

The Lord's Supper: A Local Church Ordinance

J. R. Graves
From *Old Landmarkism: What Is It?*, 1880

In This Issue:

**The Lord's Supper:
A Local Church Ordinance**
Page 1

Why Did God Create the Devil?
Page 8

After Marriage
Page 9

The Spirit Behind Anti-Semitism
Page 13

The Holiness of God
Page 15

"Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I delivered them unto you." (1 Cor. 11:2)

The Lord's Supper was observed as a local church ordinance, commemorative only of the sacrificial chastisement of Christ for his people, never expressive of personal fellowship, or of courtesy for others, or used as a sacrament.

That the Supper is a commemorative ordinance, instituted by Christ, to be observed in each local church, until he comes again, every Baptist will admit. This implies that each participant must, at least, be a member of some scriptural church, which also implies that he must have been scripturally baptized—immersed. Now the question I wish more particularly to discuss in this chapter is: Can a local church, scripturally or consistently, extend the invitation to participate beyond her own membership and discipline?

I well know that but few brethren can follow me in this discussion with unprejudiced minds, such is the power of denominational precedent over us all. I shall, without doubt, be confronted, at the very threshold, with the "traditions of fathers," and the almost immemorial "usages" of the denomination. But it weighs not a feather's weight with me; though it can be proved that Baptists, since the days of Paul, and that by the

very churches be planted and instructed, have practiced inter-communion, the question is, "What were the instructions he gave?"

These must constitute the "Old 'Landmarks'" to guide us in the observance of this ordinance, and not "denominational us-age," or the mistakes and errors of our fathers, if our ancestors did, indeed, err from the "old paths." The writer can easily remember when Baptist Associations were wont to close their sessions by celebrating the Lord's Supper, and this they did for years; but was it right because our fathers did it? Who will advocate this practice today, or what Association on this continent will presume to administer the Supper? And yet, what a clamor would have been

raised about the ears of the man who, in those days, had lifted his voice in condemnation of it!

Fifty years our fathers were wont to advise the churches to send their licentiates to the Association to receive ordination, and it was wont to select a Presbytery, and between them ordain the ministers. But who will advocate so unscriptural a procedure now? Twenty-five or thirty years ago, the overwhelming majority of our churches in the South would indorse a Campbellite, and alien

immersions as valid; but there is not an Association in the South, let the question be fairly laid before it, would indorse them to-day. And why? Because the attention of the churches has been called to a serious consideration of the question by discussions, pro and con, and scriptural truth and consistency have triumphed.

Now, touching the Lord's Supper, Baptists have not departed from "the form of sound words" in formulating their belief. They universally hold that it is a local church ordinance, i. e., an ordinance to be observed in and by a local church, but they have generally fallen into a "slipshod" way of observing it, quite as unscriptural as either of the bad "usages" I have mentioned above.

They now generally observe it, not as a strictly local church ordinance, i. e., confined to the members of the singular church celebrating the rite, but as a denominational observance, as belonging to the kingdom rather than to each local organization of the kingdom. Many and great evils, and gross inconsistencies, damaging to our denominational influence and growth, have sprung out of this practice, which it is my object to point out. Encouraged, as my faith is by the past, I believe that in a few years our churches will, as a body, return to the "old paths," in this, as in other matters, and walk in them, and find rest from the opposition which they have justly brought down upon their own heads.

ARGUMENTS FROM OUR CHURCH CONSTITUTION

1. It is a local church ordinance.

A church, by its constitution, is strictly an in-dependent body. It absolutely controls its own acts, and can, in no sense, control those of any other church. Her prerogatives, like her responsibilities, terminate with herself, and her authority is limited, as to the objects over which it is exercised, to her own membership, and she has not a church privilege she can extend to those outside her pale. If, then, the Supper was committed to each local church, its observance was limited to the membership of each church, and it can rightly be observed, only by the united membership of such churches, and not by them, in common with the membership of other churches. A church can extend her privileges, no more than her discipline, beyond her organization.

I never heard an intelligent Baptist claim that the members of other Baptist churches have a right to participate in the Supper when spread in any Baptist church. And why? Because they know it is a local church ordinance, like voting in the administration of the government of said church. If

Christ did not institute it to be observed by local churches as such, but for the denomination—the churches, and their members generally, wherever they might chance to be—then each member in good standing, would have a right to go uninvited to the Supper, wherever spread, and the local church would have no right to prevent him; but in that case, the individual churches could not be made responsible for any "leaven" that might be introduced into the feast, nor would it be in the power of any local church to obey the apostolic injunction, "Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. Therefore, let us keep the feast [observe the Supper], not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness," etc. (1 Cor. 5:7-8)

But what Christ did not authorize in the observance of the Supper, he certainly forbade, and, if he did command its observance by each local church as such, he forbade its being converted into a denominational or a social ordinance, i. e., observed by a particular church in common with parts of as many churches as may chance to be present. It certainly is either the one thing or the other—limited or unlimited. In this respect, Baptists, who cannot feel the force of the argument from the specifications of one thing prohibiting another, cannot blame Pedobaptists for not seeing that, when Christ specified believers only in the commission, he forbade the baptism of unbelievers and babies.

Again, when a person, having accepted Christ as his Savior, and seeks, as he should, the privileges of His church, he unites with a local church only, and not with the denomination generally, and receives and enjoys church privileges in that church alone. He can vote on all questions of ecclesiastical polity in that particular church, and in no other. He can participate in the Supper in that church and no other, since he is under the watch and care of that church and no other.

2. To each local church is committed the sole guardianship of the ordinances she administers.

She is commanded to allow only members, possessing certain qualifications, to come to the feast. Any who may have fallen into heresies, or whose Christian conversation is not such as becometh godliness—drunkards, fornicators, covetous, revilers, extortioners, etc.—with such she is not to eat.

The church at Corinth was not merely permitted, but peremptorily commanded, to prohibit the table to every person she did not know—so far as she had the ability to

learn—was free from leaven: "Purge out the old leaven, that ye [the church celebrating] may be a new lump." "Therefore, let us keep the feast, not with the old leaven," etc.

Each church, then, is made the guardian of this feast. She cannot alienate the responsibility; she must see that no disqualified person comes to the table; she must then have absolute control of the Supper, but if it is her duty to invite the members of all Baptist churches present, regardless of their known character, then she has no power to discharge this duty. She would evidently have no control over this ordinance, and would be robbed of one of her most important prerogatives as a church. But, if it is not her duty to invite any but her own members, then, she ought not to do it, and if the act robs her of the power to obey the laws of her Head, and preserve the purity of this sacred ordinance, then, she may know the practice is wrong, and fraught with evil.

I conclude with this argument in logical form:

1. Any practice that puts it out of the power of the church to discharge a positive command of Christ must be sinful, and forbidden by Christ.

