

# The Eight Essentials Q&A; #1

*Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.*

Date: 15 February 2026

Preacher: Billy Joe Calvert

[0:00] Amen.

I was asked as we look at the scripture, did Jesus ever say and Jesus ever quote from the book of Enoch, which is one of the apocryphal writings.

It is one of the extra biblical writings that is put there. And some have taught throughout the ages that Jesus quoted from extra biblical writings and that he quoted from the book of Enoch. We have not found any in our canon of scripture.

That is the books of the Bible that we have that are direct quotes from any apocryphal writings. Or any other things from Christ himself.

Now Paul did quote from the current events of his day. When he was writing to the church of Colossae in the book of Colossians. He quoted what some of their writers had even said.

[1:17] But we do not have any direct quotes from the book of Enoch per se. Now that is careful because when we look at the quotes of scripture in scripture. So when we see Jesus referring to an Old Testament passage.

We see any of the authors of scripture referring to Old Testament passages. When we cross reference them with our Old Testament. We say well that looks a little bit different. It doesn't read exactly the same. There's some variations in that.

So are they quoting from something else? More times than not what they are quoting from is the Septuagint. So that would be the Greek Old Testament. We don't have the Septuagint. We have the Old Testament as translated from the Hebrew.

So there is some variance in translation. But Jesus and the gospel writers are writing to a modern audience. That would have been familiar with the Greek Old Testament in the Septuagint.

So what they were quoting was what they could have cross referenced themselves. But we do not find any quotations of Christ or any other biblical author that is connected directly to any extra biblical book.

[2:20] Okay. And rather every quotation we find of scripture. Now you may find when you read. If you were to study the book of Enoch. You were to study any of the other extra biblical writings. You'll say well that sounds a lot similar to what this teaching was or similar to that.

And that is true. Because there are some similarities. There are some kind of blending or bleeding together of truths and text. But you'd be careful. I would be careful of proof texting so to say.

Finding a particular person. See this proves that that passage is real. Rather than by proof texting I mean don't bring one verse out. Say well Jesus said the same thing so this book must be true.

Rather you need to say what is this book teaching.

And is that consistent with what everything else is being taught in scripture. So that would kind of be the answer to did Jesus quote from that. And as when we were going through Bible. One of the affirmations for the canon of scripture we have.

Is that we find no direct quotes from any other writing. Of any other author. Other than the known Old Testament that we currently have.

[3:23] And even when Paul was quoting from a writer of his time. He said even your writers say. Or even your poets say. And so he is not quoting scripture.

He's being very clear in that. So we don't find any quotes at all from any of the apocryphal writing. By any of the authors. Or any of the teachers in the New Testament. Now the second question we had.

Is the apocrypha good. Because with the same light. Good for Christians to read. For historical value. Even if it contains some error. Because I did share with you when we were going through this.

That there are geographical errors. There are historical errors found in the apocryphal writing. You can find those in that. So is it good? I mean do we have to just shy away from it? Do we need to run away from it at all?

Well I would say that there is some value to it. If you want to understand. And be careful here. There is some value to it. If you want to understand the religious mind frame. Of the audience of the New Testament.

[4:18] So if you want to understand when Paul is writing. Or when Matthew, Mark and Luke and John are writing their gospels. They are writing to people that were influenced by a background. A historical background.

I have found great value in this. When I studied. It was called. I studied scripture. I studied the intertestament times. Well if you study the intertestament times.

Which is setting up everything that happens in the New Testament. I mean there are 400 years of silence there. And you don't really understand where the Pharisees. Sadducees. Essenes. Herodians.

All those people came from. Unless you know what happened. Because these people. We don't find them in the Old Testament. Right? If we were to go from Malachi and open up the book of Matthew. We say well who in the world are the Pharisees?

Who are the Sadducees? What do they believe? Who are these Herodians? And why did John the Baptist go live in the wilderness? And so for studying the word. We do have to at times consult extra biblical writings.

[5:13] To help us understand it. But again caution there. Know what you're reading. And the value therein. Okay? So you don't place the importance on this.

The Maccabean Revolt. Very important. And you find that in the writings of Judas Maccabees. First and second Maccabees. That's part of the Apocryphal writing. There's great embellishment there. Of the Maccabean Revolt. And a lot of things that happened. But Jesus when he declares in the temple. I am the light of the world. That teaching.

He taught it in the temple. During the festival of lights. We don't have an Old Testament festival of lights. We do have though.

We do know what the festival of lights is. By reading first and second Maccabees. And the festival of lights. Was the religious festival. That the Jewish people began. Because during the Maccabean Revolt.

[6:11] God performed this wonderful miracle. That when they cleansed the temple. And they lit again the candelabra. This is like festival Hanukkah. Right? This is exactly what this is. Where Hanukkah comes from. They relit the lamp inside the temple.

Because the temple had been desecrated. Under Antichonus Epiphanes. So when they cleansed the temple. And they relit the lamps. They shut themselves in the temple. To keep the Romans out. And they were revolting against the Roman rule. The early Roman rule. And the story goes. Now we have no biblical grounds. To say this actually happened. But the history teaches us.

That the oil never ran out of those lamps. That those candles burned continuously. As God had declared in the Old Testament. And the oil did not run out. That God preserved the oil.

He validated their work. So to recognize God's validation of that. They started a thing called the festival of lights. And the festival of lights. Was just celebrating the miraculous deed.

[7:08] That God provided the light in the temple. Well it was in that setting. That Jesus stood up and said. I am the light of the world. Now all of a sudden. That teaching of Jesus. Means something totally different. Now because you know.

What they were celebrating. Is the oil didn't run out. Jesus said. I'm the true light. You don't need oil. That doesn't run out. You need me. And so that. There's the benefit. Of kind of understanding.

A little bit of this. But you have to again. Be very careful. With how we equate that. With the rest of scripture. Does anybody ever read.

Any religious writings whatsoever. I mean I have. Bookshelves full of them. And they're beneficial. But none of them. Are equal. To scripture. And so.

If we look at that. And say okay. I always say. Glean what is good. Cast out what is bad. But when you go to scripture. You have to adapt your life.

[8:06] To what it says. And so there's this. Understanding right. That yes. I may can read this. And gain some historical value. But I'm not gaining.

Don't read any of the apocryphal writings. Don't read first and second Maccabees. And say okay. So next time somebody comes. And tells me to do something. I shouldn't do. What I need to do. Is get a sword out. Cut them. Slay them. And go lock myself in the temple.

