -- when we read the modern Mormon Elder John Morgan's official booklet *The Plan of Salvation*. There, John Morgan states:<sup>761</sup> "In presenting the principles of *pre-existence*, the *first principles* of the gospel, and *baptism for the dead*..., let us then...see what the teachings of the Great Creator are.

"Speaking to Job, one of the most ancient writers of the Bible, he says...: 'Where was thou when I laid the foundations of the earth...when the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy?' Job 38:2-7. Job certainly must have been somewhere, when the 'foundations of the earth were laid'....

"There was doubtless more meaning to the words 'when *all the sons of God shouted for joy*'.... Luke, in giving the genealogy of the human family, gives the necessary information on the subject [of the ancestors of Jesus] 'which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God' [Luke 3:38]....

"Paul, in his writing to the Hebrews [12:9], says: 'Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh.... Shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live?' ... An unembodied spirit is one that has not yet taken upon itself a body. An

embodied spirit is one dwelling in the flesh.... Is it so difficult to comprehend our own pre-existence, when that of Jesus is so plainly taught?"

Hence, the still-upheld *Articles of Faith of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* -- as formulated by the Mormon pioneer Joseph Smith -- are themselves unacceptable from their very outset. For the very first article declares: 'We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in His Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.'<sup>1762</sup>

The commas in this first 'Article of Faith' certainly suggest at least tritheism; possibly quadrithism (the worship of four different gods); and, by implication, also even a still-expanding pantheon of polytheistic gods at various levels of development.

For it does not express faith in the one and only true Triune God. Indeed, it does not even assert the essential deity and divine pre-existence from all eternity past of either the Son or the Spirit.

### **Mormon water-rites 'invalid' (concluded)**

Nor is this just our own assessment. In 1962, Mormon President Hugh B. Brown, Counselor in the First Presidency -- at the invitation of Rev. Prof. Dr. John Gerstner -- said in an address to the students at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh:<sup>763</sup> "In our 'Articles of Faith' we state our believe in God the Eternal Father, and in His Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.... But we believe they are separate and distinct entities. This is the first distinguishing and, to some, disturbing doctrine of the [Mormon] Church....

"The three members of the Godhead are **separate** individuals [or gods] -- physically distinct from one another.... Both the Father and the Son are persons as we are personal, and are in perfection what we are in embryo. Each of them possesses a tangible body...attended by transcendent glory; nevertheless, a body of flesh and bones.... We believe...in the eternal nature of man.... Intelligence is eternal.... Man has a god-like status."

Thus, Mormons themselves say that the god they call their 'Father' is a god of flesh and bones. Their separate second god -- the idol that Mormons call the 'Son' -- was not a true god (with flesh and bones) until its alleged conception or birth; nor was it authoritatively exalted as their god until its assumed bodily resurrection. Their separate third god they call 'Holy Spirit' still has no flesh and bones; and hence it is not (yet) the same kind of god as the first god Mormons call their 'Father' and as the second god or idol they call 'Son.'

Pre-existent Mormons, still unconceived, are not yet gods. Yet they too are believed to begin to become gods, at their Mormon 'baptism.' Indeed, they are believed to become more and more divine -- as they thereafter advance up the deificatory ladder of Mormonism.

Very clearly, none of the Mormon gods -- past, present and future -- is the one and only true Triune God of the Christian Bible. Nor is 'Mormon baptism' into the names of those false gods -- Christian baptism into the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit!

For Mormons are polytheists. It is true that they have indeed included in the formula for their own submersionistic water-rites, some of the 'trinitarian' words found in Matthew 28:19. Yet Mormon 'baptism'<sup>764</sup> is no more a Christian baptism<sup>765</sup> -- than were the 'baptisms for the dead' from which the apostle Paul distanced himself and which the Mormons themselves have imitated with their own necropseudobaptisms (First Corinthians 15:29f).

Unlike Romanists, Mormons quite wrongly do not regard their three false gods -- which they call 'the Father' and 'the Son' and 'the Holy Spirit' -- as three Persons within one and the same eternal God. Mormons do not allege that their three gods are distinct Persons within the one and only Triune God. Instead, the Mormons blasphemously attribute these three blessed Names to their own three false gods or idols (which are also quite separate from one another).

The Mormon god called 'the Father' is not the eternal God the Father mentioned in the Bible. The Mormon god called 'the Son' is not the eternal God the Son mentioned in the Bible. The Mormon god called 'the Holy Spirit' is not the eternal God the Holy Spirit of the Holy Bible.

For these three Mormon gods are all different gods -- very different even to and from one another. None of them are the "one God" *Jehovah Elohim* of Deuteronomy 6:4 - - nor the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit of Matthew 28:19. So, then, Mormon 'baptism' is not the "one baptism" of Ephesians 4:5.

### **The invalidity of Unitarian water-rites**

The matter of the (in)validity of 'unitarian baptism' is rather easier to assess. Because Unitarians deny that Christ is God, it follows that the god they call their 'father' and claim to worship, is not at all the unchanging Eternal Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the Father of our Lord Christ must always have had an Eternally-Begotten Son -- precisely in order to be the Eternal Father of that Eternal Son. John 17:5. And both the Eternal Father and the Eternal Son have always had the Eternal Spirit -- as the Personal Bond eternally linking Them to One Another. Hebrews 9:14.

Only of Spirit-indwelt Trinitarians is it true -- that "you have an anointing [compare baptism] from the Holy One, and you know all things.... Whosoever denies the Son, the same does not have the Father.... He that does not have the Son of God, does not have life." First John 2:20-23 & 5:12.

Only incipient (but not full-blown) Unitarians even bother officially to use the Biblical baptismal *formula* at all. There, our above arguments against the validity of 'Mormon



baptism' again obtain -- *mutatis mutandis*. However, once established irreversibly, fully-developed Unitarianism invariably abandons first the Biblical baptismal formula and later even the water-rite itself.

The Rev. Dr. Gerrit Verkuyl was the National Field Representative for Leadership Training -- of the Presbyterian Board of Christian Education. In that capacity, he wrote in his important book *Reclaim Those Unitarian Wastes*:<sup>766</sup> "Laelius and Faustus Socinus, uncle and nephew, were the moving spirits for Unitarianism.... The articles of their creed are: Christ was [only] a man, and the Holy Spirit an impersonal influence.... The Church is a voluntary society...; her sacraments commemorative."

However, in point of fact, "Matthew and Luke relate the baptism episode [of Jesus] in full agreement.... The Holy Spirit came upon Jesus.... The Father testified to His Sonship.... So distinct are the three Personalities of the Godhead pictured there, that - - were it not for other sources of information -- we might be led into the heresy of tritheism." Such other sources of information as the triune Numbers 6:24-27 and Deuteronomy 6:4-5 and Matthew 28:19, however, condemn tritheism too and clearly imply only trinitarianism.

"Jesus was an out-and-out Trinitarian.... The final great command of our Lord to baptize in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is found in the choicest ancient manuscripts, *Codex Sinaiticus* included.... Liberalistic religion carries in its bosom the germ of death.... The moment it becomes 'liberal' it begins to degrade into a mere philosophy." Unquote Verkuyl.

It was unitarianizing American Congregationalism which poisoned Charles Taze Russell, who later founded the Watchtower Society (as the immediate forerunner of the 'New World Society' of the modern so-called "Jehovah's witnesses"). According to Russell:<sup>767</sup> "The doctrine of the Trinity...is a tool of Satan.... It is based upon a superstitious fear inculcated by the Roman clergy, and later also by the Protestant clergy, under the threat that whoever denies the Trinity is taking a straight road to eternal torture."

