

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1235 – September 2, 2012
The Two Ordinances

Alright, today we come to point 11 in our Basics class and I'm going to combine point 11 and point 13 because they both deal with ordinances. Point 11 deals only with the ordinance of the Lord's Supper while point 13 deals with both the Lord's Supper and Baptism. So I think its best we put both of these together and deal with them in one lesson. Point 11 says,

We believe in Scriptural reception into an assembly, and the remembering of the Lord's death in the breaking of bread and drinking of the wine as the right only of those who have been born again of the Spirit of God. This right should, however, be exercised only by those who are walking in fellowship with the Lord (1 Cor. 11:20-34).

Point 13 says,

Although not required for salvation or membership in this church, we believe the Lord Jesus left for the obedience of His people two (2) ordinances, memorial in character, which are to continue during the Church Age: Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Baptism in the name of the Trinity is to show our union with Christ in His death, burial and resurrection (Matt. 28:19-20). The Lord's Supper, consisting of bread, symbolic of His broken body, and wine, symbolic of His shed blood, is a remembrance of Him who died for us, to be observed according to the Scriptures (1 Cor. 11:17-34).

Now both Baptism and the Lord's Supper have been highly debated since the time of the Reformation. In fact, it was these two issues that divided the Protestant groups into Reformed, Lutheran and Anabaptist. On what we would consider the more important issue of salvation the Protestants were at one. As Packer says, "Historically it is a simple matter of fact that Martin

Luther and John Calvin...and all the leading Protestant theologians of the...Reformation, stood on precisely the same ground...in asserting the helplessness of man and the sovereignty of God in grace..." However, on the secondary issues of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, they engaged in highly vitriolic debates. For example, Luther wrote to Zwingli on the issue of the Lord's Supper these words, "How true it is that the Devil is a master of a thousand arts! He proves this powerfully in the external rule of this world by bodily lusts, tricks, sins, murder, ruin, etc., but especially, and above all measure, in spiritual and external things which affect God's honor and our conscience. How he can turn and twist, and throw all sorts of obstacles in the way, to prevent men from being saved and abiding in the Christian truth!" Schaff says, "Luther goes on to trace the working of the Devil from the first corruptions of the gospel by heretics, popes, and Councils, down to Carlstadt and the Zwinglians, and mentions the Devil on every page."¹ That was customary of Luther, he attributed every evil, every misinterpretation as due to the Devil. And so if you disagreed with Luther you were of the Devil. I share that with you to give you an idea of the kind of temper involved in the debates among Protestants on these issues. They made every issue a major issue and that was probably their mistake, they weren't able to see there were tiers of truth so far as importance is concerned and they were going to the lockers over some of the truths in the lower tiers. At the same time they were in the midst of a tremendous upheaval with Rome so tensions were high. These men had, in a very real way, re-discovered salvation, in the sense of understanding how the benefits of Christ's cross were obtained by an individual. How does Christ's merit come to me? That was the major question of the Reformation. As John Hannah, Church History professor at DTS for many years said, "This is the grand point of dispute between Roman Catholics and Protestants!...not so much the crucial role of Christ's death but rather the manner of the procurement of His benefits." On the question, "How is a man made right with God?" Rome answered, justifying grace is progressively infused into the heart of the sinner through repetition of the sacraments so that he is progressively becoming righteous. On the same question the Protestants answered, justifying grace is instantaneously imputed to the account of the sinner through faith alone in Christ alone. So the issue was how the benefits of the cross came over to me and this is a major divide. The Protestants said if the grace is gradually infused into the heart through the sacraments as Rome insisted, then the sacraments become works that must be done to procure grace. And then justification is no longer

by faith alone. So they rejected sacramental grace, they rejected the idea that any grace was transferred to the participant in the sacrament.

