

SAUL IN THE CAVE OF ADULLAM:

**A TESTIMONY AGAINST THE
FASHIONABLE, SUB-CALVINISM OF
DOUG WILSON (EDITOR OF
CREDENDA/AGENDA MAGAZINE);**

AND,

**FOR CLASSICAL PROTESTANTISM
AND THE ATTAINMENTS OF THE
SECOND REFORMATION**

by

Reg Barrow

Please note: A "Table of Contents" follows the "Introduction."

INTRODUCTION

The following book chronicles a controversy initiated by *_Credenda/Agenda_* magazine when they published an attack on me in their *Cave of Adullam* section. In my opinion this attack was clearly in violation of the ninth commandment.

This episode with Doug Wilson (and *_Credenda/Agenda_*) evokes imagery of walking down a long narrow path (the full covenanted testimony for the truth [Rev. 12:6]), surrounded by darkness (the present apostasy from covenanted attainments [2 Thes. 2:3] -- especially among professing Christians and the visible church in its corporate character [Rev. 17:5]), my way illumined by only a flashlight (the Word of God and the testimony of faithful martyrs [Rev. 6:9] and other witnesses -- agreeable to the Word of God [Rev. 6:9]). I and other witnesses press steadfastly and determinedly onward, waiting for the sun to arise (when the Holy Spirit is poured out in world transforming power [cf. Ezek. 47:1-12, especially verses 5-12]) and illuminate not only the narrow path (Matt. 7:14), but the whole earth (during the coming millennium glory, when the covenants will again be nationally renewed and the biblical attainments of former generations vindicated on a massive scale [Isa. 2:2-5, Matt. 13:31-33]). Across this narrow path, blocking the way to further individual and corporate sanctification, is a piece of splinter-filled, rotten wood (*_Credenda/Agenda's_* original attack against me for bearing witness, on Knox Ring, against John Frame's apostasy and idolatry). Not wanting others to stumble over this obstacle, I bend down to remove it (my use of Matt. 18:15-17 to restore the offenders at *_Credenda/Agenda_*) and use my flashlight to illuminate the portion of path it obscured. To my surprise, in so doing I am confronted with a den of scorpions (the heresies [some Romish, some Anabaptist, some malignant, some independent, etc.] and further slanderous accusations of Doug Wilson -- against classical Protestantism and the biblical attainments of the second Reformation)! My attempt to exterminate and remove these scorpion-like opinions from the path of the covenanted Reformation make up much of what follows in this book.

Before I continue, I must make an important caveat. This is in no way to say that I judge Doug Wilson (or the others involved at *_Credenda/Agenda_*) to be outside the invisible church -- that is for God to decide. Throughout this book (and above) I am addressing those statements and actions (1 Cor. 3:12-15, John 7:24, 1 Cor. 2:15) which either have been published already or which Doug Wilson has agreed to make public. Furthermore, as will be seen throughout my responses, the question of what Calvin calls the "true and lawful constitution of the church" or the "lawful form of the (visible--RB) church" (*_Institutes_* 4.2.12) is often in view. Please be sure to make the distinction between the visible church as it is **duly constituted** and the "catholic or universal" visible church (or the visible church as to its **essential** character) -- which "consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children" (*_Westminster Confession of Faith_* 25:2). This is an essential biblical distinction which must be made when ecclesiastical questions are in view (cf. Larry Birger's "The Visible Church: Essence

Versus Lawful Form" free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/vischu.htm> or write us for this free newsletter). Getting this right would help clear up much of the fuzzy thinking that permeates the church today. Distinguishing between the *essential* and *constitutional* character of the visible church (as the Reformers' did) would also be useful in eliminating a great deal of the misdirected, misapplied and unnecessary name-calling that has been bandied about of late (of which Wilson provides many examples throughout his letters to me). On this point the Session of the Puritan Reformed Church of Edmonton gives us one of the most mature and faithful contemporary short summaries of the Reformation position,

"Though it is not necessary that a truly constituted church be absolutely pure as to the doctrine taught or embraced, as to the ordinances administered, or the public worship performed, it is, however, necessary that its constitution be founded upon and agreeable to the Word of God and that its constitution reflect the light attained to by the purest of Reformed Churches (for all reformation must be biblical reformation if it is reformation at all, otherwise it is not a reformation but a deformation, cf. Phil. 3:16). Wherefore, to adopt a constitution that corrupts the light of Scripture or the light of reformation is to adopt a false constitution. A false constitution renders a church and its courts unconstitutional... for a church to constitutionally adhere to Arminianism, Dispensationalism, or Charismatic experientialism (false doctrine), singing uninspired hymns or using instrumental music in public praise (false worship), Episcopacy or Independency (false government), or unrestricted communion (false discipline) is to qualify as a constitutionally false church. That is not to say that there are no believers in churches that are not truly constituted (there may be many in some cases). Nor is it to imply that ministers or elders within those churches do not courageously stand for many truths taught in Scripture. It is simply to say that authority to rule in the church must come from Christ, and if a church does not have a constitution of which He approves (as King of His church), then there is no lawful authority to rule or to administer the ordinances on His behalf. Authority to administer the divine ordinances on behalf of Christ flows directly from the King and His constitution. Authority used within His church on any other grounds is an usurped authority. It is tyranny" (A Brief Defence of Dissociation in the Present Circumstances, pp. 1-2. Free on the web at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/BriefDef.htm>).

Those failing to make this fundamental distinction (which is seen throughout Reformation writings dealing with ecclesiastical matters) are liable to become trapped by the same error which now ensnares Wilson, when he falsely labels me (and the other Covenanters in Edmonton) with the horrible heresy of the Anabaptistic schismatics. This error is refuted throughout the following debate and in appendix A by Greg Price in his "Testimony Against the Unfounded Charges of Anabaptism."

Now, to enlarge upon the preceding allegory. After being informed of Credenda/Agenda's public assault upon my name and my company, I initially spoke to the elders of the church I attend, seeking counsel as to how best to proceed. Hoping, as much as possible, to keep this controversy out of the public eye (for the sake of the brethren at Credenda/Agenda and the broader testimony to the truth [2 Sam. 1:20]),

and thinking that a presentation of the facts of the case would quickly lead _Credenda/Agenda_ to make their own public retraction, it was decided that Greg Price (who is the teaching elder at the Puritan Reformed Church of Edmonton, which I attend) would contact Doug Wilson. Accordingly, Mr. Price then made four private attempts to resolve the situation brought about by _Credenda/Agenda's_ publicly distributed false accusations. As evidenced by the book you now hold, even after these four private attempts at reconciliation, Doug Wilson was unwilling to repent -- and actually hurled additional scornful and derisive barbs in our direction. At this point I began the Matthew 18:15-17 process with Mr. Wilson, in the hope of reclaiming this brother.

In short, this book follows this controversy as it unfolded after I began the Matthew 18:15-17 process with Mr. Wilson, though it also includes those previous items which gave rise to this dispute. The table of contents below outlines each of the items covered. The most important letters -- i.e. my second and fifth replies to Wilson and appendix A, Greg Price's "Testimony Against The Unfounded Charges of Anabaptism" -- are marked with asterisks. These three sections deal with a number of larger public issues regarding the individual, church, and state, and help remove this discussion from the realm of the specific slanders I addressed (appendix B, my article "Pornography, the Anabaptists and Doug Wilson's Civil Antinomianism" might also be added to this category). I mark them as most important not because I seek to minimize the public slander that took place, but because addressing Wilson's charges exposed much more serious differences (Wilson's scorpion-like comments and beliefs) between _Credenda/Agenda_ and the Covenanted testimony which Still Waters Revival Books seeks to maintain. Some of the other letters (by Wilson and myself) probably could have been left out of this collection, because they add nothing to the more important public issues which we ended up debating; but I have included them for those who don't mind following all the rabbit trails that Wilson wanted to explore, hoping to justify himself as to our original controversy. These items contain much posturing and a repetition of previously discussed topics and can be skipped over without missing much in the way of general edification.

My earnest desire is that the reader will engage himself in the ****issues**** presented, rather than the personalities and controversy that started this dispute. Appropriate (indeed, unavoidable) conclusions about Wilson and many other modern "Reformed" teachers and guides may then be drawn (Acts 17:11; Rom. 16:17; Prov. 19:27; I John 4:1). Greg Price's "Testimony Against The Unfounded Charges of Anabaptism" (appendix A), is a case in point. Here Price compares the differences between the Anabaptists' heresies and the doctrines held by the early Reformers and covenanted Presbyterians (i.e. the paleopresbyterians) of the second Reformation. Without even mentioning Wilson, but by simply dealing with the issues and historical record, Price readily demonstrates the lack of sound scholarship exhibited by Wilson in his claims that we are Anabaptistic. Furthermore, in an ironic (yet providential) twist, the reader familiar with the public testimony of Doug Wilson and _Credenda/Agenda_ will observe that they actually adopt some Anabaptistic distinctives themselves.

For example, the Anabaptists were among the first "Reformation" groups to:

1. Introduce uninspired man-made hymns into worship;

2. Oppose the establishment of the one true Reformed religion (thereby promoting theological and religious egalitarianism/pluralism and that cut-throat of all true religion: anti-Scriptural tolerationism);
3. Deny the *specifics* of covenant obligations (though the Anabaptists go much further in this than those at Credenda/Agenda, denying covenanting outright);
4. Adopt forms of civil antinomianism (as Doug Wilson does regarding the pornography question and negative civil sanctions in "Cyberporn: A Case Study," Credenda/Agenda, vol. 7, no. 5, p. 11. See my appendix B, "Pornography, the Anabaptists and Doug Wilson's Civil Antinomianism," for a more detailed look at this error and its relationship to Anabaptist views).

Price's appendix on the Anabaptists is a fascinating study which further reveals how far the modern "Reformed" community has fallen into some of the heresies held by those once considered to be among the greatest enemies of truth -- and the Reformation in general (i.e. the Anabaptists). Remember that because of "the covert nature of the Anabaptists' methodology... Knox regard(ed) the Anabaptists as more dangerous than Papists... The 'horrible and absurd' opinions of the Anabaptists are 'rotten heresies' and 'damnable errors.' The adherents to such teachings are 'blasphemers' and vile slaves of proud Lucifer.' In the First Books of Discipline, the Anabaptists are classed among the 'enemies to the Christian religion.' The Confession of the English Congregation at Geneva speaks of the Anabaptists as 'limbs of Antichrist'" (Kevin Reed's Introduction to John Knox, A Warning Against the Anabaptists, reprinted 1984, pp. 13,16).

It may be obvious that a number of our modern day "Reformers" lay comfortably in the bed of the Romish whore (as to specific doctrinal aberrations and idolatrous worship practices), but it should never be forgotten (as evidenced by Price's appendix A and my appendix B "Pornography, the Anabaptists and Doug Wilson's Civil Antinomianism") that many have also fallen into the deep pit of Anabaptist apostasy.

In my responses to Wilson (and Credenda Agenda), I have chosen, to a great extent, to let our Protestant forefathers speak for themselves. They are more than able to convincingly make the case for classical Protestantism and the attainments of the second Reformation, thereby displaying for us the "old paths" (Jer. 6:16) and "narrow way" (Matt. 7:14). Of course, the path of the visible church can be profitably traced back to the ancients (with the use of the Old Testament); but our present battle focuses primarily on the church after she had "come of age," shedding the ceremonies of her youth, stepping out of the shadows of the old administration (of the covenant of grace), and into the glorious light and freedom brought by the work of our Lord Jesus Christ (Heb. 10:1-18). Notwithstanding our Reformation focus, I do, however, sometimes note the post-apostolic and pre-Reformation fathers and counsels, when their testimony is in accord with Scripture.

My point here is that the use of many (and sometimes lengthy) quotations is by design, for it is these very Reformation quotations which clearly demonstrate the point at issue. As Samuel Davies once wrote, "The venerable dead are waiting in my library to entertain me

and relieve me from the nonsense of surviving mortals." These citations not only vindicate, exonerate, exculpate, absolve, and acquit those walking in the "old paths" (from the charges of those seeking to hinder them by burying Reformation attainments), but clearly illustrate who is really following in the "footsteps of the flock" (Song 1:8) -- or the paths of the best (or classical) Reformers in their faithfulness to the Word of God (i.e. the paleopresbyterians) -- and who is perpetrating and perpetuating the defection (i.e. the neopresbyterians). The force of the arguments cited from the old Reformers alone, even without my additional comments, is enough to crush all the scorpions on the path -- and Greg Price's "Testimony Against the Unfounded Charges of Anabaptism," in appendix A (replete with the mature and faithful witness of the Reformers) completes the mopping up operation (sweeping aside all the splinters left-over from the previously removed rotten wood, as well as the remains of numerous dead scorpions). After reading through to the end of our complete response, future travellers engaging the narrow path should have a much easier time of negotiating the treacherous portions of terrain that are sometimes encountered in the dark night of apostasy, backsliding and declension. Furthermore, unless additional stumbling blocks are cast in the way (by Wilson, Credenda Agenda or others), future specific responses should be unnecessary.

Also, please note that at the *end of my fifth response* to Doug Wilson, in the "P.P.S." section, I have answered five questions which Wilson has previously asked. Four of these questions were initially directed to Greg Price, were later repeated in *Wilson's second letter to me*, and again turn up in Wilson's review of Frame's book noted below. All these questions address problems Mr. Wilson seems to be having with the regulative principle of worship as articulated by the bulk of Reformation divines. That he continues to repeat them indicates to me that he considers these questions serious challenges to historic Reformed worship principles. Here, in conjunction with Wilson's review of Frame's Worship in Spirit and Truth (cf. Credenda Agenda, volume 8, number 5, pp. 34-35; in which Wilson denigrates the classical Protestant position on worship by terming it the position of the "strict regulativists"), we again see that our brother has strayed from the narrow path. We also observe, once again, how conclusively his objections and concerns have already been met by the skilled teachers of old. Moreover, it is at this important juncture in the Reformation road that Wilson seems surprisingly unaware that he would have to include many of the Reformers, their Confessions, their faithful acts of government, etc., under his arbitrarily chosen category of "strict regulativism." For example: the Dutch Reformers, their older national synods (cf. "The Organ in the Worship Service and the Singing of Hymns," in the forthcoming book The Wonders of the Most High by Abraham Van de Velde, pp. 125-126 -- Lord willing we will be providing this book free of charge on our web page in the near future), "Calvin, Knox, Rutherford, Gillespie, Henderson, Baillie, the Westminster Assembly, the entire church of Scotland at the time of that Assembly, and John Owen, to name only a few" (as Larry Birger points out in his shorter letter to the editor contained in section ten below) would all neatly fit under Wilson's Reformation- denying "strict regulativist" misrepresentation. Is this the classical Protestantism which Wilson so loves to promote in the pages of Credenda/Agenda? Or should this denial of biblical attainments and faithfulness be a warning sign to those who desire to worship God as He commands? Birger again comments, "readers should note that Doug Wilson is not a 'classical Protestant' in his

doctrine of worship. Indeed, he has set himself squarely against (the) classical (Protestant view of worship--RB)."

To be a "strict regulativist" in the sense in which Wilson applies this term in his review is in reality to be just a "regulativist" -- or one who seeks to worship God according to His commands. By adding "strict" to "regulativist" Wilson seeks to subtly carve out a niche for those who want to pay lip service to the regulative principle, while denying its *particular* requirements. This attempt to obscure the original meaning of the regulative principle (of which the biblical interpretation has been clearly hammered out *in great detail* in the writings of the Reformers) may mislead the ignorant and scandalous, but it will in no way deceive those familiar with the great Reformation battles already fought over these same worship controversies -- controversies, I might add, in which much martyrs' blood was shed for the same principles and practices I am defending here). Those with eyes to see will recognize at once that, in actuality, Wilson's review of Frame was nothing more than a subtle attempt to deny our blood bought Reformation heritage, as it has been handed down to us in the regulative principle of worship. Wilson's attempt at hijacking the high ground by employing literary and historical revisionism ultimately exposes him as an anti-regulativist. Wilson is closer to Rome than the Reformation at this point and his practice proves it! When it comes to the worship question he continues to ignore, in classic neopresbyterian style, the biblical attainments of our paleopresbyterian progenitors (and thus falls into bed with the Romish whore at points). My proof for these claims (which may startle those unfamiliar with Reformation history) is found in *my fifth response to Wilson* (section 7 in the table of contents below). In this section I cover a portion of the general history and teaching of the Reformation relating to the regulative principle -- with particular focus on the Protestants' opinion relative to the "badge of Popery" (i.e. organ use in public worship). This section of my fifth response (tying Reformed ideas about close communion to the worship question) also includes a demonstration of why the old Reformers (and Calvin specifically) would have excommunicated John Frame for writing (and publicly distributing) his book *Worship in Spirit and Truth*. Thus, this section provides proof which vindicates my comments on the Knox Ring email discussion group which the brothers at *Credenda/Agenda* originally attacked. It also shows why Wilson would have come under the same negative ecclesiastical sanctions (given his present positions and practice) as Frame, had he lived in the days of the first or second Reformations.

By the way, Wilson (in the book review noted above) commends Frame's *Worship in Spirit and Truth* as "careful and irenic" and "useful... for the suggested critique of strict regulativists." Now, I have asked myself, why would Wilson, if he is a classical Protestant (as he is wont to insist), recommend Frame's idolatry promoting, innovation filled, anti-Protestant book on worship, as a critique of the very classical Protestants he says he upholds? In my opinion the answer is simple: Wilson is still an antinomian when it comes to worship. The mystical conclusion (Wilson's protest that "this is no appeal to mysticism" notwithstanding) found in the second last paragraph of his review of Frame's book gives conclusive evidence that this is the case. Here Wilson seems to have an empty bottle which he calls the regulative principle, but he has yet to fill it with anything beyond a statement noting that Jesus, as a person, is our regulative principle. How could we agree or disagree

with these words? Such statements leave us where Wilson's review begins, with an "empty bottle" labelled subjective, non-specific, musings on worship. Such writing is so ambiguous that it tells us *nothing specific* about how we are to glorify God in our public worship. Romanists, Arminians, Charismatics and a host of others, who all violate the regulative principle (i.e. the second commandment) in their public worship, could all agree with Wilson's empty platitudes (this is worse than neopresbyterianism, it is the empty-headed nonsense of modern "evangelicalism"). The Reformers wrote huge treatises on the worship question, and the bulk of them (and their confessions) adopted what Wilson calls the "strict regulativist" position. If Wilson wants to retain any credibility at all on this topic he had best *specifically* declare his position. If he denies the classical Protestant position on the regulative principle (as Steve Schlissel does, whom Wilson approbates in his review of Frame), then let him tell us *specifically* what he is going to put in its place. And, let him show that he has researched the Reformers' position by interacting with their **best** arguments for the regulative principle -- something woefully lacking in Steve Schlissel's modern assaults upon Reformed worship and Presbyterian government.

We who uphold the Reformation doctrine of the regulative principle have *specifically* set forth our *positive position* concerning public worship in **numerous** cassette lectures and sermons, new books, republished books, newsletters, videos, tracts, web pages, etc. -- it is our critics (Wilson, Schlissel, etc.) turn to give us something *specific* as to their **positive position** on the second commandment and the public worship of God. Let them tell us *specifically*, to the best of their ability (after having studied the relevant data), what the second commandment allows and what it forbids. We have done that for them (and they have taken their shots at our work); let them now do it for us and we will be happy to critique their work (and let the readers judge who has done their homework on this critical issue). And if this work ever gets done by the modern detractors of Reformation worship, the readers should pay careful attention to all the footnotes cited (to compare them with the footnotes in our critiques), so as to determine who it is that is favorably citing the Westminster Divines, the Reformation Dutch Synods, Calvin, Knox, Rutherford, Gillespie, Owen, and even most of the early Independents. It should then be clear who the real classical Protestants are, and who has set up tent in some other camp. I also ask the reader to consider the following questions: Were the Calvinistic Reformers and their Confessions all wrong in their interpretation of Scripture concerning worship? Were the Lutherans, Prelates and Romanists right? In providing the *specifics* of their position on worship will our modern reformers prove to the onlooking Christian community that they follow in the footsteps of the original Reformers? Or, will they show that they follow in the footsteps of those who opposed the Reformation? Will they adopt the classical Protestant position on worship or will they reject it -- and be honest enough to say so publicly?

The regulative principle of worship is a two way street. Agree with it (and continue to apply it faithfully to each specific act of worship, as your understanding increases) and you are on the road to Westminster and the Covenanted Reformation; disagree with it and (at the most basic level) you are on the road to Rome. There is no neutrality; you either worship God according to His appointment (Exod. 20:4-6), or you will find some human

substitute. "Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" (Mark 7:7). Regarding this observation as to the degree of faithfulness one maintains to the regulative principle, R.L. Dabney makes the same point in his book review of Girardeau's *_Instrumental Music in the Worship of the Church_*. First, Dabney warns that those who reject the classical Protestant position on the regulative principle also reject "that vital truth which no Presbyterian can discard without a square desertion of our principles." A second shot is fired when he compounds his warning in this cautionary beacon, proclaiming that those who do not adhere to what Wilson falsely calls "strict regulativism" have -- in Dabney's own words -- "***set out at once for Rome**."

Though this introduction and some of my replies to Wilson contain strong language, I hope it is clear that this project is presented with much prayer and with a sincere desire to glorify God, unify the church, and win many brothers back to the precious truths fought and died for during both Reformations. To do this, the neopresbyterian nonsense that is being passed off today as "Classical Protestantism" -- especially by those at *_Credenda/Agenda_* (and don't get me wrong, *_Credenda/Agenda_* does some very good work also) -- must be clearly exposed. In an attempt to prepare those not accustomed to the heat of the battle (or familiar with the many violently aggressive terms used by defenders of the faith, past and present [Mark 8:33; Matt. 23:16; Matt. 3:7; and read Knox or Calvin]), I caution you that some of what follows will periodically seem harsh. But remember, the cultural effeminacy which presently pervades the churches of the harlot (Rev. 17:5) is not our standard; the Word of God is!

Though the matter of *_Credenda/Agenda's_* original slander is interspersed throughout these pages, *please devote your attention to the larger issues which arose*. I am convinced that a careful study of Scripture and history will reveal that Doug Wilson and *_Credenda/Agenda_* do not faithfully set forth the whole counsel of God as it was articulated in the teaching of the best Reformers -- and, as touched on already, in a number of cases they actually oppose the biblical aspects of this teaching! The most prominent example of Wilson's opposition to the Reformation (as you will see in our letters) is his insistence that the position which we have adopted (being the position of the Covenanted Presbyterians of the seventeenth century, which included many of the Westminster Divines) is what he designates as the Anabaptist position. Christ's church is under attack on many fronts today, but some of the most dangerous assaults are coming from those who lay claim to titles like "Reformed" and "Classical Protestant" -- their cries being all the more plausible, because more truth is mixed with their error. Yet, these same "Classical Protestant" groups and individuals not only reject the hard teachings of the Reformation, but they also reject those who are sent to once again bring them to light. I pray that this little book will help to make a clear distinction (in the minds of Christians) between the truths of Scriptural Reformation and the lies of our modern day pseudo-Reformers and fashionable sub-Calvinists (for the sake of the Truth [Christ], Doug Wilson and the brothers at *_Credenda/Agenda_* included). It is also my prayer that it may assist those laboring under similar false conceptions about Scripture and the Reformation to disentangle themselves from false teachers and pretended authorities (in both the church and the state).

Though this started out as my attempt to reconcile with those who had publicly attacked me (without provocation), it turned out to be much more. **Again, and I can't emphasize this enough, please keep in mind that the most important information contained here is found in those sections (my second and fifth letters and Greg Price's work on the Anabaptists) dealing with the broader questions related to church, state, worship, separation, attainments, etc.** Don't be distracted by the side issues, personalities involved, or the frailty of this writer; ***please focus on the issues***. Let it also be known (because it is not always apparent in the heat of a battle like this) that we (the Covenanters in Edmonton, Prince George, Red Deer, the United States and elsewhere) mourn and grieve over the backslidden state (especially at the constitutional level) of the visible church. We love the Lord's covenanted Zion and pray for the day when she shall be "terrible as an army with banners" (Song 6:10), unified in the truth (Zech. 14:9), with the nations (as nations) flowing into her (Isa. 2:2).

Though Gillespie applied the following words to the malignants (made up primarily of professing Christians who opposed the covenants) of his day, I think that these words continue to apply just as well to those antichristian ideas (scorpions) which we are now seeking to oppose and vanquish in our day. Gillespie, in his dying testimony against the forces of malignancy (Sept. 8, 1648), wrote,

"I dare not be silent, nor conceal my thoughts of any sinful and dangerous course in the public proceedings... I cannot but discharge my conscience in giving a testimony against all such compliance (with the malignants--RB)... Yea, all that hear of it (the covenant breaking compliance--RB) might justly stand amazed at us, and look on us as a people infatuated, **that can take in our bosom the fiery serpents that have stung us so sore**" ("To the Right Reverend the Commission of the General Assembly" in Gillespie's Works volume 2, p. 1)

This book is dedicated to assisting those with ears to hear, that we might not be stung again and again by the same old poison of malignancy (only now dressed in the modern and subtly attractive [to the flesh] attire of the fashionable sub-Calvinists and the ever so "tolerant" [of sin] pluralistic neopresbyterians).

The constitutional daughters of the harlot always claim "I have peace offerings with me; this day have I payed my vows" (Prov. 7:14). Be not taken in by her (Prov. 7:18), for "With her much fair speech she caused him to yield, with the flattering of her lips she forced him" (Prov. 7:21). We live in times comparable to Isaiah's, and we should prepare to heed his vision "concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah" (Isa. 1:1).

"Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the LORD hath spoken, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider. Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the LORD, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward. Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more: the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the

head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment. Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire: your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers. And the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city. Except the LORD of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, and we should have been like unto Gomorrah" (Isa. 1:2-9).

One would have to be almost totally spiritually blind not to recognize that we have nationally "provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger." The result is that our cities are burned with fire, our land is devoured by strangers (covenant breakers, antichristian and pagan) and that "the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city." But the Lord has left us a remnant for "the work of the restoring of the ruined temple of the Covenanted Reformation, and thereby the effecting of a third Reformation" (James Kerr, as cited in *Sermons Delivered in Times of Persecution in Scotland* by the Covenanted Ministers of Scotland, p. 47) and, by His grace, as long as we have breath to speak and hands to write, we will be found proclaiming from rooftops: **THE COVENANTS SHALL BE OUR REVIVING!** For we have a sure promise from the "LORD God of heaven, the great and terrible God, that keepeth covenant and mercy for them that love him and observe his commandments" (Neh. 1:5),

"For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring: And they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water courses. One shall say, I am the LORD's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the LORD, and surname himself by the name of Israel" (Isa. 44:3-5).

May our Lord bless the reading of these debates to His glory, the faithful renewing of His covenants (National and Solemn League), and to a return to the biblical attainments of the covenanted Reformation.

For Christ's Crown and Covenant,
Reg Barrow
May 5, 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(*Asterisks indicate the three largest and most important sections)

1. REG BARROW'S LETTER TO KNOX RING REGARDING JOHN FRAME'S NEW BOOK ON WORSHIP

2. _CREDENDA AGENDA'S_ ("SAUL'S") ATTACK IN THE "CAVE OF ADULLAM"

3. REG BARROW'S FIRST LETTER (CHARGES AGAINST DOUG WILSON)

4. *REG BARROW'S SECOND LETTER (CHARGES AGAINST [WITH A WITNESS] AND REPLY TO DOUG WILSON)**

5. REG BARROW'S THIRD REPLY TO DOUG WILSON

6. REG BARROW'S FOURTH REPLY TO DOUG WILSON

7. *REG BARROW'S FIFTH REPLY TO DOUG WILSON**

8. *APPENDIX A: A TESTIMONY AGAINST THE UNFOUNDED CHARGES OF ANABAPTISM by Greg Price**

9. APPENDIX B: PORNOGRAPHY, THE ANABAPTISTS AND DOUG WILSON'S CIVIL ANTINOMIANISM by Reg Barrow

10. APPENDIX C: LARRY BIRGER'S LARGER AND SHORTER "LETTERS TO THE EDITOR" OF _CREDENDA AGENDA_

11. APPENDIX D: THE TESTIMONY OF THE SESSION OF THE PURITAN REFORMED CHURCH OF EDMONTON REGARDING THIS MATTER

12. APPENDIX E: FOR FURTHER STUDY OF CLASSICAL PROTESTANTISM AND THE ATTAINMENTS OF THE SECOND REFORMATION

1. REG BARROW'S LETTER TO KNOX RING REGARDING JOHN FRAME'S NEW BOOK ON WORSHIP

Distributed By:

JOHN OWEN BUTLER

Pastor-Teacher

Beal Heights PCA

Lawton, Oklahoma

United States of America

Moderator, The Knox Ring

INTERNET: jbutler@sirinet.net

WWW: <http://www.sirinet.net/~jbutler/index.htm>

===== INDEX =====

Items posted in KR960704 are as follows:

Item #1 From: swrb@swrb.com (Reg Barrow)

Subject: Worship in Spirit and Truth

Paul R. Ipema writes:

(snip)

>I am especially interested to see any comments relating to Frame's assessment >of the traditional Puritan view of the regulative principle as "minimalist." >James Jordan has described this view as "sectarian." [See his >Nestorianism and the Regulative Principle published by Transfiguration Press, 1994]. >Although I cannot agree with or endorse all of what Professor >Frame has written, I find Professor Frame's discussion to be useful in >sorting through this issue as a pastor who wishes to take seriously the >regulative principle of worship and apply it consistently in our worship.

Reg Barrow replies:

I've recently written a book review of Kevin Reed's Canterbury Tales which dealt primarily with James Jordan and his heretical views concerning worship. It is called "A Warning Against the False and Dangerous Views of James Jordan Concerning Worship." From the quotes that I have seen here and elsewhere, taken from Frame's new book, I would say that much of my warning against Jordan would apply equally well to Frame. This book review may be helpful and is posted on Still Waters Revival Books (SWRB) web page at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/BlastJJ.htm>

I have also asked an author that I know (who has already read Frame's entire book) to produce a review which will warn people of the subtle and dangerous views that Frame is publicly putting forth.

Kevin Reed's Canterbury Tales, is also available (FREE of charge) on SWRB's web page at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/Canterbu.htm>

Furthermore, Carlos Eire's book War Against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin is an indispensable aid in researching this topic - especially since Eire does not have an axe to grind concerning this issue. More information on Eire's scholarly work (published by Cambridge University Press) is at: <http://www.swrb.com/newbooks/newbe.htm>

I think that Eire's War Against the Idols proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that Calvin would have excommunicated both Frame and Jordan without a second thought - given the idolatrous nature of their beliefs regarding public worship.

I draw the same *general* conclusion at the end of my article "PSALM SINGING IN SCRIPTURE & HISTORY" (in the section "Psalmody, Separation, and the Lord's Supper). This newsletter can be viewed at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/crtppsing.htm>

A FREE copy of Calvin's Necessity of Reforming the Church, which is most germane to this subject is also located at: http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/NRC_ch00.htm

I would also note that those who introduce innovations into the public worship of God (contrary to the second commandment) are the real sectarians; for they destroy the unity of the body of Christ. This topic is covered in its relation to exclusive Psalmody (in a book which I republished) in two articles titled "The Catholicity of the Psalter" - found in The Psalms in Worship edited by John McNaugher (at: <http://www.swrb.com/catalog/m.htm>)

Moreover, the following quote by Jeremiah Burroughs should always be kept in mind when dealing with the subject of worship:

"The nearer a false worship approaches to a true one, the more dangerous it is. Israel came nearer to the true worship of God than the heathens: now the prophet saith not, Though the heathens be idolators, yet let not Judah be so too; but, 'Though Israel play the harlot, yet let not Judah offend.' There was more danger that Judah should be drawn aside by Israel, than that they should be drawn aside by any of the heathen. And so there is more danger that we, at this day, should be drawn aside by those that join with us in many things that are right, than by papists, who are hateful to us, and whose ways we see to be abominable. There is not so much danger, especially for those that profess godliness, of being drawn aside by those who grossly violate the laws of God, as by brethren that join with us in many things that are right, and come very near to the true worship of God... We must not approach places calculated to draw us into sin, especially to false worship... It is dangerous to indulge curiosity in visiting places of idolatry..."

("Comments on Hosea 4:15 by Jeremiah Burroughs [1599-1646]" cited in The Original Covenant and Contending Witness magazine [vol. 1, #19, Sept. 10/93, pp. 416-417], Covenanted Reformed Presbyterian Publishing, write: P.O. Box 131, Pottstown, PA 19464 USA for a free sample issue).

FOR FURTHER STUDY: [_Biblical Worship_](#) by Kevin Reed
[_Concerning Close Communion_](#) by W.J. McKnight
[_Shunning the Unlawful Rights of the Ungodly_](#) by John Calvin
[_Reformation Worship and Separation from Idolatry_](#) by Reg Barrow
[_Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of the Church_](#) by J.L. Girardeau
[_The Songs of Zion: A Contemporary Case for Exclusive Psalmody_](#) by M. Bushell
[_Foundation for Reformation: The Regulative Principle of Worship_](#) by Greg Price
[_Making Shipwreck of the Faith: Evangelicals and Catholics Together_](#) by K. Reed
[_The Badge of Popery: Musical Instruments in Public Worship_](#) by R.J. George
[_Paleopresbyterianism Versus Neopresbyterianism_](#) by Michael Wagner
[_A Dispute Against English Popish Ceremonies_](#) by George Gillespie
[_Westminster Confession of Faith_](#) by the Westminster Divines
[_Selected Writings of John Knox_](#) by John Knox
[_Close Communion_](#) by R.J. George

Sincerely, Reg Barrow, President, STILL WATERS REVIVAL BOOKS

END KNOX RING (URL's in "Item #1" above have been updated from original posting)

2. [_CREDENDA AGENDA'S_](#) ("SAUL'S") ATTACK IN THE "CAVE OF ADULLAM"

Cave of Adullam

Mutterings on the Regnant Follies

Rennis Dodman (i.e. [_Credenda Agenda's_](#) editorial staff-- RB)

Great Experiments in Telepathy

Reg Barrow is the president of Still Waters Revival Books. He hasn't read John Frame's new book on worship, but he thinks it is heresy anyway. In a public on-line discussion of the book he calls it "subtle and dangerous." He finds Frame's view that we are allowed to sing hymns, whether new and old, a little hotter than he can handle. And Frame is acting "contrary to the second commandment," and is a "real sectarian." And to top off his musings, Barrow claims that Calvin would have excommunicated Frame "without a second thought." And all this insight without reading the book!

We have not read all Barrow's comments on Frame, and that which we did read was not read very carefully--but that should present no barrier to the rigorous exchange of ideas!

(Excerpted from Credenda Agenda magazine, volume 8, number 4)

3. REG BARROW'S FIRST LETTER (CHARGES AGAINST DOUG WILSON)

Doug:

(This is not a letter to the editor for public use at this time).

I am writing in accordance with Christ's instruction in Mt. 18:15 that we should seek to settle offences, if possible, in private before going public.

I had hoped you would have done the same with me before printing "Telepathy." In fact, when I was first told (by one of SWRB's customers) about what you had allowed, as editor of Credenda/Agenda, to be printed in this section, I refused to believe him until I had checked your web page for myself. You not only did not contact me then, but in the intervening time you have not contacted me in order to address this matter (though the teaching elder at the church I attend has repeatedly reminded you of this offence via email). Sadly, this is not only an offence that separates us as brothers in Christ (viz., your slanderous satire of my name concerning my the defence of the truth on Knox Ring); we are also separated by your apparent lack of love (at any time before the printing of the article in Credenda or since) to privately address your concerns to me. Notwithstanding, I would much rather do everything in my power to see this situation resolved in a manner that is pleasing to God (before this becomes a larger public scandal).

Doug, I have always considered you and those that work with you as friends. I have carried some of your books, linked you to my web page, sent copies of your magazine (I get 100 copies of each) all around the world with our orders (covering the extra postage myself), published your magazine address in my catalogue in a number of locations (free of charge and without your solicitation Ñ reaching over 50,000 people), etc. I have also spoken with you (and some of your associates) on the phone and have always found the conversation cordial and interesting. I have long prayed for your work and still continue to do so (even since you slandered me in your "Telepathy" article). I would have hoped that such previous good will between us would have warranted (at least) a personal contact before you proceeded with attacking me publicly. To say the least I am grieved on a number of counts. Furthermore, I can easily prove that what you said was not true, and you certainly can't prove the contrary (i.e. that I had not read the Frame book before speaking against it). Yet, in spite of all of our previously unsuccessful (private) attempts to resolve this matter with you (through Greg Price), I still think that I should make this one last private attempt at remedying this situation. I guess I still hope that all my prayers (of the past five or six years) for you and those at Credenda/Agenda will still be answered

(especially in regard to your coming up to the attainments of the covenanted Reformation). Hopefully this information will give you a little bit of an idea as to why I am reluctant to expose your sin to our large public audience Ñ and as to why I have not done so already (though it would have been perfectly legitimate to do so).

Doug, I plead with you to acknowledge your public violation of the ninth commandment in this case. You have allowed that which was not true (about me) to be published in your "Cave of Adullam" column (_Credenda/Agenda_, Vol. 8, No. 4) Ñ under the pseudonym of "Rennis Dodman" (thus, this letter also applies to whoever actually wrote the "Telepathy" piece, though you have not been willing to give us this name). I also ask, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that you repent of this public scandal by taking all appropriate steps to indicate your repentance. If you were to sincerely repent, and print a full retraction in the "Cave of Adullam," then I believe that you would have not only made things right in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of man (Rom. 12:17). This would also allow me to point people to your retraction, as they bring the matter up, and quell any ensuing scandal.

I pray that the Lord will grant you both the humility and courage to do what is equitable in this matter.

Please respond at your earliest possible convenience.

Sincerely,

Reg Barrow, President, STILL WATERS REVIVAL BOOKS

4. *REG BARROW'S SECOND LETTER (CHARGES, WITH A WITNESS, AGAINST AND REPLY TO DOUG WILSON)

REG BARROW WRITES:

Monday, January 20, 1997

Doug:

This is not a letter to the editor, but please consider it as fulfilling the second step of recovering a wayward brother, in accord with Matt. 18:16. My witness is Larry Birger, Jr. Should you fail to repent after this letter, I will be taking this matter to the church (as Matt. 18:17 commands). Public testimonies will follow.

Also, I am well aware that I could have immediately rebuked you publicly for your sin of lying about me in _Credenda/Agenda_ "Cave of Adullam" column (_Credenda/Agenda_, Vol. 8, No. 4). But to be absolutely above reproach, and for the sake of the Gospel, I wanted to go as many extra miles as I could (though *now* my tone will be much more straight forward) concerning the public scandal necessitated by what you have published.

I must also say, that the side issues that we have been drawn into as a result of your slander (of myself) have certainly caused me to reflect on the words of the Reformed Presbytery,

"In this age of boasted charity, but really 'detestable neutrality and indifferency,' it is an irksome and painful task, but a duty, thus to bear testimony against churches, in which are to be found, no doubt, many precious sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. But personal piety never was, nor possibly can be, the condition of fellowship in the visible church. To think so, and say so, is one of the most popular delusions of the present day. It puts the supposed pious man, speaking his experience, in the place of God, speaking his sovereign will in the Bible. This is the height of impiety" (_Act, Declaration and Testimony for the Whole of Our Covenanted Reformation_, [1876 edition] SWRB reprint 1995, p. 175).

This whole exercise has certainly been a most "irksome and painful task," but one that I hope will be profitable to you (and to others that may see these exchanges in the future).

Furthermore, I would also like to state at the outset of this response that my correspondence has been produced in the prayerful hope (and with the Christian love that does not suffer sin upon a neighbor, Lev. 19:17) that you would be granted repentance in regard to your initial lies about me; and now, that you would also be granted repentance in regard to the various anti-Reformation, anti-Covenanter and, of course, anti-Scriptural errors that you espouse (that have been made manifest by your previous responses to our attempts at reconciliation). I also hope that you noticed the phrase "many precious sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty" in the citation by the Reformed Presbytery above. It will be useful, as you read my response, to keep the distinction between an individual (and his status before the Lord) and the visible church (constitutionally considered) in the forefront of your mind. Missing, obscuring, or forgetting this distinction will definitely diminish the usefulness of what I have written, likely causing the issues to be clouded by emotive responses, unthinking caricature and the construction of not a few straw men. My hope, in sending you this second private admonishment (though it would have been perfectly legitimate to have publicly rebuked you long ago), is that you will publicly repent before I am forced to take more drastic measures to clear my name, the name of Still Waters Revival Books and the biblical truths set forth by the covenanting Reformers of both Reformations (with regards to the false aspersions which you have cast upon us).

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>December 19, 1996

>Dear Reg and Pastor Greg,

>I want to take the liberty of speaking somewhat plainly. This is not because
>I am angry or provoked, and certainly not because we despise your persons or
>the valuable work you have done over the years for the cause of Christ. Our
>love for you may be difficult for you to see, but rest assured that we want
>to treat you lawfully with a whole heart (ninth commandment included). In
>his letter, Reg reminded me of the support you have given our ministry in
>the past (for which we thank you again), and would only want to remind
you
>that the support and reinforcement was mutual. We promoted and helped your
>ministry as well, and it saddens us to see you throwing it all down (what >appears to me)
an anabaptist drain.

REG BARROW WRITES:

That you continue to throw out the word Anabaptist is a clear indication that you have no understanding of the second Reformation (on the points in question) or the position that we now occupy. Were Rutherford and the other "minority" ministers, who separated themselves (to avoid schism), from the apostatizing Resolutioners, Anabaptists -- because they valiantly championed separation from corrupted and corrupting churches? Was James Renwick, the only minister to uphold faithfully the covenanted attainments of the Church of Scotland (when he was martyred near the close of the "killing times") an Anabaptist -- because he valiantly championed separation from corrupted and corrupting churches? Before the second Reformation was Calvin an Anabaptist when he pushed for excommunication (and civil sanctions) against those who would not covenant under the Confession of Faith of Geneva? What about Knox? Athanasius? Paul (2 Thes. 3:6)? the men of Judah (Hosea 4:15-19), Jeremiah (Jer. 15:15-20), etc.? Hundreds of other examples can be cited. If these men were Anabaptists, then we are too -- for we (and not you) are occupying the same ground they did regarding separation. But to say that these men were Anabaptists is to deny Scripture and the historic Christian testimony (particularly the first and second Reformations), and this is exactly what you do every time you call us Anabaptists.

This type of slander (i.e. calling Covenanters Anabaptists) was a common tactic used by malignants (i.e. covenant opposers) in the days of the Second Reformation, as I will show in the future if our problems become more public. Furthermore, many of the positions that you have publicly espoused (regarding Christian liberty, the church, civil government, subscription to confessions, worship, open communion, etc.) are in reality much closer to the Anabaptist positions than they are to the position of the best Reformers (as will also be made known publicly in the future, if necessary).

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>The culmination of your doctrinal
>"progress" will not be at all what you envision now. My distinct perception
>is that, unless you are careful, all your work for reformation is going to
>disappear in a tiny little perfectionistic puff of smoke.

How did you arrive at this "distinct perception"? You know nothing of the great things that God is now doing from our base here in Edmonton -- or what his plans for us are (not to mention that the matter of size is irrelevant; truth is what we seek). Nevertheless, we have, by the grace of God, distributed 115,000 catalogues in the last 16 months (and are aiming at distributing between 200,000 and 500,000 catalogues in 1997), published over 500 books in the last 5 years (or so), distributed over 1 million tracts and newsletters (many of them free of charge), planted three covenanted churches (with upwards of 100 new possible plants marked on the computer -- one as far away as Australia) and at the present rate we are getting well over 500,000 hits a year on our web page (where we offer over 100 free Reformation books and other articles). Many other projects are in the works, but the point is we do not "despise the day of small things" -- for in our prayers we are asking for much more (Eph. 3:20) -- viz. the re-establishment of covenanted Presbyterian nations and national, faithful, covenanted Presbyterian churches worldwide.

I guess when we see God honoring our "tiny little perfectionistic puff" with even the limited success noted above, we are exceedingly thankful; and the increased attacks (generally, not necessarily referring to you) from the wicked one just seem to spur us on.

J.A. Alexander's comment on Isaiah 6:13 also provides an appropriate picture of our contemporary situation concerning the spiritual vitality of the church,

"However frequently the people may seem to be destroyed, there shall still be a surviving remnant, and however frequently that very remnant may appear to perish, there shall still be a remnant of the remnant left, and this indestructible residuum shall be the holy seed, the true church."

That we may be relatively small *now* is no deterrent (and it never has been to those who love Christ) to continue to follow hard upon "the whole counsel of God;" for we are assured that the faith that we publish will one day cover the whole earth (Isa. 2:2-5; Ezek. 47:1-12; Ps. 72; Matt. 13:31- 33). Furthermore, seeing that the Dragon presently gives his power unto the beast and that the testimony of the two witnesses (who prophesy during the great apostasy, Rev. 11:3) is almost silenced, only further attests to the truth of the classical Protestant eschatology of Historicism -- contrary to the Jesuit planted views of Futurism and Preterism (see our free article, "Apocalyptic Interpretation," on the origins of the six major eschatological systems, at:

<http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/ApocInt.htm> or write for a free copy of this tract).

By the way, if you take the reckoning of some of the old Historicists, who place the beginning of the millennium sometime in the next hundred years or so, who knows, this revival of the covenanted Reformation -- which has begun to be published from Edmonton (with hundreds of the classics from the best Presbyterian and Reformed authors being placed back in print for the first time in centuries) -- could be the precursor to preparing the nations for that blessed period which is to come (cf. Thomas Houston's *Unity and Uniformity in the Church*, [1881] SWRB reprint 1996 and Appendix D in *The Ordinance of Covenanting* by John Cunningham [1843], SWRB reprint 1996). I am no date setter, but it is interesting to think (and pray) about, for what took place during the

days of the writing and international subscriptions to the Solemn League and Covenant has been cited before as a foretaste of the millennial glory to come. The Reformed Presbytery writes,

"These modern pigmies are too far dwarfed in intellectual stature to measure the altitude, of our glorious Covenanted Reformation -- a Reformation which, imbedded in the law and the covenant of God, has already brought civil and ecclesiastical freedom to many millions; and which is doubtless destined to be laid in the foundation of reconstructed society in the millennial period of the world" (A Short Vindication of Our Covenanted Reformation, [1879] SWRB reprint 1996, p. 4).

James Kerr, on the Sabbath, June 20th, 1880, in a sermon preached in Greyfriar's Churchyard, in Edinburgh, titled "A Third Reformation Necessary: or, the Piety, Principles, and Patriotism of Scotland's Covenanted Martyrs; With Application to the Present Times," makes the same point concerning the monumental character of the international transactions that transpired during the Covenanters' combat with the forces of antichrist. While also giving us great insight into some of the most important battles of Second Reformation warfare, Kerr proclaims, regarding the combat of these faithful witnesses,

"They stood for the Supreme Authority of the Holy Scriptures; for the Exclusive Headship of the Lord Jesus over the Church; for the Church's independent spiritual jurisdiction and power; for the Divine right of Presbytery; for the purity of worship in the Church and the Church's freedom from all unauthorized rites and ceremonies. They stood for every pin of the tabernacle, for every item of truth to which they had attained... 'Whose faith follow.' Let us embrace those doctrines affecting the Church's existence, privileges and prosperity, for which the martyrs suffered, and let us imitate their fidelity to the high attainments of a preceding period. The great Scriptural doctrines for which they were honoured to contend and which constituted the Church's glory, are still more or less lightly esteemed by even many professing Christians and ecclesiastical denominations... (A)rminianism is making rapid strides to popularity. Dishonour is done to the royal prerogative of Christ as Zion's King by those Churches that appeal to or base the claim of rights upon the Revolution Settlement -- a Settlement that proceeded upon Erastian principles and left many of the attainments for which the martyrs suffered in the oblivion to which the Stuarts had consigned them... The doctrine of Christ's Exclusive Headship over His own Church, and of the freedom of the Church under her exclusive head, requires to be vindicated and testified for against all modern departures therefrom. There is need to maintain and propagate the doctrine of the Divine right of the Presbyterian form of Church government, for at the present time only two of the Churches -- and these among the smallest -- hold this doctrine in all its Scriptural completeness. There is a need to maintain the high scriptural doctrine concerning the modes of worship in the Church, that no rite or ceremony is to be introduced into the forms of worship for which an express prescription, direct or indirect, cannot be produced from God's Own Word. The additions to the Church's worship of forms of human invention, and called for in order to the gratification of mere religious fashion, constitute one of the saddest signs of the present time. 'As though God has been defective,' as Charnock writes with reference to such innovators, 'in

providing for His own honour in His institutions, and modelling His own service, but stood in need of our directions and the *caprichios* of our brains. In this they do not seem to climb above God, yet they set themselves on the throne of God, and would grasp one end of His sceptre in their own hands. They do not attempt to take the crown from God's head but discover a bold ambition to shuffle their hairy scalps under it, and wear a part of it upon their own.' **By the unflinching maintenance and profession of these doctrines, then, we are to prove ourselves the legitimate descendants of Scotland's Covenanted Martyrs.** This duty may draw down upon us reproach and shame, but, as the doctrines are Scriptural, the shame, like that of the martyrs, is transformed into glory. These doctrines are not now popular nor fashionable; still they are in advance of this age and prevailing ecclesiastical opinions, and they shall be popular and fashionable in the Church everywhere when 'God shall help her, and that at the breaking of the morning.' They shall have a resurrection with power, when Zion shall be set upon the mountains, and when the glory of her King shall array her, they shall be triumphant when the whole banner for the truth shall wave upon the battlements of the Millennial Church of Jesus" (Cited in Sermons Delivered in Times of Persecution in Scotland [1880 ed., SWRB reprint 1996], pp. 32-35, emphases added).

Hetherington, concerning the Solemn League and Covenant (the epitome of second Reformation attainments), also comments that "no man who is able to understand its nature, and to feel and appreciate its spirit and its aim, will deny it to be the wisest, the sublimest, and the most sacred document ever framed by uninspired men" (History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, [1856] SWRB reprint 1993, p. 134).

When the churches and nations are granted repentance in (or preparing for) the millennium they will be found "going forth by the footsteps of the flock" (Song 1:8) and not turned "aside by the flock of thy companions" (i.e. those that appear religious but are actually a hindrance to the work of the building of Christ's kingdom, Song 1:7, cf. Douglas' Strictures on Occasional Hearing, [1820] SWRB reprint 1996); and there is no "footstep of the flock" more clearly distinguished in the bedrock of history (since the days of the apostles) than the Solemn League and Covenant; followed by those footsteps of second Reformation attainments outlined by Kerr above (concerning the primacy of Scripture as it is applied to purity of worship, doctrine, and government in Christ's church).

By God's most magnificent grace this Covenanted Reformed Presbyterian testimony is now also *our* testimony (as it is applied to the present circumstances in our day); exhibiting another aspect of truth (i.e. testimony bearing) which has been buried among the ruins of the covenanted Reformation by the ecclesiastical beast (cf. Steele's Notes on the Apocalypse, pp. 192f., 306, etc.) as he is seen to rise up in the apostate modern churches. Regarding specific testimony-bearing (both for the truth and against apostasy) Howie comments, in his 1779 Preface to the original edition of Sermons in Times of Persecution, on the specific content of Covenanter preaching (as cited below). Think hard, Doug, as you read this fine summary of the covenanted or second Reformation. See if your claims to be Presbyterian, a "classic Protestant," and a promoter of the covenanted Reformation resemble anything like what really took place during this watershed period of

history. If you are an honest man I think it will be becoming more and more apparent (as you read quotes like this, and the rest of this letter) that you are far from the biblical attainments of the covenanted Reformation. What these saints fought and often died for is a far cry from the trendy, fashionable sub-Calvinism which you promote. But here are Howie's comments,

"In the following discourse, a doctrinal banner is lifted up for the divine right of Presbytery -- that is, the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the Reformed Church of Scotland, as contained in her excellent Standards, Confession of Faith, Catechisms, etc. But how stands the case in this with us at present? For, not to mention these Machiavellians, court parasites, Platonic saints, or baptized heathens, whose wit is either some lascivious hint, or some broken jest upon Scripture, and who can profess one religion to-day and another to-morrow, or turn every way wherever the ministerial magnet leads them; or these gentlemen of the *Beau-monde*, who oftentimes distinguish themselves by the name of free-thinkers, under which may be comprehended all Atheists, all Deists, Unitarians, Pelagians, Socinians, Arminians, etc. How many different sects are there amongst us, whose principles (if they have any) say that the government and discipline of the Church of Christ is a thing purely ambulatory, that may be moulded or metamorphosed into any form or fashion that best suits their local circumstances and the political constitution of the kingdoms of this world will admit of. For, not to mention Episcopalians, Independents, anabaptists, Glassites, Bereans, Methodists, and Moravians, such a loose and vague scheme of sentiment now obtains amongst many of the Presbyterian persuasion that, under the notion of what they call charity, moderation, and liberty of conscience, they can admit of almost all the forementioned tribes unto their communion upon a bare supposition of their visible saintship (a common error in our day--RB), or what they term sincerity in the main, without any other test of orthodoxy than what they define the fundamentals of Christianity. Every other creed, confession, or article of faith (if compiled by men, though founded upon and agreeable to Scripture) must be reprobated and discarded; and all formal testimony bearers are accounted by them precisians, bigots, men of narrow, contracted judgements, and illiberal sentiments, 'The Word of God (say they) is our testimony.' But what is all this? Almost every heretic that appears in the Church will tell us the same. Indeed a better testimony than this cannot be. But then the Word of God properly can be no man's testimony, it is God's own testimony. It is above eighteen times, in one portion of Scripture so called (Ps 119). 'we declare unto you the testimony of God,' says the apostle. It is also called the testimony of Jesus, 'The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.' And unto every truth, particularly that called the present truth, every one of His professing people is to give a explicit adherence, and this is called their testimony. 'And when they shall have finished their testimony,' and they 'overcame by the word of their testimony.' But to tantalize or soothe up the minds of the credulous they must needs own the thirty-three chapters of the Confession too. And who thanks them to own that which their own hand-writing binds them unto? But as this seems now a point of mere form, it will likely in a little [while--RB] go out of fashion [how prophetic--RB]; for, while some are using means to be disentangled from that obligation, others subscribe with a mental reservation (like Arius's paper [and the John Frame's of our day--RB]) in their bosom; a third, to anticipate all this, must need engage with his own explanation upon it. But hear the divine mandate, 'Son of man, shew them the house, and

all the forms, and all the ordinances thereof.' 'Hold fast the form of sound words.'" (Cited in *_Sermons Delivered in Times of Persecution in Scotland_* [1880 ed., SWRB reprint 1996], pp. 62-63).

Is this your testimony for the covenanted Reformation, Doug? Close communion? Divine Right Presbyterianism? "Strict regulativism" regarding worship (as you would call it)? Separation from apostates (including Arminians)? Strict subscriptionism (the only subscriptionism in keeping with the third and ninth commandments)? etc. etc.

Furthermore, so far from believing our work will "disappear in a tiny little puff of perfectionistic smoke," as is your dim prognosis, we are very excited at the ramifications of this revival of the covenanted reformation here, and increasingly, elsewhere. Our faithful forbears expected great things to come of the covenanted reformation, and so do we, and thus we cry exultingly and confidently (as good postmillennialists) with James Guthrie (spoken as he stood upon the scaffold in anticipation of the martyrs crown) "The Covenants, the Covenants shall yet be Scotland's reviving!" And, we would add, not only Scotland's reviving, but that of the whole world!

Moreover, and especially in the light of the above (and following) quotations and Scripture proofs, it is **not** perfectionism to insist on constitutional adherence to Reformation attainments at a corporate level (ecclesiastically and civilly) -- and it certainly isn't in any way akin to the anabaptist heresy! To the contrary, it is **essential** to sanctification, both individually and corporately, to require maintenance of the growth in grace that God has granted thus far. As Scripture commands of individual believers: "Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing" (Phil. 3:16). Does this not apply, **a fortiori**, to the moral person ecclesiastically (and civilly also)? If not, how can one ever obey the fifth commandment at a corporate level? How can anyone know what they have "already attained", if they do not understand and know the preceding history upon which to differentiate what they consider biblical attainments from what are not biblical attainments? God often calls His people to remember those who have been faithful in following Christ (Heb. 11) and the Old Testament is full of examples in which we see God directing his people to hearken back to the attainments and defections of the past (Judg. 2:20-22; Mal. 2:8-10; Dan. 9:16; Deut. 1:35; Deut. 4, etc.), as a means of teaching them present public and private duties and responsibilities.

Furthermore, in conjunction with this point on attainments, you seem to have no idea about how history is a term of fellowship. At a very simple level this principle can be illustrated in the relationship between parents and children. Tell me, how would a child obey the fifth commandment if he did not know who his parents were? Does this not hold true regarding an individual's responsibility concerning civil and ecclesiastical government in their capacity as moral persons? -- though as Rutherford points out in *_Lex, Rex_* there are some important differences that need to be accounted for, between natural parental authority and civil or ecclesiastical authority, when one is attempting to determine the lawfulness of any given "power;" cf. *_Lex, Rex_* pages 3-5 and especially page 71.

The Reformed Presbytery gives us the answer concerning the question of history as term of fellowship (in **their** testimony on this point):

"Nor otherwise can a Christian know the time or place of his birth, or the persons whom God commands him to honor as his father and mother, than by uninspired testimony; and the same is true of his covenant obligations, if baptized in infancy. Against all who ignorantly or recklessly reject or oppose history as a bond of fellowship, in the family, in the state, but especially in the church, we thus enter our solemn and uncompromising protest." (*Act, Declaration and Testimony for the Whole of Our Covenanted Reformation*, [1876 edition] SWRB reprint 1995, p. 178).

It is clear, then, that we can obey the fifth commandment with respect to our natural parents only by uninspired historical testimony. Equally so, it is only by uninspired historical testimony that we can know who our ecclesiastical and civil "parents" are, and so obey the fifth commandment respecting them.

This is why we **must** require adherence to historical attainments in reformation as a bond of fellowship if truly we are to promote the unity, purity, and growth of the church. If we do not demand (as do the Scriptures -- I Cor. 11:19; Eph. 4:11-16; Phil. 3:16; II Cor. 10:8; 13:8,10; etc.) that history be a bond of fellowship, we will have an impossible time determining, with certainty, if we are submitting to our mother or to a harlot (ecclesiastically), to our father or to the beast (civilly). God **commands** submission to lawful authority, but nowhere in his word does he give us the names of the authorities to whom we are to submit. Likewise, he **commands** us **not** to submit to unlawful authority, but, again, does not tell us specifically who these alleged "powers" are. In the nature of the case, then, we must look **outside** Scripture (using Scripture as our criteria) in order to **obey** Scripture. With reference to the church, those possessing lawful authority from Christ cannot be determined simply by an abstract, ahistorical test: it is impossible to judge whether an alleged authority is working for the truth or against it (2 Cor. 13:8; Eph. 4:11-16) apart from an evaluation of the level of sanctification granted the church thus far in redemptive history (Prov. 22:28; Rev. 2:25), and whether that alleged authority is maintaining and building upon this sanctification or rather destroying it. Thus, Paul describes his lawful authority as "power which the Lord hath given me to edification, and not to destruction" (2 Cor. 13:10). Backsliding from attained growth in grace (i.e. corporate sanctification) is not edification, but destruction. Therefore, no "authority" working against any of these former biblical attainments bears God's stamp of approval: God has granted no authority for backsliding. For more on this topic see my *_A Contemporary Covenanting Debate; Or, Covenanting Redivivus_ FREE* at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/CovDebRB.htm> (or as a bound photocopy from SWRB), especially the last half (in the sections) dealing with ecclesiastical and civil attainments. A very helpful exposition of these principles, as they apply to the civil government, is also found in Greg Price's, *_Biblical Civil Government vs. the Beast; and the Basis for Civil Resistance_*, FREE at: http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/BibCG_GP.htm (or as a bound photocopy from SWRB).

To put a little sharper point on this part of the discussion, Shield's classic *_A Hind Let Loose_* ([1678, 1797 ed.] SWRB reprint 1995) demonstrates how separation from backsliding churches has long been considered the classical Protestant position,

"5. 'It is granted by *all that write against separatists*, that separation from a church is lawful, when the case so falleth out, that union cannot be kept up with her without sin,' Voet. Polit. Eccles. p. 68 quest 17.

6. The grave author of *Rectius Instruendum Confut.* 3 dial. chap. pag. 7 &c. 'Allows, every separation is not schism, even from the church which hath essentials; yea, and more than essentials: if it be from those (though never so many) who are *drawing back from whatever piece of duty and integrity is attained*; for this is still to be held fast, according to many scripture commands. So Elias, when God's covenant was forsaken, was as another Athanasius (I and I only am left) in point of tenacious integrity" (emphases added).

It is interesting that the best of the older Reformed writers designated our position (regarding attainments and separation) as one of "tenacious integrity," while you and the backslidden modern church rain down (in your ignorance) slander and derisive comments on the classic Protestant position.

Clarkson, in *_Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting..._*, also proves (by numerous Scripture proofs, specific acts of Assembly, the Solemn League and Covenant, etc.) how retrogression from attainments (corporately) makes a church unfit for ecclesiastical fellowship. He documents exactly what historical attainments were achieved during the second (or covenanted) Reformation and how these are to be reflected in our ecclesiastical terms of church communion. Reason 14 in this book ("Presbyterian Dissenters decline the Communion of this Church; because she is unsound and sinful in the Terms of her Communion") is an exceedingly valuable section of writing and should be pursued by all those who are willing to take an honest look at what we (in Edmonton) are also maintaining at the close of the twentieth century (with application to the contemporary "churches"). I can't imagine anyone reading this section of *_Plain Reasons_*, never mind the whole book, and then proclaiming any of the modern *Presbyterian* denominations lawfully constituted visible churches.

