

**Articles and Sermons :: Tozer believed in Consubstantiation****Tozer believed in Consubstantiation - posted by sdidde (), on: 2018/8/7 22:14**

I recently listened to a sermon by Tozer, where he explicitly stated the process of consubstantiation, as defined by Luther.

I wish I could quote the reference, but my question is, was this a belief that Tozer had early in his ministry, or was it something he believed in, throughout his ministry?

I know this is a non-essential but still would like to know.

Re: Tozer believed in Consubstantiation - posted by Heydave (), on: 2018/8/8 4:52

'Consubstantiation'? I can even say it, never mind know what it is! :)

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2018/8/8 5:58

Consubstantiation, the doctrine, especially in Lutheran belief, that the substance of the bread and wine coexists with the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist.

I believe Tozer believed the Lord's Supper was more than just symbolism but rather there was a mystical sense to it of Christ's body and blood. Many reformed groups even in the symbolism camp would have wording in their liturgies that essentially the elements are so holy that they should be treated "as-if" they were the body and blood of our Lord.

The modern way of being careless with the Lord's Supper in some modern evangelical churches is a down-trodding of all that is holy in the Church.

God has always shown me since I was a young believer that there is a mystery to it and it should be done very reverently when taking the Lord's Supper.

A reading of John 6 surely opens our eyes to this.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2018/8/8 10:13

Jesus said that 'when two or three gather in His name, there He is in the midst of them'.

So any time we meet together 'in His name' we should be reverent and aware that He is with us, in our midst. This is true of the Lord's supper (bread and wine), but not any more so than other acts of worship.

I don't think we have to have a mystical, or superstitious attitude to have an awareness to Christ being with us. If we look at when Christ instituted this at Passover with His Apostles, He was actually present with them (physically and spiritually) yet said the bread was His body and the wine was His blood. Surely he meant 'it represents His body and blood' because His blood was still in His veins and He was there in body! In the same way today, He is present spiritually with us when we gather in His name, and not in some strange way 'in the bread and wine'.

It seems to me that it may be that this 'consubstantiation' doctrine was a compromise by Luther to reject the RC 'Transubstantiation' teaching, but offer an alternative and lesser mystical experience that still satisfied the religious heart.

Edit: Added to paragraph 3

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/8/8 10:48

I think the "mystical" aspect simply means that something special is happening when believers take the Lord's Supper.

I have seen youth group kids take communion using pizza and coke and that did not sit right with me. There was no reverence or reflection. Could there be reverence and reflection if pizza and coke are used for the communion elements? Possibly, but I think someone like Art Katz would gag over the idea.

I think it should be a solemn sacrament.

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2018/8/8 11:15

I am a firm believer that the Lord's Supper is not just mere symbolism. The level of consequences that are shown in Corinthians testifies to this. If it were merely a symbolic act, then why was the Lord judging (and even killing!) the Corinthian believers over their haphazard taking of it?

I actually don't agree that something happens to the wine (or Welch's, if you go to my church...lol) or the bread (cracker if you are at my church) when you take it. That's silly. Something happens to the PARTICIPANT.

Seems to me that the following things happen to the believer:

- 1) They self examine
- 2) The Holy Spirit convicts
- 3) The believer responds in repentance and worship
- 4) The sacrifice of Jesus is magnified
- 5) God in His grace, reminds them that Jesus is indeed the Passover, purchasing for us our pardon
- 6) The believer takes it (if done appropriately) to display the inward working of the Spirit in his life, even in that moment.

That is not just a symbol. The Spirit of God is doing something in the heart of the believer at that time. There have been times where I have been preparing to partake in the Lord's Supper and have had to make sure that I forgive/repent/etc before I do so--and that is prompted by the Spirit, as shown in Corinthians.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/8/8 11:19

This is not a vote necessarily for consubstantiation, but what Greg said was spot-on. AMEN and AMEN.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/8/8 11:37

Like Havok: I too believe communion is more than the elements, it involves the active presence of Jesus, the active faith of the believer and the understanding of what partaking of communion truly means.

The warning in 1: Cor 11:29 align with the warnings found in numerous places For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.

The Arc, the tent of meeting, the sacrifices, the fire, the blood all symbolic and all were held sacred; these were not sacred by reason of their manufacture but by reason of God who sanctifies the article.

