

West Suffolk Baptist Church

Thoughtfully Reformed - Redemptively Relevant



Volume 13 Issue 5

West Suffolk Epistle



May 2026

Name Above All Names

*Being found in human form, he humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross. Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name that is above every name. ~ **Philippians 2:8-9***

In a sense the best summary of the message of the Bible and the most fundamental truth in this universe is simply this: Jesus Christ is Lord.

Most theologians agree that “the name” that Paul refers to in verse 9 can only be “Lord” (Philippians 2:11). Here, the Greek word for “Lord” is *kyrios*, which is also used as the translation of God’s divine name, Yahweh, over 6,000 times in the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Old Testament)—the name that is rendered in most English Bibles today as Lord. Paul’s implied use of God’s divine name emphasizes Jesus’ divinity, just after he has reminded us about Jesus’ humiliation during His time on earth.

Comprising four consonants (YHWH), Yahweh is basically unpronounceable in Hebrew—and purposefully so, for Jews did not dare take this divine name of God upon their lips. Yet Yahweh, the indescribable God, came to earth as the incarnate Christ and revealed Himself to men and women. He humbly went to the cross, and then He was raised to the highest place—His rightful place—and given this name “above every name.” Says one commentator, “He hath changed the ineffable name, into a name utterable by man and desirable by all the world.” In the one who bears this name, God’s majesty “is all arrayed in robes of mercy.”

Old Testament prophecy reinforces this idea again and again. In Isaiah 45, God gives a description that applies exclusively to Himself: “*There is no other god besides me, a righteous God and a Savior; there is none besides me*” (Isaiah 45:21). Paul, once an aggressive opponent of Christ and His followers, applies this very description to Christ, making an impressive declaration of His deity. He points out that Jesus has been publicly exalted to the position that was rightfully His even before He came to earth to suffer humiliation on our behalf. He is now seated at the Father’s right hand. His majesty is there for all who know Him as Savior to see. His identity is unclouded and undoubted.

God is the only Savior—and Jesus is that Savior, of whom it was said, “*You shall call his name Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins*” (Matthew 1:21). Years after Paul had first had his eyes opened to the truth about who Jesus is, we can still catch a sense of awed reverence and love in his words to the Philippians. Jesus Christ is LORD. He possesses the name above all names. Paul never allowed familiarity with this truth to breed complacency about it. Neither must we. Pause now and allow each word to prompt you to an awed praise of this man: Jesus, the Savior of His people... Christ, the long-promised King... is LORD, the indescribable, revealed God. And you get to call Him “brother” (Hebrews 2:11). ~ *Alistair Begg - Former pastor of Parkside Church - 1983 - 2025 - Presently Bible Teacher on Truth for Life, a daily and weekend program that brings the exposition of Scripture to a global audience through radio, podcast, and a wide range of digital and streaming platforms.*

West Suffolk Baptist Church



West Suffolk Epistle



A Warrior for the Family: Dr. James Dobson

September 22, 2025

To see him around children was to catch a glimpse of his gift. Over dinner in our home, my wife and I noticed that Dr. James Dobson had chosen to sit by our children, and was deeply engaged with our daughter, asking her: “What can I know about Katie to understand you better?” She never forgot that dinner, nor did we.

James Dobson was one of the most influential voices in American evangelicalism for at least a half-century. He was born to parents who were Nazarene missionaries and he grew up in a time of radical social change. He attended Point Loma College, and in 1960 he married his wife, Shirley. They would be married for almost 65 years. Dobson went on to do graduate work at the University of Southern California, earning a Ph.D. in psychology. Early on, he had a deep interest in marriage, children, and the state of the family. After graduation with his doctorate, he was appointed associate clinical professor of pediatrics at USC, but he also continued to work in research and began speaking and writing.

Everything changed in 1967, with the publication of his most famous work, *Dare to Discipline*. In the book, Dobson took on the liberal parenting advice doled out by influential figures such as Dr. Benjamin Spock. In a real sense, he became the antidote to Spockism, asserting that children need boundaries and rules and, yes, discipline.

