

Robert Darnall

BAPTIST ANSWERS

REVIEWED

By C. R. NICHOL

BAPTIST ANSWERS
REVIEWED

Questions Answered

By H. B. TAYLOR, Missionary Baptist

and

Taylor's "Answers" Reviewed

By C. R. NICHOL



PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS
MRS. C. R. NICHOL, *Publisher*
CLIFTON, TEXAS

BAPTIST ANSWERS REVIEWED

By C. R. Nichol

Mr. H. B. Taylor is pastor of the Missionary Baptist Church in Murray, Kentucky, and editor of *News and Truths*, a Baptist paper which he has published for a number of years. Mr. Taylor has engaged in a number of oral discussions, and is a recognized leader in the Baptist Church.

The following is the full text of a tract which Mr. Taylor publishes, and which has been widely circulated by Baptists. It is my wish that you read his tract.

I do not know who presented the questions Mr. Taylor attempts to answer in the tract. Following is the tract, *verbatim et literatim*.

CAMPBELLITE QUESTIONS AND BAPTIST ANSWERS

Three copies of a little leaflet published by some Campbellite brother have been sent to the writer of late. The leaflet is entitled "Questions for Baptists." At the head of the leaflet is the language of the Apostle Peter exhorting us to "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you with meekness and fear." Believing in the sincerity of those from whom these questions have come, with meekness and yet with delight the writer undertakes to answer these questions.

1. Why are you a Baptist? Because Jesus Christ and all His apostles were Baptists, for they were all baptized by the first Baptist preacher.

2. Where do you find Scriptural authority for wearing the name Baptist? In Matt. 3:1, etc., God called the preacher He sent to prepare the material out of which His Son was to organize His church, a Baptist. The only baptism that ever came from heaven; that God the Father ever sanctioned by audible voice; that the Holy Spirit ever approved by a visible manifestation of His presence; that the Lord Jesus, the King of Glory, ever submitted to was Baptist baptism. All other baptisms came from men. No man has followed Christ in baptism, until like his Lord, he has been baptized by a Baptist preacher.

If Jesus had been baptized to induct Him into the priesthood, it would have been done by a Jewish priest, not a Baptist preacher. The very fact that God sent John to baptize shows that it was something new and not a continuation of an Old Testament rite or ceremony.

3. Can you give chapter and verse? Yes. In Matt. 3:1 God calls the man who baptized Jesus a Baptist. If the Lord Jesus walked sixty miles to get a man, whom His Father called a Baptist to baptize him, that name ought to be good enough for any follower of His.

4. Are the disciples of Christ ever called Baptists in the New Testament?

No. They are simply called churches without any distinguishing names, as all churches then were of one faith and needed no name except the church at Jerusalem or Antioch or Corinth or the churches of Judea or Galatia or Asia. But let the reader bear in mind too that no New Testament church is ever called a Christian church; that the name Baptist came from God, while the name Christian came from the heathen; and that the name Baptist was first used in Judea, during the personal ministry of our Lord, of His forerunner, while the name Christian originated 10 or 12 years after the death of our Lord at the heathen city Antioch.

5. If so, where? Answered above.

6. Is it necessary to be a Baptist in order to be saved? No. Jesus saves, not the church. The blood of Jesus washes away the stains of sin, not baptism, (1 Jno. 1:7). Men become children of God by faith in Christ (Gal. 3:26, Jno. 1:12), not by the natural birth (Rom. 9:8, Jno. 1:13), nor by obedience (Rom. 5:19), nor by works (Rom. 4:5), nor by joining the church (Acts 2:47). Men are born into the family of God by the new birth, but men are not born into the church. Luke says the Lord added to the church daily "those that were saved." Salvation first, then baptism and church-membership.

7. If so, which kind of a Baptist—there are about a dozen different Baptist denominations? No kind at all. A sinner is saved by the blood of Jesus before and without baptism, if saved at all. In Ex. 12:13-28, the blood was applied in Egypt; they were not baptized until three days after at the Red Sea. (Ex. 14:22, 1 Cor. 10:2.) In Rom. 4:1-25 Paul shows that Abraham and David were justified by faith without works; and that Abraham's faith in a crucified and resurrected Christ was the same faith that we have today. You ask how could Abraham's faith be in a crucified and resurrected Christ centuries before His birth? Read Rom. 4:17 where Paul says on that very question: "Even God who quickeneth the dead and CALLETH THOSE THINGS WHICH BE NOT AS THO' THEY WERE."

8. Does believing and obeying the gospel make one a Baptist or simply a Christian? Believing in Christ makes him a Christian; obeying God's command to be baptized God's way makes him a Baptist.

9. Can a man be saved without being a Christian? Millions were saved from Abel's

day on down who were never called Christians. Yet they believed in Christ and in that sense were Christians. No man can be saved without believing in Christ but millions of Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians and others, will be in heaven who never wore the name Christian.

10. Can he be a Christian without becoming a Baptist? Yes, all real Baptists were Christians before they were Baptists. They would have always been Christians had they never become Baptists, for all children of God are Christians, whether they ever belong to any church or are ever baptized. We believe there are Methodist Christians, Campbellite Christians, and lots of other Christians who are not Baptists and never will be. But they are some of the kind that Paul says will be saved yet so as by fire. 1 Cor. 3:10-15.

11. Do the same steps that make one a Christian make him a Baptist too? No. Repentance and faith make him a Christian; but it takes New Testament baptism to make him a Baptist.

12. If the gospel only makes Christians only, does it not require more than the gospel to make Baptists? The Gospel only does not make Christians. Paul said: "Our Gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit and in much assurance," 1 Thess. 1:5. It takes the Gospel and the Holy Spirit to make a man a Christian. It takes a Baptist preacher and a New Testament church to make him a Baptist.

13. If a person can be saved and become a Christian without "joining" the Baptist church, is it not unnecessary—a useless institution? No. A man may be born and live, as a savage used to do, without clothes all his life but that does not prove that clothes are an unnecessary or useless thing. A man may live without hand or foot or eye or ear, but that does not prove that these are useless adjuncts to a man's anatomy. Baptist churches are the most important institutions in this world; for without them the truth would fall to the ground, as they are the pillar and ground of the truth. 1 Tim. 3:15. Baptist churches are useless institutions? Nay, verily. They are the pillar and ground of the once delivered faith. They are the custodians of the ordinances (1 Cor. 11:2). They are the only institutions that are divine on this earth. Without them Matt. 16:18 has failed of fulfillment. Baptist churches are the only institutions on this earth of which the Lord Jesus is Head and who carry out his last commission as He gave it. (Matt. 28:19 20 R. V.) Baptist churches do not save anybody; but Baptist churches are the only churches on this earth that receive no one but the saved into their membership. Baptist churches will not take anyone to heaven but a failure to belong to a Baptist church will cause many saved people to be "called the least in the kingdom of heaven," when they get there because of their wilful disobedience to the plain commands of their Lord. (Matt. 5:19). Alexander Campbell said in his debate with Mr. McCalla: "From the Apostolic age to the present time, the sentiments of Baptists and their practice of baptism have had a continued chain of advocates, and public monuments of their existence in every century can be produced." If Mr. Campbell told the truth, then this world would be without New Testament baptism and New Testament Churches, if it were not for the Baptists. Mr. Campbell was not a Baptist when he used those words.

14. And if no reference to the Baptist church can be found in the New Testament, is it not an unscriptural institution without Bible authority for its existence? Wrong again, Beloved. There were no other churches in New Testament days but Baptist churches. As A. Campbell well and truly said: "The church at Jerusalem was a Baptist church; the church at Samaria was a Baptist church."

15. Is not the Baptist church a human organization deriving its name from, and built upon, the ordinance of baptism? No. The name Baptist came from heaven, for God called John a Baptist. Baptist churches are built upon the one true and tried foundation, Jesus Christ, that the gates of hell cannot shake.—Matt. 16:18.

16. How then can it be the "household of God" or church of the New Testament, which is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone? Easily. Baptists alone claim Jesus Christ as the Founder and Head of their churches. All others have human heads and human founders. Baptists alone demand that every one received into their fellowship shall acknowledge the Lordship of Jesus and that He is Head over all things to His churches today. Campbellites have ruling elders usurping the Headship of Christ; and invest their ministry with episcopal authority in receiving members, thereby destroying the democracy and brotherhood of their members. Baptists only acknowledge the headship of Christ in all things.

17. If John the Baptist founded the Baptist church, are not Baptists the disciples of John, instead of Christ? No indeed. John did not found anything. He only prepared the material out of which the Lord Jesus built His own church. No Baptist contends that John founded a church. Jesus did that Himself.

18. As Baptists claim to take the Bible as their rule of faith and practice, why do they persist in such unscriptural teaching and practice as the following:

(1). Exhort sinners to the "mourners' bench" to "get religion"? Most of them don't do it. Those who do, do so for the same reason that Philip joined himself to the chariot of the Ethiopian Eunuch, namely, to instruct or teach the sinner how to be saved.

(2). Declare "feelings" to be the evidence of sins forgiven? Because God says so. God says we know we have passed from death unto life because we love. Love is more than feeling, but love has "feelings"; and the man who loves, feels it. We believe in a salvation that is better felt than told, too. The child of God can feel a peace that passeth understanding, a joy unspeakable, and a love that passeth knowledge, but he can't tell the height nor depth nor length nor breadth of any of these experiences. We are sure we know some Campbellites, who have the same kind of salvation we have, namely, one they can feel; and we are awfully sorry for the rest of them, who haven't got that kind.

(3). Insist that we are justified by faith alone—that baptism has nothing to do with remission of sins, that it in nowise concerns our salvation? Right there our good Campbellite friend gets down to the milk in the coconut. Baptists teach that we are saved before and without baptism; while Campbellites teach no baptism, no salvation. This man is honest enough to teach old-fashioned Campbellism, which some of them now try to deny. Baptists don't connect baptism with the procuring or appropriating or the assurance of sal-

vation as do real Campbellites because to do so would make salvation or the new birth to depend on "the will of the flesh" (i. e. the will of the man himself) and the "will of man" (i. e. the will of the baptizer), when in John 1:13 Jesus Christ says plainly that the new birth is neither of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man. We don't connect baptism with salvation because the one book in the New Testament written to sinners, the Gospel of John, does not mention baptism in connection with the instruction given by Jesus Christ to any inquirer. It does mention faith every time. Baptists do not connect baptism with salvation because they believe that salvation depends wholly upon the finished work of Christ, which don't need to be plussed by any sacrament of church or priest. As H. T. Anderson well said, "Baptism for the remission of sins is essentially Romish." Baptists wear none of the toggery or tinsel of Rome. Campbellites get their church salvation, baptismal regeneration, baptism for (in order to) the remission of sins, making baptism and communion sacraments that confer grace on those who receive them, their weekly communion and their one man reception of members from the Roman Catholic church, not from the Bible.

