

# To Tattoo or Not To Tattoo

---

Terry Watkins  
Dial-The-Truth Ministries. Used with Permission, Parts 1 and 2 of 8

## ***In This Issue:***

---

***To Tattoo or Not To Tattoo***  
***Page 1***

***The Atonement***  
***Page 6***

***Jerome of Prague***  
***Page 8***

***Who is a Baptist?***  
***Page 10***

***The Search for the True Church***  
***Page 12***

**Within the last decade the tattoo has virtually conquered the cultural world.**

**T**he taboo tattoo was until recently, the menacing fashion of heavy-metal rockers, bikers, criminals and the social outcast. But today the tattoo glamorously appears everywhere and anywhere. It's the latest fashion craze. The tattoo has found a canvas on celebrities such as Britney Spears, Julia Roberts, Jessica Simpson, Bruce Willis, Geraldo Rivera, Halle Berry, the Dixie Chicks and thousands of others.

The sports world has also received the "baptism of tattoos". A 1997 AP Poll discovered over 35% of all NBA players sported at least one tattoo, including such mega stars as Michael Jordan, and Shaquille O' Neal. Sports reporters claim similar tattoo percentages are decorating the professional football, baseball and hockey world. Holding their own, the tattoo adorns the "conservative" golf world on such notables as Lee Trevino and Tiger Woods.

The National Geographic News stated that 15% of all Americans are tattooed. The Alliance of Professional Tattooists (APT) estimates over 39 million Americans have a tattoo. Details Magazine published a poll that stated 22% of 18-25 year olds have at least one tattoo. It's also estimated 60% of the tattooed are women.

**And many more are waiting in line. . .**

Even the toy world has its very own Tattoodles doll. And it's rumored sweet little Barbie has recently been seen flaunting a "cool" tattoo. Not to be outdone by the tattooing zealous adults, the younger generation has joined the tattoo party. A Texas Tech University School of Nursing study consisting of over 2,100 adolescents from eight states reveal that 1 in 10 adolescents were tattooed and over half were planning on getting tattooed. Another study estimated 25% of all 15 to 25-year-olds are tattooed. By the way, the average age of getting tattooed is 16 years old, while some receive their first tattoo as young as eight-years-old.

**According to *US News and World Report*, (November 3, 1997) tattooing is the country's sixth-fastest-growing retail business, and growing at the amazing rate of more than one new tattoo studio every day.**

And get this...Lycos, who ranks the Top 50 search words every week, found "tattoos" was the fourth most searched word for the year 2001! For the week of October 15, 2002 (when this was written) "tattoos" was number six. **And among the**

highly-prized Lycos 50 Elite, which is the 50 most popular topics in the history of the Lycos – "tattoos" comes in at a solid number seven. (search results at <http://50.lycos.com>) [Note: Jesus or Christ did not even make the Lycos Top 100, "the Bible" ranked number 18.]

*In other words...the world has gone "tattoo crazy".*

Even among many Christians the once-forbidden tattoo is welcomed with open arms (and legs, and necks, and backs, et al). Not surprising the major perpetrator of the Christian tattoo is the Christian rock music community. And fast following their Christian rock idols, thousands of Christian young people are getting "marked for Jesus" with the tattoo. Among the fastest growing trend in the tattoo industry is the Christian tattoo shops.

We've received scores of emails from concerned Christian parents, young people, youth pastors, and pastors requesting information on the tattoo. Many parents have written pleading for help with their teenagers and tattoos. This article is an examination of tattoos in the light of the Word of God and history.

### TATTOO: The Bloody Truth

One of the oldest and most common satanic practices is cutting of the flesh or blood-letting. The term "blood-letting" originates from the word "let" – "to allow to pass, go or come"; hence "blood-letting" literally means to allow the blood to come, or pass.

Throughout history the cutting of the flesh and blood-letting are rituals performed to unleash demonic and supernatural powers. Because the "life of the flesh is in the blood" [Leviticus 17:11], the blood is highly valued in the occult as the "power source". And by releasing or letting the blood or the "power source" – supernatural power is unleashed.

The *Dictionary of Cults, Sects, Religions and the Occult*, writes of the power of the blood and its connection to Satanism and the occult.

"**BLOOD** (occult; Satanism). The vitalizing or life-giving agent used in the sacrament of the BLACK MASS. **Blood is believed to provide power** and life and therefore plays a central part in ritualistic sacrifices." (George A. Mather and Larry A. Nichols, *Dictionary of Cults, Sects, Religions and the Occult*, p.40)

*The Encyclopedia of Witches and Witchcraft*, says of the blood-letting ritual, "Blood that is let is believed to unleash power". By the way, some modern tattoo artists perform rituals during their tattoo procedure in order to unleash supernatural power. Some even lick the flowing blood bubbling from the tattoo.

"**blood**: Called the "river of life", blood is identified with the soul and is the vehicle that carries the vital energy of the universe through the body. In magic, blood is revered and feared for the miraculous power it possesses and confers. **Blood that is let is believed to unleash power.**" (Guiley, Rosemary Ellen, *The Encyclopedia of Witches and Witchcraft*, second edition, p. 26)

The Word of God in 1 Kings 18 gives a detailed and perverse example of blood-letting by Satanists (aka prophets of Baal) attempting to unleash supernatural power and ignite the fire for the sacrifice.

*25 And Elijah said unto the prophets of Baal, Choose you one bullock for yourselves, and dress it first; for ye are many; and call on the name of your gods, but put no fire under.*

*26 And they took the bullock which was given them, and they dressed it, and called on the name of Baal from morning even until noon, saying, O Baal, hear us. But there was no voice, nor any that answered. And they leaped upon the altar which was made.*



**BLOOD-LETTING ROCK FAN**

27 And it came to pass at noon, that Elijah mocked them, and said, Cry aloud: for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked.

28 And they cried aloud, and **cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them.** (1 Kings 18:25-28)

Notice how 1 Kings 18:28 describes this devil-worshipping, self-mutilation, blood-release act – "...**after their manner...**" In other words, this "blood-letting" was common practice among the prophets of the devil. Blood-letting was a familiar ritual among the prophets of Baal.

It's also evident from other scriptures that cutting of the flesh or blood-letting was common practice among the pagan, wicked nations.

In Leviticus 21:5 and Deuteronomy 14:1, the Lord condemns such demonic practices.

