

No.
101

***"IF YE THEN BE RISEN WITH CHRIST, SEEK THOSE THINGS WHICH
ARE ABOVE, WHERE CHRIST SITTETH ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD."***
COL.3.1

**BAPTISM and
THE LORD'S SUPPER.**

An Address (revised)

At Forest Gate, E,

18th June, 1917

by

PERCY W. HEWARD

***Correspondence welcome: Scriptural literature for Believers
Gottlieb-Daimler-Str.1 – 74343 Sachsenheim – GERMANY***

Copy.

BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

An Address by Mr. P.W.Heward,
At Forest Gate, E,
18th June, 1917.

If we look back, dear friends, to the condition of things when God was pleased to establish that church of which the Lord Jesus said, "I will build My church", we notice in Acts 2 the striking words, "Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is unto you and to your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves, (or be saved,) from this untoward generation. Then they that gladly received His word were baptized; and the same day they were added (*unto them*" is in italics, "there were added") about three thousand souls. And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and the fellowship, and in the breaking of the bread, and in prayers". Here we have at the beginning of this dispensation, a link between baptism and the breaking of bread, or the Lord's Supper, and I believe it will be helpful to follow out this subject, as the Lord enables. First of all we find that not only is there THIS stress, but in 1 Cor. 10 the apostle speaking of a type declares they were all baptized into Moses, and at once adds that they did all eat the same spiritual meat and drank the same spiritual drink. Thus he links these two things, Again in a spiritual parallel, with a wondrous contrast, the Lord links them. To James and John He said, Ye shall drink indeed of My cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with. Suggestively in Acts 9 we are told that when God's servant, God's chosen vessel, Saul of Tarsus, had received sight, he arose and was baptized, AND when he had received meat he was strengthened. And in Acts 16 we are told of God's wonderful work in the prison. "He took them (that is the jailor took Paul and Silas) the same hour of the night and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his straightway. AND

When he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house". I do not say these are occasions of the Lord's Supper, but the partaking of food to the glory of God is more than once caused to follow the mention of baptism. I have referred to 1 Cor. 10, looking back to the book of Exodus. We find that Israel, having been baptized symbolically in the sea were brought up the other side, and God gave them the same spiritual food in the manna, and the spiritual drink from the rock, Ex. 17 in the passing through the water. Further, it is remarkable that other types with the same lessons have similar links. That Noah's ark gives a type of baptism is evident, - a very remarkable type for it shows the special aspect of baptism is not washing because those in the ark were untouched by the water, only enveloped by it, (1 Pet. 3). We are expressly told that the ark passing through the water pictured baptism, and we are equally told of the food in connection with the ark. Or if you turn to Joshua 5 you have a parallel Old Testament type with baptism, and when the reproach of Egypt is rolled away, the children of Israel partook of the Passover, - the parallel "eating" type in the olden days. I need hardly say that knowledge of these facts apart from spiritual knowledge of the Divine teaching is very incomplete. It is beautiful to see how the Lord Jesus in the fourth Gospel alludes to baptism and the Lord's Supper alike, but gives a great contrast. In John 3 He alludes to baptism, but there we have not the mention of baptism in water, but a birth out of water. Now birth out of water and baptism in water are quite distinct. Baptism pictures and succeeds the birth out of water, but the birth out from water means a deliverance from the water of judgment in which we are drowning, and thus the Lord Jesus says, "Except a man be born out from water and spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God". Unless he is delivered out from the wrath of God, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, but a deliverance merely by a LIFTING OUT from the sphere of wrath would be incomplete. He must be BORN out from the water of judgment, that is, if anyone is in Christ there is a new CREATION. Baptism is not birth, baptism is not a saving ordinance. It typifies salvation, but that is vastly different. So as to the Lord's Supper. In John 6 we have an allusion. There the Lord Jesus says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you". But here again the contrast is as real as the parallel. Unless there is birth out from water there cannot be an entering into the kingdom; unless there is a partaking of Christ there is no possession of life. The Lord's Supper SYMBOLIZES this, but the Lord's Supper is not coextensive with this. Believers partake of Christ at all times. They depend on Him for the sustenance of that spiritual life which God has graciously given. The type is partial, temporary, - The reality far transcends it; though if God appoints a type in any dispensation, love to Him should be linked with obedience to His will respecting it. The authority of the Lord should guide all the arrangements of His blood-bought people. I said just now that the central thought of baptism is not washing. Error in this matter has led to much confusion. As with the parallel type in the old dispensation the central thought is judgment, and yet more definitely in baptism the central thought is wrath, but wrath transferred. Death and burial are pictured primarily, yet the element IS water, not only that there may be the thought of drowning in the waves of judgment, but that there may be also, though secondarily, a picture of cleansing; for we are

