

The Faith of the Ancient Church

William Cecil Duncan
From the book, *History of the Early Baptists*, 1857

In This Issue:

The Faith of the Ancient Church

Page 1

Woman's Work in Baptist Churches

Page 2

To Tattoo or Not To Tattoo – Parts 7 and 8

Page 9

Are Jehovah and Allah the Same?

Page 18

The Public and Private Life of Ancient Baptists

Page 23

In a previous section, a sketch has been given of the "speculative doctrines of the Apostolic Church and of the Church Fathers". But little, however, has yet been said of the practical doctrines of the Early Church; those doctrines which intertwined themselves with the whole life of believers, and prompted them to every word and action. Jesus, as has been intimated, did not teach a Dogmatic Theology; but only imparted, in a fragmentary form, the eternal truths of the religion of Heaven.

The Apostles, particularly Paul and John, formed indeed a system of doctrines; but not a sharply-defined and logical system like that of the Schoolmen of the middle ages, and those of the Schools of Theology of our day. It was long, however, before believers at large began to build up the doctrines of Christianity in a connected and systematic manner.

At first, they were satisfied with the simple confession that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, that he is the Messiah promised by the prophets, and that he is the Son of God and the Saviour of the world. Whoever received these simple truths in honesty of heart, and, having openly confessed his belief in them, at his baptism, afterwards conformed to their requirements in his life, he was a Christian.

The baptismal confession of faith related rather to the facts than to the speculative doctrines of Christianity. He who uttered it professed his belief, in words few and simple, in God, the Father, Creator of heaven and earth; in Jesus Christ, as the Son of God; in the Holy Ghost, as the vivifier of the Church; in the forgiveness of sins through Christ, the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting.

At a later period, early in the second century, preparatory instruction, in some of the leading doctrines of Christianity, was given to candidates for baptism; and hence arose in Alexandria, in which city also Theology was first cultivated as a science, the catechumenate, or preparatory school, for young believers who were not yet, as was thought, sufficiently enlightened in the truths of the Christian religion to be admitted, by baptism, into the full fellowship of the faithful.

It was quite necessary in the early days of Christianity, that there should be a well understood outline of Christian doctrine, which should constitute a "rule of faith"; for at this period the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament did not exist in a collected form, and had by no means found their way into the whole of Christendom. Christianity was propagated in that

age by the verbal preaching of the Word, not by the circulation of the Scriptures. The melting story of Jesus and the resurrection was told by the living voice, and not by pen, and ink, and paper.

The New Testament itself arose out of the necessities of the Church; and to understand it fully, we, in this day, must know what those necessities were. Early Christianity had and knew no religious text-book other than the Scriptures of the Old Testament. The Epistles of Paul, the first written of the books of the New Testament, grew out of the peculiar wants of churches which he had founded, or instructed; and the Gospels themselves, indispensable as they are in this age, were written years after the Lord's death, to keep alive his memory forever in the world.

The hand of God was in this all. He raised up the early Church; and He prepared men in it, who, moved and guided by the Spirit, should give to all men, in a fixed and permanent form, the narrative of Jesus and redeeming love.

Verbal tradition, kept pure by the providence of God, first instructed the Church, and then holy men, directed by the Spirit, recorded that tradition in the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament. The Church was founded. on the living Word of God; and this Word was afterwards recorded by competent and heaven-inspired penmen, in indelible characters, in the Scriptures of the New Covenant of mercy and love.—This, preserved, under God, by the early Church, has come down to us uncorrupted and truthful; telling to us from Apostolic or heaven-guided pens, if not from Apostolic lips, the wondrous story of redemption.

The primitive Christians believed in a God, uncreated, invisible, and eternal; a God, who is the Father of all things, who has made Himself visible to men in Jesus Christ, His Son, and who works in believers by the power of the Holy Ghost. This was the ground-doctrine of their faith. Christ was their Redeemer, their Sanctifier, and the source of all their blessings, temporal as well as spiritual. By his death, He freed them from the condemnation of the law; by His intercession, and the workings of the Holy Spirit, He purified and preserved them from sin; and by His mighty power over all things, He raised them from the grave, and conveyed the in to eternal glory.

Positive and fixed rules of Faith, they had few; but evidences and fruits of Faith, they had many. Faith and hope in Jesus as the Son of God, as the Saviour of the world, and as the Lord of the Kingdom of Heaven, was the root and kernel of their Christian life; the star which led them on to life eternal.

Their hearts were directed to Him; from Him, when persecuted, they looked for help and strength; and from Him they expected the perfection of the Church, and victory over every foe. Burning with love, they offered their hearts to Him: they gave all to Him, because in Him and by Him they firmly expected to attain everlasting joy and felicity. Their "lives were hid with Christ in God."



Woman's Work in Baptist Churches _____

H. Boyce Taylor
From the book, *Why Be A Baptist?*, 1928

There are few men for whom we have higher regard personally than J. B. Gambrell and J. B. Moody. We would not say one word intentionally to wound or grieve either of them. They are both much older than the editor of News and Truths. We do not want to be, nor do we mean to be, disrespectful to our elders.

If anything in this article seems to be so we here and now disavow any such intention and beg our readers to remember that any statement that might be so interpreted is not aimed at them personally but at the position which they have espoused.

We mention them by name because they both have mentioned us by name in their recent discussions in the *Baptist Standard* and the *Baptist Advance* and because they are by common consent the acknowledged champions of "women speaking in public in mixed assemblies" in the South.

With Bro. Gambrell we agree most heartily in saying: "No Scripture must be so interpreted, as to contradict another Scripture, when that other Scripture is of certain and unmistakable interpretation."

And yet that is exactly what both of the brethren have done, as we will show a little later on.

The Issue

Both of the brethren are seemingly confused as to the issue in their own minds or have unwittingly confused the issue in their articles.

The issue is not as to whether a woman may speak in a public mixed assembly, but whether it is scriptural and right for a woman to speak in public in a mixed assembly. Thousands of women at Asheville spoke every night before and after the service in a public mixed assembly, but only two spoke in public in that mixed assembly. Yet both of the brethren in their articles make arguments upon cases where women did the first, which is not the point at issue at all.

Bro. Gambrell cites the case of women speaking on Pentecost as a case in point. The women scattered through that gathering throng on Pentecost did speak as the Spirit gave them utterance, just as thousands of women spoke every night at Asheville both before and after the regular services at the Asheville Convention in a public mixed assembly, but all their speaking was private, not public.

No woman spoke in public on the day of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit is very careful to safeguard that very point so that no one need be mistaken unless he just wants to be. "But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and said unto them, Ye men of Judaea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words" (Acts 2:14). It is specifically said that when that assembly was called to order and the time for the public speaking began that "Peter standing up with the eleven" did the talking. No woman on the day of Pentecost under the control of the Holy Spirit dared to stand up before that mixed assembly and say one word. "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord" (1 Cor. 14:37).

No woman led of the Spirit will disobey his prohibitions there given as to women speaking in mixed assemblies before men. Acts 2 and 1 Corinthians 14 are in perfect harmony.

Bro. Gambrell's one and only argument in the *Standard* article was based upon an interpretation of Acts 2, which (quoting his language) is "monstrous, impossible and wrong." The consistence of the Scriptures on the woman question is shown (and incidentally their verbal inspiration) in that on an occasion when women spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit, has the inspired penman to make it plain that women, speaking as He gives them utterance, do not stand before mixed assemblies and speak. Peter and the eleven and they only stood up and spoke to that Pentecost assembly.

Bro. Moody misses the issue as widely as does Bro. Gambrell. He cites women prophesying "preaching in a private and personal way" and Priscilla's private instruction of Apollos in support of his position, not one of which touches the question of women speaking in public before mixed assemblies.

The issue before us is as to whether the Scriptures ever authorize by precept or example women standing before mixed public assemblies and addressing them as the two women did at the Asheville Convention. We think we will be able to show that the Scriptures are consistent throughout on that very point and that the only seeming exception is Deborah and the exception was made in that case because the men were all "sissies." The brethren are welcome to all the consolation they can get out of that exception.

But let us clear up the issue just a little further by noting just exactly what it is that women are prohibited from doing.