5 They shall not make baldness upon their head, neither shall they shave off the corner of their beard, nor **make any cuttings in their flesh.**

6 They shall be holy unto their God, and not profane the name of their God: for the offerings of the LORD made by fire, and the bread of their God, they do offer: therefore they shall be holy. (Leviticus 21:5-6)

Ye are the children of the LORD your God: **ye shall not cut yourselves, nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead.** (Deuteronomy 14:1)

#### **BLOOD-LETTING AND DEMON POSSESSION**

Mark chapter 5 contains the familiar account of the devil-possessed man of Gadera. Notice in verse 5, among the demonic acts, and a tell-tale sign of possession – **cutting himself with stones.**

1 And they came over unto the other side of the sea, into the country of the Gadarenes.

2 And when he was come out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs **a man with an unclean spirit,**

3 Who had his dwelling among the tombs; and no man could bind him, no, not with chains:

4 Because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him.

5 And always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, **and cutting himself with stones.**

6 But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him,

7 And cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not.

8 For he said unto him, Come out of the man, **thou unclean spirit.**

9 And he asked him, What is thy name? And he answered, saying, **My name is Legion: for we are many.**

(Mark 5:1-9)

It's also interesting that this "cutting himself with stones" was associated with a man possessed not with one, but legions or many devils. Luke describes the same account as "...a certain man, which had devils **long time.** . ."

"And when he went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man, **which had devils long time,** and ware no clothes, neither abode in any house, but in the tombs."

(Luke 8:27)

The morbid practice of cutting oneself and blood-letting has a long and dark history in the demonic pages of Satanism, demonism and the occult.

Under the definition of "Satanism", the highly-acclaimed, *Encyclopedia of American Religions*, lists among the activities performed by Satanists is "bloodletting":

"In this branch of Satanism...one can expect to find those individuals engaged in grave robbery, sexual assaults and **the ritual bloodletting**. . ." (Melton, Gordon, *Encyclopedia of American Religions*, 3rd Edition, Gale Research Ltd., 1989, p. 145)

An article in *The Independent* newspaper, acknowledges the pathway from blood-letting to Satanism found on web sites aimed toward children.

"The Association of Teachers and Lecturers said the popularity of children's programmes and books featuring witchcraft could encourage children to search for sinister material on the internet. Researchers for the union found websites promoting Satanism, **blood-letting** and Wicca (witch)...One website found by the union describes in detail **how to carry out blood-letting and blood drinking**. . ." (*Buffy 'prompting pupils to access the occult'*, Ben Russell, Education Correspondent, *The Independent*, April 22, 2000, [www.cesnur.org/testi/buffy\\_001.htm](http://www.cesnur.org/testi/buffy_001.htm))

In 1996, the satanic, Kentucky vampire cult led by the self-acclaimed 500-year-old vampire and Satanist, teenager Rod Ferrell brutally murdered two people. Ferrell began his dark journey of blood, Satanism, vampirism and murder by walking around cemeteries at night, **cutting himself and practicing blood-letting**. ("Vampire Cult Slaying Case," *Court TV* [Online]. [www.courttv.com/verdicts/vampire.html](http://www.courttv.com/verdicts/vampire.html))

### **TATTOO: A TRAIL OF BLOOD-LETTING**

There's no question that tattoos originated from the satanic ritual of blood-letting and cutting of the flesh as described in 1 Kings 18.

In fact, in Leviticus chapter 19 verse 28, where the Lord clearly condemns the tattoo, "**Ye shall not make any ...print any marks upon you.**" Notice what else is included in the same verse...Obviously, by the context, the Lord connects the forbidden "marks" or tattoo, – "Ye shall not make any **cuttings in your flesh**. . ." (more on Leviticus 19:28 later)

"Ye shall not make **any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, nor print any marks upon you: I am the LORD.**" (Leviticus 19:28)

### **TATTOO: AND THE BLOOD FLOWS**

Perhaps it would be a good time to give a few brief descriptions of the tattoo procedure. May I remind you again, these are all from pro-tattoo resources.

"Early people **cut open their skin** and rubbed soot into the wounds to mark themselves. **They punctured their skin** with the bones and teeth of animals." (Jean-Chris Miller, *The Body Art Book: A Complete, Illustrated Guide to Tattoos, Piercings, and Other Body Modifications*, p. 28)

"You'll see little **drops of blood emerge from the freshly tattooed spot...How much you bleed** has a lot to do with your personal physiology as well as outside factors (like the presence of alcohol in your bloodstream, which can make you bleed like a stuck pig). **Usually your blood will coagulate within a few minutes, clotting up the tiny punctures that have been made.** . .

When your tattoo is finished, the artist will clean it gently with an alcohol/water solution. Once that dries **and little blood bubbles have ceased rising to the surface**, the artist may want to snap a few photos of your piece." (Jean-Chris Miller, *The Body Art Book: A Complete, Illustrated Guide to Tattoos, Piercings, and Other Body Modifications*, pp. 97, 98, 99)

"The tattooist guides the tattoo machine over the skin. He or she stops the needle every minute or so **to wipe the blood and ink clean. The amounts of bleeding and pain** in the tattoo process differ according to each person...After the first two hours, remove the bandage **and wash away any collected or dried blood.**" (Bonnie B. Graves, *Tattooing and body piercing*, p. 22, 24)

"As soon as he stops working with the needle, the sailor's skin sends up **its blood beads**...the eagle's eye reddens but there is **now no telling blood from ink**...Carmey floods the flesh behind the eagle with red and the finished eagle poises on a red sky, **born and baptized in the blood of its owner.**" (Ronald Scott, *Art, Sex and Symbol*, 1974, p. 19)

"The reasons **why puncturing the skin** should be regarded with some degree of awe are not far to seek, for in the first place, **there is the drawing of blood, which to the savage world over is full of significance as a rejuvenating and immortalizing factor. There is in addition the opening of numerous inlets for evil to enter.**" ([Hambly Wilfrid D. 1925. *The History of Tattooing and its Significance*, p. 233] (Gilbert, Steve, *Tattoo History: A Source Book*, p. 162)

*Rolling Stone* magazine gives a first-hand description of the blood-letting tattoo procedure: "Evan Seinfeld, the bassist for Biohazard, sits in the chair, offers his hand and **waits for the bleeding to begin**...The instrument whirs to life, humming across Seinfeld's hand, **creating a vibrating pool of blood and ink.**" (*Rolling Stone*, March 28, 2002, p. 40)

Beware – the tattoo procedure is a fashion of the satanic practice of blood-letting or cutting of one's flesh. Rubbing a little ink or pigment in it doesn't change the fact – you are cutting your flesh – you are practicing blood-letting.

