

# The Baptist Examiner

A nation-wide, independent paper, standing foursquare for the distinguishing doctrines of Baptists, and shunning not to declare all the counsel of God.

"To the law and to the testimony if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isa. 3:20).

Vol. 2 No. 4

ASHLAND, KY., MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1932

Whole No. 20

## The Memorial Supper of Our Lord

PASTOR B. M. GLISSON,  
Student in Baptist Bible School of South Florida.

That which Paul says of the institution and design of the Lord's Supper is, in substance, the same which the evangelists have recorded. These are his words: "I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. 11:23-26).

In this Scripture Paul has expressed the Baptist position on the Lord's Supper, which we shall try to bring out in our discussion. We shall discuss our subject from the following points: 1. What is the ordinance? 2. Why observe the ordinance? 3. Who can properly observe the ordinance? 4. How observe the ordinance?

### What The Ordinance Is

We begin first by saying what the elements in the supper are NOT. **The bread is not the literal body and the "cup" is not the literal blood of our Lord.** In speaking of these Jesus used symbolic language as he did in many other instances. In John 10:17 he said: "I am the DOOR of the SHEEP." Surely he did not mean that he was a literal door that could be hung on hinges and that his followers were literal sheep that could be sheared and their wool sold. Jesus meant that the bread REPRESENTED his body and the "cup" his blood.

The bread is bread when it is baked at the home of the deacon, bread when it is brought to the Lord's table, bread when the ministering servant asks God's blessings upon it, bread AFTER the blessing is asked, and bread as it is eaten by the solemn followers of Jesus as their Lord. The same is true of the wine. It remains wine all through the service.

We are to understand these as SYMBOLS and SYMBOLS only. If we fail to realize this, we lose the meaning of the Master's words when he said: "IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME."

We well remember that Jesus said: "I am the bread of life." This bread in the ordinance represents him as the "TRUE BREAD FROM HEAVEN."

As we die to sin once, we are baptized once as a symbol of our death to sin, our burial, and our resurrection to walk in newness of life. We partake of the memorial supper as symbolic of our constant need of spiritual life in him, therefore we partake of it often. The supper also shows forth the Lord's death till he come.

This ordinance should fill the Christian with mingled sorrow and joy—sorrow as we think of his sufferings, JOY AS WE THINK OF THE REASON FOR HIS DEATH. He died as our substitute! **Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift!**

### Why Observe the Memorial Supper?

We come now to consider the question that is often raised

by some. If the ordinance has no saving power or grace, what is the use of observing it? This question is easily answered from the word of God.

The first reason, and we think the greatest one, is that Jesus commanded us to do it in remembrance of him. A child of God who does not wish to carry out his commands is a very disobedient child. We are well-pleasing to God when we do the things he commands us. Jesus was our example in this.

We are not to observe this ordinance in order to be saved. Partaking of it presuppose that we are saved, for we are supposed to be in his church to which he gave the ordinance.

The second reason for observing the Lord's Supper is to show forth his death. Only the Christian can really do this, for his death means nothing to the sinner.

The death of Christ was a sacrificial death. He was the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." His was not the death of a martyr. It was substitutionary. He died the death that the sinner should have died. He became the object of divine vengeance. And the sufferings of Christ were not all physical. "He shall see of the travail of his SOUL and shall be satisfied" (Isa. 53:11). The soul agonies of Christ far exceeded his physical agonies.

The third reason for observing this ordinance is that it points to Christ's second coming, for which all his followers should be looking with eager hearts. "Till I come" is a great expression signifying that the Lord's Supper is to be observed by the churches until they see him come in like manner as he went away.

In the fourth place we suggest that the Lord's Supper ought to be observed because of the impression it may make upon those outside. When we observe this ordinance we are showing the Lord's death, which is the thing that is necessary to the sinner's salvation. When we observe the Supper we are indirectly declaring to the world that we are believers in Christ as our Savior.

### Who Can Properly Observe the Ordinance?

This is a much disputed point between Baptists and those of other faiths, and even between Baptists themselves; but it is hard to see why so much controversy has arisen over so plain a teaching.

**First, the Lord's Supper is not a family ordinance, but a church ordinance.** It is not to be observed by those who regard fleshly ties as entering into the observance of it. It is not a communion with parents, brothers, sisters, and other relatives, nor with one's friends. Some regard the Supper as a social meal, and call Baptists selfish because they do not invite their friends to eat with them. Hence the term "close communion." The communion should be close between the individual and God.

**Second, only those of one, particular, local Scriptural church should observe the Supper together.** It is not a denominational ordinance, but a church ordinance. 1 Cor. 10:17 teaches that the "one body" should partake of the "one bread." If we invite the members of other Baptist churches, then we ought

to observe the Lord's Supper at our associations and conventions. Those of the assembled church should be the only ones to partake of this ordinance. We are not to save some to take home to "Sister Smith," who is unable to attend. That would make it an individual ordinance instead of a church ordinance.

**Third, it should be observed by Baptists only.** If we understand our confession of faith, a church **"is a congregation of baptized believers, associated in the fellowship of the gospel, observing the ordinances of Christ. . . ."** We cannot recognize those who have not been scripturally baptized as composing true churches. 1 Cor. 11:18-20 teaches that we **"cannot eat of the Lord's Supper"** when there are divisions.

What are we divided upon? A few "non-essentials?" This is what "open communionists" would have us think. We are divided upon some very important things. One of them is the way of salvation. Most sects teach "falling from grace" as opposed to God's word on the eternal security of the believer. Most of them teach salvation by works either in whole or in part. And we are divided as far as the east is from the west on baptism. When a congregation of Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others join in singing: **"We are not divided, all one body we; one in hope and doctrine, one in charity,"** they sing nothing but a bald falsehood.

