

# The Baptist Examiner

PAID CIRCULATION IN ALL STATES AND MANY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them. —Isaiah 8:20

VOL. 27, NO. 5 RUSSELL, KENTUCKY, MARCH 1, 1958 WHOLE NUMBER 1027

The Fifteenth and Last Message On "The Doctrine Of the Blood"—

## The Ordinances And The Blood

The Lord Jesus Christ placed two ordinances in His church: Baptism and the memorial Supper. The churches of the Lord are commanded to teach and to keep these ordinances until the end of the age (Matthew 28:19, 20). The apostle Paul, in his first letter to the church at Corinth, states: "Keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you." (1 Cor. 11:2). This passage certainly includes the two ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; they are to be kept as the Word of God teaches.

In the Old Testament, the chief memorial ordinance among the Jews, was the annual Passover. This Passover ceremony pointed back to God's delivering the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage. It pointed forward to Christ, our Passover, who has been sacrificed for our deliverance from bondage. The Israelites kept this ordinance until it was fulfilled in the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the fulfillment of the Old Testament types and shadows. Since Christ arose from the dead and ascended back into Heaven, the churches of the Lord have kept the New Testament ordinances —

baptism and the Lord's Supper, and shall keep these two ordinances until our Lord comes again.

Before we take these ordinances and discuss them, one at a time, let it be understood that neither of them is a sacrament, as they are often called. A sacrament is a means of grace, something which imparts saving or strengthening grace to a person. Neither baptism nor the Supper does this. These ordinances are not sacramental, but symbolical.

### Baptism—The Blood

Now first, let us consider the ordinance of baptism and its relationship to the blood of Christ. In Romans 6:3-5, we read—

"Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall (Continued on page four)

The greatness of Christ's redemption may be measured by the extent of the design of it. He gave His life a "ransom for many." We are often told that we limit the atonement of Christ, because we say that Christ has not made a satisfaction for all men, or all men would be saved. Now, our reply to this is, that, on the other hand, our opponents limit it: we do not. The Arminians say, Christ died for all men. Ask them what they mean by it. Did Christ die so as to secure the salvation of all men? They say, "No, certainly not." We ask them the next question — Did Christ die so as to secure the salvation of any man in particular? They answer "No." They are obliged to admit this, if they are consistent. They say "No; Christ has died that any man may be saved if" — and then follow certain conditions of salvation.

Now, who is it that limits the death of Christ? Why, you. You say that Christ did not die so as to infallibly secure the salvation of anybody. We beg your pardon, when you say we limit Christ's death; we say, "No, my dear sir, it is you that do it." We say Christ so died that He infallibly



CHARLES H. SPURGEON  
(Long Ago In Glory)

secured the salvation of a multitude that no man can number, who through Christ's death not only may be saved, but are saved, must be saved, and cannot by any possibility run the hazard of being anything but saved. You are welcome to your atonement; you may keep it. We will never renounce ours for the sake of it.

New Park Street Pulpit, Volume 4, Page 135.

### Coming Next Week

The first in a series of messages by Mr. Spurgeon on the general theme—  
**SERMONS ON SOVEREIGNTY**

Now is a good time to send TBE to others!

## John R. Rice Reviewed

(2nd Installment)

4. Mr. Rice uses unethical methods to prejudice uninformed readers against true Calvinists and Calvinism.

Near the beginning of his first article, Mr. Rice states: "The heresy of extreme Calvinism is particularly appealing to people from four viewpoints:

"First, it appeals to the scholarly intellect, the self-sufficient and proud mind. So brilliant, philosophical, scholarly preachers are apt to be misled on this matter more than the humble-hearted Bible-believer." (Emphasis supplied).

This is a very unethical tactic to use to show "the errors of hyper-Calvinism," which Rice purports is doing. He tries to make his readers believe that Calvinism makes its appeal to proud, puffed-up, self-sufficient men who are "scholarly" and "philosophical," not "humble-hearted" believers of the Bible. He gives the impression that men who believe Calvinism do so because of their pride, not because they humbly believe they find these doctrines taught in God's Word. According to Rice, these men are not humble, but proud; not trustful, but self-sufficient. They don't believe as they do because they have prayerfully studied the Word of God, pleading with the Spirit of God for wisdom, longing to know what God's Word teaches, —no, these men are full of pride and self-sufficiency. This is the "Calvinist" that Mr. Rice presents to his readers.

Why does this man resort to such unethical tactics as this? Why does he thus slander godly, humble men who have earnestly sought after God and His Word by prayer and hard, tearful Bible study? Who does he think he will convince against Calvinism by such misrepresentation? Surely he will not convince any person who is informed.

Will he make informed people believe that poor John Bunyan, the tinker who could not even write his name when saved — will he make people believe that this humble man, who wrote "The Pilgrim's Progress," was a scholarly, self-sufficient, proud person? Will people who sing—

"Amazing grace, how sweet the sound that saved a wretch like me"—

believe that John Newton, a strong Calvinist, was such a character as Rice describes? Humble, persecuted George Whitefield! who preached despite the eggs thrown at him—a proud, self-sufficient man? The Puritans, men such as Owen, Manton, Sibbes, Goodwin, John Brown, Jeremy Taylor, Ness — all Calvinists — these men were proud and self-sufficient?

Was Rowland Hill, the fiery Calvinistic evangelist, a self-sufficient man of a puffed-up, proud mind? Was the great missionary, William Carey? Jonathan Edwards? David Brainerd? Robert McCheyne, the Bonars, Matthew Henry, J. C. Ryle, John Gill — proud men? self-sufficient? Dear Mr. Spurgeon said "I am carnal, proud, wicked unbelieving." Are these the words of a proud, self-sufficient man? Were the martyrs

such men? Did God give a song to these "proud, self-sufficient" men as they burned in the flames for the faith of Jesus Christ?

Well, Calvinism appealed to all of these men, not to mention the scores of others. Personally, I would be blushing ashamed to utter such blasphemy against such humble men as those who have held to Calvinism. But when men are opposing truth to establish error, when men are trying to get God off the throne, they will stoop to any depth.