The Jehovah witnesses' 1943 'New World Society' book *The Truth Shall Make You Free* alleges<sup>768</sup> quite brazenly that "the trinity of gods...appears as a teaching of pagan religions...long before its adoption by the religionists of so-called 'Christendom.'" Their 1958 publication *From Paradise Lost to Paradise Regained*, shows how to repudiate the Christian Trinity -- namely, by submitting to the different 'baptism' of the "Jehovah's witnesses."

It explains:<sup>769</sup> "By being dipped right down under the water and by being raised up again, you show that you are dying to your former course of life.... God is pleased to have...all people who want to receive his blessings, to dedicate their lives to him and to be baptized."

Deliberately depersonalizing the Holy Spirit by referring to Him with small letters (as if an 'it'), the text continues: "What does it mean to be baptized 'in the name of the Father

and of the Son and of the holy spirit'? It means that you accept the heavenly Father as the supreme God who is to be worshiped and obeyed."

Now this great god they call "Father" (and "Jehovah"), is believed by Jehovah's witnesses to be antecedent to and way above and different from their other and lesser created god that they call the "Son" of that Father Jehovah. "To be baptized," continues the Jehovah's witnesses' book *Paradise Lost*, "means that you accept Christ Jesus as Jehovah's Son [but do not accept Him as Jehovah Himself].... And it means that you believe that the holy spirit is the invisible [and impersonal] active force by which the heavenly Father carried out his will" -- not, from everlasting and unto for ever, the Eternal Person of the Eternal Holy Spirit through Whom the Eternal Father and the Eternal Son act trinitarianly.

For the Jehovah witnesses's "Father" they call "Jehovah" was a 'Non-Father' before Genesis 1:1 and changed into "the Father" only when he allegedly 'created' his Son -- yet Malachi 3:6 states: "I am Jehovah; I do not change." Their "Son" is a creature, and not the Bible's "Son" Who is Himself "God" and also "the God" (John 1:1 & 20:28). Their "spirit" is neither God nor personal, and is not the Bible's eternal Holy Spirit Whom they vex (Isaiah 63:10f & Hebrews 9:14). Their "Jehovah" is not the true Jehovah-Jesus of Scripture -- not God at all, but an idol they have made.

The unitarianizing Jehovah's witnesses, as Neo-Ariomaniacs, find themselves in the middle phase of unitarianizing devolution. They still cling to an initiatory water-rite (by submersion only). Yet their water-rite is silent -- not utilizing the formula of Matthew 28:19! As George Mackinney remarks in his *Theology of the Jehovah's Witnesses*:<sup>770</sup> "No special formula is said at the time of the actual immersion."

Needless to say -- all such water-rites, totally ignoring the blessed Name of the one true Triune God -- cannot possibly be viewed as Christian baptisms at all. Indeed, to associate the very vocal trinitarian sprinklings at Roman Catholic baptisms with the necropseudobaptismal water-rites of polytheistic Mormons, or with the silent submersions of unitarizing Jehovah witnesses -- callously suppresses the truth of the totality of Holy Scripture and insults the Holy Spirit as its Author.

### **The validity of irregular (justificatory?) 'S.D.A. baptisms'**

Some also have problems recognizing the validity of (semi-justificatory?) Seventh-day Adventist baptisms. Today, the Adventists are clearly trinitarian. In the nineteenth century, certain aspects of their deology was initially suspect.

S.D.A.'s founder Ellen G. White herself seems reasonably orthodox on the Trinity, and the official 1957 S.D.A. publication *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine* clearly professes faith in the Triune God.<sup>771</sup> Yet it also admits that of "the

founding fathers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church over a century ago...some were Trinitarian" while "others were Arian."<sup>772</sup>

Thus, the noted Adventist Elder J.H. Waggoner wrote a book (published by the S.D.A. Publishing Association) in 1877. Even that book's very title apparently denies not the eternity but indeed the personality of the Holy Ghost -- *The Spirit of God: Its[!] Offices and Manifestations*.<sup>773</sup> Too, one encounters similar concerns about the trinitology of the great S.D.A. commentator on both Daniel and Revelation, the famous Elder Uriah Smith.

Today, however, there should be no doubt at all as to the trinitarian orthodoxy of Seventh-day Adventists. Thus, in their official 1988 book *Seventh-day Adventists Believe*, it is clearly stated:<sup>774</sup> "The Bible reveals that the Holy Spirit is a person, not an impersonal force.... The Holy Spirit has personality.... The Holy Spirit is considered equal with the Father and the Son in the baptismal formula (Matthew 28:19).... From eternity, God the Holy Spirit lived within the Godhead.... The Father, Son and Spirit are equally self-existent.... The Holy Spirit' s intimate involvement in creation is seen in His presence at creation (Genesis 1:2). Life' s origin and maintenance depends on His operation."

Specifically on baptism, it is then further stated:<sup>775</sup> "Christ made it clear that He required baptism of those who wished to become a part of His church.... They were to be baptized in the name of the triune God.... Peter explained that we are saved by baptism, as Noah and his family were saved through water [First Peter 3:20f]. Of course God, not the flood waters, saved Noah. By analogy, it is the blood of Christ, not the water of baptism, that removes sin from the believer....

"While baptism is vitally linked to salvation, it does not guarantee salvation. ' From the beginning SDA' s, in common with their Protestant heritage, have rejected any view of baptism as an *opus operatum*, that is, as an act that, in and of itself, imparts grace and effects salvation.' <sup>776</sup> Thus, very "characteristic of the unity the Spirit brings in God' s church, is the practice of ' one baptism' (Ephesians 4:5)."

Yet, in direct conflict with the last sentence, it then anticlimactically adds:<sup>777</sup> "At times, individuals who have experienced baptism by immersion feel convicted that they should be rebaptized.... Scripture says nothing [? Hebrews 6:1-6!] that would deny rebaptism to individuals who have broken their covenant with God through grievous sin or apostasy and then experience reconversion and desire a renewal of their covenant."<sup>778</sup>

The last ' rebaptistic' paragraph is, of course, both heretical and schismatic. But so too are the similar views of both (conditionally-rebaptistic) Romanists and (neo-catabaptist) Thornwellians in general.

Nevertheless, the schismatic heresy of Seventh-day Adventism on this particular point -- does not invalidate their baptisms. Nor could the Adventist Elder Waggoner' s denial

of not the eternity but indeed of the personality of the Holy Spirit, invalidate any baptisms that either he or his followers administered .

### **The validity of irregular (justificatory?) 'Campbellite baptisms'**

Some have had problems in recognizing the validity of Campbellite baptisms. Certainly the pioneer Campbellite (Alexander Campbell himself) clearly denied not the deity but indeed the eternity of the Son of God. See below at our note 782. To Alexander Campbell, as to his successors -- though professing to believe in the Triune God -- their far greater emphasis is heretically and schismatically on their own submersings, rather than on the blessed saving Name of the one true Triune God.