Honestly, it’s hard today to realize that *Dare to Discipline* was downright revolutionary at the time. Progressive elites insisted that children are basically good, needing only nurture and encouragement. Parents were instructed to let their children discover their inner child and blossom into their inherent potential. Rules, boundaries, obedience, and discipline were rejected as repressive. The results were predictable.

Dobson’s approach was groundbreaking in two ways. *First*, he argued for corrective discipline as necessary for the child’s moral development and nurture. *Second*, he spoke as a Christian to fellow Christians in terms of a distinctively Christian understanding of the child, the needs of the child, and the nature of the family. *Dare to Discipline* became a best-seller.

Of course, the larger culture was moving in the opposite direction—fast. Moral relativism, the sexual revolution, no-fault divorce, and the acids of modernity were subverting the family. Furthermore, the revolutionaries were in near total control of higher education, even as they dominated the cultural conversation. Dobson began pushing back, and he started communicating with parents through media. In 1977, he established *Focus on the Family*.

All this came as liberalizing trends were redefining American society. Marriage was undermined, parents were told to go to their rooms, and the sexual revolution was accelerating. By the early 1970s, groups like the American Psychological Association were normalizing homosexuality and legitimizing sexual perversions as alternative lifestyles. Dobson’s radio program and books distributed his teaching nationwide, and his influence grew—fast.

West Suffolk Baptist Church



West Suffolk Epistle



A Warrior for the Family: Dr. James Dobson

Continued from Page 2

It was almost like the larger culture had decided to declare war on the family. Dobson was determined to press back. Controversies over the White House Conference on Families (originally the White House Conference on the Family, but changed due to liberal pressure), put Dobson on the front lines of the era's hottest political and moral controversies. He didn't back off from the fight. As a matter of fact, he became one of the most significant leaders in what became known as the New Christian Right. Given his media presence and stature among conservative Christians, Dr. Dobson, as he was usually known, leveraged his personal influence for conservative causes, and ***Focus on the Family*** grew explosively. He was able to bridge influence in the White House (with Republican presidents) with influence in thousands of American homes and with millions of listeners and readers. His role was unique, and Jim and Shirley Dobson together became part of the explosion of evangelical influence in the United States.

Focus on the Family would move to Colorado Springs in 1991, and its visitor center was soon listed among the most visited attractions in the entire region. The flagship radio program was heard throughout the nation, and Dr. Dobson's soft voice carried firm conviction. The ministry expanded into international arenas and extended its reach through an entire universe of programs. In a new generation, facing unprecedented challenges to the family, its work continues.

James Dobson had his enemies, and he could be quite a fighter when it came to defending the family and influencing public policy. I served on the Board of Directors of Focus on the Family for years, and I saw his determination renewed issue by issue, program by program, and controversy by controversy. I also saw him struggle with some of the pressing challenges of an incredibly huge ministry. In time, Dobson would leave Focus on the Family and establish the Dr. James Dobson Family Institute. He continued to speak in defense of the family, even as some of the children raised on ***Dare to Discipline*** became grandparents themselves.

The death of Dr. James Dobson underlines the passing of a remarkable evangelical generation. He lived life on a big stage, and historians will have to reckon with him long into the future. But, to be honest, I will remember him most as the famous man who chose to sit next to a child and make that young person know she was important to him. It was Jesus who told his disciples, "*Let the little children come to me and do not hinder them, for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven*" (Matthew 19:14). That's the verse that comes to my mind, as I think about the life and legacy of Dr. James Dobson. I think you can understand why. ~ ***Dr. R. Albert Mohler, Jr.***

I Believe in the Holy Spirit

Modern Bible translations are in the news these days, sometimes for controversial reasons. But one universal benefit of them is that the Holy Spirit is no longer referred to as "it." Curiously a chief culprit here is the much-loved King James Version (for example, Romans 8:26: "the Spirit itself").

