

Chapter XXII

1859 - 1860

The Landmark Controversy

Embodied in a book by Mr. Pendleton; review of it as an argument; Pedobaptist doctrines it embraces; errors upon which it rests; its disastrous results.

The doctrine known in this quarter technically, as The Landmark," has been referred to in a former chapter. The object was to note the time and circumstances of its introduction, and the character of its claims. It is important that we should now examine its merits, and trace its influence and results.

Professed reformers, whether in science or religion, are never wanting in the assurance with which they propound their dogmas. Nor are those whose theories seem to clear and discriminating minds, evidently false, on that account the less confident. The great truths announced by Luther, the vagaries of Landenborg, and the wild fanaticism of Miller, come to us associated with the same earnestness. Were these reformations always true & important; were they even not injurious in their bearing and influence, these facts would be less lamentable. But, unhappily, they are often not in the direction of truth and righteousness. The latest born of them all is announced in the book entitled, "An Old Landmark Reset," by Edgar J. M. Pendleton, A. M. Union University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee. This was originally a small tract, but has grown to the size of a book by the addition

of three appendices. Of that unscrupulous and belligerent sheet, the Tennessee Baptist, then widely circulated and with many of paramount influence, this ^{motley} ~~motley~~ scheme was the leading theme. It was also espoused by the Mississippi Baptist, the Texas Baptist, the Arkansas Baptist, and the Missouri Baptist, the Biblical Recorder of North Carolina and two or three ephemeral weeklies in Alabama and Virginia. These papers, none of which manifested any learning, or ability, were all mere satellites of their Tennessee contemporaries. For years this Landmark theory received almost no attention from well read and thinking men, because its doctrines appeared to them trivial in themselves, and since its advocates so constantly and outrageously misrepresented our brethren and churches in regard to it, they supposed that if let alone, a few years would satisfy even its warmest advocates, that they had been really pursuing a phantom which existed only in their own clouded imaginations. But the hopes of these conservative brethren were disappointed. Remaining unexamined and unrefuted, the minds of many good but uncultivated men received it as true, and became unhappily ~~thoroughly~~ imbued with its teaching. Nor was it until recently that the whole theory was overthorwn and annihilated by Dr. I. L. Dagg, in his volume on "Church Order," too late to prevent the incalculable mischief which it had already done in the Southwest.

"The Landmark" as originally propounded by Mr. Pendleton, assumes that in every instance in which a Baptist invites a Pedobaptist to preach for him, or in which they exchange

pulpits that thereby the Baptist endorses the Pedobaptist as in every sense a true gospel minister; that in other words, he endorses the gospel character of his baptism, his church membership, his ordination, his ministry, and his ministrations. To avow this, he insists that we have no means except to decline to have with Pedobaptists any pulpit intercourse whatever. The argument by which he attempts to support this theory ought not to have misled any one. His statement of the subject, and much of the language he employs in its discussion, are irremediably indefinite. He sets out with one proposition, or question rather, which he substitutes for a proposition; he drops this, and discusses another; and simply reasserts his Landmark theory, and, without any proof whatever, declared it established; and seems to think that this is sufficient to convince and satisfy his readers! Let us follow him briefly in his discussion.

The proposition with which he sets out is propounded, we have said, not as is the manner of logicians, in the form of a postulate, but in the form of a question, as follows: "Ought Baptists to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits?"

This, we have said, is irremediably indefinite. What, for example, has it to do with the subject, whether answered negatively or affirmatively? If we ought, or if we ought not to invite Pedobaptists to preach in our pulpits, determines nothing as to the question in controversy. But he prepares us for his argument thus:

"In the discussion of this question opinion which have originated from our feelings, and partialities, should, as far as possible, be discarded. An honest and earnest desire to know the truth, should gain ascendancy of the heart, for there will be a willingness to adopt the conclusions to which the truth leads."

This language strikes us as very singular. Does Mr. Pendleton intend to question the honesty of Baptist desires to know the truth, or their willingness to adopt the conclusions to which the truth leads? They certainly have always professed very loudly, such honesty, and willingness. He puts his admonition into a peculiar category. He says: Then there will be such honesty and willingness. When? Then, when opinions which have originated from our partialities and feelings," are discarded. Until then you, of course, cannot be honest, and willing to adopt the conclusions to which the truth leads you! Are not feelings, and partialities, singular sources of opinions? An opinion, according to Hale, is entertained, "When the assent of the understanding is so far gained by evidence of probability, that it rather inclines to one persuasion than another, yet not without a mixture of uncertainty and doubting. Webster defines an opinion to be "The judgment, or sentiment, which the mind forms of persons and their qualities; a settled judgment or persuasion," from evidences which are presented. And opinions, therefore, cannot exist without evidence of probability, that rather inclines the mind to one persuasion than another." But what evidence do you find of the truth, or