Thus, O.B. Stockford of the 'Disciples of Christ' writes hundreds of pages on submersionism in his *Baptism in Relation to Spiritual Life* -- without ever explaining the significance of the Name of the Triune God Himself in baptism.<sup>779</sup> C.R. Nichol of the 'Christian Church' fills many pages on the requirements of baptism<sup>780</sup> -- without once even mentioning the Trinity. And Silas F. Shaw of the 'Church of Christ' issues a "Whole Life Policy" of the *Insurance Company of the Soul*.<sup>781</sup> This, he explains in a businesslike way, "can be accepted" by "President God" and "Vice-President Christ" and "Secretary & Treasurer Holy Spirit" solely and "only on the terms" of being "buried...into the water" and "saved by water" -- even as "baptism doth also now save us."

We ourselves believe that the above Campbellite baptisms are all valid and unrepeatable -- in spite of their heretical, irregular, and sometimes even blasphemous trappings. Indeed, we have little to add to Dabney's final assessment of these Campbellite baptisms -- whose assessment we now state.

In Dabney's 1880 essay *The System of Alexander Campbell*,<sup>782</sup> he states that "Campbell -- while illustrating his contempt for the learning and opinion of the church by the repudiation of the terms 'consubstantial,' 'eternal generation,' 'procession,' and even in one place...of the word 'Trinity' -- yet proposes to be orthodox as to the proper divinity of the three persons.... The characteristic of his trinitarian theory is that, while he admits an eternal personal relation between the Father and the Son, he denies that it is one of eternal generation. The second Person, according to him, is Son only as incarnate. His previous name should be only that of 'Word'....

"In refutation of this error, it is sufficient to refer here to the general argument for the eternal generation of the Son -- in the simple fact that Scripture should have chosen this pair of words, *the Father* and *the Son*, to express the relation between two persons of the adorable Trinity. There must have been a reason for the choice of these terms; there must be something corresponding to the well-known meaning of this pair of names -- else eternal truth had not employed them.... That meaning must be compatible with God's immateriality and eternity....

"In the baptismal formula [of Matthew 28:19]...the name *Son* is so used in immediate connection with the name *Father*.... It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the

one is *reciprocal* to the other. The Son is evidently *Son* in a sense answerable to that in which the Father is *Father*....

“If the *paternity* is something characteristic and permanent -- so is the *filiation*. If the Father is eternally *Father* -- the Son must be eternally *Son*....

"With Campbell's theory of the application of redemption, is closely connected his doctrine [also] touching the effect of baptism.... He is an immersionist of the strictest sect.... He denies infant baptism -- with violence. But there is nothing in his treatment of these points not already familiar in our controversy with other immersionists..., except upon one particular.... As to the design and effect of baptism, the Campbellite theory is substantially the *opus operatum* one....

"It should however be said, in justice, that like the Romanists, they make baptism only the formal cause of remission, and teach that the meritorious cause is Christ's sacrifice. They claim, with much clamor, that the Reformed divines...and especially the *Westminster* and the *Thirty-Nine Articles* teach their doctrine.... But we deny that water baptism is the *essential* term of salvation.... In the words of Turretin [affirming the valid unrepeatable of 'Romish baptism'], *non privatio sed contemptus damnat* ['not the lack but the contempt (of Christian holy baptism) condemns']....

"We may say of this doctrine as of all forms of sacramental grace -- it is the prompting of that tendency to formalism and to a sensuous religion which exhibits itself in popery and paganism.... It is 'another gospel.' It is a conception utterly heterogeneous with the nature of the Bible system. It converts the work of God's Spirit through the truth into a system of religious jugglery.

“The other striking peculiarities of Campbellites,” concludes Dr. Dabney, “are the permission of lay-baptism and lay-administration of the supper; the thoroughly independent church government; and the weekly repetition of the supper. They insist much on these. But they are not the germinant points of the system, and we pass them over. Our [Southern Presbyterian] church has committed itself definitely to a policy of non-recognition as to the Campbellite societies. Our grounds may be found stated in the *Minutes* of the General Assembly, 1871.”

With all of the above remarks, Dabney never once argued that either 'Campbellite' or 'Romish' baptism is invalid and that presbyterianized Ex-Campbellites and Ex-Romanists need rebaptizing. To the contrary. In the above paragraphs, Dr. Dabney approvingly cites the baptismal views of Turretin -- who strongly affirmed the validity and unrepeatable of 'Romish baptism.'<sup>783</sup>

Dabney witnessed the 1871 General Assembly of his Southern Presbyterian Church repudiate the validity of 'Campbellite baptism.' He also lived to see the General Assembly of 1882 -- and again that of 1884 -- 're-validate' the baptism of the Campbellites.<sup>784</sup> Without protest, Dabney himself lived on -- and did not die till 1898.

### **Conclusion: 'once triunely baptized, always baptized!'**

Our conclusion then, must surely be: once baptized, always baptized. Once branded as God's saved sheep or little lamb in His own Triune Name -- by grace and through faith, we unlosably and therefore unrepeatably thenceforth bear His Name forever! Revelation 7:2f; 14:1f; 22:4f.

Last year [1989], in a Houston (Texas) Christian Focus Publication, the well-known John Tallach of the arch-conservative Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland had rightly warned<sup>785</sup> that "the [*Westminster*] *Confession* does not say that the Roman Catholic Church is Antichrist. It is not Roman Catholicism but its Pope who is Antichrist.

Continues Tallach: "We must distinguish between, on the one hand, the body of people within the R.C. Church who profess the Christian faith -- and, on the other, the papal and hierarchical system which has so largely perverted the people belonging to that Church -- and subverted them for its own ends.... If we refuse to distinguish between the Papacy and the R.C. Church, we put ourselves in the position where we cannot apply Second Thessalonians 2:3-4 to the Pope in the way that the *Confession* does. In that passage, the man of sin appears 'in the temple of God.' Surely the temple points to the Church of God! I Corinthians 3:16; Ephesians 2:21-22."

Rev. Tallach could also have added (and we hereby do) that we should distinguish on the one hand between the Papal Church -- and on the other hand the true Christians within it who would be true to their Christian baptism. Unless we so distinguish, we have little hope of winning true Christians within the Roman Catholic Church for Protestantism. Indeed, many Baptists and Catabaptists only antagonize true Christians imprisoned in the deformed Church -- in their struggle to see and to follow the Sun of righteousness through the gloomy twilight of Romanism.

We close. Most of the "Calvinists" in the U.S.A. today [1990] are within either the Christian Reformed Church (alias the CRC) or the Reformed Church of America (alias the RCA). Both of them tenaciously hold to the validity of baptisms performed in the Roman Catholic Church.

Most Calvinists within the U.S. National Association of Presbyterian and Reformed Churches (NAPARC), are members of the CRC. As already seen, even Hoeksema's Protestant Reformed Church (PRC) holds the orthodox anticatabaptist Calvinian view. So too does James Montgomery Boice of the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA).

The Protestant Reformation was and is not an Anabaptist Revolution. What Christians within Romanism need, is an urgent invitation from the Reformed Church -- for them to trust the God of their baptism completely. Thereafter, as God's own people -- let them then, like Luther and Calvin of old, renounce the papal apostasy and come out from Babylon! Revelation 18:2-4.

### **Summary: Calvinism accepts 'Romish' baptism and rejects catabaptism**

We have been looking at Calvinism on the validity of triune baptisms even when administered in the Roman Catholic Church. Significantly, not just every Lutheran leader but also every Reformed theologian affirmed the unrepeatability of 'Romish baptism.' Thus: Ulrich Zwingli, Martin Bucer, Henry Bullinger, John Calvin, Theodore Beza, John Knox, Guido De Bres, Peter Datheen, Francis Junius, and many others.

