

Remove Not the Ancient Landmarks

First Annual Bible
Bellview Preacher Training School
Lectureship
May 12-16, 1975

“Remove Not The Ancient Landmarks”

First Annual
Bellview Lectures

Pensacola, Florida

1975

“Remove Not The Ancient Landmarks”

Copyrighted © 1975 Bellview Church of Christ
4850 Saufley Field Road
Pensacola, FL 32526

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission of the publisher.

IT IS ILLEGAL AND UNETHICAL
TO DUPLICATE COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL.

The material in this study represents a considerable investment of effort, skill, time, and finances from both the authors and the publisher. If this material is photocopied and circulated to avoid buying a book for each student, the publisher does not sell enough copies to support the publication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

On The Use Of The Mechanical Instrument Of Music In The Worship Of The New Testament Church	
Harry P. Anderson	1
In Season, Out Of Season	
Tom L. Bright	6
The Inconsistencies Of Subjectivism	
Tom L. Bright	13
The Origin Of Satan	
Foy Cherry	23
Satanism	
Foy Cherry	32
Knowledge	
Paul Clayton	43
Fellowship	
Douglas E. Cook	45
Elders	
George E. Darling, Sr.	50
Sound Doctrine	
George E. Darling, Sr.	56
Premillennialism	
Hugh Fulford	61
“Isms” In The Church	
Ray Hawk	67
Pentecostalism	
Ray Hawk	73
The Jehovah’s Witnesses	
Ray Hawk	78
The Cost Of Discipleship	
Guy F. Hester	84
There Is A Plan Of Salvation	
Guy F. Hester	90
Debates—Is Debating Scriptural And Necessary?	
Roger Jackson	96
Predestination	
Roger Jackson	103
The Sermon On The Mount	
A. Waldrep Johnson	110
Role Of Women In The Church—Its Challenges	
Wallace Maxwell	124

Women’s Role In The Church—Its Problems	
Wallace Maxwell	135
Evolution	
Ray Peters	146
The Bible: Inspired And Authoritative	
Ray Peters	155
The Prophets Joel, Jonah, Amos, And Hosea	
Rex A. Turner	160
“Mark Them That Are Causing The Divisions And Occasions Of Stumbling Contrary To The Doctrine”	
Ernest S. Underwood	166
The Church In Preparation And Fact	
William Wilder	172
The Church In Purpose, Promise, And Prophecy	
William Wilder	174
The Restoration Plea	
Doug Williams	176
The Late Great Planet Earth	
William Yuhas	185

ON THE USE OF THE MECHANICAL INSTRUMENT OF MUSIC IN THE WORSHIP OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH

Harry P. Anderson

The subject which I have been assigned to discuss is one that has caused a great deal of division in the brotherhood of Christ. The points that are presented are set forth with a plea for the “unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (Eph. 4:3). For Jesus to present the church as a “glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing” (Eph. 5:27), we must do what we can to keep the church of our Lord pure from innovations and free from the doctrines of men. My prayer is that of James 1:21-25,

Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls. But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth *therein*, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed

and that God may help us to have open and receptive hearts to the plain teaching of His Word.

First of all let us set forth the premise, that in accord with Ephesians 5:19 and Colossians 3:16, there is an instrument which God intends to be plucked during our worship in song. That instrument is the heart. It is so named in Ephesians 5:19 “making melody in your heart” and “singing with grace in your hearts” (Col. 3:16). So, our discussion will not deal with the instrument in worship, but whether the “mechanical” instrument of music is authorized in worship. This worship being conducted in the church which Christ built (Mat. 16:13; Acts 20:28).

The origin of the mechanical instrument of music being introduced to the worship of God is dated from A.D. 670 with Pope Vitalian I. It caused such a furor that it had to be removed from the Roman Church (*Americana Encyclopedia* 688f). The first account of its being introduced into the body of Christ was in 1859, Midway, Kentucky (*The Life And Times Of Benjamin* 409-411). Thus, we can see that man introduced it into worship not God. It became accepted 1800 years too late to have been the practice of the New Testament Church of the First Century. I ask the question, "Who caused the division in the 'unity of the Spirit'?" Those who violated God's Word by addition (Rev. 22:18-19), or those who oppose the doctrines of men being introduced into the church of our Lord?

Even the leaders of denominationalism were opposed to its introduction into their services. John Calvin, Presbyterian founder, stated concerning its use in worship, "It is no more suitable than the burning of incense." John Wesley, founder of Methodism, said, "I have no objection to instruments of music being introduced in our chapels, provided they are neither seen nor heard" (Clarke 4:684). Adam Clarke, Methodist scholar, wrote,

...the use of such instruments of music, in the Christian Church, is without the sanction and against the will of God; that they are subversive of the spirit of true devotion, and that they are sinful...instruments in the house of God I abominate and abhor... (684)

Charles Spurgeon, perhaps the most outstanding of Baptist preachers, preached for 20 years to 15,000 in England and never allowed the instrument of music in his tabernacles. One of the great American reformers, Alexander Campbell, said, "To all spiritually minded Christians such aids would be as a cow-bell in a concert" (*Millennial-Harbinger* 582) (These statements prove conclusively that men have even strayed from the very principle established by the founders of denominationalism and greater still from the teachings of Christ. But if all men were to agree, that would not change what the Bible says about it. The important question is and still remains, "What does the Lord have to say about it?" Once we have ascertained this, as long as we stand with God and Christ, let us be willing to stand alone if need be.

In the first place, the reason the body of Christ sings and does not play is because the use of the mechanical instrument of music rejects the very foundation upon which the church is built. That foundation

being the authority of Christ. Jesus said, “All authority hath been given unto me” (Mat. 28:18). We are told in Colossians 3:17, “And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, *do* all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him.” Where did Christ authorize it? Because if Christ did not authorize the mechanical instrument of music, we use it in worship through presumption. For man to presume to use that which is not authorized by the Lord is sin. Paul said, “For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning” (Rom. 15:4). We have several Old Testament examples of the sin of presumption. Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10:1-2) presumed and were destroyed by God. Uzzah was struck dead for the sin of presumption (2 Sam. 6:7). Moses disobeyed through the sin of presumption (Num. 20) and was not allowed to enter the promised land. Beloved, God means what He says.

The mechanical instrument of music in worship violates the Scriptures because it goes beyond that which is written. John said, “Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God” (2 John 9). Paul pronounced an “anathema” on any apostle, angel or man that went beyond that which is preserved (Gal. 1:8-9). The New Testament reveals all that God intends for us to have in religion “once for all” (Jude 3). Therefore, we need nothing additional. With the New Testament we can be complete in Christ through His will (Col. 2:10). The New Testament, as it “thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Tim. 3:17), gives us “all things that *pertain* unto life and godliness” (2 Pet. 1:3). Since the mechanical instrument of music has been excluded from worship, it must not be profitable in the worship of a Christian’s life. Furthermore, it violates God’s law of exclusion. God recognizes the silence of the Scriptures as an argument against the inclusion of certain things in worship to Him. This recognition of the silence of the Scriptures excluding anything beyond that which is written can be seen in Hebrews 1:5, “For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?” By virtue of the fact that God did not say these things to any other than Jesus Christ, He excluded anyone else from holding such an exalted position and relationship with Him. The Old Testament examples are rampant—See: Genesis 6:22. Noah did what God had instructed without deviation or substitution because God had given him

explicit instructions concerning his task and these instructions excluded anything else. God had told the Israelites exactly how to escape death at the Passover (Exo. 12) and that excluded the use of any other method. God has said of baptism, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). This automatically excludes infants because they do not have the ability to believe. But God did not say, "Don't baptize infants." True enough. He did however tell us what to do and that took care of everything else. The Lord's Supper is another example of this law of exclusion. The elements to be used are set down in Matthew 26:26-28 and 1 Corinthians 11:23-29 as the bread and the fruit of the vine. This excludes anything and everything else. To do otherwise is to go beyond that which is written. So it is with our subject. God commands vocal music played on the instrument of our heart (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16). This excludes the use of the mechanical instrument of music. Every verse of Scripture pertaining to worship in the New Testament Church that deals with music therein always refers to singing, that is vocal music. By whose authority then is the mechanical instrument of music in worship practiced? Not by God's authority.

The use of the mechanical instrument of music in the worship of the New Testament Church is in violation of scriptural worship. Jesus taught, "God *is* a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship *him* in spirit and in truth" (John 4:24). To worship God in spirit means to be humble, reverent and to realize that we are in the presence of the Lord. (Brethren we need to be more reverent). Paul said when we sing we are to "sing with the spirit," and with "the understanding also" (1 Cor. 14:15). To worship in truth means to worship according to God's truth. That is God's Word, "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth" (John 17:17). Where in God's Word, which is truth, are Christians authorized the use of mechanical instruments of music in worship? Beloved, we are commanded to compare things by that which "the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual" (1 Cor. 2:13).

The use of the mechanical instrument of music is further in violation of God's truth because it violates the divine principle of walking "by faith, not by sight" (2 Cor. 5:7). We must have faith in order to be pleasing unto Him (Heb. 11:6). Faith comes "by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17). Where in God's Word do we have it authorized that we might hear it and believe in it? Again, we "walk by faith, not by sight," and our faith finds its support in God's Word.

Show it to me beloved, and I will play. Jesus prayed for unity of all believers in Him (John 17:20-21), Paul demanded that we be of the “same mind and the same judgment” (1 Cor. 1:10). Unfortunately, the tragedy of the introduction to this innovation, devised by wicked men and abetted by the father of wicked men the Devil, has caused more division and wreaked more havoc in the Lord’s church than any other one thing. Tragically, this innovation of man has caused many other steps toward apostasy. Too many times one step away from the truth of God brings on many more.

Sin is transgression of the law, God’s law (1 John 3:4). This study shows us that the use of the mechanical instrument of music in the church of our Lord for worship is transgression—a going against that which is written. Brethren, beloved, this is not a matter for indifference or opinion. It is **sin!**

May the Lord use this lesson to His glory. May we, as children of God, always strive for the “unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” God help us to stand for righteousness and against error. May we “Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good” (Rom. 12:9).

WORKS CITED

- Americana Encyclopedia*. Vol. XII; See also, *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religions*. 2:1702.
- Clarke, Adam. *Adam Clarke’s Commentary*.
- Millennial-Harbinger*. 1851.
- The Life And Times Of Benjamin*. Franklin-Headington; See also, West, Earl. *Search For The Ancient Order*. Vol. II.

IN SEASON, OUT OF SEASON

Tom L. Bright

I charge *thee* therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away *their* ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry. For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished *my* course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing (2 Tim. 4:1-8).

Contained in these passages are several thoughts essential to those that would call themselves faithful servants of the Lord Jesus Christ. Listed herein is a grave charge to the evangelist Timothy and the reason for such a charge.

The thoughts in our lesson text are a continuation of the things mentioned in the third chapter. Paul states first of all, that perilous times would come, then he gives the characteristics of the evil ones, that would be “ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.” Paul mentions his manner of life, his persecutions, yes, even the persecutions that all would suffer if they lived a godly life in-Christ Jesus. Evil men and seducers were to wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. Paul encourages Timothy to remain steadfast in the things that he has been assured of; and most important, he refers to the inspiration of the Scriptures and the resultant feature of this inspiration, **the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures!**

THE GRAVE CHARGE

The aforementioned having been stated, Paul places upon the man Timothy a great charge. Indeed, this charge is one of the most grave of all charges, because **the souls of men would hang in the balance!**

This charge was before “God and the Lord Jesus Christ.” Mr. Thayer states in his Lexicon that the word translated “before” means

“before one’s eyes; in one’s presence and sight or hearing.” Paul, in trying to impress upon Timothy the absolute necessity of preaching the pure, unadulterated gospel of Christ said, in essence, “Timothy, I am taking you into the very presence of the great I AM and His blessed Son, and in their presence I am laying-upon you a most solemn charge; with no additions, no subtractions, with no apologies, and with no excuses, Timothy, you must **PREACH THE WORD**”! Indeed, this is a most solemn charge.

The grave nature of this charge is further shown by the fact that Paul says the Word is to be preached “in season, out of season.” This term means seasonably-unseasonably, opportunely-inopportunely, when it is convenient, when it is inconvenient. It means to be pressing, urgent, earnest. The dread disease of “itching ears” would soon be sweeping the church in epidemic proportions, assuredly the ranks would be thinned drastically. A serum was available that would cure the afflicted and vaccinate the unafflicted against this dread disease. That serum??? **The pure gospel of Jesus Christ, the Word preached “in season, out of season.”** The question is not “Is this a good time to preach the Word.” It is, “**Why isn’t this a good time to preach the Word?**” There are no “office hours,” no certain time in which the Word can be preached. It must be preached at any time possible, upon every occasion, and without exception!

Those afflicted with this malady would heap to themselves in great piles those that would “tickle” their ears; these teachers would preach and teach just those things that the “itching ear” people wanted to hear. Isaiah spoke of this same thing in Isaiah 30:9-11. Hear him!

That this *is* a rebellious people, lying children, children *that* will not hear the law of the LORD: Which say to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits: Get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us

Isaiah was faced with this type of people, Paul and Timothy had to contend with this type of person and we are confronted with the same type of false teachers today. Irregardless of the consequences, Isaiah fearlessly proclaimed the law of the Lord. Likewise, Paul and Timothy stood upon the principles of that which is right and cannot be wrong, sounding forth the gospel message. So we must today.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY TODAY

When the season is right, we must preach the Word. When the season is not right, we must still preach the Word, not **compromise it!!** But this is what many so-called “Brothers” in Christ are doing through their mouthpieces of deceit, the periodicals that they edit.

They have theorized, theologized, fraternalized and intellectualized until the Word of the truth of the gospel is nothing more than the doctrine of Universalism, pure and simple!!

The principle established in Deuteronomy 4:2 is as relevant today as it was when uttered. “Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish *ought* from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you.” Add to this Proverbs 30:6, “Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.” Paul’s admonition to the Galatians is noteworthy. “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any *man* preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed”(Gal. 1:8-9). Indeed, as Paul stated in verses 5,6 and 7, that perverted gospel to which they were moving was not another gospel, there is only one gospel, the gospel of Jesus Christ. When one takes the gospel of Christ and adds something to it or takes something from it, he no longer has the gospel of Christ, but a perverted gospel, one that has ceased to be “the power of God unto salvation” and has become the doctrines and commandments of men. But those that are “Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth (2 Tim. 3:7) could care less.

If Paul had been like the false teachers previously referred to, Galatians 2:3-4 would **never have been written!!**

But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised: And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage.

When doctrines of these men are put to the test, there can really be no “false brethren!” According to them it really makes no difference what one believes, just as long as one believes that Jesus is the Son of God.

If Paul had been of the same mold as many today, he would have never written “And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; 18 Who concerning the truth have erred,

saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some” (2 Tim. 2:17-18).

It is only when one preaches **the Word**, seasonably and unseasonably, opportunely and inopportunely, in season and out of season; then and only then can one make such statements as we have just noted.

Paul said that they would not endure sound doctrine. Sound doctrine is that which is wholesome, healthful doctrine. From this sound, wholesome, healthful doctrine they were to turn unto fables (myths). They would not endure the sound doctrine. They would not bear up under the proclamation of the Truth. But as their own lusts dictated, they would pile up unto themselves false teachers to tickle their itching ears. Sound, healthful doctrine would no longer be tolerated.

Paul’s admonition was to “preach the word” and this was to be done “in season, out of season.” This was the only cure then and it is the only cure now. All preachers, especially the young ones, should learn this valuable lesson. We have far too many in the brotherhood that like to “tippy-toe through the tulips.” We have far too many preachers that are content to preach “pleasing nothings,” that like to appease their hearers. Far too many sermons preached from “our” pulpits today could be taken, and with no adaptation whatsoever, be preached from any denominational pulpit in town! This is a shame and a disgrace! I don’t think that any man should use the pulpit as a weapon for abuse, to attack and assail the unbeliever that might be in the audience. I am convinced that we should preach **the Truth** with as much tact and love as we can possibly muster. I can tell a man that he is lost in such a way that he will accept it and change his life, but on the other hand, I can tell a man that he is lost and drive him away, never having another opportunity to teach him the Truth. Indeed, we should always be “speaking the truth in love” (Eph. 4:15); yet we should be of the same mind as Paul, “Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?” (Gal. 4:16). Let us be honest, **the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth**, will not appeal to every person, it will drive some people away because some men love “darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil” (John 3:19). Even so, this does not give anyone a license to compromise the Truth as it is presented in the inspired, all sufficient scriptures! A perverted gospel that is taught, accepted and obeyed **will not save!**

In Acts 20:26-27 there is a principle by which I preach. Paul declared himself to be free from the blood of all men. This is a

wonderful thought, knowing that one can go to the judgment, being free from any man's blood. But notice how Paul declares he had achieved this great assurance. He had not failed to declare the whole counsel of God. Can we say that today? If not, why not?

From Paul's statement, the whole counsel of God must be proclaimed. There is more than one way in preventing the declaration of the whole counsel of God. One could preach just enough truth to salve his own conscience and pacify his hearers, never touching upon those things that would "rock the boat," never mentioning the controversial things. After all, we must have unity, mustn't we? And the only way we can have unity is just refuse to mention the things over which we differ and preach only those things with which we all agree. Presto! Instant unity!!

Another thing that would prevent the whole counsel of God from being preached is to pervert it. Add the doctrines and commandments of men to it or take from the Divine revelation. Either way, the whole counsel of God will not be preached. This is exactly what far too many are doing today. The antidote? Seasonably and unseasonably, opportunely and inopportunately, **preach the Word!!** Be urgent, be earnest, preach it when they want it and when they don't want it. The Truth is under fire. It is under attack by infidels that call themselves Christians. They would grind the Truth into the dirt with their hobnailed boots. But they shall not pass. Truth will always dispel error. The light of the Word of God will shine into the darkest of the dark corners, and the vermin, the ants, the roaches will scatter as the blessed light of the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ makes them manifest before all. "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to *give* the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 4:6).

ON THE ROAD TO TOTAL APOSTASY

Liberalism in the Church is destructive, it is deceitful and it is diabolical. It is destructive because it destroys the souls of man and tears asunder the Church for which Jesus suffered and shed His precious blood to purchase. It is destructive because it destroys the souls of man, causing him not to "endure" the sound doctrine and will lead him to an eternity of torment.

It is deceitful because its propagation depends upon deceit. They work upon the unsuspecting youth, glorying in the fact that they have

successfully driven a wedge between the youth and the “traditional” Church of Christ. Liberalism is deceitful because they preach falsehoods, and when questioned about the error, they begin their chant of the old doctrine of “misunderstandability.” It is deceitful because when in the presence of one that stands for the old paths, they stand for the old paths, and vice versa. James had something to say about the man that would speak out of both sides of his mouth at the same time. “My brethren, these things ought not so to be” (Jam. 3:10).

It is diabolical because the Liberal teaches those things that—originate from the very depths of the mind of Satan. They are teaching the very same principles that divided the Church about a century ago, out of which grew the First Christian Church. We say to them as Jesus said to the Jews in John 8:44, “Ye are of *your* father the devil.”

Liberalism has only one road that it seems to want to follow and that one road leads to only one destination, **total apostasy**.

LIBERALISM IS NO ANCHOR OF THE SOUL

Liberalism can offer no “anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast” (Heb. 6:19). It has nothing to offer, no assurance, no hope. In fact, Liberalism blatantly detracts from the majesty of the name of God. When one follows Liberalism to its logical conclusion, the Bible says nothing definite, everything depends upon the thinker’s subjective feelings. Thus, we have God contradicting Himself, teaching one thing to one person and the exact opposite to another.

Look at the theory of Premillennialism. According to the Liberal we should fellowship with those that teach this false theory. To them, it is of no concern that this false theory makes God guilty of the most colossal blunder in history. He sent His Son to earth to establish the kingdom that He had promised through the prophets for centuries. Of course, God made just a “little” mistake, He just thought that the Jews would accept the promised Messiah, but was mistaken. They didn’t!! So God **was forced** (by mortal man) to reach into His “bag of tricks,” postpone the kingdom until later and come up with the “church” idea. But all is not lost, because Christ **is going** to establish this kingdom that the Jews wouldn’t allow Him to establish on His first trip to earth. Miraculously, the Jews will all be converted and like the Fairy tales of old, “they lived happily ever after.”

Consider the Liberal philosophy that just about everything is a matter of opinion. Instrumental music in our worship, the baptismal

measure of the Holy Spirit available today, speaking in tongues, the mode and design of baptism, etc. If we knew what they really teach and compare it with the scriptures, we could see the utter and irreconcilable inconsistencies in their teachings.

THE WORD PREACHED “IN SEASON, OUT OF SEASON”

All we need to do to curb this theology of the devil is to heed the Divine injunction: **preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season.** Brethren, if the Truth is preached in love, we are not responsible for the results. But we are responsible if we do not preach the Word; we are responsible if we do not preach “in season, out of season.” Let us be about our Father’s business!

THE INCONSISTENCIES OF SUBJECTIVISM

Tom L. Bright

“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto *them that are* wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!” (Isa. 5:20-21).

Here, in striking terms, this great prophet of God is pointing to the wickedness of the inhabitants of Judah. He is pointing out the wretchedness of the people that will soon bring the wrath of God upon them. It is indeed alarming when God’s people can be accused of calling evil good and good evil: of putting darkness for light and light for darkness; and putting bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter.

Even more graphically, the man of God speaks of their condition as being nothing but wounds, bruises and putrefying sores that have not been closed up, neither bound up nor treated with ointment. Moreover, Isaiah says that this is. from the sole of the foot unto the head, “*there is no soundness in it*” (Isa. 1:6).

In verse 21 of our lesson text, notice the charge that is laid to Judah. “Woe unto *them that are* wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!” Let us look at the words “wise” and “prudent.” “Wise” means having wisdom or discernment of what is true, right or lasting, judicious. The word “prudent” means wise in handling practical matters, exercising good judgment or common sense. Indeed both of these are attributes that we should long after! But notice Isaiah’s charge, they were **wise in their own eyes** and **prudent in their own sight**. Herein is the condemnation. Their wisdom and prudence was not after God, but by their own judgment and feelings. By their own wisdom and prudence, the standard by which they judged was exactly opposite of God’s! No consideration for the wishes and desires of the God of heaven, but things were made right by **their own** wisdom and prudence.

In verse 24 of this same fifth chapter, this inspired spokesman of God sets forth with vivid description the reason for such an ungodly attitude of those claiming to be the people of God—"because **they have cast away the law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the Word of the Holy One of Israel**"!!! What more serious charge could be laid at the feet of any person than that of casting away the law of God and despising His Word? Indeed when one becomes wise and prudent in his own eyes, the law of God must, of necessity, be cast away. There is no alternative!! There is no way one can be wise and prudent in his own eyes and be a true follower of the Lord,

It is imperative for us to understand that this condition that called for this severe denunciation of Isaiah was caused by Judah's contempt for the law of Jehovah. But even then we must go deeper than this. We must ask, **why did they hold the law of god in contempt?**

BASIC ATTITUDES

May I suggest that the sins of Judah were the result of their basic attitude toward God and His will as it had been revealed to them. The actions, the very conduct of a person is determined by a basic attitude.

What are your actions, thoughts and positions in the political realm? Are they not determined by a basic attitude? What are your actions, thoughts and positions in the religious realm? Are they not determined by a basic attitude?

Judah's basic attitude toward the law of the Lord of Hosts was one of casting it away as despicable, in short, total rejection. Their subsequent conduct exemplified this basic attitude; that is, they called evil good and good evil; they put darkness for light and light for darkness; they put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter. In their own eyes they were wise and prudent. In God's sight "From the sole of the foot even unto the head *there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment*" (Isa. 1:6). How vastly different is the conduct of man when he lives according to his own wisdom and prudence as compared to living according to the wisdom and prudence acceptable to Jehovah, the God of heaven. Indeed, need more be said?

SAME BASIC ATTITUDE SEEN TODAY

As in Isaiah's time, so it is today. Those calling evil good and good evil; those putting darkness for light and light for darkness; those putting bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter existed then, they exist

today. As Judah's conduct emanated from a basic attitude, so the conduct of many today reflect their basic attitude towards the inspired Word of God. Today we hear so many uncertain sounds with reference to the design of baptism, the ability to speak in tongues, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, Premillennialism, the use of instrumental music in our worship to God, how one becomes a Christian, Christian fellowship and to whom it should be extended, the authority of elders, the organization of the Church and many other subjects that we could mention. From whence comes these uncertain sounds? From those liberals among us that are bent upon the complete destruction of New Testament Christianity as it is revealed in the inspired Word of God! What is the basic attitude that engenders such a destructive heresy? May I suggest Subjectivism?

SUBJECTIVISM VS. OBJECTIVISM

Subjectivism is defined as the philosophic theory that all knowledge is subjective and relative. The definition of "subjective" would be something like this, that which exists only in the mind; illusory; that which exists only within the experiencer's mind and incapable of external verification. *Webster's New World Dictionary* gives the following definition:

...of, affected by, or produced by the mind or a particular state of mind; of or resulting from the feelings or temperament of the subject, or person thinking, rather than the attributes of the object thought of...existing or originating within the observer's mind and, hence, incapable of being checked externally or verified by other persons.

Now what this boiled down to is simply this, that the "truth" of any proposition depends upon how a person or persons look upon that proposition, and whatever they might decide about said proposition is the "truth" of that proposition. It makes no difference what any other person or persons might feel about the proposition, everyone is correct. Even though you and I might be diametrically opposed in our view of the "truth" of any proposition, we are both right!! Hence, since the "truth" of any proposition is determined subjectively, then no person has any right to consider another person's view as being untrue.

The opposite of Subjectivism is Objectivism. Simply stated, Objectivism is whatever Subjectivism "ain't." *Webster's New World Dictionary* defines Objectivism as:

...of or having to do with a known or perceived object as distinguished from something existing only in the mind of the subject, or person

thinking...being, or regarded as being, independent of the mind; real;
 actual...anything external to or independent of the mind: something
 objective, reality.

It is evident that anyone who can see through a window can see the vast difference between these two basic attitudes. The one whose actions, thoughts and conduct are directed by an objective attitude accepts the Word of God as the final authority. They believe that truth is absolute, that is, that it has objective stability and independence outside of the knower; that when any given individual comes to the knowledge of a certain truth, that truth is not changed. It is to say that the truth revealed by inspired men is the same today as it was when it was revealed, that it has not changed, that “truth” is not static! The message that was preached during the time of the infant Church told men what to do to have their sins forgiven, This same message, without addition or subtraction, must be preached today, more than 1900 years later, and if the world lasts another 1900 years plus, must be preached then, without addition or subtraction, because it was and is the “truth.” It is unchangeable and everlasting!

Not so with the Subjectivist. He believes that “truth” is subjective and relative, that “truth” is static, ever changing, ever dependant upon the person doing the thinking. He believes that there is nothing that a person can look to and say that this is absolute, this is concrete and it will always be so.

To the Subjectivist, “truth” as revealed in the Bible is not objective and absolute; it is subjective and relative. This theory we deny with all of our might and with all of our being! It cannot be true. If it is, the Bible is meaningless. If Subjectivism is the proper approach to the Holy Scriptures, then no command can be binding upon men today. And this is exactly what the modernistic Liberals in the Church today want us to believe, yea, more than that, they are openly advocating it!!

THE INCONSISTENCIES OF SUBJECTIVISM

Now that we have shown the basic meaning of the theory of Subjectivism, let us go to the Bible to various accounts that are given and draw some conclusions that are demanded by Subjectivism; By doing this, we plan to show that this doctrine is unreasonable, illogical, irresponsible and diabolical in nature. Verily so, Subjectivism is **the** inconsistent of **all** inconsistencies!

In Genesis 6:14, God commanded Noah to “Make thee an ark of gopher wood.” There was no way that Noah could have misunderstood

this plain and simple command. An ark was to be built, the material to be used was gopher wood and God gave Noah the blueprint to be used. According to the doctrine that we have in mind, the reasoning of Noah would have been something like this, “God, I know that you told me to use gopher wood, but since I have the right to interpret your commands according to the way that I look upon and react to them, I will use pine instead of gopher wood and I am still in obedience to your commands.” Naturally the age-old question will arise, “What if Noah had used some type of wood other than the gopher wood specified, would the ark have floated?” This is a spurious attempt to dodge the real issue. The real issue is this, what type of wood did Noah have to use to fulfill God’s command and did Noah have the right to assume that God did not mean what He said? I challenge the Subjectivist to answer truthfully this question.

In Numbers 15:32-36, we read the account of a man that was put to death for gathering sticks on the Sabbath day. We know that this was a direct violation of the fourth commandment (Exo. 20:3), yet by applying the doctrine of Subjectivism, **God commanded an innocent man to be put to death!!** God gave a direct command, yet according to Subjectivism, the truth of any proposition depends upon how one looks and reacts. This man could be justified with the reasoning that his reaction to the fourth commandment was that God really did not mean for the Israelites to keep the Sabbath holy and do no work thereon. If Subjectivism is correct, this man would be correct in his reasoning, thus an innocent man was put to death. Do you believe it? I deny it emphatically!! If Subjectivism be true, then the Subjectivist must admit that he is worshiping a murderer. Will they do it? I daresay that they will not because they cannot. Let us go further with this doctrine. If Subjectivism be true, innocent blood was shed by the command of God. Yet Solomon wrote that “These six *things* doth the LORD hate: yea, seven *are* an abomination unto him: A proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood” (Pro. 6:16-17) Did God hate the Israelites for fulfilling His command to put the man to death? Furthermore, God would not be innocent in this matter, because He commanded it! Did He hate Himself? Absurd? Behold, the inconsistencies of Subjectivism!

Paul wrote in 1 Timothy 1:3, “As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine.” By applying the doctrine of Sub-

jectivism, some questions cannot be answered about this passage. How would Timothy decide what is a “different doctrine”? How could Timothy “charge” some not to teach something different, when everyone must determine within himself what is the truth about any certain proposition and everyone is correct?

Again let us apply this theory. In 2 Timothy 4:1-4, Timothy is admonished to “Preach the word...For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine.” Just what was Timothy to preach to fulfill this command? What was Timothy to understand as “the word”? What Timothy might consider as “the word,” another might look upon as counterfeit. Furthermore, exactly what did Paul mean by those who would not endure sound doctrine? Subjectivist **must** define this that Paul referred to as “sound doctrine.” They cannot! What might be “sound doctrine” to one person might not necessarily be “sound doctrine” to another if their doctrine is correct. Paul states in verse 4 that some “will turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.” We call upon Subjectivism to answer these questions. What is “the truth” that some would turn from? When has one ceased to follow “sound doctrine”? Just how far away must one be before this statement applies to him and what is to determine when he has reached the point? What are the “fables” and what was Timothy to use to determine when one has turned aside to these “fables”? If Subjectivism is correct, then Paul gave Timothy commands that he could not keep.

Not only this, but consider Titus trying to speak “the things which become sound doctrine” (Tit. 2:1), or to “avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law” (Tit. 3:9), or in the next verse, trying to decide who is a “heretic.” Just imagine Titus and Timothy trying to comply with Paul’s commandments according to the doctrine of Subjectivism.

Subjectivism asks us to follow a line of reasoning that we would not even consider following in any other sphere of life, yea, the consequences would be disastrous. Consider officials giving one football team 6 points for a touchdown and another team 12 points for a touchdown, and the only explanation given is their right to interpret the rules of football as they desire.

Just suppose that your life depended upon the success of a very delicate brain surgery. Only Dr. XYZ has ever successfully performed this particular surgery, but has since died. Nevertheless, he has left written instructions giving the most minute details of this surgery. As

you are being wheeled into surgery, you hear one of your doctors say, “I don’t care what Dr. XYZ wrote, I have the right to interpret his instructions anyway that I choose and we are going to do this my way and change these particular points in the surgical procedure.” Indeed, Subjectivism applied to physical life is very frightening, but many would have us to apply this doctrine to our spiritual life and to eternity. Behold, the inconsistencies of Subjectivism. It is a doctrine of the devil (1 Tim. 4:1) and those that follow it is on the “broad *is* the way, that leadeth to destruction” (Mat. 7:13).

By continuing to pursue this false doctrine to its ultimate conclusion, we will see that it makes the Bible contradictory, even pitting an inspired writer against himself, often-times in the same book.

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16). How the Subjectivist loves to preach and write about God’s love to man. Indeed, I am thrilled when I read of God’s love for, and manifested to man. I sincerely believe that the practice of the true concept of biblical love would solve all problems but Subjectivism would have us to overlook all **doctrinal differences** in the name of “love.” The Subjectivist who preaches loud and long of the love that is mentioned in John 3:16, either ignorantly or intentionally ignores a statement by the same writer on the same subject in 1 John 5:3, “For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments.” By refusing to teach 1 John 5:3 along with John 3:16, they fail to emphasize that our love to God is exemplified by our **keeping the commandments of God!** “If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments” (John 14:15—ASV). “He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him” (1 John 2:4). “If a man love me, he will keep my words:...He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings”(John 14:23-24). Why do they pick one passage of scripture out of the Bible, mutilate it by making it teach what they want it to teach, but fail to bring in the other passages that pertain to the same subject? The Bible teaching concerning love has been twisted and perverted to accept every wind of doctrine and refuse none. I challenge any man to find one command, example or inference in the Bible that would teach us to overlook false teaching under the guise of love. It cannot be done!

“For there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4:12). All will readily admit the principle taught in this passage, that salvation is in and through Christ.

But while accepting this statement, the Subjectivist will reject another statement made by the same man, recorded by the same writer in the same book of the Bible! “Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost” (Acts 2:38). Here Peter gives the terms of admission into the Church, that blood bought institution, to which every saved person is added by the Lord (Acts 2:4?). The terms are plain, simple and understandable, yet Subjectivity will accept and look upon any person as a Christian that professes to be such, regardless of whether they have been immersed for the remission of their sins or not. Thus, they accept Acts 4:12 and reject Acts 2:38; what Peter said in one place is acceptable, but what he said in another is not! Behold, the inconsistencies of Subjectivism.

This false doctrine makes the Great Commission given by our Lord in Mark 16:15-16 utter nonsense. In this passage, the command is to preach the gospel to every creature. But Subjectivity does not define what one must preach to “preach the gospel.” Remember, according to this philosophy, the truth of any proposition depends upon the one thinking and how he looks upon any proposition. Just what must one preach to fulfill this command? What one might (subjectively) look upon as the gospel, another might (subjectively) consider as not being the gospel. But according to their doctrine, it really makes no difference what one might preach as being the “gospel,” because **both are right anyway**, even though their “gospel” might be diametrically opposed to the other! I am sure that this makes no more sense to you than it does to me, but this is the ultimate conclusion one must face when advocating Subjectivism.

In Acts 19:9, 23, 24:14, Christianity is spoken of as “that way” or “the way.” This is the **distinctiveness** that characterized New Testament Christianity as described in the New Testament. There was something that was so outstanding, so distinctive, so peculiar to it, that it was merely spoken of as “the way.” Subjectivity **destroys this distinctiveness**. This false theory fails to outline and define anything that could be distinctively referred to as the way.” Its basic philosophy is incompatible and in opposition to the distinctiveness of New Testament Christianity as revealed in the Bible. Just as the make, model, serial number and color of a car are distinctive marks of that one, certain car, so it is with “the way.” The Bible gives certain, distinctive marks of “the way.” If “a way” does not have the distinctive

marks of the way,” it is a false religion. Subjectivity offers nothing that could be distinctively referred to as “the way.”

“Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset *us*, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us” (Heb. 12:1). Let us pay particular attention to “the race that is set before us,” “Even though the Greek word for “race” signifies the contest rather than the course itself, all will agree that to have a “race” there must be the prescribed course to run. Who or what determines what the course is that we are to run? “And if a man also strive for masteries, *yet* is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully” (2 Tim. 2:5). How can we determine whether one strives lawfully or not, unless we have a code of conduct? We cannot! Thus, according to this false doctrine, the Hebrews writer admonished us to do something that no one can really define and outline for us. We call upon Subjectivism to tell us exactly what this race is that we are to run and how we might run it lawfully. They will not, because they cannot.

The Subjectivist cannot consistently refute Atheism, Agnosticism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Shintoism, Confucianism or any of the other “isms” in the world unless he will contend that Christians **only** have the right to think subjectively. If he feels that this privilege is for Christians **only**, he finds himself in the predicament of switching from Subjectivism to Objectivism to prove his contention. Now we have pushed him to the point that the “isms” of the world can be saved without **the blood of Christ**, or he must reject his Subjective position altogether (after all, these people are honest in their belief also). I dare say that he will do neither, but tenaciously hold to his subversive doctrine. He teaches that Christ is the Savior of the world and the only avenue to God is through Christ. Yet, how can a Subjectivist be so objective in his teaching? We find him using that which he denies to prove that which he wishes to affirm.

Pursuing this doctrine to its logical conclusion, one can take any simple command of the Bible and turn it into “nothingness.” According to this doctrine nothing can really be classed as being wrong. If there is no wrong, there is no sin; if there is no sin, there is no sinner; if there is no sinner, we have God in the irrevocable position that He made a mistake. God has a place prepared for all sinners, yet there will be no sinners to punish. This smacks of blasphemy!

If this doctrine be true, “we are of all men most miserable” (1 Cor. 15:19), “having no hope, and without God in the world” (Eph. 2:12). The Subjectivist will try to deny the conclusions reached in this article, but will do so unsuccessfully. We have taken their basic philosophy and pursued it to its logical conclusion. It has nothing to offer, no “anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast (Heb. 6:19).

Man will one day awaken to the utter inconsistencies of this damnable heresy, yet, in the meantime untold thousands will be ushered into Eternity, **unprepared**, because they have accepted this falsehood.

Those that love the Cause of the Lord Jesus Christ must get their heads out of the sand and “earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints” (Jude 3), and speak boldly against this insidious monster that has reared its ugly head in the Church for which Jesus died. I stand ready, either publically or privately, to defend the position that I have advocated in this speech.

“Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand” (Eph. 6:13).