falsehood of any given proposition in your feelings, or partialities. We submit to those who are skilled in the science of Mental Philosophy whether opinions ever do originate from feelings and partialities. Feelings and partialities may originate prejudices, but opinions are a different thing. They rest upon evidence. But evidence is nothing to the mind, until it is examined and understood. A man may senselessly receive, or reject a proposition overborne by his feelings and partialities, but no opinion is compelled in direct conflict with both your feelings and partialities. This confused admonition is, therefore, a poor preparation of our minds for the discussion of the proposed question. But we turn again to the question itself: - "Ought Baptists to Invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits?"

The word ought, as defined by Webster, means, "To be held bound in duty, or obligation; to be necessary; to behoove;" as "These ought ye to do, and not leave the other undone;" "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak." The word is used to express what is morally fit, or expedient. It comes from the old Saxon word owed, as some debt you are called upon to pay. It seems to be the preterit tense of the original verb to owe, the radical sense being to hold, to restrain, to stop. Hence the passive participle would be held bound. The general sense is therefore, held bound in duty or

obligation. With these authoritative definitions before us, we learn explicitly the sense of the question propounded. It is clearly this: - Are Baptists held bound in duty, or obligation, to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits? We answer, assuredly they are not. And this should certainly be the answer of the whole intelligent world, no matter to what denomination they belong. Baptists are under no such obligations. If, as a matter of convenience, of benefit, or of courtesy, they choose to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits, that is another thing. That they are under no obligations to do so seems to us perfectly certain. If it is the duty of Baptists - and if they ought it is their duty to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits, then Pedobaptists have some right to preach in Baptist pulpits. Is it pretended that they have any such right? We presume not. And still further. If Baptists ought to do anything which they fail, or refuse to do, then they neglect their duty. But since no man imagines that they neglect their duty in not inviting Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits, no man can say that they ought to do so. The affirmative of the question no one will therefore attempt to maintain.

But does it follow that the negative of the question is therefore true? Certainly not. This negative Mr. Pendleton tell us - page 5 - it is his purpose to prove! And what is this negative? It is simply no. Let it be conceded that this is proved incontestibly, and what is gained for the Landmarks?

Nothing whatever, that we can perceive. The negative merely denies the affirmative. The question whether it is wrong for Baptists to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits remains unanswered. You may be under no special obligation to do a thing, while at the same time you may be under no special obligations not to do it. Ought we, for example to become a Professor in Union University - provided that unfortunate school were yet in being? Certainly not. We are under no special obligations to do any such thing. But would it be wrong for us to become a Professor in Union University? No sir; it would not be wrong. The thing as to moral obligation is indifferent. We may decide either way, and we do no wrong. Precisely so is it with Mr. Fendleton's question before us. If he has proved the negative incontestibly - he has really done no such thing - it is nothing to his purpose. It is wonderful that a man who would consent to be a Professor of Theology, did not himself see all this? The real proposition which the gentleman labors to prove appears to be this: - For Baptists to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits is wrong. Why not then proceed to prove it? Why put it in the form of a question which has no proper affirmative, and whose negative if proved leaves his Landmark theory as far from being established as it was before?

The question, we have now seen, is irremediably indefinite, as is also the solemn admonition by which he essays to prepare our minds for it. Both are hopelessly confused. But

after all, this, as we have said, is not the question discussed! He now comes forth with another and a different question; and neither does this embrace his Landmark proposition. After a page or two of truisms, he proceeds thus: -

The question, Ought Baptists to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers must receive either an affirmative, or a negative answer. It does not admit of an ambiguous response. The truth is in the affirmative or negative. And the writer will aim to show that truth requires the question to be answered negatively. p. 4. "Ought Baptists to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers?" The question announced at the outset was not this, but another and a different one. That question was, Ought Baptists to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits? "The proposition" embracing the Landmark differs as much from this as the former. It affirms that in every instance in which you invite a Pedobaptist to preach in your pulpit, or in which you exchange pulpits with him, you in that act, recognize him as a true gospel minister, and endorse the gospel character of his baptism, his church membership, his ordination, and his ministrations. Why not prove this proposition, if he can, and be done with it? On ~~one~~ first reading of the book we naturally supposed that this second question was the first link in the chain of Mr. Pendleton's argument; but we soon saw he did not so treat it; and the error of our supposition was confirmed when we turned to the place where he sums up his argument. He there says:

"I have now attempted to establish the position that

Baptist ministers ought not to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers." p. 18.

