

Editor's Note

Selected Bible Treasures

Bible Treasures is a ministry of Open Bible Fellowship – Semi Valley, California.

The selected articles contained herein were originally published in the 1980's and are reprinted by permission.

Every effort has been made to reproduce the style and content as originally published.

Some minor printing errors have been corrected and font sizes have been reduced to conserve space.



Edited by W. W. Robinson

Table of Contents

Implications of the Reformation by Dr. David Rodabaugh	4
Soul Sleep and the Intermediate State of the Dead by Paul Ripley	14
To Make All Men See by Bill Robinson	26
Substitution and HUPER - A Big Doctrine and a Little Word by Dr. David Rodabaugh	30
For Whom Did Christ Die? by Bill Robinson	43
Creedal Issues by Dr. David Rodabaugh	49
A Ray of Sonlight by Bill Robinson	63
An Essential Doctrine by Dr. David Rodabaugh	72
Dispensationalism and Calvinism by Dr. David Rodabaugh	80
Repentance by Art Szafranski	83
Believers in the NT NOT Baptized Dr. David Rodabaugh	90
Does All Men Mean Every Man? by Dr. David Rodabaugh	101
IF CHRIST DIED FOR ALL, How Do You Know You Are Saved? by Dr. David Rodabaugh	107
The Meaning of Words Dr. David Rodabaugh	109
The Arminian Atrocity by Dr. David Rodabaugh	134
Creation Science – Its Time to Listen by Dr. David Rodabaugh	150
Our Basis For Truth by Dr. David Rodabaugh	157
The Danger of Counterfeit Faith by Dr. David Rodabaugh	168

IMPLICATIONS OF THE REFORMATION

By Dr. David J. Rodabaugh

INTRODUCTION

We have often seen in print the sentiment that Calvin, Zwingli and Luther were great men of God. Yet, it is our contention that nearly everyone who praises these men is strongly opposed to the issues important to their cause.

The issues raised by the reformers were primarily two in number.

Doctrinal - The issue of Total Depravity, Predestination and related subjects.

Hermeneutical - The return to the literal method of interpreting the scriptures. This means a departure from the allegorical method of interpretation so often employed even to this day by Roman Catholic theologians and others.

DOCTRINAL ISSUE**Introduction**

No doubt most who are not Roman Catholic believe that the major issue of the reformation was that of the indulgences. However, as we shall prove, the basic doctrinal issue of the reformation was related to issues commonly associated with predestination. This may shock some folk. However, we believe two things:

1. It is improper to praise the courage of the reformers if you do not agree with them on what they saw as the issue of

the reformation. We do not praise men who courageously spread error. Certainly, Karl Marx was courageous but deeply in error. We do not praise him; we condemn him.

If you admire Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli you may disagree with them on what they viewed as minor issues but not on what they called the major issue.

2. A careful study of the Word of God proves that they were right in what they taught about Total Depravity, Election, etc.

We will now document from some of their writings just what they did teach.

Luther's 97 Theses

The belief that the major issue of Luther was indulgences so dominates the thinking of some that all we hear about Luther's protests against the Roman Church is his 95 theses. These did indeed dwell on such issues.

But, this was not the major issue according to Luther himself. Before Luther publicized his 95 theses, he issued 97 theses against the teachings of the Roman Church. To prove this, we quote from a few of them.¹

Thesis 4 And so the truth is that man is created "a corrupt tree," and can neither will nor do anything except evil.

Thesis 5 It is not true that the desire is free and able to make one choice as well as another. In actual fact it is not free at all but is in bondage.

Thesis 6 It is not true to say that the will is able of its own volition to conform itself to that which is right.

¹ James Atkinson, Ed. Luther: Early Theological Works(1962. Westminster, Philadelphia) (library of Christian Classics Vol ____XVI)

Thesis 10 It is submitted, that the will is not free to pursue in the light of its own reason any good thing that has been made clear to it.

Thesis 11 Neither is it in its own power to will or not to will whatever has been made clear.

Thesis 28 In the texts, "Turn ye unto me and I shall turn to you" (Zech. 1: 3), or again, "Seek and ye shall find" (Matt. 7:7), or again, "If ye seek me I shall be found of you" (Jer. 29:13f.), and statements like these, if they are interpreted as implying that the first half of the activity is man's contribution and the rest is of grace, then what is asserted is only what the Pelagians said.

Thesis 29 The perfectly infallible preparation for grace, the one and only valid attitude, is the eternal election and predestination of God.

It is impossible to read the above without realizing that Luther regarded the doctrines of Total Depravity, Unconditional Election and Irresistible Grace as of paramount importance in Christian doctrine. It is possible that the reader does not know what these terms mean so we will give brief definitions.

Total Depravity

The teaching that man is totally unable to do anything that is pleasing to God. Since the Bible clearly teaches that faith pleases God, this doctrine must include the teaching that man is unable even to want to come to God.

Unconditional Election

The teaching that God chose certain ones to be His own apart from any conditions or foreseen faith or foreseen qualities.

Limited Redemption

The teaching that Christ, on the cross of Calvary effected a certain redemption for those of the Father's choosing and for them alone.

Irresistible Grace

The teaching that the Holy Spirit does a work of grace in the hearts of the elect that can't be resisted. This work of grace results in their certain salvation.

Perseverance

The teaching that God causes his own elect to persevere in their lives.

We have defined all five points of Calvinism. Each issue could be documented from the writings of the reformers though there is evidence that Luther has second thoughts about Limited Redemption late in his ministry. Calvin and Zwingli never wavered even on this point however. We do not have space to document this so we will concentrate only on the issues of Total Depravity and what all admit it implies.

In addition, to conserve space, we will only discuss the views of Luther. Our reasons for doing this are twofold.

1. There can be no doubt about the teachings of Calvin. As J. N. Darby put it so aptly, we need not show Calvin a Calvinist.
2. There is an unsupported feeling among many that Luther was weaker on these points than the others.

The reader may at this point doubt that Luther saw this as a major issue. After all, he did write on other issues. We turn now to what Luther considered his major work.

Luther's Bondage of the Will

This classic² was written in response to the Roman Catholic theologian Erasmus. (The ignorance of some believers on this matter is amazing. A large number regard Erasmus as a participant in the reformation. Erasmus did no such thing. His interest was in reforming certain practices within the church.

² Martin Luther, The Bondage of the Will (Revell, Old Tappan, NJ)

He was opposed to the doctrine of the reformers and had written a work against Luther's doctrine.)

In the conclusion of his book, Luther stated,

Moreover, I give you hearty praise and commendation on this further account -- that you alone, in contrast with all others, have attacked the real thing, that is, the essential issue. You have not wearied me with those extraneous issues about the Papacy, purgatory, indulgences and such like -- trifles, rather than issues -- in respect of which almost all to date have sought my blood (though without success): you. and you alone. have seen the hinge on which all turns, and aimed for the vital spot.

The reader would do well to purchase, read, and carefully consider the arguments in this work. We do not intend to republish the book here but one quote may show the reader the force of Luther's statements. We quote from his comments on John 6:44 (pages 310 and 311).

Next: when Christ says in John 6: 'No man can come to me, except My Father which bath sent me draw him' (v.(44), what does he leave to 'free will'? He says man needs to hear and learn of the Father Himself, and that all must be taught of God. Here, indeed, he declares, not only that the works and efforts of 'free will' are unavailing, but that even the *very* word of the gospel (of which He is here speaking) is heard in vain, unless the Father Himself speaks within, and teaches, and draws.

But the ungodly does not 'come', even when he hears the word, unless the Father draws and teaches him inwardly: which He does by shedding abroad His Spirit. When that happens, there follows a 'drawing' other than that which is outward; Christ is then displayed by the enlightening of the Spirit, and by it man is rapt to Christ with the sweetest rapture, he being passive while God speaks, teaches, and draws, rather than seeking or running himself.

The Judgment of Others

There is no question about the teachings of Luther. His works can be found in most any library and many are still in print. However, we feel constrained to mention several references to Luther's teaching on 'Calvinism' from divergent sources.

We begin by mentioning a major modern Roman Catholic and Lutheran book on the subject.³ This book is published jointly by the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans. While the author disagrees totally with Luther, he states most clearly that the major issue in Luther's split with Romanism was Luther's belief in the 'unfree will'.

There are some interesting comments in a recent book by two Arminians (those opposed to at least 3 of the doctrines of Calvinism defined above)⁴ In several footnotes of this book, the authors state their admiration of Erasmus and their opposition to Luther. These footnotes are as follows:

Favoring Erasmus -- note 45 on p. 290 and note 121 on p. 295

Condemning Luther -- note 99 on p. 293 and note 121 on p. 295.

Finally, we mention a paper by J. N. Darby on the subject of the reformation.⁵ On page 26, Darby states:

It is well known that one of Luther's principal and most laboured works was on the bondage of the will -- its absolute and unqualified incapability of doing anything but sin.

³ Harry J. McSorley, Luther: Right or Wrong (1969, Augsburg, Minneapolis)

⁴ Roger T. Forster and V. Paul Marston, God's Strategy in Human History (1973, Tyndale, Wheaton)

⁵ J. N. Darby, Collected Writings (Edited by Wm. Kelly) Doctrinal No. 1, Vol.3 (Stow Hill Bible and Tract Depot, London) Article is entitled The Doctrine of the Church of England at the Time of the Reformation.

SUMMARY

The reader may not like it but the issue of the reformation was 'Calvinism'. Consequently, those who do not believe in Total Depravity, Unconditional Election and Irresistible Grace can be literally accused of having a Roman Catholic theology. This is exactly how Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli viewed the subject.

HERMENEUTICAL ISSUE

Introduction

A number of writers have pointed out that the reformers turned from the allegorical hermeneutic of the Roman church and to a literal hermeneutic.

The importance of your hermeneutic can't be overemphasized. Those who adopt the allegorical method on some or much of scripture are essentially at liberty to 'make' the Bible teach whatever they wish. That this is the case can be amply demonstrated from the writings of those who hold this position.

We fully admit that many who hold to a literal hermeneutic are not consistent and we regret this. It is also the case that many who hold to a nonliteral hermeneutic are not consistent either. (In fact, in our opinion, we have yet to find a consistent advocate of the nonliteral hermeneutic among those who truly know Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior.⁶)

The issue, however, is not whether one particular believer is inconsistent in interpreting the scriptures. The issue is whether we can take the scriptures at face value. But this is a little ahead of the story.

⁶ A recent article by John Zens (reprinted in the October, 1980 Sword and Trowel) contains a statement that seems to admit inconsistency. In this article, critical of Dispensationalism, he states, "Our goal should not even be to arrive at an 'air-tight' system which has all the answers." While we certainly agree that we wish to see Christ exalted in the scriptures, we maintain that it does not exalt Christ to purposely follow a system that can't answer questions.

Comments on the History of Interpretation

For a more complete discussion of the history of interpretation, the reader is urged to read chapter II in the book Things to Come by J. Dwight Pentecost.⁷

Space does not permit much here. However, it is important to note that Christ and the Apostles took the Old Testament literally. Indeed, it is impossible to talk of Christ as the Jewish Messiah without referring to Old Testament prophecies about Him as if they were to be literally fulfilled.

Unfortunately, the literal approach was soon abandoned by 'believers' as they sought to combine the teachings of the scriptures with man's philosophies. There is no question that the hermeneutic of the dark ages in the Roman Church was the allegorical.

A new day -- or, rather an old day revisited -- dawned with the reformers. We see the reformers stressing the importance of taking the scriptures in their normal sense. Of course, everyone admits that there are figures of speech that occur in the normal use of language. But, this is quite apart from the allegorical interpretive scheme that takes whole passages and states that they do not mean what they state taken naturally.

Note the following from Wycliff (this and other quotes come from the book by Pentecost):

.... the whole error in the knowledge of Scripture, and the source of its debasement and falsification by incompetent persons, was the ignorance of grammar and logic.

Tyndale was willing to say that the only sense of scripture is the literal. We may apply it to our lives in various ways but its only sense is the literal.

Finally, a quote from Luther:

Every word should be allowed to stand in its natural meaning and that should not be abandoned unless faith

⁷J. Dwight Pentecost, Things to Come (1964, Zondervan, Grand Rapids)

forces us to it.

..... It is the attribute of Holy Scripture that it interprets itself by passages and places which belong together, and can only be understood by the rule of faith.

Implication of the literal Hermeneutic

The reformers had many theological battles to fight. For this reason, they did not concern themselves with the implications of their literal hermeneutic regarding future events.

There is no question that the literal approach forces one to a study of the Bible dispensationally. This is admitted by both those who are for the dispensational approach and those who are opposed to it.

That this is true is dramatically demonstrated by a little paperback book recently published under the title The Meaning of the Millennium.⁸ This book presents the views for four men on the millennium. One is a dispensationalist (admittedly, this author does not agree with his beginning the church in Acts 2, etc.) and the others are not.

What is intriguing is that all four agree that if you take the Bible literally then you will be a dispensationalist.

The reader will not be shocked that this is the view of the dispensationalist Herman Hoyt.

What is interesting is that this view is clearly admitted by at least two of the other authors. George Eldon Ladd writes only two pages of criticism of Hoyt's article and does not say it directly.

But the reader should read the responses of the other two. Note this quote from Loraine Boettner on page 95:

It is generally agreed that if the prophecies are taken literally, they do foretell a restoration of the nation of Israel in the land of Palestine ruling over the other

⁸ Robert G. Clouse, Ed., The Meaning of the Millennium (1977, Inter Varsity, Downers Grove)

nations.

Now, mind you, Boettner disagrees with that conclusion. Yet he admits that a literal interpretation implies it.

Anthony A. Hoekema states (p. 104), "My disagreement concerns primarily his method of interpreting Scripture." He then proceeds to quote Hoyt that this is, "taking the Scriptures in their literal and normal sense, understanding that this applies to the entire Bible."

Summary

It is important to note that the hermeneutic of the reformation was the literal one. It may very well be the case that this hermeneutic causes us to be at odds with what many theologians have said over the years. Nevertheless the allegorical hermeneutic is that of the Roman Church.

CONCLUSION

My dear reader, it is our hope that you will pursue these matters in the light of the Word of God. Our intention here was to clear up confusions which some have regarding the history of reformation.

If you do not believe in Total Depravity as defined by Luther and the reformers then, whether you like it or not, your doctrine of man and salvation is Roman Catholic. Yours is a position that elevates man's will.

If you are not willing to stick to the literal hermeneutic then your allegorical hermeneutic is that of the Roman Catholic Church. Yours is a position that elevates man's philosophy.

God grant that those who claim to know Christ will quit elevating man and let God be God and God's Word be God's Word.

Soul Sleep and the Intermediate State of the Dead

by Paul Ripley

Introduction: For the purposes of this study and in contrasting the two views we will use the word soul to refer to the immaterial part of man as opposed to the body or material part of man.

We believe man is tri-part in nature i.e. body, soul, and spirit. Therefore we do not regard "spirit" and "soul" as complete synonyms, but will use soul as the immaterial part of man primarily because this is the way it has historically been discussed. By way of definition, "the soul is the conscious immaterial essence of man comprising cognition and affections".

The table below outlines the progression of thought in the study. I would like to take some time and look at each section, not as a critique of soul sleep but from the historical or what I call biblical position.

Section	Soul Sleep	<i>Historical View</i>
I.	The soul and body are inseparable	Soul and body are separate
II.	The soul is unconscious at death	The soul is conscious at death
III.	Eternal life and immortality are one and the same	Eternal life and immortality are referring to soul and body respectively

- 1) The Soul and Body are Separable Entities
 - a) The body is dead when the Spirit/Soul leaves

James 2:26 For as the body without the spirit is dead

Luke 8:55 And her spirit came again, and she arose

straightway: and he commanded to give her meat.

Acts 7:59 And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. 60 And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep.

Luke 23:46 And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.

Ecc 12:7 7 Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.

b) Other scriptures relating to death

Job 19: 25-27 Yet without my flesh I shall see God

Matt 10:28 And fear not them, which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him, which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.

Matt 17:3 Transfiguration mount (see below and cf Moses' death Deut 34:5 & Elias' death II Kings 2:11)

II Cor 5:8 We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.

2) The Soul is Conscious at Death

a) Phil 1:21 -24. 21 For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. 22 But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor; yet what I shall choose, I know not. 23 For I am in a strait between the two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better; 24 nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you.

i) The second coming of Christ is not in view here since Paul would not have mentioned staying with the Philippians and his strong desire for instantaneous reunion with Christ. Unless of course Paul was anticipating the return of Christ and he knew those saints weren't invited. That doesn't make sense.

ii) What does it mean to be with Christ if I am sleeping or in an unconscious state?

iii) If Paul did not mean that he would instantaneously be with Christ he would have used a different construction in grammar.

iv) The phrase "with Christ" refers to the close and intimate relationship we have with Christ both positionally and ultimately personally. It refers to our co-extensive union and association with Christ. This is the only reference with that phrase where Paul speaks of his own desire for personal union with Christ. He alludes to it positionally and also as a firm promise in Romans 6:8 Now if we be **dead with Christ**, we believe that we shall also **live with Him**.

v) Other references to the phrase "with Christ".

Romans 8:17 and if children, then heirs--heirs of God and **joint heirs with Christ**, if so it be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together.

Galatians 2:20 I am **crucified with Christ**, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me. And the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me.

Ephesians 2:5 even when we were dead in sins, hath **quicken us together with Christ** (by grace ye are saved),

Philippians 1:23 For I am in a strait between the two, having a desire to **depart and to be with Christ**, which is far better;

Colossians 2:20 Therefore if ye be **dead with Christ** from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to its ordinances Colossians 3:1 If ye then be **risen with Christ**, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God.

Colossians 3:3 For ye are dead, and your **life is hid with Christ** in God.

b) I Thess 4:13-15 13 But I would not have you to be

ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. 14 For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. 15 For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. 16 For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: 17 Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. 18 Wherefore comfort one another with these words.

- i) This passage clearly shows a distinction between the saints which are with Christ (v14) and the bodies they will receive (v 16) at his return. To be with Christ was promised in Rom 6:8 and what Paul was looking for (instantaneously at death) in Phil 1: 23. I suggest that this was exactly Paul's point here in comforting the Thessalonians with these words. Christ reunites the souls of those dead in him (those he brings with him) with their raised immortal bodies. Otherwise this text makes no sense to me.
- ii) The dead saints are viewed as sleeping from the perspective of those still alive. That which sleeps refers only to the physical body as referenced by the word used for "dead" in v16. See Acts 7:60.
- c) Luke 16:19-31
 - i) Names are mentioned, so it is not just a parable.
 - ii) All of Christ's parables and stories are based on facts.
 - iii) The beggar died and was carried. What was carried if this is not talking about his soul essence?
- d) Luke 23:42 -43 And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou come into thy kingdom. 43 And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, Today thou shalt be with me in paradise.

- i) If the phrase read "Verily, verily I say unto you Today" it would be inconsistent with the way Christ used the expression.
- ii) What does "Today thou shalt be with me in paradise" mean if the soul sleeps after death.
- iii) The word "Today" means this very day and cannot refer to some latter day in the future.
- e) II Cor 5:8-9 We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord. 9 Therefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted by Him.
 - i) What does the phrase "to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord" mean if the soul sleeps at death?
 - ii) This passage is consistent with Phil 1: 23 and in fact compliments it. Paul is expressing his desire to be with Christ and absent from the body. Obviously to be present with the Lord (in a personal way) cannot happen until death. This is also referred to as the disembodied state.
 - iii) In v.9 we please Christ (to be accepted by him) whether in the body or absent (v8) from it. How can we do that which is acceptable to him if we're asleep? Again in context to say my soul is unconscious at death makes no sense.
- f) Matt 17:3-9 Transfiguration Mount
 - i) This was not a trance (check concordance of word) but an actual sight. The word "appeared" is never used of a trance.
 - ii) Moses and Elias talked with the Lord v3. Peter was in full capacity of his faculties by suggesting in v4 that he build a tabernacle for each of them.
 - iii) All three heard Gods blessing of his Son in v5 which followed immediately after Peters suggestion to build a tabernacle for each of them. This was a rebuke to Peter.

iv) In v8 after being touched by the Lord they saw no man except him.

3) Eternal Life And Immortality are not Synonymous Terms but Refer to the Soul and Body Respectively

a) The Biblical meaning of death

i) General Scripture showing the various meanings of death

(1) Matt 5:22 Dead buries dead

(2) I Time 5:6 She is dead while she liveth

(3) John 5:25 Dead shall hear Christ's voice

ii) Death is:

(1) Separation James 2:26; Ecc 12:7

(2) Putting off a tent II Cor 5:1; II Peter 1:13,14

(3) Exodus Luke 9:30,31; II Peter 1:15

(4) Absence from the body II Co 5:8, 12:2

(5) State of silence Ps 31:17; 115:17

(6) Penalty for sin Gen 2:17; Ezek 18:4; Rom 6:23; James 1:14-15; Rom 8:6,13

iii) Spiritual Death (of the natural fleshly man)

(1) Natural state of man Eph 2:1-3

(2) Separation of the spiritual nature of man from the life of God Eph 4:18; I Co 2:11

(3) The natural man is dead and is enmity against God Rom 8:7,8

(4) At death without Christ Ps 73:16-20; Job 20:25-26

iv) Spiritual death as it relates to believers Rom 6:11,13; 8:6,13; Eph 5:14; Col 2:13

b) Eternal Life is Different than Immortality

i) Eternal life is a vital union with Christ at regeneration, which **NEVER** ceases.

(1) The relationship between regeneration and indwelling. (Please let me know if you want more details in this area)

(a) Regeneration is the work of God's Spirit whereby he quickens alive man's dead spirit, according to the eternal purpose of God and redemptive work of Jesus Christ, producing spiritual life, and all that goes with that life namely; faith, repentance, illumination of understanding, conviction of sin, desire for holiness, knowledge and love of God, and of Christ etc. No man can exhibit the characteristics of spiritual life while in his dead fleshly state.

(b) Regeneration is more than just a restoration to Adams pre-fall state. Regeneration is to a newer and higher state in the image of Christ (Rom. 8:29). Lost sinners need more than just restoration. The spirit is not added or replaced at regeneration but changed. The spirit substance or essence is changed which makes man in his spirit and spirit life "A new man who after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. 4:29). Man has a material and an immaterial nature. The material nature refers to his flesh, bones, blood etc.. His immaterial nature is composed of two parts, his soul and spirit. Prior to regeneration the soul dominates the man; the spirit is almost indistinguishable from the soul. The man is soulish or fleshly in all of his deeds and thoughts. The soul reigns in the man with all its fleshly desires as an absolute monarch. When God regenerates, it's the spirit that is quickened alive in the image of Christ. The soul loses its reigning power but not its influence over the man. The spirit is now clearly defined (at regeneration) apart from the soul and reigns in the life of the saint (Heb. 4:12). At death the

soul is quickened alive (I Thess. 5:23), and at the resurrection the **body** is quickened alive to the glory of God (I Cor. 15:42-54; Phil. 3:21).

(c) The relationship of regeneration to indwelling:

(i) Regeneration is the mechanism (or vehicle) by which God indwells and has communion with his people. God regenerates no one he doesn't indwell; in fact God regenerates to indwell. We can therefore say that regeneration and indwelling are complimentary concepts but viewed from different perspectives. God desires to be in communion with his people, but before there can be communion there must be a change in the dead spirit of man. There are two things that are fundamental to our consideration of this topic; things must be in agreement before they can work together and there must be a likeness of essence before there can be a union.

(ii) We can't have communion with God until we are in union with him.

(iii) We can't be in union with God until our spirit essences are like his Spirit. God indwells through the Holy Spirit by means of power manifested in the new nature.

ii) Eternal life, given us by God is in Christ.

I John 5:11-13 And this is the record: that God hath given to us eternal life, and **this life is in His Son**. 12 He that **hath the Son hath life**, and he that hath not the Son hath not life. 13 These things I have written unto you that believe in the name of the Son of God, that ye may **know that ye have eternal life**, and that ye may believe in the name of the Son of God.

iii) Eternal life and immortality are given divine distinction

II Tim 1:10 but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death and hath brought **life** and **immortality** to light through the Gospel.

Rom 2:7 To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and **immortality, eternal life**:

John 6: 39-40 And this is the Father's will who hath sent Me, that of all which He hath given Me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the Last Day. And this is the will of Him that sent Me: that every one who seeth the Son and believeth in Him may **have everlasting life**, and I **will raise him up** at the Last Day."

John 6:54 Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood **hath eternal life**, and I will **raise him up** at the Last Day.

iv) Christ alone has immortality (I Tim 6:16) but will give it to his elect at his return

I Co 15:51,54; Phil 3:21; I Thess 4:13-18

v) Christ gives eternal life to his people in this life

John 10:28 And I give unto them eternal life, and **they shall never perish**, neither shall any man pluck them out of My hand.

John 17:2 as Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him.

Rom 6:23 For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

I John 5:11,13 See context. This is given at regeneration. Eternal life is in the present tense and in present possession of every believer.

vi) Eternal life is based on God's promises Titus 1:2; I John 2:25

vii) Our life is based on His life

John 14:19 because I live, ye shall live

viii) Eternal life is viewed as a present possession of believers and is unending in duration

John 5:24 Verily, verily I say unto you, he that heareth My Word and believeth in Him that sent Me, **hath everlasting life** and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life.

John 6: 47 -51 Verily, verily I say unto you, He that believeth in Me **hath everlasting life**. I am that Bread of Life. 49 Your fathers ate manna in the wilderness, and are dead. 50 This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a man may eat thereof and **not die**. 51 I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven. If any men 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."

John 6:57-58 As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth Me, even he **shall live by Me**. This is that Bread which came down from Heaven, not as your fathers ate manna and are dead; he that eateth of this Bread **shall live for ever**."

(1) As Christ lives by the Father so we live by Christ. What we say about the one affects the other. If I am separated from God at death does that mean Christ can be separated from the Father?

(2) Nothing can separate us from the love of God in Christ (Rom 8:35-39). Being unconscious at death is a separation from God and is not consistent with these truths.

c) The Lord comforts Martha

John 11:22-27 Then Martha said unto Jesus, "Lord, if Thou hadst been here, my brother would not have died. 22 But I know that even now, whatsoever Thou wilt ask of God, God will give it Thee." 23 Jesus said unto her, "Thy brother shall rise again." 24 Martha said unto Him, "I know that he shall rise again at the resurrection on the Last Day." 25

Jesus said unto her, "I am the Resurrection and the Life. He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; 26 and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die. Believest thou this?" 27 She said unto Him, "Yea, Lord, I believe that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, who should come into the world."

i) Martha did believe in the resurrection but had no clue as to the reality of eternal life.

Physical Death & Bodily Resurrection	Eternal life Which Never Dies
<u>v25</u> I am the Resurrection and the Life. He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live;	<u>v26</u> whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die
Body Material	Spirit/Soul Immaterial

ii) Christ's purpose was to comfort Martha, in that when the Prince of Life gives life to a believer it is unaffected by **physical death**.

d) What is eternal life?

John 17:2-3 Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He **should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him**. 3 And **this is life eternal: that they might know Thee**, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.

i) I have eternal life.

ii) That part of me which has eternal life will never die.

iii) The essence of that eternal life is a personal saving knowledge of the true God and the Son.

- iv) Therefore that part of me in eternal vital union with Christ will never die or be separated from Christ and I will enjoy that fellowship and personal relationship with my savior while absent from the body in his presence.