Prohibitions On Women

1. To speak in public in mixed religious assemblies. "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord" (1 Cor. 14:37).

2. To lead in public prayer in a mixed assembly. "I will therefore that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting. In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array" (1 Tim. 2:8-9). The word translated "men" here means "men" as distinguished from women and children, so says Thayer's lexicon. That means men only are to lead in public prayer in mixed assemblies.

3. To teach men. "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (1 Tim. 2:12). This prohibition limits the work of women in Sunday Schools to teaching women and children. There is plenty of work for them to do there without getting out of their place and teaching men's classes. It is significant that nearly all Sunday School experts today are saying that the teaching of men and boys above the intermediate department is a man's job. God said so a long time ago.

4. To be in authority over a man. "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (1 Tim. 2:12). Women are prohibited from having any place in the work of our churches that puts them in authority over their brethren.

"But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven. For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman: but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man. For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels" (1 Cor. 11:3-10).

These are the prohibitions which God the Spirit put upon our sisters.

Her Compensations

We mention only two:

1. Her child-bearing.

"Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety" (1 Tim. 2:15).

As B. H. Carroll well said:

"The woman shall live, indirectly, in the children she bears if they (the children) prove to be worthy. The man lives or dies according to his rule and leadership in public affairs; the woman lives or dies in her children. His sphere is the public arena; her sphere, the home. Washington's mother lived in him; Lois and Eunice lived in Timothy. The Roman matron, Cornelia, pointed to her boys, the Gracchi, and said, 'These are my jewels.'

The world is better and brighter when women sanctify and beautify home, proudly saying, "My husband is my glory, my children are my jewels and I am content to live in them. Why should I desire to be a man and fill his place: who then will fill mine?"

2. Her Hospitality and Service.

"He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me. He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man) in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward" (Matthew 10:40-42).

The Lord Jesus Himself shows that those who receive God's prophets and minister to them and to His needy little ones will get as much reward as the prophets do to whom they minister. In other words the Master said that women, upon whom these tasks preeminently fall, will get just as much reward for their private work faithfully done, as the men will for their public work, faithfully performed. The women who speak in public, like the folks who give and pray and fast to be seen of men, get their reward here in what men say about it.

Woman's Sphere and Work

While on this question it is well to give what the Scriptures have to say on the positive side of the question as well as on the negative side. There has been the weakness of much of the discussion of Paul's prohibitions. The women have been told what they were not to do; but when with earnest sincerity they came and asked what God wanted them to do they have of times been put off with no definite answer. Now God's Word is just as clear and plain on what women ought to do as on what they ought not to do.

We believe a careful reading of some of the things that God has commanded women to do will show that the most neglected work in the world is woman's work. Just to the extent that woman becomes man's competitor in doing a man's work, just to that extent her own work goes undone. Because so many women are trying to be men and fill men's places today women's work is the most neglected, the most slighted, and the most needed work in all the world.

What is woman's sphere and work?

I. The Home.

Women should above all else be homebodies. Woman was made to be man's help meet. "And the LORD God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him" (Gen. 2:18).

The "virtuous" woman in Proverbs 31 was a "worker at home." Paul enjoined Timothy, the young preacher, to teach the women to be, not idlers or tattlers, or busybodies, but "keepers at home."

"And withal they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house; and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not. I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully" (1 Tim. 5:13-14).

Peter had somewhat to say along the same line. "Having a good conscience; that, whereas they speak evil of you, as of evildoers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ" (1 Pet. 3:16).

The divorce court, the apartment house, and the modern club are menaces today that threaten the sanctity and happiness and continuity of our American homes, because many women are not willing to be and to do the things necessary to make their homes little paradises of love and of God.

The woman who neglects her home life to do any kind of public work, religious or otherwise, is not occupying her God appointed sphere or doing her God given task. Her husband is a stranger among men, wandering around lodges and hotel lobbies and other loafing places at night to find the companionship and love he ought to find at home; and her children are a menace to the public well and moral welfare of the community in which she lives. The home life is one of the most neglected spheres of woman's work, for no house ever was or ever can be a home without a woman to "guide the house."

Paul enjoined that only women should be put on the list of those supported by the church, who were too old to be mothers and whose home had been broken up by their being made widows and their children already "brought up."

"Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man. Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saint's feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work" (1 Tim. 5:9-10).

Therein is a striking example of the "consistency of the Bible on woman's work." God never calls women to neglect their homes or husbands or children to do any kind of public work.

II. Motherhood.

Paul enjoins "younger women to marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion of the adversary to speak reproachfully." (1 Tim. 5:14).

Billy Sunday told only the other day in an address to the women of Kansas City of how two physicians had told him recently of six and twelve women respectively in his choirs and engaged in other religious work in other cities where he had been, who had come to them and asked them to "prostitute their manhood" and sin against God and their husbands and homes and their unborn progeny by "relieving them of the cares of motherhood." Some doctor was found who was criminal enough to do what they asked, for none of them have had babies since. Just that thing is giving the adversary occasion to speak reproachfully of many women in many churches.

III. Teach Women.

God's Word prohibits women from teaching men. "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (1 Tim. 2:12).

God's Word equally as clearly enjoins women to teach women. "The aged women likewise, that they be in behavior as cometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things; That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed" (Titus 2:3-5).

The reason so many young women are ensnared in the meshes of the white slavers today is because they have not been taught. The reason so many girls are decoyed into the disgraceful, licentious modern dance is because mothers and other women teachers are too busy trying to do the men's work to take time to teach their daughters modesty and decency and chastity.

The reason of the popularity of the "movies" with their unlimited temptation under the most favorable surroundings for too much freedom between the sexes is because the women are neglecting to teach their daughters the sacredness of their own person and the necessity of making boys "hands off" for the preservation of their own chastity. The shameless exposure of their person, by wearing dresses too low at the top and too high at the bottom and by having on too few clothes, so prevalent among many modern women, is a sad commentary on the woeful neglect of older women to teach younger women how to dress "becomingly and chastely."

One of the best known evangelists among Southern Baptists said in Murray some years ago that in the last ten towns in which he held meetings there were more fast girls than boys. Such a fact as that exists in any town is the most severe indictment that can be brought against the women of that town. It proves my proposition that the most neglected work in the world is woman's work. They cannot do the work of men without neglecting their own.

Just to the extent that Bro. Gambrell and Bro. Moody encourage them to get out of their places and enter into competition with men for places in public religious work or in business or politics, just to that extent they are responsible for women neglecting their God given and Bible taught tasks. For Bro. Gambrell's information we will say that every one of those ten towns to which the evangelist referred were in the West where women have "more freedom" than in the East.

IV. Hospitality, Service, Sacrifice.

"Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saint's feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work" (1 Tim. 5:10). In this passage Paul outlines women's work as fourfold:

- (1) Home "bringing up children."
- (2) Hospitality "entertaining strangers."
- (3) Service "washing the saint's feet."
- (4) Sacrificial giving of time, labor or money to "relieve the afflicted" and other good works.

The widow who gave her two mites and Mary, who broke her alabaster box upon her Lord, were fine examples of sacrificial giving. Dorcas and others of her class were notable for heroic self-sacrificing service to the Lord's poor and afflicted. Lydia and Priscilla and the woman who fed Elijah a whole year and many others are marvelous examples of keeping open house for the Lord's servants.

Women have their hands full if they follow out Paul's program as outlined above. Paul was as specific in telling women what they ought to do as in telling them what they ought not to do. Just to the extent that they violate his prohibitions they neglect the God ordained tasks he enjoins. If they do the men's work the men will lie down on the job and let them, and their own work will go undone. The men will not do it for them. If they attend to their own work the men will do theirs when they see they have to do it.

Now having gotten out of the way some common objections let us note how remarkably consistent the Scriptures are in their teaching upon woman's sphere and work.

The cases cited by the advocates of women speaking in public are all cases of "wresting the Scriptures" except Deborah and she did not talk in public but she did exercise authority over men. But God tells why He permitted that.

Miriam, the Samaritan woman, the women at the Savior's tomb, Priscilla, Anna the prophetess, Phillip's daughters who were prophetesses and others are cited as examples of women speaking in public in mixed assemblies. "And Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand; and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances" (Ex. 15:20). In Miriam's case the Scriptures are very specific in saying that she led the women in their singing. Moses led the men.