With a return to the understanding of these lost Reformation truths we will again see the power of the the Lord's remnant testimony -- as "the woman in the wilderness" (Rev. 12:6) cries out against the civil and ecclesiastical beast (and their usurping of Christ's royal prerogatives). This is beautifully illustrated by the Reformed Presbytery (the last covenanted Reformed Presbyterian Presbytery) in their *_Act, Declaration and Testimony for the Whole of Our Covenanted Reformation_*,

"Likewise the presbytery testify against all ministerial or church communion with such, who, though they may occupy the place of office- bearers in the church of Christ, yet are destitute of those qualifications indispensably required by the church's Head, or enter not into their office by the door he has appointed in his word, own another head than Christ, or apostatize and *fall from the truth* and cause of Christ, *formerly* espoused and

sworn to by them in a church capacity; against all active owning and countenancing of such, by attending upon any of their corrupt ministrations, or receiving any ordinances from such, to whom the Lord has denied his blessing. Against all voluntary contracting with prelates, curates, or such officers of human invention in the church, for paying tithes or other dues unto them, as unto lawful, scriptural parish ministers. For besides that there is nothing due unto them, their office having no divine authority; so there being under the New Testament a change of the priesthood, there is also a change of the law, respecting tithes; according to Heb. 7:12; Rev. 2:20, etc. By all which it appears, from what is above asserted and declared concerning these two divine distinct ordinances, the ministry and magistracy, that the principles maintained thereanent by the presbytery, are nothing else than an endeavour, as a judicatory of the Lord Jesus Christ, constituted in his name, *to hold fast the church of Scotland's testimony*, agreeable to the scriptures of truth, her confession and covenants, fundamental acts and constitutions both of church and state; and this, according to the command of the church's sole King and Head; Rev. 2:25, and 3:11. And what is testified against (above--RB), is, in the nature of it, an homologation of the church's faithful opposition to *backsliders, in their course of defection, from the national attainments in religion and reformation*, resisting even unto blood, striving against sin" (pp. 202-203, emphases added to highlight sections resting on the foundation of the biblical doctrine of attainments).

(The preceding comments are also inextricably linked to the matter of *close communion*, which is the classical Protestant position. I have already written on this subject and thus refer you to my Calvin, Close Communion and the Coming Reformation [it is available FREE of charge at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/CalvinCC.htm> or you can write us for a free copy of the hard copy version].)

In sum, we are not "Reformed Finneyites" as you calumniate, but are simply adhering to the Scriptures' command to try "them which say they are apostles [or any other leaders in the church -- RB], and are not" (Rev. 2:2). We do this by Scripturally evaluating, in the light of the growth in sanctification God has granted to his church, whether such alleged leaders are using their authority for edification (by holding fast what Christ has given his church) or for destruction. In doing so, we affirm that, *essentially*, there are not differing terms of communion for Christ's church throughout history. However, we also affirm (with the Scriptures) that it is only in history that these essential terms can be faithfully applied, expounded, and defended. Thus, what was not explicitly required as a term of communion at an earlier date must be explicitly required at a later date, for a challenge to that portion of the truth has been made at some later point (not all such challenges occurred within the first century), and it is incumbent upon all generations thereafter to maintain the testimony emitted by her faithful predecessors. 'For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you" (I Cor. 11:19). Although we are called to be "perfect" (Matt. 5:48) we are not "perfectionistic," but are simply upholding what is absolutely necessary for true obedience to the fifth commandment. We value the unity, peace, and purity of Zion so highly that we will not suffer the freedom God has granted through previous reformations to be encroached, "No, not for an hour" (Gal. 2:5).

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>I realize you may
>feel that we are now in "controversy mode" and it may be easy to blow off
>what we are saying as expressions driven by that controversy. But please
>hear me out. I am not sure that you really understand how you all come
>across to those who are your friends.

REG BARROW WRITES:

The problem is not in our perception of how we look to "our friends," (though I don't know many friends that lie about me [as in your "Telepathy" mudslinging], and against the Reformation, publicly [by calling the modern day Reformers "perfectionists' and "anabaptists."]), the problem is among those who have apostatized from the faith (in various areas). That, in the hardness of their hearts, these "friends" become angry when we expose their sin, is a sign of their backsliding, *not* our unfaithfulness or lack of understanding (cf. _Alexander and Rufus_ throughout). I pray that you will take this to heart before you are judicially stricken with more blindness (II Thess. 2:10-12) than you are already exhibiting. Moreover, many of our friends are repenting of the sins that we are now pointing out, as we by God's grace did ourselves when these things were revealed to us. That the great Reformation truths which we are publishing are shaking up the comfortable neopresbyterians (PCA, OPC, RPCNA, etc.), sub-Reformed "evangelicals" (whether they be Independents, Arminians, Baptists, Charismatics, CRC, etc.), Reconstructionists, Lutherans, etc. (and that some, in their folly oppose themselves regarding the covenanted Reformation), is to be expected -- this has always been the case. Thankfully, many others are being granted repentance. The cleansing of the temple (individually, ecclesiastically and civilly) is never accomplished without controversy. Anyone who thinks otherwise is just not familiar with Scripture or history (John 2:13-17; Acts 17:6ff.; Acts 16:20ff.; Ezek. 16:2; etc.)

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>Public offenses may be addressed publicly. This is how Christ dealt with the
>Pharisees, and how Paul dealt with Peter at Antioch. This is how (in one
>respect) you dealt with Frame. He had written a public book, and public
>responses to it are quite acceptable. You had no responsibility to go to
>Frame privately before responding to his book

REG BARROW WRITES:

Agreed, and the only reason that I have taken the non-public route (thus far) regarding the lies that you have printed about me was in the hopes that you would have already publicly repented (and thus saved yourself the future loss of credibility that will occur when these matters are made public, and it is demonstrated that you have lied in what you printed about me). Even some of my customers, after they had asked me about your "Telepathy" smear and then heard my side of the story, thought that you would repent -- maybe this

engendered some false hope on my part (though I still pray that you will be granted repentance).

Furthermore, and most importantly, throughout your last reply to me *you do not answer the one major charge that I was bringing against you*: This charge remains and is that *what you printed about me in _Credenda/Agenda_ was a lie*. You did not even address this charge. Did you lie or did you tell the truth? If you told the truth please prove that I had not read Frame's book, as you printed in _Credenda/Agenda_. I can easily prove otherwise.

The question here is not whether I had studied enough of Frame to say what I did; the question is whether you lied or not. You said that I had not read Frame's book. I had read some of it. Thus, you publicly lied about me. This is the sin of which you need to repent.

Keep in mind that you did not print that I had not read *enough* of Frame's book to make the charges that I did (even if that was what you were thinking, as your letters to Greg Price seem to indicate): you said that I had not read it *at all*.

If you want to make other charges, as you do below (regarding whether I had read *enough* of Frame), that is a different question; but it is not the question that I am addressing -- it is also not what you printed. You lied about me publicly and you need to repent.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>, and we had no responsibility
>to come to you before responding to your public denunciation of Frame. (And
>again, the issue for us is not the fact of your disagreement with Frame; the
>problem was how you managed your disagreement with him -- i.e. unscripturally).

REG BARROW WRITES:

Again, this is *not* what you printed, and therefore this is *not* the issue. The issue is that you printed what was not true about me and you are unwilling to repent.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>With regard to the controversy over Frame, we would be willing to print
>something like this from Reg: "I acknowledge that I was out of line by
>publicly declaring on the justice of excommunicating John Frame without
>myself having evaluated the evidence in question according to the highest
>standards of evidential rigor required by such a serious pronouncement."

REG BARROW WRITES:

I would never agree to printing this because it is not true. I had seen Frame's previous debate in the _Westminster Theological Journal_ and his book is just repeating many the same heresies for which he was challenged there. I had read (and had had read to me) more than enough of Frame's Reformation-denying heresies in his new book to assert that

anyone who knows even a little about what took place at the Reformation would correctly conclude that Frame would have been excommunicated by all the faithful churches of those days. Moreover, I am not bound to satisfy a "standard of evidential rigor" that arises, not from sound scriptural or historical scholarship, but from your ignorance of the Reformation doctrines regarding worship, the sacraments, and the church. I have not only read numerous pre-twentieth century books concerning worship, the sacraments, and the church, but I have also read a number of the modern books that attempt to deal with these questions -- and, in my opinion, Frame's book on worship is the worst I have seen yet. Additionally, the Koran can be sharply denounced without having read all of it (as you yourself readily admitted in an earlier correspondence), and so can heretics like Frame, whose folly is manifest unto all with eyes to see (II Tim. 3:9).

What I said on the Knox Ring regarding Frame was true and totally appropriate -- and I am grieved that others had not publicly rebuked Frame, in this manner, previous to my testimony. If we lived in the covenanting days Frame would have not only been excommunicated, but he would have also been proceeded against with negative civil sanctions. Are there no David's in the land who will take on our modern Goliaths (i.e. those who have become the chief enemies of the Lord's covenanted Zion by taunting the church with their attainment-denying heresies)? Have those who profess themselves shepherds grown so dull that they can watch the sheep being mauled and carried away by those who prey upon the weak and sickly in the flock -- and yet not even lift their voices against such folly? What Frame promotes (regarding worship) is closer to a circus than the worship commanded by God for use in the church of Christ. But, again, what you said in "Telepathy" (about what I said) was a lie and totally inappropriate. Simply put, **that** is the issue: cease your puerile evasions and deal with it!

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>We would be glad to print something like this, and we would be happy then to
>include something from us on our continued fellowship both with you and with
>John Frame. And if your conscience will not permit you to make such a
>statement, we nevertheless want to continue in fellowship with you, if you
>would be kind enough to permit it.

REG BARROW WRITES:

We have no ecclesiastical fellowship with you (and you would not be allowed to be a member in our church -- because of your aberrant beliefs and practices), so I will assume that you are talking about private fellowship. As long as you will hear the truth and not oppose it, then this can continue -- but you are perilously close to putting an end to even that (2 Thes. 3:6; Rom. 16:17).

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>We do not suppose that such disagreements
>as we are having necessarily require nefarious or dishonest motives on the
>part of the other. We assume this of you; please consider that as a
>possibility from your vantage as well.

REG BARROW WRITES:

I am not (nor have I ever been) talking about your motives (because I do not know them -- my telepathic skills are a little rusty); I'm talking about what you *did.* Again, the issue which started this controversy between us is: Was what you printed in _Credenda/Agenda_ about me true or was it false? I maintain that it was a lie and that you need to repent of this lie.

The smokescreens that you keep throwing up do not refer to what you printed or what the initial point of controversy was (and is) between us (though the consequence of your initial attack on me has stirred up numerous other areas of disagreement). *You printed*, referring to my comments regarding Frame's book: "all this insight without reading the book." You *did not print* "all this insight without reading *enough* of the book." If you would have printed the latter statement then I would have just brushed it off as your misinformed opinion; but you printed the former words and these words are violations of the ninth commandment -- because I had read some of the book (which I can easily prove, and which was already clearly stated in my comments on the Knox-ring).

Furthermore, as previously noted, I had also seen the interchange that took place (a number of years ago) in the _Westminster Theological Journal_ in which Frame was pushing many of the same heresies (regarding worship) which he repeats in his book. He has been answered before (though not sternly rebuked), showing that others are well aware of his deviations from the classical Protestant views concerning worship. By the way, the views on worship which Frame espoused in the _Westminster Theological Journal_ were also worthy, in any duly constituted church, of excommunication. That the PCA does not excommunicate John Frame (and all the others in that declining denomination that deny the regulative principle) is just one more clear demonstration of their apostasy.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>If you permit, I would like to take a paragraph or more to answer a number
>of the various questions which have come up between us, and then move on to
>address what I consider to be the root problem. Pastor Greg, you asked if it
>had occurred to me that I had a duty to contact Reg in order to remove the
>offense. First, I thought you were interceding on his behalf and so I did
>not respond to him directly. Secondly, with regard to the principle, I have
>contacted Reg as many times as he contacted John Frame, and we were *both*
>within scriptural boundaries. Third, I am more than happy to contact Reg
>directly in order to remove any grounds of offense between us (if you all
>think that this would be profitable). I suggest a phone conversation which
>may communicate some nuances which are beyond the black and white of these
>letters. Would that be agreeable?

REG BARROW WRITES:

I have nothing against this, but I do wonder why you didn't call me earlier.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>With regard to covenanted reformation, you asked if we really were promoting
>the same thing. Please check my article in *Antithesis* written years ago
>entitled "Covenant Evangelism."

REG BARROW WRITES:

You seem to have little (or no) idea about what we are talking about when we say "covenanted Reformation" -- your article in *Antithesis* notwithstanding. We are not talking about a *general* application of covenants to a few aspects of Christian concern: we are talking about *specific* historical attainments (and they are not attainments unless they are agreeable to the Word of God) concerning the moral persons of the church of Christ, and of the nations (cf. *A Short Vindication of Our Covenanted Reformation* by the Reformed Presbytery and Samuel Rutherford's "How Covenants Bind Us," in chapter 21 of his *Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience* [1649]).

Even the little you seem to understand about the descending obligation of lawful covenants would only serve to exhibit further your spiritual adultery in the matters in which we differ. In your article you speak of the continuing obligation of the Solemn League and Covenant -- thus sanctioning it as a legitimate (and therefore containing no matter disagreeable to the Word of God) covenant. Forgetting civil obligations for the moment, please tell me: If this was a binding covenant (and as you seem to understand it can only be binding so long as it is in accord with the Word of God), when did the Presbyterian church (descending, in her purest form, as she did from the original covenanting church, the Church of Scotland) come out from under the covenanted uniformity "in religion, confession of faith, form of church-government, directory for worship and catechising," sworn 350-odd years ago?

Are you aware that the Westminster Standards, including the *Directory for Public Worship*, were produced in fulfillment of the Solemn League and Covenant (cf. the title pages of this and the other documents produced by the Assembly, which read, "as a part of the covenanted uniformity in religion betwixt the churches of Christ in the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland")? Are you aware that the *Directory for Public Worship* mandated only the singing of Psalms in public worship (as a part of the covenanted uniformity in worship)? This is easily demonstrated by consulting Robert Baillie's *Letters and Journals* ([1647-1661] SWRB reprint 1994), pp. 3, 12, 21, 60, 97, 525-556; Michael Bushell's *Songs of Zion*, (Crown and Covenant, second edition, 1993), p. 190ff.; and the *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland from the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive*, ([1682] SWRB reprint 1996), pp. 228, 238, 172, 353-354. In fact, I defy anyone to produce one shred of evidence that the making of a separate "hymnal" (full of man-made compositions) was ever discussed at the Westminster Assembly (much less presented to parliament, as was all the work of the Assembly), or the Scottish General Assembly (from 1638-1649, or long after) -- which General Assembly ecclesiastically ratified the Westminster Standards. Regarding worship this speaks to the original intent of the framers of the Westminster standards and exposes how prevalent the sin of perjury is among those ministers who have taken vows, without mental reservation, to uphold these

standards -- while they continue to practice (even in ignorance) anything other than exclusive Psalmody. The battles over the Psalter (i.e. the debates concerning translators, publication, civil and ecclesiastical ratification, etc.) are all well documented; yet strangely, not one word was ever recorded about any debates, votes or proclamations regarding a man-made "hymnal." This is truly amazing, if a human "hymnal" had indeed ever been considered (never mind ratified by the different levels of church and civil government) as in keeping with the covenanted uniformity in worship aimed at by these divines -- given the "strict regulativist" makeup of both the Westminster Assembly and the Scottish General Assembly. On top of this these divines did not even need to mention the judaizing heresy of the use of musical instruments in public worship, because that was not an issue among the Reformed folk of the day. Even the civil magistrate of that period knew enough about Scripture to provide for the eradication of organs, "along with (the--RB) other remains of Popery" (_Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland from the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive_, [1682] SWRB reprint 1996, p. 228). Those that celebrated Popish holy-days like the "Christ-mass" were also censured (in accord with the Scottish _First Book of Discipline_ [1560, here even civilly] and _Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland_, p. 285 and Scripture). This is not to mention second Reformation views concerning close communion, ultra "strict subscriptionism" (as you call it) and the many other points (all agreeable to the Word of God) included in the original intent of the source documents of the Covenanted Reformation (what you have already termed "Anabaptistic," "perfectionistic," etc.).

I will not enter into this any further now, but if you do not repent after this letter, this whole subject (of the specific nature of the covenanted uniformity of worship [doctrine, government, etc.] called for [in Scripture] and by this Reformation covenant) will be addressed in my public testimony against you -- along with many of the other questions that you have raised throughout these discussions (previously and below).

I do not know if you understand this yet, but on this count you are in the same boat as Frame, aimlessly drifting down the stream of defection and deformation. You openly deny the covenanted uniformity aimed at in the Solemn League and Covenant regarding worship and you practice and preach (contrary to the Solemn League and Covenant and the second commandment) idolatry in your public worship. That you are a covenant breaker in this regard is simply historical fact (and can be easily verified by reading the source documents of that period, not the least of which is the _Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland from the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive_). The biblical basis for each of my assertions can easily be demonstrated (and already has been demonstrated in numerous books that I have republished) for those who have ears to hear.

Your review of Frame's book, alone, provides plenty of covenant-denying, anti-Reformation evidence to attest to what I am saying here against you. In that review you explicitly deny one of the four major points of covenanted uniformity (i.e. the point to do with the specific doctrine and practises concerning the purity of public worship). There is no way around this: historically you would have been seen as one of the malignants, not

as a classical Protestant -- and certainly not as one upholding the blood- bought heritage of the Covenanters.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>The thing that grieves me most about what
>you all are doing is this: you appear to be working hard to find every
>caricature of faithful covenanting ever mentioned by the enemies of
>covenants, and doing your level best to live out that caricature in flesh
>and blood.

REG BARROW WRITES:

Can you provide some specifics? To which caricatures are you referring? Please cite books (or articles) and page numbers. Sorry Doug, but given your track record, your word is no longer good with me: you have shown great facility in making such unsubstantiated assertions before.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>More on this below, but I have no hesitation in saying that your
>work is rapidly becoming the single biggest obstacle to a renewal of the
>covenants. Of course the enemies of covenantal thinking will always see what
>they want to see, but you are rapidly alienating every natural ally you
>might have in the work of reformation.

REG BARROW WRITES:

Come on Doug, how do you know all this? Telepathy? We are experiencing a tremendous outpouring of support for every facet of our work (as noted above) -- along with the increased opposition from the modern day malignants. If you could only see what is happening I am sure that you would be staggered by the magnitude of God's blessing that we see and experience every day! What is happening here is so exciting that I often find it hard to fall asleep at night. What I have read concerning how the Holy Spirit was working in Geneva in the time of Calvin, in Scotland during Knox's day and at the height of second Reformation, is what we see happening here. That we believe the same things that these great Reformers did, follow the same confessions, promote the same books, etc., is certainly no coincidence. That you (and others like you) oppose these Reformers at some of the most fundamental points of Reform (especially concerning worship, church government, the sacraments, covenanting and church discipline) should also be noted. Those who trust you need to be made aware that though you mouth some of the language of the Reformation, you are an enemy to some of the most important biblical attainments of this period -- at some points leading the simple and ignorant into anabaptism (one example being your promotion of the doctrine of pretended liberty of conscience) and at others leading them right into the arms of the Roman harlot (your Jesuit eschatology [i.e. Preterism] being a case in point here). You may continue to judge who you think is "every natural ally" (though the flesh is often mistaken regarding such matters); we will praise God for all those who continue to prove themselves to be our true (and super-natural)

allies -- and for those who have and are about to join with us in the Lord's call for a third Reformation!

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>I agree with Rutherford's distinction between a valid calling and a lawful
>calling. Caiaphas was a valid High Priest, but he did not come to the office
>lawfully. But you say, referring to Brown, that the ministry of the scribes
>and Pharisees was not to be endorsed. This places you at some variance to
>someone else who failed to live up to the standards of the first and second
>Reformation when he said, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat.
>Therefore whatever they tell you to observe, that observe and do, but do not
>do according to their works; for they say, and do not do" (Matt. 23:2b-3).

REG BARROW WRITES:

Doug, do you think that you are the first one to have asked Protesting Covenanters these questions? You sometimes sound as if you do. If so please see 1 Cor. 10:12. This objection has been cleared in a number of Reformation books, of which I will cite only two. Interestingly, Brown went on to answer the very objection you have raised against us, in the section of his book (Apologetical Relation) just below the quote Greg Price sent, to which you here refer (above). Perhaps you haven't read Brown for yourself. He states, in answer to your question regarding Moses' seat:

"It will be objected, 1. That Christ commandeth to hear the scribes and the Pharisees who did sit in Moses' chair, Matt. xxiii. And those of whom now the question is are not worse than the scribes and Pharisees were; and therefore it cannot be lawful to refuse obedience unto this act. Ans. For solution of this objection, which seemeth to be the main one, these things would be considered: 1. That those scribes and Pharisees were as naughty men as then lived upon the face of the earth, and were still enemies unto Christ, and were false teachers; their doctrine was leavened with sour and dangerous tenets, among which this was a chief, That Christ was not the Messias; and upon this account Christ desireth his disciples to 'beware of the leaven of the Pharisees,' Matt. xvi. 6. 2. They were men that had no lawful call unto that place which they did assume to themselves, which appeareth from these particulars: (1.) Christ calleth them thieves, and robbers, and strangers, John x. 1, 5, 8, and that not merely because of their false doctrine, nor yet merely because of their carnal way of entry, as hirelings seeking gain, but also because of their usurping the place and office, and entering thereinto without a call from God; for the ground and reason why Christ calleth and proveth them to be thieves and robbers is, because they entered not by the door, but climbed up some other way, and the porter did not open unto them (ver. 3), and they came before him; that is, without his warrant and commission: they took not the right way of entry, they came not in at the right door, and with God's approbation. (2.) Matt. xv. 13, Christ calleth them plants which his 'heavenly Father hath not planted,' and there he is speaking of themselves (and not of their doctrine only), who were offended at Christ's doctrine, and it was them (and not their doctrine alone) that

Christ would have his disciples to let alone: 'Let them alone (says he), for they be blind leaders of the blind;' and this will suit the scope very well; for his disciples had laid some weight on this, that they were men in office, and therefore the stumbling and offending of them seemed to be some great business. But Christ replieth, that albeit they had been planted, or had planted themselves, in that office and charge, yet they were such plants as his heavenly Father had never planted, and therefore they were the less to be regarded. Gualther on the place saith, 'That it is clear, out of history, that God did never institute the order of the scribes which then was, far less the Pharisees and Sadducees; but they had their rise from that Greek or heathenish school, which Jason, whom Seleucus made high priest, did institute in Jerusalem, contrary to the law; and that the Pharisees did spring from the Stoics, and the Sadducees from the Epicures?' and citeth in the margin, 1 Mach. 1, and 2 Mach. 4. So, *ibid.*, he giveth the sense of that word, 'let them alone,' *discedite ab iis*, -go away from them. (3.) The place which they had assumed did properly and of right belong unto the priests and Levites, as Pareus hinteth on the place; yet these, because of their learning and pride, thinking themselves only worthy to be in office, took upon them that place, without any further call; which is the more likely, considering, (4.) That those times were times of confusion and disorder, so that (as Grotius observeth) there was no care had about this business, but every man who pleased was free to take upon him to instruct and teach the people; and this is confirmed by that passage, Acts xiii. 15, 'And after the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on.' Consider, 3. That though the words (ver. 2), be rendered, 'They sit in Moses' seat,' they may be as well rendered, 'They have set themselves down in Moses' seat.' Pareus, on the place, doth fully clear this, where he saith, 'In my judgment *ekathisan* is better rendered with the ancient Latin edition, *sederunt*, -- they did sit, than as now commonly, *sedent*, -- they do sit; for that phrase of sitting in Moses' seat signifieth the office of teaching publicly the doctrine and law of Moses. The verb in the aorist taketh not from them, but giveth unto them the present ordinary office of teaching; but, withal, it importeth that this sect had, by hook and crook, usurped this office and place which, at the first, was given by God unto the priests and Levites. They have sitten; that is, they have set themselves down in that seat of Moses which they now possess; for the verb *kathizo* doth signify not only neutrally to sit, but also actively to cause to sit, to place in a seat. Thus he. And Scapula indeed rendereth the verb actively, 'to cause or command to sit,' and citeth authors for it: so doth Pasor say, that properly it signifieth to 'place in a seat,' or 'to cause one sit.' 4. There is no word of a command here given to his disciples (to whom, with the multitude, he is speaking) to attend the ministry of the scribes and Pharisees; for if he had commanded them to do so, it is like the disciples would have done so in obedience to Christ's command; but the scripture speaketh nothing of this. And then they should have left Christ and followed the Pharisees, which is not very probable; and Christ himself would have taught them to do so by his own example, for he came to fulfil all righteousness; but there is no word of this either. 5. By the contrary, Christ is so far from commanding his

disciples and others to follow their ministry, that he dissuadeth them therefrom, not only, elsewhere, calling them 'blind leaders of the blind,' and such as should be let alone, and fled from as imposters, (Matt. xv. 13, 14), and saying, (John x. 4, 5), that the sheep know the voice of a lawful shepherd, but not the voice of a stranger; yea, they will not follow a stranger, but will flee from him: and this is meant of the Pharisees, as any may see who will look back to the end of the 9th chapter; but also in this same chapter throughout, showing at great length how naughty and perverse men they were, denouncing many a heavy woe and curse upon them and at length he calleth them a 'generation of vipers,' and serpents who could not escape the damnation of hell, (ver. 33); all which is but small encouragement to his disciples and hearers to follow them, or attend their ministry. And it is observable how fitly many of the particulars for which here Christ denounceth a woe unto these Pharisees do agree unto the persons concerning the hearing of whom the question is: As, (1.) 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.' (2.) They are at great pains to bring poor simple people over to their opinion, and make them proselytes, and, when they are made such, they make them the children of hell with themselves. (3.) As the scribes and Pharisees taught people shifts to evade the bonds of oaths, telling them that it was nothing to swear by the altar, or by the temple, so do these excel in that art of teaching perjury, and loosing the knots of covenants and oaths, as is too well known. (4.) They are much taken up with punctilios of formalities, and in causing people to attend all their nods and desires; but as for the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith, they cast these behind their back. (5.) They declare themselves the children of them who killed the prophets, and are fast filling up the measure of their fathers. But, indeed, (6.) They are behind the Pharisees in cleansing the outside of the cup and platter, and in appearing like whited tombs; for they have no show of piety, and therefore are so much the more to be shunned, and may certainly, unless they repent, expect all the woes that here are denounced upon the scribes and Pharisees. 6. It would be considered, for further confirmation of the last particular, that the main thing which Christ is pressing upon his hearers here is, that they would beware to follow the practices of these Pharisees, for all that high place which they took upon themselves in the church; and, on the by, as it were, he speaketh anent [concerning -- RB] their receiving of their true doctrine, by way of concession, or of their doing and observing whatsoever they delivered, as sitting in Moses' seat, whereof they were presently in possession, by their usurpation, and while there were no other ordinarily occupying that seat at that time. So that, these things being considered, it will appear that this place maketh no way for the attending the ministry of such men, there being no command here to hear the Pharisees at all, let be to hear them always and constantly" (_An Apologetical Relation_, [1660, 1845] reprinted 1995 as a rare bound photocopy by Still Waters Revival Books, pp. 148- 150).

A little additional testimony should suffice, as a word to the wise:

"All, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do' (Mat. xxiii. 3). 'Our Lord's words bear no command to the people to hear them at all, but only not to reject sound doctrine because it came from them: surely he would not bid them hear such as he calls plants that his Father had never planted; whom he bids let alone, and who were thieves and robbers, whom his sheep should not hear' (Shields, *Hind Let Loose*, p. 292). Since these Pharisees rejected the gospel scheme, and taught for doctrines the commandments of men, and the observance of circumcision; yea, to keep the law of Moses; and the apostles were enjoined to teach the observance of all things that were commanded them, it is not reasonable to suppose that they would be required to attend the place of instruction so entirely opposite: nevertheless the words, without affecting the case in hand, require that those who did there regularly attend, should carefully observe and practise whatever good was there taught; as much good may attend very unwarrantable administrations. These very persons, notwithstanding, were under strict command to come out from among them, and be separate: and not to hear the instruction which causeth to err" (see note AA, cited below) (James Douglas, *Strictures on Occasional Hearing*, [1820] reprinted 1996 as a rare bound photocopy by Still Waters Revival Books, pp. 83-84).

Note AA, from *Strictures on Occasional Hearing* (p. 84), referred to by Douglas reads,

"Say some on the words: "The Pharisees and Sadducees were declared enemies to our Lord, and some of them did commit the unpardonable sin; and as our Lord always bore a pointed testimony against them, we cannot understand the place of scripture, referred to in the objection, as in point. There was no place for the public worship of God but at Jerusalem, and therefore there could not be any separation from the church without giving up with the true God. We are not singular in understanding an attendance on the ministrations of the Scribes and Pharisees to be meant of civil subjection to the laws of Moses, and their sitting in Moses' seat means that they were as the executive of the laws of Moses, &c."- *Act of the Asso. Pres. of Pennsylv. &c.*, p. 16

"Saith one on the words, 'A mere inadvertancy in the translation, that misled many commentators, in opening up this passage, having taken that for a command which is truly a reproof, while they translate the words imperatively, which are as clearly in the indicative mode, and the whole connexion of words and phrases requireth it to be so understood. Thus the sense is plain; viz. The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat, (here is the snare and temptation, and hence ye are simply and sinfully imposed upon) so that, whatsoever they bid you observe, that (so great is your stupidity) ye observe and do, (right or wrong) but do not ye according to their works, for they say and do not: Though they imposed upon you, whose simplicity rendereth you an easy prey to them, yet they are not such fools, as at the expence of their own ease to put their necks under the grievous yokes which they wreath for others, as verse 4.'" James' *Letter to Holmes*, p. 18.

I think that it is now clear that the Lord had something quite different in mind, when He spoke of Moses' seat, than what our modern, false ecumenists would take from His words.

The principles involved in this question are summarized by Marshal, "Mr. Walter Marshal *Gospel Mystery of Sanctification* printed 1692 from Page 310 to 314. says -- Follow no

Church any further, than you may follow it in the way of Christ, and keep Fellowship with it, only upon the Account of Christ, because it follows Christ (surely such as betray and bury the Cause and Truth of Christ, cannot be said to follow and keep the Way of Christ) and has Fellowship with Christ, I John 1:3, Zech 8:23. If a Church revolt from Christ, (as this present Church has done, in deserting the covenanted Reformation) we must not follow it, how ancient so ever it be, as the Israelitish Church was not to be followed, when it persecuted Christ and his Apostles (which so far confirms what is above said upon their Point) and many by adhering to that Church fell from Christ, Phil 3:6, Acts 6:13,14. and 21:28. We are indeed to hear the Church, but not every one that calls itself so, nor none any further than it speaks as a true Church, according to the Voice of the Shepherd, John 10:27. We must subject ourselves to Ministers of Christ, and Stewards of his Mysteries. I Cor 4:1. But must give up ourselves to Christ first absolutely, and to the Church according to the Will of Christ, 2 Cor 8:5. Our Fear (which is very much in Fashion with this Church) must not be taught by the Precepts of Men, Matth 15:9. The Doctrines of any Men are to be tried by Scripture, whatever Authority they pretend to, Acts 17:11. An unlimited Following Church-Guides, brought the Church into Babylon, and into all Manner of spiritual Whoredoms and Abominations; you are not baptised into the Name of the Church, but into the Name of Christ, I Cor 1:13---Keep Communion with a Church for the Sake of Communion with Christ, I John 1:3, Zech 8:23. Therefore you must keep Communion in Christ's pure Ways only, and in them seek Christ by Faith, &c. --- Chuse therefore Fellowship with the most spiritual Churches, Judge of Churches and Men, according to the Rule of the New Creature, 2 Cor. 5:16,17. and try them, Rev. 2:2 and 3:9. otherwise a Church may corrupt you --- I only add --- that Church- Fellowship, without practicing the Ways of Christ (which this Church cannot be said to do, even many of themselves, and Assembly-Acts being Judges) is but a Conspiracy to take his Name in vain, and a counterfeit Church-fellowship of Hypocrites: It is Impudence to invite others to their Communion, and Tyranny to compel them. Every Christian is bound to seek a better Church-fellowship by Reformation; and those that do so, are the best Sons of Christ's Church, who inquire, is this the Way to enjoy Christ? A Church-way being appointed to enjoy Christ therein; especially leave not the Church in Persecution (as the Indulged and Tolerated, &c. did in the late Times) when you need its Help most, and are then most tried whether you will cleave to it, this is a Sign of Apostasy, Heb. 10:25,26. Matth. 24:9,10, ---13. We should cleave to one another as one Flesh, even to Prisons and Death, or else we deny Christ and his Members, Matth. 25:43." (from Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting, [1731] SWRB reprint 1996, pp. 212-213).

Furthermore, the following testimony (which refutes your wresting of the Scriptures above), written by the session of the church I attend (in their Brief Defense of Dissociation in the Present Circumstances [1996], FREE on the web at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/BriefDef.htm>), is apropos:

"2. We do testify with our covenanted and presbyterian forefathers that all churches and assemblies which do not subscribe the moral substance of the covenants have departed from the biblical light attained to by the Second Reformation and are constitutionally false (especially is this true of churches that

profess to be presbyterian and which know of the covenants, but yet have refused to own them in their constitutions).

4. We do testify with our covenanted and presbyterian forefathers that it is not schismatic to dissociate from a constitutionally false church in order to be faithful to a constitutionally true church. It is rather schismatic, sectarian, and unpresbyterian to refuse to subscribe the covenants of the Second Reformation. With Mr. Rutherford we do take our stand:

'When the greatest part of a Church maketh defection from the Truth, the lesser part remaining sound, *the greatest part is the Church of Separatists* (Samuel Rutherford, *Due Right Of Presbyteries*, p. 255, emphases added).'

"7. We do testify with our covenanted and presbyterian forefathers that it is our duty to honor the church of Jesus Christ as our mother who bore us (Ex. 20:12; Gal. 4:26). However, Jesus asked, "Who is my mother? For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is . . . my mother" (Mk. 3:33,35). The church of Jesus Christ as represented by the Church of Scotland and all churches adhering unto her covenanted and presbyterian principles since then are our mother. To presently own the _____ Church as a true constitutional expression of our mother is to disown in the same breath The Church of Scotland at the time of the Second Reformation as a true constitutional expression of our mother. When the constitutions of two churches disagree (one church requiring as a term of communion the sincere owning of the covenants while the other church refusing as a term of communion the sincere owning of the covenants), both cannot be true expressions of our mother. Thus, we are conscientiously compelled to own The Church of Scotland at the time of the Second Reformation as a true expression of our mother, and to disown The _____ Church as being such."

In sum: Christ commands us to *flee* from unlawful teachers, who are working for the destruction of his church (in perpetuating backsliding from reformation attainments), not to *countenance* them, as you foolishly assert here and elsewhere (e.g. your response to Kevin Reed regarding separation, which stated something to this effect: "When modern evangelicalism holds her Trent, then we will separate. We are reformed evangelicals."). That such *fleeing* is a divine command is evident from Prov. 19:27; 2 Cor. 6:17; John 10:5, etc. Indeed, this principle is taught by the light of nature itself, for if we are to preserve our lives from danger, how much more our souls?

Additionally, for those who try to soothe their conscience by claiming that they protest against given errors, but remain joined unto the apostate bodies, we enter the following rebuke,

"Some say, People may thereby have their Consciences exonerated (exonerated -- RB), &c.. Well, be it so, I ask, What better was Pilate's Conscience, that he gave in a Protestation against the Crucifixion of our Lord (which is indeed recorded by the Holy Ghost, not to the Honour of the Protester) seeing he concurred in the Action, and thereby consented to the Deed done? And so in the present Case, What better would Peoples Consciences be,

to give in a Protestation against this Church, for crucifying the precious Truths of Christ, and yet Pilate-like join with her? Or, what better would they be to protest against Arianism, Socinianism, Arminianism, Erastianism, and Legalism, &c. and yet join with a Church sadly leavened with such Errors (a few excepted) and which harbours and tolerates the Promoters thereof, and will not put away the accursed Thing from among them? The plain Sense of this Kind of Protesting and Joining, seems to be in short this, as if one should say to another, I see by the Word, you are pursuing a Course really evil, and truly dishonourable to Christ, inconsistent with his holy Word and Ordinances of House, and offensive to his People; and therefore, I protest against that Practice and Way of yours, for the Exoneration of my Conscience, &c. nevertheless, I will still attend and countenance you in that sinful Course, altho' ye should not receive and record my Protestation. Is this a sufficient Salvo to a Man's Conscience; or, will it free him when he comes before the Bar of God?" (Andrew Clarkson, *Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting*, [1731] SWRB reprint 1996, pp. 195-196).

But, as these questions just adumbrate the resolution of the controversy concerning your public sin against me in *Credenda/Agenda*, I will leave off any further answer at this time. These questions (which are all very important) do not comprise the *first* issue (in regard to my charges of slander against you) that needs to be resolved between us -- as I have pointed out above. For now, let us try to resolve the issue of whether or not you lied about me in your magazine.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>We do not differ with you about what many modern clowns are doing up there
>on "Moses' seat." But we reject utterly your anabaptistic and
>perfectionistic way of responding to them. When God removes the clowns from
>their teaching office, He does in the massive upheavals like the destruction
>of Jerusalem, or the continent-wide, century-long turmoil of the
>Reformation, culminating in the apostasy of Trent. It does *not* happen when
>one tiny splinter group separates from another tiny splinter group. This is
>not Reformation; it is the separatism of fundamentalist baptists.

REG BARROW WRITES:

"The separation of the fundamental baptists"? Doug, are you trying to lose all credibility? Your carefree name-calling is annoying, inaccurate, and consistent with the slander you allowed to be printed about me in *Credenda/Agenda*. "Reformation in the church has ever been effected by the protestation and separation of a virtuous minority" (*Act, Declaration and Testimony for the Whole of Our Covenanted Reformation*, p. 165). Tell me, Was the Apostolic church in ecclesiastical fellowship (and sharing the same courts, ordinances, discipline and worship) with the apostate church of the Jews before the destruction of Jerusalem? Have you ever noticed what Paul did relative to this question? "But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and *separated the disciples**..." (Acts 19:9). Calvin, on Paul "separating the disciples," writes, "Therefore, Paul did separate the disciples, lest the goats should with their stink infect the flock of sheep; secondly, that the pure worshippers

of God might make profession freely." This is exactly what we, the Protestant Covenanted remnant of "fundamental baptists," (as you call us -- you are going to get the Baptists really mad with that one) contend for -- just like Paul (and Calvin).

Furthermore, we do not deny that sometimes "massive upheavals" do occur for the good; we merely contend that Scripture gives ample warrant for faithful sheep to remove themselves from the corporate stink of the modern goat denominations, when apostasy has compromised the visible church at a constitutional level.

Additionally, your deference to majorities, as opposed to truth, puts you at odds with a certain exemplary classical Protestant:

"It is an offense to a great many people that they see almost the whole world opposed to us. And indeed the patrons of a bad cause do not neglect their own advantage, using a stratagem like this so as not to upset the ignorant and weak, that it is extremely absurd that almost the whole Christian world is disregarded, so that the faith is to be possessed by a few men. But, in particular, to destroy us they defend themselves with the sacred title of "the Church" as if with a mallet. But I wish to know how those who are alienated from the Gospel by the smallness of our numbers are to preserve their faith against the Turks.

As far as we are concerned, if one man, Noah, condemned all the men of his generation by his faith, there is no reason why a great crowd of unbelievers should move us from our position. At the same time, I say that it is not only hardly a probable, but indeed an unjust and disgraceful, cause of a scandal when regard for men outweighs the Word of God. . . . If anyone perhaps objects that we are not excused by the example of Noah, if we separate ourselves from that crowd which keeps the name of "the Church," Isaiah, when he gave orders to abandon the conspiracy of men and follow God alone, was referring not to strangers but to those who were at that time glorying exceedingly in the name of the people of God (Isa. 8:12). And when Peter compares the Church to the ark, because in a perishing world a small company of men is saved as if through a flood, he is giving warning enough that we must not be dependent on the multitude (I Pet. 3:20ff.). Why then does it please wretched men to grasp at the chance of staggering and tottering in the changeable breezes of the world when God makes us firm on the eternal foundation of his Word? Why do they prefer to be tossed about in the midst of the storms of opinions rather than lie quietly in the safe harbor of certain truth, where God invites us?" (John Calvin as translated by John W. Fraser, *Concerning Scandals*, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, MI, [1550] 1978, pp. 109-110).

Also, didn't the Reformers pull out of Rome long before Trent? I am not sure why you would bring this up or how such a point helps your case. Surely you don't think that individual Christians are absolved of responsibility to remove themselves from and testify against apostasy until "God removes the clowns from their teaching office"? If your ecumenical rhetoric has dulled your senses to the point of such stupidity, then you should know that you are taking a page out of the antinomian handbook, as well as denying the following, clear biblical testimony:

"Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us" (2 Thes. 3:6).

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them" (Rom. 16:17).

"Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you" (2Cor. 6:17).

Furthermore, do you have no regard (or a low regard), for the growth in sanctification of the church and the greater responsibility that this growth brings upon those who live in its greater light? Do you really think that the church that will cover the earth during the millennial glory will be as confused, divided and impotent as the contemporary "churches" that profess Christ? With this in mind it is easy to see how our case differs (in many ways) from that of the early church -- and that of the church of the Reformation also (cf. Fraser's The Lawfulness and Duty of Separation From Corrupt Ministers and Churches Vindicated and Explained, [1744] SWRB reprint 1996, Chap. 4, sect. 5) . You will put up with many things in your children when they are 2 or 3 years old which you would never tolerate when they are 10 or 15 years old. Taking into account those responsibilities that come with biblical attainments is imperative if one is to speak with any clearness on the subject of the Lord's covenanted Zion. John Brown of Wamphray (Samuel Rutherford's student, previously cited) makes this clear when he writes,

"(F)or there is a vast difference to be put betwixt a time wherein the church is advancing in a course of reformation, and a time wherein she is declining and sliding back from that degree of reformation unto which she had already attained. In a time wherein the church is but coming out of darkness, and the day is but beginning to break up, many things may then be comported with and tolerated which may not be submitted unto after the church hath got all these abuses reformed. Every believer and every church is bound to stand fast in that which they have attained unto, and not to cede in a hoof: so that Christians living in a time wherein the church is but beginning to wrestle up from under the heap of error and corruption, may be allowed to do many things which must not be done when the noontide of the day is come. In the time of the reformation begun by Luther and others, many things might have been comported within the church (reformation being a gradual motion that hath but small beginnings and risings) which now, since the reformation hath been carried on, through the blessing of God, to that degree it was advanced to, cannot be allowed. When God hath wonderfully, by his mighty power and outstretched arm, brought a church to a great length in reformation, it will be the duty of that church, and of the members thereof, to adhere to that degree unto which they have attained with all perseverance. It will be lawful for the church which is but coming up the hill to stand at such a step until they gain another, when yet it will not be lawful for the same church to go backward after they have advanced. The truth once bought should never be sold. So then the consequence is null. Their forefathers stumbled not nor did scruple at the doing of such or such things; therefore those in this generation who have advanced, through the blessing of God, unto a farther degree of reformation, should not scruple either. It is a poor consequence to say,

The posterity may return backwards because their forefathers could not advance further. Much more may be seen when the sun is up than in the twilight: therefore the scrupling of honest people now doth no way condemn their forefathers; but, on the contrary, the steadfastness of their forefathers, in standing to the degree to which they had reached, and their endeavouring to advance, will condemn this generation for backsliding. In their days those abuses and corruption were not remedied,-- the church was not then freed of that yoke of oppression,- - and, further, their after consent unto such ministers made up this defect; but those in this generation are not at liberty to give or grant their after consent, because they are engaged to stand to the work of reformation, and to own it in all its parts" (_An Apologetical Relation_ [1665, 1845], SWRB reprint 1995, pp. 145-146).

Again, your lack of knowledge regarding Scripture, history, and Reformation doctrine (such as the doctrine of attainments) is surprising. You may find it helpful, in seeking to master some of the fine points of these classic Reformation distinctives, to pursue the appendix in David Steele's _Notes on the Apocalypse_ (1870, forthcoming). In the section "Pastor Steele's Printed Communications With the Editor of _The Covenanter_" (pp. 395-423) Steele and James Willson debate these very issues in great detail.

But the present question between us continues: Did you lie about me in what you printed in your magazine?

We will gladly continue to address your other questions and comments at the appropriate time, but let us first deal with the question at hand.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>You remind me that satire directed at Frame (without going to him first)
>would have fine, but that it was not fine directed against you. You point
>out (rightly) that what Christ could do to the Pharisees the Pharisees could
>not lawfully do to Christ. In other words, whether or not the ninth
>commandment has been broken *depends upon who is right and who is wrong in
>the dispute.* So could we talk about *that* before the rush to judgment? I
>would love to discuss with you whether or not there was an offence before we
>separate over the purported need to remove it. The fact that someone is
>offended is not biblical grounds for assuming that offence, biblically
>defined, was given.

REG BARROW WRITES:

And that is what I have been saying throughout this letter. Stick to the issue of whether what you publicly printed was true or not. Do you still maintain that I had not read Frame's book, as you printed? I am not asking you whether you maintain that I had read *enough* of Frame's book, because that is not what you printed. Whether I had read enough of Frame's book (in your opinion) is another question completely and has nothing to do with the lies that you printed about me. You said of me "He hasn't read John Frame's new book...", you did not say "he has not read *enough* of Frame's book... to make such a charge." Why is this so hard for you to see? Is your heart so hard? You lied (or at least allowed the lie to be published); why do you refuse to repent? Is it so hard for you to

"(d)emonstrate true integrity by confessing a lack of discretion in promoting" the Telepathy slander "and by repudiating the" Telepathy slander "publicly"? (adapted from Hagopian and Wilson, *Beyond Promises: A Biblical Challenge to Promise Keepers*, Canon Press, 1996, p. 263).

I call you to stand to what you have written, in *Beyond Promises* (p. 266), regarding my case, when you said, "If anything we have written here is shown to be in error, we will not pretend that it did not happen. We will publicly retract the error and apologize for having made it."

If you do not repent of and publicly retract the Telepathy slander, but harden yourself in your position, "and continue to defend the indefensible, then we, along with all Christians concerned for the authority of Scripture and the gospel of Christ would have no choice but to move from being concerned, to opposing" you and your work "outright" (adapted from Hagopian and Wilson, *Beyond Promises: A Biblical Challenge to Promise Keepers*, Canon Press 1996, p. 267).

Furthermore, will you tell me the name of the individual who wrote the Telepathy section in the "Cave of Adullam" which started all this controversy?

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>You say, "We are not for an immediate revolution of thought and change in
>the church. However, we must not tolerate the false teaching that is
>promoted in churches, seminaries etc. by those professing to be ministers of
>the gospel." Put this another way. "We are not for an immediate revolution
>of thought and change in the church, as long as it happens right away. If it
>does not, we're leaving!"

REG BARROW WRITES:

Doug, who are you joined to ecclesiastically? Whose courts do you recognize? Do you recognize our courts? What are your terms of communion? What confession and covenants are you constituted under in ecclesiastical union with these other groups? It seems to me that you are just as revolutionary as anybody -- practically speaking. Do you think that your ecumenical rhetoric absolves you of your practical separatism? At least our walk matches our talk. Maybe I should call you the Anabaptist for not joining with the many other so-called "Reformation" denominations which are available, and which you seem to believe are so constituted as to have in them lawful courts of Christ. Why have you not submitted yourself to these courts and their ministers if they are indeed lawful? Why have you not joined with any of these denominations? The way you talk I would think that this would be a duty which you would not have ignored for so long (Matt. 7:5).

As you note above, the question of truth is paramount -- we are forbidden by Scripture to remain in ecclesiastical fellowship with those who publicly deny the corporate testimony of the church as it has been attained at any given point in history (Eccl. 3:15). As the Reformers said, "to avoid schism we must separate." We remain ecclesiastically separated from you (and consider you to be a schismatic group, i.e. you are alienated, as are many

others, from the lawfully constituted visible church as she has shown herself to remain faithful to Christ historically), and others who deny the Reformation (at various points), for many reasons. Two of these reasons, comprehending very important biblical issues (i.e. worship and government), are noted by Shields in his *Hind Let Loose* when he writes, "Those who innovate the worship and government, owned and established in a true church (i.e. the Church of Scotland at the height of the second reformation--RB), are schismatics... (p. 310). I should have the "Schism" section from Clarkson's' *Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting From the Revolution-Church...* up on our web page soon (at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/Schism.htm>). I would strongly suggest that you read this before commenting much further on any of these issues regarding separation and schism. What you have said to us so far is a complete denial of the Reformation doctrine on this point and the section on "schism" in *Plain Reasons* cites many quotes (from major Reformers) which confirm this. After reading this splendid work you might want to deny the classical Protestant position on schism (as you do with worship), but I hope, rather, that you will be humbled by the clarity of God's Word on this point, as we were, and that you will repent and embrace the truth.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>In common with the anabaptistic view of the
>church, you think that crossing the street removes you from all the
>covenantal error and sin at the place you just left. *It does not.* You
>believe a change in latitude and longitude removes covenantal connections.
>But on the fundamental level, you are as covenantally connected to the PCA
>as anyone can be. So are we, ecclesiastical boundaries notwithstanding.

REG BARROW WRITES:

This is nonsense. I am testifying against the PCA as the malignant remnant of the spawn of the spawn of the Revolution settlement (1689) defection (constitutionally and theologically) and as a limb of ecclesiastical Antichrist (again, considered constitutionally; cf. Calvin's *Institutes*, 4.2.12). They never have been any part (constitutionally) of the visible church and they have from their very inception denied the Reformed view of the visible church concerning doctrine, worship, government and discipline. They have officially opposed many Reformation attainments (usually in ignorance, I hope), tolerated many forms of public idolatry and the promoters thereof (e.g. John Frame), and have never given any indication that they have any idea of the covenant obligations that all true Presbyterians come under (much less attempting to fulfill those obligations).

As proof of some of my most recent testimony against this apostate false church (i.e. as to constitution), I cite the following item, which I composed during a discussion I was having on a PCA email discussion group:

The PCA is apostate (constitutionally) and has no ministerial authority (or courts) which Christ recognizes, as is proved in: *Why the PCA is Not a Duly Constituted Church and Why Faithful Christians Should Separate from this Corrupted "Communion"* by Larry Birger (Two letters from Larry Birger, Jr. to the session

of his former congregation in the PCA, with an historical introduction. Birger states, "This work is emitted by way of testimony against the defections from the reformation of the true religion granted by God in ages past, in hopes of playing some small part in the edification of God's people currently languishing under such defected and defecting denominations." It spotlights the differences between classic Presbyterian thought [paleopresbyterianism] and what today is but a pale imitation [neopresbyterianism] of the Reformation attainments that have been won [at the cost of much suffering and many lives] in the past. This is a good practical introduction to ecclesiology, testimony-bearing, and second Reformation thought. FREE at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/PCAbad.htm>

A Testimony Against the Prominent Errors of Our Times Adullam Presbyterian Church (Kevin Reed and others produced this testimony in June [1990]. It is directed at many specific areas of corruption found in the PCA.) FREE at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/TestProm.htm>

Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting from the Revolution Church of Scotland. Also, Their Principles Concerning Civil Government, and the Difference Betwixt the Reformation and Revolution Principles (1731) by Andrew Clarkson (An exceedingly rare and important book now back in print after 265 years! The _Contending Witness_ magazine [May, 1841] described _Plain Reasons_ "as the single best volume penned defending the principles of the second Reformation." It sets forth "the grounds why Presbyterian Dissenters refused to hold communion with the revolution church and state," [Reformed Presbytery, _Act Declaration and Testimony for the Whole of Our Covenanted Reformation_, p. 154n]. The biblical principles contained in this book still apply today and thus _Plain Reasons_ remains one of the best books explaining why [and when] an individual [church or citizen] should separate himself [or itself, as a corporate moral person] from those [in church or state] who do not hold fast to all the attainments of our *covenanted Reformation forefathers*. In this regard the session of the Puritan Reformed Church of Edmonton calls this the one book that best explains why faithful Covenanted Presbyterians must, for conscience sake, remain ecclesiastically separate from all Presbyterian denominations that have backslidden from second Reformation attainments. (This being the classic corporate Calvinistic application of such commands as "Nevertheless, whereto we have already *attained*, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing" [Phil. 3:16, emphasis added]. It is also the acknowledgement that the Lord has clearly stated in his Word that he "requireth that which is past" [Eccl. 3:15].) Furthermore, the session of the PRC of Edmonton has noted that this book "clearly spells out the reasons why to unite with the Revolution Church (1689) or any of its descendants [The Free Church of Scotland, The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and American Presbyterian Churches. etc] is to undermine and subvert the work of the Second Reformation. The argumentation is cogent [with an abundant supply of documentation]. *The section [in the book] on schism is a "classic of classics" and clearly demonstrates how very few in our day [even in the Reformed camp] understand the Reformation doctrine regarding schism, separation and the visible church.* In this file you will

find the complete table of contents, the preface and the first reason for dissent. Lord willing, other sections will follow in time. The table of contents is very valuable as it lays out in summary [and with a fair amount of detail] the whole scope of the book. It can serve as a kind of summary of second Reformation thought concerning the church, state, separation, schism, worship, civil dissent, church planting, opposition to idolatry and tyranny, and much more!) FREE at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/PlainTOC.htm>

(The first and third books cited above are also available from Still Waters Revival Books in hard copy format, and the second title is available from Presbyterian Heritage Publications [at: P.O. Box 180922, Dallas, TX, USA, 75218] for those that do not have a connection to the world wide web.)

The Reformed Presbytery has also (long ago) furnished us with a testimony which applies to the PCA and those who do not testify against this harlot daughter's many corruptions (including "liturgical dance," drama, crosses, man-made hymns, instrumental music, etc. in public worship; "ministers" who deny the Sabbath, deny six day creationism, and approve of women preachers, etc. -- and this list could extend to pages -- all the fruit of open communion, the denial of covenanted standards and the lack of Scriptural discipline, doctrine and government in this corrupt and corrupting body),

"(W)e testify against all who, under pretext of superior charity or liberality, fiercely clamor for union of churches by a sacrifice of divine truth, and in violation of order; or, who advocate intercommunion among bodies organically separate; or who furnish testimonials of Christian character to officers or members, who avow their intention to break covenant; thus inculcating hypocrisy, by precept and example, and reducing the awful sin of perjury to system. By such sinful and debasing practices; by the haughty bearing of idle shepherds of mercenary spirit -- "greedy dogs which can never have enough" -- unauthorized revivalists -- who "understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm;" (they--RB) are thus prepared to become the vassals of anti-christ..." (_Act, Declaration and Testimony for the Whole of Our Covenanted Reformation_, [1876 edition] SWRB reprint 1995, p. 175)

But to continue, even the Resolutioners (from whom Samuel Rutherford, James Guthrie and the other seventeenth century Protesters separated) were so far superior to the PCA that there is no comparison. In fact, at the beginning of this controversy, the Protesters and Resolutioners *constitutionally agreed on every point* except who would be allowed into the Scottish army, the hasty admittance of Charles II to the Covenants and the general toleration of malignants and backsliding. Because of these differences the Protesting Covenanters would not recognize the Resolutioner body as a duly constituted segment of the visible church (constitutionally) or serve the members of this diseased body the Lord's supper. Some prominent Protesters even questioned the salvation of some of the arch-malignants in their prayers. We, with Rutherford, Guthrie and the other Protesting witnesses, take the same stance in our day with regard to the PCA (and other constitutionally corrupted bodies); while noting that the level of corruption in our day is much more pronounced and therefore it is much easier for us to determine a faithful course according to Scripture. Notwithstanding, the history of this period and the biblical

justification for separation used by our classical Presbyterian forefathers in the faith remains eminently instructive. The following rather lengthy quote (recounting some of this history) may help you see how these men dealt with a situation that was far less clear than the rampant and open apostasy that we see on all fronts today (especially in so-called "Presbyterian" denominations). The Session of the Puritan reformed Church of Edmonton has written (in their Brief Defense of Dissociation in the Present Circumstances [1996]; this entire article is FREE on the web at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/BriefDef.htm>),

"Though false allegations of schism, separatism, and independency will likely attend our decision to dissociate from The _____ Church, the session of Puritan Reformed Church offers this brief defence in support of its action.

Though it is not necessary that a truly constituted church be absolutely pure as to the doctrine taught or embraced, as to the ordinances administered, or the public worship performed, it is, however, necessary that its constitution be founded upon and agreeable to the Word of God and that its constitution reflect the light attained to by the purest of Reformed Churches (for all reformation must be biblical reformation if it is reformation at all, otherwise it is not a reformation but a deformation, cf. Phil. 3:16). Wherefore, to adopt a constitution that corrupts the light of Scripture or the light of reformation is to adopt a false constitution. A false constitution renders a church and its courts unconstitutional. When the Confession of Faith (25:4) speaks of degrees of purity among particular churches within the "catholick church", we believe it designates degrees of purity within truly constituted churches. For example, though the church of Corinth was plagued with division, immorality, and false doctrine promoted by some within the church (and therefore manifested a lesser degree of purity than other truly constituted churches, cf. the church of Smyrna in Rev. 2:8-11), it was, nevertheless, a truly constituted church for it was constituted by apostolic authority (with apostolic doctrine, apostolic worship, apostolic government, and apostolic discipline). Thus, for a church to constitutionally adhere to Arminianism, Dispensationalism, or Charismatic experientialism (false doctrine), singing uninspired hymns or using instrumental music in public praise (false worship), Episcopacy or Independency (false government), or unrestricted communion (false discipline) is to qualify as a constitutionally false church. That is not to say that there are no believers in churches that are not truly constituted (there may be many in some cases). Nor is it to imply that ministers or elders within those churches do not courageously stand for many truths taught in Scripture. It is simply to say that authority to rule in the church must come from Christ, and if a church does not have a constitution of which He approves (as King of His church), then there is no lawful authority to rule or to administer the ordinances on His behalf. Authority to administer the divine ordinances on behalf of Christ flows directly from the King and His constitution. Authority used within His church on any other grounds is an usurped authority. It is tyranny. For this reason, the magistracy and the church (during the Second Reformation) did not recognize the constitutional viability of any other church within the realm of Scotland than the Church of Scotland:

' . . . there is no other face of kirk, nor other face of religion, than was presently at that time, by the favour of God, established within this realm: "Which therefore is *ever styled God's true religion, Christ's true religion, the true and Christian religion, and a perfect religion' (The National Covenant of Scotland, emphases added).

To live in Scotland and yet to be outside the Church of Scotland was to be outside the visible church, for no other church was tolerated or recognized as a constitutionally true church. It was to be excommunicated from a truly constituted church and ministry. An essential term of communion within the Church of Scotland was The National Covenant (and subsequently The Solemn League and Covenant). Concerning the National Covenant as a term of communion note the following historical accounts.

'Copies of the Covenant were carried into every corner of the land to be subscribed, and were looked upon as *tests of faith in Christ*. . . . The Presbytery of Kirkcaldy resolved, 1st August 1639, that no '*wilful non- Covenanters should be admitted to the Sacrament*' (James King Hewison, *The Covenanters, A History of the Church in Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution*, Vol. I, p. 272, emphases added).

'At length, on 2nd August 1643, the epoch-making Assembly met in the east division of St. Giles' Church, Edinburgh, when Sir Thomas Hope had the unique distinction of sitting as Commissioner, and Henderson, for the third time, filled the Moderator's chair. They began business by enacting that the National Covenant of 1638 should be issued in a little quarto volume, with blank leaves, *to be subscribed in every synod, presbytery, and parish, and that non-subscribers of it should be censured*' (Hewison, *The Covenanters*, Vol. I, p. 377, emphases added).

Furthermore, those accounted as having defected from these covenants (the defectors were called "malignants") were censured by the Church of Scotland.

'On 12th July [1648], the Assembly met in Edinburgh, George Gillespie being Moderator, approved of the Argyll policy, and condemned the 'unlawful engagement' as sinful and censurable. The Church opposed the Engagement because it violated the Solemn League and Covenant, inasmuch as it proposed the reinstatement of an Episcopal monarch, the formation of a party of Covenanters in alliance with their opponents, and the delegation of power to a government who 'mind not religion.' The Assembly further declared the Engagers to be malignants, non- Covenanters, sectaries, and enemies to the one righteous cause. . . . *The Covenant was to be the sole test of patriotism and of religion*. Other bonds and the toleration of sects were to be avoided like the pest. *Favourers of any other policy were to be excommunicated if unrepentant. Ministers approving of the Engagement were to be deposed...*' (Hewison, *The Covenanters*, [1908] SWRB reprint 1996, Vol. I, p. 446, emphases added).

In fact, the issue of faithfulness to the covenants actually rent the Church of Scotland into two parties so that the Protesters declared the Assemblies of the Resolutioners (the covenant-breaking party that developed out of the Engagers) to be unconstitutional and pretended Assemblies. The covenants were obvious terms of communion, for Protesters and Resolutioners refused to meet in the same General Assemblies together. Protesters did not recognize the unlawful courts of the Resolutioner Assemblies and would not attend them when cited to appear. Protesters were deposed from the ministry by Resolutioner Assemblies when they refused to recognize their lawful authority to rule on behalf of Christ.