Rom 8:9-11 But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. 10 And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. 11 But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

To Make All Men See

By Bill Robinson

The Apostle Paul writes in Eph. 3:9 that the reason for his ministry is "...to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God...."

What is this "fellowship of the mystery" which was so important for men to see that God raised up an apostle for this very purpose? If it were this important, why had it been kept hidden for so long and why should it now be revealed?

In answer to the why, let us simply rest assured that this was the way God wanted it and, whatever His reasons, that is the way it should be.

It remains, therefore, only necessary for us to discover what the "fellowship of the mystery" is. This we shall now attempt to do.

A mystery is a secret, which has not been revealed prior to this time, but once revealed, it can be readily understood. A fellowship is an association or joining together of two or more separate entities. From this it follows that the "fellowship of the mystery" is a secret concerning the joining together of things which had been separate prior to this point in time.

One might be tempted at this point to contend that there are many mysteries spoken of in scripture and therefore we should not choose one and claim for it the unique significance we are here attempting. While the many mysteries do exist, we believe that Paul, himself, guides us into this selection of one above all the rest. Let us, therefore, allow God's word to both speak for itself and make the choice if there is to be one.

In Eph. 3:1-8, Paul tells us he has been given the "dispensation of the grace of God," and that by revelation, God made known unto him a mystery which had not been revealed to men in other ages. In verse 4, he calls it the mystery of Christ (the secret about Christ). In verse 6 he specifically states that the mystery is **"That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the**

same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel". He then continues in verse 7 to state that he was made a minister of this message.

Many would say at this point that we need go no further for we have the key to this mystery – the Gentiles are to be added to the church founded by Christ and started by Peter and the others at Pentecost. This seems to be the case in Acts 10 where Peter, himself, is sent to Cornelius after a special revelation from God (see verses 34 & 35.)

If Peter is, in fact, preaching the "mystery" referred to by Paul, why was Paul made an apostle? After all, Peter was already an apostle and quite capable of getting the message across. This is attested to by the Holy Spirit, Himself in Acts 10:44-48.

Another point which must be carefully considered is the reason Peter was sent to Cornelius in the first place. Acts 10:1-8, 29-33 show that God was rewarding Cornelius for his good works toward Israel. This is certainly not something new. It is merely the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham – "I will bless them that bless the....in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. (Ge. 12:3) Also, that the Gentiles should share with the Jews in salvation through Christ was no secret. See Is. 11:10; 60:3; Mt. 12:17-21; Luke 2:28-32. These are but a few examples.

What then does Paul mean by "fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ"?

The beginnings of an answer can be found in Eph. 2:14-22. Here we see that Christ has broken down a partition and made into one the two that were separated by it. That men are the things being brought together can be seen from verse 15. So who are these men? Verses 11-13 clearly show them to be the Jew and the Gentile. These two then are now of the same body and that is Christ's body (2:15) of which Christ is the head (Eph. 1:22-23). We can now conclude that "**of the same body**" clearly points to the Jew, the Gentile and our Lord Jesus Christ being joined together into one body, the **Body of Christ**.

From Eph. 2:11-13, it would seem that the Gentiles have been made fellowheirs with Israel. However Eph. 2:19-22 suggests a deeper meaning. Here we see that we have become members of

God's household. If we can determine what position we are to fill in this household, we should gain additional light on our question.

Eph. 1:4-7 leads us to the key. Here we are said to be predestinated to adoption as children of God by Jesus Christ. Following this thought leads us back to Ro. 8:14-17 where we are told that we have been adopted as children of God and made to be joint or fellowheirs with Christ.

Now then, if we are not to be fellowheirs with Israel but rather are to share in Christ's inheritance, the promises that the **Body of Christ** will partake of are not the promises made to Israel but the ones made to our Lord Jesus Christ.

From this we conclude that the "fellowship of the mystery" is a fellowship consisting of Jew and Gentile, placed by the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 12:13) into one body with Christ as the head. Those so placed lose all distinction as to their background.

Ga 3:28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

Col 3:11 Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all.

The members of this body have been adopted as children of God and are to be joint heirs of God with Christ. Because of this position, they will share with Christ in all that He has received from the Father.

This fellowship is not a fellowship in which Gentiles are now to share in the gospel of the kingdom promises made to Israel as a nation. **The church, the Body of Christ, did not replace the nation of Israel.** God will keep all His promises to Israel and the nation of Israel is but a part of the inheritance of Christ in which we share.

God has divided man into four groups and decreed a separate destiny for each group. These groups and their destinies are:

The Body of Christ will spend eternity in Heaven with

God. It is impossible to even imagine the glory that we will share. (Eph. 1; 1 Cor. 6:3; Eph. 2:7; 1 Cor. 2:9)

The Elect of Israel will spend eternity ruling over the earth. (Rev. 1:6, 5:10)

The Elect Gentiles will spend eternity on the earth serving Israel. (Isa. 49:22, 54:3, 60:3, 5, 11, 16, 61:6, 62:2)

The Non-Elect will spend eternity in the lake of fire. (Rev. 20:11-15)

How marvelous a secret this is and what better way to show forth the grace of God than by its revelation. Nothing but the matchless grace of God could provide so great a treasure as fellowship with Christ Jesus – **to share with The Creator in all that He has created** -- as a free gift. A gift that cannot be purchased, earned or deserved. A gift to be given by God to those whom He has chosen to receive it – those who believe (Eph. 2:8 & 9).

Won't you join with us as we endeavor to follow the great commission given to the Body of Christ, the church of this age, through the apostle Paul – **to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery?**

Substitution and HUPER A Big Doctrine and a Little Word

by Dr. David Rodabaugh

1. Introduction

One of the most important doctrines of the Word of God is that of the substitutionary or vicarious character of the death of Christ. This doctrine states that Christ died in the place of the sinner. It is not enough to say that Christ died for the benefit of the sinner.

To illustrate the difference as normally presented, we borrow from Charles Baker ([1] p. 339). Suppose a policeman is killed while protecting a citizen. Clearly, his death benefits the citizen, However in no way was he the citizen's substitute,

Another illustration of this difference is given by Mr. Baker ([1] p. 339): If one person pays another's fine, he is in no way his substitute. The one who is benefited still stands guilty before the law. (It would appear to me that there would not be this difference in a capital case,) (Note: Numbers in brackets *refer* to the References in the back of the article.)

Without substitution there is no salvation, as Lewis Sperry Chafer put it ([4], vol, III, p. 130), "To reject this truth is to reject the plainest doctrine of Scripture, to reject the gospel, and the only righteous ground on which God may exercise grace toward the lost,"

One would expect that the scriptures would be full of direct proofs of such an important doctrine, While we fully believe that there are many such proofs, a surprising number do not believe this.

2. The Teaching of Sir Robert Anderson

For example, Sir Robert Anderson has a whole chapter on substitution in his book The Gospel and Its Ministry ([2], chapter VII). In this chapter he essentially denies

direct proof of this doctrine. He states ([2], p. 95), "To speak of Christ's dying instead of us, or as our substitute, is to adopt the language of theology, not of Scripture, and we must take care lest we use the words in a sense or a connection inconsistent with the truth, The teaching of Scripture is that He died for sinners (there is no emphasis on the preposition), and that, on believing, they become identified with Him in that death"

In a footnote on the same page, he states, "I need not say that substitution is an extra scriptural expression"

Unfortunately, this book by Sir Robert Anderson has had an impact on a number of people. Yet in some ways it is a dangerous book.

Before proceeding we should ask just what is the teaching of Sir Robert Anderson.

While we contend that there are inconsistencies and confusion in what is said, one basic thread is clear. Sir Robert Anderson contended that Christ did not die as the substitute for any person. He further claimed that Christ became the believer's substitute at the instant of salvation.

On such a central issue as this, we might wonder what arguments he used. Sir Robert Anderson claims to offer, "first a positive statement of the truth upon this subject, as it is unfolded in the types of the Old Testament and in the doctrinal teaching of the New," ([2], p. 88),

He then proceeds to base his argument on his understanding of types and his understanding of the Greek word huper. He does not give direct support from the New Testament although the above might lead us to expect that. Instead he tries to argue from his position in favor of what we call Unlimited Redemption.

a. Types and Sir Robert Anderson

The subject of types is very interesting and important. It is full of many illustrations of the truth of God.

But, a type must never be the primary basis for a doctrine. We must first learn the doctrine precisely and then the type becomes an illustration, Too often, a type is interpreted a certain way and this is then the basis for some (possibly strange) doctrinal position.

Such reasoning is wrong. We must search the scriptures for their teaching on a subject. Only after such a foundation are we in a position to study the types related to that doctrine.

Sir Robert Anderson's argument from types is clearly presented ([2], p. 91) where he states:

"And the way to follow aright the teaching of the types is to regard their historical sequence as marking their moral order. We thus learn the different aspects of the death of Christ, and the divine order of the truth concerning it.... According to the analogy of the great day of atonement, the twofold aspect of the great day of atonement, the twofold aspect of the same offering is presented by two victims, the one being killed, the other sent out of sight."

This is clearly argument from type. The fact that he presents it first is dangerous in any teaching. The fact that he states, as we quoted above, that, "substitution is an extra scriptural expression," shows that this is his only argument. And, that is scary.

While it is not our purpose to pursue the matter here, suffice it to say that we do not accept Sir Robert Anderson's explanation of types.

In summary we state that proper doctrine is the basis of the study of types; the study of types is not the basis of proper doctrine.

b. the word huper and Sir Robert Anderson

Certainly, any reader familiar with God's Word would

wonder what Sir Robert Andersen does with such basic passages of scripture as Romans 5:6-8.

He states ([2], p, 95 footnote) that the Greek word for instead of is anti, He claims that:

"the word huper no doubt may have the same force as 'for' in English. But in either case such a meaning is exceptional and forced; and in our own language we should in that case pronounce the word with emphasis, and print it in italics. A full and careful consideration of every passage where the word occurs will satisfy the student it is never so used in the New Testament, , , , I need not say that substitution is an extra scriptural expression."

This author is one student who has carefully studied every such passage and is convinced that the above quote represents serious error from the pen of Sir Robert Anderson. So serious is it that this author could not in any way recommend it.

We will first look briefly at several important errors in his treatment and then we will turn to the issue regarding huper and its meaning.

c. Problems in His Treatment

Before proceeding with proof that Sir Robert Anderson is wrong, it is instructive to note some internal inconsistencies and immediate problems in his argument.

Truth has at least two important properties. One is internal consistency and the other is conformity to known truth.

We divide this part of the inquiry into the following!

1. His (Sir Robert Anderson's) treatment of the sin-offering,
2. His concern over effectual redemption
3. Anti

4. Doctrine and Precision

(1) the Sin Offering

Sir Robert Anderson clearly states ([2], pp. 89-90) that the victim in the sin-offering gave his life instead of the offerer. And, he asserts, this is clearly substitution.

To this we quite agree. However; this would seem to totally destroy his understanding of huper.

The sin-offering pictured Christ as laden with the sins of an individual (see Lev. 4).

There is no question that Mt. 26:28 refers to the sin-offering yet anti is not used. The contention ([1,2]) that without anti, substitution is not in view really suffers for peri is used in this verse.

In Gal, 1:4 we have the work of Christ for the sins of believers. There is no thought in this passage of anything but substitution. The word huper is used in Gal. 1:14. Similar references are in Eph. 5:2, 25-27 where the contexts forbid a non-substitutionary interpretation. The reader might study all places where huper occurs. Other unmistakable references to the sin-offering where huper is used include Titus 2:14 and I Pet. 2:21-24 (huper is in verse 21).

It is interesting that Sir Robert Anderson sees substitution in 1 Pet. 2:24 ([2] p.92) but fails to read verse 21. This inconsistency alone shows his argument can't stand.

(2) Effectual Redemption

It would appear that the more blessed a truth the more it is hated and maligned.

Sir Robert Anderson states {[2], pp. 97-98):

"But to speak of the death of Christ as having this substitutional relationship to the sinner, apart from the change which takes place on his believing, and thus to make his pardon appear to be an act of justice in such a sense that it ceases to be an act of grace, is

wholly unwarranted and false. If there be those on earth whose case is beyond the scope of the work of Christ, it is not in the power of God to save them; and thus redemption has failed of its first and highest aim, which is not the saving of the sinner, merely, but the restoring to God His sovereignty compromised by sin. But if the death of Christ be substitutionally instead of the unbeliever, his conversion may alter his condition spiritually and morally, but it can in no wise affect his judicial state: he is saved in fact and of right, whether he believes or not, In either case, grace is in chains, and not enthroned." (Emphasis his).

So there you have it. He hates the doctrines commonly nicknamed "Calvinism". He doesn't understand them but he hates them.

Notice first that he has totally changed the meanings of some important words. When we speak of a sovereign God in connection with salvation we mean (and all in history have meant) that God saves whom He wishes. He is in charge. He not only makes the rules--He makes the choices. Sir Robert Anderson has twisted this to mean that you make the choice.

When we (and others) speak of grace enthroned we refer again to God doing it all because we couldn't do anything. (Even faith is a gift from God.) However, when he speaks of grace enthroned, he means that our choice is enthroned. This is not grace at all.

Such twisting of the clear meanings of words is always indicative of deception. It is a trick used in theology by liberals and other opponents of truth. After all, every person in church knows that the reformers enthroned grace in their doctrine of the sovereignty of God. To deny these truths is to be aligned with Roman Catholic theology. The trick, if you don't believe these truths, is to redefine them. It is a mean and disgusting trick and must be rejected by all.

The teaching of grace enthroned is that the sovereign triune God did the following by His grace alone!

1. The Father chose certain people.
2. The Son died in their place.
3. The Holy Spirit regenerates them, giving them faith to believe.

Thus God's work is a work of grace which is made, by the work of Christ, consistent with His justice. It is wonderful and we rejoice in it (Titus 2:11-14). It is a truth concerning which we (Titus 2:15), "speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority"

(3) Anti

In admitting that anti has the meaning of substitution ([2, p 95 footnote), Sir Robert Anderson destroys his main point. He wishes to state that no passage used anti as huper is used.

He apparently forgot that this preposition in compound forms retains its meaning (see Strong's Exhaustive Concordance word 473). In I Tim. 2:6 we read, "Who gave himself a ransom (antilutron) for (huper) all, to be testified in due time,"

Thus, even if substitution, is not included in huper (and we show later that it is), it is definitely (by his argument) in antilutron = anti + lutron. Hence, the concept of substitution is in I Tim. 2:6, On page 89, [2] Sir Robert Anderson says, "I say this without wishing in the least to pander to the tendency that prevails to map out the Scriptures by hard-and-fast lines like the squares of a chess-board,"

Later in the same chapter he talks of "a full and careful consideration" of certain passages.

The student is left with the impression that it is unspiritual to be precise on this issue except where Sir Robert Anderson chooses to be.

This attitude we heartily reject. Let the student be precise in all truth. The apostle Paul prayed that believers would have a full knowledge of our Lord in

understanding exactly truths of Scripture like these very truths (Eph. 1:16-23)

3. The Meaning of huper

The standard one volume lexicon in English is that translated by Arndt and Gingrich [5]. Under huper they give as meaning c --"in place of, instead of, in the name of," and cite 2 Cor. 5:14, 15 and 21. Arndt and Gingrich also state in support of this meaning, ", , , -- in papyri very often huper autou to explain that the writer is writing 'as the representative of an illiterate person,"

Even Thayer's Lexicon [6] published before the above papyri were known gave as meaning 3 -- "in the place of, instead of." He does add that this "is more precisely expressed by anti," but admits that Irenaeus used anti and huper interchangeably.

Obviously there are a number of "students" whose Greek is far advanced of that of Sir Robert Anderson who believe that the word "huper" teaches substitution.

An additional scholar we mention is A. T. Robertson. Robertson's reputation as a Greek scholar was unchallenged (he is now dead).

So convinced was Robertson on this matter that he spent an entire chapter on this subject in a real gem [3] which we heartily recommend to any who love God's Word. He writes,

"Once quite an argument was made against the substitutionary theory on the ground that Paul in the great passages (cf. 2 Cor, 5 and Rom, 5) employs huper rather than anti,... This antithesis between anti and huper was imaginary as a matter of fact. Neither word in itself means substitution. It is a secondary idea in each instance. Anti literally means 'at the end of' and so suggests contrast, succession substitution, opposition, as the case may be Huper means literally 'over' and the context alone can decide the resultant

meaning which may be 'concerning,' 'beyond,' 'in behalf of,' 'instead of,' The ancient Greek writers employed anti, pro or huper for substitution as they wished. In the Alcestis of Euripides, where the substitutionary death of Alcestis for her husband is the point of the story, we find huper seven times, while anti and pro together have fewer uses. The substitutionary use of huper appears in ... So then it was never fair to say that the Greek idiom required anti for the idea of substitution. One followed his whims in the matter. For instance, Pausanias (Ruger), Die Prapositionen bei Pausanias, p. 12) employed huper twice as often as anti.

Moulton (Prolegomena, p, 165), remarks that huper is 'more colourless' as compared with anti.

"But the papyri, particularly the business documents, show that Paul is following current usage when he prefers huper for the idea of substitution. The instances in the papyri are far too numerous to quote.... Certainly in all these instances the writing is done on behalf of one, but one cannot stop there. Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 382) rightly says: 'In most cases one who acts in behalf of another takes his place.' This is absolutely true in the case of the recurrent idiom so common in the papyri, where a scribe writes a document in behalf of and instead of one who does not know letters. The scribe writes 'for' one who is not able to write.

Robertson then gives a number of examples where huper means "instead of", Indeed he states ([3], p, 38):

"It is needless to add more. They tell the same almost monotonous story of the substitutionary use of huper.

"when we turn to the New Testament from the papyri there can, of course, be no grammatical reluctance to allowing the same usage for huper if the context calls for it. Theological prejudice must be overruled,"

A number of references are listed where Robertson

considers the issues to be clear: John 11:50; Gal, 3:13; Mark 14:24 2 Cor, 5:15; Rom, 5:6, ff; 8:32; Titus 2:14; Heb, 2:9; etc, Regarding these passages, he even states, ". . . there is no room left for protest from the side of grammar," Expressions like this occur several times in connection with these passages. On page 41, he concludes, "the presumption is now in favour of the use of huper for the idea of substitution."

What a fantastic parallel! A scribe writes in the place of an illiterate who is helpless: Christ died in the place of totally depraved sinners who are spiritually helpless.

Why?

When the truth is so clear, we naturally ask why men would try to avoid it. Robertson clearly asserts the reason is theological prejudice [3]. Exactly the nature of the prejudice he does not give.

Sir Robert Anderson's motives are clear ([2], chapter VII), He wants to tell the unregenerate that Christ died for them. He realizes, however, that it is logically inconsistent to teach that Christ is the substitute for any who die unsaved and go to hell. Several times he states his opposition to a salvation which was, even in the mind of God, settled at the time of Calvary. In short, his opposition to the doctrine of Particular Redemption forms the bases for what he says about huper.

Interestingly enough, Lewis Sperry Chafer who also did not believe in Particular Redemption, did teach that huper conveys the thought of substitution in Rom, 5:6-8, 2 Cor. 5:14-15, 21, Gal. 3:13, et, al, ([4], Vow. III, p, 57.

Unfortunately, much of the view of Sir Robert Anderson is found in Baker's Dispensational Theology, ([1], pp. 340--342). Indeed, typology is even given first as support for the doctrine of substitution.

4. In Our Place

Thank God! We rejoice that huper clearly means "instead of, 'in the place of' when referring to the death of Christ.

Thank God! This means that this important doctrine does not rest on some indirect argument of typology but is taught directly and frequently in the Greek New Testament.

Here is a partial list of verses that are clear on the issue:

"For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died in the place of ungodly ones. For scarcely in the place of a righteous man will one die; perhaps in the place of a good man some would even dare to die, But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died in our place" (Rom, 5:6-8)

", , . this is (represents) my body which was broken in your place , , ."!(1 Cor.11:24)

"For the love of Christ constrains us because we are convinced that if one died in the place of all then the all died. And he died in the place of all in order that those who live should no longer live to themselves but to the one who died in their place and was raised," (2 Cor. 5:14,15),

"For he (God) made him who knew no sin to be made sin in our place in order that we might become the righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. 5:21). (The reader might be interested in the fact that many have urged the meaning "sin offering" for the second "sin" in this verse. Thus, even the types of [1,2] would force huper to mean "in the place of" here.)

"...gave himself in my place" (Gal. 2:20),

"...being made a curse in our place..." (Gal 3:13).

"...given himself in our place..."(Eph. 5:26).

"...Who gave himself in our place . . ." (Titus 2:14),

5. An Effectual Redemption

A clear corollary to the above is that all that is found in the work of Christ was done effectually at the cross.

Yes, it is true that this implies that God from all eternity had in mind a particular people to be redeemed by the blood of Christ. Yes, it is true that this implies the hated doctrine of Particular Redemption.

Yes, it is true that God--praise his name--is sovereign in salvation,

But, let us not fight this truth of God--let us love and worship this God of truth.

If you have not trusted in Christ let me add a word to you. Christ died in the place of those whom God causes to trust in Him. If you should die without turning to Christ then this will prove that Christ's death did not help you in any way. Don't expect some preachers assertion that Christ did everything for you to make a bit of difference. No, my friend, you will be without Christ and without God.

God made Christ who knew no sin a sin offering in my place!

God made Christ--his one and only Son--who knew no sin a sin offering in the place of me--a totally depraved rotten sinner!!!

Hallelujah!

Amen!

References

1. Charles F. Baker, A Dispensational Theology (1971, Grace Bible College, Grand Rapids).
2. Sir Robert Anderson, The Gospel and Its Ministry (Pickering and Inglis, London)

3. A. T. Robertson, The Minister and His Greek New Testament (Baker Book House, Grand Rapids),
4. Lewis S. Chafer, Systematic Theology (1948, Dallas Seminary Press, Dallas).
5. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature 1957, University of Chicago, Chicago).
6. J. H. Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (reprinted by A. P. and A).

For Whom Did Christ Die?

By Bill Robinson

Come let us reason together!

We can certainly agree on one point. The Bible plainly tells us that all believers are saved and all non-believers are lost (Jn. 3:18-36). If you do not count yourself among the saved, then your only recourse is to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and you will be saved. Nothing else can be said or done. **It's that simple!**

To those of us who would be numbered among the saved, however, there is much to say. We are sure of our salvation and the Bible says we can and should be so because our salvation is based not on our own merit but on the word and work of our Lord, Jesus Christ. This truth is the only basis for anyone's assurance of salvation in this age of grace. (See Jn. 1:12-13 and 20:24-31 and Ro. 3:20-26; 5:1-8; 6:23; 8:1,2,25-39; II Cor. 5:18-21)

If we have this assurance then, we are resting on and trusting in the death of our Lord for our salvation and must therefore conclude that no one for whom Christ died will be lost. If even one, just one single individual, for whom Christ died is to be lost, where is our assurance? How can we ever be sure that the one to be lost is someone else? If we can be sure of our salvation **because Christ died for us** – then all, every single one for whom Christ died, have the same assurance and He could not possibly have died for anyone but those who are saved. To say anything else is merely foolish contradiction designed to appease the pride of unbelievers who would be better off if we tell them that they must believe or be lost and perhaps this very statement will be the instrument used of God to effect their salvation.

Many say that this doctrine of limited redemption (only those chosen by God are redeemed) can only cause its hearers emotional distress and despair of being worthy to be chosen. The absolute truth of the matter is that not one, whether chosen or not, is worthy and this message is the only one that properly expresses the grace of God and brings to naught the pride and self-righteousness of sinful man. (Ro. 3:10-18)

It is a plain, simple fact that either Christ died only for the saved, the elect of God, or else the Bible is a lie. If you believe the Bible is a lie, throw it away, do all the good works you possibly can and you will be judged for those works at the Great White Throne just before you are cast into the lake of fire to be punished for eternity (Rev. 20:11-15).

If, however, you believe the Bible to be true, join with me and we will seek to discover:

What saith the scripture?

In Romans 4:25, Paul tells us that Christ was delivered (He died) for our offenses and raised again for our justification. To whom does Paul refer when he says “our offenses” and “our justification”? It should be safe to assume that he meant himself and those to whom the epistle was sent. Referring back to Romans 1:5-6, we find that the epistle is addressed to the called saints of Christ. While we can readily see from this epistle that Paul in no way inferred that all Romans were saints and from his other epistles we find that sainthood was not relegated to Romans only, the addressees were definitely the saints which were in Rome. “Our” must then refer to believers. Further evidence of this can be found in I Thessalonians 5:2-11 where Paul makes a specific distinction between “we” and “they”. Here we are plainly told that Christ died for “we” and not for “they”.

Turn now to Romans 8:28-39 and very carefully read this small section of scripture for it contains not only the who, what, how and why of salvation, but also the most blessed assurance of eternal security for the saints. In fact, verses 38 & 39 alone should be enough to convince even the most skeptical individual that **no one for whom Christ died could ever be lost.**

Since salvation is presented in these verses as a completed work through and including final glorification of the saints, let's attempt an analysis in the same manner as we would with any other finished product.

Starting with the finished product, the glorified saints, found in the last part of verse 30, let's work back to the beginning of the work of salvation, the last part of verse 28, and see if we can answer the question: "**For whom did Christ die?**"

GLORIFIED – those who had been justified (30)

JUSTIFIED – those who had been called (30)

CALLED – those who had been predestinated (30)

PREDESTINATED – those who had been foreknown (29)

FOREKNOWN – those called according to God's purpose (29)

GOD'S PURPOSE – brethren for His Son (28 & 29)

From the six steps illustrated above, salvation can be plainly understood from start to finish. God working according to His own purpose that Christ should have many brethren conformed to His own image, foreknew (knew before) those whom He would use to accomplish it and predestinated them to fulfill that purpose. He then called (elected) those whom He had decided to use. Next, Christ was sent to die and rise again so that these elect ones might be justified and then glorified.

Confusion and disbelief of this process is generated by those who do not like the idea of predestination. They claim that God's foreknowledge means only that God was able to look into the future and see those who would believe in Christ. God then selected or predestinated those whom He knew would believe to fulfill His purpose. After all, they say, man is not a robot. Man has absolute free will and is therefore free to choose to accept or reject God. God is only allowed to save those who want to be saved. Their conclusion: Christ died to make man savable but man must make the final decision.

If this were true, God would no longer be God. He would be subservient to man. This would also make the grace of God worthless because salvation would not be bestowed sovereignly by a gracious and merciful God, but would be the result of the choice made by man. This is works, not grace or unmerited favor. Salvation would then become the payment due for making the proper choice.

Let's eliminate the confusion by realizing that the only way God can know the future is by controlling the future. God knows who will believe because He causes them to believe.

Before the foundation of the world, (cf. Ep. 1:3-11) God chose, selected or picked out those whom He would use to fulfill His purpose. At that time, (Re. 13:8) God caused Christ to be slain for the sins of those whom He had chosen.

The Gospel of John makes it quite clear that Jesus only saves the elect. In John 1:12-13, those who believe are said to be born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. God determines who they are!

In Jn. 6:44, Jesus states that no one can (believe) come to Him unless he is first drawn by the Father and those who are drawn are the ones He will save. The Greek word translated "drawn" is <helkuo> and means drag. It is used in 8 verses and each time has the meaning of being forcibly moved. The whole idea of the Holy Spirit wooing (begging or pleading with) someone to get him to come to Christ is merely a figment of unbelieving man's imagination.