Don't use that as foundations. For life. Okay. It sounds like a good plan. Every now and then. But. Don't do that. So hopefully. We understand that. Can we read some of the apocryphal writing. Even if it contains error. Yes. Why? Because I have some really. Really. Really good. Christian books back there. That I promise you. They contain error too. And they're just books. They do. Okay. I have. One of the. Well. Be careful. How you can call this out. One of the most prominent. Commentaries.

[9:05] Even in the baddest world. That you'll find sitting on people's shelves. Are Barclays commentaries. William Barclays commentaries. It's one of the first commentaries given to me.

If you have a William Barclay commentary. Please don't hold anything against me. That I'm about to say to you. Barclay did phenomenal. On some aspects. But he also cast doubt.

Upon the virgin birth of Christ. Now I removed the whole commentary from. I said. I didn't need it anymore. But he left the door open. But if you didn't study.

Matthew or Luke. And you read Barclays commentaries. On other things. It was amazing. Now does that mean I'm like. You know. Anathema to William Barclay. No. Because no.

Man. Knows everything. He contained error there. And to me. The error was greater than the benefit. So that's why I removed Barclay from my library.

[10:03] But. I don't go into everybody's library. And if you have Barclays commentaries. I don't. You know. Throw it away on you. And tell you that's wrong. Now I'm probably will look at you and say. Don't study. The Luke.

Commentary. At least get past Luke 2. Before you open it up. But anyway. So that hopefully will answer that one. Third question I have. If Peter. This is a good one. This one's going to take me just a few moments to answer.

Hopefully we'll get it. This is a really good one. If Peter did not claim to be the head of the church. And he never did. If Peter did not claim to be the head of the church. Who among his successors started this tradition.

Because the Pope sits upon the seat of Peter. In the Roman Empire. In the Roman Church. So who started the tradition. And why didn't someone stop it. That's a really hard one to nail down.

But it's going to take just a few moments. And you're going to have to kind of walk with me for just a minute. And then this one. Okay. We don't know anything about Peter. Other than the reality that we have included in our scripture.

[10:57] There's a lot of tradition that we have about Peter. Even some of the things that I have said. That Peter was crucified upside down. That is tradition. We cannot validate that. Some people say there's absolutely no way that that happened.

We do know that Peter was martyred for the faith. We know that he died very early on. Eusebius. Remember him. The early church historian. Likes to tell us. That Peter was the pastor.

Or the leader. The leading elder. Of the Roman Church. That Paul and Peter both were leaders of the Roman Church. That Peter ended up making his way there. Now be careful.

I told you this. Eusebius writes in the 300s. 325 and following. He was also really greatly influenced by the Roman Empire. So he read into some of his church history.

We know that he's not absolutely accurate. Because he says that Peter and Paul were both martyred on the same day. And we know historically that is absolutely not true. That did not happen.

[11:54] So it's kind of tainted a little bit there. So anyway. This is a long story to get to this. How did we get here? Tradition by the Roman Church says that Peter was the first pastor of the church in Rome.

Along with Paul. And then they began to cling on to this reality. That because the church in Rome was one of the first mega churches. It grew faster than any other one.

It was growing because it was such a diverse background. And we don't have to get very far into. The Jerusalem church fades off the scene very quickly. Because Jerusalem fell. In AD 70 the Jerusalem fell.

Because the Romans encircled around it. And so the Jerusalem believers scattered. And we praise God for that. Because that helped kind of preserve our scripture. That's where they took them. And they hit them. And the Comoran Valley.

And all that other stuff. And anyway. The Jerusalem church scattered. And so then the center of focus is Antioch. You know that. Because you read the book of Acts. But after Antioch. And then we start.

[12:52] Paul goes on his missionary journeys. People begin to start accepting Christ. And by the time Paul gets in Rome. Read the book of Romans. He is greeted by a church. Right? Paul gets to church.

And it says in the brethren. I mean when he gets to Rome on a ship in the book of Acts. It says the brethren met him at three markets in. So there's already a church there. We don't know who started the church in Rome. Nobody does.

Nobody claims to know it. More than likely it started on the day of Pentecost. And there were people there and heard it message and took it back. And all of a sudden there is a church there. But the church of Rome started beginning to claim some connection to Paul and Peter.

And they began to claim that connection very early on. Because Rome is the first big church. Now really by the time we get to the mid 100s. Rome is no longer the big church player.

As a matter of fact the big church player is the church in Corinth. Because there's a man you would know there. John. And the apostle John who is. We do know. He leads the church there for just a little while.

[13:52] He passes on. He goes to the island of Patmos. He comes back. And there's this great succession of leaders in the church of Corinth. In the Asia Minor region. But Rome is still down here.

In their place of prominence. And they began. I told you this was a long one. They began to see some connectivity to how they interpreted scripture. That God gave Peter the keys to the kingdom of heaven.

So they interpret Matthew chapter 16. And since historically they said Peter had been their first pastor. Or their first presbytery. Then all of a sudden we have a place of prominence.

And they began to kind of lift themselves up. Not in a bad way. But they began to say well we're the Catholic church. We are the ones. And Peter was the first one here. And they interpreted he is the rock. And so they began to have this succession of those following in the position of Peter.

Because Peter. Now we. Just to be quite honest. There is no historical mandate that absolutely verifies Peter was ever a pastor in Rome. We do know he was crucified.

[14:57] That he died there. A martyr's death. But we have no mandate. Now it could have been when he wrote some of the letters. And he said the church was in Babylonian captivity.

Kind of referred to them in Babylon. That could have been Rome. But we don't know. Okay. Again that's esegesis. Reading into scripture what we want. But the Roman church liked to say.

Because it gave them a place of prominence. Move forward. And this is where my son could do better than me. I don't know. In history. Number of years.

And the center of Rome. Changes. And it moves from the city of Rome to Constantinople. And now all of a sudden the leaders of the Roman Empire. Are no longer in Rome itself.

And there are these. All these warriors that are coming in. And all these people that are coming in. Trying to ransack the area. But the priest of the church in Rome. Interceded. And he alone.

[15:51] Because the Roman leader. Had left town. He's in Constantinople. And he mandated the peace agreements. He did all these other things. Again it was good stuff. But because of that he said. Wait a minute.

I have authority now. Now I not only have spiritual authority. I have political authority. Because I can say. I can mandate peace agreements. And so then Rome began to build an importance in their eyes.

But I know that it says. It happens pretty early on. But really what you don't. You have this succession of pastors in Asia Minor. And then you have this succession of people. And because of conflicts. With the center of the Roman Empire. Now being in a different region. Constantinople. And you have the Eastern. Which later becomes the Eastern Orthodox Church. The Eastern Church is growing in prominence. Because they're the center of government. Then the Roman Church needs to validate their position of authority. Now all of a sudden we begin to see them referring to it as the seat.