2. The practice of inviting all members of Baptist churches present to observe the Lord's Supper does put it out of the power of that church to discharge the positive duty enjoined. (1 Cor. 5)

3. Therefore, the practice of inviting all members of Baptist churches present is sinful and forbidden by Christ.

Each church, then, is made the guardian of this feast. She cannot alienate the responsibility; she must see that no disqualified person comes to the table; she must then have absolute control of the Supper.

ARGUMENT FROM THE SYMBOLISM OF THE SUPPER

AXIOM: The symbol cannot be appropriate where the thing signified is wanting—and conversely: Those things cannot be appropriate, or scriptural, that contradict the symbol.

No one will question these axioms, and all Baptists believe that the elements Christ employed were symbolic of great facts. Let us see what they symbolized:

The One Bread—There should be but one loaf upon the table. Christ used but one. Paul specifies the use of but one: For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread. (1 Cor. 10:17) The

church at Corinth were to partake of but one bread, and in this respect she is the model for all the churches of Christ, in all ages.

This one, undivided bread was designed to teach that only one undivided body —organization — church as such—not several churches as an Association, nor parts of several—was authorized to celebrate this ordinance, or could do it without vitiating it. The symbolic teachings of the "one bread" is nullified whenever one church, with the fragments of a dozen others, attempt to observe the Supper. Could the administrator say, "We are one body"—or organization, or church—and tell the truth?

Here Paul specifies that one, and only one, church like that at Corinth should come together "in church," i. e., as a single church, and in "church capacity," to observe this ordinance. Masons assemble "in lodge" to receive members, and perform the rites of Masonry, and so a local church must organize as such, to observe the Supper; a plurality of churches, or parts of churches, cannot.

Artos—The bread was of one specific kind and quality of flour. It was not a loaf of barley, nor of maize; neither of oat nor rye flour, much less a mixture of these, but it is specified one wheaten loaf—"heis artos" not, "madza"—and this bread was not of unbolted, but of "fine flour"—all the impurities of the wheat carefully removed. God

never permitted any other flour to be used in his ordinances of old, or offered in any sacrifice upon his altars. It certainly had a meaning, as a type; it certainly has as a symbol in the church of Christ. The ordinance is destroyed if any other element than fine wheaten flour is used in the Supper.

THE SIGNIFICATION OF THE FINE WHEATEN-BREAD

The quality of the bread signified the one faith, and that the pure faith once delivered to the saints unadulterated. Where there are diverse faiths in the same church, this ordinance cannot be observed.

This was the case—divisions produced by heresies—in the church at Corinth when Paul wrote his first letter: "I hear that there are divisions among you; and I partly believe it. For there must also be heresies among you;" etc., (1 Cor. 11:18-19). This state inhibited the celebration of the Supper by that church until they were healed. Now, suppose the parties holding these heresies had separated,

and organized each a Baptist church in the city of Corinth, could they have communed together as churches or as parts of churches? The faith would not have been the same, and, therefore, there must have been error, adulteration, leaven, somewhere.

Suppose the First Baptist Church in Memphis, upon a rigid examination, should find that several of its members were high Calvinists, and a part low Arminians, several Unitarians, some, conscientious Universalists, and yet others Spiritualists—faiths based upon doctrines fundamentally opposed—would the church be justified in celebrating the Supper? Would not the symbolism of the one wheaten loaf be degraded? But should they amicably separate and form five different churches in this city, could the First Church scripturally invite the membership of all these, who once belonged to her body, to celebrate the Supper with her? If not—why not? Because such a communion would make the symbolism exhibit a falsehood. The one fine-flour of the bread shows forth that the communicants have one and the same unadulterated faith of the gospel, and, behold, they have six different faiths between them! Such an observance of the sacred Supper would be a profanation of it, and make the participants guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

Thus the symbolism of the one bread of one flour forever settles the question of their communion by different sects, and intercommunion among Baptist churches; they are not the "one body," organization, church, nor have they the same faith. Will Protestants claim that they and Catholics are one—the self-same body—organization? If not, they cannot observe the Supper together. Will they claim that their faith is one? Will Protestants claim that their various organizations are one and the same? Will Presbyterians claim that the Arminianism of the Methodists is the same as Calvinism? They are worlds apart. How then, without profaning the feast, without making the symbolism testify to a falsehood, can Presbyterians, Methodists, and Campbellites observe the Supper together? They certainly are not one body, one church; nor have they the one and the same faith.

The last time the Old and New School Presbyterian assemblies met the same year in Philadelphia, the New School sent a courteous invitation to the Old School assembly to unite with them in a joint celebration of the Lord's Supper. This invitation was scornfully rejected, as an open insult by the Old School—"For," said a learned doctor of divinity, "they ask us to humiliate ourselves, and act a lie in the face of Christendom. Why did we separate? Because we hold to different faiths, and therefore, could not commune together. And now they ask us to say to the

world, by our act, that we are one body, and hold one and the self-same faith, which is not true." If more proof is needed that the leaders of the very bodies, who plead loudest for open communion, know that it is unscriptural and sinful, I appeal to the action of the decisions of synods and their standard authorities. One or two must suffice. From *Synodical Records*, vol. 3, page 240, I quote this from a report adopted:

"The committee are of opinion that for Presbyterians to hold communion in sealing ordinances with those who belong to churches holding doctrines contrary to our standards (as do Baptists, Methodists, and all others), is incompatible with the purity and peace of the (Presbyterian) Church, and highly prejudicial to the truth as it is in Jesus. Nor can such communion answer any valuable purpose to those who practice it, etc."

Dr. D. Monfort, Presbyterian, in a series of letters, gives the following reasons for not giving free invitations to other churches, and especially Baptists: "1. They do not belong to the fellowship (i. e., of the Presbyterian Church), and therefore they cannot consistently receive the tokens of it. 2. They profess to be conscientious in refusing the fellowship, and it is uncharitable to ask them to violate their consciences, etc." [Letter IV]

Bishop Hedding, Methodist, in his work on the administration of *The Discipline*, asks: "Is it proper for a preacher to give out a general invitation in the congregation to members in good standing in other churches to come to the Lord's Supper? No; for the most unworthy persons are apt to think themselves in good standing, etc."

And again: "There are some communities, called churches which, from heretical doctrines or immoral practices, have no claim to the privileges of Christians, and ought not to be admitted to the communion of any Christian people." (pages 72, 73)

This is what *The Discipline* enjoins: "But no person shall be admitted to the Lord's Supper among us who is guilty of any practice for which we would exclude a member of our Church."

"Inveighing against our doctrines or discipline" are the capital charges mentioned in section 5; and what Presbyterian or Baptist does not oppose both the doctrine and discipline of Methodism as unscriptural and evil? Can these bodies practice open communion?

AXIOM: No church may dare to celebrate the ordinances unless she possesses the faith and the facts symbolized.