Now this is a major issue and this is how the big issue of justification got tied in to the issues of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Is justifying grace being dispensed through these sacraments? Or not? I've mentioned the word "sacrament" and so I want to define this word and distinguish it from an "ordinance." Our statement uses the term "ordinance," not "sacrament" and it does that on purpose. Back at the time of the Reformation both Rome and Protestants used the term sacrament but now the term ordinance is typically used by Protestants while sacrament is used by Rome. A sacrament refers to the mystical nature of the elements, the bread and the wine in the Lord's Supper and the water in Baptism. Sacramentalists believe that these elements impart grace to the participant in the process of justification. An ordinance refers to the rite or practice of partaking of the elements as the Lord commanded. The elements do not impart grace to the participant but are symbols or signs. We hold that the elements are symbols or signs and do not convey any grace to the participant but are rather memorial in character.

So I'll use both terms but understand I do not mean the same thing by those terms, they are not interchangeable. And let's turn our attention to the number of sacraments and ordinances. If you look at these as sacraments as the Roman Catholic Church does then there are seven. Peter Lombard decided on seven, there were other Roman Catholics who posited more or less but seven became the accepted number. If you look at them as ordinances as the Protestant Church does then there are usually two and sometimes three. The two most Protestants hold too are Baptism and the Lord's Supper, a third sometimes included is foot washing. For example, the Grace Brethren and some Mennonites hold that Christ commanded His followers to wash others feet on the basis of John 13:12-17. However, nowhere else is foot washing treated by the NT writers as an ordinance and most Christians think that the foot washing episode was a metaphor designed to teach us to serve others humbly. In the 1st century people wore sandals down the dusty streets and got their feet dirty. Jesus was washing their feet in order to demonstrate humility in serving others and he was saying you should serve others humbly. I suspect that if Jesus were living in 21st century America He would have chosen another act to demonstrate humility in serving others since we don't normally walk up and down dusty streets in sandals. So we

don't hold that foot washing is an ordinance Christ left the Church. We hold there are two ordinances Christ left His Church; Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Let's take up the first one - Baptism, by which we're referring to the ritual baptism by water. So when I say it's a ritual, again I'm referring to it as an ordinance and not a sacrament. Everyone who holds to infant baptism holds in some form or fashion that baptism is a sacrament and that it is communicating grace to the participant. Infant baptism was held early on in the Church and Augustine of Hippo taught that if you didn't baptize your infant you were a bad parent because if the infant died it was damned to hell. So he held to baptismal regeneration of infants and this error has continued down through the Church. There is nothing communicated in baptism and there is no reason to baptize an infant. Then the Roman Catholic Church took up Augustine's concept arguing that infant baptism removed original sin so that the infant was restored to having free will and could cooperate with God in salvation by keeping the other sacraments. As they state it, "If any one denies, that, but the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted; or even asserts that the whole of that which has the true and proper nature of sin is not taken away...let him be anathema." So they're quite serious about water baptism, it's a big deal in Roman Catholicism, it's actually involved in the process of regeneration but that is an error that has been passed down and is still with us today. Paul said Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel. So baptism has nothing to do with the gospel. It's simply a ritual that memorializes the real baptism of the Spirit.

Along another line, Reformed theologians who hold that the Church has replaced Israel or the Church is Israel often argue that because an infant in OT Israel was circumcised to enter the chosen people of God as it then existed, so now infant baptism is a valid practice that makes an infant a member of the visible Church and is a pledge on the part of God that, if sincere and faithful he shall partake of all the benefits of the redemption of Christ. However, the problem with this, beyond the fact that the Church is not Israel, is that the infant isn't consciously sincere or faithful about anything. The real problem is saying Israel in the OT is the Church and therefore circumcision, which did introduce a child to identity within the covenant people of Israel, finds it's parallel in infant baptism which

introduces a child into membership in the visible Church and sets them up for future regeneration by the faithfulness of God. The fact is again, infant baptism is nothing more than a ritual, it accomplishes nothing real, and it confers no benefit on the infant.

Another line of argument that people have used for the practice of infant baptism is that the NT reference to the household. As in Acts 16:31 where Paul tells the Philippian jailer, “Believe on the Lord Jesus and you shall be saved, you and your household.” Certainly advocates claim the household contained infants. And therefore we must practice infant baptism. It should be pointed out however, that Paul told those in the household to believe, not to be baptized and that clearly Paul is addressing members of the household who can meet that condition. Infants cannot meet that condition and so are not addressed. Paul’s point with these passages is simply to make clear that everyone in the household comes to Christ in the same way, through faith, there is only one way of salvation, believe in the Lord Jesus.