(4). Invite people to join the Baptist church? For the same reason that Paul attempted to join the church in Jerusalem, namely, because they can't get in without joining. Acts 9:26.

(5). Call the church together to hear people relate their experience and then vote as to whether or not they are fit subjects for baptism? Because the apostles so practiced. Acts 10:47. Because Paul taught the churches to do so. Rom. 14:1, and 2 Cor. 2:3-8. And also because Baptist churches are pure democracies, and the only way to ascertain the will of a democracy is by a vote. Monarchies, oligarchies, plutocracies, bureaucracies, and aristocracies can settle things by ruling elders, or a bishop or a pastoral boss, but democracies let the people vote to settle things.

(6). Baptize into Baptist church? Because Paul said: "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body," 1 Cor. 12:13. The church at Corinth was a body of Christ, 1 Cor. 12:27. Every local Baptist church on earth today is a body of Christ. He has no other kind on this earth today. We baptize people into Baptist churches because God told us to do so.

(7). Close communion, etc., etc.? We teach close communion, etc., whatever etc. includes, because the Scriptures so teach. A. Campbell said open communion is both unreasonable and unscriptural. So said J. W. McGarvey and all other Campbellites of recognized scholarship. 1 Cor. 11:18-20 shows conclusively that if there are sects or divisions or heresies present at the Lord's table you can't eat the supper. God's alternative is close communion or none at all.

19. Where in the New Testament do you find authority for these things? All Scripture references bearing on doctrine, polity or ordinances of the New Testament churches plainly teach that the once-delivered faith is the faith now taught and practiced by the Baptists. Given an open Bible and an open mind and heart and a Baptist will be the sure result.

20. Baptists are unscriptural in name, doctrine and practice, why be a Baptist? Wrong again, neighbor. I am a Baptist because they are scriptural in origin, name, doctrine, faith and practice. The first New Testament preacher was a Baptist preacher. The material out of which Jesus Christ organized His church was prepared by this Baptist preacher and was therefore Baptist material. The church organized by Jesus Christ out of this material was a Baptist church. The only time all three of the persons of the Godhead ever manifested their presence on earth was at a Baptist baptism. Matt. 3:13. No man could be one of the 12 except one who was baptized by the first Baptist preacher. Acts 1:21-22.

The only churches that have stood from the promise in Matt. 16:18 to this good hour have been Baptist churches. As Ypeij and Dermout, who were not Baptists, well said: "Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the apostles, and, as a Christian society, has preserved pure the doctrine of the Gospel through all ages." I am a Baptist because the New Testament is a Baptist book written by Baptists, for Baptists and to Baptists; and put in the hands of an open minded inquirer it will make a Baptist out of him. I am a Baptist because the great commission is a Baptist document. Translated into everyday English it means: Go, make Christians by preaching Christ; make Baptists of those Christianized by baptizing them the New Testament way; and then make these baptized Christians well rounded Missionary Baptists by indoctrination.

I am a Baptist because Baptist churches are the only ones that come up to the following tests of the New Testament churches; founded by the Lord Jesus Himself; with an unbroken perpetuity and a wilderness history; Christ the only Law giver, Head and Lord; doctrinal conformity to the New Testament model; missionary activities; and being the sect everywhere spoken against.

With "meekness and fear," and yet with cordial good will and sincere regard for all with whom we differ, we have given an answer to the questions asked as to the once delivered faith. If God should use it to bring one honest inquirer to the unity of the faith and the fitly joining of such an one to a body of Christ or for the establishing in the faith of some who are already in that body, we shall be greatly rejoiced; for as John said: "I have no greater joy than to see God's children walking in the truth."

In the review of the foregoing tract you will find that my observations correspond with the numbers as they appear in the tract.

No. 1. If having been baptized by a Baptist makes one a Baptist, and the apostles "were all baptized by the first Baptist

preacher," it follows that Judas was a Baptist, for he was an apostle. (Mt. 10:4.) But Mr. Taylor says, "all real Baptists were Christians before they were Baptists." It follows then, according to Taylor, that Judas was a Christian.

Is it not about time for Taylor to come to the defense of Baptist doctrine that a Christian cannot fall from grace and be lost, for according to his doctrine Judas was a Christian? Is it possible that he will contend that Judas is not lost, even though he betrayed the Lord, and was guilty of self-murder? (Mt. 27:3-5.)

If it is true that "all real Baptists were Christians before they were Baptists," and also true that "it takes a Baptist preacher and a New Testament church to make him a Baptist," and true that the apostles became Baptists by being baptized by John; then one can be a Baptist without believing in Christ; for the ones baptized by John did not believe in Christ at the time John baptized them. When Paul went to Ephesus (Acts 19:1-5), "and found certain disciples: and he said unto them, Did ye receive the Holy Spirit when ye believed? And they said unto him, Nay, we did not so much as hear whether the Holy Spirit was given. And he said, Into what then were ye baptized? And they said, Into John's baptism. And Paul said, John baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him that should come after him, that is, on Jesus." If Taylor is correct in saying that those baptized by John, became, by that baptism, Baptists, then they were Baptists without believing on Jesus. And, if Mr. Taylor is correct in saying "all real Baptists were Christians before they were Baptists," then those baptized by John were Christians, though they did not believe on Jesus. Such is the position one is forced to take in the effort to defend Baptist doctrine. With Mr. Taylor the faith, or lack of faith, has nothing to do with one being a Baptist. If those Paul found at Ephesus who had been baptized "into John's baptism" were Baptists, they sadly needed instruction, and Paul taught them, and then baptized them "into the name of the Lord Jesus."

Mr. Taylor says: "We baptize people into Baptist churches." If such is true, and John was the first Baptist preacher, and administered the same baptism Mr. Taylor does, then John baptized people "into Baptist churches." But Taylor says John DID NOT "baptize people into Baptist churches," for he says the Baptist Church was not in existence in the days of John—John "only prepared the material out of which the Lord Jesus built his own church." If Baptist preachers "baptize people into Baptist churches" now, it is certain they do not administer the baptism John administered, for John DID NOT "baptize people into Baptist churches."

Mr. Taylor says: "It takes a Baptist preacher and a New Testament church to make him a Baptist." Yet he says there was not a Baptist Church in the world in the days of John the

Baptist. Just how Jesus and the apostles were made Baptists without there being a New Testament church Taylor does not tell. If "Jesus Christ and all his apostles were Baptists" because "they were all baptized by the first Baptist preacher"—without there being a "New Testament Church" in the world, and it now "takes a Baptist preacher and a New Testament church to make him a Baptist," people are not now made Baptists like Jesus and the apostles were made Baptists. When was the process of making Baptists changed? Let Baptists be done with the claim that Jesus and the apostles were Baptists in the sense Baptists now use the term "Baptists".

No. 2. Jehovah, by an angel, announced to Zacharias, the father of John, that the child should be called "John". When they came to circumcise the child, and desired to call his name Zacharias, after his father, his mother protested, saying: "Not so; but he shall be called John." (Luke 1:50-63.) God called his name "John". Taylor says: "God called the preacher he sent to prepare the material out of which his Son was to organize his church, a Baptist." Thus does Mr. Taylor begin the defense of the Baptist Church with an assertion, an unwarranted assertion. He declares that God called John "a Baptist". He did no such—God did not call John "a Baptist". John was called "THE Baptist". He was "THE Baptist" because he was in a class by himself—he baptized. The term "THE Baptist" distinguished John from all other men at that time, for he was the ONLY man baptizing. That he baptized Christ is true, but that Christ was called a Baptist is NOT true, neither were his disciples called Baptists. That they were Baptists, in the sense that Taylor uses that term is no more than an assertion. John was not a Baptist by reason of having been baptized by a Baptist, but for the reason that he baptized people he was called "the Baptist". Since John was not made a Baptist by being baptized by a Baptist preacher, why is it thought that because John baptized people such baptism made those baptized by him Baptists? If one should grant that those baptized "into John's baptism" were by virtue of such baptism made Baptists, what was the trouble with those Paul found at Ephesus? They had received "John's baptism," and if John's baptism made Baptists of people, these people were certainly Baptists. The baptism administered by John is the baptism on which Taylor and other Baptists rest their claims that there is a "Baptist Church". But when Paul found these people who had received "John's baptism" he taught them, and then baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus. If they were Baptists because of "John's baptism", and are of the same sort as Baptists today, Paul would teach all Baptists to be baptized "into the name of the Lord Jesus". Taylor says "all real Baptists were Christians before they were Baptists". It follows then, that if "John's baptism" makes Baptists, then these people Paul found at Ephesus were Christians before they were baptized "into John's baptism". Would it not be interesting to hear some

Baptist tell what the baptism administered by Paul made of these people in Ephesus? If "John's baptism" made Baptists, as Taylor affirms; since these people in Ephesus who had been baptized "into John's baptism" were by Paul baptized again, did this make them Baptists twice over—or Baptist Baptist? Just so certain as Taylor is right in contending that "John's baptism" made Baptists, just that certain is it that these people in Ephesus were Baptists; and it is just as certain that the Apostle Paul taught them, and baptized them again. If John's baptism did not make Baptists of these people in Ephesus, by what authority is it claimed that "John's baptism" made anyone a Baptist?

Taylor contends that those baptized by John were thereby made Baptists, and that such people were the ones out of which Christ built his church. If they were Baptists BEFORE the church was established, and Taylor declares they were, would it not be amusing to hear Taylor answer: Do Baptists make the church, or does the church make Baptists? Is there a Baptist in all the world now who is not a member of the Baptist Church? If not, how is that, according to Taylor, there were Baptists then, when there was not a Baptist Church?

God called the name of the man who baptized Jesus "John". He was afterwards called "John the Baptist" because he baptized people. The term "the Baptist" became a descriptive title. A "Baptist" is one who baptizes. It is inexcusable for one of Mr. Taylor's information to designate a body of people "Baptists", when the greater number of them have never baptized anyone. John did baptize people, but the fact that he baptized people no more made "Baptists" of those baptized than the surgeon operating on the patient makes the patient a surgeon. The word "Baptist," in the term "John the Baptist," is from the Greek word *Baptistees*, and is defined: "A baptizer; one who administers the rite of baptism"—Thayer. Mr. Taylor, in talking of the action of baptism, is loud in his claim that *baptizo* means to "immerse," and that *baptistees* means an "immerser;" that the term "John the Baptist"—(Greek, *Ionnes o Baptistees*), literally translated would read, "John the Immerser". Should we adopt what Mr. Taylor says is the correct translation of the term, and follow his method of reasoning, it would be the "Immerser Church".

