

The
TWIN MEMORIALS

THE SACRAMENT

(The Memorial of Sacrifice)

and

THE WASHING OF
THE SAINTS' FEET

(The Memorial of Service)

By J. A. RUTMAN

Editor of

THE GOSPEL BANNER

and Editor of

REDEMPTION COMPLETED

and

OLD TESTAMENT MESSAGES OF PROMISE

THE BETHEL PUBLISHING CO.

NEW CARLISLE, OHIO.

REV. J. E. HANEN
66 HALLWOOD AVE.
DAYTON, OHIO

Jasper A. Hoffmann
9/15/69

DEDICATORY.

To my beloved church, The Men-
nonite Brethren in Christ, in which
the "Twin Memorials" have been sa-
credly observed, and in which I have
all reason to believe they shall continue
to be observed until Jesus comes, I
humbly dedicate this little volume.

REV. J. E. HANEN
1943 GRAND AVE.
DAYTON 7, OHIO

THE TWIN MEMORIALS

A memorial is a thing which perpetuates in memory a person, a thing or an act. It may be a statue, a poem, an act or anything which is designed to perpetuate memory. The memorials of which I speak are the Memorial of Service and the Memorial of Sacrifice, commonly called the sacrament and the ordinance of the washing of the saints' feet. I call them *twins* because they are the results of one birth. They were instituted at the same time, in the same room, by the same Lord and Master and in the midst of the same company of disciples. Why the one is so emphasized and the other minimized may indeed be a timely question.

If we as a church are persisting in the practice of a useless, meaningless and unauthorized ordinance in the washing of the saints' feet, we should do our best to discover the fact, and discontinue the same. If we are practicing a significant and divinely instituted and authorized ordinance, we should declare for the same more intelligently and persistently, despised and unpopular as it may be.

McA
BV
873
.F7
H84
C.2

Before discussing the practicability of these ordinances, I desire to have you investigate with me the philosophy of them. Although we may not always be able to discover it, there is always a divine philosophy back of all of God's dealings with men, and his requirements of men and of the church.

In the person of Jesus Christ we find a "second Adam", a second man,—a second representative of the human race. In him the race had a second head, a new possibility. As a second representative of the race, our Lord became a subject of divine law. As "The second man," he stepped into the ranks of humanity just where he found them. It may be said of man, using the word *man* in the generic sense, as standing for the race, that he was a two-fold subject of divine law. In the first place he was an *active* subject of the law, which demanded obedience. This required obedience was not kept, consequently man became a passive subject of the law. The passive demand of the law, as punishment for disobedience, is stipulated in the following: "For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2:17, and "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Ezek. 18:4.

If Jesus Christ is to be truly denominated "The man of Triumph," in contrast to the first *man of failure*; it is his to step into the place of the man of failure, and triumphantly obey the di-

vine law, *actively* by obedience, and *passively* by his death.

THE TRIUMPH OF SERVICE.

No sooner had the Son of Man entered upon his ministry, being inaugurated at his baptism, by the anointing of the Holy Spirit, with a testimony from heaven, as to his Divine Sonship, than he was submitted to a most rigid test of his active obedience and service to divine law.

This triumph of service was won by a hand-to-hand conflict with satan, man's powerful and bitterest enemy, who had been watching our Lord's earthly career with eagerness. He, not being omniscient, may have, like men, interpreted the remarkable things connected with the birth of Jesus, as the result of the purely natural. But when the skies were rended, and God acknowledged His Son, who was walking among men; it was then that the suspicions of the fallen archangel were thoroughly aroused; and a panic seized the under world when it became evident that the Son of God was treading with human footstep upon grounds which had been conquered, and was being claimed by Satan.