The Samaritan woman did all her talk in personal private conversation to her neighbors and acquaintances as she went from house to house in the city and told of the Savior. "The woman then left her water pot, and went her way into the city, and saith to the men, come, see a man, which told me all things that ever I did: is not this the Christ?" (John 4:28-29).

The women who were first at the tomb, though not last at the cross, as is so often said, went and told what they had seen to the disciples privately. "And returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest. It was Mary Magdalene and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles" (Luke 24:9-10).

Anna the prophetess spoke of the infant Savior to the passersby as they came and went.

"And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser: she was of a great age, and had lived with an husband seven years from her virginity; And she was a widow of about fourscore and four years, which departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day. And she coming in that instant gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem." (Luke 2:36-38).

There were no public services in the temple and a woman was not even allowed to go into the men's court.

Priscilla was the wife of a man by the name of Aquila. His name is mentioned first when Paul met them and in their greeting in Corinth. She was however more active in her Master's work than her husband. In every other instance except one her name occurs first. That one case is the case of where, they gave some private instructions to Bro. Apollos. Mark you, it was done privately, not publicly.

God's Word says "they took him (Apollos) unto them and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly." (Acts 18:26). But the significant thing about the incident is this, namely, that indifferent Aquila, who is always mentioned after his wife elsewhere in the Scriptures, is here mentioned as taking the lead in even a private conversation with Apollos to set him straight in some matters. Did it happen so that Aquila's name occurred first in this instance or was it the careful work of the Holy Spirit, who is the author of God's Word, to impress upon the readers that woman's sphere and work is not that of leadership?

"And the next day we that were of Paul's company departed, and came unto Caesarea: and we entered into the house of Philip the evangelist, which was one of the seven; and abode with him. And the same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy. And as we tarried there many days, there came down from Judaea a certain prophet, named Agabus. And when he was come unto us, he took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles" (Acts 21:8-11).

The incident in connection with Phillip's daughters is equally significant. Phillip had four daughters who were prophetesses. Paul was abiding at Phillip's house at Caesarea "many days." While there God sends to him a prophet named Agabus, whose home was probably at Antioch, to tell him of the imprisonment that awaited him at Jerusalem. Now why did God send a man all the way from Antioch to tell Paul that, when he was staying in the home of a man who had four daughters, who were prophetesses? Was it Paul's prejudice against women that the Lord humored by sending Agabus to him or was it a striking example of the consistency of the Spirit who inspired all prophecy, to maintain the clear teaching of God's Word that women must not usurp authority over a man?

Now let us note Deborah's case. She was the only woman judge and deliverer. She did exercise authority over men. Why this exception? God tells "Again he said unto her, Stand in the door of the tent, and it shall be, when any man doth come and inquire of thee, and say, Is there any man here? that thou shalt say, No" (Judges 4:20) Barak said positively that he would not go at all unless she went with him.

"And Barak said unto her, If thou wilt go with me, then I will go: but if thou wilt not go with me, then I will not go. And she said, I will surely go with thee: notwithstanding the journey that thou takest shall not be for thine honour; for the LORD shall sell Sisera into the hand of a woman. And Deborah arose, and went with Barak to Kedesh" (Judges 4:8-9).

She told him then the honor would be a woman's if he was too cowardly to undertake the job without a woman taking the lead. The secret of this exception was to be found in the fact that the men of Deborah's day were cowards and "sissies."

If Bro. Gambrell and Bro. Moody have the same kind of men to deal with, then they may get some help out of Sister Deborah for their cause. But so long as there are manly men in Texas and Illinois, who can and will lead in God's work, there is no warrant from God's Word in Deborah's example for the brethren to put the women forward and thereby help to increase the number of "sissy" men in our ranks, who lie down on the job and let the women do the work.

The Lord Jesus said some very plain things to the church at Thyatira because they permitted a woman, who called herself a prophetess, to teach. "Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols" (Rev. 2:20).

The certain and unmistakable Scriptures on this question are the prohibitions of Paul in 1 Corinthians and 1 Timothy and the example of the Lord Jesus while on earth in not appointing any woman to official position and His prohibition in

Revelation 2:20. All the Scriptures the brethren introduce to support women speaking in public in mixed assemblies can be explained harmoniously and consistently with these plain prohibitions of God's Word.

According to all principles of sound exegesis, in the language of Bro. Gambrell, their interpretation is "Monstrous, impossible and wrong;" it arrays Scripture against Scripture and makes "certain and unmistakable" Scriptures to be contradicted by others, whose interpretation is to say the least of it doubtful.



To Tattoo or Not To Tattoo

Terry Watkins

Dial-The-Truth Ministries. Used with Permission; Parts 7 and 8 of 8

Part 7 Tattoos and the Bible

WHAT ABOUT LEVITICUS 19:28?

Leviticus 19:28 is the Christian (or so-called Christian?) tattooist and tattoo-bearer's worst nightmare. The Lord plainly, clearly, strongly, and **without a doubt – condemns the tattoo.**

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

Could that be any more clear?

"Ye shall not. . .print any marks upon you. . ."

Simple. . . Straightforward . . . Settled. . .

God Said It. . . I Believe It. . . That Settles It. . .

Right. . .?

Not hardly. . .

The clear statement from the word of God does not settle anything for this generation of disobedient, carnal, worldly, tolerant, non-judgmental, Christians. Rather than obey God, they run miles and miles and miles to "justify" their open disobedience to the Word of God.

How do they get around Leviticus 19:28?

Clearly, there it is. "Ye shall not. . .print any marks upon you. . ."

A lot of Christians when confronted with Leviticus 19:28, scream, "*Hey dude, that's not for today. Man, that's the Old Testament. I'm under the New Testament*".

Did you know that "bestiality" (sicko, perverted, sex with an animal) was ONLY forbidden in the Old Testament Levitical Law? Only in Leviticus 18:23 and Leviticus 20:15-16. Dude, only in the Old Testament Law. Does that mean a Holy God NOW – under the New Testament, approves of bestiality?

By the way, have you ever read Leviticus 19:29? The verse immediately AFTER the "it's not for me" Leviticus 19:28? Do not prostitute thy daughter, to cause her to be a whore; lest the land fall to whoredom, and the land become full of wickedness.

Leviticus 19:29

This is the only place in the Bible that God directly forbids someone to prostitute their daughter. And since, it's ONLY in the Old Testament Levitical Law (and "hey, dude, we're NOT under the law") – it MUST be ok by the Lord for a parent to cause their daughter to prostitute.

Same sick, perverted, wicked, line of reasoning as the "it's ONLY in the Old Testament-tattoo-bearer-wearer". Same reasoning. . . Same disobedience. . . Same perversion of the Word of God.

There are many other "moral laws" that are ONLY forbidden in the Old Testament, such as the human sacrifice of children. Nowhere in the New Testament is this forbidden. Does that mean that NOW under the New Testament, God Almighty endorses throwing babies into the fire as a human sacrifice?

And thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God: I am the LORD. Leviticus 18:21

Matthew Henry's Commentary at the beginning of Leviticus 19 explains that most of Leviticus 19 (such as verse 19:28) are moral commandments that applies not only for Israel but for the New Testament Christian today.

"Some ceremonial precepts there are in this chapter, **but most of them are moral. . . Most of these precepts are binding on us**, for they are expositions of most of the Ten Commandments." (*Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible*, Leviticus 19:28)

IT'S ONLY "FOR THE DEAD"

But by far the Christian tattooers favorite excuse for disobeying Leviticus 19:28 is the "that means nor print any marks upon you – **for the DEAD**". It's ok, as long it's **not for the dead**". See the "for the dead!!! . .for the dead!!!!".

Is it ok to practice satanic bloodletting, self-mutilation or cutting of the flesh as long as **it's not for the dead**? It's in the same verse. . . Hmm. . .?

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

Notice also, the phrase "for the dead" is ONLY referencing the "cuttings in your flesh". The condemnation of "nor print ANY marks upon you" is not qualified by the phrase "for the dead". Also, if you'll notice the verse clearly says "ANY marks" period.