The following letter and reply is in point:

Pensacola, Fla., 3-24-25.

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,
Louisville, Ky.

(Attention, Prof. of Greek.)

Dear Sir:

Will you please advise me if the words *Ioannes o Baptistees* (Mt. 3:1), rendered in American Standard Version "John the Baptist", would be correctly rendered, "John the Immerser"?

Thanking you for the information, I am,

Fraternally,

C. W. Landers.

The following is the reply:

My Dear Sir:

The term can be correctly translated "John the Immerser".

Sincerely yours,

W. H. Davis,

Associate Prof. of N. T. Interpretation.

The baptism of John was a "baptism of repentance unto remission of sins". (Mark 1:4.) The work of the apostles under the Great Commission was not a continuation of John's baptism. Their work was in the name of Christ, and submitting to the baptism they administered was an acknowledgment of Jesus as Lord. Said Christ: "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Mt. 28:18, 19.) This is a baptism John did not, and could not administer. Mr. Taylor, in his zeal for Baptist doctrine, says: "The only baptism that ever came from heaven * * * was Baptist Baptism." This he says relative to "John's baptism". The ones at Ephesus who had received "John's baptism" were taught by Paul and then they were "baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus". The baptism they received at the hand of Paul was not "John's baptism". If Taylor is right in his statement the baptism administered by Paul was not from heaven!

No. 3 is discussed in the foregoing.

No. 4 and 5. It is refreshing for Mr. Taylor to state a fact. The question is: "Are disciples of Christ ever called Baptists in the New Testament?" To this he answers: "No." In the New Testament the disciples of Christ were never called "Baptists", nor were the ones baptized by John called "Baptists". To call people by a name unknown in New Testament times cannot be a scriptural practice. Calling disciples of Christ "Baptists" is an unscriptural practice. The name "Baptist" grew out of the practice of immersing people, and only the ones who immersed were called Baptists, but later the practice of calling those who taught that people should be immersed, rather than having water sprinkled on them for baptism were denominated "Baptists"—solely because of the practice of immersion. In history the idea carried by the term "Baptist" was that such people rejected infant baptism, and immersed people. Taylor admits that disciples were not called Baptists, and says they are simply "called churches without any distinguishing name". Such is not true. The disciples were not called churches—without distinguishing terms; and I am persuaded Taylor knows such is not true. He was seeking to hide the issue. He knew the import of the question, and too, he knows he did not answer it, nor did

he attempt to answer it. There were religious organizations in the days of the apostles, other than the church of Christ. There existed then the Jewish Church, as well as churches of the heathens. But Taylor insists that no distinguishing term was used, that God's people were simply called "churches". Then, says Taylor, there was but one true church and distinguishing terms were not needed. Mr. Taylor, if the Baptist Church is the true church, and has always been the true church, why do you now attach the distinguishing term "Baptist" to it? Why not say "church"? Taylor says no name was needed, it was the "church at Jerusalem or Antioch or Corinth". Why is it that men will try to hide the truth by false statements? Paul writes: To the "church of God which is at Corinth". (1 Cor. 1:2.) If all churches then were true churches, and they were "Baptist churches", and a distinguishing name was not needed, why did Paul differentiate between the churches by the distinguishing term, "Church of God"? Paul did differentiate between the "church of God" and other churches, and specifically states that he was writing to the "church of God"; and if there was a "Baptist Church" there, Paul distinguished between it and the "church of God", and writes to the "church of God". Facts are, there was not a Baptist Church there, and Mr. Taylor knows it, and hoped to dupe his readers by his statement. Again, Paul speaks of "churches of Christ". (Romans 16:16.) Paul thought it necessary to distinguish, for there were religious bodies in his day that did not belong to Christ, and since he was writing to those that did, he specifically addresses them—"churches of Christ".

The churches in the New Testament are never called "Christian Churches". The question submitted was not about what the churches were called, but, "Are disciples of Christ ever called Baptists in the New Testament?" Seemingly being peeved because the disciples were not called Baptists in the New Testament, Mr. Taylor tries to cast aspersion on the name Christian, by saying it "came from the heathen". Peter says: "Let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or an evil-doer, or as a meddler in other men's matters: but if a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in this name." (1 Pet. 4:15, 16.) Who but a man filled with denominational pride; and who glories more in a sectarian name than in the name of Christ, will declare that Peter admonishes disciples of Christ to glorify God in a name of heathen origin? Who but one who glories more in a party name than in the name Christian would accuse the Holy Spirit, who possessed the wisdom of heaven, of directing disciples of Christ to glorify God in a name of heathen origin? The Holy Spirit says: "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this name." (1 Pet. 4:16.)

No. 6. "Is it necessary to be a Baptist in order to be saved?" Mr. Taylor says, "No." Those conversant with Baptist doctrine

know that it is not necessary for one to be a Baptist to be saved. Baptists teach not one distinctive doctrine that is true. Why be a Baptist? Why spend money to support an institution which is not doing a work peculiar to that institution necessary to the salvation of souls? After declaring it is not necessary to be a Baptist to be saved, Taylor adds: "Jesus saved, not the church". God saves, certainly. Does He save those who are not in the church—not members of the church? The blood of Christ cleanses from sin (1 John 1:7), but does God save those who do not have faith? God saved, but are the saved number members of the church—or are they saved without being in the church? God saved, but does he save those who do not repent? God saves, not the church; but does God save those who are not members of the church?

The church of God is the **house of God**. "If I tarry long, that thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God." (1 Tim. 3:15.) No thoughtful one thinks the edifice in which people meet for worship is the church—the church is composed of men and women—disciples of Christ. The Philippian jailer believed on the Lord "with all his house". (Acts 16:34.) Crispus believed on the Lord with "all his house". (Acts 18:8.) All understand that "house" in these passages means the family, or household. The "house of God" is the family of God; and when Paul says "the house of God, which is the church of the living God", he has reference to the family of God. If one is not a member of the church he is not in the "house of God"—the family of God; and if saved without being in the church, he is saved without being in the house—family—of God. If one is saved without being in the church he is saved without being in the family, and if not in the family he is not a child of God, for all God's children are in his family. So certain as one has been born again he is a child of God, and in God's family, God's house—the church. That one can be saved without being in the Baptist Church, certainly. The Baptist Church is not the family of God, it is not the house of God.

"Feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood." (Acts 20:28.) If one is saved without being in the church he is saved without being one of the blood purchased number.

Mr. Taylor quotes with approval Paul's statement: "We were all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. 12:13), and adds, "the church at Corinth was a body of Christ." It follows then that if one is not in the church he is not in the "body of Christ". But Jesus is the "saviour of the body" (Eph. 5:23), and "the body" is "the church". (Col. 1:18.) If one is not in the church he is not in the body, and Jesus is the saviour of the body, hence if not in the body, the church, Jesus is not your Saviour. Paul says we are "baptized into one body", and Taylor says such is true. But Paul says we are "baptized into Christ". (Romans 6:3.) To be

baptized into the "body" is to be "baptized into Christ". If one is not in the "body" he is not in Christ. One is not "baptized into the body" at one time, and "baptized into Christ" at another time. There is "one baptism" (Eph. 4:4), and this one baptism puts one into the "body"—"into Christ". To be in the "body" is to be "in Christ". Christ is the head of the "body", and the body is the church. (Col. 1:18-24.) To be in the body is to be in Christ, and to be in Christ is to be in his body, the church. To contend, as does Mr. Taylor and other Baptists, that one is saved without being in the church, is to contend that one is saved without being in Christ. But one is not saved without being in Christ—"that you may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus". (2 Tim. 2:10.) If Mr. Taylor means that one can be saved without being a member of the Baptist Church, I know of no one who differs with him. One cannot give a scriptural reason why he should be a member of the Baptist Church.

No. 7. "Is it necessary to be a Baptist to be saved?" "If so, which kind of a Baptist—there are about a dozen different Baptist denominations?" Mr. Taylor answers: "No kind at all. A sinner is saved by the blood of Jesus before and without baptism."

The fact that one is saved by the blood of Jesus does not exclude faith as a condition to be exercised before the blood cleanses; nor does it follow that because one is saved by the blood of Jesus he does not have to obey the command of Christ to be baptized in order to receive the salvation by the blood. One must believe to be saved (Acts 16:31), but that does not prove that the blood does not save. One must repent before he can be saved (Acts 3:19), but that does not prove that the blood does not save. Jesus declares that baptism is a condition of salvation, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16), but that does not prove that the blood does not save. It is not a question whether the blood saves—all contend the blood saves. The question is: Are there conditions to be complied with before the blood saves? If there are conditions, what are the conditions? Baptists teach that the blood saves, but they declare that one must have faith in Christ before the blood will save. Christians teach that the blood saves, but they also teach that one must believe and be baptized before the blood saves. Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16), and Christians declare this is true. Baptists teach that "he that believeth" is saved, and may be baptized if he desires; but that it is not necessary to be baptized.

Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Baptists say: "He that believeth is saved, and may be baptized."

By some it is urged: "It does not say he that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned." Certainly not, and why? Jesus knew, as each reader knows, the one who does not believe

cannot be baptized. What sense would there be in saying, "He that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned", when the one who does not believe cannot be baptized?

"He that covereth his transgressions shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall obtain mercy." (Prov. 28:13.) In this passage confessing and forsaking sins is necessary to obtaining mercy; but covering sins is sufficient to bring adversity.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16:16.) In this passage belief and baptism are mentioned as conditions of salvation; whereas disbelief is sufficient to damn.

"Repent ye, therefore, and turn again that your sins may be blotted out." (Acts 3:19.) In this passage repentance and turning are named as conditions necessary to blotting out of sins; but in Luke 13:3 impenitance alone is sufficient to cause one to perish.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16:16.)

On Pentecost, when those convicted of sin, and desiring to know what to do, inquired; Peter said to them: "Repent ye, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins." (Acts 2:38.) In this passage repentance and baptism are mentioned as conditions of remission of sins. Baptists teach that one must repent before he can have remission of sins, but the command to be baptized may be disregarded—that it is not necessary to be baptized.