West Suffolk Baptist Church



West Suffolk Epistle



I Believe in the Holy Spirit

Continued from Page 3

In fact, *pneuma* (the Greek word for “spirit” or “wind”) is a neuter gender noun and therefore attracted a neuter pronoun, “it.” Still, John 14:26 and 15:26, which refer to the Spirit by the masculine pronoun “he” (*ekeinos*), left older Bible readers in no doubt about his personal nature: “he” not “it.” Whatever it means for human spirits, created as the image of God to be personal is rooted in the very being of their Creator. God is a personal being in a unified, uncreated, eternal, tri-personal manner—we in a created mono-personal manner. We are the tiny reflection; He is the great and glorious original. But what does Scripture mean when it speaks of God as Father, Son, and Spirit?

The Old Testament word for spirit, *ruach*, is onomatopoeic. That is, its meaning is echoed in its sound: wind in motion, sometimes storm-wind.

It lies on the surface of the Bible that the Holy Spirit is both divine and personal, as Acts 5:3–4 indicates. The Spirit can be lied to (a personal characteristic); to do so involves lying to God Himself (He is fully divine).

Yet there is something about this name (“Spirit”) that suggests the mysterious and elusive. Jesus Himself said that the *pneuma* blows where it wills, but we cannot tell where it comes from or goes to, and so it is with the *pneuma* of God (John 3:8). Are we not, therefore, treading on dangerous ground if we enquire further about the identity of the Spirit, especially when our Lord stressed that the Spirit does not glorify Himself (John 16:13–14)?

We cannot truly worship One we do not know, or experience “the fellowship of the Holy Spirit” (2 Corinthians 13:14) if He remains faceless. But how can we know Him when even His name lacks the personal atmosphere of either “Father” or “Son”?

Meditation on two aspects of the Bible’s teaching helps us here. **Firstly**, the Scriptures use a series of descriptions to identify the Spirit. He is the Spirit of glory, truth, holiness, sonship—and much more (Romans 1:4; Romans 8:15; 1 Peter 4:14; 1 John 4:6).

We should notice particularly how our Lord Jesus introduces the Spirit in Jesus’ Farewell Discourse in John 13–17. In essence, Jesus tells His disciples that the Spirit will be to them everything that He Himself has been during the course of His ministry. For while the Son and the Spirit are personally distinct, they are economically entwined. Jesus is Teacher, Guide, and Counselor; Jesus goes to prepare a home for His disciples (John 14:2). The Spirit is another like Jesus (John 14:15); He teaches, guides, counsels, and brings orphans into the home and heart of God. Moreover, because He is Spirit, He can do this by a personal indwelling.

This is part of what theologians call the “economic” ministry of the Spirit in which He effects our salvation. Behind that lies the “ontological,” eternal fellowship of the Spirit with the Father and the Son. Is this a dark secret that is never to be known? No! For God’s revelation is a true self-exegesis (John 1:18). He is not different from who He reveals Himself to be.

West Suffolk Baptist Church



West Suffolk Epistle



I Believe in the Holy Spirit

Continued from Page 4

Secondly, the Scriptures teach us about the in-being and inner-trinitarian life of the Spirit. Here we can only briefly glance at a few things. The Spirit knows God the Father and God the Son exhaustively; for He searches “the deep things of God” (1 Corinthians 2:10). Between the Spirit and the Father, between the Spirit and the Son, there is total mutual understanding and knowledge. Nothing is hidden. More than that, all that is in each of the persons of Father and Son is embraced and received by the Spirit, as though He drank eternally and infinitely of the love and glory of the divine attributes expressed in a distinctively paternal (Father) and filial (Son) manner.

Furthermore, everything about the mutual relationship of the Father and the Son is known by the Spirit. Their mutual devotion, the outpouring of all of their personal attributes towards each other in perfect love, is fully absorbed and enjoyed by the Spirit. So the Spirit experiences not only who the Father and Son are individually, as it were, but also in terms of what each one is to the other.

When Jesus promised that He would ask the Father to “send” the Spirit (John 14:16; Acts 2:33), He described Him as the One who “proceeds from the Father” (John 15:26). The “sending” (future tense) from the Father is economic and looks forward to and is fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:8). But the “proceeding” (present tense) is continuous, not bound by the past or the future.