**Don't take my word for it. Here's what the pro-tattoo, historians write.** By far, the most extensive work ever published on tattoos was Dr. W.D. Hambly's, *The History of Tattooing And Its Significance*. Author Steve Gilbert, in his popular *Tattoo History: A Source Book*, writes, "Hambly concluded that historically **tattooing had originated in connection with ancient rites of scarification and bloodletting.** . ."

"**Hambly concluded that historically tattooing had originated in connection with ancient rites of scarification and bloodletting which were associated with religious practices** intended to put the human soul in harmony with supernatural forces and ensure continuity between this life and the next." (Gilbert, Steve, *Tattoo History: A Source Book*, p. 158)

Did you also notice in the above quote, that Hambly also concluded that tattoos were "associated with religious practices?" Hmm... Now I wonder what kind of "religious practices" would practice "blood-letting?" Hint: If you forgot, go back and read 1 Kings 18.

There's no doubt that the cutting and marking of one's skin [tattooing] is connected to and associated with the Satanic and demonic practice of blood-letting.

Author Gilbert again links the tattoo to blood-letting, and magic. And even gives an enlightening and frightening description of a modern day blood-letting, blood-licking, satanic, tattoo procedure. Notice, the connection to the demonic "spiritual manifestations."

"In northwest Alaska, **traditional practices of tattoo and ritually induced bleeding were often related and may have even overlapped to some extent.** Around Bering Strait, shamans commonly **performed bloodletting** to relieve aching or inflamed parts of the body. Nelson watched a shaman 'lancing the scalp of his little girl's head, the long, thin iron point of the instrument being thrust twelve to fifteen times between the scalp and skull [which is the identical technique for tattooing ...It is plausible that the release of blood functioned to appease various ills and **spiritual manifestations.** For instance, several St. Lawrence Islanders explained to **me the importance of licking the blood that was released during tattoo 'operations'.**" (Gilbert, Steve, *Tattoo History: A Source Book*, p. 181)

May I again remind you – all this information and documentation are **from books promoting and glorifying the tattoo!** These are not Christian authors writing with any anti-tattoo slant. But this is hard, documented facts from tattoo artists, tattoo historians and people who endorse tattoos.

You can *try to* justify and close your eyes to the documented FACTS – but the FACT is – the tattoo is clearly connected to satanic blood-letting.

---

And they cried aloud, and **cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them.** 1 Kings 18:28

And always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, **and cutting himself with stones.** Mark 5:6

**Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices.** 2 Corinthians 2:11



# The Atonement: A Transfer of Our Guilt to Jesus Christ \_\_\_\_\_

William Cathcart, D.D.  
From the book, *The Baptist Encyclopedia*, 1881

**T**he atonement is a transfer of our guilt to Jesus. This doctrine is strikingly foreshadowed by the Jewish scapegoat. Of it Moses says, "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited; and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." Lev. 16: 21, 22

The blood of the goat was not spilled, no blow was inflicted upon it; but the sins of the children of Israel were typically placed upon it to prefigure the transfer of our sins to the Son of God. In the case of the scapegoat the transfer was figurative, in the Saviour's, it was literal. "He was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many." Isa. 53:12

"The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53:6

"For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. 5:21

Paul shows that he means the actual transfer of our guilt to Christ by saying, "Who knew no sin,"—that is, of his own; he was made sin, he says, by reckoning our sins to him, not by any sins which he committed.

The word translated sin cannot mean a sin-offering in this text, for it is contrasted with righteousness. If the one is a sin-offering the other must be a righteousness-offering; but the word translated righteousness has no such meaning. And sin, not a sin-offering, must be the sense of the word in this connection. This is the common use of the word elsewhere. Men may put forth as many philosophical pleas as their ingenuity can furnish, but according to Paul the sins of the whole saved family were reckoned to—transferred to Jesus.

The atonement is a *transfer of our pains to Jesus*. The entire sufferings demanded by our sins were inflicted upon the Saviour. Isaiah 53:5, says, "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." Here he suffers the innocent for the guilty; he takes our wounds, our bruises, and the chastisement of our peace; and his stripes give perfect healing to the soul; "the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, shed by the transferred pains of the believing family, cleanses us from all sin."

Christ lived and died as the proper substitute of his people; so that his acts were theirs, and all his pains. This doctrine is foreshadowed by the death of the paschal lamb, and all the sacrifices of the Law of Moses; and it is presented in all its fullness by the dread scenes of Calvary.

As Peter says in his First Epistle, 3:18, "For Christ also bath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." The believer has lost his sins and pains eternally in the death of his loving Lord.

The design of the atonement was to satisfy the mercy of God. The heart of God is a fountain of love continually overflowing, and nothing can keep in its bursting streams. To gratify this irresistible affection of Jehovah Jesus became a man and endured our pains, and our death; and now "God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself not imputing their trespasses unto them." He is busy by his Spirit removing the blind hatred to himself of human hearts, that his love in the crucified Lamb might bring multitudes to trust and love him.

The atonement was also intended to meet the demands of God's law. It complies with these perfectly. In the obedience and death of Christ the precepts of the law have been fulfilled and its penalties have been endured, and he is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth." Rom. 10:4. That is, he is its completion, its fulfillment; and when a soul trusts the Saviour the law justifies him and gives him the righteousness which Christ acquired when he obeyed its precepts and suffered its penalties. "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." Rom. 3:22

Moreover, the law demanded for God supreme love from men, and a holy life. And when the Spirit changes a human heart, and gives the faith which secures the forgiveness of God in the soul, the happy recipient is melted in adoring gratitude before the Redeemer, and his heart looks up to God while it says, "Whom have I in heaven but thee? And there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee." And the spirit of grace leads him into the holy dispositions and practices enjoined by the pure law of Jehovah.

The atonement transfers our sins and pains to Christ our substitute, and by faith in Jesus it opens up to the soul a channel through which God's pardoning love may reach and rejoice it, and by which the Spirit's sanctifying grace may purify the heart, and fit it for the everlasting rest.



## Jerome of Prague

---

J. Newton Brown

From the book, *Memorials of Baptist Martyrs*, 1854

**T**his remarkable man was the intimate friend and companion of the celebrated John Huss, in the early part of the fifteenth century. He was in early life distinguished for the pursuit of knowledge, and spent many years in the Universities of Prague, Paris, Heidelberg, Cologne, and Oxford.

At the latter university he became acquainted with the works of Wickliffe; he translated them into his native language, and on his return professed warm adherence to his views.