And call you this logic? It is absolutely childish. It has in it neither sense nor reason. We must however take the book as it is. This latter then, and not the former and original one, is, "the position" which Mr. Pendleton attempted to establish. But why substitute this for the former question? He surely could not think them identical. In doing so he changes wholly the subject of discussion. And why employ questions instead of propositions? A proposition affirms something to be proved, and puts you upon the argument. A question affirms nothing, and may, as we have seen, be so framed as to admit neither of an affirmative, nor of a negative reply, since the truth may be partly on both sides, and not entirely on either. We declare that we cannot help regretting that any man who has borne the name of Baptist, and pretended to be a teacher among us, should thus expose himself to the scorn of every tyro in logic. But we return. The writer says; -

"This question (that is, this second question) must receive an affirmative, or a negative answer." "The truth is in the affirmative or negative." p. 4.

To this assumption, we earnestly object. It cannot as a matter of fact, be sustained. It is plainly not true as a general proposition and especially as to this, as we shall presently see more fully. What necessity compels the whole truth to be on one side of this question? "Pedobaptist preachers," is a phrase including very large numbers and

widely variant classes of men. Paptists, Universalists, and Unitarians, as well as Episcopàlians, Methodists, and Presbyterians are Pedobaptists. "Ought Baptists," - that is, does duty or obligation bind Baptists - "to recognize (all these) Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers?" Our astute Professor makes no distinctions. Does he insist that we shall put them all down in the same theological and moral catalogue; and either reject all or receive all as gospel ministers? They do not all so recognize each other. Why should we be called upon to do what the refuse to do themselves? We do not see that Baptists are required to act at all in this case, or that we ought, or that we ought not to recognize them, either in whole, or in part. Some think that certain classes of Pedobaptist preachers are gospel ministers and some think they are not gospel ministers. The prevalence of these conflicting opinions does not require us to decide anything regarding them. Whether they are gospel ministers or not, is their own business, not ours. We are not appointed judges in these matters. If we think any of them are gospel ministers as far as they truly minister the gospel, and that as far as they do not truly minister the gospel they are not gospel ministers, what then? We may possibly be right, and the assumption which seems to have deceived Mr. Pendleton himself that "The question must receive either a negative or an affirmative answer," is a fallacy. It is plainly not true.

His declaration in this connection, that This question, "does not admit of an ambiguous response," is one of the gentleman's own peculiar ambiguities. Lexicographers tell us

that a thing that is ambiguous is "susceptible of two or more meanings; is doubtful, being of uncertain signification; is capable of different interpretations and hence obscure. But which is the question that does not admit of an obscure answer, or an answer of doubtful interpretation? Is it the primary one, or this other which has been substituted in its place? If either of them does not admit of an ambiguous answer, there must the Professor withdraw his own answer, since that is unsurpassed in the quality of ambiguity.

We may now, having cleared away the immense amount of rubbish that lay upon the subject see clearly what it is, according to the true sense of the question, that Mr. Pendleton is to prove. We perceive definitely that it is not whether Baptists ought to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits, but whether Baptists ought to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers. The question is not whether Pedobaptists really are gospel ministers, but whether we should recognize them as such. If, for example, a minister of that class, shall preach regeneration by the Holy Spirit, justification by faith, and salvation by grace alone, the question is not whether that is the gospel, and whether we ought not to admit that he who preaches it, does preach it, but whether a man unbaptized and unordained should be tolerated in preaching even the truth. Ought we to recognize him? Are we at liberty to approve his teaching, and his obedience, as far as they conform to the word of God, and condemn the remainder, or, are we to condemn him

wholly, including both the right and the wrong,
and therefore to withdraw from him all courtesies?

We must not "recognize" a Pedobaptist preacher as a gospel minister. To recognize, Webster tells us, means "to recollect, or to recover the knowledge of a thing, either with an open avowal of that knowledge, or not; to admit with a formal acknowledgement." Now it seems to us that in so far as man preaches the gospel truly, we must recollect, admit, and acknowledge that the man, although unbaptized, unordained, and even out of the church, who thus preaches it, does preach it, and that it really is the gospel which he preaches. The question is not whether such a man is qualified to administer ordinances, or to do the work of a Bishop, but whether he is to be recognized as a gospel minister. One Professor assumes that he is not. We will now trace his argument. pp. 4-13.

He proves that since Pedobaptists are not baptized, their churches cannot be true visible churches of Christ; that sprinkling and pouring are not baptism; that Pedobaptist churches cannot be evangelical - that is, conformed to the gospel in the full sense, that since Pedobaptist churches are not true churches of Christ, they have no authority to ordain men to the ministry; and that as they have no baptism, no church membership, no ordination, they ought not to be received as gospel ministers. The conclusion is therefore, Baptists ought not to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers.

