God's Drawing Power

John G. Priola

The necessity of one's coming to Christ in order to be saved is questioned by few. Most people generally agree that man must come to Christ if he is going to be saved. There is disagreement as to how man comes but little disagreement as to the necessity of such being done.

The necessity of man coming to God in order to be saved is clearly taught in the Scriptures. Jesus, in Matthew 11:28 stated, "Come unto me all ye that are heavy laden and I will give you rest." This verse teaches that if man is to receive rest he has to come to Christ. In John 5:40, Jesus speaking to the Jews said, "And ye will not come to me that ye might have life." What he said to the Jews in this verse applies to us all. What He said was that one cannot have life without first coming to Christ. Thus, the necessity of man's coming to Christ in order to be saved is clearly taught in God's Word.

How does man come to Christ? Allow the Word of God to answer once again. John 6:44, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day." In verse sixty-four of the same chapter Jesus said, "Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it be given unto him of my Father." The "given unto him of my Father" of verse sixty-four is the "Father which hath sent me draw him" of verse forty-four. Hence, to come to Christ we must be drawn of the Father. Once again, the religious world for the most part is basically agreed on this point. But how does the Father draw us? The answer comes back: the Father draws us by the Spirit. But how does the Father draw us by the Spirit? Brethren, this is one area where we cross swords and do battle with many denominational people. Many of them believe that man was either born, or has become, so depraved that he cannot come to Christ without God assisting him by giving him the Holy Spirit directly, separate and apart from the Word of God. This reception of the Spirit, separate and apart from the Word, enables that person to come to Christ. This is the doctrine of enabling grace. The point to be stressed is that they believe that it requires more than the Word of God in order for man to be able to come to God. They believe that it takes the Holy Spirit working separate and apart from the Word of God for one to be able to become a Christian. We believe that it takes the Spirit working for one to be drawn to Christ. We have never believed that the Spirit does not work in one's being drawn to Christ; He does. But we do deny that He works directly, separate and apart from, and independent of God's Word either in conversion or in Christian living. We do not believe that it takes more than the Word of God, and one's submission to it, for one to become a Christian or for one to continue to lead the Christian life. Great men (Campbell, Harding, Hardeman, Harper, and a host of others) have defended this position upon the polemic platform. These brethren pressed the point that to believe the Spirit must work directly, separate and apart from the Word of God in drawing men to Christ was to deny the totality of Bible teaching concerning this matter. They further showed that such a position implied false doctrine. Among others, it implied that God is a respecter of persons and that the Bible is not all-sufficient, both of which are false. The position that the Spirit works in conversion and Christian living only through the Word, and thus God (Continued on page 3)
EDITORIAL

Legislating Where God Has Not Legislated

Ernest S. Underwood

It is a presumptuous person indeed who takes it upon himself to legislate where God has not done so. To the churches of Galatia Paul gave warning that such persons have the curse of God resting upon them. (Cf. Gal. 1:6-9). By this same standard of reasoning, we must recognize that such a curse also rests upon any who would be so bold as to refuse to defend a legislation given by God.

In the past few years we have heard a great deal, especially on the marriage-divorce question, about legislating where God has not given legislation. Some dear and respected friends have made statements to the effect that in some marriage-divorce-remarriage situations God has not legislated, and that we as preachers ought not to assume the position of judges. We question the validity of such reasoning. Let us consider this type of reasoning in other areas, then make the same application to the marriage and divorce problem.

The New Testament declares that without the gospel one cannot be saved. Faith is necessary to salvation, yet that faith comes as a result of hearing the word of God. Are we legislating for God when we declare that the man in the South American jungle who has never heard the word of God is lost? By inspiration we learn that Jesus shall take vengeance "on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power" (II Thess. 1:8-9). Again, are we legislating for God and becoming judges when we confidently affirm to the penitent sinner the need for baptism before salvation can be had? There are those who so accuse us. They point to the many death-bed and battlefield confessions, and with voices filled with emotion tell us that we are judging where we have no right to judge. What they fail to understand is the fact that God has already legislated in the matter. Through Christ and the apostles we are informed that baptism is essential to have sins washed away (Acts 22:16), to put one into Christ (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27), and to enter the kingdom (John 3:5; I Cor. 12:13). Dare we offer to mankind the salvation of God on any less terms? If so, by what authority? Do emotional pleas negate God's stated legislation in the matter?

What of a person, though, who confidently states that he does not believe Jesus to be the Christ of God, or who freely admits to sins of which he has no intention of repenting, but who still insists on being baptized in order to be a member of the church? Such is not a hypothetical question, this writer has encountered such persons. Do we baptize such a one, or do we refuse to do so? If we refuse to baptize such a one, are we legislating for God? On the other hand, if we go ahead and administer baptism to an acknowledged non-believer and unrepentant sinner, are we not making mockery of God's legislation concerning these sacred acts?

When we come to the subject of marriage and divorce we do
I have commanded you, and he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. It is necessary for the gospel to be taught, heard and learned for an individual to come to Christ. Paul certainly knew that. That is why in Romans ten, after he had said "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved," he further said, "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?" Then in verse seventeen he said, "So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." Now watch his argument as to how people are saved. Paul argues that for man to be saved he must call upon the name of the Lord. But for man to call upon the name of the Lord, he must believe in Him. But for man to believe in Him, they must hear of Him. But for man to hear of Him, they need preachers to preach of Him. But to have preachers to preach of Him they must be sent. And that is what God did. God chose and sent men (inspired men) to reveal His will to man. In revealing His will, man heard of the necessity of believing in Him and of calling upon His name in order to be saved. We no longer have God's revelation in inspired men but in an inspired book. And the preaching of that inspired revelation is what will convert people now, as it did then. Paul knew that God saved people by the preaching of the gospel, (1 Cor. 1:18-21). The gospel must be preached, it must be believed and it must be obeyed. But even then all didn't obey it. Why? Because it (the gospel) lacked power? No! It was because of their unbelief. The truth was available to them but they refused to hear and learn. Paul didn't develop the philosophy that the gospel was lacking and something else was needed.

The affirmation that God has to send the Spirit directly, separate and apart from the Word denies the power of God's Word. How tragic. We now have brethren in some areas calling into question the power of God's Word. True, they are not like many people in the denominational world who believe that the reception of the Spirit separate and apart from the Word is essential, but they by their actions seem to be implying that God's Word is lacking in some areas to draw men to Christ. Furthermore, they seem to think that God's Word is not sufficient to build the Christian up and to keep him strengthened spiritually. If this is not the case, then why do we have all of the gadgets and gimmicks being used in the Lord's church today? Practices which were unheard of not long ago are now commonplace in many places. Some people have brought their denominational leanings and
practices "over" into the Lord's church. We are reaping what has been sown in the philosophy of "get them into the church and teach them later". Congregations now have elaborate programs to get people to attend. Anything from seeing a man perform "gymnastics to the glory of God," receiving a bicycle, a kite or a helicopter ride can be found as promotional tactics to help get them in. One congregation in having a "Bring Your Neighbor Day" set a goal to have 1,000 in attendance. They were told "This can be done easily". "To assist in this, we will have another 'Kite Day' for all the students in our Bible School. Those who bring a guest will receive a kite and each guest will receive one". Question: If it could be done easily, why the need of assistance in having a Kite Day? Were the kites being offered as a motivational tool to get the kids to work, or as a drawing power to get others to attend, or both? If they were offered as a motivational tool to get kids to work, we have people working for the wrong reason. If they were offered as a drawing power, then we are seeking people with the wrong substance. And yes, once you have got them in (I'm hesitant to say converted) what next? You will need something to keep them there. What will it be? The gospel, or something else? That is where the Family Life Centers and Gymnasiums come in. One congregation under the rules for 'Reservations of Family Life Center' said, "Team practice for approved church athletic teams will be scheduled with the Youth Minister." I wonder what the "approved church athletic teams" are. One congregation in this city (Gateway) has advertised in their weekly bulletin a ladies exercise class to be conducted in their fellowship hall. It is an aerobics class conducted by the preacher's wife. Why should people pay $20-$25 to take a class of this type elsewhere, when they can go to Gateway and probably take it free of charge? After all, I imagine it would probably be more spiritual and motivating at Gateway. People are also being given certificates for participating in volunteer programs in some congregations. (Gateway is also one of these.) If you fold the bulletin, address it, wash windows, or a host of other jobs you can get a certificate for doing such. Why all the need of this? If we realize that as Christians we are laborers in God's vineyard, then we will labor and wait until judgment day for the certificate to be awarded.

Brethren, the gospel is God's power to save. Paul said he wasn't ashamed of the gospel of Christ for it (the gospel) "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first and also to the Greek," (Rom. 1:16). It is the drawing power of God. Paul said in 2 Thess. 2:14 that God calls us by the gospel. He doesn't draw them by the Spirit working separate and apart from the Word, nor does He draw them by gimmicks. He calls by the gospel. God's Word is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, that will pierce even to dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow. The Word of God is like a hammer that will break the rock in pieces, (Heb. 4:12; Jer. 23:29). The Word is what we need. The Word of God is all that we need, (2 Tim. 3:15-17). What we need is people with a fire in their bones to preach and teach it, (Jer. 20:9). We need people who will teach others about the cross and the benefits to be obtained therefrom. It is the preaching of the cross that ought to motivate people to render obedience to God, (1 Cor. 1:18-21). That is what ought to motivate us to service in the kingdom. Christians (whether young or old) who need various gimmicks to keep them "full of energy" have something wrong with them. God put all the nutrients, vitamins and minerals we will ever need to become, or to remain a faithful Christian, in His Word.

That is what we have to offer people at Bellview. We offer what we have always offered. That is the gospel of Christ. We intend to promote the gospel and likewise to protect and defend it. What do we intend to do to reach people? What we have always done — preach the glorious gospel of the Christ to them. We continue to proclaim that He went to the cross for us all that we might have the remission of our sins. We continue to herald the fact that salvation is found in Him, (2 Tim. 2:10); that one must be a member of His church in order to be saved, (Eph. 5:22-23); and that His Word is able to build us up and to give us an inheritance among all them that are sanctified, (Acts 20:32).
A Review Of The New King James Bible (No. 6)

Robert R. Taylor, Jr.

In the last article in this series for the DEFENDER we noted a number of word changes in the NKJB from the KJV of 1611. Some of these are helpful; others, it strongly appears to me, are changes for the sake of change.

Most serious students of the new Bibles have noted a change in dealing with the Greek term porneia which is translated fornication in the KJV and should give no trouble to any twentieth-century student who will spend just a little time in ascertaining its definitions which include sexual acts of uncleanness between men and women not married to each other, homosexuality, bestiality, etc. The NKJB uses sexual immorality part of the time and then fornication at other times. Yet they are dealing with the same term. In Matthew 5:32; 19:9; Acts 15:20; 15:29; Romans 1:29; 1 Corinthians 6:18; 7:2 and Jude 7 the NKJB renders porneia as "sexual immorality." Yet with consistency the KJV renders all these as fornication which is as accurate a rendering from Greek into English as anyone should desire. The NKJB is not consistent in dealing with this Greek term. In II Corinthians 12:21; Galatians 5:19 and Ephesians 5:3 they use the term fornication. Why the change?

Why the inconsistency in the two renderings? Why not just leave it fornication in all these verses as the KJV and the ASV of 1901 have done? The NIV translators were not content to translate porneia as fornication. In more than one place they translated the term as marital unfaithfulness. But a man can be unfaithful to his spouse in more than just the sexual realm. The NKJB is closer with "sexual immorality" than is the NIV's marital unfaithfulness but fornication is still preferred. A man is sexually immoral who commits heart adultery but goes no further than this but he has not done the physical act that the Lord placed into Matthew 19:9.

Why change err in Matthew 22:29 to mistaken in the Lord's strict statement relative to the skeptical Sadducees? The Greek word is planaomai. I have observed at least four ways in which they render this Greek term in such verses as here, in Mark 12:24,27; Hebrews 3:10; James 1:16 and 5:19. The word means to wander, to go astray, to lead aside from the right way, to lead into error, etc. Mr. Thayer does not give mistaken as one of the definitions. He does say it means "to err" and gives Matthew 22:29 and Mark 12:24,27 as precise examples of this very usage. Why the much milder word of mistaken?

One of the purposes of the NKJB is to aid the twentieth-century reader with words that he will comprehend with greater ease. In matters of various measurements we have the girtkins of John 2:6 changed to gallons in the NKJB. We have the threescore furlongs of the KJV of Luke 24:13 changed to about seven miles in the NKJB. Yet we have in the case of the poor but very generous widow her gift is still the two miles in the NKJB in Luke 21:2 the same as we do in the KJV. In the KJV of Mark 12:42 we have the measurement of the two miles together called a farthing. This is less than one-half cent in our money system. Yet the NKJB changes farthing to quadrons which is no more clear to an English reader than farthing was/is.

Why change mansions in John 14:2 of the KJV to dwelling places in the NKJB? I know the Greek word moné means the place of dwelling or abiding but the KJV and the ASV of 1901 all stayed with mansions. Why change treatise in Acts 1:1 of the KJV to account in the NKJB? Treatise is a word, discourse and both the KJV and the ASV had retained logos as treatise. Why the change? Has anyone had this much trouble with treatise across the years? Why the change from the active of save yourselves in the KJV of Acts 2:40 to the passive of Be saved in the NKJB? The ASV has the active. Is not Peter telling them they are to be active — not just passive — in the stirring exhortation?

Why the change from unto death in the KJV of Revelation 2:10 to until death in the NKJB? Is not the Lord stressing faithfulness among the suffering saints at Smyrna even up to the point of death and not till just natural death? This is misleading in the NKJB.

These are not all the observations that could be noted but will suffice for this rather brief review. The NKJB has some commendable features and some not commendable. I shall be staying with the KJV of 1611 and the ASV of 1901 as my two primary Bibles for preaching, personal reading, writing and lecturing. I see nothing in the NKJB that creates a desire to vacate the majestic KJV of 1611 for its use.

(CLOSING NOTES: Perhaps you have wondered why the review has been only of the New Testa-
ment of the NKJB. The Old Testament portion of it is now available but was not when this research was done. The research for these articles on the NKJB and their actual writing required in access of fifty hours of painstaking work. That is why I cannot answer every request to review every new Bible that comes out. A card recently received requested me to review one of the new Bibles took perhaps one minute to write and was even unsigned!! Fulfillment of that request would take many, many hours of painstaking research. This form of writing is the slowest and most difficult of any I do.)

(To be continued)
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I John 3:18

"MY LITTLE CHILDREN, LET US NOT LOVE IN WORD, NEITHER IN TONGUE: BUT IN DEED AND IN TRUTH"

Charles Blair

What does it mean to love in just "word" or "tongue"? Much needs to be said about just "talking" about love. There is much being written and preached about love. At times, some preachers enjoy impressing their audiences with definitions of "agape" love as opposed to "philoi" love. It may impress certain audiences, but love that is demonstrated is of greater value. It appears to be an insult to tell a person that you don’t love the God of heaven the way you do your favorite hound dog. Some things, through Bible study, we should know whether we ever hear of the Greek definition of agape or not.

The Bible speaks of practicing of our faith (James 1:22; Heb. 5:14). Faith, only in words, is a far cry from what God demands. You just cannot talk about faith — we must find ourselves obeying God (John 14:15). One must search the scriptures to find the correct ways of demonstrating our love for God (II Tim. 2:15).

Do you ever find yourself talking about the non-christian? That is good that we do make it a part of our conversations. It must move from the "word" and "tongue" stage to the "deed" and "truth" stage. Nothing can be done apart from the knowledge of God’s will as recorded in scriptures. If we want to have love, as God would want, then open the scriptures. Those who are lost can be saved if they will obey the truth. It is up to us to teach.

Too often today love is nothing more than a "silly game" being played by preachers with congregations for the sake of money. The love we need today is the kind that causes us to try to save the lost and restore the erring. What kind of love do you have? "Word" and "tongue" or "deed" and "truth"?

COTTONDALE CHURCH OF CHRIST
Cottondale, Alabama 35453
SECOND ANNUAL LECTURESHP  
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“The New Testament Church”

SUNDAY, APRIL 24

2:00 P.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH — NEITHER ANTI NOR LIBERAL........... Bill Cline
3:00 P.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH AND GOD'S MISSION...........John Priola
6:30 P.M. DISCIPLINE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH..................Clinton Elliott
7:30 P.M. THE ELDERSHIP AND THEIR OVERSIGHT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH...... Bill Cline

MONDAY, APRIL 25

1:30 P.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH AND PROPHECY..............Charles Pledge
2:30 P.M. IDENTIFYING THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH..................John Priola
7:00 P.M. ONENESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH...........Melvin Elliott
8:00 P.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH AND HER ENEMIES.............John Priola

TUESDAY, APRIL 26

9:00 A.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH IS MILITANT..................Ira Rice
10:00 A.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH AND LAW..................Bill Cline
1:30 P.M. VERBAL INSPIRATION, GREEK TEXT AND MODERN TRANSLATIONS......... Charles Pledge
2:30 P.M. WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH........... Melvin Elliott
7:00 P.M. UNITY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH vs. UNITY IN DIVERSITY.......Charles Pledge
8:00 P.M. DRAWING THE LINES OF FELLOWSHIP IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH...... Bill Cline

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27

9:00 A.M. BASIS OF UNITY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH................Fred Davis
10:00 A.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH: GOVERNMENT; HOME................Ben Vick
1:30 P.M. CONVERSION AND THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH..................Ira Rice
2:30 P.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH AND INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC................... Buster Dobbs
7:00 P.M. WORSHIP OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH....................Clinton Elliott
8:00 P.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH IS NOT A DENOMINATION..................Buster Dobbs

THURSDAY, APRIL 28

9:00 A.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH IS RIGHT..................Jim Thompson
10:00 A.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH AND PERSECUTION................Ben Vick
1:30 P.M. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH IS GOD’S KINGDOM...........Buster Dobbs
2:30 P.M. FAITHFULNESS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH — WHAT DOES IT COST..... Clinton Elliott
7:00 P.M. KIND OF PREACHING NECESSARY TO SUSTAIN THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH...Buster Dobbs
8:00 P.M. THE ETERNAL DESTINY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH................Ira Rice

CONTRIBUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dana Cochran</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Stoyba</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell F. Hanson</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Curless</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Walp</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon C. Bowman</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Browne</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin M. Towell</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John C. Wattson</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia M. Shockley</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Lindesmith</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter J. Monk</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. T. Tolbert</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Berry</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Geneva Rakes</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerwin McKee</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard L. Young</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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May 8–12, 1983

“Let Us Arise And Build”

SUNDAY, MAY 8

9:00 A.M. TO BE ANNOUNCED....Mitchell Temple
10:00 A.M. TO BE ANNOUNCED.....Rick Tippitt
6:00 P.M. BETTER WORSHIP........Barry Hatcher
7:00 P.M. BETTER YOUNG PEOPLE.....Ray Peters

MONDAY, MAY 9

7:00 P.M. THE PEOPLE HAD A MIND TO WORK.....Buster Dobbs
8:00 P.M. "LET US ARISE AND BUILD"..........Bill Coss

TUESDAY, MAY 10

8:00 A.M. BETTER STUDENTS OF THE WORD.......Melvin Elliott
9:00 A.M. BETTER HUSBANDS AND WIVES.........Robert Taylor
10:00 A.M. BETTER PREACHERS: 1 Timothy..........Roy Deaver
11:00 A.M. BETTER GIVING CHURCHES..............Elmer Scott
1:00 P.M. BETTER DISCIPLINE.....Ken Burleson
2:00 P.M. CHURCHES THAT UNDERSTAND THE MISSION
          OF CHRIST......................Ira Rice
7:00 P.M. BETTER MEMBERS........Charles Blair
8:00 P.M. FAITH IN THE BIBLE....Buster Dobbs

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11

8:00 A.M. BETTER BENEVOLENT CHURCHES............Jimmy Thompson
9:00 A.M. BETTER WORLD WIDE EVANGELISM.........Fred Davis
10:00 A.M. BETTER PREACHERS: 2 Timothy..........Buster Dobbs
11:00 A.M. CHURCHES THAT ARE CONCERNED ABOUT
          GOSPEL PREACHERS........W.N. Jackson
1:00 P.M. BETTER ATTITUDES....Garland Robison
2:00 P.M. BELIEF IN THE DEITY OF CHRIST........Max Miller
7:00 P.M. BETTER DEACONS.....Ernest Underwood
8:00 P.M. BETTER ELDERS........Roy Deaver

THURSDAY, MAY 12

8:00 A.M. BETTER BIBLE SCHOOLS....................Paul Cantrell
9:00 A.M. FAITH IN GOD..........................Roy Deaver
10:00 A.M. BETTER PREACHERS; Titus...............Ken Burleson
11:00 A.M. CHURCHES THAT DEFEND THE FAITH.....Gerald Reynolds
1:00 P.M. EDIFYING CHURCHES.....................Leon Cole
2:00 P.M. BETTER LOVE FOR ONE ANOTHER..........Robert Taylor
7:00 P.M. A PLACE FOR EVERYONE. Max Miller
8:00 P.M. ACCORDING TO THE PATTERN...........W.N. Jackson
Daniel's Seventy Weeks (No. 1)

H. Daniel Denham

"Introduction"

In the first year of Darius the Mede, the son of Ahasuerus, and the provincial governor of Chaldea under the great king Cyrus of Persia, the prophet Daniel "understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that He would accomplish seventy years in the desolation of Jerusalem" (Dan. 9:1,2). The year was 538 B.C. The great golden empire of Babylonia had been given to the Medes and Persians (5:25-31). The Jews, however, were still in captivity. About 68 years had elapsed since the first carrying away in 606 B.C. during the reign of Jehoiakim of Judah. This date furnishes the terminus a quo of Jeremiah's prophecy referred to above. In that year the king of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar, carried captive the vessels of the Temple in Jerusalem as well as many prominent Jews. Some of the children of the "seed royal" were also taken captive, and this group probably included the prophet Daniel (1:1-7).

The prophet Jeremiah, who remained in Judah, had prophesied that the captivity's duration would be "seventy years" (Jer. 25:11,12). In 536 B.C. Cyrus, probably encouraged by Daniel, would issue his famous edict permitting the return of those Jews "who would" to return and rebuild the Temple destroyed by the Babylonians a half century earlier (2 Chron. 36:22, 23; Ezra 1:1-4). Reckoning from 606 to 536 B.C. we arrive at the end of the "seventy years" of Jeremiah, their terminus ad quem.

It is against this background that the vision of the "seventy weeks" of Daniel is to be found. The Bible student must remain keenly aware of it at all times in his studies of Daniel 9, particularly verses 24-27.

"Daniel's Perception And Prayer"

Daniel, in the year 538 B.C., perceived on the basis of Jeremiah's writings, that the end of the period of desolation for Jerusalem was at hand. Only two more years would have to transpire before Cyrus' celebrated edict would be sent forth. Thus, Daniel, a man greatly beloved of God (Dan. 9:23; 10:11), set his face unto the Lord God, "to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes" (9:3).

Jeremiah had declared,

"For thus saith the Lord, that after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place... Then shall ye call upon Me, and ye shall go and pray unto Me, and I will hearken unto you. And ye shall seek Me, and find Me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart. And I will be found of you, saith the Lord: and I will turn away your captivity..." (Jer. 29:10-14).

Therefore, the godly Daniel prayed and sought Jehovah after an humble fashion, and his prayer — a model prayer we may add — is recorded in Daniel 9:4-19.

"The Angel And The Vision"

While Daniel was yet praying, an angel — Gabriel by name (cf. Lk. 1:19) — at the be-
(Continued on page 14)
The church of Christ is exclusive—the special and only realm of the saved on earth—and cannot be otherwise.

The Bible teaches there is but one faith (Ephesians 4:5). That faith has been once for all delivered (Jude 3). It is carefully and fully delineated in the pages of the New Testament and is, therefore, identifiable. There is no justification for anyone to invent or adopt systems of belief other than the faith fully described in God’s book. If men devise religious systems apart from the faith once for all delivered, they have not succeeded in creating many “faiths,” but have arrived at a position of no faith—they have departed from the faith-producing word. Human religious systems, though often stressing trust in Christ, are not identifiable with the one faith revealed in the New Testament. They do not even compare with it. They do not adhere to the principle laid down in 1 Peter 4:11 and are, therefore, something different from the faith that is based on and completely respects God’s will.

We cannot argue the sameness of A, B, C, and D, for they are obviously not identical either in form or function. It is true that they are all letters of the alphabet and are, then, in the same category. But none of them is any of the others. Religion is a category. It generally comprises Judaism, Buddhism, Shintoism, and many other systems of belief and worship, as well as Christianity. Judaism and Christianity were ordained by God. Christianity replaced Judaism, which was taken out of the way in the cross of Christ. Christianity remains the revealed religion God has ordained. If New Testament Christianity is represented by A, other systems in the general category of religion, whether living or dead, may be represented only by B, C, D, E, etc. Within the category of the alphabet, every letter other than A has a different form and function than A has. No matter what they are, they may all be called non-A. There is A and there is non-A. Just so, there is pure, undenominational Christianity and there is everything else that is not New Testament Christianity. A and non-A. They do not identify with each other in form or function, every pretense to the contrary notwithstanding. Since that is true, A excludes, by the fact of its A-ness, everything else.

Every real thing has limits or characteristics peculiar to itself. These make up its identity; they distinguish it from other real things. A block of lead and a block of wood may have the same dimensions, but they differ in other characteristics and cannot be called identical simply because they are the same size. Things in the same category are not necessarily interchangeable merely on the basis of this broad fact. If this were true, men and women would be identical because they belong to the same category: they are both human beings. Each sex has its own characteristic features and these limits bar male from being female and female from being male. Within the more restricted category...
of maleness, there are individual characteristics which limit one man from being another man. One man's hand is different from all other hands; each fingerprint excludes all other fingerprints. The limits of each real thing serve to exclude every other thing from itself. If we destroy the limits, we destroy identity.

As to the matter of identity, the church, since it is not like anything else and nothing else is like it, is exclusive. It is no more to be censured for this exclusiveness than is the block of wood to be blamed for not being a block of lead. That the church is exclusive is simply a fact of its nature.

The fact of the church's exclusiveness means it is unique. The one faith does not really compare with human religions, though philosophers and books or comparative religion would have us think so. A and non-A are quiet different things. We must overlook the assumptions of the philosophers and authors, for they do not really understand undenominational Christianity. But it is difficult to appreciate the attitudes of those who know the teaching of the New Testament when they react adversely to the fact of the exclusiveness of the church.

Some cringe when they hear bitter denominationalists say, "You and your little bunch think you're the only ones going to heaven!" That statement is calculated to get under the skin. When it does, too often the reaction is to reply or imply, "Oh, no! We don't think that! That's not the way we are at all!" It is quite an embarrassing dilemma. It puts one in the position of being ashamed that he is right. There is nothing shameful about being right religiously. In fact, it is the state we should desire. The New Testament is right. If we follow it, we are right and need not apologize for it. We do not have a "bunch" either big or little. What the Bible teaches is that the New Testament Church is composed of the redeemed (Acts 20:28), and if we have obeyed the gospel we belong to Christ.

Because one of the dictionary definitions of exclusive is "snobbishly aloof," and because we are not exclusive in that sense, we may be inclined to deny all exclusiveness when confronted with the "your-little-bunch" taunt. If we deny exclusiveness, however, we are throwing away much of the teaching of God's word. It is a fact that the church is exclusive. God made it that way. God also made man's response to his will the deciding factor in the matter—he gave man free moral agency. But God retains the right of judgment. God's commands exclude those who exclude God's commands. Persons may exclude God and his church from their lives by refusal to obey his commands, then complain that those who have a more complete faith are exclusive. To become defensive or apologetic in the face of such ill-conceived thrusts is to accept undeserved blame.

The church is not exclusive in the sense of not wanting others to participate in the blessings of God—it is not snobbishly aloof. Christians do not rejoice when a person refuses Christ. They react with sorrow and regret, for they want all men to be saved. Christians are not possessed of a mean spirit of selfishness about the church. They do not consider it a private club. That is not what is meant by affirming that the church is exclusive.

Jesus said the primary mission of the church is to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature (Mark 16:15). That amounts to an invitation to everyone to accept the gospel and be added to the church. But Jesus also said, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that despiseth shall be condemned." The church is open to all, upon conditions imposed by its Founder and Head. But the volition of the hearer is involved. He determines whether he will be saved or condemned, the church does not make that determination. The church earnestly desires his salvation and inclusion in the body of Christ. It would not have preached to him otherwise. Exclusion, then, is something the disbeliever chooses as the alternative to faith.

Its uniqueness is not the only ground of the exclusiveness of the church, for man's reaction to God's will enters the picture. His saved or unsaved condition opens consideration of another ground of exclusiveness, which is that the Lord does not add the unsaved to his church, nor does he add the saved to anything that is not his church.

All the initial commands of the gospel simultaneously exclude and include. The command to believe excludes unbelievers, while it includes those who accept the testimony of the word. The command to repent excludes those who cannot bring themselves to turn from sin, but places divine approval on those who will. The command to be baptized for the remission of sins excludes those who think belief only suffices or who are not scripturally baptized, while it saves those whose good conscience toward God is manifest in this act of surrender. Every step excludes those who choose to be excluded. But when the believer repents and is baptized, he is added to the body of obedient believers who, like himself, are saved (Acts 2:47). He is included among Christ's called-out. The Lord acts on behalf of the baptized believer; it is the Lord who...
adds him to the church.

It is obvious from the fact that the Lord's action takes place after baptism for the remission of sins that no unsaved person is added to the church. One is not added to the saved when he has believed or when he has both believed and repented. He has, in this state, yet to receive the forgiveness of his sins. Therefore, persons who believe and are penitent, but who have stopped short of full gospel obedience are not in the Lord's church. He has not added them to it. Denominations are filled with people in this state. Some of them have submitted to a denominational baptism—often by immersion, though not for the scriptural purpose. The Lord has not added these persons to his church. Being in a modern denomination does not equate with the Bible view of obedience and salvation. Members of denominations are not Christians in the New Testament sense.