In addition to the fact stated in a letter written to Erasmus from Bohemia, that the followers of Huss "admit none until they are dipped in water, and they reckon one another, without distinctions of rank, to be called brothers and sisters," and the statement by Robinson, that the sermons of Huss were full of "anabaptistical errors," as they were called, and that many of his followers became Baptists, Orchard tells us that he was baptized by immersion by some of the Greek Church.

This view of Jerome's creed, and the fact of his being a layman, will account for many historians omitting his name altogether. But this omission may well be pardoned while we have a full and satisfactory account furnished by some of his strongest enemies.

When Jerome heard, while at a distance, that his beloved friend John Huss was in danger before the Council of Constance, in 1411, he fled to his help, and was soon apprehended, and tried in company with him, and both were sentenced to death. Huss, however, suffered some months before him.

There seems to have been a period, when like Cranmer, Jerome's faith faltered, and he recanted; but his adherence to the Saviour was soon renewed, and he died at the same stake where his dear friend Huss had been sacrificed to Christ. "The sanguinary annals of the human race," says Bonnechose, "do not, perhaps, present any spectacle more odious than the funeral pile of Jerome."

Poggius, who was secretary to the Pope, a frank, ingenuous man, saw and heard Jerome in the council, and wrote, in a letter to his friend Leonard Aretin, a eulogium on him in a spirit of admiration and love. He says:

"Since my return to Constance, my attention has been wholly engaged by Jerome, the Bohemian heretic, as he is called. The eloquence and learning which this person has employed in his own defence, are so extraordinary, that I cannot forbear giving you a short account of him.

"To confess the truth, I never knew the art of speaking carried so near the model of ancient eloquence. It was, indeed amazing to hear with what force of expression, with what fluency of language, and with what excellent reasoning, he answered his adversaries. Nor was I less struck with the gracefulness of his manner, the dignity of his action, and the firmness and constancy of his whole behavior.

"It grieved me to think so great a man was laboring under so atrocious an accusation. Whether this accusation be a just one, God knows: for myself, I inquire not into the merits of it: resting satisfied with the decision of my superiors. But I will just give you a summary of his trial.

"After many articles had been proved against him, leave was at length given him to answer each in its order; but Jerome long refused, strenuously contending that he had many things to say previously in his defence, and that he ought first to be heard in general; before he descended to particulars.

"When this was overruled, 'Here,' said he, standing in the midst of the assembly, 'here is justice—here is equity! Beset by my enemies, I am pronounced a heretic. I am condemned before I am examined. Were you Gods omniscient, instead of an assembly of fallible men, you could not act with more sufficiency.

"Error is the lot of mortals; and you, exalted as you are, are subject to it. But consider that the higher you are exalted, of the more dangerous consequence are your errors. As for me, I know I am a wretch below your notice; but at least consider, that an unjust action in such an assembly will be of dangerous example.'

"This, and much more, he spoke with great eloquence of language, in the midst of a very unruly and indecent assembly; and thus far, at least, he prevailed; the council ordered that he should first answer objections, and promised that he should then have liberty to speak.

"It is incredible with what acuteness he answered, and with what amazing dexterity he warded off every stroke of his adversaries. Nothing escaped him: his whole behavior was truly great and pious. If he were, indeed, the man his defence spoke him, he was so far from meriting death, that, in my judgment, he was not in any degree culpable.

"In a word, he endeavored to prove, that the greater part of the charges were purely the inventions of his adversaries. Among other things, being accused of hating and defaming the Holy See, the pope, the cardinals, the prelates, and the whole estate of the clergy, he stretched out his hands, and said, in a most moving tone:

"'On which side, reverend fathers, shall I turn for redress? Whom shall I implore? Whose assistance can I expect? - Which of you hath not this malicious charge alienated from me? Which of you hath it not changed from a judge into an inveterate enemy? It was artfully alleged indeed! Though other parts of their charge were of less moment,

my accusers might well imagine, that if this were fastened on me, it could not fail in drawing upon me the united indignation of my judges."

It appears from this secretary, Poggio Bracciotini, that on the third day of his trial, Jerome obtained leave to defend himself.

"He first began with prayer to God, whose assistance he pathetically implored. He then referred to profane history, and to unjust sentences given against Socrates, Plato, and Anaxagoras. He next referred to the Scriptures, and exhibited the sufferings of the worthies: and then he dwelt on the merits of the cause pending, resting entirely on the credit of witnesses, who avowedly hated him; and here his appeal made a strong impression upon the minds of his hearers, and not a little shook the credit of the witnesses. It was impossible to hear this pathetic speaker without emotion.

"Every ear was captivated, and every heart touched. But wishes in his favor were vain; he threw himself beyond the possibility of mercy. Braving death, he even provoked the vengeance which was hanging over him.

"Through this whole oration, he showed a most amazing strength of memory. He had been confined almost a year in a dungeon, the severity of which usage he complained of; but in the language of a great and good man. In this horrid place, he was deprived of books and papers; yet notwithstanding this, and the constant anxiety which must have hung over him, he was at no more loss for proper authorities and quotations, than if he had spent the intermediate time of leisure in his study."

"In his defence, his voice was sweet, distinct, and full; his action every way the most proper, either to express indignation or to raise pity, though he made no affected application to the passions of his audience: Firm and intrepid, he stood before the council, collected in himself, and not only contemning, but seeming even desirous of death.

"The greatest character in ancient story could not possibly go beyond him. If there is any justice in history, this man will be admired by all posterity. I speak not of his errors: let these rest with him. What I admired was his learning, his eloquence, and amazing acuteness. God knows whether these things were not the groundwork of his ruin.

"Two days were allowed him for reflection; during which time many persons of consequence, and particularly my lord cardinal of Florence, endeavored to bring him to a better mind. But persisting obstinately in his errors, he was condemned as a heretic.

"With a cheerful countenance, and more than stoical constancy, he met his fate; fearing neither death itself, nor the horrible form in which it appeared. When he came to the place, he pulled off his upper garment, and made a short prayer at the stake; to which he was soon after bound, with wet cords and an iron chain, and enclosed as high as his breast in fagots.

"Observing the executioner about to set fire to the wood behind his back, he cried out, 'Bring thy torch hither. Perform thy office before my face. Had I feared death, I might have avoided it.' As the wood began to blaze, he sang a hymn, which the violence of the flames scarcely interrupted.

"Thus died this prodigious man. The epithet is not extravagant. I was myself an eyewitness of his whole behavior. Whatever his life may have been, his death, without doubt, is a noble lesson of philosophy."

To this account of Jerome, furnished by an enemy to his faith, we have only to add that he suffered martyrdom, May 20, 1416.