Again I say, Mr. Rice's tactics in this regard are utterly unethical. The only purpose they serve is to prejudice the uninformed reader against true Calvinism. But it is an old trick of unprincipled men to paint such warped pictures as this in opposing their opponent's principles. It is the same trick that communism uses to prejudice uninformed nations against the United States and capitalism. Capitalism appeals to the

greedy, they say; it makes the poor man poorer, tramples him under foot, and has no mercy upon poor fellowmen. Its advocates are represented to be men of wealth who care nothing for the common man. This is communism's slanderous propaganda line, used to prejudice uninformed people. And Mr. Rice's line is strikingly similar to it. But no honest, informed person will be led astray by these tactics. Only the ignorant, uninformed, or prejudiced person will swallow such.

Actually, Mr. Rice's charge is utterly false. It is not true that Calvinism appeals to the carnal man, the proud and self-sufficient mind. On the contrary, the doctrines taught by Calvinists are the doctrines that the natural man hates. He hates the doctrine of total depravity; he does not want to believe that he is in the hands of God, but he wants to think that he is sovereign over himself, that he can be saved

whenever he likes, that he can easily turn to God. He does not like to hear that he is spiritually dead, that his will is in bondage, and that it will take the power of God to convert him to Christ. No natural man likes this doctrine, and especially is this true of the proud intellectual. Not only is this true of the Calvinistic position on depravity, but it is also true with regard to election. This doctrine is sometimes not even appealing to saved people when they first hear it, much less to the natural man yet unsaved. People have made idols of themselves, and election is a doctrine that casts down all gods but One.

And so it is with all the five points of Calvinism — men naturally hate them. Calvinism exalts God and debases man. Is this appealing to the proud, self-sufficient man? A thousand times, No. Mr. Spurgeon says, "Men will allow God to be everywhere except on his throne. They will allow him to be in His workshop to fashion worlds and to make stars. They allow Him to be in His almonry to dispense His alms and bestow His bounties. They will allow Him to sustain the earth and bear up the pillars thereof, or light the lamps of Heaven, or rule the waves of the ever-moving ocean; but when we proclaim an enthroned God, and His right to do as He wills with His own, to dispose of His creatures as He thinks well, without consulting them in the matter, then it is that we are hissed and execrated, and then it is that men turn a deaf ear to us, for God on His throne is not the God they love. They love Him anywhere better than they do when He sits with His sceptre in His hand and His crown upon His head. But it is God upon the throne that we love to preach. It is God upon His throne whom we trust." (New Park Street Pulpit, Volume II, page 185).

When the testimonies of men such as Edwards, Brainerd, Booth, Toplady, Newton, Chalmers, Spurgeon, and the host of other Calvinistic giants are read, we find that they nearly all testify to at first struggling against the truths of divine sovereignty. (Continued on page 2, column 1)

## The Baptist Examiner Pulpit

"You May Believe It But It Isn't In The Bible"

Sermon Preached by Pastor John R. Gilpin; Mechanically Recorded for Publication

I would like to begin my message by saying that I believe the Bible — not a part of it, but all of it. I believe the Bible from beginning to end. From the first letter of Genesis 1:1 to the last letter of Revelation 22:21, I accept it all as the Bible.

I am not a Modernist because the Modernist puts new meanings on to the Book. I am not a Fundamentalist because they are not fundamental enough. I often say that I am too Modernist because they are too Modern, and I am not a Fundamentalist because they are not fundamental enough.

If an individual believes four or five doctrines of the Bible — the virgin birth, the Deity of Christ, the blood atonement, and the resurrection—he brags about the fact that he is a Fundamentalist.

Beloved, he may be the biggest heretic in the world when it comes to the matter of church truth and a lot of other doctrines, but he still brags about the fact that he is a Fundamentalist. Some of them will even say that they are a Fundamentalist of the big F type. Well, I want to tell you that I am not a Modernist and I am not a Fundamentalist. I am just a Baptist, and as a Baptist I believe the Bible from beginning to end—from the very first word of it to the very last word of it. I accept it all. I put no question mark about any portion of it. The entirety of it is the Word of Almighty God, and it is God's message to me.

I might say, in this respect, that the greatest compliment that was ever given to me was not given

as a compliment, but it was really sarcasm. A man who was a member of the Holiness persuasion said, after listening to me preach, "If you take the Bible away from Brother Gilpin, he couldn't preach a lick." Well, I will plead guilty to that, beloved. If you take the Bible away from me, I couldn't preach a lick. I wouldn't have anything else to preach. The fact of the matter is, though that was spoken in sarcasm and as satire, I consider it the greatest compliment that has ever been passed on me in all of my ministry.

This is similar to a compliment that came to Spurgeon from a rather dubious source. Spurgeon said that one of his enemies said that he hadn't moved forward since the days of Christ, that he (Continued on page 3, column 2)



# The Baptist Examiner

BOB L. ROSS

Editor-in-Chief

JOHN R. GILPIN

Editor

Published weekly, with paid circulation in every state and many foreign countries.

Editorial Department, located in ASHLAND, KENTUCKY, where all subscriptions and communications should be sent.

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES

One year	\$2.00
Two years	3.50
Five years	7.00
Club rate for churches; 15 or more subscriptions, each	1.00
Donor subscriptions, each	1.50

(This rate also applies to secured subscriptions, the agent keeping 50c commission on each subscription obtained).

THESE RATES APPLY THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Entered as second class matter MAY 31, 1941, in the post office at Russell, Kentucky, under act of March 3, 1879.

All subscriptions are stopped at expiration date, unless renewed or special arrangements are made for their continuation.

## Examiner Editorials

By Bob L. Ross

### Rice Reviewed

(Continued from page one)

But God's grace could not be effectually resisted, and the light of the Spirit revealed to them the Word of God. These doctrines are not doctrines that the natural man will receive; they are divinely taught. Let anyone try preaching these truths to carnal, proud, self-sufficient men, and he will see how they "appeal" to the carnal mind. **Yet the doctrines of Arminianism are the very things that men believe by nature.**

"We are all Arminians by nature," said Whitefield. The natural man believes in "free-will," that salvation depends upon the human will in some sense, and so on down the line. Mr. Rice has completely misrepresented matters in this regard.

5. Mr. Rice again tries to pan off the idea that Calvinism is appealing to the carnal nature of man, offering some more false charges.

He says, "Third, the hyper-Calvinistic heresy is particularly appealing to the carnal nature, unwilling to have the heart-break, the burden for soul winning, unwilling to pay the price of separation and perhaps ostracism which goes with all-out soul winning, unwilling to pay the price for the fullness of the Spirit in continual self-crucifixion and waiting on God."