If this argument is defective, in what does that defect consist? Simply in this: - It deals wholly in sweeping

generals, confounding things that are essentially different; and concludes in respect to all, what is true in every respect with regard only to a part. The argument assumes throughout, as we have seen, more than is true. The conclusion claims therefore more than is true. The reasoning of this book, as a whole, is characterized by another capital defect. It proceeds upon the assumption, which cannot be sustained, that preaching like baptism, or the administration of the Lord's Supper, is an official act, which can be legally dispensed only by those who are legitimately set apart to the work of the gospel ministry. This is certainly not true. Philologists show very clearly, that the words "preach," and "pray" come from one and the same root. Such seems not to be the impression of Mr. Pendleton. He evidently makes preaching in the ordinary sense not only an official act, but includes in it nearly all else that belongs to the ministerial office. Mr. Freeman of Jackson, Mi, an advocate of Landmarkism, speaks more sensibly on this point. In the Mi. Bapt. Vol. 2, No. 6. May 20, 1858, he says: "In discussing questions of this kind, we must not confound things that differ. A man may be truly regenerated, and yet led into error as to what is duty. In his regeneration and afterwards, he may be honestly impressed with the ~~duty~~ to call sinners to repentance. Commingling with those who have led him into error about the first step which a Christian should take, he is led to assume duties which only to baptized Christians. In our intercourse with such, we should remember always to make a dis-

inction between what we call the social acts of Christians, such as religious conversation, singing and prayer, which are commanded before as well as after baptism, and those of an official character, which belong to church relations, such as baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the (pastorship, or) regular ministrations of the word before the church. In all such we should keep separate from them that we may thereby protest against their errors, and not seem to sanction them before the public. They are in error on these subjects, and we are responsible Before God and the people, if we sanction these errors by any official intercourse with them."

Mr. Freeman does not, as we have seen, include preaching in the general sense among the official acts of the ministry. Mr. Pendleton does, and thus mistakes the whole subject, "To preach is to pronounce a discourse on a religious subject; usually in its modern sense, applied to such discourses as are framed from a text of scripture; to exhort men to repentance; to urge men to believe and accept the terms of salvation." This is the authoritative definition as to what constitutes preaching. Praying, Mr. Pendleton tells us "is a different matter;" for men ought to pray whether they are in the church or not. p. 13. Now since any good Christian man, even though not baptized, may surely speak on the subject of religion and urge people to repent, believe, and accept the terms of salvation, why should we forbid them? Preaching in the ordinary sense is no more an official act than is prayer. Men ought to pray. Why then ought not men who have been con-

verted to make known that gospel to others, which has saved them, whether they are in the church, or not, even if to do so they must speak of it publicly? And if such men preach the gospel, ought they not to be recognized as preachers of the gospel? Thus have we seen that this argument of Mr. Pendleton's fails wholly and signally to establish the position he assumes.

At this point Mr. Pendleton arrives at his conclusion as follows: - "Now if Pedobaptist preachers do not belong to the church of Christ, they ought not to be recognized as ministers of Christ. But they are so recognized when Baptist ministers invite them to preach, or exchange pulpits with them!" p. 13. But this is assuming the very point in dispute, and that too without proof. This it is distinctly the truth of which we deny, and have already fully disproved. Shall we allow it now steadily and insidiously to be thrust upon us? The conclusion does not follow from any preceding reasoning. It is a mere assertion, unsustained by a single argument, and untrue in fact. After this glaring fallacy had been pointed out to him in a public print, in an appendix, he again recurs to the point before us, but does not even then essay to prove ~~it~~ it. He merely adds: "Really the matter is so very plain to my mind, that I scarcely know how it can be made plainer." To his mind, he doubtless means to assert, it is plain|true. To our mind it is as plainly not true. Nor can we admit Mr. Pendleton's mere assertion, or his honest persuasion, as sufficient evidence against our own conviction as to a matter of fact. But Mr. Pendleton assumes

that when you invite a Pedobaptist to preach in your pulpit, the people understand you as endorsing his character, moral, ecclesiastical, and ministerial. Here we have another mere assertion; and as one assertion is as good as another, we assert that the people understand no such thing. A thousand times over they have been informed of our sentiments on these subjects. Shall we be told that the people cannot understand the truth? We trust not.

Mr. Pendleton further says: "Our refusal to commune with Pedobaptists grows out of the fact that they are unbaptized and are out of the church. We say they have no right to commune as unbaptized persons. Pedobaptists however have as much rights to commune unbaptized as they have to preach unbaptized." p. 16.