'It [the joint General Assembly of Protesters and Resolutioners--PRC] met in St. Andrews on 16th July. . . . Rutherford, and other twenty-one sympathisers, protested against the meeting as *unconstitutional*. . . . There [later at Dundee, where the General Assembly of Protesters, who had separated themselves from the Resolutioners, was now meeting--PRC], on 22nd July [1651--PRC], Rutherford's cogent Protest declining the Assembly* was read. Balcarres [a Resolutioner--PRC] in vain demanded that the twenty-two absent Protesters should be reported for civil punishment for their reflections on the King, Parliament, and Church. The Assembly [of Resolutioners--PRC] ordered Presbyteries to deal with them. It was ultimately agreed to cite [James--PRC] Guthrie, Patrick Gillespie, James Simson, James Naismith, and John Menzies. *They did not compear* [i.e. appear at the Resolutioner assembly--PRC]. The [Resolutioner--PRC] Assembly deposed Guthrie, Gillespie, and Simson, suspended Naismith, and referred Menzies to the Commission. After the meeting of the Assembly at St. Andrews, a work was published entitled *_A Vindication of the Freedom and Lawfulness of the late Assembly_* [by James Wood, a Resolutioner-- PRC], etc. This was answered by *_The Nullity of the Pretended Assembly at Saint Andrews and Dundee_*" [signed by 40 Protesters including Rutherford and Guthrie--PRC] (Hewison, *_The Covenanters_*, Vol. II, pp. 34,35, emphases added).

Separate Assemblies of Protesters and Resolutioners met in 1652 and in 1653 in Edinburgh. The Protesters declared the Assembly of the Resolutioners in 1652 to be "unlawful, unfrie, and unjust" (Hewison, *_The Covenanters_*, Vol. II, p. 43). It is worthy to be noted that the issue between the Protesters and the Resolutioners did not deal at all with the propriety of ministers and members of the Church of Scotland swearing the covenants, but over the issue of faithfulness to the covenants. Both sides upheld the obligation of ministers and members to own the covenants. Furthermore, unfaithfulness to this term of communion (i.e. faithfully maintaining the covenants) on the part of the Resolutioners led the Protesters to separate from their brethren to avoid schism and in order to maintain a truly constituted church. They would not serve with the Resolutioners while they maintained different terms of communion, neither would they serve them the Lord's Supper (e.g. Rutherford refused to serve communion with Blair at St. Andrews; and on another occasion Rutherford and Moncrieff debarred Resolutioners from the table at Scoonie). Such actions can only be defended if the covenants were terms of communion. Were the covenants biblical terms of

communion? We testify that they were and still are biblical terms of communion. To affirm otherwise is in effect to charge the faithful covenanters (Protesters) of the Second Reformation with sin and to undermine their covenanted reformation and the biblical presbyterianism they taught and practiced.

Therefore, we must maintain a faithful testimony in defence of this covenanted reformation and presbyterianism as it was taught and practiced by faithful covenanters of the Second Reformation as being biblical and "which therefore is ever styled God's true religion, Christ's true religion, the true and Christian religion, and a perfect religion" (The National Covenant of Scotland, emphases added).

As shown, then, we are striving to bear faithful testimony against the PCA and other backsliding (constitutional) daughters of the harlot (Rev. 17:5); and by this we deny that the PCA is a *duly constituted* segment of the visible church. This is not to deny the visible church (in those that believe and their children) *at* the PCA (as Calvin did with Rome in his *Institutes* 4.2.12). In fact, I have no problem affirming a covenantal connection with those in the PCA at this level (i.e. in as far as we are covenantally bound to Christ, as individuals). It is only at the "organic ministerial" level that I deny that the PCA is a *duly constituted* segment of the visible church.

This very teaching is also proclaimed (along with an expression of true love to the brethren) in one of the covenanted Presbyterian church's judicial standards. In the Reformed Presbytery's *Auchensaugh Renovation of the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant...* (1712, 1880, SWRB reprint 1994) we read,

"Believing that *the Christian Church is one by her divine constitution*, and lamenting existing divisions among the children of God; recognizing the obligation upon us to love the brotherhood, we will endeavor to cultivate charity in **private intercourse** towards all who reflect the divine image; and help to elevate them to the platform of the *Covenanted Reformation* as our **only recognized bond of organic and ministerial church fellowship**. Nor will we, in reliance upon the promised and continued supplies of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, permit ourselves to be divided from this our *covenanted unity and uniformity* by the promises, threats, or solicitations of surrounding communities. Through divine grace we will endeavour, *by practical manifestation of the truth*, to commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God, as the most effectual means of healing Zion's breaches, that are great like the sea" (p. 139, emphases added).

This may seem hard to understand without the knowledge of the doctrine of "moral persons." Here is a short explanation from David Scott's *Distinctive Principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church* (1841, SWRB reprint 1996, pp. 61-63) :

"1. Ecclesiastical and national societies are moral persons. By a moral person I mean that each of these kinds of society has an understanding and a will of its own, by which it perceives, deliberates, determines and acts. An individual person, is one that has the power of understanding and willing; the name moral person is therefore applied to a society, having an understanding and a will common to the whole body, by which, though made up

of a vast number of individuals, it possesses the power of knowing, deliberating, determining, and acting. A moral person may enter into contracts and covenant obligations; and these are as valid when entered into, as the covenant obligations of individual persons. Being moral persons, churches and nations are capable of entering into covenant with God; and that it is their duty to do so, I have demonstrated in the preceding section. Such obligations, when constituted agreeably to the will of God, are necessarily perpetual; for it is not the individuals merely of which the society consists, but the society itself, as a moral person, that covenants. In the case of personal covenanting, no one will question that the covenant obligation extends throughout the whole life of the individual; the same principle prevails in relation to social covenanting: the obligation extends throughout the duration of the moral person. 2. The church is a permanently existing body. It has undergone, indeed, several changes in its external administration, but it is the same now that it was when first constituted. The church in the wilderness of Sinai is identical with the church in the days of Adam and Eve, and continues still the same moral person in the nineteenth century. The removal by death of individual members, does not destroy the identity of the moral person, which remains unaffected by the removal of a thousand generations. Covenant obligation entered into by the church, in any given period, continues of perpetual obligation throughout all succeeding generations, and that too, on the recognised principle that the church continues the same moral person."

You see Doug, without an understanding of this doctrine, all the Scripture which speaks of the church as one (visibly) and the faithful testimony we are commanded to proclaim against the false church (as it is visible constitutionally) will make little or no sense. This is why my earlier comments regarding the fifth commandment, as applied to the church (and the state) in regard to our responsibility at a corporate level, were so important. Notice below how the Westminster Larger Catechism succinctly highlights this very truth.

"Question 124: Who are meant by father and mother in the fifth commandment?

Answer: By father and mother, in the fifth commandment, are meant, not only natural parents, but all superiors in age and gifts; and *especially* such as, by *God's ordinance*, are over us in place of authority, whether in family, *church, or commonwealth* (emphases added)."

In light of these teachings it is easy to see why we maintain, with the Reformed Presbytery (citing Thomas Sproull throughout, below), that it is not we who are the schismatics, but those who willfully abandon and disregard their covenant obligations and Reformation attainments,

"By the National Covenant our fathers laid Popery prostrate. By the Solemn League and Covenant they were successful in resisting prelatial encroachments and civil tyranny. By it they were enabled to achieve the Second Reformation... They were setting up landmarks by which the location and limits of the city of God will be known at the dawn of the millennial day... How can they be said to go forth by the footsteps of the flock, who have declined from the attainments, renounced the covenants and contradicted the testimony of "the cloud of witnesses"... All the Schisms (separations) that disfigure the body mystical of Christ...are the legitimate consequences of the abandonment of reformation attainments --

the violation of covenant engagements.' This is sound doctrine and historical truth combined. Again our author puts the important question, 'Is it not unfaithfulness to reject the obligations of the covenants of former times?' Yes, we think so, when their objects are not yet reached; and moreover, that 'Confession of sin, and especially the sins of covenant breaking should always accompany the renewal of our obligations.' This is well said. Was it thought of at Pittsburgh, 1871? To good purpose he adds, 'In the renewal of covenants there should be no abridgment of former obligations.' (All these excellent sentiments seemed to have been totally forgotten or wholly disregarded when the time came for their practical use and appropriate application. Some said, 'We have all we want;' and we strongly suspect too many wanted none of the former obligations -- 'in this free country.') And can this be denied? Once more we quote, -- 'The opposition is not so much to covenanting, as it is to the covenants of our fathers, and to the permanence of their obligations.' Then the author says emphatically and somewhat prophetically, 'The church never will renew her covenants aright until she embraces in her obligations all the attainments sworn in the covenants, National and Solemn League. This was done in the renovation at Auchensaugh, in Scotland'" (_A Short Vindication of Our Covenanted Reformation_, [1879] SWRB reprint 1996, pp. 38-39).

Our principles, constitution and terms of ecclesiastical fellowship (which are in keeping with the attainments [2 John 8] won in both Reformations) have been published for the whole world to see. That you might not further misrepresent our standards (and thus oppose yourself) our terms of ecclesiastical communion follow:

The Session of Puritan Reformed Church

Motion Concerning Terms of Communion
Adopted March 22, 1996

Moved that the session of Puritan Reformed Church of Edmonton adopt as terms of communion (or communicant membership) the following six terms:

1. An acknowledgement of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, and the alone infallible rule of faith and practice.
2. That the whole doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, are agreeable unto, and founded upon the Scriptures.
3. That Presbyterian Church Government and manner of worship are alone of divine right and unalterable; and that the most perfect model of these as yet attained, is exhibited in the Form of Government and Directory for Worship, adopted by the Church of Scotland in the Second Reformation.
4. That public, social covenanting is an ordinance of God, obligatory on churches and nations under the New Testament; that the National Covenant and the Solemn League are an exemplification of this divine institution; and that these Deeds are of continued obligation upon the moral person; and in consistency with this, that the

Renovation of these Covenants at Auchensaugh, Scotland, 1712 was agreeable to the word of God.

5. An approbation of the faithful contendings of the martyrs of Jesus, especially in Scotland, against Paganism, Popery, Prelacy, Malignancy and Sectarianism; immoral civil governments; Erastian tolerations and persecutions which flow from them; and of the Judicial Testimony emitted by the Reformed Presbytery in North Britain, 1761 with supplements from the Reformed Presbyterian Church; as containing a noble example to be followed, in contending for all divine truth, and in testifying against all corruptions embodied in the constitutions of either churches or states.

6. Practically adorning the doctrine of God our Savior by walking in all His commandments and ordinances blamelessly.

(The six "Terms of Ministerial and Christian Communion in the Reformed Presbyterian Church" listed above, along with "Queries to be put to Candidates for Ordination," can be found on pages 216-217 in the _Act, Declaration and Testimony for the Whole of Our Covenanted Reformation_, [1876 edition] SWRB reprint 1995.)

Sadly, you seem blissfully unaware of any of the specific principles of the covenanted Reformation which I have outlined, our specific terms of communion, or how they apply to our situation today; and yet you are willing to oppose us (and therefore the old Covenanters) with the most severe epithets. Moreover, your simplistic equating of our views with those of the anabaptists only continues to testify of your ignorance; as anyone who has even the least familiarity with the Protesting Covenanters will recognize at once (and the others just have to check the history books -- as even some of our worst enemies, over the last 350 years, have been more intellectually honest than you have in representing our positions). Rutherford an anabaptist? -- wow, Doug, I find it hard to believe that you are that ill informed.

>You did not like my assertion that you all are perfectionistic. In your
>defense, you say that you have cited many "historic references in our
>discussion." The issue is not your representation of (some) of our reformed
>forefathers. The issue is your ignoring of the flow of covenantal history
>since that time.

No, the issue is **your** ignoring of the flow of covenantal history since that time: which has been decidedly downhill.

Tell me, how many nationally covenanted Presbyterian churches are there today? What General Assembly would you say matches that of the Church of Scotland from 1638-1649? How many churches and nations are filled with people (and leaders) willing to submit to a covenanted uniformity such as was aimed at in the Solemn League and Covenant? How many churches and nations have bound themselves to obey all of Christ's law and testimony, as England, Scotland and Ireland did in the Solemn League and Covenant? What confessions are being produced today which rival the Westminster Confession of Faith? What catechisms are being produced which match the Westminster

Larger and Shorter Catechisms? What scholars are producing works which compare to the works of Samuel Rutherford, George Gillespie, and many others of this period?

The period since the second Reformation has been one step back after another. This is clearly seen when one compares the standard practices prevalent during the second Reformation with those of the so-called "Presbyterians" of our day. Because you are so much a part of the modern defection (and, to be fair, you are at some points among the best of the neopresbyterians) this will be very hard for you to see -- but we will continue to pray that God will open your eyes.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>You objected to my "ad hominem assertions" which were "not
>the truthful and gracious speech" you had hoped for. Believe me, I am not
>trying to resolve this by name-calling. I honestly believe that you do not
>see what you are doing. Your handling of my scriptural counter-examples are
>a case in point. When I asked about David and the showbread, and bowing in
>the house of Rimmon, and worshipping in a synagogue, and sacrificing only to
>the Lord in the high places, etc. you said that to "ask such questions as
>above is not helpful to me at all."

REG BARROW WRITES:

All these questions will again (they are not new questions and have all been answered by faithful Presbyterians before) be fully answered (D.V.) in due time in the books and articles that I intend to publish (or distribute) in the future. Many of the books that I have already published also contain the answers you are asking for. If I get time I will send you the books with the answers to each of these questions all marked out (free of charge -- to show you that I am arguing in good faith and that I still desire the best for you). Remember, I didn't start this strife between us, you did (Prov. 26:17).

Also, what I believe Greg was referring to when he said that to "ask such questions as above is not helpful to me at all," was that such questions have nothing to do with the charges at hand -- concerning what you printed in slandering me. He was not saying these question are of no value regarding the other issues that you raised. Greg would not be presently writing a book which revolved around these types of questions if he thought they were of no value in any sense. He was merely trying to keep you focused on the issue of the false claims which you published about me.

Your questions are good questions and you are to be commended for even thinking of them -- it shows that you have done more thinking on this issue than most. But, these questions (regarding separation and worship) have nothing to do with answering the charges about whether or not what you printed about me was true. The issue concerning what you printed is what we need resolved first. These other questions regarding biblical separation and worship will be answered (again) in due time -- as I (really the old Reformers) have already answered your question regarding Moses' seat above (cf. Prov. 12:15).

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>You then said I had not brought any
>evidence! What are such passages if not evidence of the very point at issue?
>You said you want to keep "the whole law." So answer me this -- in keeping
>the whole law, would you excommunicate Obadiah for remaining in charge of
>Ahab's house?

REG BARROW WRITES:

Of course not, this was a civil matter and no sinful oath or actions were involved (that we know of). At the point at which Obadiah would have had to take any sinful oaths to serve Ahab (cf. Appendix A and C in *The Ordinance of Covenanting* by John Cunningham [1843], SWRB reprint 1996), or would have had to publicly violate the law of God *HIMSELF,* then he would have come under the discipline of a duly constituted church court, if the sin was known (and if such a court existed -- remember that in the days of Elijah the visible church had become so "invisible" that even the greatest prophet in Israel at that time thought that he was the only believer left [1 Kings 19:14]; cf. vol. 1, p. 25 of Calvin's *Institutes* [Battles edition, Westminster Press] for some interesting comments on Elijah's situation and the teaching which Calvin draws out of it in regard to the visibility of the visible church. More on this can also be found in Wylie's *Two Sons of Oil*; pp. 50-53).

This is also the case regarding all slaves, employees, and even those living in covenant breaking nations like Canada and the USA.

Shields again sheds light on the principles involved, having qualified what follows with the qualification that I cite above (and many more). He writes,

"As we find the Lord's resenting it as a servitude, under which they were servants even in their own land, which did yield increase unto the kings whom the Lord had set over them, because of their sins, Neh. ix. 36, 37. 2. In divers cases there may be some compliance with a mere occupant, that hath no right to reign; as upon this account the noble marquis of Argyle and lord Warriston suffered for their compliance with the usurper Cromwell. Such may be the warrantableness, or goodness, or necessity, or profitableness of a compliance, when people are by providence brought under a yoke which they cannot shake off, that they may part with some of their privileges, for the avoidance of the loss of the rest, and for the conveniency and profit, peace and safety of themselves and their country, which would be in hazard, if they did not comply; they may do whatsoever is due from them to the public weal, whatsoever is an office of their station or place, or which they have any other way a call unto, whatsoever may make for their own honest interest, without wronging others, or the country's liberties in their transactions with these powers, even though such a compliance may be occasionally to the advantage of the usurpers, seeing good and necessary actions are not to be declined for the ill effects that are accidental to them, and arise from the use which others make of them" (*A Hind Let Loose*, [1797 ed.] SWRB reprint 1996, p. 339).

Furthermore, it has been pointed out, using other Old Testament worthies as examples, why some acted in one way (toward the civil government of the day) and some in another (and as I am sure you will agree, this was not because the Bible contradicts itself or is unclear regarding the Christian's duty concerning civil government). The article The Right of Dissent from an Immoral Civil Government (an SWRB reprint taken from a mid-nineteenth century Covenanter magazine) states,

"But, it may be asked, how is the conduct of Joseph, Nehemiah and Daniel, &c., who held office under immoral governments, to be reconciled with the principle pleaded for in this paper. The acts even of good men cannot be used in argument against a principle approved of God, and established by the strongest testimony. To their own Master they stand or fall. The acts of none of these men, in accepting office, is marked with that full and indubitable evidence of divine approval that characterizes the act of Moses in refusing office. If consistency required us to condemn one or the other, we must condemn them and not him. But consistency does not demand the disapprobation of either. They all acted in obedience to God, and on the same great principles. All the instances on record in the Bible, of good men holding office under an immoral government, are clearly of an extraordinary character, and arose from very peculiar circumstances, and were designed by God to accomplish special purposes. Such cases are not the regular and ordinary operations of the government, but are spoken of as rare and singular exceptions which happened in its administration. The conduct of these worthy and eminent saints is referred to as a remarkable interposition of Divine Providence in behalf of the church of God, when she had been brought into the greatest extremity of suffering and danger. There is no evidence that Joseph in Egypt, Mordecai in Persia, or Daniel in Babylon, identified themselves with those governments, or took an oath of allegiance to them. The remarkable circumstances in which they were called to office, and the wonderful and miraculous powers which they displayed, and for which they were appointed, would evidently supersede the necessity of an ordinary and routine introduction. These men were ministers by authority raised up and fitted, and appointed to rule in and over these governments, and clothed with extraordinary powers by Jehovah himself, for the accomplishment of grand purposes in divine providence.

It follows, therefore, that the conduct of such men, acting in such circumstances, and clothed with such powers, and for special purposes, cannot afford a precedent for Christians in totally different circumstances, approving of an immoral government and swearing to support it. The acts of an ambassador extraordinary and duly authorized, appointed for a special purpose, are they the rule of petty magistrates and constables? In the government of Egypt, Joseph accepted an office, and Moses refused one. The office which Joseph accepted was not an integral part of the government, but one appointed at the instance and recommendation of Joseph himself, for a specified object, and not governed by existing laws. Here then was no obstacle to his acceptance. The office which Moses refused was a permanent and essential part of the existing government, to be regulated by established principles and precedents of acknowledged authority,

and implied incorporation with the political organization. Hence the different conduct of these men, both serving God and doing his will. It were easy to show, were it necessary, but it is not, that, during the period of the Babylonian captivity, the people of God continued to sustain a distinct civil character, and did not identify with the Chaldean, or Persian government.

We have now before us a great truth. From the calling of Abraham until the coming of Christ, the people of God never acknowledged or identified themselves with any government, but that one which God himself placed over them. They continued to maintain the ground of dissent from all immoral governments under which they lived for twenty-eight generations."

The answer to your Obadiah question also ties into why it is sinful for a Christian to vote in Canada or the USA. Currently, to vote in these countries is to homologate immoral civil constitutions and to put someone, as your representative, in a position to swear a sinful oath to these antichrist documents (which is a violation of the third commandment). The same applies to the church -- immoral constitutions necessitate sinful terms of communion. No Christian can lawfully submit himself to an immoral ecclesiastical constitution or sinful terms of communion (since church members enter into the sins of the backsliding ministers who draft such unlawful constitutions when they testify to their oneness with these harlot bodies by receiving the Lord's Supper at their hands [cf. Reasons 1, 9, 10, and especially 14, plus the whole section on civil government, in Plain Reasons for Presbyterian Dissenting... by Andrew Clarkson, John Anderson's Alexander and Rufus: or a Series of Dialogues of Church Communion and W.J. McKnight's Concerning Close Communion] or by sitting under their preaching [cf. James Douglas's Strictures on Occasional Hearing]).

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>The fact that you do not see the relevance of such questions
>reveals the extent of your problem. Which is greater -- the Reformation or
>the faith which produced it?

REG BARROW WRITES:

All **true** Reformation is the outworking of the faith -- if it is not faithfulness it is not Reformation!

"Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set" (Prov. 22:28).

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>For the Covenants,
>Douglas Wilson
>Cordially,

> >Douglas Wilson
>Credenda/Agenda

>dougwils@moscow.com
>P.O. Box 8741
>Moscow, Idaho 83843

REG BARROW WRITES:

Which covenants are you referring to? You deny the Reformation covenants on many fronts, not the least of which is clearly displayed in your writings on worship, separation and the church.

Your recent review of Frame's book is another case in point. When you say that Frame's book is useful as a "critique of the strict regulativist," who are you talking about? The "strict regulativists" are all the best Presbyterian and Reformed leaders since the sixteenth century (even the best Dutch writers counseled the civil authorities to remove the organs from their churches on the basis of what you call the "strict" application of the regulative principle). If you think that Frame's book is useful for anything other than exemplifying and thereby revealing the gross apostasy prevalent in modern church, then you are far more ignorant (and blinded by your own idolatry) than I had first suspected. Moreover, and I wouldn't be surprised if you already know this, your version of so-called "classical Protestantism," as espoused in your public writings, would have definitely put you outside of the visible church as it was constituted during the covenanted Reformation of the seventeenth century. Furthermore, if you look carefully at the "covenanted uniformity" which Calvin was setting up in Geneva, you would have not lasted long there, either. Your heterodox views of worship, government, discipline and the sacraments would have placed you outside of the two most classical of the visible Protestant settlements of Christ's kingdom on earth, thus far in history. You may not have the literature at this point to understand what I am saying (and I do not say it with any malicious intent, as I still plan on sending you a number of these titles to review, which I hope will help you to see how far you are from what the church has already attained); but when the source documents from the first and second Reformation periods, which we are now publishing (at a rate of about 150-200 titles per year), get into the hands of enough people, it will become a lot harder for the modern anti-Covenanters (whether "evangelicals," neopresbyterians, or what have you) to bamboozle their followers with a few quotes out of context, slick looking covers, sound bite articles, and a little slander of those with whom they disagree.

Those "natural allies" of which you speak above will soon have to declare themselves for the Reformation as it was (and repent, as we have, of our pride and arrogance in thinking that we have improved on what our best Reformed forefathers had done -- because after reading them I can't think of a single area where the modern church has outdone the best Reformers) or honestly declare that they do not follow the best of the Reformation forefathers. At that time the lines will be drawn: the paleopresbyterians on one side (adhering to the biblical attainments of "mother Kirk" and "the faith which was once delivered unto the saints") and the neopresbyterians (and other so-called "evangelicals") on the other (espousing an eclectic mishmash of truth and heresy which no one from the past would fully recognize).

Walk about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following (Ps. 48:12-13).

>and with the hope of peace between us,

REG BARROW WRITES:

There will be no peace between us on a false basis. Any peace before you repent of your slander and biblical attainment denying heresies would be the same type of false peace that you so vehemently contend for in the ecclesiastical realm -- and which we, with all the faithful followers of Christ, denounce. "They have healed also the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace; when there is no peace" (Jer. 6:14). The scripture is clear: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them" (Rom. 16:17). Should I listen to Scripture or your latitudinarian fantasies?

I will close with a pertinent and timely citation from A Short Vindication of Our Covenanted Reformation by the Reformed Presbytery,

"(T)here is a rule in Logic which the learned acknowledge to be correct, *Majus et minus non variant speciem*, -- 'greater or less does not vary the nature of a thing.' And we are enjoined to 'mark them which cause divisions and offences *contrary to the doctrine which we have learned*; and avoid them, Rom. 16:17: as also to 'withdraw ourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly' -- yes, though a brother. 2 Thes. 3:6; 1 Tim. 3:5. No, no, we are not uncharitable. While hating Pharisaic exclusiveness, we no less dislike the spurious charity that 'suffers sin upon a brother' without rebuke. Lev. 19:17; Titus 1:13... We pretend to no superior light, or wisdom, or sanctity; we aim only at removing the rubbish, that the ancient landmarks may reappear, and on the principle of charity, which comprises the whole moral law (Rom. 8:8-10), we have not shunned to mention names of leaders in public measure of defection, following the example of our Lord, prophets, apostles and our witnessing ancestors... We (also--RB) distinguish here between such as are advancing and those who are retrograding (lamentably, which category, Doug, we would put you in at this point--RB), as our witnessing fathers always did, and towards which parties our deportment ought to be different. To those advancing we extend a helping hand, but from those declining we are commanded to 'turn away.' (2 Tim. 3:1-5)... To all those in whose heart the Lord has preserved a supreme love to Himself and to His truth, sealed by the blood of heroic and patriotic martyrs, as that truth has been transmitted historically in doctrine, worship, government and discipline, -- the practical results of our Covenants, National and Solemn League: to all such we address the words of good Hezekiah: 'Now, be ye not stiff-necked, as your fathers were; but yield yourselves unto the Lord, and enter into his sanctuary, which he hath sanctified forever, that the fierceness of his wrath may turn away from you'" (pp. 48, 49, 50).

Again, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, I call you to repent of your sinful slander of my name (and now, also of your sinful slander of the Covenanters [old and new] and the biblical attainments of the covenanted Reformation). For in these slanders you have stated

that I and the Covenanted forefathers which I follow are the ones who "troubleth Israel:" thus, I can only reply with Elijah, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house (i.e. all those modern "evangelical" neopresbyterians who are the malignant spawn of the Reformation denying Revolution settlement, theologically), in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the LORD" (1 Kings. 18:17-18).

I appeal to you Doug: deal with the sin which started this controversy (i.e. your slanderous "Telepathy" column) so that true reconciliation can take place and further scandal (regarding this point) can be obviated. Obviously, though, your numerous departures from the pattern of Apostolic Presbyterianism as set forth in Scripture (and reasserted by our classical Protestant forefathers) will need to be more fully addressed (and hopefully resolved) in future correspondence (books, newsletters, etc.).

Please reply at your earliest convenience. Sincerely, Reg Barrow, President
STILL WATERS REVIVAL BOOKS

swrb@swrb.com

4710-37A Ave. Edmonton AB Canada T6L 3T5

Voice: +1 403 450 3730

P.S. The following Scripture verses pretty much sum up my view of you and much of modern "evangelicalism" (especially its leaders) -- in regard to all that has been lost in terms of the attainments of the Reformations of the past (especially concerning the visible church) -- and this is not to say that I am not grieved by our contemporary defection or that I do not pray often for a return to "the old paths":

O LORD, thou knowest: remember me, and visit me, and revenge me of my persecutors; take me not away in thy longsuffering: know that for thy sake I have suffered rebuke. Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart: for I am called by thy name, O LORD God of hosts. *I sat not in the assembly of the mockers, nor rejoiced; I sat alone because of thy hand*: for thou hast filled me with indignation. Why is my pain perpetual, and my wound incurable, which refuseth to be healed? wilt thou be altogether unto me as a liar, and as waters that fail? Therefore thus saith the LORD, If thou return, then will I bring thee again, and thou shalt stand before me: and if thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth: *let them return unto thee; but return not thou unto them*. And I will make thee unto this people a fenced brazen wall: and they shall fight against thee, but they shall not prevail against thee: for I am with thee to save thee and to deliver thee, saith the LORD (Jer. 15:15-20, emphases added)

See Calvin's Commentary (vol. 9, pp. 282-300 in *part II*) on this passage and see if Calvin did not understand the Scripture regarding the church and separation as I set it forth above.

5. REG BARROW'S THIRD REPLY TO DOUG WILSON

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>January 21, 1997

>

>Dear Reg,

>

>Look. In the interests of obeying the ninth commandment, I do not tell
>people that I have read a book unless I have read it all. If I have read a
>chapter or two, I do not say I have read the book. That would be untrue.
>When I give my students an assignment, they do not have the honest option of
>saying they have read the assignment unless they have read it all. If they
>have not read it all, then I am under no obligation to credit them as having
>done so. It is entirely reasonable to say that someone who has read part of
>a book has not read the book. This is how I speak when referring to my own
>book-reading; we have done nothing here inconsistent with the golden rule.
>On the other hand, in all fairness, it would also be misleading to say that
>someone had *not* read a book if they had merely failed to read the last few
>sentences.

REG BARROW WRITES:

Monday, February 3, 1997

Sorry Doug, but I don't buy your evasiveness. Everyone who has talked to me about the "Telepathy" piece (excepting one, who said that it could *possibly* mean what you put forth above) has taken what you have written to mean that I had not read the book at all (i.e. that I had not read even one page). Since this is not the case (and you have not shown a willingness to clarify publicly what you have written) the charge of violating the ninth commandment stands.

Just for the record (and in case this goes before the session of the Puritan Reformed Church of Edmonton) I have highlighted (below) the portions of the ninth commandment which I believe you have violated. Questions and Answers 143-145 are cited in full from the original edition of the Westminster Larger Catechism.

Question 143: Which is the ninth commandment?

Answer: The ninth commandment is, Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

Question 144: What are the duties required in the ninth commandment?

Answer: The duties required in the ninth commandment are, the preserving and

promoting of truth between man and man, and the *good name of our neighbor*, as well as our own; appearing and standing for the truth; and from the heart, sincerely, freely, *clearly*, and fully, speaking the truth, and only the truth, in matters of judgment and justice, and in all other things whatsoever; a *charitable esteem* of our neighbors; *loving, desiring, and rejoicing in their good name*; sorrowing for, and covering of their infirmities; freely acknowledging of their gifts and graces, defending their innocency; a ready receiving of a good report, and *unwillingness to admit of an evil report*, concerning them; discouraging talebearers, flatterers, and slanderers; love and care of our own good name, and defending it when need requires; keeping of lawful promises; studying and *practicing of whatsoever things are true, honest, lovely, and of good report*.

Question 145: What are the sins forbidden in the ninth commandment?

Answer: The sins forbidden in the ninth commandment are, all *prejudicing the truth, and the good name of our neighbors*, as well as our own, especially in public judicature; *giving false evidence*, suborning false witnesses, *wittingly appearing and pleading for an evil cause*, *outfacing and overbearing the truth*; passing unjust sentence, *calling evil good, and good evil*; rewarding the wicked according to the work of the righteous, and the *righteous according to the work of the wicked*; forgery, concealing the truth, undue silence in a just cause, and holding our peace when iniquity calls for either a reproof from ourselves, or complaint to others; speaking the truth unseasonably, or maliciously to a wrong end, or perverting it to a wrong meaning, or *in doubtful and equivocal expressions*, to the prejudice of truth or justice; *speaking untruth, lying, slandering, backbiting, detracting, tale bearing*, whispering, scoffing, reviling, rash, harsh, and partial censuring; *misconstructing intentions, words, and actions*; flattering, vainglorious boasting, thinking or speaking too highly or too meanly of ourselves or others; denying the gifts and graces of God; aggravating smaller faults; *hiding, excusing, or extenuating of sins, when called to a free confession*; unnecessary discovering of infirmities; *raising false rumors, receiving and countenancing evil reports, and stopping our ears against just defense; evil suspicion*; envying or grieving at the deserved credit of any, endeavoring or desiring to impair it, rejoicing in their disgrace and infamy; *scornful contempt*, fond admiration; breach of lawful promises; *neglecting such things as are of good report, and practicing, or not avoiding ourselves, or not hindering what we can in others, such things as procure an ill name*.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>In a discussion between reasonable people, if we had unknowingly misled
>people on how informed (or uninformed) you were concerning Frame's book, you
>could have said to us, "Hey, guys, lighten up. So I didn't read the
>Scripture Index. Give me a break." We would then have said, "Sorry," and
>published a correction. What we got was a lot of static about the ninth
>commandment and the inaccuracy of the charge of telepathy, as though we were
>seriously claiming that you are telepathic! Please remember what a joke is,
>and keep in mind that the key word is Covenant, and not Solemn.

REG BARROW WRITES:

To lie about a brother in jest is no virtue. Maybe this will help you, when you are tempted to this sin in the future, to learn not to joke about such serious matters. Many have commented to me that your work (especially in the "Cave of Adullam") lacks credibility because of the excessive use of sarcasm, satire and jesting. "But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, *let it not be once named among you*, as becometh saints; Neither filthiness, nor *foolish talking*, nor *jesting*, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks" (Eph. 5:3-4). Also see: 1 Tim. 2:2- 4; 1 Tim. 3:8, 11; Titus 1:8; Titus 2:2, 6-7.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>In your Knox Ring post, one of the phrases you used about Frame (and Jordan)
>was this: "given the *idolatrous* nature of their beliefs regarding public
>worship." The thing which prompted us to make fun of what you were doing was
>our distress that you would say such things in a public discussion when
>*your own* comments clearly indicated that your first-hand knowledge of his
>book was minimal.

REG BARROW WRITES:

But not minimal in regard to the specific comments I was making or the previous writings of Frame *and Jordan* (**on worship**) which I had read. Please note that I was referring to their beliefs in general (in the portion cited above) and not just as espoused in Frame's latest book. You argue (above) from my general statement about Frame *and Jordan* based on my knowledge of Frame's book alone. How does this follow? In the portion which you quote from me I was taking into account all of the work done by Frame and Jordan, which I have read. Surely you don't think that I would argue that Jordan was idolatrous solely based on what Frame wrote in his latest book. In any case, this is your mistake and does not justify what you did in the "Telepathy" column.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>You said, "From the quotes I have seen here and elsewhere
>. . .", thus indicating that your knowledge of the book was from "quotes."
>You also said that you had requested a review from someone who had read
>Frame's entire book. We concluded from your words that your first-hand
>knowledge of Frame's book was piece-meal, and obtained from "quotes."

REG BARROW WRITES:

Then you should have said that I had not *finished* reading the book and not written the "Telepathy" piece in a way that was so misleading -- or as the Westminster divines wrote, "in doubtful and equivocal expressions."

By the way, who was it that wrote the "Telepathy" slander? Is there some reason why you do not want to let me know who actually penned this piece? Continuing to hide the author's name would be in keeping with my charge that the writer of "Telepathy" lacks moral courage (cf. my "Letter to the Editor" below).

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>Perhaps we can resolve the situation in this way. We are willing to stand
>corrected, and in public. How much of Frame's book had you read (and how
>much of it was read to you) before you made your comments about his likely
>excommunication in the days of the Reformation? Because we are not
>perfectionists, if you had read all but the last three paragraphs, say, we
>will publish a full clarification & correction. If you read isolated quotes
>here and there, then we think you still owe Frame an apology (his errors
>notwithstanding), and we stand by the justice and accuracy of what we
>printed. If it is somewhere in between, let's talk.

REG BARROW WRITES:

I had glanced at the book and had had read to me (in a 3 hour conversation with a friend) a number of the most offensive sections of Frame's work. I had also seen portions elsewhere (in promotional material and on the web). Each section was a *clear violation* of the second commandment -- and therefore idolatry -- especially those sections which were read to me over the phone (as they were selected, by someone who understands the classic Reformed position regarding the regulative principle, to highlight Frame's apostasy). Not only were these sections of Frame's book against Scripture, but they also transgressed the teaching of the Westminster Confession -- which Frame has supposedly vowed to uphold. I do not know exactly how many pages comprise what I had seen and heard (of Frame's book) previous to my comments on the Knox Ring, but that is beside the point; Frame (and Jordan) are both idolaters and I will not apologize for bearing witness to the truth.

In short, the point is not (and never has been) the *quantity* of information I had; rather, the salient point of our discussion is the *quality* of information upon which I based my comments concerning Frame. Unless Frame contradicted and denied all the specific information which I had regarding his book, in the rest of his book (and I don't think that he is that stupid), then the question of quantity is of no consequence anyway. As it turned out the lesser amount of evidence (which I first had) and the greater amount of evidence (which I had after finishing the book) agreed completely -- Frame had not contradicted himself (generally speaking) and had proven himself to be a consistent apostate, heretic and idolater (regarding biblically Reformed worship). Calvin would have most certainly excommunicated him and I continue to maintain that I have testified to the truth -- on the Knox Ring and since -- and God giving me strength I will continue to do so!

Furthermore, after my Knox Ring post and before your "Telepathy" comments (as I note above) I had finished reading Frame's book for myself. Taken as a whole, this book is much worse than I had originally thought (when I just had knowledge of portions of it). Had I known how thoroughly vile the book was throughout, my comments on Knox Ring would have been much stronger (again see below).

Unless you are willing to print a full retraction of your statements (without qualifications) in the "Cave of Adullam" section of your magazine, I will be taking this matter to our

session for a ruling (in keeping with the third step of discipline listed in Matt. 18:15-17). I will then be publishing what has transpired.

If you are not willing to repent publicly after receiving this letter, please let me know.

I would also like to know (should you refuse to repent) whether or not I have your permission to publish your comments regarding our discussions -- in this and our previous letters regarding the "Telepathy" scandal.

Barring your public repentance I am planning on making my responses to you available to the Christian community at large (in book form, on the web, etc.).

If you are willing to repent, please send me a copy of the retraction which you will be printing in the "Cave of Adullam."

Please respond at your earliest convenience.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>Cordially in Christ,

>

>

>Douglas Wilson

>Cordially,

>

>

>Douglas Wilson

>Credenda/Agenda

>dougwils@moscow.com

>P.O. Box 8741

>Moscow, Idaho 83843

REG BARROW WRITES:

Sincerely, Reg Barrow, President, STILL WATERS REVIVAL BOOKS

swrb@swrb.com 4710-37A Ave. Edmonton AB Canada T6L 3T5

Voice: +1 403 450 3730

P.S. My Letter to the Editor concerning this matter is attached below.

Monday, February 3, 1997

Dear Doug:

Since I have long prayed that you (and the others who write for Credenda/Agenda) would come up to the attainments (especially the corporate attainments which still bind the moral person of the visible church in its lawfully constituted form [cf. Calvin's Institutes 4.2.12]) of the second (or covenanted) Reformation (Phil. 3:16), it is with some sadness that I read the comments found in your "Cave of Adullam" (Vol. 8, No. 4).

Here you critique my comments from Knox Ring regarding the spiritual harlotry promoted by John Frame in his heretical new book on worship. In this column your writer twice claims that before I had made my comments regarding Frame, I hadn't read his book; and like a court jester (Eph. 5:4, Prov. 26:17-19) you title this diatribe "Great Experiments in Telepathy."

I have two problems with your invective.

First, what you claim (that I had gained "all" my insight on Frame "without reading the book!") is not true and thus you have violated the ninth commandment. I openly and freely admit that at the time of the writing of my letter (which can be viewed at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/FrameExc.htm>) I had not *finished* reading Frame's *complete book* -- though I had read portions of it. Furthermore, large (and the most "damnable") sections of Frame's book, which I had not yet read personally at that time, had *already been read to me over the phone*. Surely you recognize that most people can smell a cesspool long before they step in it and that one need not read every page of every heretic before speaking against heresy. Thus, it should be obvious, that contrary to the comments in your column, I was already thoroughly familiar with the most salient points of the book relative to the critique that I was making. On this point you have clearly and publicly slandered my name and therefore (after numerous unsuccessful private attempts) I now, publicly, call you to repentance.

Moreover, after having read through Frame's entire book (some portions twice) and having annotated and indexed it, I want to make it perfectly clear that this work is *much worse* than I had at first thought. Frame's book is a nauseating example of the backsliding and ignorance that exists today regarding Reformed worship -- especially among those who call themselves Reformed. I now only wish that I had *more severely denounced Frame's poisonous piece of pestilent propaganda*. Not only would Calvin have excommunicated Frame (cf. my [_Calvin, Close Communion and the Coming Reformation_](http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/CalvinCC.htm) which is FREE at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/CalvinCC.htm>), but so would have the Westminster Divines -- especially the Scottish Covenanters (cf. [_The Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive_](http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/ActsOfTheGeneralAssembliesOfTheChurchOfScotlandFromTheYear1638ToTheYear1649Inclusive_)), some of whom shed their blood in opposition to false worship far less heinous (at points) than that which Frame promotes. And Frame thinks he holds to the Westminster Confession. What delusion!

Kevin Reed's defense of classical Protestant worship, in his review of Frame, should also be of special interest in this case (it's free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/FrameWor.htm>). The Charismatics may be taking the long road to Romish worship (with most of the contemporary "Reformed" crowd lagging just behind), but Frame is no friend of the Reformation when he is standing by waiting to fill the ecclesiastical beast's gas tank. With his rejection of the classic Reformation understanding of the regulative principle he has already conceded victory to ecclesiastical antichrist (speaking in terms of the complex moral person denoted as antichrist in Scripture). Even a cursory reading of George Gillespie's [_Dispute Against English Popish Ceremonies_](http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/DisputeAgainstEnglishPopishCeremonies_) or John Flavel's [_Antipharmacum Saluberrimum..._](http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/AntipharmacumSaluberrimum..._) (which I retitled [_A Warning Against Backsliding, False Worship and False Teachers_](http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/AWarningAgainstBacksliding,FalseWorshipandFalseTeachers_) when I

published it) will testify to this fact (not to mention 99.9% of the literature on worship which came out of the *Calvinistic* Reformations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries).

My second problem with your comments is that they not only demonstrate a manifest lack of integrity, but they also expose a lack of moral courage on the part of the writer. How so you ask? My comments about Frame's book were first publicly submitted to the Knox Ring email discussion group. As your writer notes this is "a public on-line discussion" group. Why did your author not challenge me on the Knox Ring? Why did he wait for some time and then run back behind "mama's skirt" to trash my reputation behind the full editorial control of Credenda/Agenda? I put my comments in the public arena and believe me I took the heat. The gutless wonder who wrote "Great Experiments in Telepathy" didn't even have the integrity to meet me with his slander face to face Ñ where I could freely reply. Such tactics are more becoming a Jesuit than one who claims to be Reformed.

Moreover, to exhibit further how the Lord traps the unfaithful in their own snares, you add an editorial comment stating "We have not read all Barrow's comments on Frame, and that which we did read was not read very carefully--but that should present no barrier to the rigorous exchange of ideas!" "The *rigorous* exchange of ideas;" give me a break! This was exactly what your author seemed to be studiously avoiding -- he certainly was too cowardly to exchange any ideas in the open forum of Knox Ring, where he was not protected by _Credenda/Agenda's_ editorial control.

At this point I think that it would be safe to say that we have discovered a Saul in the "Cave of Adullam" (Prov. 19:5).

If your writer has evidence that I violated the ninth commandment (as he insinuates in his "Mutterings" about your "Regnant Follies") then so charge me and produce proof. If not, he would be wise to "hold his peace" (Prov. 17:28), *after* having publicly repented for this violation of the ninth commandment. The same goes for you Doug. As editor of Credenda/Agenda_ (notwithstanding the good you do), you have now printed lies concerning matters that you had not verified (and which you cannot verify!). Sadly, even if you now do what is right and publicly repent and retract your false statements, this will still be a blow to your credibility among your more thoughtful readers. I know I will have a hard time trusting anything that you say in your "Cave of Adullam" again. But, on the other hand, by publicly repenting you will also be showing genuine integrity, thus restoring some of the lost confidence and trust that this incident has engendered among your readers and your friends.

I had expected better from _Credenda Agenda_ (and have in the past and still continue to pray for it) -- but it seems that the love of idols (like "Watts whims," i.e. uninspired man-made "hymns") can be very distracting to those taken captive by them -- for this is not the first time that I have been slandered in conjunction with my defense of Reformation worship (Matt. 5:11).

I pray that you will be granted the grace to properly repent of this mis- step and that your repentance will be publicly perceived as genuine (in that you "bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance" Luke 3:8).

Sincerely,
Reg Barrow,
President, STILL WATERS REVIVAL BOOKS

6. REG BARROW'S FOURTH REPLY TO DOUG WILSON

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>February 7, 1997

>

>Dear Reg,

>

>I am sorry we are not yet of one mind, but still hope that we can make some
>little progress.

>

>You should try the same thing with your post on the Knox Ring that you did
>with my explanation to you. Read your initial post to ten folks, and how
>many people would come away from your post thinking that you had read
>Frame's book? With a clean conscience on this before the Lord, *we sure
>didn't.* If this is not the case, and we were wrong, we *have* said that we
>are willing to stand corrected. That is why I asked you in my last letter
>for a clarification concerning how much of it you had actually read (a
>question you didn't exactly answer). If you had read a substantial portion
>of the book (or had it read to you), we are more than willing to say so in
>print.

>

>In response to this inquiry of mine, you said, "I do not know exactly how
>many pages comprise what I had seen and heard (of Frame's book) previous to
>my comments on the Knox Ring, but that is beside the point . . ." But this
>is exactly the point concerning your charge against me over the ninth
>commandment. Whether your assumption about the rest of the book was accurate
>is not our point. (I *agree* that the parts you didn't read were very much
>like the parts you did, and perhaps worse.) Oftentimes, a vigilante mob will
>hang the right guy, but the process is still a matter of concern. Our reason
>for going into print was your method and lack of consideration for due
>process. You say that you don't know how many pages it was. Could you
>approximate? We would be happy to take your word for it.

>

>I have just reread your initial post. A fair reading of your statements
>would be that you had researched Jordan's views thoroughly and had concluded
>he would be excommunicated by Calvin without a second thought, and that from
>the quotes you had seen from Frame's book, he was in the same category. Is
>this not a fair representation of what you said? And does this not lead the
>average reader to think you had not read Frame's book?

>

>However, if this does not convince you, and you are still wanting to submit
>a letter to the editor, I have a practical suggestion, divided in two. The
>first brings some small limitation to your letter, but the other offers an
>expansion of it.

>

>Would you be willing to cut your letter back to two-hundred and fifty words,
>and limit the subject to your concerns over Adullam and the ninth
>commandment? (This would only be if you do not see the justice of what I
>have said above.) Incidentally, to save you space in this letter, we are
>*not* trying to protect the identity of the author of that piece. Adullam
>usually functions as a group editorial effort. Doug Jones first saw your
>comment on Knox Ring, I decided we needed to do something with it, made some
>suggestions concerning it to my son, Nathan, who wrote the rough draft. The
>thing was then processed through an editorial meeting with all of us, etc.
>For your writing purposes, the best thing to do is simply hold me
>responsible as the editor of the magazine.

>

>Secondly, with regard to the broader issues, we would be happy to give you
>space in our Disputatio column to debate with me concerning the substantive
>theological issues involved with situation revolving around the second
>commandment and the regulative principle. We would be willing to debate the
>subject of worship under the title (if Frame doesn't mind), "Is John Frame
>an Idolater?" Would you be willing for something of that nature?

>

>Taken together, this would give you more space than your letter as it now
>stands. If my explanation of how we took your words -- "I know that Jordan
>is an idolater, and from the bits and pieces I have seen, Frame is too." --
>proves satisfactory and you do not want to submit a letter to the editor,
>the offer of a debate in Disputatio still stands. (The offer of debate would
>also extend, if you preferred, to Pastor Price).

>

>I hope this is satisfactory to you, and look forward to hearing from you again.

>

>

>Cordially in Christ,

>

>

>
>Douglas
>Cordially,
>
>
>Douglas Wilson
>Credenda/Agenda
>dougwils@moscow.com
>P.O. Box 8741
>Moscow, Idaho 83843

REG BARROW WRITES:

Wednesday, February 12, 1997

Doug:

I do not believe that our correspondence is getting anywhere. You keep making the same excuses, with a slightly new spin each letter. I still maintain that what I did (in "Knox Ring") was perfectly legitimate (and part of my covenanted duty) and that your response (in the "Cave of Adullam) was a violation of the ninth commandment. You have said nothing that would cause me to retract my initial charges against you (for all the reasons which I have already previously stated in our letters to each other). Therefore I will be taking this matter to our session (in fulfillment of Matt. 18:17). I will also be publishing my responses to you -- to help clear my name and the name of Still Waters Revival Books -- on the web and as a book. If you do not contact me (before Feb. 19/97) giving me your permission to use your exact words (without monetary compensation) in the book I plan to publish (for sale, and the book will be sold at close to cost so as to eliminate the profit motive), then I will summarize what you have said myself (as I did in my debate with Joe Bell, cf. A Contemporary Covenanting Debate; Or, Covenanting Redivivus free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/CovDebRB.htm>). If I had the choice I would rather include all your words exactly as you wrote them (and I do not know why you would not want your words to be published, if you are not willing to retract them and repent of what you have written). Furthermore, if you are willing to stand by what you have written you will obtain a much larger hearing for your position. My publication of your words will grant you a large amount of free publicity which you would not otherwise have access to (and my publications [web and book] will likely reach a much larger audience than you could ever reach through Credenda/Agenda and Canon Press, including many people that would never hear of your views). Since you have not retracted anything which you have written against us thus far, I hope that you will have the courage of your convictions to stand by your words; and be willing to subject our "rigorous exchange of ideas" to public scrutiny. But, given your previous exhibition of lack of moral courage (as outlined in my original letter to the editor, which you would not print because you said that it was too long), I do not expect you to let your words stand. Moreover, though you will not repent of and retract your slanderous accusations against me, Still Waters Revival Books, the elders of the session of the Puritan Reformed Church of Edmonton and the attainments of the second Reformation, I believe that you will prove to the world that you

will not *publicly* stand by what you have written against us -- by not giving me permission to use your words as you wrote them. Again, this would be in keeping with my aforementioned assessment of your character -- though I hope you prove me wrong. I guess we will see if I am correct, regarding your level of courage and willingness to stand by what you have written, on Feb 19/97. I am more than willing to stand by what I have written; are you willing to do the same, Doug?

Concerning Disputatio, you already have a very bad reputation regarding how you handle the editorial process in this section of your magazine. Thus, I have no desire to enter into that forum with you **in its present format**. It is my opinion that the sound byte quality of the debates in Disputatio are for all practical purposes virtually useless (at least I thought they were when I used to read your magazine). I would be much more interested in seeing you produce a book length response to the book that I am about to publish rebuking you. We could then, as time permits, trade book length responses back and forth. I think that this would be much more edifying to those who would read our exchanges (as it would allow for much more development of ideas, leave a better record for posterity, etc.) and at the same time avoid all the misunderstandings and shallowness engendered by the dwarfish debates that you presently publish in Disputatio.

I may, however, consider debating you in your Disputatio column if you increased the length of the debate to *at least* 6 magazine pages (though I would prefer even more pages). I would also insist that what I write be printed exactly as you receive it, without editorial tampering. This, of course, would all take place within a pre-determined structure which would give us both exactly the same amount of space (we could use word counts to determine this) in which to present our cases. Written agreement to these terms would have to be secured before I would write anything that I would allow you to print.

I'll also ask Greg Price if he wants to debate you in your magazine; but I will be suggesting to him that strict (and fair) guidelines be agreed to by both parties before one word is ever exchanged. For example, that you (or your writers) both begin and end the debates in Disputatio is certainly not in keeping with standard (or fair) debating practice (and I am surprised that no one has pointed this out to you earlier). I will also suggest that all other points related to the format of debate (regarding length, editorial rights, republication rights, copyrights, etc.) be negotiated and that both parties agree *in writing* to these terms before any exchanges actually takes place. Of course if Greg Price decides to accept your challenge you two will have to work out the details.

In any case all the elders of the Puritan Reformed Church of Edmonton will be receiving a copy of this letter (and they already have copies of everything else that has transpired in our previous correspondence concerning the "Telepathy" controversy, including my exact charges against you). I am also considering this reply my submission to our session to render their official ecclesiastical judgement on my previously outlined charges against you (in keeping with Matthew 18:17). The email addresses of our session appear in the "cc" section of this letter. Furthermore, since you have finally divulged the specific identity of *some* of the others involved in the "Telepathy" slander, I am now asking the elders of the Puritan Reformed Church of Edmonton to include these people (Doug Jones and Nathan Wilson) in the charges which I am now presenting before the session. I will be

forwarding copies of our previous correspondence to both of these individuals so that they will know that they are being included in my original charges (of violating the ninth commandment) against you. Moreover, if you, and all those who had a hand in the production of "Telepathy" continue to stand by what was published against me in _Credenda/Agenda_ (Vol. 8, No. 4), I think that you should bring to light (cf. John 3:19-21, Eph. 5:13, etc.) the names of all the individuals who agree to and/or worked on the production of this piece -- so that they can be included in my charges. If any of them are willing to repent **publicly**, the charges against them will of course be dropped, forgotten and forgiven (in keeping with the Scriptural directives).

You know Doug, this whole controversy has an ironic providential twist to it. Before I was aware of your "Telepathy" piece (and probably before you had written it) I was already working on a book proving that Calvin, the Westminster Divines, the Scottish General Assembly (1638-1649), the Reformed Presbytery, etc., would have all rightly excommunicated Frame (in accordance with Scriptural commands) for what he has written in his new book on worship (had Frame lived under their authority). I was also in the process of proving that the basis for Frame's excommunication (by all the aforementioned individuals and bodies) would have taken place because they would have considered him an idolater, schismatic, and covenant breaker. Your attack on me interrupted the completion of this book and instead resulted in a book rebuking you. I have taken this as a providential indication (though both you and Frame stand in need of public rebuke according to God's revealed will as expressed in Scripture) that though Frame's heresy and idolatry (in opposition to the biblical attainments achieved during previous Reformations) is much more obvious than yours, the subtle nature of the errors which you publish (regarding worship, the church, unity, etc.) is much more dangerous to the church. I hope that my public testimony against you will serve as a warning to all those who seek to faithfully walk in the "footsteps of the flock" (Song 1:8) - - and that one day you, and the others who work with you to bury the covenanted Reformation (at points), will be granted repentance (regarding not only your sins against me, but also [and more importantly in my mind] regarding your rejection of the truth concerning the broader theological matters which we have been discussing). You do not yet seem to understand how many of your present positions deny the "Classical Protestantism" you often claim you hold; but if you ever do any detailed study of the many Reformation source documents which we are once again bringing back into public view (through our publication and distribution channels), I do not think that you will be far from agreement with us -- at least in agreeing that we are the theological heirs to the best Reformers (i.e. the Classical Protestants) of the second or covenanted Reformation. Many of the documents which prove this are now once again available through Still Waters Revival Books (and many more are to come) and it is my prayer you (and all others who love the truth) will make the time to study these great treasures in detail. Furthermore, other men, far more accomplished historians and scholars than you or any of the writers at _Credenda/Agenda_, have already admitted what I set forth above. This is extremely significant in light of what Scripture teaches about attainments (as outlined in my second letter to you) and in that the Covenanters which we follow produced the Westminster Standards as part of a desired covenanted uniformity -- which was ultimately aimed at not only the British Isles, but the whole world (cf. "The Solemn League and Covenant" cassette by Greg Price). The Covenanters desired a

biblically unified and covenanted Protestantism, and Protestants in France, the Netherlands, etc., had already expressed their desire to join in this covenanted uniformity. How this noble venture was blocked and then buried (even by succeeding generations of Protestants) is recounted in Greg's study (in the cassette noted above); but please do not lose sight of the fact that this vision of a covenanted and unified Protestantism is what we are once again reviving. "And they that shall be of thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The repairer of the breach, The restorer of paths to dwell in" (Isa. 58:12).

I have long hoped that you would join with us in this task, and still pray for the same; so, please, prayerfully consider all of what has recently transpired between us as my best attempt (following the biblical pattern) at procuring your public repentance (on all the points at issue between us) and opening the way to future cooperation (in the unity of the one true faith). There will be no revival of truly classical Protestant belief until the church (individually and corporately) repents of all her previous backsliding. To pretend that a compromised, attainment-denying unity is of any use to the modern church will help no one and will do nothing to remove the causes of God's wrath upon the church and the nations.

We will continue to fight for a biblically unified Protestantism -- but only within the terms of unity which the Scripture prescribes. Though it may be hard for some to understand, the fight for this unity will continue to include (as it always has) public testimony against error; separation from backsliding individuals, churches (to avoid schism) and nations; and judicial actions against those who publicly oppose the truth. Therefore I hope you understand that all my actions in our dispute have been motivated by my love for the truth and my desire to see you, as a brother in Christ, granted repentance. "Faithful are the wounds of a friend; but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful" (Prov. 27:6).

In light of everything that I have written above, and to demonstrate my sincerity in desiring the best for you, I would like to make the following proposal. Before you do yourself any more damage in the public arena, I suggest that you better acquainted yourself with the source literature of the second Reformation (and some of the best books by those who have written significant studies about this Reformation or defended certain controversial points included in the covenanted testimony). If you (or any of the others who write for you) will promise to read any of the following books in the next year, I will send them to you free of charge. I am making this offer with the hope that a careful study of this literature will bring us closer together and ultimately clear up many of the differences that now exist between us. Let me know which of the following books any of your writers at Credenda/Agenda agree to read within the next year (please list their names along with the books they promise to read if you take me up on this offer) and I will forward copies to you free of charge. I am not listing the original editions of the the National or Solemn League and Covenant, the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Westminster Larger or Shorter Catechisms, the Directories for Public and Family Worship, the Form of Presbyterian Church Government, or the the Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland relative to these documents, etc., because these items

are all readily available (in the Free Presbyterian Publications edition of the _Westminster Confession of Faith_) -- and I would think that most of your writers already have copies.