[16:48] Or the C. S-E-E. Of Peter. And so all of their authority is based upon. Only Peter served as pastor in Rome. But a.

Unbiased interpretation of history. We cannot neither validate that. Nor dismiss that. He could have. But we don't know. And so it is there.

Then they began this succession. Of Petrine. Popes. And the claim is. Because we alone have the authority. We alone have the authority. And a lot of it was in response.

To a growing church. In the Eastern world. Okay. So the one thing they could hold on to. Is we have Peter. Y'all don't. For. That's. You know. War trace grammar. Y'all never had a Peter.

We did. But there was also John. There was all these other ones. That. You know. But no. And by the time. The answer to the question. Why didn't any of his disciples. Dismiss that.

[17:45] Well the reality is. Is they all died pretty early on. They all died. Very early on. Those. I mean. Mark. And. Those who traveled with Peter.

So. There's. There's so much loss. Is what happened. They're really just trying to claim that. Okay. Last one from this individual. And this is a good one. Almost got to that.

But I figured I would get to it here. Did the early church believe. That the communion. To be the real body. And the real blood of Christ. And. Why do we see it as symbolic. And absolutely. Communion.

In the Catholic church today. Is seen as the literal body. In the literal blood of Christ. That when they gather together. For the Eucharist. Is what it's referred to there. That the.

The bread. Is. Miraculously. Transformed. Into the body of Christ. And the. Wine. Is miraculously. Transformed. Into the blood of Christ. This is why.

[18:40] And I've said this in a laughing matter. But it's really not a laughing matter. This is why. If the attendance of mass is down. The priest has to drink all the wine. Before he leaves. Because it is the blood of Christ.

And the number of priests. In the Catholic church. Have gotten DUIs. From leaving mass. That was not well attended. Because they had to finish. The blood of Christ. It's unholy.

To leave it. Unpartaken of. And so they adhere to. Lutherans. Martin Luther. Really went back and forth on this. Very early on. And even John Calvin.

They adhere to. This is why. Baptists began to make that break. Say. We don't really see that. So some of you reformers said. Okay. I can see that it could happen that way. But again. Because Jesus said.

There is some teaching. And you can read into that. And say. Well. This is my body. This is my blood. Right. Now. The reason it was so important. To the Catholic church. Is salvation. Is found.

[19:36] In the taking. Of the Eucharist. So if you don't take mass. You're not saved. You have to eat of the body.

And drink of the blood of Christ. And this is why. Very early on. We found the Roman church. Abstaining. Individuals. From the Eucharist. And this is how the Pope.

Could look at the leaders of the land. And saying. We're not going to serve you mass. And so they go. Wait a minute. So if I don't get the body. And blood of Christ. And I'm eternally condemned. And so they would succumb.

To the wills of the church. Because their whole salvation. Was wrapped up in the taking of the mass. The Eucharist. Was the central aspect. Of the early church. Sure. It was. But we have no testimony. That the early church. Literally thought it was. Actually some of the. Judgments against the early church. And by early. I mean the 100 ADs. Is that when the church gathered together.

[20:32] They were having all these. Cannibalistic love feasts. Right. So not only would they have these orgies. And that was their love feast. So they said. Okay. We won't do that anymore. And so they were. It was all behind closed doors. So some of the accusations against them were.

Think about this. That they would take babies. And bake them. In loaves of bread. And that way when they sliced the bread. They were taking of the body. And the blood. Which ought to tell you. If that is the accusation. That is being made against the church. The church never claimed. They were eating literal bodies. And drinking literal blood.

That was never the proclamation of the early church. But as it began to take on importance. In a particular branch of the church. To validate the importance. They began to interpret.

That this miraculously transforms. Into the body and the blood of Christ. Still taught today. Why do we see it as memorial and representative? Again it goes back.

[21:30] That Eurich Zwingli. Is the first. And the reformers to say. Well wait a minute now. The. Preaching did not take central focus. Of the church. Until after the reformation.

Okay. It was not until we really got into the importance of the word. Preaching was kind of a secondary. Matter. Because the common man. Couldn't read the word.

Common man didn't come in with a copy of the word. And the common man. Was only told. This is what you do. This is what you don't do. So with the printing press. And translation of scripture. And all those things. Preaching began.

To be a central part of it. So as they began to study. Into the word. They said. It looks like it's not. Christ never said. It's supernaturally transforms. He was giving a visible.

Picture. He was giving a picture. Of what it is. So in the bad. Baptist thinking. Is that. It is a visible representation.

[22:25] And we are to take it. As Paul would say. In first Corinthians 11. As a reminder. Of the broken body. And the shed blood. This is why. We did this. Not just past.

Christmas Eve. We did it two Christmas Eves ago. And I'll be honest. The first time I ever did this. Or I saw this happening. Was in a. New Circle. Church. Which is a Baptist church plant.

In Indianapolis. Whenever we were there. For Southern Baptist Convention. We'd worked there years ago. When it was a church plant. And Carrie. And the kids and I. Some of the kids and I. Were back just a couple years ago. And we went to it. And I saw the church do it then.

And I did some study on it. This is why. I think it's important. At times. When we pass the bread. We're taking a wafer out of the dish. If you remember. A couple. Christmas Eve's ago. We actually had big loaves.

And I had you break it off. Why? Because. The symbol means. That body's broken. And so. I think we've lost something. When we don't. Actually have to break the bread.

[23:22] We're just getting a part of it. And so. There is this resurgence. Among. Baptists thinking. That we ought to get back. To literally breaking the bread. Or we're losing some of the.

Worship. Meaning behind it. Because that body's broken. And the blood is poured out. So yes. There is some variance in that. Hopefully those answered that.

We get to that in just a minute. And with that in mind. I was asked. Why does. Why don't the Baptists take communion. Every Sunday. That is a great question. And. Really. The early Baptists. Did take communion. Every Sunday. And some. Still do. I've attended Baptist churches. That take it. Every Sunday. That church. In particular. New Circle Church. In Indianapolis. Takes it. Every Sunday.

I'm not. Against. Taking it. Every Sunday. Probably the reason. We don't do it. Is an overreaction. By my part. I grew up in a church.

[24:15] That took it. Every Sunday. It became rote. It became ritual. It became mundane. And it wasn't done. With the reverence. And it was just. We tacked it on at the end. And said.

All right. We're going to take communion. And we took it. Like we do. The taking up of tithes and offerings. As a matter of fact. We took it all at the same time. Past the basket. Past the bread. Past the juice. And. It just became so ritualistic.

That you lose the meaning. So. Even the church. I'm referring to in Indianapolis. Takes it every Sunday. It is an instrumental part. Of their worship. It is. Very centrally focused.