The truth is, no right exists, or can ever be claimed in the premises. I submit to every man of intelligence whether a Pedobaptist or Baptist either has any right to commune at the Lord's table in any church at all except that particular one of which he is individually a member. A Baptist even has no right of claim to commune in any other Baptist church than his own. This is sufficiently apparent from the fact that if present at a communion abroad, he always waits to be invited. If an invitation be extended he may accept it. It is wholly a matter of courtesy, and not of right. Baptist ministers have no right to preach in any Baptist church but their own. They have a right to preach there, but in no other churches. As to other churches, their

right is limited by their invitation to preach. Strangely confused seems to be the mind of Mr. Pendleton where he talks about the right of Pedobaptists to preach and to commune in Baptist churches. It is absolute nonsense. But the greatest and most fatal error into which Mr. Pendleton has fallen in his Landmark discussion, remains to be noticed. He takes, as the basis of his argument, a Pedobaptist proposition, which lies at the very foundation of nearly all the evils with which unhappily they have afflicted the world. This Pedobaptist doctrine assumes the existence of a universal visible church upon earth, with an actual government, officers and ordinances! In his simplicity the gentleman says: "By reference to what I have written you will see that Dr. Griffin, a celebrated Pedobaptist has furnished the premises from which my conclusion is drawn." p. 53. These premises he states as follows: "Baptism is the initiatory ordinance which introduces us into the visible church." p. 4. How largely this idea of a universal, visible church, enters into this discussion may readily be seen by a glance at the book. The church, the visible church, the visible church of Christ; are terms which are continually occurring! He says: "Who can be a minister of Christ according to the gospel without belonging to the church?" p. 12. Again, "Now if Pedobaptist ministers do not belong to the church of Christ, they ought not to be recognized as ministers of Christ." p. 13. And Again, "Our refusal to commune with Pedobaptists grows out of the fact that they are unbaptized, and out of the church." p. 42. Now what church is this?

Plainly the church meant by Dr. Griffin, a universal visible church upon earth. The doctrine that teaches the existence of such a church, Mr. Pendleton tells us himself, furnished the premises upon which he has drawn his Landmark conclusions. This idea of a universal, visible church, upon which he rests his argument is the very worst, and most mischievous of all Pedobaptist perversions of gospel teaching. To adopt these is recognizing Pedobaptist ministers with a vengeance.

And yet in the midst of all this, the Professor seems to labor under a confused idea that something was wrong about it. He says: "There is no universal, visible church, and if the universal visible church, composed of all the saved, has what D. E. calls "form," it is impossible to know what it is. We have no idea of form apart from visibility." p. 42.

"Put" now "this and that together" and what is the result? If there is a universal, visible church, and upon this assumption he tells us that he has based his argument, then Baptist doctrine on the whole subject of Church Order, is egregiously wrong, and Mr. Pendleton has forsaken it, and placed himself upon the Pedobaptist foundation. If "there is no universal visible church," and Mr. Pendleton himself declares there is none, then he has confessedly based his Landmark argument upon a fiction, and it is not surprising that it is, as we have seen pervaded throughout with confusion and nonsense. In either case our erudite Professor stands before the world in no enviable light. He is a teacher of

Theology, of Baptist Theology, in our Gravesite Union University!

We need not pause here to explain the teaching of the word of God on this subject. We may say briefly however, in passing, that the scriptures speak of the kingdom of Christ upon earth, and the churches of Christ upon earth. These however, are by no means identical, and must not be confounded together.

The kingdom of Christ upon earth is purely spiritual. It is consequently invisible. All those persons are subjects of this kingdom in whose hearts Christ reigns as supreme Ruler and Lord. Every one who is regenerated by the Spirit of God, is legitimately and truly a member of the invisible kingdom of Christ. All such persons will be saved whether baptized or not, or whether in or out of a visible church. A visible church is a congregation of believing men and women, organized for the worship of God, and assembling for that end in one place. Each congregation of this character is a visible church of our Lord Jesus Christ. Into this kingdom of Christ - the invisible church - baptism initiates no one. Membership in the kingdom is the result of regeneration. This kingdom has been in the world from the beginning; all who are connected with it will be saved, it has no earthly organization, head, government, officers, nor ordinances; and it never will be a visible church until all its members are assembled in heaven. Visible churches on earth are the multitudes of