THE ORIGIN OF SATAN

Foy Cherry

Any serious treatment of the subject of the origin of Satan must be confined to that which is revealed in the Sacred Writings of Christians. The oracles of God were committed unto the Jews (Rom. 3:2). Although other world religions advance their views on the origin of evil and the Evil One, the Christian recognizes these to be uninspired of God and, in fact, inspired of Satan to keep the truth about himself from being known.

Satan is a real person. This fact is plainly and painfully written throughout Divine Revelation. He appears on the scene in the Garden of Eden fully dressed with all his powers and capabilities to entice the human family. Wherever he is found thereafter, he is doing precisely what he did in Eden enticing some member of the human family to disobey God. Verily, he is man's adversary, or Satan. He is a constant and consistent accuser of man. He has never had one good word to say about man even when man was acting as his slave and obeying every whim.

The reality of Satan stands alongside the reality of God. The belief in God and Satan stand or fall together. Modern man never questioned the existence of God until after he decided that Satan didn't exist. When man believes that Satan exists as a real person he also accepts God as a real person.

We now turn to the subject at hand. From whence did Satan come? Can we know the origin of the Devil?

Among many ideas advanced over centuries of speculation (of which much has been absurd) there seemingly are two views that merit serious consideration. Some advocate eternal dualism. This claim maintains that both God and Satan exist as uncreated Beings, The second view holds that Satan was created by God but then fell from that state of dignity by disobedience.

The advocates of eternal dualism suggest several favorable aspects of their view (DeHaan 9). First, it suggests that the responsibility for

evil can be wholly placed upon Satan and not God. Second, the fanaticism of Satan is explained inasmuch as he is absolutely evil even as God is absolutely good. Third, the existence of evil angels, spirits and demons can thus be attributed to Satan's creation rather than God's creation. Fourth, the freedom with which Satan moves about, even having access into the presence of God as in his conversation with God about Job (Job 1, 2), indicate that Satan is not a fallen angel bound by a chain.

Concerning these arguments in favor of the eternal nature of Satan, some objections are in order.

In the first place, why do Christian apologists cower under the charge that God is responsible for the evil that exists in our world? Evil exists because God allows it. This point is firm. If God could not banish evil miraculously from this earth, then He would not be the God who is portrayed in the Bible. It is clear that although God hates evil and is not the author of it, yet He allows evil. Even if mortal man never understands why evil is allowed, he can be assured that God is accomplishing His will in spite of evil and that man is the beneficiary of God's tolerance and longsuffering.

To say that evil exists because Satan exists and he created it is yet avoiding the issue. Is God more powerful than Satan? If not, then the world is doomed to an eternal struggle between two equal antagonists. If He is more powerful than Satan, why hasn't He destroyed him before now? The fact that God allows Satan to continue is on a par with the fact that He allows sin to continue. The fact that both Satan and evil exist does not mean that God is responsible either for their adverse effect on man or for their continuance today.

This same point applies likewise to the existence of evil angels demons, etc. God is not to be blamed for their condition any more than He is responsible for men being evil. He did not create either man or angels to be evil. It can be said at this point that evil beings and evil are being allowed by God, but that His power is superior to both.

Other questions are now before us. If both God and Satan exist as uncreated dual beings, who is to decide which one is more powerful? How can I know that God is in the right and that He will ultimately triumph over Satan? Might not Satan's power be greater than God's? After all, if a popularity poll were taken now, who would win by a landslide? If number determines strength, then Satan is stronger than God.

Is it not possible that Satan's ways are, after all, better than God's? Thus, the person who claims "might makes right" gets his desire whereas the Christian who gives to them who ask of him soon goes destitute. Maybe Anton LaVey is correct after all! He is Satan's minister at the First Church of Satan, San Francisco. He authored a bible for Satan. He declared, "...If a man smite you on one cheek, smash him on the other!" He also said, "Blessed are the strong for they shall possess the earth—Cursed are the weak for they shall inherit the yoke" (9). Who is right, God or Satan?

What happens to the Christian's hope that right will finally win over wrong, if Satan exists in all his power alongside of God? Christian faith has always endured the fire of persecution and the agony of privation in the assurance that Satan's ways would fall and God's truth would prevail in the end.

The Bible, however, clearly teaches the absolute superiority of God over Satan.

God's knowledge cannot be fathomed by Satan. Paul declared, "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, *even* the hidden *wisdom*, which God ordained before the world unto our glory: Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known *it*, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory" (1 Cor. 2:7-8).

The crucifixion of Jesus was in the mind of God millenniums before the event transpired, but Satan caught not one glint of that plan. In the Jewish Scriptures through prophecy and sacrificial antitypes Satan was given a ringside seat, but he was too obtuse to get the message. Satan was defeated in the very act which he perpetrated to achieve his greatest victory! Imagine, if possible, the frenzied tremors which shocked Satan victory celebration when news reached that One had broken the bonds of death and now possessed a body which could not be harmed by spear, stones or sword.

The Bible clearly shows Satan to be an imitator not a creator; a counterfeiter not an originator; a deceiver not a saviour; and a liar in every instance.

Jesus said, "Ye are of *your* father the devil,...He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it" (John 3:44).

Paul said, "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light" (2 Cor. 11:14). And again, "*Even him*, whose coming is

after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved” (2 The. 2:9-10). And yet again, “But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not” (2 Cor. 4:3-4).

The power of Satan is great. But it is always a power which man himself allows Satan to have. His power consists of lies against the truth; deceptions against God’s will; fraudulent imitations of God’s power. He preys upon man’s doubts and weaknesses. He turns our tears of grief into bitter resentments. He clouds hope with despair. He turns the noble feelings of love into brutal and selfish satisfactions. But in every case, his power consists of the advantage man gives him.

Free to roam the earth as a roaring lion (1 Pet. 5:8-9) yet he flees like a howling jackal when resisted (Jam. 4:7). This is the character of the being that some are setting forth as an uncreated person who exists from eternity.

The fanaticism of Satan does not suggest eternal existence-any more than the fanaticism of evil men does. In the days of Noah, God saw that “the wickedness of man *was* great in the earth, and *that* every imagination of the thoughts of his heart *was* only evil continually” (Gen. 6:5). Paul described the ancient course of man,

Because that, when they knew God, they glorified *him* not as God, neither were thankful;...Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,...Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts,...Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator (Rom. 1:21-25).

These statements suggest that the evil fanaticism of man grows as he continues to practice evil, Satan is totally dedicated to his mission, but this in no way suggests that he has an eternal evil nature.

The theory of dual eternal existence is untenable as it exalts Satan to a degree he does not deserve and it would place a question mark before the claim of God’s omniscience and His sovereignty.

The second view, that Satan is a creation of God and now exists as a fallen angelic being, needs to be thoroughly examined at this point. If the Bible teaches any view of the matter at all, it teaches this view.

There are several facts concerning angels which are clearly set forth in the Bible.

One fact is definite: some angels sinned against God, Peter said by the Spirit, “For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast *them* down to hell, and delivered *them* into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment” (2 Pet. 2:4). Jude also spoke by the Spirit declaring, “And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day” (Jude 6).

Another fact develops out of this first one. These angels could not have sinned unless they had a law by which to live, Paul reminds us, “Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, *there is* no transgression” (Rom. 4:15). This generalization applies to all situations. There cannot be any violation, or sin, until a regulatio: exists capable of being violated. We must conclude that the angels have law to live by. The requirements of that law are beyond our scope of knowledge and have no bearing upon our salvation.

A third fact also becomes evident. Since some angels “abandoned their proper abode,” we conclude this to have been a voluntary and willing act performed by God’s creatures who had an absolute freedom of will. Man is not, therefore, the only part of God’s creation to be endowed with freedom of choice. These angels could not have sinned unless they had the opportunity and the ability to do so.

Some object at this point that how could Satan sin when there was no one to tempt him or how could the angels disobey when they live in the perfect environment of the habitation of God?

Are we not trying to transfer our earthly situation to God’s abode? Temptation may well be a problem with which we mortals have to contend. We do not have to know the requirements of the angel’s law to know they had law. We do not have to know the nature of their transgression to know they did transgress. We do not have to know what motivated them to disobey in order to know that they did disobey.

These facts cannot be brushed aside: angels were given law; they had the power to disobey that law; some of them, in fact, did disobey.

The question now before us is, “Is Satan one of those angels which sinned, and in fact, is he the leader of that disobedient host?” Several passages seemingly point in that direction. Before introducing them, two observations need to be made.

Number one, often times a truth is revealed in a progressive manner. The doctrine of the Trinity is suggested in the moonlight age of revelation but is developed more fully in the Christian age. The fact that

so little is said about Satan in the Old Testament does not argue against his presence nor activity in the lives of those persons. It remained for Jesus and His apostles to state in very unequivocal terms about his reality, antiquity, activity in man's life and his fate.

Number two, prophecies in both the Old and New Testament often begin with a description of an immediate happening, but then, the prophecy takes on an immensity of thought and grandeur which the local event cannot adequately explain.

To illustrate, in Hosea 11:8-11, God weeps over the sure fate of Ephraim or the ten tribes in this manner,

How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? *how* shall I deliver thee, Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? *how* shall I set thee as Zeboim? mine heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together. I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim: for I *am* God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee: and I will not enter into the city. They shall walk after the LORD: he shall roar like a lion: when he shall roar, then the children shall tremble from the west. They shall tremble as a bird out of Egypt, and as a dove out of the land of Assyria: and I will place them in their houses, saith the LORD.

When the Ten Tribes were carried away, they were settled in various parts of the Assyrian Empire with many of them being sold as slaves to merchantmen who in turn carried them into other portions of the world. There was no restoration for the Ten Tribes as their dispersion was complete.

The prophecy becomes Messianic, therefore, and looks over the centuries to that day when Jews, devout men, from every nation under heaven would be assembled in Jerusalem, and, accepting Jesus as their Messiah, would take this Good News back to their native countries "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Rom. 1:16).

Now let us consider part of the prophecy of Isaiah against the king of Babylon:

How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! *how* art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High (Isa. 14:12-14).

There is no question but that verses 4-21 of this chapter are directed against Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. The question being raised is whether or not verses 12-14 have only a pompous, lawless king in mind

or is there a vision behind Nebuchadnezzar of a far greater and more lawless one who is contending against God Himself? Bear in mind that the term “star” is used at times in poetry to denote an angel.

In Job 38, God describes the creation of the earth and declares in verse 7, “When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?” These morning stars and the sons of God are to be identified as the same and since man was not yet created, they would have to have been angelic beings.

Has the Holy Spirit given the reader a veiled description of the past ambitious efforts of Satan against God? Let the reader judge.

Attention is now called to Ezekiel’s lamentation against the king of Tyre in chapter 28:12-19:

Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering,...Thou *art* the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee *so*:...Thou *wast* perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee (vv. 12-15).

We readily affirm these statements are made of the king of Tyre. However, Ezekiel also speaks out against Sidon (vv. 21-24); and the king of Egypt (chapter 29) but fails to use this kind of imagery with either one.

The same question must again be raised, “Does this vivid terminology speak of one who was more privileged, more beautiful, and more perfect than the king of Tyre could ever have thought of being”? Let the reader judge.

In the New Testament, these allusions continue, however, Satan is named as the subject under consideration.

The seventy returned from their first journey and excitedly told, the Lord the demons were subject to their power. Jesus said, “I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven” (Luke 10:18). This was assuredly a forecast by the Lord that the power of Satan was being cast out by His disciples through His name. Why, however, does our Lord use this particular terminology? Why picture Satan as ever being exalted in the heavens unless he was so exalted at one time? The allusion used by our Lord was based on a fact or else the symbolism has no point.

This record was left by Luke more than thirty years before the Revelation was given to John and would have been read extensively by Christians during that period. Fuller explanation of this matter was given to John, however, on the Isle of Patmos at the close of divine

revelation. The most vivid of all these pictures is given in Revelation 12:7-9:

And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, And prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.

We need not be concerned here with the historical fulfillment of this immediate event. The imagery is based on what the readers' already accept as a fact. Why picture this war as being in heaven, unless at one time there indeed was war in heaven? Why represent angels against angels were it not historically so? This symbolism is either drawn from factual past events or it is a false analogy capable of deceiving the reader.

Let us sum up some facts at this point. Satan is pictured consistently as man's adversary. Note that of all God's earthly creatures man is the only one created in God's image and is the special object of His love. Satan could not be man's adversary without, being God's adversary.

Satan, in constantly accusing man before God, is registering his unbelief, and opposition to what God has done and is doing for man now.

The Scriptures we have studied point to a person and an event of greater magnitude than the immediate event will allow, and to my judgment, give us a dim picture of rebellion and war in heaven with Satan as a created archangel being cast out along with those lesser angels who followed him,

An objection would naturally be, "Why is this matter so dimly and cautiously revealed in the Scriptures?"

In addition to declaring, "I don't know," let it be observed that we are here dealing with a matter of the greatest magnitude which took place in the closest confines of the habitation of God, and is almost, if not altogether, outside the realm of human comprehension. God has let every human being know that Satan will ultimately be cast into the lake of everlasting fire and that man can escape a similar fate by fearing God and walking righteously before Him. We remain content with the knowledge we possess being assured that in that glorious day we shall know even as we are now known of God.

WORKS CITED

- Hodge, Charles B., Jr. *A Biblical Study of Satan*. Dallas, TX: Gospel Teachers Publications. 1973.
- LaVey, Anton. *The Satanic Bible*. New York, NY: Avon Books. 1969.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- DeHaan, Richard. *Satan, Satanism, and Witchcraft*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing.
- McClintock and Strong. *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- The American Standard Bible*. LaHabra, CA: Lockman Foundation. 1971.
- The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Vol. 4. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

SATANISM

Foy Cherry

An obsession with occultism has reached hysterical proportions in the United States. Libraries will not allow their books on these subjects to be checked out knowing they will not be returned. The user of such books in the library commonly finds pages missing which have been cut out with a sharp knife. The reader wonders what dark secrets and priceless treasure has been removed from public gaze! "The Exorcist," a movie about Satan possession, attracted larger and larger crowds as reports spread about its terrifying effect upon audiences.

That man is incurably religious is never more evident than in his antics in this generation. The rejection of the Bible by modern man has not decreased his desire to communicate with the supernatural. His repudiation of organized religion has not removed the desire to worship a being greater in power than himself.

Instead of reading his Bible for daily guidance, modern man faithfully consults his horoscope in the daily newspaper before venturing forth to his daily activities. To help understand his future, he will take an afternoon break and consult his favorite palm reader, crystal ball gazer or tea leaf diviner. In the evening, he will retire to the secrecy of his home where a private altar awaits his priestly ministrations. Supplications will go forth to the spirits of the universe that he be protected from their displeasure and that his carnal desires be fulfilled.

That mysticism should attract millions of followers and become a multimillion dollar annual business in this scientific and highly technological era is a most amazing phenomenon. It should be evident from this, that science and technology cannot provide food for the soul nor answers for the deep longings of man's spirit. The destructive efforts of many scientists in destroying faith in a personal God and in the Bible as a revelation from God have created a vacuum which the occultist has now filled with superstitions dating back to pre-Christian times (Martello 21).

But now to the subject at hand. Satanism is to be distinguished in this study from other forms of Satanic activity. The Christian views Satan as a real being who is the adversary of mankind and the enemy of God. Any idea or practice which is contrary to God's truth is therefore from Satan and is satanic. All forms of occultism whether it be Astrology, Witchcraft, Black Magic, White Magic, Fortune Telling, Spiritism and ESPism have their origin in Satan and their practice is Satanic. Satanism has to be regarded as a separate system from the previously defined occults. Satanists and devil worshippers have existed for centuries having flourished extensively in medieval Europe. Satan was commonly represented as a two-horned male goat. All nature was saturated with evil spirits and demons roamed the woods looking to perpetrate evil upon man's lives. In this age of superstition and ignorance, gruesome tales abounded of atrocities upon innocent people, of blood sacrifices of animal and even human beings. These tales, no doubt, had considerable foundation in fact.

Satanism in the twentieth century has been refined of many of its excesses. Leo Martello, a self-confessed practitioner of witchcraft even pays LaVey's brand of Satanism a compliment in quoting Arthur Lyons' assessment of the church of Satan as a "philosophy" (122). There is no doubt that the church of Satan begun by Anton LaVey represents a new concept within the folds of Satanism. Heretofore, Satanists were individual practitioners who interpreted the ancient arts very much to their own individual fancies. The same process is taken by LaVey, however the skill of the originator has skillfully adapted an age-old system to twentieth century thought. Satanism as presented by LaVey has a philosophical outlook on life which, at best, has enough sense and order to be examined. Our examination of LaVey's church of Satan will consist first, of an explanation of some of his beliefs, second a critical evaluation of those beliefs, and third, a reaffirmation of biblical teaching against this and all other forms of Satan inspired practices.

Burton H. Wolfe has in the foreword of the Satanic Bible fully explained the reasons for LaVey's dismissal of Christianity and the subsequent espousal of the occult. It seems that while playing the organ for a carnival show LaVey would play for the tent show evangelist on Sunday morning and would see the same men present with their wives who were on Saturday night lusting after show girls but were now praying for sinful desire to be removed from their minds. He decided

that Christianity was hypocritical and that man's carnal nature would find a way of expressing itself regardless of what kind of "white light" religion he had (14).

The best job LaVey ever had according to the records was as a photographer for the San Francisco Police Department. The task of photographing hit-and-run victims and victims of assault seemingly made a significant impression upon LaVey. His questioning the presence of God in such mayhem later led him to define God as a

balancing factor in nature, and not as being concerned with suffering. This powerful force which permeates and balances the universe is far too impersonal to care about the happiness or misery of flesh-and-blood creatures on this ball of dirt (40).

During these formative years of young LaVey's life, he studiously pursued studies in the occults apparently devouring every book he could find on the subject.

Through the years, LaVey developed a flair for the sensational and the organizing of the church of Satan in 1966 and the writing of the Satanic Bible is the result of carnival-like showmanship and has provoked the kind of outrageous news which is beneficial to his cause. If news about Satan makes good copy for the printer then LaVey has used Satan to the fullest advantage.

In LaVey's thinking, Satan is not a real person but rather, "a dark, hidden force in nature that was responsible for the workings of earthly affairs for which science and religion had no explanation and no control"(16). This definition of Satan compared with his definition of God would leave no doubt in the mind of the reader as to who he believes controls this earth and the affairs of man while on the earth. The worship of Satan is therefore an attempt to placate the dark force which rules men's lives.

According to LaVey this dark force can be utilized to help the devout Satanist achieve what he wants in life. LaVey gives one example by claiming that he had the power to conjure up a parking space in front of a public building when he needed one. Part of the Satanist's worship consists of a destruction ritual in which the worshipper invokes the satanic force against his enemy or whoever opposes his achieving his goals in life.

That Satanism is a self-centered way of life becomes very evident to the observer. The most important day of the year for the Satanist is not some significant religious event, nor a commemoration of a great

historical or political happening, but it is the Satanist's own birthday. Inasmuch as he has the capacity to become a god himself, the Satanist considers his own birth the greatest event the world ever beheld.

The Satanist subscribes to the belief that any gratification of the flesh is legitimate. The only qualification given by LaVey is that one's sensual indulgence is not to be forced upon others.

Sex plays an important part in the worship and life of the Satanist. A sex ritual is contrived by the worshipper to bring unseen powers to bear upon someone with whom he desires a sexual companionship. Any type of sexual activity imaginable is allowed as long as the activity is made up of willing participants.

LaVey sums up his philosophy thusly,

Satanism preaches indulgence in man's natural animalistic desires instead of abstinence and guilt feelings encouraged by other religions. Indulging yourself is the only way to eliminate harmful frustrations and guilt feelings. We encourage our members to indulge in every one of the Seven Deadly Sins of Christianity—anger, envy, gluttony, greed, lust, pride and sloth—because they all lead to physical, mental, or emotional gratification (Martello 116).

Since LaVey has attempted to set forth a philosophy for mankind to live by, we have the responsibility to subject it to intense scrutiny. If it is valid, let all mankind live by it, but if it be wrong or unworkable let it be discarded.

The founder of the church of Satan, Anton LaVey, gives us his pathetic reasons for rejecting Christianity. The story is repeated in every generation by those who rationalize themselves away from God. The pattern is consistent. An individual looks upon the weakest, the least practicing representative of Christianity and holds him up as an example of the failure of Christianity to change men's lives.

We are made to wonder why it is that the self-sacrificing spirit of Christianity which has resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars being sent in love and benevolently to all portions of the earth can be so easily ignored; and, why the tremendous change for good that has come upon thousands who have been influenced by the gospel of Jesus Christ can be passed over so easily; so that a few individuals who are half-heartedly serving God should suddenly become such important examples of what Christianity hasn't done for mankind. We find far more objections to LaVey's excuses than we do to the failure of many in Christianity.

Satanists, like LaVey, object to the stereotyping done by the newspapers who emphasize the bizarre shennanagins of perverted and maniacal cultists (Martello 19). Why, then, should they pick up the perverted cast-offs of Christianity and present them as prime examples of the best Christianity has to offer?

Let it be supposed for now that LaVey has the power to conjure up for himself a parking space on a busy, crowded city street. Doesn't this mean that there will be one less space available for the non-satanist who is also looking for a parking space? Now let us suppose that there are twenty satanists who are busy conjuring up parking spaces in front of a restaurant during a busy lunch hour in downtown San Francisco. Doesn't that mean there will be twenty less spaces available to the non-satanist? If it is possible for satanists to utilize dark unseen forces in this manner to get what they want in life, then it would be to everyone's advantage to become a Satanist and get a big piece of the action.

But what would be the result if everyone in San Francisco became converts to the church of Satan? Would a city full of Satanists have peace, tranquility and self-satisfaction for each one? No! Satanist would be truned against Satanist, each one trying to get the limited parking spaces, the limited number of seats at a restaurant and the front seats on the buses, trains and trolley-cars. The goals of the Satanist would be best available only when Satanists were few in number and far between.

If then, Satanism is not for everybody, who is it for? Doesn't the answer ring loud and clear? The Satanist is a selfish, ego-centered individual whose only concern is to get what he wants from life and if another person's rights have to be violated to do this, then he will violate them! His claim that he doesn't harm others is absurd, Our society is founded on the fact that as the population grows, the individual rights of each citizen are thereby decreased. Discomforts arise because of crowded streets, stores, and commuter vehicles, but the citizens accept this and recognize that the resulting loss of freedom is shared equally by all. The ego-centered Satanist, however envisions himself as having special powers which enable him to get the inside track on whatever is happening. The only way he can practice his philosophy is by takin advantage of others and. at the same time hope that others will not try the same process on him.

Let this matter be examined further. The sex ritual engaged in by the Satanist is designed to conjure these unseen powers to help him draw someone into a sexual relationship v\rrith him. Let us suppose for the

moment that he has access to such powers and is successful in this endeavor. How can any Satanist claim that this partner is a willing partner? Is physical force the only way to compel someone to perform an act they do not really desire to do? Has not the Satanist used emotional and mental coercion to get what he wants without concern for the effect upon his conjured partner? The Satanist supposedly is relieving his own frustrations in this endeavor. Can he guarantee that his conjured partner will not have feelings of guilt, frustration and emotional conflict after this spell is over? We again are faced with the fact that the Satanist is a selfish, ego-centered, immature individual who is using his religion as a rationalization for selfish gratification. Others become pawns in his game to be traded and sacrificed whenever the game plans call for it.

Arthur Lyons aptly describes the Satanist as they appear to him,

Most all Satanists I've met are depersonalized. They are suffering acutely from feelings of alienation and powerlessness...I see Satanism and all forms of extremism, political and religious, as being symptomatic of a psychological uneasiness that pervades our culture...The technocracy has stripped him of his individuality and he finds he needs an escape route, that escape into power usually taking militant forms (100).

This exaltation of the powerful satanic self, leads LaVey to blaspheme every doctrine of mercy and conciliation taught in the Bible. "Behold the crucifix, what does it symbolize? Pallid incompetence hanging on a tree" (31). LaVey ignores the thief who had lived by force and who cursed and threatened until his legs were smashed by a Roman club. If incompetence put Jesus on the cross, the thief's reliance upon power and curses did not prevent his dying alongside Jesus that day on Calvary.

"Blessed are the iron-handed...Cursed are the poor in spirit, for they shall be spat upon" (34). Mussolini ruled Italy with an iron fist but that didn't prevent irate Italians from ultimately shooting him and dragging his body over the cobbled streets of Rome Hitler ruled most of Europe with an iron hand but then perished in a flaming bunker. Parents continue to name their children after faithful Bible characters, the children name their dogs Hitler and Satan!

The Bible continues to teach that the meek shall inherit the earth but mankind is continually burying the tyrants, dictators and ruffians who haven't learned that maxium to be true.

The claim made by LaVey that indulgence gives relief and satisfaction is completely unsupported and is contrary to all sound studies in mental health and psychological behavior. The fact is, that practice creates desire. The more one indulges in a habit the more obsessed he becomes with that habit. The alcoholic, he one hooked on a drug, the sexual deviant have one thing in common obsession with a habit. They became obsessed through indulgence. This indulgence, however, does not bring relief nor lasting pleasure to these tortured souls!

We are not claiming that each person does not possess desires that are inherently part of their bodies. Many of these desires though can go unfulfilled with no adverse effect upon the person emotionally or physically. An individual can live a celibate life for many years, and, in busying himself with worthwhile endeavors, actually be better off for the sacrifice.

Christianity has not preached a denial of the flesh but rather a proper expression of those desires which are Inherent in us. The Christian recognizes that there are others in the world besides himself. These persons have rights also. Desire must be expressed in ways which are beneficial to all. Selfish gratification is indeed the work of the flesh condemned in the clear and definite language of the Bible.

We need to raise another question in our discussion of LaVey's Satanism. Does the worship of one's self ever enlighten man's soul or lead man to noble and lasting accomplishments? Would Washington, one of the founders of our nation, ever have left the comforts of Mount Vernon to lead the Continental Army through years of frustrating and harrowing experiences without being devoted to ideals which put selfish interests far in the background? Is not the Satanist part of our cut-flower generation which receives the sunshine of God's grace, lives upon the fertile soil of centuries of sacrifice and patient endurance, yet contributes nothing of a worth while nature for succeeding generations. A fitting summation of Satanism is given by Burton H. Wolfe:

Satanism is a blatantly selfish, brutal religion. It is based on the belief that man is inherently a selfish, violent creature that life is a Darwinian struggle for survival of the fittest, that the earth will be ruled by those who fight to win the ceaseless competition that exists in all jungles—including that of urban societies (18).

THE BIBLE TEACHING ON OCCULTISM

Turning now to the Bible, we can easily determine what low regard it always had for all forms of the occult. Moses delivers a very serious

charge to God's people as they stand poised on the east of Jordan ready to enter the land of Promise.

When thou art come into the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you *any one* that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, *or* that useth divination, *or* an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, Or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things *are* an abomination unto the LORD: and because of these abominations the LORD thy God doth drive them out from before thee (Deu. 18:9-12).

The following definitions are from the International Bible Encyclopedia on Spiritism:

- Familiar Spirit One possessed of a python or soothsaying demon. 1 Samuel 28; Acts 16:16-18.
- Divination The act of obtaining secret knowledge, especially that which relates to the future by means almost exclusively within the reach of special classes of men.
- Familiar Spirits Spirits which were supposed to come at the call of one who had power over them. "Familiar" because it was a servant belonging to the family who might be summoned to do the commands of the owner.
- Necromancy Consultation with the dead.
- Sorcerer One who mutters incantations or speaks in ventriloquial whispers, as if under the influence of the spirits of the dead.
- Witch "One who knows"—a woman that has a familiar spirit.
- Wizard "A knowing one"—a man who interprets the ravings of a medium.

Ezekiel describes the efforts of the king of Babylon to find out the future, "he made *his* arrows bright, he consulted with images, he looked in the liver" (Eze. 21:21).

Isaiah, in prophesying the downfall of Babylon, declared: "Thou art wearied in the multitude of thy counsels. Let now the astrologers, the stargazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up, and save thee from *these things* that shall come upon thee" (Isa. 47:13).

These passages clearly point out that the current rage over occultism has not one new thing to offer the fadist. The nations surrounding Israel

used every imaginable device to predict future events. They read the stars, they consulted the heathen oracles, they interpreted dreams, they read the quivering liver of a freshly killed animal, they sought to charm and cast spells on others to get their way. None of these methods brought them any closer to God nor raised their standards of moral conduct. The history of occultism to this day has been a sordid and dismal story of deception and manipulation for base and selfish gain. It is little wonder that the converts to Christianity at Ephesus put their magical books to the flames to the tune of 50,000 pieces of silver. They could easily see the difference between the miracles worked by Paul, the correct prophecies he delivered, and the false signs and cures they had been subjected to through the years (Acts 19:19).

Moses let the people of Israel know from whence their guidance would come: “The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken” (Deu. 18:15).

God not only approved of Moses’ promise but also added these words:

I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, *that* whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require *it* of him (Deu. 18:18-19).

We learn, first, that God’s knowledge would be made known through faithful Jewish men who would be known as prophets, or those speaking for God. Second, the authority of God would rest upon these men and disobedience to that authority would be judged by God Himself. Third, the ultimate application of this prophecy is found in Jesus Christ as pointed out by Peter in Acts 3:22-23.

Paul confirms this matter by declaring, “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son” (Heb. 1:1-2).

This authority given to Jesus Christ was to be expressed through the church. Hear it:

Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; And to make all *men* see what *is* the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: To the intent that now unto the

principalities and powers in heavenly *places* might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord (Eph. 3:8-11).

The church, then, is the pillar and ground of the truth because it has the truth. The church did not decide what was true—the church was given the truth. This truth was preserved in the New Testament Scriptures. They represent the fullness of the authority of Jesus Christ in the affairs of men. Jesus Himself said, “the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day” (John 12:48).

These Scriptures teach that through the death of Jesus Christ, the power of Satan was broken (Heb. 2:14) and that his final overthrow is sure and certain (Rev. 20:10). He is indeed the god of this world (2 Cor. 4:4) but John assures us that the world is passing away along with its allurements (1 John 2:17).

Occultism, in all of its devious forms, is a denial of God’s power in the universe, a rejection of the Bible as revelation and a denial of the Christian system as a means of salvation. It is a reliance upon ancient heathen practices and superstitions which past ages found to be defective. It is a repudiation of the factual knowledge which modern science has given us. It is a rejection of moral living as pointed out by a self-confessed witch, Sybil Leek, “People are searching for a religion where they don’t have to live a god-like life” (Hodge 45).

Occultism is a present danger to the Christian community. Labeled a “counter religion” by *Time Magazine*, its adherents in the United States are estimated to number 10 million (Hodge 41). Inasmuch as all restrictive laws against witchcraft have been stricken down, the occultist is free to practice his heinous ways very much as he pleases.

The responsibility rests upon every child of God to put the kingdom of God first in his own life and then lend his sacrificial efforts to a continual struggle against every false way.

WORKS CITED

- Hodge, Charles B., Jr. *A Biblical Study of Satan*. Dallas, TX: Gospel Teachers Publications. 1973.
- LaVey, Anton. *The Satanic Bible*. New York, NY: Avon Books. 1969.
- Martello, Leo L. *Black Magic, Satanism, Voodoo*. New York, NY: H. C. Publishers, Inc. 1972.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- Dehaan, Richard. *Satan, Satanism, and Witchcraft*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing.
- Fallis, Gary A. *Astrology—Can We Trust It?* Star Bible Publications, Inc.

Willcutt, James. *Witchcraft*. Ft. Worth, TX: Star Bible Publications, Inc. 1972.

The American Standard Bible. LaHabra, CA: Lockman Foundation. 1971.

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. 4. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

KNOWLEDGE

Paul Clayton

Hosea 4:6

INTRODUCTION

1. Where ignorance reigns, there superstition, in all its debasting corrupting, and revolting forms, abound.
2. A little-knowledge is a dangerous thing, this is clearly seen in medicine, swimming, driving and also in regard to our Bible knowledge. This illustrates, I think, the importance of increasing our knowledge.

DISCUSSION

I. What Is Knowledge?

- A. Primarily a seeking to know, an inquiry, investigation, denotes, in the New Testament, knowledge, especially of spiritual truths.

II. How Is this Knowledge Obtained? (Pro. 1:7)

- A. We learn from Jesus (Col.2:3;2 Cor. 4:6).
 1. He taught lessons designed to rid man's heart of corruption and replace it with pure thoughts.
 2. He taught with authority (Mat. 7:29).
 3. He taught by example. "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart.
- B. We gain this knowledge by studying the scriptures (2 Tim. 2:15; 1 Pet. 3:15; Acts 17:11). It is in the scriptures that we find the truth which we need (John 8:32; 17:17).

III. Knowledge Necessary in Becoming a Child of God.

- A. This is one of the difference between the law of Moses and the New Testament (Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:6-13).
- B. Jesus made knowledge of Him a prerequisite of the forgiveness of sins and entrance into the church (John 6:44-45).

- C. It is for this reason that He commanded the gospel be preached (Mat. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-16; Luke 24:47; Rom. 10:13-17; 1 Cor. 1:21; 9:16).

IV. **Christians must Grow in Knowledge.**

- A. A command (2 Pet. 1:5; 3:18; 2 Pet. 2:1-2).
- B. We are to present the knowledge of God and Christ through our lives and our teaching wherever we go (2 Cor. 2:14; 2 Cor. 10:5).
- C. Ignorance is no excuse.
 - 1. Ignorance is synonymous with sin and rejection. Gentile alienated in ignorance (Eph. 4:17-18).
 - 2. Ignorance once overlooked, but not now (Acts 17:30-31).
- D. Sins of ignorance.
 - 1. 1 Timothy 1:13; Acts 3:17.

V. **Results of Knowledge.**

- A. Be made free from sin (John 3:32).
- B. Escape pollution of the world (2 Pet. 2:20).
- C. Remain steadfast (2 Pet. 1:3-11; 3:17-18).
- D. Count less important things as loss (Phi. 3:7-8).
- E. Life eternal to know God and His Son (John 17:3).

VI. **Results of a Lack of Knowledge.**

- A. God's people of old destroyed (Hos. 4:6).
- B. Cause people to be lost today (Rom. 10:1-3).
- C. Christians without knowledge often [*line was unreadable in original*] but having a lingering love for it, so they do not attain to that keen perception of good and evil (Heb. 5:12-14).
- D. It is for a lack of knowledge that many church members fail in their responsibilities.

FELLOWSHIP

Douglas E. Cook

INTRODUCTION

I have been asked to speak on a subject that has shown itself to be one of the most popular in the brotherhood today. I am not sure as to how much good that I can do in my presentation on the subject; however I will do my very best in not doing injustice to the subject as presented from God's Word. This matter has been given attention in every way possible—written in almost every paper throughout the brotherhood, there has been information pertaining to the subject; discussion has been given on the platforms of lecture programs; debate has been engaged in on this matter. We will, because of time, limit our discussion to only certain areas of the subject.

BODY

Fellowship is very simply defined within the ranks of the “common” brother. When those who think of themselves more of a scholar make an attempt to define the word; much confusion seems to develop. We need to designate those who we have heard as being scholarly. The scholar usually thinks of “himself” as being better learned than his counterpart. It seems to follow in our day that the one who speaks of himself as a scholar has trouble convincing “sound” brethren of his scholarship.

When one writes to state his views of the matter of fellowship and comes up with a statement like: “I may not endorse premillennial theories, but I can fellowship a premillennialist. I may not endorse instruments of music in worship but I can fellowship the brother who use them”; then, we can but conceive that this individual has fooled no one regarding his being a scholar but himself.

Herein lies much of the problem of fellowship which faces the church today. It is simply the idea that fellowship is a noun and never a verb. Any good dictionary defines the word fellowship in both noun and verb form without change of spelling or arrangement of letters.

Not only does the dictionary so define fellowship, but God's Word does likewise. In its verb form (*koinoneo*) it appears in these Scriptures:

"Distributing [*koinoountes*] to the necessity of the saints" (Rom. 12:13), "For if the Gentiles have been made partakers [*ekoinonesan*] of their spiritual things" (Rom. 15:27), "Let him... communicate [*Koinoneito*] unto him that teacheth" (Gal. 6:6), "And have no fellowship [*sunkoinoneite*—compound verb] with the unfruitful works of darkness" (Eph. 5:11), "ye did communicate [*sunkoinonesantes*] with my affliction" (Phi. 4:14), "be partakers [*kekoinoneken*] of flesh and blood" (Heb. 2:14), "ye are partakers [*koinonete*] of Christ's sufferings" (1 Pet. 4:13), "he is partaker [*koinonei*] of his evil deeds" (2 John 11), "be not partakers [*sunkoi-nonesete*] of her sins" (Rev. 18:4).

It is abundantly clear that "fellowship" occurs as a verb in the New Testament.

Brother Alan E. Highers stated in *The Spiritual Sword*, Volume 1, Number 1, that:

Fellowship must exist vertically before it can exist horizontally; that is, it must extend upwardly to God before it can extend outwardly to men. The true basis of fellowship one with another is fellowship with God.

Fellowship with God is based upon our keeping the words of Jesus.

"If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (John 14:23), "And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him" (1 John 3:24). (1) **Hear**—"they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me" (John 6:43). (2) **Believe**—"if ye believe not that I am *he*, ye shall die in your sins" (John 8:24). (3) **Repent**—"except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13:3, 5). (4) **Confess**—"Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven" (Mat. 10:32-33). (5) **Baptized** (Mark 16:16; Mat. 28:19-20).

Fellowship with God relates to our walking in the light (1 John 2:6; 1 John 1:6,7) Fellowship with God is contingent upon our abiding in the doctrine of Christ (2 John 9).

Since we can have fellowship with no one until fellowship has been established with God, can we fellowship the various "isms" of the world. Let us consider Buddhism, Moharnmedanishm Taoism, Bahahism, etc. Their error is apparent. They walk in darkness (1 John 1:6-7) and not in the light; Thus they have no fellowship with God. If there is no fellowship with God, then there can be no fellowship with God's

people. Vincent defines fellowship: “A relationship between individuals which involves a common interest and mutual, active participation in that interest and each other.”

Among the world’s religions there is Catholicism. Can Christians partake of spiritual/religious things with this religion? We are aware we are not of the Catholics multiplied departures from the Lord’s way. God has severed relationship with those who take or add things to His Word. (Rev. 22:13, 19).