Occasionally, one of these persons will hear enough gospel preaching to learn the truth about baptism and, by a strange quirk of human nature, will convince himself that his own understanding of baptism was scriptural when he became a member of his denomination. We are sometimes urged to accommodate these persons and accept their recollection of their conversion, colored by what they have later learned. But, why? Just because they insist on it? Why cannot they accommodate? If they were so mistaken in fellowshipping denominational error in every other thing that pertains to religion, is it not highly probable that they were in error about baptism as well? If the person is as sincere as it is always reported of him, why can he not simply start all over, to be sure he is right?

But is it possible for a person to come to an understanding of the truth in regard to the plan of salvation, persuade a denominational preacher to baptize him for the remission of sins, and then mistakenly become a part of a denomination? Some have written lately as if this happens many times, implying that it is a serious problem for the church. They assert that there are saved persons in the denominations. Actually, most of this kind of writing is hypothetical; the problem is only represented as being real.

Among the many questions that should be asked about such imaginary believers is this: Where did the hypothetical person learn of the true plan of salvation? He either learned it from a personal reading of the scripture, or he learned it from a gospel preacher—speaking publicly, over radio or television, or through a tract or book. Did he learn the Bible plan of salvation from a denominational preacher—a Methodist, a Baptist, a Presbyterian, a Catholic? He did not! It is inconceivable that one could read enough of the New Testament to learn the plan of salvation and not learn anything about the church. It is inconceivable that, learning the truth about the church, he could be happy or satisfied for one minute in a denomination. And if his appetite for truth is whetted by gospel preaching, by whatever means, and not by a personal study of the scripture, it is inconceivable that he has not inquired what church the preacher is part of—that the question of the church has not entered his mind. It is highly implausible that a man might pick up a tract in the bus station, read of the gospel plan of salvation, know absolutely nothing else about the truth (the tract, it is presumed, has no address, no publisher's name, no one to contact), and dash off to the first denominational preacher he can find to persuade him to perform a scriptural baptism. That is simply too much for credulity—ours, and the denominational preacher's.

Some of the earliest men in the restoration movement did learn the truth by personal study. There were no scriptural churches in their denominational world. But they did not content themselves with scriptural conversion and unscriptural worship, church government and human creeds. They gradually began worshipping according to the Bible. The same is true of those indigenous restoration movements we sometimes read of in our time. Occasionally, there are reports of brethren finding groups in remote places already worshipping according to the New Testament pattern and following the Lord's teaching on salvation. But they are always meeting together separate from denominational and national religious bodies. They know better than to think they can be truly Christian in any setting that is not wholly scriptural in organization and worship.

We must question the motives of those persons who nowadays are pushing their assumption that there are saved people in all churches. What is their purpose? Is it to exalt the church of the Lord? Is it to strengthen it? Is it to convince the denominationalist who has almost made up his mind to leave denominationalism? What is behind all this spate of words about there being saved people in the denominations? Pragmatically, there is only one answer: It is to weaken the church! It is done to break down the walls of Zion!

Some of the agitators are all out for "open-end" Christianity. That is, religion in which there are no answers, no positive stands, no real authority—not even that of
the word of God itself. This is the position of subjectivism, and conversion through personal testimony rather than through the forceful teaching of Bible doctrine. Others are in the camp of those ultra-sophisticated modernists who are tunneling and mining under the walls to bring about that grand amalgam of "believers" they envision in terms of something equivalent to an international council of churches. They have begun with the "structural unity" now being touted by advocates of the ecumenical movement. These are the persons in the denominations who are saying churches should unite organizationally now and work out their doctrinal differences later and, in the church, they are the persons who are talking about unity in diversity. There is only one way these persons can exist philosophically: they are syncretists.

One-worlders in politics have long worked to break down nationalism. They have derided patriotism, calling it narrow nationalistic pride and jingoism, and have frightened the timid with charges of imperialism and provincialism. They have a hidden goal, of course. It is the creation of a world government, a gigantic political monolith, which would at first be ruled by an oligarchy of power, and finally by a world dictator. A parallel can be drawn with those whose hidden goal religiously is the creation of a superchurch. They have begun with the word of God itself. This is the position that if one believes, repents, and is baptized for the remission of sins, the Lord will then add him to the Lutheran Church—or perhaps the United Brethren—or maybe the Roman Catholic Church. The Bible teaches that the Lord adds the saved to nothing but his spiritual body; the saved are added to the saved. It is possible for a saved person to become part of a denomination but that does not justify his doing it; nor should he remain in it. Even novices in the faith understand that the church is the called-out, not the scattered-among!

This brings up the third ground of the exclusiveness of the church: God wills that his people be set apart or sanctified for his own possession and use. That makes them exclusive.

When the Law of Moses prevailed, the Jews were exclusively God's people; they were the elect. They were to keep themselves separate from the religious concepts of other peoples under pain of severe penalty. Much of the Old Law was designed for that purpose. Under the New Law, God's people continue to be set-apart.

"Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers: for what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity? Or what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever? And what agreement hath a temple of God with idols? For we are a temple of the living God; even as God said, "I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be to you a Father, and ye shall be to me sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty" (2 Corinthians 6:11-18). Again "... who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works" (Titus 2:14). And again, "But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession..." (1 Peter 2:9).

If the church is not exclusive, it is not unique. If it is not unique, it has no real value. If it has no real value, men cannot be asked to give up all to follow Jesus. They may be justified in weighing the advantages of every other relationship and condition against Christianity and logically arriving at a rejection of the demanding life of commitment.
without being faulted. But there is really no basis for such comparison, evaluation and judgment since the church is exclusive and without peer. Its very uniqueness poses to all men the choice for or against Christ, with attendant blessing or blame; of being either in his spiritual body or out of it; of recognizing the distinction between A and non-A.

If the biblical doctrine of exclusiveness is swept aside, the church will be destroyed; it will have become merely another human institution among many. And the light will have been overcome by the darkness.

Box 218511
Houston, Texas 77218

DANIEL'S SEVENTY WEEKS continued from page 9

ginning of his supplications being dispatched, came to him "being caused to fly swiftly." He arrived about the time of the evening oblation to give the prophet of God "skill and understanding." The angel came to comfort him, and thus, Gabriel exhorts Daniel to "understand the matter and consider the vision" (Dan. 9:20-23).

The vision is presented and interpreted by the angelic emissary from Heaven in verses 24-27. It concerned a period of "seventy weeks" which "are determined upon thy people and thy holy city" (v. 24).

"A Key Thought"

Daniel had been praying for the deliverance of the Jews from their captivity. He had prophesied of and had actually witnessed the overthrow of Babylon (Dan. 5:17-31). He had seen the end of Nebuchadnezzar’s royal lineage in Belshazzar, and the beautiful imperial city and its province pass into the hands of the Median Darius, who was 62 years old at the time. He himself had been elevated by the Mede to the first office of "president" (there were three such positions) thus giving him a powerful and influential role in the affairs of the new regime (6:1-3). He prospered throughout the reign of Darius (6:28). Therefore, knowing the great work God had wrought in Babylon’s fall and in his own exaltation, and thus knowing that according to the books (or writings) the captivity was near to its end, Daniel was undoubtedy in great anxiety of spirit in anticipation of its end. He was in dire need of Divine comfort.

He poured out his heart in supplications to God: confessing his sins as well as the sins of the people. After the Hebrew manner of fasting, donned with sackcloth and ashes, he lamented Jerusalem’s desolation. He admitted the justice of God in so punishing the rebellious city, but he beseeches God to hear his plea and grant his petition. He prays at length,

"Now therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause Thy face to shine upon Thy sanctuary that is desolate for the Lord’s sake. O my God, incline Thine ear, and hear; open Thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by Thy name: for we do present our supplications before Thee for our righteousnesses, but for Thy great mercies, O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for Thine own sake, O my God: for Thy city and Thy people are called by Thy name" (9:17-19).

The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob did not sleep, but hearkened to the earnest pleadings of this man of God. He dispatched His angel, who stands in His very presence, to comfort the anxious and heart-sick prophet in causing him to "understand the matter and consider the vision."

This is how the vision relates to the immediate context of Daniel 9. To miss this is to miss a sublime aspect of predictive prophecy. The comfort that it brings to the saints of God is invaluable. Preachers, teachers, and elders ought to spend considerable time in the prophetic portions of the Bible — as indeed in every portion — to strengthen their faith and the faith of "them that hear" them and to comfort the hearts of the anxious souls in God’s kingdom (1 Thess. 4:13-18; 1 Cor. 15:50-58).

"The Vision Presented"

The angel said:

"Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah and Prince, shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and
the wall, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate" (9:24-27).

The vision consisted of "seventy weeks" which were determined upon the Jewish nation and the city of Jerusalem. These "seventy weeks" were determined in order to, (1) "finish the transgression," (2) "make an end of sins," (3) "make reconciliation for iniquity," (4) "bring in everlasting righteousness," (5) "seal up the vision and prophecy," and (6) "anoint the Most Holy" (Dan. 9:24).

They were comprised of three distinct periods. (1) The first one was "seven weeks" in duration. (2) The second one, was "three-score and two weeks" (sixty-two weeks) in duration. (3) The third period of the 'seventy weeks' was 'one week' in duration. The first period would extend from the time of the "going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," and, taken with the second period connected, it would extend to "the Messiah the Prince," i.e. His first coming. These two consecutive periods would together be of "three-score and nine weeks" duration (69 weeks). "The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times" (9:25).

Sometime after the second period (the 62 weeks period), the Messiah would be "cut off". This would be done "but not for Himself." In the midst of the final week (the one week period), He, the Messiah, would cause "the sacrifice and the oblation to cease."

The vision ends with the determination of a further desolation of the city of Jerusalem, which determination would be made by the Messiah in the midst of the final week. The people "of the prince that shall come" — as a result of that determination — would come and "destroy the city and the sanctuary." The end would be "with a flood." With "the overspreading of abominations" the city would be desolated, "even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate" (9:26,27).

"Seventy Weeks"

Gabriel tells Daniel, "Seventy weeks are determined. ..." The expression "seventy weeks" is to be taken as a reference to seventy 'weeks of years', or periods of seven years. This is intimated by the peculiar nature of the prophecy. This is borne out by its context in its reference to the "seventy years" of Jeremiah's prophecy. Daniel had been praying with reference to these seventy years.

Seventy ordinary weeks, therefore, are not intended: "for what sort of a consolation," as Hengstenberg asks, "would it have been for Daniel, if it had been announced to him, that as a compensation for the seventy years of desolation, the city should continue seventy ordinary weeks until a new destruction?"

Furthermore, it is obvious that the Messiah's coming as the babe of Bethlehem did not occur within a literal one year and eighteen weeks following any known commandment at all respecting the restoration and building again of Jerusalem! An extra-ordinary use of the 'weeks' is thus indicated.

"Seventy sevens" or "seven seventies" are under consideration in the prophecy. Thus, a period of 490 years is under consideration. Neither seventy literal weeks nor 490 weeks would satisfy all of the particulars of the prophecy, and both these explanations, therefore, should be rejected as viable alternatives.

The "seventy weeks" are spoken of "collectively". Together they form a unit of meticulous Messianic prophecy. Edward J. Young paraphrases, "A period of sevens — even 70 of them — is decreed." Therefore, it is a grave mistake to attempt to place a gap between the various portions of the "seventy weeks". More shall be said on this matter later.

(To be continued)
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"Let Us Arise And Build"

SUNDAY, MAY 8
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10:00 A.M. TO BE ANNOUNCED........Rick Tippitt
6:00 P.M. BETTER WORSHIP........Barry Hatcher
7:00 P.M. BETTER YOUNG PEOPLE.....Ray Peters

MONDAY, MAY 9

7:00 P.M. THE PEOPLE HAD A MIND TO WORK.....Buster Dobbs
8:00 P.M. "LET US ARISE AND BUILD"............Bill Coss
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8:00 A.M. BETTER STUDENTS OF THE WORD......Melvin Elliott
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7:00 P.M. A PLACE FOR EVERYONE........Max Miller
8:00 P.M. ACCORDING TO THE PATTERN........W.N. Jackson
Daniel's Seventy Weeks (No. 2)
H. Daniel Denham

"Are Determined"

This expression has reference to a decree "by judicial decision," and thus Pusey renders it as "are decreed." The Hebrew verb here is found nowhere else in all of Holy Writ. It properly means, "to cut off, to divide; and hence, to determine, to destine, to appoint." Barnes comments,

"The meaning would seem to be, that this portion of time — the seventy weeks — was cut off from the whole of duration, or cut out of it, as it were, and set by itself for a definite purpose. It does not mean that it was cut off from the time which the city would naturally stand, or that this time was abbreviated, but that a portion of time — to wit, four hundred and ninety years — was designated or appointed with reference to the city, to accomplish the great and important object which is immediately specified." Barnes comments,

Thus, Jehovah God, the Judge of all the earth who will do right (Gen. 18:25), by His great grace and holy will decreed or appointed this period of time in anticipation of the fulfillment of His redemptive purpose by the Messiah. This is the most natural understanding of the peculiar construction, and it best accords with the specific facts of the vision. It would be 490 years from "the going forth of the commandment" till God's purpose with the Jew nation and the city as regards the redemptive work of Christ be accomplished!

"Upon Thy People"

This refers to the Jewish nation. Daniel had been praying on behalf of his fellow-countrymen. He was concerned about their state as concerned the end of the Exilic period.

The time was upon them that they would be permitted to rise up from the plains, fields, and cities of Mesopotamia and traverse to their desolate homeland. Therefore, the vision deals with their "destiny".

"And Upon Thy Holy City"

Jerusalem here is the "holy city". The Lord's house, the gorgeous Temple of Solomon, had been there. God's holy presence had been manifested to the nation there in the Most Holy. His name had been placed there. And it was the capital of Judah, the seat of David, Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Asa, Jotham, Hezekiah, and Josiah. The holy hill of Zion was also there.

The angel calls it not only the "holy city", but he calls it "thy holy city". The "thy" refers to Daniel. It was the national capital of his homeland, and probably was his "home-town" (cf. Daniel 1). He had been praying anent it and its sanctuary, the Temple.

"The Primary Purpose(s) Of The Seventy Weeks"

The seventy weeks, 490 years, were determined, or decreed, upon the Jewish nation (Continued on page 21)
Legalism And Liberalism

H. A. Dobbs

Legalism is a disposition to make laws; liberalism is a disposition to disregard law. The former seeks to bind where God has not bound, and the latter would loose where God has bound. Both extremes are wrong. The problems of legalism and liberalism facing the church today are not new, but have existed through all the history of man.

The Sadducees of Jesus' time were religious liberals and are perhaps best known for saying "There is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit" (Acts 23:8). However, we also know that they insisted upon being free of the judgment of the Mosaic Law. They were determined not to be restricted by legal regulations of any kind. "Hence they repudiated all refining deductions from the law, and appealed simply to the letter thereof, which was easier to circumvent" (The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. 9, p. 12). Jesus had no word of commendation for the Sadducees, but to the profound reverse warned, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees... Then understood they that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (Matthew 16:6,12).

Some religious teachers of today are altogether in the party of modern Sadduceeism, denying the virgin birth, vicarious death, victorious resurrection, venerable ascension; denying also a coming judgment and a future reward, and affirming a "this world only" doctrine. Such teachers have no respect for what is written in the Law of Jehovah, unless it happens to serve their subversive purpose. Other teachers are liberals with reference to some things and true to the Word on other matters. Some teacher, for instance, might stoutly affirm his faith in the resurrection of Jesus and yet seek to relax the Law of God in other areas, labeling teaching on obedience "inert legalism" and thereby diminishing respect for God's authority—and all authority! Such a person is part Sadducee. The half-breed Sadducee is the more dangerous of the two. He appears to be sound in the faith, but, in fact, undermines the very foundation upon which the gospel rests.

Everywhere in Holy Writ we are commanded to be concerned about divine law, and always careful to render to sacred injunctions uninterrupted obedience. In the sermon on the mount, where Jesus laid down the foundation principles for his coming kingdom, the Master unequivocally declared that obedience to the gospel is the condition of acceptance with God. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven" (Matthew 7:21). Both Testaments emphasize the absolute necessity of perfect obedience; "... he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation" (Hebrews 5:8b).

The Sadducee-like teachers among us today attempt to get
around the plain and simple requirements of God's Law. A few of these modern Sadducees have gone so far as to say there is no law for the disciples of Christ. "Christ died to free man from the bondage of the law principle," wrote a twentieth-century Sadducee. He then cites a number of verses which teach that Jesus died to free man from the Mosaic Law, as if such verses prove freedom from all law. What he refuses to see is that there was a change from one law to another law; the termination of the first law does not mean the law principle ended.

Paul wrote, "For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death" (Romans 8:2). The apostle refers to the law which makes free. A Sadducee of our time, being unmindful of Paul's statement, declares, "To say that Paul preached the faith is to deny that he advocated law." Such a statement is unadorned foolishness! It has nothing in it to commend him who wrote it or he who published it! It indicates a total lack of respect for the basic principles of the Bible, or a woeful and inexcusable ignorance of the teaching of the New Testament. The new covenant is law.

"For I delight in the law of God after the inward man" (Romans 7:22). "To them that are without law, as without law, not being without law to God, but under law to Christ, that I might gain them that are without law" (1 Corinthians 9:21). "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ" (Galatians 6:2). "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; ... For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my laws into their mind, and on their heart also will I write them ..." (Hebrews 8:8-10). "He that looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty ..." (James 1:25). Howbeit if ye fulfill the royal law ..." (James 2:8). "So speak ye, and so do, as men that are to be judged by a law of liberty" (James 2:12).

Is it possible that the contemporary Sadducee who dogmatically wrote, "Law and grace cannot exist together," intended to accuse Jesus, Paul, James, and all other inspired writers of the New Testament of a failure to teach grace?

Religious liberals, like the Sadducees of the first century, are interested mainly in right here and right now; they have but little real concern about the future world. They ignore Paul's admonition, "If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God. Set your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth. For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall be manifested, then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory" (Colossians 3:1-2). Modern-day Sadducees are a great deal more concerned about social issues and righting community wrongs than they are about heaven and an eternal reward.

One part-time religious liberal urges us to become involved in such things as "mass transportation; communications; light and power; pollution of the atmosphere; hygiene; garbage disposal; the police, allegedly brutal, corrupt, incompetent; finances, inadequate because there is no real base for taxation; housing; and ethnic divisions." The church has been castigated and the disciples of Jesus accused of not fulfilling their mission for failure to use the power and energy of the kingdom of God in an attempt to correct what someone imagines is a social injustice. The profane proposal has actually been made that the church for which Jesus died be prostituted to serious participation in these questions of wholly mundane interest. All attempts to turn the church from her divine mission and involve her in political matters reveals a Sadducaic mentality.

We have been told that it is a matter of Christian duty (even Sadducees can talk of duty when they are promoting items of social and political concern) for us to become Christian law-breakers. One author has had the effrontery to address the church on what he calls the morality of civil disobedience; and has undertaken to prove that Jesus and the apostles were nothing more than a social action group mainly concerned with leading demonstrations designed to disrupt the flow of traffic in downtown Jerusalem, and thereby force to the attention of the city fathers the need to institute a program of urban renewal and raise the wages of the date pickers. One would gather the impression from reading the writings of such liberals that Jesus was crucified for trying to organize a labor union.

We are all interested, no doubt, in improving society and strengthening our economic order; we are anxious, too, to get a better balance of justice throughout the world; we are solicitous for the physical welfare of all men and filled with compassion for the hungry of the earth. But Jesus Christ did not die upon the cross of Calvary in order to inaugurate a head-start program. The Son of God came to "seek and save the lost" (Luke 19:10), and to "give his life a ransom for many" (Matthew 20:28). He has taught us to
"Work not for the food which perisheth, but for the food which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you" (John 6:27). It is a matter of emphasis, and Jesus put the emphasis on the eternal and the spiritual. Our Saviour requires us to "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned" (Mark 16:15,16). Salvation is man's greatest need, and it is to that need Jesus would point the energy and power of his church. We must not permit the sacred body of the Lord to be diverted from this divine mission regardless of how worthy some other project may seem to be. Do not be blinded by the gods of this world.

Legalism, as reflected in Paul's old party, continues to be a problem in the church.

IS THE ONLY ACCEPTABLE ALTERNATIVE TO "PHARISEEISM" A BLIND AND REACTIONARY SADDUCEEISM?

There are some who suppose that legalism means respecting the law of the new covenant and insisting upon obedience to the requirements of God. However, as already noted, the New Testament makes submission to the commands of God the condition of our eternal salvation. Simple obedience to what God requires of us—and presenting God's requirements as law—is not legalism.

Others seem to think that legalism is concern for the "minor" points of the law. This suggests that divine oracles can be divided into minor and major precepts; and the minor ones should be ignored, while the major ones must be obeyed. This is a distinction no inspired writer ever attempted to make. Who, among uninspired men, is to decide which command is important and which is unimportant? David declared, "For all of thy commandments are righteousness" (Psalms 119:172). It is open rebellion to God to talk of minor matters of the law, or to complain because someone, in the judgment of the complainer, is hung up over the details of the Bible. Jesus said, "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees; hypocrites! for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, justice and mercy, and after their works; for they say, and do not" (Matthew 23:1-3). When the Pharisees spoke from "Moses' seat"—when they spoke of the commands of the Law—all of the commands—Jesus told his disciples to obey.

The Pharisees were legalists, not because they were careful to keep the Law of God, even the details of that law, but because they added to the Law. Hear Jesus, "And ye have made void the word of God because of your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men" (Matthew 15:6-9).

Legalism and liberalism are the bane of the brotherhood. We should content ourselves with continuing to "speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent." Let us not add to that which is written, or take away from that which God has spoken. "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God: he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son" (2 John 9).
DANIEL'S SEVENTY WEEKS, continued from page 17

(the people) and the city of Jerusalem (the holy city) for six purposes — all of which relate to the redemptive purpose of the Messiah. These are:

1. "to finish the transgression;"
2. "to make an end of sins;"
3. "to make reconciliation for iniquity;"
4. "to bring in everlasting righteousness;"
5. "to seal up the vision and prophecy;" and
6. "to anoint the Most Holy."

The Bible student must be keenly aware of these, or else his exposition and understanding of the purpose of the seventy weeks and their particulars shall be caught up in vain prophetic speculation. Thus, to the six preceding points we must now turn.

'To Finish The Transgression'

The rendering of the infinitive as "to finish" does not do full justice to the force of the word. It does not fully meet the requisites of the text. The idea is that transgression would be restrained in some sense or to some degree. Hengstenberg elucidates,

"Sin, which hitherto lay naked and open before the eyes of the righteous God, is now, by his mercy, shut up, sealed, and covered, so that it can no more be regarded as existing; a figurative designation of the forgiveness of sin, analogous to those, where it is said, "to hide the face from sin," and etc."8

One should examine the following passages where this verb infinitum is to be found: 1 Sam. 6:10; Jer. 32:2,3; Psa. 88:8.9 On the basis of these verses, Barnes concludes that the "Sense of shutting up, or restraining, accords better, with the connection than that of finishing."10

As "sin is the transgression" of God's law (1 John 3:4), and as Daniel had been praying and confessing relative to transgressions, this first accomplishment would be very appropriate indeed! But to limit such a benefit, as Futurists propose, to the nation of Israel at the Second Coming of Christ — and even then to only the then living — is an absurdity.

(1) First, the prophecy no where so limits this blessing, nor any of the others. While it definitely concerns the Jewish people — and that individually and not nationally, as such, it no where is limited to the Jew alone.

(2) Second, the entire position is dependant upon the assumed premise that there is yet to be a "national repentance" of Israel, and to this assumed event the prophecy refers. Upon this basis one might as well assume that it refers to the Bolshevik Revolution!

(3) Third, this effect would be brought about in the course of the 490 years, and not after it, as the Premillennial position implies, (they attempt to "gap" the 70th week from the prophecy not withstanding). (See the chart on the Premillennial Scheme of Daniel 9:24-27).

The prophecy relates to the Gospel Age in that, "by the end of the 490 year period of time," as Rex A. Turner, Sr. has astutely observed, "the gospel would be preached and sin and iniquity would be restrained or shut up. Sin would be enclosed, shut up, or incarcerated as if imprisoned. In short, the progress of sin would be restrained."12

Through the Blood Atonement of the blessed Son of God, the Messiah of Daniel 9, and the preaching of His Gospel bringing the glad tidings of the provision and terms of "the forgiveness of sins" (Matt. 26:28; Acts 2:38; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14; Acts 5:31; 10:43; 13:38; 26:18; Luke 24:27; Heb. 9:22; 10:18), sin would be restrained or shut up. The glorious blessing of forgiveness would come from the Most High upon those creatures who would gladly drink of the water of life in obeying His kind and beneficent word (cf. Acts 2:41, 47; Matt. 7:21-23; Heb. 5:8,9; John 15:1-8; etc.). The law would go forth from Jerusalem (Isa. 2:1-4; Mic. 4:1,2), and beginning there — with the Jewish people having first access (cf. Rom. 1:16,17) — "repentance and the remission of sins" would be preached in all nations (Luke 24:44-50; Acts 1:8; cf. Matt. 28:18-20; Mk. 16:15,16; Acts 8:4; 1 Cor. 1:18,21). By the Atonement for sin "as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 5:21). The way would be thusly paved for men to become the servants of righteousness by casting off the heavy shackles of sin. Under the sway of the sceptre of righteousness (cf. 1 John 3:7) sin is incarcerated and its vicious reign of death is abolished (Rom. 6:16-23).

'To Make An End Of Sins'

The idea expressed here is merely another way of viewing the preceding antenent Atonement and the "remission of sins." As the former imagery was that of "restraining" or "shutting up" sin, this present view is a "sealing" up of sin. This is the significance of the most common Hebrew reading.13

The idea is that sin would be "sealed" in the design of "removing it from sight."14
(cf. Job 9:7). The imagery refers to the custom of sealing up, says Lengeike, "Those things which one lays aside and conceals." The thought of "greater security" in controlling and containing sin is carried with it.15

"To Make Reconciliation For Iniquity"

This is a third view of the benefits of the Atonement and so forth. Brother Turner has written of it:

"The meaning of 'make reconciliation for iniquity' is that by the end of the 490 years a means would be made for the wiping out, or a covering for sins that men could and would be urged to reconcile themselves unto God."16

Through the Christ we have "reconciliation" (cf. Rom. 5:11; 2 Cor. 5:17-19). Sin is "covered over, the propitiation being offered (Rom. 3:25; 1 John 2:2; 4:10). This image of 'covering' sin "never designates any thing else other than the forgiveness of sin, the covering of sin by the veil of mercy, so that the eye of the angry Judge cannot find it."18 Prof. Girdlestone, in his Synonyms of the Old Testament, on Dan. 9:24 on this expression, "make reconciliation", comments, "The word reconciliation has been adopted by our translation instead of atonement and must be considered as identical with it..."19

The time was coming when the Lord would put His laws into the hearts of men and engrave them upon the tablets of their mind, "and their sins and iniquities" he would remember no more (Jer. 31:33; Heb. 10:16,17).

In summing up the first three images, Edward Young says,

"To sum up; sin is here pictured as transgression, sins, and iniquity. These three words well represent in its fulness the nature of that curse which has separated man from God. The first stated purpose of the decreeing of the period of 70 sevens is to abolish this curse. It is to be restrained, so shut up by God, that it may no longer be regarded as existing; it is to be brought to end, that it may no longer be present to enslave; it is also to be done away, because the guilt which it involves has been expiated."20

Thus, those who avail themselves "through the obedience of faith" (cf. Heb. 5:8,9; Gal. 5:6; Rom. 16:26; Eph. 2:8-10; Jas. 2:14-26; Phil. 2:12) are no longer to be enslaved to sin (Rom. 6:3-23) and therefore, are not to "make a practice of sinning" (1 John 2:10; 3:9). They are not perfect in its highest sense — that of sinlessness (cf. 1 John 1:8), but are yet "walking in the light as He is in the light," and when they sin they confess them (having repented of them), in order to maintain the blessings and benefits that come from the cleansing blood of the Christ (1 John 1:7,9). While they yet commit sin (even to the point of apostacy and thus failing of God's grace, (1 Cor. 9:27; 10:1-13; 2 Cor. 13:5; Gal. 5:4; Heb. 10:25-31; 12:15; 2 Peter 2:20-22; Rev. 3:14-22), they are no longer in the sinning business — or, at least, should not be! They are the redeemed (Gal. 3:13; 4:5; Titus 2:14; Luke 1:66) purchased by the Blood of the Lamb (Rev. 5:9; 1 Peter 1:18; Acts 20:28; 1 Cor. 6:20; 7:23).