Jesus says in Jn. 17:2 that He gives life to those given to Him by the Father. In Jn. 6:65 Jesus says that the only ones who can come to Him (believe) have been given that ability (elected) by the Father.

So, what about verses that appear to teach that Christ died for everybody? For example: Jn. 3:16; 2 Pe. 3:9; Jn. 1:29; Jn. 3:17; Jn. 4:42; Jn. 6:33, 51; Jn. 12:47 seem to say that God loved the world and sent Jesus to save the world. If Jesus died to save everybody, why, in Jn. 17:9, does Jesus refuse to pray for the world. Why does He pray only for those given to Him by the Father? It seems only logical that Jesus would pray for the ones He was going to die for. Actually, that is exactly what He did! First, He prayed for them and then He died for them. Not for the world – but only for those He had been given.

Now, let's define "world." The Greek word is <kosmos> defined by Strong's Greek Dictionary as: orderly arrangement, i.e. decoration; by implication, the world (in a wide or narrow sense, including its inhabitants, literally or figuratively (morally))--adorning, world. Kosmos is used in 152 verses in the New Testament. It is translated as world in all but one verse (1 Pe. 3:3) where it is translated as "adorning."

The Random House College Dictionary offers these meanings for world: 1. the earth or globe considered as a planet. 2. a particular division of the world. 3. the earth and its inhabitants during a particular period of time. 4. mankind, the human race. 5. the public generally. 6. any sphere, realm or domain with all pertaining to it. ie. woman's world, the insect world. 7. a particular class of mankind with common interests. 8. the universe. 9. a very great quantity or extent. and etc. It is clear that the word "world" has various meanings. Even in the world of today, we often hear of the third world or the civilized world or the sports world. Why then is it necessary to demand that when the Bible uses the word "world," it must always mean "each and every single individual who ever has or will live?"

John 3:16, in the King James Version, reads as follows: **"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."** From this, many conclude that Christ died for every body. But does this verse really say that? Let's dissect the verse and see what it is actually telling us.

For God so loved the world, (whatever world means, God loved it.)

that He gave His only begotten Son, (this is the action God took because of His love.)

that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. (this is the result of God's action which He took because of His love.)

From this, the verse could be rewritten as follows: **God gave His only begotten Son to save believers because He loved them.** If this is not the correct meaning of the verse, why would God only save some of those He loved? Surely God is capable of saving all if He chose to.

2 Pe. 3:9 says that God is not willing that any should perish -- does this mean God is unable to do that which He wishes to do?

Is. 46:9-10 states that God will do all His pleasure so it can only be concluded that the world in Jn. 3:16 is the believing world or world of believers (the elect.) Also the any in 2 Pe. 3:9 means any of God's elect.

A few more examples:

Jn. 1:10 – Here world is used three times with as many meanings: "He was in the world" (mankind – He became a man) "and the world was made by Him," (everything that was ever created...see Jn. 1:3) "and the world knew Him not" (some men...could not mean every man for at least Peter knew Him...see Jn. 6:69)

Jn. 12:19 – The world must exclude the Pharisees for they were not following after Christ.

2 Pe. 3:6 says the world perished but we know that 8 humans and some animals were spared.

While we have indeed gone much deeper than necessary to answer our question, this is by no means an exhaustive study of the subject.

Can there be any doubt left that all for whom Christ died are justified and all who are justified are glorified. How then could we even begin to think that it would be possible for someone for whom Christ died to perish? Can one who is glorified also be cast into eternal damnation?

For whom did Christ die? He died for the elect, the saved, those who believe, (whichever title you prefer) each and every one of them but He did not die for a single nonbeliever. Each one for whom He died will be glorified and each one for whom He did not die will be damned.

So to ALL MEN, each and every one without exception, we say, **Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and, if you do, you will be saved because He died for you – but if you do not believe, you are lost because He did not die for you. (Jn. 3:18-36)**

Creedal Issues

by Dr. David Rodabaugh

Separation

Definition of Separation

Separation (morally) is from sin and self unto God. It is separation from whatever is contrary to the mind of God unto God Himself.

Separation is also the doctrine that governs our associations with others. It affects which relations we allow and which we disallow. Our concern here is only those issues that are of a spiritual nature. The issue is always that of unfettered voluntary spiritual partnership.

This doctrine is related to:

The church — ekklesia — called-out ones

Sanctification — set apart

Obligation of Separation

- I. Spiritual Contact required
 - A. To witness — Ro 15:20; 2Co 5:18-20
 - B. To counsel the saved — Gal 6:1; 2Th 3:14, 15
- II. Spiritual Conformity forbidden (moral separation) — Ro 12:1, 2
 - A. From sins — 2Ti 2:19; Ep 5:2-5, 11
 - B. Unto God — Php 3:10-14
- II. Spiritual Cooperation Forbidden — 2Th 3:6, 13-15
 - A. Definition of 'fellowship' = 'partnership'
 1. Php 1:5, 1Co 1:9 — 'koinonia' — cp. 'partners' in Lk 5:10
 2. 2Co 6:14 — 'metoche' — cp. 'partners in Lk 5:7

- B. Refusing partnership or cooperation is the controversy
 - issue with neo-evangelicals
 - don't fear controversy — Jude 3, 4
- C. Prerequisites for unity (each issue developed further below)
 - morality — 1Co 5:1, 5-7, 9-13
 - doctrinal purity — Ep 4:3-6; 2Th 3:6, 13-15
 - practical unity — (see liturgical issues below)

III. Forbidden Fellowship

- A. with Unsaved — Ep 5:6, 7; 2Co 6:14-17
 1. Ps 1:1, 2
 2. Ps 26:4, 5
 3. Rev 18:4
 4. e.g. David at Gath — 1Sam 27-29
- B. with Saved — 2Th 3:6, 14, 15 (1Tim 5:22) At 20:30
 1. the immoral — Ep 5:11; 1Co 5: 11; 2Th 3:6, 14
 2. the doctrinally impure — 1Tim 6:3-5; (N.B. 1Tim 3:9; Tit 3:10
 - a. pervert gospel — Gal 1:8, 9
 - b. deny Pauline doctrine — Ro 16:17, 25

Moral Issues

There has never been much controversy here among those we loosely call 'evangelicals.' (Please note that we fully admit that many in this camp may not be saved at all.)

The issue is always that of public morality. This is divided into at least the following:

1. 'gross' immorality — Ep 5:11; 1Co 5:1-11

2. laziness — 2Th 3:6-15

Doctrinal Issues

The Central Passage — Eph 4:1-6

Overview of Passage

- 1A. Unity of the Spirit — 4:1-6
- 1B. Paul in Prison — 1
- 2B. Calling of which ye were called (sovereign election)
- 3B. Beseech that ye walk worthily
- 1C. First called then walk
- 2C. The necessity of this walk
- 4B. Character of this walk — 2-6 ('with' [meta] twice)
- 1C. First 'with' — selflessness - 2
- 1D. terms
- 1E. lowliness — 'tapeinophrosune' and is used of humiliation of mind or modesty in Php 2:3
- 2E. meekness — 'prautes' and means mildness or humility
- 2D. How to have this — Jn 3:30
- 1E. Recognize self-centeredness is sin — Pr 16:18,19; 6:16-19
- 2E. Recognize you are worthless — Is 64:6; Jn 15:4, 5; Ep 2:1-3
- 3E. Recognize He is worthy —

- Rev 4:11; 5:2, 3, 4-9; Jn 4:23, 24; 1:1-5; Ps 19:1

- 4E. Recognize He made the difference
- 5E. Don't insist on your rights — Php 2:5-8
- 6E. Result — Php 3:10-14; 2Co 10:5
- 2C. Second 'with' -- patience 2
- 1D. terms
- 1E. Longsuffering 'makrothumia'
- 2E. Forbearance — 'anechomai' — 'put up with'
- 3E. Love — 'agapao' — love as a matter of judgment and deliberate assent of will as a matter of principle, duty, and propriety, (cp. 'philoie' — affection)
- 2D. How to have patience
- 1E. Recognize impatience is sin — Gal 5:19-23
- 2E. Be God-centered not self-centered — Php 2:1-8
- 3E. Be controlled by love of Christ — 2Co 5:14-15
- 4E. Result — 1Co 13:4, 5
- 3C. The Unity of the Spirit — Ep 4:3-6
- 1D. Keep Unity
- 1E. Endeavoring—'spoudazo'—to use speed, be eager (2Ti

2:15)

2E. To keep — 'tereo' — to guard from loss or injury

3E. Never divide over personalities 1Co 1:11,12

4E. It doesn't say 'make' unity but 'keep' unity

- Divisions are needed 1Co 11:19 (see Separation)

2D. 'must' doctrines — Ep 4:4-6

The Doctrinal Basis of Our Unity

- 1A. One Body — 1Co 12:12-14; Ep 4:16
- 1B. Contrast with earthly program — Is 2:1-3
- 1C. Jew > Gentile (two distinct groups)—Is 2:1-3; Jer 3:17; Matt 15:24-28
- 2C. In Body, Jew = Gentile — Ep 2:16,17; 3:5-9
- 2B. The mission of the church
- 1C. Not to reform society
- 2C. To proclaim the gospel 2Co 5:14-20
- 3C. To teach doctrine — e.g. Ep 3:9
- 3B. Why first? — (?) to set off dispensational context
- cp. Heb 6:1-3
- 2A. One Spirit — Ep 2:18; 1:13
- 1B. His Person — (doctrine of Trinity) — Dt 6:4; 2Co 13:14; At 5:3-4
- 2B. His Work in salvation
- 1C. Man is totally depraved — Ep 2:1-3; Ro 3:9-12; Jn 6:37, 44
- 2C. Irresistible Grace — Ep 2:1-9; At 13:48; Jn

6:44-45, 63-65; 2Th 2:13

3C. Perseverance

1D. Delivered from the power of sin— Ro 6:11(cp. Gal 5:16-25)

2D. Kept by the Spirit — Ro 8:29-39

3D. He is the power in our lives to obey the Lord

4C. His gifts

1D. Only evangelist and teaching pastor survives — Ep 4:7-16

2D. Sign gifts were for Israel. For the Body, they were temporary and have ceased — 1Co 13:8-11

- 3A. One Hope — Ep 1:18; Col 1:5; Tit 2:13
- 1B. cp. the two hopes of the earthly program
- 2B. The heavenlies — Ep 1:3; 2:6; 2Co 12:2-3
- 1C. Heaven(s) in the Hebrew (shamayim) is always 'dual'
- 2C. Our hope is about the throne of God (cp. 1Co 6:1-5)
- 3C. note: Ep 1:22,23; 1:18-21; 3:10,21
- 4A. One Lord
- 1B. His Person
- 1C. True Man — Lk 1:35; Ro 1:3-4
- 2C. True God — Jn 1:1; Php 2:6-9
- 3C. Contrast with the pagan Lords of the heathen — 1Co 8:5-6; Dt 6:4
- 2B. His Particular Redemption — Ro 5:6-8; 1Co 15:3-4; Ro 8:29-39; Tit 2:11-15
- 3B. To be commemorated — 1Co 11:23-26

- 5A. One Faith — 1Ti 3:13; 2Ti 4:7; Col 1:23; 2:7-14; Ep 2:1-9
- 1B. The only one of the seven whose meaning is not precise.
- 1C. If doctrinal, certainly includes the other six
- 2C. If subjective, then it is the only one that is
- 2B. At the very least, includes
- 1C. The inspiration of the Bible — 2Ti 3:16-17; 2Pt 1:21
- 1D. On the content of the O.T. — Lk 24:44
- 2D. grammatical-historical method of interpretation
- 2C. Saving Faith
- 1D. Repent and Believe — At 20:21
- 2D. Produces fruit — Gal 5:22-23
- 3D. Inconsistent with animosity toward sovereignty — Jn 8:30-38
- 3B. Other possible issues
- 1C. subjective (within) vs. objective (without)
- 1D. subj. faith/subj. hope—Ro 5:1,2; 1Co 13:13; 2Co 10:15; 1Th 1:3;5:8
- 2D. subj. hope/obj. faith — Tit 1:1,2
- 3D. obj. hope/subj. faith — Gal 5:5; Ep 1:15-18; Col 1:4,5
- 4D. obj. hope/obj. faith — Col 1:23
- 5D. subj. faith — At 13:48; 2Th 2:13; Php 1:29; 2Ti 1:5
- 6D. obj. faith — Tit 1:1,4,13; 3:15; Jude 3; Php 1:27
- 7D. subj. faith said to be imparted —

- Heb 4:2; 2Th 3:2
- 2C. There are other fundamental doctrines
- 1D. The mystery of the faith — 1Ti 3:15
- 2D. Sovereignty of God — Jn 8:30-38
- 3D. Paul's prayer in Ep 1:15-23
- 4D. Specially delivered to us through Paul—1Co 11:23-26
- 6A. One Baptism — 1Co 12:13; Col 2:12
- 1B. Clearly, the work of the Spirit in salvation — 1Co 12:13; Ro 6:3-5
- 1C. There is only one Baptism today — Ep 4:5; Col 2:12; 1Co 1:17
- 2C. Therefore, Water Baptism is not for this dispensation — 1Co 1:17
- 2B. Contrast other dispensations where there are at least water and spirit
- 1C. Water — Matt 21:25; 28:19,20; Lk 7:29,30; At 2:38; 1Pt 3:21
- 2C. Spirit (regeneration) — Jn 3:5
- 3C. Spirit (miraculous power) — Joel 2:28-32; Lk 24:49; Matt 3:11
- 7A. One God and Father — Dt 6:4
- 1B. Can be used of human judges and pagan deities — 1Co 8:5,6; Jn 10:34,35)
- 2B. Once again, the doctrine of the trinity is in view
- 3B. Text should read, "who is over all and through all and in all."
- 4B. Of whom is he the father
- 1C. Only Christ and the saved — cp. Jn 8:44

- 2C. Others are called 'offspring' as they are created — At 17:28, 29
- 3C. Here, 'all' = the elect.
- 5B. Over all things
- 1C. His supremacy
- 2C. Creation — Ex 20:11 (six literal days)
- 6B. Through all — His sovereignty — purpose(s) accomplished
- 1C. Sovereignty in general — Ps 115:3; Dan 4:35; Prov 16:1,4; 21:1
- 2C. Unconditional Election — Ro 9:7-16; Ep 1:11; 2Ti 1:9
- 3C. Reprobation — Ps 5:5; Prov 16:4; Jn 12:39-40; Ro 9:18-24; 11:7-10; Ep 2:1-5; 2Pt 2:12; Jude 4
- 7B. In all — the saints

Issues of 'Liturgy'

Definition of Liturgy

Liturgy is defined in Webster's New World Dictionary (1984) as "prescribed forms or ritual for public worship in any of various religions or churches." (There is an additional meaning for the Eastern Orthodox.)

It comes ultimately from the Greek word 'leitourgia' which has the primitive meaning of 'public service to the gods.' (the verb form is 'leitourgeo').

The verb occurs only in Acts 13:2; Ro 15:27; Heb 10:11.

The noun is found only in Lu 1:23; 2Co 9:12; Phi 2:17, 30; Heb 8:6; 9:21.

The adjective form is found only in Heb 1:14.

The noun for the one who does this — Ro 13:6; 15:16; Phi 2:25; Heb 1:7; 8:2.

When such issues become creedal

This necessarily happens when two have mutually exclusive views

Example — instruments in church services. Those who prohibit and those who feel we must use them can't worship together

Example — the Plymouth Brethren 'worship meeting' versus a 'standard service' for AM

Example — those who require a preaching vs. those who teach for Sunday AM

The issue of the Lord's Supper

Does 1 Cor contradict Gal 4 or Col 2?

- 1A. What does Paul say is a dietary law?
- 1B. Col 2:14-23
- * note: if partaking elements is a dietary rule so is a religious meal.
 - * denial of certain foods — v. 21 and context
 - * 'element(al spirit)s — in both Col 2 and Gal 4
- 2B. 1 Tim 4:2, 3 — forbidding certain foods
- 3B. At 15:29—forbidding certain foods (Can we eat blood?)
- 2A. The Corinthians clearly blessed the elements — 1 Co 10:16
- 3A. Conclusion: This in no way contradicts the commands of Col 2 or Gal 4

Did Christ command/suggest observance to kingdom saints?

- 1A. Matt 26:26-28
- 1B. no such command/suggestion given
- 2B. v. 29 may imply that this wasn't done at all before the ascension

- 3B. comments about bread broken while they were eating
- 2A. Mk 14:22-24
- 1B. no such command/suggestion given
- 2B. v. 25 may imply that this wasn't done at all before the ascension
- 3B. comments about bread broken while they were eating
- 3A. Luke 22:17-20
- 1B. no uncontested testimony that such command/suggestion given
- 1C. vs. 19b-20 are contested
- 2C. vs. 18 is before the ceremony here and after in Matt., Mk.
- 2B. vv. 17-18 may imply that this wasn't done at all before the ascension
- 1C. comments about bread broken while they were eating
- 2C. comments about wine were after the supper
- 3B. Should we expect special kingdom commands in Luke
- 1C. Luke — apparently in the Body
- * apparently not of the circumcision — Col 4:10,11(cp. 5:14)
 - * not an eyewitness of our Lord — Lk 1:2
 - * Apparently joined Paul in Acts 16:10, 11 (shift 'they' to 'we') (note: 'we' disappears after 17:1 and returns in 20:6)
- 2C. Theophilus — apparently a gentile of high rank (most excellent)

- 3C. To base a doctrine on the allegation that the Lord's Supper was commanded to Israel requires more than a disputed passage in Lk.

Paul specially delivers this to the saints

1. 1Co 11:23-26
- does record the only clear record of command/suggestion of the Lord to practice
 - comments about wine were after the supper
 - "For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you"
 - * 'paralambano' (received) in Paul in 1Co 11:23; 15:1,3; Gal 1:9, 12; Phi 4:9; Co 2:6; 4:17; 1Th 2:13; 4:1
 - * Of these only 1 Co 11:23; 15:3 have 'paradidomi' (delivered) (note — Ro 6:17 seems like a related type of passage)
2. 1Co 10:14-22
- Displays the practice commanded.
 - vv. 16-17 — Lord's Supper/Lord's Table (v. 21) is something the Body does
 - * to do so means sharing in the body and blood of Christ
 - * blessing the elements is necessary — it is the point
 - vv. 18 — For Israel, eating sacrificial meat implied sharing in the sacrifice
 - vv. 19-20 — To be at a pagan feast means sharing in the idolatry

The context does contain reference to a 'love feast'

At Corinth, the Lord's Supper (special blessing of the bread and wine) was done 'during' the love feast. In 1 Cor 11, we see the clear separation of these two items. The one was subject to excesses; the other was not. This in no way negates the command to call special attention to the elements of the Lord's supper.

Can it be ignored and never done?

Argument from the Greek word used

1Co 1:25, 26 both say 'as often as' — from the Greek 'hosakis ean'. The word 'hosakis' occurs only here and in Rev 11:6 where the word 'ean' also occurs. In Rev 11:6, we have a description of the two witnesses (Moses and Elijah (?)) and we read, "These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy: and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues, as often as they will."

Note that in the Revelation passage, there are the additional words 'as they will' and yet there is not thought of their never doing the item. Rather there is the implication of frequency.

Argument from the meaning of the passage

The passage states that

1. Each time the Lord's death is shown.
2. Each time the Lord is remembered.

It is contrary to any logic that such important items could be ignored for long in the life of a proper assembly.

The consequence is that, if the Lord's Supper requires a meal (pot luck — it certainly could not take place at a restaurant), then any assembly which does not plan these events regularly is in violation on a creedal issue.

Similarly, if the Lord's Supper requires a reading (or paraphrase) of 1Co 11:23-26, then any assembly which does not plan these events regularly is in violation on a creedal issue.

Procedure for Church Discipline/Disputes

Central Passages(Matt 18:15-17; 1Co 6:1-4)

- 1A. Private Counsel — Matt 18:15 (note: some manuscripts do not have the words 'against you')
- 2A. If that fails, take two or three with you — Matt 18:16
- 3A. If that fails, take it to the church — Matt 18:17; 1Ti 5:20
- 4A. If that fails:
 - Put him out as you would an unsaved person — Matt 18:17; 1Co 5:5; 1Ti 1:20; 2Th 3:14-15
 - Turn away — Ro 16:17-19; 2Th 3:6
 - Reject Tit 3:10-11

A RAY OF SONLIGHT

by Bill Robinson

.....I will show thee my faith by my works..... (Jas. 2:18)

These words of scripture are fulfilled by each and every one of us. Whether Jew, Gentile, or Christian, our actions speak louder than our words and demonstrate our faith – weak or strong, in Christ or in Satan. How sobering this should be, especially to Christians!

Christ is the light of the world⁹ and we, the members of His body, are used of Him to show forth that light to the world.¹⁰ We

⁹ Lu 2:32 A light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel. (KJV)

Joh 1:4 In him was life; and the life was the light of men. (KJV)

Joh 8:12 Then Jesus spoke to them again, saying, "I am the light of the world. He who follows Me shall not walk in darkness, but have the light of life." (NKJV)

Joh 9:5 "As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world." (NKJV)

Joh 12:35 Then Jesus said to them, "A little while longer the light is with you. Walk while you have the light, lest darkness overtake you; he who walks in darkness does not know where he is going. (NKJV)

¹⁰ Mt 5:14-16 "You are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hidden. "Nor do they light a lamp and put it under a basket, but on a lampstand, and it gives light to all who are in the house. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father in heaven. (NKJV)

Eph 5:8-16 For you were once darkness, but now you are light in the Lord. Walk as children of light (for the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, righteousness, and truth), finding out what is acceptable to the Lord. And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather expose them. For it is shameful even to speak of those things which are done by them in secret. But all things that are exposed are made manifest by the light, for whatever makes manifest is light. Therefore He says: "Awake, you who sleep, Arise from the dead, And Christ will give you

are, in fact, tiny rays of the light of Christ in this world and we may be the only light some men ever see.

Although many claim to be in the light, very few demonstrate this condition by their actions. While a light may be large or small, bright or weak, it is always identifiable as light and is best seen when surrounded by darkness. Do we measure up?

Can we always be identified as members of Christ's body wherever we may be? Does our light shine when we are in a crowd of unbelievers, or must we be with believers for our light to show? Are we rays of light or do we merely reflect the light of those around us? A true light will always shine whether alone or with others.

The only function of light is to dispel darkness and it will always do this. We cannot eliminate light by increasing darkness. In fact, the light shines brighter as the darkness increases. We can, however, increase darkness by removing the light or by pretending to have light when there is none.

As a light dispels darkness, it accomplishes two things. First, it reveals obstacles or dangers that may be hidden in the darkness and second, it will light a path so the traveler may reach his destination safely. A true Christian will be used of God to accomplish the same things. His conduct, in the spirit, serves to reveal the wickedness and evil of the unbelieving world around him and his life serves as an example, leading others to Christ.¹¹

light." See then that you walk circumspectly, not as fools but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil. (NKJV)

1Th 5:5 You are all sons of light and sons of the day. We are not of the night nor of darkness. (NKJV)

¹¹ Compare: 2Co 2:14-17 Now thanks be to God who always leads us in triumph in Christ, and through us diffuses the fragrance of His knowledge in every place. For we are to God the fragrance of Christ among those who are being saved and among those who are perishing. To the one we are the aroma of death leading to death, and to the other the aroma of life leading to life. And who is sufficient for these things? For we are not, as so many, peddling the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as from God, we speak in the sight of God in Christ. (NKJV)

Paul tells us that his conversion serves as a pattern for those who come after him.¹² Are we following this example? In Paul's life, there was a definite change that was evident to all. Can we say the same for ourselves? While a change may be evident, is it for the better or for worse?

All too often the change is from bad to worse. A kind and considerate individual will have some "born again experience" and he will become the most inconsiderate, arrogant and self-centered "holier than thou" person in the world. It is true that a Christian is not perfect – just forgiven, but a true Christian should not be a self-centered individual. It is difficult to believe that some self-righteous individual who causes all those around him to abhor his presence is really a Christian. Although it is natural that the Spirit of Christ who indwells us will repel the lost, we should still conduct ourselves in such a manner that those without must give us a good report.¹³

In the second chapter of Romans, Paul accuses the Jews of causing the Gentiles to blaspheme God by their actions.¹⁴ Because all scripture is written for our instruction, we should examine ourselves to insure that we are not doing the same. How much worse is it when Christians cause the whole world to blaspheme?

¹² 1Ti 1:16 However, for this reason I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might show all longsuffering, as a pattern to those who are going to believe on Him for everlasting life. (NKJV)

¹³ 1Ti 3:7 Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil. (KJV)

¹⁴ Ro 2:17-24 Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, And knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law; And art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, An instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law. Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written. (KJV)

We must provide for all things honest in the sight of God and men.¹⁵ A businessman who is also a Christian should be the best man in town to deal with, however, the opposite is usually true. How sad it is to hear some unbeliever complain of being cheated by a "Christian" businessman.

Certainly, this businessman is not a true Christian but how much more careful this type of thing should make us. We should work all the harder to walk worthy of the vocation to which we are called.¹⁶

We are saved by grace but we should live our lives as though we had to earn our salvation. Let us always remember that we are not living our own lives, but Christ is living through us.¹⁷ This should cause us to continuously examine ourselves and our actions.

As we live our daily lives, do our actions confess our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ? Will your boss say that you are the best worker he has – one who can always be depended on to do his best -- even when he is not being watched? Or will he say that you are one of those "Christians" who uses religion as a crutch to get out of doing his job?

Can a friend, a neighbor or even a stranger come to you for help in his time of need or is your Christian love reserved for Sunday morning services? Ladies, is your home filled with the complaint of housework that is never done, or do you praise God for giving you a family to care for? Our joy is in the Lord and

¹⁵ Ro 12:17 Repay no one evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. (MKJV)

2Co 8:21 providing for honest things, not only before the Lord, but also before men. (MKJV)

¹⁶ Eph 4:1 I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, (KJV)

¹⁷ Ga 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. (KJV)

everything in the Lord is a joy, so, live in the Spirit and the lust of the flesh will not be fulfilled.¹⁸

If we, as members of Christ's body, are to fulfill our ministry and share the joy of Christ with the world, we must both experience and demonstrate that joy. One who is spiritually alive will have no trouble in doing this but to be spiritually alive, one must partake of spiritual food.

The just shall live by faith¹⁹ and faith comes from studying the word of God.²⁰ It is impossible to live the Christian life without feeding on God's word.²¹

Only a dead man has no need of food. So, if you have no desire for spiritual food (Bible study), it is doubtful that you are spiritually alive.

Are you fulfilling your ministry? Does a ray of Sonlight shine through you or are you spreading the darkness of hypocrisy? Can your words be heard when you speak of the Lord or do your actions stop the hearing of those who would listen? Do you practice what you preach?