It may be said: **"If others are the children of God, why forbid them to come to the Lord's table?"** We do not forbid them. God has placed his requirements before the Supper, and they are not willing to meet those requirements. Therefore, it is God that forbids them and not we. Suppose I say to my daughter: **"You must wash your face before coming to dinner."** She is unwilling to do it, and stays away from dinner. Does she cease to be my child because I do not let her eat with dirty face and hands? If others want to come to the Lord's table let them meet the requirements.

#### How Should This Ordinance Be Observed?

The adverb "unworthily" has been very much abused. Some have said: "I do not feel worthy to partake of the Supper." This is due to a lack of proper understanding of the meaning of the word. This word has to do with the MANNER of eating and drinking, and not with the fitness of the partakers of the Supper. Of course, those who partake of the Supper should walk orderly, but if a person is worthy to be a member of Christ's church, certainly he is worthy to commemorate Christ's death for sin.

#### What Is It to Eat and Drink Unworthily?

To make a communion with friends and relatives out of

this sacred ordinance is to do this, for in so doing we do not discern the Lord's body. If a church is in a state of division, it is folly to observe the Supper. To do so would be to do it unworthily.

"Open communion" for the sake of being broad is a form of perversion of the ordinance, for it is done in order to gain favor with the world. When we do this, we do not discern the Lord's body, and so partake unworthily. Some seem to think it an insult to be called narrow, but it should be considered a very high compliment if we are narrow according to the holy Word of our God. One of the highest compliments that I have ever received was when one of my Baptist brethren wrote to another preacher and said: **"Brother Glisson needs to be weaned away from denominational narrowness and Baptist bigotry."** We are to be a peculiar people, zealous of good works. We should count it a high honor to be criticized by those who would let down all the bars of the ONCE DELIVERED FAITH and unionize with anything that may come or go.

To partake of the Supper in an irreverent manner would be to eat and drink condemnation to oneself.

To invite sinners to eat with us would be a violation of the rules of practice laid down in 1 Cor. 11. I can do no better than quote O. S. C. Wallace on this point. He says: **"The Lord's Supper is to be observed by those only who have hope in his death. The nature of the ordinance, no less than the teaching of scripture, fixes this limitation. The supper is no place for an unbeliever. It is no place for the man who still companies with those who crucified the Lord. It is not for unthinking children, who would take the bread and wine without understanding the meaning of the broken bread and crimson cup. It is not for worldlings who love the bread of self indulgence and the cup of sinful leisure. It is not for hypocrites who make a fair show in the flesh while their hearts are full of iniquity. It is not for the shallow, selfish despisers of the grace of God, who refuse to come to him that they might have life. It is mockery for any one of these to partake of the Lord's Supper."** And we might add that it is mockery for children of God to knowingly eat with such a one.

In conclusion, let me say that because this is the table of the Lord and not of men, we should, as followers of our Lord, guard it with a holy jealousy, not inviting any whom the Lord of the table has not invited.

## What Mormonism Teaches

C. H. SHAFER, Blackfoot, Idaho

### Article No. 3

We have found in the past that the founders of Mormonism were of a character that one would have expected from them anything except the founding of a church. We have also found that the practices installed into the church by these men were both vulgar and blasphemous. Let us investigate, today, some of the teachings of this denomination.

All the books that I am going to quote from, are books that the church holds sacred. Either written by an allegedly inspired pen, or spoken by men who had the supposed gift of prophesy and authority. They are all held to be without error, consequently far above the Bible, as they say: **"The Bible is not a sufficient guide and is full of error."**

#### What Mormonism Says About GOD

**"Adam is our Father and our God, the only God with whom we have to do."** (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 1, Page 50.) My Bible says: **"Thou shalt have no other gods before me."** It wasn't Adam talking.

**"When our Father came into the garden of Eden he came with a celestial body and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him."** (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 1, page 50). But they fail to tell us where he got the rest of them.

**"God was once as we are now and is an exalted man. You have got to learn how to be Gods yourselves, the same as all other Gods have before you."** (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 1, Page 4). In their Sunday School they say in unison, among other things, "As God was once, man now is. As God now is, man may become." The thought is, both God and man getting better and better, neither ever reaching perfection.

**"Are there more Gods than one? Yes, many."** (Catechism, Page 13).

#### About Jesus Christ.

**"Jesus was not begotten of the Holy Ghost."** (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 1, Page 50).

**"The Son of Adam-God and Mary."** (Journal of Discourses,



Vol. 1, Page 50). They teach that Jesus was the son of Adam (and Joseph) thru natural generation. That Joseph had several other wives beside Mary. Then please read this carefully:

"It will be borne in mind, that once on a time, there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee! and by a careful reading of that transaction it will be discovered that no less a person than Jesus Christ was married on that occasion" (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 4, Page 259). Please read John 2:1-11 carefully and see if you can discover that Jesus Christ was married on that occasion.

"Christ's atonement was not sufficient for personal sins, from which men can be redeemed only by obedience to Mormon ceremonies." (Compendium, Page 8).

"All are damned who do not avail themselves of these ceremonies." (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 1, Page 339).

"The doctrine of Justification by Faith in Christ alone is evil." (Articles of Faith, Page 120).

#### About the Holy Spirit.

"The most refined and subtle of substances." Like electricity, etc. (Key, Page 39).

"The Holy Spirit is received only by the laying on of hands of Mormon Priests." (Mormon Doctrine, Page 16).

"Man may receive the Holy Ghost . . . and it may not tarry with him." (Doctrine And Covenants, Sec. 130, Verse 23).