# Who Is a Baptist?

---

Norman H. Wells

Taken from the book, *The Church That Jesus Loved*, 1973, Chapter 5

Since publishing this paper we have received letter after letter asking, "What kind of a Baptist are you?" We assume they mean what affiliations we have with Conventions or Associations.

We are of the opinion that a person or church is either a Baptist or they are not! There are no different kinds!

If it is a fact that the lost world is bewildered by the conflicting claims of hundreds of churches and denominations all calling themselves Christian; is it not equally true they would be confused by the conglomeration of beliefs that are covered by the name Baptist? There are American Baptists, Southern Baptists, Christian Unity Baptists, Primitive Baptists, Duck River & Kindred Associations of Baptists, Baptist Church of Christ, Freewill Baptists, General Baptists, General Six-Principle Baptists, Independent Baptist Church of America, National Baptist, Evangelical Life & Soul Saving Assembly of the U.S.A., Regular Baptists, Separate Baptists, Seventh Day Baptists, Two Seed in the Spirit Predestinarian Baptists, United American Freewill Baptists, United Baptists, Free Communion Baptists, Anti-mission Baptists, Conservative Baptists, Fundamental Baptists, and a host of others.

Are all these conflicting groups Baptist? Impossible! The tragedy is that Baptists have almost lost their identity in this maze of contradictory groups all using the name Baptist. Where can the line be drawn? How can a Baptist be identified?

We are not considering in this article the modernist who disguises under the name Baptist. Certainly no preacher or group could be considered Baptist who would deny the inspiration of God's Word, the Deity of Christ, the Virgin Birth, the blood atonement, the vicarious death of Christ, the bodily resurrection, the personal visible return of our Lord, etc. We eliminate this large group immediately from the right to the name Baptist.

Nor are we dealing in this chapter with those who have pursued some particular interpretation of Scripture until it has become their trademark. We mean those folks who have "gone to seed" on some pet theory. They have, by overemphasis and exaggeration of one or another phase of God's truth, warped it into an untruth. To herald only part of the Truth can be heralding falsehood.

We do not consider those as Baptist who run off on some tangent of emphasis and tack their trademark on the name Baptist. If they do not agree with Baptist why do they try to identify themselves as such? These off-brand, one-cylinder groups can be eliminated as Baptists.

In the United States the bulk of the Baptists are identified with either the Southern Baptist Convention or the American Baptist Convention (formerly Northern Baptist Convention). Over the years these two Baptist groups have developed into great ecclesiastical machines and have departed from the faith Baptists have always held. Although many of the individual preachers and churches in the American Convention and most of those in the Southern are strictly Baptist in their individual beliefs, yet they lose their identity in their support of that which is unscriptural. These individual preachers and churches that are truly Baptist get swallowed up by the unscriptural organization of the ecclesiastical machines.

However, this is not the issue we wish to discuss.

When these great ecclesiastical machines developed into bodies that were unbaptistic they left behind that great group who still remained true to the Baptist position of the ages. This is the group we have in mind. While Conventions, Associations, etc., were turning from the Baptist position this group remained loyal. All over the country there were men and churches that stood firm. With no connecting bond but their love for God and His truth these churches and preachers

stood as one for the great truths Baptists have always held. God did abundantly bless these Baptists. The line was drawn! The fight was on! Thank God the old Baptist Banner was held high!

As time went on these individual churches and preachers began to unite their efforts. Schools, colleges, seminaries, etc. were started. Great missionary efforts were launched. Hundreds of new churches were started. The blessings of God were on these Baptists!

Now we come to the matter so close to our own hearts. The same thing that happened in the old Northern Convention and is happening in the Southern Convention, and it is rearing its ugly head in the ranks of these who have stood so firm. It is an astonishing thing to find churches and preachers receiving with open arms the same kind of error they once stood so valiantly against.

Let us be more specific. There are many sound, true Baptist churches throughout the land that protested vigorously against the hierarchy of the Conventions. Their voices were raised against any group or organization elevating themselves to a place of authority over the local churches. It is an amazing thing that these same churches will now organize themselves into the same kind of hierarchy. In a lot of cases the only thing about the new groups that have been formed that is different from the old is the name.

We find Baptist and Baptist groups who paid the price to stand for true Baptist beliefs are now compromising their position in order to maintain the plaudits of the public and the support of their institutions. Success can be intoxicating. It can demand a terrific price-compromise.

I do not believe it would be too difficult to find a doctrinal statement these Baptists would agree to concerning the Scriptures, the true God, the fall of man, the Virgin Birth, the atonement, grace, salvation, justification, repentance, faith, eternal security, hell, heaven, the resurrection, etc. Where is the wedge being driven? Where has the rot started? The answer is to be found in the doctrine of the church and its ordinances and in the doctrine of the second coming.

Concerning the second coming there are numerous theories. We are premillennial. We believe in the bodily, visible, return of our Lord Jesus Christ to this earth to set tip His kingdom. However we do not believe this issue is what is corrupting Baptist forces. Sometimes it is used as a smoke screen to cover up other issues.

We believe the destructive forces of Satan are attacking and seeking to destroy Baptists by subduing our belief in the doctrine of the church. Among those standing as defenders of the faith always held by Baptists are those who adhere to the universal, invisible church theory, those who accept alien immersion and practice open communion. The sad thing is that those Baptists who are not guilty of these things will accept those that do as first-rate Baptists.

The Baptist churches have no greater danger than that presented by this unholy three, the universal, invisible church theory, alien immersion and open communion. The acceptance and practice of these three will eventually drown Baptists in the sea of interdenominationalism. God forbid!

May God help us to see how we need to hold fast on these lines! Jesus Christ established the first local New Testament church as recorded in Matthew 16.

The promise to that church was "the gates of hell shall not prevail"! It was never to be defeated, never to go out of business. It has existed in every second of history. It is with us now! If we Baptists are right, then our churches are the true New Testament churches — the one Jesus built. If this is not so, why be a Baptist?

Reliable historians trace the Baptist churches back to Christ; even if this were not possible, the church that Jesus built can be identified by doctrine. In our Baptist churches rest the same promise, privileges, commission and authority that the New Testament places there. We have the authority to baptize and to administer the Lord's Supper. No one else has this authority; no one else can baptize or administer the Lord's Supper. No other baptism is valid!

May God give us some backbone! This is the Baptist position and belief. Why tolerate compromisers in our midst? Will we too be destroyed from within?