The Unleavened Bread—The bread used by Christ was one of those prepared for the Passover Supper, and was, therefore unleavened. God required, on pain of death, that no leaven should be used in any bread brought to his altar, or mingled in any sacrifice or ordinance typical of the sacrifice of Christ for us. All the burnt offerings for sin typified Christ's sacrifice, and the Paschal Feast was an eminent type of Christ, our Passover. He certainly had good and sufficient reasons for using this sort of bread. It was not mere capriciousness in him. But he explained to the Jews why he instituted the unleavened bread of the Passover. It was to teach them and their children, in the generations following, that he, their Sovereign Lord, alone and unassisted, had delivered them and brought them up out of Egypt: "Remember this day, in which ye came out from Egypt, out of the house of bondage; for by strength of hand the Lord brought you out from this place: there shall no leavened bread be eaten." (Exodus 13:3)

Their salvation was of the Lord alone. To symbolize this fact, all leaven of every sort was to be diligently sought for in all their coasts for seven days, and burned with fire; and by this they were given to understand that God was jealous of his honor, and that no part of their salvation was ever to be ascribed to either man or idol. This Paschal Feast, Paul tells us, was a type of the Lord's Supper, by which we commemorate the supreme grace of God in Christ, by whom we are redeemed from the "power of sin and Satan," and not by works of righteousness which we have done or may do; and, therefore, it is absolutely essential to the scriptural observance of the Supper that unleavened bread should be used.

With leavened bread, Paul's allusion would be meaningless where he recognizes the church at Corinth as solely responsible for the purity of the sacred feast entrusted to her guardianship: "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye [the church at Corinth] may be a new lump," etc. The unleavened wheat bread, then, symbolized that the members composing that church celebrating, must be without the leaven of wickedness, etc. "Therefore let us keep the feast, not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Cor. 5: 8). Certainly no thoughtful Christian can doubt that the bread upon the table should be without leaven, when it is required that the body it represents should be, and when this is required by Paul in order that the significancy of the feast be not corrupted.

The Wine—The Savior used wine made of "the grape"—it was "the fruit of the vine" he commanded, and, if it was not lawful for leaven to be used in this feast, He certainly did not use an element that was little less than leaven itself, and in limiting this element to wine, he forbade the use of any other liquid than the pure juice of the grape.

One Cup—only should be used, to preserve the symbolism; yet, where the church is large, and the wine to be used necessarily considerable, it can be placed upon the table in one vessel, and thanks given, before it is divided into smaller ones, to be distributed. The church, though many, may be said, all to drink of one wine, and of one vessel, or measure of wine.

As a crowning proof that no leaven must be used at this feast, either in the bread or wine, I refer the Bible student to those burnt-offerings of old, which were typical of Christ. (Ex. 34:25; Lev. 2:11) No leaven was allowed to be used, and it was the unleavened juice of the grape that was used in the drink offerings. As was the type, so should be the antitype. The elements of the feast were, UNLEAVENED WHEATEN LOAF AND THE UNLEAVENED "FRUIT OF THE VINE."

THE ARGUMENT FROM THE DESIGN OF THE SUPPER

Ritualists, whether Protestants or Romanists, have perverted this ordinance, as well as baptism, into a "sacrament" and "seal" of salvation thus making it indispensable to the salvation of both infants and adults, and, in addition to this, they teach that the Supper is a mark of Christian courtesy, or sign of Christian fellowship, in partaking of which Christians commune with one another.

I have not space in this work to notice and expose the doctrine of transubstantiation, as taught by Romanists, nor of consubstantiation, as held by Lutherans, nor that of the "mystical body" after consecration, as taught by Episcopalians and Methodists.

The Savior expressed the whole design when he said: "**Do this in remembrance of me.**" It is, therefore, nothing more and nothing less, than a simple ordinance, commemorative of what Christ is, and what he has done for us—a remembrance of him.

It is, in no sense, a "sacrament." It conveys no saving grace, nor can it be a "converting rite" for the converted, the regenerated, and saved, alone, may, scripturally, partake of it. It is as gross a perversion of this ordinance, for

Protestants to teach that it is a "seal," or a "sacrament of salvation," as for Catholics to teach it is the veritable body, and blood, and divinity of Christ; and, for this reason, Baptists cannot unite with either in its celebration, if it was not a church ordinance. This statement will be questioned by those who know little of the teachings of the word of God, and less of the teachings of Protestants.

Presbyterians teach that it is both a "sacrament" of salvation, and a seal of the Covenant of Grace; which, if true, no one ever was, or can be, saved without them:

Q.—What are the sacraments of the New Testament?

A.—The sacraments of the New Testament are baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Q.—What is a sacrament?

A.—It is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed and applied to believers. (*Conf. Faith*, p. 335)

Q.—Wherein do the sacraments of baptism, and the Lord's Supper, agree?

A.—The sacraments of baptism, and the Lord's Supper agree in that the author of both is God; the spiritual part of both is Christ and his benefits; both are seals of the same covenant. (p. 297)

The Methodist "church" teaches the same pernicious doctrine, i. e., that the Supper, like baptism, is a sacrament of salvation, to be eaten by the unregenerate as a means of obtaining regeneration, the pardon of sins, and salvation. In their articles of faith it is declared to be a "sacrament." Wesley, the founder of the sect, explains what his church holds and teaches on this ordinance:

"The Lord's Supper was ordained by God to be a means of conveying to men either preventing, or justifying, or sanctifying grace, according to their several necessities...or, to renew their souls in the image of God. To come to the Supper of the Lord no fitness is required at the time of communicating, but a sense of our state of utter sinfulness and helplessness. Everyone who knows he is fit for hell, being just fit to come to Christ, in this as well as all other ways of his appointment...In latter times, many [these are Baptists] have affirmed that the Lord's Supper is not a converting ordinance...The falsehood of this objection appears both from scripture precept and example." (*Wesleyana*, pp. 283, 284)

The ordinance is not more grossly perverted by the Catholics. How a Baptist, or a Christian, at all conversant with the Bible—a regenerate person—can dare to partake of the Supper as a "sacrament," or a "seal," to secure conversion, justification, or remission of sins, I cannot imagine. All who partake for any such purpose, eat and drink "unworthily," and make themselves guilty of the body and blood of Christ.

The ordinance is a simple memorial of Christ's work and love for us, a photograph he has left his betrothed Bride till he comes again to marry her, and he asks her not to worship it, but to look upon it as oft as she pleases, with the sole purpose of remembering him and no one else, on earth or in heaven. It is one little service he claims all for himself, and will allow no thought to be given to another. There are times when we may properly think of earthly friends—of mother, of dear wife, husband, of precious children, of departed saints, of living relatives, but it would be doing insult to Christ, and profaning this sacred memorial, to remember anyone but "Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." (Rev. 1:5)

We do not, therefore, commune with one another at the Lord's Table, but with Christ only, if we eat and drink "worthily." We have no occasion to leave or absent ourselves from the Supper lest we indorse, by our act, the Christian character of someone who may be there. We disobey a positive command of Christ. "Do it," and we refuse to remember him when we neglect this duty.