In the light of these thoughts we must weigh denominationalism. We continue to see in them many departures from the apostolic teachings. Based upon the same reasons we deny fellowship with other of the world’s religions, we deny fellowship with denominationalism. One of the major problem areas in the denominational world is the fellowship being proposed between the independent, “conservative,” Christian churches and the churches of Christ. This advocacy is based upon the fallacy that fellowship is a “noun” and never a “verb” in form. Those advocating such fellowship do so on the premise that those of the Christian church who have obeyed the Gospel (???) Totally forgetting the principle of abiding in the doctrine of Christ (2 John 9). Since they use the instrument(s) in the worship, they have given up doctrine and in the same hour fellowship with God. Thus no fellowship can be had with the faithful of God’s people.

Notice how Paul shows us that we are to have no fellowship with the “isms” of the world since they are in darkness (1 Cor. 6:14-17).

1. Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers.
2. What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness.
3. What communion hath light with darkness?
4. What concord hath Christ with Belial?
5. What part hath he that believeth with an infidel?
6. What agreement hath the temple of God with idols?
7. Wherefore come out from among them.
8. Be ye separate.
9. Touch not the unclean thing.

Let it be understood that we are not speaking of the common meal. For we can eat with them (1 Cor. 5).

Having established fellowship vertically—with God—and horizontal—with one another in Christ, we answer the question as to whether it is always scriptural to maintain the horizontal fellowship.

We have seen that we cannot fellowship error “out” of Christ. Eastern religions are out of Christ! Catholicism is not of Christ! denominationalism is embedded in error thus they are out of Christ!

We must come to understand that it is just as wrong to be in error having been right as it is to be wrong having never been right (2 Pet. 2:19-22). We can have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, whether it be with those out of Christ or apostate brethren. The place or persons or number of persons does not change the law of Ephesians 5:6-11.

Churches are subject to sin just as the individual is. The Corinthian church sinner (1 Cor. 5:2). The church at Ephesus was to repent of sin (Rev. 2:1-7). The Laodician church was asked to repent (Rev. 3:14-22). We repent of sins!

God has no fellowship with unrepented churches (Rev. 2 and 3), we cannot, if this vertical fellowship is broken by the unrepenting have fellowship horizontally.

We recognize some of the objections usually proposed in this area; however, we are persuaded that they can with the Scriptures be answered.

1. There is no authority for one church to discipline another (Rom. 16:17-18).
2. If one church were to withdraw fellowship from another church, innocent individuals would be involved (2 John 9-11; 7:16).
3. You violate local autonomy in withdrawing from another church (2 Cor. 13:1-2; 2 The. 3:6).
4. Such fellowship cannot be withdrawn by one church from another for the simple reason that it does not exist (Rom. 16:16; 1 Cor. 16:19; Rom. 16:5; 2 Cor. 8, 9).
5. I have never heard of a church withdrawing from a church. (Rev. 2 and 3).
6. The only authorized church action for correcting those in error is simply to teach them the truth (Mat. 10:14).

Horizontal fellowship has been practiced in congregations when on the part of individuals vertical fellowship is broken. Disciple-ship is a command on the part of God’s people toward the erring brethren. Paul’s instruction is to judge those that are within (1 Cor. 5:12). Discipline toward our self is taught in Matthew 18:15-17.

Other passages on discipline must be kept within congregations if they maintain a fellowship with God. Such passages as Romans 16:17; 2 Thessalonians 3:6; 3:14-15; 1 Corinthians 5:4,5; and 1 Timothy 5:20 are implicitly commanded to the churches.

Who can deny, in the face of these phrases—"In the name of the Lord Jesus"; "Now we command you"; "Withdraw yourselves"—that discipline is authorized by man rather than by God!

Failure to fulfill these commands constitute a violation of the Word, and this action itself is subject to corrective discipline. Let me express myself in closing with the words of Thomas B. Warren:

It seems that presently there is a trend toward extending "the right hand of Christian fellowship to almost every one in sight, with little regard to the beliefs and/or practices of those to whom such extension should be made." May God help us to reverse this trend and remain faithful to the plain teaching of the Bible on the question of fellowship.

Brethren, have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.

Thank you for inviting me and giving your good attention to the thoughts which I have spoken of.

ELDERS

George E. Darling Sr.

INTRODUCTION

In the interest of the cause of Christ and for the peace and happiness of each local church—every member should learn and respect God’s law relating to the organization of the local church.

As the human body is composed of many members and all have not the same office, so the church, the body of Christ, is composed of many members and all have not the same office.

1 Corinthians 12:12-27

Ephesians 4:11-12

In our text the Holy Spirit has named the “efficiary” of the church, and in other passages to which we shall call to your attention he has specified their particular function.

I. **The Purpose of the Church “Officiary.”**

A. **Apostles**

Acts 1:22; 22:15 teach us that one of the qualifications of an apostle was that he must have seen the Lord after the resurrection, in order that he might be a witness of the same.

This first qualification does away with the possibility of apostles today.

B. **Prophets**

Since all New Testament prophets became such by imposition of apostles hands, we have no more.

C. **Evangelists**

This office is designated in the New Testament by three titles.

1. **Evangelists**—used three times in New Testament and means bearer of good news (Acts 21:8; Eph. 4:11; 2 Tim. 4:5).
2. **Preacher**—used four times in the New Testament and means a proclaimer; one who heralds (Rom. 10:14; 1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11; 2 Pet. 2:5).

3. **Minister**—used many times in New Testament and means servant; or one who serves. Neither title carries any suggestion of authority. Never capitalized.
4. **Pastors**—used only once, (Eph. 4:11), “*Poimen*” Shepherd. This office is designated in the New Testament by seven different titles. Each designating some particular phase of his office, work, or duty.
 - a. **Bishop**—means overseer (1 Tim. 3:1). We have more “over lookers” in the eldership than we have overseers.
 - b. **Overseer**—means a man charged with the duty of seeing that things done by others are done right.
 - c. **Presbyter**—means Elder—older.
 - d. **Elder**—a term denoting rank by reason of age and experience. Brethren, I know not your convictions, but I am convinced that we are treading on mighty dangerous ground when we appoint some 30-40-year old man to the high and holy office of elder. He might know the Scriptures. He might meet the physical qualifications but believe me he is going to get a lot of experience after he has reached 40. The Christian church and perhaps others have what they call “**Junior Elders.**” Teenage boys and girls (maybe these Jr. elders have Jr. elders wives) This will catch on in the brotherhood before long. We already have our “**Junior Church**”
 - e. **Pastor**—means shepherd.
 - f. **Shepherd**—one who has watch, care or control over others. The term Shepherd best defines elder as far as I am concerned. When a man tends the church as a shepherd tends the flock, brother you’ve got an elder. We have a lot of men in the eldership who need a course in “**shepherding.**”
 - g. **Ruler**—one who leads, directs (Heb. 13:7). Many elders cannot lead because they don’t know how to lead. John says “We have elders who couldn’t lead a hog to slop” (that’s John O’Dowd—not John the apostle). The average congregation is crying for leadership. God ordained that the elders take the

lead. I hear many complaints from elders. “The congregation won’t cooperate”—**teach them**. The trouble is in many cases they can’t cooperate. They know enough to see that the weakness is not theirs, “Others are better qualified than I am,”—**use them**, but not as an excuse to justify unwillingness on the part of the elders, “Preacher looks after that work.” Yes, and he ought to be ashamed. He cannot do the work of others. He doesn’t have to give an account for your work, but you do (Heb. 13:17). Elders have a serious responsibility and if they are not willing to accept it they ought to resign!

Elders need to plan the work in such a way as to involve as many as possible. If the New Testament teaches anything it teaches that the Lord’s work should be carried on in a systematic way. The early church planned their work. I can show you congregations who have not even planned for the Lord’s Day service next Sunday. Ask them if the church will meet for worship. “I suppose so” is the answer you’ll receive. Everything is just taken for granted—no definite plans are made. But it takes more than planning, the plan must be worked!

QUALIFICATIONS AND DUTIES

The New Testament sets forth 21 qualifications and 7 specific duties of elders. Of the qualifications, there are 7 negative and 14 positive. Absolute & Relative.

Of the duties, there are 4 which apply to the elder himself and 3 have to do with his duties to the flock.

All these qualifications and duties are set forth in three Scriptures:

1 Timothy 3:1-7 Titus 1:5-9 1 Peter 5:1-4

First let us notice **The Negative**;

1. Not given to wine (Beer, Whiskey, etc.),
2. not a striker,
3. not covetous,
4. not a brawler,
5. not a novice,
6. not self willed,

7. not soon angry.

The Positive;

1. Husband of one wife,
2. Vigilant,
3. Sober,
4. Of good behavior,
5. Given to hospitality,
6. Patient,
7. A lover of good,
8. Just,
9. Holy,
10. Blameless,
11. Temperate,
12. Apt to teach, and
13. Of good report from without,
14. Rule well his own house.

FOUR DUTIES OF ELDERS TO SELF

“Take heed therefore unto yourselves” (Acts 20:28). Doing comes before teaching. An elder must first practice then teach.

“Ruleth well his own house” (1 Tim. 3:4). If a man knows not how to rule his own house, how can he rule the house of God? Having his children in subjection. Ruling his house would include ruling his wife. How many congregations have been in a state of turmoil simply because some elder’s wife had a tongue long enough to sit in the front room and lick the skillet in the kitchen. I’ve known of elders meetings to be held in the home with all the elders wives present and having a part.

“Holding fast the faithful word” (Tit. 1:9). An elder who is untaught and does not know the Word, or who is willing to play fast and loose with the Scriptures, is not eligible to the office of elder.

“Being ensamples to the flock” (1 Pet. 5:3). An elder must be an example unto the flock in conduct, love, forgiveness, devotion, loyalty, prayer, giving, and in sacrifice. An elder must be a living example. Many young Christians have been discouraged by elders who smoke, slip around and buy beer, curse, tell dirty jokes or laugh when dirty jokes are told. Brother I want my children to look to the elders for examples of what it really means to be a Christian, don’t you?

THREE DUTIES OF ELDER'S TO FLOCK

1. **“Take heed to the flock.”**
 - a. As a good shepherd, protect the flock from ravages of sin and false teachings. Protect them from wolves and false teachers, and believe me there are plenty of false teachers,
 - b. Make them to lie down in green pastures, lead them beside the still waters, restore the soul. Guide them into paths of righteousness.
2. **“Feed the flock.”**
 - a. Feed the flock and cause them to be fed upon the bread of life.
3. **“Rule well.”**
 - a. Do not lord” it over the flock, by being an example. Not of constraint, but willingly. Not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind.

Having said all of this, let me say that I am for the elders. Don't you bring an accusation against an elder to me unless you are willing to face the man. I'll stand behind them as long as I feel they are doing their best to carry out the Lord's work. An elder has the most thankless job in the church. Very few of us ever go to them and tell them our appreciation for the work they do. I've never known an elder who would not do a better job if he had just a little encouragement from the congregation he serves. And Yes, I know men who **are qualified elders** and my hat is off to them.

Let me close with the poem—

THE ELDER!

An elder of the church was he;
 The church of Jesus' plan,
 Example in all charity,
 And yet, withal a man.
 He knew his task, full well indeed,
 To safeguard all the sheep,
 And, yet, how careful with the lambs,
 To train as well as keep.
 Though stern at times and standing fast
 For all the Bible way,
 He knew full well, as elders should;
 That lambs some times must play,
 And so in kindly, helpful mood
 He entered like a man
 Into whatever things were good

As, surely, elders can.
A father was he to them all,
A father true indeed,
And when he counseled them betimes
They gladly gave his heed.
By love and kindness did he rule,
And not by stern decree,
He led where he would have them go,
Example first was he.
He knew the scriptures, apt was he
To teach the word and way,
And just because they loved the man,
They loved to hear him pray.
So, when he stood to lead in prayer,
Or read the living word,
Respectfully they gave him heed
As one who loved the Lord.
Of good report was he among
The people, one and all,
Doors opened gladly to his knock
Where'er he chose to call.
The sick, the wayward, heard him read
Full often from the word,
And many turned he to the way
Of Jesus Christ the Lord.
And though sometimes the elder grieved
For sheep that went astray.
In kindly patience still he plead
For their return some day.
And though he walked all patiently
On toward the setting sun,
He smiles, for surely he shall hear,
"Well done thou faithful one."

SOUND DOCTRINE

George E. Darling Sr.

May I express my appreciation to brother Cline and to the elders and to all who had a part in arranging for this lectureship, for inviting me to have the honor of the first speech on the program, Too, I am glad to see those in the audience that I have worked with and have known and loved in times past. I am proud of the tremendous progress that has been made by the Bellview School of Preaching. Time alone will tell of the good it shall do for the cause of Christ. These men who have dedicated themselves to the preaching of the gospel are to be commended.

Several years ago I heard Brother C. R. Nichols tell the following story: “When a lad I heard a church member tell an illiterate man, with a large family, who wanted to preach, to ‘continue farming,’ your speech will bring adverse criticism and hurt the church.” The man replied: “I must preach the gospel. Even though they make fun of me, I will preach the gospel. If they put me in jail I will preach the gospel through the key hole. If they put me in a barrel I will preach the gospel through the bung hole.” That brethren, is the kind of determination that these men have and that kind of commitment will get the job done as they prove their valor by contending for the faith, but now the purpose of my coming is to speak on “Sound Doctrine.”

Let me say in the beginning that Sound Doctrine is the only doctrine that should be preached. I cannot conceive of anyone preaching anything, save the doctrine of Jesus Christ and His apostles. There are many wonderful definitions of the word “sound.” That it means wholesome, healthful doctrine. Today we can appreciate even more than ever the necessity of keeping the church pure, always in the defense of sound doctrine. God has always had a message for His messengers; and now as always, that message must be kept pure and delivered, **as it is**, without alteration, modification or apology,

But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine (Tit. 2:1).

Every word of God *is* pure: he *is* a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar (Pro. 30:5-6).

If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained. But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself *rather* unto godliness (1 Tim. 4:6-7).

Note, right along with the commands to teach sound doctrine, the good doctrine, there are warnings against the fables that corrupt sound doctrine. There is no substitution for preaching the truth. We have more job holding preachers in pulpits today than we have ever had before. To withhold God's Word is to sin against Jehovah, defraud the people and show oneself a cringing coward and a time server, "I charge *thee* therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word" (2 Tim. 4:1-2).

I visited a congregation a short time ago and talked with one of the members about some things that I had heard of that the congregation was doing that I questioned. He answered: "Maybe some of the things we are doing are not in accord with the scriptures but I'll tell you one thing, this congregation is doing more now than it has ever done before. Our contributions have tripled. We have doubled our attendance. We are "Marching for the Master and are doing GREAT THINGS!"—we used to use the slogan "Great things for God" now it is just "Great Things." The preacher welcomed the visitors, and insisted they sign the Guest Register in the foyer ("foy-ya"), bragged on the members and thanked them for their presence! Named all of the sick in the community, giving the details of their illness, room number in the hospital, and addresses where they could send cards, gospel meetings in the area, etc. He spent about 22 minutes for announcements and 18 minutes for preaching the Word of God—and then apologized for going overtime on the sermon. There is a definite trend to substitute a ceremony for preaching the Word. We must attract large crowds, enroll great numbers and spend millions. Maybe the church is on the march, but too many who are marching with us have no conviction and would not know Sound Doctrine if they heard it and certainly would not tolerate it. "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine" (2 Tim. 4:3).

NOW TO OUR LESSON

Brethren, of this I am sure, God intended for us to teach a doctrine and he intended that doctrine be sound. It was sound when he gave it and it is our responsibility to keep it that way. Only sound doctrine will save souls. There has always been a tendency to drift away from sound doctrine to a corrupt system. This can be seen in Paul's warnings to the church at Thessalonica, the Ephesian elders and to Timothy (2 The. 2:3-7; Acts 20:23; 2 Tim. 4:1-4).

This so called unity movement that is being ramrodded by Ketcherside—Garrett and that crew of God denying perverters of the gospel is simply the old doctrine of “it doesn't make any difference what doctrine we follow, sincerity is the criterion.” Surely sincerity is a virtue, but it is not a test of sound doctrine. Paul's letter to the churches of Galatia shows the danger of turning from sound doctrine to a perverted doctrine. It happened so quickly that Paul was “amazed.” Members of the Lord's church today need to recognize that we are no more immune to false teachers than the Galatians were. To me this is what needs to be emphasized today. It is obvious that people today, both in the church and out of the church do not appreciate sound doctrine, and a failure to appreciate will cause us to fall away and be damned (2 The. 2:11-12). I do not expect a denominational preacher to appreciate sound doctrine however one would think that every member of “the pillar and ground of the truth” would uphold it, but you know as well as I, many do not. They will compromise and apologize for the preaching of the truth; fail to live it and will persecute the man who has the courage to preach it. Popularity, social prestige, the love of money and friendship with the world has pulled many a church member into hell.

When a man can write several pages in defense of something he is doing or has done without quoting a single verse of Scripture and correctly applying it, that man has little appreciation for sound doctrine. When brethren refuse to discuss issues and problems that trouble the church also shows a lack of appreciation of sound doctrine. Brethren in the past who loved the truth were willing and ready to discuss their problems. Today not only are they unwilling to discuss but when they speak they refuse to be recorded.

Another indication of the lack of appreciation for sound doctrine in the church is the fact that some are not willing to defend the truth nor

allow it done. Elders will not grant the use of church buildings nor lend their endorsement for a debate.

Let me quote a statement from the pen of J. D. Bales in his book *Christian, Contend for Thy Cause*, page 18:

Those who oppose the right kind of religious debating are either weak in the faith; afraid of their own position; afraid of the consequences of standing for the truth; or they are uninformed on the particular question under discussion.

This I believe is in harmony with sound doctrine.

Today we hear from every quarter, “don’t oppose the other man’s religion.” They criticize for criticizing and condemn for condemning. They say that we should never say what is right or wrong in religion lest we be guilty of judging and try to hide behind Matthew 7:1, then turn right around and have the unmitigated gall to criticize “negative preaching.”

It is a fact that our greatest dangers in the church has been and I guess always will be from within. The false teachers of Galatians 2:4 were on the inside and were corrupting sound doctrine. It was an inside job. The most dangerous ones today are not the avowed enemies of sound doctrine but those who are unconscious of the fact. And in many cases it is not their fault. Strong Christians are not made on “Blue John” or the skimmed milk of the Word, but from the meat of the Word. Paul knew what was needed when he said, “Preach the Word!” Speak the things that become sound doctrine. We need men who are willing to put their necks out and their heads on the chopping block. Men who are converted to the truth and who will take a stand. Preaching about the high cost of gasoline; the visiting nurse program or the cost of peanuts in China is not, at least in my way of thinking, speaking the things that become sound doctrine. We need preachers who are known for their ability to “contend earnestly for the faith” and not for being among the 10 best dressed men in the city.

Thank God, we do have men today, among them a host of young men of stalwart character, with deep convictions who would suffer themselves to be beheaded before they would deny the Lord or compromise His Word at any point or condition. May God’s blessing attend them!

Our growth in the past has not been due to expensive church buildings, we haven’t had them until recently. It has not been because

we had the best educated preachers, for we have not had them. Our growth has been due to the power of the gospel,

Preach the Word Brother—

PREMILLENNIALISM

Hugh Fulford

THE TERM DEFINED

The term that serves as the subject of this lecture does not appear in the Bible. We must go outside the Bible to learn what it means. The word “millennium” comes from two Latin words: “mills” which means thousand and “annus” which means year—thus, the term “millennium” means “a thousand years.”

Revelation 20:1-9 refers three times to “a thousand years” and three times to “the thousand years” and the entire doctrine of Premillennialism is based on this passage. Take this one passage away from the millennialists and they have no basis for their doctrine.

Millennialism is divided into two main schools of thought: pre-millennialism and post-millennialism. The Pre-millennialists contend that Christ will come **before** (pre) the thousand years and at that time he will begin to occupy David’s throne and to reign over his kingdom and continue to reign for a thousand years. The Post-millennialists say the second coming of Christ will occur **after** (post) the thousand years of universal peace and tranquility which they imagine existing before the second coming of Christ. This lecture deals with the pre-millennial theory.

PREMILLENNIALISM: A PRESENT DAY THREAT

Some might question whether or not this theory should be of any present day concern to the Lord’s people. It most certainly should be. Every mainline evangelical denomination in America today has a strong strain of premillennialism running through it. America’s most prominent and influential preachers believe the theory and preach it to their nation-wide audiences via radio and television—Billy Graham, Oral Roberts, and particularly Herbert W. and Garner Ted Armstrong.

Further, the study of Old Testament prophecy (inseparably linked to the premillennial theory, though the prophecies are misunderstood and mis-applied) is the most popular aspect of Bible study in the denominational world today. Denominational bodies can draw large

crowds simply by announcing a conference or seminar on Bible prophecy

Perhaps the greatest impact for premillennialism has been made by the book, *The Late Great Planet Earth*, by Hal Lindsey. Lindsey is a graduate of the Dallas Theological Seminary, a thorough-going premillennial institution. He has written a book in the popular language of the day that has sold over five million copies—many of them to high school and college age young people! In this book he presents in dramatic and convincing language (to those uninformed in the Scriptures) the premillennial theory.

Today's bumper stickers reflect the belief in certain premillennial facets. One says, "In case of the Rapture—the driver of this car will disappear." This refers to the belief in a secret coming of the Lord (seen only by His saints) in which the saints will be caught up from the earth during a so-called seven year tribulation period immediately before the visible second coming of Christ.

But, are the churches of Christ affected by this theory? Most definitely! Anything that affects the religious world at large eventually comes to affect the church of the Lord. In Louisville, Kentucky there are a dozen or more churches of Christ that are premillennial in their beliefs. Louisville is where R. H. Boll lived and wielded such influence after leaving the *Gospel Advocate* for his erroneous views concerning prophecy. This is the same city where E. L. Jorgenson, a disciple of Boll's, was still living (though then an old man) when I moved to Louisville in 1958 to do my first local work. Premillennial churches of Christ can be found in Winchester, Kentucky and Hammond, Louisiana as well as in other places.

Furthermore, "our" members in loyal churches of Christ are being taught the theory and being influenced thereby, and, unfortunately, some of them are being converted to it. A few years ago, one of "our" preachers in Kentucky was won over to this persuasion. "Our" members are reading Lindsey's book and listening to the Armstrongs and reading their literature and are being led into an acceptance of this unscriptural belief. We **must** familiarize ourselves with its tenets and prepare ourselves to deal with it in a forthright fashion.

THE PREMILLENNIAL PROGRAM AND A REFUTATION THEREOF

There are a number of features to the premillennial program, a consideration of all of-which would be well beyond the time limit of this lecture. However, some of the leading features of the theory are as follows:

1. That God promised Abraham and his descendants the land of Canaan as an everlasting dwelling place and that promise has not yet been fulfilled and will have to be fulfilled by the Jews from all over the world migrating back to Palestine before the second coming of Christ. It is contended by premillennialists that the formation of the state of Israel in 1948 was the beginning of the complete fulfillment of this promise. However, Joshua 21:43-45 indicates that God fulfilled His promise to Abraham and his descendants in the days of Joshua following the conquest of the land of Canaan. The Jews continued occupancy of Canaan was conditioned upon their continued fidelity to God, which condition they failed to comply with (Jos. 23:16). Thus, they lost the land that God gave to them, but God is not obligated, to give it to them again since He has already fulfilled His promise to Abraham with reference to the land of Canaan.

2. That the Old Testament prophets spoke of a return of the Jews to Palestine. Indeed they did, but these prophecies were made either prior to or during the time the Jews were in Babylonian captivity and were fulfilled in the return of the Jews out of Babylon under the leadership of Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah which return began in about 536 B.C. Those prophecies speaking of a return of the Jews to Palestine were all fulfilled nearly 500 years before the **first** coming of Christ and have nothing to do with a supposed return of the Jews to Palestine prior to his **second** coming!

3. That according to the prophets Christ was to be given the throne of David and that these prophecies are yet to be fulfilled by Christ reigning on the literal throne of David from Jerusalem in the restored kingdom of the Jews. However, the Bible teaches that Christ is **now** reigning on the throne of David (which is a spiritual throne) and will continue to do so until he has put all enemies under his feet, the last of which is death itself which shall be destroyed at his second coming, (Acts 2:22-36; 1 Cor. 15:25-26).

4. That Christ came to establish the kingdom prophesied of in the Old Testament, but because the Jews rejected Him He postponed

the kingdom, set up the church as an emergency measure, and will actually establish the kingdom at His second coming. However, the Scriptures teach that the church **is** the kingdom (Mat. 16:18-19), that the kingdom was set up during the lifetime of some of those who were contemporaries of Christ (Mark 9:1), that Christ's kingdom is spiritual in nature, not earthly or civil (John 18:36), that the church itself was the subject of prophecy, not an after-thought with God (Isa. 2:2-3; 1 Tim. 3:15; Eph. 3:10-11), and that first century Christians were citizens of the kingdom (Col. 1:13; Heb. 12:28; Rev. 1:9).

5. That immediately before the visible second coming of Christ (and the beginning of the so-called millennium) there will be a seven year period of tribulation during which the living saints will be "raptured" away with Christ, that at the end of the tribulation Christ will come with the "raptured" saints, raise the righteous dead, and set up His earthly millennial kingdom during which time Satan will be bound and the earth will enjoy universal peace. Then, at the end of the millennium Christ will raise the wicked dead and the eternal state will begin. But, the Bible nowhere refers to a seven-year tribulation period, a secret second coming, a rapture (this word or the idea it teaches is not in the Bible), or two resurrections each separated by a thousand years. Instead, it teaches that when Christ comes He will be seen by all (Rev. 1:7), that He will raise all the dead (John 5:23, 29), and that He will **deliver up** the kingdom to God, the Father, not establish the kingdom (1 Cor. 15:24-26)!

WHAT ABOUT REVELATION 20?

But someone says, "Even if what you have said is true, you still have not explained the meaning of Revelation 20 which refers to Satan being bound for a thousand years and saints reigning with Christ for a thousand years."

Let me suggest that it is not necessary to understand what Revelation 20 means in order to know what it does **not** mean. Brother Alan Highers, in his lectures on Premillennialism at this year's (1975) Freed-Hardeman College lectures, relates an incident in the life of Brother G. C. Brewer that well illustrates this point. Brother Brewer was in a discussion with a premillennialist and was asked about the meaning of Revelation 20. Brother Brewer frankly admitted that he did not know what it meant. His opponent asked him, "Then how do you know it does not teach premillennialism?" Brother Brewer glanced across the

street and said to the man, “There goes your wife.” The man replied, “That is not my wife.” Brother Brewer asked, “Who is she?” The man said, “I do not know.” Brother Brewer then replied, “Then how do you know she is not your wife?” Similarly, by knowing what the Bible does teach with reference to the reign of Christ and His kingdom, we can know that Revelation 20 does not teach what premillennialists say it teaches. The Bible **does** not contradict itself. It does not teach in a multiplicity of plain passages that Christ is **now** reigning over his kingdom and in one highly figurative and symbolic passage that Christ’s reign and kingdom are yet in the future!

For instance, the following features (all essential to the premillennial theory) are **not** to be found in Revelation 20: (1) the second coming of Christ, (2) the establishment of a kingdom, (3) the Jews being regathered to Palestine, (4) a bodily resurrection, (5) the throne of David, (6) an earthly reign. It is significant that the **necessary elements** of the premillennial theory are **not** to be found in the **one** passage premillennialists dote on so heavily and without which they could not concoct their theory.

Brother Highers, in the lectures referred to earlier, puts Revelation 20 in its proper context and perspective when he observes,

The book of Revelation was written to persecuted churches, and it necessarily had meaning to the churches **to whom it was addressed**. We would do well to ask what the book meant to those who first received it. The book of Revelation was a message of hope and consolation in a time of trial and tribulation. No understanding of this book is complete unless it relates to the immediate needs of its first century recipients. In chapter 6:9-11 the souls of the martyrs were seen under the altar crying out for vindication against those who had shed their blood. In chapter 20 these martyrs are seen as **victorious**—living and reigning with Christ—and Satan is **defeated** and **bound** during that same period of a thousand years (a number which suggests completeness.)

The dispensational view of Revelation maintains that chapters 4-19 are future and that all these passages relate to that period of seven years or less at the end—times when great tribulation will be poured out upon the earth. What a small comfort (to say nothing of its incomprehensibility) this would have been to those persecution-weary saints to whom these messages were directed, and how they must have wondered (if this theory were true) how this declaration helped their tribulation-torn situation!

The theories of premillennialism and dispensationalism, with attendant doctrines of the rapture and tribulation, are without scriptural author-

ity, but rest upon speculative and arbitrary perversions of the truth of God. (Freed-Hardeman College Lectures, 1975, pp. 64-65).

“ISMS” IN THE CHURCH

Ray Hawk

When the late brother Marshall Keeble talked about premillennialism, he would say, “‘Pre’ means ‘before,’ ‘millennium’ means ‘1,000,’ and ‘ism’ means there ain’t no such thing!”

We would like to think that there aren’t any “isms” in the church of Christ, but woefully there are. Why shouldn’t there be? Paul said, “I have fought a good fight” (2 Tim. 4:7). Paul told Timothy, “war a good warfare” (1 Tim. 1:18). The Ephesians were told, “Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil” (Eph. 6:11). The church’s opponent is the devil (1 Pet. 5:8). Our weapon to fight the devil is God’s Word (Eph. 6:17; 2 Cor. 10:4). Our leader is Jesus Christ (Heb. 12:1-2; 1 Pet. 2:21). Our plan for defeating the devil is the New Testament covenant (2 Tim. 3:16-17). The battle we engage in is daily, and with God’s help, we will be victorious (1 Cor. 10:13; 2 Pet. 1:5-10). If Satan would not leave Jesus our Head alone (Luke 4:13), why should we expect him to leave us, who are the body of Christ, alone?

The church of God at Corinth (1 Cor. 1:2) had isms in it until Paul wrote to correct those isms. They were denominating (1 Cor. 1:12-13), puffed up, and refusing to administer discipline to a fornicator in their ranks (5:1-13); going to law with one another (6:6); being an offense in the matter of eating meats offered to idols (8:13); had women shamefully uncovering their heads (11:2-16); abused the Lord’s supper and ate and drank damnation to themselves (11:20-34); misused their miraculous gifts (chapters 12-14); and some espoused doctrinal error concerning the resurrection (15:12). The church in general was plagued with Judaizing teachers (Acts 15:1); and some by returning to the Old Testament law for justification, had fallen from grace (Gal. 5:4).

Whenever the church was beset with isms, Paul said,

Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock,...For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore

watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears (Acts 20:28-31).

Jude told the church to "contend" for the faith (Jude 3). John said "try" the spirits (teachers) (1 John 4:1). The church in the first century did not bury its head in the sand and pretend these isms were not present. They faced and defeated them with the Word! (cf., Rev. 2:2, 6).

Apostolic command shows evangelists have a responsibility to preach the Word, even to those who may not want to hear **the doctrine** preached (2 Tim. 4:2-4)! That same apostolic directive shows **elders** have the responsibility in each local congregation to **stop** the mouths of those who teach false doctrine (Tit. 1:5-16). We today can do no different when it comes to facing modern isms in the church!

MODERN ISMS

The two modern isms found in the church are antism and liberalism. Antism tries to make the church smaller than it is and liberalism tries to enlarge the body of Christ beyond biblical boundaries. Jesus denounced and condemned both isms when He told the apostles, "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Mat. 18:18). Antism binds what God has loosed and liberalism looses what God has bound!

The anti brother desires to sit in the place of God and tell his brethren what we must or must not do. He binds things such as one container for the Lord's supper, one Bible class with only one man teaching, no located preacher, no cooperation between congregations in matters of evangelism, and no eating in the church building.

The forerunner of modern antism were the Judaizing teachers. Whereas modern antism says, "If you have more than one container for the fruit of the vine, you cannot be saved," the Judaizing teachers said, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved" (Acts 15:1). The old and new antism is guilty of preaching another gospel (Gal. 1:6-9).

THE MANY FACETED LIBERALISM IN THE CHURCH

All liberals have one thing in common. They reject God's Word to some degree to arrive at their brand of liberalism.

NEO-PENTECOSTALISM

Pat Boone, Ben Franklin, Dean Dennis, and Dwyatt Gantt are just a few brethren who have been engulfed in this error. Pat Boone and Ben Franklin have probably done more “by good words and fair speeches” to “deceive the hearts of the simple” than any other false teacher withdrawn from by the church. Last May 20-23, 1974, brother Ben Franklin met Guy N. Woods in a public debate in Gadsden, Alabama. Although Franklin did his best, he like all Pentecostals, failed miserably to uphold his false doctrine. This was the third debate held in Gadsden, Alabama, to confront false teachers with the truth in less than fifteen months. The first debate was between Henry McCaghren, representing the Sansom Avenue Church of Christ and Tom Sharp of the United Pentecostal Church. The second debate was between me, representing the East Gadsden Church of Christ and Mr. E. J. Reynolds of the Church of God. It will probably be years before Pentecostals will want another debate in the Gadsden area.

This error can be and must be met by faithful brethren. Their “mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not.” I will deal more with this subject on Thursday.

KETCHERSIDE-GARRETTISM

Anyone who has been in the church twenty years or more knows something about Ketcherside and Garrett. These false brethren for years were the radicals in the church on the anti side. However, in the early 60s they began to swing from the radical antism they espoused to an equally radical position on fellowship. This dropped them off in the liberal camp.

In 1964 Leroy Garrett in his magazine, *Restoration Review*, Vol. 6, No. 1, p. 2 said,

The thesis that the Bible is the basis of unity is a questionable one, if for no other reason on the ground that Christians have never been able to agree on so much of what the Bible teaches...If it is the Bible that is the basis of unity and fellowship, then how is it that the primitive Christians enjoyed both unity and fellowship without having the Bible?...1 John 1:3 makes it clear that it is the person of Christ that is the ground of fellowship,...In view of language like this we have to conclude that fellowship was real and meaningful in the early church long before there existed what we call the Bible. While the Bible is the precious Word of God, and vital to our nurture as saints of God, and even to the enrichment of our fellowship, we go too far to suppose that

the Bible constitutes the basis for fellowship. It would be better to hold up the Bible and say: "The person of the Bible is the basis of unity."

Garrett holds to the old denominational concept of "The Man and not the plan" error. Ketcherside and Garrett know that if they can get brethren to throw out the Bible as the basis of fellowship and unity, we will have no objection to their form of union! Why do we withdraw fellowship from premillennial and instrumental brethren? Because they teach false doctrines concerning the kingdom and worship. Paul said, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them" (Rom. 16:17). However, if the Bible is not our basis for unity or fellowship, we could not withdraw from the premillennial or instrumental brother. Ketcherside and Garrett say our fellowship and unity is based upon the **person of Christ**, not doctrine. Since the premillennial and Christian Church brother have been immersed into the person of Christ (Gal. 3:27), they are brethren in fellowship with and united to Christ. If we want fellowship and unity with Christ, we must accept and fellowship all who are **in** Christ regardless of doctrinal differences! This is their new unity doctrine!

It is true that our fellowship and unity is based upon Jesus Christ, a person. But, one does not learn of this Jesus except through Scripture. Philip "began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus" (Acts 3:35). It is in Scripture that we find doctrine (teaching) that we "may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. 3:17). It is by following the "doctrine of Christ" that we have "both the Father and the Son" (2 John 9). The Bible (Scripture) is our basis of unity. It is strange that Garrett will say "primitive Christians enjoyed both unity and fellowship without having the Bible" and before the ink can dry writes, "1 John 1:3 makes it clear that it is the person of Christ that is the ground of fellowship." How did they know Christ was the ground of fellowship if 1 John 1:3 wasn't written? Actually, the inspired Word was **in** the inspired man in the first century from A.D. 33 to A.D. 70. The inspired Word was put down in the inspired text (Scripture) between A.D. 54-70. However, what was written down was what was spoken. Although unity and fellowship is in Christ, one may not know what the mind of Christ (1 Cor. 2:16) is until he goes to inspiration to see what that unity and fellowship involves! In the first century, the primitive Christians went both to the inspired man as well as to the inspired book. Today, we go to the inspired book to see what is involved in unity and

fellowship, I am afraid that if Ketcherside and Garrett lived back in A.D. 59, they would have advised Paul to write,

Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and *that* there be no divisions among you; but *that* ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment (1 Cor. 1:10).

According to 1 John 2:3,4, one must abide by the doctrine (commandment of the Lord) to have unity and fellowship with Christ.

MISSION'S LIBERALISM

Mission magazine takes an even more radical liberal view by accusing the four gospel accounts of having contradictions. In fact, Warren Lewis, "Every Scripture Breathed Of God Is Profitable," *Mission*, January, 1972, Vol. 5, No. 7, pp. 3-9, tells us,

Each of the Gospel writers paints a picture of Jesus which cannot be forced to agree with the other three pictures. The clashes in their stories which we have already pointed to are just a few of the large number of other such clashes which a wideawake reader could find for himself in the Gospels. We finally must say that there is a "Matthew Jesus," a "Mark Jesus," a "Luke Jesus," and a "John Jesus." One is left in the dark as to who the "real Jesus" might be, what he did, and what his thoughts and feelings were. Yes, they all point to a Jesus; but, one wonders which Jesus to believe in.

Roy Bowen Ward, "Glosses" *Mission*, December, 1972, Vol. 6, No. 6, pp. 8-9, gave his editorial swan-song by saying,

The most fundamental assumption we employ in our reading of the Bible is the inherited, traditional assumption about the nature of the Bible itself. The Bible has been assumed to be infallible, inerrant and harmonistic ("without change or variation")—attributes which have in some traditions been applicable to God. In fact, the Bible has too often functioned as a god: the Christian has believed in the Bible instead of believing in God. That may be o.k., except that it tends to reduce the deity to words and to limit the deity to a past record of the past.

Much of the response to Warren Lewis' article, "Every Scripture Breathed Of God is Profitable" (January, 1972) was predictable and disappointing.