I love taking communion and I hate when it's treated like a bullet point in a service order.

There is more to communion than symbol, what is sacred is always more than symbol.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2018/8/8 11:41

In no way do I suggest that we should be lighthearted or casual when taking the bread and wine in remembering the Lord's death 'until He comes'. However I do believe there is a lot of wrong 'church' tradition attached to it.

Havok,

Don't you consider that the 6 points you listed should apply all the time? I mean if a church only takes the Lord's supper once or twice a month, is it then OK not to examine yourself and repent the rest of the time? Does the Holy Spirit only convict at the Lord's supper? Should we not be conscious at all times that Christ is our sacrifice for sin, etc, etc?

What is often read during the Lord's supper in most churches from 1 Corinthians is in context a judgment against what was a total shambles of feasting and drunkenness, which I have never witnessed in any church. And yet this is put upon the church bringing condemnation to those weak in their faith.

Re: - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2018/8/8 12:14

I agree with Brother Greg and several of you that believe that most of the Church has not grasped or appropriated the real meaning and value of communion.

Whereas the Catholic Church falsely believes that the bread and the wine becomes the Body and blood of Jesus when consecrated by a priest, most of the Protestant Church does not embrace the spiritual reality of communion.

When we receive communion, by faith we are partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is not merely a ritual that we are going through.

If we can be sick by partaking of the Body and Blood of the Lord unworthily, we can also be healed by receiving communion as life for our whole being: spirit, soul, and body.

There is also an aspect of communion not only between the Lord and us, but the communion and fellowship with one another.

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2018/8/8 13:13

Hey Dave,

You said:

"Havok,

Don't you consider that the 6 points you listed should apply all the time? I mean if a church only takes the Lord's supper once or twice a month, is it then OK not to examine yourself and repent the rest of the time? Does the Holy Spirit only convict at the Lord's supper? Should we not be conscious at all times that Christ is our sacrifice for sin, etc, etc?"

Of course I believe that it should apply at all times.

On the opposite end, I would never say to anyone, "You've been seeking the Lord and repenting and worshipping every day. Take a break and partake in the Lord's supper." The point is that the Lord's Supper is a spiritual event and should not be treated as a mere physical event. Taking a shower is physical. You don't incur the judgment of God if you forget to scrub between your toes (although that's gross). But the Lord's Supper is Spiritual--you will incur judgment if you do not do it correctly within your heart.

Re: , on: 2018/8/9 1:21

Consubstantiation was a compromise by Luther. I think as always, context is key. If we read verses 17-34 we see what Paul was talking about, how the supper was being abused and there were folks there who were drunk or had plenty of food while others had little food at all. What a shambles. Paul was rightly disgusted and did not pull his punches. He straightly warned them about this lack of reverence. This drunkards and gluttons who disregarded their brothers and sisters and who were without holiness and righteousness in all of their dealings with the Lord would be dealt with by the Lord. Clearly our prime example is the last supper.

This is where Jesus gathers with His disciples and has a meal, a last meal, but a meal nonetheless. Then, as an example He takes the bread and the Wine as examples of His own Body and Blood and told the disciples every-time they gathered around the table, they were to remember Him. This has nothing to do with John 6, this is the classic mistake the Catholics made by taking literally what Jesus spoke of in the chapter, the bread and the wine, which represented everything He had taught them. They must accept fully and surrender to everything they He taught them for as it says in that very chapter that His Words were life indeed, His commands. In the same chapter Jesus tells us to beware of the bread of the Pharisees. He was referring to their teaching, then using the same example, He tells them about His bread, the true bread, the bread of life, the Word of God made flesh, the Word of God that leads us and guides us by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Remember how many millions of saints were martyred for rejecting the Catholic notion of the bread being His Body or of it having some mystical power when the only power is the power of the Holy Spirit that is with us daily. Every saint loves to remind Himself of what the Lord had done for us. It is no more and no less than that.....bro Frank

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2018/8/9 4:42

Frank,

Thanks for your input here, where you correctly puts Paul's rebuke in 1 Corinthians 11 in context and rightly say the last supper/passover is the prime example as it is referenced by Paul as such. This is important as taking the bread and wine is meant to be a blessing and confirmation of the New covenant, where we remember what we have in Christ, sins forgiven, reconciliation with God and a future hope of His return and kingdom.