Nor is it designed to be used as an expression of fellowship, or "courtesy" towards other Christians or members of other Baptist churches. The ordinance is profaned and eaten "unworthily" when it is observed with this design. Baptists of other churches present cannot complain, if they are not invited, of any injustice done them, for no right of theirs, or duty of the celebrating church, has been violated or omitted; and, as I have shown, no discourtesy has been shown them, because the ordinance was not given for the purpose of expressing our courtesy to others.

The command is: "DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME."

THE OPINIONS OF EMINENT BAPTISTS

We are not altogether alone in the views above expressed, at least so far as the principle is concerned.

Dr. A. P. Williams, in his "Lord's Supper," says: "Having done these things [i. e., believed, been baptized, and added to the church] he has a right to the communion in the church to which he has been added - but nowhere else. As

he had no general right when running at large, so he has no general right now."(p. 93)

Now, if he has no right to the Supper anywhere, save in his own church, it is because Christ has not given him authority to eat anywhere else, which is tantamount to a positive prohibition. It is certain that no other church has any right to extend her church privileges beyond her own bounds.

If he has no right to commune anywhere else, it is because Christ has not given him the right, and therefore, he has no right to claim, or to exercise the right. It is not true, as open and intercommunionists assert, that "they are entitled to the Supper wherever they find it."

"Now, here [Acts 2:41, 42; 20:7; 1 Cor. 10:16, 17] it is plainly argued that this joint participation in the one cup, and the one bread is designed to show that the participants are but one body; and, as such, they share this joint participation, but if the communion were obligatory upon Christians as individuals, and not as church members, it could not show this." (p. 70)

Yet Dr. Williams, influenced by feeling or usage, says that members of other Baptist churches, while they have no right on the premises, still may be invited as an act of "courtesy." But, according to his own teachings, as above, the symbolism of the Supper is destroyed whenever it is done; for it is no longer a church ordinance, but a denominational or social rite.

Prof. W. W. Gardner, Bethel College, Kentucky, in his able work, *Church Communion*, says:

"The same is equally true of communion at the Lord's Table, which is a church act, and the appointed token, not of the Christian, nor denominational, but of church fellowship subsisting between communicants at the same table. Hence, it follows that a member of one Baptist church has no more right, as a right, to claim communion in another Baptist church than he has to claim the right of voting; for both are equally church acts and church privileges. The Lord's Supper being a church ordinance, as all admit, and every church being required to exercise discipline over all its communicants, it necessarily follows THAT NO CHURCH CAN SCRIPTURALLY EXTEND ITS COMMUNION BEYOND THE LIMITS OF ITS DISCIPLINE. And this, in fact, settles the question of church communion, and restricts the Lord's Supper to

the members of each particular church as such." (pp. 18, 19)

Dr. Richard Fuller:

"If anything can be plain to those who prefer the Word of God to sentimentalism and popularity, it is that baptism is to follow faith immediately; that it is an individual duty, and must precede membership, and that as the Passover was a meal for each family only, so the Supper is a family repast, for the members of that particular church in which the table is spread. This is so plain to our minds, hearts, consciences, that there is never any discussion about it."

If the Supper is a repast for the members of each particular church only, it is because the Divine law governing the feast has made it so, and, therefore, it would be in violation of that law for a church to invite, or allow others than her own members, to partake of it; and equally so for members of another church to accept such an unlawful invitation. This is so plain to my mind that discussion is useless.

President Robinson, of Brown University, Rhode Island, and formerly pastor of the First Church of Providence, believing that the Supper is an ordinance of the local church, never extended an invitation to members of Baptist churches present, whether ministers or laymen.

Dr. Curtis, author of an able work, *Communion, and Progress of Baptist Principles*:

"Thus, then, it is clear [i.e., from 1 Cor. 15] that the Lord's Supper is given in charge to those visible churches of Christ, in the midst of which he has promised to walk and dwell (Rev. 2:1). To each of these it belongs to celebrate it as ONE FAMILY [Then certainly not as parts of different families or bodies]. The members of that particular church are to be tarried for, and it is to be a symbol of their relations, as members, to each other. In all ordinary cases, it should be partaken of by each Christian in the particular church of which he is a member." (*Progress of Baptist Principles*, p. 307)

It is only from the Scriptures we learn how an ordinance is to be ordinarily observed. From what book can Dr. Curtis, or anyone else, learn how they are to be ordinarily observed? The one specified form of their observance is the only form we may observe. Christ, nor his apostles,

gave exceptional cases, or warrant us in the least deviation whatever, under any circumstances.

Several of the leading Baptist papers of America have given a decided opinion upon the subject. *The National Baptist*, Philadelphia, warmly approved the course of Dr. Robinson; *The Western Baptist* warmly approved the position of Dr. Fuller; and, commenting upon our lecture upon this subject in the Metropolitan Temple, San Francisco, *The Evangel*, the Baptist magazine of California, thus expressed its unqualified indorsement:

“Some four or five years ago we were appointed to write an essay on the Lord's Supper, and after the most thorough examination we were able to give the subject, we were driven to the following conclusion, viz.: that the Supper is an ordinance within a Gospel church, and that there is no

authority in the Scriptures for extending it beyond the jurisdiction of the church administering the ordinance. From this conclusion we drew the practical inference that, as there is no Scripture warranting intercommunion among the members of different churches of the same faith and order, Baptists who claim that the Scriptures are a sufficient rule of faith and practice, ought to stop just where the law stops; in other words, the churches should restrict the ordinance to those over whom they exercise jurisdiction.”

This is an important "Landmark" of the primitive churches, which every friend of scriptural order should assist in restoring to its erect and firm position.



Why Did God Create the Devil?

Nick Michalinos

From *The Baptist Challenge*, September 2015

Question: If the devil causes so much trouble in the world, why then did God create the devil?

Answer: Yes, the devil has always caused problems in heaven as well as on earth, and I assure you, he's far from through. To be as simplistic as possible in answering your question, the truth is, God did not create the devil.

The word "devil" means "accuser" or "slanderer," but this does not by any means completely describe this malignant personality. His vile character is described by the various names given to him in the Bible. To name a few, he is called "Satan" 54 times, which means adversary or opponent. He is called "Beelzebub," the prince of evil spirits. He is called a "liar," a "murderer" (John 8:44), "Apollyon" (destroyer), "Dragon" (monstrous), "Serpent" (subtle, clever, sly), "roaring lion" (animal of prey), "angel of light" (thing of beauty in order to deceive), etc. Is it no wonder that he is so capable of causing so much trouble in the world?

Permit me to give you more details about the "prince of darkness." He is a created spirit that had the name Lucifer.