congregations scattered everywhere, each one of which is a distinct church, and responsible to no other, but only to Christ its head. Baptism initiates members of the invisible kingdom into these visible churches. They are organized for aggressive purposes, to destroy sin, and extend the dominion of Messiah; they are designed to include the invisible kingdom, but do not, because of the imperfections and errors of men by whom their ordinances and government are administered. Some of these churches are more or less perfectly organized. They all love the same Saviour, are governed by the same laws, and observe the same ordinances, and these constitute the only bond which unites them together. Whether any visible churches exist that are perfect in their organization we shall not now inquire. Nor shall we attempt to determine at what point of deterioration a church ceases to be a visible church of Christ. It is very certain that many join our visible churches who have no connection with the spiritual kingdom of Christ; and it is equally certain that many persons are really in the spiritual kingdom of Christ, who never unite with any visible church; it follows that union with one does not necessarily imply union with the other. Those who do not belong to the invisible, spiritual kingdom, cannot legitimately belong to any visible church. They may be baptized, and receive all the other ordinances, but this does not change the fact. Those who do belong to the spiritual kingdom may be misled, and never unite with any visible church, yet they will be saved, "so as by fire." The universal invisible kingdom - call it church

if you wish - is composed of all the saved, and will not assume its perfect form until it is assembled in the last day. A church composed of all the saved must contain multitudes who never were baptized, unless the old Popish doctrine be true, which perverts and reverses the gospel order of things, that no one can be saved without baptism, nor obtain admission to the kingdom of heaven above, but through the ordinances, and administrations of a visible church upon earth. That Mr. Pendleton, a professed Baptist, a preacher, and a teacher of Theology should have failed to comprehend this subject, is disputable, and that while laboring to detach us from a seeming approval of some Pedobaptist perversions of truth, he should himself have tumbled into the very vortex of Pedobaptist error, is outrageous.

Mr. Pendleton closes his discussion by an appeal to your sympathies. He is very positive, and very dogmatic. He enters upon his work with the bearing of a martyr. Like that of another great men yet living, his mission is of boundless importance. Mr. President Alexander Campbell was called of God to "Restore the ancient Gospel!" Mr. Professor James ^{Madison?} Monroe Pendleton is called of God to "Restore the ancient Landmark!" Their missions are strikingly similar and suggestive. We have already lived long enough to see that to the churches in the Southwest, the latter has resulted in calamities more destructive than those which attended the former. Mr. Pendleton is very severe in his inadversions upon "the unscriptural chairty" of those who differ from him.

He tells us that he expects a rigorous judgment from men, but appeals from it to the judgment of God, without intimating that they are entitled to a similar appeal. He finally protests that he expects to be stigmatized as a bigot, but is willing to bear the stigma, until it shall be effaced by the friendly hand of death. In much of all this, we cannot but think that he is mistaken. Intelligent men regard him as a weak man of confused ideas, whose sin consists mainly in his having lent himself to accomplish the interested purposes of Mr. G. R. Graves, who put him, unqualified as he was, into the Theological Professorship of Union University, that he might avail himself of his position to make money out of his Landmark book, and which he has done most effectually. Mr. Pendleton is well known to be a man of great self-conceit, excessive stubbornness, very belligerent, and of a bitter spirit. He has therefore, always lived in the midst of moral storm. Apart from these considerations his Landmark book would excite pity, rather than any other feeling. The book itself is simply contemptible.

We have thus briefly subjected this famous book, as a logical and scriptural production to a fair and candid analysis, and seen that in all important respects it is essentially wanting; that the question with which it sets out, is not the question discussed; that the question substituted for it is equally indefinite with the former, and whether either or both, be answered affirmatively, or negatively, decides nothing as to the truth or falsehood of the position claimed

as the Landmark; that the premises from which he derives his Landmark conclusions are the monstrous Pedobaptist error of a universal, visible church upon earth; and that the Landmark itself is simply the assumption that if a Baptist shall invite a Pedobaptist to preach in his pulpit, or shall exchange pulpits with him, that he thereby endorses the scriptural character of his baptism, his church membership, his ordination, and his authority to administer ordinances; and that this proposition, which is the only one in dispute, and the truth of which we earnestly deny, he has asserted only, and not sustained by a single proof or argument. Three things in relation to this work have surprised us exceedingly. The first is that such a book should have been sent forth by a man who has the charge of young men as a teacher in a Theological school; the second is that fifteen thousand copies of it should have been read by an intelligent and discriminating people; and the third is, that so many pious Christians should have been carried away by it, and become so fiery against their brethren who cannot receive the doctrine it teaches, as to divide and destroy the churches. Never perhaps has a cause intrinsically so feeble, resulted in disasters so lamentable as the Landmark.