Mr. Taylor, in his effort to prove that baptism is not a condition of salvation, says: "In Ex. 12:13-28, the blood was applied in Egypt; they were not baptized until three days after at the Red Sea. (Ex. 14:22; 1 Cor. 10:2.)" He is correct in saying the blood was applied in Egypt; but what blood, where was it applied, and who and from what did that blood save? Were all who were saved by that blood baptized, and were only the ones saved by that blood baptized? The reference is to Exodus 12 where the blood is mentioned. What was the blood to which reference is made? It is the blood of the passover lamb. The Israelites were God's children. It was just before they began their march from Egypt to the land of Canaan. God directed that each family should kill a lamb and sprinkle the blood on the door-posts; for the destroying angel would pass through the land that night, and where the blood was not found on the door-posts the angel would kill the first-born man and beast; but where the blood was found the first-born child, and beast would not be killed. But the Egyptians did not kill a lamb, nor was the blood found on the door-posts in their homes, and the first-born man, and beast in all the homes of the Egyptians was killed. "And it came to pass at midnight, that Jehovah smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne unto the first-born of the cap-

tive that was in the dungeon; and all the first-born of cattle." (Exodus 12.) The blood to which Mr. Taylor makes reference in this connection saved only the first-born man, and beast. Taylor says: "The blood was applied in Egypt; they were not baptized until three days after at the Red Sea." Does he intend to convey the idea that the ones saved were the ones baptized, and that only the ones saved by the blood were baptized? It appears to me that such is the impression he seeks to make. Are Baptists ready to stand with Mr. Taylor in this contention? The blood saved only the first-born man, and beast. Were the "beasts" baptized in the Sea? Were only the first-born baptized? What do you think of the man who, in his effort to save his doctrine, and prove that baptism is not a condition of salvation, will make an argument which calls for the baptism of "beasts"? More, the blood of the passover saved the first-born man, and beast from physical death, that was all! Were the "beasts" baptized? Certainly not—baptism is not predicated of them, for it is specifically declared that those baptized "ate and drank of Christ". (1 Cor. 10.) After the blood of the lamb was sprinkled on the door-posts the destroying angel passed through the land and killed the first-born man, and beast where the blood was not found. When the Israelites reached the Red Sea, Jehovah opened the passage through the sea for them, at which time they were baptized (1 Cor. 10), and the Bible says: "God saved Israel that day out of the hands of the Egyptians." (Exodus 14:29.) When were they saved? That day. What day? The day they passed through the Red Sea—the day they were baptized. Who were saved that day? ALL the Israelites. Who were saved by the blood to which Mr. Taylor makes reference? **Only the first-born man, and beast.** Does Taylor know this? I think so. Do you ask why he attempts to make the impression he does in his tract? Please draw your own conclusions as to why one will deal with the scriptures as he has in this place. His effort is to prove that baptism, as commanded by Christ, is not a condition of salvation.

Mr. Taylor says: "In Romans 4:1-25 Paul shows that Abraham and David were justified by faith without works." No one who believes the Bible will contend that Paul condemns faithful obedience to the commandments of the Lord. The Jews were insisting that they would be saved by the works of the law of Moses; and the Gentiles contended that they would be saved by a system of works which brought moral perfection. Both systems would make salvation by works independent of the grace of God. Paul is setting forth an argument to show that neither of the systems would bring salvation, for if they could there would have been no necessity for the death of Christ. If one is saved by his works, his works must be perfect; nor must there be any sin on the part of the man, for works cannot bring pardon apart from the grace of God. If one were morally perfect there would be nothing in him to bring condemnation. All had sinned and were under condemnation, and for that reason needed sal-

vation. Paul shows that salvation comes through the grace of God, and not through the works of the law of Moses, nor works of moral rectitude—salvation was not through the perfection of the works of men. Whether there be one, or many conditions in appropriating the salvation which comes through the grace of God, he who enjoys God's forgiveness will be saved by the grace of God, and not through the merits of any works he performs. But for one to be saved by grace he must believe in Christ, as one of the conditions of salvation. You, of course, know that to believe is a work—Jesus said so. "They said therefore unto Him? What must we do, that we may work the works of God?" Jesus answered and said unto them, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." (John 6:28, 29.) One must believe before the grace saves him, and though to believe is a work, it is not the work that saves him, but he is saved by grace. Since to believe is a work, it must follow that if one is saved by grace without any work, he is saved without faith in Christ.

Taylor says: "Abraham's faith in a crucified and resurrected Christ was the same faith that we have today." In Abraham's day Jesus had not been born, crucified, nor raised. If one could be persuaded that Abraham believed that Jesus **would** be born, crucified, buried and raised from the dead, would the belief of such be the same faith as that of the man who believes that Jesus **was** born, was buried, and was raised? Believe they are the same, who can? Taylor says they are the same; for to defend Baptist doctrine such is necessary.

Mr. Taylor well knew that those who think would not accept his bare assertion that Abraham believed in Christ as people now believe in Christ, and inquires: "You ask how could Abraham's faith be in a crucified and resurrected Christ centuries before his birth?" He then answers: "Read Romans 4:17, where Paul says on that very question: 'Even God who quickeneth the dead and calleth those things which be not as tho' they were.'" If Taylor is correct in his application of this passage in saying that Paul was speaking of Abraham's faith in a "crucified and resurrected Christ", and was speaking of something which "was not" as though it was; then Abraham **DID NOT** believe in a crucified and resurrected Christ; for Paul in the passage declares that God spoke of something that "was not"; and if he was speaking of Abraham's faith in a resurrected Christ, he spoke of something that "was not" as though it were. Thus it seems that the very passage introduced and relied on by Taylor proves the very opposite to the contention of Taylor. The truth is, in the passage cited by Taylor, Paul had no reference to Abraham having faith in a "crucified and resurrected Christ", but to a wholly different matter. In Genesis 17:5, God said to Abraham: "A father of many nations have I made thee." At the time God made the statement to Abraham, Abraham **WAS NOT** in fact the "father of many nations", but in the unfolding of the ages, and in

Jehovah's plans Abraham was to be the "father of many nations", and to Abraham, even before the fulfillment of the promise, Jehovah said to Abraham: "A father of many nations have I made thee." This passage Paul quotes in the very passage cited by Taylor, which reads: "(As it is written, A father of many nations have I made thee) before him whom he believed, even God, who giveth life to the dead, and calleth the things that are not, as though they were." (Romans 4:17.) Reader, what do you think of the doctrine which forces a man to make the application Taylor does of this passage in his effort to sustain Baptist doctrine? Surely, the man is hard pressed for argument, if not perverse in his thinking, when he thus twists the scripture.

No. 8. That one becomes a Christian by faith is taught in the scriptures. The whole life of the Christian is a life of faith. "We walk by faith, not by sight." (2 Cor. 5:7.) When one partakes of the Lord's Supper it is an act of faith. God commanded the Israelites to march around the walls of Jericho once each day for six successive days, and on the seventh day to march around the walls seven times, and then for the trumpeters to give a blast upon the horns, and for the people to raise a great shout. This they did, and the walls of Jericho fell down. (Jos. 6.) Paul says: "By faith the walls of Jericho fell down." (Heb. 11:30.) When did the walls fall? "After they had been compassed seven days." Though the walls fell "by faith", the term "by faith" included every act of the Israelites in obeying God in marching around the walls, sounding the trumpets, and raising the shout. The walls fell "by faith", but not till the Israelites obeyed God.

We are children of God "by faith;" but is it faith only? Is one a child of God the moment he believes, or must the faith express itself in obedience to the commands of God, before he is a child of God "by faith"?

"Faith apart from works is dead, being alone." (Jas. 2:24.) If one is saved before he obeys—if one is saved the moment he believes, he is saved by faith "apart from works", and that would be salvation by a dead faith.

"Even of the rulers many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess it, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the glory that is of men more than the glory that is of God." (John 12:42, 43.) These rulers believed, but they refused to confess. They believed but loved the glory of men more than they loved the glory of God. But if one is saved the moment he believes, as the Baptists teach, the rulers were saved, even though they loved the glory of men more than they loved the glory of God. "If a man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." (1 John 2:15.) Though the Bible says the rulers did believe, it also says they loved the glory of men more than the glory of God. Baptists say they were saved, because they believed; and John says the love of

God was not in them. Baptist doctrine declares one can be saved without the love of God being in him.

"And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord." (Acts 11:21.) Baptists teach one is saved the moment he believes. But the Bible declares that one believes before he turns unto the Lord. They "believed and turned unto the Lord". If Baptists are right in teaching that one is saved the moment he believes, then people are saved before they "turn unto the Lord". But pardon comes after one turns unto the Lord. (Isa. 55:7.) It follows then that if one is saved the moment he believes, as the Baptists teach, he is saved before he turns unto the Lord, and if saved before he turns unto the Lord, he is saved before he is pardoned.

We are saved by grace, but faith is necessary to access into the grace. "We had access by faith into this grace." (Romans 5:2.) If one is saved the moment he believes, as Baptists teach, he is saved before he gets into the grace—for faith is necessary to entrance into grace. "We had access by faith into this grace." Baptist doctrine calls for salvation before one is in the grace.

Baptist doctrine is that faith is so powerful that it avails to the extent that it brings salvation the moment one believes. Such contention on the part of the Baptists is a flat contradiction of the Apostle Paul. "Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love." (Gal. 5:6.) Faith must exist, then it must work through love before it avails. Baptists declare that the moment one has faith he is saved—that "faith only" avails to such an extent that it brings salvation, without any kind of work; whereas Paul declares that faith must work through love to avail.

In all the Bible there is not the record of an instance where God blessed a man on the condition of that man's faith, till his faith had expressed itself in some act.

Mr. Taylor says: "Believing in Christ makes him a Christian." What is it to believe "in Christ"? Many people confuse believing facts about Christ with believing "in" Christ. One may believe that Christ died, was buried and raised, and not believe "in" Christ. Let us learn from the scripture when one does not believe in God. When the children of Israel were journeying through the wilderness from Egypt to Canaan, and were on one occasion without water, Jehovah directed Moses to give them water from the rock. Moses failed to do as God directed in bringing water from the rock, and to him God said: "Because ye believed not in me, to santify me in the eyes of the Children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this assembly into the land which I have given them." (Num. 20:12.) Certainly Moses believed God existed, but his failure to do as God directed was due, God says, to the fact that Moses did not believe "in" God. When one says he believes "in" Christ, but does not obey Christ, he is mistaken. He is calling his belief of some facts about Christ, faith "in" Christ. The one who has faith in Christ is the one who

trustingly obeys him—the one who does not trustingly obey does not have faith “in” Christ.