1. _Act, Declaration, And Testimony, For The Whole Of The Covenanted Reformation, As Attained To, And Established In, Britain and Ireland; Particularly Betwixt The Years 1638 and 1649, Inclusive. As, Also, Against All The Steps Of Defection From Said Reformation, Whether In Former Or Later Times, Since The Overthrow Of That Glorious Work, Down To This Present Day_ (1876) by the REFORMED PRESBYTERY

2. _Auchensaugh Renovation of the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant; with the Acknowledgement of Sins and Engagement to Duties as they were Renewed at Auchensaugh in 1712... Also the Renovation of These Public Federal Deeds Ordained at Philadelphia, Oct. 8, 1880, By the Reformed Presbytery, With Accommodation of the Original Covenants, in Both Transactions, to their Times and Positions Respectively_ (1880 ed.) by the REFORMED PRESBYTERY

3. _A Hind Let Loose; or An Historical Representation of the Testimonies of the Church of Scotland for the Interest of Christ with the True State thereof in all its Periods. Together with a Vindication of the Present Testimony Against Popish, Prelatical, and Malignant Enemies of that Church, as it is now Stated, for the Prerogatives of Christ, Privileges of the Church, and Liberties of Mankind; and Sealed by the Sufferings of a Reproached Remnant of Presbyterians there, Witnessing Against the Corruptions of the Time: Wherein Several Controversies of Greatest Consequence are Enquired into, and in Some Measure Cleared; Concerning Hearing of the Curates, Owning of the Present Tyranny, Taking of Ensnaring Oaths and Bonds, Frequenting of Field-Meetings, Defensive Resistance of Tyrannical Violence, with Several Other Subordinate Questions Useful for these Times_ (1687, 1797 edition) by ALEXANDER SHIELDS

4. _The Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive (1682)_ by the CHURCH OF SCOTLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY 1638-1649

5. _A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies Obtruded on the Church of Scotland_ (1637, reprinted from the 1660 edition) by GEORGE GILLESPIE

6. _A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience_ (1649 edition) by SAMUEL RUTHERFORD

7. _The Divine Right of Church Government and Excommunication: A Peaceable Dispute for the Perfection of the Holy Scripture in Point of Ceremonies and Church Government in which the Removal of the Service Book is Justified. The Six Books of Erastus Against Excommunication are Examined; with a Vindication of the Eminent Divine Theodore Beza Against the Aspersions of Erastus, The Arguments of Mr. William Pryn, Richard Hooker, Dr. Morton... and the Doctors of Aberdeen; Touching Will-Worship, Ceremonies, Imagery, Idolatry, Things Indifferent, An Ambulatory Government; The Due and Just Power of the Magistrate in Matters of Religion, and the Arguments of Mr. Pryn, in so Far as they Side with Erastus, are Moderately Discussed. (Facsimile, 1646, also contains: "Scandal and Christian Libertie")_ by SAMUEL RUTHERFORD

8. *_A Short Vindication of our Covenanted Reformation_* (1879) by the REFORMED PRESBYTERY
9. *_Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting from the Revolution Church of Scotland. Also, Their Principles Concerning Civil Government, and the Difference Betwixt the Reformation and Revolution Principles_* (1731) by ANDREW CLARKSON
10. *_Come Out From Among Them: The "Anti-Nicodemite" Writings of John Calvin_* by JOHN CALVIN (forthcoming)
11. *_An Apologetical Relation of the Particular Sufferings of the Faithful Ministers and Professors of the Church of Scotland Since 1660, Wherein Several Questions, Useful for the Time, Are Discussed, etc., etc._* by JOHN BROWN OF WAMPHRAY (Samuel Rutherford's student)
12. *_Wholesome Severity Reconciled With Christian Liberty, or, The True Resolution of a Present Controversy Concerning Liberty of Conscience_* (1644) by GEORGE GILLESPIE
13. *_Alexander and Rufus; or a Series of Dialogues on Church Communion, in Two Parts. Part 1: Vindication of Scriptural Church Communion in Opposition to Latitudinarian Schemes. Part 2: Defence of the Communion Maintained in the Secession Church_* (1862) by JOHN ANDERSON (Contains some Seceder errors, but possibly the best book on Church communion).
14. *_Strictures on Occasional Hearing_* (1820) by JAMES DOUGLAS
15. *_An Explanation and Defence of the Terms of Communion, Adopted by the Community of Dissenters, etc._* by the REFORMED PRESBYTERY
16. *_The Testimony of Some Persecuted Presbyterian Ministers of the Gospel Unto the Covenanted Reformation of the Church of Scotland, and to the Present Expediency of Continuing to Preach the Gospel in the Fields, and Against the Present Antichristian Toleration in its Nature and Design, Tending to Bury all these in Oblivion, Lately Ostruded Upon, and Accepted by the Body of this Nation_* by JAMES RENWICK
17. *_The Reformed Presbyterian Catechism_* (1853) by WILLIAM ROBERTS
18. *_A Warning Against Backsliding, False Worship and False Teachers_* by JOHN FLAVEL
19. *_A Testimony to the Covenanted Work of Reformation Between 1638- 1649 in Britain and Ireland_* by SAMUEL RUTHERFORD
20. *_Calvin, Covenanting and Close Communion_* (1996) by REG BARROW
21. *_A Contemporary Covenanting Debate; Or, Covenanting Redivivus_* by REG BARROW

22. Biblical Civil Government Versus the Beast; and, the Basis for Civil Resistance (1996) by GREG PRICE
23. The Solemn League and Covenant (1997) by GREG PRICE (cassette)
23. The National Covenant (1997) by GREG PRICE (2 cassettes)
24. Concerning Close Communion by W.J. MCKNIGHT
25. The Covenant of Life Opened; Or, A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace, Containing Something of the Nature of the Covenant of Works, the Sovereignty of God, the Extent of the Death of CHRIST, the Nature & Properties of the Covenant of Grace: And Especially of the Covenant of Suretyship or Redemption Between the LORD and the SON JESUS CHRIST, and the Seal of Baptism: With some Practical Questions and Observations (1655) by SAMUEL RUTHERFORD
26. The Declaration of Repudiation: A Public Testimony Against Modern North American Evangelicalism (1996) by MICHAEL WAGNER
27. Paleopresbyterianism Versus Neopresbyterianism (1996) by MICHAEL WAGNER
28. Sketches of the Covenanters by J.C. McFEETERS
29. The Lawfulness and Duty of Separation from Corrupt Ministers and Churches Explained and Vindicated (1744) by JAMES FRASER (of Brae)
30. Against Romish Rites and Political and Ecclesiastical Tyranny (1554) by JOHN KNOX (Was "A Faithful Admonition to the Professors of God's Truth in England")
31. An Admonition to Flee Idolatry, Romanism and All False Worship (1554) by JOHN KNOX (Was "A Godly Letter of Warning, or Admonition to the Faithful in London, Newcastle, and Berwick")
32. Reformation, Revolution and Romanism: An Appeal to the Scottish Nobility (1558) by JOHN KNOX (Was "An Appellation to the Scottish Nobility")
33. The Songs of Zion: A Contemporary Case for Exclusive Psalmody by MICHAEL BUSHELL
34. Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of the Church by JOHN GIRARDEAU
35. Our Reformation Heritage by JIM DODSON (3 cassettes)
36. A Cloud of Witnesses for the Royal Prerogatives of Jesus Christ Being the Last Speeches and Testimonies of those Who Have Suffered for the Truth in Scotland Since... 1680 J.H. THOMPSON
37. The Scots Worthies by JOHN HOWIE

38. Distinctive Principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church (1841) by DAVID SCOTT
39. The Duty and Perpetual Obligation of Social Covenanting Compiled by GREG PRICE
40. Unity and Uniformity in the Church (1881) by THOMAS HOUSTON
41. The Distinct Denominational Position of the Reformed Presbyterian Church (1860) by JAMES M. WILLSON
42. Civil Government: An Exposition of Romans 13:1-7 (1853) by JAMES M. WILLSON
43. The Ordinance of Covenanting (1843) by JOHN CUNNINGHAM
44. Statement of the Difference...Particularly on the Power of Civil Magistrates Respecting Religion, National Reformation, National Churches, and National Covenants (1871) by THOMAS M'CRIE
45. John Knox, Oliver Cromwell, God's Law and the Reformation of Civil Government by REG BARROW
46. Reformation Worship and Separation from Idolatry by Reg Barrow
47. A Warning Against the False and Dangerous Views of James Jordan Concerning Worship: A Book Review of Kevin Reed's Canterbury Tales by REG BARROW
48. Shunning the Unlawful Rites of the Ungodly and Preserving the Purity of the Christian Religion by JOHN CALVIN
49. Vindiciae Legis: or, A Vindication of the Moral Law and the Covenants, from the Errors of Papists, Arminians, Socinians, and more especially, Antinomians (1647) by ANTHONY BURGESS
50. The Two Sons of Oil; or, the Faithful Witness for Magistracy and Ministry upon a Scriptural Basis (1850 edition, reprinted 1995) by SAMUEL B. WYLIE

I hope that you and some of your writers will take advantage of this offer and that this offer will help to prove to you that I have your best interests at heart (even though I must now testify publicly against your errors). I pray that God would use these books to unify us in the truth (1 Cor. 1:10; 2 Cor. 13:11), and bring about reconciliation between us. I harbor no personal ill will toward you and would (and hope to) rejoice in your future repentance. You and all those at Credenda/Agenda will continue to be in my prayers.

Sincerely, Reg Barrow, President, STILL WATERS REVIVAL BOOKS
 ALL FREE BOOKS at: <http://www.swrb.com/> - follow FREE BOOKS link
 swrb@swrb.com 4710-37A Ave. Edmonton AB Canada T6L 3T5

Voice: +1 403 450 3730 Fax (orders only): +1 403 465 0237
(Discount Christian resources by mail-order. ASK for a FREE catalogue!)

P.S. My shortened letter to the editor of Credenda/Agenda, which you requested above, follows:

Since I have long prayed that you (and the others who write for _Credenda/Agenda_) would come up to the attainments (especially the corporate attainments which still bind the moral person of the visible church in its lawfully constituted form [cf. Calvin's _Institutes_ 4.2.12]) of the second (or covenanted) Reformation (Phil. 3:16), it is with some sadness that I read of your attack upon myself and my company (Still Waters Revival Books) in your "Cave of Adullam" (Vol. 8, No. 4), titled "Great Experiments in Telepathy." Furthermore, since you have rejected my initial letter to the editor, claiming that it was too long to print, please let the following synopsis of what has transpired, in the controversy that you have started between us, suffice to alert your readers as to our differences.

In an attempt to allow you time to repent of your sin of violating the ninth commandment in Credenda's "Telepathy" piece we have now contacted you by email eight times, and kept all this private. Since you have not repented and I am now in the process of taking the third step of discipline found in Matthew 18:15-17 regarding your case, we have now (after eight private attempts to resolve this situation) decided to defend our good name publicly. My charges against you (following the first two steps of Matthew 18:15-17) and against all those involved (which are known at this time) in this act of public slander, along with your responses (or at least a summary of them, should you fear to have them brought to light and not grant me permission to publish them) can now be viewed on our web page at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/Saul.htm>. These two items (stating my charges and answering your increasingly slanderous attacks upon me, my company, the church I attend, and the attainments and leaders of the covenanted Reformation), along with my original letter to the editor (which you rejected) and the forthcoming (at the time of the writing of this letter) ruling of our session will also be found in this free file on our web page. My letter to "Knox Ring" (which you attacked in "Telepathy") exposing John Frame's apostasy will also be attached. All of this information will also be available in a forthcoming book titled: **_SAUL IN THE CAVE OF ADULLAM: A TESTIMONY AGAINST THE FASHIONABLE, SUB-CALVINISM OF DOUG WILSON (EDITOR OF CREDENDA/AGENDA MAGAZINE); AND, FOR CLASSICAL PROTESTANTISM AND THE ATTAINMENTS OF THE SECOND REFORMATION_**.

Your magazine does not allow for serious theological interaction (because of the truncated nature of the items printed) I hope that (barring your repentance) our differences can be aired in a more suitable form (i.e. in book length responses). This would help all those following the dispute and leave a better record for posterity.

Sincerely,
Reg Barrow,
President, STILL WATERS REVIVAL BOOKS

7. *REG BARROW'S FIFTH REPLY TO DOUG WILSON

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>February 13, 1997

>

>Dear Reg,

>

>You certainly have my permission to reprint my letters in your "book"

>with the proviso that this letter is included in the package.

REG BARROW WRITES:

May 5, 1997

Thank you for your permission to use what you have written.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>I would also encourage you to include (somewhere, *anywhere*) in your
>portion of the book an approximation of HOW MUCH OF FRAME'S BOOK
>YOU HAD READ at the time you publicly approved of his judicial
>excommunication. That would no doubt be as edifying to posterity as the
>rest of this little dust-up.

REG BARROW WRITES:

My position concerning how many pages I had read of Frame's books has already been explained (in a previous letter) and I do not feel any need to go over it again. If you understood the truth about the Reformation regarding worship, close communion, covenanting, etc., you would have had no problem seeing why I said (originally based on a few *outright violations* of the second commandment in Frame's book) that Calvin would have excommunicated Frame.

Also, as previously noted I have started writing a short book detailing why Calvin would have excommunicated Frame. I will show, in this book (if I ever get the time to finish it), how many of the other major Reformers, as well as the creeds and confession of both Reformations would lead us to the same conclusion concerning Frame's apostasy from Reformation standards (of communion) in the areas of doctrine, worship and discipline. This is especially clear in The Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 (which contains the acts of the most faithful general assembly since the days of the Apostles). Rather than rehearsing *all* of this material now (though I will cover some of it below) I would direct you to Kevin Reed's

recent review of Frame's Worship in Spirit and Truth. We offer a free copy of this review on our web page at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/FrameWor.htm>

(Those without a connection to the web may request a free copy from Still Waters Revival Books).

My summary of Kevin's review states:

Presbyterian Worship: Old and New by Kevin Reed (A Review and Commentary upon Worship in Spirit and Truth, a book by John Frame). Reed shows how Frame has abandoned the Reformation, both scripturally and confessionally, in regard to worship. He also gives an excellent summary of historic Reformed views and then contrasts them with the novel ideas now being touted by Frame. In light of the fact that Frame teaches at a Presbyterian seminary and is also a Presbyterian pastor [in the P.C.A.], Reed notes the "distressing implications regarding the disingenuous nature of confessional subscription within both the churches and the seminaries." Moreover, Reed comments that "there are also troubling ramifications concerning the doctrine of scripture, since the regulative principle rests upon the foundation of the sufficiency of scripture, with respect to worship." He continues by concluding that "Frame's book furnishes patent evidence that ecclesiastical discipline is lacking in the churches, and that seminary professors can teach heterodox views with impunity. If Presbyterians took their creed seriously, Mr. Frame would be removed from both the seminary and the pastorate, and not allowed to teach. But in the current situation, the majority of pastors, seminarians, and the people are partners in the crimes of corrupt worship and confessional laxity. 'A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land; the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so.'")

If you compare my article Calvin, Covenanting and Close Communion: A Book Review of Alexander and Rufus... by John Anderson (1862), (which is free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/CalvinCC.htm>) with Kevin's review above, you will get a brief outline as to why I contend that Calvin would have excommunicated Frame for his public promotion of heresy and idolatry. My review (which I have included below) shows how Calvin practiced close communion and how the biblical view of this ordinance is intended to purify the individual, church and state. It refutes the Popish and paedocommunion heresies (regarding this sacrament), as well as all views of open communion. It also argues that Arminians, anti- paedobaptists, anti-regulativists, and all those who openly violate the law of God (and are unrepentant) should be barred from the Lord's table -- as a corrective measure ordained of God for their recovery.

If you compare the specific violations of the second commandment which Kevin Reed notes in his review of Frame's book with Calvin's view of discipline, excommunication and the Lord's Supper in my review of Alexander and Rufus below, it should not be hard to see why I said the Calvin would have excommunicated Frame.

Here is my review (note: for non email readers a "*" equals bold emphasis and "_" indicates italics):

START REVIEW

Calvin, Covenanting and Close Communion

(A book review of _Alexander and Rufus_ by John Anderson, the first book listed after this review.)

Reviewed by Reg Barrow

Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. (Rom. 16:17)

John Calvin listed **the doctrine of the sacraments as the third most important element**, in cataloguing his four major areas of concern, regarding Christianity and the ecclesiastical Reformation of his day, writing,

"If it be inquired, then, by what things chiefly the Christian religion has a standing existence amongst us, and maintains its truth, it will be found that the following two not only occupy the principal place, but comprehend under them all the other parts, and consequently the whole substance of Christianity: this is, a knowledge, first, of the mode in which God is duly worshipped; and, secondly, of the source from which salvation is to be obtained. When these are kept out of view, though we may glory in the name Christians, our profession is empty and vain. After these come the sacraments and the government of the church..." (_The Necessity of Reforming the Church_ [Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1544, reprinted 1995], p. 15).

Second Reformation thought on church communion is clearly echoed in the words of the Reformed Presbytery, in 1876, when they declared,

"In this age of boasted charity, but really 'detestable neutrality and indifferency,' it is an irksome and painful task, but a duty, thus to bear testimony against churches, in which are to be found, no doubt, many precious sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. But personal piety never was, nor possibly can be, the condition of fellowship in the visible church. To think so, and say so, is one of the most popular delusions of the present day. It puts the supposed pious man, speaking his experience, in the place of God, speaking his sovereign will in the Bible. This is the height of impiety." (_Act, Declaration, and Testimony for the Whole of Our Covenanted Reformation_, p. 175).

These testimonies remain true today (and maybe even more so), as the close communion doctrine of the Reformation continues to be much misunderstood and even more maligned. The false ecumenists (and **theological egalitarians and pluralists**) of our day continue to batter away at this foundation of the Reformation doctrine of the church Ñ while even many of those that profess to be the heirs of the Reformation are found to be ignorant regarding this point. Any doctrine of communion which does not take into account the biblical command to "be of one mind" (cf. Rom. 15:6, 2 Cor. 13:11, Phil. 1:27, Phil. 2:2, 1 Pet. 3:8) at a corporate, visible level is skewed from the beginning. In short, latitudinarian schemes of open communion (which only include the so-called "essentials" of the faith) are schismatic (i.e. **if we do not confuse "schism" with "separation"**).

As Dodson notes, in his Open Letter to an RPCNA Elder, one should not "confuse 'schism' with 'separation.' They are not the same thing. John Brown, of Haddington, states, *'that schism in scripture, chiefly, if not solely, represents alienation of affection, and disagreement among those who continue the same joint attendance on the ordinances of the gospel,'* 1 Cor. 12:25; 1:10. Augustine said, 'It is not a different faith makes schismatics, but a broken society of communion.' In no place, in the Bible, does the word 'schism' appear to signify 'visible separation.' *Error in doctrine, corruption in worship and tyranny in discipline, render separation unavoidable, to escape the sin of schism*. Your conception of what constitutes 'schism' is that of Rome. If 'schism' is 'separation;' and 'There is no precedent for schism [re: separation] in the Bible;' then, on what basis did Protestants leave Rome? Every Reformer owned that Rome is, in some sense, a Church of Christ. After all, that man of sin is seated in the 'temple of God,' as they taught."

Schismatic schemes promoting open communion (of which *paedocommunion* is presently at the head), attempt to “*dumb down*” (to a greater or lesser degree) the requirements for partaking at the Lord’s table. Loose and latitudinarian schemes of communion lead to churches that stand for little Ñ or nothing Ñ over time; while a Scripturally regulated close communion tends to the exact opposite end. Anderson makes this very point in his preface to this book, “*corruption is the native consequence of latitudinarian schemes, (while) scriptural order in sacramental communion tends to make the visible church a heaven on earth to the faithful, terrible as an army with banners to her enemies, and to her King and Head for a name, for a praise and for glory*.”

If you love the purity and peace of Christ’s church and agree with the words of John Calvin, when he wrote, “*We are only contending about the true and lawful constitution of the church, required in the communion not only of the sacraments (which are the signs of profession) but also especially of doctrine*” (_Institutes_, 4.2.12), then you will find a meaty meal in _Alexander and Rufus_ Ñ for the author not only deals with the larger questions related to church communion, but also weaves into the fabric of this book many specific threads relating to practical applications and doctrinal controversies. Moreover, notwithstanding a couple of peculiar doctrinal foibles originating from the Seceder camp, in opposition to the Covenanters (especially regarding civil government and some points of the law), a plethora of subjects relative to the Reformed view of communion, church union, testimony-bearing, etc., are all dealt with here Ñ and these points are given the kind of attention (along with Scriptural and historical accuracy) that will be greatly appreciated among those familiar with the precise views of the “old dissenters” of Scottish origin.

Additionally, Anderson is not shy about proclaiming the fact that *Scripture teaches that anti-Calvinists (i.e. Romanists, Pelagians, Arminians, Amyraldians, etc.), anti-paedobaptists, anti-regulatists, and a host of others that deny the apostolic faith (at points related to the doctrine, worship, government and discipline of the church), should be barred from the table of the Lord* (arguing a fortiori from Math. 5:23-24); but, he is also careful to distinguish between the Popish and Prelatical views of excommunication (which equate excommunication with a sentence to hell) and the Calvinistic view which recognizes that those who are among the elect can at times come under the sentence of excommunication. For example, Greg Price has noted (in a forthcoming book on the

visible church and separation) that “Calvin distinguishes between *anathema and excommunication*. The former sentences one to hell, the latter puts one outside the fellowship of the church” (cf. Calvin’s *Institutes* 4.12.10). Samuel Rutherford makes the same distinction in his *Survey of the Survey of that Summe of Church Discipline* (1658) commenting on 1 Cor. 16:22 and 1 Cor. 5, as does James Fraser of Brae, on page 210, in *The Lawfulness and Duty or Separation from Corrupt Ministers and Churches* (1744).

It is also not without significance that Anderson’s contentings can be seen to be nothing more than classic second Reformation teaching regarding fencing the Lord’s table. Samuel Rutherford comments,

"Because the Churches take not care, that Ministers be savoury and gracious; from Steermen all Apostasie and rottenness begin. O if the Lord would arise and purge his House in Scotland! As for Church-members, they ought to be holy; and though all baptized be actu primo members, yet such as remain habitually ignorant after admonition, are to be cast out, and though they be not cast out certainly, as paralytick or rottened members cannot discharge the functions of life: So those that are scandalous, ignorant, malignant, unsound in faith, lose their rights of Suffrages in election of Officers, and are to be debarred from the Seals. Nor can we defend our sinful practise in this: it were our wisdom to repent of our taking in the Malignant party, who shed the blood of the people of God, and obstructed the work of God, into places of Trust in the Church State, and the Army, contrary to our Covenants, they continuing still Enemies" (*Survey of the Survey...*, p. 373).

This is confirmed throughout *The Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive*. Here is a *partial list of offences recorded in *The Acts* for which people were disciplined*: innovations in worship; neglecting daily family worship; Sabbath breaking; covenant refusing, covenant breaking and speaking against the national covenants; Arminianism; celebrating man-ordained holydays (e.g. Christmass); familiar fellowship with those excommunicated; promoting, countenancing, hearing or accepting false church government and unlawful ministers (whether Popish, Episcopal or sectarian [Independent]); slander; contumacy, etc.

Furthermore, recognizing Calvin’s (biblical) distinctions concerning the *visible church* (distinguishing between the visible church as to *essence* and the visible church as to *constitution*, cf. Calvin’s *Institutes* 4.2.12), Anderson writes:

"The catholic church comprehends all that profess the true religion. There is a lawful and necessary division of it into sections in respect of local situation. *But when a number of people, bearing the Christian name, combine together as a distinct society, for the purpose of maintaining and propagating doctrines and practices, which, instead of belonging to the true religion, are contrary to it; they ought not, considered as such a combination, to be called a lawful section of the catholic church* (i.e. constitutionally, according to their public character and professionÑRB). It is not denied, that they belong to the catholic church (in as far as they, as individuals, profess the truthÑRB); but it is denied, that there ought to be any such section or division in it. **Thus, there ought to be no section of the catholic church, having for the peculiar end of its distinct subsistence, the support of

episcopal hierarchy, unknown in the Scripture, of the propagation of antipaedobaptism, or of anti-scriptural doctrine, in opposition to that of God's election, redemption, effectual calling and the conservation of his people, as delivered in the scripture; or for the support of ways and means of divine worship not found in Scripture. If the catholic visible church were brought to a suitable discharge of her duty, she would abolish all such sections**. But no society ought to be called such an unlawful section, while it can be shown that it subsists as a separate society for no other end, than for the maintaining of something in the doctrine, worship or government of the church which belongs to the Christian religion as delivered in the word of God, or for exhibiting a testimony against prevailing errors and corruptions which the scripture requires the catholic church to condemn. Such a profession of any party of Christians is no sectarian profession; and a union with them is not a sectarian, but properly a Christian union; and, being cordial and sincere, is a union in Christ; and communion upon the ground of this union is truly Christian communion. *On the other hand, however much of our holy religion any body of Christians hold in common with others, and however many of them we may charitably judge to be saints, yet while their distinguishing profession is contrary to the word of God, communion with them, as a body so distinguished, is sectarian communion; as it implies a union with them in that which ought to be rejected by the whole catholic* church" (pp. 10-11).

Commenting on Alexander's" *latitudinarian contention that Calvin would have tolerated Arminians and idolaters at the Lord's table* (which together comprise the two main areas of Calvin's concern for ecclesiastical Reformation, as cited at the head of this review), Rufus" replies,

"Considering that the Arminian scheme includes some of the most pernicious errors of Popery, how reproachful it is to the memory of Calvin, to call such a base proposal, his plan revived and prosecuted? Did Mr. Calvin ever speak of independent churches in the one church of Christ? Or of promoting union, by holding sacramental communion with the professed teachers of false doctrine, as every Arminian teacher is, or with the professed defenders of superstition in the worship of God? By no means" (_Alexander and Rufus_, p. 159).

Furthermore, it is a well documented fact that *the Genevan Presbytery of Calvin's day, in 1536, sought to excommunicate anyone who would not swear an oath to uphold the Reformed doctrine as it was set forth in their _Confession of Faith_*

T.H.L. Parker writes,

"Since the evangelical faith had only recently been preached in the city, and there were still many Romanists, *the ministers also urged excommunication on the grounds of failure to confess the faith*. The Confession of faith, which all the citizens and inhabitants of Geneva... must promise to keep and to hold had been presented to the Council on 10 November 1536. Let the members of the Council be the first to subscribe and then the citizens, 'in order to recognize those in harmony with the Gospel and those loving rather to be of the kingdom of the pope than of the kingdom of Jesus Christ.' *Those who would not subscribe were to be excommunicated*" (_John Calvin: A Biography_, p. 63, emphases added).

Moreover, those who would not submit to “Calvin’s” close communion were not only proceeded against with *negative ecclesiastical sanctions*, but they came under *negative civil sanctions* also.

Mike Wagner, in *Up From Reconstructionism*”, states,

“*John Calvin, during the First Reformation, showed that he supported the concept of Covenanted Reformation by requiring all the residents of Geneva to take an oath in support of the Reformation*. The ‘Register of the Council of 24’ of Geneva notes as follows:

12 November 1537. It was reported that yesterday the people who had not yet made their oath to the reformation were asked to do so, street by street; whilst many came, many others did not do so. No one came from the German quarter. *It was decided that they should be commanded to leave the city if they did not wish to swear to the reformation*” (Scribner, Bob and Pamela Johnston. 1993. *The Reformation in Germany and Switzerland*, Cambridge University Press, p. 138).

Now, it should be obvious to those who know the commandments of God that **an honest man cannot swear an oath to uphold a confession that he does not believe. To do so, even if the man disagrees with only one point of the confession, is to violate both the third and ninth commandments** Ñ and to play the Jesuit (see the *Westminster Larger Catechism* on the duties required and the sins forbidden concerning the third and ninth commandments; these can be found as questions and answers 112, 113, 144, and 145). Such false swearing is also, by definition, perjury (I wonder how many perjured officers reside in Presbyterian and Reformed churches today?). To encourage others to so swear is subornation to perjury. These are all serious sins in themselves and all worthy of excommunication and civil penalties Ñ as the Genevan Reformers rightly taught and practiced.

In *Alexander and Rufus* *close communion is also shown (as above) to be God’s ordained method of promoting truth, unity and Reformation*; not destroying it, as the ignorant and scandalous claim,

The term sectarian, the favorite watch-word of this author, tends to divert the attention from the matter in dispute. The question is, whether a church’s refusing to have sacramental communion with such as openly avow their opposition to one or more articles of her scriptural profession has such effects as are now mentioned? Does this refusal break up the unity of the church at large? By no means. *The truths of God’s word constitute the bond of unity in the catholic church; so far as they are publicly professed and preserved in the doctrine, worship, and government of the several particular churches. Hence it is evident, that what breaks up the peace of the catholic church, is not the faithfulness of particular churches in refusing, but their laxness in granting sacramental communion to the avowed opposers of undoubted truths of God’s word, as exhibited in the public profession of any of the churches, every instance of this laxness tending to weaken the bond of their union*. Does refusing sacramental communion with the avowed opposers of the truths of God, publicly professed by a particular church, chill the warmth

of love to the catholic church? surely no: for it is manifestly the interest of the catholic church that every particular church should hold these truths in her public profession, and not tolerate opposition to them in her communion. Hence it must give sincere pleasure to a lover of the catholic church to see a particular church uniformly faithful in refusing church communion to open opposers of any one of the truths of God contained in her public profession... Does the faithfulness of a particular church, in refusing to have sacramental communion with the open opposers of any article of her scriptural profession, hinder her from using any means appointed in the word of God for promoting his spiritual kingdom? This is so far from being the case, that this refusal is supposed and implied in the use of several proper means for that end; such as, a church's contending for the whole truth exhibited in her public profession; the judicial assertion of the truths of God's word, and the judicial condemnation of the contrary errors; committing the word to faithful men, who will teach others the whole truth and nothing but the truth, according to the public profession or testimony of the church, in due subordination to the holy scriptures; recognising the solemn engagements, which the church has come under *to preserve whatever measure of reformation has been attained. These means, which are certainly appointed in the word of God, cannot be sincerely used by any particular church, unless she be careful, that such as are avowed and obstinate opposers of any article of her scriptural profession, may not be received into, or continued in her communion*. Whilst these means, of our Lord's appointment, are willfully neglected, we have little ground to expect the Divine blessing on such other means as men may pretend, to use for the advancement of his spiritual kingdom (pp. 92-93, emphases added).

To see how closely this mirrors Calvin's teaching, see pages 126 to 135 in The Necessity of Reforming the Church (Presbyterian Heritage Publications' edition).

Anderson also does an excellent job concerning: Calvin's plan for promoting a union among the churches (p. 151ff.); the place of confessions and confessional subscription (pp. 85, 179); covenanting (pp. 358-384); separation (pp. 92, 132); worship (pp. 10-13, 87, 107, 142, 155, 161-164, 456ff., etc.); the marks of the church (p. 132ff.); uniformity (pp. 7, 103, 168, 205); the Westminster Assembly (p. 169ff); the Dutch views (p. 158f.); distinctions between essentials and non-essentials (p. 168); the so-called "glorious revolution" of 1688 (p. 263); the French Reformed churches (p. 156); the covenanted Reformation (p. 253); discipline (p. 103); attainments (pp. 11, 93, 137, 162ff., 206, etc.); the government of the church (p. 123); the so-called "Apostle's creed" (pp. 100-104); the Belgic Confession (pp. 135-138); councils in the ancient church (p. 104); the Donatists (p. 112); the forsaking of sin, false doctrine, and false teachers (pp. 92, 132); occasional hearing (p. 83); Owen against open communion (p. 207); sectarianism (p. 92); and much, much more.

On the topic of church and sacramental communion you are unlikely to find many other books with as much solid information. Recommended for advanced study. Indexed, 518 pages.

Alexander and Rufus is a "rare bound photocopy" and sells for \$19.99 (Canadian funds) or for \$39.00 (Canadian funds) as a "hardcover rare bound photocopy."

This is Reformation History Notes number 2, issued Dec. 7, 1996.

END REVIEW

Though I do not want to steal all my thunder from the forthcoming book (detailing why Calvin would have excommunicated Frame), the reader may want to consider that one would have to be either absolutely ignorant of Calvin's position (on discipline, the Lord's supper, worship, etc.) or purposely misleading people to dispute the fact that "Eire's *War Against the Idols* proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that Calvin would have excommunicated both Frame and Jordan without a second thought - given the idolatrous nature of their beliefs regarding public worship," as I wrote on Knox Ring.

Eire, in *War Against the Idols* shows how tenaciously Calvin held to and defended the regulative principle of worship, as well as separation from those who deviated from it:

"Because Calvin sees human nature as inherently prone to idolatry, he constantly warns that it is dangerous to accept even the most insignificant form of material worship in the Church, for "men's folly" cannot restrain itself from falling headlong into superstitious rites (*Institutes* 1.11.3)... Calvin takes into account... that all impure worship not only displeases God, but goes to Satan as well. Those who become embroiled in idolatry, he points out, are handing themselves over to the devil, because the ultimate result of false worship is abandonment by God:

'As long as we keep this rule (that one conform to the pure doctrine of God), we know that God will approve the worship that is rendered by us; but if we add any of our fantasies or borrow anything from men, everything will be perverted and corrupted. And then the devil will be placed in charge of everything we do' (*Sermons on Deuteronomy*, *Corpus Reformatorum (CR)* 28.715; *Petit Traicte*, *CR* 6.548).

The practical implications of Calvin's warnings about the dangers of idolatry are significant. Since idolatry is a fertile danger, ****the true Christian must maintain a strict separation from all kinds of misdirected worship****" (pp. 225, 227, 228, emphasis added).

The implications of idolatrous worship on a societal scale and the centrality of biblically regulated worship in the Calvinist tradition are also noted by Eire.

Though Eire's comments focus primarily on the civil ramifications of idolatry, the application to those ecclesiastical tyrants (such as Frame) -- who destroy true Christian liberty (i.e. that liberty which only comes from obedience to Christ's commands [cf. *Westminster Larger Catechism* 108- 110]; a liberty which includes a hearty opposition to all worship which imposes or promotes the non-Scriptural commandments of men [cf. *Westminster Confession of Faith* 20:2]) -- can easily and legitimately be made. For one such contemporary application regarding our duty to attend and promote only those visible churches who are faithful (i.e. duly constituted, avoiding public idolatry, etc.) and separate and testify against the harlot daughters of the Romish whore, see: *Why the PCA is Not a Duly Constituted Church and Why Faithful Christians Should Separate from this Corrupted "Communion"* by Larry Birger, free at:

<http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/PCAbad.htm>. An ecclesiastical antichrist

(constitutionally) is at least as dangerous as a civil anitchrist (constitutionally). Christians must be at war against idolatry and revolt against its promoters and practitioners (whether civil or ecclesiastical), or else, practically speaking, they will find themselves at war with Christ and His commands. Eire writes,

"What I propose, against Skinner and Walzer, is that any definition of Calvinism needs to take theology into account as a real motivating force, especially as a vision of reality that becomes an ideology, a blueprint for behavior on the individual and social level. In regards to theories of resistance, the issue of idolatry assumes central importance. Calvinists resorted to revolution not just as a way of ensuring their survival solely for its own sake, but rather to promote a new kind of social and political vision based on certain theological principles. 'Right worship' and 'true belief' are the heart of their ideology. Calvinists struggled not just against 'tyrants' in a strictly political sense, but also, very clearly, against 'idolaters.' What made their 'tyrants' deserving of resistance is not just political or social oppression, but rather the perversion of religion. When a ruler disobeys the First Table of the Law, when he breaks the covenant with God for pure worship, then and only then is revolution fully justified: This is what Calvinist theorists never tired of repeating" (*War Against the Idols*, pp. 308-309).

For those interested in the "revolutionary" thought of John Calvin as it was worked out in practice, see Robert Kingdon's *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France 1555-1563*. That Frame's book would have never been allowed to be published in Geneva can be seen from consulting pages 46 and 96-98.

To put a little sharper point on our discussion of worship, Calvin's thoughts on the type of "human traditions" (i.e. those actions introduced into the public worship of God without basis in the Word of God) which Frame would introduce into public worship (as noted throughout his book *Worship in Spirit and Truth*) can be seen in the comments below (as found in section 17 of the *Geneva Confession of 1536*). Calvin drew up this confession, in the same year as the first edition of the *Institutes*, to assist in fencing the Lord's table. Remember, as is shown in my review of *Alexander and Rufus* above, those who would not swear to this Confession were not only to be *excommunicated*, but also "*commanded to leave the city*."

Section 17 of the Genevan Confession reads,

"17. HUMAN TRADITIONS

The ordinances that are necessary for the internal discipline of the Church, and belong solely to the maintenance of peace, honesty and good order in the assembly of Christians, *we do not hold to be human traditions at all*, in as much as they are comprised under the general command of Paul, where he desires that all be done among them decently and in order. **But all laws and regulations made binding on conscience which oblige the faithful to things not commanded by God, or establish another service of God than that which he demands, thus tending to destroy Christian liberty, we condemn as perverse doctrines of Satan, in view of our Lord's declaration that he is honoured in vain by doctrines that are the commandment of men.** It is in this estimation that we hold pilgrimages, monasteries, distinctions of foods, prohibition of marriage, confessions and other like things."

(John Calvin, "Confession of Faith Which All the Citizens and Inhabitants of Geneva and the Subjects of the Country Must Promise to Keep and Hold [1536]," *_Corpus Reformatorum_*, X/I ["Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia"], as translated [from the French] and cited in *_Calvin: Theological Treatises_*, [The Westminster Press, 1954], pp. 30-31, emphases added).

In the emphasized sections above we clearly see the regulative principle of worship stated and defended in Calvin's words, "laws and regulations made binding on conscience which oblige the faithful to things not commanded by God, or establish another service of God than that which he demands," and "that he (God--RB) is honoured in vain by doctrines that are the commandment of men." In this section of the *_Geneva Confession_* Calvin not only twice incorporates words often used in the classic summary of the regulative principle, repudiating "things not commanded by God" and enjoining only "that which he demands;" he also calls all contrary teaching the "perverse doctrines of Satan." It is the denial of the regulative principle of worship, at its most foundational points, which is one the primary threads running throughout Frame's new book on worship (again see Kevin Reed's review of Frame's book titled *_Presbyterian Worship: Old and New_*, free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/FrameWor.htm>, for more specifics on Frames denial of the regulative principle).

Those (like Frame) who repudiate the Calvinistic Presbyterian/Reformed/Puritan understanding of the regulative principle are described by R.L. Dabney below, in his Review of Girardeau's *_Instrumental Music in the Worship of the Church_*,

"The framework of his argument is this: it begins with that vital truth which no Presbyterian can discard without a square desertion of our principles. The man who contests this first premise had better set out at once for Rome: God is to be worshipped only in the ways appointed in His Word. Every act of public cultus not positively enjoined by Him is thereby forbidden. Christ and His apostles ordained the musical worship of the New Dispensation without any sort of musical instrument, enjoining only the singing of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs. Hence such instruments are excluded from Christian worship. Such has been the creed of all churches, and in all ages, except for the Popish communion after it had reached the nadir of its corruption at the end of the thirteenth century, and of its prelatial imitators."

As Dabney notes, those who try to repudiate the Scriptural Regulative principle of worship have already set out for Rome, in principle (whether they recognize it or not); but most (in the first few generations) usually adopt the milder forms of "Romish," man-ordained worship -- as they are (and have been) practiced among the Lutherans and Episcopalians (including the use of musical instruments, man-made hymns, etc.). The wild extravagances of the Anabaptists (which find expression in a much muted form among the modern Charismatics) are also another man-ordained option with which Satan tempts many, and Frame seems to favor this "free-flowing" direction in worship at most points (cf. *_Worship in Spirit and Truth_* pp. 145-154). Interestingly, as Greg Price points out in appendix A below, the Anabaptists were among the first groups to begin to introduce man-made hymns into public worship during the days of the Reformation.

I have long said: If someone tries to argue with you against the regulative principle of worship it is always a good idea to ask them what they are going to put in its place (making sure that they provide Scriptural proof for all those "liberties" and ceremonies which they conjure up out of their own brains). Also ask them: By what standard are you binding my conscience to your forms and ideas regarding worship? Where does God institute this? Or, are you just making this up yourself? Because for those who are familiar with the humanistic systems that have already developed in opposition to the Scriptural law of worship, it will soon be apparent "that there is nothing new under the sun." These "new" ideas regarding worship vary little (in practice), and not at all (in principle), with the ideas set forth in opposition to the Reformers throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There is no neutrality! You are going to buy into a system (whether you know it or not); and the system you buy into is guaranteed *not* to be new (at the level of principle). You will either worship God according to His appointment or you will do so at the behest of men (Matt. 15:9).

That Calvin and Frame hold to diametrically opposed views on worship is obvious to those familiar with both authors. One clear example of a specific point of divergence between Calvin and Frame can be seen in their views of the application of the regulative principle as it comes to bear on the question of the use of musical instruments in public worship (though application to Frame concerning the differences between his and Calvin's conception of worship could fill a book in and of themselves). This one specific example of Frame's violation of the regulative principle (i.e. the second commandment) is compared below with Calvin's view. I am deliberately choosing an area that seems insignificant to most Christians today (instrumental music) to make this point, for we have seen (in *Eire* above) that Calvin "constantly warns that it is dangerous to accept even the most insignificant form of material worship in the Church." I am choosing the instruments question to illustrate Frame's rejection of the regulative principle because the most important point to remember is not found in the actual practice which I will note (though it is a sin to use instruments in public worship), but in the prior abandonment of the regulative principle which must first take place before this idolatrous practice can be performed. I have often said that we (as Protestants) would no more use instruments in worship than we would take a sheep or goat up to the front of our meeting house and slaughter it, as if that had some religious significance for today. Both instrument music and animal sacrifice were ordained parts of worship originating in the now abrogated Old Testament ceremonial law. If you don't think this is an accurate statement ask yourself this question: Were musical instruments part of the ceremonial or moral law? -- and why? This is why the use of musical instruments in public worship was often called "the badge of Popery" by the Reformers (cf. R.J. George's *The Badge of Popery: Musical Instruments in Public Worship*). It was also considered a denial of the work of Christ (bringing back those ceremonial shadows which disappeared in the light of the work of Christ).

But, now, let's compare Calvin and Frame.

Girardeau (*Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of the Church*, pp. 63, 64) summarizes Calvin's view on instruments in public worship in this way,

“To sing the praises of God upon the harp and psaltery,” says Calvin, “unquestionably formed a part of the training of the law and of the service of God under that dispensation of shadows and figures; but they are not now to be used in public thanksgiving.” (Calvin on Ps. lxxi. 22). He says again: “With respect to the tabret, harp, and psaltery, we have formerly observed, and will find it necessary afterwards to repeat the same remark, that the Levites, under the law, were justified in making use of instrumental music in the worship of God; it having been his will to train his people, while they were yet tender and like children, by such rudiments until the coming of Christ. But now, when the clear light of the gospel has dissipated the shadows of the law and taught us that God is to be served in a simpler form, it would be to act a foolish and mistaken part to imitate that which the prophet enjoined only upon those of his own time” (Calvin on Ps. lxxxii. 3). He further observes: “We are to remember that the worship of God was never understood to consist in such outward services, which were only necessary to help forward a people as yet weak and rude in knowledge in the spiritual worship of God. A difference is to be observed in this respect between his people under the Old and under the New Testament; for now that Christ has appeared, and the church has reached full age, it were only to bury the light of the gospel should we introduce the shadows of a departed dispensation. From this it appears that the Papists, as I shall have occasion to show elsewhere, in employing instrumental music cannot be said so much to imitate the practice of God’s ancient people as to ape it in a senseless and absurd manner, exhibiting a silly delight in that worship of the Old Testament which was figurative and terminated with the gospel (Calvin on Ps. xcii. 1)”

Frame writes,

"Many of the same people who restrict song in worship to the Psalms disallow the use of instruments, choirs and musical solos in worship. On the surface, this second issue does not seem to pertain to the regulative principle. There are many commands in Scripture to use instruments in worship (e.g., Pss. 68:24-25; 98:4-6; 149:3; 150:1-6). However, some have argued that instruments and choirs were part of the distinctive worship of the Old Testament temple, and that since the temple worship has passed away in Christ, there is no warrant for the use of instruments and choirs in the church today" (*Worship in Spirit and Truth*, p. 127).

Frame then produces seven arguments which he thinks justifies the use of musical instruments in public worship -- all which Calvin would have opposed -- and all which prove that Frame is not at all familiar with the many times these very questions have been answered in the body of Presbyterian and Puritan literature (cf. James Glasgow's *Heart and Voice: Instruments in Christian Worship Not Authorized* and Begg's *Anarchy in Worship*). Frame also believes that "we are free to use instrumental music, even without words," to cover other distracting noises during worship (p. 130). Furthermore, as worship leader in his congregation he encourages individuals in the congregation "to clap, whistle, tap tambourines, or otherwise use their gifts to enhance worship" (p. 148). He also plays instrumental solos, but would in principle "like to see more instrumentalists" than just himself (p. 148). Finally, as if to totally thumb his nose at the Reformers and the regulative principle (and embrace an outright popish heresy), Frame states that he does

"not believe that we are limited to the instruments mentioned in Scripture, but in considering how to set hymns to music, the biblical instrumentation can give us some clues." If this is not the wholesale repudiation of the regulative principle (just on this one point) then lookout, because "bo-bo the clown" may soon appear in a pulpit near you -- whistles, tambourines and all.

Even given what we have seen thus far, concerning Calvin's views regarding worship and excommunication, I do not think that there is any question as to what would have happened to Mr. Frame if he had tried to peddle his nonsense in one of the Genevan Churches. In fact, when I picture the Libertines with swords in hand, ready to kill Calvin if he would not serve them the Lord's supper -- and Calvin risking his life in standing up to them, in fencing the Lord's table, until they backed away (and by God's grace left him unharmed) -- and compare that with the circus-like atmosphere that Frame seeks to conjure up each Lord's Day (as described in his book on pages 145-154) during what he calls "worship" services: I can only wonder at the inroads that the ecclesiastical beast has made in our day. Furthermore, that others would defend such blatant idolatry is staggering apostasy. But this is the fruit of the anti-regulativist mentality, not a nation-changing church, indomitable, an army "terrible with banners;" but an entertainment-filled carnival, a vanity fair, apostasy cloaked in pious language and "righteous" rhetoric, assuring itself that this is real progress (for we certainly know better than those old Reformers).

Additionally, similar proofs (exhibiting Frame's rejection of the regulative principle) could be offered contra Frame's declarations against exclusive Psalmody (pp. 123-127); for drama (pp. 92-93), dancing (pp. 130-132, cf. The Reformation in Germany and Switzerland, pp. 150-151, in regard to dancing), children's church (p. 150), grape juice at the Lord's table (p. 151), non-elders speaking as a voice of one in the congregation during worship (p. 106); and a host of other errors (many more serious) which are extensions of Frame's rejection of the Presbyterian/Puritan view of the regulative principle.

Now that we have noted a few of the differences between Calvin and Frame (and Frame's rejection of the classical Protestant or Calvinistic position on worship) we can look at how the Geneva Confession which Calvin wrote counsels us to deal with men like Frame.

In conjunction with section 17 of the Geneva Confession of Faith, section 19 on "Excommunication" states,

"19. EXCOMMUNICATION

Because there are always some who hold God and his Word in contempt, who take account of neither injunction, exhortation nor remonstrance, thus requiring greater chastisement, we hold the discipline of excommunication to be a thing holy and salutary among the faithful, since truly it was instituted by our Lord with good reason. This is in order that the wicked should not by their damnable conduct corrupt the good and dishonour our Lord, and that though proud they may turn to penitence. Therefore we believe that it is expedient according to the ordinance of God that all manifest *idolaters,* blasphemers, murderers, thieves, lewd persons, *false witnesses,* sedition-mongers, quarrellers, those guilty of defamation or assault, drunkards, dissolute livers, when they have been duly admonished and *if they do not make amendment, be separated from the

communion of the faithful until their repentance is known*" (John Calvin, "Confession of Faith Which All the Citizens and Inhabitants of Geneva and the Subjects of the Country Must Promise to Keep and Hold [1536]," *_Corpus Reformatorum_*, X/I ["Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia"], as translated [from the French] and cited in *_Calvin: Theological Treatises_*, [The Westminster Press, 1954], p. 31, emphases added).

Notice that *idolaters* head the list of those who should be "be separated from the communion of the faithful until their repentance is known." Calvin, Knox and the bulk of the reformers considered **idolatry to be committed wherever and whenever the regulative principle was not followed**. In their opinion you will either worship God according to His appointment (as espoused in the regulative principle which Frame seeks to overturn) or you will do so at the behest of men (Matt. 15:9, cf. Kevin Reed's *_Biblical Worship_*, FREE at: http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/BibW_ch0.htm for proof). With this in mind numerous specific charges of idolatry (some already noted above) could be brought against Frame based on what he has written in his book. These charges (based on transgressions of the second commandment) prove that Frame would have been considered an idolater, according to Calvin and most other Reformers, and thus excommunicated.

One of the many examples verifying Calvin's hatred for Frame's view of worship can be seen in his comments on Acts 7:44. Calvin writes,

"This is the first mark whereby the holy Spirit doth distinguish all bastardly and corrupt worshipping from the true and sincere worship. Yea, (to speak more briefly,) the first difference between true worship and idolatry is this: when the godly take in hand nothing but that which is agreeable to the Word of God, but the other think all that lawful which pleaseth themselves, and so they count their own will a law; *whereas God alloweth nothing but that which he himself hath appointed*" (emphasis added to highlight the regulative principle).

Calvin is even more pointed regarding his denunciation of idolatry and idolaters (i.e. those who do not worship God in the way "which he demands") in his "First Sermon, on Psalm 16:4" in *_Come Out From Among Them: The "Anti-Nicodemite" Writings of John Calvin_* (Protestant Heritage Publications, forthcoming).

"So, let us hold to this rule, that *all human inventions* which are set up to corrupt the simple purity of the word of God, and to undo the worship which *he demands and approves*, are true sacrileges, in which the Christian man cannot participate without blaspheming God, and trampling his honour underfoot" (p. 141, emphases added).

It should be clear by now that anyone who repudiates the regulative principle (which is simply the teaching and application of the second commandment), as Frame does in his book *_Worship in Spirit and Truth_*, would have been excommunicated from the Genevan church of Calvin's day.

However, I do openly admit that Calvin was, at times, inconsistent in his *application of some* of the biblical principles he was beginning to glimpse concerning worship, discipline and separation. For example, his great love for the unity of the church (and his keen

perception of the threat posed by Romanism and the Anabaptist scourge) sometimes seemed to cloud his vision and cause him to be far too lenient towards the idolatry and error practised by the Lutherans. Such pragmatism is unbecoming a Christian no matter how eminent for gifts and testimony (Gal. 2:11). This is especially evident when we compare the sometimes contradictory advice that Calvin gave concerning the "Nicodemites" (and their separation from Rome) with his advice to the English Calvinists fleeing Bloody Mary, who had settled in Lutheran Germany (and who asked his counsel concerning separation from some of the "lesser" Lutheran forms of idolatry). This is also illustrated in Calvin's unwillingness to openly oppose Luther (by name, while Luther was alive) and his particular view of the Lord's Supper, though he often condemned the Popish Mass. After Luther's death Calvin began (or better was forced into) responding to Lutheran attacks directed against him on this very point. At one point in 1556, dealing with this controversy, Calvin wrote to Bullinger complaining that "the Lutherans have conspired to snow us under with a mass of polemical pamphlets." Dealing with issues like this we see some of the lingering negative effects of the widespread darkness from which the earlier Reformers were just extracting themselves, and how a much clearer testimony against error and idolatry arose during the covenanted Reformation (of the seventeenth century). Samuel Rutherford is a case in point when he states,

"At the conference of Wittingberge, an. 1529, where were present Capito, Bucerus, Musculus, and other grave Divines of higher Germany; on the other side, Luther, Melanthon, Pomeranus, Cruciger, in which Luther said brethren, 'If ye teach and believe that the true body and true blood of the Lord is exhibited in the Supper, & quod hee perceptio vere fiat, and that truely or really there is a receiving thereof, we agree as brethren;' **but the truth is, there were contrary faiths touching the presence of Christs body and blood in the Sacrament; and therefor I humbly conceive all such Generall confessions as must be a coat to cover two contrary faiths, is but a daubing of the matter with untempered mortar**; much dealing like this was in the Councell of Trent, in which neither Papist not Protestant was condemned; and yet the truth suffered; I speake not this as if each side could exactly know every lich and veine of the controversie, for we 'prophesie but in part,' but to shew ***I cannot but abominate truth and falsehood, patched up in one confession of faith****" (original spelling retained, *_A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience_*, [1649], p. 67, emphases added).

Furthermore, we know from various postmillennial Scriptures that we can expect even greater attainments in the future (in the moral person of the duly constituted visible church) during the millennium (Isa. 2:2-5), and that like the sanctification of individuals, the church is ultimately growing (Eph. 4:13) and her public testimony will one day be unified (Zech. 14:7-9) and cover the whole earth (Isa. 11:9).

I should also explain that it is never my intent to sanction positively the errors of even the greatest of Christian teachers. Our **final authority** always remains the Scriptures, but because of the nature of this paper (discussing Classical Protestantism and my previous comments related to Calvin), much recourse, of necessity, must be made to history. We are to approbate the **faithful** contendings of our forefathers (Jer. 6:16, 1 Cor. 11:1, Phil. 3:17), but never to follow them in any form of dissimulation or error. As Steele notes,

"only the *faithful* contendings of the martyrs of Jesus demand our approbation and imitation" (_A Concise History of the Reformed Presbyterian Church from the Middle of the Sixteenth Century and of the Reformed Presbytery from 1840 Till the Present Time_, p. 14, emphasis in the original). The Reformed Presbytery concurs, in their explanation of our fifth term of communion, "it is only to such of them as truly deserve the characteristic epithets of SCRIPTURAL AND FAITHFUL, that we require the assent of our church members" (_An Explanation and Defence of the Terms of Communion Adopted by the Community of Dissenters..._, p. 189, emphasis in the original).

Thus, here, in regard to my comments about Calvin and Frame, I consider Calvin's testimony concerning the Nicodemites to have been in accord with Scripture -- and worthy of our imitation -- and *some* of his testimony regarding the Lutherans to have been faulty -- and therefore not worthy of our imitation.

Moreover, it is good to keep in mind that Calvin was relatively mild- mannered in comparison with Knox (who I think was more consistent on the questions we are addressing). He said,

"Moses, the mouth of God to the Israelites, spoke as follows: "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy own bosom, or thy neighbour whom thou lovest as thy own life, shall privily solicit thee, saying, 'Let us go serve other gods, which thou hast not known,' etc., obey him not, hear him not, neither yet let thy eye spare him; be not merciful unto him, nor hide him not; but utterly slay him. Let thy hand be first upon him, that such one may be slain. And then the hands of the whole people stone him with stones that he may die," etc. (Deut. 13:6- 18). And so likewise he commands to be done with a whole city, if the indwellers thereof turn back to idolatry; adding also that the whole city, and the spoil of the same, should be burnt, and that no portion thereof should be saved; neither yet that the city should be re-edified or built again for ever, because it was accursed of God.

Here is a plain declaration, what God requires of them that will continue in league with him; and what he has damned by his express word (Ex. 20). And do we esteem, beloved brethren, that the immutable God will wink at our idolatry as that he saw it not? seeing that he commanded judgment to be executed so severely against idolaters, and against such as only provoked or solicited to idolatry, that neither should blood nor affinity, multitude nor riches, save such as offended; neither yet that the husband should conceal the offence of his own wife; neither the father the iniquity of his son or of his daughter, but that the father, husband, or brother, should be first to accuse son, daughter, brother, or wife. And why? "Because he intended," says Moses, "to bring thee from the Lord thy God, who led thee forth of the land of Egypt. And therefore let him die, that all Israel hearing may fear, and that thereafter they commit not such abomination in the midst of thee. "Let nothing appertaining to such a man or city cleave unto thy hand, that the Lord may turn from thee the fury of his wrath, and be moved to have compassion over thee, and multiply thee as he has sworn unto thy fathers" (Deut. 13:10-11, 17).

In these words most evidently is expressed unto us, why **God wills that we avoid all fellowship with idolatry, and with the maintainers of the same**; in which are three things appertaining to our purpose chiefly to be noted. First, that the Holy Ghost pronounces and gives warning unto us, that maintainers of idolatry, and provokers to the same, intend to draw us from God; and therefore he wills that we neither obey them (be they kings or be they queens), neither yet that we conceal their impiety (were they son, daughter, or wife), if we will have the league to stand betwixt God and us. And here is the confirming of my first cause, why it is necessary that we avoid idolatry, because that otherwise we declare ourselves little to regard the league and covenant of God; for that league requires that we declare ourselves enemies to all sorts of idolatry.

Secondly, it is to be noted, that idolatry so incenses and kindles the wrath of God, that it is never quenched till the offenders, and all that they possess, are destroyed from the earth; for he commanded them to be stoned to the death, and their substance to be burnt; and if a city offended, that it shall be altogether destroyed without mercy. This may appear a severe and rigorous judgment. But if you shall consider the cause, God's great mercy towards us shall be espied; forthereunto he declares himself [an] enemy unto our enemies. For all those that would draw us from God (be they kings or queens), being of the devil's nature, are enemies unto God, and therefore God wills that in such cases we declare ourselves enemies unto them; because he would that we should understand how odious is idolatry in his presence, and how that we cannot keep the league betwixt him and us inviolate if we favour, follow, or spare idolaters. "Lord, open our eyes that we may understand the great necessity of this thy precept. Amen."

Thirdly, it is to be noted, that obedience given to God's precepts in this case, is the cause why God shows his mercy upon us, why he multiplies us, and does embrace us with fatherly love and affection. *Where by the contrary, by consenting to idolatry, by haunting or favouring of the same, the mercies of God are shut up from us, and we [are] cut off from the body of Christ*, left to wither and rot, as trees without sap or moisture; and then, alas! in what estate stand we? In the same assuredly that Christ declares the unfruitful branches to be, which are cut from the stock, wither, and are gathered in fagots to the fire.

O, dearly beloved, if we will stand in league with God, and be accounted the children of faith, we must follow the footsteps of Abraham, who, at God's commandment, left his native country, because it was defiled with idolatry. God gave to him but a commandment, saying, Pass out of thy father's house; and he, without further reasoning, did obey. And, alas! shall not so many precepts as are given to us to flee and avoid idolatry, move us, seeing that God shows himself so offended with idolaters, that he commands all such to be slain without mercy?

But now, shall some demand, What then? Shall we go to and slay all idolaters? That were the office, dear brethren, of every civil magistrate within his realm. *But of you is required only to avoid [the] participation and company of their

abominations, as well in body as in soul*; as David and Paul plainly teach unto you. David in his exile, in the midst of idolaters, says, I will not offer their drink offerings of blood, neither yet will I take their name in my mouth (Ps. 16:4). And Paul says, Ye may not be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils. Ye may not drink the Lord's cup and the cup of devils (1 Cor. 10:21). As these two places of God's most sacred scripture plainly resolve the former question, so do they confirm that which is said before, that the league betwixt God and us requires the avoiding of all idolatry" (John Knox, "A Godly Letter of Warning or Admonition to the Faithful in London, Newcastle, and Berwick 1553," Extracted from: *_Selected Writings of John Knox: Public Epistles, Treatises, and Expositions to the Year 1559_* [Presbyterian Heritage Publications, reprinted 1995], pp. 173-176, emphases added).

But back to one more specific surrounding the situation in Geneva. This example further strengthens both my argument that Frame would have been disciplined in Geneva (even civilly) and my contention that you are no Reformer when the worship question is in view -- and remember, purity of worship was one of the two major concerns (according to Calvin and many others) of the Reformation. Stevenson (who is no friend of classic Reformation worship), after noting that "Calvin had most intimate dealings (with) Louis Bourgeois" and took pleasure in singing Bourgeois' melodies to the Psalms, relates the following episode,

Bourgeois "was arrested in 1551 and placed in prison for having changed 'without permission' the melodies of certain psalms, which he had himself written some years earlier. Robert Bridges (*_The Yattendon Hymnal_*, p. 9) remarks: 'He was imprisoned by his employers for his musical innovation... and having suffered Calvin for sixteen years...lost his appointment and left Geneva on account of Calvin's objection to part-singing" (*_Patterns of Protestant Church Music_* [Duke University Press, 1953], p. 19).

All his proof of classic Calvinist worship patterns considered, even the antagonistic Stevenson (*_Patterns of Protestant Church Music_*) is honest enough to admit that

"(i)n our day Calvin's precepts on church music are more honored in the breach than in the observance. His authority has been invoked for the introduction of certain high-church practices into our large Presbyterian churches; but no responsible scholar has been able to discover evidence in his writings for current practices in the conduct of church music. Modern departures from Calvinist musical theory are basic. These departures from Calvin's straight and narrow path have led modern Presbyterians (neopresbyterians--RB) into an acceptance of instrumental music, and particularly organ music, as a permitted feature of divine worship; into an acceptance of 'hymns of human composure' as a permitted feature of worship song in place of the inspired psalms; into an acceptance of singing in parts as a permitted feature of worship song. But Calvin never allowed organ music in the churches of Geneva. He (positively--RB) sanctioned only inspired psalms and material suitable for congregational singing. And he vigorously opposed any attempt to introduce part singing into the congregational singing of the psalms" (pp. 13-14).

Stevenson cites Calvin's *Commentary of the Book of Psalms*, III, 494-495; V, 312; III, 98; III, 312 for corroboration.

Stevenson also charts Calvinistic opposition to "Frame-like" innovations in worship from Augustine and the covenanted Reformation in the British Isles to John Cotton ("who vigorously denounced organs: 'singing with instruments was typical, and so a ceremonial worship and therefore ceased,'" p. 17) and Cotton Mather in New England. Continuing his survey he notes,

"So reverentially did the Scottish churches regard Calvin's interpretation of Scripture that authorizations for organs in the various branches of the Presbyterian Church were delayed until 1866 for the Established Church, 1872 for the United Presbyterian Church, and 1883 for the Free Church. And, of course, the ultra-Calvinist Reformed Presbyterian Church of America even now forbid the use of organs and the singing of hymns" (pp. 17-18).

The paleopresbyterian suppression of idolatry is no new position, and if you think the circus that Frame would conjure up under the pretense of Christian worship would have escaped negative sanctions in all the major (non-Lutheran) centers of Reform (in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), then you are dreaming in some colors that have yet to be discovered. Clearly, Frame would have been disciplined (ecclesiastically, as well as civilly) for his apostasy and idolatry (as exhibited in his book *Worship in Spirit and Truth*). Only those grossly ignorant of classic Reformation thought would dispute this. Frame would have been disciplined *even* under first Reformation standards, never mind under the greater attainments of the second Reformation (and the standards many Presbyterians -- including Frame -- today *pretend* to adopt). Anyone with even a introductory knowledge of the Reformation, and a cursory acquaintance with Frame's book would rightly and readily be compelled (by honest historical scholarship) to adopt the conclusions I've set forth. This is just a matter of the historical record; you may disagree with what the Reformers did, but you can not deny that I have faithfully represented their position. Even the apostate, schismatic "church" historian Philip Schaff is honest enough to admit that my position concerning the covenanting, confessionalism, discipline and antitolerationism of both Calvin's Geneva and the later Covenanted Reformation in the British Isles is accurate. Though he clearly disparages the Reformers' beliefs and actions, Schaff conjoins Calvin's covenanting under the terms of the *Geneva Confession of Faith* with "the same inconsistency and intolerance (that) was repeated a hundred years later on a much larger scale in the 'Solemn League and Covenant' of the Scottish Presbyterians and English Puritans against popery and prelacy, and sanctioned in 1643 by the Westminster Assembly of Divines which vainly attempted to prescribe a creed, a Church polity, and a directory of worship for the three nations" (*History of the Christian Church*, vol. 8, pp. 356-357).

Schaff gets the history right, but he confuses the Reformer's corporate obedience to the first, second, third, fifth and ninth commandments with what he calls a vain attempt "to prescribe a creed, a Church polity, and a directory of worship for the three nations." Though the idea of covenanted uniformity grates on Schaff's sectarian sensibilities, and he conveniently forgets that Josiah (and other kings) made the same "vain attempts" under

the old administration of the covenant, he retains enough integrity not to attempt to bury Reformation history on this point -- though he obviously disdains this aspect of classical Protestantism.

A list of *other offences* which the Geneva Presbytery would have never tolerated in Frame can be found in *The Register of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in the Time of Calvin*, edited and translated by Philip Edgcumbe Hughes (Eerdmans, 1966). I see six chargeable offences which could be leveled against Frame in the section "Vices which are intolerable in a pastor," under the "Ministerial discipline" heading (pp. 38-39). Four others could be added from the section "Vices which can be endured provided they are rebuked" (p. 39).

Not to leave out our Dutch Reformed brothers and sisters (in our recounting of the old Reformed paths), and with the hope that I am not trying the reader's patience by multiplying citations, let us look at one quote exhibiting the old standards of Reformation maintained in the Netherlands. In a forthcoming book *The Wonders of the Most High; or, An Indication of the Causes, Ways and Means Whereby the United Provinces, Against the Expectation of the Whole World, Were Elevated in Such a Marvelous Way from Their Previous Oppression to Such Great, Awe Inspiring Riches and Acclaim*, just translated into English (from the Dutch) for the first time, Van de Velde (circa 1678), in the section "The Organ in the Worship Service and the Singing of Hymns," writes,

With one word, we judge this and other novelties, in these carefree days, a useless hindrance. This we also say of the introduction of new hymn- books, and present day ditties, which we do not find in God's Word; as also the playing and peeping of organs in the Church. The former are all against the decrees of our Synods. See about singing in the Church, the National Synod of Dordt held in 1578, art. 76; the National Synod held in Middelburg, 1581, art. 51; the National Synod held in the Hague, 1586, art 62; at which gatherings hymns not found in Scripture are expressly forbidden (in a footnote: those who would like to know more about singing of the Psalms, from the Old as well as the New Testament, can read the learned treatise by S. Omius, called 'Dissertation', the first book. Chapter 5, cap. 3).