Certainly, we must live in the world but we must constantly guard against living like the world. We are enjoined to live peacefully with every man²² but this does not mean that we should follow along with the crowd just to avoid controversy. We are also

¹⁸ Ga 5:25 If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit. (KJV)

Ga 5:16 This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. (KJV)

¹⁹ Ga 3:11 But that no one is justified by the Law in the sight of God is clear, for, "The just shall live by faith." (MKJV)

²⁰ Ro 10:17 So then faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. (NKJV)

²¹ Ps 119:11 Your word I have hidden in my heart, That I might not sin against You! (NKJV)

²² Ro 12:18 If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. (KJV)

told to contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.²³

Admittedly, it is often difficult to do that which is right, especially if it means we must stand alone, when just a slight compromise of some small point might endear us to the crowd. After all, what good can come from being right if no one will listen to what we say? On the other hand, what good do we do when we speak that which is untrue?

It is a simple matter to separate ourselves from the admitted unbelievers of this world,²⁴ but what of the "ministers of righteousness" Paul warns about?²⁵ However difficult it may be, light must be light and it must be in contrast with darkness.

God is not a respecter of persons²⁶ – are we, or do we follow Paul's example and oppose error regardless of who is proclaiming it?²⁷

²³ Jude 1:3 Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. (KJV)

²⁴ 2Co 6:14-16 Do not be unequally yoked together with unbelievers. For what fellowship has righteousness with lawlessness? And what communion has light with darkness? And what accord has Christ with Belial? Or what part has a believer with an unbeliever? And what agreement has the temple of God with idols? For you are the temple of the living God. As God has said: "I will dwell in them And walk among them. I will be their God, And they shall be My people." (NKJV)

²⁵ 2Co 11:13-15 For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into apostles of Christ. And no wonder! For Satan himself transforms himself into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also transform themselves into ministers of righteousness, whose end will be according to their works. (NKJV)

²⁶ Ac 10:34 Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: (KJV)

²⁷ Ga 2:11-14 Now when Peter had come to Antioch, I withstood him to his face, because he was to be blamed; for before certain men came from James, he would eat with the Gentiles; but when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those who were of the circumcision. And

Do we accept an individual or group because they are 80% correct in what they preach? A partial truth is worse than a lie because it is truth used to mislead. God told Israel to stone that prophet who was not 100% correct.²⁸ Should we not, therefore, at least admonish those who are only right four out of five times?²⁹

Can we accept as Christian one who preaches that Christ died for the sins of every individual and then denies that Christ is able to save without help from those individuals by requiring them to accept His atonement? Is he a Christian who denies the total depravity of man by preaching that fallen man is even capable of making such a choice?

Is one a Christian who denies the sovereignty of God by requiring Him to offer salvation to every single individual?

Is he a Christian who charges God with impotence and injustice by preaching that Christ died to save any who are not saved?

the rest of the Jews also played the hypocrite with him, so that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy. But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter before them all, "If you, being a Jew, live in the manner of Gentiles and not as the Jews, why do you compel Gentiles to live as Jews? (NKJV)

²⁸ De 18:20-22 'But the prophet who presumes to speak a word in My name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or who speaks in the name of other gods, that prophet shall die.' "And if you say in your heart, 'How shall we know the word which the LORD has not spoken?' "when a prophet speaks in the name of the LORD, if the thing does not happen or come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD has not spoken; the prophet has spoken it presumptuously; you shall not be afraid of him. (NKJV)

²⁹ Ga 1:6-9 I marvel that you are turning away so soon from Him who called you in the grace of Christ, to a different gospel, which is not another; but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. But even if we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than what we have preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so now I say again, if anyone preaches any other gospel to you than what you have received, let him be accursed. (NKJV)

Is he a Christian who preaches that once a person is saved, his life need not change as long as he can point to some experience he has had or some commitment he has made?

Is he a Christian who preaches that the Holy Spirit is only capable of wooing and the "good man" will accept this offer of salvation or reject it as he chooses?

These are not Christians but are instead false apostles, deceitful workers who have transformed themselves into the apostles of Christ.³⁰ However holy they may appear or mighty their works may be, they are still lost, and we must separate ourselves from them for light has no fellowship with darkness.³¹

Are you in Christ? Are you in the true light? Does the light of Christ shine through you to light the way for a lost world? Are you a ray of light exposing the evil that is hidden in the darkness?

Then as light will dispel even the tiniest spot of darkness, so let your ray of Sonlight shine that all may see whether they walk the narrow way or the broad.³²

In conclusion, we say with Paul:

"Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of

³⁰ 2Co 11:13 For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. (KJV)

³¹ Mt 7:15-20 "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravenous wolves. "You will know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes from thornbushes or figs from thistles? "Even so, every good tree bears good fruit, but a bad tree bears bad fruit. "A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, nor can a bad tree bear good fruit. "Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. "Therefore by their fruits you will know them. (NKJV)

³² Mt 7:13-14 "Enter by the narrow gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leads to destruction, and there are many who go in by it. "Because narrow is the gate and difficult is the way which leads to life, and there are few who find it. (NKJV)

God in Christ Jesus. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing. Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample. (For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: Whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things.) For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." Php. 3:13-21 (KJV)

An Essential Doctrine

by Dr. David Rodabaugh

Introduction

When we speak of essential doctrines we need to differentiate between three levels of error. Before listing the levels we should point out that from a Biblical standpoint fellowship is established when there is willingness to share in the work of the ministry. In this sense, eating a meal with another is not fellowship but allowing another to occupy a pulpit without censorship is fellowship. Regular and/or participatory involvement with a church is fellowship.

The three levels of errors in doctrine and practice are:

Errors over which fellowship should never be broken. Certainly, most doctrines fall into this category for there are literally thousands of doctrines in the Word of God. Relatively few of them are basis for the breaking of fellowship.

1. Errors which are the basis for the breaking of fellowship but which could possibly be held by those who are children of God.

Errors which are the basis for regarding another as lost and headed for hell.

Of course, we do not claim to know the heart. But, there are many circumstances in which we must make a judgment regarding these matters. We must judge regarding these matters when,

- testifying.
- discussing spiritual things in the presence of others.
- considering another for inclusion in certain church activities.
- considering another for church membership.
- considering another for church leadership.
- considering another for a pulpit ministry.
- considering another for marriage (or advising people on this).
- praying for others.

There certainly is a kind of judgment that is condemned by the scriptures (e.g.. Matt. 7: 1-6). It is not our purpose to exegete this and similar passages here but we should hasten to add that the **believer** is often called upon to discern the spirituality of another. We are not the final judge and must not act as such but we are fruit inspectors and we must make such 'judgments'.

One further comment is in order. There are Biblically proper terms to apply to those who hold these levels of error.

Apostate : A person who has claimed salvation who holds an error so serious that we must regard that person as lost and headed for hell.

Heretic: A person who is saved but whose error is so serious that we must, after warning him, break fellowship (Tit. 3 : 10, 11).

Heretics And Christian Fellowship

Fellowship

The English word fellowship does not have the same meaning today that it had when the King James Version was translated. Consequently, there are a number of misunderstandings when we talk of 'breaking fellowship'.

The word 'fellowship' now means 'companionship; friendly association; etc.' The word fellowship in the scripture (Gal. 2: 9; Phil. 1: 5; et al.) has quite a different meaning.

The Greek words translated 'fellowship' in the King James Version are

koinonia: This is the more common term for 'fellowship'. The verb form (koinoneo) is translated 'to be partaker' (I Tim. 5: 22) and the noun form (koinonos) is translated 'partner' (Lk. 5: 10). This last usage clearly indicates a 'business partnership'.

metoche: This word has very similar usage to the previous word. The verb is translated 'to be partaker' (I Cor. 10: 17. 21. 30) and the noun is translated 'partner' (Lk. 5: 7).

Thus, when we talk of breaking fellowship we are talking of breaking the partnership. We are clearly in partnership with a ministry when we do one of the following.

Contribute financially.

Attend regularly.

Allow those of that ministry to occupy our pulpit without clear restrictions.

Thus, the items in the above are not to be done lightly. Nor is the refusal to do these things a light matter. To refuse the pulpit or leadership to one is a serious matter.

In fact, when a new church (or an independent Bible class) is started, this is an admission of breaking fellowship with others that are within a reasonable distance.

Heretics

For some reason there is confusion on the word 'heretic' as we have used it. This is true even though we have used it in accordance with standard English usage.

The dictionary (New World Dictionary) defines a heresy as 'a religious belief opposed to the orthodox doctrines of a church; especially, such a belief specifically denounced by the church and regarded as likely to cause schism.'

The Greek word (hairesitikos) for heretic is actually a bit broader in meaning. It means 'one who causes divisions'.

Now, a person can cause divisions due to personalities or politics.

error on serious doctrines.

It is important that an organization or local assembly carefully choose and publicize those doctrines that are the basis of their definition of heresy. It has often been the case in church history that what was really a clash of personalities was masked as a doctrinal problem.

Those doctrines which are the basis of a group's definition of heresy are often called that group's 'creed' or 'doctrinal statement'. Every group has such. There are those who do not publish their 'creed'

and, as a result, the leaders can declare any doctrine a heresy. This ought not to be.

The Relationship between the Two

There is a strong relationship between your attitude on fellowship (partnership) and your definition of heretic. If you refuse partnership to one otherwise qualified then that person or ministry is heretic. If you enter into fellowship with another then that person or ministry is not heretic.

One further note: If your words or actions label another a heretic and he isn't then you have become a heretic for you have divided the Body of Christ when it shouldn't have been. (The only proper divisions are when we divide from those who are heretics.) As a result, we must carefully define our 'creed' and then stick to it.

When we deviate from it, we have let something other than our convictions based on scripture dominate our activities. Please study very carefully Titus 3: 10, 11 and its context.

Are There Apostate Doctrines and Practices?

There are some sincere believers that believe that the Bible teaches that there are no such doctrines and practices. It is their understanding that if a person has asked Jesus Christ to save them, then no matter what their doctrines and practices, they are saved and we must so regard them.

The Bible talks of saving faith and it also talks of faith that is not saving faith. In John 8, we have the following verses (30-37).

“As he spoke these words, many believed on him. Then said Jesus to those Jews who believed on him, If ye continue in my word then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. They answered him, We are Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man. How sayest thou, Ye shall be made free. Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you. Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house forever; but the Son abideth ever. If the Son, therefore, shall make you free ye shall be free indeed. I know that ye are Abraham's seed; but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you.”

Please read the entire passage. It is totally unthinkable that those who are truly saved would want to do our Lord bodily harm. In addition, it is not possible to say of a saved man that God's Word has no place in him. Other examples in scripture could be given but this is enough to establish the fact that men can believe on Christ without having saving faith.

Many examples could be given from modern time. If all who claim faith in Christ are truly saved, then clearly over 40% of the people in our country are truly saved. If you doubt that they claim to have trusted in Christ, ask them.

Several years ago, there was a man in Columbia who claimed faith in Christ. He was very active in several Christian organizations. Today, this man is an active atheist who denies everything he ever believed.

Indeed, just from the doctrinal standpoint alone we can assert that one is lost who

denies the existence of God.

denies the virgin birth of Jesus Christ.

denies the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ.

denies the deity of Jesus Christ.

And, there are other doctrines in this category but these ought to be without question.

Enter John 6

There is a most important and frightening passage in John 6. The passage starts in verse 29 and continues through verse 71. In this passage there are three participants or groups and two areas of doctrine.

The people involved are:

Christ

His disciples

The Jews -- the unbelieving throng.

It is very clear from verse 30 that the Jews made no pretense of

faith. They were requesting Christ to give them a basis for belief.

It is just as clear from the passage that the 'disciples' in the passage were those who were identified as the true followers of Christ. Of course, Christ knew the hearts. But, from all appearances, these were followers of Christ.

Imagine in your mind the scene. The whole audience (unbelieving throng and disciples) followed Christ that day. The disciples were those who were identified with Christ and had followed Christ on other days as well.

Before continuing we must identify the doctrinal areas involved:

The area of doctrine requiring the believer to spiritually imbibe Christ. It is here called eating Christ's flesh and drinking Christ's blood. (See verses 53-59.)

The area of doctrine including the doctrines of Total Depravity and Irresistible Grace. (See verses 37, 44, 65, etc.) These doctrines are included in what is generally called Calvinism.

So great is the confusion on the doctrines of Calvinism that we list them here.

Key Point	Description
Total Depravity	The teaching that man is totally unable to do anything that is pleasing to God. Since the Bible clearly teaches that faith pleases God, this doctrine must include the teaching that man is unable even to want to come to God.
Unconditional Election	The teaching that God chose certain ones to be His own apart from any conditions or foreseen faith or foreseen qualities.
Limited Redemption	The teaching that Christ on the cross of Calvary affected a certain redemption for those of the Father's choosing and for them alone.

Irresistible Grace	The teaching that the Holy Spirit does a work of grace in the hearts of the elect that can't be resisted. This work of grace results in their certain salvation.
Perseverance	The teaching that God causes his own elect to persevere in their lives.

What makes John 6:65,66 so important is what we find there,

“And he said, Therefore said I unto you that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father. From that time many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him.”

Now, one thing is clear -- men who walk no more with Jesus Christ are lost. Indeed, the conversation in verses 67-69 reinforces this. Very clearly, Peter equates saving faith with continuing with Christ. Men can be saved and refuse fellowship with you or me but that person who wishes to have no more to do with our Lord is lost. Any other understanding is unthinkable.

Which Doctrine Was Pivotal?

Since two doctrines occur in this passage, it is natural to ask which one was that which drove the unsaved disciples away from Christ.

Unfortunately, the King James Version is not accurate here. The word 'time' is not in the original. The Greek is 'ek toutou' and means 'from this' or 'because of this' or 'out of this'. The meaning is that 'because of the last statement', they left Christ.

The last statement was that of verse 65:

“And he said, Therefore said I unto you that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.”

In other words, they left Christ because he taught them Total Depravity and Irresistible Grace.

We urge the reader to examine the passage. Very clearly, one of the doctrines is pivotal. Those disciples who hated that doctrine left Christ and walked no more with him. The doctrinal area which forced that was that which includes Total Depravity and Irresistible

Grace.

Application

So far, we have been commenting on a historical incident. But, there is an important application to our time. Samuel was assured that when men rejected him they were rejecting God on the issue at hand (I Samuel 8:7). In addition, in a different era, we find the teaching that when men spurn the ministry of the Lord, they prove they were never of that ministry (I John 2:19). Finally, we find in John 6 that the doctrines of Total Depravity and Irresistible Grace are pivotal in the area of whether men are saved or not. We conclude then that when men reject our ministry on the basis that we teach these precious truths, they are proving that they are unsaved.

Clearly then, those who do not understand the doctrines of total depravity and irresistible grace are heretics. However, those who openly oppose these truths and reject others because of these truths are apostates.

Humanly speaking, one might wish this were not so. But, we must proclaim the Word of God as it is and apply when possible its truths. Such Bible preaching does not make for popularity with men but it pleases God. It is my prayer that those who do not know these truths will come to see them and that those who oppose these truths will come to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ, whom to know is life eternal.

Dispensationalism and Calvinism

by Dr. David Rodabaugh

Introduction

The common attitude among those who are Dispensationalists is to feel that any person who holds to the doctrine of unconditional election is in serious error. Indeed, some have voiced the attitude that to hold to unconditional election or other of the five points of Calvinism is to leave the fold of the Dispensationalists.

One man in private discussions even said, "When I accepted the 'grace message' I left all of that Calvinism." What he was saying was that when he came to understand the Bible rightly divided he gave up his Calvinism.

Originally Dispensationalists were Calvinists

What is sad is that historically most Dispensationalists were Calvinists but they've strayed from the truth.

J. N. Darby is often credited with being the founder of 'Modern Dispensationalism' -- both by those who condemn and those who uphold this truth. Yet Darby was a very strong Calvinist. In some of his writings he seems to be stronger on the five points than most of his contemporaries who were well-known as five-point Calvinists³³.

It is well known that Darby would have nothing to do with the ministry of D. L. Moody because of Moody's view on the depravity of man. Darby held strongly to the view of Total Depravity and Moody did not³⁴.

³³ Admittedly, there are some of his writings which seem nonstandard on 'Particular Redemption' while in others he seems strong on this issue.

³⁴ The reader should be reminded that there is no such thing as a non-Calvinist definition of 'Total Depravity'. The doctrine of total Depravity is the teaching that the unregenerate are not willing to do anything pleasing to God – they do not even want to believe on the Lord.

Darby wrote a very interesting and important paper on the importance of the various points of Calvinism³⁵. In this article, Darby proves to anyone willing to read, that the issue in the Reformation was precisely what is commonly called 'Calvinism'. He points out that to differ from this is to line up with the Roman Catholics on THE issue of the reformation.

It is to be presumed in this article that when Darby commends a writer and then quotes that writer that he at least in part agrees with that writer. Darby states, "Hence we may estimate the value of the quotation of Dr. Lawrence from Bucer appended to his own views of the subject. 'He who doubts about this (namely, about predestination), cannot believe himself to be called and justified, that is, cannot be a Christian. It is to be assumed, therefore, as a first principle of faith, that we all are foreknown, foredetermined, and separated from the rest, and selected for this, that we should be eternally saved; and that this purpose of God cannot be changed³⁶'"

Darby was not the only one of the early Dispensationalists who were strong Calvinists. Several writers have pointed out that most of the early Dispensationalists were strong Calvinists. In 1888 in a published analysis of the men who signed the call to the Prophetic Conference of 1878, it was pointed out that the proportion of those who were Augustinians was eighty-eight percent³⁷. (The reader needs to be reminded that an Augustinian was a Calvinist -- one who believes in Total Depravity, Unconditional Election, Irresistible Grace, and Perseverance.)

It is for this reason that all of the doctrinal statements of dispensational groups of that era had a statement about 'Total Depravity' in them³⁸.

What Happened?

³⁵ Willam Kelly, ed., J. N. Darby, Collected Writings, Doctrinal No. 1, Vol. 3 (Stow Hill Bible and Tract Depot, London) 1-43.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9

³⁷ S. H. Kellogg, "Premillennialism," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. XLV, 1888, pp. 253-254.

³⁸ See, for example C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America* (1958, John Knox Press, Richmond) p. 60.

The problem is that men, no matter what their persuasion on other points of doctrine, hate the doctrines of Total Depravity and Unconditional Election. These doctrines leave absolutely no basis for pride. These doctrines leave absolutely no place for anything but praise to God for having chosen us who are saved. And, men hate these truths.

When Christ taught these precious truths in John 6, we read that (John 6: 66), "From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him." Those who seemed to be disciples -- they believed on Christ, they followed Christ, they seemed to hang on every word -- were lost. They were like those mentioned in I John 2: 19 who, by their departure, proved that they never were saved.

There is a very interesting story in I Kings 22. In this chapter, the prophet Micaiah prophesied that the wicked king Ahab would be defeated and killed in battle. But, what really got Ahab and his cronies exceedingly angry is recorded for us in verses 19-23. In these verses, Micaiah pictures the LORD as actually commissioning a lying spirit (demon) to put lies in the mouths of Ahab's false prophets. There is no question that Micaiah believed in a Sovereign God who even decreed the evil that happens.

CONCLUSTON

My dear reader, if the God you worship is not in sovereign control of men's minds then your God is not the God of the Bible. This is a sobering thought but it is true nevertheless. Do not run from the careful study of this issue anymore. Do not let those *you* respect scare you away from this subject because you want to be faithful to the Word rightly divided. I beg you to bow to the authority of God's Word on this matter.

Repentance

by Art Szafranski

Repentance is a doctrine that describes the heart of one who is regenerated by the Holy Spirit. Repentance, because it deals with the nature of a man's heart, is related to Calvinism and the generic truths that are inter-dispensational in character. Repentance is a principle that is true in all dispensations. The nature of men's hearts does not change from one dispensation to another. Here is an appropriate quote from John Calvin:

“Christianity is a doctrine not of the tongue but of life. It is not apprehended by the understanding and memory alone, as other disciplines are, but it is received only when it possesses the whole soul, and finds a seat and resting place in the inmost affection of the heart.”

“For we will never have enough confidence in Him unless we become deeply distrustful of ourselves, we will never lift up our hearts enough in Him unless they be previously cast down in us, we will never have consolation enough in Him unless we have already experienced desolation, in ourselves.”

Calvin's comments are clearly related to the nature of man and the nature of true salvation of which repentance is a necessary part. When one is converted he is changed. The word "converted" implies a change of heart; the change of heart that accompanies true salvation is called repentance.

Repentance is part of the gospel message for today. The apostle Paul preached the necessity of repentance!

Acts 17:30 "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent."

Acts 28:20b "that they should repent and turn to God and do works meet for repentance"

Romans 2:4 "or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance"

Repentance is part of our gospel in the Pauline Age of Grace and repentance has always been part of the Gospel. In **Genesis 4:4b-5a** "And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering! But unto Cain and unto his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wrath, and his countenance fell."

Why did God not accept Cain's offering? Because the blood sacrifice was a confession of guilt. The sacrifice also acknowledged the need of mediation between God and man. Cain refused to bring the sacrifice. In verse 7 God instructs Cain on how to approach Him, "If thou doest well, shall thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him."

This is obscure in the English. Bullinger's notes are helpful here. "Lieth is masc. Sin offering is fem. So that the Hebrew reads "at the entrance [a male] is lying, a sin offering." ... **his**=[is] its (i.e. the lamb's) **and thou shalt rule ...him**. i.e., it (the lamb; it will not flee from fear).

Here Cain is instructed on how to approach God and be accepted, yet Cain never obeyed God because God did not grant him repentance to acknowledge the necessity of the sacrifice of the sin offering. Instead he murdered his brother.

We know that Cain never repented because God did not choose him and enable him to obey by renewing his sinful heart and granting him repentance. Repentance is sovereignly granted by God in the application of the Gospel (Acts 5:31; 11:18). Repentance is sorrow for sin and an active turning from sin unto God. The sinner in repentance learns to loathe sin. Because God hates sin, the regenerated sinner with his new nature hates sin also, even in his own self. Therefore it follows that because of hatred of sin even within himself a believer's attitude will be one of self-loathing. This view of self can only be realized by regeneration. Therefore it follows also that repentance is the result of the work of regeneration. When one stands before the Holiness and Purity of God he is uncovered, he is undone, he is stripped naked. There is no place to hide from self-guilt except in the mercy and grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Here are some scriptures that reflect the state of heart of some great men of faith:

Job 40:14 "Behold I am vile; what shall I answer thee?"

Job 42:5-6 "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes,"

Isaiah 6:5 "Then said I, Woe is me! For I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts"

Daniel 10:8 "... For my comeliness was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength."

Isaiah 64:6 "But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away."

Psalms 51:3, 5 "For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me.... Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me."

When God grants repentance to a man he faces up to the truth about himself and about God's righteousness. He understands that God's demands of holiness and righteousness are just and right.

Consider **Acts 17:30** "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent." Also see Acts 3:9 and Mark 6:12. God's demanding of repentance from men is in accordance with His holiness.

Let us look at repentance more definitively. There are two Greek words translated "repent" in the New Testament.

1. metanoew

2. metamelomai

Bullinger defines number 1 as, "1) to perceive afterwards, hence to change one's mind and purpose This change is always for the better and denotes a change of moral thought and reflection; not merely to repent of, nor to forsake sin{ but to change one's mind and apprehensions regarding it. Hence to repent in a moral and religious sense, with the feeling of remorse and sorrow. Latin *resipisco*, to recover one's senses, come to a right understanding and

resipiscentia, the growing wise to reform to have a genuine change of heart and life from worse to better."

Examples:

Noun - Acts 5:31; 20:21; 26:20

Verb - Acts 26:20; 3:19; 8:22

2. metamelomai

"2) to rue, regret, to have dissatisfaction with one's self for what one has done to change or alter one's purpose; have anxiety consequent in a past transaction to have pain of mind rather than change of mind; and change of purpose rather than change of heart."

Examples:

Matthew 21:29; 27:3; 2 Cor 7:8

Here is a quote from J. N. Darby:

"Repentance is literally an after or changed thought, a judgment formed by the mind on reflection after it has had another or previous one; habitually in its use in Scripture the judgment I form in God's sight of my own previous conduct and sentiments consequent in the reception of God's testimony in contrast with my previous natural course of felling. Again we ask what is repentance? Repentance is a state of heart produced by the gospel. We repent because we believe. We repent of our sins. Acts 8:22, Repentance is not believing. Rev: 2:21; 2 Cor. 12:21. Repentance is not believing the gospel - yet you cannot have repentance apart from faith nor is it simply a change of mind. I admit that the mind must be changed to have it - but it is not simply a change of mind."

The Lord said "repent and believe the gospel." They are not the same. Yet *they* go together. Should we preach repentance today? Paul preached repentance! Acts 17:30; 20:21. If Paul preached repentance then how can some say repentance is not for this dispensation? **2 Cor. 12:21** is a very important verse on repentance ..."I shall bewail many which sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness and fornication and

lasciviousness which they have committed, The Greek word here is **metanoew**.

Repentance is not just a one time thing. Repentance is an attitude toward sin before God. As long as we sin we have a need for repentance. God hates sin. Do you hate sin? Do you lament in tears over your sins? God is serious about sin, and so should we be. Christ's precious blood was shed for our sins. Do not take sin lightly! God slew His only begotten Son because of sin. We should be holy because God is holy. Holiness is thinking like God thinks. God hates sin. A holy man will hate sin also. Holiness takes effort. **2 Cor 7:1**, "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." All believers at times are chastened by God during this life. **Heb 12:19**, "Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence, shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure, but He for our profit, that we might be partakers of His holiness." Chastening by God brings repentance in the life of the believer - "or else you are bastards and not sons," Heb. 12:8.

Repent and believe the gospel. Is that only for non-believers? Is it a onetime thing and that is all? How often do we believe the gospel? If we are honest, oftentimes we are in unbelief - unbelief is sin. Where sin is there is need for repentance. So repentance is a lifelong process for each believer. I think most Christians today are too lenient over the sin question, because there is a lack of reverence for God the Almighty. Do most Christians see God as Almighty and Sovereign over all the heaven and earth? I think not. Most of professing Christianity has an impotent god; a god whose will can be thwarted and manipulated. God is almighty and thrice holy. He hates sin. I think one can say that the measure with which you hate sin is one way to gauge your faith. Repentance is the vital part of our message today for the Church the Body of Christ.

Those who do not think repentance is part of our message today do not see that repentance is the work of a Sovereign God. God is the source of repentance.

Acts 11:18 "When they heard these things, they held their

peace and glorified God, saying Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life,"

Rom. 2:14 "... knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?"

2 Tim. 2:25 "In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves. If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth."

Is it any wonder why most competent Covenant Theologians question dispensationalism when dispensationalists deny that repentance is part of our gospel message today? A 5-point Calvinist of any merit hearing this Arminian gospel of these dispensationalists would have to associate Arminianism with dispensationalism, Arminian dispensationalists let their view of the gospel influence their dispensationalism. Therefore we can say any dispensationalist who is not also a 5-point Calvinist has a faulty dispensationalism. To be a good dispensationalist one must believe the 5 points. Covenant Theologians question these dispensationalists. So do I question these dispensationalists. Do they really understand the plan of salvation and the nature of God and man? Do they understand even the fundamentals? They claim to be fundamentalists yet they deny the fundamentals of the faith, - Are they Christians at all?

Here is a quote from J. N. Darby: "the gospel is the means of leading to repentance; yet repentance is a state of heart produced by it, and not the belief itself. The gospel produces a subjective state which scripture calls repentance. This is not a preliminary to faith, but its fruit."

Which comes first. faith or repentance? Repentance cannot precede faith or else repentance would not be of faith nor of God.