He is a cherub that is said to be anointed. His original position was near the very throne of God (Ezek. 28:13-17). Being a free moral agent, he exercised a rebellious will against God his creator by desiring to take over the throne of God, and by so doing, he fell and became the immediate adversary (Satan) of God, and then in time, of man (Isa. 14:14-16).

He wants to take God's place; he desires to be worshiped, honored, adored and glorified. His exact words are, "I will be like the Most High" (Isa. 14:14). He tempted Eve with the same principle of attaining god-hood by declaring, "Ye shall be as gods" (Gen. 3:5). He boldly stated to our Lord that he would give Him the kingdoms of this world if He (Christ) would only "bow down and worship me" [Satan] (Matt. 4:9). As you can see, he desires creature worship.

During the Tribulation Period, Satan's "man" known as the antichrist will exhibit Satan's god-seeking desires by setting himself up "as God" (2 Thess. 2:4). Through the permissive

will of God, he is presently in charge of this world's system (Kosmos), a civilization without the true and living God. To show his authority over the world, he is called "the god of this world" (2 Cor. 4:4), the "prince of this world" (John 12:31), and the "prince of the air" (Eph. 5:8).

The foolish notion that he is penned-up in "hell" is quickly done away with when we read scriptures like Job 1:7 where we are told he goes "to and fro in the earth ... walking up and down in it" and "he goeth about as a roaring lion" (1 Pet. 5:8).

We need to know how to "resist the devil" (James 4:7). To "resist" successfully, we must not be ignorant of his devices" [purposes, thoughts] (2 Cor. 2:11). We must be

aware of his intentions. He hates God, and therefore, to get to God he persecutes and seeks to corrupt the lives of God's people (2 Tim. 3:12; John 17:14). Our real enemy is not "flesh and blood," but spiritual in nature (Eph. 6:10-17). We can "stand against the wiles (trickery, craftiness, cunning) of the devil" (Eph. 6:11), if we depend upon the power of God's might (Eph. 6:10).

Satan "deceiveth the whole world" (Rev. 12:9). He blinds the eyes of unbelievers to the truth of salvation (2 Cor. 4:3-4), by taking the Word of God out of their hearts (Matt. 13:19), and skillfully attacks the Bible full-time in various ways through the agency of his ministries (2 Cor. 11:13-15). He is the enemy of our souls. The lost will spend eternity with him in the lake of fire (Rev. 20:10, 15).



After Marriage

T. T. Eaton

From *Talks on Getting Married*, 1891

"Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself, and the wife see that she reverence her husband." (Eph. 5:33)

Having spoken to you about the obligations of marriage, and the points to be considered by both wife and husband before entering into this relation, it remains for me to add a few words respecting the after duties of the married pair to each other.

The ideal marriage is the union of a perfect man, who loves and honors his wife, with a perfect woman, who reverences her husband and submits to him in the Lord. But in this fallen world we find no perfect men and no perfect women, and so there are no ideal marriages. The best are but approximations. How then shall an imperfect husband and wife treat each other after marriage?

The first thing is for them to realize what they have done in getting married. They have solemnly chosen each other out of all the world as life companions in the most intimate and binding of all human relationships. They have assumed new and solemn obligations. They are to forsake all the world for each other's sake, that they may live together after God's ordinance in the holy estate of matrimony. In

entering upon this new and solemn relation, it is important that they begin rightly.

Often have mistakes, committed soon after the wedding, done harm all through the married life. That was not a bad custom of the old Venetians to have a special sermon on the duties of husband and wife preached to each couple immediately after the wedding. And seventy-five years ago in Kentucky special instruction was given to each newly married pair. A friend has given me a poem which it was the custom to read at every wedding.

THE FAMILY ALTAR

First then, after marriage, erect a family altar, and pray to God together for his blessing and guidance. The great Robert Hall is credited with saying that family prayer "is the hem and border that prevents wedded life from unraveling," and the hem should be there when the garment is first made. It can never be so well put on after the unraveling has progressed. Do you say, "Yes, but I never

prayed aloud in my life?" Alas, that this should be true; but, if true, immediately after marriage is the best time to begin. It will be easier then than ever afterward.

Many a man who has not maintained a family altar has bitterly regretted that he did not begin at the commencement of his married life. You may answer, "But I do not know what to say." Think of your needs, remember God's willingness to bless, and ask him to enable you to live rightly. You can at least read a selection of Scripture, and then kneel down and pray about it.

And to you who have been married for years, and for all this time have had no family altar, I would say, set up one at once. You cannot undo the past, but by God's grace you can take care of the future. You can find no greater help to right living and to domestic happiness. God will honor the families which honor him. If you will honestly do the best you can, God will accept it and will graciously bless you. You need it, and your children need it. John Randolph said he was saved from atheism by the remembrance of the prayers in his childhood home.

Alas! In this world of temptation and sin, our children need all the safeguards which our love and faith can throw around them. Give them, then, that most precious of all legacies, the remembrance of praying parents. Ah! You can never know how sadly your sons may need such recollections when in after years vice allures them and your forms lie sleeping beneath the graveyard grasses.

BEAR AND FORBEAR

You will find after marriage that your companion is not perfect. Things seen from a distance may seem faultless, but a closer inspection shows many blemishes. The intimacy of marriage reveals many little defects which were not visible in the rosy glow of courtship. Happy are you if you discover your own faults with those of your companion. If you are disappointed in your wife — if you thought she was an angel and now find her only a woman — consider that she, in all probability, is still more disappointed in you. She finds to her dismay that you are by no means the noble hero which before marriage her imagination pictured. Then is the time to act upon the old adage, "Bear and forbear."

See that you do your duty faithfully. Do not be exacting. Let not your love degenerate into a mere demand for

attention. Be careful about indulging in reproaches of any sort, and do not make comparisons. Be reasonable. Remember that you have taken each other for better or for worse till death shall part you, and so everything must be done to brighten the home and strengthen the ties of affection — nothing to cast a shadow or weaken the bonds.

If, sir, you discover faults in your wife, remember that it was you who asked her to marry you, and the arrangement is of your own making. You have taken her happiness into your hands, while, if you had let her alone, she might have married a better man. You are under the highest obligations to love and cherish her. She has committed herself to your keeping for life; her happiness is entrusted to your care, and if you have a spark of honor you will not treat her unkindly. The highest compliment a woman can pay a man is to marry him, and the man who cares so little for his solemn vows and is so false to his obligations as to be cruel to his wife, should not be tolerated in a decent community.

Many a man who has not maintained a family altar has bitterly regretted that he did not begin at the commencement of his married life.

And when I speak of cruelty I do not mean simply brutality. There are many refined sorts of cruelty which are the hardest of all to bear, and which are even baser than the more violent and brutal forms. There is no danger of your beating your wife, but is there no danger of your

treating her with coldness and neglect? If you find her lacking in qualities you desire your wife to possess, think that with all her faults she is a better wife than you deserve to have. I am sure there are many more good wives than good husbands in the world.