You will note that Rice uses the term "hyper-Calvinistic" in this paragraph. But as shown previously, he uses the terms "Calvinism" and "hyper-Calvinism" (also "extreme Calvinism") interchangeably, making no distinction whatsoever. So in this paragraph, we are forced to understand that he includes Calvinists in this charge as well as hyper-Calvinists. Therefore we will call attention to his slanderous charges against Calvinists.

Notice, Mr. Rice once again draws an ugly picture of the Calvinist. First, as we have seen, he pictures him as a proud, puffed-up somebody who is self-sufficient in himself, not an humble-hearted Bible-believer. Now he wants his reader to believe that the Calvinist is dominated by the old carnal nature's appetites, that he is not humble and broken in heart, has no burden for lost souls, does not separate from the world and sin, is not all out for soul-winning, does not seek the power of the Spirit in his life, and does not wait upon God, crucifying self and the flesh's appetites. A horrible creature indeed! A very Grendel or a Rasputin! This is the "Calvinist," accord-

ing to Rice. This is the Frankenstein monster that he sets forth to his readers as being the one who accepts and believes in Calvinism. Calvinism is appealing to such a debased and unspiritual character as this.

So says Mr. Rice. But what is the truth? Would it satisfy Mr. Rice to call to his remembrance that Knox, Whitefield, Rowland Hill, Edwards, Brainerd, McCheyne, the Haldanes, Spurgeon and other great men of God, some already mentioned, were strict Calvinists? Are these the debased men he describes? Hardly! These are some of the men whom God blessed in real revivals, not in the modern fleshly thing called "revival." Spurgeon said that he never heard of a revival apart from Calvinistic truth.

But understand, Mr. Rice's idea of soul-winning and revival is quite different from the great Calvinistic soul-winners. Soul-winning, according to Rice, is this modern "decisionism," sign-on-the-dotted-line, walk the aisle evangelism, and he even grants that Oral Roberts is a soul-winner! But the revivals that the Calvinists have seen were not characterized by the high-pressure invitation, the modern "decision," or this sign-on-the-dotted-line theology of our day and time. Mr. Rice thinks that all this carnality is soul-winning. If he means that Calvinists have had and will have nothing to do with this kind of soul-winning, then he is right. This is strictly of the flesh, not of the Spirit of God.

Mr. Spurgeon said, "I have read old Rowland Hill, and Whitefield, and several others, to see what they did; but I cannot discover a plan of turning your will. I cannot coax you, and you will not yield by any manner of means. I do not think any man has power over his fellow-creature's will, but the Spirit of God has. I will make them willing in the day of my power."

Mr. Rice speaks of "paying the price," of the "price of separation and perhaps ostracism." He says that Calvinists are unwilling to pay this price. It is true that Calvinists are unwilling to pay the terrible price that Rice has paid in order to promote his unionistic evangelism. Rice has paid the price by sacrificing doctrine after doctrine in the Word of God in order to promote unholy, spiritually adulterous unionism. He has yoked with practically every heretical group that names the name of Christ, yet criticizes Billy Graham for doing the same thing, only with a different crowd of heretics. But what difference does it make which crowd of heretics one unionizes with? Aren't they all "accursed"? (Gal. 1:8, 9).

To show how "burdened" Mr. Rice is for souls, the following illustration from his book on "The Home" should be quite revealing. On pages 92-94 of his book, Rice tells of a union meeting he held in Duke, Oklahoma.

During the invitation one evening, Rice went down into the congregation and got a man to "take Christ as Saviour." He then asked the man to come out and let it be known publicly that he had "accepted Christ as his Saviour." The remainder of the story we quote from the book:

"He replied, 'Brother Rice, for twenty years my wife has gone up to the Christian Church alone. I didn't go with her. I didn't help her when she got the children ready for Sunday School. I have made fun of the Bible and scoffed at preachers and God. Would it be all right for me not to tell anybody until tomorrow morning and go with my wife to the church where she has gone for twenty years and claim Christ there tomorrow morning?'"

"For the first time in my life, and the last, I agreed that it seemed all right to postpone public confession of Christ. The next morning he aroused the whole household demanding that every child be ready for Sunday School. To the family's amazement, he dressed his best and went to Sunday School and the preaching service. When the invitation was given he went forward to claim Christ, and was baptized at the close of that very service. He assumed his place, God appointed, as the high priest, the spiritual head, the godly example in the home."

Now here was a man who was supposedly saved in a service held by Rice. The man asked if it would be all right to go to the Christian Church the next day. Rice said that it would be all right, and holds the example of this man up as a "godly example." He hesitated, it seems, to agree to wait for this man to make an open profession, but did not seem to mind about the man's going to the Christian Church. Now everyone knows that the Christian Church teaches the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. It is a branch of the Campbellite movement, and teaches the Campbellite doctrine. Now we ask, what "price" did John R. Rice pay here? No doubt a very great one. This man, though perhaps saved, had children in his household. These children were brought up in this Campbellite church, and no doubt believed the damnable doctrine of Campbellism. Where will they be in eternity?

This is an example of Mr. Rice's irresponsible type of soul-winning. This is only one example of the price Mr. Rice pays and wants everyone else to pay. Compromise, betray clear Bible doctrine, sacrifice sacred truth, do anything to unionize for an evangelistic campaign in which sinners are urged to make a "decision for Christ," then are permitted to go away to join heretical churches, without any further teaching on the things of God from the evangelist.

If this is the price Mr. Rice wants Calvinists to pay, then certainly they have no interest in doing so. We want to see souls saved, we do and want to do more mission work and evangelistic work, and witness to the lost; but we are not for this fleshly, carnal, high-pressure "decisionism" that is as void of the work of the Holy Spirit as are these slanders against true Calvinists by Mr. Rice.

This modern evangelism does not do the job; it evidently doesn't make deep, earnest Christians. For instance, take the big churches that go in for this "decisionism" of our day. One of them, I understand, has nearly 15,000 members; yet the church auditorium will not seat but 4 or 5 thousand

## "I Should Like To Know"

1. Who started the church called "The Church of the Nazarene?" When?

Redford, the Nazarene historian, in his book entitled, "The Rise of the Church of the Nazarene," refers to P. F. Breese as the "founder of the Church of the Nazarene."

As to when it was founded, Redford traces it to October 6, 1895 (page 47). However, in 1908, there was a union of a few different "holiness" groups, the Nazarenes being one of them, and ever since then the united groups have gone under the Nazarene title.