not only possessing the criminal guilt of sin, but the uncleanness of sin. The work of Christ deals with both. He bore the judgment for our criminality. His blood cleanses from our filthiness. It is remarkable therefore that we have the same order - the water and then the eating - in the tabernacle. The WATER belongs to the court. There was even a fuller type of baptism than this when Aaron's priests were first appointed, as there was with the cleansed leper; but the water which speaks of uncleanness is in the court, and is not in the tabernacle. The eating is in the tabernacle, the holy place, and not in the court. In accord with this wondrous Divine order throughout, may I add further, baptism was APPOINTED before the Lord's Supper, even as circumcision before the Passover. Again, baptism is external. The Lord's Supper pictures that which is internal. Consequently we find the same order in 1 Cor. 12 in a parallel sphere. You will notice I am not only referring to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but referring to many parallels, and the order is the same in all dispensations and circumstances. Cor. 12 says "In one Spirit (this is not "we are baptised") were we all baptized into one body, and were all made to drink into one spirit". The same order. Further this is what we should expect. Baptism pictures the deserving of death, and the rising with new life. The Lord's Supper pictures the SUSTAINING of a life which exists. Baptism indicates separation from the world. The Lord's Supper sets forth worship, a drawing near. Baptism is an individual act. The Lord's Supper is not individual. "one" could not partake of the passover, and one alone cannot partake of the Lord's Supper. Again and again we see that there is a Divinely constituted relationship and a Divinely appointed order. Baptism sets aside the flesh in its teaching, and the Lord's Supper beautifully indicates that wondrous spiritual worship which belongs to God's people.

Having said this, I would like to ask you to notice the relationship between baptism and Christian fellowship, for Scripture knows nothing of welcoming simply to the Lord's Supper. Welcoming is to ALL the privileges and responsibilities of a house of God. The Lord's Supper reminds us of the expression "The Lord's Table". A table suggests a house, but the table is not the whole of the house. Supper is not the only meal of the day. This needs to be emphasized. Among the Greeks there were two special meals, one the breakfast and the other the supper. The breakfast (or dinner - either term can be used) was a meal in the earlier part of the day. It is before us in one of the parables, the parable of the king who made a marriage feast for his son, a breakfast. This is appropriate for we have there the BREAKFAST of blessing from which a man is turned out, but no one shall be turned out from the Marriage SUPPER of the Lamb. Here we have the thought of two dispensations. In the present dispensation the marriage breakfast, spiritual enjoyment of Christ, Some may be recognized as His who are not His. In the Marriage Supper all the redeemed of this and preceding ages will be together, none recognized there who are not His. But just now I am thinking rather of the fact that the Lord has appointed the Lord's Supper to anticipate the Marriage Supper. Is there not the suggestive thought that the Supper is not the whole of the food of the day? The breakfast must also be remembered. Unless we are feeding upon Christ and enjoying His truth, how can we rightly partake of the Lord's Supper? This illustrates the thought that the acceptance and the welcoming cannot be simply to one part of the responsibilities. It is a very responsible thing to be a Christian. A responsibility before Christ Who has so graciously saved. A responsibility before fellow believers, a responsibility before a sinful world. And God has wrapped up so much teaching in the details of His work, and everything is necessary for His people's prayerful study. I have felt of late that though this is the Divinely appointed order - baptism and Christian fellowship. (Christian fellowship expressed in the Lord's Supper, and in MANY other ways) may have an interval in between them, and why? Let us notice first with respect to baptism the way in which Scripture mentions it. "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you". The "teaching" is marked out as subsequent. What then is necessary before baptism? Go ye therefore and make disciples, baptizing them. But the word "disciple" is a very comprehensive term. Are we to accept a person's profession of discipleship, or are we to test for discipleship? Here is a deeply important problem. As to welcoming among the responsibilities of a house of God, we shall find great care in the Scriptures. As to baptism - think we find little beyond the following four things is emphasized: - First the individual must personally profess faith in the Lord Jesus. "HE THAT BELIEVETH and is baptized". This is the Divine order. Unless there is faith there cannot be an act of obedience, for without faith it is impossible to please God. They that are in the flesh cannot please God. Thus life must exist, before there can be the living act of living faith. Secondly, there must be linked with the faith a GLAD RECEPTION OF TRUTH. Perhaps the word in Acts 2 is somewhat more expressive in our English than the original, but at least we should render it "welcomed", "Those who welcomed were baptized". To say, "What a weariness is it", and to obey with sullen indifference is not to obey. There must be a glad welcoming of God's word. Thirdly, there must surely be the consistent recognition of what is involved in Matt. 28, "Make disciples baptizing them, teaching them to observe all things". Unless there is a willingness to go forward in the will of God as to all things, unless there seems to be this, surely there is not a right readiness for baptism. Fourthly, we find some who came to be baptized were hindered and held back, and why? John's plain dealing is very much needed. He said, "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and think not to