It is known from Church history, that those who are after novelties, by introducing man-made hymns and errors, have corrupted the Congregation. Although these people have no wrong motives, it is nevertheless not advisable to follow in their steps, since we may receive from them copper instead of gold, as the Pious Peter Martyr witnessed about the time hymns were introduced into the Roman Church. See Peter Martyr on 1 Cor. 14:26. The words of lord van Aldegonde in this respect are remarkable. In the introduction to his book of Psalms he says, "The experience of earlier days has taught us that it is often harmful to introduce something which is not based on the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments." The Synod of Dordt, 1578, art. 77; of Middleburg, 1581; of Gerderland, 1640, art. 3, have all dealt with terminating, when determining the place of the organ in the Church. The statement made by the Synod of Dordt, 1574, art. 50, needs our special attention; where we read, "Concerning the use of Organs in the

Congregation, we hold that according to 1 Cor. 14:19, it should not have a place in the Church; and where it is still used when the people leave the church, it is of no use but to forget what was heard before;" they witness that it is nothing but frivolity. It is also remarkable that lord Rivet, contending against the papists, mentions several of their authors, who condemn the novelty of the Organ, and point out that it is without profit. Rivet, Cathol. Orthodox. tom. 1, pag. 561.

To know the reason why Organs should be kept out of the church, read our learned theologians and their polemics about Organs against the Lutherans and Papists, see Faukee, about Psalm 45, pag. 20. Also Lodoc. Larenus, in cap. 12 Esa, pag. 47, where we find the story of the duty of Middleburg's consistory to do away with the Organ; Hoornbeek disput. 2, de Psalmodia. thes 7; Rivet, in Exod. cap. 15 vs. 12. Imprimis Gisb. Voetii. Polit. Eccl. part 1, pag. 548. Hospiniamus de Templis, pag. 309. It would be better if this and other novelties were not mentioned.

In the days of the Westminster Assembly even the civil magistrates had more sense than most modern "preachers." Girardeau, in his *Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of the Church* (pp. 132, 133 in the 1888 edition) notes,

Before the Westminster Assembly of Divines undertook the office of preparing a Directory of Worship, the Parliament had authoritatively adopted measures looking to the removal of organs, along with other remains of Popery, from the churches of England. On the 20th of May, 1644, the commissioners from Scotland wrote to the General Assembly of their church and made the following statement among others: "We cannot but admire the good hand of God in the great things done here already, particularly that the covenant, the foundation of the whole work, is taken, Prelacy and the whole train thereof extirpated, the service-book in many places forsaken, plain and powerful preaching set up, many colleges in Cambridge provided with such ministers as are most zealous of the best reformation, altars removed, the communion in some places given at the table with sitting, **THE GREAT ORGANS AT PAUL'S AND PETER'S IN WESTMINSTER TAKEN DOWN** (emphasis added), images and many other monuments of idolatry defaced and abolished, the Chapel Royal at Whitehall purged and reformed; and all by authority, in a quiet manner, at noon-day, without tumult." (Girardeau cites this quotation from the *Acts of Assembly of the Church of Scotland*, 1644.) So thorough was the work of removing organs that the "Encyclopaedia Britannica" says that "at the Revolution most of the organs in England had been destroyed." (Girardeau cites Art., *Organ*.)

When, therefore, the Assembly addressed itself to the task of framing a Directory for Worship, it found itself confronted by a condition of the churches of Great Britain in which the singing of psalms without instrumental accompaniment almost universally prevailed. In prescribing, consequently, the singing of psalms without making any allusion to the restoration of instrumental music, it must, in all fairness, be construed to specify the simple singing of praise as a part of public worship. The question, moreover, is settled by the consideration that had any debate

occurred as to the propriety of allowing the use of instrumental music, the Scottish commissioners would have vehemently and uncompromisingly opposed that measure. But Lightfoot, who was a member of the Assembly, in his "Journal of its Proceedings" (Girardeau cites *Works*, Vol. xiii., pp. 343, 344; London, 1825.) tells us: "This morning we fell upon the Directory for singing of psalms; and, in a short time, we finished it." He says that the only point upon which the Scottish commissioners had some discussion was the reading of the Psalms line by line.

The larger history on this subject is also instructive. Again Girardeau informs us ("Historical Argument" pp. 158, 159, 161, 165, 170, 179 in the 1888 edition of *Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of the Church*),

With reference to the time when organs were first introduced into use in the Roman Catholic Church, let us hear Bingham: "It is now generally agreed among learned men that the use of organs came into the church since the time of Thomas Aquinas, Anno 1250; for he, in his *Summs*, has these words: 'Our church does not use musical instruments, as harps and psalteries, to praise God withal, that she may not seem to Judaize.'...Mr. Wharton also has observed that Marinus Sanutus, who lived about the year 1290, was the first who brought the use of wind-organs into churches, whence he was surnamed Torcellus, which is the name for an organ in the Italian tongue....Let us pause a moment to notice the fact, supported by a mass of incontrovertible evidence, that the Christian church did not employ instrumental music in its public worship for 1200 years after Christ....It deserves serious consideration, moreover, that notwithstanding the ever-accelerated drift towards corruption in worship as well as in doctrine and government, the Roman Catholic Church did not adopt this corrupt practice until about the middle of the thirteenth century....When the organ was introduced into its worship it encountered strong opposition, and made its way but slowly to general acceptance. These assuredly are facts that should profoundly impress Protestant churches. How can they adopt a practice which the Roman Church, in the year 1200, had not admitted...Then came the Reformation; and the question arises, How did the Reformers deal with instrumental music in the church?...Zwingle has already been quoted to show instrumental music was one of the shadows of the old law which has been realized in the gospel. He pronounces its employment in the present dispensation "wicked pervicacity." There is no doubt in regard to his views on the subject, which were adopted by the Swiss Reformed churches...Calvin is very express in his condemnation of instrumental music in connection with the public worship of the Christian church...In his homily on 1 Sam. xviii. 1-9, he delivers himself emphatically and solemnly upon the subject: "In Popery there was a ridiculous and unsuitable imitation [of the Jews]. While they adorned their temples, and valued themselves as having made the worship of God more splendid and inviting, they employed organs (emphasis added), and many other such ludicrous things, by which the Word and worship of God are exceedingly profaned, the people being much more attached to those rites than to the understanding of the divine Word..." Whatever may be the practice in recent times of the churches of Holland, the Synods of the Reformed Dutch Church, soon after the Reformation, pronounced

very decidedly against the use of instrumental music in public worship. The National Synod at Middleburg, in 1581, declared against it, and the Synod of Holland and Zeeland, in 1594, adopted this strong resolution; "That they would endeavor to obtain of the magistrate the laying aside of organs, and the singing with them in the churches..." The Provincial Synod of Dort also inveighed severely against their use...The Rev. Charles H. Spurgeon, ...upholds an apostolic simplicity of worship. The great congregation which is blessed with the privilege of listening to his instructions has no organ "to assist" them in singing...The non-prelatic churches, Independent and Presbyterian, began their development on the American continent without instrumental music. They followed the English Puritans and the Scottish Church, which had adopted the principles of the Calvinistic Reformed Church...It has thus been proved by an appeal to historical facts, that the church, although lapsing more and more into defection from the truth and into a corruption of apostolic practice, had no instrumental music for twelve hundred years; and that the Calvinistic Reformed Church ejected it from its services as a element of Popery, even the Church of England having come very nigh to its extrusion from her worship. The historical argument, therefore, combines with the scriptural and the confessional to raise a solemn and powerful protest against its employment by the Presbyterian Church. IT IS HERESY IN THE SPHERE OF WORSHIP (emphasis added).

Tying this into the discipline question, McKnight gently and succinctly summarizes the classic Presbyterian position on worship and admission to the Lord's Supper in his book Concerning Close Communion. This book was originally written for young people in the RPCNA and is an excellent introduction to the governmental aspect of the Lord's Supper. In it McKnight writes,

"We hold, whether rightly or wrongly, that to undertake to praise God with songs other than those which the Holy Spirit has inspired for that purpose is a sin, and such a sin as, unrepented of, should prevent a person from sitting down at the Lord's table, either in our Church or in any other.

We hold, whether rightly or wrongly, that to introduce instrumental music into the New Testament worship, when the Apostles organized that worship without it, is a sin, and such a sin as, unrepented of, should prevent a person from sitting down at the Lord's table, either in our Church or in any other...

The fact is that we find ourselves under obligation, in these respects, to bear a faithful testimony not only to the world, but to such other Churches also as differ with us on these intrinsically important questions. At the communion table our testimony comes to its climax. Shall we weaken where we should be immovable? Shall we make it apparent on the Holy Mount that we are sincere in our conclusions and mean to maintain them to the end, or shall we choose the Holy Mount to make it apparent to other Churches and to the world, that we only half believe what we profess? Here, of all places, it would seem, we ought to aim to be perfect, even as our Father which is in heaven is perfect (Matt. 5:48)."

Oh no, another one of those bad "perfectionistic and schismatic anabaptists" some might claim; but those who know the truth know better. I wonder how many who claim the classic Presbyterian position today still teach their young people to walk down these "old paths." Do you teach these truths to your young people Doug?

In light of all this information I ask: Would Frame have survived Calvin's Geneva, Knox's Scotland or the Covenanted Reformation of the seventeenth century without being excommunicated for the views he sets forth in his book Worship in Spirit and Truth? I say no way! That is what I said on the Knox Ring, it is the truth, and I stand by it -- in spite of all the neopresbyterian nonsense spouted by our modern-day malignants!

The real problem here is not what I did (on the Knox Ring) or what the Reformers did (in their covenants and confessions), but rather the general level of historical ignorance (regarding these matters) prevalent in the modern professing Reformed community. The historical testimony to the truth (which cost many lives) has been to a great extent buried and forgotten in our day and your attacks on me and classic Reformation thought (and history) are a prime example of the prevailing ignorance. I do not say this out of any personal animosity against you or for any other reason than that it is true; and that it is an expression of Christ's love to tell the truth to those who are in error. I still pray that you will be given grace from God to humble yourself and repent of your errors and slander; and even that you would become open, over time, to studying the many source documents of the Reformation that I have offered to you. I would like nothing better than to join hands with you in the unity of the one true faith (Ps. 133) and together fight the ongoing battle for Reformation truth. But as two cannot walk together unless they be agreed (Amos 3:3), any show of unity at this point would be a false show and compromised unity -- which is always displeasing to God. Unity is only in the truth (cf. Unity and Uniformity in the Church by Thomas Houston).

Other testimonies verifying the Reformation position on close communion and the ecclesiastical suppression of public idolatry could easily be multiplied. For those who are willing to research this subject I suggest the following works:

ON CLOSE COMMUNION

Concerning Close Communion by W.J. McKnight (especially pp. 27-49 in regard the Frame/worship controversy). Also available on cassette.

Close Communion by R.J. George

An Explanation and Defence of the Terms of Communion, Adopted by the Community of Dissenters, etc. by The Reformed Presbytery

The Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive by the Church of Scotland General Assembly

Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting from the Revolution Church of Scotland. Also, Their Principles Concerning Civil Government, and the Difference Betwixt the Reformation and Revolution Principles Andrew Clarkson (Free sections at:

<http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/Schism.htm> and
<http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/PlainTOC.htm>)

A Hind Let Loose by Alexander Shields

Strictures on Occasional Hearing by James Douglas

Covenanting, Communion and Confessions: With a Short Summary of the Westminster Confession of Faith by W.J. McKnight

Act, Declaration, And Testimony, For The Whole Of The Covenanted Reformation, As Attained To, And Established In, Britain and Ireland; Particularly Betwixt The Years 1638 and 1649, Inclusive. As, Also, Against All The Steps Of Defection From Said Reformation, Whether In Former Or Later Times, Since The Overthrow Of That Glorious Work, Down To This Present Day by the Reformed Presbytery

A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience by Samuel Rutherford

Wholesome Severity Reconciled with Christian Liberty by George Gillespie

A Modest Apology for the Conduct of Seceders, in Refusing to Join in Christian Communion with Sectarians, Latitudinarians, etc. Who Have Departed From the Purity of Reformation Once Attained to in these Kingdoms by Anonymous

The Lawfulness and Duty of Separation from Corrupt Ministers and Churches Explained and Vindicated by James Fraser (of Brae)

ON WORSHIP

Biblical Worship by Kevin Reed (also free at:
http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/BibW_ch0.htm)

The Songs of Zion: A Contemporary Case for Exclusive Psalmody by Michael Bushell

Come Out From Among Them: The "Anti-Nicodemite" Writings of John Calvin by John Calvin (forthcoming)

Shunning the Unlawful Rites of the Ungodly and Preserving the Purity of the Christian Religion by John Calvin

War Against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin by Carlos Eire

Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of the Church by John Girardeau

The Badge of Popery: Musical Instruments in Public Worship by R.J. George

Exclusive Psalmody by Greg Price (7 cassettes)

Instrumental Music in Public Worship by Greg Price (2 cassettes)

Foundation for Reformation: The Regulative Principle of Worship by Greg Price (also on 2 cassettes)

Reformation Worship and Separation from Idolatry by Reg Barrow (Free, in two parts, at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/CRTPWors.htm> and <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/CRTPsSing.htm>)

A Warning Against the False and Dangerous Views of James Jordan Concerning Worship: A Book Review of Kevin Reed's Canterbury Tales by Reg Barrow (Free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/BlastJJ.htm>)

Christmass: A Biblical Critique by Kevin Reed

The Regulative Principle of Worship and Christmas by Brian Schwertley

_Heart and Voice: Instruments in Christian Worship Not Authorized _ by James Glasgow

A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies Obtruded on the Church of Scotland by George Gillespie (for advanced study)

The Canterbury Tales by Kevin Reed (Free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/Canterbu.htm>)

The study of these books will show how far from the Reformed faith Frame and most modern Presbyterian and Reformed denominations have strayed.

All of what I have said should be also considered in light of the fact that the church as a moral person (cf. "What is a Moral Person? How God Views the Church and the Nations" free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/moral.htm>) had grown considerably (in its corporate sanctification) from the time of the first Reformation to the time of the second Reformation. (In my book on Frame I hope to show, using documents such as the _The Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive_ by the Church of Scotland General Assembly, that my statement regarding Frame's excommunication for idolatry would have not even been close to coming into question. In fact, Frame would have never even come close to being ordained under these standards because he would have not have been allowed to be a member of the Church of Scotland in these days -- in that he publicly opposed their confessions, covenants and terms of communion.) She (the visible church) was thus then obligated to a much higher standard (in terms of public historical attainments), in the same way an individual is obligated to a greater degree of sanctification as he progresses in the faith (though we always have a duty to conform to the whole moral law of God). These ****superadded obligations**** are brought upon the church in the same way an oath further obligates one to do that which is already a moral duty (such as telling the truth). To think or do that which is a declining from previous attainments is backsliding and apostasy, and this applies to the moral person of the church as well as to individuals. Thus, "every separation is not schism, even from the church which hath essentials; yea, and more than essentials: if it be from those (though never so many) who are drawing back from whatever piece of duty and integrity is attained; for this is still to be held fast, according to

many scripture commands (see the five listed below--RB). So Elias (Elijah--RB), when God's covenant was forsaken, was as another Athanasius (I and I only am left) in point of tenacious integrity" (Shields, *_A Hind Let Loose_*, p. 271).

"Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set" (Prov. 22:28).

"Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing" (Phil. 3:16).

"That which hath been is now; and that which is to be hath already been; and *God requireth that which is past*" (Eccl. 3:15, emphasis added).

"Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein" (Jer. 6:16).

"That ye be not slothful, but *followers of them* who through faith and patience inherit the promises" (Heb. 6:12, emphasis added).

>As for the charges you are bringing against me (& Nathan & Doug) in your
>church court, I would encourage you to wait until after the publication of
>your book. A casual reader of the correspondence might wonder why charges
>against members of Church A were being brought before the elders of Church
>B. "Gee, is that presbyterian?" they might wonder. And no wonder. But no
>doubt you have found somewhere a big fat book showing how the attainments of
>the Reformation, properly understood, require that we all become
>perfectionistic and schismatic anabaptists. Well, speaking for me and my
>house, we are not going to have any of it.

REG BARROW WRITES:

First, you still don't seem to understand that you do not belong to a church that is *duly constituted* (because of the false doctrine that you preach and adopted constitutionally -- and as demonstrated by what you tolerate at the Lord's table) and therefore you posit a false premise. There is no church A and church B (constitutionally), as demonstrated in my previous letters. There is just a church A and I am bringing my charges before them. You and your "church" have no lawful *ministerial authority* from Christ.

I should also mention, in light of the fact that you have no church (constitutionally) and that you are no duly called minister (while you obstinately maintain serious errors contrary to Scripture), faithful Christians should not attend your public Lords' days services (Rom. 16:17, Prov. 19:27). Furthermore, those who attend your preaching practise the sin of occasional hearing (cf. *_Strictures on Occasional Hearing_* by James Douglas) and those who take the Lord's Supper from your hand also sin (cf. *_Alexander and Rufus_* by John Anderson on occasional communion and close communion).

Second, another point at which you continue in darkness has to do with how the Reformers judged the true from the false church. You confuse our statements concerning

doctrinal attainments and faithfulness *at a constitutional level* with the Anabaptist error of focusing on the conduct of individuals in the church (as a basis for separation). Greaves, in *Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation*, comments,

"Knox was faced with the possibility of men withdrawing from his movement because of immoral behavior by some of his adherents. He repudiated this course by contending that the lives of church members are no assured sign of a true visible church. Much more significant is the doctrine preached and accepted in the church. If the Word of God is given supreme authority, if Christ is accepted as the sole Savior, and if the sacraments are rightly administered, the church is legitimate. There have always been vices in the true church and virtuous heathen outside it. If virtuous lives are an assured sign of election, Knox argued, Moslems would have to be counted among the elect. Thus the church's status as true or malignant must be determined by doctrine rather than by the morality or immorality of its members (the endnote here refers the reader to Knox's *Works*, vol. 4, pp. 263-267).

Calvin also used and made the same distinctions regarding the visible church. The famous ecclesiastical section of the *Institutes* (Book 4, Chapter 2), particularly the portion so often referred to in debates concerning the nature of the visible church (section 12), includes Calvin's indispensable delineation of the two ways in which the church is visible (i.e. as to *essence* as seen in those professing the truth [with their children] and also as corporately *constituted*). Calvin here recognizes the visible church at Rome in the remnant of professors there present, but goes on to call for separation from Rome in that she, as a corporate entity (being a harlot and not Christ's chaste bride), is not duly (or lawfully) constituted. The Battles edition of the *Institutes* (4.2.12) beautifully translates Calvin's summary of this Scripturally faithful argument,

"However, *when we categorically deny to the papists the title of the church, we do not for this reason impugn the existence of churches among them*. Rather, we are only contending about **the true and lawful constitution of the church**, required in the communion not only of the sacraments (which are the signs of profession) but also especially of doctrine. Daniel [Dan. 9:27] and Paul [II Thess. 2:4] foretold that Antichrist would sit in the Temple of God. With us, it is the Roman pontiff we make the leader and standard bearer of that wicked and abominable kingdom. The fact that his seat is placed in the Temple of God signifies that his reign was not to be such as to wipe out either the name of Christ or of the church. From this it therefore is evident that we *by no means deny that the churches under his tyranny remain churches*. But these he has profaned by his sacrilegious impiety, afflicted by his inhuman domination, corrupted and well-nigh killed by his evil and deadly doctrines, which are like poisoned drinks. In them Christ lies hidden, half buried, the gospel overthrown, piety scattered, the worship of God nearly wiped out. In them, briefly, everything is so confused that there we see the face of Babylon rather than that of the Holy City of God. To sum up, **I call them churches to the extent that the Lord wonderfully preserves in them a remnant of his people**, however woefully dispersed and scattered, and to the extent that some marks of the church remain—especially those marks whose effectiveness neither the devil's wiles nor human depravity can destroy (note: this is why the Reformers accepted Roman Catholic

baptisms as valid, though not lawful (RB). But on the other hand, because in them those marks have been erased to which we should pay particular regard in this discourse (i.e. the faithful preaching of the Word, scripturally regulated worship, etc. -- RB), **I say that every one of their congregations and their whole body lack the lawful form of the church** (emphases added).

Without the understanding of Calvin's (and the bulk of other major Reformers') ecclesiology on this point, it is impossible to fully appreciate the Reformers' position regarding separation, schism, the sacraments, the ministry, eschatology, etc. This is one of the reasons you confuse what we (and the Reformers) are saying with what the Anabaptists taught. We are dealing with the visible church (and those that profess to be such) as to its *constituted corporate character* (regarding separation), as Calvin and Knox did; not as to the acts and beliefs of her individual members, as the Anabaptists did. By the way, the latitudinarian neopresbyterian "Alexander" makes charges similar to those you are bringing against us, against the almost paleopresbyterian "Rufus" (who represents the Seceder position), by misusing the Donatist's and Novation's (who maintained a number of positions similar to the Anabaptists). These false charges are soundly answered and refuted in John Anderson's book, *Alexander and Rufus*, on pages 110-123.

Larry Birger has been granted the following insights (adapted from a letter originally written to Larry Woiwode), further collaborating the development of this teaching from both first and second Reformation confessional documents,

My studies of the original teachings of the reformers, over the last year and a half, have led me to many striking and saddening conclusions. In short, I am more convinced than ever that if the reformers were *essentially* correct... in their exposition of the scriptures, then only one evaluation can be made of today's "reformed" and "presbyterian" churches by the candid student of scripture and history: *we are apostate*. I see clearly taught by outstanding reformers that the Roman church was the whore of Babylon (indeed, this teaching was *creedal* in at least one case), who makes war with the woman (the faithful church) and her seed, driving them to exile in the wilderness (Rev. 12; WCF 25:4; note the Scripture proofs for the WCF, suprascript 'h', here). It should be carefully noted that this wicked harlot is described as being a mother (Rev. 17:5). Who then are the daughters? All those churches who, regardless of their glorying in names like "Protestant", "reformed", etc., nevertheless follow in the footsteps of the Roman whore and her idolatry and filth.

Please note that I am referring to the churches here in their *formal* or *constitutional* capacity, for I believe that there are some, if not many, of God's people still among them. It is in this capacity that we are to apply the tests of the marks of the true church (Scottish Confession of Faith, Chapter 18, and WCF 25:4), whereas the church in her *essential* capacity is simply, "all those throughout the world who profess the true religion, together with their children" (WCF 25:2; WLC 62), and not the church's organization or government. This government and ministry is given "unto* this catholic visible church" (WCF 25:3), which presupposes her existence apart from them; this is confirmed in WLC

62-63, where the ministry, etc., are privileges given to her, not essential characteristics. That the organizational form of the church equals the church is a Popish error rampant in our day; Calvin considered this a fundamental difference between Protestants and Papists, as he says in his "Prefatory Address to King Francis," *Institutes*, p. 24-25 (Battles edition):

"Our controversy turns on these hinges: first, they contend that the form of the church is always apparent and observable. Secondly, they set this form in the see of the Roman Church and its hierarchy. We, on the contrary, affirm that the church can exist without any visible appearance, and that its appearance {i.e. when the church in her organized form is indeed visible} is not contained within that outward magnificence which they foolishly admire. Rather, it has quite another mark: namely, the pure preaching of God's Word and the lawful administration of the sacraments. They rage if the church cannot always be pointed to with the finger. But among the Jewish people how often was it so deformed that no semblance of it remained? What form do we think it displayed when Elijah complained that he alone was left [I Kings 19:10, or 14]? How long after Christ's coming was it hidden without form? How often has it since that time been so oppressed by wars, seditions, and heresies that it did not shine forth at all? If they had lived at that time, would they have believed that any church existed?"

Therefore, in the former capacity a given church can be considered false, a synagogue of Satan, and of the whore, while at the same time, considered in the latter capacity, she nevertheless can have in her a true church. This is evident from Rev. 18:4, where God's people are yet among Babylon the whore (note that Rev. 18:2 is a proof-text for the phrase, "some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan" in WCF 25:5). It is also evident from Calvin's *Institutes*, IV:2.12 (by the way, please note in this and the quote above how often Calvin uses the word "form" and similar words when considering the church from these two different angles)... It must be stressed that, because these churches have followed in the whore's footsteps, they are guilty of dividing the body of Christ; they are *schismatics*, who have *separated* themselves (though they be in the vast majority numerically) from the company of the faithful (who are the great minority), and are instead walking disorderly and causing divisions contrary to the apostolic doctrine and practice (II Thess. 3:6,14; Rom. 16:17).

As a short aside, it is also interesting to note that Birger refers to Chapter 18 of *The Scottish Confession of Faith (1560)*. This chapter (and the whole *Scottish Confession* for that matter) should be required reading for every modern evangelical and neopresbyterian. I bring this up here because it confirms my previous answer regarding your assertion about "Moses seat," separation and the visible church. Notice how chapter 18 deals with scribes, Pharisees and the "whole priesthood of the Jews" in the first century. I am going to cite the whole chapter (from the Presbyterian Heritage Publications edition reprinted in 1992) so that the reader can get the whole context. I will add emphases to the sections that address your assertion about "Moses' seat." (The complete

1560 The Scottish Confession of Faith is available free of charge on SWRB's web page at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/ScotConf.htm>).

Chapter 18

Of the Notes by Which the True Kirk is Discerned from the False and Who Shall be Judge of the Doctrine

Because that Satan from the beginning has laboured to deck his pestilent synagogue with the title of the kirk of God, and has inflamed the hearts of cruel murderers to persecute, trouble, and molest the true kirk and members thereof Ð as Cain did Abel; [Gen. 4:8] Ishmael, Isaac; [Gen. 21:9] Esau, Jacob; [Gen. 27:41] and **the whole priesthood of the Jews, Christ Jesus himself, and his apostles after him**; [Matt. 23:34; John 15:18-20,24; 11:47,53; Acts 4:1-3; 5:17, etc.] it is a thing most requisite that the true kirk be discerned from the filthy synagogue, by clear and perfect notes, lest we, being deceived, receive and embrace to our own condemnation the one for the other. The notes, signs, and assured tokens whereby the immaculate spouse of Christ Jesus is known from that horrible harlot, the kirk malignant; we affirm are neither antiquity, title usurped, lineal descent, place appointed, nor multitude of men approving an error Ð for Cain in age and title was preferred to Abel and Seth; [Gen. 4:1] Jerusalem had prerogative above all places of the earth, [Ps. 48:2-3; Matt. 5:35] where also were the priests lineally descended from Aaron; and **greater multitude followed the scribes, Pharisees, and priests, than unfeignedly believed and approved Christ Jesus and his doctrine**; [John 12:42] and yet, as we suppose, **no man (of whole judgment) will grant that any of the forenamed were the kirk of God**.

The notes, therefore, of the true kirk of God we believe, confess, and avow to be: first, the true preaching of the word of God, into the which God has revealed himself to us, as the writings of the prophets and apostles do declare; secondly, the right administration of the sacraments of Christ Jesus, which must be annexed unto the word and promise of God, to seal and confirm the same in our hearts; [Eph. 2:20; Acts 2:42; John 10:27; 18:37; 1 Cor. 1:13; Matt. 18:19-20; Mark 16:15-16; 1 Cor. 11:24-26; Rom. 4:11] last, ecclesiastical discipline uprightly ministered, as God's word prescribes, whereby vice is repressed, and virtue nourished. [Matt. 18:15-18; 1 Cor. 5:4-5] Wheresoever then these former notes are seen, and of any time continue (be the number [of persons] never so few, about two or three) there, without all doubt, is the true kirk of Christ: who, according to his promise is in the midst of them: [Matt. 18:19-20] not that universal [kirk] (of which we have before spoken) but particular; such as were in Corinth, [1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Cor. 1:2] Galatia, [Gal. 1:2] Ephesus, [Eph. 1:1; Acts 16:9-10; 18:1, etc.; 20:17, etc.] and other places in which the ministry was planted by Paul, and were of himself named the kirks of God.

And such kirks we, the inhabitants of the realm of Scotland, professors of Christ Jesus, confess ourselves to have in our cities, towns, and places reformed; for the doctrine taught in our kirks is contained in the written word of God: to wit, in the

books of the New and Old Testaments: in those books, we mean, which of the ancient have been reputed canonical, in the which we affirm that all things necessary to be believed for the salvation of mankind are sufficiently expressed. [John 20:31; 2 Tim. 3:16-17] The interpretation whereof, we confess, neither appertains to private nor public person, neither yet to any kirk for any preeminence or prerogative, personal or local, which one has above another; but appertains to the Spirit of God, by the which also the scripture was written. [2 Pet. 1:20-21.]

When controversy then happens, for the right understanding of any place or sentence of scripture, or for the reformation of any abuse within the kirk of God, we ought not so much to look what men before us have said or done, as unto that which the Holy Ghost uniformly speaks within the body of the scriptures, and unto that which Christ Jesus himself did, and commanded to be done. [John 5:39] For this is a thing universally granted, that the Spirit of God (which is the Spirit of unity) is in nothing contrary unto himself. [Eph. 4:3-4] If then the interpretation, determination, or sentence of any doctor, kirk, or council, repugn to the plain word of God written in any other place of scripture, it is a thing most certain, that there is not the true understanding and meaning of the Holy Ghost, supposing that councils, realms, and nations have approved and received the same. For we dare not receive and admit any interpretation which directly repugns to any principal point of our faith, or to any other plain text of scripture, or yet unto the rule of charity.

You used the example of "Moses' seat" to buttress your false ecumenism and confusion over the visible church; the National Presbyterian church of Scotland (in Knox's day) obviously came to the exact opposite conclusion. They term those sitting in Moses' seat Satan's "pestilent synagogue," adding that "no man (of whole judgment) will grant that any of the forenamed were the kirk of God." Once again you are at odds with the classic Presbyterianism view of what Scripture teaches -- even to the point of mistaking Presbyterianism for the Anabatist heresy. More on this question is also found in John Anderson's Alexander and Rufus on pages 237-238.

The distinction between the two ways in which the visible church was viewed by the Reformers, which we continue to maintain, is sprinkled throughout their writings (and the writings of those who followed in their footsteps). Some examples of this can be seen in:

Alexander and Rufus by John Anderson pp. 10, 15-17, 53, 77.

For those interested in specifically determining the differences between what Greg Price terms the "Constitutional vs. the Unconstituional Church," he has also provided this short list:

An Apologetical Relation by John Brown (of Wamphray) pp. 156, 157, 158.

Due Right of Presbytery by Samuel Rutherford pp. 64, 67, 72, 73, 74, 78, 79, 117, 240, 241, 151, 158, 265, 283, 286, 287, 415, 223 (--the second p. 223 in the book), 230 (b), 231 (b), 243(b), 249(b).

A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience by Samuel Rutherford pp. 36, 41, 66, 67, 68, 73, 98, 271.

Larry Birger has also written a useful introduction to these ideas, see his "The Visible Church: Essence Versus Lawful Form" free at:
<http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/vischu.htm> (or write us for this free newsletter).

While the Reformers did not always utilize the exact same terminology we use, the ideas are clearly the same.

Third, some examples from history will further serve to expose your ignorance of Presbyterianism and your "church A, church B" scenario. These examples prove that those outside of a duly constituted visible church can come under discipline (even if only as a matter of testimony before God and men). This is due, in part, because they are baptized members of the visible church (as to her essential character). If the greater sanction of excommunication can be brought against those not of the same church, then certainly the lesser steps (i.e. charges) leading up to excommunication are also legitimate. Because you are not a member of the a duly constituted visible church (though individually you are part of the visible church, as to essence, by baptism and profession) there is no reason that Matthew 18:15-17 can not be used to reclaim you to the truth.

Below I will site two examples (enacted by two covenanted Presbyterians) of public excommunications of those outside duly constituted churches. This will be followed by an appeal to two classic Presbyterian standards of the first Reformation. The two historical examples and the the two confessional citations prove that your comments (above) reflect anything but the classic Presbyterian view of discipline.

John Macmillan, was the principle architect of the Auchensaugh Renovation (of the National and Solemn League and Covenant). He was the first minister of the Covenanting Societies (when he accepted a call on Oct. 9, 1706) since the martyrdom of James Renwick in 1688 and the defections of Boyd, Linning and Shields (in 1689 to the apostate and compromised Revolution church). Three days after the Auchensaugh Renewal of the National and Solemn League and Covenant, a remnant of faithful Presbyterians in Scotland came together for the Lord's Supper (on July 27, 1712). The excommunication or "fencing of the tables" which took place on this momentous occasion, including some of the words which Macmillan proclaim, is explained by the Reformed Presbytery when they note,

It may be some will desiderate an account of the other solemn holy action that followed upon the back of this (i.e. the covenant renewal lead by John Macmillan at Auchensaugh in 1712--RB), in regard there were some circumstances in it not so ordinary in this church in former times, because of the paucity of public instruments; but neither do we think it needful to give any large account of it, nor will it fall so properly into this preface, which concerneth only national covenanting, and, it is likely the reader's patience is too far transgressed upon already; *nor was there any substantial or formal difference betwixt it and the comely order of the Church of Scotland observed in our purest times of

reformation in the celebration of that sacred ordinance, except what in the form arose from the circumstances we were in, and the reason now mentioned*. The work was awful and great, the persons employed about it few, insignificant in their own eyes, as well as mean in the eyes of others; and hence the Lord's power and grace was the more conspicuous, who (we must not dissemble it) was present to the sensible experience of many, sealing instruction upon the hearts of some, and granting, strengthening, and confirming grace to others, for which he ought to have all the glory.

But because there has been, as we are informed, no small clamor raised anent some expressions used in debarring the ignorant and scandalous from the holy table of the Lord; *That the Minister should have unreasonably and presumptuously excommunicated the Queen and Parliament, and the whole Ministers of the established church of Scotland*; Therefore, we shall here insert the very words relating to that affair, as they were uttered by him without any alteration. In warning the ignorant, scandalous and profane to beware of presuming to approach to the holy table of the Lord, the minister observed (as the manner is) the order of the decalogue, where, in the sins forbidden in the second commandment, as they are enumerated by the very Reverend the Assembly of Divines sitting at Westminster, in their humble advice concerning a Larger Catechism, we find these amongst others -- "All devising, counseling, commanding, using, and any ways approving any religious worship not instituted by God himself, tolerating a false religion. -- All superstitious devices, corrupting the worship of God, adding to it, taking from it, whether invented and taken up of ourselves, or received by tradition from others, though under the title of antiquity, custom, devotion, good intent, or any other pretence whatsoever." Hence, he expressed himself in these words -- "***I excommunicate and debar from this holy table of the Lord, all devisers, commanders, users, or approvers of any religious worship not instituted by God in his Word, all tolerators and countenancers thereof**"; and by consequence I debar and excommunicate from this holy table of the Lord, Queen and Parliament, and all under them, who spread and propagate or tolerate a false superstitious worship, ay and until they repent." And in relation to the opposing of the covenants and work of reformation, he had these words -- "I excommunicate and debar all who are opposers of our covenants and covenanted Reformation, and all that have taken oaths contrary to our covenants, and such particularly as are takers of the Oath of Abjuration, whether Ministers or others, until they repent."

That this was no presumptuous and rebellious arrogance is evident, because the sins for which he debarred Queen and Parliament, and all others guilty of them, are proven from Scripture to be gross breaches of God's law, and every violation thereof persisted in without repentance, is a sufficient cause (in the opinion of Protestant Divines) to debar and exclude from the Lord's table. Now, it is certain that even those ministers of the established church who make such obloquy against the work for this particular, do the same thing in effect every time that they administrate this ordinance, for (as can be proved if they please to require it, or do deny it,) *they excommunicate from the table all guilty of such sins as are

forbidden in the second commandment, according as they are specified in the foresaid Catechism*; and so, by an infallible consequence, they excommunicate the Queen and Parliament, who are grossly guilty of the most of them, only they have not the courage ingenuously and freely to own and express the consequence, but that it follows natively and necessarily from the premises, even according to their own principles, they will never be able to disprove.

Now, Reader, thou has a just and true account as far as was necessary, of our poor and weak endeavours in this matter, which we hope will, at least, stand as a witness and testimony (without arrogance we desire to speak it) against the apostacy of some and indifferency of others, who should have been to us as the he-goats before the flock in paving our way to Zion, but are rather making to themselves captains to carry us back to Babylon, and pollute our land with idolatry and superstition; and, as a pledge to posterity that the Lord has not yet utterly deserted the land, though we rather wish, (if so it may consist with his holy purpose, who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working) that it might tend to excite some to bethink "whence they have fallen, and repent, and to do their first works, lest the Lord come quickly, and utterly remove his candlestick from us:" and engage them to renew these covenants in a more public way, and prosecute the ends of them with more zeal, fidelity, and constancy, "that the Lord may yet delight to dwell amongst us, make our judges peace, and our exactors righteousness," and make us to be called Hephzibah, and our land Beulah" (Auchensaugh Renovation of the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant by the Reformed Presbytery and John Macmillan [Still Waters Revival Books, 1880, reprinted 1995], pp. 54-56, emphases added).

This is an interesting quote for many reasons. I will mention just two.

First, it demonstrates that those who held to the full covenanted testimony (of second Reformation attainments) focused on one of the same areas (worship) which I did when bearing testimony (on Knox Ring) against Frame and his heretical book. That the Covenanters would have included Frame in this excommunication, had he been living in their day (and had written what he wrote), is beyond a shadow of doubt. In fact, Frame's views are so novel that I doubt that any Presbyterian church of that day (including the constitutionally apostate Revolution Church -- who still practised exclusive Psalmody, forbade instruments in worship, etc.) would have even allowed Frame membership in the congregations.

Second, Macmillan's charges would also include you and your congregation in the above excommunication (based on original intent of the specifics mentioned in the Larger Catechism concerning both worship and the covenants). You do not hold to the covenants and you publicly practice and condone false worship. Moreover, with your slanderous charges of Anabaptism against us (the modern heirs to Macmillan and the older Covenanted testimony) you would have been a prime candidate for excommunication on many counts.

Another example of disciplinary proceedings against those outside of a duly constituted church can be seen in the actions of Donald Cargill. Cargill studied under Samuel Rutherford at St. Andrews, so I think that he would be considered at least "somewhat" representative of second Reformation Presbyterianism. Those familiar with Rutherford and Cargill know that both these men held to the covenanted attainments of the second Reformation and were willing to risk their lives for these truths. The *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology* gets it right when they note that "for many," Cargill's "abiding legacy was the steadfast endurance he displayed in asserting the historic claims of the Church at a time of intense testing and trial" (p. 137). These "historic claims" can easily be seen to be congruent with the doctrine and practice of his teacher Samuel Rutherford. Not two months after the martyrdom of Richard Cameron (whom Cargill preached with in the fields in the summer of 1680) we read of the following account,

"Cargill's audience were now well prepared for what was to follow. After closing his discourse and calling his hearers to prayer, 'that we may the better proceed', he came directly to the climax of his day's work. 'We have spoken of excommunication', he said, 'of the causes, subjects and ends; we shall now proceed to the action, being constrained by the conscience of our duty, and zeal for God, to excommunicate some of those who have been the committers of so great crimes and authors of so great mischiefs of Britain and Ireland, but especially those of Scotland, and in doing of this we shall keep the names by which they are ordinarily called, that they may be the better known.'

Cargill then pronounced: 'I, being a minister of Jesus Christ, and having authority and power from him, do in his name, and by his Spirit, excommunicate, cast out of the true church and deliver up to Satan, Charles II, king, and that upon the account of these wickednesses:

1. For his high contempt of God, after he had acknowledged his own sins, his father's sins, his mother's idolatry, and had solemnly engaged against them in a declaration at Dunfermline, the 16th day of August 1650, he has notwithstanding of all this gone on more avowedly in these sins than all that were before him.
2. For his great perjury, after he had twice at least solemnly subscribed that Covenant (i.e. the Solemn League and Covenant--RB), he did so presumptuously renounce, disown and command it to be burnt by the hand of the hangman.
3. Because he had rescinded all laws for establishing of that religion and reformation engaged to in that Covenant, and enacted laws for establishing its contrary, and is still working for the introducing of popery in these lands.
4. For commanding of armies to destroy the Lord's people who are standing in their own just defence and for their privileges and rights against tyrannies, oppressions and injuries of men; and for the blood he has shed on fields and scaffolds and in seas of the people of God, upon account of religion and righteousness (they being most willing in all other things to render their obedience,

if he had reigned and ruled them according to his covenant and oath) more than all the kings that have been before him in Scotland.

5. That he has still been an enemy to, and a persecutor of the true Protestants, a favourer and helper of the papists, both at home and abroad, and has hindered, to the utmost of his power, the due execution of just laws against them.

6. For his relaxing of the kingdom by his frequent grant of remissions and pardons for murderers (which is in the power of no king to do, being expressly contrary to the law of God) which was the ready way to embolden men to commit murders, to the defiling of the land with blood.

7. To pass by all other things, his great and dreadful uncleanness of adultery and incest, his drunkenness, his dissembling with God and man and performing his promises where his engagements were sinful.'

Cargill then went on to pronounce sentence 'by the same authority, and in the same name' on six of the king's leading officers of state: the Duke of York, brother of the king, 'for his idolatry'; the Duke of Monmouth, 'for leading armies against the Lord's people, and for refusing, that morning at Bothwell Bridge, a cessation of arms, for hearing and redressing their injuries, wrongs and oppressions'; the Duke of Lauderdale, the king's former commissioner in Scotland, 'for his dreadful blasphemy, his scoffing at religion, his perjury, his adulteries and uncleanness, his gaming on the Lord's Day, and his usual and ordinary cursing'; the Duke of Rothes, Chancellor of Scotland and President of the Privy Council, 'for his perjury, his adulteries and uncleanness; his allotting the Lord's Day for his drunkenness; for the heathenish, barbarous and unheard-of cruelty, whereof he was the chief author, contriver and commander, to that worthy gentlemen David Hackston of Rathillet, and for his ordinary cursing, swearing and drunkenness'; Sir George Mackenzie, the king's Advocate, 'for his apostasy, his constant pleading against and persecuting to death the people of God, his pleading for sorcerers, murderers and other criminals, and his ungodly, erroneous, fantastic and blasphemous tenets'; and Thomas Dalrymple of Binns, general of the king's forces, 'for his leading armies and commanding the killing, robbing, pillaging and oppressing of the Lord's people; for his lewd and impious life led in adultery and uncleanness from his youth, with contempt of marriage, which is an ordinance of God; and for his other injurious deeds, in the exercise of his power'.

Cargill had now come to the close of his momentous work. 'I think', he said as he concluded, 'none that acknowledge the Word of God can judge these sentences to be unjust. And as the causes are just, so being done by a minister of the gospel, and in such a way as the present persecution would permit, the sentence is just; and there are no kings or ministers on earth, without repentance of the persons, can reverse these sentences upon any such account. God, who is the author of that ordinance, is the more engaged to the ratifying of them, and all that acknowledge the Scriptures of truth ought to acknowledge them.' And he ended by applying to the case the following words of Scripture: 'Should he deal with our sister as with

an harlot? Would they deal with our God as with an idol? Should they deal with his people as murderers and malefactors, and we not draw out his sword against them?'

For Cargill the consequences of the Torwood excommunication were incalculable. The news of it spread like wildfire throughout the country; copies were posted up in prominent places in Edinburgh and other principal towns, and the subjects of the sentence soon came to know of it. In a day when ecclesiastical censures meant more than they do now, the significance of the excommunication was not lost upon the authorities, for they recognized that those people who believed that Cargill had divine authority for his action would now regard themselves as loosed from their allegiance. Cargill well knew the dangers to which he had exposed himself and the outburst of fury to which he would be subjected. He had entered on the work in the certain assurance that he was obeying God's command, and his utterance was characterized at every step by assertions of the divine authority. But there is evidence too that he was under intense mental strain: he forgot at first to include the Duke of Lauderdale in the sentence and was obliged to mention him separately in the afternoon, and also during his discourse he referred mistakenly to St Ambrose as Bishop of Lyons instead of Bishop of Milan. These were slips of which Bishop Paterson of Edinburgh took full advantage when writing later that week to Lauderdale expressing his horror at what Cargill had done. But the fact that Cargill had taken this action was of itself of profound significance. For one thing it showed that it had been no empty gesture by a rash or impetuous spirit, for deliberation and forethought characterized all Cargill's public actions. Nor was he inclined by nature to the sensational or dramatic, or to any action which invited public attention. The mere fact that his work that day had been uncharacteristic and alien to his natural inclinations suggests strongly that he had been acting under a compulsion which overbore his own nature and which he clearly recognized as carrying divine authority.

Speaking some time later he said, 'I know I am and will be condemned by many for what I have done, but condemn me who will, I know I am approved of God, and am persuaded that what I have done on earth is ratified in heaven; for if ever I knew the mind of God, and was clear in my call to any piece of my generation-work, it was in that.'

...on any dispassionate analysis, **Cargill's action can be seen as being fully in accord with the historic principles of Scottish Presbyterianism**. As he had said, *all baptized persons -- all members of the visible church (as to essence--RB), whatever their rank or station* -- were subject to the discipline of the church and so were potentially liable to her ultimate sanction. This had been made abundantly clear in the Reformation standards of Knox and his successors, which had stressed the **essential** unity and catholicity of the visible church (speaking here as to those who profess the truth, notice 'essential' or as to essence--RB) and her jurisdiction (only lawfully constituted churches have true jurisdiction; thus though Grant comes to the correct conclusion and is historically accurate he has mixed his

terms somewhat--RB) over all within her pale, high or low, whatever their religious allegiance or affinities might be" (Maurice Grant, *No King But Christ: The Story of Donald Cargill* [Evangelical Press, 1988], pp. 135-139).

This historical information is also noted and confirmed, beginning on page 408, in *The Covenants and the Covenanters: Covenants, Sermons, and Documents of the Covenanted Reformation* (James Kerr, ed.) and Shield's, in *A Hind Let Loose* (pp. 169-172), also recounts this episode; verifying that the persecuted remnant of covenanted Presbyterian's saw Cargill's "Torwood excommunication" as an action of faithfulness to Christ and His cause. Shield's also calls Cargill "a burning and shining light" and notes that shortly after this testimony he was "crowned with the glory of martyrdom" (*A Hind Let Loose*, p. 172).

Furthermore, endnote 7 (found on page 258 of Grant's, *No King But Christ: The Story of Donald Cargill*, right at the end of the longer quotation that I have provided above in the preceding paragraph) completely confirms my position (regarding the taking of disciplinary actions against those outside the bounds of a duly constituted church). Notice that Grant's references are taken from *First Books of Discipline* and *Order of Excommunication*; "somewhat" *classic* statements of the Presbyterian position.

"To discipline must all estates within this realm be subject, if they offend, as well the rulers as they that are ruled' (*First Books of Discipline*, in Laing's *Works of Knox*, vol. II, p. 233). Similarly in the *Order of Excommunication* of 1569: 'All crimes that by the law of God deserve death, deserve also excommunication from the society of Christ's church, **whether the offender be papist or Protestant, for it is no reason that under pretence of diversity of religion open impiety should be suffered in the visible body of Christ Jesus**' (Ibid., vol. VI. p. 449, emphasis added)."

So you see, your question "Gee, is that presbyterian?" should be no cause for "wonder;" for it would have been answered by the faithful Presbyterians of the past with a resounding "YES! THIS MOST CERTAINLY IS PRESBYTERIANISM." I must say, Doug, that I am surprised that you have not read (or at least remembered) these citations from the *First Books of Discipline* and *Order of Excommunication*; though I am *not surprised* that you were unaware of the history surrounding the second Reformation excommunications which I have recounted above. I'll send you a free copy of the *First Books of Discipline* and the *Order of Excommunication* if you promise to read them.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>Reg, you are having trouble hitting the presbyterial ground with your
>covenantal hat.

REG BARROW WRITES:

I don't know what presbyterial *ground* you are talking about (and you have not yet given any evidence that you even know where the presbyterial *planet* is). On the other hand I have provided ample proof that I adhere to classic Presbyterian thought -- whereas you have provided nothing but a number of virtually useless one-liners, much empty

rhetoric and some wild-eyed (and unsubstantiated) charges. But I am content to let the reader study the CLASSIC PRESBYTERIAN position and determine who knows what they are talking about; that is why I have included so many clues (throughout our correspondence) directing individuals to Reformation source documents and books chronicling the history of Reformation thought. Neopresbyterianism is dead, it just needs to be buried by Paleopresbyterian truth. Get (and read) the books which I have noted and you will see what I mean.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>You say you subscribe to the covenants. So did Charles II.

REG BARROW WRITES:

So what? What does an argument from abuse prove? It is not hard to see, from the excommunications noted above (which I agree with), what my position on Charles II is. Charles only added to his monumental antichristian wickedness by sinfully perjuring himself by swearing a covenant which he did not believe or intend to keep. Moreover, my position on Charles II is that of the Covenanted Presbyterian Protestors of the second Reformation. I have already publicly addressed this question in:

Oliver Cromwell by Reg Barrow (Barrow's letters on Theonomy-L exposing Cromwell as a covenant-breaker, a liar and a dictator [who executed and imprisoned covenanted Presbyterian ministers -- so much for his so-called toleration and his "pretended liberty of conscience"]. These letters also set forth some of the biblical basics of the covenanted Reformation [of the seventeenth century] which gave us the Westminster standards and the Solemn League and Covenant.) FREE AT:
<http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/Crom.htm>

For those that do not have access to the web, this material touching on the Protester/Resolutioner controversy, along with other articles I have authored is found in the book John Knox, Oliver Cromwell, God's Law and the Reformation of Civil Government.

DOUG WILSON WRITES:

>For the covenants,
>
>Douglas Wilson
>Credenda/Agenda

REG BARROW WRITES:

You still haven't answered which covenants you are for and how you are for them; or any of the *many* other questions which I asked you throughout our exchanges (I challenge the reader to look back over all the questions which Mr. Wilson has left unanswered, for his silence tells as great a story as his replies). You seem to like to attach labels to yourself which you do not understand, while stigmatizing others falsely, based on your ignorance

of Scripture and history. I guess that is one of the most disappointing aspects of our interaction in these letters -- for I had expected so much more from you. You exhibit almost no knowledge of the doctrines and history which we have discussed, you have not answered even a fraction of the questions which I asked you (though I have given detailed answers to your questions and will be providing more in books which are presently being written), you show virtually no familiarity with the many source documents of the Reformation which are now available, you wildly slander us with ridiculous charges (that apply better to yourself and not at all to us), and beyond all this you provide no proof to back up your erroneous and imaginary charges and assertions. Moreover, you exacerbate the situation by remaining stubborn and obstinate in your error to the extent that you will not even take one of the many free books which I have offered you throughout our discourses -- not even to try and refute them (Luke 6:39; Matt. 23:34).

Calvin faced a similar situation in his day and gave an useful reply, with which I fully concur. Calvin's rebuke of those who falsely charged him with schism can be appropriately directed at you; for you have a tendency (on one hand) to adopt *portions* of Rome's view of the church, schism, separation and excommunication.

"But the most serious charge of all is that we have attempted to dismember the Bride of Christ. Were that true, both you and the whole world might well regard us as past redemption. But I will not admit the charge, *unless you can make out that the Bride of Christ is dismembered by those who desire to present her as a chaste virgin to Christ; who are animated by a degree of holy zeal to preserve her spotless for Christ; who, seeing her polluted by base seducers, recall her to conjugal fidelity; who unhesitatingly wage war against all the adulterers whom they detect laying traps for her chastity*. And what but this have we done? Had not your factious Church attempted and even violated her chastity by strange doctrines? Had she not been violently prostituted by your numberless superstitions? Had she not been defiled by that vilest species of adultery, the worship of images? *And because, I suppose, we did not suffer you so to insult the sacred chamber of Christ, we are said to have wounded his Bride!* But I tell you that this wound, *of which you falsely accuse us*, is observed not dimly among yourselves -- a wound not only of the Church, but of Christ himself, who is there beheld miserably rent. How can the Church adhere to her Spouse, while she fails to hold him safe? For where is the safety of Christ when the glory of his justice, and holiness, and wisdom is transferred elsewhere?

But it appears that, before we kindled the strife, all was tranquillity and perfect peace! True: among pastors, and also among the common people, ignorance and indolence had been at work so that there were almost no controversies respecting religion. But in the schools, how lustily did sophists brawl! You cannot, therefore, take credit for a tranquil kingdom, when there was tranquillity for no other reason than that Christ was silent. I admit that, *on the revival of the gospel, great disputes arose where all was quietness before. But that is unjustly imputed to our side, who, in the whole course of their actions, desired nothing but that religion be revived and that the Churches, which discord had scattered and dispersed, might

be gathered together into true unity*. And not to go back upon old matters, what did they lately decline to accept, just to procure peace for the Churches? But all their efforts are rendered vain by your opposition. For while they desire peace, that with it the kingdom of Christ may flourish, you on the other hand think that all which is gained to Christ is lost to you, and it is not strange that you strenuously resist. And you have artifices by which you can in one day overturn all that they accomplish for the glory of Christ in many months. I will not overwhelm you with words, because one word will dispatch the matter. **The Reformers offered to render an account of their doctrine**. If overcome in argument, they do not decline to give way. Whose fault then is it that the Church does not enjoy perfect peace and the light of truth? Go now, and charge us with sedition for not permitting the Church to be quiet!

But lest you might omit anything which might tend to prejudice our cause, since many sects have sprung up during these few years, *you with your usual candour lay the blame upon us*. But note with what fairness or even plausibility. If we deserve hatred on this account, the Christian name also must of old have deserved it from the ungodly. Therefore either cease to molest us on this subject, or openly declare that the Christian religion, which begets so many tumults in the world, ought to be banished from the memory of man. It ought not to hurt our cause in the least that Satan has tried in all ways to impede the work of Christ. **It would be more to the point to enquire which party has devotedly opposed itself to all the sects which have arisen. It is plain that, while you were idle and fast asleep, we alone bore the whole weight**.

The Lord grant, Sadolet (Doug--RB), that you and all your party may at length perceive ***that the only true bond of ecclesiastical unity consists in this, that Christ the Lord, who has reconciled us to God the Father, gather us out of our present dispersion into the fellowship of his body, that so, through his one (!!--RB) Word and Spirit, we may join together with one heart and one soul***."

(John Calvin, "Reply by John Calvin to the letter by Cardinal Sadolet to the Senate and People of Geneva" *_Corpus Reformatorum_*, V ["Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia"], [pp. 369-416 for the Latin text], as translated and cited in *_Calvin: Theological Treatises_*, [The Westminster Press, 1954], pp. 255-256, emphases added.)

This debate has also been published separately and can be found in our photocopy edition of *_Calvin's Selected Works_* [in volume 1] or in our photocopy edition of just this reply [with Sadolet's letter] which I have titled *_Defending the Reformation_*. Baker Book House also released a softcover edition, titled *_A Reformation Debate_*, in 1976, which is now out of print but may be available in some libraries.).

Calvin also said,

"I come now to our doctrine. Many people condemn it out of prejudice, without hearing or exploring it. They are too occupied with some opinion or other that totally dulls the sharp edge of their minds. I am not going to mention the insults and even criminal acts that are imputed to us in an effort to keep everyone from tasting our doctrine. Only one thing can be charged against us, that we strive to call back to their own banner (namely, the Word of God) all those who are counted as belonging to Christ but who have been wandering about wretchedly. We are also bringing it about that all controversy over the worship of God is settled on the basis of his Word, so that each person may believe what is established as being from God.

What of our adversaries? They are making a counterfeit church, a sort of shield of Ajax, so that they may hide safely behind its empty facade. The prophets and apostles faced the same situation when they had to deal with men who were usurping, by their wicked beliefs, the very name of the church of its highest authority.

We acknowledge a church that rests on the sure foundation of *prophetic and apostolic doctrine*, whose single and unchanging head is and remains Christ. The church in which God's Word does not rule is adulterous. **On this basis we conclude that the worship of God must be instituted in accordance with his command. Nothing handed down or introduced by men can be tolerated. It is for God alone to fix the law in our consciences. Only he has the right to ordain what he wants us to do.**

This causes people to complain: "You have destroyed the statutes of holy mother church." We teach, following Isaiah and with Christ as our authority, that God is worshiped in vain when worshiped by the commands of men. James likewise says that there is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy. Any embellishment added in the name of worshipping God will be found, on closer inspection, to be a pure fiction invented by the human brain."

(John Calvin, "A Letter of Exhortation and Defense, Addressed to a Certain Pontiff," Corpus Reformatorum, vol. 38, part I, pp. 181-184, as translated and cited in Calvin's Ecclesiastical Advice [Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991], pp. 55-56, emphases added).

Moreover, as can be clearly seen in the Covenanters' defense of their own position, you would have been considered the schismatic *and* separatist, because you are the cause of the breach, in that you have separated from the truth. See Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting from the Revolution Church by Andrew Clarkson, especially the chapter on schism, for proof of this assertion. This chapter is FREE on our web page under the following description and URL:

"The Reformed View of Schism" by Andrew Clarkson (The Reformers often said "that to avoid schism we must separate." This should give the perceptive reader some indication of how badly misunderstood the biblical teaching regarding schism and separation [which should be differentiated in many ways] has become in our day. Sadly, some of the most anti- Reformed work on this subject has been written by contemporary individuals, who, though calling themselves Reformed, "understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm" (1 Tim. 1:7). This excerpt from Clarkson's Plain Reasons for Presbyterians

Dissenting_ should contribute much to correcting the promotion of unbiblical ecumenism and place this doctrine back on its Scriptural foundation -- which was recovered during the Reformation. Clarkson cites Beza, Rutherford, Gillespie, Dickson, Durham, McWard [Rutherford's "disciple"], Marshal, Watson, Owen, Burroughs, and many others, while defending the truth about schism. Objections brought against the Reformation view of schism are also carefully answered. This is probably the single best short treatment of this subject.) FREE at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/Schism.htm>

Additionally, you publicly ridicule me with with false charges (when I told the truth) and jest about my use of *telepathy* (and you wonder why people get the impression that I had not read *any* of Frame's book) and yet you do far worse yourself (in lying against the truth and fabricating charges which you do not even attempt to defend). This is just rank hypocrisy. In these things you prove yourself the separatist and schismatic, destroying the very unity of the church (which is a commanded duty [1 Cor. 1:10; 2 Cor. 13:11; Phil. 1:27; 1 Pet. 3:8, etc.]) that you think you defend. Our reasons for warning others of your schismatic behavior are well stated by Shields (regarding the prelates of his day),

"That party in a reformed church, which having overturned her reformation, hath shut out, laid aside, and persecuted away sound adherers thereunto, both ministers and professors, and will not admit ministers to officiate, but upon sinful terms of compliance with their way, are schismatics... therefore they are the schismatics to be withdrawn from, and their way is schism, which we are bound to extirpate in the covenant.

Those who separate from a church whose principles and practices are subservient to that church's true union and communion, and right establishment, are properly schismatics... but their principles are stated in opposition to her purity and reformation. Those who innovate the worship and government, owned and established in a true church, are schismatics.

Finally, for union's sake, and to avoid schism in the body, we must withdraw from them."

"But they must be such as we can own church communion with in the ordinances administrated by them, as to the matter of them. Otherwise if they pervert and corrupt their ministry, by preaching and maintaining errors, either in doctrine, worship, discipline, or government, contrary to the Scripture, our confessions, and principles of our covenanted reformation, and contradictory to our testimony founded thereupon, and agreeable thereunto, maintaining errors condemned thereby, or condemning truths maintained thereby, we must withdraw from them. (cf. Deut. 13:5,8; Prov. 19:27; Rom. 16:17; 1 Tim. 6:3, 5)... Hence we must not hear false teachers, who, in preaching and prayer, bring forth false doctrine contrary to the principles of our reformation... and vent there bitter invectives against presbyterian government, condemn the work of reformation, and inveigh against the covenant, and so teach and encourage people to follow them in open perjury, and condemning all our testimony, as nothing but treason and sedition."

"But with those that oppose, suppress, reproach, and abandon this testimony, we cannot own this organical communion, in this broken state of the church... (The testimony

includes those who own and adhere to--RB) the true received principles of the church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, founded upon the written word of God, and whatsoever declarations or testimonies, former or later, particular or more general, are agreeable thereunto; though differing from us in some of the integral and not essential parts of our testimony against the enemies of our covenanted reformation. But with such as deny or decline from it, by schism or defection, or compliance with the enemies thereof, we cannot own this congregational communion, in this broken state of the church."

(Alexander Shields, *_A Hind Let Loose_* [Still Waters Revival Books, 1797 edition reprinted 1996], pp. 265, 293, 294, 309, 310, 311).

Our (i.e. the Reformed Presbyterian) terms of communion (cf. Greg Price's 19 lectures on cassette called *_Terms of Communion_*) and the requirements for membership in a duly constituted church (cf. Greg Price's cassette *_Biblical Church Membership_*), mirroring the old Covenanter testimony given by Shields in his last comment (cited above), have long been published and known. I listed them in my second reply to you, so you have no excuse as to our *exact* position concerning church and sacramental communion (cf. "Terms of Ministerial and Christian Communion in the Reformed Presbyterian Church," as listed in the Reformed Presbytery's *_The Act, Declaration and Testimony for the Whole of Our Covenanted Reformation_* (SWRB reprint 1995, [1761, 1876], p. 216). This makes your recent sin of calling us "perfectionistic and schismatic anabaptists" all the more grievous, because it is a sin against more light. Hear the rebuke of *_Westminster Larger Catechism_* on this point,

Question 150: Are all transgressions of the law of God equally heinous in themselves, and in the sight of God?