It so happens that this year is regarded by official Nazarene headquarters as the Golden Anniversary of the organization called "Church of the Nazarene." Thus, this church is about 1900 years too young to have been the church that Jesus built.

2. I cannot find where it's not permissible for a woman to pray in public. Jesus said, "The hour cometh, and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Is prayer not worship?

Yes, prayer is worship. But God teaches us about worshipping by prayer in public. Paul says in II Timothy 2:8, "I will therefore that men (Greek, aner—the males) pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting." Women are to pray in services, but not audibly. In church services, they are to keep silent (I Cor. 14:34). Any woman who does not want to obey the Word of God and keep silent is a rebellious woman.

people, and I have been told by a reliable source—a former member of this church—that the auditorium is seldom filled, even on Sunday mornings. Now what is wrong here? Why is it that this church has so few of its membership in attendance? We believe it is due to the high-pressure tactics that get "decisions" but not conversions to Christ. There are churches, big churches in membership, but their auditoriums seat far less than the number on the church roll, and furthermore, these auditoriums are not always filled. Somewhere there is a reason. We say it is the shallow, carnal "decisionism" preached and practiced by these churches. Big numbers on the roll can not drown out the evident lack of spirituality on the part of these churches.

Also, Arminian and hyper-Arminian theology is responsible for much disobedience that is connected with union evangelism. It can definitely be shown that Arminian and hyper-Arminian theology engenders and leads to disobedience to God, and if any Arminian or hyper-Arminian wishes to dispute the argument which follows, then he is perfectly welcome to do so.

I say that Arminian theology engenders and leads to disobedience to God for this reason: As to importance, it places the souls of men before absolute, full obedience to God. For instance, the Arminian, and especially the hyper-Arminian, does not care to compromise and keep silent about any doctrine of God's Word that is not essential to salvation. He takes the attitude that if he takes a stand and stands for some "non-essential," although it is taught in God's Word and is right for all to believe and practice, he will thereby hurt his chances of winning souls to Christ. So he puts the souls of men before conformity to the revealed will and Word of the Sovereign, Almighty God, as if God does not mean for us to obey Him fully! The Arminian or hyper-Arminian may know and believe what the Bible teaches about baptism, for instance; but what does he do? Well, Mr. Rice's

Godly women, we have noticed, would not dare speak out against this plain teaching. Of course, some honest, well-meaning Christian women have not been properly taught, and therefore err through lack of knowledge. But women who have been taught properly have no reason for their disobeying the Word of God.

3. What do you think of church leaders who have no interest in spiritual things, but go all out to promote socials and clubs within the church?

God must surely be displeased with professing Christians who thus disgrace the place dedicated to the service of God. Such people need our prayers that God will awaken them to their sinful abuse and lead them to center their efforts upon the work of God.

4. What do you think of churches having hostels for young men and young women?

A church has no business having any connection whatsoever with such worldliness. The business of churches is to preach, baptize, and teach. We are not to furnish recreation, entertainment, banquets, etc. for anyone. Such things only help to put people in a spiritual slumber.

5. What do you think of deacons who consider themselves to be the supreme court of the church?

They are poorly instructed as to the work of a deacon. Deacons are not persons of authority, but servants in the minor matters of the church. Many have the idea that deacons are like Presbyterian ruling elders. But this is not the Bible teaching. Scriptural deacons are servants, not masters.

act, before pointed out, show how they act. They will compromise and betray God's plain Word in order to win a soul. Souls are greatly important! Yes! But humble obedience to God in all matters is more important! Only act of "minor" disobedience cost Uzzah his life. And what did it do for King Saul! Arminian and hyper-Arminian evangelists need to learn that obedience to God is essential to the blessings of God!

These men know that if they take a stand for what God says about this doctrine and that doctrine and this other doctrine, they will hinder their method of soul-winning. They won't be able to unite with this group and the group and the other group. They will not be accepted by those who do not obey God, if they obey Him on these doctrines. So they conclude that unless they disobey God, they will not be able to help God do what God wants to do. So they get paint and brush, paint a sign, and hang out the shingle saying, "We preach the 'essentials,' not the 'non-essentials.' In other words, we will disobey God, we will keep silent about certain truths, we will put men first, for if we obey God, we will not be a successful soul-winner. Then they point the finger at anyone who is endeavoring to obey God in the "essentials" and "non-essentials," yea, even in the "least of these commandments" (Matt. 5:19), and brand all such persons as "bigoted sectarians."

Why do they act this way? Because of their Arminian or hyper-Arminian theology that debases the sovereignty of God, and exalts man and man's good before full obedience to God.

When criticism is offered about some evangelist's compromise with unionism, it is often met with "Well, souls were saved, weren't they?" This is the old philosophy that the end justifies the means, that is, if you can do good by disobedience, then go right ahead. We could easily write a book on the matter as to whether or not souls are actually saved in such (Continued on page 3, column 1)

## PROTESTANT PERSECUTION OF BAPTISTS IN EARLY AMERICA

Per Copy \_\_\_\_\_ 25c  
6 copies \_\_\_\_\_ \$1.00

Order From  
Baptist Examiner Book Shop  
Ashland, Kentucky

Write for a Free Copy  
of Our  
BOOK CATALOG  
Containing Descriptions  
of Our Bibles, Books,  
and Tracts



## Rice Reviewed

(Continued from page two)

unionistic campaigns, but supposing that they are, does this justify disobedience to God?

Mr. Rice has severely criticized the Graham methods in holding union meetings. On what basis does he do so? Why, on the basis that the Bible teaches separation from modernists and modernism. But the Bible does not use the terms "modernists" and "modernism." The Bible speaks not of one particular group of heretics or errorists; it includes ALL of them. The same Scriptures Mr. Rice uses to show that Billy Graham is doing wrong may be applied to the union meetings held by Mr. Rice himself. What difference does it make if we unite with one who teaches Mr. Peale's philosophy or one who teaches Mr. Alexander Campbell's philosophy? What difference does it make as to which heretical church the converts go?

Is the baptismal regenerationist church any better off than the modernist church? Is the "falling from grace" crowd in grace, while the "social gospel" and "morality" crowd is outside of grace? If a man doesn't believe that he is entirely, once for all saved by the work of Jesus Christ, then what difference does it make whether or not he believes in the Deity of Christ? What does it matter to him; he isn't trusting the God-Man for salvation, anyway! Christ is no more a Saviour to him than to the modernist who denies Christ's Deity.