(To be continued)
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SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL LECTURESHIP

MARCH 20-24, 1983

Memphis School of Preaching

Memphis, TN 38118

GENERAL THEME: “Ancient Truth and the Restoration”

SCHEDULE OF LECTURES

Sunday, March 20, 1983

10:30 a.m. E. L. Whitaker
6:00 p.m. J. F. Camp “Basic Principles of the Restoration” No. 1

Monday, March 21, 1983

9:00 a.m. R. L. Curry “Mysteries of the Bible”
10:00 a.m. J. H. Renshaw “Evidences of the Inspiration of the Bible”
11:00 a.m. J. F. Camp “Basic Principles of the Restoration” No. 2
11:50 a.m. INTERMISSION FOR LUNCH
7:00 p.m. CONGREGATIONAL SINGING
8:10 p.m. Max R. Miller “Evidences of the Deity of Christ and the Virgin Birth”

Tuesday, March 22, 1983 (continued)

7:00 p.m. CONGREGATIONAL SINGING
7:15 p.m. Winfred Clark “The Need for Bible Preaching versus Human Philosophy and Theology”
8:10 p.m. J. T. Marlin “The Church the Falling Away and the Restoration”

Wednesday, March 23, 1983

9:00 a.m. J. H. Renshaw “Evidences of the Inspiration of the Bible”
10:00 a.m. Max R. Miller “Wonders of Creation”
10:00 a.m. Mrs. Emily Huffard “Coping with Stress” (Ladies Class)
11:00 a.m. Bert Thompson “Paleontology and the Fossil Record”
11:50 a.m. INTERMISSION FOR LUNCH
1:10 p.m. Paul Sain “Genuineness of Genesis One and the Days of Creation”
2:10 p.m. Robert R. Taylor, Jr. “Clear-cut Arguments against Evolution”
3:10 p.m. Max R. Miller “Power of the Gospel versus Gimmicks in Reaching the Lost”
4:00 p.m. INTERMISSION FOR DINNER
7:00 p.m. INTERMISSION FOR CONGREGATIONAL SINGING
7:15 p.m. Max R. Miller “Evidences of the Existence of God”
8:10 p.m. Bert Thompson “Evolution a Threat to the Christian Home”

Thursday, March 24, 1983

9:00 a.m. Willie Bradshaw “Fight the Good Fight of Faith”
10:00 a.m. Basil Overton “Theistic Evolution Refuted” (Ladies Class)
11:00 a.m. Bert Thompson “The Bible, Science and the Age of the Earth”
11:50 a.m. INTERMISSION FOR LUNCH
1:10 p.m. Linda Ferguson “Holding Fast the Pattern of Sound Words”
2:10 p.m. C. A. Cates “The Doctrine of Special Creation”
3:10 p.m. Roger Jackson “A awakenings of the Restoration”
4:00 p.m. INTERMISSION FOR DINNER
7:00 p.m. CONGREGATIONAL SINGING
7:15 p.m. Ben F. Vick, Jr. “Ancient Truth and the Restoration”
8:10 p.m. Robert R. Taylor, Jr. “Influence of Christianity versus Evolution”
NINTH ANNUAL LECTURESHIP
BELLVIEW PREACHER TRAINING SCHOOL
May 8–12, 1983
"Let Us Arise And Build"

SUNDAY, MAY 8
9:00 A.M. TO BE ANNOUNCED........Mitchell Temple
10:00 A.M. TO BE ANNOUNCED.....Rick Tippitt
  6:00 P.M. BETTER WORSHIP........Barry Hatcher
  7:00 P.M. BETTER YOUNG PEOPLE.....Ray Peters

MONDAY, MAY 9
  7:00 P.M. THE PEOPLE HAD A MIND TO WORK......Buster Dobbs
  8:00 P.M. "LET US ARISE AND BUILD"............Bill Coss

TUESDAY, MAY 10
  8:00 A.M. BETTER STUDENTS OF THE WORD.......Melvin Elliott
  9:00 A.M. BETTER HUSBANDS AND WIVES..........Robert Taylor
 10:00 A.M. BETTER PREACHERS: I Timothy.........Roy Deaver
 11:00 A.M. BETTER GIVING CHURCHES................Elmer Scott
  1:00 P.M. BETTER DISCIPLINE........Ken Burleson
  2:00 P.M. CHURCHES THAT UNDERSTAND THE MISSION
  OF CHRIST.............................Ira Rice
  7:00 P.M. BETTER MEMBERS........Charles Blair
  8:00 P.M. FAITH IN THE BIBLE........Buster Dobbs

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11
  8:00 A.M. BETTER BENEVOLENT CHURCHES.............Jimmy Thompson
  9:00 A.M. BETTER WORLD WIDE EVANGELISM...........Fred Davis
 10:00 A.M. BETTER PREACHERS: 2 Timothy.........Buster Dobbs
 11:00 A.M. CHURCHES THAT ARE CONCERNED ABOUT
  GOSPEL PREACHERS.......................W.N. Jackson
  1:00 P.M. BETTER ATTITUDES........Garland Robison
  2:00 P.M. BELIEF IN THE DEITY OF CHRIST....Max Miller
  7:00 P.M. BETTER DEACONS.......Ernest Underwood
  8:00 P.M. BETTER ELDERS...............Roy Deaver

THURSDAY, MAY 12
  8:00 A.M. BETTER BIBLE SCHOOLS..................Paul Cantrell
  9:00 A.M. FAITH IN GOD................Roy Deaver
 10:00 A.M. BETTER PREACHERS: Titus............Ken Burleson
 11:00 A.M. CHURCHES THAT DEFEND THE FAITH....Gerald Reynolds
  1:00 P.M. EDIFYING CHURCHES........Leon Cole
  2:00 P.M. BETTER LOVE FOR ONE ANOTHER........Robert Taylor
  7:00 P.M. A PLACE FOR EVERYONE........Max Miller
  8:00 P.M. ACCORDING TO THE PATTERN............W.N. Jackson
The Diaz—Kilpatrick Debate

Terry M. Hightower

On the nights of January 10th and 11th, 1983, brother Steve Diaz and brother Marlin Kilpatrick debated the orphan home issue in the Fine Arts Auditorium of Lake Sumter Community College in Leesburg. Paul Brock moderated for brother Diaz and Terry M. Hightower for brother Kilpatrick. The debate was significant in that (1) it was the first debate on this issue in this area since the Wallace—Miller Debate in Tampa in 1965 and (2) in the radicalness of Diaz' affirmative proposition. The 1st night's proposition was: "The scriptures teach that organizations such as the orphans' home at Mt. Dora, are divine organizations and have a right to be supported by churches of Christ." (Kilpatrick affirmed—Diaz denied). The 2nd night's proposition was: "The scriptures teach that orphan care is limited to individual Christian responsibility and must be fulfilled in the individual role of the Christian." (Diaz affirmed—Kilpatrick denied). Brethren commented that debaters and audience conducted themselves on a high plane all the way through and for this we are grateful. Here is a partial list of Diaz' Errors, Blunders, and Inconsistencies—some of which certainly "plowed new ground" even for HIS anti-orphan home brethren as you will see!!

1. Diaz admitted that the best situation for an orphan child is to be in a home or family situation but later claimed that NO ONE (churches or individuals) can give to a home, but ONLY to individuals.

2. He admitted that the best situation for an orphan child is to be in a home or family situation, but turned around and contended that the word "visit" in relationship to "orphans" in Jas. 1:27 does NOT include (imply) a home!

3. Diaz claimed that his failure to have orphans in HIS home or not has nothing to do with Monday's proposition—just as anti-class brethren claim their practice of "teaching" has nothing to do with the proposition. BUT NOTE: Diaz is NOT practicing pure and undefiled religion EITHER individually or through his congregation.

4. Diaz admits that when a church incorporates it does NOT become a separate organization from the church—yet on charts claimed that incorporation by a home DOES make it a separate organization from the home.

5. He claimed that whether or not Jas. 1:27 is individual only had nothing to do with the issue on Monday night.

6. Diaz tried to place or force his (Diaz') definition of "HOME" on brother Kilpatrick and then "answered" THAT!!

7. He claimed that Jas. 1:27 doesn't say anything about a home and so denies that the word "visit" implies meeting the needs of orphans!!

8. He (wrongly) assumed that Jas. 1:27 has nothing to do with church action but belonged to Tuesday night's proposition.

9. He claimed that brother Kilpatrick had to be right on BOTH night's propositions—but this is obviously not true—Proof of Proposition 1 destroys the Diaz position on Proposition 2.

10. He confused the difference between what the church can scripturally do (support) and what the home can scripturally do (meet specific needs of orphans, i.e. family relationship, nurture, train, etc.). In private conversation I later asked him if the church can support the state and he said "Yes!" (taxes), but when I asked further if the church can take over the state's specific (Continued on page 27)
EDITORIAL

What To Do?

Fred Davis

Many brethren, when publicly rebuked from a publication or from the pulpit for their false teaching which they have taught publicly or have in written form that has appeared in printed form, oftentimes run to Matthew 18:15-17 and declare that they have been wronged!! The false teacher then proceeds to use this passage of scripture trying to establish the fact that the brother owes him an apology. Is this what Matthew 18:15-17 teaches? And if it isn't, just what does it teach?

Jesus said in Matthew 18:15-17, "And if thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established, And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican."

The word brother here means a fellow Christian. If a fellow Christian sins against thee. This is singular action—a personal sin against another Christian. This is a private matter and should be settled by private means if possible. Inspiration requires the one who has been wronged by his brother to go to the brother and try to settle the matter. But if the brother will not hear him he then should take with him two or more witnesses that every word may be established. Then if the matter cannot be settled, then, and only then, should the matter be taken to the church. Then if he will not hear the church, he should be as the Gentile and the publican. As you are able to see, inspiration is not talking about someone who teaches false doctrine. False teaching has nothing to do with this matter!!! This is a different action that is required!!! What should we do if false teaching is the issue? I believe that is the question. Why not let the Bible answer the question? God's word should settle this matter!!!

Jude 3 says, "Beloved, while I was giving all diligence to write unto you of our common salvation, I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." It is evident that Jude here was going to write to the brethren about a common salvation; but he was constrained (that is, "I had necessity") to write to them exhorting them to contend for the faith. He went to the subject of contending for the faith. Jude must have thought that contending for the faith was a very important subject.

Paul writes in Galatians 1:6-8, "I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel; which is not another gospel: only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we
preached unto you, let him be anathema." Even if an angel from heaven should preach any gospel other than that which was preached. Brethren, that is pretty strong language!!

Again in Romans 16:17-18, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ, but their belly; and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent." Then again in II John 9-11, "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ hath not God: he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son. If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting: for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works."

It is strange to me, with the teaching of these passages, how SOME can run to Matthew 18:15-17 and use this as their defense. If the false teacher is asked to publicly discuss what he is teaching, he is not willing. But he is willing to publicly teach false doctrine and will scream loud if exposed. Sometimes he makes the statement that the attitude that has been displayed is not Christlike. But just what kind of attitude did Christ have toward false teachers? Matthew 7:15 says, "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves." On every occasion our Lord rebuked false teaching!!

I do agree that sometimes in debates and discussions less than a Christlike attitude has been displayed by SOME who have had the truth. This certainly does nothing for the Word. This type of attitude is not to be commended by anyone!! Some, if they aren't able to meet the opponent's argument, will resort to dealing with personalities. But this attitude isn't right either. Issues of doctrine are too important to have them lowered to a personality fight!!

In view of these plain teachings of the scriptures then, we conclude that we must be loyal to Christ and His teachings at any cost. We face a choice. On the one hand is loyalty to Christ and His teachings; and on the other hand is loyalty to our friends and trimming of the gospel to meet their beliefs. Our choice is easy when put in this clear light. Our loyalty belongs to Christ and not to false teachers!!

THE DIAZ-KILPATRICK DEBATE
works he said "No!!" Amazing!!

11. He assumed that since a home is a "benevolent organization" or "benevolent institution" that it therefore is NOT a home--yet in so doing destroys any private home's taking care of orphans.

12. He called Mt. Dora a "home" one minute and "benevolent organization" the next--as if they were two different things.

13. He grossly contradicted scripture on his Chart #5 in putting I Tim. 5:16 under the individual (ONLY) column when the passage authorizes the CHURCH to help widows "in need".

14. He asserted that Jas. 1:27 is individual only despite the fact that Kilpatrick showed in detail that this passage applies to the church also.

15. He admitted that Kilpatrick had dealt with the "principle" but then calls for specific Bible passages about the Mt. Dora Home.

16. He assumed that because a board of trustees is over a home that it is therefore automatically a business, yet when a board of trustees is over a church that it is NOT turned into a business.

17. He asserted that Kilpatrick incorrectly claimed the church to be all-sufficient and that Kilpatrick had to have another organization (THE HOME!!)--but Diaz himself is a part of another organization (THE HOME!!)!!

18. In reference to Kilpatrick's reference to the church's all-sufficiency, Diaz deleted Kilpatrick's phrase "to do HER (the church's) work".

19. He deleted Kilpatrick's oral statement "or anything parallel to it" in reference to the Missionary Society, thus perverting what his opponent said.

20. He tried to parallel the Mt. Dora Christian Home to the Missionary Society but AMAZINGLY does not see how the same points made apply to the private home!!

21. He claimed that it is inconsistent and wrong to ask an opponent who is telling you that your way is wrong: "How CAN we do it scripturally?"

22. He put Florida statutes or child-care laws up as the ultimate standard of what a HOME is--despite Bible passages defining it (Gen. 2; Psalm 68; Eph. 6:1-4, etc.).

23. He claimed that Mt. Dora is NOT a legal home because it does not adopt the children, but his own Chart #13 showed that the incorporation papers of the state view the Mt. Dora Home as a home.

24. Diaz practices Special Pleading by asking if a church can contribute to a Baptist Home, but by not explaining (until strongly pressed later) if an individual Christian can contribute to a Baptist Home.

25. Diaz will provide water in the church foyer for some orphan children but not in a
cottage for orphans: this implies a "sin of geography"!

26. He chided Kilpatrick for using II John 9-11 with Jas. 1:27 but knows that this is very good procedure with Matt. 26:28 and Acts 2:38.

27. He claimed that what Homer Hailey and others taught before embracing Antism has nothing to do with the debate--yet he claimed we started the division!!

28. He claimed that the method by which we determine if passages concerning teaching, singing, praying, and visiting are applicable to "individuals only - church only - or both"--had NOTHING to do with proving opponent's proposition, and thus IGNORED the hermeneutical procedure by which we know passages apply to both churches and individuals.

29. Incredibly, Diaz said that whether or not the church can practice pure and undefiled religion (Jas. 1:27) has nothing to do with the proposition.

(To Be Continued Next Month)
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Daniel's Seventy Weeks (No. 3)

H. Daniel DeHaven

"To Bring In Everlasting Righteousness"

The bringing in of righteousness is connected with the "forgiveness of sins" (Psa. 69:28). Whereas God's pardoning of men means that He will no longer regard them as alien sinners, the bringing in of righteousness thereby means that He will regard them as righteous: for they do His righteous will in obeying His word (I John 2:29; 3:7-10; Rom. 1:16,17). In this fashion Christ, "of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" (I Cor. 1:30).

This righteousness is "everlasting" in quality as it extends forth from Him who is everlasting and immutable in His nature. The Christ is in truth the glorious "Sun of righteousness" who has arisen in the Gospel Age "with healing (salvation) in His wings" (Mal. 4:2). He is "the Lord our Righteousness" (Jer. 23:6). And His spiritual city, "the heavenly Jerusalem", bears that name (cf. Jer. 33:16; Heb. 12:22,23). It is of eternal duration as thus contrasted with the fleeting gifts and felicities available under the Old Testament (Gal. 2:21; 3:21; Heb. 7:11lf.).

"To Seal Up The Vision And Prophecy"

Hengstenberg translates this as, "to seal up vision and prophet,"21 as also does Young.22 The idea of the sealing up here is not "to fulfill, confirm, ratify, with reference to the custom of confirming the contents of a uniting, by affixing to it a seal,"23 but it is the thought of "the custom of sealing things which are laid aside, and concealed."24 Gesenius renders it here as "to complete,"25 and comments that it means, "until the predictions of the prophets be fulfilled."26 Young says, "The reference is not to accreditt-
even the prophets of old spake by His Spirit (cf. 1 Peter 1:10-12; 3:18-21; 4:6). He is, in short, "the end of the law" (Rom. 10:4). Thus, Philip declares to Nathaniel, "We have found Him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph" (John 1:45).

He is "the Seed" who smites the head of the Serpent (Gen. 3:15). He is the "Virgin" born Deliverer (Isa. 7:14), the One who rules and sways the sceptre of righteousness (Isa. 9:6). He is "Shiloh" (Peace). (Gen. 49:10; Eph. 2:10-20). And there are many other such pictures bearing upon His work in redemption and its great benefits and consequences. He is the great "Anti-type," the substance, the reality of Old Testament "types" the shadows and figures "of the true." He is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29). He is the Rock of salvation and provision (I Cor. 10:4). And many other such images and symbols abound relative to Himself, the Gospel, and the Church. Prophecies abound in regard to His coming, the Savior of Israel, the Messiah of Jehovah God in types, shadows, visions, dreams, various theophanies, and such like; all whose purpose was in anticipation of His great sacrifice, and the Blood Atonement for sin, and the application of these to those who would "repent and be baptized unto the forgiveness of sins." And why blood? "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul" (Lev. 17:11). Again, "without the shedding of blood is no remission" (Heb. 9:22). Justice demanded it; man by "the blood of bulls and goats" could not do it (Heb. 9:12-14; 10:4-6); but Christ, the Lamb "without spot or blemish," could and out of His great love did (Heb.9:28; 10:16ff; I Peter 2:21-25). Of this the prophets spoke (I Peter 1:10-12).

"To Anoint The Most Holy"

The word "anoint" (Heb. Mashach), from whence comes the word "Messiah," and which is almost always rendered χρωμ in the LXX, is variously used in the Hebrew Scriptures. Consider some of the following examples:

1. Gen. 28:18; 31:13 -- the pillar at Bethel;
2. Ex. 25:6 -- "the anointing oil!";
3. Ex. 28:41 -- the consecration of Aaron;
4. Ex. 29:36 -- the brazen altar;
5. Ex. 30:26-28 -- the tabernacle and various parts of its contents;
6. Lev. 2:4 -- the unleavened wafers and some other meal offerings;
7. Jud. 9:8,15 -- Abimelech who had made himself king;
8. I Sam. 2:10 -- Hannah's inspired hymn;
9. I Sam. 9:16 -- of Saul the son of Kish when he became king;
10. Cf. Psa. 2:2; 18:50; 20:6; 45:7; 92:10; 105:15; Isa. 21:5; 45:1; 61:1; Ezek. 28:14; Amos 6:6.33

Other passages to examine would be: Lev. 7:12; 2 Sam. 1:21; Ex. 40:15; I Kings 19:16; I Sam. 10:1; 15:1; 2 Sam. 2:4; et al.35

Because of this word's frequent use with the consecration, and appointment of kings (cf. I Sam. 9:6; 10:1; 15:1; 2 Sam. 2:4; I Kings 1:34), priests (Ex. 28:41; 40:15), and prophets (I Kings 19:16; Isa. 61:1), some have been taking the word in Daniel 9:24 to refer to the consecration and appointment of the Messiah, "the Anointed One," as "the Most Holy" to these offices which He fills under the New Testament Economy. He is both King (Acts 17:7; I Tim. 6:14,15; Rev. 1:4,5; 17:14; 19:6), Priest (Heb. 4:14,15: 5:1ff; 6:20; 7:1ff; 8:1-4), and Prophet (Matt. 17:5; Acts 3:22,23; Heb. 1:1,2; 12:25).

However, the image of the "Most Holy" would be familiar to Daniel, a Jew probably even from Jerusalem. This expression, "the Most Holy" (Heb. qodesh haq-qodashim) is frequently used of "the Holy of Holies," the second compartment "within the veil" of the tabernacle and its successor, the Temple (cf. Ex. 26:33,34; Ezek. 41:4; 45:3; I Kgs. 6:16; 7:50; 6; 1 Chron. 23:13; 2 Chron. 3:8,10; 4:22; 5:7). Within that compartment, the "inner shrine" of Jehovah God, there lay the beautifully ornamented ark of the testament," overlaid with "pure gold," and bearing the copy of the law given by Moses (as well as the entire Pentateuch), the pot of Manna, and Aaron's rod which "budded." Mounted upon it, and overlooked by the golden cherubim gazing inquisitively into its midst, was "the mercy seat" -- the place of the Atonement, upon which the victim's blood was sprinkled each year on the tenth day of the seventh month by Aaron and his successors. The imagery employed by the angel to Daniel of the ultimate Atonement would undoubtedly stir his remembrance of these things. We take the expression "to anoint the Most Holy" then to refer to the Atonement.

The tabernacle and its furniture had been "anointed" on the occasion of their consecration and dedication to service (cf. Ex. 30). While no specific reference is made to such as regards the Temple, this probably occurred as well upon the day that it went into Divine service. In the Most Holy (place) the High Priest made the annual offering for sin under the first testament anticipatory to the final and complete offering in the heavenly Most Holy by the great High Priest of the second testament (cf. Heb. 9:1-28).

This offering was done in association with the dedication of the first testament (Heb. 9:19-22). Likewise, the second was dedicated
with blood — the blood of Christ "unto (ἐγκ) the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:28; Heb. 9: 22). "The pattern of the things in the heavens" were thusly purified (Heb. 9:23; 24). Christ passed into heaven itself, passed the veil that separates this realm from that spiritual realm of bliss, "to appear in the presence of God for us."

The key implication is that a new system would dawn — a new Economy with (a) a new and effectual testament able to grant salvation by God's grace, (b) a new sacrifice, one once-and-for-all Atonement for sin (cf. Heb. 9:26; 10:1-18), (c) a new Tabernacle and Temple (cf. I Tim. 3:15; Eph. 2:20-22), whose "Most Holy" would be "the Holiest of All" (Heb. 9:8; 10:19), "heaven itself" — the throne of God (Heb. 9:24; 8:1). The place of ultimate intercession would be made ready with the Great Barrister to present our pious and humble petitions to the Father (I John 2:1). It was from above "the mercy seat between the two cherubims" that God communed with Aaron and Moses, and now in "the Holiest of All," having made expiation for our sins and thus brought the obedient ones into a proper standing before His Father, Christ appears before Him to sympathetically (Heb. 2:18; 4:14,15) plead our case in the court of the Most High.

The thought of the Atonement — one of final and full efficacy — would be one of comfort to the Prophet of God. The law could not give life nor grant righteousness, but there was coming a system which could. The weakness — relatively speaking, for the law of Moses did accomplish its purpose as a "schoolmaster", the relative weakness of that law would be rectified by the coming of the Son of God, who "for sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3). But this thought would also introduce a new consideration to Daniel. If a second "Most Holy" must be dedicated, then the former must be abolished. Such is implicit in the nature of things (cf. Heb. 8:6-13; 10:9). This the angel confirms in verses 26 and 27 of Daniel 9. First, the acceptance and limited efficacy of "the sacrifice and oblation" of the Jewish Dispensation would be made to cease. Second, the Temple and its environs would be destroyed in war, and desolated along with the city of Jerusalem.

(TO BE CONTINUED NEXT MONTH)

4040 Schanen Blvd. Apt. 457
Corpus Christi, Texas 78411

Footnotes

21Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 199.
22Young, op. cit., p. 200.
23Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 409.
24Ibid.
EDITOR'S NOTE: Brother George Darling passed away March 27, 1980. Following is a reprint of an article he wrote for the DEFENDER which was published in July, 1977.

Get On Or Get Off

George E. Darling, Sr.

For the past thirty six years I have tried to preach the gospel without fear or favor. Many times, I must admit, I was tempted to compromise on some issues that have disturbed the "brotherhood". God being my witness, I have tried to "stay with the book". As I look back over these years I am made to wonder just what might have happened had I gone along with the popular groups. I have seen many preachers who said, "I won't take sides", or "I'm on the fence in this matter." This has been especially true in matters that concerned their standing in the "brotherhood" or that might effect their jobs and incomes. They had to keep in mind their popular standing among the "better known preachers" and the community, so they set their sails to catch the popular wind while their "theology" became as flexible as "Silly Putty".

On Sunday morning they preach to a large audience. It matters not to these preachers that the audience is made up of liquor dealers, libertines or "Black Jack dealers". He does not care, for these are the ones who have the dough and who wield the influence in the town. If faithful and honest men and women in the congregation call for discipline, they are laughed off and quietly subdued by being told that "There is a difference of opinion in the brotherhood concerning sin nowadays and that discipline in the 20th Century church is a thing of the past." (Ain't that the truth!) Or to bring it up to the present, "It's a matter of judgment."

While the "better known" and popular Pussy Footer preacher speaks so sweetly on love, and deals so gently with sin, the spiritual hosts of wickedness in high places moves in and he sits there, straddling the fence, while the church is polluted and corrupted. The Devil moves in, the church blows up, and God's people finally get their eyes open enough to move out. THAT IS JUST WHAT THE DEVIL WANTS!

This is the picture of the "popular" church. The Devil laughs on one side of the fence as he steals God's sheep and the Lord stands on the other side saying, "Cry aloud, and spare not." The preacher looks to his "Tub of Butter" and his "community popularity" and sits on the fence. The press lauds him, "Man of the Year" -- "Best Dressed Man", etc. The Chamber of Commerce praises him for his freedom from bigotry and his "Broad Views". He speaks learnedly on the aesthetics of Christianity. He dabbles and babbles in the ethical field, and on occasion, (when no dissenters are present) he touches lightly upon some phrase of the Gospel...with a "shiny foot feather...Never mentions hell...the doctrine of damnation that Jesus preached is out of date and too old fashioned for him. He robs God of His justice and wrath as he speaks at length on God's mercy, grace and love...and the people respond. Every service when the invitation is extended to "appropriate God's blessings" (NEVER -- oh never -- Faith, Repentance, Confession and Baptism) the aisles are full. Sinners confess Christ without having repented. They are baptized in water in a form of mockery and naturally are born dead as far as New Testament Christianity is concerned.

The eldership, in general, in the "popular church" is in hearty agreement with the "popular preacher" and just as long as the church flourishes, the preacher stays on good terms without any friction from the Devil, all is well and good. But that preacher MUST stay astraddle of the fence on EVERY issue in which there would be any dispute or controversy with any mortal being. He lies awake at night trying to figure out some way to label differences between right and wrong as "non-essential distinctions" and of no VITAL IMPORTANCE ANYWAY. Preachers of this stripe--(YELLOW, down the middle of the back) have made this an age of "On the fence religion".

Now don't you young preachers try to preach any of this. If you do you will probably get FIRED...I did, and I was...If any of you preachers, referred to in this article, want to contact me, the address is Box 128, Fort Deposit, Alabama. Population--about 1700--give or take a few.

"PREACH THE WORD, BROTHER!!"

-31-
NINTH ANNUAL LECTURESHIP
BELLVIEW PREACHER TRAINING SCHOOL
May 8–12, 1983
"Let Us Arise And Build"

SUNDAY, MAY 8
9:00 A.M. BETTER WORKERS.....Mitchell Temple
10:00 A.M. THE SINS OF ISRAEL....Rick Tippitt
6:00 P.M. BETTER WORSHIP.......Barry Hatcher
7:00 P.M. BETTER YOUNG PEOPLE.....Ray Peters

MONDAY, MAY 9
7:00 P.M. THE PEOPLE HAD A MIND TO WORK.....Buster Dobbs
8:00 P.M. "LET US ArISE AND BUILD".............Bill Coss

TUESDAY, MAY 10
8:00 A.M. BETTER STUDENTS OF THE WORD........Melvin Elliott
9:00 A.M. BETTER HUSBANDS AND WIVES...........Robert Taylor
10:00 A.M. BETTER PREACHERS: 1 Timothy........Roy Deaver
11:00 A.M. BETTER GIVING CHURCHES.............Ernest Underwood
1:00 P.M. BETTER DISCIPLINE.....Ken Burleson
2:00 P.M. CHURCHES THAT UNDERSTAND THE MISSION
OF CHRIST.............Ira Rice
7:00 P.M. BETTER MEMBERS.......Charles Blair
8:00 P.M. FAITH IN THE BIBLE....Buster Dobbs

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11
8:00 A.M. BETTER BENEVOLENT CHURCHES..........
     Jimmy Thompson
9:00 A.M. BETTER WORLD WIDE EVANGELISM........
     Fred Davis
10:00 A.M. BETTER PREACHERS: 2 Timothy............
     Buster Dobbs
11:00 A.M. CHURCHES THAT ARE CONCERNED ABOUT
GOSPEL PREACHERS........W.N. Jackson
1:00 P.M. BETTER ATTITUDES...Garland Robinson
2:00 P.M. BELIEF IN THE DEITY OF CHRIST....
     Max Miller
7:00 P.M. BETTER DEACONS....Ernest Underwood
8:00 P.M. BETTER ELDERS........Roy Deaver

THURSDAY, MAY 12
8:00 A.M. BETTER BIBLE SCHOOLS...............Paul Cantrell
9:00 A.M. FAITH IN GOD...........Roy Deaver
10:00 A.M. BETTER PREACHERS: Titus............Ken Burleson
11:00 A.M. CHURCHES THAT DEFEND THE FAITH....
     Gerald Reynolds
1:00 P.M. EDIFYING CHURCHES.......Leon Cole
2:00 P.M. BETTER LOVE FOR ONE ANOTHER........
     Robert Taylor
7:00 P.M. A PLACE FOR EVERYONE.....Max Miller
8:00 P.M. ACCORDING TO THE PATTERN...........
     W.N. Jackson
A Response To Brother Jack Lewis

Robert R. Taylor, Jr.

In the HARDING GRADUATE SCHOOL OF RELIGION BULLETIN for October, 1982, brother Jack Lewis of the faculty there had a brief article entitled, HOW MANY TIMES WAS CAIN KILLED? This was a Lewis reaction to my article in the July, 1982, DEFENDER in which I was dealing with the NKJV's changes of old verb endings such as "eth" to a simple "s" at the end. I pointed out that there may (NOTE THE MAY HERE AND NO DOGMATIC ASSERTION) well have been a point of Biblical accuracy aim and intent here easily overlooked. Surely, brother Lewis will not accuse the 148 KJV and ASV translators of intending or aiming at less than accuracy in usage of the "eth" endings when continuous action was demanded!! I gave a few examples where the "eth" endings demand continuous action. In Lewis' reaction he gave several examples from the Old Testament and a few from the New Testament of where the "eth" meanings call for point action or one time occurrence. These I readily grant to be true. I neither argued nor IMPLIED that ALL "eth" endings for verbs meant continuous action. I learned that in Greek studies in college days long before I ever heard of the name of Jack Lewis. I wrote that NUMEROUS ones (NOT ALL) meant such and supplied three examples of such. Many more might have been given.

Relative to the Lewis article the Graduate School Paper allowed me equal space in responding to brother Lewis. This I appreciated on the part of brother Bill Flatt, editor of the paper. I told brother Flatt if I responded to the Lewis article in the DEFENDER, that his ENTIRE article would be presented for every reader of the DEFENDER to see exactly what he said and to what I was responding. I think this is an eminently fair way in dealing with what he had to say by way of criticism. Here is his article in full.

HOW MANY TIMES WAS CAIN KILLED?

by

Jack F. Lewis

An outspoken advocate for the exclusive use of the KJV and ASV (with preference for the KJV) argues that old English "commiteth" implies continued action in a way that "commits" does not. Thus he finds "commiteth adultery" (Matt. 19:9), "cleanseth us from all sin" (I John 1:7), and "whosoever believeth in him" (John 3:16) more accurate representations of the continuous action of the Greek tense than "commits adultery," "cleanses us from all sin," and "whosoever believes in him," respectively. He insists that these last forms can refer to one time actions whereas the earlier ones show continuous action.