In the middle of their worship. Everybody has to get up. And come forward. And so. In that manner. I am not opposed at all. To taking it every Sunday. But it's.

The Baptists. Historically. Have gotten to the point. Where it says. As often as you do this. Not to be binding. Again. There's freedom. In that. That you're not bound. To do it week to week.

[25:09] But we can see some binding there. In the book of Acts. Where it says. And from. Day to day. They were breaking bread. And taking. They were fellowshiping. With one another. So. We can see that.

But really. It's just up to each. Local body. Of believers. In the Baptist world. As to why we don't take it. Every Sunday. And it's been. At times. Once a month. Once a quarter.

Whatever. My personal opinion is. As long. As it can be done. In reverence. And worship. And not become ritual. Then I will do it as often. As we can.

For a reminder. But it needs to be done. Intentional. With some intentionality. If you know what I mean. Not just. We don't want to take communion. The same way. We take up the offering.

Because it's different.

There's a meaning there. Okay. So. Yeah. Great question. Okay. Here's a few questions. And this one. Was asked by a couple people. And I'm trying to make my way guys. So that I can get to your questions here.

[26:08] Do infants who die in the womb. Go to heaven. Or what about those who die. Before the. Quote unquote. Age. Of accountability. Do they die? That's a good question.

It's a great question. The answer I give you. Is probably not going to be sufficient. To your question. And the answer I give. Is probably going to. Upset some people. So I'll just go ahead.

And tell you this one at all. We don't know. Okay. We don't know. But we do know.

And this. This is. I have my beliefs in this one. And this again. This. This gets me in trouble. God does know. His sheep. He does know those.

Who are his. The historical. London confession. Of the Baptist church. I have it actually. In the back of my Bible. It's in this Bible. Who needs the 1689.

[27:00] London confession of faith. Who reads that. Happens to be in mine. So. Along with others. But the historical. Baptist confession of faith. Is this. Those children.

Who die in infancy. That were. Predestined. And elected. By God. Before the foundation. Of the world. Will reside with him. In eternity forever. Now the reason.

That upsets us. And I know. Because the core of your being. You mean there'll be kids. Who are not there. That. I'm just telling you. What the 1689. Historical. London confession of faith.

Says. It is. Essentially. Just a good way. Of saying. God is the author. Of salvation. And he knows. Those who are his. And at times.

We have to surrender that. We don't know. Because I'm going to challenge you. With this. Because this is what's. You're going to say. Those kids. Didn't do anything. Right or wrong. And I'll say.

[27:55] You're absolutely. Right. But. There's a bigger picture. In this. And this is going to make. Your brain smoke. And this is going to make. You upset. I promise. Because these are things.

I've wrestled with. The question is. And it's a historical question. It's been asked. Are we wrong. Because we do wrong.

Or are we wrong. Because we were born. With an inherited sin nature. Are we wrong. Because we sin.

Or do we sin. Because that's our nature. And that's a question. That has to be answered. It's not. I'm not saying. It's a divisive question. It is a challenging question.

Baptists have always. Stood on the side. Of. We are sinners. Because that is our nature. We inherited. The endemic sin. The sin of Adam.

[28:51] That when Adam fell. All of humanity fell. It's the curse of humanity. And therefore. Every descendant of Adam. Has inherited the sin nature. Where do you find that? The Romans chapter five.

And following. Right. The first Adam. And the last Adam. And therefore. We have inherited. The endemic sin nature. And we are not sinners. Because we do bad things. We're sinners. Because we're born that way.

And therefore. That means from the womb. We are. By nature. Sinful. And that's wrestling. I know. And even when I. Hey. When I talked to Carrie. She's like. I can't get with that. I said. I know. I can't get with it either. At times. It's not about feelings. Okay. It's not about. I don't. I try to talk. Regardless of feelings.

Because you have to. Separate yourself. From feelings. And the reason. We have to separate ourselves. From feelings. Is because. Is scripture true.

[29:50] Or are our feelings true. And I told you. It was going to. I told you. It was going to hit hard. And. And so.

We just have to say. Okay. God is the author. And giver of salvation. Because if you say. Well we're sinners. Because we do bad things. But then how are you saved. Are you saved. Because you do good things.

See. See. You have to take it. To its logical conclusion. Who you are. Defines how you see your salvation. So it means. If you never sin.

If you never do anything. Quote unquote bad. Then you don't need a savior. And. That's difficult. I know it's difficult. These. They're deep questions. They're hard. And I'm not going to sit here.

And tell you. I have it all figured out. I'm going to tell you. My. I beat my. Brain. And my head. Against the couch. In my office. Praying over these matters. Time and time and time again. For my own self.

[30:43] Trying to work it out. With fear and trembling. God. God. These are questions. I can't answer. And I don't. I don't know the answer. To all of them. But that's. That's a good one. This one kind of sets me up.

How does Calvinism. And doctrine of grace. That is. Tulip. If you know. The tulip acronym. Hold up against scripture. John Calvin. Was really. Good. In scripture. Calvinism.

Please. I've had people come up. Say. Oh you're a Calvinist. And I'll tell them. Everything. I'll tell them. The same answer. I'll tell them. Please. Never call me a Calvinist. You don't call me anything. Call me a biblicist.

Okay. I'm going to stand. Where the Bible stands. I don't want to be called. Arminian. I don't want to be called. Calvin. I don't want to be called. After the name of any individual. I don't want to be called that. But how does Calvinism. Hold up to biblical teaching.

It is pretty solid. But I think John Calvin. Was a little extreme. On some things. Just as short. Short answer to that. I cannot adhere to everything. That he teaches. And all of that. But I can see the scriptural mandate.

[31:39] That he. He brings to that. I can see where he got it. But I cannot adhere to all of that. Okay. Thoughts on the 1689. London Baptist confession of faith. It's pretty good. But it's also pretty general.

What you do need to know. You're in a Baptist church. 1689. London confession of faith. Was staunchly. Calvinistic. And by. When I mean staunchly.

It taught everything. John Calvin taught. So all. That's 1689. That's not us. Okay. We're based upon the Philadelphia. Confession of faith. The London Baptist confession of faith. Came in the 1600s. The Philadelphia. Baptist confession of faith. Came later in the 1700s. And then you move. You keep on going down. You get the confession of faith. In North Carolina. And then you end up with the Baptist faith. And message by the Southern Baptist.

The Baptist faith. And message is neither Calvinistic. Nor Armenian. And it's not any of that there. Okay. I'm just telling you. Historical doctrines. It was staunchly. So because of that. Some of the things. That are listed in the London confession of faith.

[32:33] I can say. Okay. I can see where they get that. But I'm not going to say. I'm sold out on that. I have not found. A single individual. In



my entire life. That I can say. I completely agree with that person.