With these and several other words, Ward turned the mantle of editorship over to Victor Hunter, a liberal cut from the same cloth! Finally, in the June 1974 issue of *Mission*, Victor's little brother, R. Lanny Hunter denied the restoration movement completely.

CONCLUSION

Each one of these isms gives up a portion of the Bible to arrive at their error. They charge us with harshness for opposing them, while they harshly label us as legalists and Pharisees. They say we do not have any real love in our hearts for our brethren (meaning them) when it is they who have no real love for us or the commandments of our Lord. They ridicule the idea of giving book, chapter, and verse from the Bible for one's authority and then quote prolifically from modern liberal scholars as their authority. They tell us the Bible is not a pattern for the church today, but when it suits their purposes will use it as a pattern to prove their false assertions. They accuse us of witch hunting, axe-grinding, and an inquisition spirit. Yet, they practice deception, dishonesty, and wreck churches with their underhanded and unashamed of tactics.

The brethren in the church who have swallowed legalism or liberalism, regardless of the form, are those

Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away. For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth (2 Tim. 3:5-7).

PENTECOSTALISM

Ray Hawk

J. D. Tant often included within his reports to the *Gospel Advocate*, “Brethren, we are drifting.” I obeyed the gospel in May, 1957. If anyone would have told me then that the Pentecostal movement would make inroads into the churches of Christ, I would have laughed in their face. I am not laughing now!

WHY ARE NEO-PENTECOSTALS FOUND IN OUR RANKS?

I believe there are three basic reasons why some preaching brethren have fallen into the Pentecostal camp. I believe these same reasons apply to elderships and congregations that take a soft-attitude toward Pentecostalism. (1) We have not practiced discipline in the churches of Christ for so long, that too many churches have skeletons in their closets and are afraid to rock the boat, even to withdraw from false teachers! (2) We have been trying for the past ten to fifteen years to “make friends and influence people” rather than “preach the word” (2 Tim. 4:2), and have therefore been feasting and feeding a watered down gospel. (3) Basically, our whole problem is wrapped up in not continuing to be a people of the book and give book, chapter, and verse for what we believe and practice. With too many, it has been “do your own thing,” rather than “If any man speak, *let him speak* as the oracles of God” (1 Pet. 4:11).

WHAT ARE WE AFRAID OF?

More and more we hear of brethren asking, “How do you explain their tongues,” and “If the miraculous age has ceased, how can people be healed”? I find brethren who are afraid to take a stand against Pentecostalism without and within because “we might find ourselves blaspheming the Holy Ghost”! **Ridiculous!**

How many of you have witnessed any Pentecostal doing what Jesus did in Matthew 12? He made a man’s withered hand whole, verse 13. He healed **all** in a multitude that followed him, verse 15. He cast out a devil who had possessed a man and made that man blind and dumb,

healing the man so that he both saw and spoke, verse 22. Then, the Pharisees had the gall to say Jesus did these things by the power of the devil! When I see any Pentecostal doing these things, I will not attribute it to the devil. I'll praise the Lord! But, I have yet to see one Pentecostal do anything that even comes near to a New Testament miracle! I can't even attribute their miraculous works to the devil because I have never witnessed any miraculous works. All I have ever witnessed have been claims, testimonies, and so-called healings that anyone could induce a Pentecostal crowd to claim if he wanted to hoodwink such people and perpetuate falsehood upon them.

I have asked Pentecostals for a sign. Instead of receiving one, they directed my attention to Matthew 12:39 and only quoted part of that verse to me, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it." But, that is not where Jesus stopped! To stop there is to do so out of ignorance or deception! Jesus went on to say, "but the sign of the prophet Jonas: For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Now, if my Pentecostal friends are going to use that passage on me, use it all! If they are going to use it at all, then I suggest they supply me with the same sign Jesus supplied the Pharisees with! Do you think they will? Don't fool yourself.

I have asked Pentecostals for years to strike me blind as Paul did with Elymas in Acts 13:6-12. Do you think one Pentecostal has ever tried to strike me blind in all those years? Don't kid yourself. They don't try because they know they would end in failure and make themselves look ridiculous. How do they save face? They tell you that you aren't as bad as Elymas, or that the Spirit hasn't given them any indication that He wants you struck blind. If you can't do something, blame the Spirit—seems to be the philosophy of the average Pentecostal preacher. I know I am not as bad as Elymas, but if their doctrine is true and we oppose it, we are no better than Elymas. If Pentecostal claims were true, don't you think they would use their power on me as readily as Paul used his on Elymas? You can bet your bottom dollar they would!

I am not afraid of any miraculous powers the Pentecostals claim, because I know they do not have any. In the first century Judaizing teachers tried to bring Gentile churches into bondage to the Law of Moses through binding circumcision (Acts 15:1; Gal. 5:1-4). They tried

to make the Corinthian church believe they were not a bonified church of God, but Paul told them differently (1 Cor. 9:1-2). These Judaizing teachers came in word only, but with no miraculous power. Why? Because God would not confirm their false word with signs following as He did with those who actually taught His Word (Mark 16:20; Heb. 2:3-4). Paul reminded the Corinthians that “the kingdom of God *is* not in word, but in power” (1 Cor. 4:20). In fact, Paul told the Thessalonians, “For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power” (1 The. 1:5). If miraculous gifts indeed continue today, our Pentecostal friends would not enter debates with us in word only, but they would come **with power!** Since they come and go from these debates without any power, it indicates that they stand with the Judaizing teachers! Brethren, if these Pentecostals had power, don’t you believe they would use it to confirm their word in a public debate? You know they would. Mark 16:17, 20 says, “And these signs shall follow them that believe...And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with *them*, and confirming the word with signs following.” I’m still waiting for a Pentecostal that will do what brethren in the first century did rather than stand around claiming they can do it today because first century saints did it!

HAVE WE BEEN SHORT CHANGED TODAY BECAUSE MIRACLES HAVE CEASED?

My answer is No. If a man in the first century wanted to know God’s will, he went to an inspired man. Today, I don’t have to travel miles to find an inspired man, I simply turn to my copy of the New Testament and find what inspired men revealed, I haven’t been short changed, I have what they did not have until the close of the miraculous period. I have the complete or perfect for which they worked toward. They only had the parts, but I have the complete!

Some feel we have been short changed because we do not have the baptism of the Holy Ghost, We are told that the baptism of the Holy Ghost makes a person more spiritual. Why didn’t it make the church of God at Corinth more spiritual? Most Pentecostals teach that the church in Corinth possessed the baptism of the Holy Ghost. If that is so, why weren’t they spiritual? Paul said some were carnal (1 Cor. 3:1, 3). He said some were puffed up (5:2). He said some were drunken (11:21). He said some were ignorant concerning spiritual gifts (12:1; 14:38). If the baptism of the Holy Ghost makes one spiritual, why did those with

gifts fall away (Heb. 6:4), and commit despite to the Spirit of grace (Heb. 10:29)? Holy Ghost baptism nor miraculous gifts made one more spiritual; The Word, received through the power of the Spirit by His gifts, when obeyed and applied to the life of the receiver made him more spiritual!

There isn't one blessing nor one thing a Pentecostal has or can do that I don't have or can do! I have **every spiritual blessing in Christ** (Eph. 1:3). The Pentecostal does not because he is not **in** Christ, I can duplicate any so-called miracle any Pentecostal claims he can do. In fact, I can do more. Any Pentecostal who will go with me to a cemetery and allow me to be first in commanding the dead not to rise, after which he commands them to rise, will soon find out who has more power! I'll command a man with one arm to remain in that condition while the Pentecostal commands him to be whole. Guess who will suffer defeat? I'll command a loaf of bread to remain as one loaf while the Pentecostal tries to multiply it as Jesus did. If the Pentecostal had to depend upon his miracle to eat, guess who would not eat that day? I'll command the waters to swallow up the Pentecostal while he tries to use his claimed power to walk on water. Guess who will need a life jacket? I'll provide the snakes and poison and then stand a respectful distance away while the Pentecostal drinks the poison and handles the snakes. Guess who will not be feeling too well in about ten minutes or less? Brethren, let these folks who claim so much get busy and confirm their claims with signs following (Mark 16:20; Heb. 2:3-4).

WHAT IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN THIS MATTER?

We should "Try the spirits," 1 John 4:1 anywhere and everywhere until we have driven the Pentecostal back into his buildings and shut his mouth as all false teachers need to be treated (Tit. 1:9-12). We debated them into silence twenty-five and more years ago; we can do it again if...I-F...if we ourselves will get back to the Bible and quit trying to coddle, pamper, and excuse error in our ranks! If we are not going to face error and expose it, then withdraw from those who fail to repent, let us take down our signs and quit dragging the name of Jesus Christ through the slime of apathy, spinelessness, and sin! We have the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ. It is the sword of the Spirit (Eph. 6:17), and it is going to prick the hearts of all we preach it to. Let's not concern ourselves with those who scream, reject it, and try to stop us from

cutting their hearts further; let us concern ourselves with those who can be pricked with the gospel and converted!

THE JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES

Ray Hawk

BACKGROUND

The Witnesses were established by Charles T. Russell around 1879 when he founded *Zion's Watch Tower* which is known today as *The Watchtower Announcing Jehovah's Kingdom*. When Russell died on October 31, 1916, Judge J. F. Rutherford became the leader of Russell's foundation. It was under Rutherford that the Witnesses became a highly organized group. Rutherford gave the group their present name in Columbus, Ohio in 1931. Rutherford passed away on January 8, 1942. He was followed by the present head of the Witnesses, Nathan H. Knorr.

THE JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES

“Jesus said to him: ‘I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me’” (John 14:6—New World Translation¹). The Witnesses claim that their doctrine is **the** way, **the** truth, and **the** life which leads to Jehovah. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Witness gospel is another gospel (Gal. 1:6-9). As such it leads to destruction for those who espouse it.

THE WITNESS GOSPEL ON THE TRUE NAME IS ANOTHER GOSPEL

In *Jehovah's Witnesses in the Divine Purpose*, we read,

It became necessary for Jehovah, in fulfillment of his own prophecy, to raise up his witnesses in these modern times, not as a new religion, but as a climax to the long succession of Witnesses that he has had down through the past millenniums all the way back to Abel (10).

The Witnesses believe that they are truly Jehovah's spokesmen on earth today. As such, they claim to restore God's true name to men (*New World Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures* 19). Yet, in *Let Your Name Be Sanctified*, page 18, they candidly admit, “All the available evidence is that Roman Catholic clergymen introduced that pronunciation.” What pronunciation? JeHoVaH! Isn't it strange that

these so-called “Witnesses” claim to restore the divine name, yet freely admit that they know neither the true spelling nor pronunciation? How can you restore something that you cannot spell? One could as easily spell the name of God as JiHiViH! Also, the Witnesses reject Christmas, Easter, and other Catholic traditions vehemently. Why not reject the Catholic spelling and pronunciation of God’s name with as much fervor?

THE NAME TO GLORIFY GOD IN TODAY!

What name is the Father glorified in? Acts 4:10-12—NWT says,

Let it be known to all that in the **name of Jesus Christ** the Nazarene, whom you impaled but whom God raised up from the dead, by this one does this man stand here sound in front of you. This is “the stone that was treated by you builders as of no account that has become the head of the corner.” Furthermore, there is **no salvation in anyone else**, for there is **not another name under heaven** that has been given among men **by which we must get saved** (emp—RH).

Again, Isaiah 62:2—NWT, “And you will actually **be called by a new name**, which the very mouth of **Jehovah will designate**” (Emp—RH). Notice, none of the following names were **new** in the first century. Disciples, brethren, Jehovah, and Witnesses or Jehovah’s Witnesses. We find the fulfillment of Isaiah 62:2 in Acts 11:26—NWT, “...and it was first in Antioch that the disciples were **by divine providence called Christian**” (Emp—RH). This, coupled with 1 Peter 4:16—NWT, “But if (he suffers) as a Christian, let him not feel shame, but let him keep on glorifying God in this name,” proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that **the name** the Father or Yahewah, is glorified in the name Christian! It is not JeHoVaH, but **the name** Christian.

We also find that the apostles were not JeHoVaH’s Witnesses, but rather, “and you will be witnesses of me” (Acts 1:8—NWT). Witnesses of **me!** Me, who? Witnesses of Christ! And so they were “This Jesus God resurrected, of which fact we are all witnesses” (Acts 2:32; cf., Acts 3:15; 4:33; 5:32; 10:39; 13:31; 22:15; 23:11—NWT). These passages show without a shadow of a doubt that the apostles were Christ’s witnesses, not JeHoVaH’s Witnesses.

The Witnesses use Isaiah 43:10 as a proof text for their modern name. However, Isaiah and Yahewah were speaking to Israel, not to a modern religious group begun by a man called Russell! There isn’t one passage in the New Testament which teaches Christians should be called JeHoVaH’s Witnesses. Not one!

When one reads the New Testament, he sees how outstanding the name Christ is. Christ has a name far above every name named (Eph. 1:21—NWT). We are to do all things in Christ's name (Col. 3:17—NWT). The first century world blasphemed the fine name the disciples wore (Jam. 2:7—NWT). They were immersed into Christ (Gal. 3:27—NWT). Paul appealed to Christians in the name (by the authority) of Christ (1 Cor. 1:10—NWT). Christians are in the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:27—NWT). Christ, not the Father, died for us (1 Cor. 1:12-13; Acts 20:28—NWT). No one, either in the Old or New Testament is referred to as a "Jehovah's Witness" as such until 1931 in Columbus, Ohio! The name came from uninspired lips, whereas the name Christian was given by the mouth of Yahewah!

THE WITNESS GOSPEL ON THE SPIRIT OF MAN IS ANOTHER GOSPEL

The Witnesses believe the spirit is "spirit, wind or breath" (*Let God Be True* 107). They believe the soul is the living, breathing person (*Make Sure of All Things* 464-465).

The Bible shows man is Body—Soul—Spirit. Sometimes the expression soul is used to mean the person as a whole: body and spirit. For our purposes, we will look at the difference between body and spirit. The body is made from dust (Gen. 2:7; Ecc. 12:7—NWT). The spirit is made in the image of God (Gen. 1:26—NWT). The body is unconscious or dead without the spirit (Jam. 2:26—NWT), whereas the spirit has intelligence, reason, understanding, and etc., *Make Sure of All Things*, p. 466, "One's Mental Disposition" (Luke 5:22; Psa. 49:3; Pro. 16:9; Rom. 10:10—NWT). The father of the body is earthly (Heb. 12:9—NWT) whereas the Father of our spirits is God (Heb. 12:9—NWT). Our body is mortal (Rom. 8:11—NWT) whereas our spirit is renewed (2 Cor. 4:16—*The Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures* 813). The spirit leaves the body and the body dies (Jam. 2:26—NWT), whereas the spirit goes to hades (Acts 2:27, 31—NWT). The body dies (Heb. 9:27—NWT), whereas the spirit lives (Mat. 22:32—NWT). The body is placed in the grave (Ecc. 12:7—NWT), whereas the spirit returns to God or hades (Luke 16:19-31—NWT). The body lies in an unconscious state (Psa. 6:5—NWT), whereas the spirit is conscious (Luke 16:25—NWT). The body returns to dust (Ecc. 3:20—NWT), the spirit returns unto God (Ecc. 12:7—NWT). The body appears to be asleep (Psa. 13:3—NWT), whereas the

spirit never sleeps (Psa. 22:26—NWT). The body awakens when the spirit returns to it (1 Kin. 17:21-22—NWT), whereas the spirit returns to the body at the last trumpet (1 The. 4:14; 1 Cor. 15:52-53—NWT). The body will be made incorruptible (1 Cor. 15:53—NWT), whereas the spirit is already incorruptible (1 Pet. 3:4; Psa. 22:26—NWT).

The Witnesses, in their effort to make the spirit appear to only be man's breath, have **mistranslated** some passages to get this idea before the reading public. However, parallel passages have caused their perversions to backfire! "And Jesus cried out with a loud voice, and yielded up (his) **breath**" (Mat. 27:50—NWT—Emp—RH).

The Kingdom Interlinear, page 168 under the Greek word (*pneuma*) has "spirit." Is it breath or spirit? It must be translated one way or the other. If it is spirit, it cannot be breath. If it is breath, it cannot be spirit. Luke 23:46—NWT settles the matter! This is a parallel passage to Matthew 27:50. "And Jesus called with a loud voice and said: Father into your hands I entrust my spirit" (Emph—RH). Jesus did not entrust His breath to Yahewah, but rather His spirit. The Witnesses' rendering of Matthew 27:50 is a perversion of scripture and they know it!

THE WITNESS GOSPEL CONCERNING JESUS IS ANOTHER GOSPEL

In **Make Sure of All Things**, page 232, we find the following headings, "First Creation By God," "Referred to as a Mighty God, but not the Almighty God, Jehovah." In *Let God Be True*, page 33, we are informed, "...after God had created him as his firstborn Son." Witnesses believe Jesus is a created Son who is a mighty god, but JeHoVaH is the Almighty God. Two gods! However, what is said about Yahewah in the Old Testament is said about Jesus in the New Testament! The one God is Yahewah and Jesus! Notice that Yahewah is the first and last in Isaiah 41:4—NWT whereas Jesus is in Revelation 2:3—NWT. Yahewah is the I AM in Exodus 3:14—NWT, but Jesus is in John 3:53. *The Kingdom Interlinear*, page 46 Greek translation of ἐγὼ εἰμί. Yahewah is the author of eternal words in Isaiah 40:8—KJV, but Jesus is in Matthew 24:35—NWT. Yahewah is almighty in Genesis 17:1—NWT but Jesus is in Revelation 1:8—KJV. In Isaiah 10:21—NWT, but in Isaiah 9:6—NWT Jesus will be. In Romans 1:7 Yahewah is Father, but in Isaiah 9:6—NWT, Jesus will be. Isaiah 3:3—NWT Yahewah is Immanuel, but in Isaiah 7:14—NWT; Matthew 1:23, Jesus is. In Isaiah 40:3—NWT, Yahewah is the one who has a way prepared for Him But,

in Matthew 3:3—NWT this is Jesus. It indicates that both make up the one essence of God! In fact, Jesus said, “I and the Father are one” (John 10:30—NWT). If Jesus is a created god, why does Isaiah 43:10-11—NWT say, “...and that you may understand that I am the same One. Before me there was no God formed, and after me there continued to be none. I-I am Jehovah, and besides me there is no savior”? No god formed before nor after Yahewah! Where does that leave the Witness theory? Without a leg or Scripture to stand upon.

THE WITNESS GOSPEL OF SALVATION IS ANOTHER GOSPEL

The Witnesses' teach “the final number of the heavenly congregation will be 144,000.” “All other creatures...will not be a part of ‘the congregation of God’ but will live on this earth” (*Let God Be True* 130). The average Witness admits that he is not in the body of Christ and will not go to heaven. Yet, John 14:6—NWT says the only way to the Father is by Jesus Christ. If one can be saved outside the body of Christ, he is saved (1) without the new birth (John 3:3, 5—NWT); (2) without being a citizen (Eph. 2:1-22—NWT); (3) without being reconciled to Yahewah (Eph. 2:16-18—NWT); (4) without the blood of Christ (Acts 20:23—NWT); (5) without Christ (Eph. 2:12—NWT) and therefore without God; (6) without being a new creature (2 Cor. 5:17—NWT); (7) without salvation (2 Tim. 2:10—NWT); and (g) without being children of God (Gal. 3:26-27—NWT).

WITNESSES FOLLOW FALSE PROPHETS INSTEAD OF THE GOSPEL: DEUTERONOMY 18:22—NWT

Based upon the argument heretofore set forth, then, that the old order of things, the old world, is ending and is therefore passing away, and that the new order is coming in, and that 1925 shall make the resurrection of the faithful worthies of old and the beginning of reconstruction, it is reasonable to conclude that millions of people now on earth will be still on the earth in 1925. Then, based upon the promise set forth in the divine Word, we must reach the positive and indisputable conclusion that millions now living will never die (Rutherford 97).

In *Life Everlasting in Freedom of the Sons of God* (29) the Witnesses say, “According to this trustworthy Bible chronology six thousand years from man’s creation will end in 1975, and the seventh period of a thousand years of human history will begin in the fall of 1975 C.E.” Although they look for the 1,000 year reign, they hedge and say, “It would also be most fitting on God’s part, for, remember,

mankind has yet ahead of it what the last book of the Holy Bible speaks of as the reign of Jesus Christ over earth for a thousand years, the millennial reign of Christ” (*Life Everlasting in Freedom of the Sons of God* 30). “It would also be most fitting.” That’s their door to get out of the “trustworthy Bible chronology” of page 29! That is, if that “trustworthy” chronology does not work out in 1975?

CONCLUSION

The so-called Jehovah’s Witnesses are a heretical sect following the old false doctrine of Arianism. They are a zealous group of people who must be dealt, with. We need to be ready to give an answer of our hope to them (1 Pet. 3:15), and win as many as we can to Jesus Christ **the** Lord!

WORKS CITED

Let God Be True. Brooklyn, NY: Watchtower Bible & Tract Society, Inc., 1946.

Let Your Name Be Sanctified. Brooklyn, NY: Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society, 1961.

Life Everlasting in Freedom of the Sons of God. Brooklyn, NY: Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society, 1966.

New World Translation Of The Christian Greek Scriptures. Brooklyn, NY: Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society, 1950.

Rutherford, J. F. *Millions Now Living Will Never Die*. Brooklyn, NY: Watchtower Bible & Tract Society, 1920.

The Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures. Brooklyn, NY: Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society, 1969.

ENDNOTE

¹One should use the New World Translation (NWT) as much as possible to convert the Witnesses with their own Bible.

THE COST OF DISCIPLESHIP

Guy F. Hester

Whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple. For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have *sufficient* to finish it? (Luke 14:27-23).

The subject that was assigned me is **“The Cost of Discipleship.”** Brother Cline asked that I approach this subject from the standpoint of preaching or the price that a man must be willing to pay to be a faithful preacher of the gospel. Paul said, “Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution” (2 Tim. 3:12). I am glad that we are living in an age and a country where we are not as severely persecuted for being Christians as the early Christians were. However, I believe, with all my heart, that if one truly lives the Christian life that he will be persecuted. This is especially true of gospel preachers. And the most tragic thing about the matter is that now there are more persecutions from within than from without. Within the past year I can name at least a dozen gospel preachers who have been fired or given notice to “resign.” Some of the reasons that have been given were: “Your lessons are scriptural but untimely.” “What you are teaching is the truth but some of the members are taking it personally.” “That sermon on ‘Worldliness In The Church’ should never have been preached here, we have too many young members who have not grown enough in the faith for that kind of preaching.” “We believe what you teach on marriage, divorce and remarriage but since we have so many in the congregation that have been divorced and remarried, we think you should apologize.” “One of the members wanted to talk to you and you had gone shopping with your wife.” “We don’t think it is right for a preacher to have a Post Office box, he should get his mail at home.” “There is a certain element in the church that you don’t appeal to.” “We have just decided that we want a younger man.” “We have a policy that we don’t keep a preacher for more than two years.” These things may sound too wild to be true, but I assure you that each of these statements were given as “reasons” for dismissing preachers. Yes, the cost of discipleship for the gospel preacher is great but the rewards are a thousand

times greater than the cost. Bearing up under persecution is not the only price that must be paid.

The apostle Paul, in writing to the young preacher Timothy, clearly outlined the price that the faithful gospel preacher must pay.

First, There Is the Price of Being a Worthy Pattern or Example.

“Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity” (1 Tim. 4:12). The preacher should set the example in conduct, love, faith and purity. Now I am aware of the fact that the Bible knows no double standard. Every member has the same obligation to live a pure wholesome life that the preacher has. However, the preacher has the responsibility of teaching others how to live and it cannot be done by the “don’t do as I do, but do as I say” method. The man who gets into the pulpit to preach should be careful that his example in word and in deed is such that the church will not be ashamed of him but rather he will be an encouragement to them and strengthen their faith and purity.

Next, There Is the Price of Giving Sufficient Time to Reading and Study. “Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine” (1 Tim. 4:13). “Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth” (2 Tim. 2:15). Study is an important thing in the life of any preacher. In spite of what some may think, his number one job is his pulpit work and the preacher, especially the young preacher, who allows anything else to take away his time that ought to be given to reading, study and meditation will not be able to do the work of the Lord that is outlined for him. Every gospel preacher ought to set aside special periods of time for study and give special attention to reading and study for only in this way can he give the people the message that they ought to have,

Then There Is the Price of Giving Oneself Wholly to His Work.

After Paul had instructed Timothy concerning his work, he said, “give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all” (1 Tim. 4:15). That just means that if Timothy did his work as a part time affair he would not be able to make the progress that he would if he gave himself wholly to that work. There is nothing wrong with a man working to support himself while preaching the gospel. Paul did that. I am thankful for all of those who preach and teach on a part time basis as long as their preaching is not just a side line affair. I know a man that has been preaching the gospel for thirty-five or forty years but has

never been fully supported by the church in his life. He works five and sometimes six days a week in the maintenance department of the County Board of Education. If you should ask him, Brother Wheeler, what do you do? He would answer, I am a gospel preacher. Then he would add, but I make my living working for the County. I am thankful for men like that. They have done so much for churches that could not have a full time preacher. But I am also thankful every time one of these men is able to leave his secular job and give himself wholly to the work of studying and teaching the word of God.

Next, There Is the Price of Learning to Be Gentle and Respectful. “Rebuke not an elder, but intreat *him* as a father; *and* the younger men as brethren” (1 Tim. 5:1). I do not believe that the expression “rebuke not an elder” has reference to one who has been appointed an elder in the church. It means any aged man. Certainly, it includes the elders of the church but it includes more than that. He uses old men as contrasted with young men and said to the preacher, “Do not rebuke an old man but entreat him as you would your own father, and the young men as you would your brothers.”

Then he said, “The elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters, with all purity” (1 Tim. 5:2). The same principle applies to the older women and younger women as that of older men and younger men. Notice that he said, “the younger as sisters, **with all purity.**” Many preachers have been ruined and have done the church untold damage because they did not behave themselves properly toward the opposite sex.

In the book *The Preacher and His Work* by Jack Meyer, on page 68, there are some special rules that will help one to avoid this pitfall. They are:

1. As to women, be more careful with your hands than is observed in some preachers and teachers.
2. Avoid being in a position with one where either of you could be tempted.
3. Avoid situations where enemies could reasonably charge the possibility, or probability, of evil. After you exercise the utmost care at this point, dishonest people will seek—and sometimes find—such pretexts. And other people will believe their stories.
4. Assist women with their problems, but be careful as to how or where.
5. It is best to have your wife along, at least most of the time, in visiting women, and practically all of the time in conferences with them. If you have no wife, then enlist the assistance of some mature aged woman, or couple. Many men have landed in this pitfall who never dreamed that it could happen to them.

Then There Is the Price of Giving Honor to Whom Honor Is Due. “Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine” (1 Tim. 5:17). In other words, Paul is saying, “I want you to see to it that faithful elders are duly honored and respected.” Many times a preacher has it within his power to cause the people to love and respect their elders or to cause severe criticism to be brought down upon them. Paul admonished young Timothy to see that those elders who ruled well received “double honour.” If a preacher is jealous of the elders, and some are, he will make their work much more difficult and destroy his own effectiveness. Paul said, “Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses” (1 Tim. 5:19). I believe that this applies, not only to elders, but to all who take a public part in the work of the church. If a person has been selected to lead in a public way in the work of the church, we ought not to receive or entertain any accusation against him unless it is established by a plurality of witnesses that would be regarded as reliable witnesses. The reason being that an elder or a leader in the church may rebuke some one for his sins and then that person might be mean enough to tell a lie about him. So the instruction is, Don’t believe it, don’t even listen to it unless it is by the mouth of two or three reliable witnesses. The witness of one man must not be accepted.

There Is Also the Price of Courage to Rebuke Publicly, Before All, Those That Sin, to Cause Others to Fear to Sin. “Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear” (1 Tim. 5:20). This is a fearful responsibility that has been placed upon gospel preachers. It takes a great deal of judgement to know when it ought to be done. If a man sins and continues to commit that sin and will not repent and straighten up, it is the duty of the gospel preacher to point him out and rebuke him publicly, that other people will be afraid the same thing will happen to them if they commit wilful sin. I suppose that if a preacher were to actually do that today that most churches would fire him. That is the reason so much preaching is done in generalities. I have known of such a thing as a preacher preaching on the sin of adultery and fornication and men chasing around with somebody else’s wife and he would be fired the next week. They say that such preaching hurts the church. That he is causing those out of the church to think that there are members guilty of such. In reality such preaching would cause the world to respect the church because of its stand for the purity of its

members. “The hit dog always barks.” Usually when someone howls about the preacher condemning sin it is because he is guilty.

In summary, Paul commanded Timothy to endure hardship as a good soldier of the cross, to keep the disciples reminded of the facts, commands, promises and threats which are found in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. He was to give heed to his ministry, to study to show himself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed rightly dividing the word of truth. He was to avoid youthful lusts. There are certain temptations all are subject to and especially young people and Paul told young Timothy to avoid these lusts. He was not to argue about foolish questions but to be patient toward all men and, in view of the many false teachers in the land at the time, to persevere in sound doctrine.

Timothy was admonished to do all of these things as a preacher in the Lord’s church. These are the very things that every preacher ought to do today. The job is not easy. It would be much easier to quit preaching and get a job selling insurance than to do the work of an evangelist at times. There are times when it would be much easier to compromise or dodge issues than it is to stand foursquare for the truth. It is easier to ignore sin than to rebuke people for their sins.

Yes the cost of discipleship for the faithful gospel preacher is great. But, as we stated in the beginning, the rewards both here and in the hereafter are much greater.

Preaching the truth about adultery cost John the Baptist his head. Preaching the gospel of Christ caused Stephen to be stoned to death. But just think how much greater would have been the cost if they had sacrificed their convictions. Standing for the right is worth any pleasure that one may have to forego, any sacrifice that must be made, or any price that must be paid.

I am a preacher because I would rather be a preacher than anything else in the world. I have four children, two of which are boys. I would rather my boys would be gospel preachers than anything else in the world. But before anyone decides to make preaching the gospel his life’s work, he should first sit down and count the cost and see if he is willing to pay the price. “No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God” (Luke 9:62).

I charge *thee* therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke,

exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away *their* ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry (2 Tim. 4:1-5).

THERE IS A PLAN OF SALVATION

Guy F. Hester

Although there are exceptions, most religious people will agree that there is a plan of salvation. However, the religious world is vastly divided on what that plan is or just what one must do in order to be saved. Even some of our own “brethren” are calling those who stay with the Bible plan of salvation “five steppers.” If it is necessary to do anything that the Bible says to be saved, it is necessary to do everything that the Bible says one must do to be saved. Jesus said in Matthew 7:21, “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 which is in heaven.” The Hebrews writer said, “Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him” (Heb. 5:8-9). These passages teach beyond a shadow of a doubt that there is something that one must do to be saved from his sins and to be saved eternally in heaven.

Romans 10:13-17; Hebrews 11:6; Mark 16:15-16; Matthew 28:18-20; Luke 24:46-47; Luke 13:3, 5; Acts 17:30; Romans 10:8-10; Matthew 10:32-33; Acts 8:26-40; Acts 2:38; Romans 6:3-5; 1 Peter 3:21.

These verses of Scripture clearly establish the fact that **hearing, believing, repenting, confession, and baptism** are **all** necessary to salvation. If someone chooses to call me a “five stepper” for teaching the necessity of these things that is alright with me.

I call your attention to the fact that the plan of salvation is a universal plan. When the Lord sent out His apostles to preach the first time under what we sometimes speak of as the limited commission, they were forbidden to preach to the Gentiles, and were limited to the Jews only. He said, “Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into *any* city of the Samaritans enter ye not: But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Mat. 10:5-6). This was before salvation became a reality. But after He was crucified and raised from the dead He gave the

great commission, or world wide commission, which includes or embraces every creature, of all nations. I would like to pause here just long enough to say that when our Lord spoke these words to His apostles, instructing them preach the gospel to all the world, He was giving marching orders to the church. We notice, according to Matthew's record, after He commanded them to go and teach all nations, baptizing them, He said, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Mat. 28:20). What did he teach them to do? He taught them to teach. Hence those who have been taught and baptized have the responsibility of teaching and baptizing others.

Paul, in his instructions to Timothy, said, "the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also" (2 Tim. 2:2). So we can see that the great commission and the gospel plan of salvation, as it was given by the Lord to His apostles, has been handed down from them to those of us who are members of His church. We call attention also to the fact that Paul said, "the things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the **same** [not something else, but the **same**] commit thou to faithful men" (2 Tim. 2:2—ASV). Now that doesn't sound like it makes no difference what we teach or preach; does it? Why, certainly not! We can't preach anything other than what the apostles preached, and which the Lord commanded or authorized them to preach, and have the approval of the almighty God. In fact if we preach anything else we are not pleasing God, and are inviting the curses of heaven to rest upon us. Hear the apostle Paul in Galatians 1:6-9,

I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any *man* preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

Now with this brief introduction before our minds, we want to notice some of the many reasons why the plan of salvation is a universal plan. First of all the Bible teaches that sin is a universal fact. In Romans 3:8-9 Paul, in his letter to the church at Rome, asked the question, "What then? are we better *than they*?" (Paul here of course was talking about Jews and Gentiles, asking if the Jews were any better than the Gentiles) and then in verse nine he answers his own question

by saying, "No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." Then in verse 23 of the same chapter he said, "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Since sin therefore is a universal fact, a universal remedy is demanded. The gospel plan of salvation is the answer. It is a universal remedy. Paul said 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." God has made this universal provision, or prescribed this universal remedy for sin because He loves all men. The passage which we sometimes refer to as the "golden text of the Bible" says, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16).

God loves all men because He is the creator of all men. The record says in Acts 17:26, "And 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." Yes, man is the crowning act of God's creation, in that He created him in His own image, and after His own likeness, and since God is no respecter of persons, He created all men equal, as Acts 17:26 states, and hence He wants all men to be saved. In John 3:17 we read, "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." Again in 1 John 4:14 the record says, "And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son *to be* the Saviour of the world." Of course the world includes all who have ever lived, all who are living, and all who shall ever live. The apostle Peter said in 2 Peter 3:9, "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

We call attention further to the fact that the plan of salvation is a universal plan because Jesus came to save all men. He said in John 6:51, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Not for a chosen few, but the whole world. Then again He said in John 12:47, "And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." That doesn't sound like the doctrine of predestination, does it? The idea that God has predestinated a certain few to be saved, and all others to be lost is foreign to the

teaching of the Word of God, and did not come from the Bible. The fact that Jesus came to save the world, does not mean that the whole world will be saved. It simply means that he made a universal atonement, or made it possible for all to be saved. In Hebrews 2:9 the writer of the Hebrews letter says, “But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.” Then in 1 Timothy 2:4-6, the apostle Paul said,

Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For *there is* one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.

Since the plan of salvation is a universal plan, it follows that all men must be saved by the plan. Paul said in 1 Corinthians 1:21, “For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.” Of course Paul was talking about the preaching of the gospel. Hence he said in Romans 1:16, “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.” Then turning to Romans 10:13-17 he said,

whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. 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?

Certainly Paul was talking about gospel preachers, and not false teachers. For in the following verses he said, “as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the **gospel** of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!” Then in verse 17, “So then faith *cometh* by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.” One may ask, why are so few saved by the preaching of the gospel? The answer is very simple. Only a few are saved by the preaching of the gospel because the minds of so many people have been poisoned and blinded to the truth by false teachers: those who deny, discredit, and set at naught that which the Word of God teaches, Listen to Paul in 2 Corinthians 4:3, “if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost.” Then he goes on in the next verse and tells why it is hidden. He said, “In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glor-

ious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.”

Then again the plan of salvation is a universal plan because all men alike need to be converted. We are told in Psalms 19:7, “The law of the LORD *is* perfect, converting the soul.” We are told something of the importance of conversion in Matthew 18:1-4. The record says that Jesus “called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, And said,...Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.” Then the apostle Peter said in Acts 3:19, “Repent ye therefore, and be **converted**, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.” Since the plan of salvation is a universal plan, it contains universal requirements. That is, it requires all to comply with the same conditions. All must **believe**, because Jesus said, “He that believeth not shall be damned” (Mark 16:16). It also requires all men everywhere to **repent**. Paul said in Acts 17:30, “And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth **all men every where to repent**.” All alike are required to **confess** faith in Christ as the Son of God. Jesus said in Matthew 10:32-33, “Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven.” Then, finally, all alike are required to be **baptized** for the remission of sins. When those people on Pentecost were pricked in their hearts, and said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, “Men *and* brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” These are the conditions upon which God has promised to save an alien sinner from his past sins, and since God is no respecter of persons, He does not have one plan of salvation for some, and still another plan for others. I am aware of the fact that even some of our “brethren” are saying that we should “preach the **man** and not the **plan**.” But the truth of the matter is, the **man** is the **plan**. In Acts 8 Philip preached the plan by preaching the man.

Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus. And as they went on *their* way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, *here is* water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the

eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing (Acts 3:35-39).

In preaching **Jesus** to the Eunuch Philip preached the gospel plan of salvation. Yes **there is a plan of salvation** and we need to preach it.

DEBATES—IS DEBATING SCRIPTURAL AND NECESSARY?

Roger Jackson

INTRODUCTION

I appreciate this opportunity to speak on the subject of “**Debates,**” a subject that is close to my heart. It has long been my contention that a man has no right to advocate a position in public if he is not willing and able to defend that position in the same manner. This does not mean that everyone is cut out to be public debaters. There is no question that some men’s characters are not suited for the task. This does not release them from the responsibility to “*give an answer to every man*” (1 Pet. 3:15). Eldershops, congregations and other gospel preachers should encourage a man who is willing to undergo the rigorous training, personal sacrifice and self-control it takes to ascend the polemic platform. He lays his entire career as a gospel preacher on the line as well as the Truth for which he contends (Jude 3). There is no way that he can truly experiment with it. He must be sure that he is ready. Brother Alan Highers put it this way, “I never entered a debate where I did not think I could make my opponent’s arguments better than he could.” In preparing for the King-Nichols debate in his twilight years brother Gus Nichols arose at 4 a.m. every day and studied into the night. We may surmise, therefore, that there are two outstanding necessities every debater must have **before** he enters a discussion; (1) The Truth. (2) Intense preparation. The world can burn around you but there is no need to fear if you have these two. The Goliath has not yet been born who can frighten a David who has the stone of truth. Someone has said, “The world will step aside for a man who knows where he is going.” If you have the Truth no one can stand in your way and if you are sufficiently prepared you will know where your opponent is going and be there when he arrives.