Without claiming to be an expert of any sort in old English usage, I would argue that "commiteth," "believeth," and "cleanseth" have exactly the same span of variety, except in the mind of the person who wants to make it otherwise, that the "s" forms of the same verbs do. One is not at all persuaded by an ef-

(Continued on page 35)
Obedience—The Only Basis Of Acceptance With God

Walter W. Pigg, Jr.

Since man was created as a free moral agent, he has the option to obey or disobey God. However, if one would be accepted with God he must choose to obey; there is no other basis of acceptance. By obedience we mean submission to the demands or requests of one in authority. In this case the one in authority is God.

Since I began preaching, almost thirty years ago, there has been a very noticeable decline in concern as to whether or not we produce a "thus saith the Lord" for what we believe and practice. "Book, chapter and verse, preaching" is not demanded by the elders and membership as it once was. In fact, this type of preaching is actually criticized in widening circles. A growing number of our preaching brethren can be credited (at least in part) with this condition. As they drink deeply from the pens of today's theologians, and court the capers of denominational neighbors, they cease to believe in Bible preaching, and would not do it if demanded of them. The bottom line of this condition is that obedience to God isn't all that important anymore, and sadly, too many "love to have it so" (Jer. 5:31).

The deterioration of concern relative to obeying God may be attributed to a number of things... it is quite evident that the following do have some influence.

1. WE HAVE COME TO RELY MORE HEAVILY UPON WORLDLY WISDOM. With an increase in the level of our secular education we tend to think we are smarter than we really are, even to the point of thinking our way of doing things may be even better than the Lord's way. We forget that Paul said, "the world by wisdom knew not God," and that God's way of saving man by the gospel is through the "foolishness of preaching" (I Cor. 1:21). Paul goes on to say, "The foolishness of God is wiser than man," and that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called" (verses 25,26).

2. SOME ARE LED TO BELIEVE THAT THE SPEAKER IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE MESSAGE SPOKEN. We are attracted to people who are kind, gentle, congenial and friendly. We like to be complimented (deserving or not), made to laugh, to be entertained. We much prefer to hear that which makes us feel good, rather than that which may make us feel badly by calling attention to our sins. In view of this, whatever is said may be accepted with little or no thought as to whether or not it is in accordance with God's word. People have been known to say, "Such a nice person as brother so-and-so just couldn't say anything wrong." We should be reminded however, that Paul warns that those teaching a contrary doctrine may by "good works and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple" (Rom. 16:18b).

3. OUR SOCIETY JUST DOESN'T LIKE THE IDEA OF OBEDIENCE, GENERALLY SPEAKING. Obedience to civil law is lacking; schools have their discipline problems; children are reluc-
tant to obey their parents, and the world of denominationalism obeys fewer and fewer of God's laws. Consequently, we have allowed the spirit of disobedience to affect us, thereby losing sight of the fact that acceptance with God is completely dependent upon obedience.

4. A DESIRE FOR RECOGNITION HAS HAD ITS IMPACT. Some have obviously taken on a spirit of compromise in order to be numbered among the "in crowd," which is of liberal persuasion. Those who are liberal minded do not look kindly upon those who contend for unquestioned obedience to God's will as it has been revealed through the inspired word.

It matters not how popular and widespread disobedience is, it still remains that if we would be accepted by God we must obey Him. When king Saul tried to justify his failure to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken through the inspired word.

"And Samuel said, hath the Lord as great obedience was called "rebellion," and disobedience amounts to the same thing today...

In order that we may not lose sight of the importance of obedience to God, we should constantly keep before us that greatest of examples of complete obedience to the heavenly Father, I speak of Christ, who "...humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross" (Phil. 2:8). IF WE WOULD BE ACCEPTED WITH GOD, THAT SAME SPIRIT OF OBLIGIENCE MUST BE EXEMPLIFIED IN US.
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* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

**CONTRIBUTIONS**

* Ector R. Watson ........ $10.00 *
* R. R. Sawyer .......... 5.00 *
* Jeffrey W. Neeland ....... 5.00 *
* Herbert N. Hurd ........ 25.00 *
* Jerry Lindesmith ........ 35.00 *
* Eugene Walm .......... 10.00 *
* Anonymous ............ 5.00 *
* *

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

A RESPONSE TO BROTHER JACK LEWIS

fort of this sort to push a personal preference. Rules of English usage are not determined by personal preference.

The simple fact is that the KJV did not consistently render either the Greek present participles or the Greek present active indicative by "eth" verbal forms. In English the "eth" verbal endings no more exclusively express continuing action than the "s" endings do. The same option is in both. How many times was Cain found and killed: "everyone that findeth me...whosoever slayeth Cain" (Gen. 4:14,15)? How continuously did one have to curse Abraham ("curse him that curseth thee," (Gen. 12:3) to qualify for God's curse? How repeatedly did one have to hit ("he that smiteth," (Ex. 21:15) his father and mother, how often did he have to kidnap and sell a man ("he that stealeth a man and selleth him...", (Ex. 21:16); how continuously did he have to sacrifice to other gods ("sacrificeth", Ex. 22:20)? Lest one say that these are all Hebrew examples and not Greek; or lest he say they are all O.T. examples and not N. T., how many times did a prophet have to be received ("receiveveth", Matt. 10:41) in order for Jesus to be received?

He that argueth as the above brother doeth, committeith (continuous action intended by the verb endings) great error.

A SERIOUS LEWIS OMISSION

Brother Lewis could have quoted all I said relative to this point in far less space than I have used to give his article in fullness. This he did not do. He made several short quotes from my article in the DEFENDER. For some undisclosed reason on his part he failed to give my conclusion which was so very vital to the point made. I had to follow him with an article in the Graduate School Paper to allow its readers to know of this conclusion. It is now given and the reader may judge for himself as to whether I argued or implied what Lewis said I argued or implied. It read:

The older translations came just as close to rendering these as continuous action as do the modern forms. Sufficient Greek helps are so easily available in reliable commentaries that no serious student of the Bible has to be in the dark about whether point action or continuous action is meant by verb forms. I fail therefore to find why such verb endings should bother modern day English students who are really serious in...
learning truth and why such changes are so highly hailed as great improvements (DEFENDER, July, 1982, p. 52).

Please note and observe with care that I said they came JUST AS CLOSE—NOT CLOSER!! Lewis said the same thing in the course of his article. Would brother Lewis say that the modern versions and their translators who now employ the "s" endings rather than the older "eth" endings of these verbs were aiming at less than accuracy when continuous action was demanded? If not, why charge me with great error in affirming this for the versions and translators in their usage of the older "eth" endings for these verbs?

THE LEWIS CONCLUSION

Brother Lewis closes with, "He that argueth as the above brother doeth, committeth (continuous action intended by the verb ending) great error." Is it a great error to argue that in aim and intent the KJV and ASV translators desired to be accurate by the usage of the "eth" endings? That is one of the points I argued for on this disputed point. Is it a great error to say the "eth" endings of these verbs came just as close to indicating continuous action as the "s" endings do in the modern versions? If so, then Lewis is just as guilty of great error as am I for he argued the same point. I suppose his would be great error of the continuous type just as he says mine is!!

In reality I find the charge of being in "great error" to be of signal interest. During 1982 I purchased and read his book, THE ENGLISH BIBLE FROM KJV TO NIV. If brother Lewis EVER charged any modern translator or any modern speech translation or version with this precise expression of being in "great error", I do not now recall reading it. I readily think his usage of such, had it occurred, would have leaped up from the page at me for that has NEVER been his stock-in-trade type of reviewing these modern speech versions. If he ever labeled such as "great error", I surely missed it and I read his book slowly and carefully.

Personally, I wish we could get brother Lewis and ALL the Harding Graduate Faculty to label plainly and positively ALL the fatal error in the new Bibles as "great error." But that problem of apathy toward version dangers and toleration for unreliable Bibles is far wider than the Graduate School. It exists among far too many of our professors in our colleges, preachers in our pulpits and congregations scattered throughout the brotherhood. I wish we could get all these to see the perverted Bibles for what they really are—real threats to the church of our Lord!!

But relative to brother Jack Lewis and this "great error" bit, I SURELY do not have a monopoly with him in his seemingly uncrowded realm of "great error" as touching modern Bibles. But again maybe I do and am giving him TOO MUCH credit here in this final appraisal!!

A Response To Brother Jack Lewis On Versions Read In Public Services

Robert R. Taylor, Jr.

Within recent months the HARDING GRADUATE SCHOOL OF RELIGION BULLETIN has been rather top heavy with articles from the pen of brother Jack Lewis on version matters. To date at least three have come from his pen. Brother Lewis is quite adept in telling us what we should and should not do relative to version matters and yet at the same time being rather caustic relative to some of us who are writing things about versions that he dislikes. In two or three articles for the DEFENDER I am taking note of some things he has written about in the Graduate School Bulletin.

In the 1982, December issue of the aforementioned bulletin brother Lewis had a rather lengthy article entitled,"'Read From The King James Or The American Standard.'" It occupied all of page one and half of page two and was written in smaller print than is usually customary for articles that appear in that monthly publication. Since its appearance in the Graduate Bulletin I have noted its appearance elsewhere also. While recently in a gospel meeting in the Detroit, Michigan, area one of the brethren there handed me a publication and this same article by brother Lewis was featured. I desire to take note of some of the things about which he wrote. This is the other side of the coin so to speak.

In the said article brother Lewis took note of both colleges and congregations that
would dare choose such a policy as to which versions might be employed in the public reading, preaching and teaching of God's Word. He feels that colleges are less deserving of rebukes for such a policy than are congregations since their boards and administrations have charge of what goes on there and those in disagreement are free to go elsewhere if present policy does not suit them. Hence, the main thrust of his article touches elders who daringly propose such and preachers who endorse such. This hits close to home since I am such a preacher of this persuasion and serve under a fine, dedicated eldership of the SAME persuasion. This is not really a new position for brother Lewis. During April of 1977, he and I spoke on the Graduate School Lectureship for the entire morning and to a packed house at Park Avenue's building. The planned facilities for the lectureship at the Graduate School would not come close to affording room for the hundreds of religious leaders from throughout the Mid-South who were in attendance. At the last moment larger facilities had to be sought. For an hour brother Lewis lectured us on WHY we need modern versions of the Bible. For the same length of time I followed him with a listing of dangers that flow so freely and frequently from modern versions of the Bible. Then each of us fielded questions from an alert and interested audience. During that all morning session of version matters I defended the right of elders to make such a policy and I still defend it with vim and vigor. (As already indicated we have such a policy at Ripley, Tennessee, where I preach and I endorse it one hundred per cent!! I feel absolutely confident that brother Lewis knows of NO truth that we need to be preaching and practicing at Ripley in order to become and remain Christians that cannot be preached and practiced under such a policy and such a policy has not stagnated us either!! I expect our people know as much Bible as White Station does where his membership is in Memphis and where such a policy as we have would not be allowed at all.) But in the question and answer period that morning at Park Avenue someone queried brother Lewis to the effect, "Can the elders make such a policy?" His answer, in essence, was, "If the congregation allows them to!" The intense impact of his implication hit the audience with full force—the elders may only do what the congregation allows in matters like this. Such makes rubber stamps of elders and in reality puts the congregation in the driver's seat relative to expediency or matters of judgment. Yet the Lord -- not Lewis -- put elders in the driver's seat relative to these matters.

Brother Lewis, THEN and NOW, is dead set against such a ruling by elders. It is amazingly amazing that a Graduate School Professor can tell an eldership what they cannot do in a congregational matter but an eldership is totally powerless to tell him or one of his students what Bible is to be used while appearing in their pulpit or before a class of impressionable students of which they are pastors and protectors, of which they are shepherds and shields.

SOME RELEVANT QUESTIONS

Suppose a preacher who uses the NIV is to teach a Bible Class in Romans 7 and 8. This new Bible is crammed full and overflowing of Calvinism in these two chapters. Do the elders have NO control at all of whether he uses a Bible that promotes Calvinism at this point or one that does not promote Calvinism at this point?

Suppose this preacher is an avid devotee of the RSV and is still using an edition that omits the last dozen verses of Mark 16. (Later editions of the RSV have now restored these twelve verses to the text but he has one that still omits this section of Holy Scripture from the text of Mark's gospel record.) He is teaching Mark 16 to the adult class in the auditorium on Sunday morning. He insists on closing Mark's gospel at verse 8. Do the elders have a right to suggest that he not use the RSV in teaching that chapter? What would brother Lewis do if he were an elder and this very problem emerged? Would he and the elders have to check with the congregation before taking any action relative to this matter?

Suppose a devotee of the NIV and TEV is teaching a series on the Lord's Supper and intends in the next lesson of the series to analyze carefully Acts 20:7. Do the elders have the right to tell him to use a Bible that does not remove the first day of the week from the passage as does the NIV? Do they possess any right to say a great, big, decisive NO to his using Bratcher's TEV which omits the first day of the week or one that does not promote Calvinism? Suppose a lady Bible teacher is really carried away with Taylor's paraphrased work--THE LIVING BIBLE PARAPHRASED. Down deep in her heart she really feels her little primary children's class can understand it better. Do the elders have any say at all about whether she may or may not use a so-called Bible that promotes denominationalism, Calvinism, premillennialism, vulgarity and is a totally reckless volume in its usage of paraphrasing what the Bible should be saying. They either do or they do not!! What would brother Lewis
Suppose a man wanted to bring a denominational creed, manual, confessional or catechism into the pulpit (not for purposes of refutation but to promote their good points and some late scholarship finds that will aid better understanding of what he is attempting to teach the congregation.) Furthermore, he maintained that no one had the right to regulate what he preached from as touching content? Would the elders have any right to say a NO to such? If they do, then they also have rights to deal with so-called Bibles used in their pulpits and Bible Classes that put the VERY SAME errors into the so-called text of the Bible as do these denominational creedal works? If not, WHY NOT? What would brother Lewis do in such situations were he an elder when such a problem emerged? Would he seek to convince his fellow shepherds that they do have some responsibilities along these lines? Or would he have to check to see if the congregation would allow them to make any decisions along these lines? A man's errors cannot help but haunt him in later life.

May elders keep preachers of falsehood out of the pulpit? May they keep teachers of error out of their Bible Classes? May they say no to a series of VBS material or material for Sunday morning and Wednesday evening classes that are all untrue to the Bible? Could they say no to a teacher who has a book that makes shambles of God's law of marriage, divorce and remarriage and yet he demands to teach it to his class of young married people? Why could they keep error out in a false book that does not propose to be a Bible and yet cannot say a single word to a pseudo-Bible that any far-out preacher desires to use in the pulpit or a teacher desires to use in a classroom? Is oral danger less dangerous than written error? Is error less dangerous when it is in a book that does not have Bible stamped on the cover than error that is embedded in a book that has Bible stamped on the cover?

I strongly suspect that an elder who enrolled to take a Bible Class under brother Lewis at the Graduate School would not have total freedom to select his own textbooks for the course. Brother Lewis would be in the driver's seat about what could and could not be used and he would not survey the class to see if he could issue such textbook demands either!! Yet when brother Lewis went to preach where that same elder served as shepherd, the entire eldership would be out of place if they told brother Lewis not to use the NIV for they wanted him to teach Romans 8 in the auditorium class and they did not want him teaching from a Calvinistic Bible. Again, by the Lewis logic(?????) they would be out of place if they told brother Lewis not to use a RSV with its modernism, a NEB with its Romanism and charismatic leanings, a TEV with its de-emphasis on the blood of Christ, or the new READER'S DIGEST BIBLE with its omission of forty per cent (more than 300,000 words) of the Biblical text. I strongly suspect great and godly elders will continue to do what brother Lewis says they cannot do unless the congregation allows them to do it!! AND MORE POWER TO EACH ELDERSHIP THAT DOES SO!!

Elders DO have rights along these lines regardless of what Graduate School Professors say to the contrary. The Lord has made elders the shepherds of the flock -- not Graduate School Professors!! And wisdom is herein PERSONIFIED!!

P.O. Box 464
Ripley, TN 38063

The Diaz—Kilpatrick Debate (No. 2)
Terry M. Hightower

(CONTINUED FROM APRIL ISSUE)

30. He implied that Kilpatrick cannot explicitly find the phrase 'orphan home' in Jas. 1:27, yet he (Diaz) CAN find money, house or housing allowance, insurance, part or all of social security paid, gas allowance, vehicle provided, and utilities paid in the word 'wages' in II Cor. 11:8!! All his brethren can!!

31. He absurdly claimed that if the orphanage (orphan home) is a home then Kilpatrick's home (which has no orphans in it!!) is an orphanage!!

32. He claimed that if the state did the same thing as an orphan home in meeting the needs of orphans, then the state would be a divine institution or home—thus Diaz did not know the difference between the civil state supporting an orphan home and the civil state becoming a home!!
33. He confused "Legal Home" with "legal children" in defining child as meaning only "son or daughter whether by birth or adoption": ANON-ADOPTED CHILD LIKE A FOSTER CHILD IS THEREFORE NOT A CHILD!! Once again, state statutes reign supreme with Diaz!!

34. He refused to say if Jas. 1:25-26 applied to both the church and the individual.

35. He denied that the board of directors was a part of the Mt. Dora Orphan Home, yet we wonder who would bear the brunt of it if the Mt. Dora Home were sued? (Privately, he answered: "the board"!!).

36. He claimed that since the Mt. Dora Home has a school connected with it that then the SCHOOL would also be a divine institution!! (If I run a school in connection with my home does that make that school a divine institution like my home?).

37. He asserted that the church cannot give to a home but only to individuals!! (Does this mean that we could give church money to orphaned individuals or money to board members as individuals??).

38. He said there are no homes under any eldership yet ALSO said Maude Carpenter Home WAS under elders.

39. Diaz claimed that there was no Bible authority for an orphan home to give to a foster home but failed to tell us if it was a sin for him in his private home to give to a foster home.

40. He admitted that the Galatian letter was written to churches, that "we" and "us" are plural terms, that the terms "you" and "your" in I Cor. 4:6 are plural, and when finally forced to answer -- he said that BOTH verses were "individual only"!! Congregations (collectively) cannot "go beyond the things which are written" as congregations!!

41. He claimed orphan care was an individual Christian responsibility ONLY and yet contradicts this by affirming in regard to church cooperation that one congregation (A) may send funds to congregation (B) whereby the elders there (in B) could then use the money to take care of orphans who are members of congregation (B)!! (When speaking at another time he asserted that orphan care was not the local church's responsibility) Diza was so confused about this he claimed that we held "infant membership" in the church!! What this one point showed was that he did not believe his OWN proposition!!

42. He got caught leaving out the last part of I Tim. 5:16.

43. He claimed that I Tim. 5:16 showed the difference between what the church and the individual could do, but on a chart correctly showed that the verse concerns whether FAMILY or the church have the primary responsibility in caring for RELATIVES.

44. He tried to force Kilpatrick into affirming that everything an individual Christian can do a church can do--which position Kilpatrick repeatedly denied.

45. He never explained to us if and how there was anything an individual Christian can do that the church can do!!

46. He claimed that there was only one passage in the New Testament that talks about orphan care (Jas. 1:27) and thus ignored the generic "do good" of Gal. 6:10 altogether!!

47. He asserted that the idea of "togetherness" must be in a passage or it cannot be referring to the church, yet he applies Matt. 28:18-20 and Gal. 6:1 to both the church and the individual. (Or will he say that the Great Commission applies only to the individual as one of his cohorts did to me in Lakeland?)

48. He claimed that no one could show how the church (collectively) could keep itself unsotted from the world!! Will he also contend that the church is NOT to be "clean" through the word (Jno. 15:3)???

49. NOTE BRETHREN: Diaz actually said that II Jno. 9-11 and I Cor. 4:6 (ASV) applied ONLY to the individual Christian, yet in first affirmative speech said that church discipline applied ONLY to the CHURCH ("together")!! One thing for sure, he left a lot of his own brethren behind when he made these simply incredible statements about II John 9-11 and I Cor. 4:6 (ASV), but EVERY anti-orphan home advocate MUST do this to remain consistent with themselves. By so doing they deny plain Bible truths!!

50. Diaz used SINGULAR nouns and personal pronouns in II Jno. 9-11 and Jas. 1:27 in attempting to restrict these verses to the individual, yet he used PLURAL pronouns in I Cor. 4:6 and Gal. 6:10 to attempt to restrict these verses to the individual!!

51. He finally admitted when pressured that he WOULD individually give to the private Baptist home (if family burned out) as to the necessities of life, but he cannot see that the CHURCH could also give to it under the same conditions (without bidding Godspeed to error).

52. He TRAGICALLY contended that Christ gave himself ONLY for the individual Christian's
sins and **NOT FOR THE CHURCH!!** (Read Acts 20: 28; Eph. 5:25 and decide if Diaz has gone with the denominationalists on this one!!) I hope that he doesn't start openly teaching this!!

53. He incorrectly assumed that we maintain that who a letter is addressed to is the SOLE determinant of to whom the particular verses apply.

54. He said that a congregation cannot sow to the flesh (Gal. 6:8)!! Does this mean that the Corinthian church was not "sowing to the flesh" when it perverted the Lord's supper or that the Christian church is not "sowing to the flesh" when it sings with the piano or organ?!! Surely all of us can recognize this gross perversion of God's Word!!

55. Diaz used terms like "distributive action" and "collective action" and yet chided brother Kilpatrick for not finding the specific statement "orphan home" in the New Testament.

56. Diaz said that a church cannot violate Rom. 3:8 ("Let us do evil that good may come. . .")!! A church cannot collectively do evil--so why debate this issue at all??

57. He said that 1 Cor. 1:30 applied ONLY to the individual Christian and that Christ was therefore NOT made unto the church 'Wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption'!! Error always implies further error (1 Cor. 15:12-19)!!

58. He said that 1 Cor. 8:6 ("Yet to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him") did not apply to the church but only to the individual! Are we now to start teaching from this that a church (collectively) **CAN SCRIPTURALLY HAVE** more than one God? More than one Lord? Will Diaz continue to harp: "Was Paul a church, etc.??"

59. He dodged the question as to why he refuses to fellowship some of us who differ with him—but fellowships men like Roy Cogdill and others who also differ with him.

60. Diaz refused to say if a husband and wife sustaining a legal (rather than natural) relationship to 10 children, possessing a license, and incorporated was a sin.

61. He refused to say if it was a sin for a church to provide water for an orphan home board member who sees that some orphans receive it in the foyer.

62. He claims that Jas. 1:27 is an "individual only" passage but then turns around and cuts it in half (because of 1 Tim. 5:16) and ends up with the orphan part being "individual only" but the widow part being **BOTH** church and individual.

One individual informed us that he had learned the truth on Monday night, though he was formerly identified with the anti-orphan home movement. We have refused to divulge his name to Diaz and others so they will not "swarm" to pull him back into this grave error. Brother Marlin Kilpatrick did a tremendous job in this debate, though he had never debated before and works full-time at Sears during the week. I feel sure that Diaz' comrades will shrug off his performance by saying that he was too young and inexperienced, but I am convinced they could not refute the truth so ably presented and pressed so skillfully by brother Kilpatrick. Brethren should rejoice in his stand for truth and for the Bushnell church for backing him. Tapes and charts are available from the Florida School of Preaching.

---

Brother H. Daniel Denham's article on **DANIEL'S SEVENTY WEEKS** will be continued next month.
What About Withdrawing From The Withdrawn?

Thurman Self

The question is sometimes raised "Is it right to withdraw fellowship from a member who has already withdrawn himself from the church?" This question usually has reference to members who cease to assemble for public worship. Some wonder if they can Scripturally be withdrawn from since they no longer attend. Let us consider the following:

1. The purpose of Christians withdrawing fellowship is served whether the disorderly is in attendance or not: This purpose involves:

   (1) Making brethren sufficiently aware of sin to restore them (1 Cor. 5:5; Jas. 5:20).

   (2) Purging ungodly leaven which threatens to contaminate others (1 Cor. 5:6).

   (3) Promoting Godly fear and respect for truth among all (1 Tim. 5:20; Acts 5:11).

This collective action is designed to make the disorderly "ashamed" literally, "to turn in, that is, to turn one upon himself and so produce a feeling of shame, a wholesome shame which involves a change of conduct." (Expository Dictionary of N.T. Words, Vine.)

There are also numerous daily contacts among Christians in which they keep company. Paul included more than religious assembly when he said, "Put away the wicked man from among yourselves" (1 Cor. 5:13). He was including all of these other various relationships as well, for he explained -- "have no company -- with such a one, no not to eat" (1 Cor. 5:9-11).

A member might "withdraw himself" by forsaking public worship for any number of sinful causes, yet still desires the company and seeks the friendship of faithful brethren in personal affairs. But Scriptural discipline denies him such company so as to make him ashamed of his condition before God.

One finding himself so ostracized should examine his wayward state. Then there remain but two alternatives; His heart will either be hardened in his sin, perhaps revealing a perverted and self-condemned condition (Titus 3:11) or godly sorrow will work repentance unto salvation (II Cor. 2:6-11; 7:10). Thus this purpose as well as the other objectives of corrective discipline is served even in the case of one forsaking assembling.

2. The Lord commands withdrawal from the "disorderly" (II Thess. 3:6). Yet one of the most common sins of negligent or rebellious brethren is violating Hebrews 10:25 which involves Matthew 6:33 also.

If the church is unable to discipline those that forsake assembling, then it is unable to deal with one of the most prevalent sins within the body of Christ. The divine pattern would be insufficient. But since God's plan is perfect (II Peter 1:3; II Tim. 3:16,17) we have the instructions necessary to deal with this and all other disorderliness.

3. A good shepherd goes after his wayward sheep (Luke 15:3-7). He doesn't conclude that his hands are tied and that there is nothing (Continued on page 43)
A Cause To Champion

William S. Cline

In commenting on the problem of human organizations which arose during the Restoration Movement, Earl West wrote, "The controversy over human organizations in the restoration movement shows the development of an attitude on the part of the advocates of these organizations that become a thorn in their side. Oddly enough those who favored human organizations generally managed to generate more enthusiasm and energy on behalf of these organizations than they ever had for the church." (Search For The Ancient Order, Vol. 1, p. 209.)

We feel that brother West underscored one of the basic human weaknesses which often impedes the progress of the church with regard to its divine mission. The marching orders of the apostles was to "Go into all the world and preach the gospel." The plan was to begin in Jerusalem and proceed to Judea, Samaria and the entire world (Acts 1:8). This they did, and evidently they did it without one single human organization! One will search in vain through the pages of the New Testament to find any cause being championed other than the cause of Christ. Not one time do we find some human innovation being enthusiastically pursued while side-stepping the simple, yet successful plan of God. There are no super programs, colossal campaigns, gigantic workshops, nor mountain-top experiences!! They simply went from house to house, city to city and nation to nation with the pure, plain, powerful gospel of the Christ. Men believed and obeyed and the church grew. The mission Christ had given was carried out and by Col. 1:23, within approximately 30 years after Pentecost, the world had heard the good news of the salvation which could be had in Christ.

Isn't it strange that today we can't get brethren to generate much enthusiasm over that mission? We see tremendous enthusiasm being voiced over various human ideas and organizations, and enormous amounts of energy are expended to plan, promote and prosecute them. Let us not be misunderstood. We are not speaking against various forms of organizations which expedite the preaching of the gospel. But we are setting our pen against any attitude or action that generates more enthusiasm for human ideas and programs than for the simple preaching of the gospel. It is a fact and a shame that multitudes in the church are "past feeling" when it comes to the plan of Jesus -- go into all the world and preach the gospel. If we must champion a cause then let's champion that one! I know it's not our idea, but it is our responsibility!
WHAT ABOUT WITHDRAWING FROM THE WITHDRAWN?

He makes every effort to save them (withdrawal is such an effort). Elders are to work as shepherds, watching for souls (1 Pet. 5:1-4; Heb. 13:17). Can they say to the chief Shepherd of their failure to discipline, "Those unruly sheep jumped the fence and got into the enemies pasture, so there was nothing we could do when they had already withdrawn themselves"?

4. If the disorderly can withdraw themselves and avoid discipline, where is the scripture inferring such? On the contrary, the instructions are plain for the church to withdraw from all ungodly members (1 Cor. 5:4-5; II Thess. 3:6-14).

5. It is objected that an employer would have no power to fire an employee who had already left the company. This is misleading because the comparison is fallacious.

The parallel ought rather to be made of an army of soldiers with responsibilities from which they cannot just walk away (Phil. 2:25). An A.W.O.L. soldier knows he is not free from disciplinary action, even court-martial, simply because he "withdrew" himself from active duty.

6. Israel and Judah forgot Jehovah, days without number (Jer. 2:32; 3:6-10). They had forsaken the Lord (Isa. 1:4), as brethren today do in neglecting to worship in the assembly. After many years of gracious long-suffering, God finally punished his disobedient children, through the Assyrians and Babylonians. Their withdrawal from God did not frustrate the discipline willed by God, nay, it assured it.

We hope these 6 points are sufficient to show that objection to withdrawing from quitters is invalid. Our responsibility toward restoring those no longer attending services is just as great as it is toward the disorderly who do assemble.

It would be easy just to drop their names from the church directory after a period of continued absence. That would eliminate some of the thorns involved in disciplinary action.

But, it would not show brotherly love, nor love of God and His word.

Neither human wisdom nor convenience can be allowed to alter the course the Lord has planned for his church in this matter.

Second Annual
Denton Lectures Planned

The Pearl Street Church in Denton, Texas will host its second major annual lectureship November 13-17, 1983. The SECOND ANNUAL DENTON LECTURES will be devoted to a study of the epistle to the Hebrews. A wide variety of material will be covered by 37 speakers from all parts of the nation, delivering 39 lectures. The Pearl Street elders aim for these lectures to provide all who come with fundamental and sound Biblical teaching to help combat the profusion of doctrinal errors both within and without the church. A book of these lectures will be published (orders are already coming in). The book of the FIRST ANNUAL DENTON LECTURES (Studies in I Corinthians) was sold out in the first edition in less than five months and is now available in a second edition. Studies in Hebrews is expected to be just as much in demand as a classic and standard reference work. All of the lectures will also be available on cassette audio tapes and on video tapes.