Again I quote Darby:

"I appeal to experience whether he who recalls what has passed in his own mind does not know that he was brought to a subjective state of hatred of sin - self-judgment, confession of sins with humiliation and self-loathing. In a word whether repentance was not produced in his soul if it were

through the terms of the law, with fear and dread perhaps yet if real, always with some drawing to God as good, some love of holiness some sense of responsibility in grace whatever the terror, for mere terror of consequences is not repentance at all. Repentance is that state in which one is humbled, broken and subdued; where one repents toward God, where God's claim is owned, in which self, past self is judged. There is joy in heaven over a soul that repents. Luke 15:7,10. Where there is nothing to judge, repentance has no place. Where sin is, this judgment of one's own state is called for - So the Lord called sinners to repentance, Luke 5:32“.

Perhaps those who teach that repentance is not for today's gospel have never experienced repentance themselves and are therefore not God's servants as they claim. This issue is serious. Paul in **2 Cor. 13:5** ... "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?"

Again Darby is appropriate here:

"He looked, not merely that crimes and wickedness should be judged, but that a man should judge all his state in the light of God's own presence, and in reference to His divine character and authority over him, as in the thought of His goodness. This is true repentance; man is judged and judging himself in the presence of God to whom he belongs and to whose nature he has to defer with mercy before Him. Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ meets this, because there God has judged sin according to His own nature and authority."

Who can argue with this presentation of Salvation? It would behoove many of our professing dispensationalists to dig back into the roots of dispensationalism and discover the fundamentals of those such as Darby to see how far afield they have come from the basics of gospel preaching of their forefathers.

Believers in the NT NOT Baptized

Dr. David Rodabaugh

(every occurrence of the mentioned names In the NIV is given)

I. The List in Romans 16

- A. The name or word only once in the NT—Phoebe; Epenetus; Andronicus; Junias; Ampliatus; Urbanus; Stachys; Apelles; Aristobulus; Herodion; Narcissus; Tryphena; Tryphosa; Persis; Asyncritus; Phlegon; Hermes; Patrobas; Hermas; Philologus; Julia; Nereus; Olympas
 1. Acts 14:12 Barnabas they called Zeus, and Paul they called Hermes because he was the chief speaker. (note: this is not the Hermes of Romans 16)
 2. Rom. 16:1 I commend to you our sister Phoebe, a servant of the church in Cenchrea.
 3. Rom. 16:5 Greet also the church that meets at their house. Greet my dear friend Epenetus, who was the first convert to Christ in the province of Asia.
 4. Rom. 16:7 Greet Andronicus and Junias, my relatives who have been in prison with me. They are outstanding among the apostles, and they were in Christ before I was.
 5. Rom. 16:8 Greet Ampliatus, whom I love in the Lord.
 6. Rom. 16:9 Greet Urbanus, our fellow worker in Christ, and my dear friend Stachys.
 7. Rom. 16:10 Greet Apelles, tested and approved in Christ. Greet those who belong to the household of Aristobulus.
 8. Rom. 16:11 Greet Herodion, my relative. Greet

those in the household of Narcissus who are in the Lord.

9. Rom. 16:12 Greet Tryphena and Tryphosa, those women who work hard in the Lord. Greet my dear friend Persis, another woman who has worked very hard in the Lord.
10. Rom. 16:14 Greet Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas and the brothers with them.
11. Rom. 16:15 Greet Philologus, Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas and all the saints with them.

B. Priscilla or Aquila

1. Acts 18:2 There he met a Jew named Aquila, a native of Pontus, who had recently come from Italy with his wife Priscilla, because Claudius had ordered all the Jews to leave Rome. Paul went to see them,
2. Acts 18:18 Paul stayed on in Corinth for some time. Then he left the brothers and sailed for Syria, accompanied by Priscilla and Aquila. Before he sailed, he had his hair cut off at Cenchrea because of a vow he had taken.
3. Acts 18:19 They arrived at Ephesus, where Paul left Priscilla and Aquila. He himself went into the synagogue and reasoned with the Jews.
4. Acts 18:26 He began to speak boldly in the synagogue. When Priscilla and Aquila heard him, they invited him to their home and explained to him the way of God more adequately.
5. Rom. 16:3 Greet Priscilla and Aquila, my fellow workers in Christ Jesus.
6. 1Cor. 16:19 The churches in the province of Asia send you greetings. Aquila and Priscilla greet you warmly in the Lord, and so does the church that meets at their house.

7. 2Tim. 4:19 Greet Priscilla and Aquila and the household of Onesiphorus.

C. Rufus

1. Mark 15:21 A certain man from Cyrene, Simon, the father of Alexander and Rufus, was passing by on his way in from the country, and they forced him to carry the cross.
2. Rom. 16:13 Greet Rufus, chosen in the Lord, and his mother, who has been a mother to me, too.

D. Mary (many different people)—Matt. 1:16 Matt. 1:18

Matt. 1:20	Matt. 1:24	Matt. 2:11
Matt. 13:55	Matt. 27:56	Matt. 27:61
Matt. 28:1	Mark 15:40	Mark 15:47
Mark 16:1	Mark 16:9	Luke 1:27
Luke 1:29	Luke 1:30	Luke 1:34
Luke 1:38	Luke 1:39	Luke 1:46
Luke 1:56	Luke 2:5	Luke 2:16
Luke 2:19	Luke 2:22	Luke 2:34
Luke 2:39	Luke 8:2	Luke 10:39
Luke 10:42	Luke 24:10	John 11:1
John 11:2	John 11:19	John 11:20
John 11:28	John 11:29	John 11:31
John 11:32	John 11:45	John 12:3
John 19:25	John 20:1	John 20:11
John 20:16	John 20:18	Acts 1:14
Acts 12:12	Rom. 16:6	

II. Co-workers of Paul

A. Timothy (be sure to check all contexts)

1. Acts 16:1 He came to Derbe and then to Lystra, where a disciple named Timothy lived, whose mother was a Jewess and a believer, but whose father was a Greek.
2. Acts 17:14 The brothers immediately sent Paul to the coast, but Silas and Timothy stayed at Berea.
3. Acts 17:15 The men who escorted Paul brought him to Athens and then left with instructions for

- Silas and Timothy to join him as soon as possible.
4. Acts 18:5 When Silas and Timothy came from Macedonia, Paul devoted himself exclusively to preaching, testifying to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ.
 5. Acts 19:22 He sent two of his helpers, Timothy and Erastus, to Macedonia, while he stayed in the province of Asia a little longer.
 6. Acts 20:4 He was accompanied by Sopater son of Pyrrhus from Berea, Aristarchus and Secundus from Thessalonica, Gaius from Derbe, Timothy also, and Tychicus and Trophimus from the province of Asia.
 7. Rom. 16:21 Timothy, my fellow worker, sends his greetings to you, as do Lucius, Jason and Sosipater, my relatives.
 8. 1Cor. 4:17 For this reason I am sending to you Timothy, my son whom I love, who is faithful in the Lord. He will remind you of my way of life in Christ Jesus, which agrees with what I teach everywhere in every church.
 9. 1Cor. 16:10 If Timothy comes, see to it that he has nothing to fear while he is with you, for he is carrying on the work of the Lord, just as I am.
 10. 2Cor. 1:1 Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, and Timothy our brother, To the church of God in Corinth, together with all the saints throughout Achaia:
 11. 2Cor. 1:19 For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by me and Silas and Timothy, was not "Yes" and "No," but in him it has always been "Yes."
 12. Phil. 1:1 Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus, To all the saints in Christ Jesus at Philippi, together with the overseers and deacons:

13. Phil. 2:19 I hope in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy to you soon, that I also may be cheered when I receive news about you.
14. Phil. 2:22 But you know that Timothy has proved himself, because as a son with his father he has served with me in the work of the gospel.
15. Col. 1:1 Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, and Timothy our brother,
16. 1Ths. 1:1 Paul, Silas and Timothy, To the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace and peace to you.
17. 1Ths. 3:2 We sent Timothy, who is our brother and God's fellow worker in spreading the gospel of Christ, to strengthen and encourage you in your faith,
18. 1Ths. 3:6 But Timothy has just now come to us from you and has brought good news about your faith and love. He has told us that you always have pleasant memories of us and that you long to see us, just as we also long to see you.
19. 2Ths. 1:1 Paul, Silas and Timothy, To the church of the Thessalonians in God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ:
20. 1Tim. 1:2 To Timothy my true son in the faith: Grace, mercy and peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.
21. 1Tim. 1:18 Timothy, my son, I give you this instruction in keeping with the prophecies once made about you, so that by following them you may fight the good fight,
22. 1Tim. 6:20 Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to your care. Turn away from godless chatter and the opposing ideas of what is falsely called knowledge,
23. 2Tim. 1:2 To Timothy, my dear son: Grace,

mercy and peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.

24. Phlm. 1 Paul, a prisoner of Christ Jesus, and Timothy our brother, To Philemon our dear friend and fellow worker,
25. Hebr. 13:23 I want you to know that our brother Timothy has been released. If he arrives soon, I will come with him to see you.

B. Silas (check all contexts)

1. Acts 15:22 Then the apostles and elders, with the whole church, decided to choose some of their own men and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas. They chose Judas (called Barsabbas) and Silas, two men who were leaders among the brothers.
2. Acts 15:27 Therefore we are sending Judas and Silas to confirm by word of mouth what we are writing.
3. Acts 15:32 Judas and Silas, who themselves were prophets, said much to encourage and strengthen the brothers.
4. Acts 15:40 but Paul chose Silas and left, commended by the brothers to the grace of the Lord.
5. Acts 16:19 When the owners of the slave girl realized that their hope of making money was gone, they seized Paul and Silas and dragged them into the marketplace to face the authorities.
6. Acts 16:22 The crowd joined in the attack against Paul and Silas, and the magistrates ordered them to be stripped and beaten.
7. Acts 16:25 About midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns to God, and the other prisoners were listening to them.
8. Acts 16:29 The jailer called for lights, rushed in

and fell trembling before Paul and Silas.

9. Acts 16:36 The jailer told Paul, "The magistrates have ordered that you and Silas be released. Now you can leave. Go in peace."
10. Acts 16:38 The officers reported this to the magistrates, and when they heard that Paul and Silas were Roman citizens, they were alarmed.
11. Acts 16:40 After Paul and Silas came out of the prison, they went to Lydia's house, where they met with the brothers and encouraged them. Then they left.
12. Acts 17:4 Some of the Jews were persuaded and joined Paul and Silas, as did a large number of God-fearing Greeks and not a few prominent women.
13. Acts 17:5 But the Jews were jealous; so they rounded up some bad characters from the marketplace, formed a mob and started a riot in the city. They rushed to Jason's house in search of Paul and Silas in order to bring them out to the crowd.
14. Acts 17:10 As soon as it was night, the brothers sent Paul and Silas away to Berea. On arriving there, they went to the Jewish synagogue.
15. Acts 17:14 The brothers immediately sent Paul to the coast, but Silas and Timothy stayed at Berea.
16. Acts 17:15 The men who escorted Paul brought him to Athens and then left with instructions for Silas and Timothy to join him as soon as possible.
17. Acts 18:5 When Silas and Timothy came from Macedonia, Paul devoted himself exclusively to preaching, testifying to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ.
18. 2Cor. 1:19 For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by me and Silas and Timothy, was not "Yes" and "No," but in him it has always been "Yes."

19. 1Ths. 1:1 Paul, Silas and Timothy, To the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace and peace to you.
20. 2Ths. 1:1 Paul, Silas and Timothy, To the church of the Thessalonians in God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ:
21. 1Pet. 5:12 With the help of Silas, whom I regard as a faithful brother, I have written to you briefly, encouraging you and testifying that this is the true grace of God. Stand fast in it.

C. Erastus

1. Acts 19:22 He sent two of his helpers, Timothy and Erastus, to Macedonia, while he stayed in the province of Asia a little longer.
2. Rom. 16:23 Gaius, whose hospitality I and the whole church here enjoy, sends you his greetings. Erastus, who is the city's director of public works, and our brother Quartus send you their greetings.
3. 2Tim. 4:20 Erastus stayed in Corinth, and I left Trophimus sick in Miletus.

D. Titus

1. 2Cor. 2:13 I still had no peace of mind, because I did not find my brother Titus there. So I said good-bye to them and went on to Macedonia.
2. 2Cor. 7:6 But God, who comforts the downcast, comforted us by the coming of Titus,
3. 2Cor. 7:13 By all this we are encouraged. In addition to our own encouragement, we were especially delighted to see how happy Titus was, because his spirit has been refreshed by all of you.
4. 2Cor. 7:14 I had boasted to him about you, and you have not embarrassed me. But just as everything we said to you was true, so our boasting about you to Titus has proved to be true as well.

5. 2Cor. 8:6 So we urged Titus, since he had earlier made a beginning, to bring also to completion this act of grace on your part.
6. 2Cor. 8:16 I thank God, who put into the heart of Titus the same concern I have for you.
7. 2Cor. 8:17 For Titus not only welcomed our appeal, but he is coming to you with much enthusiasm and on his own initiative.
8. 2Cor. 8:23 As for Titus, he is my partner and fellow worker among you; as for our brothers, they are representatives of the churches and an honor to Christ.
9. 2Cor. 12:18 I urged Titus to go to you and I sent our brother with him. Titus did not exploit you, did he? Did we not act in the same spirit and follow the same course?
10. Gal. 2:1 Fourteen years later I went up again to Jerusalem, this time with Barnabas. I took Titus along also.
11. Gal. 2:3 Yet not even Titus, who was with me, was compelled to be circumcised, even though he was a Greek.
12. 2Tim. 4:10 for Demas, because he loved this world, has deserted me and has gone to Thessalonica. Crescens has gone to Galatia, and Titus to Dalmatia.
13. Titus 1:4 To Titus, my true son in our common faith: Grace and peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Savior.

E. Trophimus

1. Acts 20:4 He was accompanied by Sopater son of Pyrrhus from Berea, Aristarchus and Secundus from Thessalonica, Gaius from Derbe, Timothy also, and Tychicus and Trophimus from the province of Asia.

2. Acts 21:29 (They had previously seen Trophimus the Ephesian in the city with Paul and assumed that Paul had brought him into the temple area.)
3. 2Tim. 4:20 Erastus stayed in Corinth, and I left Trophimus sick in Miletus.

F. Aristarchus

1. Acts 19:29 Soon the whole city was in an uproar. The people seized Gaius and Aristarchus, Paul's traveling companions from Macedonia, and rushed as one man into the theater.
2. Acts 20:4 He was accompanied by Sopater son of Pyrrhus from Berea, Aristarchus and Secundus from Thessalonica, Gaius from Derbe, Timothy also, and Tychicus and Trophimus from the province of Asia.
3. Acts 27:2 We boarded a ship from Adramyttium about to sail for ports along the coast of the province of Asia, and we put out to sea. Aristarchus, a Macedonian from Thessalonica, was with us.
4. Col. 4:10 My fellow prisoner Aristarchus sends you his greetings, as does Mark, the cousin of Barnabas. (You have received instructions about him; if he comes to you, welcome him.)
5. Phlm. 24 And so do Mark, Aristarchus, Demas and Luke, my fellow workers.

G. Luke

1. Col. 4:14 Our dear friend Luke, the doctor, and Demas send greetings.
2. 2Tim. 4:11 Only Luke is with me. Get Mark and bring him with you, because he is helpful to me in my ministry.
3. Phlm. 24 And so do Mark, Aristarchus, Demas and Luke, my fellow workers.

H. Sopater; Secundus

1. Acts 20:4 He was accompanied by Sopater son of Pyrrhus from Berea, Aristarchus and Secundus from Thessalonica, Gaius from Derbe, Timothy also, and Tychicus and Trophimus from the province of Asia.

I. Lucius; Jason; Sosipater—Paul's relatives as well

1. Acts 13:1 In the church at Antioch there were prophets and teachers: Barnabas, Simeon called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen (who had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch) and Saul.
2. Acts 17:6 But when they did not find them, they dragged Jason and some other brothers before the city officials, shouting: "These men who have caused trouble all over the world have now come here,
3. Acts 17:7 and Jason has welcomed them into his house. They are all defying Caesar's decrees, saying that there is another king, one called Jesus."
4. Acts 17:9 Then they made Jason and the others post bond and let them go.
5. Rom. 16:21 Timothy, my fellow worker, sends his greetings to you, as do Lucius, Jason and Sosipater, my relatives.

Does All Men Mean Every Man?

by Dr. David Rodabaugh

1 Timothy 2 is an extremely important passage to us who live in this, the “dispensation of the grace of God”. This is implied in verses 6 and 7.

This passage states that God “will have all men to be saved” and that Christ “gave himself a ransom for all”.

The difficulty in this passage is that some insist that all men must mean all men without exception. Among other arguments some assert that:

“all, without distinction” is a misuse of the English language.

If God only meant “all kinds” He should have used the words “all kinds”.

“all, without exception” includes “all, without distinction” but not the converse.

Other verses such as Heb. 2:9 and John 3:16, 17 clearly state that God loved the “world” and that Christ tasted death for “every man”.

That I Timothy 2:4 is talking of God’s desire (thelo) not His resolve (bulimia)

The Meaning of All

To insist that all must always mean totality is, at the very least a naïve approach to language. This is particularly true of the Hebrew and Greek language as we shall see.

However, even in English, universal terms are not always to be taken as meaning totality. For example, we could truthfully state that, ‘everyone knows Irving Kaplansky’ and that he is a “world famous” mathematician. Yet, very few (percentage wise) actually know him. Here, it merely means that men all over the globe know him.

Indeed, the Random House Dictionary gives as one of the meanings of “all” “every: all kinds, all sorts, and all manner of

men“. Checking the dictionary on other universal terms will show that each has a large variety of meanings.

In fact when a person says “all men” means “all men”, he has said nothing at all. Such statements are usually intended to appeal to the emotions rather than to the mind.

But, what is the meaning of the word 'all' in the Greek New Testament. The Arndt & Gingrich lexicon (A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament) is the recognized standard among one volume lexicons. Its definition of 'pas' (the Greek word for 'all' in I Timothy 2:1-8) includes the meaning 'every kind of, all sorts of' and, among others, it lists Matt. 4:23: 23:27.

Let us consider Matt. 23:27. Here, our Lord refers to sepulchres in which are dead men's bones and all uncleanness. There is nothing in the context to indicate that it means 'all manner of uncleanness' and it is not so translated. Thus if arguments 1, 2 and 3 are valid, there must be 'every single uncleanness without exception' in a sepulchre. But, from OTHER THINGS WHICH WE KNOW ABOUT SEPULCHRES, we know that this is simply not the case. Simply because we are reading scripture does not mean we turn our minds off. We know that many unclean things are not in sepulchres so we understand it to mean 'all manner of'.

Another interesting use of this word is Acts 10:12. In this verse, even the translators translated 'pas' by 'all kinds' or 'all manner'. Furthermore, in the King James Version, the additional words are not in italics. They did not consider them to be added. Clearly Peter did not see all animals on the sheet. Indeed, he did not see any clean animals. Had he seen a clean animal, he would not have responded as he did. No, he saw only unclean animals. Yet, the Holy Spirit uses 'pas' to describe what he saw.

We next turn to I Timothy 6:10 where we are told that, "the love of money is the root of all evil." Remember, we are concerned with the meaning of 'all' in scripture. What does it mean? Those who argue that 'all' must mean 'all' (whatever that means) are forced to the fantastic conclusion that the love of money is the root of every single evil without exception! Certainly, if we think at all, we know that often evil is not the result of greed. For example, adultery is often not the result of greed. Yet, there is nothing in the context of this verse to so indicate. However, from OTHER THINGS WHICH

WE KNOW ABOUT EVIL, we know that this is simply not the case. Once again, we profited by meditation on the meaning of the verse.

Another interesting example is Ex. 9:6 where we are told that all of the cattle of the Egyptians died and yet their beasts are mentioned in verses 22 and 25.

In fact, this very use of 'all' or the Greek 'pas' is clearly indicated in I Timothy 2:8. Here, we are told literally that men are to pray in every place, lifting up holy hands. But, there are some places where men can't pray and lift up holy hands for these places are most unholy.

Dr. E. W. Bullinger in Figures of Speech used in the Bible refers to I Tim. 2:6 on pages 31 and 32 and mentions that here 'all' means 'all kinds of'. He further states that this is the figure synecdoche. Under his discussion of that figure (on page 638) he lists John 3:16; 12:19; Rom. 1:8; I John 2:2 as further examples of this figure of synecdoche. More can be found in his discussion under the figure metonymy and on pages 616 and 617 where I Tim. 2:4 is mentioned.

The naive use of language that insists that either each word must have only one meaning (which has led to some bad 'concordant' type translations) or that there are no figures of speech (which, has led to the Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation) must be rejected by the student of the Word.

God's Desire versus God's Resolve

Some who have studied 1 Tim. 2:4 have concluded that the key to the passage is the use of the Greek word 'thelo' for the English word "will". They argue that I Tim. 2:4 merely tells us that it is God's desire for all men without exception to be saved. However, they hasten to mention that God has not resolved this for had this been true, He would have used the Greek word "boulomai".

One thing that is shocking about this view is that it presents God as wanting something so badly that He sent His Son to die on the cross and yet God does not save all for He has not resolved it. This is presented even though, "our God is in the heavens: He hath done whatsoever He hath pleased." Anything that God truly wants He gets. Many other scriptures can be presented to show this. Indeed,

this is an important basis for prayer we pray to a God Who can do whatever He pleases.

But, there is more much more. In II Peter 3:9, we are told that, "(God is) not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance." Here, the word for 'willing' is 'boulomai'. And, we are clearly taught in Romans 9:19 that none can resist God's will (boulomai). The only conclusion if 'all' means 'all without exception' is that all men will someday be saved! However, the scriptures often speak of those who will never be saved. The only way to understand II Peter 3:9 without contradicting OTHER THINGS WE KNOW FROM SCRIPTURE is to appreciate that 'all' here (Greek 'pas') does not mean 'all without exception'.

There is still much more to say on the comparisons between these two Greek words. The word 'thelo' is used in Romans 9:18,22 where it is clear that God fully intended to accomplish His desire. Read Romans 9:22!

What Is A Ransom?

The specious reasoning that has led some to conclude that 'all men' in I Timothy 2:1-8 means 'every single person without exception' has forced some strained teachings about the word 'ransom' in verse 6.

The Greek word translated 'ransom' is 'antilutron' and is found only in this verse. However, it is composed of the two words 'anti' and 'lutron'. The Arndt & Gingrich lexicon gives the meaning 'ransom' and lists the expression 'lutron anti panton' as an essentially equivalent expression. This expression is actually stronger than the corresponding one with 'lutron' in the place of 'antilutron'.

The word 'lutron' means 'price of release, ransom'. It is used in Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45 only. The verb 'lutroo' means 'redeem' and is used only in Luke 1:68; 2:38; Heb. 9:12. A careful perusal of all of these verses will convince anyone that some men are definitely not ransomed.

The reader who wonders why Eph. 1:7 is not in the above lists should note that the word there is 'apolutron'.

One more comment about the meanings of words. A word

always has a region of meanings rather than a point of meaning. The more common a word the larger (normally) is the region. In other words, the common word 'all' would be expected to have more meanings than the uncommon word 'ransom'.

Furthermore, think of the doctrinal implications of teaching that Christ's death is a ransom for every single person who ever lived. All men then would stand before God as redeemed and saved. Such reasoning implies the serious error of universalism.

For Whom Do We Give Thanks (I Tim 2:1)?

Does this verse teach that we give thanks and pray for every single person without exception? There are four billion people alive today so clearly no person could even begin to obey such a command. It is impossible.

Or, perhaps, we are to do this collectively. This would be contrary to the rest of the passage. Whatever these verses mean they mean people as individuals.

No, we are to pray for all kinds of people. I Timothy 2:2 mentions a kind of men we often omit and gives a compelling reason to pray for them.

For Whom Is Christ A Mediator?

A mediator is one who interposes between two parties. One party is God. The question is,

“Who is the other party--all without exception or saved men?”

The Greek word is 'mesites' and comes from 'mesos'. It is used in Gal. 3:19, 20 I Tim. 2:5, Heb. 8:6, 9:15: 12:24.

Romans 2:34 makes it perfectly plain that the other party in Christ's mediation is the elect. He certainly does not make intercession for any but those who are saved.

Concluding Remarks

There is no question that all who love the Lord should put aside all prejudice about I Timothy 2:1-8 and read it as God's word to us.

Certainly, the chief doctrine that set Paul's ministry apart was that taught in Ephesians 3:1-9. The fact is that God is today saving all kinds of men alike and placing them in the Body of Christ.

When we read I Tim. 2 we do not set aside his doctrine.

The Bible further sets those who are redeemed apart from those who are not redeemed. We do not set aside this doctrine when we read I Tim. 2

The Bible further sets those for whom Christ intercedes apart from those for whom Christ does not intercede. We do not set aside this doctrine when we read I Tim. 2.

We further know that we are not to simply read a passage but to study it thoroughly. Only then are we God's approved workmen. We do not set aside this doctrine when we read I Timothy 2.

Let Us Thoroughly Study I Timothy 2:1-8.

IF CHRIST DIED FOR ALL, How Do You Know You
Are Saved?

by Dr. David Rodabaugh

An Instructive Conversation,

In the following discussion, A believes that Christ died for all and that he is saved; B believes that Christ died for those whom God will bring to Himself.

A. I am so glad I can say that Christ died for ME,

B. But, you also believe that Christ died for Adolph Hitler, yet I'm sure you teach that Hitler is in hell today, You also believe that Christ died for Esau yet the scriptures clearly teach that Esau went to hell,

A. But God has saved me and I'm on my way to heaven.

B. Ah, but how can you say that! Don't you also believe that Christ's death was for Hitler and Esau? Indeed, in YOUR teaching about 'unlimited redemption' don't you also teach that Christ's death was a ransom for Hitler and Esau? If Christ died redemptively both for you and Esau and if Esau is burning in hell, how do you know you are saved

A. I know that I am saved because I have believed that Christ died for my sins.

B. Let me clarify your understanding. You believe that Christ died for Hitler and Esau, yet they are not saved because they did not believe. You believe that Christ died for you and that you are saved because you have believed, Is this a fair statement?

A. Yes, I believe that Christ died for every single person who ever lived. But He saves only those who believe.

B. Then, Christ died for a number of people who will never be saved.

A. Yes, that is what I believe the scripture teaches.

B. Then, your assurance of salvation is based on the fact that you

have believed. That is, your evidence for your own salvation is by human experience. Remember, "The heart is deceitful above all things," so there is a real danger of deceit here.

Indeed, if Christ died for all men without exception but does not save all men without exception, then you are not basing your faith for salvation on the Word of God, are you? The scriptures do not say that Christ has saved you, do they? They do not have your name in them, do they?

A. Well . . . (Is there any valid answer to this question except "No"?)

What have we proved?

In a published article not long ago, an imagined conversation like the above seemed to indicate that the one with the view of B was basing his hope of salvation on his faith and not on the Word of God.

Do not be deceived by this kind of thinking. The only way that any person can ever be sure that they are saved is when they see the evidences of spiritual life in their own lives. This is why the apostle Paul challenged the Corinthians to, "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith,' prove your own selves Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" (II Cor. 13:5).

This is extremely important - God's Word is very clear that the basis for salvation is the work of Christ on the cross of Calvary, Our faith is in Him to save us.