Taylor says: “Obeying God’s command to be baptized God’s way makes him a Baptist.” Being baptized in the days of the apostles, as required by the Great Commission, made people Christians, not Baptists; and Mr. Taylor declares that in no place in the New Testament were the disciples of Christ called “Baptists”. Baptist requirements and procedure, when one applies to them for baptism, was unknown in the days of the apostles. In “Church Manual,” by J. M. Pendleton, “designed for the use of Baptist churches,” is the following: “Persons wishing to unite with a church give an account of the dealings of God with their souls, and state the ‘reason of the hope that is in them’; whereupon, if, in the judgment of the church they ‘have passed from death unto life’, they are by a vote of the church recognized as candidates for baptism, with the understanding that when baptized they will be entitled to all the rights and privileges of membership.” (P. 18.) The Baptist Church determines the fitness of the applicant by comparing his experience, as he may relate it, with their own, and thus they measure him by themselves—and are not wise. “But they, measuring themselves by themselves and comparing themselves with themselves, are without understanding.” (2 Cor. 10:12.) Not till a Baptist Church has voted on the fitness of a man for baptism, and passed the enabling act—voted favorably—will a Baptist preacher baptize the man. Does such a course, in any way, resemble the course of Philip, the Christian evangelist, when he baptized the nobleman from Ethiopia? Philip preached Christ to the man, and the man inquired: “See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?” Philip did not refer the matter to the church in Jerusalem where the apostles were, from which place the man had departed only a few hours before; nor did he refer the matter to the church in Samaria where Philip had been laboring. The man was baptized immediately. There was not the submitting of the matter to a church for their vote of approval. (Acts 8:26-40.)

Taylor says Baptist preachers “baptize into Baptist churches”. Would it not be interesting to hear Taylor tell what Baptist Church Philip, the Christian evangelist, baptized the eunuch into. Surely it was not the church in Samaria, nor was it the church in Jerusalem, for neither of these churches knew anything about the man being baptized, and beside, neither of these churches were Baptist churches. The procedure of the evangelist Philip was not the course followed by Baptist preachers. It should be remembered though that Philip was directed by the Holy Spirit, and Baptist preachers are following the doctrine and commandments of men.

The church at Corinth was not a Baptist Church, neither did they pass judgment on people who wished to be baptized, as do the Baptists. To the church of God at Corinth, Paul said:

“Do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth.” (1 Cor. 5:12, 13.) But Baptists do pass judgment on them “without” when they pass judgment on those who make application to them for baptism, for they are not in the Baptist Church till after baptism.

Baptists declare that one is saved before baptism, but that he is not, and cannot be in the Baptist Church till he is baptized, and the baptism must be administered by a “regularly ordained Baptist preacher” (as though there was some kind of baptismal grace which oozes through the hands of such preachers). Baptists teach that one can go to heaven without being baptized; but he cannot be a member of the Baptist Church without being baptized. According to their doctrine it is easier for one to get to heaven than it is to get into the Baptist Church.

No. 9. I have no idea who asked the questions Taylor is trying to answer; but I am persuaded the querist had in mind the people of today—people of this age; and that Taylor knew such was the import of the question. His reference to Abel is wide the mark. He says: “Millions were saved from Abel’s day down who were never called Christians.” The question was not about “being called Christians”, but “can one be saved without being a Christian”? It seems so absurd for one to make claim that people in the days of Abel believed in Christ, that reference to such claim appears to me to be useless. They did not then believe that Christ had died, and was raised from the dead—and they could not believe such then. Can one be saved today who does not believe such? “If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead thou shalt be saved.” (Rom. 10:9.) The people in the days of Abel, if they complied with the requirement of the law under which they lived, were saved; but the sacrifices they were required to make are not demanded at the hands of the people in this dispensation, nor were they required to obey the law people are now required to honor by obedience.

No. 10. Taylor declares: “All real Baptists were Christians before they were Baptists. They would have always been Christians had they never become Baptists.” One is a Christian before he becomes a “Baptist”, and will go to heaven without becoming a “Baptist”, says Taylor. But one cannot go to heaven without obeying the gospel. God will “render * * * wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul” that obeys not the truth. (Romans 2:6-9.) To those who obey not the gospel God renders “vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel”. (2 Thess. 1:7, 8.) Since one must obey the gospel to go to heaven, but does not have to be a Baptist to get to heaven, it is evident that that which makes one a Baptist is not the gospel; nor does obeying the gospel make one a Baptist. Taylor contends that it takes the power of God to make a Christian, but when made Christians by the power of God they are not Baptists. I here make the charge that accord-

ing to Taylor God cannot make a Baptist. It takes "baptism to make him a Baptist", and this baptism must be administered by a "Baptist preacher". God can, and does make Christians, and Christians are in the family of God—children of God; and must be such to go to heaven. First a Christian, says Taylor, then be made a Baptist. A Baptist cannot be made out of a sinner—he must be a Christian, and then make a Baptist out of the Christian. Thus Baptists contend that the Baptist Church supplements the work of God; God makes the Christian, but cannot make the Baptist; so the Baptist Church steps in and makes the Baptist—a thing God cannot do; but it cannot make a Baptist till God has exhausted his power by making the Christian. Thus they make the Baptist Church more powerful than God, claiming the Baptist Church can do something God cannot do, and has never done.

Jesus sent the apostles to preach the gospel. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation." (Mark 16:15.) According to Taylor, and the Baptists, it takes more than the gospel to make one a Baptist; and therefore requires something the apostles did not preach. Paul preached the gospel to the Corinthians. "Now I make known unto you the gospel which I preached unto you." (1 Cor. 15:1.) Since Taylor says the gospel does not make Baptists, it follows that it requires something in addition to the gospel to make one a Baptist. So certain as one can be a Christian without being a Baptist (and he can), just that certain is it that Paul's preaching did not make Baptists. There was never a desire on the part of Paul to make Baptists. He was persuading people to be Christians. (Acts 26:28.)

Taylor says Christians who do not become Baptists "will be saved yet so as by fire". (1 Cor. 3:10-15.) The interpretation placed on this passage by Taylor is wholly inexcusable. Paul declares that the church in Corinth was "God's building". (1 Cor. 3:9.) He then adds: "As a wise masterbuilder I laid a foundation; and another buildeth thereon. But let each man take heed how he buildeth thereon. For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. But if any man buildeth on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble; each man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it is revealed in fire; and the fire itself shall prove each man's work of what sort it is. If a man's work shall abide which he built thereon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet so as through fire." (1 Cor. 3:10-15.) The foundation is Christ, and the work is built on him. Men and women are the material built on the foundation, built into the building, the church. If the material proves to be faulty, it will be burned, and the builder will suffer loss, but he, the builder (not the material), will be saved; yet so as by fire.

No. 11. "Do the same steps that makes one a Christian make him a Baptist too?" Taylor says "No". Correct he is in such answer. One is made a Christian by obeying the gospel, and becomes a Baptist, Taylor says by being baptized by a Baptist preacher. Taylor then adds: "Repentance and faith make him a Christian." Baptists insist that repentance comes before faith. Of course, such is absurd, and utterly impossible. Baptists teach this crooked, but they have to practice it 'straight in spite of their false doctrine, for it is not possible for one to repent of his sins against God before he has faith in God.

Visualize the following: Mr. Taylor is preaching to a man who does not believe there is a God, angels, heaven, hell, or a Christ.

Taylor: Repent of the sins you have committed 'against God, and then believe in Christ, and he will save you.

Infidel: I do not believe there is a God, or Christ; nor do I believe I have sinned.

Taylor: I understand that you do not believe in God, or Christ, and that you do not believe that you have sinned; but repent and then you can believe.

Infidel: But how can I repent when I do not believe there is a God against whom I have sinned, nor that I have sinned?

Taylor: The Bible says "Godly sorrow worketh repentance". (2 Cor. 7:10.)

Infidel: If it takes "Godly sorrow" to work repentance, tell me how can I have sorrow for sins you say I have committed against God, when I do not believe there is a God, nor do I believe I have sinned against such a being?

Taylor: "The goodness of God" leads to repentance. (Romans 2:4.)

Infidel: But I do not believe there is a God who has been good to me, nor do I believe there is a God against whom I have sinned.

Taylor: Faith comes by hearing the word of God. (Romans 10:17.) Repent of your sins, and then I will preach to you that you may believe there is a God against whom you have sinned; but you cannot believe till you repent.

How ridiculous to talk about one repenting of sins committed against God, when such an one does not believe there is a God, nor that he has sinned against God.

Baptists teach one is saved the moment he believes; but they know the Bible teaches one must repent before he can be saved; so they teach that men must repent before they can believe; else if one is saved the moment he believes, he would be saved without repenting. To repent before one believes is an impossible feat.

Baptists often quote, as proof that repentance precedes faith, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel". (Mark 1:15.) This language was addressed to Jews who believed in God, and were in covenant relationship with him; but having sinned against

him, Jesus calls on them to repent of the sins they had committed against God, and believe the gospel.

"Without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing unto him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him". (Heb. 11:6.) Were it possible for one to repent before he has faith, it would be repentance without faith, and would not be pleasing to God.

The angels in heaven rejoice when a sinner repents. (Luke 15:10.) But if sinners repent before they have faith, it would cause discord in heaven. The angels would rejoice because of the sinner's repentance, and God would be displeased because the sinner did not have faith. (Heb. 11:6.)

Baptists are hard in their criticism of Methodists because the Methodists propose to baptize infants who do not have faith. But according to Baptist doctrine, on the order of repentance and faith, they accuse Peter of commanding people to be baptized who did not have faith. Said Peter: "Repent ye, and be baptized." (Acts 2:38.) If Baptists are right in their contention that repentance comes before faith, then these people did not have faith, for they had not repented. But Peter commanded them to repent and be baptized. There is not one word said about the necessity of these people believing *after* they repent. Baptist contention on the order of repentance and faith has Peter commanding people who do not believe, to be baptized!

No. 12. The Holy Spirit does operate in the conversion of sinners. Baptists teach that the Holy Spirit operates separate and apart from the word of God in conversion. They teach that the sinner is totally depraved, and is unable to hear and obey the gospel till the Holy Spirit comes into his heart, enabling him to believe the gospel. Such doctrine makes the devil more powerful than God; in that the devil could and did deceive man by his word, but God is unable by his word to lead men from sin; not only so, but such doctrine makes man more helpless than devils, for devils did believe (Jas. 2:19), but man, Baptists say, cannot believe till God sends the enabling power by a direct influence of the Holy Spirit into the sinner's heart.