A special feature of these lectures on Hebrews will be the daily (Monday-Thursday) two-hour "Discussion Forum" in which four subjects of controversy will be discussed by men with opposing views. The subjects will be: "Old or Young Earth?", "The Authority of Elders", "Is Empirical Knowledge More Certain Than Faith?" and "Premillennialism". Besides a discussion between two well-known men on each of these subjects, there will be questions allowed from the audience. Exhibit space is available for both commercial and non-commercial interests, subject to invitation and/or approval by Pearl Street elders. Housing in the homes of local Christians will be provided as long as it lasts. Hook-ups for RV units will be provided on the church parking lot. For further information, inquiries may be addressed to: Dub McClish, ADL Director, 312 Pearl Street, Denton, Texas 76201; 817/387-3531, 387-1429.
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Poison To Condemn The Soul
Garland M. Robinson

The poison of which I speak is concerning the new modern versions of the Bible. One of the surest ways to leave man condemned in his sins is to poison God's Holy Book, that which is the only means of learning the gospel of salvation. Obviously, we recognize that God's Word is from everlasting to everlasting (Matt. 24:35). His word is pure and right (Psalms 119:140; 33:4). The word of the Almighty is forever settled in heaven (Psalm 119:89). The Book of God is His word and not the word of men (2 Cor. 2:13; 1 Thess. 2:13). It is that which will judge us in the last day (John 12:48).

However, it is not always the case that men will accept the truth when they hear it. It is common knowledge to the faithful that you cannot correctly imagine a doctrine and then go to the Bible to prove it. It must be the other way around. We go to the Bible to learn the doctrine. Needless to say, we can understand it (Eph. 3:4). It was written for our example and learning (Rom. 15:4; 2 Peter 2:6). But to which "Bible" does one turn? So many are on the market today and are being pushed even by our own schools and many churches. Are they all correct and reliable translations? Does it make any difference which Bible one uses? The resounding answer is YES!!

"But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who shall bring in damnable heresies..." (2 Peter 2:1). What more damnable heresy could there be than to change and corrupt God's Holy Word? How gullible can people be than to use and promote a false version of the Bible (may we say perversion!). "In God I will praise his word, in God I have put my trust; I will not fear what flesh can do unto me. Every day they wrest my words: all their thoughts are against me for evil!" (Psalm 56:4-5). We read in 2 Peter 3:16 of the unlearned and unstable who "wrest" the scriptures unto their own destruction. In turn, this leads to the destruction of those who follow their pernicious ways. To wrest something (according to Vine, pg. 239) means "to twist, to torture, to turn." All the modern versions have been distorted and twisted to cater to the doctrines and commandments of men. It is up to you to prove this is not the case. Every single one has doctrinal error in it!!

You may have heard the illustration used concerning "rat poison". Rat poison contains 98% good grain and 2% poison. Yet, the 2% poison is adequate to kill mice. It only takes a little doctrinal error to cause one to lose his soul.

The great commission given by King Jesus is to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15). We have preached and taught for years giving the "book, chapter and verse" to back up our teaching. There was a time that most people respected the Bible. They would not all do what it said, but at least they believed and respected it. The time is drawing closer and closer when our battle will not be to get people to listen to what the Bible says but to try to convince them which Bible is right! This is a major setback. We quote a passage and apply it to our text and when they look it up in their Bible (?), it doesn't say that at all. This causes a major problem with those we teach.

How can we teach people about the deity of Christ (and that he has all authority) if they use the Revised Standard Version that changes the word virgin to young woman in Isaiah 7:14 and removes and alters many other passages that declare his deity?

How can we teach people that Christians are to partake the Lord's Supper every first day of the week when they read in their Today's English Version that it was taken on Saturday night?

How can we convince those who believe in miracles and the direct operation of the Holy Spirit, that miracles have ceased and the Holy Spirit operates only through God's Word, when their Bible (!) (The New International Version) does not say they have stopped (1 Cor. 13:10; 2:10ff)? How will they understand the kingdom has already been established when it has Jesus coming to set up his kingdom in 2 Timothy 4:1? How can we preach we are to "sing" (vocal) in worship when it has "make music" in Ephesians 5:19?

Brethren, I'm scared. The battle of the versions is upon us. A perverted Bible is only going to lead people into eternal damnation. Jesus said, "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the..."
soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matthew 10:28). Our allegiance is to Jesus Christ and his Word, but if people no longer know what his Word is or where to find it, how can we be ready when he comes again?

It is a grave responsibility to be a teacher. James says, "Be not many of you teachers, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive heavier judgment" (3:1 ASV). I can not but grieve over all the supposedly faithful and educated preachers who use and promote a perverted version. They ought to know better! If they do not know better, then they should surely not be teaching and should not be filling our pulpits. Woe unto anyone who would lead precious souls astray.

Which Bible? Use the reliable King James and American Standard 1901. Both of these have been proven through the years. You can't go wrong by following God's Word.

3421 Thurber Avenue
Fort Wayne, IN 46809

Daniel's Seventy Weeks (No. 4)
H. Daniel Denham

"Know Therefore And Understand"

Gabriel now directs Daniel's attention to the prophetic program of "the Seventy Weeks." As previously noted, he sets forth three key time periods which in turn comprise the 490 years, the unit of "the Seventy Weeks."

The first period will be comprised of "seven weeks" or 49 years (7x7). It will be marked "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem." This would be its terminus a quo. Its terminus ad quem would be the end of the rebuilding of the city (cf. "street"; "walk"). (Dan. 9:25).

The second period would follow it, and would consist of "threescore and two weeks" or 434 years (62x7). Sometime after its completion (v.26) the Messiah would be "cut off, but not for Himself." Periods one and two combined give 483 years (69x7, the 69 is the 69th week), and would bring the flow of Divine history to the coming of "the Messiah the Prince," viz. the beginning of his earthly ministry. Thus, verses 25, 26a foresee (1) the restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem — from the time of the edict so designed, (2) the appearance of the Messiah — His tabernacling with and labours before the human creature, and (3) His ultimate death for "the sins of the world" sometimes after the end of the second period (the 434 year period) or the 69th week.

The third period would be composed of but "one week" or 7 years. During that time "He (the Messiah, H.D.D.) shall confirm the covenant with many" (v. 27a). But in the midst of that week He would "cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease" (v. 27b).

There was also foreseen the destruction of the city (viz. Jerusalem) and the Temple — "the sanctuary." It would be brought about by "the people of the prince that shall come." As a result, the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined" (v. 26b,c,d). "And for the
the "people of the land" — the Gentile "Samaritans" whose fore-fathers had been transported in under the Assyrian king Esar-haddon. Thus, to stir Israel to its needful labours, God inspires Zechariah to paint a visionary portrait of Jerusalem — one not of the city in ruins as it was in the days of Daniel and Zechariah, but one restored and rebuilt in beautiful splendour. Hear that prophet,

"There shall yet old men and old women dwell in the streets of Jerusalem, and every man with his staff in his hand for very age. And the streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof" (Zech. 8:4, 5).

Zechariah had reference to a time when Jerusalem would again be safely inhabited. It would be when the Lord would, "save My people from the east country and from the west country" (v. 7). The spared remnant would return. "And I will bring them, and they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem: and they shall be My people, and I will be their God, in truth and in righteousness" (v. 8). While ultimately this would find its fulfillment in the remnant obedient to the Gospel (cf. Joel 2:32; Acts 2:21; Zech. 13:7-9; Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:10; Rom. 9:27; 10:1-21; 11:23-27) — the spiritual offspring of God and Seed of Abraham and Isaac, nonetheless its primary reference is to one of the returns from captivity in Mesopotamia. This would be either the one under Ezra in Ezra chapter 8 or the one under Nehemiah — which is more likely — in Nehemiah 2 (We shall have more to say on this matter). The reference in Zechariah 8 to "the east country" and "the west country" pose no great exegetical dilemma for this view, as the Futurists envision in trying to apply it — unsuccessfully we may add — to the so-called "restoration" of Israel in 1948 A.D. During the Babylonian captivity many of the Jews went westward into Egypt (cf. Jer. 43:44) to escape the Chaldaean army. Also, as Hendriksen has shown, the practice of exchanging, trading, and selling captives of war was commonplace in the Ancient World (cf. Ezek. 27:13; Joel 3:7; Amos 1:6, 9). Zechariah 8 therefor is a picture of the consequent following the issuance and completion of the edict or command to restore and build Jerusalem of Daniel 9:25.

The angel refers in Daniel 9:25 to "the street" and "the wall". He speaks thus of the system of streets and alleys which would arise in the city's rebirth, and of the defensive walls designed to protect the civilian populace with their special gates and towers aggregately under the singular number, a form not unknown in the Hebrew Scriptures. (cf. Psa. 55:11; Isa. 59:14). These would be built again "even in troublous times." And they indeed were. (Here one should examine the books of Nehemiah and Malachi as they historically enter the picture). Opposition from the enemies of Israel abounded; moral and religious corruption had to be dealt with by Ezra, Nehemiah, and Malachi. The threat of war with its neighbors lingered over the struggling nation's head; compromise with the idolatrous heathen from within worried and wearied the earnest restorers, who under God's supreme hand guided the people to stability in government and religion; usury (the unlawful variety), deceit, divorce, and treachery held many Jews in their powerful clutches; indifference to the worship of God, improper sacrifices, and holding the Lord's altar in contempt were commonplace and flaunted in the face of the Great "I Am" service to God was considered "wearisome" by many. And the great majority of such sins were to be found among the supposed to be "consecrated" priests: teachers, upholders, and examples in the law! (Preachers ought to know how and where to apply these!) These were "troublous times" alright, but the work would be and was completed under the exhorting, rebuking, and reproving done by those eager to restore the "holy city" to its pristine glory.

"The Commandment To Restore And Build"

There were four edicts issued by Persian monarchs bearing on the program of the return of the Jews from captivity and the repopulation of the Jewish Homeland. The terminus a quo is to be found in one of these four.

(1) The first was the edict of Cyrus. It is dated about 536 B.C. It called for a return of those Jews who were "willing" to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem with provision for the work being made from free will offerings and even the royal treasury (2 Chron. 36:22, 23; Ezra 1:1-11). "The glory of the Gentiles" began to flow "like a stream" into Canaan land to aid in the work of the Temple and to magnify God's glory (cf. Isa. 66:12). Cyrus performed "the pleasure" of the Lord (Isa. 44:28; 45:1ff.) 42,360 Jews \(33\) returned to the "promised land" under Zerubbabel and Jeshua, and were somewhat settled in the land by the seventh month (Tishri) of the first year of Cyrus (in Babylon, H.D.D.; Darius the Mede was a subordinate ruler to him from 539 B.C.). (cf. Ezra 1:1; 3:1; Dan. 6:28; 10:1; 11:1 — Observe "the third year of Cyrus", "the first year of Darius," etc.).

The date of 536 B.C., however, furnishes no appropriate terminus a quo of the commandment of Daniel 9:25. The 483 years designed to bring us down to "the Messiah the Prince" would give us from that point the year 53 B.C., or there about — definitely not an adequate terminus ad quem of that portion of the prophecy. This would be about 80 years
prior to the Lord's earthly ministry.

An attempt to reconcile this problem to Daniel 9 has been made by a number of expositors. Such an attempt was made by the erudite Foy E. Wallace, Jr. in God’s Prophetic Word on the contention that the seventy weeks "are heptades, a sum or a number of seven or groups of seven, and do not necessarily follow in order to carry out the prophetic purpose; but the heptades may be separated by other periods and events, and are not therefore subject to a continuous or successive mathematical calculation." He comments further at length,

"In this view the first heptad would be the period of restoration under the decree of Cyrus; the second heptad would be the necessary intervening time between the restoration and the transition to the new age and kingdom of eternal righteousness; the third and final heptad would be the period of consummation of the prophecy between the cutting off of the Messiah and the end of the Jewish state, not indicating an exact date nor a single event, but covering broadly the Neroan persecution and the destruction of Jerusalem.

He takes the reference to "seven" or multiples thereof to stand for the completion of a purpose or the sufficient time to stand for the purpose of each part. He says that "When periods are the basis of prophetic vision and apocalyptic description they are not subject to exact mathematics. . . . The sabbath of the Jews was the seventh day of the week, and the jubilee was based on seven times seven years. The term seven would indicate a complete time."

The problems with this position are many, however, and it thus presents more problems than it answers. (1) First, the heptades consideration is baseless. The Greek word for seven is ἑπτά (fr. whence heptad), and is so used in the LXX. The Hebrew word for "seventy" is שבעים; it is used here in Daniel 9:24. Its Greek equivalent is ἑβαϊκαί. The use of these words or their appropriate variables are exactly what we would expect to have been used if a mathematical consideration was involved. The symbolism of seven is the exception and not the rule in its use. Jeremiah prophesied of "seventy years," and so forth. While it is admitted that the idea of the "seventy weeks" is the thought or contemplation of "extra-ordinary" weeks in the place of seventy literal weeks, to divorce the use of it entirely from the normal idea of "seventy" is contextually untenable. The angel is too specific in detail to be merely symbolizing the time needed to accomplish each. (2) Second, the position implies a series of "gaps" within the prophecy, and each period is not to be taken "successively." This reduces the force of the time-line prophecy, and its argument for the inspiration of Daniel. (3) Third, such a position places the end of Judaism within the scope of the last week, a conclusion unsustained by the text. (4) Given the force of the preceding, it is historically and, above all, Biblically obvious that 49 years from 536 B.C. gives a date of c. 487 B.C. Neither Ezra nor Nehemiah had returned by that date to complete their tasks. Jerusalem, for the most part, was still unoccupied, even though the Temple had been completed "on the third day of the month of Adar, which was in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king (.i.e. Hystaspes)" (c. 515 B.C.), according to Ezra 6:15. When Nehemiah was yet in Persia serving as cup-bearer to Artaxerxes Longimanus he heard of Jerusalem's desolate condition (Neh. 1:2,3), and he, upon his arrival at the once great city, saw that "Jerusalem lieth waste, and the gates thereof are burned with fire." The wall was broken down with great gaps in the battlements (Neh. 2). This was in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes' reign, or about 445 B.C. under the Julian calendar — 91 years after Cyrus' edict.

One point that should here be cited is that to some degree Cyrus did have a part in the rebuilding of Jerusalem, even though it is not expressly stated in the edict preserved in 2 Chronicles and Ezra. Isaiah had prophesied, "of Cyrus, He is My shepherd, and shall perform all My pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the Temple, Thy foundation shall be laid" (Isa. 44:28). In Isaiah 45:13 we read of him, "he shall build My city, and he shall let go My captives." His work in fulfilling the building again of Jerusalem was in setting in motion by his edict and his benevolent attitude toward the Jews the impetus from an imperial level to carry out this grand aim. He poured a solid foundation upon which a future king of Persia would raise the city by the hand of ardent labourers. (cf. Nehemiah). Therefore, the position expressed by brother Wallace cannot be taken lightly despite its various and sundry problems.

Someone might here point out that brother Wallace's view that the Destruction of Jerusalem is included in the "seventieth week," and it therefore parallels the position by brother Max R. King. This is true as far as it goes. However, there is a distinct difference in their views on Daniel 9 that put these men 'miles apart' eschatologically. Brother Wallace's view was put forth in refutation of Premillennialism as alternative to the Millennial view advocated by so many commentators. Brother King's view was put forth in a divisive fashion sowing discord in the brotherhood. Also brother King attempts to use Daniel 9:27 as a springboard into an
outright denial of the Second Coming, the End of the World, the Resurrection and Judgment, etc. There therefore is a tremendous difference between these two men in purpose and consequence of their teaching. Brother Wallace was trying to defend the Brotherhood being encroached upon by the obnoxious and odious dogmas of Chiliasm, while brother King was surreptitiously trying to trouble the church with his obnoxious and odious brand of Realized Eschatology. For Kingites to defend Kingism by the involving of the good name of Foy E. Wallace, Jr. is about as reasonable and charitable as Dr. Frank Norris gallingly invoking the name of Alexander Campbell as a "fellow" Premillennialist.

(2) The second edict regarding the return from captivity and the repopulation by the Jews of Palestine was issued by Darius I Hystaspes. (cf. Ezra 6:1ff.) This edict commanded that a search be made for Cyrus' original decree of 536 B.C., for it seems to have been lost amidst the Medo-Persian bureaucracy, and to reinstate it. Smerdis the Magiane called by some Pseudo-Smerdis and by Ezra 'Artaxerxes' in 4:7,11,23, had ordered a halt by force of arms to the work on the Temple during his usurpation of the Persian throne (r. 522-521 B.C.). The royal treasury under Darius was again, made available to accomplish this task by his decree, and it provided for royal protection against the Jews' enemies. But it made no provision for the rebuilding of the wall, nor of the city. It was issued in B.C. 520, and thus would not furnish an adequate terminus a quo bringing us short of "the Messiah the Prince."

(TO BE CONTINUED NEXT MONTH)
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I'm Catholic:
A Lesson Of Religious Attitudes
Louis Everette Rushmore

"I'm Catholic" was a reply with which I was well familiar when, in fact, I was one of some seven-hundred-million Roman Catholics. "I'm Catholic" was the all sufficient response intended to discourage any 'protestant' religionist who might knock at my door. Though I would, like other 'good Catholics,' assert my official religious affiliation, at no time did I feel compelled to state my degree of religious conviction or attitude. Not attempting to determine the degree of my faithfulness to Catholicism was a mistake which Christians cannot afford to repeat in their evangelistic efforts. Since the former days of Catholicism in my life, I have heard familiar, similar sounds at the doors of others: "I'm Baptist," "I'm Jewish," "I'm Pentecostal" or perhaps, "I'm a Christian." THOUGH SUCH SOUNDS MAY ACQUAINT ONE WITH THE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OF AN INSTITUTION, "I'M CATHOLIC," ETC., IN NO WAY, OF NECESSITY, RELATES THE INDIVIDUAL CONVICTIONS OR RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE OF A PROSPECT!

Many people's religious backgrounds are well sprinkled and well stirred with several, often incompatible, denominational doctrines, derived from various warring sects of denominationalism which have at sometime had influence over them; it is not uncommon today for some people to have considered themselves members of three or more denominations in the course of their lives. Further, EVERY RELIGIOUS AND SECULAR INSTITUTION IS COMPRISED OF PEOPLE WHICH TOGETHER HOLD DIFFERING CONVICTIONS AND DISPLAY VARYING DEGREES OF FAITHFULNESS! This is true with regard to the United States and its citizens wherein we speak of degrees of loyalty. In the denominational world and even in the church for which Jesus died, people are found to exhibit different, varying attitudes of faithfulness. I never cease to be amazed when studying with denominational people to discover that the person with whom I am studying either is not aware of denominational doctrine he is supposed to believe or believes a doctrine which is contrary to the denomination of which he is a member; then, too, I never cease to grieve when I discover brethren who believe less or more than the gospel of Christ!

Following, we will observe four definite attitudes, distinctively present, though possibly combined on occasion, in every institution, including the body of Christ. For the purpose of illustration, I refer to the Catholic church from whence I came.

DEDICATED CATHOLIC

A dedicated Catholic is one who is thoroughly INDOCTRINATED in the Catholic faith. Catholics begin teaching their children early, continue to teach Catholic dogma constantly and force feed a steady diet of complete dependence upon the Catholic 'clergy.' Hence, dedicated Catholics believe it to be sinful to discuss religion with a 'protestant' and look upon the Bible as a 'dead letter.' Dedicated Catholics today are often senior citizens or elderly, though some younger people (Continued on page 51)
GUEST EDITORIAL

The Truth About Booze

Dalton Key

I read with interest a while back an article entitled, "Ten Reasons Why I Drink." These were the reasons given: "I love to vomit; it makes my children respect me; my wife loves my whisky-breath and beer-bleary eyes; drunkards make the best citizens; it helped me win the 'Safe Driving' award; I want to encourage juvenile delinquency; it helps me think more clearly; "it's my way of saving money; I have always wanted to live in a 'flophouse' on skid row; it's my way of obeying God."

If the most recent reports are correct, the number of American drinkers has doubled in the past 20 years. It is estimated that Americans are spending in excess of 30 billion dollars on alcohol annually. Apparently, the truth about booze has either not gotten out or not been accepted. We need not possess a remarkable intellect to see the many problems brought about by this marked increase in drinking. Most of our social and spiritual ills could be cured if only we would first throw away our bottles. For proof, read on.

Alcohol was abolished from the Canadian province of Prince Edward Island in 1900. The results of this ban are astounding. This small island currently has only 13 policemen for a population of over 90,000. Unemployment does not exist. Divorces are extremely rare. Since 1947, there have been no recorded cases of child abuse. Prince Edward Island has no penitentiary. And to top it all off, there have been years when the accident rate has been only two for every 1000 cars. Yes, the consumption of alcohol just may be the culprit behind many of our most serious problems.

Nick Hamilton, preacher for the Pleasant Valley Church in Little Rock, has written, "Imagine a nuclear plant going awry every day killing 80 people immediately, seriously injuring about 3,000 others, driving 15 people to suicide, directly causing 400 broken homes, causing 500 people to suffer brain damage, influencing 500 children and attack other loved ones, and causing about 10 billion dollars worth of direct damage per year. That would be something, wouldn't it? We would have a problem on our hands roughly the same as the consequences caused by alcohol." Solomon told the truth about booze long ago when he said, "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging; whoever is deceived thereby is not wise" (Proverbs 20:1). In light of the foregoing, one would have to be deceived and deluded to begin the drinking habit. One does not drown his sorrows in the bottle; he merely irrigates them so they will better reproduce themselves.
Here is some good advice. If you are a married man who absolutely must drink, start a saloon in your own home. Be the only customer, and you won't need a license. Give your wife $50 to buy a gallon of whisky. Then buy your drinks from your wife. When the first gallon is gone, she will have $150 to deposit in the bank and $50 to start business again. If you should live ten years, continue to buy booze from her, and then die a hopeless drunkard, she will have enough money to bury you respectfully, bring up your children, marry a decent man, and forget all about you!

"Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Gal. 6:7). As a people, we have been deceived by strong drink long enough. Let's work to reveal the truth about booze.

THE CASUAL CATHOLIC

THE CASUAL CATHOLIC IS TAINTED WITH THE APATHY FOR WHICH LAODICEA WAS CONDEMNED, (Rev. 3:15,16). IN ADDITION TO THE ERROR OF CATHOLICISM. Often casual Catholics are from the subsequent generation following dedicated Catholics. The casual Catholic is somewhat rebellious and happy-go-lucky toward religion. He has turned the Catholic error into a 'sin-forgiveness-sin' system by which he easily appeases his conscience. His attendance is irregular, prayers few and contribution little. THE CASUAL CATHOLIC IS OF NO REAL VALUE TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH NOR IS HE EVEN A GOOD PROSPECT FOR CONVERSION because of his defective attitude. Were such a one 'converted' without altering his general attitude, he would likely be a poor convert. Unfortunately, too many, having the same defective attitude as the casual Catholic, have been less than truly, thoroughly converted from Catholicism and denominationalism in general. Too, many reared in 'Christian homes' have never been completely converted as evidenced by the vivid lack of conviction in their lives. Anyone having this defective attitude, regardless of religious affiliation, is of no value to the kingdom's cause. The casual Catholic and the casual Christian both need to consecrate themselves to the sincere vigilant service of God, (Rom. 12:1,2); the Catholic, naturally, would of necessity begin by rendering obedience to the author of eternal life, (Heb. 5:8,9).

NON-CATHOLIC-CATHOLIC

THE NON-CATHOLIC-CATHOLIC, as I call them, ARE THOSE WHO FOR ALL PRACTICAL PURPOSES ARE NOT CATHOLICS AT ALL! Often these Catholics represent the second subsequent generation proceeding from the dedicated Catholics. Non-Catholic-Catholics are characterized by virtually no attendance of religious services, (perhaps twice annually, on Easter and Christmas); virtually no contribution and virtually no prayers. Like the casual Catholics, the non-Catholic-Catholics, do not feel compelled to live pure, good, moral lives. The non-Catholic-Catholics, however, are not often, if ever, troubled in conscience. Since their Catholicism rests at the door like some hex sign to drive away both Catholic and protest-
tiant religionists, THEY TOO ARE POOR PROSPECTS FOR CONVERSION AND LIKELY TO BE POOR CONVERTS WERE THEY TO BE IMMERSED without a drastic improvement of attitude.

Alarming to me is that this basic attitude is definitely present in nearly, if not every community in which the Lord's church meets. Even in Memphis, Tennessee, in which I once lived a short while, where the area churches of our Lord boast some forty-five-thousand active members, thousands of non-Christian-Christians live in the same community. As bad as that is, more frightening to me is THE FACT that faithful Christians are often doing little if anything to restore or discipline their erring brethren. Yes, THERE ARE THOUSANDS OF CHRISTIANS WHOSE CHRISTIANITY RESTS AT THEIR THRESHOLDS TO WARD OFF DENOMINATIONALS AND BRETHREN TOO! Shame on the erring; shame on us for permitting the erring to continue in this sinful masquerade. God will not be fooled by the disorderly and we must not be fooled, (2 Thess. 3:6).

DISSATISFIED CATHOLICS

THE DISSATISFIED CATHOLIC IS A GOOD PROSPECT FOR CONVERSION AND LIKELY TO BE A GOOD CONVERT TO CHRISTIANITY: however, we will never know this person nor the pleasure of his conversion if we fail to make inquiry beyond his 'automatic response,' "I'm Catholic." Like the non-Catholic-Catholic, the dissatisfied Catholic is often the third generation from the dedicated Catholic. By reason of the influence, perhaps, of his grandparents (dedicated Catholics), and the parental influence of casual Catholics, the dissatisfied Catholic may have learned love and respect for God from his grandparents, but yet learned to be critical of tradition and form from his parents; such was the case with me. The dissatisfied Catholic is somewhat rebellious against tradition without authority and the demand of blind obedience which is made upon him. He is actively searching for truth but does not know where to look. He might as soon look in Genesis or to some man for the plan of salvation. Because the dissatisfied Catholic recognizes his own inadequacy and unfamiliarity regarding the scriptures, he is skeptical toward both truth and error. Ungrounded in biblical truth, he is especially vulnerable to error, particularly the Baptist and Pentecostal errors. The Baptist faith is in many ways a large step toward the truth from Catholicism, though the dissatisfied Catholic is unaware he has not yet arrived at truth by becoming a Baptist. Pentecostalism has a peculiar appeal to dissatisfied Catholics, probably because of the vivid contrast to Catholicism in which they have lost confidence. Equally important to him is a more personable religion, less formal and ritualistic. Unfortunately, dissatisfied Catholics who espouse denominationalism are unaware of the error to which they have succumbed and many refuse any further investigation for reasons of insecurity. Having left Catholicism, he longs for spiritual security in what he has found to replace Catholicism. To leave his new found religion, to him, is the same as admitting there is no spiritual security anywhere; he fears failure in discovering truth by which he can sense real meaning in his life and therefore does not wish to cross-examine his new faith.

The best prospect for conversion is the dissatisfied Catholic, Lutheran, etc. He is longing for truth; we need to direct him to it and free him from his bondage of sin, (John 8:32).

It is a grievous thought to imagine that there are dissatisfied Christians. I am sure, however, that there are such Christians. In turning from the salvation which they have found in Christ, they will find no salvation anywhere as salvation is only to be had in Christ, (Gal. 3:27; Eph. 1:7).

CONCLUSION

The attitude or heart of a man, (Matt. 13: 3-23), is the determining factor whether or not one is a good prospect for conversion and likely to be a good convert. It has always been so. The souls who are sincere or dissatisfied in their present religious persuasion are more likely to be good converts to Christianity than marginal or unproductive members of some denomination. Only the dissatisfied soul, though, is likely to listen to the gospel message, and then with some apprehension.

In closing, I would like to speak for all those who have been converted to Christ from some denomination and are now endeavoring to diligently serve the Lord. BECAUSE WE LEFT ERROR AND HAVE ESPoused TRUTH, WE ARE PARTICULARLY RESENTFUL TOWARD THE ESPOUSAL OF ERROR BY BRETHREN IN SOME QUARTERS OF THE CHURCH. EQUALLY DISTURBING IS IT THAT OTHERWISE FAITHFUL BRETHREN HINDER EFFORTS TO COMBAT ERROR WHICH THREATENS THE PURITY OF THE BRIDE OF CHRIST. Too, we are thankful that someone inquired beyond our defense, "I'm Catholic," "I'm Lutheran," etc., and taught us the gospel. Will you please uphold God's word and teach the lost?! The souls of the world, including ours, depends on it!

P.O. Box 72
Rosiclare, IL 62982
"The Commandment To Restore And Build"
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(3) The third edict was given by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the seventh year of his reign to the "ready scribe" Ezra the son of Serailah. (cf. Ezra 7:1ff.) Artaxerxes' reign began about 465 B.C., according to Bruce under the Dionysian Calendar. Langer also follows this date, as also does T. Cuyler Young. Seven years from that date gives 458 as the year of Ezra's return and the first edict of Artaxerxes. 483 years from that year would bring us down to the year A.D. 24: as it is the case that there is no year 0 and from B.C. 1 to A.D. 1 is but one year. This brings us pretty close to the beginning of Christ's earthly ministry. Some historians date the first year of Artaxerxes' reign as B.C. 464, thus moving the count one year closer. But it is not close enough: for A.D. 25 is several years shy of the beginning of Christ's earthly ministry under the Dionysian Calendar, which date would be A.D. 20 or 30 (Christ being crucified about A.D. 33). The Gregorian reckoning of A.D. 26 as the beginning of His ministry (and A.D. 30 as His death) would push the beginning of Artaxerxes' reign to about B.C. 468 and Jerusalem's fall to the Romans to A.D. 70 (whereas the Dionysian gives A.D. 73 for this event). For the sake of memory and to prevent confusion, many writers follow the Dionysian until the birth of Christ and, at least in part, the Gregorian after His birth. However, there is a three to four year discrepancy to be reconciled between the two in consideration of the chronology, especially as to the seventy weeks." (Note: In this work we have thus far given Dionysian dates for the most part, except the date of Jerusalem's Destruction in A.D. 70 which is Gregorian.) The exposition must be cognizant of these facts and thus respect those three/four years in his count.