It grieves me (and I think the Holy Spirit) that what is meant to be a blessing often becomes a condemnatory fear of partaking in case we are 'not worthy'. Here's how it is often presented in many churches:-

1. Before distributing the bread and wine 1 Cor 11:23-32 is read. Verses 17-22 or 33-34 are never read, which would give the correct context!
2. We are told we need to examine ourselves to see if any sin needs to be repented of. The implication here (from the passage read) is that you may not be worthy and will be drinking judgement on yourself.
3. After a few minutes of searching for any sins I need to acknowledge, the bread/wafer and wine/grape juice is distributed. Then there are those who rather than be drawn closer to the Lord in partaking are now unsure if they are 'worthy' (who is in themselves?) and exclude themselves adding to their problem. In fact the passage read (verse 29) does not say anything about sin in general, but 'not discerning the Lord's body'. The 'Lord's body' here in context is clearly the body of believers, the church.

Of course there are those who are strong in the faith and use this time (despite the misapplication of scripture) as a blessing to themselves, but the fact is this passage of scripture being used as a regular instruction at the Lord's Supper is wrong and stumbles many who may not be as strong or mature.

It amazes me that Christian churches who would normally be very zealous about correct exegesis will persist in such traditions from age to age and not be willing to rightly handle the word of God. But it is ever so!

Re: , on: 2018/8/9 8:53

Excellent Dave, could not agree more. Men love rituals, they always have. It is much easier to observe a ritual than to walk in the Spirit, so that path of least resistance is almost always taken.....bro Frank

Re: - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2018/8/9 9:35

The Importance of Communion - Derek Prince:

We have noted that the life is in the blood. (See Leviticus 17:11.) If we want the life, we must appropriate the blood. We do that by taking Communion, as well as by the word of our testimony.

To me, this matter of taking Communion has become extremely important. Paul quoted Jesus in 1 Corinthians 11:25, saying, "This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me." Many churches think that says, "As seldom as you do it." Some of the most beautiful services I have ever attended were liturgical Communion services; they were so beautiful because they held on to that fact.

At one point, my wife, Ruth, and I came to the conclusion that we were not taking Communion as often as we should. As the priest of our home, I decided we would have Communion every morning during our time with the Lord. I am not saying that every Christian should do this, but I am thankful that we did. We would have felt that something had dropped out of our lives if we had omitted it.

Every day, when we took Communion, we would say, "We receive this bread as Your flesh, Lord, and this wine as Your blood." I would do this in a simple, specific way, saying, "Lord, we are doing this in remembrance of You; we are proclaiming Your death until You come." In Communion, we have no past but the cross, no future but the coming. We do it in remembrance of the cross until Jesus comes. Let this compel us to consider whether we are really availing ourselves of the life that is in the blood.

Thank You, Lord, for the blood of the Lamb. I avail myself of the life that is in the blood through Communion, and I proclaim that I overcome Satan by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of my testimony, and I do not love my life to the death. Amen.

Re: - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2018/8/9 9:38

Thoughts On Communion - A.W. Tozer:

What a sweet comfort to us that our Lord Jesus Christ was once known in the breaking of the bread. In earlier Christian times, believers called the Communion "the medicine of immortality," and God gave them the desire to pray: Be known to us in breaking bread, but do not then depart; Savior, abide with us and spread Thy table in our heart. Some churches have a teaching that you will find God only at their table-and that you leave God there when you leave. I am so glad that God has given us light. We may take the Presence of the table with us. We may take the Bread of life with us as we go. Then sup with us in love divine, Thy body and Thy blood; That living bread and heavenly wine Be our immortal food! In approaching the table of our Lord, we dare not forget the cost to our elder Brother, the Man who was from heaven. He is our Savior; He is our Passover!