#### About Spirits.

"Spirits are eternal. At the first organization in heaven (the creation) we were all present and saw the Saviour chosen and appointed and the plan of Salvation made, and we sanctioned it. . . . We came to the earth that we might have a body. . . . The great principle of happiness consists in having a body. The Devil has no body and herein is his punishment." (Compendium, Page 270).

#### About Satan.

"Satan's only punishment is that he has no body as we have. His retaliation is, using men's bodies and making them miserable." (Compendium. Page 259.)

#### About Creation.

"This earth was organized or formed out of other planets which were broken up and remodeled and made into the one on which we live. The elements are eternal." (Compendium, page 270.)

#### About Baptism.

"Might as well baptize a bag of sand as a man, if not done in view of the remission of sins and the baptism of the Holy Ghost." (Compendium, page 262).

#### About Polygamy.

The Book of Mormon, the one Book above all others in the sight of the Mormon, says, "Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was an abomination before me, said the Lord; Wherefore, thus saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem, by the power of mine arm, that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the fruit of the loins of Joseph. Wherefore I, the Lord God, will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old. Wherefore, my brethren, hear me, and harken to the word of the Lord; for there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife; and concubines he shall have none; For I, the Lord God, delighteth in the chastity of women. And whoredoms are an abomination before me; thus saith the Lord of Hosts. . . . For behold I, the Lord, have seen the sorrow, and heard the mourning of the daughters of my people in the land of Jerusalem; yea, and in all the lands of my people because of the wickedness and abominations of their husbands, and I will not suffer, saith the Lord of Hosts, that the cries of the fair daughters of this people, which I have led out of the land of Jerusalem, shall come up unto me, against the men of my people, saith the Lord of Hosts; For they shall not lead away captive the daughters of my people, because of their tenderness, save I shall visit them with a sore curse, even unto destruction: for

they shall not commit whoredoms, like unto them of old, saith the Lord of Hosts." (Book of Jacob, 2:24-28, 31-33.) Nevertheless, in the face of this, Joseph Smith issued in a revelation dated July 12th, 1843, at Nauvoo, Ill., a command authorizing polygamy. This revelation, Section 132, Doctrine and Covenants, is a long one. A few verses will give an idea of its contents: "Verily, thus saith the Lord unto you, that inasmuch as you have inquired of my hand, to know and understand wherein I, the Lord, justified my servants Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; as also Moses, David and Solomon, my servants, as touching the principles and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines: Behold! and lo, I am the Lord thy God, and will answer thee as touching this matter; therefore, prepare thy heart to receive and obey the instructions which I am about to give unto you; for all those who have this law revealed unto them must obey the same; for Behold! I reveal unto you a new and an everlasting covenant; and if ye abide not that covenant, then ye are damned; for no one can reject this covenant, and be permitted to enter into my glory; for all who have a blessing at my hands, shall abide the law which is appointed for that blessing, and the conditions thereof, as were instituted from before the foundation of the world; and as pertaining to the new and everlasting covenant, it was instituted for the fulness of my glory; he that receiveth a fulness thereof, must and shall abide the law, or he shall be damned, saith the Lord God. . . . And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood: If any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent; and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man then he is justified; he cannot commit adultery, for they are given unto him; for he cannot commit adultery with that that belongeth unto him and to no one else; and if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him, and they are given unto him, therefore he is justified" Verses 1-6; 61, 62. These statements in the face of the ones just given from the Book Of Mormon show just how much of a hold Joseph Smith had on his followers, or at least, most of them. Among those who failed to accept this doctrine was his wife Emma.

We find from accounts that she bitterly opposed the plan, therefore Joseph, or the Lord, thoughtfully added a few words in this revelation for her. "And let my handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those that have been given unto my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before me; . . . And I command mine handmaid, Emma Smith, to abide and cleave unto my servant Joseph, and to none else. But if she will not abide this commandment, she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord; for I am the Lord thy God, and will destroy her if she abide not in my law; but if she will not abide this commandment, then shall my servant Joseph do all things for her, even as he hath said; and I will bless him and multiply him and give unto him an hundred fold in this world, of fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, houses and lands, wives and children, and crowns of eternal lives in the eternal worlds." (Vs. 52-55.)

This opposition and other difficulties that arose caused H. C. Kimball, one of the First Presidency, to make the following statement in the Tabernacle at Salt Lake on Feb. 1st, 1857: "Suppose that I lose the whole of them before I go into the spiritual world, but that I have been a good, faithful man all the days of my life, and lived my religion, and had favor with God, and was kind to them, do you think I will be destitute there? No. The Lord says there are more there than there are here. They have been increasing there; they increase there a great deal faster than they do here, because there is no obstruction. They do not call upon the doctors to kill their offspring. In this world very many of the doctors are studying to diminish the human race. In the

(Continued On Page 5)

# The Baptist Examiner

Published Semi-Monthly By The Editor  
At 5025 Williams Avenue,  
Ashland, Kentucky

T. P. SIMMONS.....	Editor
C. D. COLE, Plant City, Fla.....	Contributing Editors
ROGER L. CLARK, Martin, Tenn.....	
A. N. MORRIS, Doerun, Ga.....	
W. M. WEBB, Texarkana, Ark., Tex.....	
R. Y. BLALOCK, Caldwell, Idaho.....	

## SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

1 Year in advance - - - - -	\$1.00
6 Months in advance - - - - -	\$ .50
Foreign Subscriptions, per year - - - - -	\$1.25

The paper will not be sent to any one beyond time paid for, except by special arrangement.