Also the edict to Ezra does not concern the rebuilding of the city per se. Though several thousand more Jews returned under his leadership, Ezra was primarily sent to restore the law in all of its economical connections. He was to teach "in Israel statutes and judgments" (Ezra 7:10). The edict made provision for:

(1) a second return of those Jews so willing (v. 13);
(2) the teaching of the law by Ezra in Judah and Jerusalem (v. 14);
(3) the offering of gold and silver by the king and his counsellors — the entire province of Babylonia — and by a free-will gift of the priests and people of Israel within Mesopotamia (vs. 15,16);
(4) the use of these funds for the Temple service (vs. 17,18);
(5) the giving of vessels to the Temple (v.19);
(6) the subsidizing of any want for the Temple out of the royal treasury (vs. 20-23);
(7) the exemption of the Levites and priests of Israel from taxation (v. 24);
(8) the royal authorization of the judgeship of Ezra (v. 25); and
(9) the punishing of transgressors of the edict (v. 26).

Many authorities, however, hold to this edict as the one in Daniel 9:25. But we see no firm basis for this contention.

(4) The fourth edict, and we believe the one to be identified with the commandment of Daniel 9:25, is the one given by Artaxerxes Longimanus to Nehemiah in the twentieth year of his reign (c. A.D. 445 under the Julian calendar). We wish now to deal with the reasons in favor of this conclusion.

"The Work Of Nehemiah"

The book of Nehemiah opens in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes' long reign. It is the month of Chislev, and the scene is the royal palace of Shushan (the old Elamite city of Susa). Nehemiah is the cupbearer of the Persian king, who lives in a splendour most common to the Achaemenids.

Nehemiah is visited by one of his "brethren" recently come from Palestine. Nehemiah questions him of the state of "the Jews that had escaped, which were left of the captivity, and concerning Jerusalem" (1:2). This brother (Hanani by name) was also accompanied by several other men of Judah. He answered the inquiry of the Royal Cupbearer, "The remnant that are left of the captivity there in the province are in great affliction and reproach: the wall of Jerusalem also is broken down, and the gates thereof are burned with fire" (v. 3).

Nehemiah mourned over this news (vs. 4-10; 2:1-2), and the king, into whose favor God had brought Nehemiah, perceived that he was sad by his fallen "countenance" or demeanor. When he is questioned for the source of such sadness, he responds, "...why should not my
countenance be sad, when the city, the place of my fathers' sepulchres, lieth waste, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire?" (2:3). We may add here that the conclusion that the city was waste would naturally inhere in the city's greatness — perhaps, comparable to the Ancient metropolis of Sardis, the seat of Croesus. Oftentimes the city's rise from the ashes of its ruins.

"An Apparent Dilemma And Its Dissolution"

But what of the date of the commission given by Artaxerxes to Nehemiah? The twentieth year of his reign was when it was given. Thus, from 465 B.C. this would give the year 445 B.C. This would also give the Julian date of 37 A.D. as the beginning of the Messiah's earthly ministry.

While on the surface this seems to pose a problem, it is one that can be dispensed with by consulting the histories of Xenophon, Thucydides, and others. All chronologists are generally agreed that the father of Artaxerxes Longimanus, Xerxes I, began to reign in the year 485 B.C. Thucydides places the flight of Themistocles (c. 471 B.C.) to Persia during the reign of Artaxerxes I, "the son of Xerxes, who had recently come to the throne." Vitringa, on this basis, reckons the flight occurred about B.C. 473-472. One is here exhorted to examine the historical objections adduced in favor of the traditional (465 B.C.) date for the beginning of Artaxerxes' reign and their answers given by Hengstenberg, as time and space fail us to present them in any detail here. At any rate, Thucydides implies that Artaxerxes was reigning prior to 465, whereas Strabo places it in 465.62 (One must keep in mind that Strabo was writing several centuries after the fact).

One objection shall here be noted, however, as it has bearing on the Bible itself, and that is the objection produced from the Book of Esther. The objection runs that the Ahasuerus of Esther is Xerxes I, and that Esther refers to his "twelfth year" expressly in 3:7, even its twelfth month (Adar) in 9:1. From 485 this would bring us down to 473 B.C. at least — with Xerxes still reigning without any inclination that it would be cut short so soon. Some authorities question the Ahasuerus-Xerxes connection. Rollin maintained that Ahasuerus is to be identified with Darius Hystaspes.63 However, it is most probable that the traditional connection is correct. But, while it is true Esther refers to the twelfth month of the twelfth year, it does not necessarily follow that the year in question was B.C. 473. The difficulty is dispelled when we consider the fact, according to Herodotus, that Xerxes, two years before Darius' death, was made co-regent (c. 487 B.C.). Thus, Esther, following the Hebrew custom of including the time of co-regency

...
with the actual reign, gives twelve years—
not to 473 as the objection presupposes, but
to about 475 B.C. thus giving adequate time
for Xerxes' demise and Artaxerxes' ascendancy.
Hengstenberg suggests that the occasion of the
great feast of Esther I was the coronation
of Xerxes in his third year (v. 3) since be-
coming co-regent, and that the event of 2:16
finds its occasion in Xerxes' return from
Greece. 65

Rollin, following Xenophon and Thucydides
places the reign of Artaxerxes as beginning in
473 B.C. 66 He attributes to him a reign of
some 49 years to 425 B.C. 67 (Ctesias gives
him 42 years). 68 Aelian and Justin also so
closely connect Xerxes' return from Greece
(c. B.C. 480) with his death that, as Hengs-
tenberg says, "we cannot possibly assume a
fifteen years' reign after this return." 69
He further suggests that a date no later than
474 should be assigned. 70

Other problems arise with the traditional
(B.C. 465) date as the beginning of Artaxer-
xes reign. There is the age problem. Justin
calls Darius, the first-born of Xerxes, an
"adolescent" at the time of his father's
death, but following the traditional reckon-
ing of Ctesias he would have been 31 years of
age, hardly an adolescent. Artaxerxes would
have been about 17 and Darius about 20 or 21
at their father's decease under the revised
accounting—thus giving Artaxerxes (who
mistaking his elder brother as his father's
assassin, slew Darius) a reign of about 50
years. 71 (Rollin 49; Hengstenberg 51).

There is also the problem of the peace of
Cimon after the battle of Eurymedon (c. B.C.
470). As this peace was concluded with
Artaxerxes, this would place his ascendency to
the purple sometime prior to B.C. 470. 72
Langer, however, places it in B.C. 466, 73
though with some chronological inconsistencies.

Charon of Lampsacus likewise places the
flight of Themistocles during the time of
Artaxerxes, according to Plutarch 74 who dis-
agrees with that assessment. 75 Plutarch
chooses to follow the view espoused by Ephorus,
Dinon, Clitarchus, and Heraclides, though
reluctantly admitting that "Thucydides' ac-
count seems to agree better with the chrono-
logical tables..." 76 Charon was a historian
living in Asia at the time of Themistocles'
famous journey to the Persian court, while
Thucydides, called by Hengstenberg "the prince
of historians," was born about the time of
that event and set about to record the facts
of it due to the relative silence of his pre-
decessors 77 (incl. Herodotus, "the father of
history"). The earliest witnesses on record
to the contrary lived more than a full cen-
tury after the event. 78

Indirect proofs could be cited here from
Cicero, Diodorus Siculus, and other historical
considerations, 79 but the preceding is suf-
ficient to establish the feasibility of the
Nehemiah commission as the terminus a quo of
Daniel 9:25. Reckoning from 473 B.C. as the
beginning of Artaxerxes' reign, we come to
453 as the year of the edict given to Nehemiah.
483 years from that point would give us A.D.
29, the Dionysian date for the beginning of
the Lord's earthly ministry. (A.D. 26 under
the Gregorian Calendar). This accords with
the prophecy in bringing us to "the Messiah
the Prince." This would correspond to Luke's
reference in Luke 3:23 to Christ as being
"about thirty years of age" when He began His
work beginning at His baptism by John the
Baptizer.

From 453 the "seven weeks" or 49 years
brings us to 404 B.C. as the end of those
"weeks of years" determined for the rebuil-
ding of the city of Jerusalem. This would be
accomplished thus by the last year of the reign
of Darius II Notus (r. 423-404 B.C.),
hence the scope of the "seven weeks". It is
not merely incidental that Herodotus, writing
about that time, refers to the greatness of the
city: for its rise once more to such heights had been judiciously decreed by the
Lord God of Heaven. Hence we have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Artaxerxes Begins Reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Edict to Nehemiah -- to restore and build Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483 years</td>
<td>End of the &quot;Seven Weeks&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>The &quot;threescore and two weeks&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Seven Weeks and Two Weeks" c.26 A.D. (Gregorian Date)

"The Street...And The Wall..."

The rebuilding of the city would naturally
involve two of its most important systems:
travel and defence. The "Street" refers to
the system of streets which honeycomb the
city of Jerusalem. The "Wall" refers to the
system of walls and fortifications which sur-
rounded the city. The Book of Nehemiah
especially emphasizes the work on the latter
system (using both the singular and plural
number). (cf. Neh. 1:3; 2:8,13,15,17; 3:8, 13,15,27; 4:1,3,6,7,10,13,15,17,19; 5:16; 6:
1,6,15; 7:1; 12:27,30,31,37,38; 13:21).

Such an emphasis upon the wall is exactly
what one would expect in a writing of the
antiquity of Nehemiah and concerned with
building a city as it is. The key advancement
in civilization in the art of defence was the
wall. All great centers of political autho-
rity developed the wall. Jericho, Babylon, Mysenae, Ninevah, Thebes, Sardis; and so on, were famous for their massive fortifications system. The kings of Israel and Judah built "walled cities" and "cities for defence." They "built up" already existing cities by fortifying the strongholds, the towers or citadels commanding the walls of the city. All was done to strengthen the land by providing sufficient defences for its inhabitants. A city properly supplied and protected would oftentimes be a deterrent to an invasion, or else, while under siege, continue to function normally. And a series of such cities could wear down a would-be-conqueror's resolve and forces.

Thus, the natural progression in the rebuilding of Jerusalem would include special emphasis upon the wall, especially when one remembers that not far from that city lay the Gentile Samaritan forces sworn to the city's destruction and continued desolation. Such a fortified city was viewed as a threat to their dominance of the Palestine region within the Persian Empire.

Therefore, we are not surprised to find in Nehemiah and Malachi, who began to prophesy about B.C. 410, that the work was done "even in troublous times." There were military and political problems formented by the Samaritans to face; there were social problems and consequentially religious problems created by the intermarriage of many Jews with the Samaritans; there were also problems—both moral and religious—that arose from greed, apathy, treachery, etc., from many of the people themselves. (To be continued)
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The ability to differentiate between things that differ is one thing. The execution of that which we know is right, but refusing to do it, is another thing. Because of the familiarity of knowing and not doing, we slip into a rut or rebellion and contempt for holy things becomes common place. How easy it is to get caught up in the maze of the times and lose our perspective for sacred things! (Lev. 10:10; Ez. 22:26; 44:23). The old adage, "We cannot see the trees for the forest" has meaning. The web we weave around ourselves becomes impenetrable as we continue to plunge deeper and deeper into our projects and programs. This results, too many times, in a proprietary attitude. The familiarity of things can take on the ownership complex, that is, our schools, our teachers, our elders, our services, and our church. Developing a rationale of justification for our defense, becomes our deception and we lose our sense of reasoning. (Mk. 13:5; 1 Cor. 3:18.) We take positions that fail to distinguish between the "holy and profane." (Ez. 22:26.) We even progress to calling, "...evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!" (Isa. 5:20.) Familiarity reduces sacred things to common things, if we lose sight of divine authority. It becomes easier for us to take for granted the things that belong to God, and misuse them and abuse them. Let us concentrate on the idea of keeping separate the Divine and the Human.

THE DIVINE

Christ owns the church by right of purchase. (Acts 20:28.) Christians belong to Christ because we have obeyed His gospel. (Mk. 16:16; 2 Cor. 5:17.) Christ has all authority "in heaven and in earth." (Matt. 28:18.) Thus, in every activity that we do in the church, worship, teaching, and benevolence, we do by the authority of His word. (Col. 3:17.) To add to or subtract from His word would be "profaning" the word of God. (1 Tim. 4:7; 6:20; 2 Tim. 2:16; Rev. 22:18-19.) In the area of the Divine we must have a "thus saith the Lord" for the things we do, being careful that we do not become like the prophets and priests of old, "For both prophet and priest are profane; yea, in my house have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord." (Jer. 23:11.) Since, "...it is not in man that walketh to direct his own steps" (Jer. 10:23), we should be very careful lest familiarity leads us down the primrose path to desecrating the Divine which belongs solely to God. (Matt. 7:21-23.)

THE HUMAN

The prerogative for all things to exist comes from God. (Rom. 13:1.) Our homes were instituted by God, yet they are human in execution. Our schools are human deductions from a divine premise. In our homes, schools, professions, and occupations, God has overshadowed them with divine principles, yet, (Continued on page 59)
William S. Cline

I guess I always knew that the time would come when I would write my final line as editor of the DEFENDER. Because of the love I had for the paper and the energy I had put into it, I looked upon that day as something sad and to be avoided if at all possible. With the help of Ernest Underwood, the advice of Max R. Miller and the encouragement of numerous brethren, we started the paper on a dream. The years it has been in existence have been good. It has fought much-needed battles and has been well received by thousands around the world. Even though we dreamed when we began the paper, it went far beyond our dreams and today has become more widely circulated than we ever thought possible. We humbly thank each of you who supported the paper so generously. Without you and the ladies at Bellview who so freely gave of their time, none of this could have been done.

Thus, the time for that final line has come and it is not as we had anticipated. The Showalter family, who has owned the FIRM FOUNDATION PUBLISHING HOUSE for approximately 80 years, decided recently to sell that business which included the weekly paper the FIRM FOUNDATION. The FIRM FOUNDATION has been in existence since the first Tuesday in September 1884 and begins its 100th year next month. H. A. (Buster) Dobbs of Houston, Texas, and I were fortunate enough, with the help of other interested individuals, to purchase the FOUNDATION. When the contract to purchase was finalized, I resigned my work with the Bellview church of Christ and all the responsibilities which I had relative to the pulpit work, the Bellview Preacher Training School and the DEFENDER. The resignation is effective August 21, 1983. This completes 15 years of most pleasant work with the Bellview church. No one could ever serve under a more faithful eldership nor work with a more wonderful congregation.

We anxiously look forward to the tremendous opportunities we will have to further and strengthen the cause of Christ through the new areas that have been opened to us. I will serve as President of the FIRM FOUNDATION PUBLISHING HOUSE, INCORPORATED and as Editor of the weekly journal owned and published by that corporation. The responsibilities in journalism and publishing materials for the Lord’s church are truly challenging and looked forward to with great anticipation.
Brother John G. Priola, who serves as a preacher at Bellview and an instructor in the Preacher Training School has been selected to serve as the Vice-President of the corporation and associate editor of the FIRM FOUNDATION. His resignation, like mine, is effective on August 21.

The Bellview elders have chosen brother Max R. Miller to shoulder the responsibilities at Bellview. He will be the preacher, the editor of the DEFENDER and the Director of the Preacher Training School. All of the works which Bellview has engaged in, in the past will continue, and we trust with renewed zeal and enthusiasm under the guidance and labours of brother Miller. He is a most capable man, sound in the faith and set for the cause of Christ. It is my firm conviction that the elders could have searched this brotherhood over and never found a better man for the job. My prayers and well wishes are with brother Miller.

The FIRM FOUNDATION needs your help! We are in need of people who love the truth and want to see this work progress who will invest money in the corporation. We are in immediate need of over $30,000 to pay off a short-term note. Anyone interested in investing at least $1,000 should contact me at the FIRM FOUNDATION, P.O. Box 610, Austin, Texas 78767. Secondly, we need to greatly increase the subscriptions to the FOUNDATION. Single subscriptions will be $12.00 per year. Send your check with the appropriate address to the above address. Discounts can be had at club, congregational and group rates. Write for more information. Over the past few years the paper's subscription has dwindled to approximately 15,000. With your help we believe it can be back to over 30,000 as it once was a few years ago.

Thus our final line is being written as editor of the DEFENDER; our pen is being transferred to a noble scribe, but we are taking up a new responsibility at the helm of the FIRM FOUNDATION PUBLISHING HOUSE and a new pen as the editor of the FIRM FOUNDATION. I pray God that this centennial year will be one of the greatest for the FOUNDATION and that in some small way this humble scribe may be worthy of the tremendous responsibility that has been laid upon his shoulders.

DIVINE-HIS-HUMAN-OURS Continued from page 57
the control of these, are wholly human, that is, we are at liberty to marry or not to marry, we can have private schools, public schools, or no schools (unless we violate state or federal laws), and we can be doctors, lawyers, farmers, or whatever we choose. Many times we are prompt and prone to mix and mingle the divine and the human and forget who controls which and what! It is the Lord's church, the Lord's work, but they are our schools, our papers, and our projects! Though we may have a divine right to do our things, yet, it might be expedient that we do not do them because they do not edify or build up the divine. (I Cor. 10:23.) In doing our things, let us also be careful and not violate, "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth." (I Cor. 10:24.)

If our works conflict with Christ's work, and our liberty becomes detrimental and dangerous to the church, then let the Word of God be true. Our works have done good and will continue to do good if we keep in mind the scriptural realm for them to exist. But when we lose sight of the biblical right, we mix and mingle the divine and the human, then troubles, factions, and divisions are sure to follow! After more than a third of a century of observation, it is this writer's opinion that we are setting trends toward profaning the "holy" more and more with each generation with our works! Some brethren with scruples and principles of Hymenaeus, Alexander, and Diotrephes are operating some of our institutions. (I Tim. 1:20; 3 John 9.) Of course, the Lord will take care of this at the judgment. (Matt. 25:46.) But the bad publicity, desecration, and putting "...him to an open shame" (Heb. 6:6), has done untold harm to the blood bought church of Jesus Christ.

We must teach our children the difference between the Divine and the Human. These principles must be set forth clearly and enunciated with precision to the church. It is the amalgamation which produces the dangerous and damaging effects. Men are becoming blinded to truth, failing to discern, thus generating more and more familiarity and contempt for sacred things. If we would distinguish between the Divine and the Human, and put our brains to work in the divine, as men do going into space, we could turn the world upside down once more. (Acts 17:6.) When the most of our efforts and energies are used to promote the human, the church comes in second, we have violated Matthew 6:33. The greatest need is for Christians to get behind the one divine institution wherein is salvation and execute Romans 12:1, 2, to the saving of our souls.

22 Sugar Creek
North Little Rock, AR 72116
Getwell Church of Christ presents

*The Eighth Annual*

"SPIRITUAL SWORD LECTURESHP"

Oct. 16-20, 1983

1511 GETWELL ROAD, MEMPHIS, TN 38111

**SCHEDULE OF LECTURES**

**SUNDAY, OCTOBER 16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>R. GILMORE</td>
<td>An Introduction To The Book Of Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>R. DEAVER</td>
<td>An OVER-ALL Look At The Book Of Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>G. JOBE</td>
<td>Address And Conciliatory Statement (Rom. 1:1-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>G. ELKINS</td>
<td>The POWER And Universality Of The Gospel (Rom. 1:16-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>T. WARREN</td>
<td>The NEED For The Gospel And Its Power (Rom. 1:16-3:20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MONDAY, OCTOBER 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>W. CLAIBORNE</td>
<td>The ESSENTIALITY Of The Power And Universality Of The Gospel (Rom. 3:21-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>G. WORKMAN</td>
<td>The NATURE Of The Gospel — Salvation Is By A Living Faith Which Is Possible To Jew And Gentile (Rom. 4:1-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>C. WILLIAMS</td>
<td>The BLESSINGS Are The Result Of The Work Of Jesus Christ And Are To Be Seen In The Light Of The Consequences Of The Sin Of Adam (Rom. 5:1-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>J. MOFFITT</td>
<td>The OBLIGATION Not To Live In Licentiousness (Rom. 6:1-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>A. HIGHERS</td>
<td>The GOVERNING Factor Which Is Involved — Not The Mosaic Law (Rom. 7:1-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>K. JONES</td>
<td>The GOVERNING Factor Which Is Involved — The Law Of The Spirit Of Life In Christ Jesus (Rom. 8:1-39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>R. TAYLOR</td>
<td>The CONDITION Of Fleshly Israel In Their Rejection Of The Gospel (the place of the sovereignty of God in this whole matter, et. al.) (Rom. 9:1-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>C. CATES</td>
<td>The CONDITION Of Fleshly Israel In Their Rejection Of The Gospel (the place of the sovereignty of God in this whole matter, et. al.) (Rom. 9:1-20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**-60-**
Lunch Break - 11:45-1:00
Dinner Break - 3:45-7:00
ATTENDED NURSERY

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 18

9:00 A. CONNALLY The CONDITION Of Fleshly Israel In Their Rejection Of The Gospel (the universality of the gospel leaves all — both Jew and Gentile — without excuse) (Rom. 9:30-10:21)
10:00 G. MUSIC The CONDITION Of Fleshly Israel In The Rejection Of The Gospel (God is always merciful to the faithfully obedient) (Rom. 11:1-36)
11:00 B. SMITH A Plea For Dedication To God Which Results In Humility And Obedience To His Will (Rom. 12:1-3)
1:00 G. COLLEY Responsibilities As Members Of The One Body (Rom. 12:4-6)
2:00 P. SAIN Responsibilities To Other Individuals (Rom. 12:9-13)
3:00 T. HIGHTOWER Responsibilities To Rulers (Rom. 13:1-7)
7:00 M. MILLER The Duty To Love All Men (Rom. 13:8-10)

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19

9:00 D. CONLEY Exhortations To Holiness Of Life Based On The Fact That Eternity Is Constantly Drawing Nearer (Rom. 13:11-14)
10:00 N. MERIDETH Christian Freedom And Brotherly Tolerance In Matters Of Option (Rom. 14:1-23)
11:00 C. PUGH Christ's Example Is Further Enforcement Of The Law Of Love Manifested In Self-Denial (Rom. 15:1-13)
1:00 D. GODDARD Paul's Account Of Himself And His Plans (Rom. 15:14-33)
2:00 D. McCLISH Greetings — Along With A Warning — To Those In Rome (Rom. 16:1-20)
3:00 C. BRADLEY Greetings From Paul's Fellow-Laborers (Rom. 16:21-24)
7:00 D. SZTANYO An Intensive Look At The Doctrine Of God
8:00 B. JACKSON An Intensive Look At The Doctrine Of Christ

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20

9:00 F. NICHOLS An Intensive Look At The Doctrine Of Truth
10:00 R. DEAVER An Intensive Look At The Doctrine Of The Covenants
11:00 F. CAMP An Intensive Look At The Doctrine Of Salvation
1:00 R. BROWN An Intensive Look At The Life Which Christ Would Have Men To Live
2:00 M. DEAVER An Intensive Look At Christian Apologetics
3:00 P. DAVIS An Intensive Look At The Providence Of God
7:00 W. WINKLER An Intensive Look At The Relationship Of Grace, Law, Love, And Works
8:00 R. TURNER An Intensive Look At Romans Versus The Doctrine Of Premillennialism
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CORRESPONDENCE
FROM A READER

Mr. William S. Cline
Bellview church of Christ
4850 Saufley Road
Pensacola, Florida 32506

Dear Brother Cline:

I am a serious reader of your paper, "Defender". Your article written by the late George E. Darling Sr. prompts the writing of this letter. While I am a graduate of Middle Tennessee University, I never had the opportunity to associate with Brother Darling Sr. As I read his article, I realize how much I missed by not meeting this fine Christian brother.

The greatest need in the church today is sound, scriptural gospel preachers. Preachers who speak where the Bible speaks and are silent where the Bible is silent. Few preachers are capable of quoting the scriptures today. Most of them either paraphrase the scripture or give their interpretation. This is where error creeps into the body of Christ.

I was instructed at the feet of such great Bible scholars as Brethren N. B. Hardeman, G. C. Brewer, Claude Hall, Homer Hailey and Clinton Hamilton. These instructors told us when we got up to preach to produce the scripture that supports our comments. Of course, this required memorization of the scriptures, book, chapter and verse. This approach I have followed for over thirty five years and have never been led into error by so doing.

When one preaches the gospel of Christ, like Peter and Paul, he will suffer many adversities. I began preaching in rural country churches at the age of fifteen. While serving with the Olustee Church of Christ in Oklahoma, I decided to seek another congregation to work with. I wrote a congregation in Texas concerning this work and their reply was "I didn't have a college education." Even though I had attended Freed-Hardeman College as a Special Bible student, been preaching the gospel at that time for over ten years; because I was a high school dropout and didn't have a college education, I was refused the opportunity to preach Christ in that locality. This is happening even today in churches throughout the world.

After careful evaluation and prayerful study, I took on the attitude of Paul by reasoning, "If not having a college education impedes me from preaching the gospel, I will get an education so I can serve my Lord. I received my associate of Arts in 1963 from Middle Tennessee State University; my Master of Arts in 1976 from Marycrest College; and my Educational Specialist from Western Illinois in 1982. Now I am equipped to serve the Lord wherever I am needed. Not so! Recently I have applied for two congregations concerning preaching opportunities and the reply from each one was, "Your education is too high for what we were seeking." Can you imagine? Brethren refusing to use the service of a sound gospel preacher because of his education.

Brother Cline, these have been actual experiences of mine for the past forty years. In my younger years, I was denied opportunities because of my education; but now many brethren tell me I am too old and they are seeking for a younger man. This has led me to the following conclusion of the ideal preacher in most churches of Christ.

THE IDEAL PREACHER

A man who is relatively young; but not too old; He needs to have a little secular education; but not too much. His wife must be willing to seek outside employment; but doesn't miss any of the services of the church. His children must be good athletes that will contribute to our local school programs; but must not associate with the evil environment of our schools. This man must be willing to participate in Civic and Social Clubs of the community; but must not be influenced by the members. He must have a little knowledge of the Bible; but doesn't use it to hurt peoples' feelings of the community. He must be willing to teach against adultery, drunkenness and immodest dress; but don't teach on divorce, social drinking and public swimming. He must be a good mixer with the people of the community; but only associate with the elite groups of the church. He will teach the church of Christ was purchased by the blood of Christ; but he won't condemn the other religious bodies in the community.

We are willing to provide him with a small salary; but not too much. His house is provided; but we prefer he purchase his own house so he can feel a part of the community. Half of his utilities will be provided by the church as long as they aren't too high. The church doesn't discriminate against age,

(Continued on page 64)
First and Second Peter

October 5–9, 1983

WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 5
7:00 P.M.  THE CHRISTIAN GRACES (1 Peter 1:5-11)............John Priola
8:00 P.M.  ELDERS ARE TO FEED THE FLOCK....... (1 Peter 5:1-3).......Bill Cline

THURSDAY OCTOBER 6
1:00 P.M.  BE READY ALWAYS TO GIVE AN ANSWER  (1 Peter 3:15)......John Priola
2:00 P.M.  PREACHED UNTO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON -- THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO THE DEAD -- THE RIGHTEOUS SCARCELY BE SAVED (1 Peter 3:18-19; 4:6; 4:17-18)............Ray Peters
3:00 P.M.  VINDICATION OF THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS (2 Peter 3:15-16).....Johnny Polk
7:00 P.M.  GODLY LIVING (1 Peter 3:10-12; 2:11-12; 1:13-16 etc., etc., etc.)......Ray Peters
8:00 P.M.  THE IMPERATIVES OF 2 PETER 3.......Bill Cline

FRIDAY OCTOBER 7
9:00 A.M.  THE FLIGHT OF THE FALSE PROPHET (2 Peter 2:1-9).....Ben Vick, Jr.
10:00 A.M.  THE BIBLE IS INSPIRED AND COMPLETE (2 Peter 1:3-4)........Glen Jobe
11:00 A.M.  DUAL FULFILLMENT OF PROPHECY (1 Peter 1:9-12).....Johnny Polk
1:00 P.M.  ONE DAY IS AS 1,000 YEARS -- NEW HEAVENS AND NEW EARTH -- THE END OF ALL THINGS IS AT HAND (2 Peter 3:8-9,13; 1 Peter 4:7)........Bill Dillon
2:00 P.M.  THE FOREKNOWLEDGE, ELECTION, FOREORDINATION AND SANCTIFICATION (1 Peter 1:2, 20).....Jim Waldron

FRIDAY OCTOBER 7, Continued
3:00 P.M.  MATERIALISM, EVOLUTION AND HUMANISM (2 Peter 3:1-7)....Bill Dillon
7:00 P.M.  OBEDIENCE TO THE TRUTH (1 Peter 1:22-25)............Ben Vick, Jr.
8:00 P.M.  THE REJECTED STONE & THE BLOOD OF CHRIST (1 Peter 2:4-8; 1:17-18).........Buster Dobbs

SATURDAY OCTOBER 8
9:00 A.M.  HUMBLE YOURSELVES (1 Peter 5:6-7).......Glen Jobe
10:00 A.M.  FOLLOWING THE WAY OF BALAAM (2 Peter 2:15)..........Jim Waldron
11:00 A.M.  BUT GROW IN GRACE AND KNOWLEDGE (2 Peter 3:18; 1 Peter 2:2-3)......John Barcus
1:00 P.M.  SUBMISSIVENESS: TO CHRIST, GOVERNMENT, ONE ANOTHER, WIVES TO HUSBANDS..............Jim Waldron
2:00 P.M.  TEMPTATIONS, TRIALS AND SALVATION (1 Peter 1:6-9; 2:18-25; 3:13-17; 4:12-16; 5:10; etc.)...John Barcus
3:00 P.M.  THE DEVIL AS A ROARING LION (1 Peter 5:8)........Mark Bass
7:00 P.M.  THE PLEITHE OF THE ERRING (2 Peter 2:20-22)..........Bill Dillon
8:00 P.M.  THE DAY OF THE LORD (2 Peter 3:10-12)..............Buster Dobbs

SUNDAY OCTOBER 9
9:00 A.M.  THE SHEPHERD AND BISHOP OF OUR SOUL (1 Peter 2:25)........Mark Bass
10:00 A.M.  BAPTISM SAVES US (1 Peter 3:20-21)..............Buster Dobbs
6:00 P.M.  A CHOSEN GENERATION, AN INCORRUPTIBLE INHERITANCE (1 Peter 2:9-10; 1:4-5)........Keith Besson
7:00 P.M.  SPEAK AS THE ORACLES OF GOD (1 Peter 4:11)...Garland Robinson
CORRESPONDENCE FROM A READER

race, and color; but we prefer a man between
the age of 25-30, white and from the United
States.

