

The Biblical Examiner

Since 1985, seeking first the Kingdom of God and its Advancement

The Biblical Examiner. 5130 Danville Rd, Lynchburg, OH 45142
540.255.2243 ; Bro. Need, 740.637.4191 facebook.com/ovid.need
www.biblicalexaminer.org ; tbe@biblicalexaminer.org ; ovid.need@gmail.com
Sermonaudio.com/providence

Holding to the *1689 London Baptist Confession of Faith*

LEGALISM VS LIBERTY

Answered from the 1689 London Baptist Confession of Faith.

It is distressing to hear people say “That is Legalistic” as they might be confronted with the need to live righteously and even dress modestly, among many other things clearly required under Christian law: “You are trying to rob me of my Christian liberty!” Are we committing such robbery as we promote Christian Law? One must question if they are wanting to avoid certain things required of them by Christian Law?

Modern Christianity has wrested “Legalism” and “Liberty” completely from Scripture, and has given them modern, non-Christian meanings that have nothing to do with Biblical Christianity.

• DEFINITIONS:

Legalism: The false charge of legalism comes from trying to place another under the Ten Commandments as a rule of life, saying that Christians are still required to obey them. Actually, *Legalistic* means that one is looking to the law, including baptism, in addition to Christ for justification, but that is not how the word is perceived today.

Liberty: The idea is that one is basically permitted by Scripture to do whatever does not violate the Christian’s conscience, since the indwelling Holy Spirit will guide properly in various areas. (Of course, this is a very basic doctrine of Darbyism/Scotfieldism. See *Death of the Church Victorious*.)

Some years ago, a Christian tabloid was republishing some of my articles until one of the readers called the editor’s attention to the fact that I was a Calvinist. The editor wrote a nasty letter to me, accusing me of deceiving him. However, I never asked him to publish my articles. I had simply added him to my mailing list

Contents

Legalism vs Liberty—1689 Confession...1; The Kitten...6; The Old Paths...7; Translation and Subversion...8; The Great American Heartache...12; Baptism...13; Great Dispensational Excitement Generated by Trump-Cyrus...14; Next Event on the Prophetic Calendar? Temple in Jerusalem With Animal Sacrifices...15; Animal Sacrifice...20; The New Dark Age...20; Recess for Adults...21; Lloyd Sprinkle...21; The Transfer of Wealth...22; Personal...23; A Personal Warning-Deadly Vaccines...23; The Worship of Weeds...24; Wait ... Christians confessing to plants?...24.

SPEED BUMP by Dave Coverly



since I was on his. From that time on, about every piece of material I have sent out, particularly on letterheads, I have made it clear that I hold to *The London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689*. In fact, I reprinted it for the folks of my church in Linden, and taught through it in SS class. My stand has not changed over the years, except it may be stronger. Maybe people just have not paid attention to where I have stood nor what I have been teaching since the middle ‘80s.

Regardless, let me deal with the Biblical teaching of Legalistic and Christian Liberty. The following is from the 1689 London Baptist Confession of Faith, as found on the Online Bible. The “{#text}” are areas where one can click in the program, and the verses will come up. I will not reproduce the verses. (Order the OLB from us, \$40, post paid, US. This program is better than Bible programs costing ten times as much. If after using it, you do not find it so, I will refund your money. The new one requires XP or newer.)

I am not trying to press others into my mold with my stands in these areas, nor am I changing my position.

My position is the historic Particular (Calvinistic) Baptist position, which has been held for centuries. Though there are several good confessions from the past, I use this one not only because it is closest to what Scripture teaches, but also because everyone can identify with Spurgeon. Most Baptists sing his praises, yet many who praise him would not let him preach one of his strong Calvinistic messages in their pulpits. He used the London Baptist Confession for his people.

I realize the social climate today has forced good men to depart from the old paths established by our godly forefathers. Sometimes the justification is that times have changed, so God and his word have changed. However, the apparent reason for change is because the people demand a change from a strict understanding of God's word to a much looser and thus more socially acceptable understanding, or they will find a spiritual leader who will change with the times. The logical conclusion is that God and his standards change with the times, though he clearly tells us that it is because of his unchangeableness that his mercy endures forever, and his people are not consumed. (Malachi 3:6) Therefore, when we change God and his word, we sacrifice his mercy.

Most Christians have never heard of the 1689 Confession of Faith, or similar confessions, such as the Westminster Confession. Few of those who have heard of Confessional Christianity, may deny many truths contained in them, i.e., Armenians. However, not desiring to reinvent the wheel as we compare Legalism with Liberty, we will use what has been provided for us by the divines of old, the 1689 Confession, which is almost identical with the Westminster.