Calvin wrote his *Institutes* -- to prove that the Reformers were not Anabaptists. He approved of the *antirebaptism* taught by the Romish Council of Trent. He opposed Rome's ritualistic additions to baptism, and her *ex opere operato* theory. Yet he asserted the *validity* of all triune baptisms, even when administered by heretics (such as Anabaptists and Romanists). For he insisted that Rome, impure and dilapidated indeed, was still part of the Christian Church -- even in spite of her being oppressed for many centuries by the papal antichrist. Hence, he decisively rejected the Catabaptists' rebaptizing of all converted Ex-Romanists previously "baptized in the papacy." *Institutes* IV:15:16. And he enjoined Knox to do the same.

Knox did so. He too regarded not the Romanists but the Anabaptists as "the enemies most to be feared." Indeed, he and his Scottish associates clearly declared that "we damn the error of the Anabaptists." While indeed condemning Rome as 'the false Kirk' in the *First Scots Confession*, in the *First Book of Discipline* the Knoxians provided for the utilization of rehabilitated Ex-Romish former priests -- as 'Precentors' and 'Readers' in the Reformed Church of Scotland!

In the fifteen-sixties, the *Belgic Confession* in Holland and the *Heidelberg Catechism* in Germany and the *Second Helvetic Confession* in Switzerland were all anticatabaptist. By 1576, Romanists and Protestants had universally agreed to recognize one another's baptisms. The *Second Book of Discipline* of 1578 and the *Second Scots Confession* of 1580 are officially anticatabaptist. So too are the decisions of: the 1581 Dutch Synod of Middelburg and the French Reformed Church; the 1615 *Irish Articles*; the 1618f Synod of Dort; and the 1643f *Westminster Standards*.

Of the British Westminster divines, George Gillespie and Samuel Rutherford are known to have been officially anticatabaptist. So too were Cocceius and Wendelin in Germany; Turretin and Pictet in Switzerland; and Marckius, Riissen, Maastricht and De Moor in Holland. The British Puritans John Owen, David Dickson and Matthew Henry -- and Jonathan Edwards in America -- all seem to have been so. Indeed, there is no trace of any catabaptism at all among American Calvinists -- until the fateful 1845 General Assembly of the declining PCUSA.

There, under the influence of 'Great Awakening' theology on the one hand and ever-

increasing snipings from Baptists on the other, even the great Thornwell capitulated to catabaptism -- and for a time dragged also the General Assembly of the PCUSA with him. Asserting that even tiny covenant children should be regarded as "baptized unbelievers" and "enemies of God" (*Collected Writings* IV:348), he abandoned the doctrine of the *Westminster Assembly's Directory* that God's covenant children "are Christians and federally holy before baptism."

Thornwell also relinquished the teaching of the *Westminster Confession* (28:7) that "baptism is but once to be administer to any person" (*cf.* too the *Larger Catechism* 167). Also, his view that some Romish misrepresentations of God are worse than those of "modern Hindoos" (*C.W.* III:373) betrays bigotry.

Charles Hodge and others stoutly resisted Thornwell's baptismal imbalance. So too did Drs. W.G.T. Shedd and A.A. Hodge. Indeed, by 1875, the Northern PCUSA had all but repudiated the catabaptism of 1845. After the death of Thornwell in 1862, even in the Southern PCUS, Dabney (d. 1898) did not endorse the deceased Thornwell's catabaptism. By 1882, the PCUS had reversed itself on the (in)validity of Campbellite baptism. Indeed, in the twentieth century, it *de facto* returned to Calvin's view on the validity of Romish baptism.

Anticatabaptist Reformed theologians since Thornwell's time onward, include: Heinrich Hepppe in Germany; the Dutchmen Gravemeijer, Kuyper, Bavinck, and Berkouwer; the Free Church of Scotland's William Cunningham and 'Rabbi' Duncan; the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland's Cameron, MacIntyre, Beaton, Macfarlane, Macqueen and Maclean; the American Calvinists Warfield, Berkhof, McIntire, Buswell, Hoeksema, and Boice; Heyns (and all other Reformed theologians absolutely) in South Africa; and the Reformed Ecumenical Synod worldwide.

"Down under" in Australia the miniscule Presbyterian Reformed Church went officially catabaptist -- and 'invalidated' even 'Methodist baptism' after seceding from the mainline Presbyterian Church of Australia in 1967. The (Free) Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia apparently averted an attempt to catabaptize it in 1982. By 1990, it seemed well on the way back toward reaffirming Calvin's anticatabaptism. All other Australian Reformed denominations are solidly anticatabaptist.

In the United States, the 1981 Reformed Presbyterian Church Evangelical Synod re-affirmed the validity of 'Romish baptism.' In 1982, the Presbyterian Church in America was advised not to repeat infant baptisms in later life (even where both parents concerned are subsequently seen to have been unbelievers at the time of the infant baptisms of their children).

In 1983, the RPCUS seceded from the PCA -- and immediately upheld the clear anticatabaptism of the *Westminster Standards*. Indeed, in 1987, even the PCA General Assembly itself received without approval both an Anti-Calvinian catabaptist *Report* and a Calvinistic anticatabaptist *Report* on the validity of baptism when administered by Rome -- thus noting the clear anticatabaptism of Calvin and his colleagues.



In 1989, a Free Presbyterian publication from Houston urged the upholding of Dr. John Calvin's anticatabaptist recognition of Romish baptisms. And in 1990, the RPCUS -- alias the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the Americas -- moved outward into the Old World (see below), in order to re-establish worldwide the theological views of John Calvin.

### **Postscript: baptism in the future 'Church of the Triune God'**

Dr. Lee had written<sup>786</sup> to Dr. J.G. Thompson in December 1983 that Ultraprotestant Catabaptists needed to revise their theory, and True Protestants their strategy, as regards their commitment to the Great Commission -- as also Dr. J.C. Morecraft III was then saying. Dr. Lee, Dr. Morecraft and Dr. Thompson were then all three still in the denomination known as the 'Presbyterian Church in America' (PCA). So Dr. Lee applied his remarks to Dr. Thompson about Dr. Morecraft -- with reference to the PCA's practice of funding baptistic and/or catabaptistic missionary organizations with presbyterian money.

Thus, Dr. Lee alleged to Dr. Thompson that Dr. Morecraft "would enjoy this letter; especially its references to LAM [Latin American Missions] and WIM [West Indies Missions].... On vacation together, he [Dr. Morecraft] and I [Dr. Lee] often spoke of the anti-evangelistic idiocy of going forth to catabaptize converts from Roman Catholicism....

"At PCA General Assemblies, we were always standing against those actions of the MTW [the PCA's 'Mission to the World' Committee] -- wherever it collaborated with non-denominational [if not anti-denominational] immersionistic missions which would 'transubstantiate' converted Latin American Ex-Romanists into *de facto* Baptists." To the contrary, however, "we should rather have been out stirring up the South American Romanists to serve the trinitarian God Whose Name they already bear in baptism -- as 'Monseigneur' Morecraft so strenuously tried to do, on his trip to Chile and Paraguay."

Dr. Thompson is still in the Presbyterian Church in America; Dr. Lee is now in the Presbyterian Church of Australia; and Dr. Morecraft is now in the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States. With the expansion of that latter denomination's outreach into Canada on the one hand, and into the Caribbean and Central America and South America on the other -- the name was changed in the middle of 1990 to: Reformed Presbyterian Church in the Americas. Since then, the denomination has further expanded into England, and will probably soon yet further expand even into South Africa.