Re: , on: 2018/8/9 10:41

When a man or woman is born again of the Spirit, then the Lord takes up residence with that one in his heart, He is one with God because of the blood shed at Calvary, because the lord was willing to die for us. This is life and in this is all life. We do well to remember often what the Lord did for us, it gives our whole lives context, we live in the shadow of Calvary and in that shadow, under the wings of our Lord, there is peace in the sure knowledge that He has saved us and that we are His own. Anything that takes away from that or is miss applied is not of the Lord. He dwells not in temples made with human hands but dwells in us and among us. Communion is the gathering, breaking of bread is the remembering. Any attempts to make the bread itself the "communion," is not Biblical. There are no mystical or magical powers in any bread or any wine, to believe so is to have fallen captive to the teachings of Rome and not to stand alone upon the Word. Do well minded and good people believe otherwise, yes indeed, but it is the Scriptures that never change, not the traditions of men.....bro Frank

Re: - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2018/8/9 11:04

Excerpt from Like Christ

By Andrew Murray

Though the words of our Lord Jesus in the sixth of John were not spoken directly of the Lord's Supper, they are yet applicable to it, because they set forth that spiritual blessing of which the Holy Supper is the communication in a visible form. In eating the bread and drinking the wine, our spiritual life is not only strengthened because therein the pardon of our sins is signified and sealed to us, but because the Holy Spirit does indeed make us partakers of the very body and blood of our Lord Jesus as a spiritual reality. So one of our Reformed Church Catechisms, the Heidelberg (Qu. 78), puts it, "What is it then to eat the broken body and drink the shed blood of Christ" "It is not only to embrace with a believing heart the sufferings and death of Christ, and so to obtain the pardon of sin and life eternal; but moreover also that we are united to His sacred body by the Holy Ghost, who dwells both in Christ and in us, so that we, though Christ be in heaven and we on earth, are nevertheless flesh of His flesh and bones of His bones."

It is known that there are in our Protestant Churches three views of the Lord's Supper. On the one hand, the Lutheran with its consubstantiation, teaching that the body of our Lord is so present in the bread, that even an unbeliever eats no longer only bread, but the body of the Lord. On the other the Zwinglian view, according to which the effect of the Sacrament is a very impressive exhibition of the truth that the death of Christ is to us what wine and bread are to the body, and a very expressive confession of our faith in this truth, and so of our interest in the blessings of that death. As the Holy Spirit in the Word speaks to us through the ear, so in the Sacrament through the eye. Midway between these views is that of Calvin, who strongly urges that there is in it a mysterious blessing, not well to be expressed in words; that it is not enough to speak of the life which the Spirit gives to our spirit through faith but that there is a real communication by the Holy Spirit of the very flesh and blood of Jesus in heaven to our very body, so that in virtue of this we are called members of His body, and have His body in us as the seed of the spiritual body of the resurrection. While avoiding, on the one hand, the sacramentarian view of a change in the bread, it seeks to hold fast, on the other, the reality of a spiritual substantial participation of the very body and blood of our Lord Jesus.

This is not the place to enter on this more fully. But I am persuaded that, when a more scriptural view prevails as to the relation between body and spirit, it will not be thought strange to believe that without anything like a real presence in the bread itself. we are indeed fed with the very body and blood of our Lord Jesus. The body of our Lord is now a spiritual body, transfigured and glorified into the spirit-life of the heavenly world, the spirit and the body in perfect, unity and harmony, so that now the Holy Spirit can freely dispense and communicate that body as He will. Our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us; our bodies are members of Christ; our mortal board are even now being quickened and prepared by the indwelling Spirit for the resurrection (Rom. 8:11): why should it be thought strange that "by the Holy Spirit the communion" of the body of Christ, so distinctly promised, should be, not an Old Testament symbol or shadow, but a blessed heavenly reality?

Calvin's words are as follows: "I am not satisfied with the view of those who, while acknowledging that we have some kind of communion with Christ, only make us partakers of the Spirit, omitting all mention of flesh and blood." "In His humanity also the fulness of life resides, so that every one who communicates in His flesh and blood, at the same time enjoys the participation of life". The flesh of Christ is like a perennial fountain which transfuses into us the life flowing forth from the Godhead into itself. The communion of the flesh and blood of Christ is necessary to all who aspire to the Christian life. Hence these expressions: "The Church is the body of Christ." "Our bodies are the members of Christ." "We are members of His body, of His flesh and His bones." "What our mind does not comprehend, let faith receive, that the Spirit unites things separated by space. That sacred communion of flesh and blood by which Christ transfuses His life into us, just as if it penetrated our bones and marrow, He testifies and seals in the Supper, not by representing a vain or empty sign, but by these exerting an efficacy of the Spirit by which He fulfils what He promises." "I willingly admit anything which helps to express the true and substantial communication of the body and blood of the Lord, as exhibited to believers under the sacred symbols of the Supper, understanding that they are not received by the imagination or the intellect merely, but are enjoyed in reality as the food of eternal life." "We say that Christ descends to us, as well by the external symbol as by His Spirit, that He may truly quicken our souls by the substance of His flesh and blood." "Such is the corporeal presence which the sacrament requires, and which we say is here displayed in such power and efficacy, that it not only gives our minds undoubted assurance of heavenly life, but also secures the immortality of our flesh." - Calvin's Institutes 4. 17, §§ 7, 9, 10, 19, 24.