A hundred percent. And you probably won't ever either. And so you can say. Well we are in the same vein. But I don't know for a hundred percent.

Does Mark 16. 16. First Peter 3. 21. And Acts 2. 38. Teach baptismal regeneration. Is true. The first challenge. I'll give you. Is on Mark 16. 16. The oldest.

Fragments of scripture. Again. This is going to make you go. What? And kind of get upset at me.

The oldest fragments of scripture. We have stops at Mark 16. 8. Where the women were in fear and trembling. And everything.

After Mark 16. 8. And I can say this. Because I've had to define this. I've had to refute this. I've had to discuss this. With my own family. I've had to do it. Sitting on a telephone pole. And a set of hooks. With an individual. Who really adhered to Mark 16.

[33:29] 16. And thought he had me caught. I've had to do this. The whole time. I profess Jesus Christ. As my Lord and Savior. In a Baptist church. Mark 16. 16. Is the verse that. Some denominations stand on. And believe absolutely.

Because those who believe. And are baptized. Shall be saved. Is what it says. Mark 16. 16. So they connect. The baptismal word. Their belief. And are baptized. I'll get to that in just a moment.

The first refutation. That I'll give to that. Is our oldest text. Of scripture. Do not contain anything.

Beyond Mark 16. 8. It is. The understanding. Of most biblical scholars.

Most historically. That the rest of that. Was a scribal edition. Trying to reconcile. The conclusion of Mark. With the conclusion. Of the other synoptics. Does that mean.

We shouldn't read it. Does that mean. We shouldn't adhere to it. We're going to preach that. At some point. Pretty quickly. Right. But also. There's some kind of telltales. If you were to read it. And just kind of read it. And it's just a normal setting.

[34:23] And you say. Wait a minute. Some of that's different. The great commission. In Mark. Is also the only one. That says anything. About handling snakes. And not. And being bitten. Not dying. That's nowhere else. In scripture. Or drinking poison.

That's nowhere else. In scripture. So if we're going to use. Mark 16. 16. Then we can also say. I've been baptized. So now I can drink poison. And I won't die. I can handle snakes. And I won't die. By the way.

A lot of the churches. That adhere to baptismal regeneration. And use Mark 16. 16. Do not want to be. Snake handling. Baptists. We've met some snake handlers. Before. They do not want to handle snakes.

And I say. Well wait a minute. If you're going to have one. You've got to have the other. And then the other. Reputation of the Mark passage. Is this. That word. Your whole theology.

Is based upon. Those who profess Christ. And. Are baptized. So that whole. Baptismal regeneration. Does baptism save us? That's what that means. Is based upon a.

[35:20] Conjunctive. And. And there were no conjunctives. In the original language. And was not in existence. So the wording.

Could literally read. And more than likely. Does literally read. Those who profess. Jesus Christ. And have been baptized. For. Their salvation. Or because.

Of their salvation. Even the will be. Is not in the original. So it could read. Those who profess Christ. And have been baptized. Because of their salvation. Are saved. And that's different.

If you've been baptized. Because of. Your salvation. Or for. Your salvation. There's a big difference. The Acts 2 passage. Is another one. That is used. Because Peter. They asked Peter. What shall we do then.

To be saved. And Peter says. Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. And be baptized. For the remission of your sins. So I'll see. That's. That one's there. We know that one's there. We absolutely know. That one's there. That is in the original manuscript. What about that?

[36:15] Well that's good. But what is the question. In Acts 2. What shall we do? That's the question. It doesn't say. What shall we do. To be saved. What shall we do? Who is Peter preaching to.

In Pentecost? He's preaching to. A Jewish audience. Because it's the Jewish people. Who have come around. From the Roman Empire. To observe the Passover. Baptism. Is a Jewish symbol.

Of renewal. Is a Jewish right. They. They were baptizing people. Into Judaism already. So it was something. The Jewish people. Are really familiar with. If you want to see. What you must do. To be saved.

You have to go to Acts 16. And you have now. The first. Non-Jewish person. Asking. What shall I do. To be saved. It is the direct question. The Philippian jailer says. What must I do.

To be saved. And what does Paul say? Believe on the Lord. Jesus Christ. And you will be saved. In your whole household. So if baptism. Was required. For salvation.

[37:07] Then Paul surely. Would have said. Believe. And be baptized. But he doesn't. He says. Believe. On the Lord Jesus Christ. So no. I do not adhere. To baptismal regeneration. I cannot find proof. For that.

I can see some picking. And choosing. On that. Next question. Are people. Who do not affirm. Faith alone. In Christ alone. Going to be saved. They believe. In working with God. For their salvation. I'm going to go ahead.

And just answer this one. Really quickly. I believe. When we get to heaven. We're going to see. All kinds of people there. And we're going to say. Wow. I never expected. To see them there. I believe God is sovereign. I believe. That there are people. That are genuinely saved.

Who are attending churches. That preach and teach. Baptismal regeneration. Or preach and teach. Where I believe. There are people. Whose hearts. I've been converted. And drawn by the Lord. I'm not going to ever say. Oh this is the only true way.

This is the right way. And I'd be very. Very very cautious. Anytime I hear somebody say. This is the true. This is the only true way. This is the only absolute way. Because that is still. A man interpretive way.

[37:59] Okay. That's just. That's just my. My thought on that. I have some dear friends. That are not Baptist. I believe they're genuinely saved. I believe that they know Christ. Is their Lord and Savior.

I believe that they think. That he is their Lord and Savior. Because of some good things. They have done. I think their doctrine. Is a little weak. But that's okay. Okay. That's matters. That they have to work out.

Before the Lord themselves. Just as I had to. And I cannot. I'm not their judge. I'm not. I'm their judge for fruit. So if they profess Christ. And I can hold them. To a higher standard.

I can judge them. By the fruits. But I'm not their final judge. Of condemnation. You say. Ah. You're not a believer. And so. I'd be cautious on that. And this is a good question. Don't think much through this.

Do you have to be. Water baptized. In a local assembly. Or can you have another Christian. Baptize you. And it still be valid. This is a good question. That's pertinent to this time. Because you see all these. Great quote unquote. Awakenings.

[38:53] Going across campuses. In our college campuses. And they pull out this water trough. And they're baptizing. All these new believers. And glory. Praise God. God is moving. Again. Historical Baptist.

Distinctive says. Baptism. Is a local church ordinance. Because everywhere in scripture. We see someone being baptized. They're also joining a community.

Of believers. And so. If you separate that. Then you are. Discounting the church. Which is the bride of Christ. And so.

Baptism. Without church membership. Is really. Anti-scriptural. Okay. But here. And here's a question. Which I think is a good one. Can anyone baptize you?