For *The Covenant* sworn and subscribed by the 1871 Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America<sup>787</sup> clearly states<sup>788</sup> "that, believing the Church to be *one* -- and...moreover, that schism and sectarianism are sinful in themselves and inimical to true religion, and trusting that divisions shall cease and the people of God

become one catholic Church over all the earth -- we will pray and labor for the visible oneness of the Church of God in our own land and throughout the world....

"Rejoicing that the enthroned Mediator is not only King in Zion but King over all the earth, and recognizing the obligation to His command to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature and to teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and resting with faith in the promise of His perpetual presence as the pledge of success -- we hereby dedicate ourselves to the great work of making known God's light and salvation among the nations."<sup>789</sup>

Significantly, in a recent letter (November 13th 1990) to Dr. Lee, his friend Dr. Morecraft (now of the 'Reformed Presbyterian Church in the Americas') wrote as follows:<sup>790</sup> "A couple of months ago, we ordained a man from Yorkshire (England). So we will have to change our name again. Perhaps the 'Intergalactic RP Church' should do the trick. Our church in Spokane (Washington) -- the Sovereign Grace RP Church -- three years ago was the Cary Memorial Baptist Church. Our RP church in Managua [Nicaragua], three years ago was the First United Methodist Church. People are 'riper' for Calvinism and Presbyterianism than ever before. Praise God!"

Yes, praise God indeed. It is truly encouraging to see Baptists and Methodists, from Nicaragua to Canada -- and from the New World back to the Old -- now becoming Presbyterians (and, indeed, 'Reformed' Presbyterians at that). Yet the only way of bringing them together permanently -- is through the "one baptism" of Christ's Great Commission. Matthew 28:19 *cf.* Ephesians 4:4-6.

Hence, even an "Intergalactic RP Church" will not, permanently, suffice. For even all the galaxies everywhere, are only created creatures. And the hearts of men as the very images of God remain restless -- until they come to rest in their uncreated Creator!

The Christian Church is supra-catholic; supra-galactic; supra-protestant; and even supra-lapsarian. For her members have been chosen by the Triune God Himself prior to Adam's fall and even before the foundation of the world -- from all eternity, and unto all everlastingness. They have been baptized, through His ministers, by Him Himself -- baptized unrepeatably with the "one baptism" into His Own Name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Matthew 28:19; Ephesians 4:4-6; Hebrews 6:1-6. They are nourished by their great Creator-Redeemer-Consummator -- Himself. For they are indeed the very bride of the one and only true Triune God.

Probably during the millennium -- and certainly as the Completed Church on the New Earth still yet-to-come -- she will be the Church of Jehovah-Jesus Himself: "My Church." Matthew 16:18. This is neither the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) nor the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA) -- but the Church of *Jehovah Elohim*, alias the Church of the Triune God (CTG). That Church is indeed intergalactic, international, 't-u-l-i-p-p'<sup>791</sup> -- and, above all, ontologically trinitarian.<sup>792</sup>

So, in the words of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (28:1-2), "baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament ordained by Jesus Christ not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the Visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace...and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ to walk in newness of life -- which sacrament is by Christ's own appointment to be continued in His Church until the end of the world.... The party is to be baptized in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

For King Jesus commands His officers:<sup>793</sup> "Keep on going into all the world! Keep on preaching the Gospel to every creature! Keep on turning all nations into My disciples! He who, having believed, is baptized -- shall be saved! But he who keeps on not believing, shall be damned!

"Keep on baptizing -- into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost! And then, keep on teaching them to continue observing all things whatsoever I have ever commanded" -- to "My Church." For Christ's Church is the Triune God's Church -- the "Church of the Living God," the "Church of the firstborn written in heaven," the "Church of God" the "Judge of all." Revelation 3:12f; 7:2f; 14:1f; 22:4f.

Church of the Triune God! With this then in view, our prayer here and now, at baptisms and at all times, should always be that of Matthew 6:9f (*cf.* 28:19f). "Our Father in heaven! Hallowed be Your Name! May Your Kingdom keep on coming -- here and now on earth, as it already is in heaven! For the Kingdom and the power and the glory are Yours! For ever! Amen!"

As the *Westminster Larger Catechism* (191) here explains: "In the second petition...'Thy kingdom come'...we pray that the kingdom of sin and Satan may be destroyed, the Gospel propagated throughout the world, the Jews called, the fulness of the Gentiles brought in; the church, furnished with all gospel-officers and ordinances [such as baptism], purged from corruption."

Thus we pray "that the ordinances of Christ [such as baptism] may be purely dispensed and made effectual to the converting of those that are yet in their sins, and the confirming...and building up of these that are already converted." Thus indeed we also pray "that Christ would rule in our hearts here, and hasten the time of His second coming, and...exercise the Kingdom of His power in all the world!"

## ENDNOTES

<sup>644</sup> Presbyterian Church in America: *Minutes of the Tenth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America*, Committee for Christian Education and Publications of the PCA, Decatur Ga., 1982, p. 100. Our only disagreement with the Answer given in this excellent advice which came before the General Assembly, is the Anti-Calvinian and 'Hodgean' assumption (here omitted in our own citation of it) that John's baptism and Christ's baptism are perhaps not one and the same institution. See too *Draft Minority Report of the Committee to Study the Validity of Certain Baptisms to the General Assembly of the PCA*, J.G. Thompson, Kingsport Tenn., February 1984, pp. 6-7.

<sup>645</sup> See in our text at its n. 644 above. <sup>646</sup> *Draft Minor. Rep.*, pp. 506. <sup>647</sup> *Ib.* p. 6, section 2.

<sup>648</sup> F.N. Lee: *Letter to Dr. J.G. Thompson* of Kingsport Tenn., Dec. 3rd 1983. See the citation from this, re the RPCUS's Rev. Dr. Morecraft, at our n. 786 below.

<sup>649</sup> See J.G. Thompson: *Letter to [the PCA's GA's] Committee on the Validity of Certain Baptisms*, January 16th 1984, p. 1, heading. The letter is addressed to: "Messrs. Barker, Bogue, Knight, and Settle."

<sup>650</sup> *Ib.* pp. 1-2. <sup>651</sup> *Ib.* p. 1, 2nd para. from bottom. <sup>652</sup> *Ib.*, p. 2, point 5.

<sup>653</sup> *Ib.* p. 1, last para.; and p. 2, points 1, 3 & 5.

<sup>654</sup> J.G. Thompson: *Communication to Lee*, undated, received February 2nd 1984, p. 1, marginal remark. On the first page of the *Draft Minority Report* (prepared for the then forthcoming 1984 General Assembly of the PCA), reference is made to the 1981 "General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church Evangelical Synod" which "endorsed the validity of Roman Catholic baptism." Alongside of that printed reference, Dr. Thompson penned in his own handwriting on the copy he sent to Lee: "Bogue *et al.* say there is no re-baptism, since R.C. baptism is no baptism at all."

<sup>655</sup> J.G. Thompson: *Letter to the Committee on the Validity of Certain Baptisms*, January 16th 1984, p. 2, point 2.

<sup>656</sup> J.G. Thompson: *Letter to Lee*, November 23rd 1983.

<sup>657</sup> F.N. Lee: *Letter to Dr. Thompson*, December 3rd 1983.

<sup>658</sup> F.N. Lee: *The Unrepeatability of Circumcision and of Baptism as its Replacement*, Jesus Lives, Brisbane, 1983. In this dissertation, we quote from the 1990 'Revised Version.'