Signed: Elder Anythingoes

Sincerely,
(s) Billy B. Butler
505 E. 9th Street
Rock Falls, Illinois 61071

Correction

In the July 1983 DEFENDER we carried an article on pages 50-51 titled "The Truth About Booze." The article carried an illustration using Prince Edward Island and its abolishment of alcohol in 1900 (See article, page 50, paragraph #3).

In a letter we received this week from a brother Ralph Walker in Concord, North Carolina we were informed that that specific paragraph was false information. The Chamber of Commerce of Charlottetown, which includes Prince Edward Island, has called the information a hoax and not at all factual.

The illustration may sound great and we can all wish it were true, but our best sources say that such is not the case.

--Editor

Contributions

Richard H. Feltner............... $35.00
James Mel Futrell............. 15.00
Eugene Walp.................. 10.00
Jerry Lindesmith............. 35.00
Aubrey L. Prestridge......... 5.00
John Artie Wakefield........ 5.00
Terry Schmidt................. 5.00
Neil McBride.................. 5.00
Edith Nunnery................. 10.00
James W. Berry............... 10.00
Mark W. Wilz................ 10.00
Alice Bethel.................. 5.00
Elmer J. Brozek.............. 30.00
William D. Goldman........... 5.00
Paul sitting in the prison house in Rome cheered his beloved brethren in Philippi in saying, "I am set for the defence of the gospel" (Phil. 1:17). These words not only encouraged the Philippians but no doubt were an inspiration to Paul as well. There is strength in one's repeating those words of Paul: "I am set for the defence of the gospel."

Truth is eternal, imperishable, and unchanging--but it must be defended. Not only is the gospel to be defended, it is to be contended (Jude 3). One action is defensive warfare; the other is aggressive warfare. To sincerely defend the gospel, and to 'barnesly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints' is but to "fight the good fight of faith" (I Tim. 6:12). Paul pleads for the Christian warrior to "endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ," not entangling himself in worldly affairs (II Tim. 2:3,4). He is to put on the whole armour of God, to take his stand, wielding "the sword of the Spirit; which is the word of God" (Eph. 6:11-17). Staunchly defend; aggressively contend. This is the duty of all those who march in the army of the Lord.

The scenes are shifting, change is in the breeze. The ship of Zion is straying from its divinely ordained course. More boisterous seas are ahead. Unity in diversity is a mounting plague for the church. Prevailed versions of the Scriptures have raised doubt and confusion; doubt not as to what the Bible teaches, but doubt to what the Bible actually is? Many who know the truth, who have defended it, and who have earnestly contended for it, have a finger in the breeze awaiting the proper moment to go in the direction of those who would run aground the ship of Zion. Is faith nothing to them?

The precious faith must be defended from forces of radicalism, criticism, and liberalism. At the same time the gospel must be preached to every creature, in every place, until the end of time. Those who wield the sword of the Spirit must realize they stand in the presence of the Almighty. Their eternal salvation is dependent on their faithfulness and loyalty to Him and His charge to "preach the gospel...in season, out of season...endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry" (II Tim. 4:1-5).

No greater joy and satisfaction is to be experienced than that of preaching the gospel of Christ. To stand with those of "like precious faith:" is to thrill the soul. To reap in the rich harvest of saved souls is a present and an eternal reward. All sacrifices necessary to preaching the gospel are but for a moment as one views the glory of eternity.

The plains of Ono beckon (Neh. 6:2,3); the language of today's Rabshakehs demoralize (II Kings 18:26-19:5); the allurements of the world exercise their magnetic force; "but none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God" (Acts 20:24).

To begin and end with Paul's bold statement instills determination to maintain the faith, continue in the race, to fight the fight of faith: "I am set for the defence of the gospel --None of these things move me."
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Received With Thanksgiving

Max R. Miller

Every good and perfect gift is from God. Life, sunshine, and all things are from the benevolent hand of the loving Father. The many opportunities for Christian service are to be counted as gifts of God's grace. They are freely dispensed to us all.

Some distinct opportunities are now presented to the editor of Defender. The privilege of editing this paper, influencing minds, presenting divine truths, associations with those who contribute to the pages of Defender, and so much more, are all received with thanksgiving to the heavenly Father.

To follow in the work of its former editors is a sobering yet exciting challenge. To be associated with Winston Temple as he serves as Assistant Editor will indeed be a pleasure. To extend through the pages of Defender the works and influence of the great Bellview Church of Christ will be a noble purpose to fulfill.

We look forward to a pleasant and fruitful work in his vineyard. We seek, greatly desire, the assistance of loving brethren and their prayers. Above all, we seek the blessings of God and His providential guidance as we go about this work. May God bless us all together as we seek to glorify His name above every name, and to magnify His cause.

We wish to also express our feelings toward brother Miller's new position as editor of the Defender. He has been the editor of several papers: *Journal of Truth*, *First Century Christian*, and *Spirit of Truth*. We welcome him as the new editor of the Defender.

In view of his good work in the past as an editor, we are assured that he will continue to produce such work through the pages of the Defender. This (September, 1983) issue of the paper will be the first to be printed under his direction. In addition to editing the Defender, he will be the editor of Bellview's Bulletin, The Beacon. He will also be serving as the evangelist for the Bellview Church of Christ and as director of the preacher's training school.

We look forward to working with and assisting him in whatever way that we might be of help.

Winston C. Temple
We Have Won The Battle Of Denominationalism

Winston C. Temple

A few years ago this writer was talking with an Assembly of God preacher. During the course of our discussion, the point was made to him that denominations originated with man and not with God. To which he immediately replied: "We have fought the Battle of Denominationalism, and we have won!" He went on to explain that what he meant by his statement was that the Pentecostal Movement had crossed all denomination lines or barriers. He further explained his comment by stating that there were people in all denominations who were of the pentecostal persuasion. At this point, he was informed that the church of Christ was not a denomination, nor was it a religious sect of any kind. It is the blood-bought church of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Again, his reply came: "But I beg to differ with you" I know of those who are members of the church of Christ who are of the pentecostal persuasion." After this was said, we were interrupted and our discussion ended.

Since the time of that discussion with the Assembly of God preacher, this writer has observed that what he said in regard to pentecostals being in our midst is true. All that one needs to do to observe the truthfulness of the above statement is to read some of the publications which are circulated in the brotherhood of the church.

As one of the teachers in the Bellview Preacher Training School, I have the responsibility of teaching a course on pentecostalism. One of the requirements of the course is to read and understand a book which bears the following title: "The Holiness Pentecostal Movement in the United States." It is written by Dr. Vincent Synan, who at the time of the writing of his book, was currently serving as Chairman of the Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences at Emmanuel College in Franklin Springs, Georgia. Mr. Synan received his Ph.D in History from the University of Georgia. He is a member of the Pentecostal Holiness Church. If anyone of the pentecostal groups should be qualified to write such a book, it appears to this writer that Mr. Synan would be such a man.

In his book he traces the movement as follows:

(1) It started with the Methodists.
(2) Out of the Methodist grew the Holiness Movement.
(3) Out of the Holiness Movement grew the Pentecostal Movement.
(4) Out of the Pentecostal Movement grew the Neo-Pentecostal movement which has crossed the fellowship lines of all denominations.

We might add that it has also entered into many congregations of the church of our Lord.

At this point some quotes from Mr. Synan's book are in order.

"John Wesley, the indomitable founder of Methodism was also the spiritual and intellectual father of the modern holiness and pentecostal movements which have issued from Methodism within the last century."

Moving toward the last pages of the book we read:

"One event which seemed to promise much for the future of pentecostalism was the creation of a school billed as the first distinctly pentecostal university in the nation -- Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Founded by two Pentecostal Holiness preachers, Oral Roberts and R. O. Corvin... Symbolic of increasing acceptance by the traditional churches of the Pentecostals was the fact that Billy Graham assisted in the act of dedication in April of 1967.

"Soon after the dedication of the new university, however, Roberts shocked the religious world by joining the Methodist Church in March, 1968. He also transferred his ordination vows as an ordained minister .... The overwhelming source of his support during his earlier years had been from the pentecostals. But by the 1960's a larger share of his income had been from people in the more traditional churches. These people, most of whom had experienced speaking with other tongues, were dubbed "neo-pentecostals" by old-line members of the Pentecostal Church.

(Continued on page 68)
"The fact that Roberts was accepted by the Methodist Church, although he vowed never to change his pentecostal doctrines was indicative of the new acceptance pentecostalism was experiencing in American society by the middle of the twentieth century. . . . The best informed guesses were that by 1970 there were about four million persons in the United States who could be classified as being pentecostal. About half of these were in the mainline organized denominations and the other half in the thousands of independent storefront churches and missions that dotted the nation's cities and countryside. In addition there were uncounted thousands of 'neo-pentecostals' in the traditional denominations who were pentecostal in experience and belief and generally designated themselves 'the Charismatic Movement.' 12

Lest after reading the above quotes, perhaps one or more of our readers would be prone to say that these statements are merely the words of a pentecostal preacher, we present the following: A few years ago brother William Woodson came to Bellview and presented a series of lessons on 'Neo-Pentecostalism in the Church.' Brother Woodson followed closely the same tracing of the pentecostal movement as Mr. Synan did in his book. Brother Woodson went further in his analysis than did Mr. Synan, in that he (brother Woodson) showed how pentecostalism has entered the church of our Lord. Brother Woodson gave several documented evidences to prove the truthfulness of his statements. We can not give all of them, but perhaps the following will suffice sufficiently to make our point.

Bill Jackson, son of an elder in Texas, came to a Louisiana congregation where a couple of people from the congregation began to talk with him. They invited brother Woodson to join them in the conversation. The following story came forth: He (Jackson) had grown up in the church, but was concerned with spiritual growth. He began to meet with people in the Full Gospel groups and they taught him some things that he had never known. He was baptized in the Holy Spirit and began to speak in tongues. NOTE! We know that brother Woodson did all that he could to refute such teaching.

Another example that brother Woodson gave us was that Jim Rogers wrote in a church bulletin the following: Mrs. June Smith, an elder's wife, who lived in Michigan, was lying in her bed doing some soul searching. She was overcome with remorse for telling her mother that she hated her. She started praying and suddenly a presence was in her room. She said that she felt Jesus was standing at the foot of her bed. She said that it was so real that she felt that she could almost reach out and touch him. She wept for joy. She said that it was then that she knew she had been forgiven, and that if she died, she knew that she would be with Him in heaven. Brother Woodson wrote the elders of the congregation where sister Smith was a member. The elders told him to mind his own business!

We could go on to cite documented evidences from such books as E. R. Harper on the Holy Spirit Issues in the Twentieth Century, Pentecostalism in the Church by brother James D. Bales, and many different brotherhood papers and bulletins, but we feel that we have presented enough evidence to show that pentecostalism does exist in some congregations of the brotherhood.

What are some of the causes of pentecostalism raising its erroneous head in the brotherhood of the church? This writer believes that all the causes can be summed up under one main heading—Rebellion against God and His Holy Word! The following causes which will be mentioned are mere sub-headings under the major heading or cause.

What can we expect to happen except what has already happened (i.e. the pentecostal movement which has entered the church) when we have such a strong force as it is outside the church pushing with uncontrollable zeal to cross the lines of all religious fellowship? Why are some of us so amazed as to some of the things we read and hear about? We know that the bulk of our people, including elders, preachers and teachers, are ignorant of what the word of God teaches on the Holy Spirit and His Work! This ignorance did not just start yesterday; it has been a curse upon us for years. When we have elders, preachers, teachers and members openly and publicly teaching and practicing Crossroadism, what can be expected, except to have pentecostalism in our midst? When we have brethren who are advocating receiving people from denominations into our fellowship who claim to have been baptized for the remission of sins, what can we expect? Let it be read clearly; this writer can conceive that it is possible for a person who is a member of a denomination, or for that matter a person who is not a member of any denomination, to read, understand, and obey the Scriptures' teaching in regard to God, Christ, the gospel and the church. But let it be also read clearly, that in all of the years that he has been preaching, he has not found one such individual. He has found some who claimed to be baptized for the re-

(Continued on page 69)
mission of sins, but upon further examination, it was always a claim and not the truth, are some among us so unlearned as to think that all one needs to know to be born again is that he must be baptized for the remission of sins? Those of our brethren who are advocating receiving into our fellowship those of denominations who claim to have been baptized for the remission of sins, please listen to my plea and read John 6:44,45, and make sure that these individuals who are making such claims have been fully taught and that they have fully obey the whole truth of how one obeys the gospel and becomes a member of the church. Brethren, at such a time as this, when the Lord's church is being destroyed by all types of "isms", why is it that some among us have to publicly fan the fires? Why is it that at such a time as this we find so many who are raising every objection they can which either directly or indirectly attacks the fellowship of the Lord's church? Yes, my dear brethren, the pentecostals have broken down our lines of fellowship and it appears that many of our own brethren are trying to aid them every way that they can.

This writer has not intentionally misrepresented any facts or anyone. He feels that if others can publicly write and teach what they believe, then why can not he do the same? He is not asking you, the reader, to accept what he has written in this article without proper study and research, but he earnestly begs that you consider what he has written. After you have acted as requested, then ask yourself the following question: Was the Assembly of God preacher correct in his statement that they (the pentecostal) have crossed all lines of fellowship, including the church of Christ?


1 Ibid., pages 210, 211, 214.

Baptist Teach: The Church Was Established During The Days Of John The Immerser

Winston C. Temple

In the Freed-Hall Debate conducted at Corinth, Mississippi, August, 1894, Elder J. N. Hall affirmed the following proposition: "The Bible teaches that the church of the New Testament was set up, organized, and begun on earth, in the days of John the Baptist."1 For many years elder Hall was the editor of a paper entitled, "The American Baptist Flag," and was an able proponent of the Baptist doctrines.2

On April 19-22, 1938 Ben M. Bogard, dean of the Missionary Baptist Institute, Little Rock, and pastor of the Antioch Missionary Baptist Church of the same city, engaged in a public discussion with N. B. Hardeman, president of Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, Tennessee. Mr. Bogard affirmed that:

The church of the New Testament was set up and organized by Jesus Christ during his personal ministry on earth.3

About ten years later, in the Porter-Bogard Debate, Dr. Bogard affirmed that the church began from the baptism of John. He used Acts 1:21 as his proof text. Speaking in regard to the text he said:

...Note, it did not say beginning with the baptism of John, but beginning from the baptism of John. John the Baptist was the first Baptist. Why? Because the word Baptist means one who is authorized to baptize; therefore, he was called the Baptist because there was no other one at that time. The church had not begun at that time, but beginning with the Baptist preacher sent from God, the material was prepared, and Jesus organized that material into His church, and said, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'4

In brother Porter's first negative, he read from one of Dr. Bogard's books, entitled 'Baptist Way Book,' where he (Bogard) made the following comment about Acts 1:21:

(Continued on page 70)
This passage affirms that certain men 'companied' with Jesus and that this 'company' began 'with the baptism of John'.

In the book, "What Baptist Believe and Why The Believe It," Dr. J. G. Bow took a different position from the two Baptist debaters mentioned in the above paragraphs. He stated:

There was no such organization as the church of Christ until Christ builded it. He said, 'upon this rock I will build my church'. It was, then at the time of speaking, in the future.

The position that the church was established in the days of John the Baptist(Immerser) cannot be sustained by the Scriptures for the following reasons:

1. John was "...the voice of one crying in the wilderness." (Is. 40:3; Matt. 3:1-3; Jn. 1:23).
2. He was the messenger of the Lord (Mal. 3:1; Matt. 11:7-11; Jn. 1:6).
3. John was a prophet of the Highest (Jn. 1:76), but he was not that prophet (Jesus Christ) of which Moses had spoken (Deut. 18:15-18).
4. He was not the light (Jesus Christ, Jn. 1:1-3), but he was sent to bear witness of the Light (Jn. 1:7,8).
5. His name was John (Lk. 1:63; Jn. 1:6) and not John the Baptist. The title "the Baptist" or "the Baptizer" (Mk. 6:14, 24, A.S.V.) was given to John because he baptized.

...His name John means "gift of Jehovah" (cf. German Gotthold) and is a shortened form of Johanan. He is described as "the Baptist," "the Baptizer" for that is the rite that distinguishes him. . .

6. His mission was one of preparation and not one of establishing the church or kingdom.
   (1) He was to "...go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways" (Lk. 1:76).
   (2) His work was to "...Make ready a people prepared for the Lord," (Jn. 1:6,33; Mk. 1:2; Lk. 1:17 ).
   (3) John was to prepare the material (people) of which the Lord's church was to be built (Matt. 3:3; Lk. 1:17,76,77).
   (4) He "...baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus" (Acts 19:4).

7. During his ministry he spoke of the kingdom or church being in the future tense (Matt. 3:1-3)
8. He was not in the kingdom (Matt.11:11).
9. John died before it was established (Matt. 14:10-12).
10. Christ promised to build his church after John was already dead and buried (Matt. 16:18).

Based on the above facts, how could anyone believe that John was the founder of the church?

Likewise, the position that the church was established and organized by Jesus Christ during His personal ministry on earth can not be sustained by the Scriptures for the following reasons:

1. During His personal ministry, Jesus taught that the kingdom of heaven or the kingdom of God was "...at hand" (Matt. 4:17; Mk. 1:15). Note:
   (1) The phrases "the kingdom of heaven and "the kingdom of God are one and the same (Matt. 19:23, 24).
   (2) Dr. Hugh Pyle, a noted writer among the modern day Baptists seems to think that there is a difference. Speaking against the Church of Christ in one of his works, he said:

   They teach that the kingdom of Christ came at Pentecost, and that Christ is reigning now in His kingdom. Thus do they fail to discern the difference between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Heaven in scriptural teaching.

2. The twelve apostles taught that the kingdom of heaven was "...at hand" (Matt. 10:7).
3. The seventy taught that "...the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you" (Lk. 10:9).
4. It was still future when Jesus promised to build it (Matt. 16:18,19).
5. The kingdom was still future when the Lord instituted His Supper (Lk. 22:18).
6. After the death of Christ, Joseph of Arimathaea...waited for the Kingdom of God" (Lk. 23:51).
7. The Kingdom of God was to come with power (Mk. 9:1). The apostles were to wait in Jerusalem until they were endowed with power (Lk. 24:49; cf. Acts 1:8). They received the power (Acts 2:1-4). The apostles preached (Acts 2:4) repentance and remission of sins in the name of Jesus (Acts 2:38), and those who obey that teaching were added to the church (Acts 2:47).
8. The kingdom or church was no longer (Continued on page 71)
future by the time of Acts 2:47. It was fully established as a fact on that day.

9. Some object that the kingdom or church could not have been established on the day of Pentecost in Acts chapter two because it was already in existence before that time. They cite such passages as Luke 16:16; 17:21; 11:20; Matt. 23:13, 11:12; 21:31,32 and 6:33. It is true that the church or kingdom did exist before Pentecost of Acts chapter two, but is has already been shown that the only way in which the church existed before Acts chapter two was in preparation. The passages cited in this paragraph must therefore be interpreted in light of the church or kingdom in its preparatory stage.

In conclusion, we have shown that Elder J. N. Hall affirmed that the church was established in the days of John the Baptist, and that later on in time, Dr. Ben M. Bogard affirmed that it was set up during the personal ministry of Jesus while He was on earth. We have also refuted both positions by the Scriptures. By quoting the statement of Dr. J. G. Bow, we have further shown that not all Baptist agree with Elder Hall's nor Dr. Bogard's position on the establishment of the church. We also went on to prove that the kingdom or the church was set up on the first Pentecost after the ascension of Christ to heaven (Acts Ch. 2). We pray that this work will do much good to the glory of the Christ and His church.

Footnotes


2. Ibid., p. 222.


5. Ibid., p. 13.


SECOND ANNUAL DENTON LECTURES
Planned On Hebrews

The SECOND ANNUAL DENTON LECTURES, presented by the Pearl St. Church in Denton, TX is planned for November 13-17, 1983. All of the lectures will be devoted to the theme, "Studies in Hebrews". Lectures will be delivered by 37 speakers from all parts of the nation. Four major types of material will be presented: numerous expository sermons on major themes of the book, lectures on difficult passages, lectures answering false doctrines relating to Hebrews and a daily "Discussion Forum" dealing with controversial subjects. The daily "Discussion Forums" will consist of the following subjects and speakers: Monday - "Old or Young Earth?"; Jack Wood Sears and Bert Thompson; Tuesday - "Authority of Elders", Waymon Miller and Gary Workman; Wednesday - "Empirical Knowledge or Faith - Which is More Certain?", Arlie Hoover and Dick Sztanyo; Thursday - "Premillennialism", Robert Shank and Wayne Jackson. Time will be allowed for questions from the audience in these forums.

Besides the eight speakers listed above, the following will also speak: Tom Bright, Winfred Clark, T.B. Crews, Troy Cummings, Roy Deaver, Bobby Duncan, Garland Elkins, Larr-Fluitt, Hugh Fulford, Carl Garner, Norman Gipson, Tom Hicks, Bill Jackson, B.B. James, Roy Lanier, Jr., Avon Malone, Dub McClish, Hugo McCord, James Meadows, J. Noel Merideth, Jerry Moffitt, Frank Morgan, Goebel Music, Johnny Ramsey, Ira Rice, Robert Taylor, John Waddey, Charles R. Williams and Wendell Winkler.

Almost 5,000 tapes of "Studies in 1 Corinthians" (FIRST ANNUAL DENTON LECTURES) have been ordered. The book of almost 500 pages ($13.00 plus $1.25 postage and handling) has already gone into a second edition and is being used by at least four schools as a text. Studies in Hebrews (available at beginning of ADL) promises to be of equal significance and popularity and will sell for the same price as Studies in 1 Corinthians. Besides being audio taped, all lectures will also be available on video tape (as are FIRST ADL). Exhibit space is available subject to approval (FIRST ADL had 31 exhibits). Housing in the homes of local Christians will be provided as long as it lasts. Hook-ups for RV units will be provided on the church parking lot. This will be a strong BIBLE lectureship! Address inquiries to: Dub McClish, 312 Pearl St., Denton, TX 76201, 817/387-3531, 387-1429.
GREAT OPPORTUNITY OFFERED

For those desiring to preach or for those who want to better prepare themselves for service in the kingdom of the Christ.


Under the oversight of Bellview Church Of Christ's Elders.

Located in beautiful Pensacola, Florida. V.A. approved.

College level instruction. Two-year program involving six tri-mesters, 84 weeks curriculum of intensified study. The two-year curriculum is a complete exegetical study of the Bible, evidences, debate, languages and history; fully preparing the student to preach, teach and defend the truth.

FACULTY
Max R. Miller
Winston C. Temple
Fred Standcliff

For further information write:
Max R. Miller, Director
4850 Saufley Road
Pensacola, Florida 32506
Trusting In Chariots And Horses

Mitchell Temple

In Psalms the twentieth chapter verse seven we read, "Some trust in chariots and some in horses; but we will remember the name of the Lord."

How easy it is for people of the twentieth century, even those who profess to be christians, to forget that we are to put complete faith and trust in the Lord and his divine will (Mt. 6:33).

America as a whole, no longer trusts in God. We look for the day when congress will pass a bill to eliminate the words "In God We Trust" from U.S. currency. For we know that America no longer puts her trust in God. Sure there is a great majority of people who are left who claim to believe in God, but by the way most live, they prove otherwise. The word home in America is a word that is laughed at today when mentioned. Divorce is as common as trading for a new car. The divorce evil has wrecked many homes. Children are being uprooted from one "family" to another like boxes of cargo from one destination to another.

Abortion has become a familiar and accepted term. I wonder would the fore-fathers of this country ever dreamed that our government would pass a bill to allow defenseless, innocent, human beings to be murdered in cold blood (legally and even with government aide) by thousands of teenagers and adults?

Homosexuality is being accepted today in America by many people. The homosexuals march the streets of our cities "demanding" their rights, when our government has already given them as many rights as normal citizens have today. In fact many employers are pressed (by our government) to hire homosexuals over qualified hard working men and women.

Does America really trust in God? We saw recently on nation-wide news that one of our congressmen admitted he was a homosexual, and had heard in times past that it is suspected that there are many more.

Our televisions are filled with sex and violence "Gutter" language is becoming more open and used more and more. You are now hearing offensive words on our prime-time shows that would have cause an individual to be arrested if used on our streets twenty years ago. And consider that it is estimated that the average child in 1983 will watch 1,825 hours of television; thus everything that is said and done is being programed into their innocent but receptive minds (including the sex, violence and language). With our children having such sin imbedded in their minds each year, will they trust in God when they reach maturity? Bit, some of our more "liberal" parents argue "that it doesn't hurt them to watch such things as long as they are taught that it is wrong to do those wrong things". But I wonder how many hours of "right" teaching these same parents will give their children compared to 1,825 hours of 'wrong' teaching? And keep in mind that our children will attend only 60 hours or less of Bible Class. Can we counteract the

(Continued on page 76)
Give Up Our Traditions

Max R. Miller

But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.

Matthew 15:9

Doctrines of men are contray to the law of God. Those doctrines are often spoken of as religious traditions. Traditional, ritualistic religion is far from worship of God in spirit and in truth (cf. John 4:23,24). We would hold no tradition that is not grounded in truth. Paul spoke of the truth and commandments of God as given through His apostles as traditions, not traditions of men, but of God (2 Thess. 3:6).

Some among us frequently urge that we should give up our traditions, inferring that which we do in worship and service to God is not strictly Biblical, but is the long accumulation of traditional sayings and actions. The plea to "give up our traditions" implies that there is something wrong and out of place in our worship to God. Some go further contending that "our traditions" are a disbarment to others of similar beliefs to join together with us in the bond and fellowship of mutual faith and edification.

The impression is made, and sometimes boldly stated, that we received our traditions from men of the early movement of restoring New Testament Christianity in the new world. From those who make sure an impression we hear, "we should take another look at the restoration movement," thus casting some doubt or suspicion on the worthiness and soundness of the movement. Are the principles of the Restoration Movement what they should be? Is the worship and practices of our religion really God ordained and Scripturally revealed, or do we look toward another direction?

When one is quizzed as to specifically naming the traditions that we should surrender in order that we might participate in a broader scope of brotherhood relations he gives no or little response. Do they mean the traditional three songs and a prayer? Do they mean the collection after the Lord's Supper? Should we reverse the traditional order? To do so, would it encourage those not now in fellowship with us to unite with us? Should we, to a marked degree, change those sayings when the preacher is about to baptize one into Christ for the remission of sins? In order to give up hidebound tradition, should we begin our worship with a sermon, have all the singing at one period (as we do the preaching), all the prayers in one block, and so on? This certainly is not traditional. Such procedures would be different from anything we have ever experienced. But, the (Continued on page 75)
question is, would it invite and encourage other to come into this fellowship? Would it be doing a greater service unto God to shake-up our customs and traditions? I am persuaded that the plea for a non-traditional religion has no reference to such ideas as expressed here. Well-what do they mean?

From urgings among the brethren, articles in religious journals, and from some preaching (?), we can know more of a certainty what is meant by "giving up traditions." To give up our religious traditions means: We should give up our faith and teaching of the one body. That is, there is but one body (Eph. 4:4); that body is the church of our Christ (Eph. 1:22,23; Col. 1:18). There being but one body, there can be only one church (which Jesus Christ spoke of as "my church," the "kingdom of heaven") (Matt. 16:18,19). There cannot be two churches known among both man and God, and certainly there cannot be some three or four hundred churches as claimed by denominationalism. All those in those denominational churches are outside that which the Lord has promised to save (Eph. 5:23). They are not the one body, neither are they a part of the one body.

Truth of God, not tradition, teaches that all the saved are in the Lord's church (Acts 2:47) because God put them there. The church is composed of those who wear the name of Christ, and are recognized only as Christians, yea, the only Christians. Truth teaches these things, not tradition. We insist on the retention of the doctrine that teaches "there is but one body" and that also teaches those of that one body are called Christians.

Truth, not tradition, teaches there is only one baptism (Eph. 4:45). Baptism upon confession of an experience of saving grace is not the one baptism. Baptism on the eighth day of life is not the one baptism. Neither is the so-called baptism of the Holy Spirit, triune baptism, or any baptism other than the baptism of the Great Commission the one and acceptable baptism of the Bible. The true baptism is in water (Acts 10:47,48) and is for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38); is into the one body of Christ the church (1 Cor. 12:13). This is the baptism that saves sinners from the condemnation of sins (Rom. 6:23; 1 Pet. 3:21). It is the baptism that is to continue until time shall be no more (Matt. 28:19,20). To give up the one baptism will not expand the ranks of Christianity. It is simply another way of denying the faith and joining the infidel ranks in the world.

The exchanging of pulpits with denominational preachers; acceptance of the choir of singers, then the mechanical instruments of music in worship; accepting a democratic form of church government and such other unscriptural practices would be getting away from our traditions. It would also be getting away from the truth instead of opening our ranks to a broader scope of brotherhood. It would mean our joining the ranks of denominationalism. What would we be without those traditions (truths, 2 Thess 3:6) received from the apostles but another denomination? Without truth we lose our distinctive identity with Christ and the church of the New Testament.

What about our tradition. Let someone change the routine order of worship services. Let us change some of those old and familiar expressions mouthed in prayer. Let us get us a new song book, change the seating in the building, have Bible classes on Sunday night rather than in the morning--if we should and must give up our traditions. But-such is foolish! If we can provide a better, more spiritual worship, by making some changes in customary procedures, let us do so. But--but--let us not depart from the truth; let us not exchange the truth for a lie (Rom. 1:25). Give no heed to those iconoclasts who clamor for a change in our traditions. They mean, "Let us change our doctrines and practices that we might court favor of the world and be esteemed by men. Let us obtain unity in diversity." But we say, "Let us stand fast on the faith received from above" (Rom. 10:14).