So if souls are saved in Mr. Graham's meetings, with modernists backing the campaign, then why does Mr. Rice kick? Just because Mr. Rice doesn't have the same liking for the crowd of modernists that he has for the crowd of other heretics he unionizes with, is no reason for Mr. Rice to kick. If Mr. Rice wants to stand on Bible ground, if he wants to clean out Mr. Graham's eyes, then first of all, he should apply the Murine of God's Word to himself. If the end justifies the means for Mr. Rice, then why not for Mr. Graham? If not for Mr. Graham, then why for Mr. Rice?

I am simply saying that Arminian and hyper-Arminian theology exalts the souls of men above humble, absolute obedience to God, in all matters, and it leads to compromise, unionism, and betrayal of sacred principles. The Arminian and hyper-Arminian are so "concerned" about souls that they forget about the God who said "obedience is better than sacrifice." To put any man's soul, be it ever so dear, before loving obedience to God in all things, is idolatry.

The Calvinist, on the other hand, is not afraid that some one is going to stumble into Hell over his obedience to God in the "essentials" and "non-essentials." If someone stumbles into Hell over another's obedience, then it is not the fault of the Calvinist. Calvinists put God first, and if he offends the whole world by his obedience to God, yea, if the whole world stumbles into Hell because of his obedience, he still sees that the foremost thing is obedience to God. He is assured that all that the Father has given to Christ shall come to Him (John 6:37), and those that are not of that number will reject God's Word and go out from Him. (John 10:26-28). The Calvinist will not disobey God for the spoils of the Amalekites. If he must be unpopular with the world to stay true to God, if he is regarded as

a bigoted sectarian, then what of it? He will rest upon the fact that God is sovereign and doeth according to His will in the army of Heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth (Daniel 4:35).

Calvinistic theology does not lead to compromise and disobedience as a means unto the end. It realizes that God's appointed means shall accomplish God's appointed purpose, and nothing else will (Isaiah 55:11). That is why Calvinists won't whittle the Word or employ the carnal methods of men in "soul-winning." They preach the Word, pray that God will bless it according to His will, and leave the results with God.

We must stop here; more will follow next week, with particular emphasis being put upon Mr. Rice's misrepresentation of two great Calvinists, George Whitefield and C. H. Spurgeon.



## "You May Believe It"

(Continued from page one)

was still exactly where the apostles of Christ stood in the first century." Spurgeon said that that was the greatest compliment he ever received in his life, and I think it was the greatest compliment that I ever received, when this individual said that if they took the Bible away from me I couldn't preach a lick.

I might say that the man to whom this individual said that to is now in Glory, but when it was spoken to him, he said, "Yes, and if they gave one of you Holy Rollers a Bible, you couldn't preach a lick," and that was right.

Well, beloved, I want to say to you at the very outset that I believe the Bible from beginning to end. I believe it is final, and I take it for what it says in every particular.

The Bible claims for itself to be the final word of authority. Listen:

"What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not ADD thereto, nor DIMINISH from it."—Deut. 12:32.

Notice that you are not to add to the Word of God, and you are not to diminish from the Word of God. It is to be taken just exactly as it stands.

Listen again:

"Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. ADD THOU NOT unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."—Prov. 30:5, 6.

Here is a verse that tells us that the Word of God is final. You are not to add to the Word of God, and if you do, God will prove you to be a liar.

Notice another Scripture:

"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. 8:20.

If you will notice the context, you will see that it is talking about false prophets, and it says that if you want to test a preacher to see if he is a true prophet or a false prophet, then test him according to the Word of God; if he preaches not according to this Word, then there is no light in him.

May I say that is the test that was suggested in Isaiah's day eight hundred years before the birth of the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is the same test that we need to apply today to false prophets. We are not to test a preacher by the congregation that he has. We are not to test him by the number of folk that join the church under his ministry. We are not to test him by the amount of money he is able to raise. We are not to test him by his pleasing personality and his pulpit mannerisms. We are not to test him by his eloquence or his persuasiveness when he stands in the pulpit. Rather, beloved, the test of every preacher is the Word of God, and if a man doesn't preach the Word of God, then classify him as Isaiah did, as a false prophet.

Here is another Scripture which shows us that the Bible is final:

"And Balaam answered and

said unto the servants of Balak, If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I CANNOT GO BEYOND THE WORD OF THE LORD my God, to do less or more."—Num. 22:18.

At the time this text was spoken, the children of Israel were marching toward the land of Canaan. Balaam was a prophet and I wouldn't be a bit surprised that I find him in Glory when I get there, although I wouldn't want to argue the matter of his salvation. But be that as it may, he was supposedly a prophet of God. When the children of Israel were journeying toward the land of Canaan, they were planning on going through the country of Moab, and Balak, the king of Moab sent a number of servants unto Balaam to persuade him to put a curse on the children of Israel. However, Balaam, knowing that it was wrong, refused to do so. He said, "I cannot do it," and they said, "You just don't understand. Our master, Balak, is a wealthy individual. He has lots of money and he can make it worth your while if you preach the preaching that he wants preached. He will give you lots of silver and gold for your preaching." It was then that Balaam said, "If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do less or more," as if to say that the Word of God was final and that it made no difference what Balak had to say, and what he had to offer. The Word of God was final, and Balaam could not go beyond it.

We find the same truth in the New Testament, when we read:

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall ADD unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man SHALL TAKE AWAY from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."—Rev. 22:18, 19.

Without entering into a discussion as to the full meaning of this passage of Scripture other than to say that John is talking in terms of chastisement and rewards, let me remind you that he literally says that the Word of God is final, that you are not to add to it and you are not to take from it. It is a dangerous thing to add to the Word of God, and it is equally as dangerous to take from the Word of God. This is to tell us that the Word of God is final in every particular.

Now having shown you from God's Word that the Bible is final, I come back to my subject, "You may believe it, but it isn't in the Bible," and I want to show you some things which people accept as being true, which are not found in the Bible.

I

## YOU MAY BELIEVE IN PRAYING THROUGH, BUT IT ISN'T IN THE BIBLE.

I know that there are people who believe in what they call "praying through." They say that for a man to be saved, he has to come to an altar of prayer and then "pray through" until he is saved. Now, beloved, an individual may believe in praying through, but it isn't in the Bible. In fact, I will challenge anybody to bring to me one passage of Scripture that says anything about an altar of prayer.