Many New Testament scholars today ignore the significance of this change of verb tense, regarding the two statements (sending from the Father, proceeding from the Father) as synonymous parallels. But the change of tense in the verbs expresses an actual difference. The procession is an ongoing, not merely a historical, relationship.

The implication here, as Augustine recognized, is that the Spirit always “goes out from” the Father, radiating from Him all the fullness that is in Him. But, as we have seen, the Spirit simultaneously searches and experiences the deep riches that lie in the Father’s relationship with His Son and vice-versa. From this glorious fellowship, the Spirit “proceeds”—“from the Father and from the Son” (filioque), as the church in the West has long confessed. Furthermore, while in the “sending” (economic) the Spirit sweetly yields to the revelatory will of the Father and the Son, in the “proceeding” (ontological) He voluntarily displays the glory of the ineffable relationship in which He shares. It is in terms of an expression of His possession of full deity that He reveals the fullness of fellowship of the Trinity to us!

We are stretching our intellects to the limit here. But as our minds stand on tiptoe, exploring the horizons of divine revelation, we are not distressed by our limitations. Rather, we are gazing on the endless beauty and wonder of God’s ineffable being, lost in wonder, love, and praise. The Spirit shines on the face of Christ; the Son leads us to the Father. Thus we begin to realize who He is who has brought us to know God. With the Apostle John, we say “*Surely, Blessed Spirit, You have brought us into the fellowship of the Father and his Son Jesus Christ!*” (1 John 1:3). ~ *Dr. Sinclair Ferguson*

West Suffolk Baptist Church



West Suffolk Epistle



Is It OK to Argue?

The answer depends on what “argue” means. The Bible is clear that some types of arguing are sin. For example, the Bible instructs Christians to use “sweetness” in their speech (Proverbs 16:21) and to not be quarrelsome (2 Timothy 2:23). The Bible also condemns arguing about things that are not worth arguing about, a type of arguing that the Bible sometimes labels “*foolish controversies*” (1 Timothy 6:4; Titus 3:9). Additionally, the Bible condemns ungodly anger, the type of anger that sometimes leads us to engage in unbiblical arguments (James 1:20).

But there is also a biblical way of arguing. Jesus often engaged in arguments to challenge His opponents with the truth of God’s Word. Also, Paul frequently argued with others for the truthfulness of the gospel and for the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 17:1–9, 22–34). Peter encourages his readers to always be ready to defend their faith, and that often requires making arguments (1 Peter 3:15). Pastors are also called to defend orthodox doctrine that may sometimes include godly arguing (Titus 1:9). Argumentation that seeks to challenge falsehood with the truth of God’s Word is called apologetics, and it is biblical and commended as a practice for every Christian.

In the end, answering two questions can help us determine whether it is OK to argue. *First*, are we arguing with a heart of humility or are we being contentious? *Second*, are we arguing for God’s glory and God’s truth or for some other reason? To argue in humility for God’s glory according to God’s truth is to argue in a biblical way. ~ *Ligonier Editorial*

The Regulative Principle of Worship

Put simply, the regulative principle of worship states that the corporate worship of God is to be founded upon specific directions of Scripture. On the surface, it is difficult to see why anyone who values the authority of Scripture would find such a principle objectionable. Is not the whole of life itself to be lived according to the rule of Scripture? This is a principle dear to the hearts of all who call themselves biblical Christians. To suggest otherwise is to open the door to antinomianism and license.

But things are rarely so simple. After all, the Bible does not tell me whether I may or may not listen with profit to a Mahler symphony, find stamp-collecting rewarding, or enjoy ferret breeding as a useful occupation even though there are well-meaning but misguided Bible-believing Christians who assert with dogmatic confidence that any or all of these violate God’s will. Knowing God’s will in any circumstance is an important function of every Christian’s life, and fundamental to knowing it is a willingness to submit to Scripture as God’s authoritative Word for all ages and circumstances. But what exactly does biblical authority mean in such circumstances?