Merrill F. Unger's, very popular and authoritative, *Unger's Bible Dictionary* under the definition for "Mark" includes the following reference for Leviticus 19:28:

"In Lev. 19:28 we find two prohibitions of an unnatural disfigurement of the body: 'Ye shall not make any cutting in your flesh for the dead, nor any print any *marks* upon you.' The latter (Heb. *qa aqa, incision*) refers to tattooing, **and has no reference to idolatrous usages**, but was intended to inculcate upon the Israelites a proper reverence for God's creation." (Merrill F. Unger, *Unger's Bible Dictionary*, 1974 ed., p. 696)

Notice that Unger teaches that tattoos were **forbidden without any reference to pagan, heathen, or idolatrous usages**. In other words, the tattoo itself, regardless the reason, was forbidden. Amen. Brother Unger.

Wycliffe's Bible Encyclopedia under the definition for **TATTOOING** distinctly says:

"While 'cuttings in the flesh' have reference here to mourning customs [for the dead], **the tattooing does not appear to pertain to such practice.**" (*Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia*, 1975 ed., p. 1664)

The New American Commentary on Leviticus 19:28 writes the condemnation was for, "cutting the body either for the dead **or with tattoo marks.**" (Mark F. Rooker, *The New American Commentary* on Leviticus, 2000 ed., p. 262)

Explicitly recognizing the tattoo was not "for the dead."

Do you see how dishonest and disobedient this "it doesn't apply to my New-Testament-Christian-marked-for-Jesus-tattoo" is? Find what you don't like in the Word of God, cut it out (doesn't apply to New Testament Christians) or misapply (it's just for the DEAD, when it's clearly NOT). Same tactics used by the satanic cults and heretics for years. You can prove anything and everything with such deceitful methods.

THE "FORBIDDEN" HAIRCUT

One of the silliest and childish arguments to justify the Christian tattoo is the: "*Hey man, do you get a haircut or trim your beard? God condemned getting a haircut or trimming your beard in the verse before forbidding the tattoo. Dude, the tattoo is the same as getting a haircut.*"

Believe it or not . . . this is a widely used argument.

Leviticus 19:26-28 is a clear condemnation of pagan, witchcraft and heathen practices. Look at the context. Verse 26 is plainly referring to "enchantment [spells or witchcraft] nor observe times [astrology]. . . Verse 28 is the pagan, demonic practice of bloodletting [cuttings in your flesh] and tattooing. Why would the Lord stick in the middle a verse that "condemns simply getting a haircut"? Of course, He wouldn't. . . And He didn't. . .

Leviticus 19:26-28 reads:

26 Ye shall not eat any thing with the blood: neither shall ye use enchantment, nor observe times.

27 **Ye shall not round the corners of your heads**, neither shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard.

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

The condemnation found in verse 27 of "rounding the corners of your head" or "mar the corners of thy beard" was the forbidding of a common pagan practice that cut the hair as worship and honor of the hosts of heaven.

Here's how *Matthew Henry's* and *Coffman's Commentaries* reflect on the "forbidden haircut" of Leviticus 19:27:

"Those that worshipped the hosts of heaven, in honour of them, **cut their hair so as that their heads might resemble the celestial globe**; but, as the custom was foolish itself, so, being done with respect to their false gods, it was idolatrous." (Matthew Henry, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, Leviticus 19:27)

"Herodotus tells of the use of this type of haircut, forming what is called a tonsure, as the practice of pagan religious cults of ancient times who did so honoring one of their gods." (*Coffman Commentaries on the Old and New Testament*, Leviticus 19:27)

The fact is. . . Up until a few years ago, virtually everyone, including the most liberal Christian, KNEW the tattoo was clearly forbidden by the Word of God. And throughout history, the tattoo has ALWAYS been condemned by Bible Believing Christians. Always. Every historical resource ever written on tattoos clearly confirms this fact.

"Just as occurred in other cultures with tattoo traditions, when these pagan tribes were 'converted' to the Christian religion, their spiritual and cultural rites (which included tattooing, piercing and scarification) were outlawed. . ." (Jean-Chris Miller, *The Body Art Book : A Complete, Illustrated Guide to Tattoos, Piercings, and Other Body Modifications*, p.9)

"Whenever missionaries encountered tattooing they eradicated it." (Gilbert, Steve, *Tattoo History: A Source Book*, p. 101)

"While these and other body modifications continued to be practiced underground as a way for non-Christian people to identify each other, God forbid you got caught and your mark was revealed. (Jean-Chris Miller, *The Body Art Book : A Complete, Illustrated Guide to Tattoos, Piercings, and Other Body Modifications*, p.11)

Up until a few years, virtually every commentary written understood Leviticus 19:28 as an open condemnation of the tattoo. The Christian acceptance of a tattoo was not even considered for serious discussion.

Jameison-Faussett-Brown Commentary and Explanatory on the Whole Bible writes under Leviticus 19:28:

"nor print any marks upon you—by tattooing, imprinting figures of flowers, leaves, stars, and other fanciful devices on various parts of their person. The impression was made sometimes by means of a hot iron, sometimes by ink or paint, as is done by the Arab females of the present day and the different castes of the Hindus. It is probable that a strong propensity to adopt such marks in honor of some idol gave occasion to the prohibition in this verse; and they were wisely forbidden, for they were signs of apostasy; and, when once made, they were insuperable obstacles to a return." (*Jameison-Faussett-Brown Commentary and Explanatory on the Whole Bible*, Leviticus 19:28)

James M. Freeman in his excellent book, *The New Manners & Customs of the Bible*, says of Leviticus 19:28:

"Tattooing Forbidden: Both cutting and tattooing were done by the heathens, and so God forbade His people from doing so in imitation of them." (James M. Freeman, *The New Manners & Customs of the Bible*, 1998 edition, p. 157)

Coffman's Commentary on the Old and New Testament under Leviticus 19:18 says:

"The cutting of one's flesh also characterized pagan worship as attested by the priests of Baal on Mount Carmel in the contest with Elijah. Tattooing was also a device of paganism. . . Christians generally disapprove of tattooing, despite the fact of the widespread use of it by many even today. In the light of what God says here, and in view of the history of it, it seems strange that anyone would pay someone else to tattoo him." (*Coffman's Commentaries on the Old and New Testament*, Leviticus 19:28)

Charles R. Erdman, in his commentary on Leviticus 19:28, writes:

"The custom of tattooing was forbidden, while among all the nations of antiquity it was common." (Charles R. Erdman, *The Book of Leviticus*, 1951 ed., p.93)

But Naves famous Topical Bible puts it best. Under the topic "Tattooing", Nave's simply and bluntly writes: "TATTOOING, forbidden, Lev. 19:28" (*Nave's Topical Bible*, p. 1312)

BUT WHAT ABOUT ISAIAH 44:5 & EZEKIEL 9:4?

I've seen several references by Christian tattooers who claim Isaiah 44 and Ezekiel 9 are examples of God-ordained tattoos in the Bible.

And the LORD said unto him, Go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and that cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof. Ezekiel 9:4

One shall say, I am the Lord's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another **shall subscribe with his hand unto the LORD**, and surname himself by the name of Israel. Isaiah 44:5

The following excellent explanation of Isaiah 44:5 and Ezekiel 9:4 came from a Jewish web site:

1) In Leviticus 19:28 the term used is "k'thoveth qa'aqa." "K'thoveth" means "writing or inscription." "Qa'aqa" comes from a root whose meaning is "to insert or to stick in." Together, "writing that is stuck in"(see Rashi's commentary on the verse). Jewish oral tradition explains that the verse is talking about what we refer to today as tattoos, i.e. scratching or piercing the skin and filling it in with pigment.(see the tractate "Makoth" 21a).

2) Isaiah 44:5 uses the word "yichtov" which means "will write" without the word "qa'aqa" "to insert or to stick in." Isaiah is not talking about tattoos. What he is saying is "...and he will write with his hand to the L-rd..." like someone who signs a contract to express his utmost commitment and obligation (see Metzudath David's commentary on the verse).

3) Ezekiel 9:4 uses the word "tav" which means "a mark or a sign." The man clothed with linen is going to mark the foreheads of the righteous with ink, not tattoo them!