Legalism:

Chapter 19: Of the Law of God

1. God gave to Adam a law of universal obedience written in his heart, and a particular precept of not eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; {#Ge 1:27; Ec 7:29} by which He bound him and all his posterity to personal, entire, exact, and perpetual obedience; {#Ro 10:5} promised life upon the fulfilling, and threatened death upon the breach of it, and endued him with power and ability to keep it. {#Ga 3:10,12}

Here we see that God initially wrote his law in Adam's heart. That law was passed down to Adam's posterity with its blessings and curses according to one's obedience or disobedience thereto. Adam had the power

and the ability to keep it, but he yielded his obedience so he could be united with his wife in her sin. (Christ united with his wife the church, in order to redeem her.)

2. The same law that was first written in the heart of man continued to be a perfect rule of righteousness after the fall, {#Ro 2:14-15} and was delivered by God upon Mount Sinai, in ten commandments, and written in two tables, the four first containing our duty towards God, and the other six, our duty to man. {#De 10:4}

God did not change his standard of right and wrong after the fall. Western Christian civilization gets its authority for the death penalty for murder from Genesis 9:6. Thus, as Christians reject what God established with Adam at the start as lawful and unlawful, so does the modern judicial system. As the general Christian population rejects God's commandments, so the courts will stand against the commandments. (Isaiah 24:2, Jeremiah 5:31.)

The law, the ten commandments, continued to be the perfect rule of righteousness even after the fall. Those commandments, which were already written in the heart of all men, were later delivered to Moses in the ten commandments. God did not change his standards with the times. Man's fallen nature did not cause him to change his personality. The commandments continued to describe the holiness of God and how man should think and act in order to be right with God. (*Be ye holy; for I am holy.* Lev 20:7, 1 Peter 1:15, 16)

3. Besides this law, commonly called moral, God was pleased to give to the people of Israel ceremonial laws, containing several typical ordinances, partly of worship, prefiguring Christ, His graces, actions, sufferings, and benefits; {#Heb 10:1; Col 2:17} and partly holding forth divers [diverse] instructions of moral duties, {#1Co 5:7} all which ceremonial laws being appointed only to the time of reformation, are, by Jesus Christ the true Messiah and only law-giver, who was furnished with power from the Father for that end abrogated and taken away. {#Col 2:14,16-17; Eph 2:14,16}

A common charge we hear from those who desire to be free from the bands and cords (Psalms 2) of God's law is that there is only one law, and because Christ became the sacrifice spoken of in the law, now all of the law is void. Again, though some may claim to follow this old Baptist confession, they evidently have not read it. These godly men of the past point out that there were several parts to the law. **First**, the moral law, or the ten commandments, which includes all of its implications

worked out throughout the law of Moses. **Second**, the ceremonial law which contained the ordinances that prefigured the work of Christ. Those ceremonial laws were done away with in the work of Christ, for he fulfilled those laws which spoke of his work for his people.

The ceremonial laws also separated Old Testament Israel from the surrounding pagans. Christ did away with those laws, tearing down (literally ripping the separating curtain, Mark 15:38) the middle wall of partition that separated Jew from Gentile, and man from God, and uniting all nations in himself. Thus, since Christ, there is no longer a distinctive “Jewish” and “Gentile” race of people. (Any “Jewish” race ended in the destruction of Jerusalem. That distinction was spiritually removed in Christ in c., 33 AD. It physically ended in AD 70 when the Jewish race was totally destroyed by God, using his mighty Roman army. The only distinction now is “Christian, or the New Israel” and “non-Christian”. Any remaining “Jew-Gentile” distinction is strictly man made, and has nothing to do with the “Jew-Gentile” distinction of the Old Testament.

We should mention that the ceremonial law was known in a limited way from the time of Adam, which was well before Moses – for Abel offered an acceptable sacrifice, while Cain did not. At that early point in history, man knew what kind of sacrifice pleased God and what did not, for Cain’s was rejected. Moreover, Noah offered a sacrifice upon leaving the Ark. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob all offered sacrifices. From the time of Adam, it was known that the blood sacrifices spoke of the true Sacrifice to come to pay the price for sin. (Genesis 3:15.)

4. To them also He gave sundry judicial laws, which expired together with the state of that people, not obliging any now by virtue of that institution; their general equity only being for modern use. {#1Co 9:8-10}

The Law of God! **First**, he gave the moral law, known as the ten commandments. **Second**, he gave the ceremonial laws that prefigured Christ, and were done away with Christ’s blood sacrifice. **Third**, the Lord gave sundry judicial laws, which developed the second half of the ten commandments — that is, man’s duty to man. Though the ceremonial laws “expired together with the state of that people, ... their general equity” continues for use in modern application – among other things, they show the holiness of God to us in a very

practical way.