Answer: All transgressions of the law of God are not equally heinous; but some sins in themselves, and by reason of several aggravations, are more heinous in the sight of God than others.

Question 151: What are those aggravations that make some sins more heinous than others?

Answer: Sins receive their aggravations, From the persons offending: if they be of riper age, greater experience or grace, eminent for profession, gifts, place, office, guides to others, and whose example is likely to be followed by others. From the parties offended: if immediately against God, his attributes, and worship; against Christ, and his grace; the Holy Spirit, his witness, and workings; against superiors, men of eminency, and such as we stand especially related and engaged unto; against any of the saints, particularly weak brethren, the souls of them, or any other, and the common good of all or many. From the nature and quality of the offense: if it be against the express letter of the law, break many commandments, contain in it many sins: if not only conceived in the heart, but breaks forth in words and actions, scandalize others, and admit of no reparation: if against means, mercies, judgments, light of nature, conviction of conscience, public or private admonition, censures of the church, civil punishments; and our prayers, purposes,

promises, vows, covenants, and engagements to God or men: if done deliberately, willfully, presumptuously, impudently, boastingly, maliciously, frequently, obstinately, with delight, continuance, or relapsing after repentance. From circumstances of time and place: if on the Lord's day, or other times of divine worship; or immediately before or after these, or other helps to prevent or remedy such miscarriages: if in public, or in the presence of others, who are thereby likely to be provoked or defiled.

Also, as previously noted, these terms of communion were adopted by the session of the Puritan Reformed Church of Edmonton on March 22, 1996. By all six of these terms I (and all other Reformed Presbyterians) are bound to *testify for* the true doctrine, worship, government and discipline set forth in Scripture (i.e. Divine Right Presbyterianism and all that is included in it, addressing every aspect of life). We are also bound to *testify against* all deviation from these truths (whether set forth by John Frame, yourself or any other individual, church or nation that opposes the Crown Rights of King Jesus).

Examples of such testimony-bearing abound. I will cite only one, because it continues to testify against both Frame and you (as covenant-breakers, schismatics, idolaters, etc.). In Andrew Clarkson's Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting from the Revolution Church in Scotland (Still Waters Revival Books, reprinted 1996, [1731]) we read on pages 182-184,

"It is also evident... that Schism from our covenanted Church consists in this, to wit, When Members of the Church make Defection to the contrary Part, that is in plain Terms, when they associate or incorporate with, assist and defend Parties against whom the Covenant was made and sworn, viz. Papists, Prelatists, and the Underlings, Heretics, etc. the common Enemies of Reformation; and fall from the Duties of preserving and propagating the Reformation of the three Kingdoms (which now include the churches in Canada and the USA because the church is one moral person--RB); and refuse to join with, assist and defend those, who adhere to the Covenants, in the necessary Work of Renewing them, for Extirpation of Popery, Prelacy, Erastianism, Superstition, Heresy, Error and Prophaneness, and whatsoever is contrary to sound Doctrine and the Power of Godliness; and for re-establishing, preserving, and propagating the covenanted Reformation, once happily established in these Lands, and sworn unto by our Covenants.

Schism from our covenanted Church consists also in this, viz. When Members, Ministers or others, give themselves to a detestable Indifferency and Neutrality, in the Cause of God, namely, in the preserving and propagating the covenanted Reformation of these three kingdoms; that is to say, When Men are like so many Gallio's in the Cause of God, preferring worldly Ease, Honour and Wealth, their own Interest to the Interest of Christ, become easy, whether the covenanted Reformation in these Lands sink or swim; and, from a cowardly Disposition in some, and a malignant, perfidious, Temper in others, coalesce and accord in apostatizing from the Articles of the Covenant foresaid (i.e. the Solemn League and Covenant-- RB), the Cause of God, and its honest-hearted friends; and frightened from both, as if they thought it both Sin and Shame to have it said, that they carried any warm Side to either the one or the other. I say, All Members of the National Church, who, on Account of any Combination, Persuasion, or Terror, and Fear or worldly

Loss, or Sufferings of whatsoever Kind, are guilty in any of these two Cases, are also guilty of making SCHISM from the covenanted Church, as is clearly manifest by the 6th Article of our Solemn League.

Now, seeing this Church is notoriously and grossly guilty of making Defection to the contrary Part, by altering, or rather departing from the legal Establishment 1649, changing the Terms of Communion, and by going into the legal Establishment of the incorporating Union with England, whereby English Erastian Supremacy, and English Popish Ceremonies (Frame especially!--RB) are established; and the Jurants, by the Abjuration-Oath (abjuring the Solemn League and Covenant; that is claiming that the SL&C has no lawful authority over the individual, church and state--RB), have solemnly ratified that Union, as proven above: Then it plainly follows, by a just Consequence, that this Revolution-Church (whom the modern Presbyterians have followed in renouncing the covenanted Reformation and the faithful Covenanters--RB) is not only guilty of Schism (and the Jurants most hainously guilty by their Oath) on Account of the foresaid Defection and sinful Deserting of the foresaid Establishment, etc. But also in respect of Neutrality and Indifferency in the Cause of God, in never making any suitable Endeavours to have that glorious Work revived and restored, or her own lost Ground retrieved; and so she is allowed to apply the Hainousness of Schism, the bitter Effects, and lamentable Concomitants thereof, to herself, which she endeavours to father upon, and apply unto Presbyterian Dissenters (times don't change much, Doug!--RB).

Any who have rejected our Covenants, and design not willfully to trample on that Reformation, may be fully satisfied as to this Sense of the Solemn League and Covenant, from the printed Acts of the Venerable Assemblies, Anno 1645, Sess. 14 p. 283. 1647, Sess. 15. p. 334 and 1648, Sess. 21. p. 391, 392, in their Explications of that 6th Article of the Solemn League and Covenant."

After reading the Acts referred to above (which are available in our reprinted edition of The Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649) and interpreting them according to *original intent* of the banders, please tell me Doug: Are you still *really* "for the Covenants"? If you can honestly answer yes, most of your present practice and belief *must* change -- or you make yourself a liar.

By the way, the type of innovations in worship which Frame would introduce into the Presbyterian church are also condemned throughout The Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland. One of many examples of excommunications which included the charge of "pressing the Kirk with novations (innovations--RB) in the worship of God, and for sundry other haynous offences, and enormites" can be found of pages 18-19 of this book. In this particular example you will find the "Sentence of deposition and excommunication against Mr. John Spottiswood, pretended Archbishop of St. Andrews..." and many others.

Finally, to your charges that we are the separatists, I reply, using the faithful words of Macmillan and Mackneil in their "Secession from the Revolution Church" (Kerr, ed., The

Covenants and the Covenanters: Covenants, Sermons, and Documents of the Covenanted Reformation_, pp. 440-442),

"Let none say, That what we have done here flows from ambition to exalt ourselves above others, for as we have great cause, so we desire grace from the Lord, to be sensible of what accession we have with others in the land, to the provoking of His Spirit, in not walking as becomes the Gospel, according to our Solemn Engagements, neither proceeds it from irritation or inclination (by choice or pleasure) to discover our mother's nakedness or wickedness, or that we love to be of a contentious spirit, for our witness is in heaven (whatever the world may say) that it would be the joy of our hearts, and as it were a resurrection from the dead, to have these grievances redressed and removed, and our backsliding and breaches quickly and happily healed, but it is to exoner consciences by protesting against the defections of the land, especially of Ministers: and seeing we can neither with safety to our persons, nor freedom in our consciences, compear before the Judicatories, while these defections are not acknowledged and removed, so we must, so long decline them, and hereby do decline them, as unfaithful judges in such matters: in regard they have, in so great a measure, yielded up the priviledges of the Church into the hands and will of her enemies, and carried on a course of defection contrar to the Scriptures, our Covenants, and the acts and constitutions of this our Church. And hereby we further protest and testify against whatever they may conclude, or determine, in their ecclesiastick courts by acts, ratifications, sentences, censures, &c., that have been, or shall be made or given out by them, and protest that the same may be made void and null, and not interpreted as binding to us or any who desire firmly to adhere to the Covenanted work of Reformation.

But let none look upon what we have here said, to be a vilipending or rejecting of the free, lawful, and rightly constitute courts of Christ, for we do acknowledge such to have been among the first most effectual means appointed of God for preserving the purity and advancing the power of reformation in the Church of Christ; the sweet fruits and blessed effects whereof, this Church hath sometimes enjoyed, and which we have been endeavouring and seeking after, and are this day longing for.

We detest and abhor that principle of casting off the ministry, wherewith we are odiously and maliciously reproached by these who labour to fasten upon us the hateful names of schismatics, separatists, despisers of the Gospel: but, herein as they do betray their enmity to the cause we own, so till they bring in their own principles and practices, and ours also, and try them by the law and testimony, the measuring line of the sanctuary, the Word of God, and the practice of this Church, when the Lord kepted house with, and rejoiced over her as a bridegroom over his bride, they can never prove us schismatics or separatists from the kirk of Scotland upon the account of our non-union with the backslidden multitude, ministers and others.

Finally, that we may not be judged by any, as persons of an infallible spirit, and our actions above the cognisance of the judicatories of Christ's appointment: we appeal to the first free, faithful and rightly constitute Assembly in this Church, to whose decision and sentence in the things lybelled against us we willingly refer ourselves, and crave liberty to extend and enlarge this our Protestation, Declinature, and Appeal as need requires.

It is interesting to note that among the reasons given for separation from the apostate Revolution church we find: defection from attainments, defection from and ignoring the covenants (civilly and ecclesiastically), not renewing the covenants (National and Solemn League), Erastianism, failure to explicitly and by formal act proclaim the Divine Right of Presbytery, "not confirming and ratifying the Acts of the (faithful--RB) Assemblies," "admitting in many places, ignorant and scandalous persons to the Lord's table," etc.

So, in short, what has our little "dust up" proved? I think that the reader can be the judge of that; but one thing is certain: We continue the covenanted Reformed Presbyterian (i.e. the most classic form of Protestantism) testimony, while you, at present, continue the defection (not even up to the backslidden standards of the Revolution church -- especially concerning worship!).

May the our Lord have mercy on you and grant you repentance.

For Christ's Christ's Crown and Covenant,

Reg Barrow

President, STILL WATERS REVIVAL BOOKS

ALL FREE BOOKS at: <http://www.swrb.com/> - follow FREE BOOKS link

swrb@swrb.com 4710-37A Ave. Edmonton AB Canada T6L 3T5

Voice: +1 403 450 3730 Fax (orders only): +1 403 465 0237

(Discount Christian resources by mail-order. ASK for a FREE catalogue!)

P.S. I have decided that I would be willing to engage in a debate with you in your _Disputatio_ column (even in the short two page format) if you will agree to the following three stipulations:

1. We both get exactly the same amount of space (by word count) in the debate.
2. You agree not to edit anything that I write, if I stay within the word count limit which we agree to in point one.
3. We agree as to what the topic of debate will be in its exact wording.

Are you willing to step into the ring under these conditions?

P.P.S. In our previous correspondence you had asked four questions regarding worship which I have yet to address. You said, "I asked about David and the showbread, and bowing in the house of Rimmon, and worshipping in a synagogue, and sacrificing only to the Lord in the high places." I will take up each question, in order, giving *short* answers to each below. I've also answered one question you have raised outside of our discussions

here. This question has to do with using "Hezekiah songs" as a warrant for uninspired hymns in worship.

In answer to "David and the showbread."

I don't see how transgressing a ceremonial law (in the most extraordinary of circumstances -- "hard cases make bad laws") to fulfill a moral law (i.e. the sixth commandment -- "The duties required in the sixth commandment are, all careful studies, and lawful endeavors, to preserve the life of ourselves and others..." _Westminster Larger Catechism_ answer 135) would somehow overthrow or annul the duty to obey another moral law (i.e. the second commandment or the regulative principle). All 10 commentaries I checked are in essential agreement, but I think that Matthew Henry best gets to the heart of the matter when he writes, "*Ritual observances* must give way to *moral obligations*; and that may be done in a case of necessity, which otherwise may not be done" (_A Commentary of the Whole Bible_ volume 5, p. 463, Henry is commenting on Mark 2:25-26, emphases added). Calvin (on Matt. 12:3) writes "that the *ceremonies* of the Law are not violated where there is no infringement of godliness (i.e. the moral law--RB)" for "if David had attempted to do what was contrary to (moral--RB) law, it would have been in vain for Christ to plead his example" (emphasis added). Matthew Poole, on 1 Sam. 20:5, states that ceremonial enactments "must give place to the great law of necessity and charity (the law of love or the moral law--RB), because God will have *mercy* preferred before *sacrifice*" (emphasis Poole's). "The ceremonies of the Law are not against the love of our neighbour" (The 1599 _Geneva Bible_, sidenote on Matt. 12:8). Or, finally, as our Lord said, in answering this question (and in rebuking the *real* Pharisees; those who added to the moral law and burdened men's consciences with man-made innovations and ceremonies), "But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless" (Matt. 12:7).

In answer to "bowing in the house of Rimmon."

Your question about Naaman's "bowing in the house of Rimmon" is answered in Anderson's _Alexander and Rufus_ on page 15. Anderson writes,

"They who have justly withdrawn from the communion of any particular church on account of its corruptions; and yet allow themselves in the practices of occasional communion with the church in her public ordinances, are far more involved in the guilt of its corruptions, than Naaman the Syrian was, in the guilt of worshipping Rimmon, when he bowed in the temple of that idol: for they cannot pretend, that communion with such a church is no end of their attendance on her public ordinances; as Naaman pleaded, that his intention, in going to the temple of Rimmon and being present there, was not to worship the idol, but to serve his master. Grotius, indeed, and some other commentators, justify or excuse the conduct of Naaman. But more candid interpreters hold that the indulgence, which Naaman desired, was unlawful; that there was such an appearance of evil, such a countenancing of idolatry in it, as he ought to have avoided, that his presence in the temple of Rimmon in the time of worship of that idol, was a dangerous example to others; that, on such an occasion, he ought either to have obtained leave of absence from his

master, or to have quitted his service; and that even his desire of pardon intimated his consciousness of something sinful in this matter."

Matthew Henry takes a stronger line on Naaman's dissimulation, but ultimately tempers it with his usual pastoral insight. See Henry's commentary (volume 2, p. 716) on 2 Kings 5:18. I especially like his following comment, which faithfully answers your question, because in the final sentence he uses the words "house of Rimmon" analogously for sin.

"If, in covenanting with God, we make a reservation for any known sin, which we will continue to indulge ourselves in, that reservation is a defeasance (i.e. a making void or breaking--RB) of his covenant. We must cast away all our transgressions and *not except any house of Rimmon*" (emphasis added).

For Calvin's more lengthy response to your "Naaman question," see "A Short Treatise Setting Forth What the Faithful Man Must Do When He is Among Papists and He Knows the Truth of the Gospel" (1543). This article can be found in the book *Come Out From Among Them: The 'Anti- Nicodemite' Writings of John Calvin* (Protestant Heritage Publications, forthcoming), pp. 70-73 (in the proof copy).

In answer to "worshipping in a synagogue."

You questioned us (Greg Price and me) regarding "worshipping in a synagogue" in an attempt to weaken the force of the regulative principle. I would suggest that you read Bushell's treatment of "Psalmody and Synagogue Worship" in his book *The Songs of Zion: A Contemporary Case for Exclusive Psalmody*. This is found on pages 68-74 of the second edition. Though this was written before Steve Schlissel started pushing his novel views on worship, it does a good job of shooting holes in Steve's over-simplification of the matter. Besides noting some of the differences in synagogue services and those of the early church (destroying the one-to-one identification that Schlissel implies throughout his arguments against the regulative principle), Bushell writes (and shows) that "the temple rather than the synagogue is the ultimate source of a number of the most important aspects of Christian worship" (p. 72). He also shows that "the primary function of the synagogue was instruction, not worship. The Christian Church, however, was a replacement for both the synagogue and Temple, and as such it combined in one structure the instructional aspects of the former and the ritualistic aspect of the latter" (p. 71) -- of course, also incorporating the changes which the New Testament era brought about.

Some useful notes on the synagogue are also found on pages 93-94 in Samuel Rutherford's *The Divine Right of Church Government and Excommunication: or a Peaceable Dispute for the Perfection of the Holy Scripture in Point of Ceremonies and Church Government; in Which the Removal of the Service Book is Justified...* (1646). Gillespie's *Dispute Against English Popish Ceremonies* (Naphtali edition) deals with the some aspects of synagogue worship on pages 290-292 and Gillespie even comments, "Yet the synagogue was tied to observe those (and no other than those) ceremonies which the word prescribed" (p. 292).

It is also interesting to me that if the synagogue was not regulated by some kind of divine command (in keeping with the second commandment which is of perpetual moral force),

which was not recorded *for us* in Scripture (which was sometimes the case in the Old Testament economy, see Greg Price's outline below),

"1. That there was no such thing as an uninspired hymn ever sung; and 2. That there was no such thing as an instrumental accompaniment to singing ever employed in the ancient synagogue."

(Robert Nevin, *_Instrumental Music in Christian Worship_*, 1873, pp. 15- 16).

All those years of supposed "de-regulation" in the synagogue and no innovations: astounding! Give our modern anti-regulatavists and pretended-regulatavists a decade and you'll have all sorts of innovations (from instruments and man-made hymns to dance, drama, responsive readings, women preachers, cool-aid communion and a host of other heresies). Were the Jews really that much more holy than men today (in restraining themselves from introducing innovations and violating the second commandment); or did they understand something that the modern anti-regulatavists don't?

On the question of the origin of the synagogue and similar ploys to undermine the historic (classic) Protestant/Presbyterian defense of the second commandment (i.e. the regulative principle), Dr. R.D. Anderson, in *_Prophetic Singing in the Corporate Worship of the Church_* (unpublished manuscript, p. 13), has written,

Modern scholarship has come up with a variety of theories regarding the origin of the synagogue. It has been dated from the time of the exile, from the time of Ezra, or even later (long footnote not cited here). What enables scholars to come up with such divergent theories is the fact that we have very little information to go on.

What we do have, however, is a common tradition in the first century that dated synagogue worship back to the time of Moses. Josephus says that Moses ordained "that every week men should desert their other occupations and assemble to listen to the Law and to obtain a thorough and accurate knowledge of it" (*_Ag. Ap._* 2:175). Likewise, Philo traces the practice in his own day of meeting in synagogues every sabbath, to the command of Moses to set aside the sabbath for the study of the Scriptures (*_Vit. Mos._* 2.215-16; cf. *_Op. Mund._* 128).

Important for us is the fact that this explanation of the origin of synagogues is also recorded in the New Testament. When James delivered his speech at the council of Jerusalem, he noted that "Moses from ancient generations has in every city those who preach him, since he is read in the synagogues every Sabbath," Acts 15:21. This explanation also fits in with what we discussed above concerning the command of Lev. 23:3 for every Israelite to assemble every Sabbath to worship God.

Since Greg Price is now preparing a book-length defense of the regulative principle, in light of some of the modern attacks on it (including answers to questions surrounding the synagogue and its institution), I will not elaborate further at this time. But here is the outline for Greg's book (as it stands at present):

Defending the Reformation Regulative Principle of Worship; or, Was Synagogue
Worship Regulated By God's Revealed Word?

1. The Second Commandment (like the First Commandment) is moral, and therefore of perpetual and universal obligation having been written upon the hearts of all men from the point of creation (i.e. God has written upon the hearts of all men not only that He alone is to be worshipped as is taught in the First Commandment, but also that He is to be worshipped only by those means which He has authorized as is taught in the Second Commandment).

2. The Regulative Principle of Worship (RPW) is simply an articulation of the Second Commandment, and therefore is morally binding upon all people from the first man to the last. Since the RPW is a part of the moral law of God, it cannot be limited to the Ceremonial Law. To the contrary, tabernacle/temple worship, synagogue worship, and all public worship must be regulated by the Second Commandment/RPW.

3. The RPW defined and defended from Scripture (both the Old Testament and the New Testament).

4. The RPW expounded in history (especially its articulation from the First and Second Reformation).

5. The Sabbath is a creation ordinance having been instituted as a day of rest and and worship at the creation of the world (Gen. 2:1-3; Ex. 20:8- 11). The Sabbath was observed as a weekly day of rest and worship prior to the institution of tabernacle worship (Gen. 2:1-3; Ex. 16:23-30). Since God gave one day each week to be dedicated to Himself in rest and worship, and since God regulated worship from the very beginning of time (Gen. 4:1-7), it is therefore inferred that God's people must have used only worship authorized by God before the regulated worship of the tabernacle was instituted.

6. Worship was in fact regulated by God's authorization prior to the tabernacle/temple, even though one may search in vain to find the original and explicit authorization of God within the pages of Scripture.

a. Blood sacrifices were required by God, though no explicit authorization was recorded (Gen. 4:1-7). Thus, it must be inferred that God revealed His will concerning blood sacrifices to Adam, Eve, Cain and Abel, but did not record His original authorization in Scripture.

b. Clean animals were offered in sacrifice by Noah rather than unclean animals (Gen. 8:20-21). Where does God specifically authorize clean animals and forbid unclean animals in sacrifice? Or where does God identify which animals are clean and which are unclean prior to the Levitical law? It must be inferred that the Lord revealed His will concerning clean and unclean animals to Noah, though He did not record the original prescription in Scripture.

c. Melchizedek was priest of the Most High God, and thus performed worship on God's behalf (Gen. 14:18-20). Where is the office of priest instituted prior to Melchizedek? What

were his duties as a priest? Abraham paid tithes unto Melchizedek as the priest of God (Heb. 7:1-10). Where is there any warrant for tithing stated in Scripture prior to Abraham? Therefore, it must be inferred that God gave explicit instruction concerning these matters related to worship, although these instructions are not specifically stated in the biblical record.

d. In like manner, God's people faithfully gathered each Sabbath to worship the Lord in synagogues subsequent to the institution of tabernacle/temple worship. Where is synagogue worship specifically authorized in Scripture? It must likewise be inferred that it was explicitly regulated by God (since He authorized their meeting in such assemblies each Sabbath), although that regulation (like the examples above) is not explicitly recorded in Scripture.

7. Even if (for the sake of argument) tabernacle/temple worship alone was explicitly regulated in the Old Testament, that does not alter the fact that New Covenant worship is regulated (according to the Second Commandment and the RPW) by the explicit precepts, the approved examples, and the good and necessary deductions derived from Scripture, the light of nature, and the general rules of God's Word even as all public worship was regulated in the Old Testament (Mk. 7:6-13; Jn. 4:24; 1 Cor. 11:16; 1 Cor. 14:26-40; Eph. 5:19; Col. 2:23; 1 Tim. 4:2; Heb. 10:1 etc).

8. The example of the Lord in worshipping in synagogues during His ministry provides no proof that the Lord approved of unregulated worship outside of temple worship. It must first be demonstrated that the synagogue worship which He attended was not regulated by God's revelation (by revelation not recorded in Scripture). The Lord did indeed forbid His disciples from sitting under the ministry of heretical scribes and Pharisees (Mt. 15:13,14; 16:6,12; 23:2-36), but He did not forbid His disciples from attending faithful synagogue worship.

9. It has been claimed by the opponents of the RPW: "Jesus is our RPW." We agree. However, it is only by His revelation that we know Christ as our RPW.

10. What is the biblical alternative to the RPW? All views of worship principally lead either to Rome or to Westminster. Thus, that which prevents churches from becoming epistemologically consistent with their Romish views of worship is ultimately preference, expediency, and mere pragmatism, not biblical principle.

Lord willing this book will be ready sometime in the near future and if I remember I will send you a complimentary review copy.

In answer to "sacrificing only to the Lord in the high places."

I see nothing in what took place at the high places, rightly considered, which militates against the regulative principle correctly understood. The high places were "places of worship, specifically of idolatrous worship. So the title was transferred from the elevation to the sanctuary on the elevation (1 Kings 11:7; 14:23) cf. the burning of the 'high place' in 2 Kings 23:15), and so came to be used of any idolatrous shrine, whether constructed on an elevation or not (note 2 Kings 16:4; 2 Chron. 28:4 the 'high places are distinguished

from the 'hills'). So the high places in the cities (2 Kings 17:9; 2 Chron. 21:11 [LXX] could have stood anywhere, while in Ezk. 16:16 a portable structure seems to be in point" (_International Standard Bible Dictionary_ hereafter _ISBD_, (Hendrickson, 1939, 1956, reprinted 1994, vol. 3, p. 1390).

Furthermore, the _ISBD_ notes,

"The opposition to the high places had many motives. When used for the worship of other gods their objectionable character is obvious, but even the worship of Jeh in the high places was intermixed with heathen practices (Hos. 4:14, etc.). In Amos. 5:21-24, etc., sacrifice in the high places is denounced because it is regarded as a substitute for righteousness in exactly the same way that sacrifice in the Temple is denounced in Jer. 7:21-24. Or, *sacrifice in the high places may be denounced under the best of conditions, because in violation of the law of one sanctuary* (2 Chr. 33:17, etc.)" (pp. 1391, emphasis added).

One aspect of this question, with which we must be careful if we are to determine a faithful answer to the biblical view of the "high places" (and which may be confusing to those who have not yet been given better insight into the regulative principle of worship -- at least to the level which most of the Reformers seemed to enjoy), has to do with the historical chronology of worship in "high places". For example, "in 1 Kings the practice of using the high places is treated as legitimate before the construction of the Temple (1 Kings 3:2-4), *but after that it is condemned unequivocally*" (_ISBD_, p. 1391, emphasis added).

In short, worship (contrary to the second commandment or what we call the regulative principle) in the high places brought national judgement upon the covenanted people of God in the OT (for much Scriptural corroboration see the second column, page 1393, of volume 3 in the _ISBD_ article on the "high places"). Our modern "Reformed" and "evangelical" communities are much like Israel (to give the moderns the benefit of the doubt) when she worshiped Jehovah in the high places. "Reformed" and "evangelical" defection from biblical and Reformation attainments (concerning worship) is of such long standing and has become so much a matter of habit (or the traditions of the elders, Mark 7:9) that she denounces those faithful servants of Christ sent to rebuke her and overthrow her idols. The _ISBD_ (p. 1391) notes, "the practice had been of such long standing that Hezekiah's destruction of the high places (2 Kings 18:4) could be cited by Rabshakeh as an act of apostasy from Jehovah (2 Kings 18:22; 2 Chron. 32:12; Isa. 36:7)."

I think we need to pray for the success of our modern paleopresbyterian Hezekiah's and Josiah's (2 Kings 23:19-22) and the overthrow of the modern neopresbyterian and "evangelical" Rabshakeh's. We also need to mark the words and actions of our faithful Reformation forefathers (Phil. 3:16-17, and as noted throughout my letters), who have already fought and won many of the same battles against idolatry and apostasy which are being rekindled today. Note Gillespie's answer to your question, "whereas many of the kings of Judah and Israel did either themselves worship in the groves and the high places, or else, at least, suffer the people to do so, howsoever they might have alleged specious reasons for excusing themselves (Hospin, _De Orig. Templ._, lib. 1 cap. 1; Wolph. in 2

Reg. 12:4) as namely, that they gave not this honor to any strange gods, but to the Lord only; that they chose these places only to worship in wherein God was of old seen and worshipped by the patriarchs; that the groves and the high places added a most amiable splendor and beauty to the worship of God, and that they did consecrate these places for divine worship in a good meaning, and with minds wholly devoted to God's honor; yet notwithstanding, because this thing was not commanded of God, neither came it into his heart, he would admit no excuses; but ever challenges it as a grievous fault in the government of those kings, that those high places were not taken away, and that the people still sacrificed in the high places. From all which examples we learn how highly God was and is displeased with men for adding any other sacred ceremonies to those which he himself has appointed (Hospin., *ibid.*, p. 3)." (*_A Dispute Against English Popish Ceremonies_*, Naphtali edition, p. 318)

In answer to "Hezekiah songs" as a warrant for uninspired hymns in worship.

You (outside of our recent letters) and others often appeal to Hezekiah for warrant to sing uninspired songs in public worship. Because this is a common (and I believe fleshy) appeal, please note the following from pages 85-86 in SWRB's republication of *_The Psalms in Worship_* (McNaugher, ed., 1907, reprinted 1992),

"Prof. Heron claims the songs of Hezekiah were sung. This claim is based on a line contained in Hezekiah's song of thanksgiving composed on the occasion of his recovery from sickness:

'Jehovah is ready to save me: Therefore we will sing my songs with stringed instruments All the days of our life in the house of Jehovah.' (Isa. 37:20, R.V.)

The Hebrew word here rendered 'sing,' whenever it occurs in the Bible, except three times, is translated 'stringed instruments.' The word rendered 'we will sing' should be rendered 'we will strike'; Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon gives no other meaning for it. The verse is properly translated:

'Jehovah is ready to save me: Therefore my stringed instruments we will strike All the days of my life in the house of Jehovah.'

Cheyne, Delitzsch, George Adam Smith, Orelli, Blake, the Cambridge Bible, the Encyclopedia Biblica, and, indeed, all modern commentators translate the verse as I have given it. Prof. Heron's argument is based on what is certainly a mistranslation of this verse.

This rendering would be in accord with what we know of all the great Reformations of Old Testament times,

As to the Biblical evidence outside the Psalter, the various references to praise in the Old Testament show conclusively that the Psalms were the matter of the songs. At the dedication of the temple in Solomon's time, and again in the days of Zerubbabel, when the foundation of the new temple was laid, the Psalms we sung. 2 Chron. 5:13; Ezra 3:11-12. And again they were sung when good King

Hezekiah, in a reformation that is worth more than all the history of the years of Israel's backsliding as a testimony to what had divine appointment, did everything "according to the commandment of David... for so was the commandment of the Lord by His prophets" 2 Chron. 29:25. "Hezekiah the king and the princes commanded the Levites to sing praise unto the Lord with the words of David and of Asaph the seer." 2 Chron. 29:30. The singers came up from captivity with Ezra and Nehemiah. We are told that "both the singers and the porters kept the charge of their God... according to the commandment of David, and of Solomon his son. For in the days of David and Asaph of old there were chief of the singers, and songs of praise and thanksgiving unto God." Neh. 12:45-46. These reformations and rededications are the best witness of what was the real practice required by the Lord, for they then sought to do everything according to the divine pattern. The objection that songs outside the Psalter were used in God's worship, as the songs of Moses, of Hezekiah, and of Habakkuk, is no positive sanction for singing extra-Biblical hymns. And if there were uninspired songs used at times, they are only exception and infractions that prove the rule ("The Psalms Are the Divinely Authorized and Exclusive Manual of Praise" by Kennedy, as cited in McNaugher, ed., The Psalms in Worship , p. 62).

Do you think that things were more in order ecclesiastically in Calvin's Geneva, Knox's Scotland and during the covenanted second reformation than today among the OPC, PCA, CRC, etc.? What about the times of OT reformation versus the days of OT backsliding? Even though it is unlikely that uninspired songs, outside of those God provided for his people (and possibly still inspired outside of the Psalms), were ever sung in public ecclesiastical services; that they may have very sporadically appeared at times of declension and apostasy is no argument for their lawful use -- much less an argument for writing and singing *uninspired* songs today. This is not to mention that most (or possibly even all) of the modern uninspired hymns are unbalanced and full (to a greater or lesser degree) of heretical statements. But this is not surprising, because the hymn writers often held to various heresies themselves -- from Wesley's Arminianism to Watts' denial of the Trinity (and many hymns written by Papists, Universalists and sundry other malignants). For your information Watts' denial of the Trinity can be found in his Works, volume 7, pages 476-477 (Leed's edition). It may also be of interest to you to know that when Watt's was subverting Reformation exclusive Psalmody with his Imitations of David's Psalms his stated purpose was to make David a Christian. He also said that there are words in the Psalms which ought never to be found on the lips of a Christian (information on Watts gleaned from a letter by Jim Dodson). Our modern hymn-mongers fear not to compose their own ditties for public worship, while the Apostles and the Lord Himself, while He walked the earth, saw no need to add to God's already existing hymnal (i.e. the Psalter). Why is it that heretics, from Bardesanes (a Syrian Gnostic in the third century), Arius (d. 336 A.D.), the Donatists (of Augustine's day), the Anabaptists (during the Reformation), Wesley, Watts, and the "Frame's" of our day, always want to add to God's finished Psalter? Why is it that the Council of Laodicea (about 360 A.D.), the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.), the Calvinistic Reformers (and their creeds) all opposed the introduction of uninspired hymns? Were the most orthodox defenders of the church *always* wrong on this question and the heretics and the

compromised *always* right? Are you walking in the footsteps of the flock (Song 1:8)? Who really defends the classic Protestant (and Apostolic) position today? (cf. "The Psalms in the Post Apostolic Church" in *The Psalms in Worship*, pp. 159-168 for more).

Walk about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following. For this God is our God for ever and ever: he will be our guide even unto death (Ps. 48:12-14).

P.P.P.S. So as not to leave the honest inquirer after truth in confusion as to your ill informed and slanderous charges of Anabaptism against us, I will use your false charge as a case in point to exhibit how far from the classical Protestant mark you have drifted. Greg Price has already been working on a book refuting this charge (because it is a continuing favorite false charge of fashionable malignants, the ignorant and factious). This short book, which will be called *A Testimony Against the Unfounded Charges of Anabaptism*, is instructive in exposing the level of defection and backsliding that has taken place in the professing Reformed community today. Thus, I am including it (in as far as it is completed) as Appendix A below. You will notice that we do not hold to any of the *distinctives* of the historic Anabaptist positions outlined by Price. You will also notice (I hope) that it is actually you who has adopted some Anabaptist distinctives! But this is illustrative of one of the main problems with our whole discussion. You have been speaking in vague generalities and I have been dealing with specifics. You have proved almost nothing, while I have provided ample proof of my assertions. You often oppose classic Reformed thought, I have upheld the Reformation.

Well, here we go with some more specifics and proof. Greg's comparison of Reformation views with those of the Anabaptists should convince any fair minded reader of the ridiculous nature of your charges that we are "perfectionistic and schismatic anabaptists." This work should also help convince anyone who is even moderately knowledgeable about Reformed truth (and familiar with the Anabaptist heresies) that you (and not us) have picked up on some of the Anabaptistic distinctives. Notice how the Anabaptists were among the first "Reformation" groups to introduce man-made hymns, oppose the establishment of the one true Reformed religion (thereby promoting tolerationism and religious pluralism), deny the specifics of covenant obligations, adopted forms of civil antinomianism (as you do in *Credenda/Agenda* regarding the pornography question and civil sanctions, see appendix B, "Pornography, the Anabaptists and Doug Wilson's Civil Antinomianism"), etc.

8. APPENDIX A: A TESTIMONY AGAINST THE UNFOUNDED CHARGES OF ANABAPTISM

by Greg Price

When theological and historical knowledge sinks so low that those who walk in the good old paths of their covenanted forefathers of the First and Second Reformations are smeared with the names of heresies their forefathers vigorously attacked (which is simply a contemporary case of historical revisionism), it becomes necessary to answer such unfounded allegations for the sake of the truth as found in holy Scripture. It seems as though it has become a popular way of debating in some "reformed" circles to accuse a person or church of being "anabaptistic" (of course, without supplying any historical evidence that would tie the heretical views of the Anabaptists to faithful descendants of the reformers). All too often, such **ad hominem** arguments focus upon the unlawful separatism and perfectionism practiced by the Anabaptists (for which the Anabaptists and all walking in their paths should rightly be condemned). However, we must not stoop to the tactics of the world who falsely label a person or church "racist" and "homophobic" simply because they condemn affirmative action and sodomy. Neither should a person or church be falsely labeled "anabaptistic" simply because they condemn ecclesiastical toleration of false doctrine, unauthorized public worship, and unbiblical church government. The warning of Calvin alerts us to the danger of such misapplied labels:

Thus, the wickedness of many is still the reason why the Church is troubled by divisions, and why contentions are kindled. **Yet those who disturb the peace, throw the blame on us, and call us Schismatics**; for the principal charge which the Papists bring against us is, that our doctrine has shaken the tranquility of the Church. Yet the truth is, that, if they would yield submissively to Christ, and give their support to the truth, all the commotions would immediately be allayed. But when they utter murmurs and complaints against Christ, and will not allow us to be at rest on any other condition than that the truth of God shall be extinguished, and that Christ shall be banished from his kingdom, they have no right to accuse us of the crime of schism; for it is on themselves, as every person sees, that this crime ought to be charged. We ought to be deeply grieved that the Church is torn by divisions arising among those who profess the same religion; but it is better that there are some who separate themselves from the wicked, to be united to Christ their Head, than that all should be of one mind in despising God. **Consequently, when schisms arise, we ought to inquire who they are that revolt from God and from his pure doctrine**.¹

Thus, let us clearly distinguish between the heresy of the Anabaptists and the orthodoxy of the Reformers (and those who own the biblical truths for which the reformers stood), and thus shun the sin of calling evil good and good evil:

Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! (Is. 5:20).

Anabaptism is indeed rampant throughout the ecclesiastical landscape of the present era. Like a cancer, anabaptism has infected the modern church (including many churches that profess to be reformed), and its malignancy continues to spread. But unless we can accurately diagnose this heresy in its various forms, we will not be able to destroy it by means of the Spirit and the truth. To the end that this ancient heresy might be exposed and removed from the Church of Christ, the following contrasts between the positions of the Anabaptist and Reformed churches are made. Anabaptism has generally shunned confessional formulations (one exemption to this general rule however is the The Schleithem Confession, also known as The Seven Articles of 1527):

They [i.e. the anabaptistic Brethren movement-GLP] emphasized believer's baptism (as opposed to infant baptism) and *shunned creeds and "statements of faith"* due to the possibility of over-emphasizing some teachings or beliefs, and minimizing or ignoring others. *They took the entire New Testament as their creed*.2

Thus, it is not always a simple task to identify the "distinctive" beliefs and practices of the Anabaptists, for they were far from a monolithic system. In fact, the Anabaptists at times differed as much amongst themselves as they did with those who were within the Reformed Church (a covenanted uniformity in doctrine, worship, and government was not one of the distinctives of anabaptism, though it was a distinctive of the Reformed Church particularly of the Second Reformation). Although all of the positions cited below may not be representative of every anabaptist church, nevertheless, there has been made a serious attempt to catalogue some of the prominent errors embraced by various historical representatives of Anabaptism.

1. The Incarnation

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Though Christ was fully God, he lacked a true human body (i.e. a human body that was derived from the Virgin Mary). Christ's body was no different than that of angelic appearances in the flesh.

He is called, they [the Anabaptists-GLP] say, the "Son of David," not because He has taken anything from the Virgin Mary or was made man from her substance, but only because she carried Him in her body, *as water passes through a tube*.3

This same woman [i.e. the Virgin Mary-GLP] conceived in her womb the afore-mentioned seed [i.e. Christ-GLP], which is God's Word, *not from her body nor of her body*, but of God, by the power of the Holy Ghost, through faith. . . . The Word [i.e. Christ-GLP]. . . was not Abraham's natural flesh and blood. . . . For Christ Jesus, as to His origin, is no earthly man, that is, a fruit of the flesh and blood of Adam.4

(2) This is simply the ancient heresy of the Valentinians who denied that Christ's human nature was derived from the virgin Mary.

As the divinity of Christ was attacked by the fury of various heresies, so Satan has raised up many enemies against his humanity. . . . The Valentinians held that indeed he had a body, but one sent from heaven, not one received from the virgin. They also believed that the body of the virgin was like a channel through which the body of Christ passed. . . . Treading in the footsteps of all these, *the modern Anabaptists deny that Christ took flesh and blood from the substance of the blessed virgin*.5

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) It was absolutely essential that Christ should receive a real body and a reasonable soul in order to become a mediator between God and man who could redeem us from the fall of the first Adam.

Furthermore, *the matter was necessary for our redemption*: that the disobedience which was committed in our nature might also be repaired in the same. For this reason our Lord Jesus became *true man*, presenting Himself as in the person of Adam, whose name He also assumed (Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:47), in order to pay the price of sin *in the flesh in which it was committed*.6

Q.37. How did Christ, being the Son of God, become man?

A. Christ the Son of God became man, by taking to himself *a true body*, and a reasonable [i.e. rational-GLP] soul, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, *of her substance*, and born of her, yet without sin.7

Q.39. Why was it requisite that the Mediator should be man?

A. It was requisite that the Mediator should be man, that he might advance our nature, perform obedience to the law, suffer and make intercession for us in our nature, have a fellow-feeling of our infirmities; that we might receive the adoption of sons, and have comfort and access with boldness unto the throne of grace.8

2. Salvation

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Divine election is conditioned upon the foresight of God in knowing all those who would first choose to believe in Him.

For with the Pelagians and Papists, *ye [Anabaptists-GLP] are become teachers of free will*, and defenders of your own justice.9

(2) Salvation or corresponding punishment are only for sins personally committed rather than for original sin imputed and inherited from Adam.

They [i.e. Anabaptists-GLP] deny that the posterity are guilty on account of the fall of their first parents.10

(3) Good works are necessary to justification . Schaff notes that the Anabaptists rejected Luther's theory of forensic, solifidian [by faith alone-GLP] justification.11

Balthasar Hubmaier, one of the early pillars of Anabaptism, articulated this subjective view of salvation when he represented God as stating, Man, help yourself, and then I will help you.¹²

(4) True believers may finally fall from grace and true faith. The question concerning perseverance is agitated by us with old and new Pelagians and Semipelagians, who agree in opposing and denying it. Such are the Romanists, Socinians, *Anabaptists* and Remonstrants, *who, on this point (as in the others concerning grace), depart from the orthodox doctrine and were condemned by the Synod of Dort in Article 5* (Acta Synodi Nationalis . . . Dordrechtii [1619-20], 1:311-17).¹³

(5) These errors are rampant in Arminianism (which promotes a thoroughly man-centered salvation).

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Divine election is not conditioned upon foreseen faith in man or any merit found in man, but rests entirely in the freedom of God's sovereign will.

Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, *without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto*; and all to the praise of his glorious grace.¹⁴

(2) Justification is an objective, judicial act of God whereby He forgives all those who believe in Christ and declares the believing sinner righteous on the basis of the righteousness of Christ alone. Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, *only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone*.¹⁵

3. The Scriptures

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Though the Old Testament is of divine inspiration, it was given only to the Israelite nation as a rule. It is the New Testament alone that is the rule for the Christian, for only the New Testament manifests the perfection of Christ.

[T]hey rejected the Old Testament as equal with the New Testament *as a basis for faith and practice*.¹⁶

This question [concerning the authority of the Old Testament-GLP] brings us into collision with Anabaptists who reject the books of the Old Testament from the canon of faith, as if they had not the least reference to Christians and as if they should not draw from them doctrines of faith and rules of life. *The Mennonites in their Confession (Article

11) teach that "all Christians, in matters of faith, ought to have recourse necessarily only to the gospel of Christ"17

The second question treats of the morality of the Sabbath-whether the fourth commandment, sanctioning the sanctification of the Sabbath, is moral and perpetual; or only ceremonial and constituted for a certain time The second [view-GLP] asserts that it is merely ceremonial and so entirely abrogated by Christ. *This was the opinion of the ancient Manichaeans and of the Anabaptists and Socinians of the present day (who hold that it was so abrogated as to pertain in no way to Christians)*.18

According to Anabaptists,

The Old Testament was given to the Jews alone and had no authority for Christians. The Old was therefore especially inferior to the New, because the hope of everlasting life was lacking.19

(2) This error has been (in substance) propounded by modern day dispensationalists.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) All of Scripture (Old and New Testaments) is inspired by the Holy Spirit, and is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16). The moral law found in the Old Testament binds the consciences of all men, even as that same moral law does that is revealed in the New Testament.

The Old Testament in Hebrew, (which was the native language of the people of God of old,) *and the New Testament in Greek*, (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations,) being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical; *so as in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them*.20

There are not therefore two covenants of grace differing in substance, *but one and the same [covenant of grace-GLP] under various dispensations [i.e. Old Covenant and New Covenant-GLP]*.21

4. The Church

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Only those who profess faith in Christ and have reached a demonstrable level of sanctification are eligible to become members of the Visible Church. Thus, the Visible Church is a body composed of a regenerate membership.

Its [Anabaptism's-GLP] characteristics were. . . a "pure" church *consisting of the "truly" converted* who desire a "holy community" separated from the world.22

Although we think true believers alone are [truly-GLP] members of the church, we do not on this account favor the error of the Novatians, Catharists and Donatists, or of the modern Anabaptists (which the Romanists calumniously charge us with doing), *who hold

that the church consists of those who are perfectly sanctified*. For besides the fact that in the external communion hypocrites are mixed with true believers, the elect (who alone formally belong to the mystical body of Christ as long as they live on earth) are always exposed to various stains and sins (1 Jn.1:8); as the moon never shines in such a way as to be without various spots.²³

(2) There is no formal connection between separate congregations. Thus, there is no church court higher than the independent congregation to whom the congregation must submit.

(3) This humanly instituted form of church membership and church government may be observed in various independent and congregational churches.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) The visible church consists of all those who profess (in the judgment of charity) the true religion together with their children. Within the membership of the visible church are both regenerate and unregenerate. God addeth such as should be saved to the visible Church by baptism, because the adjoining to a visible Church is a way to salvation, *but it followeth not that all whom God addeth to the visible Church are saved ones*, for then the visible Church should consist only of believers, which only Anabaptists teach.²⁴

(2) There ought to be a formal constitutional connection between individual congregations, and higher ecclesiastical courts to which individual congregations must submit in the Lord.

It is lawful, and agreeable to the word of God, that the church be governed by several sorts of assemblies, which are congregational, classical [presbyterial-GLP], and synodical . . . *It is lawful, and agreeable to the word of God, that there be a subordination of congregational, classical, provincial, and national assemblies, for the government of the church*.²⁵

And it is so obligatory to all persons, states and degrees, that none ought to be exempted from that Church-government which is jure divino [by divine right-GLP], nor to be *tolerated* in another Church-government, which is but jure humano [by human right-GLP]; nor ought any Christian to seek after, or content himself with any such Exemption or *Toleration*.²⁶

For in so doing, inventions of men are [would be] preferred before the ordinances of God; our own wisdom, will, authority [would be] before the wisdom, will, [and-GLP] authority of Christ. . . . *That the Law of God holds forth a subordination of a particular Church to greater Assemblies, consisting of several choice members, taken out of several single Congregations, which Assemblies have authoritative power and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction over that particular Church by way of sentencing in and deciding of Ecclesiastical causes*.²⁷

5. Worship

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Baptism (according to Anabaptists) should only be administered to those who sincerely profess their faith in Christ and give evidence of genuine repentance. Since infants can neither believe in Christ nor repent of sin, they cannot receive Christian baptism.

Baptism shall be given to all those who have learned repentance and amendment of life, and who believe truly that their sins are taken away by Christ, and to all those who walk in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and wish to be buried with Him in death, so that they may be resurrected with Him and to all those who with this significance request it (baptism) of us and demand it for themselves. *This excludes all infant baptism, the highest and chief abomination of the Pope*.28

This is simply the unbiblical view of Baptists today who exclude the children of believers from the blessings of the covenant.

(2) Furthermore, Anabaptists composed some of the earliest Protestant [uninspired-GLP] hymns in the German language. . . . They dwell on the inner life of the Christian, the mysteries of regeneration, sanctification, and personal union with Christ.29

In composing uninspired hymns to be used in worship (contrary to the universal practice of the Reformed Churches), the Anabaptists find expression in most twentieth century churches (regardless of denominational label) who have departed from the Regulative Principle of Worship.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Baptism is rightly administered to all who profess faith in Christ and to the infant children of one or both believing parents.

Q.95. To whom is baptism to be administered?

A. Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible church, till they profess their faith in Christ, and obedience to him; *but the infants of such as are members of the visible church are to be baptized*.30

[T]hose infants who derive their origin from Christians, as they have been born directly into the inheritance of the covenant, and are accepted by God, are thus to be received into baptism.31

(2) The spiritual descendants of Calvin and the Westminster Assembly have steadfastly maintained that God is only to be worshipped according to His own revealed will. This is known as the Regulative Principle of Worship and is simply an articulation of the Second Commandment.

So let us hold to this rule, that all human inventions which are set up to corrupt the simple purity of the word of God, and to undo the worship which he demands and approves, are true sacrileges, *in which the Christian man cannot participate without blaspheming God*, and trampling his honour underfoot.32

Now, if you will prove that your ceremonies proceed from faith, and do please God, *you must prove that God in expressed words has commanded them*; or else you shall never prove that they proceed from faith, nor yet that they please God; but they are sin, and do displease him, according to the words of the apostle, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."³³

But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, *or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture*.³⁴

But what Augustine says is true, that no one can sing things worthy of God, unless he has received them from Himself [i.e. from God-GLP]. Therefore, after we have sought on every side, searching here and there, we shall find no songs better and more suitable for our purpose than the Psalms of David, dictated to him and made for him by the Holy Spirit. . . . it should accustom itself hereafter to sing *these divine and heavenly songs* with good King David.³⁵

The reading of the Scriptures with godly fear; the sound preaching, and conscionable hearing of the word, in obedience unto God, with understanding, faith, and reverence; *singing of psalms with grace in the heart*; as also the due administration and worthy receiving of the sacraments instituted by Christ; *are all parts of the ordinary worship of God*.³⁶

It is the duty of Christians to praise God publicly, *by singing of psalms* together in the congregation.³⁷

With one word, we judge this and other novelties, in these carefree days a useless hindrance. This we also say of the introduction of new hymn-books, and present day ditties, which we do not find in God's Word; as also the playing and peeping of organs in the Church. The former are all against the decrees of our Synods. See about singing in the Church, the National Synod of Dordt held in 1578, art. 76; the National Synod held in Middleburg, 1581, art. 51; the National Synod held in the Hague, 1586, art. 62; *at which gatherings hymns not found in Scripture are expressly forbidden*.³⁸

It is known from Church history, that those who are after novelties, by introducing man-made hymns and errors, have corrupted the Congregation. . . . The statement made by the Synod of Dordt, 1574, art. 50, needs our special attention; where we read, "*Concerning the use of Organs in the Congregation, we hold that according to 1 Cor. 14:19, it should not have a place in the Church*. . ." To know the reason why Organs should be kept out of the church, read our learned theologians and their polemics about Organs against the Lutherans and Papists.³⁹

6. Separation

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) It is warranted and justified to separate from a church due to the toleration of moral corruption within the life of members of the church. Where scandalous sin is evident in the

life of professing members of a church, such a church is not perfected in Christ and cannot be a true church. Like the Novatians and the Donatists of old who would not allow repentant sinners back into the fellowship of the church until they had manifested years of fruitful repentance, so the Anabaptists required a pure membership in the visible church. From this we should learn that everything which is not united with our God and Christ cannot be other than an abomination which we should shun and flee from. *By this is meant all Catholic and Protestant works and church services*.40

The debate is over this: they [the Anabaptists-GLP] think that wherever this order [i.e. the ban or excommunication- GLP] is not properly constituted, or not duly exercised, no church exists, and it is unlawful for a Christian to receive the Lord's Supper there. *Thus they separate themselves from the churches in which the doctrine of God is purely preached, taking this pretext: that they do not care to participate in the pollution committed therein, because those who ought to be excommunicated have not been banished*.41

(2) This is the error practiced by true schismatics and sectarians.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) It is warranted and justified to separate from a church due to an habitual and notable defection from the truth in doctrine, worship, or government. However, separation is not justified merely on the grounds that a church tolerates sin in the members of its congregation.

This is undoubtedly a warning highly necessary, in order that when the temple of God happens to be tainted by many impurities, we may not contract such disgust and chagrin as will make us withdraw from it. *By impurities I understand the vices of a corrupt and polluted life. Provided religion continue pure as to doctrine and worship, we must not be so much stumbled at the faults and sins which men commit, as on that account to rend the unity of the Church*. Yet the experience of all ages teaches us how dangerous a temptation it is when we behold the Church of God, which ought to be free from all polluting stains, and to shine in uncorrupted purity, cherishing in her bosom many ungodly hypocrites, or wicked persons. From this the Catharists, Novatians, and Donatists, took occasion in former times to separate themselves from the fellowship of the godly. *The Anabaptists, at the present day, renew the same schisms, because it does not seem to them that a church in which vices are tolerated can be a true church*. But Christ, in Matth. xxv.32, justly claims it as his own peculiar office to separate the sheep from the goats; and thereby admonishes us, that we must bear with the evils which it is not in our power to correct, until all things become ripe, and the proper season of purging the Church arrive.42

When the greatest part of a Church maketh defection from the Truth, the lesser part remaining sound, *the greatest part is the Church of Separatists*.43

The blame of Schism must not be upon those who forsake such as have forsaken Christ, and the ancient Faith, but upon those who have thus forsaken Christ, and his Truths: Yea farther, if they impose that which is not necessary, (tho' in itself not sinful) and will not

bear with the Weaknesses of such as think it to be evil; *if, upon that, they be forced to withdraw, in this the Governors are the Schismatics, because the Rent is in them*.44

7. Perfectionism

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Christians are saints, and as those who are holy, they are not to have any contact with those who are polluted and corrupted with sin. Christians should withdraw from the corruption in this world and live in their own communal societies.

A separation shall be made from the evil and from the wickedness which the devil planted in the world; in this manner, simply that *we shall not have fellowship with them*.45

Once the Novatians stirred up the churches with this teaching, but our own age has certain Anabaptists (not very different from Novatianists) who are lapsing into the same madness. *For they feign that in baptism God's people are reborn into a pure and angelic life, unsullied by any carnal filth*.46

The same question [concerning perfectionism-GLP] was renewed in this century by the Neopelagians, Romanists, Socinians and *Anabaptists*, who, to pave the way for the merits of works, *maintained that the law can be perfectly fulfilled by the renewed*.47

(2) This is the dangerous error of Wesley and Finney who taught that Christians can (through a second work of grace) reach a perfect state of entire sanctification in this life.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Christians are saints by calling and are being conformed by the power of the Word and Spirit into the image of Christ. However, sanctification is gradual in this life, and the remnants of sin remain within every Christian. Although the Christian cannot remove himself entirely from sin and sinners in this life, yet he is not to consent (in thought, word, or deed) to the sin around him. Furthermore, establishing and guarding purity in doctrine, worship, and government as a part of a church's true constitution is not perfectionism, but simply faithfulness to Christ.

This sanctification is throughout in the whole man, yet imperfect in this life; there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part.48

No man that takes due care of his salvation, can join himself to it [i.e. to a church-GLP], when the fundamentals of religious worship are corrupted or overthrown, *it is absolutely unlawful to join unto, or abide in any [such-GLP] Church*.49

However, when we categorically deny to the papists the title of the church, we do not for this reason impugn the existence of churches among them. *Rather, we are only contending about the true and lawful constitution of the church, required in the communion not only of the sacraments (which are the signs of profession) but also especially of doctrine*. . . . To sum up, I call them churches to the extent that the Lord wonderfully preserves in them a remnant of his people, however woefully dispersed and

scattered, and to the extent that some marks of the church remain-especially those marks whose effectiveness neither the devil's wiles nor human depravity can destroy. But on the other hand, because in them those marks have been erased to which we should pay particular regard in this discourse, I say that everyone of their congregations and their whole body lack the lawful form of the church.⁵⁰

8. Civil Government

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Civil government is outside the realm of Christ's kingdom and, and thus no Christian should serve in a civil capacity. War, capital punishment, judicial retribution, nor self-defence have any place in the life of a Christian.

Therefore, there will also unquestionably fall from us the unchristian, *devilish weapons of force*-such as sword, armor and the like, and all their use (either) for friends or against one's enemies-by virtue of the Word of Christ. Resist not (him that is) evil.⁵¹

Shall one be a magistrate if one should be chosen as such? The answer is as follows: *They wished to make Christ king, but He fled and did not view it as the arrangement of His Father. Thus, shall we do as He did*, and follow Him, and so shall we not walk in darkness.⁵²

(2) The civil magistrate should not establish by law the Reformed Church (or any other church) nor a reformed and presbyterian creed (or any other creed) as the official church and creed within a nation. Rather a civil government should establish a position of liberty of conscience with regard to all religions.

From this we should learn that everything which is not united with our God and Christ cannot be other than an abomination which we should shun and flee from. *By this is meant all Catholic and Protestant works and church services, meetings and church attendance*, drinking houses, civic affairs, the oaths sworn in unbelief and other things of that kind, which are highly regarded by the world and yet are carried on in flat contradiction to the command of God, in accordance with all the unrighteousness which is in the world.⁵³

Wherefore we condemn *the Anabaptists*, and all those troublesome spirits, *which do reject higher powers and magistrates, overthrow all laws and judgments*, make all goods common, and, to conclude, do abolish and confound all those orders and degrees, which God hath appointed among men for honesty's sake.⁵⁴

Gillespie provides a very helpful summary of the three major positions concerning established religion and liberty of conscience. *The Papists* believed that the civil magistrate should put all heretics to death (and promoted the use of many abominable means of torture in order to compel confessions and recantations) without making any distinction amongst the various degrees or obstinacy of heresy. *The Anabaptists* believed that the civil magistrate should tolerate all religions, even legally protecting the free exercise of false religions (this is the position endorsed by not only evangelicals today,

but also the position propounded by Reformed Churches as well). *The Reformed Churches* offered a mediating position wherein the civil magistrate should legally establish the one true Reformed Religion, protecting and defending it from all heresy, schism, and false worship. Although not tolerating false religions, the magistrate, nevertheless, should make distinctions amongst heresies as to the degree of seriousness and as to the degree of obstinacy in the heretic (i.e. all heretics should not be punished to the same extent).

The first opinion is that of the Papists, who hold it to be not only no sin, but good service to God, to extirpate [i.e. uproot-GLP] by fire and sword, all that are adversaries to, or opposers of the Church and the Catholic religion. . . that all heretics without distinction are to be put to death.⁵⁵

The second opinion [which represents the position of the Anabaptists, Independents, and other sectaries-GLP] falls short, as far as the former exceeds: that is, that the Magistrate ought not to inflict any punishment, nor put forth any coercive power upon heretics or sectaries, but on the contrary grant them liberty and toleration.⁵⁶

The third opinion [which represents the position of the Reformed Churches-GLP] is that the Magistrate may and ought to exercise his coercive power, in suppressing and punishing heretics and sectaries, *less or more, according as the nature and degree of the error, schism, obstinacy, and danger of seducing others, requires*. . . . And lest it be thought that this is but the opinion of some few, that the magistrate ought thus by a strong hand, and by civil punishments suppress heretics and sectaries: let it be observed what is held forth and professed concerning this business, by the Reformed Churches in their public confessions of faith. *In the latter Confession of Helvetia (cap.30)*, it is said that the magistrate ought to "root out lies and all superstition, with all impiety and idolatry." And after, "Let him suppress stubborn heretics." *In the French Confession (art.39)*, "Therefore he hath also delivered the sword into the hands of Magistrates, to wit, that offenses may be repressed, not only those which are committed against the second table, but also against the first." *In the Belgic Confession (art.36)*, "Therefore hath he armed the Magistrate with the sword for punishing them that do evil, and for defending such as do well. Moreover it is their duty not only to be careful and watchful for the preservation of the civil government, but also to defend the holy ministry, and to abolish and overthrow all idolatry, and counterfeit worship of God." *Beza* (De Hareticis), tells us in the beginning, that *the ministers of Helvetia* had declared themselves to be of the same judgment, in a book published of that argument. And toward the end he cites *the Saxon Confession, Luther, Melancthon, Brentius, Bucerus, Wolfgangus Capito, and Bullinger. The Synod of Dortt (ses.138)*, in their sentence against the Remonstrants does not only interdict them of all their ecclesiastical and academical functions, but [does] also beseech the States General [of the Netherlands-GLP] by their secular power to suppress and restrain them.⁵⁷

(3) Herein we find the ever popular heresy of religious pluralism (or religious toleration) which legally protects (and therefore promotes) all false religion (contrary to the First Table Commandments), thus subverting the true Reformed religion, the truth of Christ, and the unity of faith.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Civil government is an ordinance of God established for God's glory and the welfare of man. To that end God has entrusted into the hands of the *lawful* magistrate the sword. It is lawful for Christians to serve as magistrates in a *lawful* government in order to exercise capital punishment, just wars and judicial recompense to the guilty.⁵⁸ It is also lawful for a Christian to exercise self-defence after all other options to preserve one's life have been exhausted.

We condemn the Anabaptists, who, as they deny that a Christian man should bear the office of a magistrate, so also they deny that any man can justly be put to death by the magistrate, or that the magistrate may make war, or that oaths should be performed to the magistrate, and such like things.⁵⁹

We do clearly protest, that, together with all other doctrines which are directly contrary to the sound and pure doctrine of Jesus Christ, we do not only not receive, *but, as abominations and blasphemies*, reject and condemn those strange and erroneous doctrines, which the spirits of hurlyburly [i.e. commotion-GLP] among other damnable opinions do bring forth, *saying, &c. that magistrates cannot be Christians*. And, in the margin:-*The magistrate doth then shew himself to be a good magistrate, when he is a true Christian*.⁶⁰

(2) A Christian may even serve and hold civil office in an unlawful government provided no sinful act is required in order to hold office, such as an oath of allegiance to an immoral constitution.