Well, Scripture lays down certain specific requirements: for example, we are to worship with God’s people on the Lord’s Day, and we should engage in useful work and earn our daily bread. In addition, covering every possible circumstance, Scripture lays down a general principle:

West Suffolk Baptist Church



West Suffolk Epistle



The Regulative Principle of Worship

Continued from Page 6

Present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship. Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that by testing you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect. (Romans 12:1–2)

Clearly, all of life is to be regulated by Scripture, whether by express commandment or prohibition or by general principle. There is therefore, in one sense, a regulative principle for all of life. In everything we do, and in some form or another, we are to be obedient to Scripture.

However, the Reformers (John Calvin especially) and the Westminster Divines (as representative of seventeenth-century puritanism) viewed the matter of corporate worship differently. In this instance, a general principle of obedience to Scripture is insufficient; there must be (and is) a specific prescription governing how God is to be worshiped corporately. In the public worship of God, specific requirements are made, and we are not free either to ignore them or to add to them. Typical by way of formulation are the words of Calvin: “*God disapproves of all modes of worship not expressly sanctioned by his Word*” (“The Necessity of Reforming the Church”); and the Second London Baptist Confession of 1689:

The acceptable way of worshiping the true God, is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshiped according to the imagination and devices of men, nor the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representations, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scriptures. (22.1)

Where does the Bible teach this? In more places than is commonly imagined, including the constant stipulation of the book of Exodus with respect to the building of the tabernacle that everything be done “after the pattern . . . shown you” (Exodus 25:40); the judgment pronounced upon Cain’s offering, suggestive as it is that his offering (or his heart) was deficient according to God’s requirement (Genesis 4:3–8); the first and second commandments showing God’s particular care with regard to worship (Exodus 20:2–6); the incident of the golden calf, teaching as it does that worship cannot be offered merely in accord with our own values and tastes; the story of Nadab and Abihu and the offering of “*strange fire*” (Leviticus 10); God’s rejection of Saul’s non-prescribed worship—God said, “*to obey is better than sacrifice*” (1 Samuel 15:22); and Jesus’ rejection of Pharisaical worship according to the “*tradition of the elders*” (Matthew 15:1–14). All of these indicate a rejection of worship offered according to values and directions other than those specified in Scripture.

Of particular significance are Paul’s responses to errant public worship at Colossae and Corinth. At one point, Paul characterizes the public worship in Colossae as *ethelothreskia* (Colossians 2:23), variously translated as “*will worship*” (KJV) or “*self-made religion*” (ESV). The Colossians had introduced elements that were clearly unacceptable (even if they were claiming an angelic source for their actions—one possible interpretation of Colossians 2:18, the “*worship of angels*”).

West Suffolk Baptist Church



West Suffolk Epistle



The Regulative Principle of Worship

Continued from Page 7

Perhaps it is in the Corinthian use (abuse) of tongues and prophecy that we find the clearest indication of the Apostle's willingness to "regulate" corporate worship. He regulates both the number and order of the use of spiritual gifts in a way that does not apply to "all of life": no tongue is to be employed without an interpreter (1 Corinthians 14:27–28) and only two or three prophets may speak, in turn (vv. 29–32). At the very least, Paul's instruction to the Corinthians underlines that corporate worship is to be regulated and in a manner that applies differently from that which is to be true for all of life.

The result? Particular elements of worship are highlighted: reading the Bible (1 Timothy 4:13); preaching the Bible (2 Timothy 4:2); singing the Bible (Ephesians 5:19; Colossians 3:16)—the Psalms as well as Scripture songs that reflect the development of redemptive history in the birth-life-death-resurrection-ascension of Jesus; praying the Bible—the Father's house is "*a house of prayer*" (Matthew 21:13); and seeing the Bible in the two sacraments of the church, baptism and the Lord's Supper (Matthew 28:19; Acts 2:38–39; 1 Corinthians 11:23–26; Colossians 2:11–12). In addition, occasional elements such as oaths, vows, solemn fasts and thanksgivings have also been recognized and highlighted (see Westminster Confession of Faith 21:5).