But, the scripture is equally clear - the evidence that I am saved (when the vast majority of people are not saved) is found in my own life.

We are challenged repeatedly to examine our own lives. God grant that each person professing to be saved will examine his own heart to *see if* the Spirit has wrought a work of faith in him. There are counterfeits.

It is my firm conviction that, when we get to glory, some we expected to see there won't be there. Will you be there? (See Acts 20:21 and Rom. 10:9-10).

The Meaning of Words

Dr. David Rodabaugh

JUST WHAT DOES RUN MEAN?

John decided to run¹ for Mayor so he ran² home to tell his wife. He drove the 20 miles on a highway that ran³ along the Missouri River. Now the Missouri River runs⁴ from Montana to St. Louis where it joins the Mississippi River.

When John parked in the driveway, his wife ran⁵ out to greet him. "What time is it?" he asked. "I don't know," she said, "the clock isn't running⁶." She scratched her leg, so her hose had a run⁷ in it.

Unfortunately, John's little girl had a cold so her nose was running⁸. In fact, she was running⁹ a fever.

Normally, his daughter would run¹⁰ circles around him and his wife but with this cold, she had run¹¹ out of gas.

His wife had worked so hard, she was feeling run¹²-down. Otherwise, it was a run¹³-of-the-mill kind of day.

Propitiate

1. Verb

- a. Greek 2433. hilaskomai, hil-as'-kom-ahee; mid. from the same as Grk 2436; to conciliate, i.e. (trans.) to atone for (sin), or (intrans.) be propitious:-be merciful, make reconciliation for.
- b. Baur-Arndt-Gringrich Lexicon
 1. propitiate, conciliate.... Passive be propitiated, be merciful or gracious...Lk 18:13
 2. *expiate*: of Christ as high priest... Hb 2:17

c. Occurs-

1. LUK 18:13 And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner.
2. HEB 2:17 Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.

2. Noun

- a. Greek 2434. hilasmos, hil-as-mos'; atonement, i.e. (concr.) an expiator:-propitiation.
- b. Baur-Arndt-Gringrich Lexicon
 1. expiation, propitiation... 1Jn 2:2; 4:10
 2. sin-offering
- c. Occurs
 1. 1JO 2:2 And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.
 2. 1JO 4:10 Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.

3. Noun

- a. Greek 2435. hilasterion, hil-as-tay'-ree-on; neut. of a der. of Grk 2433; an expiatory (place or thing), i.e. (concr.) an atoning victim, or (spec.) the lid of the Ark (in the Temple):-mercyseat, propitiation.
- b. Baur-Arndt-Gringrich Lexicon—*that which expiates or propitiates*
- c. Occurs
 1. ROM 3:25 Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;
 2. HEB 9:5 And over it the cherubims of glory shadowing

the mercyseat; of which we cannot now speak particularly.

4. English Word

- a. pro-pi-ti-a-tion n.
 1. The act of propitiating.
 2. Something that propitiates, especially a conciliatory offering to a god.
- b. English Word—propitiate tr.v.
 1. To conciliate (an offended power); appease.
- c. English Word-ex-pi-ate v.
 1. —tr. To make amends or reparation for; atone.
 2. —intr. To make amends; atone.

Make Alive

- A. Greek 2227. zoopoieo, dzo-op-oy-eh'-o; from the same as Grk 2226 and Grk 4160; to (re-) vitalize (lit. or fig.):—make alive, give life, quicken.
- B. Occurs
 1. JOH 5:21 For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.
 2. JOH 6:63 It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.
 3. JOH 19:35 And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe.
 4. ROM 4:17 (As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were.
 5. ROM 8:11 But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from

the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

6. 1CO 15:22 For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.
7. 1CO 15:36 Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die:
8. 1CO 15:45 And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.
9. 2CO 3:6 Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.
10. GAL 3:21 Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.
11. 1TI 6:13 I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession;
12. 1PE 3:18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:
- C. Baur-Arndt-Gringrich Lexicon—to make alive, give life to
 1. lit. of God, who ... *gives life to all things* 1Ti 6:13. Esp. of supernatural life: of dead persons who are called to life ... *bring the dead to life* J 5:21a ...
 2. in a less pointed sense and fig.
 - a. ... I feel new life
 - b. of a child ... kept alive with milk
 - c. of the sprouting of seed ... 1Co 15:36

Love

- A. God's providential care for creation—Mt 5:43-47

- B. Greek 25. *agapao*, ag-ap-ah'-o; perh. from *agan* (much) [or comp. Heb 5689]; to love (in a social or moral sense):-*(be-)* love (-ed). Comp. Grk 5368.
- C. Character of redemptive love
1. Guarantees salvation for nothing can separate—Rom 8:32-39
 2. Is exclusive so is a model for husbands love of wives—Eph 5:26
 3. Causes us to love Him for He first loved us—1Jn 4:19
- D. Beloved ones—title of redeemed only
1. Greek 27. *agapetos*, ag-ap-ay-tos'; from Grk 25; beloved:-*(dearly, well)* beloved, dear.
 2. used only of Christ and believers
 3. Where do we get the idea that God loves all redemptively—only from John 3:16 and the insistence of a multi-meaning word having one meaning
world n.

JOH 1:9 That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. (*elect*)

JOH 1:10 He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. (*?, creation, non-elect*)

1CO 4:9 For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death: for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men. (*includes angels and men*)

- A. Greek 2889. *kosmos*, kos'-mos; prob. from the base of Grk 2865; orderly arrangement, i.e. decoration; by impl. the world (in a wide or narrow sense, includ. its inhab., lit. or fig. [mor.]):-adorned, world.
- B. Baur-Arndt-Gringrich Lexicon
1. *adornment, adorning*—1Pt 3:3

2. in philosophical usage the *world* as the sum total of everything here and now, *the (orderly) universe*... Phil 2:15 ('sky?'); Jn 17:5; ... Eph 1:4; etal.
 3. *the world* as the sum total of all beings above the level of the animals ... 1Cor 4:9
 4. *the world* as the earth
 - a. generally Mk 16:15; Mt 4:8 ...etal.
 - b. *the world* as the habitation of mankind Jn 16:21 etal.
 - c. *earth, world* in contrast to heaven ...Jn 1:9...
 - d. *the world* outside in contrast to one's home (no scriptures)
 5. *the world* as mankind
 - a. generally ... Mt 18:7 etal.
 - b. of mankind but especially of believers as the object of God's love
 6. *the world* as the scene of earthly joys, possessions, cares, sufferings ... Mt 16:26
 7. *the world*, and everything that belongs to it, appears as that which is at enmity with God
 8. *totality, sum total* ... Ja 3:6
- C. English
1. The earth.
 2. The universe.
 3. The earth with its inhabitants.
 4. The inhabitants of the earth; the human race.
 5.
 - a. Humankind considered as social beings; human society.
 - b. People as a whole; the public.
 6. Often World. A specified part of the earth.
 7. A part of the earth and its inhabitants as known at a given period in history.

8. A realm or domain.
9. a. A sphere of human activity or interest.
 - b. A class or group of people with common characteristics or pursuits.
10. A particular way of life.
11. All that relates to or affects the life of a person.
12. Secular life and its concerns.
13. a. Human existence; life.
 - b. A state of existence.
14. Often worlds. A large amount; much.
15. A celestial body such as a planet.

All

- A. Greek 3956. pas, pas; includ. all the forms of declension; appar. a prim. word; all, any, every, the whole:-all (manner of, means), always (-s), any (one), X daily, + ever, every (one, way), as many as, + no (-thing), X thoroughly, whatsoever, whole, whosoever.
- B. Acts 10:12
 1. ejn w/ uJph'rcen pavnta ta; tetravpoda kai; eJrpetai; th'" gh'" kai; peteina; tou' oujranou'.
 2. Literally—in which were all the quadrupeds of the earth, and the beasts, and the reptiles, and the birds of the heaven
 3. Yet, here 'all' must mean only the unclean animals because of the context
- C. Some Verses
 1. MAT 2:3 When Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.
 2. MAT 3:5 Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judaea, and all the region round about Jordan,
 3. MAT 4:8 Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the

- world, and the glory of them;
4. MAT 4:23 And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people.
 5. MAT 4:24 And his fame went throughout all Syria: and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatick, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them.
 6. MAT 9:35 And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people.
 7. MAT 10:22 And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved.
 8. MAT 27:25 Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us, and on our children.
 9. MAR 1:5 And there went out unto him all the land of Judaea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins.

atone v.

- A. English
 1. —intr.
 - a. To make amends, as for a sin or fault.
 - b. Archaic. To agree.
 2. —tr.
 - a. To expiate.
 - b. Archaic. To conciliate; appease.
 - c. Obsolete. To reconcile or harmonize.
- B. Only used in NT
 1. ROM 5:11 And not only so, but we also joy in God through

our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.

2. Greek word there means 'reconcile'
Reconcile

A. Noun

1. Greek 2643. katallage, kat-al-lag-ay'; from Grk 2644; exchange (fig. adjustment), i.e. restoration to (the divine) favor:-atonement, reconciliation (-ing).
2. Uses in NT
 - a. ROM 5:11 And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.
 - b. ROM 11:15 For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?
 - c. 2CO 5:18 And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;
 - d. 2CO 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

B. Verb

1. Greek 2644. katallasso, kat-al-las'-so; from Grk 2596 and Grk 236; to change mutually, i.e. (fig.) to compound a difference:-reconcile.
2. Used
 - a. ROM 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.
 - b. 1CO 7:11 But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.

- c. 2CO 5:18 And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;
- d. 2CO 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.
- e. 2CO 5:20 Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.

C. Verb—strengthened

1. Greek 604. apokatallasso, ap-ok-at-al-las'-so; from Grk 575 and Grk 2644; to reconcile fully:-reconcile.
2. Used
 - a. EPH 2:16 And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:
 - b. COL 1:20 And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.
 - c. COL 1:21 And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled

Buy

- A. Greek 59. agorazo, ag-or-ad'-zo; from Grk 58; prop. to go to market, i.e. (by impl.) to purchase; spec. to redeem:-buy, redeem.
- B. Uses
 1. MAT 13:44 Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field; the which when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.
 2. MAT 13:46 Who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.

3. MAT 14:15 And when it was evening, his disciples came to him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past; send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves victuals.
4. MAT 21:12 And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves,
5. MAT 25:9 But the wise answered, saying, Not so; lest there be not enough for us and you: but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves.
6. MAT 25:10 And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut.
7. MAT 27:7 And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in.
8. MAR 6:36 Send them away, that they may go into the country round about, and into the villages, and buy themselves bread: for they have nothing to eat.
9. MAR 6:37 He answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat?
10. MAR 11:15 And they come to Jerusalem: and Jesus went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves;
11. MAR 15:46 And he bought fine linen, and took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre.
12. MAR 16:1 And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him.
13. LUK 9:13 But he said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And

- they said, We have no more but five loaves and two fishes; except we should go and buy meat for all this people.
14. LUK 14:18 And they all with one consent began to make excuse. The first said unto him, I have bought a piece of ground, and I must needs go and see it: I pray thee have me excused.
15. LUK 14:19 And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them: I pray thee have me excused.
16. LUK 17:28 Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded;
17. LUK 19:45 And he went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold therein, and them that bought;
18. LUK 22:36 Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one.
19. JOH 4:8 (For his disciples were gone away unto the city to buy meat.)
20. JOH 6:5 When Jesus then lifted up his eyes, and saw a great company come unto him, he saith unto Philip, Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat?
21. JOH 13:29 For some of them thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of against the feast; or, that he should give something to the poor.
22. 1CO 6:20 For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.
23. 1CO 7:23 Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.
24. 1CO 7:30 And they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not;
25. 2PE 2:1 But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even

denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.

26. REV 3:18 I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see.
27. REV 5:9 And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;
28. REV 13:17 And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.
29. REV 14:3 And they sung as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts, and the elders: and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, which were redeemed from the earth.
30. REV 14:4 These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb.
31. REV 18:11 And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for no man buyeth their merchandise any more:

Redeem

- A. Greek 3084. lutroo, loo-tro'-o; from Grk 3083; to ransom (lit. or fig.):-redeem.
 1. Used
 - a. LUK 24:21 But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and beside all this, to day is the third day since these things were done.
 - b. TIT 2:14 Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a

peculiar people, zealous of good works.

- c. 1PE 1:18 Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers;
- B. Greek 487. antilutron, an-til'-oo-tron; from Grk 473 and Grk 3083; a redemption-price:-ransom.
 1. Used—1TI 2:6 Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.
- C. Greek 3083. lutron, loo'-tron; from Grk 3089; something to loosen with, i.e. a redemption price (fig. atonement):-ransom.
 1. Uses
 - a. MAT 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.
 - b. MAR 10:45 For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.
- D. Greek 1805. exagorazo, ex-ag-or-ad'-zo; from Grk 1537 and Grk 59; to buy up, i.e. ransom; fig. to rescue from loss (improve opportunity):-redeem.
 1. Uses
 - a. GAL 3:13 Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:
 - b. GAL 4:5 To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.
 - c. EPH 5:16 Redeeming the time, because the days are evil.
 - d. COL 4:5 Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time.

Lord—Despot

- A. Noun

1. Greek 1203. despotes, des-pot'-ace; perh. from Grk 1210 and posis (a husband); an absolute ruler ("despot"):- Lord, master.
2. Uses
 - a. LUK 2:29 Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word:
 - b. ACT 4:24 And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is:
 - c. 1TI 6:1 Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed.
 - d. 1TI 6:2 And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort.
 - e. 2TI 2:21 If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work.
 - f. TIT 2:9 Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again;
 - g. 1PE 2:18 Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.
 - h. 2PE 2:1 But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.
 - i. REV 6:10 And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?

Run—Definition

- A. run v. ran, run, run-ning, runs.
 - intr.
 1. a. To move swiftly on foot so that both feet leave the ground during each stride.
 - b. To move at a fast gallop. Used of a horse.
 2. To retreat rapidly; flee.
 3. a. To move without hindrance or restraint.
 - b. To keep company.
 - c. To go or move about from place to place; roam.
 4. To migrate, especially to move in a shoal in order to spawn. Used of fish.
 5. a. To move or go quickly; hurry.
 - b. To go when in trouble or distress.
 - c. To make a short, quick trip or visit.
 6. a. To take part in a race or contest.
 - b. To compete in a race for elected office.
 - c. To finish a race or contest in a specified position.
 7. To move freely, on or as if on wheels.
 8. To be in operation.
 9. To go back and forth especially on a regular basis; ply.
 10. Nautical. To sail or steer before the wind or on an indicated course.
 11. a. To flow, especially in a steady stream.
 - b. To emit pus, mucus, or serous fluid.
 12. To melt and flow.
 13. To spread or dissolve, as dyes in fabric.
 14. To extend, stretch, or reach in a certain direction or to a particular point.

15. To extend, spread, or climb as a result of growing.
16. To spread rapidly.
17. a. To be valid in a given area.
b. To be present as a valid accompaniment.
18. To unravel along a line.
19. To continue in effect or operation.
20. To pass.
21. To tend to persist or recur.
22. a. To accumulate or accrue.
b. To become payable.
23. To take a particular form, order, or expression.
24. To tend or incline.
25. To occupy or exist in a certain range.
26. To be presented or performed for a continuous period of time.
27. To pass into a specified condition.
—tr.
1. a. To travel over on foot at a pace faster than a walk.
b. To cause (an animal) to move quickly or rapidly.
2. To allow to move without restraint.
3. To do or accomplish by or as if by running.
4. To hunt or pursue; chase.
5. To bring to a given condition by or as if by running.
6. To cause to move quickly.
7. a. To cause to compete in or as if in a race. b. To present or nominate for elective office.
8. To cause to move or progress freely.
9. To cause to function; operate.

10. To convey or transport.
11. Nautical. To cause to move on a course.
12. a. To smuggle.
b. To evade and pass through.
13. To pass over or through.
14. To cause to flow.
15. To stream with.
16. Metallurgy.
a. To melt, fuse, or smelt (metal).
b. To mold or cast (molten metal).
17. To cause to extend or pass.
18. To mark or trace on a surface.
19. To sew with a continuous line of stitches.
20. To cause to unravel along a line.
21. a. To cause to crash or collide.
b. To cause to penetrate.
22. To continue to present or perform.
23. To publish in a periodical.
24. To subject or be subjected to.
25. Games.
a. To score (balls or points) consecutively in billiards.
b. To clear (the table) in pool by consecutive scores.
26. To conduct or perform.
27. Computer Science. To process or execute (a program or an instruction).
28. To control, manage, or direct.
- B. run n.
1. a. A pace faster than a walk.

- b. A fast gallop. Used of a horse.
- 2. An act of running.
- 3. a. A distance covered by or as if by running.
 - b. The time taken to cover such a distance.
- 4. A quick trip or visit.
- 5. a. Sports. A running race.
 - b. A campaign for public office.
- 6. Abbr. r, r. Baseball. A point scored by advancing around the bases and reaching home plate safely.
- 7. Football. A player's attempt to carry the ball past or through the opposing team, usually for a specified distance.
- 8.a. The migration of fish, especially in order to spawn.
 - b. A group or school of fish ascending a river in order to spawn.
- 9. Unrestricted freedom or use.
- 10. A stretch or period of riding, as in a race or to the hounds.
- 11.a. A track or slope along or down which something can travel.
 - b. Sports. A particular type of passage down a hill or across country experienced by an athlete, especially a skier or bobsledder.
- 12. Sports. The distance a golf ball rolls after hitting the ground.
- 13.a. A scheduled or regular route.
 - b. The territory of a news reporter.
- 14. a. A continuous period of operation, especially of a machine or factory.
 - b. The production achieved during such a period.
- 15. a. A movement or flow.
 - b. The duration of such a flow.

- c. The amount of such a flow.
- 16. A pipe or channel through which something flows.
- 17. Eastern Lower Northern U.S. See creek.
- 18. A fall or slide, as of sand or mud.
- 19. Continuous length or extent.
- 20. Geology. A vein or seam, as of ore or rock.
- 21. The direction, configuration, or lie.
- 22.a. A trail or way made or frequented by animals.
 - b. An outdoor enclosure for domestic animals or poultry.
- 23.a. A length of torn or unraveled stitches in a knitted fabric.
 - b. A blemish caused by excessive paint flow.
- 24. An unbroken series or sequence.
- 25. An unbroken sequence of theatrical performances.
- 26. Music. A rapid sequence of notes; a roulade.
- 27. A series of unexpected and urgent demands, as by depositors or customers.
- 28. a. A continuous set or sequence, as of playing cards in one suit.
 - b. A successful sequence of shots or points.
- 29. A sustained state or condition.
- 30. A trend or tendency.
- 31. The average type, group, or category.
- 32. Computer Science. An execution of a specific program or instruction.
- 33. runs. Slang. Diarrhea. Often used with the.
- C. run adj.
 - 1. Being in a melted or molten state.
 - 2. Completely exhausted from running.

D. phrasal verbs.

run across.

To find by chance; come upon.

run after.

1. To pursue; chase.
2. To seek the company or attention of for purposes of courting.

run against.

1. To encounter unexpectedly; run into.
2. To work against; oppose.

run along.

To go away; leave.

run away.

1. To flee; escape.
2. To leave one's home, especially to elope.
3. To stampede.

run down.

1. To stop because of lack of force or power.
2. To become tired.
3. a. To collide with and knock down.
b. Nautical. To collide with and cause to sink.
4. To chase and capture.
5. To trace the source of.
6. To disparage.
7. To go over; review.
8. Baseball. To put a runner out after trapping him or her between two bases.
9. a. To collide with and knock down.

b. Nautical. To collide with and cause to sink.

run in.

1. To insert or include as something extra.
2. Printing. To make a solid body of text without a paragraph or other break.
3. Slang. To take into legal custody.
4. To go to or seek out the company of in order to socialize; visit.

run into.

1. To meet or find by chance.
2. To encounter (something).
3. To collide with.
4. To amount to.

run off.

1. To print, duplicate, or copy.
2. To run away; elope.
3. To flow off; drain away.
4. To decide a contest or competition by a runoff.
5. To force or drive off (trespassers, for example).

run on.

1. a. To keep going; continue.
b. To talk volubly, persistently, and usually inconsequentially.
c. To continue a text without a formal break.
2. a. To keep going; continue.
b. To talk volubly, persistently, and usually inconsequentially.
c. To continue a text without a formal break.

run out.

1. To become used up; be exhausted.
2. To put out by force; compel to leave.
3. To become void, especially through the passage of time or an omission.

run over.

1. To collide with, knock down, and often pass over.
2. To read or review quickly.
3. To flow over.
4. To go beyond a limit.

run through.

1. To pierce.
2. To use up quickly.
3. To rehearse quickly.
4. To go over the salient points or facts of.

run up.

To make or become greater or larger.

run with.

To take as one's own; adopt.

E. idioms.

a run for (one's) money.

Strong competition.

in the long run.

In the final analysis or outcome.

in the short run.

In the immediate future.

on the run.

1. a. In rapid retreat.
- b. In hiding.

2. Hurrying busily from place to place.

3. a. In rapid retreat.

b. In hiding.

run a temperature.

To have a fever.

run away with.

1. a. To make off with hurriedly.

b. To steal.

2. To be greater or bigger than others in (a performance, for example).

run foul or run afoul of.

1. To run into; collide with.

2. To come into conflict with.

run in place.

To go through the movements of running without leaving one's original position.

run off with.

To capture or carry off.

run (one's) eyes over.

To look at or read in a cursory manner.

run out of.

To exhaust the supply of.

run out of gas. Slang.

1. To exhaust one's energy or enthusiasm.

2. To falter or come to a stop because of a lack of capital, support, or enthusiasm.

run out on.

To abandon.

run rings around.

To be markedly superior to.

run scared. Informal.

To become intimidated or frightened.

run short.

To become scanty or insufficient in supply.

run short of.

To use up so that a supply becomes insufficient or scanty.

run to earth or run to ground.

To pursue and successfully capture.

The Arminian Atrocity

by Dr. David Rodabaugh

The history of the church has, for the most part, been a history of error. Those in the leadership of the church have refused to study in order to know the truth, refused to stand for truth, or outright lied about the truth of God. Those who stood for the truth have been maligned, persecuted, or even killed.

We could wish that the above were only true of minor doctrines, but, it is true of the most fundamental of truths. Some of the truths affected are right at the heart of the gospel. The doctrine of the Trinity, that of creation, that of the person of Jesus Christ, the person of the Holy Spirit, the virgin birth and resurrection of Christ and other important truths.

But, perhaps the subtlest and most "successful" attack of the enemy is in the area of the nature of man and the nature of God's salvation, Satan has so done his work that many who claim allegiance to God and His Word not only err on this subject but are furious with those who teach the truth. There is no question that those who so react should seriously examine their hearts for they might well be on their way to hell.

There have been others in the past who claimed allegiance to God and His Lord whose lack of saving faith was revealed by their opposition to these precious truths. Consider John 8:27-44 where a group of people who believed on Christ were so angered at the truth of TOTAL DEPRAVITY that they wished to kill Christ and He declared that they were children of the devil. The thought that they were ever in bondage to sin sent them into a rage.

And, this still happens. Nothing can so upset professing believers as the fact that they, like all humans, are in bandage to sin until the Holy Spirit chooses to do the work of grace in their hearts and cause them to come to Christ.

The Issue Stated - Total Depravity

The Arminian View - Free Will or Human Ability

This view teaches that man was seriously affected by the fall. But, God graciously moves in each heart to enable each person

to repent and believe the gospel. The unregenerate, though a sinner, is able to choose to believe or to resist the inner working of the Spirit. His will is never in bondage in these matters

The View of Calvinism - Total Depravity or Total Inability

This View teaches that man is rendered, by the fall, totally unable to do anything pleasing to God. This inability rests in a will that is enslaved to sin; the sinner is dead, blind, and deaf to the things of God. He cannot because he will not choose good over evil in the spiritual realm. Thus, it takes much more than the Spirit's - assistance to bring the sinner to Christ. It takes regeneration by which the sinner is made alive and given a new nature.

The View of Scripture - Total Depravity or Total Inability

There is so much in scripture on this basic point that whole books have been written on this subject. First, note that the unregenerate are called dead in Rom, 5:12; Eph. 2:1-3 and other places. Man's heart is said to be only evil in a number of scriptures such as Gen. 8:21; Jer. 17:9; Mk. 7:21-23; Jn. 3:19; Rom. 8:7, 8; Eph. 4:17-19; Titus 1:15. The unsaved are called slaves of sin and of Satan in John 8:44; Eph. 2:1, 2; I Jn. 5:19; Jn. 8:34; Rom. 6:20; Titus 3:3. A number of passages such as Rom. 3:10-12 teach that there is none that seeks God and there is none that understands - not even one. In John 6:44 and other places we learn that not one person is able to come to God unless God draws (literally "drags") him.

The View of the Reformers - Total Depravity or Total Inability

Lest we be misunderstood, let us emphasize that church history never proves what is the truth of God - only the scriptures can prove this. However, the vast majority of those professing faith in Christ and in Him alone are willing to call Luther, Calvin and other leaders of the Reformation great Christians. What is amazing is that they do this while opposing what the Reformers saw as the issue of the Reformation. The doctrines we commonly call "Calvinism" were the basic issues of the Reformation. Since this doctrine of total depravity is so basic to the whole issue, we will spend some time to show that the Reformers saw it as basic.

Before Luther posted his 95 theses that shook the world, he already had published a list of 97 theses that laid the

groundwork of all that followed. These theses are today entitled "Disputation against Scholastic Theology" in Luther: Early Theological Works (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962 edited by James Atkinson. In this list there are a number of theses that touch on the nature of man. We list a few:

4. and so the truth is that man is created "a corrupt tree", and can neither will nor do anything except evil.
5. It is not true that the desire is free and is able to make one choice as well as another. In actual fact it is not free at all but is in bondage.
6. It is not true to say that the will is able of its own volition to conform itself to that which is right,
7. On the contrary, without the grace of God the will produces of necessity an action which is wicked and wrong,

Luther continues to state his conviction that man can't even love God. So basic was this to Luther's position that when Erasmus, the chief Roman Catholic writer against Luther's views, wrote he attacked Luther on this point and related issues such as predestination. Luther's response to Erasmus is still a classic. It's entitled The Bondage of the Will and several still publish it including an excellent edition published by Revell with a forward that summarizes much historical material. In the conclusion, we read:

"Moreover, I give you hearty praise and commendation on this further account that you alone, in contrast with all others, have attacked the real thing, that is, the essential issue. You have not wearied me with those extraneous issues about the Papacy, purgatory, indulgences and such like trifles, rather than issues in respect of Which almost all to date have sought my blood (though without success); you, and you alone have seen the hinge on which all turns, and aimed for the vital spot. For that I heartily thank you; for it is more gratifying to me to deal with this issue, insofar as time and leisure permit me to do so."

We have labored this point for several reasons:

It is basic - get this point right and the rest follow.

Many professing believers will praise the courage of the Reformers while denying what they taught on the central issue of the Reformation.

Many today profess to believe total depravity when they do not teach it at all. (We will comment more on this later.)