Someone who read the verses (Isaiah 44:5 and Ezekiel 9:4) in the Hebrew original would never dream that they are referring to tattoos. (www.geocities.com/mnlerner2000/let007.html, used with permission)

THE "TATTOOED" LORD JESUS CHRIST. . .

Some Christian tattooers go so far as claim that the Lord Jesus Christ has a tattoo!

Many Christian tattooers claim that when the Lord Jesus Christ returns in Revelation chapter 19 on a horse – **He has a tattoo on his thigh!**

Revelation 19:11-16 says:

11 And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war.

12 His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; **and he had a name written**, that no man knew, but he himself.

13 And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God.

14 And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean.

15 And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.

16 **And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.**

I know you don't believe Christians can be that deceived so here's the proof:

"And what of Christ Himself? Twice in chapter 19, our Lord is depicted as having a name written on Him (verses 12 and 16). **As unthinkable as it may be for some to picture our Lord Jesus as having a tattoo, the author of the Apocalypse had no problem with it.**" (www.larryoverton.com/berean/tatoos.htm)

Revelation 19:16 clearly is referring to the "vesture his thigh" – ". . . **he hath on his vesture and on his thigh. . .**"

Can anyone with any spiritual discernment (and a brain) really believe the Lord Jesus Christ has a tattoo? Isn't it amazing how spiritually blind someone becomes when they began to justify their disobedience to the Word of God?

But what really is frightening about this gross, perverted, wicked interpretation of a "tattooed" Jesus Christ in Revelation 19:16 – **it makes the Lord Jesus Christ a SINNER!**

It means the Lord Jesus CLEARLY disobeyed Leviticus 19:28! It means the Lord Jesus Christ was not Holy! He was not the sinless, spotless Lamb of God. He clearly was disobedient and broke the Levitical Law of Leviticus 19:28!

And if the Lord Jesus Christ committed sin – everyone is either in hell or on the way to hell. There is no salvation without a sinless, spotless Lamb of God. It took a sinless, perfect, Saviour to pay for your sins.

And thank God – despite what these spiritually sicko, perverted, Christian tattooers "preach" – **The Lord Jesus Christ was without sin – and without "tattoo"!**

18 Forasmuch as **ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things**, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers;

19 But with the precious blood of Christ, **as of a lamb without blemish and without spot**: 1 Peter 1:18-19

For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, **yet without sin**. Hebrews 4:15

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 Corinthians 5:21

21 For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps:

22 **Who did no sin**, neither was guile found in his mouth: 1 Peter 2:21-22

4 Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.

5 And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; **and in him is no sin**. 1 John 3:4-5

DEFILING THE TEMPLE OF THE LIVING GOD

Most Christians, even the most carnal and backslidden, would never desecrate or defile the local church building. Even among most lost people there is a reverence and sacredness to the church building.

But. . . Did you know?

If you are truly born again the Holy Spirit of God dwells within in (John 14:17, Romans 8:9, 11) and your body is the temple of God. 1 Corinthians 6:19-20 makes this very clear.

19 What? **know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost** which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?

20 For ye are bought with a price: **therefore glorify God in your body**, and in your spirit, which are God's. 1 Corinthians 6:19-20

And . . . Did you know?

The Lord warns several times of the seriousness of defiling the temple of God – your body! In 1 Corinthians 3, the Lord clearly and sternly warns against defiling your body – the temple of God. If any man defiles the temple of God – HIM SHALL GOD DESTROY!

16 Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?

17 **If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy**; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are. 1 Corinthians 3:16-17

My Christian friend, you'd better watch what you do with your body. It is the temple of a Holy God. You'd better not defile it with pagan, devil-worshipping tattoos!

" . . . If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy. . . "

What God said – He meant!

God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: **hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?** Numbers 23:19

7 Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.
8 For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting. Galatians 6:7-8

Do you really believe the Lord Jesus Christ is pleased with a Christian wearing a pagan tattoo? Do you honestly believe God's perfect will is for a Christian, *any* Christian, to be "marked" with a demonic tattoo?

With the unbiased documentation and Bible we've given (and we could supply much, much more) there is no question to the pagan and devil-worshipping source of the tattoo. Every tattoo historian I've read traces the root of the tattoo to religious paganism. Every one.

2 Corinthians 6:14-17 is another warning against the tattoo. Notice the warning against the "fellowshipping" and concord with Christ and Belial (the devil). Verse 16 is very interesting. . . As it relates the "fellowshipping" with your body – the temple of the living God.

2 Corinthians 6:14-17 reads:

14 Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?

15 And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?

16 And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

17 Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you,

I realize in writing this, a lot of Christians (or so-called Christians?) could care less what God says. They're going to do what they want to do – despite heaven or hell. But there are many Christians who want to serve God more than anything – with every fiber of their soul. I've talked to many, many Christians who were thinking about getting a tattoo. But after showing them the satanic origin of the tattoo they realized a tattoo was not the will of God. And it was for those "good and faithful servants" of the Lord Jesus Christ that this was written for.

His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord. Matthew 25:23

Friend, God loves you and desires more than anything you love and obey Him. He desires first of all obedience unto salvation by receiving the Lord Jesus Christ (John 1:12). And after salvation, His will for you is to serve and love Him with all you heart, body, mind and soul.

You won't regret it!

It'll be worth it one day!

If you are truly a Christian and still have doubts about whether the tattoo is the perfect will of God, go back through this article with an open Bible and an open hear. Prayerfully, look up the verses. And before you start, pray and ask the Holy Spirit to "guide you into all truth" (John 16:13).

17 Ye therefore, beloved, **seeing ye know these things before**, beware lest ye also, **being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness.**

18 But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory both now and for ever. Amen. 2 Peter 3:17-18

Part 8 TATTOO: The Mark of Regret

One of the businesses booming (*along with the medical profession and pharmaceuticals thanks to the "hepatitis C-tattoo" alliance*) as a consequence of the tattoo-craze is the dermatology industry. **According to the American Society of Dermatological surgery, over 50% of everyone receiving a tattoo wants it removed.**

Tattoo removal via laser surgery is among the fastest growing areas of the dermatology industry.

Depending on the size of the tattoo and colors used, the laser tattoo removal surgery can be very painful and very expensive. Tattoos performed by commercial tattoo parlors are much more difficult to remove because the tattoo is deeper, the ink more complex and thicker. It normally takes between 10 and 15 laser surgery sessions to remove the average tattoo, but 25-30 sessions are not uncommon, depending on the complexity of the tattoo.

When you consider the average single session costs between \$400 - \$800, the removal surgery can be very expensive, costing as much as \$20,000. That \$25 tattoo might cost \$5000 to remove. And may I remind you, health insurance does not cover tattoo removals – this is strictly out of the pocket expenses. And yet despite this enormous personal cost, most people are so disgusted with their tattoo they'll literally pay any cost to have it removed.

Plastic Surgeon Tolbert S. Wilkinson, of San Antonio, Texas, who has removed tattoos warns, "If people only realized **how difficult it is to remove a tattoo, understood how costly and how painful tattoo removal is, and recognized that society as a whole still views tattoos as a stigma, maybe they would think seriously before getting one.**"

Laser removal costs a minimum of \$7,000.00 (national average) per tattoo, and takes at least 10 to 15 treatments, spread out over two or more years. Even with this treatment, the tattoo is still visible." <http://www.heloise.com/tattoo.html>

Tattoo author Laura Reybold, writes that ". . .an ever rising number of people are so unhappy with their tattoos that they are willing to pay anything to have them removed."

"Yet an ever rising number of people are so unhappy with their tattoos that they are willing to pay anything to have them removed. Tattoo removal laser surgery is becoming big business for the dermatologists who perform it." (Laura Reybold, *Everything you need to know about the dangers of tattooing and body piercing*, p. 30)

Ronald Scutt, says in *Art, Sex and Symbol* that even among sailors in the Royal Naval, over 50% regretted ever getting a tattoo. And among the married it rose to over 70%

"From the statistics of the Royal Naval survey, **the most significant factor to emerge was almost certainly the incidence of regrets.** Out of the whole sample, **more than half admitted that they wished they had never been tattooed.** In the married group, the figure rose to around 70 per cent." (Ronald Scutt, *Art, Sex and Symbol*, 1974, p. 179)

One article claims that as many as 80 percent of people with tattoos regret their tattoo.