In our day there is a great deal of opposition to debates though they seem to be becoming more popular among most brethren. Its especially

unpopular to debate a brother. Every “argument” that I have ever heard against debates has been both illogical and injurious to the Lord, N. B. Hardeman said, “God had only one Son and He was a preacher.” He might have equally added. “...and a debater.” Jesus debated and any argument that condemns debating condemns Him, necessarily so!

The two arguments most advanced to condemn debating are; (1) “I don’t believe in arguing.” The irony of it all is that they are already debating the merits of debating. Sectarians are delighted to see brethren oppose our opposing them. In 1972 I wrote a letter to the sectional presbyter of the Assemblies of God in Arkansas about a statement he had made in a radio station about my brethren being afraid to debate him. He wrote me a two-page, single spaced letter of contention on the ills of being contentious. My reply was that everything he accused me of, the Lord was guilty of also. He never replied. When a debate comes about it is not the respondents who caused the trouble, they are just honest enough to admit it exists and face it. (2) The second argument against debating is that it will hurt the Church to have a debate. I deny its true. Who will cease to speak evil of the Church if we refuse the debate? Which sectarian will keep coming to services if we refuse the debate? Lets face it brethren, we can’t please everybody! Good, honorable discussions have never driven honest people away from the Church, it’s the degenerate “fusses” that do that. If elderships censored “fussing brethren” the way they do our debating brethren we would be far better off. Sectarians are converted by debates. When Foy Wallace met Charles Neil in 1933 on the Premillennialism controversy they met for the first half of the debate in a sectarian church building. In the middle of the debate they were asked to move it elsewhere. Why? Because they were being taught the Truth and they didn’t want it!

As a rule, preachers do not debate to gain prominence. Amos wrote, “Can two walk together, except they be agreed?” (Amos 3:3). This is why preachers debate. The Bible does not teach us to go along our merry way as though there were no doctrinal differences even among ourselves. It teaches us to oppose error wherever it may be (1 John 4:1; Eph. 5:11). It is lamentable, to say the least, that brethren, even elders, would stand in a gospel preacher’s way of complying with these divine injunctions.

It is without question that some debates have turned into common squabbles. Such is not the fault of debating but the participants. The abuse of a thing does not argue against it. Like the Calvinist who tags

Adam's sin on all of us the very mention of debating someone stamps you "contentious" or even worse by those who have witnessed a squabble. I personally resent this and have voiced my disapproval many times. It is not fair to judge how I would act on the basis of how someone else acted.

Alexander Campbell was opposed to public debate at the first. Mr. Walker chided him rather severely for it. Finally, in 1819 brother Campbell accepted his challenge and debated him the following year. Afterward brother Campbell became the challenger and McCalla accepted in 1823. In this debate Campbell affirmed for the first time that water baptism was for the remission of sins and therefore could not be for infants, since they have no sins. What a break-through! And we owe its early appearance to debating. Nothing more solidly confirms the Truth outside of the divine conformations than to have it tested and see it stand the test. After these two debates Campbell observed that "A week's debating is worth a. preaching" (*Search For The Ancient Order* 66). May he speak to our generation!

Campbell went on to debate the famous infidel Robert Owen in 1829. In this debate Mr. Owen suddenly announced that he was finished and that brother Campbell could take as much time as he wished. Brother Campbell took eight (8) hours! In those eight (8) hours he delivered one of the greatest discourses on Christian evidences extant.

In 1837 Campbell debated the bishop of Cincinnati, Mr. Purell. In this debate he showed the unique and enviable talent of being able to reduce a man's position to the absurd. Putting the Roman problem into its simplest form he announced, "If it is Roman it cannot be catholic, and if its Catholic it cannot be Roman."

Through it all what were the results? The Church did not suffer and shrink as we are told it will today if we debate. In 1849 the church of Christ was the third (3rd) largest religious body in America!

CHAMPIONS OF PUBLIC DEBATE

Jesus was a debater. Webster defines "argument" as; "A reason or reasons offered for or against something." When arguments are offered in debate they are orderly reasons for accepting or rejecting a thing. The object is to make them so "air tight" that not a word can be spoken against them. This Jesus did to perfection and every debater must not overlook His style. In Matthew 22:29-33 His argument on the existence of the spirit of man from the premise that God is the God of Abraham,

Isaac, and Jacob who are dead and yet He is not the God of the dead admitted of no other interpretation but that they were alive in some sense. It took care of Sadduceeism and it will take care of Jehovah's Witnesses too.

In Matthew 22:41-46 Jesus' argument on His being both the Lord and son of David at the same time left no room for questioning the virgin birth or His pre-existence.

Jesus was a master of the question. He did not ask questions to trick people. He asked questions He knew they could ill afford to answer. When a man will not answer a question its good policy to question His doctrine. In Mark 11:29-30 He asked a simple question of the origin of John the Baptist. His antagonists could not answer—that is they could not afford to answer. Only those with some thin to hide refuse to answer questions.

Jesus was a debater from the time He was baptized in Jordan, led to the mount of temptation and sat in the synagogue at Nazareth. He met His opponents with "Thus saith the Lord" and I would never debate anyone but an infidel who denied that as the standard.

Stephen was a debater. Acts 6:9-10 tells us that the Libertines, Cyrenians and Alexanderians could not withstand the wisdom with which he spake. Verse 8 tells us that Stephen was inspired, at least we may surmise it. It is not likely that God would inspire a debater and then stand opposed to debates.

It is also noteworthy that Stephen's antagonists were given a name in this debate. Such a practice is looked upon unfavorably today especially by our "anti" brethren. Reading from most any of their works today, one is impressed most unfavorably with the far less charitable names we must bear. Of course calling us "liberals" doesn't count.

Stephen was a perfect example of logic. Such can be equally said of Peter with reference to his Pentecost sermon (Acts 2:27-36). When the logic was there the emotions were touched in a most legitimate fashion. In debate logic is supreme. Though emotions are good and need to be touched logic is supreme in debate. Emotionalism and sensationalism have no place in a debate and are usually used to cover up logic or the lack of it. The Truth and the Church both rest upon logic. Let Christian Scientists, Mormons, Pentecostals and Catholicism appeal to the emotions and super sensations but give me logic and I can stand the test. Logic uses facts. Facts are stubborn things. When what we say is factual we may assert with dignity and unashamed, "God said it, I

believe it, that settles it.” For the lack of a knowledge of logic many sectarians have defeated themselves and didn’t even know it. When a man’s position is scriptural and logic the only recourse by the opposition is that of Stephen’s audience (Acts 7:54).

In debate the gospel preacher has the opportunity to demonstrate to his audience that he is not a Campbellite, radical, ignoramus, freak, sectarian, biggot, Pharisee, weakling or idiot and all by keeping his composure when accused of all these. Of course its best not to debate a man who will make such accusations anyway.

Paul was a debater. In Acts 19:9-10 it is affirmed that he debated every day. I know of congregations that would not allow such a fellow to preach for them. What was the result of this debating? “all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks.” What a pity some of my brethren weren’t there to tell him of the ills of debating.

Apollos was a debater. Acts 13:24-26 reveals both how he mightily convinced the Jews and how he lost one. Unlike many “professional” debaters of today, who can argue it either way, Apollos was not ashamed to say “I was wrong.” I have seen men whom I have admired greatly lose my esteem for them because they were unwilling to admit they were wrong. I know of nothing that is more repulsive.

A man cannot afford to be wrong in debate. I don’t mean that he cannot misquote a passage of Scripture, mispronounce a word, use the wrong word, use the wrong passage or any number of other minor mistakes. I mean he must have the doctrine right!

A man’s character is severely tested in debate. Anything he has written or stated in public may come back to him. Anything he has done may have to be faced. I hesitate not for one moment to say that the public debate is the refining furnace of a gospel preacher. If he enters one it will make him or break him.

In preparing for debates with brethren I have often been told, “Well, you can’t convert that fellow.” Let me clear up this misconception. In the first place that’s judging a man and making a decision that rightfully belongs only to him. In the second place a debate is not for the benefit of one’s respondent. If it were it could be more properly done in private. The public debate is for the public for the purpose of converting the disciples.

Martin Luther was a great debater. When I propose a debate I usually send 4-6 propositions. Martin Luther signed 95. Luther,

however, possessed something a debater cannot afford and that was a quick temper. When hard pressed by Huldreich Zwingli in their debate on the nature of the Lord's Supper Luther became furious and wrote on the banquet table "this is my body." Such an outburst of temper at the festive gathering was unbecoming of the great reformer. There is no need for anxiety when one is right.

Moses E. Lard was a great controversialist. He had only one public debate but was always in the thick of the fight. He wrote, "I like controversy. I like it all the better the hotter it grows. I like to see it leap up even to a white heat" (*Search for the Ancient Order* 289).

Joe Blue was a debater. In the Northeast section of Arkansas where he lived it is said today that not one sectarian sermon was heard for 35 years.

What further shall we say of men like Guy N. Woods, Foy E. Wallace Jr., G. K. Wallace, Gus Nichols, Thomas Warren, Alan Highers and others? We're warming by the fires they kindled. They fought the battles against Premillennialism, anti-ism, all brands of sectarianism and atheism. They are not our gods but surely we owe them a debt of gratitude while they live and need more men to take their place when they are gone.

OBJECTIONS

The arguments brethren use to oppose debating are the same arguments sectarians use to get out of it. I could go to my files and get verbal testimony to that fact. I could produce in almost exact duplicate the same arguments from sectarians. Sectarianism cannot afford public scrutiny and they know it.

There are two Greek words that may be correctly translated "debate." They are *eridos* and *epagon*.

Eridos comes from a root word which means, "Altercation, strife contentious disposition. To quarrel; to wrangle; to use the harsh tones of a wrangler or brawler, to grate" (*Analytical Greek Lexicon* 166). Some passages where it is used are Romans 1:29, 13:13; 1 Corinthians 1:10-11, 2 Corinthians 12:20; and Philippians 1:15. In all of these passages it is condemned. Though these passages are often used to condemn honorable public discussion it is easy to see that none of them have reference to it.

Epagon comes from *epago* which means, "To bring upon, cause to come upon. To cause to be attributed to, to bring guilt upon." In Acts

5:28 it is used to show the manner in which the apostles brought the guilt of Jesus' blood upon the Jewish leaders. It is used in 2 Peter 2:1 to indicate the swift destruction false prophets bring upon themselves and that, through their guilt. In verse 5 it is again used to describe God's action in bringing the flood upon the guilty world of Noah's day. The clincher is in Jude 3 where we are told to "contend" for the faith. The word "contend" comes from *epagon*. God is commanding us to bring guilt upon those who pervert the gospel the same way He has brought guilt upon false teachers in the past. Debating is not only scriptural, it is essential and I say let's be at it!

CONCLUSION

Truth has nothing to fear. Solomon said, "The wicked flee when no man pursueth: but the righteous are bold as a lion" (Pro. 28:1). The works of darkness are opposed to debates. Jesus noted, "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved" (John 3:20). Let no man deceive you. Through all the red tape and quibbles that's exactly why sectarians won't debate.

When a young preacher occupies a pulpit every Sunday he must establish a confidence in himself. He must have a strong pulpit. He does not have to be impetuous and cause men to despise his youth in order to affect this. He must let the congregation know that he will not fall apart if what he preaches in a corner is challenged in public. He will have little influence if he does not establish this principle. In a mature fashion he must let the brethren know that what he preaches is sound and both he and his message will stand the test.

Not all preachers are cut out to be public debaters and I know some who should never debate publicly because of their quick temper, overbearing personality or slowness of thought, I do not advocate every preacher's being a **public** debater but every preacher must contend for the faith.

PREDESTINATION

Roger Jackson

CALVIN'S VIEW

Someone has said that a person has to be “untaught” before he can be taught. His mind must be cleared of error before the seeds of Truth can be sown. For this reason the sectarian doctrine of predestination must be proved erroneous before proceeding to examine the truth on the matter. The beginning point is Calvin’s brand of predestination, appropriately called “Calvinism.”

Calvin’s position on the matter is expressed in these words from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, P-35, Art.1-4;

God, from all eternity, did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, free ly and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus pre-destinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

Now consider the consequences of this view. It means (if it were true) that an alien sinner of the non-elect can do nothing to secure the remission of his sins. He may believe, repent, confess Christ, and be buried with Him in baptism just like the “elect” but it docs him no good. His heart may be as contrite as the “elect” and his service may be as much in earnest but it does him no good. Through no fault of his own God has determined that he burn in hell! But this is not the worst of the matter. God may even let him “feel-like” he is saved in his heart. He may even deceive him into thinking he is of the “elect” but alas, he is not! He is no worse off by doing evil and no better by doing good. Believe it, who can?!

On the other hand the “elect saint” can do nothing to jeopardize his election if this view is correct. This position is a necessary conclusion from the above. In fact, we are to believe that the flesh of the elect sins

but it does not effect the soul. God has assigned the sinful to hell and the righteous to heaven according to Matthew 13:41-43. This means that the sinful “elect’s” body would go to hell while his spirit would go to heaven! Furthermore, it would mean that none of the “elect” would be any worse off by doing evil. Neither the “elect” nor the “non-elect” would have any moral reason at all for doing good. Having eliminated morality altogether the doctrine becomes extremely dangerous. It negates the usefulness of the Church and renders the atonement of Jesus unnecessary and of no value at all.

SOME THINGS WE CANNOT CHANGE

We must all recognize, in candor, that there are some things that we cannot change. At the same time it is also true that there are some things which we do control and are expected to control. Let me illustrate this in this manner: There once was a gentleman who was terrified of tornadoes. His neighbor constantly observed his hasty retreat to the storm house upon the approach of any storm of noticeable size. As they rode to work one morning the neighbor remarked, “Why do you take shelter from these storms? If its your time to go the Lord will send it down into the storm house to get you.” After a few miles they came to a railroad crossing all lit up and blinking. They heard the scream of the train’s whistle and the automobile came to a halt. “Why are you stopping,” asked the puzzled passenger? “Why to let the train pass,” answered the neighbor who had taunted him earlier about the storms. “But,” replied his passenger “if its your time to go don’t you know the Lord will make the train jump the track and run you down?” Thus we see that there are some things that we can control, I read in the paper once that a preacher of predestination and his son were run over by a man in another car. The father was killed and the son sued. The lawyers argued that according to the plaintiff’s doctrine his client wasn’t liable at all being predestinated so that he had no control over his actions. The argument stood the test and the preacher went home empty handed.

The fact is that men better themselves every day. If we were machines and God directed us without our having any control over it how could we explain the desires we have to excel?

There are at least three (3) facts that disprove Calvin’s brand of predestination:

#1 The Fact of Divine Punishment

By what standard could we consider Jehovah God just when He punishes men for doing what He ordained that they must do? Certainly not by the Bible for in it justice just doesn't work that way (Psa. 89:14; Eze. 18:20; Rom. 14:12). Calvin's brand of predestination denies the doctrine of justice taught in the Bible, If God teaches one kind of justice and practices another what then are we to think of Him?

In Genesis 2:16-17 Adam and Eve were told not to eat of the forbidden fruit. When they disobeyed God Calvin's position would be that they were doing what God ordained that they do. In Chapter 3 a most severe penalty was placed on them. By what standard can that be considered just?

In Exodus 20:3 God ordained that man shall not kill. Men do kill. God punished thousands of people for killing in times gone by and promises all murderers that they will burn forever (Rev. 21:8). Why? Why indeed, if they have no choice?!! Did Cain not have a choice when he slew Abel (Gen.4:5)? Then why punish him so severely (Gen.4:13)? Just how does this abound to the glory of God?

Inasmuch as Calvin's view of predestination cannot be reconciled with the justice God in punishing transgressors we must reject it as false.

#2 The Fact That Divine Ordinances Have Been Changed

Calvin's position is that God, "Freely and Unchangeably" ordained everything that comes to pass. What does the Bible say?

Hezekiah fell sick unto death. The prophet of God diagnosed his malady as fatal (2 Kin. 20:1-2). There is no evidence that any exception was given, God decreed that he should die. Hezekiah prayed in his own-behalf and according to verses 8-10 God changed the decree. "But," says one, "God intended to spare him all the while." Then did He lie to him when He said he would die?

Jonah was instructed to enter into Ninevah proclaiming these words, "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown" (Jon. 3:4). There is no exception named at all. God had decreed it. The people repented and God changed His mind (Jon. 3:10). "But," says one, "God intended to spare them all along." Then did He lie when He said they would be overthrown?

From these two cases we learn that; (1) There are conditions to every promise and threat God gives whether stated or understood and

the one receiving the promise or threat controls the outcome -to some extent, and (2) that God has changed His decrees in some instances depending upon the obedience of the individual. Inasmuch as these facts are true we must reject Calvin's brand of predestination.

#3 The Fact of the Free-will of Man

Here Calvin met the greatest challenge of his theory and lost. When he wrote of the free-will of man he contradicted what he had said about election and predestination. When he wrote of election and predestination he contradicted what he had said about the freewill of man. Joshua 24:15, Matthew 11:28-30, and Revelation 22:17 are just a few of the passages which affirm the free-will of man and his ability to make a choice. If they do not offer a choice to all men indiscriminately they are the greatest mockery of time and eternity. When commenting upon Calvin's theory Beecher said, "The elect are 'whosoever will' and the non-elect are 'whosoever won't'" (West 57).

Inasmuch as the free-will of man, clearly taught in the Bible, contradicts Calvin's brand of predestination it is abundantly clear that Calvin's theology is false.

Now what does the Bible say about the subject of predestination:

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FOREKNOWLEDGE AND PREDESTINATION

The Greek word translated "**foreknowledge**" comes from a root word, *prognosis*. The meaning of this word is; "Previous purpose" (*Analytical Greek Lexicon* 342). To prognostigate is to tell the future not make it. A weather man prognostigates but he does not make the weather he predicts from his instruments. In the foreknowledge of God He no more unconditionally directs the affairs of men than does the weatherman make the weather

The Greek word translated "**predestinate**" comes from the root word *proopidzo* which means; "To limit or make out beforehand, to design definitely, ordain, predestinate" (*Analytical Greek Lexicon* 345). The difference lies in telling what is going to happen and making it happen.

BIBLE TEXTS Matthew 10:29-30

"Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head

are all numbered.” A passage taken out of its context becomes a mere pretext. The context here deals with persecution and God’s concern about it. The wonderful message of God’s awareness of our trials is lost in Calvin’s hobby. Calvinists must look further for divine sanction for their doctrine.

Acts 4:27-28

For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.

God ordained that Jesus should die for the sins of the world and that there should be no salvation outside Him or without this sacrifice. This we shall learn when we come to Romans 3:29-30. There is no indication, anywhere, that He ever named those who would carry out this plan of the sacrifice before it took place. The office was there but the names of those who filled them was a matter of choice on the part of Herod and Pilate.

Acts 18:10

“For I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city.” Does this teach that God had already determined who would obey the gospel in Corinth before Paul preached? First Peter 1:2 says, “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.”

From this passage we surmise; (1) Election is by the foreknowledge of God in cases where the person’s name is given and not by predestination. (2) This election is through sanctification of the Spirit, which is to say by the Word of God, the agency of the Spirit (John 17:17; 1 Pet. 1:22-23). (3) This election is dependant upon obedience (Rom. 6:17-18). (4) There is no election without Jesus’ blood. It is clear, therefore, that God knew beforehand who was of the disposition of heart to obey the gospel when they heard it.

Romans 8:29-30

For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate *to be* conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

Who was it that He foreknew? The answer is Israel. What did He predestinate? The answer is that they should conform to the image of His Son. Not that they would be unconditionally saved but that they could not be saved without conforming to the image of His Son. This is done in baptism (Rom 6:3-4) and in the subsequent Christian life (Col. 3:1-4). God predestinated that no man can be saved outside His Son and the only way to get into His Son is to be baptized into Him (Gal. 3:26-27). How sadly the Calvinists have missed the point! The purpose of this was to make Christ “all-in-all” (Col. 1:18-19). Having determined this beforehand God proceeded to “call” men to what He had predestinated. Paul said that he did this through the gospel (2 The. 2:14). Those who respond to the call cannot justify themselves so Jesus gave His life for that purpose and those called are justified by the Blood of Jesus (1 Cor. 6:11). The glorification is the setting apart as His (Isa. 62:2, 12).

Ephesians 1:4-5, 11; 2:10

“According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world.” It is clear that the choice was of the location “in Him” and not the individual. God predestinated the location of group—the Church (Eph. 1:3).

“Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.” This verse says “by Jesus Christ” and then verse 6 says “in the beloved” (Christ) and verse 7 says “in whom” (Christ) “we have redemption.” Again we affirm that the thing predestinated is the location of the election. This makes the Church absolutely essential, being His Body wherein election is located (Eph. 1:22-23).

“In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.” “In whom,” refers to Christ. In Him we can become a part of the elect. God is working His will in Him to bring all nations together in Christ. Chapter 2:16 says, “And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body.” Verse 10 states that we were created “unto” good works; that is to do good works.

CONCLUSION

God has predestinated that salvation is to be found in Christ which is to say in His Church (Mat. 16:13; Eph. 1:22-23). How sadly Calvinists have missed the mark! God gave His Son to the end that the

Church might be saved (Eph. 5:25). The destiny of man does not depend upon the arbitrary selection of God but upon his recognition of where God has located salvation and his seeking to arrive at that point.

WORKS CITED

Analytical Greek Lexicon. Zondervan Publishing Co.
West, Earl. *Search for the Ancient Order*. Vol. 1.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

A. Waldrep Johnson

What a great privilege to have this great sermon of the greatest teacher that the world has ever known, or can ever know. In John 7:46, even His enemies, the officers who were sent to arrest Him, said, “Never man spake like this man.”

Those whom Jesus addressed on this occasion were His disciples. A disciple is a learner who follows. According to the dictionary’s definition, a disciple is “an adherent of the doctrine of another; a follower.” This great sermon delineates the course of life for the followers of the Lord; therefore, it is essential doctrine for every child of God.

THE BEATITUDES—THE BLESSINGS THE CHRISTIAN ENJOYS

He begins this sermon with the Beatitudes of a Christian. These are introduced by the word “blessed,” which is almost synonymous with the word “happy,” and yet it has a deeper and generally more spiritual connotation than we usually associate with happiness. These beatitudes picture the very character of the children of God.

“Blessed *are* the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven” (Mat. 5:3). This refers not to the materially poor, for poverty doesn’t take us to heaven, nor riches **necessarily** take us to hell. But here Christ speaks of poverty of spirit, speaking of the humble and lowly-minded man. We can learn this grace of lowliness best from Christ Himself, who, being in the form of God, made Himself of no reputation humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death (Phi. 2:6-3).

“Blessed *are* they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.” This mourning is not over the loss of a loved one, nor other natural calamity, but over our spiritual condition, as David mourned over his sins in Psalms 51:1-5. When such mourning leads to repentance and obedience to God, He Himself comforts us with the assurance of forgiveness.

“Blessed *are* the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.” A man is meek when he gladly submits to all of God’s laws and discipline. Not a moral weakling, but with strength to be gentle, kind, and not easily

provoked into anger or sin. “They shall inherit the earth,” i.e., an abundant measure of its blessings in harmony with Paul’s formula that “all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to *his* purpose”(Rom. 3:28).

“Blessed *are* they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.” This implies an ambition, not to be rich or great, but to know and do the will of God, which expresses His righteousness, (Psa. 119:172). His dreams and desires are higher than the animal plane. Doing God’s will is His highest desire. They shall be filled with the joy and satisfaction of their salvation.

“Blessed *are* the merciful”: those who are full of compassion to wards others, who pity all who suffer from sin or sorrow. “For they shall obtain mercy,” for having dispensed mercy; “Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world” (Mat. 25:34).

“Blessed *are* the pure in heart.” The word pure means unadulterated; hence, wholly devoted to God, with nothing coming before his Lord. With the impurity of every sin abhorred in both heart and lift “For they shall see God.” Yes, see Him in His holiness and receive His eternal mercy,

“Blessed *are* the peacemakers”: those who use their best influence to bring peace between man and God, and between man and man, and strive to make all men love each other. “For they shall be called the children of God,” for they are most God-like, as children following in the steps of their fathers, who is the Lord of peace (2 The. 3:16).

“Blessed *are* they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.” But, oh how little we suffer due to persecution today in comparison to our Lord and His apostles and those of their day, and yet how much we complain at the very insignificant inconveniences associated with our religious life!

THE CHRISTIAN IS A BLESSING TO OTHERS (5:13-16)

The Christian is a blessing to others because he is the salt of the earth. Before modern refrigeration salt was the chief preservative of the world. The chief use of salt was to preserve meat. Likewise the Christian, as the salt of the earth, keeps the world from putrefication and corruption. Ten righteous men in Sodom would have saved it from destruction. Salt also has the quality of imparting a satisfying sense of

taste to food. This is the idea involved in the savor of salt. Likewise God's people impart the satisfying quality of righteousness that makes the world a fit place to live. If the salt loses these qualities it is good for nothing. If the Christian loses these qualities by too close contact with the world, he thus loses his influence for good, and becomes worthless to God and His cause.

The Christian is also a blessing because he is the light of the world. "As light dispells darkness and enables a man to see his ways so the Christian, by his teaching and example, removes ignorance and prejudice, and discloses the way of life" (McGarvey). This influence of the Christian is not to be hidden, as "under a bushel," but is to be freely displayed before all. It is not in ostentatious conceit, but as a natural consequence of living the godly life.

THE RELATION OF CHRIST'S TEACHING TO OLD TESTAMENT AND TRADITIONAL TEACHING (5:17-48)

This section begins by a general statement of Christ's relationship to the Law of Moses. He said that He came not to destroy (or improperly demolish it) by violating it or ignoring it, nor by depreciating its authority while it was yet valid. He came to fulfill the law and did fulfill it by living perfectly and thus demonstrating that it had no natural weakness of its own. He was the antitype of all its types, the complete fulfillment of that of which the law was the picture.

Of course after it was fulfilled, it was taken out of the way because it had no further purpose. Christ qualified his statement that "one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law" by adding "till all be fulfilled." Certainly this implied that when it was fulfilled (and He said He came to fulfill it) then it would pass or cease to be God's authoritative way. Men today refuse to admit its having passed away because they want to cling to some of its privileges. For example: Instrumental Music and the burning of incense, etc. And yet, they show their insincerity by rejecting those parts they do not like. For example: circumcision and animal sacrifice.

The Scribes and Pharisees of Christ's day maintained a purely formalistic relation to the law, keeping its minutest detail, and yet there was no pure spirit of love and devotion manifested. Therefore, Christ said, "except your righteousness shall exceed *the righteousness* of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of

heaven.” This does not bind the Christian to the same laws, but does demand a purer spirit in relation to the demands of Christianity.

THE FIRST CONTRAST: THE LAW IN REGARD TO KILLING (5:21-26)

The law of Moses regulated civil conduct, and being state laws, could only regard overt acts. But Christ’s laws are given to the individual and regulate his inner spiritual condition and the very initial motives of conduct; hence, not only killing, but the anger that motivates killing, is condemned. Paul said “Be ye angry, and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath” (Eph. 4:26). Hence the holding of anger, or letting it express itself in evil words or deeds, is condemned.

Furthermore, if you have aroused anger in someone else, i.e., have a brother who has aught against thee; remove the cause of the anger before attempting to offer devotions to God. One cannot properly worship God when responsible for estrangement from man. We must properly honor our fellowman because of the image of God in him.

In matters of litigation God’s people must quickly come to agreement even with an adversary. There is nothing to be gained by continued strife, and much to be lost. This is an occasion where we must sometimes suffer wrong (cf., 1 Cor. 6:7-8) rather than being exposed to an even greater wrong.

THE SECOND CONTRAST: THE LAW AS TO ADULTERY (5:27-30)

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

Here it is simply said that one can be guilty of adultery in thought, that is, in plan or intention. The essence of vice is intention, and those who indulge in unchaste imaginations, desires and intentions are guilty before God. Peter speaks of those who have “eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin” (2 Pet. 2:14). Jesus legislates against the thought which lies back of the act. He cuts off sin at its lowest root.

Next he emphasizes the earnestness with which men should seek a sinless life, “And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell.” Then He repeats the application using the right hand as the offending member.

The thought is that the person permitting such offences in his life shall be lost in hell. We must “blind” ourselves by refusing to look with eyes of evil and “maim” ourselves by refusing to lend the hand, the member of the body which represents our actions, to evil deeds. The body must be strictly disciplined by proper control of our thinking and our deeds. The heart guides the eye and the hand, and if we will get the heart right all will be well.

THE THIRD CONTRAST: THE LAW AS TO DIVORCE (5:31-32)

The modern trend in divorce is towards a “no fault” divorce law. In some countries a man can get a divorce simply by saying “I divorce you.” The law of Moses permitted divorce by giving the wife a “writing of divorcement.” But Jesus says marriage is for life, the only exception being unchastity. “But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.”

McGarvey comments, “It is implied that divorce for unchastity breaks the marriage bond, and it is therefore held almost universally, both by commentators and moralists, that the innocent party to such a divorce can marry again.” Jesus endorses this position in Matthew 19:9. It is in the “and shall marry another” that the adultery is involved. If both parties of a divorce (not caused by fornication) remain unmarried no adultery is involved. But so many people “divorce in haste and repent at leisure,” for before long they meet someone and fall in love and marry in spite of having had no scriptural reason (fornication) to divorce in the first place. Hence the all too common inclination to divorce for practically any cause will almost surely cause deep and serious trouble further down the line.

THE FOURTH CONTRAST: SWEARING (5:33-37)

Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God’s throne: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

The Jews, it seems, thought lightly of oaths which did not contain the sacred name of God. They used such oaths constantly and heedlessly. They did not consider it to be forswearing (false smearing) just so long as they did not use the sacred name of God. But our Lord classes all oaths together, for all ultimately imply an appeal to God. Thus His universal language in condemning them is evidently applied to “such” oaths, that is rash and idle oaths, such as were common among the Jews. His language does not apply to those solemn occasions when an oath is required by law, nor when it is made in utmost solemnity. We conclude this from the principle that we must not “so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another.” In harmony with this principle we observe that God is represented as swearing by Himself (Heb. 6:13; 7:21); that Jesus answered the adjuration of Caiaphas “by the living God” (Mat. 26:63-64); a mighty angel swears “by him that liveth forever and ever” (Rev. 10:6); and Paul frequently used the name of God in solemn asseverations (Rom. 1:9; 2 Cor. 1:23; Gal. 1:20; Phi. 1:6). McGarvey says in this connection, “we conclude, then, that judicial oaths, and oaths taken in the name of God on occasions of solemn religious importance, are not included in the prohibition.” But all light and common swearing is both prohibited, and also is meaningless in establishing the truth of a statement. Rather than such practice of light and common swearing, make it a practice of always speaking the truth, so such meaningless oaths will not seem to be necessary.

THE FIFTH INSTANCE: THE LAW OF RETALIATION (5:38-42)

Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have *thy* cloke also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away

The Jews considered the words of the Law of Moses which Jesus refers to here as permitting private revenge; whereas, they were intended for the opposite purpose of preventing private revenge by warning that, any injury you inflict can be legally inflicted upon you. It forbids the revengeful temper, but is not intended to turn the conduct of the world over to the wicked. The universal language “Resist not him

that is evil” refers to private revenge in relatively small matters. But a literal application in all matters would not always be right; it would sometimes do harm rather than good by actually encouraging evil. Our Lord Himself, the gentlest and the meekest of men, expostulated with those who struck Him wrongfully (John 13:23). Rather than literally turning the other cheek, he issued forth a reproof, however mild and gentle. Thus, in the Sermon on the Mount he is laying down general principles, which in their application must be modified by other rules and examples of Holy Scriptures,

Also His words, “Give to him that asketh thee” are modified by other scriptures and do not command indiscriminate almsgiving. Paul would not have us give to the idle (2 The. 3:10), and Jesus Himself was critical of those who sought Him “because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled” (John 6:26).

We must understand our Lord’s words as interpreted by His own example and by other parts of the Scripture. Thus, we must forgive injuries, we must resist not evil, we must give freely; but in all these things we must be guided by the wisdom from above as revealed in all Scriptures.

THE SIXTH INSTANCE: LOVE THY NEIGHBOR (5:43-43)

Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others*? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.

The commandment of the Law was, “but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” (Lev. 19:18). The Pharisees had added a false and wicked gloss, “Thou shalt hate thine enemies,” But the Lord bids us “love your enemies.” It is easy to love those who love us; such love is mere natural affection.

But the command to “Love your enemies” seems almost impossible of accomplishment. Indeed this would be hard for humans to obey if love had but one meaning; if it referred only to that application which applies to our close friends and near kinsmen. But there are many shades and degrees of love. Jesus gives the example of the good

Samaritan to exemplify the kind of love he here enjoins. It is also illustrated by praying on the cross for those who were crucifying Him.

Such love is God-like, "That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." Rain and sunshine preach charity and love to all. This kind of love puts the child of God above "others," such as the gross publicans or others who have not the spirit of God in their hearts.

The being "perfect" here enjoined does not refer to being sinless or without fault (cf., Rom. 3:23; 1 John 1:3, 10). The word is translated from *teleios* meaning "mature" or "full grown." It refers therefore to a mature love for another that we may be mature children of the Father. His perfection is our model.

RELIGIOUS OSTENTATION: IN GIVING (6:1-4)

The truth is here presented that many men do their good works from the false motive of being seen of men. Although such works may be good of and within themselves, they are worthless in the eyes of God and shall receive no reward from Him. It is the motive that gives character and spiritual meaning to an act, and that determines its spiritual value.

The hypocrite acts a part before men. He gives in the streets. In his heart he does not pity the afflicted; he is not merciful. He does not really care to do good. Although these may be permissible side-effects, his real desire is to win the praise of men. If he receives such praise, it is all he can receive. Or, even if men see through his hypocrisy and do not praise him, he still has no reward from God, for his motive was not godly.

The command does not forbid publicity but the **spirit** that **desires** publicity. The gift of the widow's mite was made public, as was the gift of Barnabas (Luke 12:41-44; Acts 4:36). Thus good deeds may be published by others to stimulate good in others. Jesus said "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Mat. 5:16). There is a distinction to be made between "Letting" your light shine and "Making" it shine by our own initiative to satisfy our own conceit.

Even the giver should take as little notice of his gift as possible as suggested by "let not they left hand know what thy right hand doeth." The open reward of the Father should be stimulation sufficient to the one who gives sincerely from the heart.

RELIGIOUS OSTENTATION: PRAYER (5-8)

Here again it is the false motive of a religious act that is condemned. The false motive is “to be seen of men.” This earthly motive poisons the life of the soul; it destroys all the beauty of good deeds. The prayer of the hypocrite is no true prayer; it is only acting; it goes no deeper than the lips and reaches no higher than the ceiling. Many prayers are offered. They are alike to men hearing them, but God can distinguish them. He knows which ones are intended for His ears, and which are intended for the ears of men. He ignores the one and rewards the other. When you pray in secret, with the world shut out, as if in a secret closet, the Lord will hear you and reward you openly.

There is also here a caution against “vain” repetition. Not all repetition is vain. Our Lord repeated the same petition three times in one evening of prayer (Mat. 26:36-44). Nor does He forbid a long prayer, for He prayed all night (Luke 6:12). What He does forbid is making the number and length of prayers an object of consideration or a source of trust as is done today by the repetition of the Roman Catholic rosary.

God already knows both our needs and desires. Therefore, our prayers are not intended to **inform** God, but to put ourselves in such communion with Him as to make us fit to receive, and to make us conscious that all good things come from Him.

Jesus then gives His disciples a model prayer (6:9-15) While the words of this prayer are wholesome and good, they are not to be mechanically repeated as a religious cant, but they are intended to guide us in knowing the proper things for which to pray. The petitions are so obvious in their meaning and application that they need no further comment. Only the first petition, “Thy Kingdom come” has a different application today. Being introduced before the kingdom or Church of our Lord was established it was a prayer for its successful establishment. But today, subsequent to its establishment (cf., Acts 2), our meaning should be for it to come in ever increasing glory and power.

RELIGIOUS OSTENTATION: IN FASTING (6:16-18)

Jesus closes this part of His sermon by warning against one more external exhibition. He spoke of fasting, of going without food for spiritual purposes. We will remember that He fasted, as well as other Bible characters. Surely it must please God when we lay aside everything else, even including eating, in order to seek His face.

Fasting, as an aid to meditation and prayer, is a good and wholesome thing, which is too little practiced by His people today. But, fixed and stated fasts (such as the modern Lenten season) lead to hollow formalism without meaning before God,

Fasting should be a personal matter between a man and his God, and Christ admonishes us to conceal the fast so as to avoid hypocritical ostentation. Therefore, “anoint thine head, and wash thy face” (Mat. 6:17) that is, conceal the fast as much as possible. For fasting is intended for self-abasement, and not to cultivate pride. This religious act, too, when done in secret shall have the open reward of our heavenly Father.

THE TWO TREASURIES (6:19-21)

In every age of the world great emphasis has been placed on money and material things. The greatest desire of the majority of people is to be rich. We dream and scheme and work to this end, and are never satisfied with what we have. And yet everything we have of earthly value is constantly subject to moths, rust and decay. And even if they should not slip from our grasp while we live, they will surely be forfeited at death. And we have no assurance that they will even be a blessing to those to whom we leave them; they may rather be the greatest curse to their eternal welfare, or even to their happiness on earth. Nor is there any assurance that they shall even go to those you want to receive them. God said of the rich fool “*Thou* fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided?” (Luke 12:20). Hence the utter folly of laying up treasures upon earth.

The only place where our treasures are safe is in heaven. We place them there by using our material means, as well as ourselves, for the advancement of the Kingdom of God on earth, and for the good of the unfortunate of earth.