<sup>659</sup> A.H. Stong: *Systematic Theology*, Pickering & Inglis, London, 1956 rep., p. 950.

<sup>660</sup> J.G. Thompson: *Letter to Lee*, January 26th 1984, p. 1 paras. 1-2.

<sup>661</sup> J.G. Thompson: *Letter to the Committee on the Validity of Certain Baptisms*, January 16th 1984, (2 pp.) p. 1, address heading: "Messrs. Barker, Bogue, Knight, and Settle, Committee on the Validity of Certain Baptisms."

<sup>662</sup> J.G. Thompson's *Opus* [against catabaptism], Kingsport Tenn., January 16th 1984, (4 pp.).

<sup>663</sup> See in our text above at nn. 568-70 above.

<sup>664</sup> *Letter to the Committee*, January 16th 1984, p. 1 paras. 1 & 4, and p. 2 section 2. <sup>665</sup>  
See too our text at n. 636. .

<sup>666</sup> *Opus*, p. 1 paras. 1-4. <sup>667</sup> *Ib.*, p. 1 paras. 4-6. <sup>668</sup> *Ib.*, p. 2 paras. 1f. <sup>669</sup> *Ib.*, p. 2,  
last line.

<sup>670</sup> *Ib.*, p. 3, para. 1f. <sup>671</sup> *Corpus Reformatorum XIII:308 & 486.* <sup>672</sup> *Opus* 1b., p. 3,  
para. 1f.

<sup>673</sup> Calvin, in *Corpus Reformatorum X:625.* Cf. Heb. 5:4; I Tim. 2:11-15; 3:1-5; 5:17; I Cor.  
3:5; 4:1-2; 14:24-27.

<sup>674</sup> *Opus* p. 4 paras. 1f. For the gist of the text of Calvin's *Letter to Farel*, see Lee's *Baptism  
Does Not Cleanse!*, at its nn. 615f.

<sup>675</sup> *Ib.* p. 4, para. 3.

<sup>676</sup> C.W. Bogue: *Letter to Dr. Thompson*, January 20th 1984. Unfortunately, the latter was  
not typed neatly but written cryptically and in longhand. This present writer here transcribes  
it just as accurately as possible from a photocopy thereof sent him by Dr. Thompson on  
January 26th 1984. He would apologize to Dr. Bogue if he has, while transcribing the  
photocopy of the manuscript letter into type, quite innocently misread any part of Dr. Bogue's  
most tortuous handwriting in the latter's letter to Dr. Thompson.

<sup>677</sup> Here Dr. Bogue is apparently referring to the matter referred to in Dr. Knight's *Letter to  
Thompson* of Oct. 27th 1983, and in Dr. Thompson's Jan. 16th 1984 *Letter to the Committee  
on the Validity of Certain Baptisms.* On this matter, the latter states (p. 1 last para. and p. 2  
sections 2 & 5 & its last para.): "With reference to Dr. Knight's letter of October 27 1983,  
specifically, his list of proposals, let me say...my view with regard to the statement on  
justification is that it is not germane to the issue at hand. The RC view on baptism was not  
changed by Trent, nor is justification the only reason the Committee majority would cite to  
justify its view that RC baptism is invalid. Therefore, this statement is functionally irrelevant  
to the Committee's work..... As to waiting for [Dr.] Bogue in order to do something with the  
justification statement, it will probably not be tantamount to waiting for a finger to put in the  
dike, but as the Committee wishes..... Having said not all I could say, but more than I had  
justification to say, I'll quit!" See also Grace Presbytery's first question (alleging that  
Campbellites and Lutherans and Romanists all hold justificatory views anent their baptism):  
given at our n. 665 above.

<sup>678</sup> Bogue: *Letter to Thompson*, Jan. 20th 1982, p. 2 last para.

<sup>679</sup> J.G. Thompson: *Letter to Dr. C.W. Bogue*, Jan. 25th 1984 (referred to in para. 3 of J.G.  
Thompson's *Letter to Lee* Jan. 26th 1984).....

<sup>680</sup> J.G. Thompson's *Letter to Lee* Jan. 26th 1984, pp. 1-4. <sup>681</sup> *Ib.* p. 1 para. 2. <sup>682</sup> *Ib.* p. 1  
paras. 2-3.

<sup>683</sup> See our text above at its n. 680. <sup>684</sup> Thompson: *Letter to Lee* Jan. 26th 1984, pp. 1 & 4.

<sup>685</sup> F.N. Lee: *Letter to Dr. Thompson*, "Feb. 11th 1984 anti-Orwell, A.D."

<sup>686</sup> Bogue: *Letter to Thompson*, Jan. 20th 1984, p. 1 para. 4.

- <sup>687</sup> Lee: *Letter to Thompson* Feb. 11th 1984, p. 1 para. 2.      <sup>688</sup> *West. Conf.* 25:2,4-6 & 331:3-4.
- <sup>689</sup> Bogue: *Letter to Thompson*, Jan. 20th 1984, p. 1 para. 5.
- <sup>690</sup> Lee: *Letter to Thompson*, Feb. 11th 1984, p. 1 para. 3.
- <sup>691</sup> Bogue: *Letter to Thompson*, Jan. 20th 1984, p. 1 para. 5.
- <sup>692</sup> Lee: *Letter to Thompson*, Feb. 11th 1984, p. 1 para. 4.
- <sup>693</sup> Bogue: *Letter to Thompson*, Jan. 20th 1984, p. 1 para. 6.
- <sup>694</sup> Bogue: *Letter to Thompson*, Jan. 20th 1984, p. 1 para. 7.
- <sup>695</sup> Lee: *Letter to Thompson*, Feb. 11th 1984, p. 1 para. 5.      <sup>696</sup> *Inst.* IV:2:11-12.
- <sup>697</sup> Bogue: *Letter to Thompson*, Jan. 20th 1984, p. 1 para. 8.
- <sup>698</sup> Lee: *Letter to Thompson*, Feb. 11th 1984, p. 1 para. 6.
- <sup>699</sup> Bogue: *Letter to Thompson*, Jan. 20th 1984, p. 1 para. 9.
- <sup>700</sup> Lee: *Letter to Thompson*, Feb. 11th 1984, p. 1 para. 7.
- <sup>701</sup> J.G. Thompson: *Communication to Lee*, undated (received Feb. 22nd 1984).
- <sup>702</sup> J.G. Thompson: *Draft Minority Report* [against rebaptism] to the PCA General Assembly, Feb. 1984, p. 1 paras. 1-2.
- <sup>703</sup> *Ib.* p. 1 para. 3 to p. 2 para. 5.      <sup>704</sup> *Ib.* p. 2 para. 6 to p. 3 para. 1.      <sup>705</sup> *Ib.* p. 3 paras. 2-3.
- <sup>706</sup> *Ib.* p. 3 past para. to p. 4 para. 1.      <sup>707</sup> *Ib.* p. 4 paras. 3-11.      <sup>708</sup> *Ib.* p. 4 para. 12 to p. 5 para. 4.
- <sup>709</sup> See our text above at its n. 707.      <sup>710</sup> *Draft Minority Report* p. 5 last para. to p. 6 para. 5.
- <sup>711</sup> See our text at n. 701 above.      <sup>712</sup> See our text at n. 702.      <sup>713</sup> See our text at nn. 704-705.
- <sup>714</sup> See C.W. Bogue: *Dr. John Gerstner Withdraws from the Presbyterian Church (USA)*. In *Christian Observer*, Manassas Va., June 8th 1990., p. 20. There, according to Bogue: "After 50 years of distinguished service in the Presbyterian Church (USA) and her predecessor, Dr. John H. Gerstner...was convinced it fell to him to pronounce dead a once great church. Declaring his conviction that the denomination is apostate, Gerstner's only choice was to unilaterally withdraw from fellowship. On May 5 [1990], Gerstner was examined by the [PCA] Presbytery of the Ascension. At the same time Gerstner did brand the group [apparently meaning the PCUSA] far more corrupt than Rome was at the time of the Reformation. Says Gerstner...: 'The Roman Catholic non-church was millennial, in comparison with the PCUSA today!'"
- <sup>715</sup> F.N. Lee: *Letter to Dr. Thompson*, Mar. 23rd 1984.