Somebody may say, "Brother

## SECOND-HAND SET

Romans by Haldane Available

We have a five-volume set of Robert Haldane's EXPOSITION OF ROMANS now available for \$6.00. This set is like new except for pencil marks in various portions.

Baptist Examiner Book Shop  
Ashland, Kentucky

Gilpin, you are wrong. The Bible talks about an altar over and over again." I grant you, beloved, that the Bible does, but it doesn't talk about an altar of prayer. If you will go back and read in the Old Testament, you will find that the altar is referred to many, many times, but the altar that is spoken of in the Old Testament is an altar of sacrifice. It was the altar upon which they put their sacrifices when the Jews were bringing a blood offering, or a burnt offering, or a sacrifice unto the Lord. You will find many, many references to an altar of sacrifice, but you will never find one reference to an altar of prayer, and whenever an individual talks about an altar of prayer, he is talking about something that has been spun out of the brain of a heretic, because there is not one sentence in the Word of God that refers to an altar of prayer.

So I say, beloved, whenever an individual talks about praying through, he is talking about that which is not to be found within the Word of God. The fact of the matter is, an unsaved person cannot pray acceptably unto God. Listen:

"Now we know that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth."—John 9:31.

Beloved, an unsaved man can't pray acceptably unto God. In fact, even a saved person can't pray acceptably unto God if he is out of fellowship with the Lord. If you are out of fellowship with God and your life isn't being lived for His glory, even though you may be saved, you can't pray acceptably unto the Lord. Listen:

"If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me."—Psa. 66:18.

Now, beloved, if a saved man has to be living a life that is clean before God, if he has to be living a life that will please God in order for God to hear him, then surely an unsaved man can't even expect to get a prayer through to God.

Beloved, a saved man needn't expect to have his prayers answered if there is a wrong relationship existing between him and the Almighty. I tell you, God will not hear us when we pray if there is unconfessed sin standing between us and God. Many, many times God's people cry out to God for power, yet they remain powerless all because God has closed His ears to the cries that have come from their unclean hearts. I tell you, beloved, God will not hear saved people pray if there is sin within their lives.

Well, if God won't hear a saved man pray when there is unconfessed sin within his life, why then would we think that God would hear an unsaved man when he comes to God with all of the sin of his lifetime piled up on top of his soul? We read:

"The man answered and said unto them, Why herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence he is, and yet he hath opened mine eyes. Now we know that God HEARETH NOT sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth."—John 9:30, 31.

Beloved, regardless of what you may have been taught about praying through, come to this conclusion now—you may believe it, but it isn't in the Bible.

I will go further and say that I stand ready to renew my offer that I have had standing for the last twenty years—namely, a hundred dollars reward to any individual that will prove to me that there is any such thing as an altar of prayer in the Bible, and that a sinner can pray through.

I remember several years ago that I wanted to announce a revival meeting and I put in great big red letters on some placards "\$100 Reward" and tacked them all around town. I offered one hundred dollars reward to any individual who would show me a passage of Scripture about a sinner's praying through. A man that operated a press in my printing shop at that time said, "That will be easy money. My wife can find that in the Bible." Beloved, that man's wife started searching for it, and she is still searching for it, and she hasn't found it yet. The fact of the matter is, she will search another twenty years and she will never find it. I tell you, beloved, you may believe in a sinner's praying through, but you won't find it in the Bible.

Some people believe certain doctrines because their pastor taught them that way. Other people believe it because the church that they attend practice it in that manner. Some people believe the way they do because their mother or some friend or some acquaintance misleads them with false teachings. Beloved, it doesn't make any difference where you may have gotten it or how you may have gotten it, if you believe that a sinner can pray through to God, and that God will accept and hear a sinner when he prays and that God will save him as a result of his praying—if you believe it, you may do so, but it isn't in the Bible.

II

## YOU MAY BELIEVE IN SHOUTING, BUT IT ISN'T IN THE BIBLE.

You say, "Brother Gilpin, don't you believe in a heart-felt religion?" Yes, I do. I believe in a heart-felt religion just as much as anybody in this world. I believe that Christians ought to feel good when they go to church. I think that they ought to leave the house of God, and feel a nearness to the Lord. Beloved, a sermon that doesn't draw God's people to the Lord, and help them spiritually, and lift them up to the Lord isn't much of a sermon. The fact of the matter is, a preacher can't preach much if he can't say something through the course of a sermon to cause your heart to rejoice and to cause your soul to be happy in the Lord.

I say to you, I believe in a heart-felt religion, but I don't believe in shouting. You just don't find it in the Bible. There is just not one hint about it. There is not one indication of it. There is not one time that you ever find concerning a New Testament church any reference to the matter of shouting.

Only two times do you find shouting in the New Testament. The first instance is relative to Herod's birthday celebration.

"And upon a set day Herod, arrayed in royal apparel, set upon his throne, and made an oration unto them. And the people gave a SHOUT saying, It is the voice of a god, and not of a man. And immediately the angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not God the glory: and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost."—Acts 12:21-23.

The second instance is at the Second Coming of Christ:

"For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a SHOUT with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first."—I Thes. 4:16.

Sometime ago Mrs. Gilpin was telling me about being in a store and hearing one woman who was a clerk tell another woman, who evidently attended services at the same place, about the wonderful service that they had had the night before. She said, "You know the preacher never did get to preach any at all because we got such a big service going." They thought it was so wonderful that they had such an emotion-stirring service that the preacher never got to preach at all.

I heard a fellow make an announcement over the radio a few Sundays ago and he said, "You know last night, I didn't get to do a bit of preaching. The Lord came down and the service was just taken out of my hands, and I didn't get to do a bit of preaching at all." He seemed to think that it was wonderful that they shouted and cavorted and ranted and raved and he didn't get to do any preaching at all.

I remember a woman who was talking to me several years ago concerning her pastor. She said, (Con't on page 4, Col. 1)

THE BAPTIST EXAMINER

PAGE THREE

MARCH 1, 1958

## Spurgeon's Autobiography

Two More Sets Available

4 Large Volumes—\$16.00  
Postage Extra

First Come, First Served

Order from:  
Baptist Examiner Book Shop  
Ashland, Kentucky



## "You May Believe It"

(Continued from age 3)

"I wish he were a spiritual man. The pastors that we have had in the past have all been good spiritual men." She said, "The pastor that we have now is so cool that he is not spiritual." I said to her, "He is a spiritual man. What you want is an emotional man." I said, "There is a lot of difference between being spiritual and emotional. The man who reads the Word of God and stays close to the Book is spiritual." I said, "What you want is someone who is a clown, who is able to kick his heels and cavort around, and that is nothing in the world but the work of the flesh."