Van Dyke tells the story of a hypothetical rich man. He dreamed that he went to heaven and was being escorted down the golden streets. They came to a certain house, the most beautiful in heaven. The rich man asked whose house it was. The escorting angel told him it belonged to a Christian who had been the rich man’s gardener on earth. The rich man said, “You must have made a mistake. He was never used to anything like this!” But the angel replied, “We make no mistakes in heaven. We built this house out of the material he sent up for us to use.”

Soon they came to a very small, unpretentious house on an insignificant, out of the way street. The man asked the angel whose house this was, and was told it was the rich man's house. In great disbelief the man replied, "Oh, you have certainly made a mistake now. Down on earth I lived in the finest house that money could buy." Again the angel replied, "We make no mistakes in heaven. We built that house, the best that we could build, out of the material you sent up for us to use." What kind of treasures are we laying up in heaven? If our treasures are not in heaven, neither can our hearts be!

SIMPLICITY OF CONSCIENCE (6:22-23)

The intellect is the eye of the soul. The eye receives the light of the sun. If it is blinded all is dark; if it is diseased, the image presented to the mind is no longer clear, distinct and single, but confused and distorted. Earthly affections distort and pervert the clear, single image that our intellect should present to the soul. If the heart is set on low, carnal objects, the intellect cannot discern clearly things that are high and heavenly. Its vision is obscured and darkened. This is the sad result of letting the eye of the mind stray to foreign, worldly and sinful interests that compete with the best interests of the soul. "And that which fell among thorns are they, which, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of *this* life, and bring no fruit to perfection" (Luke 8:14).

THE TWO MASTERS (6:24)

There are two Masters who divide the allegiance of mankind. Some serve the living and true God; some serve Mammon-riches, earthly things. But no man serves both; it is impossible. The heart cannot be divided between the two; its chiefest affections must be set on one great center. Those who really set their love and service on God will not be distracted by the relatively insignificant things of this material life on earth. They will be despised, that is relegated to an insignificant place in the life of the true Christian, There is nothing upon earth that he desires in comparison with God. But on the other hand, those who set their love on mammon will end up hating God, because He will not allow them the free and full expression of their growing sensual desires. "The friendship of the world is enmity with God" (Jam. 4:4). To serve mammon is to desert the true God, and set up an idol in the heart, for Paul declares that "covetousness which is idolatry" (Col. 3:5). There is no escape from this awful, solemn alternative. It is God or Mammon,

Jehovah or Baal, heaven or the world. There is no middle way; no compromise. “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart” (Luke 10:27). “Love not the world” (1 John 2:15).

CHRIST’S REMEDY FOR ANXIETY (6:25-34)

The only true remedy for anxiety is to fully trust in the Lord and His loving care for His servants. Peter encourages us by saying, “Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you” (1 Pet. 5:7). Those who serve Him must not be divided in mind. They must not allow over-anxiety concerning earthly needs to distract their hearts.

The Psalmist said, “I have been young, and *now* am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread” (Psa. 37:25). The apostle Paul assures us “that love God, to them who are the called according to *his* purpose” (Rom. 8:28). And Jesus says,

Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? (Mat. 6:25-26).

Why should we then be worried half sick day after day? Is not this a lack of faith in God and His promises?

But, we must remember that it is this over-anxiety, not carefulness, industry and thrift, that Christ forbids. He nowhere commends the thoughtless, the careless, the loafer. Holy Scripture bids Christians to work “with quietness...and eat their own bread” (2 The. 3:12), and it condemns those who “provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house” (1 Tim. 5:8). Thus, Jesus does not advocate a gross irresponsibility in regard to even material needs. What He forbids is distracting anxiety for the future. We must do our duty day by day and leave the future to God. God made the body. It is His gift to each individual. And He who gave the greater (the Body) will give the less (the needs for the body). That He will give the things needed for the human life He illustrates by His treatment and care for the fowls of the air and the lilies of the field.

Jesus concludes His discussion of the comparative value of heavenly versus earthly things by saying “But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you” (Mat. 6:33). His general theme had been earthly needs, and these are the things He will provide for those who seek Him first. This will not only

be best for us here on earth, but it is the only course that will save the soul. It is the depth of human folly to do otherwise, for “what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?” (Mark 8:36).

THE CHRISTIAN’S RELATIONSHIP WITH GOD (7:7-12)

In this consoling passage we are taught that God has the same concern for His spiritual children that a human father has for his son-yea, and even greater, to the extent that He is greater than man. This means that He hears the prayers of His children, and gives them what they need. He will not give “evil” gifts, the “stone” or the “serpent” even though we may blindly ask for them. Rather He knows how to give good gifts unto His children.

“Every one that asketh receiveth.” Here again Jesus uses a universal language “every one”; but the term is modified by His conditions of acceptable prayer, including being His “son” as implied in verse 9. As another illustration; He must “ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord” (Jam. 1:6-7).

To this thought he adds the “golden rule.” As God gives us “good things,” and only such, so we must at all times do good unto our fellowman. If there be any difficulty in determining what is truly good then simply apply the consideration unto yourself. You know how you want people to treat you; then, simply treat others likewise.

OBSTACLES WHICH IMPEDE OUR PROGRESS (7:13-20)

Here we are given a vivid contrast between the “broad way” and the “narrow way.” This contrast has to do with the different destinies of the two ways. The “broad way” of the “many people” leads to destruction. The “narrow way” of the “few that find it” leads to life. Thus, our progress towards heaven is impeded by the broad way of sin and error, which characterize the majority of the people of earth.

Next we are given the impeding influence of false teachers. They come unto you with a guise of goodness and love for your soul; that is “in sheep’s clothing.” But they are hypocritical, rotten to the core, or as Jesus expresses it “inwardly they are ravening wolves.” It is the glut of their own satisfaction, as they make “Merchandise” of your souls, that they are interested in.

“Ye shall know them by their fruits.” If they lead into immorality and sin, of course they are false prophets, as their evil fruits declare. But another, less commonly used, standard of judgment concerning them is their relation to the Unity of the Spirit. If their doctrine leads to divisions of a religious and spiritual nature they are also false prophets, teaching heresies a work of the flesh. (Gal. 5:19-20). In the end they shall be “hewn down, and cast into the fire.” This end we all applaud as just, but we must know that their followers shall share their evil fate; for “if the blind lead the blind, **both** shall fall into the ditch” (Mat. 15:14).

THE VANITY OF MERE PROFESSION (7:21-27)

This familiar passage sounds the death knell to all whose religion does not conform to “the will of my Father which is in heaven.” Even those who are most zealous and sincere find no comfort here unless their religion is right, conforming strictly to the Father’s will. Even many who boast of “many wonderful works” are still unknown by divine recognition; “And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.” The will of the Father is revealed in the Bible. It contains “All scripture...given by inspiration of God” (2 Tim. 3:16). The will of God thus revealed, must be done, explicitly obeyed, if we would be recognized of God and be saved.

This truth is illustrated in the concluding paragraph of the sermon on the Mount. To hear these “sayings of mine” and do them, Jesus said is to be likened unto a man who builds on the solid foundation of rock. To hear them and do them not is to build on the insufficient foundation of sand. The testing time of life will reveal whether we are wise or foolish; especially the Great Testing Time called the General Judgment that shall come unto all (Heb. 9:27; 2 Cor. 5:10). Only they who have done the will of God shall be permitted to enter unto that eternal city of the soul.

ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCH: ITS CHALLENGES

Wallace Maxwell

The role of women in the church continues to be a great challenge. In our efforts to restore the church of the first century, we must understand the important role of women in first century Christianity and encourage women in the church today to follow their example. Although the status of women has undergone great changes in most areas of life since the first century, women's role in the church as set forth in the Bible remains unchanged; therefore, we have an obligation to challenge the women in our congregations to accept that role.

ROLE OF SUBJECTION

Our first challenge to women in the church is to accept and be happy in the God given role which requires them to be subject unto man. The apostle Paul wrote, "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman *is* the man; and the head of Christ *is* God" (1 Cor. 11:3) In the creation "God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, *it was very good*" (Gen. 1:31). The first thing God saw that was not good was man being alone; therefore, God made a "help meet" for him. (Gen. 2:18) A "help meet" is "a helper that will assist him in the work given him to do, carrying it out in the same spirit" (*Hastings Bible Dictionary* 3:34).

Woman was made from man and for man, "For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man" (1 Cor. 11:3-9).

And Jehovah God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof: and the rib, which Jehovah God had taken from the man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And the man said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man (Gen. 2:21-23).

The sacredness and the exaltation of woman's position is set forth by the apostle Paul when he compares the position of the wife to her

husband to that of the church to Christ (Eph. 5:23). “Wives, *be in subjection* unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the church” (Eph. 5:22-23). The church is blessed and exalted by being in subjection to Christ; and in like manner, the wife is blessed and exalted in being in subjection to her own husband. God has created woman for this role; there—fore, it is the role in life where a godly woman can find true happiness and glorify her creator.

The Woman’s Liberation Movement takes a very dim view of the Genesis account regarding women’s subjective role. In the book *Female Liberation* by Roberta Salper there is a chapter concerning the creation written by Ellen Battelle Dietrick. In regard to the record of Genesis, chapters 1 and 3, she says,

Now as it is manifest that both these stories cannot be true; intelligent women, who feel bound to give the preference to either, may decide according to their own judgment of which is more worthy of an intelligent woman’s acceptance. Paul’s rule is a good one in this dilemma, “prove all things; hold fast to that which is good.” My own opinion is that the second story was manipulated by some Jew, in an endeavor to give heavenly authority for requiring a woman to obey the man she marries (n.p.).

The Women’s Liberation Movement calls upon women to reject the God ordained role of subjection in the church and in domestic life. Liberationist claim that this God ordained role is an unfair and discriminatory hindrance to women who want to reach great goals in life. They seem to think that God has unduly restricted them. Their assertions sound like the one used by the serpent in beguiling Eve. He made her think that God was unduly restricting her by not allowing her to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. He said to Eve, “for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil” (Gen. 3:5). But Eve’s rejection of God’s ordinance did not bring her happiness. Neither will women’s rejection of God’s ordinance today bring them happiness.

Ladies, the so called Women’s Liberation Movement does not just have for its goal equal opportunity, equal job rights and equal pay for women who have the same profession or do the same work as men. Some of the chief writers and leaders of the Women’s Liberation Movement are trying to destroy the sacred institution of marriage and the home as God ordained it. What are they offering in place of mar-

riage? Listen to this quote from *Female Liberation* by Roberta Salper on Marriage and Love.

If, however, woman is free and big enough to learn the mystery of sex without the sanction of state or church, she will stand condemned as utterly unfit to become the wife of a “good” man, his goodness consisting of an empty head and plenty of money. Can there be anything more outrageous than the idea that a healthy, grown woman, full of life and passion, must deny nature’s demand, must subdue her most intense craving, undermine her health and break her spirit, must stunt her vision, abstain from the depth and glory of sex experience until a “good” man comes along to take her unto himself as a wife, that is precisely what marriage means. How can such an arrangement end except in failure? This is one, though not the least important, factor of marriage, which differentiates it from love (n.p.).

Ladies, the women’s liberationist are out to liberate you from the life and peace that God offers His children in Christian marriage to a life of fornication, anarchy, unhappiness and eternal ruin. I challenge you to accept your God given role in life and be happy therein. Do not look upon yourself as “just a housewife.” As a Christian homemaker, you are a wife, mother, nurse, teacher, hostess, etc.

The woman who chooses to become a wife and mother should not look upon her work as inferior to the careers of others. It is a calling which glorifies God and perpetuates his creation. It is the greatest calling of all, having the gravest responsibilities and the greatest possibilities. The magnitude and fame of her work are expressed in the following quotations:

All that I am, or can be, I owe to my angel mother.—Abraham Lincoln

The mother’s heart is the child’s schoolroom.—Henry Ward Beecher

The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world.—John Gray

Youth fades, love droops, the leaves of friendship fall;

A mother’s secret love outlives them all.—Oliver Wendell Holmes

The bravest battle that ever was fought,

Shall I tell you where and when?

On the maps of the world you will find it not;

It was fought by the mothers of men—Joaquin Miller (Browlow 66).

A CHALLENGE TO TEACH

Our attitude toward women teaching in the church has been generally characterized by negativism. We have preached far more about the limitations that God has placed on women as teachers than we have about the great opportunities that are open to them as teachers. We have

emphasized the importance of the role of those who serve the congregation when it is assembled in such a way that anyone who does not serve the congregation when it is assembled is not doing important work. This attitude has caused many congregations to neglect the great role that women should have in the church. A congregation that fails to use its “woman power” neglects one of its greatest potentials.

Women in the first century recognized the opportunity to be a “help meet” in teaching the gospel of Christ. Priscilla was a “help meet” to her husband in teaching the eloquent Alexandrian Jew, Apollos, the truth concerning baptism. “they took him unto *them*, and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly” (Acts 13:26). We need to challenge women in the church to become soul winners like Priscilla. Ladies, by encouraging your husband to work with you in personal evangelism, you can do far more working together than both of you can do working alone. By working together you compliment one another in the work and are able to teach in any home situation,

There were women at Phillip! who were “help meets” of Paul in the gospel. “And I intreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and *with* other my fellowlabourers, whose names *are* in the book of life.” (Phi. 4:3). How did these women labor? The anti-Sunday school, anti-women teacher faction in the church used to say that these women washed Paul’s shirts, that would also make Clement and the other fellow labourers just laundry workers. Paul said they “laboured with me in the gospel.” “Labor” is translated from the Greek word *sonathleo* and is also translated “striving together” in Philippians 1:27. It means “to contend on the side of anyone; in N. T. to cooperate vigorously with a person (Phil. 4:3) to make effort in the cause of; in support of a thing” (Phil 1:27) (*Analytical Greek Lexicon* n.p.). We must remember that in Grecian and Asiatic countries, women were generally kept secluded; therefore, it was necessary that they should have capable women teachers to instruct them. The secluding of women brought about the role of deaconesses, women servants of the church, according to Phillip Schaff.

This office was more needful on account of the rigid separation of the sexes of the day, especially among the Greeks and Orientals. It opened to pious women and virgins, and chiefly to widows, a most suitable field for the regular official exercise of—their peculiar gifts of self-denying charity and devotion to the welfare of the church. Through it they could carry the light and comfort of the gospel into the most

private and delicate relations' of domestic life, without at all overstepping their natural sphere (*The History of the Christian Church* 1:449).

The need for women to teach the gospel to other women is just as great today as it was in the first century. They often have more time and opportunity to do personal work than men and they need to prepare themselves to teach the families in their communities. Ladies, I challenge you to attend personal evangelistic workshops and become an active personal evangelist among the ladies in your community. Personal evangelism is an "equal opportunity program" and you must become involved.

Women are doing a wonderful job teaching in the Bible School programs in most congregations. We never had a nursery class at Wesconnett until about 4 years ago, and our preschool program consisted of women babysitting for an hour each Sunday morning. At that time, the elders placed a dedicated woman over our preschool department and today we have a preschool department that is second to none. A workshop is conducted each Tuesday and the women of the congregation are encouraged to come to the workshop and help the teachers make their visual aids and become better acquainted with the work they are doing. The godly women in our preschool department are trying to create in little children respect for God's Word and respect for those who teach it. Little boys two and three years old are encouraged to take their Bibles and stand at a little pulpit before the class and be "the preacher." They told me about one little fellow who stood up to be "the preacher" and he had trouble finding something to say, his face became flushed, his eyes protruded, and he looked like he would burst. Finally, he spoke one word, "Jesus." He then walked over and sat down. That was his first attempt at preaching—we hope it won't be his last. Ladies, we need to restore respect for God's Word and for the preachers and elders that uphold it. This teaching must be started at the preschool age. If you do not have such a program where you worship, I suggest you start one immediately.

Women are usually more effective than men in taking a religious census, canvassing for the bus program, setting up cottage meetings, advertising the gospel meeting, etc. If you can collect for the heart fund or solicit for other good causes, you can solicit for Christ and His church. Women will open their doors for you when their husbands are not home but they will refuse to answer the door when they "peep out" and see a strange man at the door. Furthermore, some mothers will

agree for their children to ride the church bus when they are approached by a woman who would not discuss the matter with a man. Some mothers are afraid and would not think of their children going anywhere with a strange man. However, I do not think it wise for women to go knocking on doors in large cities without male accompaniment—it is too dangerous. Sometime ago a young girl in Jax was selling candy to raise money for a program at her school. When she knocked at one house where four teenage hoodlums lived, they took her into the house and raped her.

Aged women in the church are specifically instructed to teach younger women “to love their husbands, to love their children, *To be* discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed” (Tit. 2:3-6). This passage designates who is to do the teaching, and who is to be taught; it also names the subject material. Many problems in the home and in the church today are due to the failure of the older women regarding these matters. The word “teach” in this passage is often translated “train.” It means “to make sober minded, to steady by exhortation, guidance, to restore to right mind” (*Analytical Greek Lexicon* n.p.). “To moderate, control, curb, discipline, to admonish, to exhort earnestly” (*Thayers Greek Lexicon* n.p.).

The major part of this teaching should be done before the young women have husbands and children. The principles and values upon which young people start out in marriage are usually the principles and values which they have learned from their own homes. The attitudes that the mother has toward her husband, her children, and her family responsibilities are passed on to her daughters. The failure of mothers to prepare their daughters for marriage has contributed to the high divorce rate among Christian couples. Some mothers give too much attention to training and dressing their daughters “to catch” husbands and too little attention is given in training young women to be wives, mothers, “keepers at home” and keepers of husbands. Some young women are like falcons—trained to catch but not trained to respect and appreciate what they catch. Many young women today are not trained to cook, to sew, to keep house, and to live within the family income. In this materialistic age, Christian mothers are caught up in the craze to give their children all the material gadgets that money can buy, but too often neglect to teach them to know and to appreciate spiritual, moral, domestic and marital responsibility. Some young mothers who are now

working to give their children a college education are not giving them enough attention to successfully see them through Junior High School.

When a child is born into a Jewish home, the mother may say, "This child will be a devout Jew." When a child is born into a Catholic home, the mother may say, "This child will be a devout Catholic." When a child is born into a Christian home, the mother may say, "The Lord only knows what this child will be." These expressions often reveals the training the mother expects the child to receive. We often hear the statement, "The church is losing its young people." Statistics and personal observation shows this to be true. But, in too many cases, the parents were lost to the church before the children were lost. The church cannot take over the responsibility of the home and most young people are lost due to the failure of the home and not the failure of the church.

The apostle gives the purpose in having the older women to train the young women regarding their responsibility, "that the word of God be not blasphemed." The "word of God" is "blasphemed," "evil spoken of" because those who profess to be children of God do not live according to the Word of God in their domestic and material responsibilities. "What have they seen in thine house" often determines whether the word of God will be honored or blasphemed. The world and our own children need to see a sermon as well as to hear one. Christian mothers are challenged to meet their responsibilities in training their daughters as homemakers, "that the word of God be not blasphemed."

Aged women whose behavior "becometh holiness" should be used by congregations to counsel younger women who are having problems as wives and mothers. They are better qualified by experience and by nature to teach these principles to younger women than preachers and elders. All the materials instructive in this subject which are available to the average preachers and elders are also available to women, who should be encouraged to buy books on counseling and to take courses offered in the local colleges and universities on counseling. Using older women who are qualified to work in this capacity has manifold advantages:

1. The older women are enabled to follow the instructions Paul has given to them regarding the younger women.
2. The younger women are benefited by learning firsthand from the aged women how to face the problems of life.

3. The older women learn about the failures of other women by seeing the need of their daughters. This enables them to make corrections in their teaching program.
4. The preacher is also helped, as most of the people who seek counseling from preachers are women; when older women do this work, it gives the preacher more time to study and to fulfill his God-given role.
5. The preacher is also removed from the situation where he might be criticized for being involved in the affairs of young women.
6. The older women who serve as counselors are made to feel that they are useful servants of the Lord in his church.
7. Bible things are done in Bible ways.

Preachers have taken the responsibility of counseling women because older women are failing in their duty. I know that preachers can be helpful in counseling families who are having marital problems but preachers are out of their field when they start trying to counsel women regarding matters mentioned in Titus 2:3-6. I know that some preachers are specialist in the field of counseling. I have no criticism of the work they are doing. But even specialist in the medical field have general practitioners who refer most of their cases to them. I think it is wise for preachers to have some godly woman to serve as “general practitioners” in the realm of counseling women and let them recommend to the preacher the cases they are unable to handle.

Some preachers have paid a high price for failing to have older women work in this field. Preachers’ counseling sessions with young women can interfere with his own family happiness. Preacher, your wife might not be happy to realize that her husband is counseling some young woman “to love her husband” and “to love her children.” She might suggest to you this parable, “Physician heal thyself.” Young preachers, what are you going to do when the young woman goes home and tells her husband what she has discussed with you. She might say, “The preacher and I discussed the fact that you are not nice to me or you don’t treat me right.” You might have done the listening and she did the talking, but to her, it may be considered as a discussion. If her husband is not a Christian and she is, as is usually the case, you are going to have a hard time teaching him the gospel. I believe such discussions between preachers and young women are usually out of propriety and are contrary to the teaching of the Scripture. If we are

going to restore New Testament Christianity as it was in the first century, we must restore the role of women in this matter and encourage them to exercise themselves therein. Brethren, we do not want women to exercise the responsibility of men in the Church, and we should be just as concerned about men exercising the responsibility of women.

Here is how we handle the counseling at Wesconnett. We have three or four women in our congregation and one in another congregation who have been approved by our elders as counselors for young women. When some woman comes to me with a problem that relates to the things mentioned in Titus 2:3-6, I refer her to one of these women in our congregation. If she is too ashamed or embarrassed to go to one of the ladies in our congregation, I suggest that she talk to one from another congregation. Sometimes she does not even tell the other lady who she is, she just tells the older woman that I suggest that she contact her.

We have three major prerequisites that we look for in these older women: (1) That they have successfully raised a Christian family, (2) That they have the biblical and marital knowledge to counsel young women; and (3) That they have the willingness to listen to the young women's problems and the courage to tell them in kindness their responsibility. Brethren, when these Godly women use the Bible and common sense in discussing these matters and do not resolve the matter, the young woman usually needs medical or psychiatric help

OTHER CHALLENGING BIBLICAL EXAMPLES

Dorcas is a challenging example of benevolence. "This woman was full of good works and almsdeeds which she did" (Acts 9:36). She exercises the stewardship of sewing. *The Great Men and Women of the Bible* expresses her case in this way:

The special charm of Dorcas charities lies in the fact that she worked for the poor with her own hands. She is celebrated for her "good works" as well as for her "almsdeeds": If the latter means her gifts, the former would point to her personal actions. Perhaps she remembered her Lord's commendation, "I was naked and ye clothed me" and thought that, if it was true that in clothing the poor she clothed Christ, she would do it with no other hands than her own, for it might be that she would, in spirit at least, draw virtue from the hem of his garments while she made them (n.p.).

Dorcas' action is a challenging example for individual action, doing what one can with what one has. Too much work in the church today awaits special motivation and regimentation. Christians should need no greater motivation than the love of Christ to move them to evangelism and benevolence.

There are widows today who need clothing and there are many aged who are suffering from loneliness and boredom. Women today should take advantage of the same opportunity to warm the hearts and bodies of the needy as Dorcas did.

Lydia is a good example of hospitality. Her invitation to Paul and his friends was, "If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide *there*" (Acts 16:15). Hospitality does not depend upon the size of your house or the size of your table, but the size of your heart and of your faithfulness to the Lord. "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels un-awares" (Heb. 13:2).

In writing to the church at Rome, Paul includes this salutation, "Salute Rufus chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine" (Rom. 16:13). There is no indication that Paul and Rufus were fleshly brothers. Paul had received from Rufus' mother the care and affection she gave to her own son. He responded to her with the care and affection that he gave to his own mother.

Christian ladies, there are many young Christians scattered throughout the United States who are away from home and the influences of a godly mother. As you have opportunity, you can invite them to share the fellowship of your home and family. They will usually respond to your kindness with the same love and appreciation that Paul declared to Rufus' mother. Furthermore, there are young people in your own community who have never experienced the joy of being associated with a Christian family and "whosoever ye will ye may do them good" (Mark 14:7).

Peter challenges women to adorn their hearts in that which is not corruptible—a meek and quiet spirit.

Likewise, ye wives, *be* in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; While they behold your chaste conversation *coupled* with fear. Whose adorning let it not be that outward *adorning* of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; But *let it be* the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, *even the ornament* of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight

of God of great price. For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands: Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement (1 Pet. 3:1-6).

Paul instructs women to adorn themselves as “women professing godliness.” (1 Tim. 2:10).

The concluding challenge unto women in the church today is to manifest Jesus Christ in thought, word, dress, and action. Women who accept this challenge will find so much to do in life that God’s restrictions prohibiting them from exercising a public role in the church will be considered a blessing.

WORKS CITED

Analytical Greek Lexicon.

Brownlow, Leroy. *Some “Do’s” and “Don’ts” for the Christian.*

Hastings Bible Dictionary.

Salper, Roberta. *Female Liberation.* New York, NY: Alfred H. Knopf Cor., 1972.

Thayers Greek Lexicon.

The History of the Christian Church.

WOMAN'S ROLE IN THE CHURCH: ITS PROBLEMS

Wallace Maxwell

The problems concerning woman's role in the church fall into two classifications: (1) Woman's failure to carry out her God given role; (2) Woman's usurpation of authority to carry out a role God has not given her.

WOMEN TEACHING AND PRAYING

The problems that have been created by congregations which permit women to pray and to teach in mixed assemblies were almost unknown among our brethren ten years ago. The congregations which permit women to pray and to teach in mixed assemblies have changed from their former position by the combined influence of neo-pentecostalism, "Women's lib" and liberalism coupled with weak Bible preaching. These influences cannot prevail in a congregation where the Scriptures regarding the role of women in the church are faithfully declared. If people will accept the verbal inspiration and the complete authority of the Bible, they will reject the liberal position that some brethren are presenting on this subject.

First Timothy 2:8-14 contains sufficient information on this subject to satisfy all sincere seekers of truth. This passage is vital to our study because (1) Paul is writing to establish proper behavior in the church.

These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly: But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. 3:14-15).

(2) He is not concerned with the conduct of those possessing spiritual gifts; therefore, the passage is applicable to our time and circumstance; (3) Paul sets forth the rule of the Holy Spirit regarding the conduct of both men and women in mixed assemblies.

First Timothy 2:8-14—

I desire therefore that the men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and disputing. In like manner, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefastness and sobriety; not with braided hair, and gold or pearls or costly raiment; but (which becometh women professing godliness) through good works. Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness. For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression.

There is general agreement that Paul in this chapter has reference to the conduct of men and women in public worship. What constitutes public worship? The answer to this question is very important to our understanding of Paul's instruction in 1 Timothy 2.

There are those among us who define and limit "public worship" to the "regular services" and "special meetings" conducted in meeting houses or church buildings under the oversight of the elders or leaders of the local congregation to which the public is invited. Any worship service that is not covered by their definition of "public worship" is "private worship," and women who engage in these private services are not subject to Paul's restriction in 1 Timothy 2. When you ask these brethren about women leading prayer in the presence of Christian men, they will say "that was a private service and 1 Timothy 2 is not relevant to women leading prayer in private worship." Their concept of what constitutes public and private worship is not supported by the Bible or by church history. A separate public meeting house for Christian worship was unknown to first century Christianity.

There is no clear example of a separate building set apart for Christian worship within the limits of the Roman empire before the third century, though apartments in private houses might be especially devoted to this purpose (Lightfoot 2:179).

Church historians tell us that in the early church there were both private and public services. The service was private when the Lord's supper was observed, limited to Christians, and not open to the general public; but when the early disciples met for prayer and edification, the services were open to the general public. References regarding the services are formed in *The Internal Standard Bible Encyclopedia* Vol. 5, p. 3112; *A Dictionary of the Bible* edited by James Hastings Vol. 1, p. 462; and *A History of the Christian Church* by Willistan Walker, p. 84. These references regarding what was called private and public

worship in the early church are almost directly opposite to the concepts of private and public worship today.

Scholars generally agree that 1 Timothy 2 has reference to the conduct of men and women in public worship. In 1 Timothy 2, Paul mentions two acts of worship, prayer and teaching. He gives instructions which are material to the conduct of men and women who jointly participate in prayer and in teaching. If 1 Timothy 2 has reference to public worship, the joint participation of men and women in prayer and in teaching constitutes public worship and must be conducted according to Paul's instructions in 1 Timothy 2,

Brethren, I believe we can all agree that when men and women join together in prayer and in teaching, they are worshiping. In what sense can it always be called public worship? The word "public" is defined as "a group of people having common interests or characteristics" (*Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary*). A group of men and women jointly engaged in prayer and in teaching have common interests or characteristics. Therefore, the term "public worship" is always applicable to men and women who jointly engage in prayer and in teaching.

Whether 1 Timothy 2 is applicable to men and women who jointly participate in prayer and in teaching is often determined by what the worship is called. If it is called "public worship," 1 Timothy 2 is applicable; but if it is called "private worship," 1 Timothy 2 is not applicable. For example, when 50% of the members of a congregation of 200 assemble on Sunday evening to pray, to sing, and to receive edification from the Word, this is called "public worship" and women must follow Paul's instructions in 1 Timothy 2. But 10% of the members of this same congregation can assemble on Monday evening in a room of the educational building or in a private home to sing, to pray, and to be edified from God's Word; this is called private worship and women are not bound by Paul's instruction in 1 Timothy 2. Notwithstanding this fact, they are engaged in the same acts of worship as on Sunday night. Is it the time, the place, the number present, or the number invited that determines whether women may or may not lead prayer in the presence of Christian men? Certainly not! The instructions in 1 Timothy 2 are applicable anywhere men and women jointly engage in prayer and in teaching.

Notice what is said regarding prayer in verse 8, "I desire therefore that the men pray in every place." The word "men" is translated from

the Greek word *aneer* and is used to distinguish men from women. "Every place" or "everywhere" means "in all places." "Every place" or "everywhere" is broad enough to include youth meetings, retreats, Bible camps, meeting houses, and private homes (with small groups or large groups). In every place, in all places where men and women pray together, men are to audibly word the prayer.

In verse 9 Paul says, "In like manner, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel. "Modesty (*aidas*) indicates a sense of shame, a shunning from trespassing the boundaries of propriety; hence proper reserve" (Hendriksen n.p.).

Scholars tell us that this verse has reference to the apparel of women who are prepared to participate in public worship. If the worship is public enough for women to dress in modest apparel, it is public enough for men to lead the prayers.

In verse 12 the woman is not permitted "to teach, nor to have dominion over a man." This prohibition is not limited to the "public assembly" or "regular worship hour." The word "man" in 1 Timothy 2:12 is genitive singular. I have never found a Scripture that gave women authority over men in a private service. If she can teach men outside "the regular worship," she can exercise dominion outside the public assembly (even over her husband).

The solution of the problem is to be found in the nature of the teaching here forbidden. The word "teach" in this passage is from the Greek word "didasko" and Thayer says it means "to deliver didactic discourses." This women are forbidden to do (*Gospel Advocate Annual Lesson Commentary* 346).

Lenski makes an interesting comment on this verse,

Paul refers to teaching scriptures and not to imparting intellectual secular information to the mind. The public teacher of God's people does not only tell others what they need to know, but in the capacity of such a teacher he stands before his audience to rule and govern it with the Word. That position and that authority the Word itself accords to the man and withholds from the woman, and no woman may step into the place of the man without violating the very Word she would try to teach to both women and men. Her efforts to do so would be self-contradictory in God's eyes despite what the world may say. Paul is bound as much in this as we are. God and his Word have not "turned over" to him or to anybody else a right to say anything on this relation of the sexes in the church that is different from what Paul says (Lenski n.p.).

But some will say if prayer and teaching in mixed assemblies constitutes public worship, then women cannot ask or answer a question in a Bible class because she is commanded to be quiet.

Brethren, what does 1 Timothy 2 prohibit women from doing when they jointly participate with men in prayer and in teaching?

1. They are prohibited from leading prayer (v. 8).
2. They are not allowed to teach nor to have dominion over a man (v. 12).

What are women instructed to do in 1 Timothy 2? They are instructed to adorn themselves in modest apparel which becometh women professing godliness with good works.

What are women permitted to do in 1 Timothy 2? They are permitted to learn in quietness with all subjection (v. 11). Is the asking and the answering of questions a part of learning? Certainly! The apostle Paul states that asking questions is a part of learning in 1 Cor. 14:34. Therefore, women may ask and answer questions in quietness and subjection.

Quietness (*hesuchie*) does not necessarily mean total silence. Paul commands the busy bodies at Thessalonica “that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread” (2 The. 3:12). “Quietness” in 1 Timothy 2:11 is contrasted with being a teacher over men. “Quietness” in 2 Thessalonians 3:12 is contrasted with being a “busy body.”

In verses 13 and 14 Paul gives us two reasons for his prohibiting of women from teaching or exercising dominion over a man,

He states man’s headship in creation. “For Adam was first formed and then Eve.”

This verse tells us that man was first in creation and that the woman was created in a subordinate position. ‘Woman’ is also secondary and subordinate to man and the cause of his ruin, but of identical nature (Hastings 1:36).

Women and men are equal in nature but not in authority.

He states woman’s priority in the transgression. “And Adam was not beguiled but the woman being beguiled, hath fallen into transgression.” “And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat” (Gen. 3:12). The woman taught and exercised authority over the man in the transgression. Otherwise, Paul’s use of the woman’s role in the fall of man would be meaningless in this context. God said unto Adam, “thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife” (Gen. 3:17). It should be also noticed that this teaching and

dominion which she exercised over the man was done in private. This refutes the idea that the restrictions regarding women in 1 Timothy 2 are limited to the public assembly. The inspired apostle used the deception of the woman and her leadership in the fall as a reason for not allowing her to teach and to usurp authority over the man.

The Expositor's Greek Testament has an interesting comment in this connection.

Eve's reasoning faculty was at once overcome by the allegation of jealousy felt by God. An allegation plausible to a nature swayed by emotions rather than by reflection. The tempter's statement seemed to be supported by the appearance of the fruit as it was rendered attractive by hopes of vanity to be gratified. Adam's better judgment was overcome by personal influence (Gen. 3:1 "Thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife") (n.p.).

The word quietness or silence *hesuchia* should not be equated with the word "silent" (*sigao*) in I Cor. 14:34. "Sigao" describes a mental condition and its manifestation especially in speechlessness (silence from fear, grief, awe, etc)" (*Thayer's Greek Lexicon*). The word is translated in 1 Corinthians 14:23, 30, 34 and denotes a complete absence of speech. A silence motivated by fear or awe seems appropriate for people who are present in a service where miraculous gifts are being exercised. Notice verse 26, "What is it then, brethren? When ye come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying." I believe that 1 Corinthians 14 has reference to the conduct of those possessing spiritual gifts and is not specifically applicable to our time and circumstance. Now let us briefly notice, as time will allow, the arguments that are being made by brethren who believe that woman should be allowed to pray or testify in mixed assemblies.

1. Women prayed and prophesied in the public assemblies at Corinth. Paul instructs them to be veiled and show subjection (1 Cor. 11:3-5):

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head; for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven.

The women have the same right to speak in the public assemblies today as long as they do it in a submissive manner under the authority of the elders.

I have heard this argument made a number of times in the North Florida area. These brethren assume that the women prayed and prophesied in the public assemblies at Corinth, It is strange indeed that Paul would permit in Chapter 11 that which he forbids in Chapter 14. He is not writing a history that covers a period of several years. He is writing a letter, and it would be contradictory to both allowing and condemning women prophets speaking in public assemblies in the same letter. The women prophets referred to in 1 Corinthians 11:5 were married. The women referred to in 1 Corinthians 14:34 were also married, "let the women keep silence in the churches." I believe the same women are referred to in both instances.

Where do you get the idea for someone leading prayer in public assemblies? Why can't we have spontaneous prayers as they did in the early church (Acts 4:24-30 is given as an example) where both men and women prayed in the assemblies lifting up their voices together in prayer to God?

I have heard some of my brethren actually scoff at the idea of someone leading a public prayer. They seem to fail to notice such passages as 1 Corinthians 14:16. The prayer recorded in Acts 4:24-30 is not an example for the spontaneous prayers that are being offered by some congregations today. Could everyone in a spontaneous prayer say the same thing at the same time? The word "voice" is in the singular in the Greek text and the K.S.V. and A.S.V., This indicated that one spokesman expressed in words the prayer of all present.

If all of the people present said the same prayer aloud in unison, they would have either spoken by the miraculous inspiration of the Holy Spirit, or the prayer was read by all present, or the prayer had been memorized and was recited; but in any of these circumstances, the prayer would not have been spontaneous.

2. Woman was created co-equal with man, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman" (Gen. 2:23). Prior equality is implied in that woman was subjected to man after the fall (Gen. 3:16). This subjection was also given as part of her punishment. The subjection became a part of God's natural law and will continue to be binding as long as the natural order of things exist. However, what she lost spiritually in the fall, she has regained in Christ.

“There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one *man* in Christ Jesus” (Gal. 3:26). The only law (rule) making woman's role in God's kingdom different from man's is God's natural law wherein he made her subject to man. As long as God's natural order of things continue women will be obligated to perform in a modest submissive manner.

The conclusion of this argument cannot be true because the argument is based upon false assumptions.

(1) There is nothing in Genesis 2:23 that suggests that woman was co-equal with man in authority.

The language is expressive at once of woman's derivation from man (1 Cor. 11:3, 12) and likeness to man. The first of these implies her subordination or subjection to man, or man's headship over woman (1 Cor. 11:3) which Adam immediately proceeds to assert by assigning to her a name; the second is embodied in the name which she received (*The Pulpit Commentary on Genesis* 1:52).

The apostle Paul recognized the superiority of man in the creation and the confirmation of that authority in the fall (1 Tim. 2:11-12). He also revealed the submissive position of woman in the creation in 1 Corinthians 11:3, 7-9.

The statement in Genesis 3:16 that “he shall rule over you” is not given as a part of woman's punishment. Man was given this authority in creation (1 Cor. 11:3, 7-9). Some seem to think that because it is mentioned following the fall, it must be regarded as punishment for woman's part in the fall. The bearing of children is also mentioned in the same connection, but not as punishment because the woman was to bear children before she sinned (Gen. 1:28). But because she sinned, she brought sorrow and pain upon herself, particularly in childbirth.