No sooner had the Saviour entered upon his office than he encountered the oppositions of the evil one. Though perhaps certain of his Divine Sonship, he finds him in the form of humanity;

and with diabolical skill plans to seduce the "second man," as he had the first at the beginning. Neither was this forbidden by God, for the Holy Spirit evidently delivered him into the hands of Satan, to be tempted, knowing that he who came as man's Redeemer could, and *must* meet Satan on any and every battlefield, and overcome him. Every advantage was allowed the tempter, who, after the body of Christ had become weak during a period of forty days fasting, approaches him with the temptation which would most naturally appeal to one who is hungry. It was a challenge to prove his Deity by making the stones of the wilderness bread to satisfy his hunger.

It was a temptation appealing to the same sense, that of the appetite, by which the first man was overcome. "Jesus proves himself to be able to resist the temptation, and not vainly desirous of proving his Deity replies: "It is written, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

Failing to obtain any fanatical evidence from Jesus as to his Sonship, by appealing to the sense of hunger, he proceeds to another temptation; this time appealing to his supposed sense of pride. Taking him to the temple, he seated him upon a very high pinnacle. This pinnacle was possibly the "King's Gallery" which was built at the

South East corner of the temple, overlooking the steep precipice, into the valley of the Kedron. The distance is said to have been so great that the bottom below could not be seen from the gallery, and caused one to become dizzy.

"Here," said Satan, "Is an opportunity for you to display your abilities, and prove your Divinity and Sonship. More than that, it is written: (reciting from Psalms 91:11, 12) "He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: And in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." Whether or not satan purposely misquoted this text, or being a poor Bible student, simply blundered; leaving out the clause "to keep thee in all thy ways," it is evident that its application to an occasion of this kind, would be a presumption upon God's goodness and help. Again Jesus met him with another scripture saying: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." While refusing to comply with Satan's request for a proof of his Deity he does not hesitate to profess himself as Lord and God.

Finding no response in Christ to this temptation, satan proposes another. This time he risks all chances and outdoes himself in a third and final effort, to overcome the Son of God. He invites him to an exceedingly high mountain, and shows him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them.

Whether by a supernatural vision Christ beheld all the kingdoms of the world, or whether the vision was a mental one, matters but little. "All these" says satan: "I will give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me." He furthermore declares that they are all his, and that he can give them to whomsoever he chooses. For this claim many have charged Satan with falsehood, saying, that he possessed nothing and had nothing to give. This is, however, a false accusation, as satan truthfully said: "For that is delivered unto me and to whomsoever I will give it;" and he still shares the kingdoms of the world with his subjects. Who are they who sit on the thrones and wear crowns and sway sceptres? In the majority of cases they are not the Lord's people. Jesus recognized and confessed satan to be the "prince of this world;" for he said as he neared his crucifixion, "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me." St. John 14:30. And also, that he shall be cast out. St. John 12:31. Consequently those things which Satan offered Jesus were temporarily his, he possessing them as a usurper; and would doubtless have given to the Christ the thrones of the world, without his going by the way of the cross to conquer them, if he would only have fallen down and worshipped him. This would have been honoring him as God, which was evidently Satan's highest ambition, and

which caused him to be cast out of heaven. Vain, vain indeed, for a usurper of the kingdoms of the world to offer to the Lord of Heaven and Creator of all things, these kingdoms at the price of homage. "No", was the verdict from the council chamber of the skies: "I will bring these kingdoms back to their legal owners, those for whom they were created, and to whom they were given, and annex them again to heaven as at the first, before sin entered the world; they will be conquered gloriously, though it be at the price of blood." Again Jesus makes use of the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, and says, quoting from Deut. 10:20, it is written: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." In this he not only refused the offer of Satan, but boldly declared his Lordship.

Satan having exhausted his resources, he now leaves Christ, and angels come and minister unto him.