It is important to realize that the regulative principle as applied to public worship frees the church from acts of impropriety and idiocy—we are not free, for example, to advertise that performing clowns will mime the Bible lesson at next week's Sunday service. Yet it does not commit the church to a "cookie-cutter," liturgical sameness. Within an adherence to the principle there is enormous room for variation—in matters that Scripture has not specifically addressed (*adiaphora*). Thus, the regulative principle as such may not be invoked to determine whether contemporary or traditional songs are employed, whether three verses or three chapters of Scripture are read, whether one long prayer or several short prayers are made, or whether a single cup or individual cups with real wine or grape juice are utilized at the Lord's Supper. To all of these issues, the principle "*all things should be done decently and in order*" (1 Corinthians 14:40) must be applied. However, if someone suggests dancing or drama is a valid aspect of public worship, the question must be asked—where is the biblical justification for it? (To suggest that a preacher moving about in the pulpit or employing "dramatic" voices is "drama" in the sense above is to trivialize the debate.) The fact that both may be (to employ the colloquialism) "neat" is debatable and beside the point; there's no shred of biblical evidence, let alone mandate, for either. So it is superfluous to argue from the poetry of the Psalms or the example of David dancing before the ark (naked, to be sure) unless we are willing to abandon all the received rules of biblical interpretation. It is a salutary fact that no office of "choreographer" or "producer/director" existed in the temple. The fact that both dance and drama are valid Christian pursuits is also beside the point.

What is sometimes forgotten in these discussions is the important role of conscience. Without the regulative principle, we are at the mercy of "worship leaders" and bullying pastors who charge noncompliant worshipers with displeasing God unless they participate according to a certain pattern and manner. To the victims of such bullies, the sweetest sentences ever penned by men are:

West Suffolk Baptist Church



West Suffolk Epistle



The Regulative Principle of Worship

Continued from Page 8

God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are, in anything, contrary to His Word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commands out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience: and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also. (WCF 20:2)

To obey when it is a matter of God's express prescription is true liberty; anything else is bondage and legalism. ~ **Dr. Derek Thomas** - *Ligonier Ministries teaching fellow and Chancellor's Professor of Systematic and Pastoral Theology at Reformed Theological Seminary.*

Love for the Penitent

After Paul's "painful visit" to the church at Corinth, the Apostle thought it better not to visit the congregation there immediately but instead to send a letter of reproof in hopes that the church would amend its ways and seek reconciliation. This was no easy choice for the Apostle, but it was necessary because an in-person visit would have made restoration more difficult (2 Corinthians 1:12–2:4). Second Corinthians 7:2–16 makes clear that this letter of reproof brought about the repentance that Paul was looking for among the Corinthians, but today's passage gives us the first indication that the Apostle's correspondence was successful.

Paul makes reference to one who has caused pain at Corinth and who has since endured some kind of "punishment by the majority" (2:5–6). The Apostle is speaking of someone who has come under the discipline of the church. Based on other passages such as 7:12, commentators believe that the man in question was someone who opposed him during his painful visit to Corinth, but identifying the man and his exact actions is difficult. Historically, many commentators have said that the man is the same man from 1 Corinthians 5 who was engaged in an incestuous relationship with his stepmother. This is possible, but many modern commentators view it as unlikely because the offender seems to have sinned specifically against Paul during the painful visit after 1 Corinthians was written. In any case, from 2 Corinthians 2:5–11, we see that the church, after the painful visit with Paul and the hard letter of reproof, had taken action against the man, most likely excommunicating him.

Certainly, Paul had wanted the church to take action as a necessary part of reconciling with the Apostle. The problem, however, was that the church had gone too far and was not forgiving and restoring the man to the congregation upon his repentance. They had missed the purpose of church discipline, which is to bring about restoration to Christian fellowship, not revenge (Matthew 18:15–20). So, Paul calls the church to forgive and reaffirm their love for the sinner by restoring him to fellowship. John Calvin comments: "The end of excommunication, so far as concerns the power of the offender, is this: that, overpowered with a sense of his sin, he may be humbled in the sight of God and the Church, and may solicit pardon with sincere dislike and confession of guilt. The man who has been brought to this, is now more in need of consolation, than of severe reproof."