Again. I'm teaching. From this. Perspective. Okay. Historical. Baptist. Distinctive. Say. Since we believe. In the priesthood. Of the believers.

[39:48] That the authority. Historical. Not Southern Baptist. Historical. That the authority. To baptize. Resides. Within every true believer. And historically.

It was practiced. Women baptizing women. Men baptizing men. And that was okay. I did it. When Miss Sarah. Asked. To follow the Lord. In believers baptism.

The greatest influence. On her life. I hope it's okay. If I call you out. I had this meeting with her. And she had a desire. And the greatest influence. Spiritually on her life. Had been her father. And she said. Can my dad baptize me?

I know her dad. I know her dad's. Genuine in his faith. I know her dad's. A genuine believer. I said absolutely. And so. Her dad came. We walked through it. Her dad did the baptism. I was here. I was present.

I'll just go ahead and say. And I'm not calling this. Anything out on this. Her dad's pastor. Called me and said. I don't think you should be doing that. Because baptism is. I shouldn't have brought that up. Baptism is.

[40:42] Is. Is confined. To the priest. And I said. I believe. I said respectfully. I disagree with you. Because when I read scripture. I see the priesthood of the believers. So I believe. He is the priesthood of his home. And the greatest ministry he had.

Was to his daughter. And now he has the right to baptize his daughter. I took the stand. We still fellowship. I mean that pastor still fellowship. But we just disagree. Among Baptist churches. So. My understanding is. If an individual is a genuine believer. And if. They are following Christ. I think it should be under the care of a pastor or elder.

But I believe that. That. Is absolutely possible. One of the greatest privileges I've had in pastoral ministry. Is to baptize my children. And so.

Why would I. Not allow. A dad. To have that same privilege. As well. Just because I happen to be the pastor. If we're going to be consistent. In our understanding of Baptist distinctives.

[41:41] The priesthood of the believer. Then we have to take it to its uttermost. Right. Without it. Then I'm the high priest. And you guys don't have the authority I have. That's. That's just the only other interpretation we can have.

Okay. Let's move through these other. Really quickly. What about this whole greeting one another with a holy kiss thing. Is it a cultural thing. What's the heart of what Paul is telling us. Please don't come greet me with a holy kiss.

Took me a while to get used to people hugging me. And then finally when I came to Christ. I was really a guy that kind of guarded that. Paul really is speaking of intentional fellowship there. It was a cultural thing.

Intentional fellowship. Being committed to one another. Letting someone know that yes. I'm allowing you into my bubble. I want you in my space. We're brothers. And so I believe that's the thing. And last I have to ask you guys if you have a question.

Where exactly does War Trace Baptist Church vary from Southern Baptist? What issues do you think differently than the Southern Baptist Convention? I said this morning. I was talking about historical Baptist doctrine. I wouldn't say that I in particular vary.

[42:40] from Southern Baptist faith and message. I take a little bit different stance than what Southern Baptist are willing to take at times.

Okay. And I've had people say, well then why are you still a pastor of Southern Baptist Church? Because of the Baptist thought of the autonomy of the local church. And if I pull myself out, then I no longer have the freedom to speak to the problems I see.

And so I feel like it's my due diligence to say, hey, I'm here. I write letters. I send emails. I make calls. I make calls. And say, I don't think this is right. Because when you remove the statesmen, and I'm not saying that I'm a statesman.

It's happened historically in the Southern Baptist world. They took the statesmen, Adrian Rogers, all those people, R.G. Lee. They took them out of the room because they're all passed on. And when the statesmen are gone, then the convention goes however it wants to go.

And so when you take people who are not willing to stand up and go, wait a minute, guys. I think this is wrong. And everybody just says, forget it. I'm going to do my own thing. Then you let it go. I think there's too much freedom at times found in the Southern Baptist.

[43:49] They like to affirm some matters. It's really going to get me in trouble here. They like to affirm things, but they won't take a hard stance because they're afraid of what legal implications they may get.

This past convention we said we want to put it in writing that pastors, the position of pastoral ministry is reserved for men only. We've asked that in the last three conventions.

And it's been like the majority of messengers have asked for that, but it's not a super majority. And since the super majority hadn't done it, then it won't pass an amendment to the faith and message.

And they keep saying they won't do it.

And the reason it's not a super majority is because from the platform you have people say, well, no, if we do this, we may face legal implications. And we could face defamation lawsuits from the churches that we disfellowship. And because we're going through a lot of that right now in the Southern Baptist world.

And just to be just fully transparent, my mindset is so what? If it's right, it's right. If you face the lawsuit and face the lawsuit, I would rather trust the Lord as opposed to trust the government. So there are times I don't think they take a strong enough stance.

[44:50] There have been times where they have pushed agendas that I wish they wouldn't have pushed. And then they come back and they say, wait a minute. I don't like the platform mentality. I'm just being honest with you. I don't like the platform mentality of Southern Baptist world.

I don't like the fact that you got the guys up on the platform and they're going, oh, they've made it. They've done all this. And they're going, there's, it's, I just don't like that. So when I go to the meetings, I go as a messenger of this church and I go as a representative of this church.

And I call out things that I think need to be called out as much as I can. I've told some of the deacons and elders know this. I've told some other people this. I carry and, and I, along with those that were with us last year that went to the Southern Baptist convention, I went to the small church pastors luncheon put on by one of the entities of the Southern Baptist convention.

And while I was there, again, I'm 20 years into pastoral ministry up on the platform. And I looked around the room and, and then there I'm 20 years in the ministry and I feel like a novice in the room of all these pastors.

I mean, there are some men who have 40 and 50 years of ministry. You can just tell. And I'm in all of these men because they are all pastoring churches of 150 or under, which is by the way, 90% of Southern Baptist churches.

[46:06] And these are men that are in unknown places, pastoring unknown churches, and they're doing it every week. And what was brought in on the platform was a pastor had been pastoring for eight years and a pastor had been pastoring for three years.

And they started telling us how to do ministry. And that upset me. And then there was a comment made of which I stood up and walked out of, out of the meeting with my wife and everybody else that was with me in attendance.

Is the comment was, even if you're pastoring in an insignificant church, you can still do great things for the kingdom. And I got mad because they, I looked at Carrie and I said, did they just tell me that the bride of Christ is insignificant?

She said, I think that's what I heard. I said, then I'm leaving. And when I got back and they sent me the survey to ask how the meeting went, I told them.

Did I hear anything back? No. But if I hadn't been there, I wouldn't be able to call it out. So those are the things that bother me. Don't tell a man that's pastoring a church of 50 people in a community that may have 200 people in it that his church is insignificant.