If the universal, invisible church theory is to be received by Baptists, then we lose our identity. We lose our mission. We lose our purpose. We become one of many branches where chaotic confusion reigns. To accept this theory is to surrender every truth we hold dear. This theory places Baptists in the same pot with every church, cult, denomination, etc. that cares to call itself Christian! Will Baptists lose themselves in apostate Christianity or stand true to God's purpose?

The greatest single weapon that God gave the church to use to maintain its identity was baptism. To open the church doors and receive baptism from a source other than a Baptist is to deny all the historic Baptist doctrines.

The mark of distinction, then, between the church that Jesus built and others is scriptural baptism. The ordinance of baptism was given to the church. To drop the line here and accept so-called baptism from other so-called churches is to cease to be Baptist. To compromise the Bible position on baptism and receive into our churches "every variety" is to become interdenominational. The first line of departure of every great Baptist group from the historic Baptist position has been on baptism.

To throw open the Lord's Supper to everyone is to lose the identity God gave the church. How can standards and discipline be maintained if this sort of thing would be practiced?

May we repeat, an individual or church is either a Baptist or they are not; there are no different kinds. The only way the world will know the difference is as Baptist brethren and churches the world around stand forth and declare themselves and stop compromising the issue.



## The Search for the True Church ---

Roy Mason

Taken from the book, *The Church That Jesus Built*, 1923, Chapter 6

"Any church whose origin was in Mediaeval or modern times is not the church that Christ set up, for the simple reason that it was not in existence when Christ set up His church, and did not come into existence for a long time after."

—W. M. Nevins, in  
*Why a Baptist and Not a Roman Catholic*

"In many instances fate seems to have fixed the name of their human founders upon the churches they instituted."

—J. W. Porter, in *Random Remarks*

"It is a fact that none but Baptists make the claim that our Lord during His personal ministry founded their church or denomination. The one that come nearest making such a claim is the Catholic Church. However, when the Catholic claim is investigated it is found that they claim that Peter was the first Pope . . . But we know their claim is false, that the Catholic Church is not of Christ but is a combination of heathenism and Judaism, bearing the name Christian to cover up its anti-Christian doctrines and practices."

J. L. Smith, in *Why I Am a Baptist*

**W**e have seen that Jesus founded or established the church, that He founded it during the days of His personal ministry on earth, that the church which He established was the local assembly, and that He promised to perpetuate it "till He come." Having ascertained these truths, we are driven to the conclusion that somewhere in

the world today is to be found the true church of Christ—the church that has been perpetuated from the days of Christ and the apostles, and that holds fast the doctrines that prevailed in the New Testament church.

As has been said, "We must either suppose that there has been a Christian people existing in every age from the apostolic to the present, characterized by the same doctrines and practices, or that there were periods in the intervening history when apostolic faith and practice had absolutely no representative on the face of the earth. Are we prepared to take the latter alternative? What then becomes of the Saviour's promise?"

Forced, therefore, to the conclusion that in accordance with Christ's promise, His church has been perpetuated, and that is to be found in the world today, let us ask the question, "How shall we go about finding it? How shall we, from among the multitudes of so-called churches and denominations, find the true, New Testament church?"

I propose to conduct our search for the true church along three corroborative lines, as follows:

1. THE LINE OF HISTORICAL ELIMINATION.
2. THE LINE OF COMPARISON OF DOCTRINES.
3. THE LINE OF HISTORICAL STATEMENTS BY RELIABLE HISTORIANS.

Let us then begin our search along the first line proposed—namely, that of historical elimination. Possibly an illustration will serve to make clear what I mean just here. Let us suppose that you come into possession of a valuable document. You lay the paper upon your library table and soon you are called away for something and, forgetting the paper, you go off and leave it lying there among the papers and books that litter the table. Presently you return and upon looking for your paper you find that your table has been put in order during your absence and the document removed. You call the housekeeper and make inquiry. She tells you that she placed the document between the pages of one of the books on the table. She is very sure about it, but she does not recall just which book she placed it in.

You begin a search, looking through book after book without result. Finally you have examined every book save one, and you are certain that the books examined do not contain the document. What conclusion do you reach? There is only one conclusion possible, and that is, if you were told the truth, the paper you seek must be in the one book remaining.

So in our search we must eliminate every so-called church whose origin may be dated after the time of Christ. If in this process we eliminate every church save one, we shall be forced to the conclusion that that one is the true church.

Going back to the much-discussed Matthew 16:18, we find two historical tests defined by Jesus—tests that should help and guide us in our investigation.

The first is that the only true church was founded by JESUS HIMSELF—"I will build my church."

The second is that the institution which Jesus called "My church" shall never cease to exist through the ages—"The gates of hades shall not prevail against it."

If in applying these two scriptural, historical tests we find that none of the organizations calling themselves churches, save one, can meet these tests, I reiterate we must conclude that that one is the true church of Christ. Let us then inquire into the origin of the various denominations that exist today. In this inquiry we shall concern ourselves only with the origin of the Mill denominations: those that are well known and typical of all others.

The denominations that we shall consider are those from which the many small sects have sprung in more recent years. Being the offspring of the older denominations and having their rise in very recent times, they of course fall so far short of meeting Christ's historical test that it would be entirely superfluous to deal with them.

In this investigation, of course the Church of Rome, which we today call the Roman Catholic Church, takes priority. Let us then begin by asking:

**WHEN DID THE CHURCH OF ROME ORIGINATE?**

We have this question from Dr. J. B. Moody (*My Church*, p. 95): "It did not originate in a day or year, but gradually subverted the apostles' teaching, and in centuries inaugurated full-grown popery. But there is not a trace of a Pope or Universal Father . . . in the first three centuries of the Christian era."

The Catholic Church is the result of gradual perversion and corruption. From the days of Constantine, when soldiers without regeneration were baptized into the church by the thousands, and compromise was made with paganism, conditions waxed worse and worse, finally bringing about a state that made the Catholic Church possible. The actual establishment of the Roman Papacy was, according to Dr. S. E. Tull (*Denominationalism Put to Test*), accomplished by Gregory the Great in the year A. D. 590. Dr. Tull corroborates his statement by the following quotation from Ridpath ( Vol. 4, p. 41):

"This epoch in history should not be passed over without reference to the rapid growth of the papal church, in the close of the sixth century and the beginning of the seventh. Most of all by Gregory the Great; whose pontificate extended from 590 to 604, was the supremacy of the apostolic See attested and maintained under the triple title of Bishop of Rome, Prelate of Italy, and Apostle of the West, he gradually by gentle insinuations or bold assertions as best suited the circumstances, elevated the Episcopacy of Rome into a genuine papacy of the church. He succeeded in bringing the Arians of Italy and Spain into the Catholic fold, and thus secured the solidarity of the Western Ecclesia."