Let us elaborate a little on number 2 above. We have shown you Luther's view on this subject. Calvin's view was just as clear. It is clear in his Institutes. It is clear in his commentaries. We quote from his commentary on John 6. We urge the interested reader to go to the library and read this portion in its entirety. Here are some quotes:

- On **John 6:37** - "By these words He means that faith is not at men's disposal so that this man or that may believe indiscriminately and by chance, but that God elects those whom He hands over, as it were, to the Son,"
- On **John 6:44** - "Christ says that although the teaching of the Gospel is preached to all indiscriminately, it cannot be understood by all, but that a new mind and a new attitude are necessary. Therefore faith is not at men's disposal but conferred by God. "Hence it follows that not all are drawn, but that God honours with this grace those whom He has elected,"
- On **John 6:45** - "Again, as Christ earlier had denied that men are fitted for faith until they have been drawn, so He now declares that it is the effectual grace of the spirit by which they are drawn so that they necessarily believe," "The whole faculty of free will which the Papists dream about is utterly overturned by these two clauses,"

Much more could be said here but note that Calvin and Luther regarded the basic error of the Roman Catholic Church to be its contention that man's will is free (able) to respond to the gospel in a positive way.

Now, dear reader, what do you think of a person who praises Luther and Calvin in their stand against the Roman church when such folks believe that the unsaved are able to believe the gospel? You might say, "They praise their courage!" But, do you praise the courage of men who fight for error? Do you praise the courage of Karl Marx? Do you praise the courage of the Ayatollah in Iran? These men had courage for error.

No, indeed we regard those who are courageous for error foolhardy. How then can any honest person praise Luther and Calvin while arguing against them on this issue?

For those who are interested, the Council of Trent formulated Roman Catholic doctrine on these issues in opposition to Luther's views. The teaching of Trent centered on two issues (see Present Truth (October 1975) p. 16):

1. Justification is a real and profound transformation of man, a genuine gift of sanctification to him.
2. Man is not deprived of freedom, but cooperates through grace in justification and the process of salvation,

The Issue Stated - Unconditional Election

The Arminian View - Conditional Election

This view teaches that God's choice of certain individuals unto salvation before the foundation of the world was based upon something foreseen in the individual. Usually, it is stated that God foresaw who would believe or who would cooperate with the Spirit. Thus, the sinner's choice of God is the ultimate cause of God's choice.

The View of Calvinism - Unconditional Election

This view teaches that God's choice of certain individuals unto salvation before the foundation of the world rested Solely in His sovereign will.

The View of Scripture - Unconditional Election

That scripture teaches election both sides agree. It is the basis of election over which there is disagreement. Yet we see many scriptures that show that God's choice was sovereign and not

based on anything foreseen in the individual. The reader is urged to read Ram. 9:11-13; 9:16; 10:20; 1 Cor. 1:27-29; II Tim. 1:9. Good works are the result of God's choice - not it's cause - Eph. 2:10; John 15:16. Faith is the result of God's choice - Acts 13:48; 18:27; Phlp. 1:29; 2:12,13; I Thess. 1:4,5; II Thess. 2:13, 14; James 2:5. It is clear that faith cannot be both the cause of election, and also its effect. This makes faith the cause of faith!!!

The View of the Reformers - Unconditional Election

We will not labor the point as we did previously but it is clear that both Luther and Calvin were strong on this subject. Luther's comments on Romans 9 are exceedingly clear. Calvin's comments are even more forceful in his comments on John 10:8-16; II Pet. 3:9; Matt. 24:21-22 and a number of references in the Institutes. Again, we should emphasize that our faith rests on the scriptures not some group of teachers.

However, as before, we should not praise Luther and Calvin when we oppose what they saw as central in their opposition to Rome.

The Issue Stated - Limited Redemption

The Arminian View - Universal or General Redemption

Christ's redeeming work was intended for the salvation of all men. His death was for all men. Some who hold this view will state that all are reconciled but that not all are saved. Others state that Christ's death secured a potential redemption for all but not a certain redemption for any. The redemption becomes effectual upon man's acceptance.

The View of Calvinism - Particular or Limited Redemption

This view teaches that Christ's death was intended to secure the certain salvation of the elect only. His death was substitutionary on the behalf of the elect. Christ's death secured everything needed for their salvation including faith which unites them to God.

The View of Scripture - Particular Redemption

The issue is never the value of Christ's death. Christ's death was of such value that God, had He so intended, could have saved

every individual in all of history. The issue is what Christ accomplished in His death and what was intended in Christ's death. There is not one passage which speaks of "potential" redemption as an accomplishment of Christ's death. Instead, actual reconciliation, redemption, and justification are what Christ accomplished in His death - Rom. 5:8-10, II Cor. 5:18-19; Eph. 2:15-16, Col. 1:21-22; Rom. 3:24-25; Col. 1:13-14; Heb. 9:21; 1 Pet. 2:4. No thought in these verses of a "potential" redemption but rather there is the teaching of an actual redemption.

In addition, there are many passages that teach that Christ died for those whom the Father gave Him or that He died for the sheep or some other expression that implies that the work of Christ was for a particular group of people. Consider such passages as John 6:35-40; 10:11, 14-18; 10:24-29; 17:1-11, 20, 24-26. Some other passages which talk of the work of Christ in definite and particular terms - Acts 20:28; Eph. 5:25-27 (try to reconcile universal love with this passage!); Rom. 8:32-34; Heb. 9:15; Rev. 5:9.

The View of the Reformers - Particular Redemption

There is no question that the Reformers generally taught limited redemption. However, in all honesty, it must be admitted that in some of Luther's later works, he weakened on this issue. In Luther's commentary on Romans, he clearly saw that God's love for Jacob was related to his election, but references to his later works convince this writer that Luther had indeed weakened here. Perhaps, this is why the Lutherans have historically not been willing to hold the line on the subject of election. Indeed, this has nearly always been the case. Those who proclaim election but weaken on particular redemption sooner or later no longer teach election. Sad but true.

The other Reformers did hold the line. Calvin's testimony to the truth of God was consistent. In spite of men's efforts to misquote Calvin, it is clear that even in his later commentaries, limited redemption was his teaching. One of the most humorous phenomena in connection with Calvin's writings is the desire by non-Calvinists (Arminians) to misquote Calvin. In Calvin's comments on I John 2:2, he writes:

"Here a question may be raised, how have the sins of the

whole world been expiated? I pass by the dotages of the fanatics, who under this pretence extend salvation to all the reprobate, and therefore to Satan himself. Such a monstrous thing deserves no refutation. They, who seek to avoid this absurdity, have said that Christ suffered sufficiently for the whole world, but efficiently only for the elect. Though then I allow that what has been said is true, yet I deny that it is suitable to this passage; for the design of John was no other than to make this benefit common to the whole Church. Then under the word all or whole, he does not include the reprobate, but designates those who should believe as well as those who were then scattered through various parts of the world."

Note that Calvin calls fanatics those who would apply the passage to the reprobate (non-elect). The others he took issue with were believers in limited redemption who took this passage as a reference to the sufficiency of the work of Christ. The slogan "sufficient for all, efficient only for the elect" has been a common slogan among those who accept the five points of Calvinism.

Calvin's entire comments on I John 2:2 are very clear. Yet, Strong's Systematic Theology claims to quote from this commentary a statement denying the doctrine of limited redemption. I have not been able to find this passage allegedly quoted by Strong, under the possibility that the translation of Calvin's commentary or I John 2:2 was dishonest. I looked up the Latin original. It says the same thing, and clearly supports limited redemption. Those who care to translate the Latin, consider the following:

"Sed hic movetur quaestio, quomoda mundi totius peccata expientur. Omitto phreneticorum deliria, qui hoc praetextu reprobos omnes, adeoque Satanam ipsum in salutem admittunt, Tale portentum refutatiene idignum est. Qui hanc absurditatem volebant effugere, diserunt, sufficienter pro toto mundo possum esse Christum; sed pro electis tantum efficaciter. (lingo haec solutio in scholis obtinuit. Ego quamquam verum esse illud fuit consilium Iohannis, quam toti ecclesiae commune facere hoc bonum. Ergo sub omnibus reprobos non comprehendit; sed eos designat, qui simul credituri erant, et qui per varias mundi plagas

dispersi erant."

Unfortunately, the quote in Strong has found its way into other books as well (Strong himself did not claim to get it directly from Calvin's writings, but from a writer named Richards). From every indication, it is simply an untruth. If an author does not agree with Calvin it would be honest to so state. It is patently dishonest to assert that Calvin said something in his commentary on I John 2:2 that he did not say. To those who appeal to this alleged quotation to demonstrate that Calvin "moderated" his view of Limited Redemption in later years, we reply that, in some of Calvin's writings dated even later than his Commentaries, we find it clearly stated that the benefits and virtues of the death of Christ extend to the children of God alone, and that God does not will that all men without exception be saved.

Another trick by the dishonest writers is to quote Calvin out of and contrary to the context. One who does this has several times referred to Calvin's commentary on I Timothy 2:4. The quote he gives is "Paul demonstrates here that God hath at heart the salvation of all because he invites all to the acknowledgment of truth". There is no way for an honest person to so represent Calvin's views on this verse. We urge the reader to go to a library and read the entire passage for himself. We now give a longer quote from what Calvin said on I Timothy 2:4. (The reader will note a word or two different in what is quoted above. This is due to different translations from the original.)

"Lastly, he demonstrates that God has at heart the salvation of all, because he invites all to the acknowledgment of his truth. This belongs to that kind of argument in which the cause is proved from the effect; for, if "the gospel is the power of God for salvation to every one that believeth", (Rom. 1:16), it is certain that all those to whom the gospel is addressed are invited to the hope of eternal life,,,

"Hence we see the childish folly of those who represent this passage to be opposed to predestination. "If God," say they, "wishes all men indiscriminately to be saved, it is false that some are predestinated by his eternal purpose to salvation, and others to perdition,

They might have had some ground for saying this, if Paul were speaking here about individual men;,,,

"...for the Apostle simply means, that there is no people and no rank in the world that is excluded from salvation.... But the present discourse relates to classes of men, and not to individual persons; for his sole object is, to include in this number princes and foreign nations,"

The reader should, as mentioned above, secure the passage and study what Calvin actually says. We have quoted enough to show that those who quote the first statement and then stop have misrepresented Calvin. My dear reader, you might agree or disagree with Calvin, but to misrepresent what Calvin states is a lie. To do so after you have been told that you have done it is purposeful dishonesty - one who does so is a false teacher, He may be bright or even brilliant but he is a false teacher. He may be able to quote the entire Bible but he is a false teacher. He might even "rightly divide" the Word but he is a false teacher. No doubt such are guilty of the sin of Diotrephes (III John 9) who put himself first.

We have elaborated a little on this for we believe that there are many false teachers who distort the scriptures for their own ends and there are many who distort church history for the same reasons. Our reasons for believing any truth is that God's Word teaches it. If this means that we agree with Arminius so be it. And if it means that we agree with the Roman church and not with the Reformers so be it. But, it is not faithfulness to our convictions to distort what Calvin or anyone else has to say on the scriptures it is deliberate falsehood. Unfortunately, there are teachers of the word whose followers rarely if ever check up on them. But, they will lose out at the judgment seat if they are saved and at the Great White Throne if they are not.

So emotional and unthinking are some on this doctrine that in a recent publication a writer even stated, "...God certainly does not always do what He wishes, and especially not where to do so would violate His own holy standards". Now, I do not for one moment believe that the author of these words believes that God can wish something that violates His holy standards. However, he did get "carried away" in his article and made this statement. That I have not misunderstood is clear from the fact that two sentences

later he says, "God does not always do what he wishes; He always does what is right," (Emphasis his).

The Issue Stated - Irresistible Grace

The Arminian View - The Spirit's Work can always be Successfully Resisted.

This view teaches that the Spirit calls inwardly all who are called outwardly by the call of the gospel. He does all that He can do to bring every sinner to God, but some exercise their free will to resist Him and others exercise their free will to cooperate with Him and be saved.

The View of Calvinism - Irresistible Grace or The Efficacious Call.

This view teaches that in addition to the outward call of the gospel, the Spirit extends to the elect a special inward call that will inevitably bring them to salvation. This inward call that is special to the elect is always effectual. Man's will does not limit the Spirit's effectual work. Rather, the will of the elect is affected by this work so that they believe, repent and freely and willingly come to Christ.

The View of Scripture - Irresistible Grace

This doctrine is the natural counterpart to the rest of what we have noted. It is impossible to believe in Total Depravity and deny this precious truth. There are many passages that teach that it is God who changes the heart – Deut. 30:6; Ezek. 36:26; Gal. 6:15; John 5:21; Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:13.

In addition, there are the terms that are used that force this conclusion. A new birth (no person ever could decide to be or not to be born) - Titus 3:5; a new creation (the creature can't create itself) - Eph. 2:10; made alive (no one can self-resurrect or bring himself to life) - Eph. 2:1-3; a new heart (none can do this for himself or even will it or not) - Deut. 30:6; heart opened (none can do this); blind made to see; etc. Faith is spoken of as that which God gives to men – Eph. 2:8-9; Phlp. 1:29; Acts 13:48 and many other places.

The View of the Reformers - Irresistible Grace.

The Reformers were united on this point. Indeed, there is scarcely a mention of Total Depravity in their writings in which they do not also mention and teach Irresistible Grace. Again,

Luther's book The Bondage of the Will could just as easily be taken as a treatise on this issue as well.

The Issue Stated - Perseverance of the Saints

The Arminian View - Falling from Grace.

This view teaches that those who are saved and truly believe can lose their salvation.

The View of Calvinism - Perseverance of the Saints.

This view teaches that all who were chosen by God, redeemed by Christ, and regenerated by the Holy Spirit are eternally saved. They are kept in faith by the power of God and thus persevere.

The View of Scripture - Perseverance of the Saints

Not only does scripture abound with passages on this subject, it is even difficult to define the terms of the Arminian position in a way consistent with their view. If a man can lose his salvation, from what was he saved. If a man has been redeemed and loses it, from what was he redeemed? If a man were chosen and goes to hell, to what was he chosen? The scriptures clearly teach this truth in Romans 8:28-39 as well as a number of other passages.

The View of the Reformers - Perseverance of the Saints.

That this was the united view of the Reformers, no student of history doubts. We need not give any quotes here.

Summary of the Issues Above

We have pointed out the differences between the views of the Arminians and those of the Calvinists. We have also pointed out that at least some of these truths were right at the heart of the difference between Roman Catholicism and the Reformers, We have even pointed out that some false teachers distort the teaching of Calvin to make it appear that they deserve to be called Calvinist.

The basic difference between these two camps is that one has a religion which is man-centered and the other has a religion which is God-centered.

The Arminian has a religion that is man-centered. God is pictured as doing various things ultimately for man's good. Since

man is able to trust in Christ, it is important to such folk that gospel preaching appeals to man. If a man trusts in the Lord, it is common to congratulate that person and elevate the minister or personal worker.

What a contrast is Calvinism! God is pictured here and in scripture as doing all for His pleasure and glory. When a man trusts in the Lord, God alone is praised. The man involved is taught that he must thank God alone and take absolutely no credit ever for "spiritual attainment".

The Great Defection

Bible believers are often horrified at the twisted ways in which liberal theologians use Biblical terms. Yet, for the most part, those who profess to know the Lord have done much the same thing.

Some years ago, I knew a man who would say to me, "I am a five point Calvinist if you let me define the five points." What a travesty of truth! What dishonesty! To deceive others in this way is terrible. Yet it is common.

Many claim to believe in Total Depravity that do not so believe. They will say to you, "I just don't believe in total depravity as you define it." But there really is no other definition. There are other definitions of depravity but not of "total depravity". In the Merriam-Webster Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary under "total depravity" we read, "a state of corruption due to original sin held in Calvinism to infect every part of man's nature and to make the natural man unable to know or obey God."

Yet, today almost every fundamental and or evangelical "believer" claims to believe in total depravity yet accepts the Arminian position of depravity. This is clearly wrong. For those who know what the doctrine means, it constitutes falsehood.

Over the years, it has been my privilege to work with a number of those who ministered the word of God. Unfortunately, although every person I worked with in certain groups signed a statement affirming belief in total depravity very few of them really did hold this view and none ever taught the doctrine to me. God chose to use others and the writings of the past to show me what the scriptures taught.

Indeed, some of the writings of those with whom I served are clearly against the doctrine of total depravity. One writer pictured Calvinism as the tool of the devil. In one of his writings, Lucifer sends a False Prophet with the TULIP (five points of Calvinism) in order to stop all of the missionary work that is going on. Included in the "TULIP" is of course the doctrine that the unbeliever can't be convinced unless the Spirit irresistibly opens his heart. This leaflet clearly states that its author is against the Calvinistic doctrine of total depravity and lists all of the five points we have listed. There is no mistaking this author's meaning; these doctrines, including total depravity, have been the cause of less missionary effort.

What a dishonest charade this leaflet is!!! First, its author has signed doctrinal statements affirming belief in total depravity (that is, he belonged to such organizations which asserted that to disagree with any part of the creed was sufficient reason for any person to remove himself from the organization). In doing this, he deceived the masses of people who assumed that he believed the doctrinal statement. His dishonesty is no different from that of the liberals who sabotaged the main-line denominations a century ago by claiming to believe the creed while not agreeing with it on certain points.

But, there is more - much more to this kind of crookedness. Most of history's greatest missionaries and evangelists were strong Calvinists. Spurgeon, Brainerd, Edwards, Knox, Whitefield just to name a few. The gall, the unmitigated gall in writing a story that implies that the God-centered view of the Calvinists would weaken the gospel and it's preaching when this is its greatest strength.

You can write a story so that your side is the best. But to defeat these precious truths, the entire Bible will have to be rewritten.

Another author who asserts belief in total depravity by his signing a doctrinal statement has also in recent years opposed this important truth. He writes, "Extreme Calvinists often ask us, with regard to Eph. 2:1, 'How can a dead person believe?' ... Why could God be angry with them if they were dead so that they could not believe?"

Note again the same spirit as in the first writer:

1. Each author denied the truth of total depravity while signing doctrinal statements affirming belief in this truth.

Each writer slandered those who believed the truth.

Note the slander of this second writer - "Extreme Calvinists" No one in history ever challenged Calvin's or Luther's belief in total depravity. In fact, as we have shown, it was precisely on this point that the Council of Trent took issue with the Reformers. You see, if you are big in an organization and brand another as "Extreme" it works. Your "opponent" is discredited. What else you say doesn't really matter. In fact, only a short while before the above was written this same author wrote, "The Word teaches that the unbeliever is 'dead in trespasses and sins' (Eph. 2.1). Can a dead sinner then repent, confess and believe apart from the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit? No, Eph. 2:5 declares that it is God who 'quickened us together with Christ' when we were "dead in sins." This last quote appeared in a denunciation of the neo-evangelicals (who assuredly should be denounced on this and other issues). What hypocrisy is there to slander those who believe your own writings. Believe it or not, he still sells this writing which he now calls "Extreme Calvinism". What hypocrisy is there for those who follow a person like that!

There is so much more like this. One writer actually calls Calvin an ultra-Calvinist. How absurd!

Conclusion

My dear reader, there are some important points here for you to ponder. First, face up to the scriptures honestly on the five points that distinguish the Calvinist from the Arminian.

Second, be honest about your beliefs and how they relate to others in history. If you do not agree with total depravity, admit it. Call your view of depravity the Arminian view. Call it depravity. But for honesty's sake, do not call it total depravity; do not call it the view of Calvin.

Third, note which Bible teachers misrepresent the truth and slander the opposition. They have proved themselves to be false teachers. There is another misrepresentation on which we have not even touched - giving saints false information about Greek or

Hebrew words. This is so common today.

Fourth, dedicate your life anew to the Lord. Make it your goal to live for the Lord. Do not live for an organization! Do not play politics in Christian circles! We know that to stand for God's truth will not win us friends here below but that should not be our goal.

We close by quoting from Paul's first prayer in Ephesians 1:17-20:

"That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him. The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, ..."

Yes, it took resurrection power, not persuasion, to save the sinner. God grant that you might be convicted on this point.

Creation Science - It's Time to Listen^{39 40}

edited by Dr. David Rodabaugh

What we believe about our origin is of great importance to our lives, for what we believe about our origin inevitably conditions what we believe about our destiny. Currently, what is being taught in the classrooms of our public schools and universities is that the theory of evolution gives a scientific explanation for these origins. Since the Supreme Court banned the exclusive teaching of creation in our schools, it has gotten to the point where evolution is taught exclusively. Textbooks for our public schools have in fact turned the Supreme Court decision into a ban on the teaching of creationism. It is my observation that by the time we have graduated from high school or college, we have become so saturated with evolution that it is implanted in many of our minds as an undeniable fact. Evolution, however, is not an undeniable fact. In fact, there are a growing number of scientists and people who feel that creation provides a superior account for origins. These people feel that apart from the Bible there is an immense amount of scientific evidence to support creation. This is why it is called creation science.

I feel it is important that the creation science model of origins be taught on an equal basis with that of evolution. There is really no reason why creation should not receive this equality unless it can be shown to be strictly a religious viewpoint and scientifically bankrupt. These were the accusations made on January 5, 1982 by Judge William Ray Overton when he ruled against the state of Arkansas in the case of McLean vs. Arkansas State Board of Education over the "Balanced Treatment for Creation - Science and Evolution - Science Act." These are also the same bases for judgment by all evolutionists against creation

³⁹ This article is an edited version of a classroom assignment in an English course. Interestingly enough, the instructor gave high marks for the points made

⁴⁰ This article concerns itself with the creation-science issue. The believer's commitment to creation is based on taking God at His Word.

(Jurmain 24-25)⁴¹. However, upon taking a close look at these two models of origins I think that we will find that neither of these accusations can stand. First of all, creation is no more religious than is evolution. Secondly, current scientific evidence clearly contradicts evolution's hypotheses and yet is in strict accordance with the predictions of the creation model.

Although the evolutionist complains that creation implies religion, this is in the same sense true of evolution. According to the *General Theory of Evolution*, all living things have arisen by a naturalistic, mechanistic, evolutionary process from a single living source which itself arose by a similar process from a dead, inanimate world. (Gish, p. 17) It is the origin of life from nonliving matter without intelligent planning. Creation on the other hand claims that life was brought into being suddenly by a divine creator. Creation thus says that there is a God, where evolution denies it.

Where creation supports theistic religions, evolution supports atheism and other non-theistic religions such as humanism. Says Wysong, "Evolutionists attribute to time, chance and nature the capacities that creationists attribute to God. (13, p. 419)" Both beliefs are held sacred to the individuals in a religious manner. Louis T. More, a noted paleontologist and evolutionist, states:

The more one studies paleontology, the more certain one becomes that evolution is based on faith alone; exactly the same sort of faith which it is necessary to have when one encounters the great mysteries of religion. (160-161)

More has recognized how persistent he and his colleagues have been to maintain the dogma of evolution regardless of scientific evidence. The writer of the Foreword of the 1971 edition of Darwin's *Origin of the Species*, himself a distinguished evolutionary biologist, has also recognized that evolution is simply a belief. He declares, "[The theory of evolution] forms a satisfactory faith on which to base our interpretation of nature."

In fact, evolution is an integral part of the non-theistic religion of humanism. This is proclaimed by literature printed by

⁴¹ Reference to the Bibliography

the humanists themselves. A pamphlet released by The Humanist Community of San Jose (California), a chapter of the American Humanist Association, quotes the following statement by Sir Julian Huxley, British biologist, and evolutionist:

I use the word "Humanist" to mean someone who believes that man is just as much a natural phenomenon as an animal or plant; that his body, mind, and soul were not supernaturally created but are products of *evolution*, and that he is not under the control or guidance of any powers. (Morris 81)

Thus, humanism is an atheistic religion with evolution as its basic dogma. While evolution is falsely being pushed as pure science, the students are being denied the opportunity to hear the alternative of creation on the grounds that it is religious.

Judging on religious implications, therefore, we can see that evolution has no more right in our schools than does creation. Although separation of religion and state has been one of the main arguments against creation's being taught, I don't think that this is a valid reason to throw either theory out. However, it is a valid reason for teaching both sides. If we don't teach both viewpoints, then we do get into a problem of state sponsored religion. Our freedom of religion is taken away when we are only allowed to hear one side of the story.

Creationists are not attempting to oust evolutionary humanism from the public schools, but only to obtain a fair hearing for theistic creationism as an alternative. Both concepts involve faith and neither is scientifically testable in the ultimate sense.

This is due to the fact that the scientific method is based on experimental observation and repeatability, neither of which can be applied to origins.

Evolution literature consistently portrays the viewpoint of the creationist as unscientific and immediately states definitions of science according to the scientific method as proof.

A hypothesis is empirical or scientific only if it can be tested by experience ... A hypothesis or theory which cannot be, at least in principle, falsified by empirical

observations and experiments does not belong to the realm of science. (Ayala 700)

Although the above statement was issued by a leading evolutionary biologist, it would exclude evolution, no less than creation, from the realm of science because neither evolution nor creation is falsifiable, nor can either of them be observed. In fact there are now many evolutionists who recognize that the evolutionary theory is really a tautology and thus not falsifiable.

I argue that the "theory of evolution" does not make predictions, so far as ecology is concerned, but is instead a logical formula which can be used only to classify empiricisms and to show the relationships which such a classification implies ... these theories are actually tautologies and, as such, cannot make empirically testable predictions. *They are not scientific theories at all.* (Peters 1)

Theodosius Dobzhansky, a leading evolutionist, has admitted that the experimental method is an "impossibility" when applied to evolution (388). This is because evolution operates too slowly for scientific observation.

Although it is impossible to scientifically prove which of the two viewpoints is really true, it is possible to construct two scientific models and make predictions based on these models. Proven laws of logic and probability can then be applied as a means of scientific comparison. The model having the most scientific evidence supporting its predictions would be considered the explanation most scientifically probable.

According to Gish, the creation model would predict a sudden appearance in the fossil record of highly complex forms of life without evidence of ancestral forms. All of the major types of life, that is the basic plant and animal forms would appear abruptly in the fossil record without evidence of transitional forms linking one basic kind to another (6).

The evolution model, on the other hand, would predict that as living forms diverged into the millions of species which have existed in the past and which exist today, we would find a slow and gradual transition of one form into another. We would predict that

new types would not appear suddenly in the fossil record.

Scientific evidence clearly contradicts these predictions of evolution, but is in strict accordance with those based the model of creation. For a long time the fossil record was cited as the main proof of evolution; however, this has changed. Dr. Mark Ridley, of Oxford University's Department of Zoology, now says: "In any case, no real evolutionist, whether gradualist or punctuationist, uses the fossil record as evidence in favor of the theory of evolution as opposed to special creation" (831). This is because the fossil record clearly lacks any proof of transitional forms necessary to the theory of evolution, and the record does not display a gradual evolution at all. Morris quotes Dr. D. V. Ager then president of the British Geological Association, in his 1976 presidential address, saying:

It must be significant that nearly all the evolutionary stories I learned as a student have now been debunked. The point emerges that, if we examine the fossil record in detail, whether at the level of orders or of species, we find-over and over again -- not gradual evolution, but the sudden explosion of one group at the expense of another. (66-67)

Concerning the evolution of plant life, Professor Corner of the Botany Department of Cambridge University, though an evolutionist himself, was quoted by Gish as saying: "... but I still think that to the unprejudiced, the fossil record of plants is strictly in favor of special creation" (86-87). Thus, as we add more and more evidence to the fossil record, it is creation and not evolution which appears to prosper scientifically.