To the soul who seeks fully to live by Christ as He did by the Father, the sacrament is a real spiritual blessing, something more than what faith in the word gives. Let all the praying and believing and living in which we seek to realize the wonderful blessing of living just as Christ did by the Father, ever culminate in our communion of the body and blood at the L

ordâ€™s table. And let us go forth from each such celebration with new confidence, that what has been given and confirmed on the great day of the feast, will by Jesus Himself be maintained in power in the daily life through the more ordinary channels of His graceâ€”the blessed fellowship with Himself in the word and prayer.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2018/8/9 11:45

Frank said "Do well minded and good people believe otherwise, yes indeed, but it is the Scriptures that never change, not the traditions of men"

Amen! So why when scripture is put forth (in context) is it refuted by posting the teachings of men. Men are fallible, no matter how good these men might be.

Jesus said to the religious in His day "Your traditions nullify the word of God".

Re: - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2018/8/9 13:08

Quote //3. After a few minutes of searching for any sins I need to acknowledge, the bread/wafer and wine/grape juice is distributed. Then there are those who rather than be drawn closer to the Lord in partaking are now unsure if they are 'worthy' (who is in themselves?) and exclude themselves adding to their problem. In fact the passage read (verse 29) does not say anything about sin in general, but 'not discerning the Lord's body'. The 'Lord's body' here in context is clearly the body of believers, the church.//

Dave, are you saying that because they were abusing the Lord's supper they were being judged by the Lord (v.30) For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.

But if they were sinning in general they would not be judged.

In other words, are you saying that misusing the Lord's supper is the only sin that makes someone unworthy of it?

Sorry, I am just trying to understand what you're saying here.

The reason I asked is because you talked about correct Bible interpretation and right context which is something I am very passionate about.

Correct Bible interpretation takes the following steps:

1. Read the text in its original context.
2. Draw a general principle.
3. Apply the principle to any context.

Brother Frank did step 1 for us and we don't need to do steps 2, 3 either because Paul in that case does that for us as well.

Here the general principle the apostle draws found in verses 31,32 and which could be applied to any situation.

""31 For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.

32 But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world."

Edited...

Re: - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2018/8/9 13:49

I think we insist on fooling ourselves that the problem of our age is that we condemn ourselves too much, when in fact if we have an iota of honesty we would admit that the problem is licence and the absence of the fear of God.

Some would dare to say that we don't need revivals of the past with all that overemphasis on holiness and conviction of sin. What we really need instead is revival of the realization of our sonship.

How foolish to think that sonship preceds repentance and humiliation or that glory preceds the cross..

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2018/8/9 16:11

Hi Fifi,

Thank you for asking.

First, please do not misunderstand me, I'm not at all suggesting that we should not judge ourselves and that God will not judge sin in general. Yes that is a general principle that we should and He will.

But yes I am saying that in this letter of Paul to the Corinthian church he is saying that God was judging them specifically for abusing the Lord's supper and not discerning (recognising) the Lord's body. This is the context of why they were being judged here, for this specific sin.

My point is that we should be judging ourselves all the time and there is nothing particularly unique (in this regard) about the Lord's supper in this. Jesus told us that before we go to worship, if we have anything against a brother, we must first be reconciled to our brother before we offer our worship. You rarely hear anyone say at the beginning of a service, now please examine yourself to see if there is any sin before we begin our worship. Then there is Ananias and Sapphira who were judged by God and no mention they were partaking of the bread and wine when they lied.