<sup>716</sup> J. Jones: *News of the 15th General Assembly (PCA)*. In *Journey Magazine*, Lynchburg Va., July-Aug. 1987, p. 6.

<sup>717</sup> C.W. Bogue: *Letter to the Editor of Journey Magazine*, Lynchburg Va., Nov.-Dec. 1987, p. 19.

<sup>718</sup> F.N. Lee: *Letter to the Editor of Journey Magazine*, Lynchburg Va., Dec. 21st 1987.

<sup>719</sup> *Corp. Ref.* XIII:308 & 486.

<sup>720</sup> J. Calvin: *Letter to a Gentleman of Provence* (whose child had died before having received baptism), in ed. Bonnet's *Sel. Works of Calvin*, VI, pp. 71f: "You could not, without offending God and your neighbours, have brought up your child without having it baptized. Not that those who present their children to be polluted with popish superstitions are to be held excusable, otherwise than that they cannot reject the visible sign of the Christian religion without at the same time marking their contempt for God. But your intention was quite different.... You were desirous to take refuge...in the bosom of the Christian church..., conveying the child soon after its birth, along with its mother, in order to have it baptized according to the ordinance of God.... Now God has been pleased to deprive you of that blessing.... Your child has been deprived of baptism.... On your part there has been no contempt of the sacrament. It brings no prejudice to the salvation of your child that it died before you had leisure or the means to have it baptized."

<sup>721</sup> Art. 28. <sup>722</sup> Quick's *Synodicon*, I:48. <sup>723</sup> Hodge: *Ch. Pol.* p. 204 n. +.

<sup>724</sup> F.N. Lee's *Calvinism versus Catabaptism*, Jesus Lives, Brisbane, 1990, pp. 1f.

<sup>725</sup> See *Council of Trent*, Sess. VII, canons IX-XII *Of the Sacraments in General*, and canons II & IV and XI-XIII *Of Baptism*, and Calvin's *Antidote* thereto (in his *Tracts & Treat.* III pp. 177-82).

<sup>726</sup> *Inst.* IV:2:11-12 & IV:15:16-18; *West. Conf.* 22:7; 23:4; 24:3-6; 25:2-6; 27:1-3; 28:2-7; 29:2,5; *West. Larg. Cat.* 165, 167 & 177; *West. Direct. Pub. Worsh.: Of Bapt.*, paragraph 12 (prayer after baptism); *West. Form of Presb. Ch. Gov.: Rules for Examinations*, 10f.

<sup>727</sup> F.N. Lee: *Calvinism versus Catabaptism*, Jesus Lives, Brisbane, 1990, pp. 6f. <sup>728</sup> *West. Conf.* 29:8.

<sup>729</sup> *Ib.* 1:1-2. <sup>730</sup> *Ib.* 7:5-6. <sup>731</sup> *West. Larg. Cat.* 169.

<sup>732</sup> *West. Ass. Form of Presb. Church Gov't: Pastors* mnop.

<sup>733</sup> *West. Assembly's 'Directory for the Publick Worship of God': Of the Celebration of the Communion*, paragraphs 2 & 5.

<sup>734</sup> *West. Conf.* 28:5. <sup>735</sup> *West. Larg. Cat.* 173. <sup>736</sup> *Ib.* 177. <sup>737</sup> Bogue: *Letter to Lee*, 9/27/1990, pp. 1f.

<sup>738</sup> C.W. Bogue: *Dr. John Gerstner Withdraws from the Presbyterian Church (USA)*. In *Christian Observer*, Manassas Va., June 8th 1990, p. 20.

<sup>739</sup> F.N. Lee: *Letter to Dr. Bogue*, Oct. 10th 1990. On Ward's correct assessment of the invalidity of the 'baptism' of Mormons and Jehovah's witnesses, see our text at n. 642 above.

<sup>740</sup> LeGrand Richards: *op. cit.*, p. 9. <sup>741</sup> *Ib.* p. 6. <sup>742</sup> *Ib.* p. 11f.

<sup>743</sup> See: J. Smith's *Doctrine and Covenants* (1:17f & 2:1f), The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, 1971, pp. 2-4); J.K. van Baalen's *The Chaos of the Cults*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1962, p. 190.

<sup>744</sup> *Doct. & Cov.* 13:1 comp. 20:37f,73f & 27:7f. <sup>745</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 94f. <sup>746</sup> *Doct. & Cov.* 20:71f.

<sup>747</sup> *Poreuthentes oun matheeteusate panta ta ethnee, baptizontes autous eis to Onoma tou Patros kai tou Huiou kai tou Hagiou Pneumatos, didaskontes autous teerein panta hosa eneteilameen humin.* Thus Matt. 28:19. The Greek passage between the commas show above after the word *ethnee* (namely the passage *baptizontes autous eis to Onoma tou Patros kai tou Huiou kai tou Hagiou Pneumatos*), is absolutely identical in all extant manuscripts: except that the manuscripts *B* and *D* have *baptisantes* instead of the Majority Text's *baptizontes* as shown. This, however, has no bearing whatsoever upon "the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."

<sup>748</sup> *Doct. & Cov.* 130:22. <sup>749</sup> *Doct. & Cov.* 76:19-24. <sup>750</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 19f, 115 & 119.

<sup>751</sup> Thus (ed.) Douglas: *op. cit.* pp. 910 & 1066. <sup>752</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 322.

<sup>753</sup> J.A. Widtsoe. comp.: *The Discourses of Brigham Young*, p. 116.

<sup>754</sup> B. Young: *Journal of Discourses*, I:50.

<sup>755</sup> A.E. Young: *Wife Number Nineteen*, ch. 35. Cited by Van Baalen: *op. cit.* pp. 226f.

<sup>756</sup> J.F. Smith: *Gospel Doctrine*, Deseret Books, Salt Lake City, 1973, pp. 66-68.

<sup>757</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 127. See too: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints' *Book of Mormon* (I Nephi 2:16f; 10:17f; 11:1f; 18:22f), Salt Lake City, ed. 1961, pp. 4, 17f, 40.

<sup>758</sup> Anon: *What the Mormons Think of Christ*, Deseret Press, Salt Lake City, 1973, p. 10. <sup>759</sup> *Idem.*

<sup>760</sup> *Ib.* pp. 19, 35f, 39 & 44.

<sup>761</sup> J. Morgan: *The Plan of Salvation*, Deseret news Press, Salt Lake City, n.d., pp. 2-7. <sup>762</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 35.

<sup>763</sup> H.B. Brown: *Mormonism*, Deseret News Press, Salt Lake City, 1963, pp. iii, 1, 12-13, 28-30 & 47.