(www.spacecom.af.mil/hqafspc/News/News_Asp/nws_tmp.asp?storyid=02-93)

We received the following email shortly after we published this article on the web. (Used with permission):

I've just completed reading your article on tattooing and the truth of it all deeply troubled me. I am a Christian, and like most I've back-slidden several times throughout my life. During one of these times, I received two tattoos.

One is a "tribal" band on my left arm, though it doesn't fully circle the whole upper-arm. The other is on my right shoulder, the letters "MSC" in cursive writing signifying the names of my best friend, his wife, and their little daughter. Even though I love my friend and his family, I deeply regret getting their initials tattooed onto my body. Moreover, I seriously and gravely regret with all my heart getting my other tattoo (the tribal band on my left arm).

Being a few years older now (29 and married), there is not a day that goes by that I don't regret getting these tattoos. When I dress, I'm forced to see them in the mirror. When I shower I'm forced to see them.

What makes matters worse, is that I knew all along that it is was wrong. I justified it with a back-slidden mind by thinking such things as "God only considers the heart and mind", "physical sins don't compare to spiritual sins", and so on, and so on. With my depraved and back-slidden mind, I justified an abomination to God Himself, who instructs us through His divine law not to print any marks on our bodies (Leviticus 19:28). If this is the law that will be used to rightly judge the world, how much more should we as Christians observe and uphold it?

The woman doing my first tattoo (the tribal band) had to stop several times for mysterious reasons. She was visibly shaken and could not concentrate. She kept saying, "Man, I need a break." Though it wasn't for my sake, I hid the pain very well and tuned it out for the most part--but this woman could not wait to get me out of that chair. She claimed that she drank quite a bit the night before (I was getting the tattoo on a Saturday afternoon), and this seemed to be the most logical reason that she was having such a tough time. I can't help but wonder, however, if there was more to it. Even then my diminished discernment was working, and I sensed a spiritual conflict taking place. When the woman had finished, she made a disturbing remark that will forever echo in mind, "There ya go. You're no longer a virgin." Of course, she spoke not of physical sexuality, but of spiritual defilement against God in the form of marking my flesh. Now I was "one of the gang", one of the "cool people", and one of the rebels who shakes their fist at the law of God.

I'm still troubled, even knowing that I'm forgiven. My only hope is for the glorification of the body, when the Lord shall raise us uncorruptable. My tattoos stand as constant reminders of my past depravity when I forsook truly walking with God, and only rendered Him lip-service. They will continue to be my marks of shame for the rest of the time appointed. Thank you for your article.

Hopefully this message will get out and all the right people will hear it, and save them from the fate of my shame and regret. It would bring great solace to know that another person would read your article and avert my mistakes--which I would take back in a second if only I had the chance. Through my own research, I've drawn all the same conclusions you have concerning tattooing, body modification, and other self-destructive practices.

May the Lord bless you and grant you peace and understanding,

Before you let that ink "mark" you for life you'd better think very careful about the possible health, spiritual and social consequences. Most people later regret, and even hate, their tattoo. The cost of getting a tattoo can be very high among social and health risks.

"Emotional risks include negative feelings you might have as a result of getting a tattoo or piercing. **Social risks are those that could damage your relationship with others, including friends, parents, teachers, and employers.** . . . For example, body modification can affect your chances for future employment. **Certain jobs are not available to people who have visible body art.**" (Bonnie B. Graves, *Tattooing and body piercing*, p. 43)

"**The fact that so many people change their minds** should lead you to think carefully about whether you want to lock yourself into a fashion statement that might cause you a lot of aggravation and heartache later in life." (Laura Reybold, *Everything you need to know about the dangers of tattooing and body piercing*, p. 32)

"**What so few realize, tragically, is that such a mark [tattoo] becomes the albatross around the neck for all time.**" (Ronald Scutt, *Art, Sex and Symbol*, 1974, p. 181)

21 **Prove all things**; hold fast that which is good.

22 **Abstain from all appearance of evil.**

23 And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul **and body be preserved blameless** unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Thessalonians 5:21-23



Are Jehovah and Allah the Same? _____

by Art Sadlier

From *Sound the Trumpet!*, 2012

Allah was the Arabic name for a higher power, or a god. Mohammed's god was Allilah, the moon god which became the generic name for god, Allah. That is why the crescent moon and star are on the flag of Islam and on the mosques.

The Qur'an makes it very clear that Allah and Jehovah cannot be one and the same. The Qur'an explicitly teaches, "They do blaspheme who say: Allah is one of three in a Trinity: for there is no god except One Allah. If they desist not from their word (of blasphemy), verily a grievous penalty will befall the blasphemers among them" Quran (5:73).

The Qur'an states that Allah has no son, thus eliminating the Gospel of Jesus Christ if Allah and Jehovah are one and the same God.

The Muslim religion states that Jesus Christ did not die on the cross. They claim that someone else took His place. The Koran presents Jesus as a minor figure, as a prophet. They do believe that He will come back to earth as an aide to the Muslim Mahdi. Jesus will, according to Islam, kill everyone who is not a Muslim then; He will kiss the feet of the Mahdi.

Only those whose eyes are blinded by the adversary could suggest that Allah and Jehovah are one and the same God. Today there are a large number of evangelical pastors and leaders who ascribe to this idea of the oneness of Jehovah and Allah.

On Sunday, February 26, 2012, the *Orange County Register* published the following item headlined "Rick Warren Builds Bridges to Muslims." The first paragraph reads as follows:

"The Rev. Rick Warren, pastor of Saddleback Church in Lake Forrest and one of America's most influential leaders, has embarked on an effort to heal divisions between evangelical Christians and Muslims by partnering with a Southern

California mosque and proposing a set of theological principles that include the acknowledgement that Christians and Muslims worship the same god."

Among other things involved in the accord between the two groups is a pledge not to seek to evangelize each other. Yet within this article Warren states that he still believes that Jesus Christ died on the cross for our sins and that there is no other Name under heaven whereby we must be saved. This is classic double speak; he seeks to be all things to all men. Warren denies the gospel in one breath for the ears of Muslims and affirms it in another for the ears of Christians.

As stated above, Rick Warren has undertaken to bridge the gulf between evangelicals and Muslims. He has partnered with a mosque in Southern California and is proposing a set of theological principles which include the proposition that Christians and Muslims worship the same God.

Such an idea is absurd in the extreme. To begin with, Allah has three daughters while Jehovah has an only Son who is equal with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

If you compare the personality of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; the God of the Hebrews and the Christians, with Allah, Islam's god, the contrast could not be more extreme:

- The Hebrew-Christian God is characterized by love. The Islamic god is characterized by war and vengeance.
- The Hebrew-Christian God provides a clear path to redemption and personal salvation in a fallen world; through repentance. The Islamic god provides only one certain path to personal salvation; martyrdom as the result of attempts to kill infidels.
- The Hebrew-Christian God elevates the status of women. The Islamic god does the opposite.
- Jehovah encourages followers to be a light to the whole world. Allah encourages jihad on the non-Islamic world and calls for the death of unconverted Jews and Christians.

In the midst of such contrast Warren proposes common theological ground. The absurdity seems to escape Warren. It would be comparable to seeking common theological ground between Christians and atheists, or seeking common theological ground between Jehovah and Baal.

Warren is involved in blasphemy against Jehovah when he compares Him to Allah. He is on a par with those Israelis of old who worshipped Jehovah and worshipped false gods at the same time.

Warren is leading both Muslims and Christians astray by proposing that they are worshipping the same God. It robs everyone of the message of salvation through the death of God's Son on the cross.

The effort by Warren to bridge the deep rift between Muslims and evangelical Christians culminated in a dinner at Saddleback in December attended by 300 including Muslims and members of Saddleback's congregation.

At the dinner, Abraham Meulenberg, a Saddleback pastor in charge of interfaith outreach, and Jihad Turk, director of religious affairs at a mosque in Los Angeles, introduced "King's Way" as "a path to end the 1,400 years of misunderstanding between Muslims and Christians."

The difference between Islam and Christianity is not a misunderstanding, it involves the identity of God and the way of salvation, how can such a gulf be bridged? It can only be bridged by denying the identity of God and His Word and the message of the gospel.