The argument made from Galatians 3:28 to show that man has no spiritual authority over woman is invalid. The passages have reference to salvation. Salvation through Christ, the promise to Abraham, is given to all regardless of sex, social status, or ethnic origin. The passages do not remove sexual, social, psychological, and emotional differences. Peter commands men to show special consideration to “women” as “weaker vessels” (1 Pet. 3:7).

The conclusion that “woman will be obligated to perform in a modest submissive manner” is false, predicated upon the unscriptural assumptions that we have just considered in the preceding arguments. The “performance” that is mentioned has reference to women teaching and

praying in the public assemblies. No woman can “perform” what God has forbidden her to do in “a modest submissive manner.” In trying to do that which is forbidden by God, she becomes immodest and rebellious.

3. Paul is just regulating a custom of the time as he did with the custom of the holy kiss.

The two “customs” cannot be equated. The prohibition of women speaking in public assemblies is of Divine origin (1 Tim. 2:12, 34). The “custom” of greeting one another with a kiss is not of divine origin.

All the commands and ordinances of God are commanded by Jesus Christ, repeated by the apostles, and then embodied in the main teaching of the Holy Spirit, not left simply to the salutations and greetings at the close of the letters to the churches. We have no example of the apostles practicing it. It is nowhere mentioned in the body of the letters, but is given at the close, among the incidentals and the salutations to the individuals. Kissing was the salutation of the East, and the apostle cautioned that it should be a pure and holy kiss. He did not ordain kissing as a mode of salutation (Lipscomb n.p.).

4. Paul is just regulating a custom of the time. In those days it was a shame for a woman to speak in a mixed religious assembly; therefore, she was to keep silent. We do not have the same custom today. Women have much more liberty today than they had then. It is not a shame for a woman to speak in a mixed religious assembly today. Therefore, she is not obligated to remain silent.

This is an argument that the Disciples of Christ (Christian churches) have used for years. Let’s apply the same reasoning to baptism. It was a custom in apostolic days to baptize by immersion. Therefore, all valid baptism was by immersion. It is not a custom that everyone be baptized by immersion today. Therefore, immersion is not the only valid baptism. The Christian Church has accepted this invalid argument and allowed women to speak in mixed assemblies for several years. In more recent years they have come around to accepting the same invalid argument on baptism. I hope some of my brethren will wake up and see where they are headed.

5. “Women may participate in any phase of the assembly worship as long as they do so by the authorization of the eldership—man eldership—and performs their role in a submissive manner.”

How can elders have the right to allow a woman to do what God has forbidden? If they can give women the right to preach or teach in mixed assemblies, why can’t they also give them the right to exercise authority

over their own husbands? The same passage would be ignored in both circumstances (1 Tim. 2:11-14). Elders cannot give that which they do not possess, the authority to nullify the commands of God.

6. The general view held by these brethren concerning Paul's limitation in 1 Timothy 2 is that he is speaking of the public worship service. Therefore, the passage is not relevant to small groups of men and women meeting in a private home, to youth meetings, or to meetings not planned by the elders of the congregation.

An unbiased consideration of the passage clearly reveals the error of their interpretations. If this passage is limited to the public worship then, (1) women are required to dress modestly, "which becometh women professing godliness," only in the public assembly, and (2) women would be restricted from exercising authority over men (even their own husbands) only in the public worship. We have too many immodestly dressed women and too many domineering women in the church even where Paul's instructions are faithfully proclaimed. What will be the results where this erroneous interpretation is allowed to run its full course?

Some of the more radical brethren claim that Paul was expression, his own ideas and practices in the matter; he said, "I," therefore, he was not inspired but was giving his own judgment. They say Paul makes a difference in his speaking by inspiration and the giving of his own judgment in 1 Corinthians 7:6, 10, 25. These brethren have failed to notice that Paul concludes the seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians with these words about his judgment, "and I think that I also have the Spirit of God" (v. 40). The distinction that Paul is making is between the things that Jesus had directly commanded and the things he has revealed through the Holy Spirit*

The same contrast is found in 1 Corinthians 11:3 and 23. In verse 3 Paul says, "But I would have you know" and in verse 23 he delivers what he had received from the Lord. These brethren who want to "liberate" the women in the church have no doubts concerning Paul's inspiration in 1 Corinthians 11:3. They like to quote this passage because they think it gives women the right to teach and pray in public assemblies. This reveals an inconsistency on their part. They accept Paul's inspiration in 1 Corinthians 11:3 where he uses the pronoun "I," but reject his inspiration in 1 Timothy 2:11 because he uses the pronoun "I." They seem to disregard the fact that Paul is discussing the same subject in both passages. This is the convenience of not accepting

verbal inspiration—you accept the part you want to accept as being the word of God and reject the part you don't want to accept as being the word of men.

Brethren, the Bible has given explicit instructions regarding the limitations of women who jointly engage with men in worship. I urge you to accept these explicit instructions and reject all doctrines of men that are contrary to the plain teaching of the Bible.

WORKS CITED

“Genesis 2:23.” *The Pulpit Commentary*.

Gospel Advocate Annual Lesson Commentary. 1946.

Hastings, James. *A Dictionary of the Bible*.

Hendriksen, William. *New Testament Commentary on 1 Timothy*.

Lenski. *From Interpretations of Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon*.
Vol. 9. n.p.

Lightfoot. “Colosians 4:15.” *Expositors Greek New Testament*.

“1 Timothy 2:13.” *The Expositor's Greek Testament*.

EVOLUTION

Ray Peters

INTRODUCTION

1. Evolution defined: Latin, “Evolvere,” meaning, “to roll out or forth, to unfold, open out, work out, **develop gradually.**”
2. There are two areas of the theory of evolution: **Naturalistic** and **Theistic**:
 - a. **Naturalistic Evolution** is the theory that all forms of life on earth today originated from a very primitive and simple form of life and exists in the present forms because of a connected series of changes. It is claimed that each change was a natural process and that eventually, science will be able to explain such changes. This doctrine excludes a mind or intelligence from being responsible for the universe. It concludes that the only power active in the history of the world is that which is natural or inherent in nature.
 - b. **Theistic Evolution** is the hypothesis which assumes that God created and developed things but he did it by the evolutionary processes. These advocates contend that the first chapter of Genesis teaches this kind of evolution. This doctrine holds the view that the “day” in Genesis 1 refers to a very long period of time or epochs.
3. It will be the aim of this study to show the weaknesses and fallacies of Naturalistic and Theistic Evolution,

DISCUSSION

- I. Evolution Has Many Problems Which Christianity Does Not Have:
 - A. Evolution has never been offered as a fact by an Evolutionist.
 1. It is a philosophy or a faith that people believe in.
 2. It demands more faith to subscribe to evolution than to believe in God!
 3. It has never been demonstrated by facts that there have been changes from one “phylum” to another. Until this happens, evolution remains a theory.

4. **“Phylum”** is from the word “phylon” meaning, “a race or tribe,” therefore, “phylum” came to mean, “a primary division of the animal or vegetable kingdoms and that the members assume the same descent.”
- B. There is no way to test the theory by experiment.
1. It requires long periods of time for any distinctive change, there is no way to show that there is any validity to this theory.
 2. The fact that all continuing characteristics are passed-on by inheritance and not by acquiring shows conclusively that there could never be a way to satisfactorily test by experiment in favor of evolution.
 3. Dr. George Gaylord Simpson of Yale said, “The ultimate mystery is beyond the reach of scientific investigation” (*Doctrine of Evolution* 40).
- C. Evolution has no known controlling goal or principle.
1. Some try to sustain the idea that the “natural selection of genetic variants” is the guiding principle.
 2. Yet, the majority of “gene mutations” studied have proved to be harmful and those which prove helpful only strengthens existing organs and does not bring new organs into existence.
 3. The strongest advocates of evolution view it as “going in all directions at the same time, BUT yet moving forward or from the simple to the more complex during this random movement,”
 4. Julian Huxley, the son of Thomas Huxley who was a contemporary with Darwin, stated, “It is a one way process in time, not irreversible in the sense of being irrevocably determined from within, but that it appears not to be actually reversible, as various chemical reactions are. In its course, evolution produces a large amount of novelty and diversity and also generates higher levels of organization” (*Doctrine of Evolution* 22).
 5. Therefore, the theory has found no principle to guide it which could be supported by scientific knowledge. It is a chaotic theory.

- D. Many arguments used in the past in favor of evolution were found to be waning by their advocates and were forced to be abandoned.
1. The age of man has been changed to a more modern one.
 2. The idea of man evolving from a monkey is no longer argued by some.
 3. The famous eohippus to horse claim is no longer with force.
 4. The “straight line” evolution is no longer claimed.
 5. The abandonment of these long held positions shows a “glaring weakness.”
- E. The doctrine of evolution requires a favorable chance mutation beyond the range of reasonable probability.
1. Julian Huxley said, “a proportion of favorable mutations of one in a thousand does not sound like much, but it is probably generous, since so many mutations are lethal, preventing the organism from living at all, and the great majority of the rest throw the machinery slightly out of gear. And a total of a million mutational steps sound like a great deal, but it is probably an underestimate—one step every two thousand years during biological time as a whole. With this proportion, but without any selection, we should clearly have to breed a million strains to get one containing two favorable mutations. Of course, **this could not really happen**, but it is a useful way of visualizing the fantastic odds against getting a number of favorable mutations in one strain through pure chance alone—a thousand to the millionth power—one with three million naughts after it is the measure of the unlikeliness of a horse the odds against it happening at all” (*Doctrine of Evolution* 27).
 2. He said it couldn’t happen but it did.
 3. One of the great weaknesses of this theory is that it just isn’t probable!
- F. There are no transitional fossils showing a change from one phylum to another.
1. “Fossil”—from Latin, “Fodere”—to dig, and came to mean, “the imprint or form of something that has been left in sediment and in rock in the earth’s crust.”

2. Dr. H. H. Clark said, “No matter how far back we go in the fossil records of previous animal life upon the earth, we find no trace of any animal forms which are intermediate between the various groups of phyla.”—“There is not the slightest evidence that any of the major groups arose from the other” (*Doctrine of Evolution* 36).
 3. Without fossil evidence there is no valid reason to accept the theory because this is the method by which such change could be demonstrated if it had ever occurred!
 4. Without a valid demonstration through the study of fossils the whole structure of argument for evolution is without foundation!
 5. All fossils indicate the sudden appearance of life, and not a gradual process:
 - a. This sudden appearance was in many phyla, both simple and complex and have continued to the present without change.
 - b. Therefore, a creation is strongly suggested.
- G. The doctrine of evolution is necessarily **materialistic** and **atheistic** in nature.
1. “Scientism” is assumed. It is the faith that science alone can eventually answer all of man’s questions and needs,
 2. This is completely contrary to historical facts. The present situation of communistic countries shows the fallacies of such thought.
 3. The existence of mind, spirit, or moral values is necessarily excluded in scientism because these are out of bounds to science.
 - a. The materialist cannot explain words like honor, love, ought, or why,
 - b. When he accepts these words in his vocabulary he must compromise to some degree his faith in naturalistic evolution.
 4. The doctrine of evolution is productive of evil and is harmful:
 - a. If materialism or scientism is accepted, then moral values must be rejected.
 - b. In fact immorality would be the result. T. H. Huxley called it the “tooth and claw” existence, and

- some have referred to it as, “survival by any means.”
- c. George B. Shaw, a creative evolutionist, admitted that evolution could not change people from uncivilized to civilized or from bad to good, but rather it would have the opposite effect.
5. Materialism cannot account for the existence of intelligence:
 - a. It cannot account for the existence of **design** in the universe.
 - b. It is also contrary to science concerning the existence of the universe.
 - c. Materialism necessarily implies that matter is eternal, but science demonstrates by the Second Law of Thermodynamics that matter must have had a beginning:
 - (1) The First Law of Thermodynamics, “Even though energy changes forms it cannot be created or destroyed, therefore, the sum total of energy remains the same.”
 - (2) The Second Law of Thermodynamics, “Energy deteriorates in the sense that it becomes displaced or less available for work in the processes of energy changing forms. In other words, the universe is growing old or wearing out!
 - (3) This strikes a death blow to the theory of evolution!
 6. The doctrine of evolution, if followed fully, demands a rejection of God.
 - a. For this reason it is harmful and unreasonable.
 - b. It is rejected by the reasonable mind.
- H. The doctrine of evolution is very **complicated**,
1. It at first may have seemed to be a simple process, turned into a theory that is complicated beyond understanding.
 2. The only way the theory can be accepted is “by faith.”
- II. Why Has The Doctrine of Evolution Had Such Wide-Spread Acceptance?
- A. It claims to be scientific.

- B. It claims to be “the intellectual” way.
 - 1. Its advocates stress claim to “superior” knowledge over those who cling to “belief” in an “outdated” book, the Bible.
 - 2. In our sophisticated society and generation most people want to be at least on the side of the intellectual.
 - C. It relieves the individual of “personal” responsibility for the conditions of sin.
 - 1. It reconciles the presence of sorrow, suffering, and evil with the carnal mind.
 - 2. It explains that it all is the result of natural change and will **progress** for the better.
 - D. Evolution claims to be the only respectable and reasonable way.
 - E. It is very **militant!**
 - 1. Its advocates are extremely evangelistic.
 - 2. It begins its battle for the mind while the child is very young.
 - a. Many of the books of the pre-school age are slanted toward evolution.
 - b. In many states, by the time the boy or girl reaches the third grade, evolution is accepted as fact by them.
 - F. It has been able to place Christianity in an unfavorable light in the minds of many young people in the last generation.
 - 1. These young people have taken their places as teachers, preachers, politicians, and other leaders,
 - 2. They are in a position to state, both publicly and privately, their beliefs in a manner to influence others.
 - 3. Evolution has swept education.
 - 4. It has invaded religion in the ranks of the leaders as well as in the pew.
 - 5. Journalism is permeated with evolution because it feels that this is what appeals to the masses.
 - G. Evolution has been widely accepted because it offers a positive way to explain existence without God to the individual who wants to live apart from God.
- III. What Ways, May We Contend Against the False Doctrine of Evolution.

- A. Be aggressive in our approach:
 1. Take the offensive against every form of false doctrine.
 2. Inform people about the false theory of evolution.
 - B. Be careful about making assumptions about the doctrine.
 1. We want to meet it squarely and “fairly,” therefore, we need to represent it correctly.
 2. Choose the truth which really meets the need.
 - C. Begin early with our children.
 1. Impress upon them the exalted majesty and Glory of God.
 2. Teach them the respect for God’s Word.
 - D. Conduct lectureships in our localities:
 1. In places away from the church buildings.
 2. Teach on subjects dealing with truths which refute evolution.
 - E. Use radio programs and newspaper articles which deal with the subject of evolution.
 - F. We need to take an overall approach that will promote in a better way, faith in and love for God.
- IV. Theistic Evolution: A Contradiction in Terms.
- A. The greatest weakness of Theistic Evolution is that it is a contradiction in its very proposition.
 1. “Theistic”—this refers to God, from Greek, *Theos*.
 2. “Evolution”—in its strictest sense, claims to be governed by “forces within” and therefore, disallows any influence from without, such as God.
 3. In view of this, the term, “Theistic Evolution” is a contradiction in terms.
 - B. The Theistic Evolutionist assumes that God created and developed things but that He did it by the evolutionary process.
 - C. This theory teaches that the “day” in Genesis refers to a long period of time.
 1. The “Concordistic theory” alleges that the “days” of Genesis 1 were periods of time extending over millions of years.
 2. Others feel it refers to six geological ages, each of great duration.

- D. The “Day-Age” fallacy of the Theistic Evolution or Reasons why the “days” of Genesis are 24 hour periods and not long periods of time:
1. The “Hermencutical principle” that a word is literal unless there are compelling reasons for adopting a figurative one. Such reasons for taking “days” figurative are not found in Genesis 1.
 2. Most reputable Hebrew dictionaries do not permit the interpretation of *yom* as a “period of time.”
 3. When the *yom* is associated with a definite numeral, solar days are meant: Genesis 7:11; 3:14; 17:12; Exodus 12:6, and many other passages.
 4. The wording of Genesis point to a short time or day: Genesis 1:11, God commands the earth to sprout and in verse 12 the response. Therefore, instantaneous action is what is warranted.
 5. The “days” are spoken of having a “morning and evening.” Have never heard of a epoch or long period of time referred to as having an “evening and morning.”
 6. The “Sabbath day” in the Old Testament and as observed by the Jews as 24 hour periods (cf., Exo. 20:8-11).
- E. The fact of the matter “Theistic Evolution” is a practice in futility. It is simply a feeble effort among some to, “have their cake and eat it too.”
1. In an effort to hold on to their past training and yet to try to obtain an intellectual level that they feel they have attained in college, they turn in desperation to the hypothesis of “Theistic Evolution.”
 2. Evolution, whether Naturalistic or Theistic, is still a theory and both are damnable doctrines. Yet, for one who claims to be a Christian and would attach the name of the Most High God to such a theory, is blasphemy of the highest order!

CONCLUSION

1. It is more “reasonable” to believe in God than in the theory of evolution.
2. Even though the evolutionists accuse us of believing in God, whom we have not seen, their system is built upon “blind faith,”

whereas our faith in God and that He created the heavens and the earth are based upon evidences, which form proof.

3. God help us to stand militantly against this false theory!

WORK CITED

Doctrine of Evolution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Clark, Robert T. and Bales, James. *Why Scientists Accept Evolution.* Grand Rapids, MO: Baker Book House, 1967.

“Evolution.” *Spiritual Sword*, Vol. 2, April 1971, Number 3.

Morris, Henry M. *Evolution and the Modern Christian.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

- - - and others, *A Symposium on Creation.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Overton, Basil. *Evolution or Creation?* Nashville, TN: Gospel Advocate Co.

Thomas, J. D. *Evolution and Antiquity.* Abilene, TX: Biblical Research Press.

Zimmerman, Paul. *Darwin, Evolution, and Creation.* St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1959.

THE BIBLE: INSPIRED AND AUTHORITATIVE

2 TIMOTHY 3:16-17

Ray Peters

INTRODUCTION

1. There has never been a time when the basic position that the Word of God is both inspired and authoritative needs to be reaffirmed.
 - a. There are attempts in the church and out to destroy the basic position.
 - b. Ridicule and contempt for the Bible seems to be the trend.
2. The importance of the position of inspiration and authority:
 - a. If the Bible is a product of human reason, or if only inspired as a book of literature is inspired, as was Shakespeare or Milton, then we need not rely upon it for our standard of authority.
 - b. If it is inspired in the biblical sense, that is God gave every word, then it is infallible, inerrant, and authoritative.
3. It will be affirmed in this study that the Bible is both inspired and authoritative.

DISCUSSION

- I. The Bible Itself Claims and Affirms That it Is Inspired.
 - A. The fact that the Bible is inspired has been accepted by men throughout the ages and recognized God as the author.
 1. Man could not have written a book like this and would not if they could.
 2. The Bible condemns the things that the world commends and commends things which the sinful world scorns.
 3. Its level of writing far exceeds man in nature and design.
 - B. The claims of inspiration found in the Bible:
 1. Expressions which acclaim inspiration: “Thus saith the Lord,” “God spake,” “The Lord testified saying” and “The Lord hath spoken.”

2. The prophets used these phrases 1,300 times and are found in the Old Testament 2,500 times.

C. Statements from the writers of the Bible:

1. The apostle Paul (2 Tim. 3:16-17; 1 The. 2:13; 1 Cor. 2:13).

a. These statements condemn the theory of partial inspiration.

b. This is quite a contrast to the modernistic statement that the Bible **contains** the Words of God. Paul claims, **it is** the Word of God.

2. Others: **Peter** (2 Pet. 1:20-21), **Moses** (Exo. 4:12), **David** (2 Sam. 23:1-2), **Jeremiah** (Jer. 1:9).

3. **Jesus endorsed** the fact that the **Old Testament** was inspired:

a. In Luke 24:44, He speaks of the three divisions that the Jews spoke of in regard to the Old Testament: Law of Moses, prophecy and psalms.

b. He endorsed portions of Scriptures that are attacked:

(1) The story of the creation (Mat. 19:3; Mark 10:6).

(2) The account of the flood (Mat. 24:37).

(3) The story of Jonah and the whale (Mat. 12:40).

(4) The book of Deuteronomy. He quoted from it when tempted by Satan (Mat. 4:1-11).

c. Jesus endorsed the New Testament before it was written:

(1) He promised the "how" and "what" to speak (Mat. 10:19).

(2) The Spirit would "guide them into all truth" (John 16:13).

(3) These promises to the apostles were fulfilled on Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4).

II. The Meaning of the Word Inspiration in the Biblical Usage.

A. When asking one if they believe the Bible is inspired, we need to be more explicit because of "modernistic inspiration":

1. They say the Bible is inspired, but what they mean is that it is inspired just as Milton, Shakespeare, and other writers are inspired to write. Hence, they deny any supernatural intervention or guidance as the writers wrote the Bible.

2. Their reply to the Divinity of Christ is that He was Divine, but so are all men. Therefore, they deny the Deity of Christ.

B. Inspiration defined:

1. From the Latin, “inspire,” to breathe in.
 2. In the Greek, *Theopneustos*—*Theo* = God, *pneustos* = breathed, from *pneo*, to blow or breathe. Therefore, the Bible is, God breathed and a product of Divine influence.
 3. In the book, *General Introduction to the Bible*, by Miller, it is stated, “The word implies an influence from without producing effects which are beyond natural powers.”
- C. The difference between Inspiration and Revelation:
1. Revelation:
 - a. Has reference to the communication of knowledge.
 - b. The means through which God imparts facts and truths not previously known.
 2. Inspiration:
 - a. Has reference primarily to the accurate communicating of knowledge.
 - b. The influence that God exercised, through the Holy Spirit, over the minds of the biblical writers to make them infallible in the **receiving** and **recording** of God’s will.
 - c. It was the means that kept the speaker or writer from errors.
- D. The Bible Position of Inspiration: Plenary Verbal Inspiration:
1. Paul said, “All” (2 Tim. 3:16), and “words” (1 Cor. 2:13).
 2. Jesus in Matthew 10:19: “What”—means the “thought”; “How”—the manner of expression.
 3. These statements show the theories on inspiration such as: Thought Theory, Partial Inspiration, and Mechanical Dictation, are false.
 4. Therefore, the Bible position, and the position of every one who loves God and His Word, is that of Plenary (all) Verbal (words) Inspiration (God breathed).
- III. The Bible Because it Is Inspired, Is the Objective Standard of Authority.
- A. Authority defined: “The right to command and to enforce obedience” or “that which may be appealed to for the right to believe or act in a particular way.”
 - B. The need for Bible authority:
 1. Paul said, “And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, *do* all in the name of the Lord Jesus” (Col. 3:17).

2. There must be an objective standard, otherwise, subjectivism is the guide.
 - a. This amounts to every man being his own guide or standard, and become like those Paul said who, measuring themselves by themselves” (2 Cor. 10:12).
 - b. It would mean that **any** answer given by **anyone** to **any** religious question is a true and acceptable answer!
 - c. Hence, there **must** be an objective standard to guide man. Without it there would be utter chaos.
- C. The writers of the Bible, through inspiration, compiled what is considered the Bible today.
 1. This is the only logical explanation to the formation of the canon.
 2. There were other letters that were selected and sent to congregations, but the ones that form the New Testament were selected because they together provide one with all one needs to go to heaven (Acts 20:32).
- D. The warning not to add or subtract from the Divine Standard, the Bible, is echoed throughout the Scriptures (Deu. 4:2; Pro. 30:6; Rev. 22:13, 19).
 1. Men have added by: Creeds, Disciplines, Manuals, or Confession of Faiths.
 2. Some add to the Bible by trying to create another Bible: Joseph Smith is an example. Even in view of the above warnings and what Paul said in Galatians 1:6-10, “though we, or an **angel** from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.”
 3. Some try to **pervert** the Word of God: To pervert is to, “twist, distort.”
 - a. Various doctrines arise as a result: Faith only, Once saved always saved etc.
 - b. Jehovah Witnesses and their New World Translation.
 - c. The new versions that have flooded the market: Good News For Modern Man, Cotton Patch Version, etc.
- E. The inevitable result of rejecting Bible authority, either partially or completely, is to reject Christianity.
 1. To reject Christianity is to reject Jesus Christ.

2. To reject Jesus Christ is to reject the only way of salvation which is available to man (John 14:6).
- F. Contrary to popular thought this standard of authority and objective truth can be ascertained and understood and can be classified as “absolute”:
1. Jesus said, “And ye shall **know the truth**, and the truth shall make you free” (John 8:32).
 2. Paul stated, “Wherefore be ye not unwise, but **understanding** what the will of the Lord *is*” (Eph. 5:17).

CONCLUSION

1. One can rest assured that the Bible is the Word of God and is to be the guide in all things pertaining to pleasing Him.
2. It is objective and must be followed completely. Feelings can not be a guide but is subjectivism and is but an effort to get away from the Divine Rule, the Bible.
3. God help us to take the Bible as our only guide and to follow it completely.

THE PROPHETS JOEL, JONAH, AMOS, AND HOSEA

Rex A. Turner

- I. Introduction
 - A. The subject assigned to me for this occasion is quite broad—Joel, Jonah, Amos, and Hosea.
 - 1. The less a man knows the broader his subject should be.
 - 2. My longtime friend, Winston Temple, is responsible for the assignment of this subject.
 - 3. I am sure that his assignment of this broad subject is a recognition of my limitations.
 - B. This assignment amounts to the putting of four lectures into one—a four-in-one lecture,
 - C. When I speak on these four prophets, and that one at a time, I designate them as follows:
 - 1. Joel, the pest exterminator preacher.
 - 2. Jonah, the gourd vine preacher.
 - 3. Amos, the country preacher.
 - 4. Hosea, the preacher whose wife was a swinger.
 - D. These prophets appeared in the chronological order as enumerated.
- II. The Times, Places, Persons and Occasions Relative to the Ministries of These Four Prophets.
 - A. Let us consider first the time, place, persons, and occasion, with respect to the prophet Joel's ministry.
 - 1. The time was about 633 B.C.
 - 2. The place was the city of Jerusalem, the capital of the nation of Judah.
 - 3. The persons were the people of Judah at a time when King Joash was in his minority—somewhere between the seventh and fifteenth years of his life—and at a time when Jehoida was the titular king of the nation.
 - 4. The occasion was the calamity that had befallen Judah.

- a. God had sent His great army—the palmer worm, the locust, the canker worm, and the caterpillar—upon the land of Judah.
 - b. The land was stripped and eaten bare.
 - c. A drought was on.
 - d. All faces were pale.
 - e. The sin of Judah was not idolatry as one might suppose, nor violence and greed, nor immorality and impurity.
 - f. The sin was that the people were rending their garments, but not their hearts.
 - g. The people were keeping up all regularities of worship, but their hearts were not in it.
 - h. They had a form of godliness, but they denied the power thereof.
- B. Let us consider next the time, place, persons, and occasion with respect to the prophet Jonah's ministry.
1. The time of his ministry was about 781 B.C.
 2. He succeeded to the prophetic office after the death of the great prophet Elisha (2 Kin. 14:25).
 3. The young king Jeroboam was on the throne, and the young prophet Jonah was in the prophet's chair.
 4. Israel had long been under the heavy hand of Syria, and the time had come when justice was best served by a turn of affairs.
 5. Thus Jeroboam restored the border of Israel from the entrance of Hamath unto the sea of the Arabah (2 Kin. 14:25-27).
 6. Jehovah saved Israel by the hand of Jeroboam, and almost overnight, so to speak. Israel became the ascendant kingdom among the small kingdoms of that period.
 7. Israel had only one cloud on the horizon, and that cloud was the rising military power of Assyria.
 8. Under those prevailing circumstances, Jehovah called upon Jonah to go and preach to the Ninevites.
 9. Jonah did not want to go. He understood God's message. He understood that with every threat of doom there is an implied promise of mercy if the people should repent.

10. More than anything else, Jonah did not want the people to repent. He wanted them to be destroyed.
 11. Jonah boarded a ship for Spain, but he was thrown over board, swallowed by a great fish, and vomited up on land.
 12. When Jonah was charged again to go preach, he did so.
 13. The people of Nineveh repented from the king to the beggar.
 14. Jonah went out to wait out the forty days and see those heathens destroyed.
 15. On the thirty-ninth day God caused a gourdvine to come up over Jonah, and he was happy for it, but on the fortieth day the gourdvine died.
 16. Jonah was in a raving mood.
 17. Jehovah asked Jonah: “Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd?” (Jon. 4:9).
 18. Jonah replied: “I do well to be angry, even unto death” (Jon. 4:10).
 19. “Jehovah said, Thou hast had regard for the gourd, for which thou hast not labored, neither madest it grow; which came up in a night, and perished in a night: I and should not I have regard for Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand”—or 120,000 children.
 20. Jonah was truly an arrogant, covenant-advantage gourdvine preacher.
 21. He later reported his great meeting in Nineveh in the form of a confession.
- C. Let us consider now the time, place, persons, and occasion with respect to the prophet Amos’ ministry.
1. The time of his ministry was about 754 B.C.
 2. Amos prophesied “in the days of Uzziah king of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash king of Israel” (Amos 1:1).
 3. The last fourteen years of the reign of Jeroboam II were concurrent with the first fourteen years of the reign of Uzziah.

4. The nation of Israel has become the ascendant nation among the small nations to the north of Judah.
 5. The nation of Judah was the ascendant nation among the nations to the south of Judah.
 6. Prosperity, with its attendant sins, prevailed in both nations.
 7. At the time of this period of prosperity, God called Amos to the prophetic office and sent him to Bethel to preach for the rich and influential sanctuary at Bethel.
 8. The sanctuary at Bethel was where King Jeroboam worshiped.
 9. Now Amos had not attended a school of the prophets. Further, his father before him was not a prophet.
 10. Amos lived at Tekoa.
 11. He was a herdsman and a dresser of sycamore trees.
 12. In short, Amos was a country preacher who was sent by Jehovah to preach to a rich, corrupt, and influential church.
 13. Amos' preaching shook the nation of Israel.
 14. It so shook the nation that Amaziah, the high priest at Bethel, sent word to Jeroboam that "Amos hath conspired against thee in the midst of the house of Israel: the land is not able to bear all his words" (Amos 7:10).
- D. Let us consider at this point the time, place, persons, and occasion with respect to the prophet Hosea's ministry.
1. Hosea's ministry extended from the reign of Jeroboam II to the reign of Hoshea—a ministry of more than sixty years.
 2. He prophesied on the eve of the captivity of Israel.
 3. His lot was cast in mournful times.
 4. Jehovah instructed him to take a wife from the land of whoredom and children of whoredom for "the land," God said, "doth commit great whoredom."
 5. In short, Hosea was to be a living object lesson for the people of Israel.
 6. He would be married to adulterous Gomer, just as Jehovah was married to adulterous Israel.

7. His grief, suffering, longsuffering, and forgiveness of his wayward wife would reflect and represent Jehovah's grief and longsuffering with wayward Israel.
8. Further, Hosea's children were for signs in the continued spiritual decline of Israel.

III. Conclusion

- A. From Joel we learn of the disapprobation of God upon those who rend their garments but do not rend their hearts.
 1. The people of Judah were observing and keeping up all of the regularities of worship.
 2. The church today is observing the regularities of worship, but in many cases the hearts of the people are really not in the worship.
- B. From Jonah we learn of the disapprobation of God upon those who are arrogant, prejudiced, and selfish.
 1. Jonah was a covenant-advantage preacher.
 2. He was interested only in his church.
 3. Many affluent churches are like this today.
 4. When they pay for one addition of brick and stone for their own comfort, they build another.
- C. From Amos we learn of the disapprobation of God upon those "that are at ease in Zion and secure in the mount ain of Samaria."
 1. Times were prosperous in both Israel and Judah.
 2. The people reasoned that God was with them, else they would not enjoy such prosperity.
 3. Prosperity brought on many sins.
 4. The church today is suffering from the same sins that characterized Israel and Judah.
 5. The church today, like the church at Laodicea is rich, increased with goods, and has need of nothing—not even the Lord.
- D. From Hosea we learn of the disapprobation of God upon a people whose hearts are set on sin and idolatry.
 1. God sent His prophets to warn Israel.
 2. He brought punishments of increasing severity upon them, and ultimately He gave them up to captivity,
 3. Israel trusted in their mighty men instead of listening to God's prophets.

4. The course of the church today is in the direction of liberalism.
5. The church tends to listen to mighty men instead of the Word of God.

“MARK THEM THAT ARE CAUSING THE DIVISIONS AND OCCASIONS OF STUMBLINGS CONTRARY TO THE DOCTRINE.”

Ernest S. Underwood

TEXT: Romans 16:17-16

SUBJECT: Administration

TITLE: Mark Them That Are Causing The Divisions and Occasions of Stumbling Contrary To The Doctrine.

PROPOSITION: To study the law of God concerning discipline and refusal to fellowship all error.

OBJECTIVE: To encourage all Christians to be just as faithful in obeying God’s Word concerning this subject as in other subjects,

INTRODUCTION

1. Read Romans 16:17-18.
2. Regarding the text:
 - a. Paul states that there are some who are causing divisions.
 - b. Those who do so are not serving Christ, but their own self purposes.
 - c. Concerning such, all faithful brethren are to mark and turn away from them.
3. More will be said about the text as we get into the lesson.
4. In the last hundred years or so the church has suffered the on-thrust of evil men with evil designs. There was:
 - a. The Missionary Society.
 - b. The instrumental music faction.
 - c. The premillennial group.
 - d. The numerous “anti” groups; i.e. cups, literature, Sunday School, co-operation.

- e. In our own generation, the modernistic and liberalistic onslaught.
5. Each of these factions has done untold harm to the body of Christ.
 - a. The world has looked on with disgust.
 - b. Faithful brethren have been thrust out of their buildings.
 - c. Souls have been lost,
6. It is my conviction that the **one most contributing factor** to this malady has been the lack of obedience to God's command to discipline individuals, and to mark and refuse to fellowship entire apostate congregations,
7. There are many excuses that have been given for failure to obey these commands, but the fact still remains that God said do it! Those who refuse to do so, disobey. When one disobeys, he may as well build an altar.
8. In this lesson we want to examine God's Word relative to the subject, and we want to examine excuses that are often given for not abiding by His laws.

DISCUSSION: Concerning discipline we notice:

- I. God's Acts of Discipline.
 - A. Adam and Eve (Gen. 3).
 - B. The flood (Gen. 6).
 - C. Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10).
 - D. Achan—36 innocent died (Jos. 7).
 - E. Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5).
 - F. Thus from these examples we are able to comprehend God's attitude toward the disobedient and rebellious.
- II. Scriptural Basis for the Practice of Discipline in the New Testament Church Today.
 - A. Are we in the church authorized to practice discipline?
 1. Some argue that the unfaithful should just be "marked off" and forgotten.
 2. Others argue that unless one is perfect he cannot "condemn" another.
 3. Both arguments fail in the light of God's Word.
 - B. The fact that the unfaithful are lost shows the need for discipline. There is the need:
 1. To attempt to save the erring (Jam. 5:19-20).

2. To guard the faithful from corrupt influences (1 Cor. 5:6-7).
 3. To let the world know that we **are** the true church (cf., 1 Pet. 4:11). We cannot partially restore the new Testament Church and be acceptable to God.
- III. Who Is to Be Disciplined, and What Is to Be the Attitude of the Faithful Toward Those Who Have Been Disciplined?
- A. The disorderly (2 The. 3:6).
 1. Analysis of the proof text.
 - a. The apostolic command—“We command.”
 - b. The command comes with the authority of heaven—“in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.”
 - c. The command stated—“that ye withdraw yourselves.” (This phrase is in the Greek middle voice.)
 - d. Object of the action of withdrawal—“from every brother that walketh disorderly.”
 - e. Description of the “disorderly.”—Those who walk “not after the tradition which they received of us.”
 - f. “Walking” indicates a course which is being actively pursued.
 - B. Those who teach a different doctrine.
 1. 1 Timothy 1:3, 18-20—Analyze and discuss.
 2. 2 John 9-11—Analyze and discuss.
 - C. Those who commit sins of the flesh and refuse to repent (1 Cor. 5:4-5). The specific sins mentioned are incest and fornication; however, the principle applies to all sins of the flesh (cf., 1 Cor. 6:9-10).
 - D. Those who cause division (Rom. 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 own belly; and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent.”)
 1. The proof text analyzed.
 - a. An apostolic entreaty—“I beseech.” This entreaty is authoritative.
 - b. The command—“Mark” (Note; identify).

- c. The object of the “marking.”—“Them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling.” (Whether 1, 100, 1,000, or 1,000,000).
 - d. Causes of division and occasion of stumbling occurred when there was a deviation from “the doctrine which ye learned.”
 - (1) This division was not that which is caused when faithful men resist the false teacher. Such division has the sanction of God.
 - (2) This division was caused when evil men desired to depart from the sound doctrine.
 - e. Action to be taken toward the marked—“Turn away from them.”
 - (1) Greek—*Ekklinatē*: 2nd person plural aorist imperative of *Ekkleio*: Meaning: *The Analytical Greek Lexicon*: “To shut out, exclude; to shut off, separate, insulate.” Thayer: “To shut out; to turn out of doors.”
 - (2) The aorist imperative indicates that this is a command to be executed once for all time. This “shutting off” is not a gradual thing.
 - f. Description of the troublemakers (v. 18).
 - (1) They serve not the Lord.
 - (2) They serve their own bellies.
 - (3) They have smooth and fair speech (cf., Mat. 7:15; 2 Cor. 10:14).
 - (4) By this they are able to beguile the innocent (cf., Gal. 1:6-7; 3:1).
2. In this passage we are given a description of the evil-doers, a command to take action against them, and the reason for such action; i.e. they beguile the innocent.
 3. Even with such men doing their evil deeds, there are some who argue against any disciplinary action. Surely, such do not love the truth.
- E. Surely, from these passages and others we can see the need for discipline, and the need to refrain from “socializing” with the disciplined. We are to avoid them for as long as they resist the truth and remain in their error.