No, my concern is that we over emphasize and misapply the judgement we read here in 1 Corinthians and (probably because of a wrong mystical/superstitious view of the actual bread and wine elements) put people into a wrong thinking and fleshly fear, rather than draw them to Christ in a Godly reverent fear. I have no problem with the Lord's supper being a reverent time and even taking time to reflect and judge ourselves. It is the reading of a passage about a judgement for extreme abuse of the Lord's supper and applying it to every Lord's supper I have a problem with. If the context is explained then that would be fine, but it never is in my experience.

Wrong doctrine leads to wrong practice and I have witnessed churches where they have abstained from taking the bread and wine for a matter of months because there was disunity in the church. So rather than get things right, they carried on, but I guess they thought that if they did not take the bread and wine (I mean the whole church) they would not get judged and die. This is crazy! Sin is sin and will result in judgement if not repented of, Lord's supper or not.

Re: - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2018/8/9 16:38

Wholeheartedly agree. Thanks so much for this explanation, Dave.

Re: - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2018/8/10 7:24

Amen! So why when scripture is put forth (in context) is it refuted by posting the teachings of men. Men are fallible, no matter how good these men might be.

Dave,
Yes brother, men are fallible, and you are fallible, so you believe that your interpretation of the scriptures concerning communion are correct, and Tozer, Andrew Murray, and Derek Prince are in error.

I believe that communion is a communion with the Body of Christ (church), and the literal Body and Blood of Christ.

Does not the cup of thanksgiving for which we give thanks a participation in the blood of Christ? And is not the bread that we break a participation in the body of Christ? (1 Corinthians 10:16).

The cup of wine is not the blood of Christ, but when we drink the cup by faith in the blood of Jesus, we are spiritually by rightly drinking the wine partaking of the life that is in the precious blood.

For me receiving communion in the right way, more than a remembrance, but a participation in the Body and Blood of Christ makes the truth of the Body and Blood a greater reality.

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2018/8/10 8:32

Sometimes I think we lose our minds when we read the Bible. I like context. I am a staunch proponent of keeping things in the context. But 1 Corinthians is not a book addressing only the Corinthian believers of that century. It applies, in its entirety, to us today. Did Jesus intend for that passage to apply to anyone other than the Corinthians? All scripture is good for training in righteousness.

There is nothing mystical about the bread or wine. I agree with this wholeheartedly. However, this is not merely a ritual-Jesus established rituals. Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Church order, Church Offices, the means of Salvation, and everything else that Jesus established are spiritual matters. They affect us spiritually.

The kind of thinking that relegates the Lord's Supper and Baptism to mere symbolism also allows for people to be converted and never partake in those events at all. While I don't believe either to be necessary for salvation, we rob people of grace and worship and closeness to the Lord when we ascribe those events as only symbolic.

I thank God that when I take the Lord's supper, it is both a sombre/joyous occasion. It is incredibly worshipful, and if I were to be honest, probably my favorite mode of worship. Do I think the wine is blood. No. Do I think if it is grape juice that I've done something wrong. No. Do I think the bread or cracker is flesh. No. The spiritual even occurs within me and within the greater congregation as we all partake together. It drives us to unity as we are all experiencing the same thing with our One Lord.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/8/10 10:00

Amen Havok.

If I remember hearing Art Katz correctly he had a little "communion kit" that held the elements and he took communion every morning privately along with reading his "Psalm of the day."

One of the most meaningful, worshipful and prophetic experiences I have ever experienced was an intimate communion taken with a small group that I used to pray with on Saturday mornings. We arrived to pray and unbeknownst to us one of the guys arrived early and arranged communion in the room where we prayed. As each of us entered the room he gave us a hug and said "there is a place prepared for you."

It still gives me goosebumps writing this.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/8/10 11:00

A couple of things...

"teachings of men" There's plenty of that out there, but to relegate anything that runs counter to our own private understanding of things as 'teachings of men' is immature. If that were the case, literally every post made on this website could be deemed 'teachings of men' and therewith all that is written can be dismissed as useless unbiblical nonsense. Do you all really think that everything you say and others say is just 'teachings of men'?

Foxes book of Martyrs has a lot of testimony regarding the persecution and death of many a saint because of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

But behind transubstantiation there is a greater and more substantial cause for the death of the saints. That being it took a special priest with special powers to perform the Mass and say the right words whereby the elements would transform into the actual body and blood of Christ.