Those are all sacramental views of baptism that people believe through the water baptism some grace is communicated to the participant. We disagree with this. We hold to the ordinance view of baptism, that it is memorial in character, a ritual that portrays the real baptism of the Spirit and is for believers only. This would be in line with the Anabaptist tradition and is followed by Baptists and independent Bible churches. After a person has believed in the Lord Jesus they undergo baptism as an outward sign that depicts the reality underneath the sign, namely, Spirit baptism. The water does nothing mystical.

Alright, turn to Matt 28:19, the Great Commission. And let me define baptism before we get too far into this. What does the word baptism mean? Baptism is just a Greek word that was transliterated into the English because there were differences in the Church about the mode of baptism, whether you should sprinkle or immerse and so nobody wanted to translate it, they just took it over from the Greek. So now we have this word everybody is confused about. The word essentially means “identification,” to be thoroughly identified with someone or something. For example, in Bible times they would take a white fabric and dip it into another color to dye it. Lydia in the Book of Acts sold purple garments and she made these by taking the white garment and dipping it in a purple dye collected from a certain sea

mollusk. That process of dipping the garment in the dye was known as baptizing, the garment was baptized because it was so identified with the purple dye that it was now considered a purple garment, so its essential identity had been changed. And in the ritual of water baptism the point is to signify that through Spirit baptism they had become thoroughly identified with the person and work of Jesus Christ.

Many Christians think the Great Commission is to go take the gospel to all nations, to go evangelize the world. That is not the Great Commission. Even if you evangelized the whole world and lots of people became believers you would not have fulfilled the Great Commission because that's not what it is. As normal people don't read out of the text what is there, they read into the text what they have assumed. Notice Matt 28:19, "Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age." Now did it say anywhere in there go and make believers, go evangelize? No, it said, go and make disciples. Believers and disciples aren't always the same thing; in some contexts they are but in most contexts they are not. The Greek word "disciples" means "a learner, a student, a pupil," and Jesus is commissioning His apostles to go and make students, Bible students. So "Go therefore," participle of attendant circumstance, it's not an imperative but it has imperatival force, and it assumes evangelism, he is telling them to "go," but the imperative in the entire sentence is, "make disciples of all nations." That is, you take those who you evangelize or who have been evangelized and you train them, you disciple them. Well, how do you do that? How do you make disciples? Jesus uses two participles to explain how to make disciples. First of all, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit," that's water baptism, it's a ritual baptism administered by men, so it's the ritual, nothing occurs in the water other than the person gets wet. But what the person is saying by getting baptized is I am taking the first step toward being a true disciple of the Lord. I am now enrolling in Jesus Christ's school and I am actively pursuing learning His curriculum, I want to know His word. So this is a ritual baptism in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit that inducts you into Christ's school and it's very important to finish the school, to stay with it until the end of your life.

Now let's comment on the issue, baptism **in the name** there, **name**, singular, **of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit**, that's the Trinity, there's one name or essence and three persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. But the reason I want to comment on this is because our statement takes it like it's a baptismal formula and that's the way the Eastern Churches take it but this seems to have a problem. What I'm asking is when you go out and baptize someone in the creek do you have to say, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit," is that what Jesus is instructing the Church to do, or is something else being said here? Because if you turn to the Book of Acts you'll see that the apostles did not baptize in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, they only baptized in the name of Jesus. Acts 2:38 and as you can see, what I'm doing here is disagreeing with our statement. So as I do this I want you to recognize that I'm illustrating to you that the Bible is the final authority; creeds and doctrinal formulations are not on the same level as Scripture, they are important for articulating what a group believes the Scriptures are teaching but ultimately when it comes down to it all creeds are subject to the Scripture. I'm also subject to the Scripture so if I find something in our statement that is contrary to Scripture then I have to go with what? The Scripture. Doctrinal statements can change but the word of God is forever. Now in doing this I'm not rushing off headlong; I'm very careful and sensitive to this because I think it's serious. So keep that in mind as we go through. All I'm saying is I don't think the apostles understood Jesus to be giving them a baptismal formula. Because if they thought that why did they baptize 3,000 on the Day of Pentecost in the name of Jesus only? Acts 2:38, "Peter *said* to them, "Repent, and each of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Why didn't Peter say, be baptized in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit? Because evidently Peter didn't understand our Lord to be giving a baptismal formula in Matt 28. Turn to Acts 8:16, that was Jews, this is Samaritans. Philip had preached to them and they believed. But verse 16, Peter came up because when they believed the Holy Spirit did not fall on them, there are strange things happening in the period of Acts because it's a transitional period. Notice verse 16, "For He [the Spirit] had not yet fallen upon any of them; they had simply been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Not the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. So again, simply baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus. Now Acts 10:48 and we come to the Gentiles. Peter has been preaching at Cornelius' house, they believed and the Holy Spirit did fall upon