West Suffolk Baptist Church



West Suffolk Epistle



Love for the Penitent

Continued from Page 9

When discipline is brought against a sinner, forgiveness and restoration must always be the goal. We cannot control whether the sinner will respond with repentance, but we can stand ready to forgive when the sinner turns from his transgression. As we are engaged in church discipline or even when we are facing someone who has sinned against us personally in a less significant way, let us stand ready to forgive when the person repents. *Coram Deo*

Red Skelton's Recipe for the Perfect Marriage

1. Two times a week we go to a nice restaurant, have a little beverage, good food and companionship. She goes on Tuesdays, I go on Fridays.
2. We also sleep in separate beds. Hers is in California and mine is in Texas.
3. I take my wife everywhere, but she keeps finding her way back.
4. I asked my wife where she wanted to go for our anniversary. "Somewhere I haven't been in a long time!" she said. So I suggested the kitchen.
5. We always hold hands. If I let go, she shops.
6. She has an electric blender, electric toaster and electric bread maker. She said "There are too many gadgets, and no place to sit down!" So I bought her an electric chair.
7. My wife told me the car wasn't running well because there was water in the carburetor. I asked where the car was. She told me, "In the lake."
8. She got a mud pack and looked great for two days. Then the mud fell off.
9. She ran after the garbage truck, yelling, "Am I too late for the garbage?" The driver said, "No, jump in!".
10. Remember: Marriage is the number one cause of divorce.
11. I married Miss Right. I just didn't know her first name was 'Always'.
12. I haven't spoken to my wife in 18 months. I don't like to interrupt her.
13. The last fight was my fault though. My wife asked, "What's on the TV?" I said, "Dust!".

Can't you just hear him say all of these? I love it. These were the good old days when humor didn't have to start with a four letter word. It was just clean and simple fun. And he always ended his programs with the words, "And May God Bless" with a big smile on his face.

West Suffolk Baptist Church

Thoughtfully Reformed - Redemptively Relevant



West Suffolk Epistle



If you have a birthday or anniversary in May that is not posted here or is listed in error or you do not want to be published in this newsletter, please contact Walt or e-mail him at gwlcf10415@gmail.com.

Birthdays and Anniversaries Corner May 2026

Birthdays

Elyse T. (1)
Patrick D. (2)
Mike M. (22)
Jackson T. (22)

Jonathan K. (25)
Oliver H. (30)
John H. (30)

Anniversaries

Nic and Katie G. (22)
Tom and Marcie S. (22)
Ben and Charlene S. (25)

Grieving the Holy Spirit

The phrase “Grieving the Holy Spirit” comes from Ephesians 4:30, where the Apostle Paul urges believers not to bring sorrow to God’s Spirit, who marks them for redemption. To grieve the Holy Spirit means causing offense or sadness through thoughts, words, or actions. It’s a relational concept—similar to hurting someone who loves you and is always present. Paul mentions behaviors like lying, uncontrolled anger, harmful speech, bitterness, rage, slander, and malice as examples of what grieves the Spirit. These attitudes can break unity, hurt others, and are opposed to the Spirit’s purpose in building character.



The West Suffolk Epistle is a monthly publication of West Suffolk Baptist Church.

Office: 1001 Kenyon Court, Suffolk, VA 23435 (Across from Paul D. Camp Community College)

E-Mail: pastorscofield@gmail.com

Website: <https://www.graceforsuffolk.org>

Phone/Fax: 757-539-0363

Teaching Pastor/Elder: Pastor Mike Prince (Front Center)

Teaching Elders: Scott Thomas (LF) and Ben Scofield (RF)

Deacons: Marlin Halsey, John McPhatter and John Hurst (L to R)(Back Row)

Editor: Walt Lawrence, gwlcf10415@gmail.com/757-619-3268

Please submit information to the editor by the second Sunday of each month preceding publication by e-mail, in person or at the church office. The editor reserves the right to edit for content or space. May the Father be glorified in every word.

Disclaimer: The views and opinions from the contributors to this newsletter do not necessarily reflect those of West Suffolk Baptist Church or its leadership.

*West Suffolk Baptist
Church
Leadership*