IV. Arguments Some Use to Justify Their Failure to Practice Discipline.

- A. “We may run them off.” It is argued that if discipline is executed that the person may be lost for good to the cause of Christ.
1. The logic of this type of reasoning is fallacious. **They are already lost!** The only effect that discipline can have on the sinner is to cause him to repent and turn again to the Lord.
 2. It is further argued that certain faithful brethren will be discouraged if action is taken.
 - a. If the church is properly taught all faithful brethren will not only accept the action of discipline, but will heartily encourage it.
 - b. **Illustrate:** The woman who told the elders that she would stop her contribution if they withdrew from her daughter who was living in adultery. To the glory of hell and the shame of heaven that situation still exists.
- B. “We don’t have elders, therefore we cannot practice discipline.”
1. First of all it must be remembered that discipline is an action of the entire congregation (cf., Corinth; Thessalonica; Rome).
 2. Certainly, where a church has elders they are to take the lead in the administering of discipline.
 3. If a church cannot practice discipline where there are no elders then it cannot prevent a Baptist preacher or a Catholic priest from occupying the pulpit. If false brethren cannot be prevented neither can the others.
 4. It is up to faithful brethren to take the lead where there are no elders. When they fail to do so they, themselves, violate God’s law.
- C. “But there is no Scripture which authorizes one congregation to withdraw from another.”
1. There is Scripture for it! Every passage in the New Testament which deals with the subject authorizes it in principle.

2. The argument is made that such actions violates the autonomy of the offending congregation.
3. Not so! It is the exercising of its own autonomy by refusing to fellowship that which is false.
4. If we use the above rationale then a faithful congregation would be forced to fellowship another congregation regardless of how great the digression of the latter had become. Certainly, such is not taught in God's Word.

CONCLUSION

1. The God of heaven has always exercised discipline to the ungodly.
2. He commands that all faithful Christians do likewise.
3. He will not accept our excuses for refusing to obey him in this matter.
4. May we all have the courage to stand for the truth on this vital subject.

THE CHURCH IN PREPARATION AND FACT

William Wilder

Before the establishment of any government, or organization, there must be the work of teaching and arousing in the people an interest in the principles of the institution to be established.

Matthew states that John the Baptist came in fulfillment of God's plan to "Make ye ready the way of the Lord" (Mat. 3:3). Thus, the preaching of John and of Jesus and His apostles during the personal ministry of Jesus, served to further create in the people an interest in the coming kingdom, which is the church. John further preached: "the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Mat. 3:2). His message was designed to prepare a people in heart and mind to receive the Christ as the Son of God. He convicted throngs of people of their sins, preaching "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The coming of Christ and His church was the greatest event ever—so John was saying, clean up your lives to participate in this event. His message was so effective that all Jerusalem and Judea and the region round about the Jordan came out to be baptized in the river Jordan, confessing their sins (Mat. 3:5-6). When Jesus ordained the twelve, He sent them out saying: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Mat. 10:7). When He sent the seventy He bade them preach: "The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you" (Luke 10:9). The expression, "at hand" is same as, "is come nigh." Thus, showing that at the sending of the twelve, and the seventy, the kingdom was still in the future.

John told the people plainly that he was not the Christ, but that he had come before Him, and after Jesus began His ministry, John said that Christ must increase and he would decrease. The apostle Paul, looking back upon the work of John, said that he preached a "baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him that should come after him, that is, on Jesus" (Acts 19:4).

When God gave the Law at Mt. Sinai, He was working out His eternal purpose. Before one feels a need for a savior he must be made

aware of his sins. This is what the Law did. The Law of Moses became a schoolmaster to bring people to Christ (Gal. 3:24). This law was not abolished until Christ died on the cross, and since two laws cannot exist at the same time, we know that the kingdom under Christ did not become a reality until after His crucifixion. The fact that Jesus kept the law and taught His disciples to do so, show that the church was not in existence during His personal ministry.

The expression in Matthew sixteen, "I will build" proves that the church was yet to be established. Further proof that the church was not established in the days of John the Baptist and the personal ministry of Christ, but rather it was in its preparatory state, is found in the statement that Jesus made in Mark 9:1.

Pentecost marks that wonderful event of the birthday of the church. Back in the Old Testament Isaiah said, "the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem" (Isa. 2:3-4). According to Zechariah, "I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies; my house shall be built in it" (Zec. 1:16). Paul told Timothy that the "house" was the church (1 Tim. 3:15). The promise of Christ that the Apostles would be filled with the Holy Spirit was fulfilled on Pentecost. The kingdom, the church was to come with power (Mark 9:1) and the Holy Spirit also was to come on the Apostles with power (Acts 1:8). All of this shows clearly that in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost recorded in Acts 2 that the church was set up.

THE CHURCH IN PURPOSE, PROMISE AND PROPHECY

William Wilder

The death of the Incarnate Son of God on a Roman cross marks the central point in the history of mankind. From the fall of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, through the patriarchs and prophets, God's plan began to unfold. This mystery of Christ was not made known to other generations, but rather it was to be revealed according to His eternal purpose (Eph. 3:5-11).

The setting up of the Church of Christ on earth was the culmination of all the plans and purposes of God from the beginning to the end of time. The desire to rescue mankind from the power of the evil one is the background against which God's purpose in Christ was formed. This purpose was gradually unfolded during the preceding dispensations; but it was not until the coming of Christ that it reached its full fruition. It is also clear from these scriptures, that, in the economy of God, Christ and the church are inseparably bound together. This is to say that God's eternal purpose in Christ, so far as the world is concerned, is accomplished in and through the church.

The call of Abraham in Genesis twelve and the Old Testament prophecies serve to set the stage for the coming of Christ and His church. There is a continuity of prophetic teaching that runs through the whole of the Old Testament, beginning with Moses and making its way throughout the thirty-nine books. Paul taught that God's promise for the Jews and Gentiles, or "all families" (Gen. 12:1-3) is fulfilled in Christ and in His one body, His church (Eph. 3:6). The promise of God to Abraham included both Christ and the church. One cannot preach about the Christ in the Abrahamic promise without preaching about His church!

God's aim for man as we have already observed, is to gather all men into one body, or assembly, which is the same thing as the church, with Christ as the head. To sum up or gather in Christ therefore is equivalent to bringing all men into the church. And it should be further observed

that God's purpose in gathering all things together in Christ, during the present dispensation, is to prepare them for His complete and universal rule in the eternal kingdom.

Old Testament prophecies tell us where and when the church would be established. Daniel shows that it would be set up in the days of the kings of the Roman Empire (Dan. 2:44) and that it was to be an eternal kingdom. Isaiah states that when the word of Jehovah would go forth from Jerusalem, Jehovah's house was to be set up and all nations would flow into it (Isa. 2:2-3). He further states that a virgin would bear a son who would be called Immanuel (7:14) and that His soul would be made an offering for sin. That He would also bear our iniquities and be cut off from the land of the living for the transgression of the people (chapter 53). Zechariah specifically informs us that the Lord would return to Jerusalem for the express purpose of building His church. (Zec. 1:16) Paul declares that Christ "purchased [the church] with his own blood" (Acts 20:23).

In looking back upon such prophecies we see clearly God's plan to send His own Son into the world to erect such an institution as the church that all might be saved and ascertain the hope of eternal life.

THE RESTORATION PLEA

Doug Williams

The subject assigned me for this lectureship is “The Restoration Plea,” and please permit me to introduce this subject by reading the following Scriptures: 1 Peter 4:11; Galatians 1:6-9; 2 Timothy 3:16-17; 2 Peter 1:20-21; 2 Peter 1:3. From these passages one can readily see that God has given us His Divine Pattern in the New Testament, which is the complete instructions for the Lord’s church, and for all mankind in all matters of religious practice. Therefore, we can see, not only why those in the early restoration movement through the study of the Bible realized the importance of going back to the Bible, but that we too must continue to keep this thought prevalent in our minds. And so those who are interested in restoring pure New Testament Christianity, understand the importance of going back to the Bible and taking the New Testament as the only basis of authority (Mat. 28:18-20).

If all men would take the Bible and stand foursquare on it, and abide by the principles of the preceding verses of Scripture, then we could have the unity for which Christ prayed (John 17:20-21); the apostle Paul pleaded (1 Cor. 1:10-13); and that we desire today. God calls for Unity in His Word and condemns division, and gives us the platform for unity (Eph. 4:1-6).

Not a single problem can arise in an individual’s life, in a congregation of the Lord’s people, or in a nation that cannot be solved by the teachings of God’s Word. The New Testament is the law to which all men are now amenable and subject, and such will be the case until the end of the world, and thus this is God’s way for those living today. For this reason members of the Churches of Christ (Rom. 16:16) base their teaching completely on God’s Divine Word which He promised will “endure forever” (Mat. 24:35).

There may be those who say they are not interested in history and things that are past; in what men said and did of a former generation, and so may I remind us that the Restoration Plea is not just a thing of the past, but a **continuing** process—something about which we should

all be even now concerned and for which we are working. The church which Christ built is neither denominational nor protestant. It possesses no denomination creed, name or hierarchy. It was not founded in protest to any existing institution. It is not the product of the "Reformation" or "Restoration," but it is, and must be, the plant which has arisen from the "seed of the kingdom" sown in the hearts of people (Luke 3:11). Its origin is to be found in the gospel of Christ. It is founded on the apostles and prophets with Christ as the chief corner stone (Eph. 2:20). To date its appearance in history earlier or later than the atonement of Christ is in vain, for it is His body and He purchased it with His own blood (Eph. 1:22-23; Acts 20:23). By its very nature the body is exclusive: it is one (Eph. 4:4). There could not conceivably be more than one body as there is but one head (Col. 1:18). In the presence of a divided Christendom one runs the risk of being misunderstood by suggesting that there is but one church, but that is what the Bible teaches. It is not here suggested that there is but one "denomination." The church of Jesus Christ is neither Jewish, Catholic nor Protestant. It is non-denominational in its origin, worship and organization. It is the body of Christ, functioning according to New Testament directions, organized according to New Testament pattern, and worshipping according to New Testament instructions; extensive enough to embrace in its fellowship all (and only all) who comply with God's requirements in obedience to the gospel of Christ in becoming a part of that body. Let it ever be emphasized that a matter is not true **just** because it was taught during the Restoration Movement, or any other time, or by any particular person, but it is true because it is taught in the Bible. Therefore, let us always go back to the Bible, and have a "thus saith the Lord" for what we teach and practice, and not take the word of any man (Acts 17:11).

The Restoration Plea was also based on principles of Christian Unity, the plea for undenominationalism and the restoration of primitive Christianity, as well as the autonomy of the church, i.e., local congregational church government, as these things were taught in the New Testament. We have, in the Church of Christ, by and large, restored the names, plan of salvation, organization, worship, etc. (Even though in recent months and years some even in the church have digressed in these and other areas of Bible doctrine.) But we still need to follow the idea of the Restoration Plea in that there are some things we still need to restore, e.g.,

1. Zealous Activity
2. Phenomenal growth
3. Brotherly love
4. Discipline
5. Purity of life as taught in the New Testament
6. Confident optimism

In Luke 2:41-51 we have the sacred story of the Lord's going up to Jerusalem at the age of 12, and of His being lost there by His parents. Brother Roy Deaver, in reference to this account, observes:

(1) Mary and Joseph were together with the Lord in Jerusalem. They left Jerusalem, and in doing so they left the Christ. They came to realize that they had departed from him, and turned back. They found the Lord in Jerusalem. (2) The apostles and members of the early church were together with the Christ in Jerusalem, and all was well. In time, men departed from the Jerusalem gospel, and in doing so they left the Christ. Men came to realize they had departed from the Christ, and turned back. They found him (and he is yet to be found) in Jerusalem.

Reference is here made to this reading not to prove, but to illustrate. It sets forth points to which certain facts in church history are distinctly analogous. It thus becomes a valuable memory tool.

Our purpose in this study is not to give a detailed description of the history of the Restoration Movement, but at this point I feel we need to notice a few facts that will serve as a foundation on which to build.

God prepared the perfect plan for the salvation of all mankind, and presented it to man by Christ His only begotten Son, and the Holy Spirit. Men departed from this plan, and in time this led to the apostasy in what we know as the Roman Catholic Church. Then when men began to obtain copies of the Bible and to study it, even those in the Catholic church, came to realize that there were many errors being practiced, and thus they sought to return to the Divine Plan to reform the apostate church. These men of the Reformation are to be commended for their work, but some began to see that reforming was not the answer but that man-made creeds must be totally abolished and the Bible alone accepted as their standard. There were numerous great and good men, both in Europe and in America, who were deeply concerned about the religious situation as it existed about 1700. They knew this situation to be out of harmony with the New Testament teaching. They had a wonderful knowledge of the problem, and they were prayerfully concerned about the solution. They believed and confidently affirmed

that the only solution was a complete **restoration** of simple New Testament Christianity; a complete **return** to the **original gospel**.

In Europe, there were the effective labors of great men, who were generally associated with a group called the “Independents.” A listing of these men would include the names of James and Robert Haldane, John Glas, Robert Sandeman, Rowland Hill, Greville Ewing, John Walker and Alexander Carson.

Likewise, in America there were the effective labors of great and good men; This listing would include the names of James O’Kelley, Rice Haggard, Elias Smith, Abner Jones, Barton W. Stone, Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott. Later, in America, there were other great workers for restoration of the original gospel, the original church, and the original (and only) plan of salvation. There were the labors of W. K. Pendleton, D. S. Burnet, Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Rogers, Tolbert Fanning, Jacob Creath, Jr., “Raccoon” John Smith, Moses E. Lard, J. W. McGarvey, David Lipscomb, etc.

Let it be emphasized that these men were not seeking to establish a new religious body; that these men were pleading for a return to primitive Christianity—a **restoration**. These men were pleading with others (with all men everywhere) to resolve “to speak where the Bible speaks, and to be silent where the Bible is silent; to have no creed but Christ, no book but the Bible, and no name but the divine name; to determine to do nothing in matters religious excepting that divinely authorized.”

The “Restoration Plea” can be seen in the thinking of some of the early leaders in this great movement. And so we now look at some of the things they said, and from these it can be seen that their full intention was to take the Bible alone as their sole guide, “to Search for the Ancient Order” as Brother Earle West entitled his books.

We begin with the Haldanes in Scotland in 1775. One of them was quite well educated. The other one was not so highly educated, but he had gone into business and had made a lot of money while the other fellow was gaining a lot of knowledge. They pooled their resources, they founded a school and they started teaching that we ought to be non-denominational. They said, “Let us go back to the Bible and be Christians. Let us just teach the Bible itself—the naked word of God and nothing else with it.”

The first major development of the Restoration Movement in America was a meeting held on August 4, 1974 at Old Lebanon in

Surry County, Virginia. Among others present at that meeting was James O'Kelley, Rice Haggard, and a Brother Hafferty of North Carolina. They decided to lay aside every manuscript and go by the Bible alone. Rice Haggard stood up, reportedly holding up his Bible, and said: "Brethren, this is a sufficient rule of faith and practice. By it we are told that the disciples were called Christians, and I move that henceforth and forever the followers of Christ be known as Christians simply." Then Hafferty stood up and moved that they take the Bible itself as their only creed. From these two motions the O'Kelley movement devised what became known as the "Five Cardinal Principles of the Christian Church."

1. The Lord Jesus Christ as the only Head of the Church.
2. The name Christian to the exclusion of all party and sectarian names.
3. The Holy Bible, or the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament our only creed, and a sufficient rule of faith—and practice.
4. Christian character, or vital piety, the only test of Church fellowship and membership.
5. The right of private judgment, and the liberty of conscience the privilege and duty of all.

The significance of O'Kelley's action lies in the main, in the direction he was looking. Theirs was a movement to overthrow human elements in religion and go only by the Bible. That weaknesses appear in their five cardinal principles is evident, but that they were on the high road back to the ancient order is equally evident.

O'Kelley, a Methodist, preached, "Why be divided? Why be fighting one another? Let us unite on the Bible. Let us be Christians guided and directed by the Bible." Thus we have the first effort in the New World to restore primitive Christianity using the Bible as the sole guide.

Dr. Abner Jones, a medical doctor up in Vermont who was a member of the Baptist church, and he also preached for the people. He said, "It is the most ridiculous thing on earth for people to be divided—fussing and arguing with one another," so he started preaching that everybody ought to be Christians and ought to be guided strictly by the Word of God.

Barton W. Stone a prominent and distinguished young Presbyterian preacher was sent to preach at Paris, Kentucky. He was disgusted with the "special election" doctrine of the Presbyterians. He arose in his

pulpit and said, "That is not the truth for the Lord said, 'Whosoever will may come' and I am declaring to you this morning that whosoever will may come to the Lord and be Christians." He led a great revival from 1801 to 1804 at Cane Ridge, Kentucky baptizing thousands.

Thomas and his son Alexander Campbell came to America in 1807 and 1809 respectively, from Ireland, as members and preachers in the Presbyterian Church. Before Alexander arrived in America his father had written a great piece of literature called the "Declaration and Address," in which he pleads for unity on basis of the Scriptures, and using the Bible as the only guide. When Alexander arrived in the States the first thing he is said to have read was his father's Declaration and Address. His reply was that he agreed with it, and that it contained the principles he had attained. That it was what he believed, and planned to preach the rest of his life.

They had been sprinkled, but decided that they needed to be baptized scripturally by immersion, buried for the remission of their sins, and thus in June, 1811, they were baptized by Matthias Luce.

The Campbells preached that men ought to leave every doctrine not in the New Testament, ought to leave every name not in the New Testament, and ought to come to the Bible itself, that there ought not to be a denominationalist of any kind, but they ought to stand on the Bible and read the Old Book and proclaim that to the world. Thomas has been referred to as the architect, and Alexander as the builder in the great work they did.

Please be impressed, as we have noticed from history, that Alexander Campbell came after other men who had preached the same thing in calling men to a return to the Bible, and thus was not the founder of the Church of Christ as has been falsely reported so many times. This accusation is due, no doubt, to the great influence that Alexander Campbell had in leading people back to the church of Christ as we read of it in the Bible.

Walter Scott was a great preacher, but he had many eccentricities and this can be seen from Brother West's account of the following:

Brother Walter Scott took great care of his voice. His mind was greatly under its influence. If the instrument was in perfect tune, how admirably he could play upon it! When out of tune, he was as weak as Samson when shorn of his hair. Dear Walter! He was a great dyspeptic; and like all such persons, at times eccentric. He would change his diet to keep his voice, and consequently, his mind, in working order. Sometimes he would drink coffee, and then tea, and then water; and

now and then milk. He was taking supper once with a good sister who had heard of his fondness of milk (he had just laid aside the lacteal diet and had gone back to coffee and tea), when she said, "Brother Scott, will you have a glass of milk?" "I thank you, sister. There is no music in a cow," said Walter, in his blandest way. Of course he thought that milk was injurious to his voice."

Scott's chief contribution to the Restoration Movement was his preaching the "plan of salvation." He introduced the 5-finger exercise of: Faith, Repentance, Baptism, Remission of sins, and gift of Holy Spirit. He would say, "Faith removes the knowledge of sin; repentance removes the practice of sin; baptism removes the fact of sin; remission removes the stain of sin; and gift of the Holy Spirit removes the guilt of sin."

Scott believed the great central idea of the Christian religion was the Messiahship of Christ. This idea he called the "Golden Oracle." He was such an orator and great preacher that it is told that Alexander Campbell who was normally a quiet, dignified man, hearing him preach on one occasion shouted "Hallelujah." This was the only time Campbell ever did such a thing, but he was so carried away that it was natural and he couldn't contain himself.

None of these men started a new denomination, but taught people to be Christians exactly like those people in New Testament days. We still plead the same in trying to get people to come to the Bible alone, and stand upon it. Whatever is in the Bible, believe it. Whatever is not in the Bible, reject it. Whatever the Lord has said in the Bible to do, do it. Whatever the Lord has not said do, reject that and have nothing to do with it. We believe that is the plan upon which the religious world can be united. Jesus prayed that all of His followers might be one. How can we be one? By going to the Bible! In 1 Corinthians 1:10, the apostle Paul said, "Now I beseech you, brethren,...*that* there be no divisions among you; but *that* ye be perfectly joined together." How can God's children be perfectly joined together? By coming to the New Testament, by standing for the things that are in the New Testament and by being simply Christians.

Luke 3:11 says, "The seed is the word of God." We plant the seed and that seed grows up and just like it produced Christians in the first century, the word of God planted in our hearts now will make Christians out of us.

I believe we can best sum up the Restoration Plea, and do it in a helpful way to us by noticing some famous statements that are the products of the Restoration Movement. So we note the following:

“Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent.”

“Call Bible things by Bible names, and do Bible things in Bible ways.”

Have a “thus saith the Lord” in all things.

“In matters of faith—unity; in matters of opinion—liberty; in all things—charity.”

“No Creed but the Christ. No book but the Bible. No name but the Divine.”

The Restoration Movement is a continuing process. It is unfinished and incomplete. We should never speak of it in past tense! Throughout the world devout men are still advocating non-denominational Christianity. The history of Christ’s church is still in the making. Voices are everywhere blending themselves into a harmonious anthem to the tune of “Restoration” pleas. “Back to the Bible” and “Let us speak where the Bible speaks and remain silent where the Bible is silent” are phrases echoing from every quarter. May God help each of us to ever stand up for the truth, to uphold the Bible, and obey it regardless of cost to us. We should be like Brother T. B. Larrimore who said, “I’d be ashamed to be afraid to preach the truth of God’s word; and afraid to be ashamed to preach the whole counsel of God.”

Let me close by relating an incident as told by Brother J. M. Powell, which he says expresses the full meaning of the Restoration Movement. He tells of a man who wanted to hear Alexander Campbell preach, and so he was to preach at Warren, Ohio, and this man was present to hear him preach there in 1824 for the first service. This man says Campbell was 33 years of age at this time and he was the sharpest man he had ever seen in both appearance and intellect. He took as his subject the words from the Lord’s prayer, “Thy kingdom come,” and he showed by the Scriptures that the kingdom of Christ had been established on the first Pentecost following the resurrection of Jesus. He also showed by the Scriptures that Jesus is now reigning on David’s throne over His Kingdom, over His people, over His church. And then he made a statement that this man had never heard before, a statement that changed the course of his life. And the statement was this, “The true disciple will follow the truth wherever it leads him.” This is the heart and soul of the

Restoration Movement.” Our people need to get hold of that truth. We need to digest it. We need to make up our mind that we are going to follow the truth wherever it leads us. A man with such a conviction will find himself in harmony with God. He will find himself in a position to do a world of good in the community in which he lives, and he will find the people will love him and respect him.

THE LATE GREAT PLANET EARTH

William Yugas

On May 14, 1948 David Ben-Gurion declared that the new state of Israel had been established. Since then, hosts of books and magazine articles have been written declaring that this is the harbinger of the second coming of Christ. One of these books that is widely read is *The Late Great Planet Earth* by Hal Lindsey. It was originally published in May 1970 by Zondervan. It has now sold approximately five **million copies**! Lindsey is a graduate of Dallas Theological Seminary, whose president, John F. Walvoord, is probably the leading spokesman for dispensational premillennialism, and he (Lindsey) has been a lecturer for several years on the theme of Bible prophecy, especially before college and university students. The book is simply the old theories of dispensationalism in a new cover premillennialism in “modern language” for the “NOW generation” (for an example of this see chapter 2, page 11, 3rd paragraph; page 12, 2nd paragraph). A complete description of this book would be dispensational pretribunal secret rapture premillennial eschatology!

After reading the introduction we notice several statements by Mr. Lindsey that truly stand out. The first is in the 3rd paragraph and reads as follows: “I make no claim of knowing EXACTLY when the world is going to end.” Please notice the implication in the wording of this statement. He does not know **exactly** when the world is going to end but we may assume, and rightly so, that he may know generally when it will end. If this were not the implication, this book would not have sold over five **million copies**. The 2nd outstanding statement in his introduction is found in the last paragraph and reads as follows: “In this book, I am attempting to STEP ASIDE and let the prophets speak. If my readers care to listen, they are given the freedom to accept or reject the conclusions.” First, I ask if Mr. Lindsey is going to step aside and let the prophets speak wouldn’t a simple reading of their words suffice? Secondly, I ask Mr. Lindsey, whose conclusions are we to accept or reject, yours?, or the prophets? And last of nil, if it be Mr. Lindsey’s

conclusions then we certainly can put no confidence in an uninspired man's conclusions, which are no more than opinions. Actually, what Mr. Lindsey has admitted is that this book is what Mr. Lindsey thinks might probably happen according to his opinion of what the prophets said in the Scriptures, not what the prophets concluded! Strangely enough, we find in the first chapter of his book this statement:

Astrologers frequently guard their trade by predicting in generalities. However, sometimes they venture beyond vagaries and are explicit in attempting to foretell exact happenings. The result may be acute embarrassment for the astrologer.

It is quite evident that Mr. Lindsey has a low regard for astrology. But, to our amazement, Mr. Lindsey plunges head first into a general, almost specific prediction of the time of Christ's return (page 40, last paragraph connected with the first sentence of page 41, and the first sentence of page 42). Notice particularly his statement on page 51, "Since the restoration of Israel as a nation in 1943, we have lived in the most significant period of prophetic history. We are living in the times which Ezekiel predicted in chapters 38 and 39." Whose conclusion is that? The prophets that he is stepping aside for, or his? It seems like the very thing that Mr. Lindsey has a low regard for, he himself is engaging in. Mr. Lindsey's inconsistencies become even more ludicrous in chapter 2; "When is a Prophet a Prophet?" On page 9, the sixth paragraph we read as follows: "And Moses gave the answer the true test of a prophet: 'When a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord, if the word does not come to pass, or come true, that is a word which the Lord has not spoken' (Deut. 18:22)." Then on page 10, the 5th full paragraph, we read as follows: "The astonishing thing to those of us who have studied the prophetic scriptures is that we are WATCHING the fulfillment of these prophecies in our time." Mr. Lindsey is not **watching** but is **predicting!** He has set himself up as a prophet and is therefore himself subject to the test of a prophet. Proof is found on the bottom of page 42, the first 3 paragraphs of page 43, and page 78, 2nd paragraph. Especially noticeable is this statement:

A generation in the Bible is something like 40 years. If this is a correct deduction, (and he gives no reason why it isn't) then within 40 years or so of 1943, all these things could take place. Many scholars who have studied Bible prophecy all their lives believe that this is so.

Whose conclusion is this? The prophets he is stepping aside for, or his? Mr. Lindsey is not going to be **exact**, but he will predict within one

year or so the beginning of the signs of Christ's coming and His being "at the door" ready to return. Here is one Scripture Mr. Lindsey didn't quote: Matthew 24:36-39. Specifically, the obvious import of these passages (especially to a scholar such as Mr. Lindsey) is that we cannot know even the general time of Christ's return. For it will be a **complete** surprise!

HOW LITERAL ARE MR. LINDSEY'S INTERPRETATIONS?

Mr. Lindsey not only claims to be a prophet with "special insight into the prophetic word" (read page 78, 2nd full paragraph), he says that he is also a premillennialist (page 165). He says that he disagrees with the amillennialists because he believes the prophecies should be "interpreted literally" (p. 165). But, he interprets prophecies literally only when they fit his theory. He says: "The apostle John predicts that so many people will be slaughtered, that blood will stand to the horse's bridles for a total distance of 200 miles northward and southward of Jerusalem" (p. 154, Rev. 14:20). But, it should be noted that the blood spoken of in Revelation 14:20, to which Mr. Lindsey refers, comes "out of winepresses" and not from "people" who will be slaughtered. Deuteronomy 32:14 speaks of "the pure blood of the grape." Why doesn't Mr. Lindsey remain literal with Revelation 14:20?

THE LITERAL WEAPONS OF GOG AND MAGOG

Mr. Lindsey would have us believe that Ezekiel 37, 38 and 39 refer to the invasion of Palestine by Russia in the last times (pp. 48-60). But, the literal interpretation of Ezekiel 37, 38, 39 declares that the weapons of Gog and Magog are swords, shields, helmets, horses, bucklers (Eze. 38:4), bows, arrows, handstaves, and spears (Eze. 39:9). Can't you just see Russia, who is now equipped with all the latest jets, atomic bombs, tanks, etc., returning to the use of swords, handstaves, spears etc., when they invade Israel? Ezekiel 37, 38, 39 describes wars that took place in a time when there were "walled" and "unwalled" cities with "gates" and "bars" (Eze. 36:11). Why not stay literal, Mr. Lindsey?

WHY NOT STAY LITERAL IN MATT. 24:34?

Mr. Lindsey says that "this generation" (Mat. 23:36) means the generation that crucified Christ (p. 37), but that "this generation" of Matthew 24:34 refers to within 40 years or so of 1948 (page 43). Which is it? The generation that crucified Christ in Matthew 23:36 as **literal** or the generation within 40 years or so of 1948 in Matthew 24:34 as

figurative? Both passages describe the same events that are to take place in and near Jewish Synagogues, for Matthew 24:16 and Matthew 24:24 speak of the same false teachers as Matthew 23:36, only they are “in Judea.” Mr. Lindsey says we must use literal interpretation of prophecy. Obviously, the literal interpretation of Matthew 24:1-29 is the same generation that Christ was speaking to, and not one 1,918 years later!

“THAT DAY” AND “THE LAST DAYS”

Mr. Lindsey is confused because he does not understand the biblical expressions “that day” and “the last days.” “The phrase latter days always referred in the Old Testament to the time of Israel’s final and complete national restoration and spiritual redemption” (p. 41). Mr. Lindsey and Dr. Kac would not have made that serious blunder if they had observed the scriptures. Joel prophesied that in the “last days” God would pour out his spirit on all flesh. (Joel 2:28-30) Peter said on the day of Pentecost “this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel” (Acts 2:16). The Hebrew writer said that the days when God no longer speaks to us through prophets, but through His Son are the “last days” (Heb. 1:1-2). In fact, Paul was even more specific. He said: “these last days,” that is the days in which Paul wrote and lived, were “the last days.” So, “the last days” referred to the entire Christian dispensation. The 2nd coming of Christ will occur suddenly when men are saying “peace and safety” (1 The. 5:3), not when there are books being written by men like Mr. Lindsey pinpointing the time by the signs of wars. So, we are told to watch and be ready at all times. (Not just the times predicted by Hal Lindsey.) “But of **that day** and hour knoweth no *man*, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only” (Mat. 24:36). The “latter days” are clearly the entire time beginning from Pentecost to date, whereas “that day” is the culmination of the “last days.”

“SHOCK THE PEOPLE INTO BELIEVING”

Mr. Lindsey’s literal interpretation of prophecies is exactly what is wrong with his book. He tries to make Christ a literal king on a literal throne using literal weapons to give people the “shock” treatment to convert them. “The catastrophic events...are primarily designed to shock the people into believing in their true Messiah” (Ezek. 38, 39) (Lindsey’s page 38). The apostle Paul declared that the gospel is God’s power (Rom. 1:16) not swords, war, etc.

MR. LINDSEY AND THE “ANCIENT OF DAYS”

Mr. Lindsey says: “The Ancient of Days” who is described here (Dan. 7:21-22) is identified in Daniel 7:13 as “one like the Son of Man” (p. 81). But Daniel 7:13 does not say this. It says: “I saw in the night visions, and, behold, *one* like the Son of man [Christ] came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days [God], and they brought him near before him.” Note the expression “brought him before him.” Christ did not come before Himself, but before God. When did this take place? Mr. Lindsey would have us believe that this refers to the 2nd coming because the “clouds of heaven” are mentioned. It is true that Christ will come again with the clouds of heaven. But He also ascended into a cloud: “While they beheld He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight...” “This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven” (Acts 1:11).

Daniel 7:13 described a scene when Christ “came to” the Ancient of Days, “and they brought Him near before Him.” According to Mr. Lindsey, this is a description of when Christ will “come from” the Ancient of Days **to earth**. Did Mr. Lindsey overlook the rest of the verse in Daniel 7:13? Is this what Mr. Lindsey calls “stepping aside, letting the prophets speak,” by leaving off part of a passage to get the desired results of his conclusions?

THE KEY TO MR. LINDSEY’S BOOK

Lindsey says:

I believe this generation is overlooking the most authentic voice of all, and that is the voice of the Hebrew prophets. They predicted that as man neared the end of history as we know it that there would be a precise pattern of events which would loom up in history. Nations would fit into a certain power pattern. And all of this would be around the most important sign of all—that is the Jew returning the land of Israel after thousands of years of being dispersed. The Jew is the most important sign to this generation. (Hal Lindsey in the documentary film “The Return,” Evangelical Communications Research Foundation, producers, Pyramid Film Distributors).

“The same prophets who predicted the world wide exile and persecution of the Jews also predicted their restoration as a nation” (p. 37).

WILL THE JEWS RETURN AS A PHYSICAL NATION?

In Genesis 12:2-7 God promised to Abraham through his seed a great nation, in Abraham would all families of the earth be blessed and the possession of the land of Canaan. The question arises, were these

promises fulfilled? According to Mr. Lindsey's statement on page 40, the promise of a nation has been fulfilled, but it must be fulfilled again in a rebirth! The land promise has also been fulfilled, but must be fulfilled again. But Mr. Lindsey says nothing, by implication, that the promise of "all the families of the earth being blessed in Abraham. On the other hand, Mr. Lindsey might be implying that these promises were never fulfilled. In either case, Mr. Lindsey offers no sound interpretation of any scripture to support his implications. Yet on the same page he said

When the plain sense of scripture makes common sense, seek no other sense, therefore, take every word at its primary, ordinary, usual, literal meaning UNLESS the facts of the immediate context, studied in the light of related passages and AXIOMATIC and FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS indicate clearly otherwise.

On the very same page, he begins to contradict this very statement by his interpretation of Ezekiel 38:8 (p. 40). Let us see how he does it. Mr. Lindsey insists that Ezekiel 38:8 refers to a nation of Israel whose presence in Palestine will trigger the judgement of all nations. Is this, or is this not, a contradiction to the axiomatic and fundamental truths that the promises to Abraham have already been fulfilled and that nowhere else in the hagiography is there the slightest intimation that Israel will be **reborn** as the **actual** nation of Israel. There is furthermore no suggestion anywhere that the promises to Abraham will be realized in two **separate events**. In absolute contradiction to this is Deuteronomy 17:7-9 connected with Joshua 7, 8 and in Joshua 21:43, 1 Kings 4:21; and Nehemiah 9:7-8 which clearly indicates the land promise as having been fulfilled with no hint whatsoever of there being another fulfillment of this promise in the future. The condition of repossession is found in Deuteronomy 30:1-10. Mr. Lindsey and other premillennialists sees the Jew of today returning to the land of promise according to Old Testament prophecy. Yet, the condition which was bound upon Jews was that they should turn back to the law of Moses. But this is impossible, for Christ abolished the law of commandment (Eph. 2:15). The old covenant is done away with in Christ (2 Cor. 3:14). Isaiah declared only a remnant would return (Isa. 10:20-22). Premillennialists claim the whole nation will return (p. 33, Dream and Reality). The remnant did return according to God's promise, (Ezra 1; 9:13-15; Neh. 1:1-3; Hag. 1:12-14; 2:2-3). Nehemiah recorded the very language that Moses used in Deuteronomy 30:4-5 when he spoke in Nehemiah 1:8-10

and made it clear that the prophecy of the return had been fulfilled. Jeremiah said the nation could never be restored completely in Jeremiah 19:1-11. If Mr. Lindsey were to follow his own advice, he would not set Ezekiel 38:8 against plain axiomatic and fundamental truths, and the silence of the Scriptures. Mr. Lindsey fails to mention to his unsuspecting readers that there are five methods in use in the theological world in regard to Ezekiel. These are (1) the historical method, (2) the allegorical method, (3) the typical method, (4) the symbolical method, and (5) the Judaistical method. Mr. Lindsey uses the Judaistical method which is shown to be contradictory to other plain passages. The historical view supposes Ezekiel's prophecies and visions to have their fulfillment in the restoration of the captive Israel in Babylon after the 70 years. The typical method recognizes, both in history, and in the temple and its services, types of the Christian Church and its ordinances. It is the combination of these two latter methods that offers the best explanation in light of the whole teaching of the Bible. Mr. Lindsey, like all other theorizers, uses Ezekiel 38:8 for the answer he has already decided upon, and not what it was originally intended for. As a summary of Mr. Lindsey's book, we quote again from his introduction: "As a traveling speaker for Campus Crusade for Christ I had the opportunity to give messages on prophecy to thousands of people. These messages have consistently proven to be popular with every age group." Mr. Lindsey has entangled himself in the world and has catered to their desires (2 Tim. 4:1-4). He had not learned the first principles of hermeneutics nor the first principles of the gospel. Mr. Lindsey fashions himself as a special ambassador of God to interpret prophecy and has made predictions. Let us analyze a true prophet and see if Mr. Lindsey measures up!

MARKS OF A PROPHET

1. Always an **uncompromising individualist**. He could not be bound by public opinion nor swayed by the caution of diplomats.
2. He was conscious of a divine call. He was God's mouthpiece to bear precious truths from the throne of God to needy men.
3. He was a man of action with ruggedness of character to persevere. His presence commanded attention, his way often stirred antagonism and opposition.

4. He was always conscious of God's authority. Many times he stood alone against most of his contemporaries. Even the religious leaders often challenged his stand—yet, he stood firm.
5. He was a man of prayer. His often lonely, solitary life gave him plenty of time to keep in touch with God.
6. His life was clean and consecrated. In the long line of prophets we find not a single breath of criticism of the moral life of one of them.
7. He was an outspoken critic of the evils around him. Kings, priests, princes, nobles, judges and all sinners were denounced fearlessly. He did not deal in general terms. He raised his voice against anything and anyone which merited denunciation.
8. While his main work was preaching to his own age, he also revealed things to happen in the future. He was given special insight into the will of God for generations yet unborn.

Mr. Lindsey is found wanting. He has been found to be inconsistent in what he says and therefore, he speaks not the truth and on this basis, we reject his conclusions as being false. We ask that all who read literature such as this weigh it carefully against what has been revealed in God's Word.