Entered as second-class matter Jan. 6, 1932, at the post office at Ashland, Ky., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Our next issue (D. V.) will be devoted mainly to sovereign grace. We have several good articles along this line. And we expect to write a few remarks concerning it. If you love the great old doctrines of grace, this next issue will feed your soul.

We will accept subscriptions at our special fifty cent rate until March 10. But this will leave only a brief time between the time our readers receive this issue and the end of this special subscription offer. So, if you hope to subscribe or get others to subscribe, act at once. This special offer has been running for three months. We are well pleased with the results. And we hope that a number of others will take advantage of this remarkably low rate, which is below the cost of the printing of the paper. **UNTIL MARCH 10 THE EXAMINER IS FIFTY CENTS A YEAR. SUBSCRIBE NOW!**

We are glad to announce for Missionary H. A. Roshto that his address is now Istrouma, La., instead of Zachary, La. He is a faithful missionary.

## SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS

In an article by William James Robinson in the December, 1931, issue of "The Teacher," published by the Southern Baptist Sunday School Board, there are some significant words to which we wish to call attention. They are as follows: **"Our plans call for so many teachers THAT MOST CHURCHES ARE UTTERLY UNABLE TO MEET THE DEMAND.** (emphasis ours). But those who are in authority insist on using the prescribed plans. To do this worldlings are called upon to teach the words of life. I know of no other organization that places a premium on incompetency. . . . . We are confronted with two needs. Competent trainers and suitable material for training. Under our present organization the demand is years ahead of the possible supply. We have neither the trainers nor suitable material to readily supply the demand for competent teachers for most churches. We must create a demand for teachers of the right sort and insist on genuinely thorough training. (As teachers of the right sort, we would suggest consistent Christians that have a spiritual urge toward this work. Given this kind of material and faithful pastors, the training problem will be solved) . . . . . What shall we do while we are waiting for a supply of competent teachers? The answer is clear. **CLASSIFY OUR**

**SCHOOLS WITH REFERENCE TO COMPETENT TEACHERS AND NOT WITH REGARD TO PUPILS"** (emphasis ours).

The last sentence, which we have embodied in capitals, expresses one of our contentions concerning the Sunday school. Our only difference with the above writer in regard to this statement is that he recommends it as a temporary exigency, and we advocate it as an enduring principle. We have seen where God says that he **"taketh the wise in their own craftiness"** (1 Cor. 3:19), but we have never read where he allows the wise to take him and adapt his plan to theirs. We have gone wild after modern humanistic and animalistic psychology. Like Israel patterned after other nations, we have patterned after other denominations. The plans and the standards of men have turned us from the simplicity of God's word. We are in great need of turning away from these back to the God's word and Spirit. These are sufficient without the standards of men. None should teach in a Baptist Bible school except those to whom God has given the gift of teaching. Study Rom. 12:6, 7; 1 Cor. 12:7, 8. All do not have this gift, and a Baptist church cannot bestow it. It is as foolish to think that we can produce teachers by training as it is to think that we can produce preachers in like manner. James warns men against assuming this holy office. The begging and pulling that goes on constantly in the average Baptist Sunday school in order to get teachers is an insult to the Holy Spirit. Why should God have bestowed his sovereign gifts if we are to ignore them? A good bonfire would greatly profit the average Baptist Sunday school. For our part we are forever off of the plans, schemes, and inventions of men that ignore the Spirit of God and deny the sufficiency of his word. We believe in a Bible and teacher centered school rather than a "standard of excellence" and pupil centered school. Do we speak as a fool? Then bear with us, for **"Ye suffer fools gladly, seeing yourselves are wise"** (2 Cor. 11:19).

## WE WONDER

The American Baptist of Feb. 3rd, in speaking of the Sunday School Board, says editorially: **"Unfortunately the Board is financially so strongly entrenched, that it is well nigh impossible to pass any measure relating to the Board's interest that is not according to its liking."** We wonder if that is the reason the said Board can go on quarter after quarter publishing heresy in the Sunday school literature. As a fresh reminder of its heresy, we will give you a little up-to-date taste of it under the next heading.

## MORE HERESY IN SUNDAY SCHOOL LITERATURE

In the lesson in the Intermediate Quarterly for Jan. 3rd we find this statement: **"At birth all persons are given the capacity to receive spiritual truth and thus become a child of of God."** Now let's just see how the following Scripture sounds along with this: **"The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."** The natural man is the dead sinner. All who believe the above statement do not believe in total depravity, and just lack that much being Baptists. Then again: **"All are children of God from birth, but not his true children until they have EARNED (take note of this word) the right, by coming in contact with the blood of Jesus Christ."** In this we have two rank heresies. One is the universal fatherhood of God, which denies John 1:12; 8:44; Gal. 3:26; 1 John 3:10. The second heresy is that we **earn** the right to become the children of God. This is a contradiction of John 1:12; Rom. 3:24; 4:4, 5; 11:6. How's that for heresy in one lesson? We will probably point out some more soon.



## What Mormonism Teaches

(Continued From Page 3)

spiritual world . . . we will go to brother Joseph . . . and he will say to us, 'Come along, my boys, we will give you a good suit of clothes. Where are your wives?' They are back yonder; they would not follow us. 'Never mind,' says Joseph, here are thousands; have all you want.'" (Journal of Discourses, Vol. 4, page 209.)

These words seem utter folly to you, I'm sure. They are; the vilest kind. But to the real Mormon they are as true today as they ever were, except that the government has prohibited this practice, so an accommodating God excused them from it for the present. They don't practice open polygamy any more, but they scarcely have any moral pride. If the Government should lay down the ban in a short time they would be into polygamy as much as they ever were. Their books teach it, and they still hold the books to be without fault.