An individual said to me concerning another individual, "He is bound to have the Spirit. He is seventy-four years old and he can jump four feet in the air every-time he shouts." She thought that he was bound to have the Spirit because he could jump four feet in the air — that he couldn't jump that way if he didn't have the Spirit. Beloved, you set a fire cracker under most anybody and he will jump four feet in the air and there won't be any Spirit about it at all.

I am saying to you, shouting is nothing but the work of the flesh. You may believe in shouting, but it isn't in the Bible.

### III

#### YOU MAY BELIEVE IN TESTIMONY MEETINGS, BUT IT ISN'T IN THE BIBLE.

Someone will say, "Brother Gilpin, don't you like to hear people give their testimonies? Don't you like to hear people tell about their experience?" Yes, beloved, I am glad always to hear about anybody who has had an experience with the Lord, but you don't find a single instance of a testimony meeting in the Bible.

I rather imagine that that comes as a surprise to some of you. You may not have thought about it, but it isn't to be found in the Word of God. It doesn't make any difference whether it is a woman, who has gotten out of her place to testify, or whether it is a man who has gotten up to speak, you just don't find anything about testimony meetings in the Word of God. You may believe in them. A lot of folk have been brought up with the idea that you can't have a spiritual service, unless you have a testimony meeting in connection with it, but beloved it isn't in the Word of God.

You may say that it sounds good to hear some old granny get up and tell of her experience. Some people think it does. "Why yes, Brother Gilpin, we could have a good service, if we would just let some of these old grandmothers who have walked with the Lord for years, get up, and testify, and tell about their experience. You let some of these men that know the Lord tell of their experience, and it will be a blessing to the service." Beloved it may be that you might enjoy it. It may be that you think it is all right, but you don't find it in the Word of God.

### IV

#### YOU MAY BELIEVE IN CALLING A PREACHER "REVEREND" OR "DOCTOR," BUT IT ISN'T IN THE BIBLE.

A lot of preachers like the idea of being "Doctored," and after listening to some of them preach, I think they need to be doctored. The fact of the matter is, I think a lot of them need a shot. Some of them need several shots to get them back on their feet, to be able to preach. I say, there are a lot of preachers who like the idea of being called "Doctor."

Years ago J. B. Gambrell said that the D. D. is just like the curl of a pig's tail — a little more beauty, but no more pig, and I guess that is just about right. There is a little more beauty, but there is no more pig than there was to start with.

Beloved, the same thing is true so far as a preacher is concerned. You can call him "Doctah" and it sounds beautiful, but there is no more preacher than there was to start with. We read:

"But be not ye called RABBI:

for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. Neither be ye called MASTERS: for one is your Master, even Christ." — Mt. 23:8, 10.

Beloved, if one is our master and all of us are brethren, then it isn't right for one of us to be Doctor So-and-So and the rest of us Brother So-and-So. We are all just brothers in Christ.

I don't want anybody to think that it is a case of "sour grapes," that I don't have a Doctorate. I tore mine up two different times when they were conferred upon me when I wasn't present. I had one of the prettiest blue sheepskin-lined degrees with my name written on it as "Doctor." Beloved, it isn't a case of "sour grapes" with me, for, as I say, two different times, universities have conferred the D. D. on me, and I have torn them up and thrown them in the wastebasket. I don't believe that it is right for a preacher to be called Doctor. You may believe it, but it isn't in the Bible.

Then, beloved, there are some individuals who like the title of Reverend. Listen to what God's Word has to say:

"He sent redemption unto his people: he hath commanded his covenant for ever: HOLY and REVEREND IS HIS NAME." — Psa. 111:9.

The word "Reverend" is never used but one time in the Bible and that time as a characteristic of God. Certainly it ought never be applied to any preacher, because no preacher is as reverend and as holy as Almighty God.

Do you know what the word "reverend" really means? Actually, it means "aweful." In other words, we are to stand in awe before God. We are to stand in reverence before Him.

I would just as soon call a Catholic priest "Father" as to call a Baptist preacher "Doctor," and I wouldn't call a Catholic preacher "Father" if I knew he was a daddy a hundred times. Listen to me, you may believe it all right to call a preacher "doctor" or "reverend," but it isn't in the Bible.

What I am saying is, the Word of God is final to us, and we are not to believe anything or teach anything but what the Word of God says. It doesn't make any difference what you have been taught, if it isn't in the Word of God, it is not to be accepted.

### V

#### YOU MAY BELIEVE THAT IT IS ALL RIGHT FOR SOMEONE ELSE TO COME BETWEEN YOU AND GOD, BUT IT ISN'T IN THE BIBLE.

In a little while as the spring season draws nearer and the Easter season comes around the corner, there will be folk who will be getting ready for the Easter service and they will be godfathers and godmothers in the service. Those individuals will present their child to a preached to be sprinkled. Notice, I didn't say to be baptized, for if I did I would be lying. When the individual stands up and answers for those children, he is literally putting himself up between the soul of that child and Almighty God.

Beloved, there is another group which says that the Virgin Mary can come between the soul of man and God, and that same group says that the religious leaders of their church can come between the soul of man and God. In fact, they say that no man can come to God except through the church. What does God's Word say? Listen:

"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." — I Tim. 2:5.

Who is the only one who can come between God and men? The Lord Jesus Christ. Away with the idea of the Virgin Mary interceding for us. Away with the idea of godfathers and godmothers coming between the soul of an unconscious infant and God. Away with the idea that a minister of religion of any kind or caliber can come between the soul of man and Almighty God. This verse tells us that only one can come between God and man and that is the Lord Jesus Christ. No one but

## Doctrine of the Blood (Con't from page 1)

be also in the likeness of his resurrection."

This is a marvelous passage, and it teaches us that baptism is the likeness of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection. It speaks of being buried with Him by baptism and being raised up out of the water like as Christ was raised from the dead. And thus being raised up out of the water, we are to walk in newness of life, even as Christ ascended to be with the Father. Our affections are now to be set on the things above, not on the things of the earth (Colossians 3:2).