The Holy Spirit must "convince the world of sin". (John 16:8.) The one question is: How does the Spirit convince of sin? The words spoken by the apostles were the words of the Spirit. "And they began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." (Acts 2:4.) Whatever is accomplished by the words spoken by the apostles is accomplished by the Spirit, for their words were the words of the Spirit. Paul declares that he was a sinner. Jesus said the Spirit would convince of sin. It is true, then, that if Paul was convinced that he was a sinner, he was convinced by the Spirit. How was Paul convinced? Fortunately we are not put to the necessity of making a guess about the matter, for Paul declares: "I had not known sin, except through the law." (Romans 7:7.) "Through the law comes the knowledge of sin." (Romans 3:20.) To the

thoughtful it is apparent, since the Spirit was to convince of sin, and that Paul knew he was a sinner, through the law; that the Spirit convinced him through the law. When one learns from the Bible that he is a sinner, the Bible being the words of the Spirit, such an one is convinced by the Spirit that he is a sinner. On Pentecost (Acts 2) when Peter spoke—rather when the Spirit spoke through him—they were convinced that they were sinners. They were convinced by the Spirit.

Taylor quotes: "Our gospel came not in word only, but in power and in the Holy Spirit." Assuredly. The gospel came to the Thessalonians not in word only, but it was accompanied with miracles, wonders and signs, by which it was confirmed.

Taylor says: "It takes a Baptist preacher and a New Testament church to make him a Baptist." Then it requires neither the Holy Spirit, nor the gospel to make him a Baptist. If Taylor is right, where there is not a Baptist preacher there cannot be a New Testament church. Believe it, who can? Baptist preachers are just men. A Baptist is one who has been baptized by a Baptist, says Taylor. Then Baptists are the product of men. God has nothing to do with making Baptists. God makes Christians; men make Baptists! There was not a church present when the eunuch was baptized (Acts 8), nor did a church authorize his baptism. Was his baptism valid? Did baptism make him a Baptist? Certainly not. He became a Christian.

No. 13. Taylor says: "Baptist churches are the most important institutions in this world." Does he mean by this that Baptist churches are more important than the kingdom of God, or does he mean that the kingdom of God is not in existence? What think ye of the man who professes to believe the Bible making such claim—that the Baptist Church is of more importance than the kingdom of God; and at the same time declaring that it is not necessary to be in the Baptist Church to be saved. Again, hear him: Baptist churches are the "only institutions that are divine on this earth." Yet he says one can be saved without being in the Baptist Church. If he is right, then one can be saved without being in the only institution on this earth that is "divine". The new birth is a divine birth, and so certain as one is born again, by such birth he enters a divine institution, and if the Baptist Church is the only divine institution on this earth, as Taylor says, one enters the Baptist Church when born again, and not only so, every man who is born again by such birth becomes a member of the Baptist Church; but one cannot be in the Baptist Church without baptism. Thus Taylor makes baptism necessary to the new birth. But if one can be born again and not be a member of the Baptist Church—the "only institutions that are divine on this earth", then one can be born again and still be in the kingdom of the devil. If one can be born again and not be in a Baptist Church, which Taylor says is the "only institutions that are divine on this earth", then one can be saved without being in the kingdom of God, and if saved

without being in the kingdom of God, he is saved in the kingdom of the devil, else, if he must be in the kingdom of God to be saved, if the Baptist Church is the only institution that is "divine on this earth", then the kingdom of God is a human institution. When God saves one, he delivers him from the power of darkness and translates him into the kingdom of the Son of his love. (Col. 1:13.) So certain as one is delivered from the power of darkness, just that certain is it that God translates him into the kingdom. But if Baptist churches are the "only institutions that are divine on this earth", the man, though translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son, is in no more than a human institution.

Says Taylor: "Baptist churches are the only churches on this earth that receive no one but the saved into their membership." If he is right in his claim, and correct in declaring that the first church was composed of the twelve apostles, and was a Baptist Church, then Judas was one of the saved, and will be in heaven with all saints, for Baptists declare that one who has been saved cannot apostatize, and be lost.

Be it known by all, that when the Baptists "receive" one into their membership, that such an one is saved, for "Baptist churches are the only churches on earth that receive no one but the saved into their membership". It matters not how the man may live after he is "received" by the Baptists, he is saved; for Baptists receive none but "the saved into their membership". More, Baptists declare that when one is saved it is not possible for that person to be lost. Then we are to be advised by Taylor that when the Baptists "receive" one into their membership, it matters not how such a man may live, his soul is not in jeopardy, for it is not possible for him to be lost.

When one would become a member of a Baptist Church they require that the applicant for membership tell an "experience of grace" and then they pass judgment, vote on the matter of the man's salvation, by which they determine whether he is saved or lost. Can they be mistaken touching the matter of the man's spiritual condition? Indeed, no! for if they "receive" him into their membership, he is saved, for "Baptist churches are the only churches on this earth that receive no one but the saved into their membership". What matters it then how the one "received" by the Baptists lives—they receive none but the saved, and they declare that the one saved cannot—that it is not possible for such an one to be lost. Seriously consider such teaching. Mr. Taylor says it is possible for one "received" by the Baptists to lie, but by such act he does not in the least jeopardize his soul, he is just as certain of heaven as the man who lives a faithful, consecrated life. Think of such teaching. It says to the world: It is not necessary for one who is "received" by the Baptists to live a faithful, pious, devoted Christian life in order to enter heaven. His life may become one of dissipation, he may become a moral pervert, a libertine of the lowest type,

but having been "received" by the Baptists it is not possible for him to be lost. Such is the teaching of H. B. Taylor, the Baptist preacher, the man who for years has been editor of "News and Truths," is a teacher in West Kentucky Bible School, Murray, Kentucky, and is often called to represent Baptists in public debates. Do you wonder that Christians are opposed to such teaching? Certainly there are some most excellent people in the Baptist Church, but they are such in spite of the doctrine taught by Baptists on this point. A life of devotion on their part, according to their doctrine, makes their entrance into heaven no more certain than is certain the entrance into heaven of the man who has been "received" by them, even though he becomes a moral pervert. Such is Baptist doctrine!

Taylor says: "Baptist churches are the custodians of the ordinances." The Lord's Supper is an institution in the kingdom—Jesus said so: "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." (Luke 22:30.) The church and kingdom are different institutions, says Taylor, yet he says the church has the right to take an institution of the kingdom and say who shall and who shall not partake of it. You may be surprised at the bigotry of some Baptist churches, but remember, they only reflect their feeling of importance, for they teach they have the right to take in hand the Lord's Supper, an institution of the kingdom, and say who may and may not partake. Baptist churches are so restricted, so close, in their communion that when one Baptist is visiting in some other community than his home, and a Baptist Church observes the Lord's Supper, the visitor does not commune with the church he is visiting. Oh, no, I am not speaking of the church the Lord built. I am making reference to the Baptist Church. It is certain that Paul and his companions were not members of the Baptist Church, nor was the church at Troas a Baptist Church, for when Paul and his companions were at Troas they remained there seven days, and had the Lord's Supper with that church. (Acts 20.) Had Taylor, or some of the Baptist preachers of today been present, and had the church at Troas been a Baptist Church, they would have forbade Paul and his companions partaking the Lord's Supper.

"Baptist churches are the most important institutions in this world," says Taylor. Why? They receive none but those who are already saved, he says. That being true, they are not necessary to the salvation of people. "It takes the gospel of and the Holy Spirit to make a man a Christian." It does not take the Baptist Church to make Christians; other churches can, and do, he says preach the gospel. The Baptist Church does not make Christians, it makes Baptists, and they declare one is a Christian before he is a Baptist; and they insist they make Baptists out of Christians. When saving sinners is counted the Baptist Church has no part in that matter, it proposes to deal with Christians, and make Baptists out of them. In the matter of saving sinners the Baptist Church is of no importance. Just

how is it the "most important institution in this world"? As a religious home for saints on this earth it is of no more importance than any other church, for Taylor declares there are Christians in all the churches, and that they will go to heaven. Passage through the Baptist Church is not necessary to entrance into heaven. Why are Baptist churches the "most important"? Taylor says they are the "custodians of the ordinances". The Lord placed the Supper in the kingdom. (Luke 22:29, 30.) Baptists declare the kingdom is one thing, and that the church is an institution separate and apart from the kingdom; and that they now have the Supper in the church. If such is true, I submit that Baptists are the greatest burglars in all the world, for they have, if they are right in their claim, been guilty of stealing the Supper out of the kingdom, where the Lord placed it, and locating it in the church!

Reader, carefully ponder the following from Taylor: "A failure to belong to a Baptist Church will cause many saved people to be 'called the least in the kingdom of heaven', when they get there because of their wilful disobedience to the plain commands of their Lord." Who, but a Baptist, or someone blinded by false doctrine, or one who does not believe the Bible, would make such a statement? Saved and sure of heaven though in "**wilful disobedience to the plain commands of their Lord**". What does "wilful" mean? "Wilful, 1. Self-determined; voluntary; intentional; as wilful murder. 2. Governed by will without yielding to reason; obstinate; perverse"—Webster. Think of the man who professes to preach the gospel declaring that one can be saved in "wilful disobedience" to the plain commands of the Lord. Saved, though "intentionally" disobeying the plain commands of the Lord. Saved, though refusing through "self-determination" to obey the plain commands of the Lord. Saved, though in "intentional" "disobedience to the plain commands of their Lord". Such is the teaching of Mr. Taylor, the Baptist preacher. Paul, the Christian preacher, declares that when the Lord comes he will take vengeance on all those who "obey not the gospel", that they will be punished with "eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might". (2 Thess. 1:7-9.) Again: Christ is "unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation". (Heb. 5:10.) Christ is the author of eternal salvation to how many? "All them that obey him." Is that true, Mr. Taylor? Many will be saved in "wilful disobedience to the plain commands of their Lord," says Taylor. Paul says God will render "wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish" upon those who "obey not the truth". (Romans 2:6-9.) Taylor says that many will be saved in "wilful disobedience to the plain commands of their Lord". Mr. Taylor teaches Baptist doctrine. Friend, can you longer remain a Baptist and support men who teach such doctrine?