<sup>764</sup> On Mormon "baptism," *cf.* above our ch. I at its n. 32, and in this present ch. IX at its nn. 402 & 642.

<sup>765</sup> See our n. 747 above.

<sup>766</sup> See G. Verkuyl: *Reclaim Those Unitarian Wastes!*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1935, pp. 1, 16f, 31, 37, 49, 110 (esp. pp. 37 & 110 as quoted).

<sup>767</sup> C.T. Russell: *Studies in the Scriptures*, International Bible Students Assoc., Brooklyn N.Y. (1899), rep. 1912 & 1924, V, p. 64. See too Mackinney's *op. cit.* pp. 20f.



- <sup>768</sup> Anon: *The Truth Shall Make You Free*, Watchtower, Brooklyn N.Y., 1943, p. 29.
- <sup>769</sup> Anon: *From Paradise Lost to Paradise Regained*, Watchtower, Brooklyn N.Y., 1958, p. 247.
- <sup>770</sup> Mackinney: *op. cit.* p. 87; cf. R. Pike's *Jehovah's Witnesses*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1954, p. 114.
- <sup>771</sup> Seventh-day Adventists: *Questions on Doctrine* (prepared by a Representative Group of Seventh-day Adventist Leaders, Bible Teachers, and Editors), Review & Herald Pub. Assoc., Washington D.C., 1959, pp. 3,10f, 22, 645f.
- <sup>772</sup> *Ib.* p. 29.
- <sup>773</sup> J.H. Waggoner: *The Spirit of God -- Its[!] Offices and Manifestations*, Steam Press of the Seventh-Day Adventist Publishing Association, Battle Creek, Mi., 1877, pp. 7-11f.
- <sup>774</sup> Seventh-day Adventists: *Seventh-day Adventists Believe* (prepared by the Ministerial Association of the General Conference of S.D.A.), Review & Herald Pub. Assoc., Washington D.C., 1988, pp. i, ii, vi & 59-61.
- <sup>775</sup> *Ib.* p. 182f & n. 4.
- <sup>776</sup> Seventh-day Adventist Church: *Baptism*, Art. in *SDA Encyclopedia*, rev. ed., p. 128.
- <sup>777</sup> *Ib.* p. 183 and its nn. 4 & 6.
- <sup>778</sup> Seventh-day Adventist Church: *Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual*, pp. 51 & 162; E.G. White: *Evangelism*, p. 375.
- <sup>779</sup> Stockford, O.B.: *Baptism in Relation to Spiritual Life*, Calgary, Alberta, 1938, pp. 3 & 17-236f (esp. pp. 67-69).
- <sup>780</sup> Nichol, C.R.: *Nichol's Pocket Bible Encyclopedia*, ACC Bookstore, Abilene Tx., 1949, pp. 1, 2, 27-40 & 225.
- <sup>781</sup> Shaw, S.F.: *The Eternal Life Insurance Company of the Soul*, 4500 Nebraska Ave., Nashville Tenn., 1951 pp. 1-3 & 9.
- <sup>782</sup> *Disc. Evang. & Theol.* I pp. 314, 330f, 341f & 449. Dabney here also cites from A. Campbell's *Christian System*, pp. 124-25.
- <sup>783</sup> See above at our nn. 304f.      <sup>784</sup> See our text above at nn. 505-10.      <sup>785</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 9f.
- <sup>786</sup> Cited in F.N. Lee's *Letter to Dr. J.G. Thompson* of Kingsport Tenn., Dec. 3rd 1983.
- <sup>787</sup> At Pittsburgh on 21st May 1871. See ch. 25:2 of its *Declaration and Testimony* republished as is, in the 1881 *Reformation Principles Exhibited by the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*, Christian Stateman, Philadelphia, 1881, pp. flyleaf and 147-48 and 222.
- <sup>788</sup> At its points 4 & 5 (see in our next n.).

<sup>789</sup> See *The Reformation Pulpit*, Toowong, Brisbane, Australia, Vol. III No. iii, Nov./December 1990, pp. 11 & 13.

<sup>790</sup> J.C. Morecraft III: *Letter to Dr. F.N. Lee*, Nov. 13th 1990.

<sup>791</sup> The well-known theological acronym 't-u-l-i-p' summarizes the so-called 'five points' of Calvinism (alias consistent Biblical Christianity). It stands for: total depravity; unconditional election; limited (or effective) atonement; irresistible grace; and perseverance of [God in] the saints. To 't-u-l-i-p' some would add an extra 'p' (thus: 't-u-l-i-p-p'). But what should that additional 'p' then stand for, without fragmenting Biblical Christians against one another? Should it stand for: 'paidobaptism' (thus excluding antipaidobaptists like Bunyan, Gill and Spurgeon); 'preterism' (this excluding historicists like David Brown, Fairbairn, and F.N. Lee); 'postmillennialism' (thus excluding amillennialists like Kuyper, Van Ruler, and Van Til); 'paidocommunionism' (thus excluding antipaedocommunionists like Calvin, the Westminster divines, and Morecraft); or 'presuppositionalism' (thus excluding the propositionalists like Bogue, Clark, Gerstner, Hodge, and Sproul)? The very addition of the extra 'p' is divisive. It is best omitted, while leaving these matters here mentioned for resolution by the God-of-the-future Who has promised to lead His Church on the right way in which she should and finally will go.

<sup>792</sup> By the Reformed term 'Ontological Trinity' (an expression long antedating Van Til), is meant the orthodox viewpoint that there is indeed both a personal distinction and a divine unity among the Father and the Son and the Spirit from all eternity past and unto all eternity future as to Their very Essence, quite apart from the way in which They reveal Themselves to man (as a merely 'economic trinity').

<sup>793</sup> Mt. 16:18; 28:19f; Mk. 16:15f; Rom. 16:16; I Cor. 1:1 & 12:13; Eph. 4:4-6; I Tim. 3:15; Heb. 12:23.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Francis Nigel Lee was born in 1934 in the Westmorland County of Cumbria (in Great Britain). He is the great-grandson of a fiery preacher whose family disintegrated when he backslid. Though Lee's father was an Atheist, he married a Roman Catholic who raised her son in that faith.

At the onset of the Second World War, Lee's father was appointed by the Royal Navy as Chief Radar Officer (South Atlantic). So the family then moved to South Africa. There, Lee became a Calvinist; had the great joy of leading both of his parents to Christ; and became a Minister of God's Word and Sacraments in the Dutch Reformed Church of Natal.

Emigrating to the U.S.A., Lee transferred his ministerial credentials to the Presbyterian Church in America and pastored in Mississippi and Florida. He was too: Professor of Philosophy at Shelton College in New Jersey; Visiting Lecturer at Reformed Theological Seminary in Jackson Ms.; Staley Distinguished Visiting Lecturer at Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis; Scholar-in-Residence at the Christian Studies Center in Memphis; and Dean of Graham Bible College in Tennessee.

Lee has been round the World seven times; has visited one hundred and ten countries (several repeatedly); and also every Continent (except Antarctica). He is in demand as a Promoter of Doctoral Students in Australia, England, Germany, South Africa and the United States. He has lectured or preached in all of those countries, as well as Brazil, Scotland, Korea, Japan, Namibia, New Zealand, and Zambia.

A diehard predestinarian, Lee lives in Australia where till 2001 he was Professor of Systematic Theology and Caldwell-Morrow Lecturer in Church History at the Queensland Presbyterian Theological College.