[47:06] Don't ever refer to me. Don't ever refer to the bride of Christ as insignificant because it doesn't have this major. And what was going on, and I'll just, this is a boiling point for me, okay?

As they say, because you can do great things by partnering with us and doing missions. And when I looked up there, we had done more missional work as a church than anybody on that platform the past year.

We had had people in more countries, we had supported more church plants, and we had given more, a greater percentage of our income to missions than anybody on that platform. Yet they were telling me we were insignificant.

So I got upset. I'll just be honest with you. I got really mad. That's where I vary from Southern. Now, the majority of your Southern Baptist churches are those saints that were sitting beside me in that room.

But it's the platform that bothers me at times. Do I stay there? Yes. Why? Because I want to tell the platform they're bothering me. Just to be honest.

[48:10] Now, if they ever start taking hard stances that I think are unbiblical, I'm much like Adrian Rogers in the 80s, I don't have to be

Baptist, but I have to be biblical, and I'll pull out in a minute.

Whether or not you as a church pull out with me, that's up to you. But I will pull out in a minute. The moment they depart from Scripture, I'll pull out in a minute. So they haven't taken any scriptural mandates, but there are some practical mandates that I say, Ah, I can't go with that.

Okay? All right, that's all the questions I had sent to me in advance. I'm going to open it up to you real quick, okay? Anybody have a question? We're after 7 o'clock, but I'll give you a moment.

Travis, don't ask me yours right now because yours is very long.

I have yours in the text message, so don't ask me yours yet. You gave me permission in your question not to answer it tonight. You did, so I'm not, and it's going to take, yeah, yeah, yeah.

So if I can get to it, I'll get to it in just a moment. Yours takes me a long time to get to. Okay. Any questions? Yes. Yes. Right.

[49:18] Right. Right.

Well, it wasn't held for all of Christendom because, again, the early church, early, early church, didn't adhere to literal blood, literal body.

We find that coming into, and so, yes, there was, and I could go, I know where you're going with this. Can I say that for that amount of years that it went on that way wrong?

Yes. And because, for lack of a better way of putting it, because you're talking about years where understanding the scripture was clearly defined from the platform.

You didn't have the right. There were no translations of scripture. You had the Latin Vulgate. You were being taught from the Latin Vulgate. The common church member did not speak Latin nor read Latin, so what was being taught by every established church at that time, well, we won't say every established church.

[50:37] There's always a remnant because what we know of the early church for years coming out of the Middle Ages and the Dark Ages, everything was being dictated by the church.

The church told you what you were to do. The church told you what this meant. The church told you that. And so it wasn't until 1500s, 1600s, all of a sudden we begin to see Bible translations in every man's language, and they begin to read the word for themselves.

But that came in because we had this connectivity because of the Crusades with the Eastern Orthodox Church, and the Catholic Church began to trade back and forth. So all of a sudden these manuscripts came in.

So Eastern Orthodox Church had some of the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts, and their practices were at a little bit of variance. The churches in Ethiopia, the Coptic Church is completely different in variance, but they had some of the old fragments and all that was going on.

So we have to be careful when we confine all of Christendom to what we have published Christendom coming out of the West. So because all of Christendom actually didn't adhere to that because you had a lot in the East that was different.

[51:40] You had a lot of Coptic Christians that were completely different in their understanding of that. But it's not until the 1500s, 1600s that all of a sudden now the common man, the parishioner, can read the word, and we can see the word in our own language and say, Wait a minute, I don't think it means that.

And we have this freedom. We started having pastors that show up and say, Even Luther and Calvin, they were struggling with that because neither one of them wanted to break fellowship with the Catholic Church.

They weren't seeking to break it. They wanted to reform the fellowship in the Catholic Church. So they were adhering to that. And they were big proponents of it. I'll agree with you. Calvin himself said that there was some questioning in it.

And he did believe that it would transform, but he wasn't completely sure that it was the way the Roman Catholic Church. He did not see salvation being rooted in the taking of the Eucharist and communion and all that.

So, yeah. So, long answer. But the short version would be like, yeah. It says, when the Bible was made in the language of every man, man all of a sudden said, Wait a minute. I don't think this is completely right.

[52:43] And that's when we begin to see the denomination difference. We begin to see all this. The Reformation did so much more than just some people show up and say, well, I think this is wrong. You know, and yeah.

We can go through 1,600 years of history if we're completely dependent upon an individual and do things. I mean, I'm willing to admit that some of my interpretations may be wrong.

And that's why I read wider than my interpretations to ensure that I'm at least exposing myself to people who see things differently than I do.

Okay. Any other questions? Yes. Yes.

Let's turn it. Acts 22, 16. Okay. And so, just for full transparency, I grew up Church of Christ, which was complete baptismal regeneration. And so, you know, that's how I grew up.

[53:57] And a lot of these passages were used. The ones I brought up were the passages that I was asked about. So, yes. Acts 22, 16. Let me get there so I can read it for you.

Acts 22, 16 says. Let's read here. Okay. So, let me go back to verse 12. A certain Ananias, a man who was devout by the standard of the law and well spoken of all the Jews who lived there, came to me.

This is Paul testifying of his conversion. And standing near me, he said, Brother Saul, why receive your sight at the very time you looked up? And at that very time, he says, I looked up at him.

And he said to me, Great verse, by the way.

And so, the question is, what do we mean by the wash away your sins? What does that mean? Are we cleansing ourselves of our sins? Are we, is that regeneration? When was Paul absolutely saved?

[55:05] Was his salvation found in the moment of encounter with Christ? Or was his moment of salvation come when the sins are washed away? Well, the greatest commentation on scripture is scripture.

So, if we want to know how Paul saw his salvation experience, then we need to see what Paul says about it. Now, sure, again, Paul grew up in a Jewish society that saw baptism as being a symbol of conversion.

And, you know, Judaism, people converted to Judaism. Then they went through that right through baptism. And the washing wasn't a literal sense. It was a visible sense of something that had already been done. Because these people were already converted to Judaism.

And they were just symbolizing that outwardly. Paul writes kind of the magnum opus in the book of Romans on salvation. And nowhere in Romans does Paul kind of confirm that it is baptism that saves us.

It is he that is declaring his own experience here and even what he's talking about. So, you would think that if Paul saw this verse here as a testimony that his salvation was in the washing away of his sins, then when he wrote the book of Romans, surely he would have said that man is saved by faith, not by works, lest any man should boast.

[56:15] He would also have added, and baptism that washes away their sins. And so, I have a hard time if this is Paul being saved and affirming and confirming that his salvation came when he was baptized.

Then why was baptism not given such prominence in the book of Romans when Paul is really addressing the issue of salvation? Paul himself said, I did not come baptizing. Paul is writing to people.