And what do they say about the Bible that we hold so dear. "And because my words shall hiss forth, many of the gentiles shall say, A Bible! A Bible! We have got a Bible and there cannot be any more Bible. Thou fool, that shall say, A Bible, we have got a Bible, and we need no more Bible. Have ye obtained a Bible, save it were by the Jews? Wherefore, because that ye have a Bible, ye need not suppose that it contains all my words; neither need ye suppose that I have not caused more to be written." (Book of Mormon, II Nephi 29: 3; 6:10.)

"The Bible is not a sufficient guide and is full of error." (Divine Authority of Book of Mormon, page 218.)

"The Book of Mormon, Doctrine and Covenants, and Say-

ings of Joseph The Seer are guides in faith and doctrine as much as the Bible." (Compendium Preface.)

"The Book of Mormon is more Holy and nearer God than the Bible." (Compendium, page 256.)

### The Mormon Priesthood

"Men who hold Mormon Priesthood possess divine authority to act for God, and by having part of God's powers, they are in reality part of God." (New Witness for God, page 187.) According to this my wife's father, a brother and an uncle are "Gods."

"The Mormon Priesthood holds the power and the right to give laws to individuals, churches, rulers, nations and the world, also to appoint, ordain and establish kings, presidents, government, or judges." (Key, page 70.)

"The Mormon Priesthood is the rule of God, whether in heaven or on earth." (Journal of Discourses.)

[And what do they say about your pastor?]

"The ministry of the so-called Christian churches is spurious; all ministers are counterfeits." (Mormon Doctrine, page 21.)

"Any person who receives an ordinance from ministers of other churches will be sent to hell with them, unless they afterwards become Mormons." (The Seer, Vol. 1, 2, page 255.)

Brethren, I have tried, in a very brief way, to give you a glimpse of what Mormonism really is. There are thousands of people who are thoroughly honest who are following in the teachings of this denomination and going down to hell. It is my desire to do all that comes within my power to take them the "glorious gospel of Christ." Will you not help me, at least, with your prayers?

## The First Baptist Church in America

O. E. RIDENOUR, Bible School Supt.

First Baptist Church, Russell, Ky.

### Article No. 2.

The first article was almost entirely given to the claims awarded to Roger Williams, and now we will turn to John Clark, the first Baptist preacher of the First Baptist Church of Newport, Rhode Island.

The Colony of Massachusetts, or The Bay, having its center at Boston, was in 1637 in a hot fermentation, being full of restless spirits, eager for and yet afraid of all novelties in church and state. They were fearful of being in minorities, and equally afraid of organizing their majorities. Church and state had been united in 1631 by laws which made church members alone eligible to citizenship, and consequently the larger part of the colonists were neither church members nor citizens. Satisfied, however, with their new liberties, the people disputed little about politics or government, but much about religion.

The crystalization of religious opinions almost immediately exhibited in Boston the three great phases of Protestant Christianity: First, the host of people which attaches itself to church organizations and ordinances, entering by infant baptism, so called. Second, the doctrinal phase called Arminianism. Third, the doctrinal phase which bears in a restricted sense the name of Calvinism. A sweeping law of exclusion was passed, forbidding strangers to even remain in the territory of the Bay more than three weeks without a governmental permit. This was the first time that there was direct issue raised between parties in respect to "liberty of conscience," although these three words had for many years been on every

tongue, and men's peculiar conscience had involved them in many difficulties. At this time, Boston produced no competent leader for the despairing "antinomians." Sir Henry Vane returned to England. Several others, who had been high in office, in more tranquil days, now showed no genius for leadership.

In this juncture, in November, 1637, John Clark, just turned twenty-eight years of age, arrived in Boston. Immediately he counselled the "antinomians" to unite in a movement to other territory, and his advice was adopted.

Who was this young man, so promptly accepted as a leader?

In Westhorpe, Suffolk, which was, in the sixteenth century, the seat of the Duke of Suffolk, but now is an insignificant hamlet, John Clark was born, and here is registered in the parish house as having been baptized October 8, 1609. He was well educated, a learned physician and one of the ablest men of the seventeenth century. He was an advanced student of Greek and Hebrew, and at his death, he had nearly ready for publication a "Biblical Concordance and Lexicon."

In his own narrative, Clark says:

"I was no sooner on shore, than there appeared to me differences among them touching the covenants; and in point of evidencing a man's good estate, some pressed hard for the covenant of works, and for sanctification to be the first and chief evidence: others pressed as hard for the covenant of grace that was established upon better promises, and for the

evidence of the Spirit. Whereupon I moved the latter for peace sake, to turn aside to the right hand or to the left. The motion was readily accepted, and I was requested, with some others, to seek out a place."

Clark visited New Hampshire, but returned and advised a more southern location of a colony. In Boston in the first week of March, 1638, the colony was fully organized for emigration. The first instrument in the series is one of the most remarkable documents in political literature, as a terse enactment of law and liberty, recognized as necessarily united in a government subordinated to Christ. It was signed March 7, 1638, and it is as follows:

"We, whose names are underwritten, do here solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah, incorporate ourselves into a Bodie Politich, and as He shall help, will submit our persons, lives and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords, and to all those perfect and most absolute laws of His, given us in His Holy Word of Truth, to be guided and judged thereby." Exod. XXIV. 3; II. Chron. XI. 3, 4; II. Kings XI. 17.

The scripture references, attached to this document are necessary to its interpretation.