To invalidate transubstantiation is to invalidate the necessity of a special priesthood...which also became a main tenant of the reformation and it invalidated the necessity of papal power to confer authority upon the priests. The false doctrine was only the symptom, the real cause was the usurping of men over the place of God.

Point is, behind errors lay causes and they are not recognized by quick dismissals of others simply because understandings are different.

You see, if were simply a doctrinal perspective...no one need die over perspective, but when it comes to power, position, ego, pride...then it's no longer opinion but a fight to keep what you believe is yours by right.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/8/10 11:33

excerpt from Foxes book of Martyrs, Richard Sharpe.

"Neighbors, bear me record that yonder idol (pointing to the altar) is the greatest and most abominable that ever was; and I am sorry that ever I denied my Lord God!" Notwithstanding the constables were ordered to apprehend him, he was suffered to go out of the church; but at night he was apprehended and carried to Newgate. Shortly after, before the chancellor, denying the Sacrament of the altar to be the body and blood of Christ, he was condemned to be burned by Mr. Dalby. He was burnt the seventh of May, 1558, and died godly, patiently, and constantly, confessing the Protestant articles of faith. With him suffered Thomas Hale, shoemaker, of Bristol, who was condemned by Chancellor Dalby. These martyrs were bound back to back.

And if that testimony is not strong enough, allow Mrs Prest to show you what it means to follow Christ at the cost of everything.

Bishop. I promise you, you are a jolly Protestant. I pray you in what school have you been brought up?

Mrs. Prest. I have upon the Sundays visited the sermons, and there have I learned such things as are so fixed in my breast, that death shall not separate them.

B. O foolish woman, who will waste his breath upon thee, or such as thou art? But how chanceth it that thou wentest away from thy husband? If thou wert an honest woman, thou wouldst not have left thy husband and children, and run about the country like a fugitive.

Mrs. P. Sir, I labored for my living; and as my Master Christ counselleth me, when I was persecuted in one city, I fled into another.

B. Who persecuted thee?

Mrs. P. My husband and my children. For when I would have them to leave idolatry, and to worship God in heaven, he would not hear me, but he with his children rebuked me, and troubled me. I fled not for whoredom, nor for theft, but because I would be no partaker with him and his of that foul idol the Mass; and wheresoever I was, as oft as I could, upon Sundays and holydays. I made excuses not to go to the popish Church.

B. Belike then you are a good housewife, to fly from your husband the Church.

Mrs. P. My housewifery is but small; but God gave me grace to go to the true Church.

B. The true Church, what dost thou mean?

Mrs. P. Not your popish Church, full of idols and abominations, but where two or three are gathered together in the name of God, to that Church will I go as long as I live.

B. Belike then you have a church of your own. Well, let this mad woman be put down to prison until we send for her husband.

band.

Mrs. P. No, I have but one husband, who is here already in this city, and in prison with me, from whom I will never depart.

Some persons present endeavoring to convince the bishop she was not in her right senses, she was permitted to depart. The keeper of the bishop's prisons took her into his house, where she either spun worked as a servant, or walked about the city, discoursing upon the Sacrament of the altar. Her husband was sent for to take her home, but this she refused while the cause of religion could be served. She was too active to be idle, and her conversation, simple as they affected to think her, excited the attention of several Catholic priests and friars. They teased her with questions, until she answered them angrily, and this excited a laugh at her warmth.

"Nay," said she, "you have more need to weep than to laugh, and to be sorry that ever you were born, to be the chaplains of that whore of Babylon. I defy him and all his falsehood; and get you away from me, you do but trouble my conscience. You would have me follow your doings; I will first lose my life. I pray you depart."

"Why, thou foolish woman," said they, "we come to thee for thy profit and soul's health." To which she replied, "What profit ariseth by you, that teach nothing but lies for truth? how save you souls, when you preach nothing but lies, and destroy souls?"

"How provest thou that?" said they.