He's calling the brethren. And he says, I didn't baptize any of you save a few. And he names the few baptized. So, if that is the understanding of this passage, then Paul is not writing to believers yet.

But he calls them saints. And so, yeah, I mean, I could see the interpretation. I understand that. And the question we have to wrestle with, what does he mean by wash away his sins? Again, in context, Paul grew up in the Jewish society.

Paul was a Pharisee of the Pharisees, sat at the feet of Gamaliel. He knew what the symbol of washing away was. It was an outward display of an inward reality. And so, yeah. Yes.

[57:14] He would go to him.

So many times after that, for children and babies. And I'll agree with you on that. Yeah. That they would be in heaven.

Yes. That was wonderful. And I could see that. I could absolutely see that. And again, I say, you know, it's a wrestling passage. And I thank you, Miss Jan, for that. Because it is a great testimony. Where David says, I'm going to go to my son. My son can't come to me, but I will go to him. And here's a son who dies at a very young age, just after a number of days. He's sick. Hadn't either done good nor bad.

And yes, I understand that. Yes. And I lean towards that interpretation. That there is an age of accountability.

[58:17] And that those who die before the age of accountability are forever in the presence of the Lord. That is my, that's why, when I was, and the one who asked the question, asked on what I thought about the London Baptist faith and confession.

The London Baptist faith and confession goes the other way. And that's why I say I cannot adhere to that one. I can say there's some good passages in it. But I cannot adhere to that wholeheartedly and say, oh, I agree 100% with it.

Because they speak specifically to that. The Baptist faith and message does not address that because we understand. Again, confessions in the Baptist world are not binding.

They are just professions of what we believe. And much of what we believe, we're still working out. And so, thank you, Miss Jan. Yes. Yes. Yes. When Catholics and Anglicans take Eucharist, they call it Christ, they actually believe that Christ is present.

Present in. They believe that he's dying again, and it's obviously broken. Right. The belief is not. I thought that belief is in marriage.

[59:32] No, yeah. And so, and I'll get with you, that is why the Baptists adhere to a symbolic picture of it. Because if you take it to its logical conclusion, and by logical, I mean if you take it to its final end, if he is physically present, then he would have to be broken again, and his blood shed again.

It would have to happen over and over and over again. I know that's not the teaching of the church. I know the church doesn't teach that, that it was once for all. But it's just, that's why when Zwingli thought on that, considered that, well, if we take that to its fullest measure, that means he's crucified again.

That his blood is not shed once, but that his blood continues to flow eternal. Yeah. Yes. Yes. Right. Sure.

There's a spiritual moment there that is happening. That's what I'm saying. It's not taught by the church, but I understand the departure from it, because when you think through it to its end, that's why there was such a conflict in the medieval churches, because you were continuously re-sacrificing the lamb, so to say, in the early church.

[61:00] Yeah. Yes. Right. Correct.

Right. Right. And he says, this is my body, which is broken for you. This is my blood, which is shed for you. Right. Right.

So we have to try to reconcile. How could he be doing that when the body was not yet broken and the blood had not yet been shed? Yeah. Yeah.

Exactly right. Yes. Sure. Sure. Thank you.

Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Right. Yeah. Because when he first, the first teaching of Christ was, whoever eats of my flesh and drinks of my blood, he is my savior.

[62:23] So there were a lot of people left because they said, that's difficult. And he said, I'm not talking literally because this is a spiritual teaching, not a physical teaching. Yes. Any other questions? Yes.

Yes. You're talking about a group of pastors. You're talking about a group of pastors. You're talking about a group of pastors. You're talking about a group of pastors. You're talking about a group of pastors. You're talking about a group of pastors. You're talking about a group of pastors. You're talking about a group of pastors. What do you actually have to be Ethiopian in Philip?

Philip baptized his name and then got made of the way, I mean, I guess he's probably in that church somewhere. Yeah, so he's considered historically the founder of the Coptic Christians in Ethiopia. So he went back home and started a church. So yeah, I mean, it's a good question. And it's a struggling point because you think, well, then all of a sudden he should be connected to the church in Antioch, right?

Because that's who Philip's connected to. But Philip is on the move, so Philip is not anywhere there. So yeah, and I can understand the passage. I see what you're talking about because there was no church for him to join, to understand that.

[63:26] And so I can accept, again, I can accept baptisms outside the church, so to say.

The revivals, the things that are going on. I'm not going to sit here and dismiss it and say that's all completely wrong. What I can't accept, and one thing, I affirm this.

Historically, it's been affirmed by Baptists, but I'm not, again, I'm not tainted so much by Baptists. This is things I'm learning that I had already affirmed that Baptists affirmed too. What I'm saying is that the church is that the church is not a physical church.

The one thing we find in Scripture is there's always a physical church. And so to say you're a member of the universal church, but to be absent from the physical church kind of seems discounted from Scripture, with the few exceptions of the Ethiopian eunuch and, you know, well, what church did the Philippians yell or join?

Well, I guess the church of Philippi because, you know. So with some few there, again, we're trying to prove text that it's okay. Yeah. Now, I mean, for lack of clarity there, is I would say, yes, there is a universal church, but the universal church is displayed in a local body of believers called the church because by name it just means the called out ones.

[64:52] So the connectivity, now, I've said this before, every promise we find in Scripture is written to a local body of believers called the church. Every, you know, is really connected to a body. And so without that, which is why traditionally, Baptists, I mean, in our own nation, Baptists said your baptism has to take place inside the church.

Now, I'm not saying that I'm 100% in that. I'm just saying traditionally that it must take place inside the church because that was a way of preserving regenerate church membership. The church was actually those that were saved.

Any, one more question. I'm really pressing upon time. It's 720. Any pressing question? Need to be asked before we leave. Any questions?

Hey, thank you, guys. Really appreciate your time. Thank you for your input. Thank you. Thank you for your input. Thank you for feedback. Let's pray, and we'll be dismissed.

Father, thank you so much for the day. Praise you for your faithfulness and your goodness and kindness. We praise you that we can be challenged. We can think through matters.

[66:00] Lord, understanding our own limitations, understanding our own shortcomings. And, Lord, each and every one of us read things through varying lenses. Lord, we praise you for the corporate body of believers called the saints.

And we praise you that you can speak to us through your word. And, Lord, that we can come before you free from any intercessor other than Jesus, our Lord and Savior.

So we pray that you help us to walk faithfully before you. Help us to walk as lights in the world around us. And may you be glorified and honored through it. And we ask it all in Jesus' name.

Amen. Thank you, guys. I really appreciate your time. I took a little extra time tonight, but I appreciate that. Thank you.