We here dismiss this book, with the painful consciousness that it has done in the Southwest an amount of injury that all our best efforts cannot repair in fifty years; not on account of any merit in the book itself, for we have seen

that it has none; but in consequence of the perculiar advocacy it has received. It inaugurated at its very inception, a period of fiery denunciation, individual pro- scription, and personal assaults, and detraction, whoãly foreign to the religion of Christ, and which while in the estimation of good men, it was disgraceful to our people, has brought upon us the frowns of God. It is not enough however, to have shown as we now have clearly, that this book is an argument fallacious, deceptive, and unworthy of respect. We proceed to make it apparent that the theory which it inaugurated is impracticable, false, un- scriptural, and ãestructive of all the interests, among us, of the cause of Christ.

1. The theory which the Landmark inaugurates is impracticable.

The Landmarkers hold that to invite Pedobaptists to preach in your pulpit is as inconsistent as it would be to invite them to sit down with you at the Lord's table. If this be so, it cannot be less inconsistent for Baptists to preach by their invitation in Pedobaptist pulpits, since there is little difference between your going with them to their com- munion, and your taking them to yours. In the light of these facts, look at the practice of Mr. Pendleton himself. During the session of the last General Association held in Nashville, the one preceding the explosion of that body at Lebanon, he preached in one of the Presbyterian churches in that city. He has done the same thing in various other places. Thus he abjures one-half of his Landmark. Not long after this even, a Methodist Annual Conference was held in Mur- freesboro. At that time, Mr. Pendleton was himself the

pastor of the Baptist Church there. To this conference his pulpit was tendered. It was accepted, and, during the meeting occupied by Methodist ministers. In this act, he abjured the other half of his Landmark. Yet he insists that you shall conform your practice to its teachings. It will be said however, that those were special occasions. Very true. But if, as Landmarkers maintain, "The principle of table and pulpit communion is the same," why do not these gentlemen go to the Pedobaptist communion table, and receive them at theirs, on special occasions? It is indeed only on special occasions that Pedobaptists are in this quarter, ever invited to preach in Baptist pulpits. Do they except these special occasions as times when it is not wrong to do what other times it would be wrong to do? Then it is not wrong on special occasions to go to Pedobaptist communion tables, or to receive them to yours. If it be not wrong at one time to go into Pedobaptist pulpits, or to receive them into yours, it is not wrong at another. If it be wrong at one time, it is wrong at all times. They maintain by their practice that it is not wrong on special occasions. If so, then plainly it is not wrong on any occasion. Their practice falsifies their doctrine. They are contending for nothing.

2. The theory maintained by the Landmark is false. This has, we think, been already so clearly shown that no additional arguments are needed. We will only therefore, here remark that we never can approve of the old Popish spirit

of proscription that every where characterizes the Landmark. The disciples of this new school evidently act upon the principle that because some Christians are deceived, and misled, we must withdraw from them all courtesy, and denounce and insult them, as the means of bringing them to truth and righteousness! This is a most miserable policy. The principles that lead to it are false.

3. The theory of the Landmark is unscriptural.

Mr. Pendleton says, in the book before us, "Let it be supposed that there were persons in apostolic times corresponding to modern Pedobaptists. Can any Baptist believe that Paul would have recognized the ministers of such sects as the ministers of Christ? Surely not." "He would have said to these ministers, Will ye not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" p. 14. Happily we are not left to conjecture as to what Paul would have said. We know what he did say in regard to a case similar to that supposed by our Professor. On a memorable occasion he expresses himself thus to the church at Philippi: -

"I would that you should understand brethren, that the things which happened unto me, have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel; so that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places; and many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear. Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and some of good will. The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds; but the other of love; knowing that I

am sit for the defense of the gospel. What then? Notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice."

But a greater than Paul has expressed himself on this subject. Let us hear him:

"John answered him saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us, and we forbade him because he followeth not us. But Jesus said; Forbid him not, for there is no man who shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me." - Mark 9:4,9.

In these extracts we have the Landmark of Christ and his apostles. This we take to be the "Old Baptist Landmark," and it continued to be up to the time of this new discovery by our Theological Professor, which seems to have been made and advocated especially for the benefit of Mr. Graves. This Pendleton Landmark is plainly another Landmark, and not that laid down in the word of God. The disciples forbade the ministry of certain men, who did not follow them, and so reported to their master. Christ reversed their decision, and gave as his reason that these men were not against him, but for him. Shall we now forbid such men? If we do, will our conduct be scriptural? Paul rejoiced when Christ was preached, even by those who were not his friends, but man, in part, at least, actuated by a spirit of hatred and contention. Shall we now proscribe such men? Would this be scriptural? No, let them, if they will, preach Christ. We lament their errors; we will, if we can, refute and coneract

them. We will seek to win them to the whole truth; but we will not denounce, and so alienate them, and thus destroy our own power to do them any good. In so far as they preach Christ we "rejoice, ye, and will rejoice.