say within your hearts We have Abraham for our father, for I say unto you, God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham". That is to say, he found evidence in their life which was against baptizing them. We have a similar plainness of speech in Luke 3 and we notice that whether in Matt.3 or Luke 3, or in Acts 2, baptism is associated with a confession of sins. Unless there be a confession of sins, there is not an entering into the meaning of baptism. Baptism pictures the reality which is greater than the picture, - That Christ went under judgment because WE deserved to be there, and took wrath because WE deserved to take wrath, and that our sole title to life and blessing can be found in Him. We find in Acts 8 that one at least was baptized who had no right to be baptized, but the responsibility seems laid upon him. Not so as to Christian fellowship, at least not exclusively so. There were those who held false teaching in some of the churches in Rev. 2 and 3. How is the angel of the church addressed? "I have a few things against thee BECAUSE THOU HAST THEM THERE that hold the doctrine of Balaam" I do not know of a Scripture which rebukes for the wrong baptism of one professing to be a Christian who was not a Christian. Undoubtedly there should be a reasonable care, as we see John manifested, but as to Christian fellowship there is a vast difference, for a house of God is viewed as a temple in 1 Corinthians, and if there is building into that temple of hay and stubble, there is dishonour to the house of God. An individual may be baptized wrongly. The individual is damaged by the act. Do not misunderstand me. I do not mean that if a child of God looks back and says, "I wish I had been much more spiritual when I was baptized" that such an one need have a continual grief, and say "I wish I had entered into all into which I now enter". Beloved friends, if we do not know more now than when we were baptized there is something radically wrong, because we are to keep learning "all things whatsoever" the Lord has commanded. I mean that if one professes Christ who is not a child of God, if there is a glib putting on of the appearance of being a believer, this damages the individual; but if one is brought into Christian fellowship who is not saved, that one damages the whole assembly. Whereas baptism is individual, the gathering of an assembly is collective, and the whole of the worship is hindered, and the whole relationship of saint to saint is somewhat damaged. We find that the word Jesus did not unfold some of His precious teaching till Judas had gone out; and we are not surprised that there was a serious rebuke because of those who were wrongly present (as we have seen) in the assembly at Pergamum. We need, therefore, to distinguish the two aspects. In the early church baptism was usually followed immediately by welcoming into Christian fellowship, and why? The true relationship of baptism to salvation (not saving, but picturing salvation with its separating power), and the true relationship of baptism to the gathering of believers was then recognized. "Repent and be baptized" says Peter, "and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit". I suppose we accept the statement that they did receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. How is this described? They were "added". Do you see the precious thought? They were added to the Lord, AND recognized among believers as possessing the gift of the Spirit. On another occasion Peter words it thus, God gave them the like gift as unto us, what was I that I could withstand God? That was the position of the early assemblies. The Lord marked out by baptism in the Spirit, which He promised in each of the Gospels. He marked out those who were to be gathered. Hence in almost every case, and in every case at first, those who were gathered were believers. There were no false ones among them. It was not till men slept that the enemy came and sowed tares, but after men slept the tares remain among the wheat till the harvest time. And in the field they must remain, but in a local assembly we have no authority for having a miniature of the field, but a miniature of what the Lord's people will be in that day. Now, beloved friends, this has a very precious teaching for us. It suggests that in the present days of weakness when there is not the baptism in the Spirit to mark out who are to be gathered, that we must show godly caution as in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. The Tirshatha said of some who could not show their genealogy that they should not EAT of the holy things till there arose a priest with Urim and Thummim. I can understand how some have developed this principle and said, In days of weakness we cannot be gathered together, and we cannot have the breaking of the bread. I can understand how some have thought the true position is simply to preach God's word and leave Him to put things right. I need hardly say that would be a far simpler position to take, if we could simply have our meetings here together, and if we could simply preach the word, and then I could feel my responsibility is finished, and so forth. But that is the position which is NOT MARKED OUT IN SCRIPTURE for the present days. "Ye do show forth the Lord's death TILL HE COME", and therefore responsibility exists till He come. Consequently, in the absence of the parallel with the Urim and Thummim, in the absence of the Lord's marking out who are His, there needs to be godly caution and godly finding out. So we see in Acts 11 that there was a work of grace, and many turned unto the Lord, but there was no gathering till Barnabas went down and investigated the work. Then we read the Lord marked them out as His, and there was a beautiful season of Christian fellowship, of which the latter verses speak. In 1 Cor. 14 we have those who are private persons, not part of the assembly, yet wishing to say "Amen", entering into the meeting, but they have not been marked out by the Lord as those to be gathered. "THE LORD added on to the same object the ones being saved". Any man can make an organisation, only God can arrange an assembly which is His will, and in days of weakness we need to seek very definitely from God that we may know at all who and how He is marking out. Even in the early church, as far as we can see, baptism was not always immediately followed by gathering .. We think of the Ethiopian eunuch, whose baptism has a very individual aspect. But it was always meant to lead to being gathered, for immediately after baptism we read in Matt.28, as we have seen "Teaching them to observe ALL THINGS whatsoever, have commanded you". I think you will

follow from what I have said that there is in Scripture a real distinction between the two acts of pleasing God before us. May I in closing just refer to the wondrous privilege of both, and the wondrous privilege of knowing- more and more fully- the spiritual teaching of both. Oh what a mercy to realise what it is to be in Christ, because He took our place not under water, but under the waters of Divine wrath. What a mercy to realise what it is to feed on Christ, and as the bread and the fruit of the vine become part of our earthly body, so His life is to be reproduced in increasing measure, not only in our individual, but in our collective assembly witness. This is only possible in the power of the Spirit of God. Oh that it may be our longing, and that our gracious God may be exalted.