them, and then notice his instruction in verse 48. “And he ordered them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.” Not the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Isn’t that interesting? I’ve shown you three passages, all involving Peter in some way. Lastly I’ll take you to Acts 19:5 and this is Paul. Peter and Paul are the two most visible apostles in Scripture. The first three examples were Peter, here’s an example from Paul. Paul found these strange believers in Ephesus, they had been out by the Jordan when John the Baptist was preaching and had repented and promised to believe in the one John pointed out as the Messiah, but they left the Promised Land before Jesus arrived. So they never found out who the Messiah was. Here it is years later, Paul points out the Messiah is Jesus and they were believing in Him. Verse 5, “When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.” Notice again, you don’t see baptized in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, you just see “the name of the Lord Jesus.” So what I would say was that Jesus in the Great Commission was not giving a baptismal formula but rather the key is understanding the significance of the term “name,” that term means “authority” and Jesus is telling them to baptize in the authority of the Triune God. In other words the Triune God is authorizing them to baptize others. So it’s not a baptismal formula, it’s an authorization by the Triune God for them to baptize. And this is evidenced by the fact when they actually baptized people they baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Let’s turn to Rom 6 because the ritual baptism with water is a depiction of the real baptism of the Holy Spirit and what He does at the moment we trust in Christ. The context is living the new life, how do we live the Christian life? What are the mechanics of victory? Well, it is very important to recognize verse 3, “Or do you not know that all of us have been baptized into Christ Jesus have been baptized into His death?” So this is not talking about water baptism, this is talking about Spirit baptism. Spirit baptism is a real baptism not a ritual. The ritual just depicts outwardly the inward reality. The inward reality is that the Holy Spirit baptized us into Christ Jesus, namely, into His death, burial and resurrection. Verse 4, “Therefore we have been buried with Him through baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life. ⁵For if we have become united with *Him* in the likeness of His death, certainly we shall also be *in the likeness* of His resurrection, ⁶knowing this, that our old self was crucified with *Him*, in order that our body of sin might be done away with, so that we would no longer be slaves to sin; ⁷for he who has died is freed

from sin.” He’s arguing for the freedom from the power of sin over your life, you no longer have to sin, the power of the sin nature has been broken and now we are to reckon ourselves dead to sin and alive to God, this is the battle cry for victory. Verse 8, “Now if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him, ⁹knowing that Christ, having been raised from the dead, is never to die again; death no longer is master over Him.” See, death no longer has power over him so it no longer has power over you because your old sin nature died with Him and was buried and you have been given a new nature that is not subject to the power of sin. Verse 10, “For the death that He died, He died to sin once for all; but the life that He lives, He lives to God. ¹¹Even so consider yourselves to be dead to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus. ¹²Therefore do not let sin reign in your mortal body so that you obey its lusts, ¹³and do not go on presenting the members of your body to sin *as* instruments of unrighteousness; but present yourselves to God as those alive from the dead, and your members *as* instruments of righteousness to God.” Now this is a presentation you make as often as you like, daily would be good, presenting yourself to God as an instrument to do His will. This is how you have victory over the sin nature; you make this presentation of yourself. People argue over whether this is a once for all presentation or if it’s a once at a time presentation. I take it this is something you need to do all the time, present yourself to Him and do not present your members to sin or else you’ll fulfill it.