The men presented a document which they co-authored outlining points of agreement between Islam and Christianity.

The document affirms that Christians and Muslims believe in "one God" and share two central commandments: "love of God" and "love of neighbour". The document also commits both faiths to three goals:

1. Making friends with one another,
2. Building peace, and
3. Working on shared social service projects.

The document quotes side-by-side verses from the Bible and the Koran to illustrate its claims.

The two men agreed they would not attempt to evangelize each other's people. They stated that any sharing would not focus on conversion. This closes the door to evangelizing these lost people.

Saddleback representatives declined to make Warren available for comment.

Warren has faced criticism from some evangelicals for his outreach to Muslims. Late last year, he issued a statement flatly denying rumours that he promulgates what critics term "Chrislam," a merging of Islam and Christianity.

Warren says he is not promoting "Chrislam," but his efforts to bring Christians and Muslims together for the sake of his Peace Plan is a movement toward the unity of all religions.

Tom Holladay, associate senior pastor at Saddleback, said the outreach to Muslims is part of Saddleback's PEACE Plan, a wide-ranging effort to solve major world problems by mobilizing governments, businesses and faith communities. This is clearly the agenda of the harlot church as seen in Revelation 17. Warren is building a Tower of Babel that leads to temporary unity and ultimate destruction.

The root of this madness goes back several years to "***A Christian Response to a Common Word between Us and You.***" This was a joint effort between Muslims and Christians to deepen dialogue and relations at the Yale Centre for Faith and Culture.

Pastor Warren was one of the signers, along with hundreds of other Christian leaders who signed at the time or at a later date. They also acknowledged that neither Muslim nor Christian would try to evangelize each other. Just like that, evangelism evaporates in the minds of major Christian leaders.

The contrasts and differences between Christianity and Islam are so vast and so intense that to even suggest that unity is possible is absurd in the extreme. Those who take such an approach, including Rick Warren, have forfeited any right to be called Christians, they have succumbed to apostasy.

Why are we so concerned about Rick Warren?

Warren has destroyed the pattern of what the Scriptures teach the church is to be. His apostasy is spreading like wild fire within the church of Jesus Christ. Warren claims to have trained 600,000 pastors in his purpose driven perversion of the church, how it is to function and what are its goals and purposes.

Let us suppose that 600,000 churches were to follow Warren's lead and begin partnering with Muslims. Suppose they entered into an accord that accepted the concept that Allah and Jehovah are one and the same god. This would be a foundation stone for the harlot church of Revelation 17.

The following is quote from Rick Warren: (Analyse it carefully)

"We now have 'purpose driven' churches in 122 countries. And if I were to ask every purpose driven church in America to raise their hand, it would shock America because we don't tell them to change their label. On the front it says Lutheran, Second Methodist, Holy Power Episcopal, you name it; Four peas-in-the-pod Four Square – it's got everything! Every name you can imagine. And we have Catholic 'purpose driven' churches..."

And I don't make any apology in saying to you that the 'purpose driven' paradigm is the operating system of a 21st century church. I believe that because we now have 36,000 case studies, and it is in every country.

*And so it doesn't demand that they change from being Lutheran or Methodist or Nazarene or Assembly of God or Baptist or whatever. **I don't care what your doctrine is.** What I care about is, do you have a process by which you **bring people into membership**, build them up to maturity, train them for ministry, send them out on a mission, for the glory of God?" (Foundation Magazine, Nov 2004)*

In *Time Magazine*, the November 1, 2005 issue, Warren was quoted as saying:

"...What if in the 21st century we were able to network these churches providing the ...manpower in local congregations. Let's just take my religion by itself; Christianity...The church is bigger than any government in the world. Then you add Muslims, you add in Hindus, you add in all the different religions, and you use those houses of worship as distribution centers, not just for spiritual care but health care. What could be done?"

My friend, if you have any discernment at all you can see Rick Warren is laying the infrastructure for the world church of Revelation 17. Warren is building the church of Laodicea; a church that will be spewed out of the Lord's mouth at the time of the rapture. Laodicea will then be incorporated into the harlot church of Revelation 17.

Remember, Laodicea is the last church of the church age. I tremble at the possibility that millions of evangelicals, who profess to be born again believers, are really unsaved members of the Laodicean church. Paul said in 2 Corinthians 13:5 *"Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?"*

We are living in the great days of deception about which Jesus warned us. What an unspeakable tragedy to awaken in eternity to discover you were self-deceived and not a true believer.

Where are the marks of true salvation in the lives of a great host of today's Evangelical? Their lifestyle is the lifestyle of the world. Their dress is the dress of the world. Their desire is for the things of the world, they love the world and the things of the world. Their music is little different than the world's. They go to theatres which spew out the philosophies and filth of Hollywood. They watch the same TV programs the world does. When it comes to social drinking there is little difference from the world. God's people, in every dispensation, are called out of the world. They are called to be separated from the world, not to be like the world. *"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him"* (1 John 2:15).

We are not under the law and do not keep the Sabbath Day. I am not suggesting that the Lord's Day is a new Sabbath Day. But within the liberty we have in Christ there ought to be a desire to follow the principal of honouring the Lord on the day the church has designated the Lord's Day. Where is the Lord's honour on the day the church has set aside to worship, to serve and to please Him?

*"If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, **from doing thy pleasure** on my holy day; and call the sabbath **a delight**, the holy of the LORD, honourable; and shalt **honour him**, not doing thine own ways, **nor finding thine own pleasure**, nor speaking thine own words: Then shalt thou **delight thyself in the LORD**; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it" (Isaiah 58:13-14).*

This verse refers to those who are under the law; however from this verse we can glean a principal. The issue is our love for the Lord, a Christian is one who is deeply in love with Christ and desires above all else to honour Him and please Him six days a week and in a special way on the Lord's Day.

Jesus said, "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him" (John 14:21).

The following is excerpted from a book review by Evangelist Justin Peters and it draws attention to the problem of the widespread false profession within evangelicalism:

"In their new book, Falsified: The Danger of False Conversion authors Vincent and Lori Williams seek to use Scripture to identify what they define as an 'epidemic' of false conversions currently sweeping evangelical churches in the U.S. The couple speak from personal experience, as they too were once false converts.

"The Williams define a 'false conversion' as one in which the converted feel that they are saved, but in reality are not because they are not living by the correct teachings of Scripture.['Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new' 2 Corinthians 5:17] The couple confess in their book that they were at one time 'false converts led into a false sense of security by seeker-sensitive churches preaching a watered-down Gospel.'

"God, in His sovereign grace, opened up their spiritual eyes, saved them, and gave them new hearts which yearn to know Him by knowing His Word,' writes Justin Peters, an evangelist and public speaker, in the book's preface.

"The problem of false conversion is the theological elephant sitting in the living room of evangelical Christianity,' Peters claims.

"Lori Williams shared with The Christian Post, 'If the topic of sin is not being addressed, from the pulpit, or from these teachers/preachers, then what does someone know they're being saved from?'

*"In their book, the Williams outline different movements and situations that can result in false conversions. One such movement is the seeker-driven/seeker-sensitive movement, which, according to the couple, seeks to fulfill the **needs of unbelievers** instead of teaching the word of God to believers.*

"Some of these seeker churches that are out there, they are preaching a different Gospel, or an incomplete Gospel,' Lori told CP. She contends that these skewed Gospel teachings result in people falsely believing they are saved."

Nearly 25 years ago, Wendell Kempton, former director of ABWE, stated that he was personally told by a number of pastors of large evangelical churches, that they were convinced that as many as 75% of their congregations were not truly born again. If that were true 25 years ago, how much more so would it be true today?

Today, in much of evangelicalism we have a counterfeit Christianity. Like the liberalism of the last century, it has a form of godliness but is denying the power thereof.

Jeremiah preached the same message to Israel prior to the coming of the Babylonians. Jeremiah warned Israel that they were about to be destroyed by God. Israel said, Jeremiah you don't understand, we are the people of God and God is not going to destroy us.

Jeremiah wept over them and said, "Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people!" (Jeremiah 9:1).

Five hundred years later John gave a similar warning to the Laodicean (Evangelical) church of our day. "So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked:" (Revelation 3:16-17).