4. The Landmark ^{destructive - ?} is distinctive among us of all the best interests of religion.

Those who receive its principles are inflated by them into pride and selfishness and thus most seriously injured. They injure those upon whom attempts are made to impose their Landmark by initiating them, and destroying their brotherly love, and Christian enjoyment. They injure us all by destroying our spirituality on the one hand, and on the other by calling our thoughts perpetually to formalities, churchism and externals generally. They cut off our approach to our erring brethren of other denominations and completely frustrate all our attempts to lead them in the scriptural paths of truth and duty. Their appearance of illiberality takes away from us the sympathy of intelligent men of the world, and thus closes against us the door of usefulness. These are enormous evils, but they are the least of those with which the Landmark has afflicted us.

The labors of our ministry have, as we saw in the last chapter, ceased in this quarter to produce any salutary results. And what effect has the Landmark had upon our denominational schools, male and female, in Middle Tennessee, and North Alabama? Ten years since we had many, and they were all prosperous. Where are they now? Except a female school at Winchester, belonging to Z. E. Graves, a brother

of J. R. Graves, a pet of the reformers, and specially of the Tennessee Baptists. They have all gone down. Not one of them remains. Even Union University, which they had completely subsidized to their purposes is no more. It sleeps the sleep of death. It may be said that the war had much to do in destroying these schools. It had something to do with destroying the Female Academy in Murfreesborough, and the Burnett College, but Union University was hopelessly bankrupt and breathing its last when the war came, and could have existed, under any circumstances only a few months longer. The others were all overthrown before the war commenced. The Landmark destroyed them.

And wher are our pastors, the men of cultivation, piety, and influence in Middle Tennessee? We have seen in a former chapter that they are all gone. Not a single man of weight, or power out of the city of Nashville remains; nor are their places supplied, or likely to be supplied. The whole field is now utterly abandoned to the Landmarkers. And not a few of them, forsaken by their congregations, and starved out by their churches have followed those whom they had before driven from the country.

At Lebanon in 1858, our missionary organizations were broken up and destroyed, since which time not fifty dollars have been contributed by all the Landmarkers in Middle Tennessee to any of the purposes of the Southern Baptist Convention. Indeed as a body they have become hostile to the Convention. In 1859 the Concord Association took

measures to divide the churches, and fully consummated the schism which had been forming itself for eight, or ten years.

Thus have we seen that the Landmark, while it is impracticable, false and unscriptural, is utterly destructive of all the true interests of the religion of Christ. Unhappily the truth of all this is but too deeply impressed upon us by the terrible desolations that now surround us on every side. Ten years ago the garden of the Lord was blooming and beautiful. Now it is a solitary wilderness. The only verdant spot is the city of Nashville, in which, notwithstanding the residence here of Mr. Graves, Landmarkism never had any influence.

But enough and too much of this "Old Landmark Reset." It had its origin in false doctrine, selfish purposes, and bad logic. Yet its friends would persuade us that in its advocacy they believe themselves doing God's service. And so did Saul of Tarsus, when he was persecuting the people of God, and making havoc of his churches. Desolation has followed the steps of the Landmarkers, ~~whenever~~ ^{wherever} they have gone. What is to be the result in future years? God only known. Whether it is to expire in the storm of civil war that now overwhelms us, or whether when that is passed away, it is to go on in its blighting career, the future only can reveal. Baptists in Tennessee have been ever since the state was settled, the easy victims of religious demagogues. First they were agitated, and divided on the doctrine of Divine Sovereignty; then on the doctrine of ~~the~~ Parker; next came

Campbellism; then missions; and now Landmarkism! Storm after storm has swept over the churches in quick succession. Any, it seems, who can get up a novelty and has sufficient unscrupulousness, can lash our people into a fury. When shall we have wisdom and piety enough to resist successfully these endless innovations? For ourselves, we protest that we are not Antinomian Baptists, nor Free Will Baptists, nor Old School Baptists, nor Campbellite Baptists, nor Landmark Baptists, but what we have ever been Baptists of the old apostolic stamp, taking the Bible as our exclusive guide, loving all who love Christ and ready always to do what we can to reclaim the erring and to save the lost. The treatment proper for ~~Redo~~Baptist preachers, may, as we believe, be safely left to the churches, where it of right belongs, and when after all it must be left under the guidance of the word and Spirit of God. These churches may err on the side of a mistaken charity; they may precipitate themselves into a proscriptive bigotry, but a praying Christian heart will by the grace of God, eventually lead them safely out of all extremes. This Old Landmark is a deceptive guide. To those who have not been deceived, and carried away by it, we recommend the True Guide, the word of God, carefully studied and sedulously followed with earnest prayer, in the spirit of peace, humility, and love.