It is, I grant, often God's decree revealed by the event, that a conqueror be on the throne, but this will [i.e. God's providential will-GLP] is not our rule, *and the people are to swear no oath of allegiance contrary to God's Voluntas signi, which is his revealed will in his word regulating us*.⁶¹

And I have never been able to satisfy myself, how it was consistent, in those who profess Presbyterianism, to swear an oath [e.g. when assuming a civil or military position-GLP], which involves the supporting of idolatry [by means of constitutionally protecting false religions-GLP], &c., while, at the same time, in their creeds and church constitutions, they solemnly recognize their obligation, in their respective stations, to remove every monument and vestige of it from the land [as expounded in "The Larger Catechism", Q. 108, i.e. in the original Larger Catechism of 1648-GLP].⁶²

The friends of truth cannot justifiably persevere in supporting the British Constitution as the ordinance of God. . . . The friends of truth under the present government should say to it in such a manner as not to be misunderstood.--We will obey your good laws, because they are good; *but by oaths or otherwise we will not recognize your authority as of God*.--We will co-operate with you in doing what is good; *but so long as you continue to support evil, we cannot swear allegiance to you*. Abolish all oaths of allegiance, and we will act along with you in every right matter.--Were all those who hold the truth in the united kingdom to do so, would not the request extort regard? And might not rulers see

the propriety of yielding? Were such oaths to the present government abolished, then those who love the truth might enter parliament, and act without being responsible for the evils of the civil constitution and of the administration, and at the same time lead to essential political reformation; and the people could with a clear conscience return to parliament such men as might be possessed of proper character, and be of known attachment to the truth. Were a door opened in this manner for men consistently uttering their voice in the councils of the nation, then means should be assiduously used, on the part of the people and on the part of their representatives, for scripturally reforming the State, and for giving to true religion that external countenance and support which is due it.⁶³

(3) It is the duty of civil magistrates to suppress all false religion and to establish the true reformed religion (in doctrine, worship, and government) by law within his realm.

Yet civil government has as its appointed end, so long as we live among men, *to cherish and protect the outward worship of God, to defend sound doctrine of piety and the position of the church*, to adjust our life to the society of men, to form our social behavior to civil righteousness, to reconcile us with one another, and to promote general peace and tranquility.⁶⁴

Moreover, to kings, princes, rulers, and magistrates, *we affirm that chiefly and most principally the conservation and purgation of the religion appertains*; so that not only they are appointed for civil policy, but also for maintenance of *the true religion*, and for suppressing of idolatry and superstition whatsoever: as in David, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah, and others, highly commended for their zeal in that case, may be espied.⁶⁵

The orthodox churches believe also, and do willingly acknowledge, that every lawful magistrate, being by God himself constituted the keeper and *defender of both tables of the law*, may and ought first and chiefly to take care of God's glory, and (according to his place, or in his manner and way) *to preserve religion when pure, and to restore it when decayed and corrupted*: and also to provide a learned and godly ministry, schools also and synods, as likewise to restrain and punish as well atheists, blasphemers, heretics and schismatics, as the violators of justice and civil peace.⁶⁶

All pious fatherlanders rejoiced when the States General [of the Netherlands-GLP] in the great Assembly of 1651 declared, "*That each in his own province must keep and maintain the Reformed religion*, as it is presently preached and taught publicly in our Churches, as was established by the National Synod held at Dordt in 1619." They also decided that "*the before mentioned religion*, by the provinces, as well as by the States General in the provinces under their jurisdiction, *shall be maintained with the law of the land, without allowing anyone ever to make any changes*." Synod of Dordt, Article 1 and 2.⁶⁷

Q. 108. What are the duties required in the second commandment?

A. The duties required in the second commandment are, the receiving, observing, and keeping pure and entire, all such religious worship and ordinances as God hath instituted in his word. . . *as also the disapproving, detesting, opposing, all false worship; and,

according to each one's place and calling, removing it, and all monuments of idolatry* . . .
.68

Q. 109. What are the sins forbidden in the second commandment?

A. The sins forbidden in the second commandment are, all devising, counselling, commanding, using, *and any wise approving, any religious worship not instituted by God himself; tolerating a false religion* . . .69

9. Oaths

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) All oaths (personal, ecclesiastical, and civil) are forbidden to the Christian, because his own word is sufficient to bind him to his duty.

The oath is a confirmation among those who are quarreling or making promises. In the Law it is commanded to be performed in God's Name, but only in truth, not falsely.

Christ, who teaches the perfection of the Law, prohibits all swearing to His (followers), whether true or false.70

(2) Anabaptism denies a biblical warrant for personal and social covenanting in this age, thereby denying the perpetual obligation of personal, ecclesiastical, or national covenanting.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Covenanting (whether personal, ecclesiastical, or national) is a moral duty binding all men under the New Covenant even as it did under the Old Covenant. Oaths required on certain solemn occasions are lawful provided that the matter of the oath is agreeable to the Word of God and is able to be performed.

Calvin's first objective was to obtain, at a meeting attended by the whole city, *an oath forcing the entire population to abjure the papacy and adhere to the Christian religion and its discipline, as comprehended under a few headings*.71

Register of the Council of 24 *12 November 1537*. It was reported that yesterday the people who had not yet made their oath to the reformation were asked to do so, street by street; whilst many came, many others did not do so. No one came from the German quarter. *It was decided that they should be commanded to leave the city if they did not wish to swear to the reformation*.72

26 November 1537. Some people have been reported to have said that it was perjury to swear to a confession which had been dictated to them in writing . . . [Farel or Calvin] replied that if the contents of the written confession were studied carefully it would be seen that this was not so, but that it was a confession made according to God. Examples from holy Scripture (in Nehemia and Jeremiah) proved that the people should all be assembled to swear to keep faith with God and observe his commandments.73

To swear to the true religion, the defence and maintenance thereof is a lawful oath; as to swear to any thing that is lawful, and to lay a new band on our souls to perform holy duties, where we fear a breach, and find by experience there hath been a breach, is also *a duty of moral and perpetual equity*; therefore such a sworn covenant is lawful.⁷⁴

(2) The Westminster Assembly, the Church of Scotland, and the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland (and "*all his Majesties dominions*") swore the Solemn League and Covenant on behalf of not only their living posterity, but also on behalf of all their national, ecclesiastical and individual posterity who would follow them.⁷⁵

We Noblemen, Barons, Knights, Gentlemen, Citizens, Burgesses, Ministers of the Gospel, and Commons of all sorts, in the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, by the providence of GOD, living under one King, and being of one reformed religion. . . *after mature deliberation, resolved and determined to enter into a mutual and solemn League and Covenant, wherein we all subscribe, and each one of us for himself, with our hands lifted up to the most High GOD, do swear*. . . we shall each one of us, according to our place and interest, endeavour that they may remain conjoined in a firm peace and union *to all posterity* . . .⁷⁶

Note who the "all posterity" (as mentioned in the Solemn League and Covenant) includes by the language of the Westminster divines in their letter to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (1644):

Those Winds which for a while do trouble the Aire, do withall purge and refine it: And our trust is that through the most wise Providence and blessing of God, the Truth by our so long continued agitations, will be better cleared among us, and so our service will prove more acceptable to all the Churches of Christ, but more especially to you, while we have an intente eye to our peculiar Protestation, *and to that publick Sacred Covenant [i.e. the Solemn League and Covenant- GLP]* entered into by both the Kingdomes [Ireland is not formally omitted here, but is omitted only because this English Assembly is addressing the Scottish General Assembly-GLP], for Uniformity *in all his Majesties Dominions*.⁷⁷

Not only did the Westminster Assembly understand the posterity bound by the Solemn League and Covenant to be "all his majesties dominions", but the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland also officially declared the same to be true in their letter (1648) to Charles I:

As we do not oppse the restitution of your Majestie to the exercise of your Royall Power; So we must needs desire that that which is GODS be given unto Him in the first place, and that Religion may be secured before the settling of any humane interest; Being confident that this way is not only most for the Honour of GOD, but also for your Majesties Honor and Safety. And therefore as it was one of our Desires to the High and Honourable Court of Parliament that they would sollicite your Majestie for securing of Religion, *and establishing the Solemn League and Covenant in all your Dominions* [the Solemn League and Covenant having been sworn and made law by the Parliaments of England and Scotland, it was required that Charles I swear to establish it and to enforce it in all his

dominions before he would be allowed to return to his throne and to exercise his royal authority-GLP].78

Is it possible to know which nations were bound as posterity by the Solemn League and Covenant (1643) and included in "all his majesties dominions?" Clearly, it was all the subjects and the dominions under the Crown of Great Britain (including the United States and Canada both of which were then designated as "the dominions in America").

The first colonial Charter issued by the English crown (1606) was for the settlement of Jamestown in Virginia. Here it is noted that the colony of Virginia is declared to be one of the kings "Dominions" as much as any other royal dominion, and its members are considered by James I to have the same rights as those living in the "Realm of England." It provided that all . . . Persons, being our Subjects [i.e. subjects of the Crown of England-GLP], which shall dwell and inhabit within . . . any of the said Colonies and Plantations, and every [one] of their children, which shall happen to be born within any of the Limits and Precincts of the said several Colonies and Plantations, shall Have and enjoy all Liberties, Franchises, and Immunities, *within any of our other Dominions*, to all Intents and Purposes, as if they had been abiding and born, within this our Realm of England, *or any other of our said Dominions*79

In 1663, Charles II granted a charter to eight English gentlemen who had helped him regain the throne of England. The charter document contains the following description of the territory (then designated Carolina) which the eight Lords Proprietors were granted title to:

All that Territory or tract of ground, situate, lying, and being within *our Dominions in America*80

In a document written by Thomas Jefferson entitled "A Summary of the Rights of British America", the following brief reference to an Act from King George III demonstrates that even those living in America understood they were a dominion of his majesty.

One other act passed in the 6th year of his reign [George III-GLP], entitled "An Act for the better securing dependency of *his majesty's dominions in America* upon the crown and parliament of Great Britain.81

The following excerpts occur in the newspaper that Benjamin Franklin published in Philadelphia (The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser) wherein reference is made to colonies in what is now Canada and the United States as being dominions of the Crown.

In considering of these questions, perhaps it may be of use to recollect; that the colonies were planted in times when the powers of parliament were not supposed so extensive, as they are become since the Revolution: - - That they were planted in lands and countries where the parliament had not then the least jurisdiction: -- That, excepting *the yet infant colonies of Georgia and Nova Scotia*, none of them were settled at the expence of any money granted by parliament: That the people went from hence by permission from the crown, purchased or conquered the territory, at the expence of their own private treasure and blood: That these territories thus became *new dominions of the crown*, settled

under royal charters, that formed their several governments and constitutions, on which the parliament was never consulted; or had the least participation. Jan. 6, 1766.⁸²

The Colonies had, from their first Settlement, been governed with more Ease, than perhaps can be equalled by any Instance in History, *of Dominions so distant*. February, 1773.⁸³

Whereas Anabaptist churches have not viewed themselves as being bound by such national covenants as the Solemn League and Covenant, Reformed churches have rightly viewed such historical covenants as obligating their posterity even as biblical covenants bound the posterity of the fathers who swore them. Francis Turretin (1623-1687) of the Academy of Geneva has declared concerning such national covenants that *covenants once sanctioned are to be kept*, as they bind the magistrate no less than the people⁸⁴

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (1649) declared without reservation that even unfaithfulness on the part of any one kingdom could not free another covenanted kingdom from its obligation to the Solemn League and Covenant.

Although there were none in the one Kingdome who did adhere to the Covenant [i.e. The Solemn League and Covenant sworn by the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland in 1643-GLP], yet thereby were not the other Kingdom nor any person in either of them absolved from the bond thereof, *since in it we have not only sworne by the Lord, but also covenanted with him. It is not the failing of one or more that can absolve others from their duty or tye to him; Besides, the duties therein contained, being in themselves lawfull, and the grounds of our tye thereunto moral, though others do forget their duty, yet doth not their defection free us from that obligation which lyes upon us by the Covenant in our places and stations*. And the Covenant being intended and entered into by these Kingdoms, as one of the best means of stedfastnesse, for guarding against declining times; It were strange to say that the back-sliding of any should absolve others from the tye thereof, especially seeing our engagement therein is not only nationall, but also personall, every one with uplifted hands swearing by himself, as it is evident by the tenor of the Covenant.⁸⁵

10. Eschatology

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Christ will reign bodily upon the earth for a thousand years.

It appears that Calvin was well informed about the preference for chiliasm [premillennialism-GLP] on the part of the Radicals [from the Anabaptist movement-GLP]. *[C]alvin named Muntzer, Melchior Hoffman, and Storch, all of whom were chiliasts, as leaders of the Anabaptist movement*.⁸⁶

(2) "Some [Anabaptists-GLP] believed in the sleep of the soul between death and resurrection."⁸⁷

It is renewed in this age by the milder Socinians and *Anabaptists* who, pressing in their footsteps, presume to defend at least *a night of the soul (viz., that souls either sleep and are without all sense or are extinguished until the resurrection)*.88

(3) The one thousand year reign of Christ upon the earth after His coming is the error of the premillennialists.

(4) The doctrine of soul sleep is prevalent among those cults (e.g. Jehovah Witnesses) who deny the immortality of the soul.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Christ will reign from heaven over all nations for an extended period of time. This glorious era will be evidenced by the success of the gospel, the calling of the Jews, the uniformity of one faith throughout the world, national covenanting (and covenant renewal), and both civil and ecclesiastical governments working together for biblical reformation.

The coming of Christ to reign here on earth a thousand years is, if not a groundless opinion, yet so dubious and uncertain as not to be admitted a place in the analogy of faith to regulate our interpretation of Scripture. . . .89

(2) At death the souls of the righteous immediately ascend to enjoy conscious rest in God, while the souls of the wicked immediately descend to endure conscious torment in hell.

[F]aithful souls immediately after death experience some enjoyment of the heritage that has been promised to them, but inasmuch as the glory of Jesus Christ their king has not yet appeared and the heavenly city of God has not yet been established in its fullness, they must wait until that day arrives.90

The bodies of men after death return to dust, and see corruption; *but their souls, (which neither die nor sleep,)* having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them. The souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the scripture acknowledgeth none.91

The heresy of Anabaptism lives today! It has infected the modern church with its cancerous errors and heresies: anti-creedalism, arminianism, dispensationalism, independency (sectarianism), anti-paedobaptism, will-worship (anti-regulativism), perfectionism, societal escapism, religious pluralism and tolerationism (anti-establishmentarianism), denial of the perpetual obligation of social covenanting, pacifism, pietism, socialism, premillennialism, and a refusal to recognize *lawful* civil government as the ordinance of God. These unbiblical positions of the Anabaptists were not tolerated by the Reformed Churches of the First and Second Reformations, and neither should they be tolerated by any Church today that claims to be Reformed or Presbyterian.

To those who would mindlessly hurl anabaptistic stones at churches espousing the biblical principles of the Reformers (as found in the citations above), the words of our Lord should be carefully heeded:

Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again (Mt. 7:1,2).

Thus, let us all remove the anabaptistic beam from our own eyes before we seek to pull out the anabaptistic mote from our brother's eye. Moreover, Reformed and Presbyterian Churches must repent of their defection into anabaptistic tendencies and affirm again the biblical views of their reformed forefathers in the following areas: the regulative principle of worship, biblical unity founded upon the truth, biblical separation from all churches who are constitutionally committed to false doctrine and worship, and covenanted uniformity in doctrine, worship, and government (through means of a faithful covenant as exemplified in the Solemn League and Covenant, sworn and emitted by the Westminster Assembly in 1643).

Finally, we must be willing to buy the truth of Christ and sell it not, even when it appears to the majority that we are too few in number to be committed with the truth. Let us never forget that it was to the two spies (Joshua and Caleb) and not to the ten spies that Jehovah our God entrusted His precious truth. Remember, God warns us that we are not to follow the majority (multitude) to do evil (Ex. 23:2).

It is an offense to a great many people that they see almost the whole world opposed to us. And indeed the patrons of a bad cause do not neglect their own advantage, using a strategem like this so as not to upset the ignorant and weak, that it is extremely absurd that almost the whole Christian world is disregarded, *so that the faith is to be possessed by a few men*. But, in particular, to destroy us they defend themselves with the sacred title of "the Church" as if with a mallet. . . . If anyone perhaps objects that we are not excused by the example of Noah, if we separate ourselves from that crowd which keeps the name of "the Church," *Isaiah [Is.8:12-GLP], when he gave orders to abandon the conspiracy of men and follow God alone, was referring not to strangers but to those who were at that time glorying exceedingly in the name of the people of God*.92

Endnotes

1. John Calvin, Commentary on John 10:19, *_Calvin's Commentaries_* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1979), XVII:411. Emphases added.
2. Cited from the World Wide Web page entitled "Anabaptists." Emphases added.
3. John Calvin, *_Treatises Against the Anabaptists_*, Benjamin Wirt Farley, ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), p. 110. Emphases added.
4. Menno Simons, *_Incarnation_* [1496-1561], cited by Benjamin Wirt Farley, ed., *_Treatises Against the Anabaptists_* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), pp. 114,115, footnote 58. Emphases added.

5. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 2:306. Emphases added.
6. John Calvin, *Treatises Against the Anabaptists*, Benjamin Wirt Farley, ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), p. 114. Emphases added.
7. *Westminster Larger Catechism*, Question 37. Emphases added.
8. *Ibid.*, Question 39.
9. John Knox, *Works*, V:121-122, cited by Kevin Reed, ed. in *A Warning Against the Anabaptists* (Dallas, Texas: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1984), p. 4. Emphases added.
10. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 1:614.
11. Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (AP&A, no date), VIII:38.
12. Ray Sutton, "The Baptist Failure," *Christianity & Civilization*, James B. Jordan, ed. (Geneva Divinity School, 1982), p. 156.
13. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 2:593,594. Emphases added.
14. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 3:5. Emphases added.
15. *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, Question 33. Emphases added.
16. Kenneth Ronald Davis, *Anabaptism and Aceticism* (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1974), p. 72. Emphases added.
17. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 1:98. Emphases added.
18. *Ibid.*, 2:83. Emphases added.
19. Willem Balke, *Calvin and the Anabaptist Radicals* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1981), p. 310. Emphases added.
20. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 1:8. Emphases added.
21. *Ibid.*, 7:6. Emphases added.
22. Ray Sutton, "The Baptist Failure", *Christianity & Civilization*, James Jordan, ed., (Geneva Divinity School, 1982), p. 152. Emphases added.
23. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 3:23. Emphases added.

24. Samuel Rutherford, *The Due Right Of Presbyteries* (London: E. Griffin, 1644), p. 261. Emphases added.
25. *The Form of Presbyterial Church-Government* [1645] emitted by the Westminster Assembly. Emphases added.
26. *The Divine Right of Church-Government* originally asserted by the Ministers of Sion College (London: December, 1646), pp. 7,8. Emphases are in the original text.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 238. Emphases added.
28. Michael Sattler, *The Schleithem Confession* [1527], Article 1. Emphases added.
29. Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (AP&A, no date), VIII:40.
30. *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, Question 95. Emphases added.
31. John Calvin, *Institutes*, John T. McNeill, ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960) IV, xvi, 24:1347. Emphases added.
32. John Calvin, "The First Sermon, On Psalm 16:4", cited by Kevin Reed, ed., *Come Out From Among Them-The 'Anti-Nicodemite Writings of John Calvin* (Dallas, Texas: Protestant Heritage Press, forthcoming), p. 141. Emphases added.
33. John Knox, *Works* (Edinburgh: The Bannatyne Club, 1846), I:195,196. Emphases added.
34. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 21:1. Emphases added.
35. John Calvin, *Opera*, VI:171, cited by Michael Bushell, *The Songs of Zion* (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Crown and Covenant Publications, second edition, 1993 [1977]), pp. 181,182. Emphases added.
36. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 21:5. Emphases added.
37. *The Directory For The Publick Worship Of God*, "Of Singing of Psalms," emitted by the Westminster Assembly. Emphases added.
38. Abraham Van De Velde, *The Wonders Of The Most High or Indication of the causes, ways and means whereby the United Provinces [of the Netherlands-GLP], against the expectation of the whole world, were elevated in such a marvelous way from their previous oppression to such great, awe inspiring riches and acclaim. As related by several eminent historians, and which after the manner of the time are compiled to a necessary and profitable use* (c.1674, first English translation forthcoming), p. 125. Emphases added.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 125,126. Emphases added.
40. Michael Sattler, *The Schleithem Confession* [1527], Article 4. Emphases added.

41. John Calvin, *Treatises Against the Anabaptists*, Benjamin Wirt Farley, ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), p. 57. Emphases added.
42. John Calvin, "Commentary on Psalm 15:1", *Calvin's Commentaries* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1979), IV:204. Emphases added.
43. Samuel Rutherford, *The Due Right Of Presbyteries* (London: E. Griffin, 1644), p. 255. Emphases added.
44. Voetius, cited by James Fraser, *The Lawfulness and Duty of Separation from Corrupt Ministers and Churches* (Edinburgh: George Patton, 1744), pp. xxxi,xxxii. Emphases added.
45. Michael Sattler, *The Schleithem Confession* [1527], Article 4. Emphases added.
46. John Calvin, *Institutes*, John T. McNeill, ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press,1960), IV, i, 23:1036. Emphases added.
47. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 2:694. Emphases added.
48. *The Westminster Confession of Faith*, 14:2.
49. John Owen, *Inquiry into the Nature and Communion of Evangelic Churches*, p. 180, cited by Andrew Clarkson, *Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting from the Revolution-Church in Scotland* (1731), p. 214. Emphasis added.
50. John Calvin, *Institutes*, John T. McNeill, ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press,1960), IV,II,12:1052,1053. Emphases added.
51. Michael Sattler, *The Schleithem Confession* [1527], Article 4. Emphases added.
52. *Ibid.*, Article 6. Emphases added.
53. *Ibid.*, Article 4. Emphases added.
54. *Belgic Confession*, Article 36. Emphases added.
55. George Gillespie, *Wholesome Severity Reconciled*, cited in *An Anthology of Presbyterian & Reformed Literature* (Dallas, Texas: Naphtali Press, 1991 [1645]), 5:179,180,181. Emphases added.
56. *Ibid.*, 5:180. Emphases added.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 181. Emphases added.
58. For a more detailed discussion of biblical civil magistracy, consider the author's recent book, *Biblical Civil Government Versus The Beast; & The Basis For Civil Resistance*, also available through Still Waters Revival Books.

59. *The Second Helvetic Confession* [1566], Chapter 30, "Of Magistracy." Emphases added.
60. *The Confession of Basle* [1532], Article 11. Emphases added.
61. Samuel Rutherford, *Lex, Rex, or The Law And The Prince* (Harrisonburg, Virginia: Sprinkle Publications, 1982 [1644]), p. 40. Emphases added.
62. Samuel Wylie, *Two Sons Of Oil; or, The Faithful Witness For Magistracy And Ministry Upon A Scriptural Basis* (Pottstown, Pennsylvania: Covenanted Reformed Presbyterian Publishing, 1995 [1803]), pp. 36,37.
63. John Cunningham, *The Ordinance of Covenanting* (Glasgow: William Marshall, 1843), p. 392. Emphases added.
64. John Calvin, *Institutes*, John T. McNeill, ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), IV, XX, 2:1487. Emphases added.
65. *The Scottish Confession of Faith*, Chapter 24. Emphases added.
66. George Gillespie, *Works* (Edmonton, Alberta: Still Waters Revival Books, 1991 [1846]), 1:12. Emphases added.
67. Abraham Van De Velde, *The Wonders Of The Most High or Indication of the causes, ways and means whereby the United Provinces [of the Netherlands-GLP], against the expectation of the whole world, were elevated in such a marvelous way from their previous oppression to such great, awe inspiring riches and acclaim. As related by several eminent historians, and which after the manner of the time are compiled to a necessary and profitable use* (c.1674, first English translation forthcoming), p. 157. Emphases added.
68. *Westminster Larger Catechism*, Question 108. Emphases added.
69. *Westminster Larger Catechism*, Question 109. Emphases added.
70. Michael Sattler, *The Schleithem Confession*, Article 7. Emphases added.
71. Pamela Johnston and Bob Scribner, *The Reformation in Germany and Switzerland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 138. Emphases added.
72. Ibid. Emphases added.
73. Ibid. Emphases added.
74. Samuel Rutherford, *The Due Right Of Presbyteries* (London: E. Griffin, 1644), p. 134. Emphases added.
75. For further information about the binding obligation of the Solemn League and Covenant upon the United States and Canada, please consult the author's forthcoming work which is available through Still Waters Revival Books, *Are the United States and Canada Covenant-Breaking Nations?* _

76. *The Solemn League and Covenant* [1643-GLP]. Emphases added.
77. *The Acts Of The Generall Assemblies Of The Church Of Scotland: From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive*, 4 June 1644, Session 7, "The Letter from the Synod of Divines in the Kirk of England, to the General Assembly", pp. 231,232. The original spelling and punctuation have been retained. Emphases added.
78. *Ibid.*, August 12, 1648, Session 40, "The Humble Supplication of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland unto the Kings Most Excellent Majesty", p. 439. The original spelling and punctuation have been retained. Emphases added.
79. Cited by Clarence Carson, *Basic American Government*, (Wadley, Alabama: American Textbook Committee, 1993), p. 126. Emphases added.
80. Cited on the World Wide Web page entitled, "State Library of North Carolina," <http://HAL.DCR.STATE.NC.US/ncslhome.htm>. Emphases added.
81. Cited from the World Wide Web page at: gopher://gopher.vt.edu:10010/02/106/8. Emphases added.
82. Cited from the World Wide Web page at: gopher://gopher.vt.edu:10010/02/85/28. Emphases added.
83. Cited from the World Wide Web page at: gopher://gopher.vt.edu:10010/02/85/28. Emphases added.
84. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 3:327. Emphases added.
85. *The Acts Of The General Assemblies Of The Church Of Scotland: From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive*, 6 August 1649, Session Ultimate, "A Brotherly Exhortation from the Generall Assembly of the Church of Scotland, to their Brethren in England", pp. 474,475. The original spelling and capitalization have been retained. Emphases added.
86. Willem Balke, *Calvin and the Anabaptist Radicals* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1981), p. 297, emphases added.
87. Philip Schaff, *History Of The Christian Church* (AP&P), VIII:40.
88. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 3:327. Emphases added.
89. John Owen, *Works*, 20:154, emphases added.
90. John Calvin, *Treatises Against the Anabaptists*, Benjamin Wirt Farley, ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), pp. 138,139, emphases added.
91. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 32:1, emphases added.

92. John Calvin, *Concerning Scandals* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978), pp. 109,110, emphases added.

9. APPENDIX B: PORNOGRAPHY, THE ANABAPTISTS AND DOUG WILSON'S CIVIL ANTINOMIANISM

by Reg Barrow

(A special note of thanks is offered to Larry Birger for his editorial expertise and assistance in completing this piece.)

"For the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light" (Luke 16:8b).

The civil antinomianism which Doug Wilson adopts regarding pornography and negative civil sanctions in "Cyberporn: A Case Study" [*Credenda/Agenda*, vol. 7, no. 5, p. 11] is a fundamental error also prevalent among antiestablishmentarian *modern* Theonomists. Wilson believes that

"Christians must learn to distinguish sins from crimes. If God reveals His will on a matter, disobedience is sin. If God reveals the civil penalty which must be applied, then it is also a crime. But without wisdom from Him on the civil penalty to be applied, the civil order must leave enforcement of God's law to the church, family, or the providence of God."

He further states that "when pornography is made and distributed, it should simply be used as evidence -- of the adultery or of the sodomy, etc." In his analogy between adultery/pornography and theft/movies showing theft, he laments, "Why do we resist punishing what God requires punishment for, and insist on punishments found nowhere in Scripture?" In short, according to Wilson, because God in his word has *not specifically mandated* negative civil sanctions against pornography *per se*, "with a biblical approach, pornography would not be [a] crime."

It bears mentioning that not all modern Theonomists agree with Wilson that pornography is not a crime. For example, R. J. Rushdoony states, "the link between pornography and revolutionary totalitarianism is a necessary one. The rise of totalitarianism has always been preceded by moral anarchism... the politics of pornography is a moral anarchism whose purpose is revolution, a revolution against Christian civilization. . . . Certainly new and clearer legislation [against pornography--RB] is *necessary and urgently needed*. . . we need and must have sound legislation" (*Law and Liberty*, pp. 18-20; emphasis added). However, others, like Greg Bahnsen (cf. his cassette "Pornography, Obscenity,

Censorship"), do concur that the making and distribution of pornography, generally, is not a crime. Regardless of some disagreement amongst themselves, the idea that the civil magistrate is limited by *explicit* biblical pronouncements in what and how he may punish is a teaching some *modern* Theonomists (as opposed to biblical "*historical*" theonomists" like Calvin, Knox, Rutherford and Gillespie) have promoted for about three decades. In fact, some in the movement even suggest this "hyper-regulativism" (defined below) extends to the actual method of punishment, while others are content to apply it only to the crime and negative sanction itself. Either way, its proponents insist that their view alone provides an antidote to civil despotism by offering divinely prescribed limitations on the civil magistrate's power in punishing offenders of God's law. Such a view may sound pious, appeal to a libertarian mentality, and appear to be the only possible check against civil tyranny, but it is in opposition to God's revealed will and therefore must be rejected as just another form of modern heresy -- a heresy, which as Rushdoony notes above, actually helps usher in civil tyranny.

There are a number of major problems with Wilson's principles and their applications, and it may be helpful to survey some of these before giving a more full refutation from history and Scripture.

To begin with, on the pornography question Wilson (and other *modern* Theonomists) apply a *form* of "regulativism" (really "hyper-regulativism"; see below) where it does not belong -- i.e. in the case of negative civil sanctions. Ironically, many of these same people also deny (if only by their practice; James 1:22; Titus 1:16) the true regulativism where Scripture teaches it does belong -- i.e. in the public worship of God.

The regulative principle *of worship* has been skillfully handled in *The Songs of Zion* by Michael Bushell, *Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of God* by John Girardeau and *A Dispute Against English Popish Ceremonies* by George Gillespie, and reader is urged to consult these. For our purposes here, we simply note that the regulative principle, as taught and practiced by the Reformers, permitted only those acts of public worship which had "divine warrant from God's Word either by (1) command; or by (2) authorized example of the apostles; or by (3) good and necessary inference" (Greg Price, *Foundation for Reformation: The Regulative Principle of Worship*, p. 5).

The imposition of anything God has not prescribed has long been *rightly* exposed and rejected in the area of *public worship* (cf. my *The Regulative Principle of Worship in History* [free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/CRTPWors.htm>], my *Psalm Singing in Scripture and History* [free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/CRTPsSing.htm>] and my *Doug Wilson's Five Questions on the Regulative Principle of Worship Answered* [free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/Doug5Qs.htm>]). Wilson and other *modern* Theonomists, however, take this approach not to *worship*, but to *negative civil sanctions*. As he says, "We do not have the capacity to legislate wisely where God has been *silent*" (emphasis added). Not only does he make a *fundamental* mistake in attempting to apply a form of the "regulative principle" to negative civil sanctions, he takes it one step further by misconstruing the regulative principle itself. Wilson's form of "regulativism" in the civil sphere denies "good and necessary inference" (an integral part of

the true regulative principle), and therefore cannot be rightly called biblical regulativism without causing some confusion. Hence, I call Wilson's view "hyper-regulativism" because he makes the regulative principle *more strict* than do the Scriptures, or the Reformers who expounded this principle from the teaching of Scripture. Furthermore, Wilson's rejection of what Samuel Rutherford termed "logical or natural consequences," and what the Westminster Confession of Faith (1:6) designates as that which "by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture," (when applied to the pornography question before us) does not comport with the classical Protestant position on negative civil sanctions.

The combination of these errors by Wilson, in the distortion (through the denial of natural consequences) and misapplication of the regulative principle, actually turn the making and distribution of pornography into a *civil right* (except for certain *actual participants* who explicitly violate biblical judicial laws; i.e. those actually committing the acts of adultery, sodomy, etc. in the making of the pornography). Noted author and Reconstructionist-turned-Covenanter, Michael Wagner (who is presently completing his doctorate in political science), has defined one aspect of civil rights as "imposing an obligation on the state not to interfere with some aspect of an individual's life by applying negative civil sanctions." This definition, given Wilson's view of pornography, would grant most aspects of the pornography industry a *civil right* (based on Scripture falsely interpreted) to practice their vile trade freely, without any threat of civil punishment; and, according to ministries like Credenda/Agenda (unless they disagree with their editor), such actions would have a kind of "civil blessing" from God, inasmuch as Scripture allegedly *forbids* negative civil sanctions against pornographers.

Even more, not only would the making and distribution of pornography be a civil right (and not a crime), but it would actually be a **sin** for the civil government to intervene and violate Wilson's "hyper-regulativism" in such cases (outside of "simply" using the pornography "as evidence -- of the adultery or of the sodomy, etc." in civil trials). Sin is "any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God" (Westminster Shorter Catechism question and answer 14). By applying negative civil sanctions to the pornographers the civil government would be doing that which God has given them *no mandate* to do; and thus, in Wilson's scheme, the civil government would "lack conformity unto... the law of God" in punishing pornographers. As Wilson writes, "If God reveals His will on a matter, disobedience is sin;" and, "Why do we resist punishing what God requires punishment for, and insist on punishments found nowhere in Scripture?" Therefore, if God has indeed revealed his will on this matter -- that most pornographers are *not* criminals -- then *for the civil government to treat them as such* is sin.

We cannot escape this conclusion to which the regulative principle drives us. For example, concerning public worship, if everything except that which God has instituted is forbidden (outside of "some circumstances... common to human actions and societies"; cf. Westminster Confession, 1:6), then any addition of elements and regulated circumstances not instituted of God for use in public worship (e.g. man-made hymns, musical instruments, drama, dance, women preachers, holy days other than the Sabbath, etc.) is, of necessity, sin. The same is also true if Wilson's "hyper-regulativism" is to be applied to

negative civil sanctions. The addition of any negative civil sanctions *not explicitly revealed* in Scripture would be a transgression much akin to the sin we speak against in the sphere of public worship. Thus, Wilson must argue that a civil government that enacts laws for which it has no biblical warrant, such as laws against the possession, production and/or distribution of pornography, ***must be sinning***.

On a practical level, the situation that has developed in the African nation of Zambia may be instructive here. Shortly after Zambia threw off her communism and embraced Christianity as the official state religion it was reported that "whether by accident or design, new found freedoms also led to the legalization of pornography and abortion" ("Those Who Walk In Darkness, Will See A Great Light... The Christian Reconstruction of Zambia" by Abshire, free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/zambia.htm>). In the case of pornography, was this a good or bad testimony to the other nations of the world? Wilson would have to say that it was very good, as it was in keeping with God's (alleged) instruction concerning negative civil sanctions. The communists kept the nation relatively free of pornography but a professedly Christian government actually initially legalized it (along with abortion) -- and Wilson's views would have the Zambians "glorifying" God by legalizing pornography! (One wonders where the civil leaders of Zambia originally got the idea that it was honoring to God that pornography be free from negative civil sanctions!) But , thanks be to God, it came to pass that,

"the Zambian government then took a most encouraging turn. President Chiluba made a public speech against pornography and called for its total eradication. This was followed by vigorous action by the Zambian police in rooting out all publicly displayed pornography and arresting those who sold it. Representations of Zambia Christian Action convinced the Zambian government to have the police burn the pornography on the streets wherever it was found" (ibid.).

Given these developments in Zambia it would now seem appropriate for _Credenda/Agenda_ to provide a short article (their specialty) rebuking the Zambian civil government for "backsliding" into this latter state of affairs (by enacting negative civil sanctions against those involved with pornography). After all, "Why do [Zambians] . . . insist on punishments found nowhere in Scripture? . . . [Zambians] must learn to distinguish sins from crimes. If God reveals His will on a matter, disobedience is sin. If God reveals the civil penalty which must be applied, then it is also a crime. But without wisdom from Him on the civil penalty to be applied, the [Zambian] civil order must leave enforcement of God's law to the church, family, or the providence of God." Articles, attacking the faithful, are becoming more common in the pages of _Credenda/Agenda_, so the production of such a column should not catch many off guard -- especially if _C/A's_ writers turn the Zambian's faithfulness on this matter (and disagreement with them) into some kind of a joke or parody (thus confusing people into believing something about such righteous actions which have nothing to do with what has actually transpired in reality). Beware the man who is *quick* to jest about sin or other serious matters related to the kingdom of God (Eph. 5:3-4). Somehow I doubt we will ever see such an article (rebuking the Zambian's) from our "jovial" (I'm being kind) friends; for I think -- or at least hope -- that they are already wiser than the principles Wilson espouses in

"Cyberporn: A Case Study." But, if no rebuke to the Zambian civil government (for their "sin" of outlawing pornography) is forthcoming from Credenda/Agenda, a public retraction of Wilson's published principles may be in order. But alas...

Having thus given a brief overview of some of the glaringly absurd and destructive problems inherent in Wilson's position, we now turn to an examination of irrefutable historical and Scriptural evidences against it. We will thereby briefly, but I believe sufficiently, demonstrate that Doug Wilson's position (though we doubt that he holds to it consistently) on the application (or lack thereof) of negative civil sanctions, especially regarding pornographers, is not the "classical Protestant" position, nor is it biblical.

Beginning with some historic proof we find that Wilson's "hyper- regulativism" can be soundly refuted in citations taken from the individual (major) Reformers, their confessions and their covenants. Our first quote is taken from Wholesome Severity Reconciled With Christian Liberty; or, the True Resolution of a Present Controversy Concerning Liberty of Conscience by George Gillespie (1644; free at: <http://www.reformed.org/ethics/wholsome.html>). Gillespie, one of the Scottish commissioners to the Westminster Assembly, here illustrates that the basis of Wilson's position has historically been used by at least one Anabaptist. Gillespie writes,

"I have endeavored in the following discourse to vindicate the lawful, yea necessary use of the coercive power of the Christian Magistrate in suppressing and punishing heretics and sectaries, *according as the degree of their offense and of the Church's danger shall require*: Which when I had done, there came to my hands a book called The Storming of Antichrist (by Christopher Blackwood, 1644--RB). Indeed, "The Recruiting of Antichrist, and the Storming of Zion" (if so be that I may *anabaptize an Anabaptist's book*). Take one passage for instance (p.25): 'And for Papists,' says he, 'though they are least to be borne of all others, because of the uncertainty of their keeping faith with heretics, as they call us, and because they may be absolved of securements that can arise from the just solemn oaths, and because of their cruelty against the Protestants in diverse countries where they get the upper hand, and because they are professed idolaters, yet may they be born with (as I suppose with submission to better judgments) in Protestant government, in point of religion, **because we have no command** to root out any for conscience,'" etc. (1644 edition, p. v, emphases added).

Note that this Anabaptist's tolerationism is built on the same foundation Wilson insists is the magistrate's guide regarding negative civil sanctions. The Anabaptist argues that we must not punish the "papists" because "we have **no command** to root out any for conscience" (emphasis added). Gillespie subsequently distinguishes the truth from the error in the Anabaptist's statement (on tolerationism and conscience), but for our purpose it illustrates that this was one instance where Wilson's principle of civil hyper-regulativism is called upon to justify the Anabaptist position regarding civil penal sanctions.

I also addressed this question on pages 17-18 of my work, John Knox, Oliver Cromwell, God's Law and the Reformation of Civil Government:

"One further example of weakness in the modern Theonomic movement is found in the application of the *regulative principle to civil penal sanctions*. This idea has led some to such logical extremes that they would deny the civil government the right (or should I say duty) to censor or prohibit the *investment* in, or the *distribution* and *sale* of, pornographic materials (the seventh commandment notwithstanding). In such a 'Theonomic' state hard-core pornographic movies, books and magazines would be protected by a 'Theonomic' civil legal code -- while the 'Theonomic' police would have authority (based on a constitution which establishes the application of the regulative principle to civil penal sanctions) to apprehend *only* those who have *participated* in the adultery, fornication or sodomy of the pornography *itself*. The regulative principle, when applied to penal sanctions, would insure all other 'non participants' the constitutional *right* to involve themselves in the chain of production and distribution of pornographic materials, because the civil penal sanctions of the Old Testament don't *specifically* cite them as offenders. One further example would involve the sixth commandment. Would it be no crime to hire, counsel or plan a murder that was carried out by another because the penal sanctions do not *specify* anything other than the *actual murdering* as the crime? Obviously, matters must be judged in regard to allowing for an interpretation of Scripture, concerning crime and punishment, which takes into account those things which can, 'by good and necessary consequence... be deduced from Scripture' (_Westminster Confession of Faith_, ch. 1, sect. 6). Questions 91 to 151 of the _Westminster Larger Catechism_ would be an indispensably helpful guide to the civil magistrate here."

In this vein Gillespie notes:

"Fourthly, I distinguish between bare opinions or speculations, and scandalous or pernicious practices, as Mr. Burton does in his _Vindication of the Independent Churches_. 'You must distinguish,' he says, 'between men's consciences and their practices. The conscience simply considered in itself is for God, the lord of conscience alone to judge, as before. But for a man's practices (of which alone man can take cognizance) **if they be against *any* of God's commandments, of the first or the second table; that appertains to the Civil Magistrate to punish**,' who is for this cause called *custos utriusque tabulae*, the keeper of both tables.' For this he cites Rom. 13:3-4, and he adds, 'So as we see here that is the object of civil power, to wit, actions good or bad, not bare opinions, not thoughts, not conscience, but actions.' And this in his answer to the interrogatory concerning the lawful coercive power of the civil Magistrates in suppressing heresies. In which he handsomely yielded the point, for who advises the Parliament to punish men for their thoughts, bare opinions, or for conscience simply considered in itself? It is for preaching, **printing, spreading** of dangerous opinions, for schismatical, pernicious and scandalous practices, for drawing factions among the people contrary to the covenant [the Solemn League and Covenant -- RB], for resisting the reformation of religion, for lying and railing against the covenant [the Solemn League and Covenant -- RB], the Parliament, the [Westminster -- RB] Assembly of Divines, or against the Reformed Churches" (_Wholesome Severity_, p. 34, emphases added).

Likewise:

"Those that are in authority are to take such courses and so to rule, that we may not only lead a quiet and peaceable life, but further that it be in all godliness and honesty (1 Tim. 2:2). The Magistrate is keeper of both tables, and is to punish the violation of the first table, as well as of the second. 3. 'Will any man,' says Augustine, 'who is in his right wit, say to Kings, "Do not care by whom the Church of God in your Kingdom is maintained or opposed; it does not concern your Kingdom, who will be religious, who sacrilegious:" to whom, notwithstanding, it cannot be said, "It does not concern you in your Kingdom who is chaste, who whorish," etc. Is the soul's keeping faith and truth to God a lighter matter, than that of a woman to a man?'" (_Wholesome Severity_, p. 14).

In another place Gillespie goes so far as to say that

"though *other* judicial or foreseccall laws concerning the punishments of sins against the Moral law, may, yea, *must* be allowed of in Christian Republickes; Provided always they be *not contrary* to Gods own Judiciall laws: yet I fear not to hold with Junius, *de Politia Mosis* cap. 6, that he who was punishable by death under the Judiciall law, is punishable by death still; and he who was not punishable by death them, in not to be punished by death now" (_Wholesome Severity_, p. 9, emphases added).

So we see, whereas Wilson would not even have the godly magistrate protect the public for the "lesser" second table physical whoredoms (of pornography), Gillespie would have the magistrate punish for the "greater" first table spiritual whoredoms (e.g. tolerationism, heresy, false worship, etc.). Wilson says that we need *specific institution* for sanctions; Gillespie says that the magistrate can punish as long as the punishment is *not contrary* to Gods own Judiciall laws." The antithesis is clear: either Gillespie and his fellow Covenanters at Westminster were wrong on this point, or Wilson, the "Classical Protestant"; for there are no revealed penal sanctions which specifically call upon the magistrate to punish people "for drawing factions among the people contrary to the covenant [the Solemn League and Covenant -- RB]... for lying and railing against the covenant [the Solemn League and Covenant -- RB], the [English -- RB] Parliament, the [Westminster -- RB] Assembly of Divines, or against the Reformed Churches." Negative civil sanctions for these crimes must be specifically 'by good and necessary consequence... deduced from Scripture' (_Westminster Confession of Faith_, ch. 1, sect. 6). Clearly, Gillespie and other *historic* theologians oppose Wilson and many *modern* Theonomists.

John Knox's "Appellation... to the Scottish Nobility" in volume 4 of his *Works* also refutes Wilson's civil regulativism. In this appeal Knox repudiates the use of the regulative principle to guide magistrates (in regard to negative civil sanctions) when he notes that we are to submit to the laws of the magistrate except *such as be expressly repugning to God's commandment*" (cited in Knox's "Appellation" as printed in *John Knox on Rebellion*, R.A. Mason, ed. [Cambridge University Press, 1994], p. 107; see also the discussion of Westminster Confession 20:2,4 below). This is not the regulative principle applied to negative civil sanctions, which Wilson sets forth (i.e. only that which is expressly *instituted* of God is a lawful negative civil sanction), but the Reformation principle of negative civil sanctions, which allows for sanctions rightly *deduced from*

Scripture "by good and necessary consequence"**. The bulk of Reformed divines believed that God allows the magistrate much more room to *apply* Scripture to the area of negative sanctions -- as the Judges in Israel of old did, as well as a father disciplining his children -- than our modern "Presbyterians" and Theonomists do. Samuel Rutherford clearly states, "that which the *master of a christian family* may doe, that the *father of the Common-wealth the King*, in his place may doe" (_A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience, p. 176; emphasis added).

One contemporary author who has diagnosed part of the problem with applying the regulative principle to the state, writes:

"I have read in other places the argument that government should have no involvement in education because the Bible does not give instructions for it to be involved. These authors set forward what I call the 'regulative principle of the state.' Just as the regulative principle of worship says that what is not explicitly commanded is therefore forbidden, the regulative principle of the state says that what is not explicitly commanded to the government is forbidden. This principle is, as far as I know, without significant precedent in Church history, lacking in exegetical support, and leads to absurd policy implications (e.g. the elimination of traffic laws). This "libertarian model" of Christian statesmanship is inferior to the historic Calvinist view, which I call the 'patriarchal model.'" (Jerry Bowyer, _Christian Statesman_ magazine, "Bowyer's Blast" in the Educational Choice Issue, Jan./Feb., 1993).

This leads us to some incisive questions. Is the state really forbidden to intervene, because there is no explicit or specific biblical law mandating civil punishment against those who would *corrupt the morals of young children* through the use of lewd pictures? What about when hard core pornography is being displayed in a local community playground (or the local corner store)? Are we really to think that a godly civil magistrate would be honoring God by allowing triple X billboards on public highways because there is *no specific negative civil sanction* against the public display of such morally reprehensible trash -- only negative civil sanctions against those who actually participated in the act, as Wilson asserts? And what if the participants were married, or only one person was before the camera? Are pornographers then free from any form of punishment? Is there a *specific* negative civil sanction against *watching* married couples copulating or against self stimulation for public viewing? Against filming such acts? Against publicly displaying the film? Against selling the film? Against selling the film to minors? Is God really a civil libertarian? Or is He a "covenanter"? Can we lay on our beds at night and thank God in prayer that He is biblically glorified by a civil government that protects those that *publicly* pimp off of the base lusts forbidden in Scripture -- rather than bringing negative civil sanctions against them? Or would we not rather bless God for his benevolent ordinance of civil government which, rightly functioning, would have delivered us from the filth that has defiled so many, and which continues to sound its siren song? Can a *public* moral wrong, which is an affront to God (openly violating the seventh commandment) and destructive to society (violating the fifth and tenth commandments), be a civil right? Or should it be punished by the civil magistrate?

Just stop for a moment and try to thank God in prayer that pornographers (at just about every level -- excepting paedophiles -- from production to distribution) are free from civil punishment in our society today. In attempting such a prayer, at a very practical level (by the testimony and witness of the Holy Spirit with your spirit) you should know immediately and intuitively that pornography is not a civil right positively sanctioned by Scripture. In fact, if your conscience is acting in accord with truth, you should also clearly see what the civil magistrate should *deduce from Scripture, by good and necessary consequence* regarding negative civil sanctions against pornographers (unless, of course, you have become so hardened that you can falsely "bless" God in prayer that the pandering dogs of pornography are free from civil sanctions). And, it should be carefully noted that these same type of questions -- which produce such horrid answers if approached with Wilson's principles of biblical interpretation -- may with equal force and revulsion be asked of other areas. For example, is there a *specific* negative civil sanction in the Scripture against *promoting* Nazism (or similar immoral political philosophies, ideas and/or antichristian civil governments)? Or was Paul Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's official propagandist, undeserving of civil sanctions in his marketing of Hitler and his murderous and tyrannical regime? The reader is left to continue this *reductio ad absurdum* (see the end of this essay for other examples) and conclude for himself whether Wilson and *modern* Theonomy really provide the check against civil tyranny as they claim; whether their conception of the civil magistrate really is "the minister of God to thee for good" (Rom. 13:4). "Wisdom is justified of her children" (Matt. 11:19) and the offspring of Wilson's and many *modern* Theonomists' principles (on this point) are illegitimate -- and look much more like the bastard children of the Anabaptists and Libertines.

As an interesting side note, we also see that the application of the regulative principle to civil penal sanctions (what we might rightly term a "sub-theonomic" view of God's law) ties closely together with the antiestablishmentarianism prominent in many Reconstructionist and "evangelical" circles today. Antiestablishmentarianism is also another aspect of Anabaptist thought that finds its ways into the pages of *_Credenda/Agenda_* (when was the last *_Credenda/Agenda_* article, much less entire issue, defending -- or even mentioning -- the truth of establishmentarianism?), and sadly much of the modern "Reformed" community as well adopts this species of defection (moving away from Reformation attainments to the innovations and heresies of the Anabaptists). We will not discuss extensively why Wilson's view of civil sanctions is the sister to antiestablishmentarianism, but the Anabaptist connection is clearly evident. Cunningham notes:

"Under the general head of the civil magistrate, or of civil magistracy, -- that is, in the exposition of what is taught in Scripture concerning the functions and duties of the supreme civil authority of a nation, whatever be its form of government, -- *the Reformers were unanimous and decided in asserting what has been called in modern times the principle of national establishments of religion*, -- namely, that it is competent to, and incumbent upon, nations, as such, and civil rulers in their official capacity, or in the exercise of their legitimate control over civil matters, to aim at the promotion of the honour of God, the welfare of true religion, and the prosperity of the church of Christ. This principle, which comprehends or implies the whole of what we are concerned to

maintain upon the subject of national establishments of religion, we believe to be fully sanctioned by Scripture; and we can appeal, in support of it, to the decided and unanimous testimony of the Reformers, -- *while the Anabaptists of that period seem to have been the first, if we except the Donatists of the fifth century, who stumbled upon something like the opposite doctrine*, or what is now-a-days commonly called the Voluntary principle" (William Cunningham, *_Historical Theology_*, Still Waters Revival Books, [1882] reprinted 1991, vol. 2, pp. 559-560, emphases added).

According to the Anabaptists, then, it was not the civil magistrate's official task "to aim at the promotion of the honour of God, the welfare of true religion, and the prosperity of the church of Christ" by causing the nation, in her official character, to make a public confession of the one true reformed religion, to the exclusion and suppression of all contrary heresies and corruptions. If, rather, his job is to ensure every citizen's "freedom to choose" their own religious practices (even if only amongst the differing sects of Christianity) then it is not difficult to see the link between "freedom" in this area and "freedom of speech" in disseminating pornography. And, we need look no farther than the United States, with its dogmatic religious pluralism and thriving pornographic market, for verification.

Citations could be multiplied from Calvin, Knox, Rutherford, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland 1638-1649, the best Dutch Synods, other Reformed Confessions, etc., to offer further historical "Classical Protestant" support of our position and opposition to Wilson's. We will consider only four more, however: another from Gillespie; one from *_The Register of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in the Time of Calvin_*; a third from the Solemn League and Covenant; and the fourth, and perhaps most powerful, from a fruit of that Covenant, the Westminster Confession of Faith.

Turning again to *_Wholesome Severity_*, we find mentioned a number of others who concur with the position on civil punishment here set forth. In answering the question of "Whether Christian Judges may lawfully punish Hereticks" (p. 1), Gillespie deals with three views, first disposing of the Papists' opinion, "who hold it to be no sin, but good service to God, to extirpate by fire and sword, all that are adversaries to, or opposers of the Church and Catholick Religion" (p. 1).

He then says,

"The second opinion falls short, as far as the former exceeds: that is, that the Magistrate ought not to inflict any punishment, nor put forth any coercive power upon Heretics or Sectaries, but on the contrary grant them liberty and toleration. This was the opinion of the Donatists, against which Augustine has written both much and well, in diverse places: though [he] himself was once in the same error, till he took the matter into his second better thoughts, as is evident by his Retractations (lib. 2, cap. 2, & epist. 48). In the same error are the Socinians and Arminians (See Peltii Harmonia, Artic. 21; Nic. Bodecher, Sociniano. Remonstrantismus, cap.25. See also Grotii Apologeticus, cap. 6, p. 130; Theoph. Nicolaid, Refut.Tractat. de Ecclesia cap. 4, p. 33). The very same is maintained in some books printed amongst ourselves in this year of confusion: viz. The Bloody Tenent [by Roger Williams -- RB]; Liberty of Conscience; The Compassionate Samaritan; John

the Baptist; and by Mr. [Thomas--RB] Goodwin [the Independent --RB] in his *Theomaxia*, p.50, and in his *Innocencies Triumph*, p.8. In which places he denies that the Magistrate, and particularly that the two houses of Parliament, may impose anything pertaining to the service and worship of God under fines or penalties. So M.S. to A.S. (pp. 53- 55, &c.), disputes against the coercive power of the Magistrate to suppress Heresies and Sects" (pp. 2-3).

Finally, Gillespie gives the classical Protestant position:

"The third opinion is that **the Magistrate may and ought to exercise his coercive power, in suppressing and punishing Heretics and Sectaries, less or more, according as the nature and degree of the error, schism, obstinacy, and danger of seducing others, requires**. As this was the judgment of the orthodox ancients (_vide Optati opera_, edit. Albaspin, p. 204, 215), so it is followed by our soundest Protestant writers; most largely by Beza against Bellius and Monfortius, in a peculiar treatise, *_De Hareticis a Magistratu puniendis_*. And though Gerhard, Brochmand, and other Lutheran writers, make a controversy where they need not, alleging that the Calvinists (so nicknamed) hold as the Papists do, that all Heretics without distinction are to be put to death: the truth is, they themselves say as much as either Calvin or Beza, or any other whom they take for adversaries in this question, that is, that heretics are to be punished by *fines, imprisonment, banishments*, and if they be gross idolaters or blasphemers, and seducers of others, then to be put to death. What else does Calvin teach, when he distinguishes three kinds of errors: some to be tolerated with a spirit of meekness, such as ought not to [cause] separation between brothers; others not to be tolerated, but to be suppressed with a certain degree of severity; [and] a third sort so abominable, and pestiferous, that they are to be cut off by the highest punishment? And lest it be thought that this is but the opinion of some few, that the Magistrate ought thus by a strong hand, and by civil punishments suppress Heretics and Sectaries: let it be observed what is held forth and professed concerning this business, by the Reformed Churches in their public confessions of faith. In the latter Confession of Helvetica (cap.30), it is said that the Magistrate ought to "root out lies and all superstition, with all impiety and idolatry." And after, "Let him suppress stubborn Heretics." In the French Confession (art. 39), "Therefore he hath also delivered the sword into the hands of Magistrates, to wit, that offenses may be repressed, not only those which are committed against the second table, but also against the first." In the Belgic Confession (art. 36), "Therefore hath he armed the Magistrates with the sword for punishing them that do evil, and for defending such as do well. Moreover it is their duty not only to be careful and watchful for the preservation of the civil government, but also to defend the holy ministry, and to abolish and overthrow all idolatry, and counterfeit worship of God." Beza, *_De Hareticis_*, tells us in the beginning, that the ministers of Helvetia had declared themselves to be of the same judgment, in a book published of that argument. And toward the end he cites the Saxon Confession, Luther, Melancthon, Brentius, Bucerus, Wolfgangus Capito, and Bullinger. The Synod of Dordt (ses. 138), in their sentence against the Remonstrants not only interdicts them of all their ecclesiastical and academical functions, *but also beseeches the States General by their secular power further to suppress and restrain them*" (pp. 3-5, emphases added; spelling and some wording modernized).

Moving next to The Register of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in the Time of Calvin (P.E. Hughes, ed. and trans., Eerdmans, 1966), it is evident that Wilson's view of negative civil sanctions was alien to Calvin and the Geneva Presbyteries. Blasphemies, contradiction of the Word, drunkenness, usury over five percent, dissolute games, missing church, being late for sermons, women (midwives) baptizing, superstitious worship, observing Romish festival days, attending Mass, etc., all came under civil cognizance (usually fines, pp. 53-59). Never mind punishing pornographers, the Genevans correctly deduced from the seventh commandment that "anyone who sings indecent, dissolute, or outrageous songs, or dances the fling or some similar dance shall be imprisoned for three days and shall then be sent before the Consistory" (p. 58). This, and even stronger laws, could be used in our day to rid the land of the Devil's minstrels, and all the literary "pornography" (in the form of the antichristian propositions that infect our society through Rock and Country music, blasphemous comedy, etc.) that bombards us through radio and television. Is there any real question how AC/DC, Led Zeppelin, the Rolling Stones, Stevie Ray Vaughan, Madonna, Michael Jackson, "Rappers" or even Shania Twain (and their videos) would fare among the real classical Protestants? How much more those who corrupt the nations with pornography!

Thirdly, we consider an illustrative section from the Solemn League and Covenant (SL&C), the bond that joined the nations and churches of England, Scotland and Ireland in a covenanted "uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of church-government, directory for worship and catechising" (Head 1). The portion in question is Head 4, which we simply reproduce with appropriate emphases (noting that reference can be made to the The Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive for further understanding of the original intent and actual implementation of this section of the SL&C, concerning the question of negative civil sanctions):

"We shall also, with all faithfulness, endeavour the discovery [disclosing or making known -- RB] of *all* such as have been or shall be incendiaries, malignants, or evil instruments, by hindering the reformation of religion, dividing the king from his people, or one of the kingdoms from another, or making any faction or parties among the people, contrary to this League and Covenant; that they may be brought to public trial, and receive *condign [appropriate -- RB] punishment*, as the **degree of their offences shall require or deserve**, or the supreme judicatories of both kingdoms respectively, or others having power from them for that effect, **shall judge convenient [suitable or proper -- RB].**"

Finally, we look at the fourth and perhaps most powerful example, taken from chapter 20 of the **original** Westminster Confession of Faith, "Of Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience." Section 2 of that chapter teaches, "God alone is lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing **contrary** to his word, or *beside it*, in matters of faith or worship." Section 4 condemns practices subversive of lawful power and lawful exercise thereof which might plead Christian liberty for their warrant. It frankly describes the biblical sanctions due to such offenders: "And for their ***publishing*** of such opinions, or **maintaining** of such practices, as are **contrary to the light of nature**, or to faith, worship, ***or

conversation [conduct or behavior -- RB]***; or ***to the power of godliness***; or such erroneous opinions or practices, as either in their own nature, or in the manner of publishing or maintaining them, are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the church; they may lawfully be called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the church, ***and by the power of the civil magistrate***.

Note carefully the distinction between the qualifiers, "contrary to" and "beside" the word of God in Section 2. The latter, "beside", is a reference to the regulative principle of worship which teaches that God may only be worshiped in ways "prescribed in the Holy Scripture" (cf. 21:1). Anything *beyond (or "beside") this*, except those "circumstances . . . common to human actions and societies" (1:6) is strictly forbidden in public worship. "Contrary to," on the other hand, is applied to all other "doctrines and commandments of men," which would include (according to the *historic* theologians at Westminster) the laws and punishments of the civil magistrate. We saw this view in our earlier mention of John Knox, and it truly is the "Classical Protestant" position as taught by the reformers and their creeds.

This observation on Section 2 alone overthrows Wilson's position. Even more pointed, however, is the wording in Section 4, which not only contradicts Wilson's principles, but would subject Wilson himself to the civil sanctions of a truly biblical magistrate. This is evident because Wilson (and many *modern* Theologians) are "publishing such opinions . . . as are contrary to the light of nature . . . or conversation [conduct or behavior -- RB]; or to the power of godliness," inasmuch as they declare most of those involved in the making and dissemination of pornography (excepting certain participants) to be free of negative civil sanctions. Of course, this says nothing of their erroneous views of worship which likewise are "contrary to . . . the power of godliness" and "are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the church." (Cf. Larry Birger's copious citations from the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant which prove the same point regarding his former elders, in "Why The PCA Is Not A Truly Constituted Church, And Why Faithful Christians Should Separate From This Corrupt Communion," free on the web at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/PCABad.htm>).

It is time for those like Wilson to acknowledge that not only are they *not* holding to the positions of our reformed forefathers, but these very forefathers (as evidenced by their national **confessions and covenants**) would have sought civil sanctions against them if they did not repent of their errors! Then, based on this admission they must either repent (as we ourselves have done by the grace of God) or cease claiming to be the progeny of the Reformation.

Even a cursory survey of the small amount of historical evidence presented above renders impossible the conclusion that Doug Wilson (and a number of *modern* Theologians) adopt anything near the classical Protestant position on negative penal sanctions. But historical practice is no rule outside of its agreement to Scripture; so we now turn to some clear examples revealed by "the supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined" (WCF 1:10).

Gillespie, in "Whether it be lawful, just, and expedient, that the taking of the Solemn League and Covenant be enjoined by the Parliament upon all persons in the kingdom under a considerable penalty" (Chapter 16 of "A Treatise of Miscellany Questions," pp. 85-88 in The Works of George Gillespie volume 2, Still Waters Revival Books reprint -- or free at <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/SL&CGil.htm>), presents a **positive** biblical example of approved negative civil sanctions which are nowhere **expressly** revealed in the portions of Scripture dealing with the laws related to civil punishments:

"When king Josiah made a solemn covenant (the effect whereof was a thorough reformation, the taking away of the ancient and long-continued high places, the destroying of Baal's vessels, altars, priests, &c. 2 Kings 23, throughout), he did not leave his covenant arbitrary; but 'he caused all that were present in Jerusalem and Benjamin to stand to it,' 2 Chron. 34: 32. In all which he is set forth as a precedent to Christian reformers, that they may know their duty in like cases" (p. 86).