But the background of it all is that when you trusted in Jesus Christ the power of the sin nature was broken and you no longer have to obey the sin nature, now you can have victory over the sin nature, it is no longer the master over you, present yourself to Him and as chapter 8 will say, live by the Spirit and you will have victory! It’s the real baptism of the Spirit that makes this possible, and it’s the ritual baptism of the water that symbolizes this reality.

Therefore water baptism is not necessary to salvation. Salvation is by faith alone. As Paul later says to the Corinthians, I wasn’t sent to baptize but to preach the gospel. But while water baptism is not essential to salvation it is essential to discipleship. It’s the first step, it’s the person who is already saved saying I want to enter into the discipleship process, I want to be separate from the world, I want to sit under the teachings of Jesus Christ.

He is my master and I want to learn from Him and live as Him. That's the ordinance of baptism.

Now we turn to the second ordinance, the Lord's Supper or Communion or the Eucharist or the breaking of bread, there are several expressions used to describe this ordinance. The expression Lord's Supper comes from the fact that the ordinance grew out of the Last Supper in the Upper Room so that's a good title for the ordinance. The expression Communion comes from the Greek word for fellowship or participation showing that the ordinance depicts our sharing in the spiritual union with Christ so that's a good term for the ordinance. The term Eucharist is the Greek word that means "to give thanks" but is used to communicate the idea that grace is communicated in the elements, so that's a sacramental understanding we wouldn't agree with. And the term breaking of bread refers to the breaking of Christ's body for our sin, so it depicts what Christ did for us on the cross in symbolic language and so it's a good expression. I agree with all this terminology except Eucharist. I can't agree that any grace is conferred mystically through the elements of bread and wine.

If you'll turn to 1 Cor 11 we'll make note of the four views since the time of the Reformation. And again, this was a hot topic at the time. The four views are transubstantiation, consubstantiation, spiritual and memorial. The first view is the Roman Catholic position; transubstantiation. What this doctrine teaches is that by the authorized priest's words in the service a miracle is performed and the bread and wine turn into the actual physical body and blood of Jesus Christ, so that you are eating Christ's flesh and drinking Christ's blood, although the bread and wine appear and taste like normal bread and wine. This is official Roman Catholic doctrine since the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. If anyone disagrees with it they are anathema. So then, in the Mass the actual body and blood of Jesus are offered up on the altar as a continual bloody sacrifice. This position rests on a wooden literal understanding of Jesus' words in the Last Supper, "This is my body" and Jesus' words, "unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you have no life in yourselves."

As for the critique of this view, first of all, if the bread and wine turn into Christ's actual body and blood then to eat Him is to commit cannibalism. Second, in the context where Jesus says eat my flesh and drink My blood He

is clearly speaking metaphorically. His meaning is that unless you partake of Me through faith then you have no part in Me. Jesus in the same passage said, "It is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh profits nothing;" so clearly even if the bread turned into Jesus' flesh it would not be beneficial to eat it. Jesus goes on to explain, "The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and are life. But there are some of you who do not believe." It was those who did not believe that did not understand the spiritual significance of what Jesus was saying and I'd put Roman Catholics in with them. Third, transubstantiation requires that each priest presiding over the Eucharist has miraculous apostolic powers and this is contrary to Scripture. There are no humans doing miracles today. God does miracles but God does not work miracles through men because that would authenticate them as apostles. Fourth, the continual offering of the body and blood of Christ on the altar is a denial of the once for all sacrifice of sins on the cross. Jesus Christ is not a continual sacrifice, He is a once for all sacrifice.