It is interesting to note the peculiar correspondence between the temptations of Jesus, and those of the first man in Eden. St. John tells us that all there is in the world, by the way of sin, may be comprehended under the three following heads: "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the vain glory of life." 1st John 2:16, A. V. In other words, these are the three gateways by which the citadel of a man's inner self

or true character is reached, or they are three points of contact between the outer world and the individual. In both of these temptations, those of Christ and of Adam, entrance was sought at each of these ways, and inducements were offered at each point of contact, proving that satan, although not omniscient is an apt student of human nature. The first was "good for food"—"the lust of the flesh," second "pleasant to the eyes,"—"lust of the eyes," and third "to be desired to make one wise"—an appeal to the pride or "vain glory of life." Christ's temptation was an exact parallel: The bread was "good for food"—and appealed to the flesh; the pinnacle scene was purposed as a temptation to attract the spectators in admiration—"the lust of the eyes;" and the offering of the kingdoms, an attempt to gain entrance by the way of "vain glory". But these being the only ways of entrance, and satan receiving no response at either of these ways, by any of these temptations, found his resources exhausted and slunk away as one who suffers shameful defeat.

The importance of this triumph of Jesus over Satan, cannot easily be overestimated. It was a great crucial moment. Had satan succeeded in his last temptation, the crown which was wrested from man at the beginning, would have been placed upon *his* head by the Son of God himself. The battle of all

the ages between satan and God, would have been brought to an end, and the wicked ambition of Satan, from the earliest, to be equal with God, would have materialized.

The Eden pair easily succumbed to the temptation and sinned. The Son of God though tempted in like manner, but with multiplied severity, resisted and drove the enemy from the field.

Tested and triumphant in the hour of great temptation, the steps of our Lord became the tread of a conqueror. He being the incarnation of divine truth, living in obedience to divine law, was placed in a distinct rank of service, in contrast to all others. His life of sinless SERVICE met the requirement of the law, actively. Before his conquering tread diseases departed, fevers fled, the lame leaped, evil spirits cried, and the dead arose from silence. Who dares to deny to this Son of Prophecy, the title of the Man of Triumph?

THE TRIUMPHS OF SACRIFICE.

The triumphs of service seemed to be giving place to the despair of dying. The conqueror seems well nigh conquered.

Bloodthirsty Jews have succeeded in falsely condemning Him before the high-priest and Pilate; and amidst noise and tumult, we hear the groanings of the suffering Saviour, and hear one deridingly exclaim: "He saved others;

himself he cannot save." Was this true? Unwittingly a great truth of two-fold nature had been expressed. He *had* saved others, and from the very nature of the circumstances, he *could not* save himself. Not that it was impossible for him to escape from the cross, even at that late hour; but a passive obedience to the justice of a divine but broken law, was at stake; and because of this he could not, he would not save himself.

Deeper and deeper became the anguish and sufferings of our Lord, until in a manner something like a penitent, repenting soul he casts himself upon the mercy of God. Amidst the tremblings of the earth and the blackness of the skies, he exclaims: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," and died. Jews and wicked men skulked homeward, with a feeling of mixed satisfaction and fear. Satan and demons were doubtless chuckling with hellish glee, assuring themselves, that at last they had conquered the honored, mighty, miracle worker. He had finally succumbed to death, and was lying in the grave. Vainly did they suppose that the great plan of human redemption was forever thwarted.

Swooping down from the highest Heaven, came a mighty angel, who smiled at Roman dignity, defied Roman law, smote to temporary deadness,

the Roman soldiers, ignored the Roman seal and rolled away the stone from the door of the sepulchre. Freed from grave clothes and death, the Son of God stepped forth in resurrection life.

Shouts whose echoes will never cease, must have arisen in the heavenly world when the Son of God stepped from the grave, triumphant over death, leading a procession of spirits of Old Testament saints, who had been retained in Paradise, awaiting the full promised payment of their redemption price; and placed the resurrection life within the possibility of every lost son of Adam's race.

In the foregoing meditations we have seen the Man of Triumph rendering an *active* subjectivity to Divine law, and serving the same to its complete fulfillment. We have also seen him submitting to a *passive* subjectivity of a divine but broken law, while its wrath like angry ocean-billows rolled over his head, and he became a voluntary sacrifice. These two facts in the ministry of Jesus—his service and his sacrifice, are the ones upon which hinge all the future possibilities of man—without them His coming is a failure. They must forever stand out in man's dark night of sin and ruin, like beacon lights and guiding stars, pointing to hope and heaven.

