

## Old Landmarkism – What is it?

### Chapter 8 – 30 Minutes

#### Objections and Difficulties to Non-Intercommunion Noticed

Logic: Objections are Not arguments unless insuperable.

--- Insuperable: That which cannot be overcome or surmounted.

#### Objection

Should the Churches return to the strict practice, many ministers who are now pastoring four or five Churches could Not commune with the Churches they serve and for which they administer the supper.

- Christ ordained that each Church should have its own pastor like:

--- Each wife should have her own husband

--- Each flock should have its own shepherd

- If a Church is unable to support its own pastor, it should Not form as such

- A scripturally ordained minister could administer without exercising privilege

--- Only members have the right to vote in business and participate in supper

--- Such a pastor has No right to vote on receiving a member – same with supper

#### Scripture - Advocates Use to Support the Objection

[Act 20:7] And upon the first [day] of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.

- Comparison of this verse to Mark 10:14-16 [book cites verse 14] which are used by Pedobaptists to support the idea that the Lord endorses the practice of baptizing infants. Verse 16 is provided here:

--- [Mar 10:16] And He took them up in His arms, put [His] hands upon them, and blessed them.

--- To prove the Pedobaptist position, the word “blessed” change to “baptized”

- Likewise, notice in Acts 20:7 would have to say Paul and Luke also ate bread

#### Side Note

Attempts to use practice of Apostles and first ministers to support current work

- These examples should Not be quoted as proof to do so today

- No one is justified to preach and baptize now without endorsement of Church

--- Attempting to call on John the Baptist as an example holds No support

--- Attempting to use Philip as an example that deacons can baptize is invalid

--- Acts 19:3-4 disproves John the Baptist example; Acts 21:8 disproves Philip

#### Back to the Acts 20:7 Position

The plain teaching of the book of 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians shows the supper is to be practiced till the Lord returns using one loaf by one Church as one body which is responsible to purge out its own leaven to be able to observe a pure feast.

- Acts 20:7 is the sole support many use to justify the contrary practice

--- Indepth examination is in “Intercommunion; Unscriptural and Inconsistent”

#### Conclusions to Demonstrate there was No Church at Troas in the First Century

1. Acts 16:6-7 shows Paul was forbid by the Holy Ghost to preach there at first

- This is when the advocates say the Church was established there by Paul

2. Rather than opening a door at Troas, it was opened in Greece, Acts 16:9

- It cannot be supposed a door was opened in Greece but Paul disobeyed-Troas

3. Acts 20:5-13 shows no evidence of a Church at Troas

- Brethren traveling to meet Paul were waiting for him at Troas

- No salutation or parting address to them mentioned like at Ephesus, Acts 20:17

4. Only ones mentioned being present were Paul, Luke, and 7 brethren in travel

5. When supper is administered its “to break the loaf” Not “to break bread”

6. 2 Tim 4:13 shows Paul had books and parchments which he left at Troas

- Because they broke bread, Not the “loaf”, they must have been eating a meal

- As they ate this meal, Paul began to reason out of the scriptures

- The word given as “Preach” in vs 7&9, No where else. See Acts 18:4&19.

7. This meal must have been delayed as the group was leaving in the morning

8. Revelation was to THE Seven Churches of Asia, Not seven OF the Churches

9. History confirms there were only seven Churches in Asia in the first century

10. For advocates to hold the supper was held at Troas they must maintain:

- A) It was in direct contradiction to what is taught in the book of 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians.

- B) If without a Church, the supper is a social event and Not a Church ordinance

--- These are the two horns of a dilemma when holding this view of Acts 20:7.

#### **Direct Scriptural Proof Against Inter-Church Communion**

1. Example of false teachers of the law, members at Jerusalem, going to Gentiles

- “...certain which went out from us, have troubled you with words”, Acts 15:24

- “Some who trouble you, and would pervert the gospel”, Gal 1:7

- “If ye be circumcised...a little leaven leaveneth whole lump”, Gal 5:2-9

--- The false doctrine taught by these teachers, Paul called “leaven”

2. How is the Church instructed to respond to such teaching?

- For any who preach other gospel, “...let him be accursed”, Gal 1:8-9

- “I would they were even cut off which trouble you”, Gal 5:12

- “Purge out the old leaven” those who hold false doctrine, 1 Cor 5:7

3. To invite members of sister Churches is to expose us to leaven of others

#### **Conclusions**

1. Intercommunion with those holding diverse beliefs is to profane the supper

2. The supper is a local Church ordinance to be held by its qualified membership

3. Intercommunion between Baptist churches is unscriptural

#### **Questions**

1. Which verse is used to support intercommunion among Baptist churches?

2. How does this compare to what Pedobaptists use to support infant baptism?

3. What do the letters by Paul teach to do to address those holding false beliefs?

4. Briefly explain why Bro Graves believed there was No Church at Troas.

5. What conclusions do you draw from Acts 20:7 regarding intercommunion?