Here is, in fact, the first constitution of Rhode Island, and the first in the world, which guaranteed religious liberty. There is scarcely a possibility of doubt that Mr. Clark was the writer of this constitution. William Coddington was, indeed, the first signer as the elected President and Judge of the Colony, but John Clark's name is the second. The evidence of his authorship is conspicuous in the fact that it is an epitome of those writings from his pen which display him as the unique and almost ideal champion of liberty of conscience in the seventeenth century.

Clark, when in prison, in Boston, for religious acts done by him as a Baptist minister, while visiting in Lynn, challenged the governmental offices, and the preachers of the colony, to a debate on four theses. The next year, in London, he published a book in which he three times stated those propositions, each time with increased elaboration, until the last statement fills forty-four octavo pages. His propositions briefly condensed, declare: **First**, Christ is King. **Second**, baptism is dipping, and only baptized believers may join in the order of the church. **Third**, every believer ought to use his gifts. **Fourth**, no servant of Christ has authority over other persons in matters of conscience.

These are good evidences of the authorship of the covenant, but there are better ones in its correspondence, with the words, which, in 1662, Clark addressed to a king:

**"A flourishing civil state may best be maintained with full liberty in religious concernment; and true piety, rightly grounded upon Gospel principles, will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to truer loyalty."**

Early in March, 1638, Clark, with a body of the colonists, set out from Boston southward. Following the natural route they found, at the head of Narragansett Bay, Roger Williams, who had come there, in the summer of 1636, with two men and two youths. These two men, however, had left him, and three others had joined him in 1637. Some of these were accompanied by their wives. These four men had no land by deed from the Indians, but Roger Williams claimed that the natives had promised to him personally the territory now occupied by the city of Providence. The men were all at variance in their religious and irreligious views. One, soon after, left Providence, but was during all his life a bitter enemy of Roger Williams. One was married to the undivorced wife of another man, and did not stay long at Providence. These five men, and their successors, had no law, nor an officer, nor an organization of any kind until 1647.

Roger Williams gave John Clark no invitation to stay with him. He waived thereon further south, even off the land, to the island of Aquedneck. Coddington obtained, by payment

of a large price, a deed from the Indians. Roger Williams accompanied Mr. Coddington in the negotiation, and on the same day obtained for himself the first deed that he ever had from the natives. From Mr. Williams' own letter it is shown that Providence and Newport lands were acquired on the same day; but the island lands were bought by a colony, and Providence lands by an individual.

Among the first acts of the colony was the erection of a meeting house, but the cardinal principle of religious freedom, viz: absolute separation of church and state was maintained. Governor Winthrop records that Mr. Clark was a preacher on the island in 1638, and elsewhere calls him "their minister." The records of the island tell a story of perpetual harmony and peace.

In contrast with the history thus recorded we notice the correspondent features of the Providence Colony. Roger Williams kept the lands at Providence and Pawtucket as his private property until October 8, 1638, six months after the island lands were partitioned.

In 1639 he confessed that his mind was all unsettled about church organization and ordinances. The world was ringing with the protests and appeals of Anabaptists and of the General Baptists, but the persons of Baptist sentiments were still mostly members of other churches. Baptist Churches were few. The first church of the Particular Baptists was formed after Mr. Williams left England. In 1639 Roger Williams caused himself to be immersed by Ezekiel Holliman, and then himself immersed eleven others. There is no evidence, nor even tradition, that by this act these persons constituted a church. Even the members of the first of Particular Baptists in London—Mr. Spilbury's—remained in their membership in the Pedobaptist Church till 1633. In 1639 a minister of Mr. Spilbury's church, Hanserd Knollys (Knowles), was in New England preaching. Mr. Clark was also probably from Mr. Spilbury's church. But Roger Williams summoned neither of these to baptize him and sought no affiliation with recognized Baptists. Who the persons were whom he immersed is entirely unknown. Mr. Benedict gave a list of names, but they were only names of some land owners, copied out of a deed. Some of these were not professing Christians, and some were never Baptists! Some names of known or supposed Baptists are omitted by Mr. Benedict. The company that was immersed thus was soon after scattered. Mr. Holliman and others went to Warwick, others to Pawtucket and Newport.

Even this baptism, and his associates in it, Mr. Williams renounced in three or four months, and repudiated all ministries and church organizations.

Clark's leadership continued preeminent on the island. So rapid was the growth that the new town of Newport was established in 1639. Mr. Clark and most of the leading men of Portsmouth removed thither.

Clark was a delegate from Newport in every assembly until he was sent to England in 1631. In 1649, 1650 and part of 1651, he also held the offices of general treasurer, and of "assistant" magistrates, but it is worthy of note that these three years were those in which his active Christian ministry is best known.

One of the recorded evidences of this is noteworthy. Roger Williams wrote in 1649:

**"At Seekonk a great many have lately concurred the point of a new baptism, and the new manner by dipping. And Mr. John Clark hath been there lately, and Mr. Lucas (an elder in Mr. Clark's church), and hath dipped them. I believe their practice comes nearer the first practice of our Great Founder, Christ Jesus, than other practices of religion do, and yet I have not satisfaction, neither in the authority by which it is done, nor in the manner."**

In the summer of 1651, the religious ministry of Dr. Clark was interrupted by great political movements. Mr. Coddington



ton, who had gone to England in 1649 to secure a repeal or modification of the patent for the colony, obtained in 1651 a commission for himself as Governor of the island for life. This practically abrogated the charter, which probably was Governor Coddington's chief desire, and opened the way for reorganization. In this crisis Clark was the soul hope of the islanders. One hundred and six citizens presented to him a written request that he would go to England to remedy the existing evils. He consented and sailed in November, 1651. As soon as it was known that Clark was going to England, the towns of Providence and Warwick commissioned Roger Williams to go also and watch over their interests. They sailed together, and Clark's greatest success was due to the capture of Williams, who thence-forward for several years seems to have heartily co-operated with Clark's friends on the Island. The result of this union was that the two envoys obtained, October 2, 1652, from the council of state a revocation of the commission of Mr. Coddington, and a renewal of the patent. Clark, after this, remained in England, but Roger Williams returned home. Of his welcome at Providence he said:

"I am like a man in a great fog. It hath been told me that I labored for a licentious and contentious people. At present, I am called a traitor by one party, and, it is said, that I am as good as banished by yourselves, and that both sides wished that I might never have landed, that the fire of contention might have had no stop in burning."