Schaff (*History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 1, p. 15) tells us that Gregory the Great (A. D. 590-604) was the first of the "proper popes," and that with him begins "the development of the absolute papacy." Says Dr. J. T. Christian in commenting on this point: "The growth of the papacy was a process of history. Long before this the bishop of Rome made arrogant claims over other churches." Then he adds: "The line of absolute Mediaeval popes began with Gregory."

We have seen that the Catholic claim to apostolic origin breaks down at several points (See Introductory Chapter): First, in failing to establish the primacy of Peter. Second, in failing to establish that Peter was a pope, or indeed that any pope existed for several centuries after Christ. Third, in failing to prove that Peter was ever in Rome. Fourth, in the fact that Catholic faith and practice is utterly at variance with that of the apostolic church. In connection with the points mentioned above. It may be well, at the risk of multiplying quotations, to give the words of Dr. J. W. Porter (*World's Debt to Baptists*, pp. 165, 166):

"As is well known, the Roman Catholic predicates its claim to Scriptural origin on the supposition that Peter was the first Pope of Rome. Unless they can prove that Peter was at Rome, and that he was also a Pope, their claim to apostolic origin is utterly false. However, there is no controversy on this point, as all the claims of the Roman hierarchy are conditioned upon the primacy of Peter. The two are inseparable and must rise or fall together. Hence for the purpose of this discussion, it will only be necessary to prove that Peter was never a pope at Rome or anywhere else . . . The overwhelming supposition is that Peter was never at any time in Rome . . . There is nothing in the New Testament to suggest that Peter ever thought that he was a pope, or that anyone else ever thought so . . . But even were it granted that Peter was at Rome and that he was a pope, the Roman Catholic hierarchy has by faith and practice forfeited its right to be called a Scriptural church."

If, as Dr. Tull asserts, with Ridpath, world-renowned historian, and others to corroborate him, the Roman papacy was actually accomplished by Gregory the Great, whose pontificate extended from A. D. 590 to 604, then Gregory the Great may be termed the founder of the Catholic Church. True, it is admitted that the Roman apostasy began long before this, but we may rightfully attribute the real formation of the papacy—the real crystallization into a fixed hierarchy—to Gregory the Great, under whose pontificate the "Supremacy of the Apostolic See was asserted and maintained."

To illustrate: It is a well-known fact that David during his reign over Israel, collected vast quantities of materials for the building of a temple. It was his work that in a sense made the temple possible. Yet we do not attribute the temple to David, but to Solomon, his successor, under whose reign the structure was actually erected. Similarly the heresies, traditions, heathenish practices, and indeed all of the elements necessary, had accrued one by one and were in existence at the time

of Gregory the Great. It only remained for him to elevate, as Ridpath puts it, 'The episcopacy of Rome into a genuine papacy.'

Let us now apply the historical test laid down by Jesus in Matthew 16:18. It is very evident that the Catholic Church, built by Gregory the Great from the existing paganized, apostate material, five hundred and ninety years after Christ, cannot meet the historical test of Christ as to origin and perpetuity, and therefore is not the true church—the church which HE founded and promised should never cease to exist.

#### **ORIGIN OF THE LUTHERAN' CHURCH**

The history of the world does not refer to the existence of a Lutheran, or Lutheran Church before the days of Luther. That he was the founder of the Lutheran Church none can successfully deny. Luther, revolting against the degeneracy of the Catholic Church, organized a movement for reform. There is no historical evidence that he even thought of breaking with the Catholic Church and forming a new one. But his activities brought down upon him the anathema of excommunication, and Luther and his followers were almost forced into forming a new organization. The year 1520 is the very earliest date that can be assigned to the formation of the Lutheran Church. It was in this year, according to McGlothlin (*Guide to Study of Church History*), that Luther burned the bull of papal excommunication and openly defied the pope. It was not, however, until the year 1530 that the system of doctrine and morality which he and his followers had adopted was presented to the Diet of Augsburg.

It cannot be but evident that the Lutheran Church founded by Martin Luther, 1,523 years or thereabouts after Christ, fails to meet the historical test of Christ as to origin and perpetuity, hence cannot be the church -which He founded.

#### **THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND OR EPISCOPAL CHURCH**

The origin of this church is very clearly and succinctly summed up by Dr. S. E. Tull, in his booklet before mentioned, in the following words:

"In 1509 Henry the Eighth was crowned King of England. Henry was only twelve years of age at the time. He was married the same year to Catherine of Aragon, daughter of Ferdinand and widow of his brother, Arthur. Twenty years later than this, when Henry came to exercise his own prerogative in personal matters, he decided to divorce Catherine and to marry Ann Boleyn, an English girl who had been reared at the court of Charles the Fifth of France.

"This question of Henry's divorce raised a great discussion, which was finally carried to the Pope of Rome for settlement. The Pope decided against Henry. Realizing the political impotence of the Pope to interfere in England's political matters, Henry thereupon took matters in his own hands, and proceeded to put away Catherine and to marry Ann, notwithstanding the Pope's pronounced interdiction. This defiance of the Pope caused Henry's excommunication from the Church by Pope Clement the Seventh, 1534.

"Accepting the situation as an opportunity to rid himself completely of all political alliances with the Pope, Henry immediately convened his Parliament, and on November 23rd of the same year, 1534, caused his Parliament to pass an act known as "The Act of Supremacy," which declared Henry the Eighth to be "The Protector and Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England."

Thus it was that on the 23rd of November, 1534, the "Church of England" was set up, with the profligate, adulterous, murderous Henry as its founder and head. Brought into existence in a day by the power of a political fiat, the Episcopal Church started on its career as a "Christian" denomination.

Of the church mentioned above, Macauley writes as follows (*History of England*, Vol. 1, p. 32): "Henry the Eighth attempted to constitute an Anglican Church differing from the Roman Catholic Church on the point of supremacy, and on that point alone. His success in this attempt was extraordinary."

Can anything be clearer than that the Church of England, or Episcopal Church, founded not by Christ, but by Henry the Eighth, 1,534 years after Christ, fails to meet the test as to origin and perpetuity, hence cannot be the true church?