Thus, we see what a glorious ordinance baptism is. It points us to our death and resurrection in Christ.

We died to sin in His death; for listen: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." (Romans 6:6).

We were raised from death in His resurrection; for listen: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace ye are saved); and hath made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus." (Ephesians 2:4-7).

Representatively, we died and were resurrected in Christ. And also, we ascended to Heaven and are now seated at the right hand of God, in our Representative.

Behold, then, the glory of the ordinance of baptism! It gloriously symbolizes, as nothing else can, the union that we have with Jesus Christ, our Saviour. The blood—His substitutionary work—is that which this ordinance points to. You who have trusted Christ, yet have not been baptized, are missing the joy that comes to one who has been baptized. As I look back on my baptism, I am made to rejoice in Christ's death and resurrection. I am happy that I have professed to the world, in the act of baptism, that Christ is my all in all — my death to sin and my resurrection to new life.

If you are saved, then by all means, follow your blessed Lord in water baptism.

### The Lord's Supper — the Blood

The other ordinance left by the Lord to the church, is the Lord's Supper. Many people do not have a knowledge of the significance of the Supper, and this is somewhat due to the corruption it has suffered at the hands of the religion of pomp and formality and gaudy

the Lord Jesus Christ can come between God and man.

Years ago when I was holding a revival meeting in another town I made a statement relative to false religions. There happened to be a young girl in the congregation who took offense, and exception to what I had to say. She went to the home where Mrs. Gilpin and I were staying and said that she would like to talk to me. I sat up until 2:00 o'clock in the morning talking to that young girl. Finally, I read to her I Tim. 2:5, which says, "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." She said, "Is that in my Bible?" I said, "It is in every Bible." She said, "I will believe it if it is in my Bible." I didn't have a Catholic Bible, and I couldn't read it to her out of her Bible, but I assured her that it was in her Bible. She said, "If it is in my Bible, then the whole system of my church falls," and she was exactly right.

Listen, beloved, the whole system of Catholicism fails on the truth of this Scripture. The verse says that there is just one mediator to come between God and man and that is the Lord Jesus Christ. There is no Virgin Mary, no priest, no pope, no bishop, no godfather, no godmother — no one to come between us and God — no one but the Lord Jesus Christ.

Beloved, you may believe that it is all right for somebody to come between your soul and God, but it isn't in the Bible.

### VI

#### YOU MAY BELIEVE IN FALLING FROM GRACE, BUT IT ISN'T IN THE BIBLE.

"Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are FALLEN FROM GRACE." — Gal. 5:4.

"Why, Brother Gilpin, you say

that you don't believe in falling from grace and then you read it to us out of God's Word." Listen, beloved, and I will explain it.

When you talk about a person falling from grace you mean that he can be saved today, and then lose his salvation, and become unsaved at a later date. Beloved, that is not what Paul meant when he wrote to the churches of Galatia. When Paul wrote to the churches of Galatia he spoke of people that were unsaved. Listen:

"Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." — Gal. 2:16.

In this Scripture he says that a man depending upon his works is not saved. Then he says in Galatians 5:4 that a man depending upon his works has fallen from grace. He is talking to people that had never had salvation. They never had been the recipients of the grace of God. They had been depending upon their works all the time. He said that they had fallen away from the principles of grace.

Let me tell you something, every person in this world who teaches salvation by works, or by the city's water works is in the same class. He has never been saved. If a man believes that he can be saved by his works, or by the city's water works, he has never been saved. He has fallen from the principles of grace. He has fallen away from the standards of grace. He has fallen away from the teachings of grace.

The grace of God teaches us that a man is saved by what Jesus Christ did for us on the Cross of Calvary. He is not saved in any other way. The man who

ceremony. So let us simply notice what the Scriptures teach us with regard to the Supper.

We find the Bible teaches that the Supper is simply a memorial Supper. In I Corinthians 11:23-26, we read: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I 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 he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come."

So when we partake of the unleavened bread and the wine, we are simply doing so in remembrance of the death of Christ for our sins. We both commemorate His death for our sins, and proclaim that He died for our sins. So in this act, we are actually preaching the Gospel that Christ died for our sins. Also, we are reminded of the fact that Christ is coming again. We are to keep this ordinance "till He come." Everytime we come to observe the Lord's Supper, we should be reminded that we shall not always keep this ordinance, but only "till He come."

Our eating the unleavened bread and drinking the wine is a physical representation of spiritual truth. Jesus often used the physical to illustrate the spiritual. He said, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." Of course, Jesus did not have reference to physical thirst, but spiritual thirst. Again He said, that He was the Bread of Life, and that one must eat of Him to live. This, too, is referring us to our spiritual need of Christ.

So the bread and wine of the Supper are no more than physical representations of spiritual truths. Christ is our spiritual bread and drink. The unleavened bread symbolizes Christ's sinless body, broken in death for us. The wine symbolizes His pure blood, shed for the remission of sins. I might add here that only unleavened bread and wine should be used in this ordinance. Leavened bread symbolizes evil, for one of the symbols of evil in the Bible is leaven. Grape juice contains leaven also, but in fermentation, all its impurities are cast off — so, wine is pure. These pure elements symbolize the purity of Christ.

So you see, the Lord has given us two glorious ordinances to observe, in order to keep the doctrine of the blood ever before our minds. May God help us to see their glorious significance each time they are observed.

has never been saved, but rather believes in salvation by works or baptism is the man who is fallen from grace.

The Bible does not teach that a man can be saved and then lost. Instead, we read:

"And I give unto them ETERNAL LIFE: and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." — John 10:28, 29.

"For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." — Rom. 8:38, 39.

Beloved, there are not enough devils inside, nor outside of Hell, to take a saved man out of the hand of God when once he has been saved.

Oh, you may believe in falling from grace, in the sense of a man losing his salvation after having been saved, but it isn't in the Bible. The Bible teaches that when you are saved, you are saved forever. When you are once born into the family of God, you are always in the family of God. When you once become God's child, you will never be anything else but God's child.

### CONCLUSION

I ask you, are you willing to listen to the Bible? Are you willing to take what God says in His Book? You may believe something, but the question is, is what you believe substantiated by the Word of God? If it isn't backed up by the Word of God, you had better throw away what you believe and just take what God says in His Book. His Book is final.

May God bless you!