Likewise, his comments in Wholesome Severity (p. 10):

"Josiah caused 'all that were present in Jerusalem and Benjamin to stand to the Covenant,' 2 Chron, 34:32, which could not be without either threatening or inflicting punishment upon the transgressors; there being many at that time disaffected to the Reformation."

Did Josiah "not have the capacity to legislate wisely where God had been silent," as Wilson contends? Where in Scripture is Josiah, as king, told to ***cause*** "all that were present in Jerusalem and Benjamin to stand to" this **particular covenant**? Does Scripture commend or condemn Josiah's work as a covenanting king?

Another clear example, contrary to Wilson's position (as noted in my, A Contemporary Covenanting Debate; or, Covenanting Redivivus; free at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/CovDebRB.htm>), is King Asa -- who "nationally caused (by civil power) the inhabitants of the nation to stand to the covenant." The Scripture relates it thus:

"So they gathered themselves together at Jerusalem in the third month, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Asa. And they offered unto the LORD the same time, of the spoil which they had brought, seven hundred oxen and seven thousand sheep. And they entered into a covenant to seek the LORD God of their fathers with all their heart and with all their soul; **That whosoever would not seek the LORD God of Israel should be put to death, whether small or great, whether man or woman**. And they sware unto the LORD with a loud voice, and with shouting, and with trumpets, and with cornets. And all Judah rejoiced at the oath: for they had sworn with all their heart, and sought him with their whole desire; and he was found of them: and the LORD gave them rest round about" (2 Chron. 15:10-15).

Was this ***particular*** covenant renewal revealed in Scripture as a duty which king Asa was to enact (in his civil capacity over the nation), or was this civil duty deduced by Asa "by good and necessary consequence" from the moral law of God? (See "Covenanting a Duty," chapter 3 in John Cunningham's The Ordinance of Covenanting for a **detailed**

explanation of the answer.) Were the *negative civil sanctions* attached to the malignants (covenant refusers) in Judah *explicitly* revealed or were they also deduced from Scripture, "by good and necessary consequence," from the moral law of God? Was God "found of them" for these actions? Was Asa, at this point in his reign, a Covenanter or an Anabaptist? On this point is Wilson closer to the Covenanters or the Anabaptists?

Samuel Rutherford touches on matters related to negative penal sanctions in numerous places in his *_A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience_* (1649). Pertinent, in principle, to the Scriptural question before us are Rutherford's comments when he writes,

"but they had just powers, as the [civil -- RB] Ministers of God, to punish seducing Prophets as well as other ill-doers, by the law of nature and Nations. And this I take is holden forth by Job 31.26,27,28. *who being under no Judicial Law*, obliging the Jewes, but a Gentile, and so in this led **by the Law of nature and Nations**, maketh Idolatry and worshipping of the Sunne and Moone, to be an iniquity to be punished by the Judge" (*_Free Disputation_*, p. 313, emphases added).

Two final Scriptural examples follow demonstrating that God approves of negative civil sanctions which are not *explicitly* revealed in the judicial law.

The first is found in Ezra's godly example during the covenanted Reformation of his day.

"Now therefore let us make a covenant with our God to put away all the wives, and such as are born of them, according to the counsel of my lord, and of those that tremble at the commandment of our God; and let it be done according to the law. Arise; for this matter belongeth unto thee: we also will be with thee: be of good courage, and do it. Then arose Ezra, and made the chief priests, the Levites, and all Israel, to swear that they should do according to this word. And they sware. Then Ezra rose up from before the house of God, and went into the chamber of Johanan the son of Eliashib: and when he came thither, he did eat no bread, nor drink water: for he mourned because of the transgression of them that had been carried away. And they made proclamation throughout Judah and Jerusalem unto all the children of the captivity, that they should gather themselves together unto Jerusalem; *And that whosoever would not come within three days, according to the counsel of the princes and the elders, all his substance should be forfeited, and himself separated from the congregation of those that had been carried away*" (Ezra 10:3-8, emphases added).

Where in the judicial law do we find civil penalties which state that if one did not attend this particular covenant renewal "within three days" that the civil magistrate could relieve him of all his "substance," and separate (exile) him from the covenanted people of God? If no such negative civil sanction can be expressly found in God's Word, then Wilson's view of penology stands overturned. Clearly we need to look beyond his truncated view for guidance on such contemporary questions as how the civil magistrate should deal with the pornography plague.

Though the preceding Scriptural and historical examples provide more than ample refutation of Wilson's hyper-regulativism as applied to negative civil sanctions, we

consider briefly one final, devastating account. Nehemiah, a civil reformer par excellence, exemplifies God's ordinance of civil magistracy as a "nursing-father" (Isa. 49:23) to the church of Christ:

"In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine presses on the sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the sabbath day: and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals. There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the sabbath unto the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem. Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the sabbath. And it came to pass, that when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark before the sabbath, I commanded that the gates should be shut, and charged that they should not be opened till after the sabbath: and some of my servants set I at the gates, that there should no burden be brought in on the sabbath day. So the merchants and sellers of all kind of ware lodged without Jerusalem once or twice. Then I testified against them, and said unto them, Why ****lodge ye**** about the wall? ****if ye do so again, I will lay hands on you****. From that time forth came they no more on the sabbath" (Neh. 13:15-21, emphases added).

Note carefully that in his treatment of those who just gave "the appearance of evil," by waiting outside the gate for the Sabbath to end, Nehemiah threatens to apply negative civil sanctions ("I will lay hands on you") ***before*** any actual ***explicit*** Sabbath violation (i.e. buying and selling, etc.) occurs. Is there an explicit judicial law requiring the magistrate to punish those who look as if they are about to break the Sabbath? Or were Nehemiah's civil threats a logical inference deduced by good and necessary consequence from the fourth commandment and the Scriptural duty of the civil magistrate?

But further -- and this observation once-and-for-all nullifies Wilson's civil hyper-regulativism -- consider the nature of the offense for which Nehemiah was to punish these merchants who were camping outside of the city. It is apparent from the context that Nehemiah was seeking to keep the inhabitants of Judah, and especially Jerusalem, from desecrating the Sabbath by merchandising. He does not wait until the actual infraction occurs to threaten punishment, nor does he promise those lodging outside the city that they will be punished ***if they break the Sabbath by buying and selling the following day***. Rather, he assures them that if they even *****tempt***** his constituents to break the Sabbath *****he will "lay hands on" them*****. Matthew Poole concisely concurs: "For this was a ***temptation*** to covetous or needy Jews, that lived in or near the city, to steal opportunities of buying their commodities, which then they might do with more advantage" (emphasis added). And thus we have righteous Nehemiah's example standing as an eternal and irrefutable testimony against the teaching of Wilson and a number of ***modern*** Theonomists, for what is pornography but *****a temptation to violate the seventh commandment*****?

As we have seen, at the root of this issue are two questions. First, Is Wilson's "hyper-regulativism" to be applied to negative civil sanctions? And second, what is the

place of logical consequences in determining upon whom (and why) these sanctions should be applied? Samuel Rutherford, one of the greatest biblical political philosophers ever to have lived (and one of the Westminster Divines) answers both of these questions as we have answered them (contra Wilson).

In arguing against the application of "hyper-regulativism" to negative civil sanctions, Rutherford writes,

"I see *nothing said against bodily punishing* [notice Rutherford does not say I see something 'said *for* bodily punishing,' as Wilson's view requires--RB] of such as teach transubstantiation to others: for the Idolaters and Seducers in the Old Testament believed the same way, there is one true God 'Jehovah that brought them our of Egypt,' Exod 32.4,5. Jereboam who made two Gods, and Jehu who was zealous for Jehovah, 1 King 13.6,c.13.1,2,3,. 2 King 9.25-36,37.c.10.16.20,21... [Rutherford here adds many biblical examples concerning various idolaters, some who claimed to worship Jehovah and some who did not, which we have omitted--RB]" (*_A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience_* [1649], p. 71, emphases added).

He then states, on the question of logical consequences, that each of these idolaters

"yet denied and hated this *logically consequence* that they had 'forsaken the Lord,' Jer. (.13,14. or Deut 32.18. 'forgotten the rock that begat them', Ps.78.11,41. Ps. 107.12,13. that 'they forsooke him dayes without number'... and *they did error indeed in a consequence*, against the light of nature, yet the irreligious and wicked stopping of eyes and eares at *naturall consequences in matters of Religion is no innocent error*, as is cleare, Isa.44.18... yet *the Papist will deny this consequence*, that he multiplies Gods as loaves are multiplied in an oven; because as Esaiah saith, 'he knoweth not, he understandeth not, God hath shut his eyes'; certainly that knowledge he denyes to the Idolater, *is the natural knowledge of a naturall consequence*; if ye worship a bit of an ash-tree, or a bit of bread, ergo, the halfe of your God, or the quarter thereof, 'is baked in an oven', ergo, 'there is a lye, and an abomination in your right hand'; then **the deniall of logically consequence in Religion, and the teaching thereof to others, may be, and is an heresie, and punishable by the Magistrate**, as Duet.13 and Exod. 32. So Christ rebukes Matth. 22 Saduces as ignorant of the Scripture, when they denied but the consequence or a logically connexion, as God is not the God of the dead but of the living, ergo, the dead must rise againe, and Abraham must live, and his body be raised from the dead. And the Idolaters who were to dye by the Law of God, Exod. 32. Deut.13. denied not the true God more than our false teachers doe now [who deny him in consequence--RB]. We see no reason why none should be false teachers, but such only as deny fundamentals, and that pertinaciously, though these by Divines be called Heretickes" (*_A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience_* [1649], pp. 72-73, emphases added).

Moreover, in accord with these principles, Rutherford writes,

"I say not for believing tran-substantiation only, men are to be hanged; the question now is of bodily punishing, hanging and burning quick, are particular kinds of punishing, in which I should be as sparing as another man, but the question may draw to this, whether the

Laws of England & Scotland be bloody and unjust, that ordains seminary Priests and Jesuits, whose trade it is to seduce souls [soul murder--RB] to the whole body of Popery, to be hanged. I conceive *they are most just Lawes*, and warranted by Deut. 13. [based on the good and necessary inference that the enticing of the people to Romanism, and 'Romanism' is not mentioned by the name 'Romanism' in Scripture, is the enticing of the people to 'go and serve other Gods' Deut. 13:2,6,13--RB] and many other Scriptures, and *that the King and Parliaments of either Kingdomes serve Christ, and Kisse the Son in making and executing these Laws*" (*A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience* [1649], pp. 70-71, emphases added).

But you may say that "This is an hard saying; who can hear it?" [John 6:60]. The answer from the lips of our Lord: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me" [John 10:27].

Thus, we find that here, using different examples (idolatry, transubstantiation and seduction to soul murder [as an occupation]), Rutherford has summarized and refuted Wilson's view of negative civil sanctions on the pornography question -- at a principal level. Rutherford attacks the use of Wilson's "hyper-regulativism" and approbates the use of lawful ("good and necessary") inferences regarding negative penal sanctions (for further study see the whole section "Errours in non- fundamentalls obstinately spread, punishable," pages 64-77, in *A Free Disputation...* for extensive Scripture proofs on this point). On the two most important points of principle related to the question of pornography and criminal penalties Rutherford (the Westminster Divine) is diametrically opposed to Doug Wilson the "classical Protestant." And Rutherford's view was not novel in his day, but rather the majority position among the Reformers.

We agree with Rutherford (and Scripture), and thus proclaim that all pornographers should come under negative civil sanctions (to a greater or lesser degree depending on the level of offence) as a logical consequence of their public violation of the law of God (and in light of the damage their actions do to the promotion of godliness in society as a whole). This is the "classical Protestant" position on the power of the civil magistrate, in opposition to the "freedom of choice," Anabaptistic, Libertarianism rampant among Christians today.

In our brief treatment we have noted a number of Scriptural and historical examples squarely opposed to the civil "hyper-regulativism" which Doug Wilson promotes in *Credenda/Agenda*, and thus we must reject forever this hermeneutic and its illegitimate, socially destructive offspring.

One of the tragic ironies of the *modern* Theonomy/Reconstructionist movement is its (seemingly) paradoxical antinomianism. We say "seemingly" because, as noted, their principles lead some of them unembarrassedly to avow that the civil magistrate leave stumbling blocks in the middle of the road (such a pornography) which ultimately encourage its citizens -- especially the young and immature -- to break the seventh commandment (and how many Christians compromise their testimony and injure their soul by watching "off color" movies and television programs or listening to "adultery glorifying" music?, "But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after

her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" Matt. 5:28). Such stumbling stones, if they were found in the middle of a busy highway (and caused car accidents) would never be tolerated, yet we are told that the *greater dangers* posed by *spiritual stumbling stones* are to be left alone civilly, until they are removed by the "church, family, or the providence of God." Even a civil highway department couldn't be run on the bases of such principles, much less a nation seeking to honor God. Could you image the traffic jam that would occur on a busy mountain road, after a landslide (leaving massive boulders on the highway), as people waited for the "church, family, or the providence of God" to clear the way? This is a graphic picture of the problem caused by civil antinomianism and the antiestablishmentarianistic views of civil government held by many Christians today -- and we have many detouring off the road to Zion (practically speaking) and on to the highway to hell, along with multiple car collisions in ruined Christian testimonies, to prove it. Hordes are held captive to the lusts that readily available pornography feeds, when civil governments are commanded by Scripture (rightly understood) to have long ago brought out the graders and rock crushing equipment and to have removed such impediments from the road. And this is not to say that externals will produce salvation or righteous behavior, but the older Reformed writers all recognized the value of (civilly) limiting the public expression of sin in every legitimate way possible. But this aspect of the Reformed understanding of Scripture has been largely ignored or forgotten in our day.

Others have also noted this antinomian streak of which we speak (e.g. Kevin Reed, The Antinomian Streak in the Reconstructionist Movement free on the web at: <http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualnls/AntinomR.htm>), particularly concerning offenses against the first four commandments (the first table of the moral law). Every bit as tragic, however, have been their opponents' insipid and equally antinomian criticisms. Indeed, we are convinced that one of the greatest strengths of *modern* Theonomy is the weakness and more blatant lawlessness (at least at a principal level) of the majority of its critics.

Likewise lamentable has been Doug Wilson's insistence in claiming the title, "Classical Protestant"; yet as we have briefly demonstrated he is simply rehashing antinomian *Anabaptistic* principles. Similarly, other Theonomists have mustered the alleged support of the Westminster Confession (and other products of the Reformation), when in reality their principles fly directly in the face of the biblical truths championed by the best of our reformed forefathers. We believe much of this misrepresentation has arisen from ignorance, for many of the compositions of our covenanted forebears have laid buried for centuries. However, by the abundant grace and lovingkindness of God many of these works are again being made available to the general public. Thus, while we do not denounce everything these brethren have asserted (for who could not be roused by the invigorating return to God's law that some of them have so eloquently proclaimed?) we do call upon them to beware of willful ignorance (2 Pet. 3:5), and to reject the cockiness exemplified in Wilson's one-liner dismissals of the true "classical Protestantism" of the Westminster Divines and other reformers (Rom. 12:3). We also admonish them to consider a verse often appealed to in their writings: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven."

We ourselves once zealously promoted many of the errors we now abhor and testify against, so it is not a matter of who is superior: we are **all desperately wicked**. We only ask that our brethren humble themselves and admit their ignorance and errors, as we by God's grace have done, and that in the meantime they do not rail against the truth they fail to comprehend. May they also heed another sobering warning: "It is impossible but that offences will come: but woe unto him, through whom they come! It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones" (Luke 17:1-2). Civil magistrates are to be the church's "nursing- fathers, and their queens [her] nursing-mothers" (Isaiah 49:23), not the protectors of her enemies.

A more extended treatment of this topic is well overdue, and perhaps this essay will arouse such an edifying endeavor. In the meantime, we encourage the reader **not** to be content with the evidence shown herein. Rather, armed with an introduction to the true, **historical** theonomy held by our reformed progenitors, and tasting of how their faithfulness to Scripture would deliver us (as a body politic and as individuals) from many of our society's temptations, let the reader obtain the **source documents** of the Reformation for himself and enjoy a hearty spiritual feast. In doing this he will certainly partake of Christ's wondrous gift to the church: "And he gave . . . **pastors and teachers**, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the **ministry**, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine" (Eph. 4:11-14, emphases added).

The following list presents some questions, aimed at the thoughtful reader, which we believe will help demonstrate the absurdity of the modern "Anabaptist" view of negative civil sanctions. When we speak of civil punishments, we do not have anything particular in mind, for the type and severity of punishment are other issues which need to be addressed separately. But, once civil coercion is allowed in a given instance, outside of an **explicit** negative civil sanction from God's Word (as in the biblical and historical examples we have cited above), Wilson's "hyper-regulativism" as applied to the state stands overthrown.

¥ Is the magistrate to punish a neighbor who inconsiderately and obstinately plays his stereo (from his front porch) at 120 decibels (every night of the week) from 3 to 5 A.M.? What if "Mr. Rock and Roll" decides to do the same thing outside of an old folks home? A hospital? A church "meeting house" on the Lord's day (at 11 A.M.)?

¥ Should those in favor of abortion be allowed to speak publicly in favor of their views, or to print pro-abortion literature, or make pro-abortion videos and music? Should they be punished for seeking to win others to their view?

¥ Should medical establishments be free from civil punishment for training abortionists?

¥ Should the civil magistrate allow triple X videos to be intermingled in the children's section of the local video store? Should those who do such things be liable to negative civil sanctions? What would you think of a father who said that he doesn't agree that civil

sanctions are lawful in such a case, and though he would boycott such a store *personally*, and have his church pray against them, he would also defend (in his magazine?) the *civil right* of the store owner to pervert others who do not find (in their reprobate minds) such public perversion to be offensive to them or their children? This is an interesting question, as *modern* Theonomists often denounce those who focus on *only* individual (or family) piety, to the exclusion of civil matters -- and yet some of them exempt pornographers from criminal penalties (which in effect makes them less reconstructionists than some of the pietists who understand by "the law of nature and nations" [as the old divines would say] that public pornography should be suppressed by the civil magistrate).

¥ Should heroin, LSD, PCP, MDA, mescaline, peyote, pot, or other mind (and spirit) altering drugs be legal and available at your local corner store? Does the Bible explicitly mandate any civil restrictions on the *age of buyers* of such poisons? Does the Bible explicitly mandate any civil restrictions on the age of buyers of alcohol? Tobacco? Pornography?

¥ If a group of university students takes it upon themselves to block a major interstate as some sort of protest (as happened a few years ago in San Diego), should the magistrate use his coercive force to intervene, and later punish these offenders in some way? Given Wilson's published principles civilly defending pornographers, could there even be a law making such behavior criminal?

¥ Can the police, as police (and not as private men) stop a crime at its beginning, or even before it begins, or do they need to wait until it's been committed to apply negative sanctions (even death to the criminal) against the perpetrator (or would-be perpetrator)?

¥ Should terrorists be apprehended and proceeded against with sanctions *before* they have detonated the bombs they are found to be manufacturing? Which *explicit* biblical negative civil sanction deals with bomb *making* (in and of itself)? Is there not much which a lawful civil magistrate must determine, that is not explicitly stated in Scripture, in order to rightly apply the *spirit of the law of God* in a case such as this?

¥ Should a teacher (in a public, private or home school) be punished for positively *promoting* (not just exposing) homosexuality, atheism, communism, Romanism, Islam, occultism, or even bestiality in the classroom? What about for providing recipes for home-made hallucinogenics (as one of my high school teachers did many years ago)? For teaching evolution as a fact?

¥ Should a drunk driver be punished by the civil magistrate before he actually hurts anyone?

¥ Should those flagrantly violating traffic laws be punished, though they may not yet have hurt anyone or damaged property? Should there even be traffic laws (or other safety standards applied to vehicles)?

¥ Should those wearing flagrantly immodest clothing in public (e.g. bikinis) be prevented from doing so by the magistrate, and punished if they persist in this sin? Should those running naked in public ("streaking") be subject to civil sanctions?

¥ Should those making movies, songs or books promoting blatant error be subject to civil sanctions?

¥ Should the civil government ever repress godless (and blasphemous) art or music, and punish those producing and promoting such filth?

¥ Is the U.S. law mandating civil punishments for "conspiracy to violate an international treaty" biblically legitimate (apart from the question of whether or not the US is a duly constituted nation)? Does this depend on which treaty is being violated (i.e. whether it is lawful or unlawful to begin with)?

¥ Is it a crime in Scripture for one person to commit adultery, while, on the other hand, promoting, counselling and encouraging millions to do so (as pornographers do) is free from civil punishment?

¥ Is the public toleration of pornography, Romanism, abortion, Islam, homosexuality, idolatry, the occult, atheism, etc. (all parts of the complex moral person of Antichrist) one of the causes of God's wrath upon our nations? Should all publicly known national or provincial causes of God's wrath be dealt with by the civil magistrate?

¥ Are patent laws legitimate?

¥ Should cigarette companies, who knowingly deceived the public about the health hazards of smoking, be liable to civil penalties?

¥ Are there explicit penal sanctions revealed in Scripture (without the use of lawful inferences) regarding medical malpractice (which does not result in death)? For example, if the undisputed negligence of a doctor causes a person to become a paraplegic, is the negligent doctor free from civil liability?

¥ Would it be a crime for a company to produce a food containing traces of peanut extract, and not alert their customers as to this ingredient, if they knew that severe allergic reactions would seriously harm a small portion of those who consume this product? What *explicit* Scripture deals with this from the civil standpoint? Do we again have to rely on necessary and lawful inferences, based on Scripture, to determine this case?

¥ Should avowed Satanists be allowed to homeschool their children? Unitarians? Romanists?

10. APPENDIX C: LARRY BIRGER'S LARGER AND SHORTER "LETTERS TO THE EDITOR" OF _CREDENDA AGENDA_

December 29, 1996

Editor
Credenda/Agenda
P.O. Box 8741
Moscow, ID 83843

Dear Sir:

It is with grieved indignation that I write you concerning your recent piece (Vol. 8, No. 4) in "Cave of Adullam," concerning Reg Barrow, president of Still Waters Revival Books. Therein you state that Barrow "hasn't read Frame's new book on worship," and go on to lampoon him for the serious charges he made about Frame on the "Knox-Ring" on-line forum. Your title, "Great Experiments In Telepathy," and commentary, imply great carelessness on Barrow's part -- and really, even worse things than this.

In your concluding barb, you state that, "we have not read all Barrow's comments on Frame, and that which we did read was not read very carefully." In saying this you indicted yourselves, for had you read carefully, you would have noted what Barrow actually said (and not what you slanderously reported): "From the quotes that I have seen here [on Knox Ring] and elsewhere taken from Frame's new book. . . ." From his actual statement it is clear that Barrow had read at least some of Frame, and was appraised of his views concerning worship.

Barrow has earned a well-deserved reputation for his zealous promotion of the best historic reformed teaching available today. You have sullied this reputation, presenting to your readership a gross caricature of Barrow's character and scholastic aptitude. Thus, I call upon you to repent of this violation of the ninth commandment, which forbids "all prejudicing the truth, and the good name of our neighbours. . . [and] giving false evidence" (Westminster Larger Catechism, Q. 145). Should it be asserted that Barrow was himself guilty of violating the ninth commandment, inasmuch as he had not read all of Frame's book before commenting that Calvin would have excommunicated Frame (and therefore, that he made this serious charge recklessly), I obviate this by noting two things. First, even if this were true, it is NOT what you printed; and if this was indeed the concern -- that Barrow was too hasty -- you should have printed something to THAT effect: NOT that he had not read ANY of Frame's book. Second, had you printed something to this

effect (instead of your libel), it would still be to no avail. Having read Frame's book myself (and please, don't misrepresent me as well on this point), I submit that anyone with a basic knowledge of the classical reformed doctrine of worship would not need to read much more than the introduction to conclude that Frame has deviated egregiously from this position. A further skimming (let alone thorough reading) of the book bears this out, indicating that Barrow's allegation about how Calvin would have responded to Frame was right on target. One does not need to read all of the Koran to condemn it, and neither are more than a few quotations (and for the record, Barrow had considered far more than simply a few) from Frame's recent work necessary to demonstrate that he has abandoned, and is attacking, the very regulative principle he claims to uphold -- at least if we're judging by the teaching and practice of the Westminster divines who so clearly enunciated it, and who Frame disingenuously claims as his theological fathers.

This leads me, in conclusion, to comment briefly upon Doug Wilson's review of Frame's book in the latest issue of C/A. I have noted Wilson's apparent fondness (e.g. in his response to Kevin Reed, concerning separation) of such terms as 'classical Protestant' and 'reformed evangelical', and his readiness to apply them to himself and his positions. However, Wilson, in criticizing the "strict regulativists" as he does, shows very clearly that he is not historically reformed in his doctrine of worship. Indeed, he has set himself squarely against such classical Protestants as Calvin, Knox, Rutherford, Gillespie, Henderson, Baillie, the Westminster Assembly, the entire church of Scotland at the time of that Assembly, and John Owen, to name only a few. This does not automatically mean that he is wrong (for history is only a hand-maid, and not a mistress, to borrow from Anthony Burgess), but it does mean that in keeping with biblical candor, C/A ought to inform its readers that Wilson (and any on staff who agree with him) are not 'classical Protestants' in their doctrine of the worship of God.

For the cause of God and truth,
Larry Birger, Jr.

LARRY BIRGER'S SHORTENED LETTER:

Dear Doug,

Here is the edited version of my earlier letter to the editor. Hopefully it is suitable now. I must say that it is virtually impossible to communicate meaningfully and cogently any important idea in only 150 words. Such a restriction, it seems to me, is well-suited to the sound byte format of your magazine -- which I find very distasteful, and a hindrance to the competent scholarship which alone can promote and defend the true faith to the true edification of the saints. What was wrong with the _Antithesis_ format? It seemed much better suited to the ends of promoting 'classical Protestantism'.

Please receive my criticism as a loving challenge from a concerned brother. I am convinced that you are capable of far better than what you currently publish, and I long to see you and the other writers use your talents to best profit the scattered and confused church of Christ.

Yours in Christ,

**Larry
February 9, 1997**

[Note: The following is a condensation of my previous letter concerning Reg Barrow, which I was informed was too long for publication.]

Dear Sir:

Reg Barrow's original piece said: "From the quotes that I have seen here [on Knox Ring] and elsewhere taken from Frame's new book. . .," clearly indicating he had read **some**** of Frame. One does not need to read all of the Koran to condemn it publicly; likewise, a few quotes from Frame readily show he has abandoned, and is attacking, the very regulative principle he claims to uphold.**

You have sullied Barrow's reputation, presenting to your readership a gross caricature of his character and scholastic aptitude; thereby violating the ninth commandment, which forbids "all prejudicing the truth, and the good name of our neighbours. . . [and] giving false evidence" (Westminster Larger Catechism, Q. 145).

Finally, your readers should note that Doug Wilson is not a 'classical Protestant' in his doctrine of worship. Indeed, he has set himself squarely against such classical Protestants as Calvin, Knox, Rutherford, Gillespie, Henderson, Baillie, the Westminster Assembly, the entire church of Scotland at the time of that Assembly, and John Owen, to name only a few.

**For Christ's Crown and Covenant,
Larry Birger, Jr.**

11. APPENDIX D: THE TESTIMONY OF THE PURITAN REFORMED CHURCH OF EDMONTON REGARDING THIS MATTER

From the minutes of the March 4 (1997) Session meeting of the Puritan Reformed Church of Edmonton:

OUR TESTIMONY AGAINST THE STAFF OF CREDENDA AGENDA:

We note in our public record that Mr. Reg Barrow has faithfully addressed and answered the scandalous article published in Vol. 8 No. 4 of _Credenda Agenda_ magazine entitled "Great Experiments in Telepathy." We note that Doug Wilson, Doug Jones and Nathan Jones have failed to repent of their public violation of the ninth commandment and that Doug Wilson has subsequently aggravated his sin by slandering the Puritan Reformed Church of Edmonton, falsely and maliciously labelling us "anabaptists" and "separatists" in his written correspondence. Since these men are outside the jurisdiction of a lawful judicatory of Christ, we have no other recourse than to publicly testify against their sinful obstinacy, by warning others to mark them and avoid them.

Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. (Romans 16:17-16, KJV).

Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us. (2 Thessalonians 3:6, KJV).

If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself. (1 Timothy 6:3-5, KJV).

A record of the false accusations of the above mentioned men and the answers that were returned to them can be found in the book entitled _Saul in the Cave of Adullam_ published by Still Waters Revival Books. An answer to their false charge

of Anabaptism can be found in the book entitled A Testimony Against The Unfounded Charges of Anabaptism by Pastor Greg Price.

We will continue to pray that God will grant the above-named offenders repentance, and bring us to a likemindedness in doctrine, worship and government.

12. APPENDIX F: FOR FURTHER STUDY OF CLASSICAL PROTESTANTISM AND THE ATTAINMENTS OF THE SECOND REFORMATION

CASSETTES FOR FURTHER STUDY

PRICE, GREG

Each CASSETTE listed below sells for \$2.55 (Canadian funds) each, unless marked otherwise.

Terms of Communion: Covenants and Covenanting (\$17.85, 7 cassettes)
Explains and defends the fourth term of communion, which is "That public, social covenanting is an ordinance of God, obligatory on churches and nations under the New Testament; that the National Covenant and the Solemn League are an exemplification of this divine institution; and that these Deeds are of continued obligation upon the moral person; and in consistency with this, that the Renovation of these Covenants at Auchensaugh, Scotland, 1712 was agreeable to the word of God." Includes the studies offered separately on the National Covenant (2 tapes), the Solemn League and Covenant (1 tape), the Auchensaugh Renovation (2 tapes), as well as two introductory lectures (only available in this set) on the biblical principles related to the ordinance of covenanting, the descending obligation of lawful covenants, objections against covenanting, etc. Roberts, in his *Reformed Presbyterian Catechism* (\$8.99), catches the spirit of this tape set in the following question and answer: "Q. May we not indulge the hope, that, in the goodness of our covenant God, and by the promised outpouring of his Holy Spirit, 'the kingdoms of the world' at large, and the British empire in particular, will dedicate themselves to God in a covenant not to be forgotten - animated by the example of our covenant fathers exhibited in these memorable deeds? A. Yes. We have the most cheering grounds for this blessed hope; for it is written, that the nations at large in the spirit of devoted loyalty, shall cry -- 'Come and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten': and it cannot be well doubted, that the death-cry of the martyred Guthrie has been heard on high, and shall be verified -- 'The covenants, the covenants, shall yet be Scotland's (and the world's -- RB) reviving'" (p. 151). A thoroughly amazing set of tapes -- among our best!

Terms of Communion: The Martyrs and Historic Testimony (\$4.99, 2 cassettes)
Explains and defends the fifth term of communion, which is "An approbation of the faithful contendings of the martyrs of Jesus, especially in Scotland, against Paganism, Popery, Prelacy, Malignancy and Sectarianism; immoral civil governments; Erastian tolerations and persecutions which flow from them; and of the Judicial Testimony emitted by the Reformed Presbytery in North Britain, 1761 (i.e. *The Act, Declaration and Testimony for the Whole of Our Covenanted Reformation--RB*) with supplements from the Reformed Presbyterian Church; as containing a noble example to be followed, in contending for all divine truth, and in testifying against all corruptions embodied in the constitutions of either churches or states." Price demonstrates how and why uninspired historical testimony must be a term of communion. A number of the same arguments apply to this question (of fencing the Lord's table based on uninspired historical testimony), as apply to fencing the table based on biblically accurate creeds and confessions -- so those that understand biblical credalism (and close communion) should have no problem with this aspect of Reformation thought. Reformation views are also differentiated from Romish views of history, church authority, etc., as they come to bear on this point. At one of the most interesting points of this study, Price also proves how one cannot even keep the inspired commandments of God without the use of uninspired history (using the fifth and ninth commandments as examples). History is here set on its biblical foundations. Testimony is also well dealt with. Testimony is defined as "That record which a witness gives (in a court) in defense of the truth and in opposition to error." Faithful biblical testimony is shown, by various examples from inspired and uninspired history, to bring the fury of the enemy. This is where the Reformation theological rubber meets the road of experimental Christianity and disinterested self-sacrifice (often resulting in suffering and persecution as the antichristian beast [ecclesiastical and civil] is stirred from his slumber by the barbs of faithful Christian witnesses as they testify to the truth and against "all corruptions embodied in the constitutions of either churches or states" -- thus the long list of Christian martyrs throughout history).

Terms of Communion: The Westminster Standards (\$12.75, 5 cassettes)
Explains and defends the second term of communion, which is "That the whole doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, are agreeable unto, and founded upon the Scriptures." Price not only explains why we need creeds and confessions (answering the question: Isn't the Scripture sufficient?), but he shows how everyone has a creed and how such statements of faith are actually inescapable -- for as soon as one says what he believes the Bible means, he has (by definition) put forth his creed ("credo" in Latin means "to believe"). There is no neutrality! He also gives a summary of the Westminster standards and the history of this august assembly, demonstrating why these standards are agreeable to the word of God. After showing how faithful creeds and confessions (i.e. human testimony) have brought untold blessings to the church he gives a history of the Westminster Assembly (setting the context for the study of

the Standards themselves). The doctrines contained in the confessional standards are then summarized. Price also exposes and rebukes much false teaching and false practice (contrary to the standards) using the specific names associated with each heresy refuted. The following doctrines are covered: sola Scripture (refuting popery, neo-orthodoxy, liberalism and the charismatics), the doctrine of God (refuting Unitarianism, Oneness theology [Modalism, Sabellianism], and tritheism), God's decrees and predestination (refuting Arminianism, fatalism [Islam]), creation (refuting Evolutionism, Pantheism and New Age and Eastern mysticism), the covenant of works, Providence (against "luck" and "accidents"), the fall of man (refuting Arminianism and Pelagianism), the covenant of grace (refuting dispensationalism), Christ our mediator (refuting Arianism [JW's], Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism [which led to the transubstantiation and consubstantiation heresies]), the free offer of the gospel, effectual calling (contra Arminianism), justification by faith alone through Christ alone (contra Rome and the Arminians), sanctification and good works (condemning antinomianism and legalism), assurance of faith, perseverance of the saints, the law of God, Christian liberty (against pretended liberty of conscience and the imposition of legalistic standards outside of the law of God), worship (against the anti-regulatists and promoters of will-worship), the regulative principle (condemning Arminianism in worship), the Sabbath (taking the high Scottish view), lawful oaths and vows (condemning covenant breaking [churches and nations included], perjury, etc.), the civil magistrate (against pluralism, false toleration, Erastianism, and for biblical establishments), marriage, the church (contra popery, prelacy and independency [all of which are forms of sectarianism]), and the resurrection and general judgement.

Terms of Communion: Presbyterian Worship and Government (\$4.95, 2 cassettes)
Explains and defends the third term of communion, which is "That Presbyterian Church Government and manner of worship are alone of divine right and unalterable; and that the most perfect model of these as yet attained, is exhibited in the Form of Government and Directory for Worship, adopted by the Church of Scotland in the Second Reformation." "To many readers, the subject of church government will not seem terribly exciting. Judging from the lack of contemporary literature on the topic, one might conclude that church polity is not very important. Yet, if the truth were known, many of the practical problems facing the church are the result of an abandonment of scriptural church polity. The church is not a mere social club. The church is the kingdom of Christ (Col. 1:13), subject to his rule. In the Bible, the Lord has established an ecclesiastical government by which his people are to be ruled. Just as Christ has instituted civil government to ensure civil order, so he has established ecclesiastical government to preserve order in the church (1 Cor. 14:33). A man is not free to dispense with the church's government anymore than he is at liberty to disregard the (lawful--RB) civil authorities. We do not contend that the divine order for church government extends to every detail. Obviously, the Lord did not mandate how many times the elders of the church must meet each month; nor did he prescribe any particular attire for them to wear while performing their official duties. Such incidentals are adapted to the needs and

exigencies of the time and place; according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed. Nevertheless, the scriptures do provide an overall plan of government which the church must follow if she is to remain faithful to her Lord. Therefore, it is important to examine biblical principles of church polity," writes Kevin Reed in his *Biblical Church Government*. Much the same could be said regarding worship. These tapes are an excellent introductory explanation of the fundamentals of Divine Right Presbyterian church government and Divine Right Presbyterian worship. They are jam-packed with Scripture, history and sound reasoning and should be very helpful to all those seeking the Lord's will concerning these two important subjects. Price distinguishes between the elements and circumstances of worship (contra John Frame's heretical innovations, wherein he rejects these distinctions), while the vital issues of unity and uniformity, separation from false worship and false man-made church governments are not forgotten. All this is set in the context of faithfully approaching the Lord's table. "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you" (1 Cor. 11:2).

Terms of Communion: The Practice of Truth (forthcoming, #? cassettes)
Explains and defends the sixth term of communion, which is "Practically adorning the doctrine of God our Savior by walking in all His commandments and ordinances blamelessly."

BOOKS FOR FURTHER STUDY

PURITAN REFORMED SESSION

A Brief Defence of Dissociation in the Present Circumstances (1996)

This work explains why Christians should separate themselves from those churches which deny biblical truth and its implications. It defends this position using many Reformation source documents. Samuel Rutherford has been especially misunderstood concerning separation. Examples of misleading and seriously flawed presentations of Rutherford's position on the church and separation have been seen in Walker's *The Theology and Theologians of Scotland 1560-1750*, Bacon's *The Visible Church and Outer Darkness* and a host of other works -- all of which overlook foundational second Reformation truths set forth by Rutherford and his follow Covenanters. This book clearly demonstrates, from Rutherford's own actions and teaching (during the Protester/Resolutioner controversy in the Scottish church), how far off many previous works on this subject have been. One example given by the Puritan Reformed elders exhibits Rutherford's (and the other Protesters) stand regarding covenanting, close communion and separation,

In fact, the issue of faithfulness to the covenants actually rent the Church of Scotland into two parties so that the Protesters declared the Assemblies of the Resolutioners (the covenant-breaking party that developed out of the

Engagers) to be unconstitutional and pretended Assemblies. The covenants were obvious terms of communion, for Protesters and Resolutioners refused to meet in the same General Assemblies together. Protesters did not recognize the unlawful courts of the Resolutioner Assemblies and would not attend them when cited to appear. Protesters were deposed from the ministry by Resolutioner Assemblies when they refused to recognize their lawful authority to rule on behalf of Christ.

It [the joint General Assembly of Protesters and Resolutioners--PRC] met in St. Andrews on 16th July. . . . Rutherford, and other twenty-one sympathisers, protested against the meeting as unconstitutional. . . . There [later at Dundee, where the General Assembly of Protesters, who had separated themselves from the Resolutioners, was now meeting--PRC], on 22nd July [1651--PRC], Rutherford's cogent Protest declining the Assembly was read. Balcarres [a Resolutioner-- PRC] in vain demanded that the twenty-two absent Protesters should be reported for civil punishment for their reflections on the King, Parliament, and Church. The Assembly [of Resolutioners--PRC] ordered Presbyteries to deal with them. It was ultimately agreed to cite [James--PRC] Guthrie, Patrick Gillespie, James Simson, James Naismith, and John Menzies. They did not compear [i.e. appear at the Resolutioner assembly--PRC]. The [Resolutioner--PRC] Assembly deposed Guthrie, Gillespie, and Simson, suspended Naismith, and referred Menzies to the Commission. After the meeting of the Assembly at St. Andrews, a work was published entitled *A Vindication of the Freedom and Lawfulness of the late Assembly* [by James Wood, a Resolutioner--PRC], etc. This was answered by *The Nullity of the Pretended Assembly at Saint Andrews and Dundee* [signed by 40 Protesters including Rutherford and Guthrie--PRC](Hewison, *The Covenanters*, Vol. II, pp. 34,35, emphases added).

Separate Assemblies of Protesters and Resolutioners met in 1652 and in 1653 in Edinburgh. The Protesters declared the Assembly of the Resolutioners in 1652 to be "unlawful, unfrie, and unjust" (Hewison, *The Covenanters*, Vol. II, p. 43). It is worthy to be noted that the issue between the Protesters and the Resolutioners did not deal at all with the propriety of ministers and members of the Church of Scotland swearing the covenants, but over the issue of faithfulness to the covenants. Both sides upheld the obligation of ministers and members to own the covenants. Furthermore, unfaithfulness to this term of communion (i.e. faithfully maintaining the covenants) on the part of the Resolutioners led the Protesters to separate from their brethren to avoid schism and in order to maintain a truly constituted church. They would not serve with the Resolutioners while they maintained different terms of communion, neither would they serve them the Lord's Supper (e.g. Rutherford refused to serve communion with Blair at St. Andrews; and on another occasion Rutherford and Moncrieff debarred

Resolutioners from the table at Scoonie). Such actions can only be defended if the covenants were terms of communion. Were the covenants biblical terms of communion? We testify that they were and still are biblical terms of communion. To affirm otherwise is in effect to charge the faithful covenanters (Protesters) of the Second Reformation with sin and to undermine their covenanted reformation and the biblical presbyterianism they taught and practiced.

The following excerpt gives a short synopsis of those truths which this book seeks to vindicate. The elders of The Puritan Reformed Church write:

"Though it is not necessary that a truly constituted church be absolutely pure as to the doctrine taught or embraced, as to the ordinances administered, or the public worship performed, it is, however, necessary that its constitution be founded upon and agreeable to the Word of God and that its constitution reflect the light attained to by the purest of Reformed Churches (for all reformation must be biblical reformation if it is reformation at all, otherwise it is not a reformation but a deformation, cf. Phil. 3:16). Wherefore, to adopt a constitution that corrupts the light of Scripture or the light of reformation is to adopt a false constitution. A false constitution renders a church and its courts unconstitutional. When the Confession of Faith (25:4) speaks of degrees of purity among particular churches within the "catholick church", we believe it designates degrees of purity within truly constituted churches. For example, though the church of Corinth was plagued with division, immorality, and false doctrine promoted by some within the church (and therefore manifested a lesser degree of purity than other truly constituted churches, cf. the church of Smyrna in Rev. 2:8-11), it was, nevertheless, a truly constituted church for it was constituted by apostolic authority (with apostolic doctrine, apostolic worship, apostolic government, and apostolic discipline). Thus, for a church to constitutionally adhere to Arminianism, Dispensationalism, or Charismatic experientialism (false doctrine), singing uninspired hymns or using instrumental music in public praise (false worship), Episcopacy or Independency (false government), or unrestricted communion (false discipline) is to qualify as a constitutionally false church. That is not to say that there are no believers in churches that are not truly constituted (there may be many in some cases). Nor is it to imply that ministers or elders within those churches do not courageously stand for many truths taught in Scripture. It is simply to say that authority to rule in the church must come from Christ, and if a church does not have a constitution of which He approves (as King of His church), then there is no lawful authority to rule or to administer the ordinances on His behalf."

This book is the **best short introduction** to questions regarding the visible church and separation which we list.

(Bound photocopy) \$9.95-60%=3.98

SYMINGTON, ANDREW, editor

Lectures on the Principles of the Second Reformation (1841)

Written by ministers of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland, this book contains the following chapters: "Introductory Lecture on the Principles of the Second Reformation" by Andrew Symington; "The Headship of Christ Over His Church and Her Independent Jurisdiction" by James Ferguson; "Evils, Constitutional and Practical, of the Prelatic Establishment of the British Empire" by Thomas Nelson; "The Revolution Settlement of the Church of Scotland: Its Provisions, in several Respects, Inconsistent with the Approved Principles of the Second Reformation" by John Graham; "Patronage Opposed to the Independence of the Church, and to the Scriptural Rights of the Christian People" by W.H. Goold; "Headship of Christ Over the Nations" by Andrew Symington; "Nature and Obligation of Public Vows; with an Explanation and Defence of the British Covenants" by William Symington; "The Sin and Danger of Union Between the Church of Christ and an Immoral or Antichristian Civil Government" by Stewart Bates; and "The Evil of Relaxed Discipline in the Church" by John Milwan. 472 pages, each chapter can also be purchased separately, except the preface.

(Bound photocopy) \$99.95-85%=14.99

(Hardcover photocopy) \$29.00 (Canadian funds)

SHIELDS, ALEXANDER

A Hind Let Loose; or An Historical Representation of the Testimonies of the Church of Scotland for the Interest of Christ with the True State thereof in all its Periods. Together with a Vindication of the Present Testimony Against Popish, Prelatical, and Malignant Enemies of that Church, as it is now Stated, for the Prerogatives of Christ, Privileges of the Church, and Liberties of Mankind; and Sealed by the Sufferings of a Reproached Remnant of Presbyterians there, Witnessing Against the Corruptions of the Time: Wherein Several Controversies of Greatest Consequence are Enquired into, and in Some Measure Cleared; Concerning Hearing of the Curates, Owning of the Present Tyranny, Taking of Ensnaring Oaths and Bonds, Frequenting of Field-Meetings, Defensive Resistance of Tyrannical Violence, with Several Other Subordinate Questions Useful for these Times (1687, 1797 edition)

First printed in 1687 (near the end of the "killing times"), we have used the 1797 edition for this rare bound photocopy because all of the Latin has been translated into English (an obvious improvement for English readers). This rare Covenanter classic, concerning Calvinistic political philosophy and tactics of civil resistance, is comparable to Samuel Rutherford's *Lex, Rex*; in fact it could rightly be referred to as "*Lex Rex* volume two." It is solidly in the line of John Knox's teachings on civil disobedience and addresses numerous topics that are relevant to today's Christian. "In *A Hind Let Loose*, Shields justified the Camerionian resistance to royal absolutism and the divine right of kings. He argued that government is divinely ordained, but the people are entitled to bring a king to judgement for wrongdoing. Parliament is commissioned by the people to oversee the nation's affairs, but the compact between the people and their rulers does not entail a forfeiture of the people's power to depose tyrants and confer authority on someone else. Government is by consent, and must justify itself to the consciences of the people. God

has given men the right of self defence, and this extends to a right not only passively to resist, but also to kill relentless persecutors" writes Isbell (in the Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology, p. 773). Controversial chapter titles include: "Concerning Owning of Tyrants Authority;" "Defensive Arms Vindicated;" "Of Extraordinary Execution of Judgement by Private Men;" and "Refusing to Pay Wicked Taxation Vindicated." **This book sets forth the Crown rights of King Jesus, against all usurpers in both church and state, giving a history of some of faithful sufferings endured by the elect, in maintaining this truth. It bears testimony against "the popish, prelatical and malignant enemies' of Christ and proclaims the only true basis of liberty for mankind.** "The matter is argued with a vast abundance of Biblical illustration, and with much reference to Reformation and Puritan divines. It should be consulted, if practicable, by all who wish fully to understand the inner spirit of the Covenanting Movement," writes Purves in *Fair Sunshine* (p. 202). Isbell interestingly notes that Shields was once "amanuensis to the English Puritan John Owen." Over 750 pages, this very rare item sells for from \$250-\$800 on the rare book market. Now you can have it for much less!

(Rare bound photocopy) \$199.95-80%=39.99

(Hardcover photocopy) \$59.00 (Canadian funds)

REFORMED PRESBYTERY

Act, Declaration, And Testimony, For The Whole Of The Covenanted Reformation, As Attained To, And Established In, Britain and Ireland; Particularly Betwixt The Years 1638 and 1649, Inclusive. As, Also, Against All The Steps Of Defection From Said Reformation, Whether In Former Or Later Times, Since The Overthrow Of That Glorious Work, Down To This Present Day (1876)

Upholds the original work of the Westminster Assembly and testifies to the abiding worth and truth formulated in the Westminster family of documents. Upholds and defends the crown rights of King Jesus in church and state, denouncing those who would remove the crown from Christ's head by denying His right to rule (by His law) in both the civil and ecclesiastical spheres. Testifies to the received doctrine, government, worship, and discipline of the Church of Scotland in her purest (reforming) periods. Applies God's Word to the Church's corporate attainments "with a judicial approbation of the earnest contendings and attainments of the faithful, and a strong and pointed judicial condemnation of error and the promoters thereof" (*The Original Covenanter and Contending Witness*, Dec. 17/93, p. 558. Write for a sample of this highly recommended publication at: P.O. Box 131, Pottstown, PA, 19464, USA). Shows the church's great historical victories (such as the National and Solemn League and Covenant, leading to the Westminster Assembly) and exposes her enemies actions (e.g. the Prelacy of Laud; the Independency, sectarianism, covenant breaking and ungodly toleration set forth by the likes of Cromwell [and the Independents that conspired with him]; the Erastianism and civil sectarianism of William of Orange, etc.). It is not likely that you will find a more consistent working out of the principles of Calvinism anywhere. Deals with the most important matters relating to the individual, the family, the church and the state. Sets forth

a faithful historical testimony of God's dealings with men during some of the most important days of church history. A basic text that should be mastered by all Christians.
(Rare bound photocopy) \$19.95-70%=5.99

(Hardcover photocopy) \$19.00 (Canadian funds)

REFORMED PRESBYTERY

Auchensauh Renovation of the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant; with the Acknowledgement of Sins and Engagement to Duties as they were Renewed at Auchensauh in 1712... Also the Renovation of These Public Federal Deeds Ordained at Philadelphia, Oct. 8, 1880, By the Reformed Presbytery, With Accommodation of the Original Covenants, in Both Transactions, to their Times and Positions Respectively (1880 ed.)

"In 1712, at Auchensauh, the Covenants, National and Solemn League, were renewed... At the renewal the covenant bonds were recognized as binding the descendants of those who first entered into those bonds. The Covenanters, however, sought to display the true intent of those Covenants with marginal notes. These notes explained that the Church of Jesus Christ, in Scotland (and around the world), must not join hands with any political power in rebellion to the crown rights of King Jesus. The Covenanters pledged the Covenanted Reformed Presbyterian Church to the support of lawful magistracy (i.e. magistracy which conformed itself to the precepts of God's Word) and declared themselves and their posterity against support of any power, in Church or State, which lacked biblical authority." (From "About the Covenanted Reformed Presbyterian Church" P.O. Box 131, Pottstown, PA 19464). An excellent introduction (historical and moral) regarding the reasons, motives and manner of fulfilling the duty of covenanting with God. Especially helpful concerning the Biblical view of the blessings (for covenant-keepers) and cursings (for covenant breakers) related to covenanting. As noted on page 37, "the godly usually in times of great defection from the purity and power of religion, and corruption of the ordinances of God's worship, set about renewing their covenant, thereby to prevent covenant curses, and procure covenant blessing; as we find both in scripture record, 2 Chron. 15:12-13; 29:10; 34:30-31; Ezra 10:3, and in our own ecclesiastical history." Times like ours certainly call for a revival of the Scriptural ordinance of covenanting, for "[t]he nations throughout Christendom, continue in league with Antichrist and give their strength to the beast. They still refuse to profess and defend the true religion in doctrine, worship, government and discipline, contrary to the example of the kingdoms of Scotland, England and Ireland in the seventeenth century" (p. 136 in this book).

(Rare bound photocopy) \$19.95-70%=5.99

(Hardcover photocopy) \$19.00 (Canadian funds)

REFORMED PRESBYTERY

A Short Vindication of our Covenanted Reformation (1879)

Until the church comes to terms with what is written in this book it will remain weak and divided. Covenant breakers will not prosper, as this rare item demonstrates from both Scripture and history. The power packed ordinance of covenanting, (the National and

Solemn League and Covenant in particular), was foundational to the second Reformation and the work of the Westminster Assembly. "By the National Covenant our fathers laid Popery prostrate. By the Solemn League and Covenant they were successful in resisting prelatic encroachments and civil tyranny. By it they were enabled to achieve the Second Reformation... They were setting up landmarks by which the location and limits of the city of God will be known at the dawn of the millennial day... How can they be said to go forth by the footsteps of the flock, who have declined from the attainments, renounced the covenants and contradicted the testimony of 'the cloud of witnesses.'" ...All the schisms (separations) that disfigure the body mystical of Christ... are the legitimate consequences of the abandonment of reformation attainments, the violation of covenant engagements." If you are interested in knowing how to recognize a faithful church (or state), when and why to separate from unfaithful institutions, who has held up the standard of covenanted Reformation attainments and who has backslidden (and why), what it means to subscribe to the Westminster Confession (and why most that say they do so today do not have any idea of what that means), and much more concerning individual, family, church and civil duties, this is one of the best books you will ever lay your hands on. It chronicles "some instances of worldly conformity and mark(s) some steps of defection from our 'covenanted unity and uniformity,' " noting how "it is necessary to take a retrospect of our history for many years; for we did not all at once reach our present condition of sinful ignorance and manifold apostasy." Presbyterian and the Reformed churches lay under the heavy hand of God's judgement in our day, because of the very defections noted throughout this fine work. "We heard (hear) from various quarters the cry, 'maintain the truth, stand up for the principles of the Second Reformation;' and yet many of those who are the most loud in uttering this cry, appear desirous to bury in oblivion those imperishable national and ecclesiastical deeds, by which the church and kingdom of Scotland became 'married to the Lord.'" Are we married to the Lord, or have we thrown off the covenants of our forefathers; are we the chaste bride of Christ, or a harlot who is found in the bedchambers of every devilish suitor (whether ecclesiastical or civil) who tempts us with the favors of this world? Let us cry out, as with "the noble Marquis of Argyle, upon the scaffold," when he said, "God hath tied us by covenants to religion and reformation. These that were then unborn are yet engaged, and it passeth the power of all the magistrates under heaven to absolve them from the oath of God. They deceive themselves, and it may be, would deceive others, who think otherwise." Not for the weak of heart.

(Rare Bound Photocopy) \$14.95-70%=4.49

(Hardcover photocopy) \$14.00 (Canadian funds)

ROBERTS, WILLIAM L.

The Reformed Presbyterian Catechism (1853)

A manual of instruction, drawing from such notable authors as William Symington and J.R. Willson, presenting "arguments and facts confirming and illustrating the 'Distinctive Principles'" of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. Chapters deal with: "Christ's Mediatorial Dominion in general;" "Christ's exclusive Headship over the Church;" "The Supreme and Ultimate Authority of the Word of God in the Church;" "Civil Government,

the Moral Ordinance of God;" Christ's Headship over the Nations;" "The Subjection of the Nations to God and to Christ;" The Word, or Revealed Will of God, the Supreme Law in the State;" "The Duty of Nations, in their National Capacity, to acknowledge and support the True Religion:" "The Spiritual Independence of the Church of Christ:" "The Right and Duty of Dissent from an immoral Constitution of Civil Government;" "The Duty of Covenanting, and the Permanent Obligations of Religious Covenants;" "The Application of these Principles to the Governments, where Reformed Presbyterians reside, in the form of a Practical Testimony;" and finally "Application of the Testimony to the British Empire." A most important book, as we approach (possibly) the end of the great apostasy and will be in need of preparing for the dawning of the glorious millennial blessings to come; the days prophesied in which the church "shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breast of kings" (Isa. 60:16).

(Rare bound photocopy) \$29.95-70%=8.99

(Hardcover photocopy) \$19.00 (Canadian funds)

RUTHERFORD, SAMUEL

A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience (1649 edition.)

Rutherford's *Free Disputation*, though scarce, is still one of his most important works Ñ with maybe only a few copies of the actual book left in existence. Though Rutherford is affectionately remembered in our day for his *Letters*, or for laying the foundations of constitutional government (against the divine right of kings) in his unsurpassed *Lex Rex*, his *Free Disputation* should not be overlooked Ñ for it contains the same searing insights as *Lex Rex*. In fact, this book should probably be known as Rutherford's "politically incorrect" companion volume to *Lex Rex*. A sort of sequel aimed at driving pluralists and antinomians insane. Written against "the Belgick Arminians, Socinians, and other Authors contending for lawlesse liberty, or licentious Tolerations of Sects and Heresies," Rutherford explains the undiluted Biblical solution to moral relativism, especially as it is expressed in ecclesiastical and civil pluralism! (Corporate pluralism being a violation of the first commandment and an affront to the holy God of Scripture). He also deals with conscience, toleration, penology (punishment), and the judicial laws, as related to both the civil and ecclesiastical realms. Excellent sections are also included which address questions related to determining the fundamentals of religion, how covenants bind us, the perpetual obligation of social covenants (with direct application to the Solemn League and Covenant and the covenant-breaking of Cromwell and his sectarian supporters), whether the punishing of seducing teachers be persecution of conscience, and much more. Walker adds these comments and context regarding Rutherford's *Free Disputation*, "The principle of toleration was beginning to be broached in England, and in a modified shape to find acceptance there. Samuel Rutherford was alarmed, or rather, I should say, he was horrified, for he neither feared the face of man or argument. He rushed to the rescue of the good old view... It is not so easy to find a theoretical ground for toleration; and Rutherford has many plausible things to say against it. With the most perfect confidence, he argues that it is alike against Scripture and common sense that you should have two religions side by side. It is outrageous ecclesiastically, it is sinful civilly. He does not,

however, take what I call the essentially persecuting ground. He does not hold that the magistrate is to punish religion as religion. Nay, he strongly maintains that the civil magistrate never aims at the conscience. The magistrate, he urges, does not send anyone, whether a heretic (who is a soul murderer--RB) or a murderer, to the scaffold with the idea of producing conversion or other spiritual result, but to strengthen the foundations of civil order. But if he gives so much power to the king, he is no lover of despotism withal: the king himself must be under law. To vindicate this great doctrine is the object of another book, the celebrated *Lex Rex*; of which it has been said by one competent to judge, that it first clearly developed the constitutionalism which all men now accept" (*Theology and Theologians...*, pp. 11-12). In our day Francis Schaeffer, and numerous others, have critiqued many of the problems found in modern society, but most have spent little time developing explicitly Biblical solutions -- especially regarding the theoretical foundations that Rutherford addresses here. Rutherford's *Free Disputation* provides a detailed blueprint for laying the foundations that must be laid before any lasting, God-honoring solutions will be found. Furthermore, Rutherford and his writings were the enemies of all governments not covenanted with Christ. This book will give you a very clear picture as to why "the beast" (civil and ecclesiastical) has reserved his special hatred for such teaching. As Samuel Wylie noted "[t]he dispute, then, will not turn upon the point whether religion should be civilly established... but it is concerning what religion ought to be civilly established and protected, -- whether the religion of Jesus alone should be countenanced by civil authority, or every blasphemous, heretical, and idolatrous abomination which the subtle malignity of the old serpent and a heart deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, can frame and devise, should be put on an equal footing therewith" (*Two Sons of Oil: or, The Faithful Witness For Magistracy and Ministry Upon a Scriptural Basis*, softcover). Can our generation swallow Rutherford's hard, anti-pluralistic, Covenanter medicine, poured forth from the bottle of the first commandment, without choking on their carnal dreams of a free and righteous society divorced from God (and His absolute claims upon everyone and everything)? Not without the enabling power of the Holy Spirit -- that is for sure! In summary, this book answers all the hardest questions theonomists (and their wisest and best opponents) have been asking for the last 20-30 years (and these answers are much more in depth than any we have seen in the last couple of millennia [less about a century to account for the apostles]). As the reader will discover, Rutherford was a wealthy man when it came to wisdom (and much advanced theologically), and those who take the time to gaze into the King's treasure house, as exhibited in this book, will find that they are greatly rewarded. Furthermore, because of its uncompromising stand upon the Word of God, this book is sure to be unpopular among a wicked and adulterous generation. However, on the other hand, it is sure to be popular among the covenanted servants of King Jesus! This is one of the best books (in the top five anyway) for advanced study of the Christian faith. We have now obtained an easy-to-read, amazingly clear copy of this very rare, old treasure. Great price too, considering that a copy of the 1649 edition, containing this quality of print, would likely cost upwards of \$1000 on the rare book market -- though it is unlikely you would ever see a copy for sale!

(Rare Bound Photocopy) \$199.95-90%=19.99

(Hardcover photocopy) \$39.00 (Canadian funds)

ANDERSON, JOHN

Alexander and Rufus; or a Series of Dialogues on Church Communion, in Two Parts. Part 1: Vindication of Scriptural Church Communion in Opposition to Latitudinarian Schemes. Part 2: Defence of the Communion Maintained in the Secession Church. (1862)

Anderson does an excellent job concerning: Calvin's plan for promoting a union among the churches (p. 151ff.); the place of confessions and confessional subscription (pp. 85, 179); covenanting (pp. 358-384); separation (pp. 92, 132); worship (pp. 10-13, 87, 107, 142, 155, 161-164, 456ff., etc.); the marks of the church (p. 132ff.); uniformity (pp. 7, 103, 168, 205); the Westminster Assembly (p. 169ff); the Dutch views (p. 158f.); distinctions between essentials and non-essentials (p. 168); the so-called "glorious revolution" of 1688 (p. 263); the French Reformed churches (p. 156); the covenanted Reformation (p. 253); discipline (p. 103); attainments (pp. 11, 93, 137, 162ff., 206, etc.); the government of the church (p. 123); the so-called "Apostle's creed" (pp. 100-104); the Belgic Confession (pp. 135-138); councils in the ancient church (p. 104); the Donatists (p. 112); the forsaking of sin, false doctrine, and false teachers (pp. 92, 132); occasional hearing (p. 83); Owen against open communion (p. 207); sectarianism (p. 92); and much, much more. **On the topic of church and sacramental communion you are unlikely to find many other books with as much solid information.** Recommended for advanced study. Indexed, 518 pages.

(Rare bound photocopy) \$99.95-80%=19.99

(Hardcover photocopy) \$39.00 (Canadian funds)

[Back to swrb home page](#)