"Do you not destroy your souls, when you teach the people to worship idols, stocks, and stones, the works of men's hands? and to worship a false God of your own making of a piece of bread, and teach that the pope is God's vicar, and hath power to forgive sins? and that there is a purgatory, when God's Son hath by His passion purged all? and say you make God and sacrifice Him, when Christ's body was a sacrifice once for all? Do you not teach the people to number their sins in your ears, and say they will be damned if they confess not all; when God's Word saith, Who can number his sins? Do you not promise them trentals and dirges and Masses for souls, and sell your prayers for money, and make them buy pardons, and trust to such foolish inventions of your imaginations? Do you not altogether act against God? Do you not teach us to pray upon beads, and to pray unto saints, and say they can pray for us? Do you not make holy water and holy bread to fray devils? Do you not do a thousand more abominations? And yet you say, you come for my profit, and to save my soul. No, no, one hath saved me. Farewell, you with your salvation."

During the liberty granted her by the bishop, before-mentioned, she went into St. Peter's Church, and there found a skillful Dutchman, who was affixing new noses to certain fine images which had been disfigured in King Edward's time; to whom she said, "What a madman art thou, to make them new noses, which within a few days shall all lose their heads?" The Dutchman accused her and laid it hard to her charge. And she said unto him, "Thou art accursed, and so are thy images." He called her a whore. "Nay," said she, "thy images are whores, and thou art a whore-hunter; for doth not God say, 'You go a whoring after strange gods, figures of your own making? and thou art one of them.'" After this she was ordered to be confined, and had no more liberty.

Re: - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2018/8/10 12:44

Quote

//You see, if were simply a doctrinal perspective...no one need die over perspective, but when it comes to power, position, ego, pride...then it's no longer opinion but a fight to keep what you believe is yours by right.//

Thank you, Marvin for pointing that out.

I guess I will dare to ask this. Does the death of a martyr for his or her stand for a certain doctrine necessarily and automatically validate that that doctrine is correct?

If someone believes with his whole heart that a certain doctrine is false, to him it is false. It would be violation of conscience and a denial of Christ for safety's sake to embrace what he knows to be false.

But for those who do not believe it to be false, but rather are wholeheartedly convinced it is true and biblical. Are they in danger of violating conscience and denying Christ?

There were people who believed and died a martyr's death for their stand on infant baptism, yet we have to this day people who still believe in infant baptism who we have no doubt are children of God. Yes, infant baptism is false, but to those who believe it is okay. Are they in danger of violating their conscience and denying Christ, and therefore on their way to hell?

I, for one stand on middle ground when it comes to the Lord's supper. I do not believe as the Catholics that something magical happens to the elements, that regardless of the heart condition of the partaker, he will receive cleansing along with the bread and wine.

On the other hand, I do not believe that it is merely symbolic.

I believe that just as with the woman who by Faith touched the hem of Jesus' garment and was healed while many others who crowded, pushed him were not.

So, here also, the faith of the partaker can make the difference between mere bread and wine or the cleansing power of the broken body and shed blood of the Lord.

And no, I do not believe that faith creates reality. I simply believe that faith receives the promise.

Re: , on: 2018/8/11 1:13

To be fair Havok, Dave and I both stated that good men were involved in the established practices of the church, no one mentioned baptism, not sure why you threw that in there, but since you mentioned it, baptism became a horrendous tradition of men whereby they departed from the Scriptures and baptized babies and burned those at the stake who did not. I am very sure that people have felt wonderful and close to God as they performed this ritual on their children. What one feels has nothing to do with the Word. If that were the case then charismatics all over the world who are "slain in the Spirit," or barking like dogs must be correct because they feel wonderfully close to God while they do it.

Anyone ever wonder why there was never any sacrament of washing each other's feet as the Lord commended that we do? We pick and choose obviously. Bottom line, there has been no bigger ritual instigated by men and there were more people killed over this particular ritual than any other, even more than the killing of those who rejected infant baptism. I have no doubt that good men have baptized babies, they were wrong. I have no doubt they felt wonderfully close to God while they baptized their babies, they were wrong. We stand upon the Word and yes indeed what Paul wrote to the Corinthians absolutely applies to us all right down through the ages to us today. Do we practice what was taught in this chapter? How about the next chapter about the gifts or the 14th chapter about how we gather. All of this has been replaced by the traditions of men and men like it so.....bro Frank

Re: - posted by StirltUp (), on: 2018/8/11 3:59

Beautiful example Todd!

Those stand out experiences where a believer takes God's Word and puts it into practice in a simple but powerful way.

I once had a similar experience with foot washing.

Blessings,