WOMAN - THE WEAKER VESSEL

Woman is the "weaker vessel," and is peculiarly susceptible to influences from a man she loves and who she knows loves her. Love your wife even as you love yourself, and you will find her development under that love like a beautiful flower under the sunshine. She is to be your helpmeet, and you are to make her the best helpmeet possible. And for this it is indispensable that you should have full confidence in her, and take her fully into your confidence. You should make her acquainted with all that concerns and interests you. Let her know all about your plans and your business. Let her enter fully into your life. Frequent no place you would be ashamed to have her go, and engage in no pleasure which you cannot ask her to share. Nowhere will you find truer sympathy than with her, and you will receive from her that support which only a true wife can give.

THE HUSBAND - INDEBTED TO THE WIFE

Many a great man's success in life has been due to his wife, though the world gave all the credit to him. It would be a long list, and would contain the names of many of the earth's greatest and best, that would tell of the successes of men which were in a great measure due to their wives. Erasmus tells us of the home of Sir Thomas Moore, and we see there the secret of his power. Luther acknowledged his obligations to his wife, and so, did Bunyan and Baxter and Edmund Burke and Buckland and Niebuhr and Sir William Hamilton and Fichte and Guizot and Carlyle and many others. Listen to Dr. Livingston saying on the death of his noble wife: "I never was anything till I knew you, and I have been a better, happier, and more prosperous man ever since."

In a church on Fleet street, London, there is a tablet with an inscription to the memory of Sir Samuel Romilly, whose devotion to his wife was such that seven days after her death he died of a broken heart. He described her as a woman of strong understanding, noblest sentiments, warmest affection and utmost delicacy. These are but few of many cases, and we get bright glimpses of these great women incidentally. None of them sought notoriety as good wives. It has been well said, "The best women are necessarily the most difficult to know; they are recognized chiefly in the happiness of their husbands and the nobleness of their children; they are only to be divined, not discerned, by the stranger."

THE HUSBAND CAN MAKE THE WIFE

It is always a loving husband who makes such a wife, and where a wife is lacking in intelligent sympathy it is likely the husband is lacking in love. Away with the foolish notion, which poets have written about, that a wife is to be like a vine growing about her husband, who is the tree supporting her, while she beautifies him. What help does the vine give the tree? It would grow better and flourish better without the vine, while a wife is to be a helpmeet for her husband, and a man cannot rightly do his life work unaided by the intelligent sympathy and loving tact of his wife. Do not look upon your wife as a vine. Women are not designed merely to be attractive; they are to be helpful. And the man who regards his wife as an ornament simply, as an object to be admired, like a beautiful painting, decking her, it may be, with silks and jewels, but making no life companion of her, asking no intelligent sympathy from her, he need not be disappointed if she becomes frivolous and vain, and in time of trial is found wanting.

"Husbands, love your wives and be not bitter against them." (Col. 3:19) This is a complete summing up of marital duty. Love here is "the fulfilling of the law." (Rom. 13:10) So "love your wife even as yourself," (Eph. 5:33) for she is to be part of your very self, heart of your heart, mind of your mind, and soul of your soul. The man, who is not as careful to please his wife after marriage as before, is taking cruel advantage of the fact that the marriage tie is indissoluble.

Your love after marriage ought to be better and stronger than ever, and it should express itself in a hundred delicate ways. I do not mean that you should be uxorious and live for the sake of your wife. Great as is your obligation to be a good husband, your wife has no right to absorb your time and thoughts to the neglect of the great life-work that lies before you. "The man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man;" (1 Cor. 11:9) but you ought to love her as yourself, and never give her the slightest reason to doubt your affection. Be not bitter against her; that is to say, do nothing that shows irritation or that will provoke it. Always be gentle, kind, and considerate. Do not go home annoyed by business cares, and be sour at your family because things have gone wrong with you during the day. Never tease or annoy your wife. The word "bitter" in the passage I have quoted carries the idea of being provoking. Say and do nothing which will distress her. Love her as you love yourself, and thus you will make her more lovely as the years go by, and more helpful.

Be careful about making an exhibition of selfishness to your wife. To be self-absorbed and to care for your own pleasure more than for her happiness, to put upon her cares you ought yourself to bear, will injure you in her estimation in a way she can never entirely overcome. It is your duty to provide for her and to protect and cherish her, and if you fail here you can never be the same to her again. You are the head of the family, and this God-given responsibility you cannot shirk. You are responsible for the right training of your children, and you must not put the entire care of them upon your wife while you go off to seek your pleasure. Whatever you do which makes her believe that you are selfish and care more for your gratification than for your vows to her, will mar her reverence for you, and while, if she be a true woman, it saddens her life, it will also take away her power to be helpful to you. It is not in woman's nature to be a helpmeet to a man who does not love her.

THE WIFE SHOULD HELP, NOT MANAGE, HER HUSBAND

And to the wives let me say, see that you reverence your husbands. (Eph. 5:33) This means that you shall recognize him as the head of the family, and that you cherish toward

him a spirit of submission in all things which do not involve moral wrong. Do not try to manage him. God has declared, "He shall rule over thee." (Gen. 3:16) This ruling over men is the one thing which is forbidden to women in the Bible, and it seems to be the one thing a certain sort of woman is most of all determined to secure. No, you, as a wife, must exercise a great influence over your husband, but so far from ruling him you are to help him rule well in whatever direction his authority extends. You are a helpmeet for him, and while he works on the world, you are to work on him, to make him purer, wiser, and better. With loving tact you are to labor to correct his thoughts and to win him more and more into the right way. What path of life he will choose, what avocation he will follow, or what lifework he will undertake — these he must decide, and it is yours to make yourself as helpful to him as possible. Is he a lawyer? Then see to it that he is a better and more successful lawyer because you are his wife. And so for all other pursuits. You have no right to remain in ignorance of your husband's affairs. Your highest earthly obligation is to give him the intelligent sympathy he needs, and which he cannot get so well from any other source. To fail in this is to fail to be a true wife.

If you find your husband lacking in some important quality, then you are to strive to make good the defect, so that his lifework shall not suffer because of it. Do not imagine that his interests and yours are separate. You best help yourself in helping him. Think not that if he will only attend to his business you will attend to yours, for husband and wife have no separate business. Marriage is the closest corporation and the completest co-partnership in the world. There should, therefore, be a full understanding and a state of perfect confidence between the husband and wife.

It is your husband's duty to love you, and you need his love; then be lovely; cultivate loveliness of disposition, for this will give you power to mold his character. Do not let him see any exhibition of ill temper, whether it be in the form of scolding or sulking. You may, by showing anger, get his consent to something you wish to do, or get him to do something you desire, but believe me, the gain is not worth the cost. You injure his love for you and lessen your power to be a helpmeet for him. If he is unreasonable, the remedy is not in answering back. That may silence him, to be sure, but it injures him. If you will but watch your opportunity, you can say to him without irritation all that he needs to hear from you. Strive by God's grace to make yourself as helpful to him temporarily--and above all, spiritually — as you are capable of becoming. This is your highest earthly duty. You cannot begin too soon or work at it too long or too vigorously. Woe to you if you neglect it.