THE MEMORIALS INSTITUTED.

The closing hours of His earthly ministry have come. It was upon a quiet evening after a busy day of toil, that He was seated with His disciples around the Passover table for the last time. Last things are not only attended by a consciousness of the close of an order, but are frequently overhung with anticipations of the first things in the new order. So in this event. Though Christ was truly human, he was also truly divine, and with an eye of omniscience, which saw far into the future, He knew the necessity of holding ever before the mind of his followers these two great facts of His ministry, His *service* and His *sacrifice*. Even while in the midst of the contentions of His disciples as to who should be greatest, he arises from the table, and pours water in a basin, and washes his disciples' feet, thus performing the act of the humblest of servants. He then declared "Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his Lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." John 13:13-16.

An *example* is something to be imitated or patterned after. *Ought* is an exceedingly strong word, constituting a command of highest moral obligation. The unfaithful steward who failed to do something he *ought* to have done was severely punished, Matt. 25: 24-30. By this act, precept, example and command, He instituted for his followers for all time, of which the disciples were the representatives, a concrete memorial of His service.

Having again seated himself at the Passover table, while they were eating, He took bread, and blessed it and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said "Take, eat; this is my body". He also took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them saying: "Drink ye all of it. For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Without any command relative to a future observance of this institution, He has given to His followers for all time a concrete memorial of His sacrifice.

We must doubtless agree, that should the world have been ransacked for symbols of *service* and *sacrifice*, none more appropriate, if any as much appropriate could be found. Nothing more fully symbolizes the loving and humble service rendered by Christ and to be imitated by his followers, than to perform this humblest of services. Nothing more beautifully represents his sorrows and sacrifice than the cup of wine and

broken bread. It would be reasonable to conclude that the one memorial should meet with the same measure of approval by the church as the other. He who usurps the prerogative of declaring for the one twin memorial a favored place in the church, observing it frequently, sometimes every Lord's day while he banishes the other one into ridicule and contempt, is practically assuming himself to be superior to the Lord and Master, whose offspring they are. This, however, is what many churches are doing. Is there any wonder that Christ has long since ceased to smile upon the churches, and they have become lifeless, powerless and joyless. This is exactly in keeping with what Jesus taught when He said: "If ye know these things happy are ye if ye do them." John 13:17. From this we conclude that disobedience to this command will be punished by God's disapproval the same as any other disobedience.

Many there are who are willing to share in the blessings of His sacrifice, but are not willing to engage with Him in His life of service. Many are willing to share His glory but not His reproach; the crown but not the cross.

I have approached these ordinances in a different manner than I have ever heard or seen them approached; but I have an enlarging conviction that I have the true philosophy of them, and when viewed in this light, they take on

new beauty and significance. Especially relating to the memorial of service, I think that we make a mistake in trying to argue against the prevailing practice or custom of washing feet upon entering houses, returning from journeys or upon eating especially upon certain occasions. The act was performed usually by the individual himself, and sometimes by the attending servant. I have looked carefully and unprejudicedly into this matter and find almost a universal agreement among commentators and historians. Further, the scriptures give a few illustrations. So strongly prevalent was the custom of washing the feet when resting from a journey that when the angel of the Lord visited Abraham in his tent upon the plain of Mamre, Abraham said, "Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree." Gen. 18:4. There is also a similar incident mentioned in Genesis 24:32, when the servant of Abraham arrived at the home of Bethuel in search for a wife for Isaac. Also a similar one in Judges 19:21. There is also a reference to this practice made when the servants of David announced to Abigail, that their master had chosen her for a wife, and she replied: "Behold, let thine handmaid be a servant to wash the feet of the servants of my Lord." I Samuel 25:41. Thus she accepts even the second humble place of washing the feet of the

servants. There is also a New Testament reference in Luke 7:44 when the Pharisees criticized Jesus because of the woman who washed his feet with her tears, when he said unto Simon, "Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head."