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." 1 Thessalonians 5:21

***********************************************************************
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TRUSTING IN CHARIOTS AND HORSES— from page 73

Shall we ignore these facts as well as the fact that America as a whole no longer puts its trust in God, or will we accept it and do what we can to save ourselves and our families and those who are willing to be saved? We should keep in mind the words of the Apostle on the day of Pentecost: "...save yourselves from this untoward generation" (Acts 2:40).

But where has America put its trust? In "...chariots and some in horses" (Ps. 20:7); not God Almighty. America has put its trust in the world and things concerning the world and no longer God. In our text, this is compared to those that David says "have trusted in chariots or horses". But notice how David concludes this verse "...but we will remember the name of the Lord".

We should apply this to us as Christians today. Even though the world as a whole no longer trusts in God, we should have David's attitude and say "but we will trust in the name of the Lord".

The beloved John writes in 1 John 2:15 "Love not the world neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the father is not in him." John plainly shows that a person is not a true believer in God and a recipient of the love of God, if he trusts in the things of the world. Thus, we can truthfully say that the church as a whole is innocent from this dangerous sin, or is a major percentage of the church trusting in "chariots and horses" as were many in David's time?

Notice that in our text, the enemies of God's people did put their trust in "chariots and horses". This was that which they had to rely upon because they rejected God and served idol gods. Thus the more horses and chariots they could bring into battle the more secure they felt. Possibly David had his eye on the Syrians, whose races consisted of many chariots and horsemen (See 11 Sam. 8:4; 10:18).

The Israelites trusted in God. By David's statement in verse seven "...but we will remember the name of the Lord," the Israelites were in essence saying that they did not possess chariots and horses even if they did, they would not trust in them. Their trust was in Jehovah and not in material strength.

And notice; in verse 8, those that trusted in chariots and horses "...are brought down and fallen." Their chariots and horses were so far from saving them that they even helped to sink them and made them the easier and richer prey to the conqueror (11 Sam. 8:4). But, those that trust in the name of the Lord "are risen" above the enemy and "stand upright" and keep ground and have triumphed over them.

There should be no doubt in our minds that the world no longer trusts in God, but what about the Lord's church in the 20th century? Has the church in many aspects turned to the world and devices of the world and doctrines of the world rather than completely trusting in the name of the Lord?

What about the programs that have infiltrated the church under the disguise of evangelism? For example: family life centers, gadgets and gimmicks? and other affairs of the world. Do not these devices indicate that the church is beginning to trust in "chariots and horses" rather than relying solely upon the name of the Lord? Are not these brethren showing that they no longer believe in the power of the gospel (Rom. 1:16) and that alone? Some say that you can't keep people in the church any longer with "plain" gospel preaching so they turn to devices of the world to fill their elaborate buildings with people who trust in "chariots and horses" rather than the Lord.

Instead of preaching the pure Jerusalem gospel like the restoration preachers proclaimed throughout this nation, some of my brethren are trying to build the church with worldly devices and thus are dragging the church right back into the very pit from which the pioneer preachers of old helped pull us out of many years ago.

It seems that some have forgotten the solemn words of the apostle Paul in Romans 1:16, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek." Some say today that we should try new methods of 'evangelism' and not tell people that we are the only Christians, for this scares them off! But rather tell them that as long as they have been baptized in the name of Jesus they are our brothers. Is that the method of evangelism that Peter used on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2) which caused some 3,000 souls to be added to the Lord's church? Is that the method that Stephen used in Acts chapter seven?

The prophet Jeremiah walked the streets and wept because of the sins of the people. His own people turned against Him. They mocked him and even placed him in stocks and bonds, but he did not waver (Jer. 20:1-7). (Continued on page 77)
Even though he loved his people, he did not compromise God's will. Why didn't he give up or try some other "method"? But His word was in my heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones; and I was weary withforebearing and I could not stay. Did he compromise God's word to satisfy their "itching" ears and preach smooth things unto them?

Certainly we are to exhort and encourage each other as fellow Christians, but we can't do so 100% of the time, especially when many are following after and trusting in "chariots and horses" (the world). Rather we must reprove, rebuke and then exhort. (II Tim. 4:2; I Tim 5:20).

Unity is something that all Christians desires. And the church would be unified and would grow like it never has before if all would go back to God's word and trust and follow in it and not try to mix it with the world, (horses and chariots).

Therefore, we must be like David and the Israelites of Psalms 20:8 who trusted in the name of the Lord and thus "...are risen and stand upright."

Brethren, just because our nation and the world as a whole have turned to "chariots and horses" we should not. We don't need their devices to trust in nor to base our success upon. Rather our trust will be in "the name of the Lord" to be victorious in the end. (Heb. 8:5; II Tim 2:15; II Thess. 3:16; II Pet. 2:2; Mt. 4:4; Rev. 2:10; Rev. 22:14)

Route One
Trenzevant, Tennessee 38258

Boldness: A Definition In Fact
Bill Boyd

Shortly before Max Miller began his work in Pensacola I had an opportunity to hear him preach the gospel at a rural congregation in northwest Tennessee. After the services we stood in the parking lot for about an hour and talked of many things. Being a young preacher I appreciated his council and encouragement. It was a conversation I will long remember. In the midst of our discussion he asked me to send him an article on "Boldness".

Luke said in Acts 4:31, "they spake the word of God with boldness." He not only told us what they spake (the word of God), but how they spake it (with boldness). Now what did Luke mean, "boldness"?

Definitions do not determine the use of a word, rather the use of a word determines the definition. The best way to discover what Luke meant by "boldness" is by examining the preaching to which this word applied.

We can begin at Pentecost. A multitude had gathered around the apostles. In their midst were those who, fifty days earlier, had brought Jesus before Pilate crying, "His blood be on us" (Matt. 27:25). These were the ones who had just crucified Christ on the cross. When they heard the apostles speaking in tongues they were confounded and amazed; marveling, doubting, and mocking. Peter stood, lifted up his voice, and said:

"Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it" (Acts 2:22-24).

Peter proved his proposition by their Scriptures and his testimony, and concluded saying,

"Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." (Acts 2:36)

They were pricked in their hearts, they were told what to do, and about three thousand were obedient to the gospel and were added to the (Continued on page 79)
"After Threescore And Two Weeks"

The "seven weeks" and the "threescore and two weeks: taken together would bring us to the appearance of "the Messiah the Prince." We have seen that this appearance (c. A.D. 29, Julian) is the beginning of His earthly ministry upon His baptism in the Jordan River by John the Baptist, who had been busily preparing the way of the Lord and who began from that time to "decrease". (cf. Matt. 3; Mk. 1; Lk. 3; John 1).

Jesus is "the Messiah the Prince" of Daniel 9. He is "the Anointed One: (Gr. Χριστός). He is the Anointed King (I Tim. 6:14,15; Rev. 1:4,5; Col. 1:12,13), Priest (Heb. 4:14,15; 8:1-4), and Prophet (Heb. 1:1,2; Acts 3:22, 23). He was anointed with the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3:16,17) without measure (or degree of manifestation/power). (John 1:22,31; 3:29-36). (cf. Luke 4:18; Heb. 1:9; Acts 4:27; 10:38). Girdlestone writes,

"What, then, is the idea which we ought to connect with the name Christ or Messiah? It points to One who is King by Divine authority, and signifies that God would set His mark upon Him by giving Him the Holy Ghost, without measure. Perhaps also it teaches that the ministrations of the prophet, priest, altar, and tabernacle with all its vessels, were shadowings of the work which He was to accomplish."80

We pause here to note that the definite articles are omitted by the angel in the original tongue, and hence a literal rendering is "an Anointed One, a Prince." However, this does not militate against the Messianic application. Hengstenberg states in this regard that,

"The prophet, in accordance with the uniform character of his prophecy, has chosen the more indefinite, instead of the more definite designation, and spoken only of an Anointed One, a Prince, instead of the Anointed One, the Prince...leaning his hearers to draw a deeper knowledge respecting him from the prevailing expectations, grounded on earlier prophecies of a future great King, from the remaining declarations of the context, and from the fulfilment; the coincidence of which with the prophecy must here be the more obvious, since an accurate date had been given."81

All attempts to make "the Messiah the Prince" Onias III or Judas Maccabees, or one of the other Maccabees, have all ended in abject failure. Onias III began officiating as High Priest about 198 B.C., only 255 years after the edict given to Nehemiah -- Not 483 years! And the last of the Asmonaeans (the line of Maccabees) perished with Marianne in B.C. 29. Only by a subjective and arbitrary manipulation of the "weeks" of Daniel 9 could one make "the Messiah the Prince" to be identified with an inter-testament figure.

In Daniel 9:26 the angel tells Daniel, "and after threescore and two weeks shall (the) Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined." The angel sets forth that sometime after the 434-year period (483 years when added to the 49 years of the "seven weeks") a number of things will occur. (1)The Messiah would be "cut off". (2) a people under orders from their prince "shall come and destroy the city and the sanctuary". (3) The end of these would be "with a flood." (4) There would be the determination of desolation "unto the end of the war."

Gabriel does not here specify how long after the end of the 434-year period these will occur; nor does he, it will be observed, intimate that all of these things will transpire together. He merely has said that they will occur after the second period, the second set or series of "sevens". To each of these four things we now turn our attention.

"The Cutting Off Of The Anointed One"

The definite form is again omitted, but Jesus Christ is still here understood in keeping with the imagery of verses 24 and 25. Isaiah 53, the prophecy of the Suffering Servant, declares in verse 8 that "he has been cut off from the land of the living." This was a prophetic picture -- note the propheticum perfectum -- of the Lord's death. (cf. Acts 8:30 - 35). The expression "cut off"
BOLDNESS (continued from page 77)

church.

In the next chapter, Peter and John healed a lame man on their way to the temple. When all the people saw him walking and praising God they ran unto the apostles, filled with wonder and amazement. Peter again spoke, but not with smooth words and fair speech to gain winning favor. Peter said,

"The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; And killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses: Acts 3:13-15).

Again he proved his proposition with the Scriptures and told them what to do. Everyone did not like this approach; Peter and John were arrested while they spake. "Howbeit many of them which heard the word believed; and the number of the men was about five thousand" (Acts 4:4).

Peter and John now stood in the midst of the rulers, and elders, and scribes. They had been arrested by the Sadducees who were grieved to hear them speaking through Jesus the resurrection from the dead. Peter and John were asked, "By what power, or by what name, have ye done this?" (Acts 4:7). The question may have been evasive, but the answer was not.

"If we this day be examined of the good deed done to the impotent man, by what means he is made whole; Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole" (Acts 4:9-10).

Luke tells us that they saw the boldness of Peter and John. They commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus.

"But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard" (Acts 4:19-20).

Being let go, they went to their own company, who prayed, "Lord, behold their threatenings: and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word" (Acts 4:29). And Luke said in Acts 5:31, "they spake the word of God with boldness."

Many today have lost faith in the power of a bold proclamation of the word of God. Many have turned from the preaching of Peter and the apostles to professional promotionism, Ph.D.'s, and prayer-partners. As a result the church has been filled with many who will not endure sound doctrine. Now is the time for a new generation of preachers to restore the preaching of an older generation of preachers, for "they spake the word of God with boldness" and turned the world upside-down.

Daniel's Seventy Weeks continued from page 78 should thus be so taken in Daniel 9:26. (cf. Zech. 12:10).

Under the Dionysian Calendar this event took place in the year A.D. 33 or 34 on the 14th day of Nisan. The Gregorian (which dates Christ's birth from about B.C. 4) places it in the year 30 A.D., the 14th day of Nisan. This would be about 3½ years after His baptism.

As a result of His death, "He has naught" (the KJV translates it as "but not for Himself," giving the idea that His sacrifice was not on His own behalf, but on the behalf of others: because He "did no sin," Heb. 4:14, 15). But here we follow the rendering of E. J. Young, "He has naught" or literally, "there is not to him." The ASV renders it, "and shall have nothing." All commentators admit to difficulty in discerning its precise meaning. E. J. Young takes it to indicate that all which should properly belong to the Messiah. He does not have when He dies. This is a very forceful way of setting forth His utter rejection, both by God and man. 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' were the works from the Cross. In that hour of blackness He had nothing, nothing but the guilt of sin of all those for whom He died. Utterly forsaken, He was cut off. This is more likely the proper explanation of the expression.

Footnotes

80Girdlestone, op. cit., pp. 183, 184
81Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 415
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I Believe In God

Grady M. Miller

I believe in God. I am not ashamed to declare my faith, even though I realize that much of the world has outgrown their dependency on Deity. I believe in God, in spite of the unbelief that is being spread and taught by the so-called scientific community on every hand, from the grade school to the university level. I believe in God even though the forces of atheism have made shipwreck the faith of many. As a reasoning, feeling human being, I believe in God because I must.

I do not believe in God simply because I was reared in a good, Christian home. Like many of you, from early on I was taught the simply Bible truth that an all-wise, all-powerful Creator exists, who oversees and judges all the works of His vast creation. Still, there are some things I learned as a youth that I have since discarded because I discovered in later years that they cannot be supported. The existence of God, however, is not a belief that has been laid aside. Furthermore, my belief in God is not a blind, "leap in the dark" faith that is impossible to defend or prove. I believe in the existence of God because God alone can account for the following.

I believe in God because of the HOW OF MAN. Evolutionists assert that man is the product of chance and change; they claim that the human species evolved from some primordial soup over long aeons of time. But the theory of evolution, as developed and declared by some scientists, is actually unscientific. It demands that, at some time in the long ago, the inanimate produced the animate. Imagine, if you can, the living the offspring of unliving matter! This is not only contrary to natural law, but to common sense as well! I believe in God because the tenets of atheistic evolution cannot satisfactorily explain our purpose here. The various systems of ethics, philosophy, and human behavior set forth by atheism and humanism fail to give man a reason for and purpose in life. Only God has revealed unto man the great purpose of life. "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty, of man" (Eccl. 12:13).

And finally, I believe in God because of the OUGHT OF MAN. Why is it wrong to murder a fellow human being and not wrong to slaughter another kind of creature? Why is there a difference between a right way to live and a wrong way to live? What else can account for that instinct of ought in man, except God? Environment, society, upbringing—none of these factors can explain the ought of man. But God can, and does!

I believe in God because it is reasonable. Only the existence of God can account for our wonderful world, including man himself.
His Cap Didn’t Fly Off

Max R. Miller

Hank Aaron is the greatest home run hitter in the history of baseball. Hammering Hank socked so many home runs he surpassed the great Babe Ruth’s record of 714 home runs—and some. He was an excellent fielder, a great team player, a quiet and courteous gentleman, and truly the king of home run hitters. These qualities we admire. Strangely, such a man only briefly and at times electrified the crowds. The excitement and clamor of hitting number 714, matching the Babe’s mark, and then unto number 715, soon paled into an echo and faded away with somber silence. Hank could beat the Sultan of Swat in home runs, but he could never create excitement as did the Bambino; as for that matter, many of the lesser players of baseball and other games. But Hank hit that ball. He produced. He quietly went about his work in a masterfully way, a fine artisan of his craft. His record stands and likely will for all of baseball history. It is unlikely that a greater home run hitter will excel the magnificent record of one Henry Aaron.

Who can explain it: A man of great talent, years of success in the major league, an excellent fielder, the greatest home run hitter of all time and a courteous gentleman—but one who never excited the masses, had no continual clamorous following of Aaron—crazy fans, whose exploits of fame were framed in small headlines of sport journals? Why was he apparently just another ball player on the field, just another guy off the field?

Perhaps Hank himself can best explain this enigma. Hank Aaron, reflecting on why he wasn’t lionized in his career by the fans and media stated, "My cap didn't fly off when I played. I didn't run after balls that were twenty rows in the stands. I guess I just wasn't flashy." Aaron was no show-off; he was no grandstander. Flair, fanfare, heroics, showmanship, color, put-on and put-down, were not in his character. He simply played ball, he produced. He needed no gimmicks. His cap didn't have to fly off in making sensational but futile demonstrations of plays that didn't count for anything. But his record stands—and where are all those caps that flew off in grandstand play? There was no chaff in Hank's baseball career.

Although our game isn't baseball I see somewhat a parallel. In the kingdom of Christ there are those great men who daily go about serving God without their cap flying off. No color, no fanfare, without clamor, no chaff—just quite and constant service that brings "forth fruit, some an hundred fold, some sixtyfold." Servants of this sort are doing the work of greatness, producing fruits for eternity; their deeds are recorded in the record book of God's eternal hall of fame. In the final accounting the gadgets, gimmicks, and the "caps that flew off" will be but the chaff that is consumed in the fire without an ash remaining.

Preachers should evaluate their preaching and methods. Some seem to think their cap must fly off; they must make a demonstration of their preaching ministry. Not content with the staid old Jerusalem gospel they create an exciting message to share with their fans. Their dress and pampered hair-do must distinguish them from others. Sensational exclamations, boasts of claims of their former atheism shock their audiences. Sarcastic and satirical preaching shame and humiliate his audience while elevating the speaker to a
god-like image in his own mind. Numbers flock forward to "respond" to something, and for something, or for some cause, but after the clamor, color, showmanship, all pass by and sobriety gains the moment --- it was only chaff, just another cap that flew off in a grandstand play. Fruits for eternity? None!

We sometime see the cap fly off in "special services." These often are youth rallies, sessions for singles, or the great sing-a-thons. Such can set the stage for some grand and colorful demonstrations. We, at one time, assumed these gatherings were for worshipping and glorifying God. Are They? When the popular song master comes forth in skin-tight leather britches (excuse me, trousers), with the coat that made Joseph's of many colors look drab, demonstrating with wild gestures of hands and arms, bouncing on ankles of coil springs, getting excited, sweating, singing solo lead parts (or some part) -- the cap flies off, the audience is excited -- but it is all chaff.

About the same can be said of the puppet ministry (as if a puppet could be a minister). The puppet provides for the demonstration of someone's acting ability; allows for impersonation and mimicking of TV personalities. Little children go home and tell mom and dad what Ernie, Kermit the frog, Charlie Brown, or some such said. Would it not be ironic that they grew to have faith in the puppet characters rather than in Christ. Is Christ hid in a sock puppet?

When all the excitement is over, when chrisma is laid in the shade, where halls filled with clamorous excitement are again swaddled in quietness, when exciting speakers are hushed, the puppet out of fad, the gimmick is buried and forgotten -- what? What were they, who were they, what did they do, where did they go? Say, o'fellow, isn't that a cap I see there or the dusty ruins of time! But the record of true and genuine service stands forever.

"He will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire" (Matt. 3:12).

It is not the flying cap, but the crown that really counts.

---

The Sin Of Compromise

Billy Bland

"But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication" (Rev. 2:14).

These words were written to the angel of the church in Pergamos. Jesus had just spoken of their good qualities. Even though they dwelt "where Satan's seat is" (a place of sensual surroundings of lust, corruption, idolatry) they held fast Christ's name and had not denied His faith -- not even when Antipas was slain among them for the cause of Christ (2:13). How sad it is that this church which stood fast in Satan's place allowed false doctrine to take root among them. Jesus said there were some who held the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel (Cf. Numbers 25:1-3). When Israel pitched tent in the plains of Moab, Balak, king of Moab, tried to hire the services of Balaam to curse the Israelites. God, however, would not allow Balaam to curse them, instead He had Balaam to bless Israel. Yet in spite of this, Balaam counseled Balac how to trap the Israelites into sin. Through his counsel the Israelites sinned against God by eating things sacrificed unto idols and committing fornication (Num. 31:16). Because of this sin against God, some 24,000 Israelites died!

The church in Pergamos had some within it that were in some way influencing others to commit sin. In spite of the good this congregation had done and was still doing, they needed to repent of this error.

There is a great lesson in this for us today. No matter what good we have done in the past, or what good we are currently doing in some areas, that in no way gives us permission to allow digression or compromise to come in other areas. Here were some who would die for Christ, yet they had not done anything about "the doctrine of Balaam" that was in their midst. Evidently, they had compromised in this area. Jesus says: "repent: or else I will come against thee quickly, and will fight (continued on page 85)
Nuggets Of Pure Gold

II Kings 4:1–7

Winston C. Temple

These Old Testament stories are gold mines. They contain nuggets of pure gold for the spiritual life. We picked seven of these nuggets out of this story recorded in the first seven verses of this fourth chapter of II Kings.

The Nugget Of Need

"Thine handmaid hath not anything in the house save a pot of oil." The good husband had died leaving the widow and two sons and the creditor was come to take unto him her two sons to be bondmen. According to Leviticus 25:39,40 "and if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee; thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant: But as an hired servant, and as a sojourner, he shall be with thee and, shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee."

These verses state that a person may sell their children in case of poverty to pay their debts; but the buyer was to treat them in an respectable manner and that they should be released at the time of jubilee.

When the prophet of God conferred with the family, the report was made that nothing was left on which to live. In relating her need to the prophet she was taking stock of the present and planning for the future. It is always good for any christian to take stock of his spiritual standing before the Lord. This will reveal outstanding spiritual needs.

Oil was used for anointing the body after bathing and to anoint the dead. It was also used as a medicine in the times of Christ. The good Samaritan in Luke chapter 10:34 bound up the man's wounds pouring in oil and wine.

The Nugget Of Empty Vessels

"Borrow thee vessels abroad of all thy neighbors, even empty vessels." The prophet was preparing the family for taking care of abundant supplies which would be granted by the Lord. It was essential therefore to have vessels empty, and clean. It is the same when a heart must be emptied of all earthly desires and then filled with spiritual and eternal blessings. Such hearts the Lord can bless and fill with his grace and goodness. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lust we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world" (Titus 2:11,12). Paul said in Romans 2:4 "Or despiest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?"

The Nugget Of Use

"Thou shall set aside that which is full." The prophet instructed the poor widow to take the empty vessel and the single pot of oil which she had, and pour oil out of this pot and fill the vessels as the sons would bring them. Soon all the vessels available were filled. The lesson of use comes from this message. The Lord expects us to use what we have for his glory. Paul said in Philippians 4:20 "Now unto God and our Father be glory for ever and ever. Amen." We may not have much, but what we do have belongs to him and should be used in service. John 12:26 "If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be: if any man serve me, him will my Father honour."

Christians should use their time, talents, possessions, personality, and everything they have and can acquire for the glory of the Lord. It is a law of nature that use increases value and efficiency. Plant a grain of corn and reap a thousandfold. Cultivate a voice and ring his praises more sweetly. The mere use of a thing ordinarily increases its value and efficiency.

At the close of the parable, verse 13, we hear the Savior's words: "Watch therefore for you know neither the day nor the hour wherein the son of man cometh."
Paul said in 1 Cor. 6:20: "For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." Chapter 7:22,23 "For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant. We are bought with the precious blood of Jesus Christ (Acts 20.28). We are bond servants to serve the only true and living God.

The Nugget Of Obedience

Verse three - She was to borrow thee vessels abroad of all thy neighbours and not scant. Verse four - She was to shut the door upon her and her sons and pour into all those vessels. Set aside that which was full. Verse five - Tells us she obeyed the prophet's instruction.

She did not say to the prophet: "Why do I have to do that?" "I can't see any logic in that." She didn't try to figure out how the Lord was going to do his part. She obeyed!

People today say I can not see why I have to be baptized. There is nothing in that water. You are correct. But you are not saved until you are baptized for the remission of your sins (Acts 2:38).

"Now to him that is of power to establish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began. But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith:" (Romans 16:25,26). So there my friends, you see it is the commandment of the everlasting God for you to obey. He didn't say for you to wonder and to ponder; just obey.

SIN OF COMPROMISE continued from page 83 against them with the sword of my mouth" (Rev. 2:16).

Today, we have those who compromise what God says on various subjects (marriage-divorce-remarriage; authority of the elders; etc). When compromise has been made, Jesus says "repent or else" (2:16). The church cannot let such continue and still be acceptable to Christ. No doubt there will always be some who do not want truth. This was the case centuries before Christ came. In Isaiah's day some were saying "to the seer, see not; and to the prophets, Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us sooth things, prophesy deceits" (Isaiah 30:10). Jeremiah said, "The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priest bear rule by their means, and my people love to have it so: and what will ye do in the end thereof?" (Jer. 5:31).

Let us not be guilty of allowing sin in the camp of God's people by compromising the precious truths which God has committed to our care.
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"The People of The Prince Who Shall Come"

The angel foresees the coming of a prince, not to be confused with "the Messiah the Prince" even though the definite article is lacking throughout, and his "people" or host shall destroy the city and the sanctuary (i.e. the Temple). As stated before, the end of the Jewish economy with its earthly sanctuary was implicit in the prophecy of verse 24 of the anointing (consecration) of the heavenly one. The angel confirms the end of the former.

The "prince" who would come would either be Vespasian, the Roman general turned emperor who ordered the devastation and reduction of the Jewish nation before returning himself to Rome to secure the Flavian sceptre and diadem, or Titus, his eldest son who as the general-imperator was charged with executing the orders. (cf. Notes on Matthew 24). The "people" refers to the Roman army under Titus' immediate command.

"The Flood"

The end of the Jewish polity would be "with a flood." This expression here refers to a figurative inundation of the land by the Roman expedition. (cf. Dan. 11:12,26). The destruction would be complete, and not transient as was the desolation under Antiochus Epiphanes IV of Syria.

The image invokes the picture of a ship being swamped by a gigantic tidal wave, in this case that of Romani who under the direction ultimately of Him who "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." (Acts 17:26).

"The Desolations Determined"

The angel also foresees that desolations would be "determined" to last "unto the end of the war." The "desolations" refer to the acts of destruction. The effect is put for the cause.

The determining of these has reference to the Divine decree which signalled the desolations. Gesenius gives the rendering "a decree of desolations." (cf. Dan. 9:27). According to verse 27 this determination or decree would be made during the span of the "one week", as Roy Deaver notes,

"It should be pointed out that the prophecy does not say that the city would be destroyed within the span of the one week. Rather, it says that within that week the destruction of the city was determined. One could hardly read verses 26 and 27 without recalling our Lord's words: 'Behold, your house is left unto you desolate' (Mt. 23:38)."

We take this then to refer to the Lord's prophecy regarding the desolation of the Temple by the Roman army of Titus. In it the desolations were decreed because of the rejection of the Messiah by the Jewish people.

"The One Week"

Gabriel says further, "And He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations He shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate" (Dan. 9:27).

It will be observed that the angel does not place a "gap" between the 434-year period and the "one week" or 7-year period. The "one week" is pictured as part of the 490 years -- thus forming an organic whole. Yet, Futurists insist on dividing it from the other 483 years by about 2,000 years, and all because of an assumed theory which holds that (1) Israel as a nation will be restored, (2) its former economy with all its Levitical trappings and temporal manifestations -- including the Temple -- will be restored, (3) physical Israel is the greater purpose of God -- hence the need for millennium, (4) the church Age was not foreseen by the Old Testament prophet and was in this sense a "mystery," and (5) the church, being a lesser purpose of God, was a fill-in for the time space on "the prophetic clock," as some pre-millennialists put it, created by the Jews' initial rejection of Christ -- hence the postponement theory of the kingdom. For a thor-
DANIEL'S SEVENTY WEEKS (continued from page 86) 

ough refutation of such nonsense we exhort you to read Wallace's God's Prophetic Word, Harper's Prophecy Foretold and Prophecy Fulfilled, and such like. At any event, there is no "gap". All so-called "evidence" for it is mere assumption, and a thing assumed is a thing not, proved! And that goes for brother King's own prophetic "gap" theory!

Thus, the "one week" begins with the baptism of the Messiah, His anointing with the Holy Spirit, and proceeds 7 years. Its terminus ad quem would thus be dated C. A.D. 36, 37 (Dionysian) or A.D. 33, 34 (Gregorian).

"And He Shall Confirm The Covenant"

Due to the prominent position of the "Messiah" we take the subject of Verse 27 to be He. The Messianic character of the prophecy also confirms this view. Within those 7 years following His baptism it is obvious that (1) Antiochus IV Epiphanes had long been dead (C. B.C. 164 and (2) no "future" Anti-christ arose. The vision here refers to that week as part of the "seventy weeks", and only a Messianic application fits the picture.

"The many" (the definite article is there) would probably refer to "the people" of verse 24. Hengstenberg comments,

The article shows that the discourse is not concerning many in general, but definitely concerning those who were manifest to the reader, from the circumstances of the discourse, as definite in their kind.

Such a definiteness, however, can be derived only from the twenty-fourth verse. The imparting of all the blessings, which the prophet there promises, he here embraces in one comprehensive expression, to confirm a covenant, and that he does this, he shows by representing the objects of the confirmation, as those, who do not here first come forward, but are already known from what precedes, and who were the objects of the former gracious promises. 

Unto the Jewish race God had "committed the oracles of God" (Rom. 3:2), and by this the promise made of God "unto the fathers" would first be offered to the Jew and then finally to the Gentile--the promise of salvation, to become "the children of the promise," the precious righteous seed. (cf. Rom. 9:6-8; Gal. 3:14-29; Acts 26:6-8, 22, 23) The offering of such blessing would be made to the Jew first, and indeed was. In the period of preparation the Lord sent His workers to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" alone, (Matt. 10:5, 6). They were to refrain from carrying that preparatory / anticipatory message to Gentiles and to Samaritans at the first. And even after the Great Commission of Matthew 28 and Mark 16 was put into effect by Divine decree for His workers to "go into all the world and preach the gospel!"--one which on Pentecost had come in full force--"to every creature," the early church for quite sometime was made up of "Jews and proselytes." Not until after the fomenting of the persecution signalled by the stoning of Stephen did evangelism spread geographically and ethically to Samaria (Acts 8) and to Gentiles (Acts 10, 11). The ultimate scope of the promise was for all men (Acts 2:38, 39), but for a period of time the church at Jerusalem labored amongst the Jews--and this by Divine purpose, until persecution and, in Acts 10, a vision stirred the forces, of Jehovah's army universal conquest. (cf. Col. 1:6, 23; Rev. 11:15).

Thus, the "covenant" confirmed is the New Testament which in the course of the "one week" would be Jewish in scope, but would later become of universal accessibility. At the outset the only beneficiaries of the immediate benefits and blessings of that testament or covenant "when sin would be taken away" (cf. Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:5-13), were Jewish in religion. (cf. Acts 2:10; 6:5). It was "to the Jew first and then to the Greek" (Rom. 1:16).

(To be continued)
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