Mr. Taylor then quotes Mr. Campbell as follows: "From the apostolic age to the present time, the sentiment of Baptists and

their practice of baptism have had a continued chain of advocates, and public monuments of their existence in every century can be produced." Does Mr. Campbell mean that there have been Baptist churches like the church of which Mr. Taylor is a member? Certainly not. Mr. Campbell uses the word "Baptist" in the quotation as Baptist historians use the term. He was debating with a pedo-Baptist, and in combatting their teaching on infant baptism, and sprinkling and pouring for baptism, he made the statement quoted in the foregoing. Let us hear what Baptist historians mean by the term "Baptist" in history. "But a Baptist proper, in modern parlance, is one who rejects the baptism of babes under all circumstances, and who immerse none but those who personally confess Christ under any circumstances; and those who are thus properly immersed upon their faith in Christ, we have a right to claim in history as Baptists to that extent, but no further."—Armitage, page 283. Benedict, another Baptist, says in his "History of All Religions," page 198: "The peculiar sentiments of this denomination having spread so much among people of all opinions, to affirm that a man is a Baptist, proves nothing more, than that he rejects infant baptism, and holds to believers' baptism, by immersion; he may be a Calvinist or Armenian, a Trinitarian, a Universalist or Swedenborgian; for some of all these classes come under the board distinction of Baptists." But am I certain that Mr. Campbell did not intend to convey the idea that there have been Baptist churches like the one of which Mr. Taylor is a member through the ages since the apostles. Certainly I am, and more, I am persuaded that Taylor knows such was not the view expressed by Campbell. But let Mr. Campbell speak: "Baptists, as now distinguished from other Protestant parties, began since the Protestant Reformation; and it is only in the 17th century they appear to assume any respectability, either of number or character, amongst the parties opposed to the assumption of the Roman Pontiffs." (Campbell, in *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 5, pp. 385, 386.) When did the Baptists begin, Mr. Campbell? They "began since the Protestant Reformation".

No. 14. That the church in Jerusalem, and in Samaria immersed people, and refused to baptize infants, is true; but that they were Baptist churches in the sense one now speaks of the Baptist Church is not true. In his history of the Baptists, Mr. Benedict, a Baptist, quotes from the "Baptist Jubilee Memorial": "The first regularly organized Baptist Church of which we possess any account, is dated from 1607, and was formed in London by a Mr. Smyth, who had been a clergyman in the Church of England." (Benedict's *History of the Baptists*, p. 304.) This church, organized in 1607, is the FIRST Baptist Church in all history; and this one was formed by a man who baptized himself. (Vedder's *Short History of the Baptists*, p. 113; Armitage, p. 453; Cutting's *History of the Baptists*, p. 57; Whitsitt, p. 20.)

No. 15. The name "Baptist" has been dealt with in the

former pages of this tract.

That Christ was the "tried stone" before the church was built, is true; but Baptists of the Taylor stripe insist that the church was built when Christ ordained the apostles. (Mt. 10.) In truth, more than a year after Jesus ordained the apostles, he said: "Upon this rock I will build my church." (Mt. 16:18.) Taylor says the church was built more than a year before Jesus said: "I will build my church." Had Taylor been present, and entertained the views he now holds he would have said: No, no, Jesus, you built the church more than a year ago! Thoughtful people who are not blinded by a false theory know that the church could not have an existence in the world had Jesus not been raised from the dead. If Christ had not been raised from the dead we would be in our sins. (1 Cor. 15:12-15.)

No. 16. Baptists no more claim Christ as head than do other religious people who believe the Bible. The facts are the Baptist Church is of human origin; the first Baptist Church in all the world was formed in England by a Mr. Smyth, who baptized himself. The first Baptist Church in America was formed by Roger Williams. "Some time about March, 1639, therefore, Williams baptized Ezekiel Holliman, who had been a member of his church at Salem; and, thereupon, Holliman baptized Williams. Eleven other obeyed their Lord in this way, and the first Baptist Church on American soil was formed." (Vedder's History of Baptists, pp. 154, 155.) Speaking of Williams, Benedict says: "In 1639 he was baptized by Ezekiel Holliman, a layman who was appointed by the little company for the purpose. Then he baptized the rest of the company, and laid the foundation for the first Baptist Church in Providence, and on the American Continent." (Pp. 441, 442.)

Churches of Christ have a plurality of elders. "And when he had appointed them elders in every church." (Acts 14:23.) "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called to him the elders of the church." (Acts 20:17.) Baptists have, usually, one elder to four congregations, and it is often the case that an elder presides over a congregation in which he does not hold membership. Baptist churches are not like New Testament churches, for New Testament churches had a plurality of elders in each congregation. Baptist churches do not.

No. 17. If John was a Baptist preacher it is certain he was not like Baptist preachers of today; for one cannot be a Baptist preacher now unless baptized by the authority of a Baptist Church, and there was not a Baptist Church in existence in the days of John, and Taylor so declares. More, Taylor says Baptist preachers now "baptize people into Baptist churches". If he is right in this, then Baptist preachers now do not administer the baptism John administered, for John did not baptize people into Baptist churches. Taylor declares there were no Baptist churches in the days of John.

No. 18. (1) Says Taylor, most Baptist preachers have

ceased to use the "mourner's bench". Let us rejoice that they have turned from their unscriptural practice in this particular. Christians never used the "bench".

(2) The Bible does not teach that "feelings" are an evidence of pardon, as Baptists claim. Christians believe and teach that "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God." (Romans 8:16.) Christians have the witness of the Spirit that they are children of God. "These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life." (1 John 5:13.) If one knows he is God's child by his feelings there would be no need that John write to let them "know" such. Yes, God says "we know we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren" (1 John 3:14); but how do we know we love the brethren? "Hereby we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments." (1 John 5:2.) Feelings are not evidence of pardon. Jacob believed that Joseph was dead, and said: "I will go down to Sheol to my son mourning." (Gen. 37:26-35.) He "felt" like his son was dead, because he believed his son was dead; but in fact his son was not dead. Feelings are not evidence. The more intelligent Baptists have ceased to teach the "mourner's bench" system of "getting religion", and soon you will not hear them making claim that they know they are children of God by their "feelings". Christians rejoice, but the joy, and feelings which accompany the joy is not the evidence of salvation.

(3) Taylor says: "We do not connect baptism with salvation because the one book in the New Testament written to sinners, the Gospel of John, does not mention baptism in connection with the instructions given by Jesus Christ to any inquirer." If one cannot be a Baptist without baptism, and Jesus did not mention "baptism in connection with the instructions given by Jesus Christ to any inquirer", it is very certain then that Jesus Christ did not instruct anyone to become a Baptist. If Taylor is right in saying that the Book of John is "the one book in the New Testament written to sinners", and that it "does not mention baptism in connection with the instructions given by Jesus Christ to any inquirer", and that therefore baptism is not necessary to salvation, then it must follow, according to such reasoning, that repentance is not a condition of salvation, for repentance is not mentioned "in connection with the instructions given" any sinner in the Book of John. Hard pressed is the man who, in his effort to prove that baptism is not a condition of salvation, will make an argument, the logic of which is so faulty that it excludes repentance as a condition of salvation.

But Jesus does mention baptism as a condition of salvation in the Book of John, when he said: "Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5.)

Again, says Taylor: "Baptists do not connect baptism with salvation, because they believe that salvation depends wholly

upon the finished work of Christ, which don't need to be plussed by any sacrament of church or priest." In the Bible we read nothing about "sacraments". If he contemplates baptism by the term "sacrament", and the connection shows clearly that he does, let me advise that baptism is not a "sacrament" of the church, but is a command of Christ. (Mt. 28:18, 19.) Not the church, but Christ, gave the command to be baptized. True it is though, that Baptist preachers must seek the authority of a Baptist Church, and administer baptism only when the Baptist church has authorized such. Christians baptize by the authority of Christ, and not by the authority of the church. Taylor's declaration that one is saved by the "finished work of Christ" which does not have to be "plussed" by anything, means, as used by him, that baptism is not necessary to salvation. If one is saved by the "finished work of Christ, which don't need to be plussed" by anything, then one is saved without obedience to the gospel—obedience to the commands of Christ. If such is true, then one is saved without faith, or repentance, for these are commands of the gospel, and are commands to be performed by the one who would be saved.

Christ "gave himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. 2:6); "he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world." (7 Jno. 2:2.) Is this what Taylor means by "finished work of Christ", which "don't need to be plussed" by anything? If yes, then all will be saved, regardless of their character. But Taylor says one must believe and repent before he can be saved. Whatever Taylor means by the "finished work of Christ", he declares that one cannot be saved without that work of Christ being "plussed" by the faith, and repentance of the man who would be saved. Taylor's effort was to make an argument which would lead people to believe that baptism is not necessary to salvation, but in his awkwardness, and lop-sided effort, he makes an argument, which if it was a valid argument, would also exclude faith and repentance as conditions of salvation. It should be remembered, though, that the effort of Taylor is to defend Baptist doctrine, and in such effort he involves himself in these false positions. No one can successfully defend the Baptist doctrine.

"Weekly communion," Taylor says, comes from the Catholics. Usually when Baptists cannot meet an argument, or harmonize their practice with the Bible, they attempt to bring the position they combat into disrepute by calling it by some ugly name. Baptists observe what they call the Lord's Supper semi-occasionally. They run true to Baptist form. The Lord's Supper is an institution in the kingdom—Jesus said so. (Luke 22:29, 30.) Baptists declare the church and kingdom are separate institutions, but that the church has the right to take in charge the institution of the kingdom, and determine how often they will partake of it. Who, but those who do not recognize the authority of Christ, would be so presumptuous as to claim that the

Lord left a memorial institution, but gave no direction as to how often it should be observed? Speaking of the Supper, Jesus said: Do this "in remembrance of me". Baptists say we will, but we will suit our own convenience as to how often we will do so!

"And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them." (Acts 20:7.) Each week has a "first day", and it was on that day they came together to break bread. It was the practice of the New Testament church to meet on the first day of EVERY week.

Luke 8:4: "Every city" is from **kata polin**.

Acts 14:23: "Every church" is from **kata ekklesian**.

Rev. 22:2: "Every month" is from **kata meena**.

1 Cor. 16:2: "First day of the week is from **kata mian sabbatoon**.

"As **kata polin** signifies every city; and **kata meena**, every month; and Acts 14:23, **kata ekklesian**, in every church; so **kata mian sabbatoon** signifies the first day of every week."—MacKnight.

On the first day of EVERY week the disciples assembled. "And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread." (Acts 20:7.) Paul exhorts: "Not forsaking our assembling together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting one another; and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh." (Heb. 10:25.)

(4) Taylor says Baptists "invite people to join the Baptist Church for the same reason that Paul attempted to join the church in Jerusalem", and cites Acts 9:26 as proof. But Taylor says one is baptized into the Baptist Church—and with Baptists the church is a local congregation. But Paul was baptized some years before he went to Jerusalem (Gal. 1:16-18), and if there is any proof in the reference Taylor makes, it proves that Paul was not a member of the Baptist Church, and that Ananias was not a Baptist preacher. With Baptists the term church means a local congregation, and only a local congregation; and into the local congregation Baptist preachers baptize people. The one, and only way to get into the Baptist Church is by baptism—and the Baptist Church is no more than a local congregation. It follows then that when one goes from one place to another, or from one Baptist Church to another, the only way he can become a member of the congregation—church—where he goes, is to be baptized into it! Certainly the Baptists do not so practice, but such is necessary, if they would follow the logic of their teachings.