Apart from the fossil record lacking evidence for evolution, the evolutionist is faced with the extreme improbability of life arising from non-life through random, naturalistic processes. Morris quotes the distinguished British astronomer, Sir Fred Hoyle, picturesquely describing the possibility of this occurring:

At all events, anyone with even a nodding acquaintance with the Rubik cube will concede the near-impossibility of a solution being obtained by a blind person moving the cubic faces at random. Now imagine 10^{50} (1 followed by 50 zeros) blind persons each with a scrambled Rubik cube, and try to conceive of the chance of them all *simultaneously* arriving at the solved form. You then have

the chance of arriving by random shuffling at just one of the many biopolymers on which life depends. The notion that not only biopolymers but the operating program of a living cell could be arrived at by chance in a primordial organic soup here on the Earth is evidently nonsense of a high order. (29)

The evolutionists don't refute this fact, but merely state that given enough time even the impossible becomes possible (Jurmain 40-52). *Giving* this supernatural power to the element of time, however, I see as no more superstitious or scientific than giving the credit to God. Evolution, in addition to contradicting all laws of probability and logic, also is at odds with many well-established laws of physics and biology. Many scientists and evolutionists can see this and have expressed their doubts. One angry scientist, in a letter which appeared in *New Scientists* stated in part,

... despite the hostility of the witness provided by the fossil record, despite the innumerable difficulties, and despite the lack of even a credible theory, evolution survives ... Can there be any other area of science, for instance, in which a concept as intellectually barren as embryonic recapitulation could be used as evidence for a theory? (Danson 35)

With all of these holes and gaps in the theory of evolution, it seems that there is certainly room in the textbooks and our classrooms for creation science. After all, when the facts of the real world are considered, creationism fits them more naturally than does evolutionism.

Creation should certainly be taught on an equal basis with evolution in our public schools. It is neither more religious than evolution nor scientifically inferior. Furthermore, comparing the two models of origins stimulates real thinking on the part of the student. Teaching only evolution is also discriminatory to those of us who, for whatever reason, believe in creation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ayala, F. "Biological Evolution: Natural Selection or Random Walk?" *American Scientist*, Vol. 62, 1974: 700.

Coppedge, J. *Evolution: Possible or Impossible -Grand Rapids*: Zondervan Publishing House, 1973

Danson, R. *New Scientist*, Vol. 49, 1971: 35

Dobzhansky, T. "On Methods of Evolutionary Biology and Anthropology," *American Scientist*, Vol. 45, 1957: 388

Jurmain, R. & Nelson H. *Introduction to Physical Anthropology*, 3rd Edition. New York: West Publishing Co., 1985

Gish, D. *Evolution: The Fossils say No!*. San Diego: ICR Publishing Co., 1973.

Matthews, L. *The Origin of Species*, London: J. M. Dent, 1977: xii.

More, L. *The Dogma of Evolution*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1925: 160-161.

Morris, H. *Evolution in Turmoil*. San Diego: CreationLife Publishers, 1982

Myers, E. "Aristotle And Creationism." *Creation Research Society Quarterly* June 1987: 5-8.

Peters, R. "Tautology in Evolution and Ecology," *American Naturalist*, Vol. 110, No. 1, 1976:1

Ridley, M. "Who Doubts Evolution?" *New Scientist*, Vol. 90, June 25. 1981: 831

Wysong, R. *Creation-Evolution: The Controversy*. East Lansing: Inquiry Press, 1976

Our Basis For Truth

by Dr. David Rodabaugh

Introduction

Of fundamental importance to all who claim to seek God's will is, "What is the basis of truth"?

There are several views that are held:

1. Philosophical speculation.
2. Some other book (e.g. the Koran).
3. The Bible PLUS
 - a. Other inspired writings e.g. the Book of Mormon.
 - b. Current prophetic utterances
 - c. Church traditions such as that of the Roman Catholic Church and other groups.
4. The Bible alone.

Among those who profess faith in the Bible alone there is also the concern of the status of certain books such as 1 Maccabees.

This issue is the basic issue. Settling it sets the tone for how we arrive at all truth. We can't even begin to discuss truth until we settle this issue.

The Folly of Philosophical Speculation

To begin with, many who reject revelation also reject the idea of God. Such is absolute folly. As Paul in Romans 1:18-21 taught,

'For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth. For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. Ever since the creation of the world his invisible nature, namely, his eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse; for although they knew God they did not honor him, but they became futile in their thinking and their senseless minds were darkened.'

There is no such thing as an honest and unbiased person who really studies the marvels of creation and concludes that there is no God. Men suppress the truth because of the wickedness in their hearts. Indeed (Jer 17:9), "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked".

This is the reason why the secular humanists want so much to suppress so much as a mention of creation in our school rooms. The natural world screams, "THERE IS A CREATOR." They don't want that thought to be expressed.

Yes, the natural world with its order proves the existence of an intelligent creator, and, this does imply that men will have to answer to this creator.

Another point that needs to be made is that there is no way for men to find out about God's plans apart from revelation. God is an infinite being. We are finite, He knows everything. Even the smartest human knows only a very small fraction of what there is to know.

Given these considerations, how can a finite mind (or even four billion finite minds) figure out the intentions of an infinite mind? He can't. There is no way!

If God had not chosen to reveal himself to man, there would be absolutely no way for man to know anything about God's ways.

We confess that this is a very brief section on this important subject. Books have been written on it. However, we close this section with an observation from Psalm 8: 3-4,

"When I look at thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast established; what is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou dost care for him?"

The Uniqueness of the Bible

The Bible-- that unique book formed from Hebrew and Greek scriptures, is the most unique book in the world.

There is a common view that all religions are trying to do the same thing-- make men get along better with other men.

Believe it or not, that is not the central theme of the Bible. Its

chief message is about God. Its chief goal in the lives of men is that they might see themselves as God sees them. Its foremost impact in the lives of believers is that they might, through the work of Christ, be made acceptable to a holy God who is supremely offended by their sins.

Of course, men whose lives are changed toward God will behave differently toward their fellow man. However, they might not behave as men would have them behave. For, our chief concern with others is that they might learn what God says.

Think about the uniqueness of the Biblical message. We list a few teachings that make the scriptures stand apart from all other writings that claim inspiration.

1. Its writers are not eulogized. Think of it. We learn from the Bible of the sins of David even though he is clearly a hero in scripture. We learn of the sin of Moses. What other "sacred book" is so honest?
2. Its teachings about God are unique.
 - a. God is eternal -- Ps 90:2
 - b. God is sovereign - Isa 46:9, 10. Believe it or not, heathen gods like the gods of the Hindus are finite creatures. In no way do they rival the God of the Bible.
 - c. God is omnipotent – Jer. 32:27. By this is meant that God has the power to do whatever he wishes. God cannot be overcome by vote or power. He simply can't be challenged.
 - d. God is omniscient - Ps 147:5. God knows all past, present, and future. This implies, among other things, that God knows our faults and sins,
 - e. God is omnipresent - Jer 23:24.
 - f. God is immutable - Heb 13:18; Jas 1:17
 - g. God is to be man's judge - Gen 18:25
 - h. God is inflexibly just - Num 14:18
 - i. God is absolutely holy - Isa 6:5 Contrast this with

the heathen gods who engage in affairs and other follies.

Clearly, these heathen deities are angels, not rivals of the God of the Bible

3. The Bible alone tells us of the DEPRAVITY OF THE HUMAN HEART - Jer. 17:9, Man is not "basically good" as is so often taught even by some who are falsely called Christian. Man is absolutely and totally incapable of pleasing God. Man is even unwilling to want to please God.
4. The Bible teaches that the WORLD HATES GOD - Jn 15:18, 19, Men do not necessarily hate a god they hate the God of the Bible. They would love to have a god like the heathen. Some who reject that would love a god who chooses to not exercise his sovereign will in salvation, but, they hate the God of the Bible,
5. The Bible teaches that SIN IS HEINOUS AND THAT MAN CANNOT COMPENSATE FOR IT - Ps 51:4; Rom 6:23. Think of the different religions that teach that if man just cuts himself or pays a fine then his sin is gone.
6. The Bible teaches that the PUNISHMENT OF SIN IS ETERNAL - Mk 9:48; Rev 20:10; 14:11 (cf Lk 16:24).
7. The Bible teaches that SALVATION IS BY GRACE ONLY - Eph 2:8,9
8. The Bible teaches that the saved have a future in eternal bliss.

The Bible has a unique message. No other writing(s) can claim this. The Hindus and the ancient Greeks have their gods as do all other heathen religions (with the exception of the Moslems). These gods fight and fume among themselves. One appeases first this one then that one.

Not so in the Bible. There is but one God. While there are three persons, they are united in every way. No differences of opinion among the members of the Trinity.

God is sovereign and able to do whatever he wishes. Not one event in history has happened without God's desire that it happen.

Prophecies prove the Bible is of God

Believe it or not, the Word of God dares men to challenge it. The appeal is constantly made to think and not just to feel.

A most remarkable passage is found in Isaiah 41:21-24,

"Present your case," says the LORD 'Set forth your arguments,' says Jacob's King. 'Bring in your idols to tell us what is going to happen. Tell us what the former things were, so that we may consider them and know their final outcome. Or declare to us the things to come, tell us what the future holds, so we may know that you are gods. Do something, whether good or bad, so that we will be dismayed and filled with fear. But you are less than nothing and your works are utterly worthless he who chooses you is detestable.'" (NIV)

Yes, God throws down a challenge to any false god. And, that challenge still stands. But, there is a very somber catch. In Deuteronomy 18:20-22, we read:

"But the prophet who shall speak a word presumptuously in my name which I have not commanded him to speak, or which he shall speak in the name of other gods, that prophet shall die. And you may say in your heart, 'How shall we know the word which the LORD has not spoken?' When a prophet speaks in the name of the LORD, if the thing does not come about or come true, that is the thing which the LORD has not spoken. The prophet has spoken it presumptuously; you shall not be afraid of him." (NASB)

A great deal of the Bible is prophecy. Some of it has been fulfilled and some of it will still be fulfilled. Not once has a fulfillment failed.

Some of the most amazing prophecies that have been fulfilled are those concerning the first coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. The very first prophecy in the Bible is in Gen 3:15 where we read, "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Note that Christ is called the woman's seed unique in scripture. We already have an indication of the miraculous in

connection with the birth of Jesus Christ.

It is easy to compile quite a list of prophecies concerning the first coming of Christ. Here are a few:

Born in Bethlehem - Mic 5:2.

Had a forerunner - Mal 3:1,

To ride into Jerusalem on a colt - Zech 4:9

1. Betrayed and had wounds in his hands - Zech 13:6
2. Though innocent, yet he presented no defense Isa 53:7.
3. Betrayal price (30 pieces of silver) into a potter's field - Zech 11:12.

To be crucified - Ps 22:16.

4. The year of his death given - Dan 9:25-26.
5. Virgin birth - Gen 3:15; Isa. 7:14; Jer 31:22.

Flight into Egypt - Hos 11:1,

His many miracles - Isa 35:5-6,

6. The manner of betrayer's death - Ps 55:15,23,
7. Desertion by disciples - Zech. 13:7
8. Lots cast for vesture - Ps 22:18,

This is but a small sample of the prophecies concerning Christ's first coming. Yet they happened.

These facts prove two things. The Bible is the Word of God and Jesus Christ is the one he claimed to be.

There is no other book that can claim legitimately to have fulfilled prophecy like the Bible. The challenge in Isa 41:21-24 is yet unanswered.

Years ago, while working a summer for a research firm in Kansas City, two of us who knew the Lord debated (discussed) spiritual matters with two who were Mormons. When we talked of fulfilled prophecy, they mentioned that Joseph Smith had prophesied. "What?" we asked. We were told that Joseph Smith had

predicted the Civil War. Half of the people in the country were predicting such a war at the time. This is not a prophecy. It is a prediction.

Recently on a 'Christian' TV program, the host admitted that some of their prophecies in the past had been in error. I could hardly believe my ears. Think of it. This was an admission that they were false prophets, According to Deut 18:20-22, they were admitting to either fraud or inspiration of demons!

No, the challenge is still there. The Pentecostals (today they are called 'Charismatics') don't measure up. The Koran, Book of Mormon, and Science and Health do not measure up. Church tradition does not measure up. Only the Bible has fulfilled prophecy as its unmistakable stamp of inspiration.

(The interested reader might take just the 14 prophecies about Christ and note how improbable the events are. Such an analysis will convince the honest inquirer that only the Bible measures up.)

The Solitariness of the Bible

One last point should be mentioned. As a consequence of what has been said above, the Bible and it ALONE can be our only basis for truth.

Our constant refrain on any spiritual matter must be that of the apostle Paul in Gal 4:30, "But what does the scripture say?" There is no other way.

But some honest inquirer might wonder just which books should be in the Bible. To begin with, there is essential agreement on the New Testament.

The disagreement over the Old Testament has been over certain books never recognized by our Lord as scripture. In Luke 24:44, Christ said, "Everything must be fulfilled that is written about me in the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms." This division of the Old Testament into Law, Prophets and Psalms is still followed in the Hebrew Bible, and the Hebrew Bible has NEVER HAD THE ADDITIONAL BOOKS.

Much more could be added on this point, but this ought to be sufficient. By the way, the issue would be even more apparent if the Reformers had followed the canonical order of the books of the Old

Testament. The Reformers kept the correct books but allowed them to remain in the wrong order.

Let us return to the main idea of this section. The Bible stands apart from all other writings. It alone has the proof of its inspiration in its unique quality and its fulfilled prophecies.

Without the Bible, God is unknowable for man can't reason God out for himself. No writing meets the criterion of God's Word except the Bible. It is the Bible or nothing.

If you do not believe that the Bible is the Word of God and the only basis for truth then you are committed to remain in the dark about spiritual matters. You may understand all sorts of things but, you are ignorant spiritually.

Application of the Truth

"All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work." (2 Tim 3:16-17, NIV)

A realization that the Bible is the only basis for truth has tremendous consequences. We will briefly comment on a few.

You need to be saved.

There is no other way to put it. The Bible clearly declares that you are a terrible sinner. Listen to God's evaluation of you in Romans 3:10-12 (NIV).

"There is no one righteous, not even one; there is no one who understands, no one who seeks God. All have turned away, they have together become worthless; there is no one who does good, not even one." (Ps 14:1-3)

Much more is given in this and in other passages. God declares that you are a sinner by nature and by practice. God states that you are spiritually dead, blind, and deaf.

In short, God says that you are rotten. This is the part that men have so much trouble accepting. They will admit that they sin even that they sin a lot, but, they will not admit that they are rotten.

(Years ago, some who professed to know the Lord objected to calling men 'rotten', However, this is the type of term that God

uses. Perhaps those who objected have yet to see the truth of the awfulness of their condition in the sight of God.)

The Bible declares that God is a holy God. As such, he can't tolerate sin much less the rottenness that we present to him.

In the light of this, God (Acts 17:30-31, "commands all people everywhere to repent. For he has set a day when he will judge the world with justice by the man he has appointed. He has given proof of this to all men by raising him from the dead.")

The resurrection of Christ actually proves two things to men in general, it proves that God will indeed judge the world, to the believer; it proves that God accepted the sacrifice of Christ on the cross.

With respect to the first, men everywhere are called upon to repent. Turn from your wicked way to the Lord, and, quit claiming that your way isn't wicked. It is!

With respect to the second, God's Word declares that Christ on the cross of Calvary died for the sins of believers. His sacrifice on the cross satisfies the justice of a holy God, and, Christ's resurrection signaled acceptance by God of that sacrifice.

God therefore calls upon you to believe that Christ died on the cross for sinners and to repent. Having repented and believed that only through Christ can you be saved, you can rest assured (Romans 8:32), "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not freely give us all things?"

Your doctrine must come from the Bible.

Recall that in 2 Tim 3:16-17, we are told that the scripture is profitable for doctrine. No other book can claim this. The Bible is our basis and our source.

It has been said that Christianity is the religion of a book. It is true that our faith centers about the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, it is still the case that our faith centers on what a certain book tells us about Christ.

We are not allowed to come to this book with prejudice about anything. We must learn from it and bow to its authority.

Bible study takes effort and Bible study brings humbling.

First, we must study. My, how people hate that. They would far rather be entertained at church. They would far rather watch TV (even 'christian' TV) than to study the Word of God. We are told to study (2 Timothy 2:15), but, study is not enough. We must accept the fruit of our study and apply it to our doctrine and practice.

Think of some of the things a careful study of the Bible forces:

1. The Bible must be taken literally. To do otherwise is to prejudice the outcome. To do otherwise is to assume you know OUTSIDE OF SCRIPTURE what is right and what is wrong.
2. Such study forces you to make a distinction between what God has for the Jew in the future and what God has for the Body of Christ in the future. Those who are saved today become members of the Body of Christ.

We must accept the doctrine of a sovereign God.

Much more could be said here and we will be more than glad to furnish other helpful literature where desired. For our purposes here, let it be emphasized that acceptance of the Bible as our ONLY basis for truth forces our doctrine. We can't object to an idea or support an idea unless our response begins with, "Nevertheless, what does the scripture say?"

Your practice must conform to the Bible

We live in such a sick society that it is hard to know where to begin. The Bible condemns a number of things accepted by modern America.

For example, the Bible clearly condemns homosexuality. It is not an 'alternate life style'. God calls it a capital offense.

Another example: The Bible calls adultery a capital offense.

I fully appreciate that we are not to take the law in our own hands. However, let us quit treating these sins as minor little offenses. They are terribly serious.

Other things the Bible teaches that our society does not like include clear condemnation of abortion. According to scripture, the

man is the head of the house, etc.

And, there are other matters. You must read and study and memorize the Word of God and let it speak to you about your own life.

In Conclusion

Yes, the Bible is THE BASIS FOR TRUTH. We must read it, study it, memorize it and meditate upon it.

It is our prayer first that you will trust in the Christ of the Bible and then study the Word of God for all of your truth.

The Danger of Counterfeit Faith

by Dr. David Rodabaugh

The most frightening prospect facing a man is that of spending eternity in the lake of fire. Those in the lake of fire will drink of the undiluted wrath of God (Rev. 14:10,) Furthermore, we are told that the smoke of their torment will ascend up for ever and ever.

The most marvelous prospect facing a man is that of spending eternity with the Lord. Scripture pictures this as eternal bliss.

What a contrast! What a difference!

Obviously, then, the most important question facing a person is, "Will you spend eternity with the Lord or will you spend eternity in the lake of fire?"

The Bible gives us the basis for the answer to this question. Unfortunately, much of what the Bible says has been distorted, even by those claiming to preach the gospel. We live in a country where over 40% of the adults claim to be born again, yet, it's clear that most of those who claim to be born again are living in sin with essentially no interest in what God says about their lives.

If you were to quiz one of these people about their faith, they would assure you that they believe in Jesus Christ. In fact, they would further assure you that they believe that Christ died for their sins and that their sins are forgiven. There are many not claiming to be born again that claim faith in Christ.

Yet such people are frequently assured that if they have 'believed in Christ' then they can be sure they are saved even if their lives reek with sin. It is surprising that even some who claim to be students of the Word, write and or endorse articles pushing such ideas.

We believe that such ideas are totally contrary to the Word of God. Unfortunately, there are many who are constantly being assured by such teachers that they are saved when they are not. The situation is so bad that it is safe to say that the vast majority of those who say they are saved are not. Indeed, many (if not most) of those in conservative or fundamental churches may have been deluded into believing they are saved because they remember some

'going forward' experience in the past.

Much of the trouble begins with a defective gospel. Men are told to believe in Christ without ever being told to repent. They are not told the awfulness of sin. Oh, they may be told the awful consequences of sin but they are not told the awfulness of sin. God is never pictured to them as one who is full of wrath at sin but rather He is pictured as one who is only too willing to ignore sin.

Not that there isn't some truth in what is said. But, a half gospel is not gospel, it is serious error. The scripture talks of those who believed but were lost. One interesting case is that of Simon the sorcerer. Turn to Acts 8 and read the entire account. Several times in the narrative, the case of Simon is separated from that of all the others who had believed. We are told in verse 13 that Simon believed, But later in the verse we see that Simon was overly interested in the miracles that Philip and possibly others did. In verses 18 and 19, we find that Simon wanted the apostolic gift of being able to confer on others miraculous power and offered money for this. It is clear from what Peter said to Simon that he was not saved. (That he needed according to verse 22, was to repent for, as Peter said to Simon, "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God.")

Yet, some will assert that Simon was saved because the passage says that he believed. With this in mind, let us consider John 8:27-44. In this passage a group of people who believe on Jesus are called children of the devil.

Let us look at the passage in greater detail. The immediate context does not mention any great miracles so we can't claim that they only were fond of His miracles.

No, the scripture clearly teaches that their faith was on Christ as He was teaching them (verses 27-30).

In verse 31, Jesus addressed those who believed on Him. His comments were totally unlike those normally given today to those who profess to believe on Christ. Christ told them that they were truly His disciples if they continued in His Word and that in so continuing they would truly be free (verses 31-32).

This does not for one moment teach that one who truly trusts the Lord is not immediately saved. What it does teach is that one

who truly trusts in the Lord will continue in His Word. The concept of trusting in the Lord and then having no abiding evidence of salvation in the life is absolutely foreign to the testimony of scripture.

There was a very basic point in Christ's near rebuke of those who had believed. He wanted them to see that they were in total bondage to sin and unless the Spirit had done His perfect work in their hearts, they were not saved. This very important doctrine is in most instances today totally missing from any gospel preaching. The Bible declares time and time again that apart from the Spirit's sovereign work, men will follow the dictates of their depraved natures and will turn their backs on God. Oh, they may have a temporary interest in the things of God. They may show a temporary interest in the Word, in prayer, in purity of life. They may even show a temporary interest in testifying. But, if their interest does not endure, it is evidence that it was not the work of God. It was rather from another source. It was counterfeit.

Years ago in Columbia Missouri, there was a young man who was very active in church as well as other Christian organizations. I was told that he was always eager to give his testimony. He was eager to study and to engage in other activities which are normally taken as evidence of being saved. He clearly stated that he had trusted the Lord.

When I arrived in Columbia, some who knew John suggested that I call on him. He had quit attending services when certain things had happened in his church. Imagine my surprise when John assured me that though he once believed on Christ, he no longer did. In fact, John had become a confirmed atheist, because John had totally renounced God, Christ and the Bible. Christians seem to have no problem in admitting that he was no doubt never saved.

But, suppose John still claimed to believe while no longer showing interest in the things of God. Suppose he lived in open immorality. Suppose he drank heavily, etc. Would Christians then admit that this was a mere professor of eternal life and not a possessor? I think not! They would only continue to state, "But, he believes".

Let us again join the narrative in John 8. Remember that in verses 31 and 32, Jesus is addressing those who had believed on

Him. This was not some number counting evangelist trying to drum up support for his ministry. This is the commentary by the Holy Spirit. These men believed on Him.

When our Lord told them that they should continue in the truth and they would be truly free, they rebelled (verse 33). They assumed that they were never in bondage to anything because they were Jewish. Christ's response to them was that they were in bondage to sin (verse 34).

They so hated this doctrine of "total depravity" that they desired to kill Him (verses 35-37). Those who profess faith in Christ clearly fall into two groups--those who find it impossible to believe that they were ever in total bondage to sin and those who are able to admit it. There are those who freely admit that their salvation was the sovereign work of God and those who ultimately find such teaching abhorrent and wish at least the feeling that they were able to do the slightest thing if only to believe, and the Bible makes it clear that the one group are truly saved and the other consists of lost people on their way to hell.

For, in trusting Christ, we must repent. We must come to the end of ourselves. We must come to say that in our flesh dwells no good thing. It does not matter that some of us may have been raised in Christian homes--we are still totally depraved. It does not matter that we have never broken important laws (in the sight of others) -- we are still totally depraved. It does not matter that we fear God we are still totally depraved. It does not matter that we attend fundamental, dispensational, even Calvinistic churches we are still totally depraved. No defense based on environment or inheritance can change this one thing unless God the Holy Spirit supernaturally intervenes and changes our hearts, we are totally depraved. We need to be set free, we can't escape of ourselves. God must free us.

How the natural man hates this truth. He may like some of what he hears in the gospel, but he hates this. He may believe, but he hates this truth (Of course, we realize that such faith is counterfeit).

The response of the believers in John 8 to the doctrine of total depravity proved that they were not truly saved but were the children of the devil (verses 37-44).

Yes, the faith that the Holy Spirit gives is often counterfeited. While we fully agree that Matthew 13 belongs dispensationally to another dispensation, we must also state that there are some important interdispensational truths here as well. One is found in certain aspects of the parable of the sower (Matthew 13;3-9) which has an inspired interpretation in verses 18-23. Notice that the seed that fell on stony ground was received with joy. It was the Word of God that was received. Yet such seed was soon gone for the ground was not good. In fact, we can list some interesting parallels between true faith and counterfeit faith;

Both are in Christ -- John 2:23,24

1. Both are based on the Word -- Matt. 13; 20, 21 3.
2. Both are accompanied with joy -- Matt, 13;20,21

But, one is generated by a depraved human heart and the other comes from the Holy Spirit, One involves bad ground and the other good ground. The difference is crucial.

The preaching of the gospel has become so distorted that we seldom hear the full message as Paul preached. Paul included repentance and faith (Acts 20:21). The Gospel certainly includes:

1. **Truth about God** -- His nature, character and standards. Men must be brought face to face with the fact that God is a holy and sovereign. He hates sin and He hates sinners -- the Bible so teaches.
2. **Truth about sin** -- there must be a conviction about sinfulness. Men must be told how ugly and terrible they really are. The Bible teaches that men are rotten sinners not just little sinners, Yet, many who claim to know the Lord object to such teaching. Perhaps we should pray for their salvation for they have not faced up to what God says about them.
3. **Truth about Jesus Christ** -- men must understand the person and work of Jesus Christ. The incarnate Son of God paid the penalty for the sins of those of God's choosing. And He rose from the dead and lives today. Jesus Christ is either your judge (Acts 17:31) or your savior.
4. **The SUMMONS of the Gospel** -
 - a. BELIEVE -- there must be faith in Jesus

Christ

- b. REPENT -- there must be a renouncing of all that you are outside of Jesus Christ.

Notice in Romans 10:9, 10 that men are called upon to confess Jesus as Lord and believe that God had raised Him from the dead. Men must be in submission to God to be saved. Anything else is counterfeit, and, any gospel that ignores this aspect of conversion is not the gospel, Indeed, BE CONVERTED is perhaps a better translation of the word translated REPENT.

To you who profess to know Jesus Christ as your savior. What is the basis of this conviction" Is there present evidence in your life of the work, of the Holy Spirit? Is there a willingness on your part to renounce all that you were and are (apart from Jesus Christ)? Or, do you rebel against this basic doctrine of the total depravity of the human heart--your heart!

We urge you to trust Christ and to repent. We urge you to test your life to see if you are saved. There is a strong connection in scripture between disobedience and disbelief (the same Greek word is translated both ways--compare Heb, 4:6,11 where it is translated unbelief with Eph. 2:2; 5:6 where it is translated disobedience),

When you come face to face with a truth of scripture you never before heard, do you fear God enough to study it through? Or is it of no consequence to you that your beliefs may not be in agreement with God's Word?

Is your faith genuine or counterfeit? Search your heart and see! Don't go to the past in your life. Look for the evidences of life in your present behavior and attitude.

And, if it becomes your concern that your faith may not be genuine, fall on your knees before God, repent and trust in Him. He promises to save all who genuinely come to Him, and the faith God gives endures.