The second view is the Lutheran position; consubstantiation. This was developed by Luther and what this doctrine teaches is that there is a real presence of Jesus Christ in, with and under the elements, so that you are partaking of Christ but there is no change in the elements, they remain bread and wine and taste like bread and wine. Luther would argue that while this seems impossible we were not to try and rationally make sense of it, we are simply to receive it by faith that indeed Christ is present in, with and under the elements. As Luther said, when Jesus said "This is my body," "It is no longer mere bread of the oven but bread of flesh or bread of body. That is, bread which is sacramentally one with Christ's body." Such that the bread really is Christ's body, it does not merely represent Christ's body, the real presence of Christ's body is the bread, yet not that a change has taken place. Now I critique this view simply by saying that the body of the Lord Jesus Christ cannot really be present in the bread because it is really not omnipresent, but present only in heaven at the right hand of the Father. The eternal attributes of God are not transmitted to the body of the Lord Jesus or vice versa, but the hypostatic union requires that the attributes of divinity are not mixed with the attributes of humanity or vice versa yet also inseparable from. Secondly, I do think that Jesus is speaking figuratively and the Lutheran view rejects this. So I think consubstantiation is not the biblical doctrine.

The third view is the Calvinist position, what I call spiritual and is practiced in the Reformed Churches and this gets much closer to the truth. This view teaches that the elements are symbolic but when we partake of them the Holy Spirit confers a spiritual benefit upon us. Calvin says of the words “This is my body” as Christ was passing out the bread at the Passover that it is, “beyond all controversy that Christ is here speaking of the bread. Now the question is—“In what sense?” “That we may elicit the true meaning, we must hold that the expression is figurative; for, assuredly, to deny this is exceedingly dishonest.” So he means the figure of metonymy, that the bread is used as a symbol of the body and he says later, “I conclude that Christ’s body is really, (as the common expression is,)—that is, truly given to us in the Supper, to be wholesome food for our souls. I use the common form of expression, but my meaning is, that our souls are nourished by the substance of the body, that we may truly be made one with him, or, what amounts to the same thing, that a life-giving virtue from Christ’s flesh is poured into us by the Spirit, though it is at a great distance from us, and is not mixed with us.” So there is a spiritual benefit from partaking of the supper and that is why I call it the spiritual view of the Lord’s Supper. He says explicitly, “You see bread—nothing more—but you learn that it is a symbol of Christ’s body. Do not doubt that the Lord accomplishes what his words intimate—that the body...is given to thee as a spiritual repast. It seems incredible, that we should be nourished by Christ’s flesh, which is at so great a distance from us. Let us bear in mind, that it is a secret and wonderful work of the Holy Spirit.” So that’s the spiritual view of Calvin, much better but not the best because he still has a spiritual benefit coming through the elements.

The fourth view is the Zwinglian position, known as the memorial view and this is the Anabaptist tradition that came into Baptist circles and independent Bible Churches, which is what we practice, this view says that the elements are symbolic of the body and blood of Christ and is taken in memorial of what Christ has done for us through which we have become partakers through faith. It is evidenced by the fact that it grew out of the Passover which was memorial in character, so then it too is memorial in character. It is affirmed by the words of our Lord quoted in 1 Cor 11:24, “This is My body, which is for you; do this in remembrance of Me.” And again in verse 25, “This cup is the new covenant in My blood; do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.” Both statements of our Lord emphasize the memorial character of the Supper. Further, verse 26, it is a proclamation of

the Lord's death which are signified by the bread and the cup, "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes." By saying "until He comes" He limits the partaking of this Supper to His Second Coming. And yet, if there is some spiritual benefit conferred in the elements then why would they be taken away at His Coming? Would they not still confer a benefit? By so much we can infer that no spiritual benefit is conferred through the elements in the Supper but rather what they signify should be dwelt upon intensely so as to be reminded once more of all that He has done for us.

The important point is to recognize that sacraments and ordinances are not the same thing; sacraments convey a spiritual benefit to the partaker; with baptism it is commonly believed that it prepares one for or contributes to salvation; with the Lord's Supper it is commonly believed that it contributes grace upon the participant in the process of salvation or spiritual growth. This couldn't be further from the truth. There is nothing mystically transmitted to the participant in either of these ordinances. They are rituals memorializing the death of Christ and our co-death, co-burial and co-resurrection with Christ through faith that we practice until He comes.

¹ Schaff, P., & Schaff, D. S. (1910). *History of the Christian church*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2012