I am quite sure some one may object that by making this concession, we have lost our argument for the continuation of the ordinance. By no means. Christ had just as much right to exalt an ordinary custom among men to the place of a sacred memorial of service in the church as to snatch from the Passover table the common articles of food and to exalt them to the place of a memorial of sacrifice. No argument with which I have ever met can be pressed against the memorial of *service*, with any more propriety than against the memorial of *sacrifice*.

Here are a few of them:

1. Jesus washed the disciples' feet because it was a custom for a servant so to do.

Answer. If so, perhaps Jesus also gave them bread and wine, because it was customary to eat bread and drink wine at the Passover meal, and no sacrament or memorial of sacrifice was instituted.

2. Jesus meant to practice something more than a custom when he gave his

disciples the cup and the broken bread.

Answer. It is also equally evident that he introduced something more than a custom when he washed His disciples' feet. The answer of Jesus to Peter's objection: "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter" is a strong testimony to the fact that it was not an old custom which was being practiced, but that a new thing was being instituted.

3. We believe in feet washing when they are in need of cleansing.

Answer. All reasonable people do. All believe in eating and drinking when we are hungry and thirsty, and ordinarily we do not believe in so doing when we are not hungry or thirsty. It would be equally as reasonable to discredit the memorial of sacrifice unless we are hungry or thirsty as to discredit the memorial of service because our feet do not need cleansing. Hence the ordinance of feet-washing is not to be observed because the feet need cleansing any more than the sacrament is to be kept because people are hungry or thirsty.

4. Why should Jesus institute something distinct from the necessary feet washing.

Answer. Just for the same reason that he instituted something beyond the necessary eating and drinking.

5. It is evident that Jesus washed the feet of his disciples because they were in need of cleansing.

Answer. No more evidence that he did this than that he gave them bread to eat and wine to drink because they were hungry and thirsty. Furthermore, there is not so much as a hint that the disciples had overlooked any etiquette or custom becoming the time or place.

6. Reference is made to the practice of the sacrament, in the church in later years, but not to the washing of the saints' feet.

Answer. Also of the memorial of service in 1st Timothy 5:10. Here a widow was not to be taken into the support of the church, unless she had practiced the washing of the saints' feet. Further, Rice says "Traces of the ceremonial are found in the church at different periods of its history. It is asserted that Ambrose practiced it in the Church at Milan, but the treatises on which it is based are of doubtful authority. The council of Toledo, 694 A. D. mention Maunday Thursday as the day for observing this ceremony. Forms for such a service for the newly baptized are found in the early Gillican and Gothic missals. Bernard of Clairvaux tried to convert the ceremony into a sacrament, but without success, Wolsey, 1530, washed, wiped, and kissed the feet of 59 poor men in Peterborough. English sovereigns held to the practice so late as the reign of James II, and in the Russian imperial palace the custom still prevails, as also in Rome during holy week, when the pope washes the feet

of several men, and in the palaces of Vienna, Madrid and Munich." Rice on St. John, Page 224. Further there are various churches who have always observed the ordinance of the washing of the saints' feet in connection with the sacrament. Among these are various branches of the Baptists, River Brethren, Mennonites, as well as our own church.

When viewed in the light of the foregoing philosophy, I am sure that both of these memorials take on new beauty, significance and equality.

It is to be noted that when mention is made of this ordinance later in scripture, it is not spoken of in the common way as "feet washing" as though the cleansing of the feet is meant, but as washing of "the saints' feet." As those who teach and practice this sacred ordinance, we will do well to observe this and always speak of it in this scriptural and significant manner.

Relative to the sacrament, I have not stopped to discuss the doctrine of transubstantiation as believed by the Catholics or the doctrine of consubstantiation, as believed by the followers of Luther. Neither one of these doctrines are consistent with reason or scripture, and when viewed in the light of the memorial of sacrifice, this ordinance needs no other explanation. The Catholic view of the memorial of service above referred to, though literal, is also far from correct. No representative of

Christ though he be priest or pope can act for the whole church in either one of these ordinances. They are twin memorials, to be perpetuated by all of His people, for all time.