MUTUAL DUTIES

Husband and wife are joined together for life, to strengthen each other in all labor, comfort each other in all sorrow, and minister to each other in all need, till they go out into eternity "equal to the angels." (Luke 20:36) The wife is to hold and increase her husband's love, and to make herself more and more lovely in his eyes. The husband is to cherish his wife as his choicest treasure, and to become more and more worthy of her reverence and love. Perfect confidence, perfect frankness, and perfect good will should characterize the home. If at any time any differences of opinion should arise, and it is to be expected they will arise, let each party be careful to give the other the last word. And do not let your children know of your differences. Let neither imagine the other is guilty of neglect when doing his or her proper work.

It is not true love which is constantly demanding attention that is selfishness, Simple Simon pure. You did not marry to promote your convenience, but to fulfil the great design of your Father in Heaven. If the wife, for example, is ever demanding attentions from her husband, and feeling hurt if he takes time for his lifework which she prefers he should devote to her, then, so far as being a helpmeet for him, she will be a millstone about his neck. Let the husband also remember that his wife is to do, not what he likes to have done, but what he needs to have done, and he is not to translate his convenience into her duties.

CHURCH RELATIONS

I have been asked about the duties of husband and wife when they belong to different churches. Shall either give up to the other, and if so, which one? In religion "there is neither male nor female," (Gal. 3:28) and each one is to "give an account of himself unto God." (Rom. 14:12) If no question of conscience is involved, as, for example, if both churches are of the same denomination, the wife should go with her husband. But if points of conscience are involved, then each must do what he or she regards as duty. It is very desirable, especially where there are children, for the husband and wife to belong to the same church. I would, therefore, recommend the following course: With an earnest prayer to God for guidance, and a perfect willingness to go wherever the Holy Spirit shall lead, let husband and wife take up the New Testament and carefully study together its teachings on the questions at issue. Let this be patiently and conscientiously done, and then let them, if they can agree, join that church whose doctrines come nearest the New Testament teaching. But if, after this investigation, they cannot agree, then it only remains for

them to agree to disagree, and let each be as faithful a church member as possible.

It has been said that marriage is the bird of Paradise that flew over the walls of Eden, and has through all the centuries, blessed the world by its presence. In this institution lies the hope for the future of the world. The family is the one government God established in the earth, and whose perpetuity he decreed. In these days it is fiercely attacked by infidelity, as in the cases of Hume and Strauss, and by false religion, as Mormonism and Mohammedanism. It is also assailed by lax laws concerning divorce. The family is the foundation of all that is good in government and all that is worth saving in society. Nothing

is more plainly written in the records of history and on the pages of revelation.

A true home is the fairest flower Christianity has planted in the garden of the world; a place where the husband loves and honors the wife, while she reverences him with true devotion, and the children are dutiful and obedient to both, as they are being trained "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. 6:4) "There is no place like home," we are fond of singing, but, thank God, there is a place which home is like—a place of which our brightest and happiest home on earth is but the shadow and symbol — the home of "Our Father which art in Heaven." (Matt. 6:9)



The Spirit Behind Anti-Semitism

Bill Randals

From www.soundthetrumpet.ca, August 2014

And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars: And she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered. And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born. And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne. (Revelation 12:1-5)

In a recent article we began an exploration of the mystery of the near universal hatred and antipathy towards the Jews. We examined possible human reason why people seem to have hated, blamed and suspected the Jews of much evil.

Such causes as envy at the successes of Jewish people, and badly misreading scripture, or the fact that God exiled the Jews and caused them to be perpetual strangers in the diaspora over the centuries, all factor in, no doubt. Also the fact that even in their estrangement from God and temporary exile, the Jews are yet a witness to the reality of the God of the Bible would be a reason why those who hate God would hate the Jews.

But there is a virulent, irrational aspect to anti-Semitism which points to even deeper, darker causes than these. I

believe that the vision the Apostle John had in Revelation 12 is a spiritual explanation for Anti-Semitism.

There is a correspondence between the sacred books of Genesis and the Revelation. As it was in the beginning, so shall it be at the end, for there is continuity in the Divine Revelation.

Genesis chapter three features a woman, in a garden of delight, being tempted by a serpent. By the time we come to Revelation 12, the woman is in labor, with child, and the serpent has become a multi-headed, multi crowned Dragon! There is a man in the garden also. He was called to rule the world. In the vision of John, there is now a man-child, destined to rule all nations.

Who is the woman? We know who the woman is in Genesis; she is Eve, the mother of us all. But who is the woman in Revelation? She is clothed with the Sun, with the moon under her feet and has a crown of 12 Stars.

When I was a Roman Catholic, I used to think the woman was the Virgin Mary. Our little church even featured a statue of Mary, standing on the globe, crushing the serpent underneath her feet. She had a crown of 12 Stars.

Of course this was a blasphemous misinterpretation of the original gospel in Genesis 3:15, the promise of the "Seed of the woman" who would himself crush the serpent's head, but would bruise his own heel. Mary, the mother of Jesus, didn't crush the serpent's head, for she confessed that she too was a sinner in need of salvation.

"And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." (Genesis 3:15)

"My soul magnifies the Lord, and my spirit rejoices in God my Saviour, For he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden: for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For he that is mighty hath done to me great things; and holy is his name." (Luke 1:46-49)

The European Union, a new political entity heavily influenced by Roman Catholicism, has chosen as its flag the 12 Stars in a circle, the so-called "Crown of Mary."

But the woman in the vision is not Mary. Then who is she?

Let us interpret scripture with other scripture, Revelation with Genesis in this case. The identity of this vision is revealed in the story of Joseph and his dreams.

"And he dreamed yet another dream, and told it his brethren, and said, Behold, I have dreamed a dream more; and, behold, the sun and the moon and the eleven stars made obeisance to me. And he told it to his father, and to his brethren: and his father rebuked him, and said unto him, What is this dream that thou hast dreamed? Shall I and thy mother and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth?" (Genesis 37:9-10)

The twelve stars are the sons of Israel, and the Sun and the Moon are Jacob and Leah. Thus the Woman in the vision is Israel.

What does the part mean about Israel laboring in birth? The chosen nation has ever been in labor, for beyond the reception and custody of the written Word of God, and the maintenance of a Holy nation of Priests and Kings, and the sole witness to the true God in a pagan world, Israel's great task was to be the vessel through whom the Messiah, 'the seed of the woman' should come into the world to save us from our sins.