(5) The practice of the Baptists in voting on those who apply to them for baptism was unknown in New Testament days, nor is there precedent in the scriptures for such practice. Jesus commissioned disciples to baptize believers. It is not possible for Baptists to determine by a "vote" whether a man is or is not a believer. Their claim is that a man is saved before he becomes a member of the Baptist Church—that one can go to heaven without being a Baptist, but he must submit to the decree of the

Baptist Church, by which they determine if they will receive him as one with them. Their practice of "voting" on one before they baptize him is, as is everything they teach peculiar to them, unscriptural. A Baptist Church did not vote on the eunuch (Acts 8) and thereby determine whether he was or was not a proper subject for baptism. The three thousand on Pentecost (Acts 2) were not voted on by a church, to determine their fitness for baptism. His reference to the six brethren who accompanied Peter when he went to Cornelius falls short of proof for: (1) There is no proof that there was a church in Joppa. (2) If it could be proved there was a church at Joppa, the proof is lacking that the church accompanied Peter. (3) There is no intimation that they voted to determine if Cornelius should be baptized. That Peter was not a Baptist preacher is certain, for he was sent to tell Cornelius what to do to be saved (Acts 11:15), and he commanded him to be baptized in the name of the Lord. (Acts 10:48.) Never did a Baptist preacher tell people to be baptized that they might be saved.

(6) It is a fact that "in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body". (1 Cor. 12:13.) Too, it is a fact that there is "but one body" (1 Cor. 12:20), and the "one body" is "the church". (Col. 1:18; Eph. 1:22, 23.) Proper subjects are baptized into the "one body", the church. Paul also says we are "baptized into Christ". (Gal. 3:27.) We are not "baptized into Christ" at one time, and at some subsequent time "baptized into one body". We are baptized only one time, and the baptism which puts one into Christ puts him into the body. It follows then that if one is not in the "one body" he is not in Christ. Baptists declare we are baptized into the "one body", which baptism also puts one into Christ. When they contend that one is saved without baptism they are making claim that one is saved without being in Christ. That one is saved without being in Christ is a false doctrine, for salvation is in Christ—"that ye may obtain the salvation which is in Christ". (2 Tim. 2:10.) In all the Bible there is not one reference to baptizing people into Baptist churches, yet Mr. Taylor says "we baptize people into Baptist churches because God told us to do so". What proof does Taylor offer? His assertion. Is that all? Yes, that's all.

(7) Jesus said: "Eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." (Luke 22:30.) The Lord's table is in the kingdom. Taylor says many of the Methodists, and others who are not Baptists are in the kingdom; but the Baptist Church in Murray Kentucky, the home of Taylor, says to the Methodists: You have no right to partake of the Lord's Supper. True, Taylor asks them to assist him in the meetings he holds, to lead prayers, and assures them that he expects to go to heaven with them, but when he comes to partake of the Lord's Supper he says: Stand back, ye Methodists. We Baptists are a privileged class in the kingdom. You Methodists, though children of God, and many of you are certainly going to heaven, yet you have no right to partake of the "communion of the body of Christ". You cannot have the

"communion of the body of Christ" till you cease to be Methodist children of God, and become Baptist children of God by having the baptismal grace which flows through the hands of a Baptist preacher.

No. 19. No, Mr. Taylor, according to your contention, "an open Bible and an open mind and heart" will make a Christian. Eptism at the hands of a Baptist preacher will make a Baptist.

No. 20. Baptist churches scriptural in origin? Indeed, when the first Baptist Church ever heard of in the world was not brought into existence till 1607. (See Benedict's History of Baptists, p. 304.)

Baptist churches scriptural in "name"? Surely, no one seriously considers the claim of Baptists on this point. Not one time is such a name (Baptist Church) found in all the Bible. Taylor is pipe-dreaming, or worse, when he, or any Baptist, makes claim that the name "Baptist Church" is found in the Bible. Baptist glory in the name "Baptist". "Everyone will walk in the name of his god." (Mic. 4:5.)

Baptist churches, says Taylor, have a "wilderness history". Indeed. Let us hear some Baptists who have written history—history of the Baptist Church, talk about the history of the Baptist Church. The following quotations are from Baptists:

"In the year 1633, by a secession from the Independent Church gathered by the Rev. Mr. Jacob, may be regarded as fixing the epoch of our own distinct denominational life." (Cutting, p. 40.) "A period of a thousand years intervenes, in which the only visible church of unbroken continuity was the Romish Church, which had far departed from the early faith. How is it possible to trace during this time a succession of Baptist churches?" (Vedder, p. 45.) "It is impossible to show that any one person, or any one sect, for a period of more than a thousand years, consistently and continuously held the entire body of truth that Baptists believe the scriptures to teach, or even its vital parts." (Vedder, pp. 50, 51.) "A succession of churches, substantially like those of our own faith and order in doctrine and policy—that is the will-o'-the-wisp, likely to lead the student into a morass of errors, a quagmire of unscholarly perversions of facts." (Vedder, p. 52.) "And many who are not Catholics think that if they fail to unroll a continuous succession of regularly organized churches, they lose their genealogy by a break in the chain, and so fail to prove that they are legitimate Apostolic Churches. Such evidence cannot be traced by any church on earth, and would be utterly worthless if it could. * * * The very attempt to trace an unbroken line of persons duly baptized upon their personal trust in Christ, or of ministers ordained by lineal descent from the apostles, or of churches organized upon these principles, and adhering to the New Testament in all things, is in itself an attempt to erect a bulwark of error." (Armitage, pp. 1, 2.) Such quotations I could multiply many times. The Baptist Church of today does not teach the doctrine of the churches of the New Testament, nor are they like the New

Testament churches in name, organization or practice.

Taylor declares "the Great Commission is a Baptist document". Let us read it:

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."—Jesus.

He that believeth is saved, and may be baptized, provided a Baptist Church authorizes it.—Baptists.

Does what Jesus said sound like what Baptists teach?

The Commission, as found in Matthew, reads: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." (Mt. 28:19, 20.)

Taylor says: The Great Commission, "translated into every-day English, means: Go, make Christians by preaching Christ; make Baptists of those Christianized by baptizing them the New Testament way; and then make these baptized Christians well rounded Missionary Baptists by indoctrination."

Is it not too bad that those who translated the Bible did not have H. B. Taylor, the Baptist preacher, present to advise them how to translate the Bible into every-day English? By his statement, Taylor simply means that the Great Commission, as it appears in the Bible, does not teach Baptist doctrine, and to meet the demands of Baptist doctrine it must be "doctored" in the way he indicates. We should at least appreciate the frankness of Taylor, for his version of the Commission is an admission that the way it is found in the Bible does not correspond with Baptist doctrine.

Let us strip Taylor's version of the Commission of the things he says are unnecessary to salvation. Give attention, Taylor, while you are catechized:

Is it necessary to be a Baptist to be saved?

Taylor: "There are Methodist Christians, Campbellite Christians, and lots of other Christians who are not Baptists and will never be."

What does it take to make a Baptist?

Taylor: "It takes New Testament baptism to make him a Baptist."

Is it necessary to be baptized to be saved?

Taylor: "Baptism has nothing to do with remission of sins."

How is a "well rounded Missionary Baptist" made?

Taylor: "By indoctrination."

That part of the Commission, in Taylor's version, which speaks of baptism and indoctrination is unnecessary to salvation. Stripped of the unnecessary things, according to Taylor, it reads: "Make Christians by preaching Christ." The other things in the Great Commission are not necessary, when one's salvation is contemplated.

There is not one thing taught by the Baptists, peculiar to them, that is true.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

May 5-8, 1925, Mr. Taylor and I were engaged in discussion in Monticello, Kentucky. In this discussion Mr. Taylor contended for Baptist doctrine, insisting that it is impossible for a child of God to do anything which will result in that child being lost.

I submitted the following questions, which Mr. Taylor answered in writing:

1. "Can a child of God tell a lie?" Mr. Taylor answered: "Yes."

Mr. A. and Mr. B. are both children of God. Mr. A. lives a devoted Christian life. Mr. B. wanders far off in sin; flagrantly disobeys the Lord by lying. Baptist doctrine declares that Mr. B., though he does lie, is just as certain of heaven as Mr. A. who lives the faithful life. The Bible says: "All liars" shall have their part in "the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." (Rev. 21:8.)

2. "Is it possible for a child of God to die while drunk?" Mr. Taylor answered: "No."

That a child of God can get drunk is clearly stated. Noah did get drunk. (Gen. 9:20, 21.) Mr. Taylor says it is not possible for a child of God to die while drunk. If he is correct, it follows that a safeguard against death for a child of God is to get drunk—and stay drunk! The child of God cannot die while drunk, says Taylor. True it is, that a faithful child of God can die; one whose life is for good, who labors for the reclamation of his fellowmen and the advancement of the cause of Christ, can die—God will let such an one die, and thereby bring to an end his active participation in good works; but the child of God who gets drunk, and stays drunk, whose life is corrupt, and whose influence is for evil, such an one God will not let die. Baptist doctrine on this point puts God in league with the devil. The devil wants wicked men to live and continue in evil works; and according to Baptist doctrine God will not let them die, if they are His children and participating in evil works.

Baptists do not teach children of God to live wicked lives; but they do declare that it is possible for a child of God to get drunk, and that he cannot die while drunk. Does it not follow that if you are a child of God, and do not want to die, you can prevent it, according to Baptist doctrine, by becoming a drunkard?

3. "Can a child of God commit fornication?" Mr. Taylor answered: "Yes."

Baptists declare that a child of God can commit fornication, but the sin of fornication in no way jeopardizes their entrance into heaven. That children of God, though they commit fornication, need have no fears, that they should have no alarm, that they are just as certainly going to heaven as though they lived faithful lives; that the sin of fornication will not prevent their

eternal happiness. God says "fornicators" shall have their part "in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." (Rev. 21:8.)

4. "Can a child of God call his brother a fool?" Mr. Taylor answered: "Yes, they have."

Baptists declare that if a child of God does call his brother a fool, he is in no danger of being lost. Jesus said: "Whosoever calleth his brother a fool is in danger of the hell of fire." (Mt. 5:22.) Jesus says they ARE in DANGER of hell fire. Baptists declare they ARE NOT in danger of hell fire.

"When the righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth therein; in his iniquity that he hath done shall he die." (Ezk. 18:26.)

You cannot afford to give your influence to the teaching of false doctrine.