Viewed in the light of the foregoing, the legitimate conclusion would be, that if the sacrament the memorial of His sacrifice is a sacred and divinely instituted ordinance to be kept by the Church, so is the washing of the saints' feet, the Memorial of His service. Again we should note that they are "twins," instituted the same night, by the same Lord, in the same room, in the midst of the same company of disciples, both by precept and practice. Will the Lord not call into account such who ignore the memorial of His service, the only divinely instituted memorial of his life of unselfish devotion, love, pity and continuous blessing?

THE JOY OF OBEDIENCE.

Recalling the statement of Jesus: "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them," it is perfectly legitimate to conclude that those who obey the Lord in keeping the memorial of service will be happy in so doing. I have seen persons so wondrously blessed in keeping the memorial of service—the washing of the saints' feet, that they could scarcely finish the ordinance.

It is possible to go through this ordinance in a formal, perfunctory

manner, and in such cases the memorial of service—the washing of the saints' feet will be as dry and joyless as will also be the memorial of sacrifice—the sacrament. In our services where the memorial of service has been observed, we have had the privilege of seeing members of almost every denomination participate. Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Reformed, Evangelicals, Christians, Mennonites all alike proved the promise of Jesus and received the "happy" he promised.

THE ANSWER EASY.

Those who observe the ordinance of the washing of the saints' feet have an easy matter to tell the reason why. The reason is simply this: Jesus said we ought. Those who try to deny the ordinance of the washing of the saints' feet a place in the church, alongside of the sacrament have a hard job to give a reasonable cause for so doing. I heard a minister attempt to preach away the ordinance of the washing of the saints' feet. He went into the pulpit with a heavy load of books under his arm; read what some other men had written, and told us what he thought. After he had sweated and worked to preach it away, it still remained a fact that Jesus did it; said that He had given us an example, and that we ought do as He had done. He certainly will not condemn us for doing the thing for which he gave us the

example, and told us we ought to do it, and promised to reward us by giving us joy if we would do it. Those who refuse to do it, find it difficult to explain why they do not, but those who observe the ordinance, find it an easy matter to give the reason why.

A DIGNIFIED ORDINANCE.

In conclusion, there are those who argue against the ordinance of the washing of the saints' feet, declaring it too undignifying and unbecoming to the Lord's house. This depends entirely upon our definition of "dignity" and our ideas of propriety. Our view point determines this largely.

There are a number of things in connection with the service of Christ which seem, especially to the unregenerate, undignifying. This is the reason why the true religion of Jesus Christ has never been and never will be popular in this evil age. Most of the professed followers of Jesus Christ, today, would be ashamed to reveal their identity if Jesus was here on earth. I fear that the Saviour would find a great many of the church doors closed against him, if he should announce an itinerary of this world.

There are strange but divinely real paradoxes in religion. The great apostle had a knowledge of them when he declared himself to be unknown, but yet well known; as dying, yet being alive; as sorrowful, yet rejoicing;

as being poor, yet making many rich. 2 Cor. 6. Jesus also said: "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted," Luke 14:11. The paradox then as it relates to humility is this: The lower we get down at the feet of Jesus, the higher we are exalted in christian experience and service.

Nothing should be too undignifying for a creature which is not for his creator. A subject should not be ashamed to engage in a thing in which his Lord and master engaged. Jesus said: "Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am." Here then He drew the conclusion and said: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet" (St. John 13: 13, 14. He who is invited to engage in the practice of anything with a king looks upon that service as dignifying, and is envied his position. How much more dignifying and honorable it is to be invited to engage in the practice of the King of Kings, the Lord of heaven and earth!

This ordinance, then, is not undignifying, but truly dignifying; it surpasses the propriety of earth, and partakes of the propriety of heaven. Oh blessed paradox, not understood by the world, but divinely real to the Christian!