Mr. Clark in 1654, sent home a statement of his plans, and requested that they should be approved by the state government. His plans were formally approved without an amendment, and he was appointed sole agent of the state to represent it in England.

At length, July 9, 1663, the royal seal was affixed to the charter of Rhode Island, and it was a document so extraordinary that no words of praise can be extravagant. Let the reader mark an unparalleled fact. This charter was the constitution of Rhode Island, and although formulated amid the convulsions of the seventeenth century, it continued to be the constitution of the State through all the period of growth; through the war of independence; and through the formulating of state constitutions all around it, and of the national constitution—even one hundred and seventy-nine years—till 1842.

Its preamble quoted from Clark's second address to the king, is thus:

"Our royal will and pleasure is, That no person within the said colony, at any time hereafter, shall be anywise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question for any differences in opinion in matters of religion, who do not actually disturb the civil peace of our said colony; but that all and every person and persons may, from time to time, and all times hereafter, freely and fully, have and enjoy his own and their judgments and consciences, in matters of religious concerns, throughout the tract of land hereafter mentioned, they behaving themselves peaceably and quietly, and not using this liberty to licentiousness and profaneness, nor to civil injury or outward disturbances of others; any law, statute, or clause therein contained, or to be contained usage or custom of this realm, to the contrary hereof, in anywise notwithstanding."

Clark returned home in 1664. The charter was received with universal joy. The government was immediately organized. The legislature opened its records with this entry: "The present assembly, now by God's gracious providence enjoying the helpful presence of our much honored and beloved Mr. John Clark, doth declare," etc.

Clark was a member of the government every year after his return until 1672. In 1666 he was appointed alone to make a digest of the laws, "leaving out what may be superfluous, and adding what may appear unto him necessary." For two years he was deputy governor. Three times he was appointed to go to England under certain contingencies, but did not go.

From 1664 till his death, April 20, 1676, Clark held the place of first elder in his church. It was a time of difficulties. In their anxiety to be scriptural, many persons were becoming strenuous about laying on of hands, and kindred points, and a seventh day Sabbath. These disagreements penetrated the First Church in Newport, and soon after Clark's death produced divisions, but his influence helped, in the providences of God, to hold this first of Baptist churches in America faithful to its early principles, and to preserve it a foster mother and teacher of a great denomination.

The last act of his life was in keeping with the whole. On the day of his death he made a will by which a considerable portion of his estate was placed in the hands of trustees as a perpetual fund, of which the rents and profits are to be used "for the relief of the poor, and the bringing up of children unto learning." This fund, of which a portion was then appraised at five hundred and twenty pounds, is still performing its beneficent work, and in it John Clark lives.

No posterity of John Clark survived him. It is better so. Let the name belong to no unworthy child. It belongs to the ages, and to the world. Its record belongs in a sense to the best chapters of Baptist history; but far more it belongs to the history of civilization and of Christian statesmanship. Let it be said of him as a man, a Christian, and as a statesman, that in an age when all men blundered, and most men conspicuously sinned, he so lived that Mr. Backus wrote: "**I have not met a single reflection cast on him by anyone.**" And Governor Arnold wrote: "**His character and talents appear more exalted the more closely they are examined, and his blameless, self sacrificing life left him without any enemy.**" Mr. Bancroft says: "**He left a name without a spot.**"

## CHURCH AND KINGDOM

The Bible tells us to hold fast the pattern of sound words. There is lots of mighty loose and unsound talking among Baptists today. One of the most common examples of loose talking today among Baptists is to talk about kingdom building. Men are born anew or from above into the kingdom, not built into it. The New Testament nowhere, so far as I am able to find out, uses the word build in connection with the kingdom. The word build is frequently used of the church or churches: but never used of the kingdom. Lots of the loose talk about the kingdom grows out of not holding fast the word which the Spirit uses when speaking of the kingdom. The reason why the word for kingdom is never used in connection with the word build, in my judgment, is due to the fact that the word translated build always refers to a house or temple or church or something else that is local. That is incidentally one of the very strongest proofs that Jesus built only one kind of a church, and that was a local church. There is no need of any confusion on this point. Church is always local: kingdom is always universal—takes in all the saved on earth at any one time. The terms church and kingdom are not interchangeable. The kingdom is entered by repentance and faith (Matt. 21:32): the church is entered by baptism. 1 Cor. 12:13. We do not build the kingdom: we build Baptist churches out of those already born from above into the kingdom of God by faith. Men by the new birth are translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son. The word build in Thayer and other lexicons is defined as meaning being built up from the foundation. That shows the difference between the kingdom and the church of Christ. We get on or in the foundation, when we enter the kingdom by faith: after we are in the kingdom by faith, then we are built up from the foundation by hearing the Word and feeding on and obeying it. One of the infallible proofs that God's Word is inerrant is that it nowhere uses words loosely or interchangeably that mean entirely different things.—News and Truths.

## BAPTIST POLITY

ELDER J. H. GRIME, Lebanon, Tenn.