#### **ORIGIN OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH**

"The success of Luther's Protestantism on the Continent gave liberty for other like movements. John Calvin, who was born in the year 1509, the same year that Henry the Eighth was crowned King of England, who was educated a Catholic monk, joined hands with Luther and aided the Reformation. In some respects Calvin's ideas of both doctrine and polity were different from those of Luther. For this reason, Calvin's reform fell into distinct channels and crystallized into an independent organization, and because of their form of government, Calvinists became known as Presbyterians."

We may date the beginning of the Presbyterian Church as a separate denomination in the year 1538, as it was in this year that "Calvin's Institutes" was given to the world.

It follows quite naturally that the Presbyterian Church, founded by John Calvin, 1,538 years after Christ, cannot meet the historical test of Christ and cannot be the true church—the one that Jesus founded and promised to perpetuate.

#### **THE CONGREGATIONALISTS**

The Lutherans, Episcopalians and Presbyterians constitute the three great Catholic-Protestant denominations. There are in existence two great denominations, who protested from the Episcopalians, and consequently are the offspring of the Episcopal Church. Let us briefly consider the facts relating to their origin.

I quote from Tull's excellent tract:

"There lived in England in 1580 an Episcopal preacher by the name of Robert Brown. He started a movement in opposition to the State Church, in which he advocated a congregational form of church government and greatly opposed sacerdotalism. He got a following who called themselves "Independents." Robert Brown organized the first Independent church in 1580. Afterwards Brown repented, made confession of his mistake, went back to the Church of England and died in that faith. His followers, however, continued the movement, and became known as "Congregationalists."

Having been founded by Robert Brown 1,580 years after Christ, the Congregationalist Church fails to meet the historical test imposed by Christ and cannot successfully claim to be the true church of Christ.

#### **ORIGIN OF METHODISM**

Let us next consider the other Protestant movement that arose in the Episcopal Church—the one that has in the course of time come to be known as the "The Methodist Episcopal Church." This movement was led by John Wesley and his brother Charles. While in Oxford University they, by their regular habits of religious study and work, earned for themselves the designation of "Methodists," which later attached itself to the movement originated by them. Wesley never intended to organize a church, and indeed did not even dignify his organization by the name church, but called it a "Society." Neither of the Wesley's ever affirmed the right to start a church, and as a matter of fact both of them died members of the Episcopal Church.

With reference to the origin of Methodism, we find the following statement in the "Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church" (1912 edition):

"In 1729 two young men in England, reading the Bible, saw that they could not be saved without holiness, followed after it and incited others to do so . . . God then thrust them out to raise a holy people. This was the RISE of Methodism, as given in the words of its FOUNDERS, John and Charles Wesley . . . Throughout England and in Scotland and Ireland, arose united SOCIETIES of men having the form and seeking the power of godliness."

These subsequently became the Wesleyan churches of Great Britain." Again, referring to Methodism in the early days of its history in the United States, we find these words on page 16 of the same Discipline: "The parish clergy had mostly returned to England and the Methodist SOCIETIES were without ordained pastors for hundreds of miles together."

It may be seen from these quotations that Methodism at first did not assume to express itself in the form of a church, but was a society within the Episcopal Church. It did not start on a separate denominational existence until the year 1739, according to Dr. McGlothlin in his "Guide." It was in this year that the first class meeting was held. However, the first conference was not held until five years later.

The question here arises, if the Methodist Society had a right to evolve into a Church, why may not any church society of the present day do the same? They assuredly have as much right. Again, this question comes: If Luther, Calvin, the Wesley's and others had the right to found a church, have not you and I an equal right to do the same? Again, this question: How old must a movement or society become before it can properly evolve into a "Church"?

But to return to the origin of Methodism, it ought not be difficult to see that the Methodist Church, or "Society" as it was formerly called, founded by John Wesley about 1,740 years after Christ, in no wise meets Christ's test as to origin and perpetuity, and cannot be the true church of Christ.

#### **ORIGIN OF THE CAMPBELLITE DENOMINATION**

It scarcely seems necessary to take the space to detail the origin of this sect, since it is of such recent origin that it would be absurd for anyone to claim for them apostolic origin. Indeed, I am personally acquainted with individuals who knew Alexander Campbell, and remember many incidents connected with the early days of his church, which is more commonly known today by the name "The Christian Church." The date of the beginning of the Campbellites or "Christians" as a separate denomination cannot well be fixed earlier than 1827, although, ignoring the facts of history, they date their origin a few years earlier than the date I have just given. However, a few years makes no difference so far as we are concerned in this discussion.

I remember quite well that just a few years ago this denomination with great enthusiasm, all over the land, celebrated their one hundredth anniversary! To accept their own date, they are only slightly over a hundred years old. Yet I remember to have seen carved on the cornerstone of one of their large church buildings, a statement to the effect that they trace their origin to the time of Jesus and the apostles. Strange statement indeed in the light of their own admission!

Since they had a human founder and are of modern origin, it is quite evident that they do not meet Christ's test and are not the true church.

I could go on and make mention of the Mormons, Christian Scientists, Seventh Day Adventists, Russellites, Nazarenes, "Holy Rollers and others, and detail their origin, but it would be entirely superfluous. It is sufficient to say that each of these just mentioned, together with all the numerous other smaller sects, have had human founders and were never heard of for more than a thousand years after Christ.

#### **WHAT ABOUT THE BAPTISTS?**

We have shown that every sect, denomination, and so-called church, Baptist alone excepted, can be traced to a human founder, and originated long after Christ started His church. Plainly all of these being of post-apostolic origin are eliminated. Just as when in the illustration you looked in every book save one and failing to find the document, knew that it must be in the one remaining, so when every church save one fails to qualify historically as the true church of Christ, it is but right and logical to conclude that the remaining church is the institution that Christ founded.

Baptist churches are unique and clearly distinguished from all others in that no one can truly point to anyone as the human founder. Neither can the date be fixed for their beginning this side of Christ. Some have tried it, and their disagreements and contradictions constitute prima facie evidence of their historical inaccuracy. Those who would deny that Baptists date

back to Christ, and who would assign them a modern origin, ought to hold council together and agree on some certain date! Otherwise their contradictory statements are liable to prejudice people in favor of the very thing they deny!

In succeeding chapters I shall offer historical proof to substantiate my statement that Baptists alone have had existence from the time of Christ. As Dr. Tull puts it:

"The first Baptist church was organized by Jesus Christ, the Son of God, during His personal ministry on the earth. The Baptist church has Jesus for its Founder, the Holy Spirit for the Administrator of its activities, the New Testament for its articles of faith and laws of being. Throughout the Christian ages, pure Baptist teaching has survived. The 'gates of Hades' have not and shall not prevail against it."