John said in verse 18, in so many words, you Laodiceans need to be born again.

I believe that right now there are two great and pressing issues:

First - the trumpet is soon to sound and it is imperative that the gospel be declared far and wide.

Second – sound the warning to evangelicals about the spiritual peril threatening them.

Jesus said, “*For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect*” (Matthew 24:24). We now understand that those false prophets are in the pulpits of many evangelical churches today.

This message will not make you popular, but you need to warn evangelicals who do not show the fruit of salvation.



The Public and Private Life of Ancient Baptists

William Cecil Duncan

From the book, *History of the Early Baptists*, 1857

Christians of the Baptist Church of the first three centuries exemplified in their lives the distinctive traits of the Gospel. Their minds were wholly devoted to Christ and to his service. They carried their religion with them into all the relations of life.

Christianity with them was not a mere profession: it was an active existence, a living, breathing, reality. Separate from the world, they yet lived in the world, to bring men by their example to Christ; "the salt of the earth," shining forth as lights among a wicked and benighted people. Living lives of simplicity and truthfulness; strong in the faith of the Gospel, and in Christian, purity and holiness; filled with love to God, to the brotherhood, and to all mankind,—these Baptists of the early Church were models of piety and zeal in the work of the Lord.

The Baptist of this age of the Church felt bound to live up to the vow of obedience to Jesus (his *sacramentum*, or *oath*) which he took on receiving the ordinance of baptism; when he solemnly engaged to renounce Satan and all his works; and declared, by a symbolic action of beautiful significance that he had "put off the old man with his deeds", and that, being buried with Christ, he would rise with Him to walk in righteousness and holiness forever.

Created anew unto good works in Christ Jesus, he viewed his calling "as a holy warfare for God and Christ against all the powers of darkness", and against all that should oppose itself to the reign of Jesus in the hearts of men. Hence, though he was obedient to the laws of the government under which he lived, he could take no part in any thing which seemed to recognize the truth of heathenism. He kept himself aloof from all its idolatrous worship and ceremonies.

Its festivals, its triumphal marches, its gladiatorial shows, and its: theatrical exhibitions, he carefully avoided. Even its musical concerts, and its exhibitions of art, he was loathe to attend; for they were each interpenetrated with the

leaven of idolatry.

Rather than violate the honest scruples of his conscience, he would suffer death. And many Christians were led to execution, in this period of the history of the Church, by the enraged and misguided heathen. They died in triumph. Few wavered: few yielded, when called upon to deny Christ.

They endured to the end; feeling as did Polycarp, who, when about to be led to the stake, in his old age, said, in words of touching tenderness, "Eighty and six years have I served him [Christ], and he has done me nothing but good: how then can I speak reproachfully of him, my Lord and my Saviour?"

They despised the pleasures of earth; and wanted only the joy which comes from God, the "joy unspeakable and full of glory." Their pleasures were high and holy; "the contempt of everything earthly, true liberty, a clear conscience, and a contented life, free from the fear of death".

Christianity was compelled, however, to come frequently into contact with heathenism. It could do so lawfully, so long as it did not recognize idolatry as a true religion. Nay, the believer was even bound, in some respects, to seek the heathen; for it was his duty to convert them to the truth. It was necessary, therefore, to obtain their friendship and good will. He might mingle with them freely in private life; being careful to "keep himself unspotted from the world.

A believer married to an unbeliever, broke not he marriage tie, when converted to Christ; but sought, by and through it, to bring the other to the same life-imparting reception of the Gospel. The Christian wife was thus made an instrument for the conversion of her husband; and, through her means, often, their children, instructed in the Gospel, were brought to a saving knowledge of the Redeemer.

The Christian woman not only brought up her children in the nurture and admonition of the lord", and set to her family an example of faith and patience; but she also performed offices of charity and love to the brethren at large. "She seeks not", says Tertullian (*De Cult. Fem. c. 10*), "the heathen theatres; but she goes forth to search for brethren who are ill, to partake of the communion, and to hear the word of God. Her chief occupation is to seek out those who are imprisoned for conscience sake, to visit the sick brethren even in the poorest huts, and to receive into her house and entertain traveling brethren from abroad." Such was the Baptist lady of the olden time.

Every believer, of whatever station, had his appropriate work in the early Church. Slaves, as well as freemen,—many of whom were called into "the glorious liberty of the Gospel",—labored to spread the good news of salvation. They stood high in the Church, in which there was neither bond nor free, but all were one in Christ Jesus. Through their influence, not a few from among the heathen were brought from darkness into light.

In pagan families, where they often had the oversight of the children, they sowed in the minds of the young the seeds of Christian instruction; and, not infrequently, they did not point to Christ in vain. The truth lodged in the hearts of the children, often ripened, at a later day, into perfect knowledge that made wise unto salvation.

Perhaps, the most distinguishing trait of the early Christian Baptists was their love for the brethren. Their mutual affection was such as to astonish the heathen; who used to exclaim in wonder, "See how these Christians love one another!" To the malicious scoffer, this brotherly union appeared ridiculous; and he would ironically say, with the mocker Lucian, "Your law-giver has persuaded you that ye are all brethren."

In the jealous world, this affection excited suspicion; "for the Christians", they said, "know one another by secret signs; and love one another almost before they are acquainted". What a testimony in favor of that religion which professes to be the perfection of love to God and love to man!

Especially, did this fraternal affection manifest itself in times of persecution? A church would appropriate its funds to supply the wants of its imprisoned members; and individual believers in it would vie with one another in ministering to the necessities of the captives. Their spiritual, as well as their temporal, wants were fully supplied; and "ministers were sent into the prisons, to read and explain the Word of God to the confessors who had been weakened by tortures."

This brotherly love was not confined to members of the same church: it extended itself to all Christians. Any believer, on coming to a strange city, would meet with a warm reception from the brethren, if he could show a testimonial from the pastor of the church with which he was connected. If he desired to remain and engage in business, the brethren would look him out some suitable occupation.

One church, too, would aid another; the richer contributing to the necessities of the poorer in this world's goods. On one occasion, in Cyprian's time, the church in Carthage, North Africa, sent a large sum (more than four thousand dollars) to certain churches of Numidia, to aid in ransoming some of their members from captivity.

When brother differed in opinion from brother, he strove to do it in love. In combating what they thought to be error, the saints, as was meet, proceeded in the spirit of gentleness and patience. If repelled, they answered not "with hate and persecution, but with the manifestation of peace and true love."

"We gain much," says Chrysostom, "showing love and the true spirit of a disciple of Christ. We must condemn false doctrines; but in every way spare the men who espouse them, and pray for their salvation."

Such was the love Baptists entertained for each other in the times of early Christianity. It was holy, pure, sincere, and abiding. Love they each other so today? An affection of this kind is god-like; and forms a bond of union between brethren that is stronger than a chain of adamant.

The Baptists at this time not only loved one another: they loved all men, and sought to do good unto all. They aided the heathen, as well as the brethren, in their earthly troubles, by means of earthly consolations.

An example of this world-embracing benevolence was given by Cyprian's church, during the great plague in Carthage. Numbers of the dead and dying being east forth by their pagan friends to lie unburied in fine highways, the brethren, rich and poor, stimulated by their loved bishop," furnished money and help to bury the bodies of their persecutors, and to rescue the city from the danger of a more terrible devastation."

The surest proof, however, which these Christians gave of their love to the heathen, was their earnest striving, by precept and example, to bring them to Christ. Not the clergy only, but all believers, took a part, each in his own sphere, in advancing the interests of the religion of Christ. Each one had his own work to do; and each did it. Each preached the Gospel, if not by word, yet in his life.

In the age of the Apostles, and that immediately succeeding, every believer was a preacher of the truth as it is in Jesus ; though each was not a teacher in the Church.—Every man and every woman took some active part in spreading a knowledge of Christianity. Every believer tried to bring others to Christ. He that was a trite Christian, so far from finding it impossible to win others,—found it impossible *not* to do it: his love to the Redeemer *would* speak forth, and would be heard.

So labor, in our day, the Baptists in Germany,—fit descendants of the Baptists of Apostolic times. This is "aggressive Christianity" in the only sense in which Christianity may be aggressive; and thus attacking, it must conquer the world.