A study of this question will show the divine wisdom of Christ, our head, in giving to Baptists the polity he did. He knew human weaknesses, and how foolishly Baptists would sometimes act. So in the beginning he gave to Baptists a polity that would hold them in a straight line, and make it impossible for them to either divide, or break their line of continuity.

**1. Division.** There is no way by which Baptists, as long as they remain Baptists, can divide. They may separate into different bodies and work apart, but as Baptists they are one, and exchange members, pastors, and work. This is clearly seen in the instance when in 1845 some brethren withdrew from the Triennial Convention over the question of Slavery, and formed the Southern Baptist Convention. They said ugly things about each other, and said we will divide. This unfortunate tragedy continued until arms were resorted to, in the Civil war, and Baptists fought against Baptists. But did they divide? Nay, verily, but went on as brethren, exchanging members, pastors, and work, as though nothing had occurred. God had fixed it in giving to Baptist local church government, a pure democracy, separate and apart from interference or or control, of any other body or official in the world. The action of one church or body in no way affects the standing of another church. To contrast the difference between this and a hierarchy, let us note that our Methodist brethren had a like separation at the same time, and for the same cause, and as a result they stand hopelessly divided until this day.

Paul and Barnabas had a difference with sharp words, and "parted asunder," but did not divide.

There are no grades in the Baptist ministry. It stands on equality, and each minister is absolutely independent of each other. To talk about dividing them would be nonsense. The churches are likewise independent of each other. If a church or part of a church becomes heterodox, they slough off, but it leaves the Baptists a unit. But suppose the members of a local congregation disagree and separate, then what? We simply have two churches instead of one, not two parts of the same church. There is no way under the sun that you can divide Baptists. Factions may slough off but it leaves the Baptists intact. Baptists may get ugly, and fail to work in harmony, but if they are Baptists, they work together all the same.

**2. Perpetuity.** Baptist church polity only, can put over church perpetuity intact. No hierarchy can run the gauntlet unscathed. But with Baptist church polity, where each church is independent, and not affected by the action of any other church, just as long as one single church can be found true and faithful, their continuity stands unimpaired. To illustrate: If every Baptist church in Tennessee should go to the bad, and cease to be Baptists, except one little church back in "the sticks," with a plain uncultured pastor, and this church should remain true and faithful to Baptist principles, it follows that the perpetuity of Tennessee Baptists would be complete.

If there is any one thing made plain in the Bible, it is that the church established by Christ will be perpetuated until Christ comes again just as Christ left it when he went away. He says: "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. 16:18. Again: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, as a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. 24:14. Once more. Just before the ascension, Christ gave the commission to his church and closed in these words: "Lo I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28:20. Paul said: "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." Eph. 3:21.

These scriptures are sufficient guarantee to every one who believes the Bible that the same church established by Jesus Christ, just as he formed it, will be perpetuated to the time

when Christ shall come again to receive his own.

Apart from the Bible one of three things is true. 1st. The church established by Jesus Christ, just as he established it, will be perpetuated to the end of the world; or, 2nd He was not able to perpetuate it; or, 3rd. He did not want it perpetuated. Take your choice.

I close with the statement of four facts concerning Baptists. 1. Baptists have the only church polity that makes perpetual continuity possible. 2. Baptists were here in the days of Christ. 3. Baptists are here today. 4. No historian can point out the time when, or the place where, Baptists ceased to exist, or had a new beginning, between the days of Christ and the present.

## WATCH THE OUTCOME

We have written to Mr. Robert R. Hull, Secretary of the National Catholic Bureau of Information of Huntington, Ind., and have offered him space in which to reply to our article on "A Reply to the Recent Encyclical of Pope Pius XI." So we bid you watch the outcome of our offer.

## WILL NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN BAPTIST UNITE?

We understand that the presidents of the Northern and Southern Conventions have been touring the North together in the interest of closer fellowship between the two conventions and possibly the union of the two. It would not surprise us if the next decade witnesses the union of the two conventions. There is very little difference between them now. And were it not that the union would produce an unwieldy body, it would doubtless come sooner than it is likely to as it is. But with an increasing trend toward centralization, this hindrance can be more or less overcome. Both conventions are shot through with worldly wisdom, anti-scripturalness, and Modernism. The Northerners, being by nature more aggressive than the Southerners, and having also a greater number of educational centers from which to dispense the wisdom of the world, have traveled faster in their downward course than the Southerners. But the Southerners are perilously close behind. For some time we have believed that the Northern and Southern Conventions will, in a spiritual way, repeat the history of the northern and southern kingdoms of Israel. The Northern Convention has already been taken into the camp of Modernism. The Southern Convention is slowly succumbing to the besieging forces of Modernism. We look for this to continue. If it does not, then we will acknowledge we were wrong. But until we are certain that we are wrong, we are going to remain of our present opinion. The hope of Baptists lie in the true churches that dare to take the word of God as their guide and press on in the doing of the will of God. Our interest is in these churches. And the less connection these churches have with the Southern Baptist Convention, the better off they will be. But somebody says: "Shall we turn the convention over to the Modernists?" No, we can't do that. They already have it. The convention has a Modernist for president, and a Modernist preached the last annual sermon. And the whole thing is permeated with Modernism. And aside from that, the convention is anti-scriptural in its work from start to finish. So, so far as we are concerned, the Modernists are welcome to it. The sooner they completely triumph, the sooner the true churches will wake up and get out of this unholy alliance.

We also have a 75-day summer contract for college students guaranteeing three dollars a day. And for college women we have a 72-day summer contract guaranteeing two dollars a day. We are now signing up college students so that they may have time to prepare before summer. This enables those who work to make good money. We have a special proposition with increased pay for those who will act as student managers.