"Now why dost thou cry out aloud? is there no king in thee? is thy counsellor perished? for pangs have taken thee as a woman in travail. Be in pain, and labour to bring forth, O daughter of Zion, like a woman in travail: for now shalt thou go forth out of the city, and thou shalt dwell in the field, and thou shalt go even to Babylon; there shalt thou be delivered; there the Lord shall redeem thee from the hand of thine enemies." (Micah 4:9-10)

All of the above, though being Divine privileges, have involved a lot of pain, endurance and hatred from the world which "lies in the power of the wicked One".

The Red Dragon? The very text tells us who that is...

"...that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." (Revelation 12:9)

The Dragon waited for the woman to give birth, that He might devour the man-child, 'the seed of the woman who would one day crush the serpent's head'. The 'man-child' is Jesus of Nazareth, "Born of a woman, and born under the law".

From the time of the announcement in the garden of Eden, of the coming 'man-child', all through the calling and election of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and on into the history of the twelve tribes of Israel, the serpent has ever sought to destroy the 'seed', before He could rise up to rule and crush the Devil's head.

This is why Pharaoh took Abraham's wife, and Isaac's wife, and tried to obliterate the children of Israel, tempting them to commit fornication with idolaters, trying to wipe out the grandchildren of David through Athaliah, or to get the Jews to intermarry with pagans in the days of Nehemiah.

Behind all of these incidents was the Serpent seeking to devour the seed! Thus, Anti-Semitism is Satanic! Everywhere Anti-Semitism is promoted, you are hearing the hiss of the serpent.



The Holiness of God

From *The Pulpit Cyclopædia*, 1851

"Glorious in holiness." (Exodus 15:11)

By the holiness of God is meant the essential purity and perfection of his moral character. This attribute of Deity is often presented to our consideration in the Scriptures. He often proclaimed his holiness to his ancient people, the Jews—"Ye shall be holy, for I the LORD your God am holy." (Lev. 19:2)

The seraphim and cherubim cry one to another, "Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts." (Isa 6:3) He is said to be so holy that he cannot behold evil, nor look on iniquity. He says, by Isaiah the prophet, 43:15, "I am the Lord, your holy One."

Now, we observe that:

I. GOD IS HOLY IN HIS NATURE AND ESSENCE.

As a perfect being, he is necessarily and infinitely removed from all evil. He is the centre of perfection. His will and mind are holy; his purposes and counsels are holy. This is the supreme dignity of the divine nature, that it is perfectly holy. This constitutes the moral grandeur and beauty of God; this, in the language of the text, is his essential glory - "Glorious in holiness." God cannot be otherwise than holy, for he is as necessarily holy as he is necessarily God. Nothing could affect his holiness—it is the immutable brightness of his character, "For in him is no darkness at all." (1 John 1:5)

II. GOD IS HOLY IN ALL HIS WORKS.

The first-born sons of glory were created in all the excellency of holiness; they are called the holy angels. In the creation of man he displayed his holiness, creating him in his perfect and upright likeness. In all the works of nature he made everything according to the counsels of his own purity and wisdom, and pronounced the whole very good. Whatever proceedeth from his hands must of necessity be holy.

III. GOD IS HOLY IN HIS DOMINION AND GOVERNMENT.

All the laws which relate to intellectual and moral beings must be the emanations of his holy mind. Such was the law given to the first of our race; such was the moral law, "holy, just, and good." So were all the ceremonial institutions, &c., designed to express the holy character of God, and the necessity of holiness in his creatures. However inexplicable to us the ways of God, however much clouds and darkness may surround him, yet absolute purity and rectitude are the basis of his throne. He is righteous in all his ways, &c. The laws and principles of the government of God, whether affecting angels, or men, or devils, are all just and holy. There is no unrighteousness in him.

IV. GOD IS HOLY IN HIS WORD.

Hence his Word is called "the Holy Scriptures." Every word of God is pure. (Prov. 30:5) His word must necessarily resemble himself, being the revelation of his holy mind. Here the holiness of God is made known to us. Without this we could not have seen it in the works of nature, &c. But the Bible is a mirror of the divine purity. Here he shines forth in all the resplendent rays of holiness. His word, also, is the perfect rule of holiness. Here are holy statutes—holy counsels—holy precepts—holy warnings—holy promises—and invitations to holiness. Here holiness is taught in all its principles, and features, and importance. It is also the instrument of holiness. It tends to the change of the character, and the sanctification of the heart. It cleanses like holy water—purifies and refines as holy fire—it renews as the pure and vital air.

V. GOD IS HOLY, ESPECIALLY IN HUMAN REDEMPTION.

The great object of redemption was to exhibit the divine holiness to all creatures and all worlds. He embodied it in the obedience of his Son—he taught it in his doctrines—confirmed it by his miracles—wrote it in crimson characters with his precious blood. The end of man's redemption was his restoration to holiness - "To redeem us from all iniquity." (Titus 2:14) Hence the blood of the great sacrifice

is represented as "cleansing from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1:9)

VI. GOD IS HOLY IN THE DISPENSATION OF HIS GRACE.

The revelation of that gracious dispensation is by the holy and glorious gospel of the blessed God. He calls with a holy calling; he regenerates and makes men holy; he imparts his Holy Spirit to dwell in the hearts of his people; he adopts them into his holy family—he guides their feet in the way of holiness; he beautifies them with holy virtues. Within them he infuses the holy graces of his Spirit—and they are enabled to have a holy conversation, and to grow in holiness of life, by increasing conformity to his holy likeness.

VII. GOD WILL BE HOLY IN THE DECISIONS OF JUDGMENT.

He will then sit on the great white throne of his holiness. He will judge men by his holy law and word. His decisions,

both as it regards saints and sinners, men and angels, will be in strict accordance with his holy nature.

OBSERVATIONS

1. How greatly should God be feared by his saints! With what awe, and lowliness, and fear, should they draw near to worship him! How evil to use his name lightly, or to worship him with heedless levity!

2. How evil must sin be in his sight! It is the one and only thing that he abhors and hates.

3. We see why sinners must necessarily be excluded from heaven. It is God's holy place; there is his throne and attendants—it is his holy temple.

4. We see the moral grandeur of the gospel: to bring men back to holiness, and thus eventually to God, and to eternal life.

As a perfect being, God is necessarily and infinitely removed from all evil. He is the centre of perfection. His will and mind are holy; his purposes and counsels are holy.



Men Needed For The Pulpit

Give us men to fill our pulpits
Who have been alone with God —
Men who have a vital message
As the path of life they trod.

Men who love our God and people
More than money, pomp and ease;
Men who seek to do God's bidding
Though the world they may displease.

Give us men whose hearts are yearning
For redemption for the lost —
Men who pray for real revivals
That may come at any cost.

Men who preach the Holy Bible
And believe its truths sublime;
Men who long to bless their fellows
As to God they give their time.

Give us men with hearts o'erflowing
With the fulness of God's grace —
Men who show they've been with Jesus
By the sunshine on their face.

Men who can't be bought with money
Nor with that which points to fame;
Men who want God's blest approval
On their character and name.