5. The moral law doth [does] for ever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience thereof, {#Ro 13:8-10; Jas 2:8,10-12} and that not only in regard of the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God the Creator, who gave it; {#Jas 2:10-11} neither doth [does] Christ in the Gospel any way dissolve, but much strengthen this obligation. {#Mt 5:17-19; Ro 3:31}

Examples: Did not Paul apply the ox’s pay to the care of the spiritual leaders? Moreover, who might desire to do business with those who refuse to recognize the law’s requirement for honest weights and measures? (Deuteronomy 25:15, Proverbs 11:1, 16:11. Romans 13:8-10.) Is a reason for the hatred of God’s commandments the desire to violate the debt avoidance of Romans 13:8? God’s word, though Old Testament, is certainly true: *The rich ruleth over the poor, and the borrower is servant to the lender.* (Proverbs 22:7.) This United States is now populated with people controlled by the slave mentality. Low interest rates have sucked multitudes into debt-servitude. Watching the news, we see that the US is now concerned about offending the foreign nations who have bought the debt produced by Washington as those in power seek to purchase votes. China now owns the US, including our technology, through the trade imbalance brought about by “outsourcing” American jobs in the never-ending search for more profits and lower prices, *the love of money.*

Does Christian liberty free us from obedience to the moral law, the ten commandments? Is the only instruction I need under grace found in my “Christian” conscience, since I am indwelt by the Holy Spirit? The historic, orthodox position, as defined in the 1689 Confession, has always been that the moral law, the ten commandments, binds all, both saved and unsaved, and it has bound all men from the time of the first man, Adam. The Confession explains why the moral law is binding: **First**, the authority of who gave it, “God the Creator” – we are the sheep of his pasture, owing our undivided obedience to our Creator. (Ps 95:7, 100:3, Isa 33:22, James 4:12) **Second**, Christ, “in the Gospel” does not in any way dissolve it, “but much strengthen this obligation” to obey the moral law. **Third**, the holiness of God is revealed in the ten commandments, and we are commanded to be holy even as he is holy. (Lev 20:7, 1 Peter 1:15, 16)

Psalms 2:3 is certainly true today as even self-professed Bible believing churches and Christians say, *Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us*, for we are no longer under Moses, but under Paul. However, the “Pauline” crowd fails to recognize Paul’s words of Romans 13:8-10.

6. Although true believers be not under the law as a covenant of works, to be thereby justified or condemned, {#Ro 6:14; Ga 2:16; Ro 8:1; 10:4} yet it is of great use to them as well as to others, in that as a rule of life, informing them of the will of God and their duty, it directs and binds them to walk accordingly; discovering also the sinful pollutions of their natures, hearts, and lives, so as examining themselves thereby, they may come to further conviction of, humiliation for, and hatred against, sin; {#Ro 3:20; 7:7-25} together with a clearer sight of the need they have of Christ and the perfection of His obedience: it is likewise of use to the regenerate to restrain their corruptions, in that it forbids sin; and the threatening of it serve to shew [show] what even their sins deserve, and what afflictions in this life they may expect for them, although freed from the curse and unallayed rigour thereof. These promises of it likewise shew [show] them God’s approbation of obedience, and what blessings they may expect upon the performance thereof, though not as due to them by the law as a covenant of works; so as man’s doing good and refraining from evil, because the law encourageth [encourages] to the one and deterreth [deters] from the other, is no evidence of his being under the law and not under grace. {#Ro 6:12-14; 1Pe 3:8-13}

- **LEGALISM SCRIPTURALLY DEFINED**

Biblically, legalism is adding the works of God’s law to the work of Christ’s for justification.

The historic, orthodox position has been that the works of the law could never justify anyone. In fact, the works of the law will only lead to condemnation, if those works are looked to for any part of justification. It was according to the Tri-Une God’s covenant plan of redemption that Adam would fail according to the covenant of works, which would lead to Christ. (Eph 1:4, 1 Peter 1:20, Rev 13:8, 17:8)

However, though there is no covenant of works, keeping the ten commandments for justification, those commandments are of great use as a “rule of life.” They inform us of the will of God; they inform us of our duty to God and to man; they direct and bind us to walk accordingly. They show the sinful pollution of our natures, our hearts and of our lives. They call us to examine ourselves accordingly; they convict of sin,

humiliate us, showing us how sin has dominion, and our need of God’s grace. They guide us in restraining corruption, show us the forbidden sins, show what our sins deserve, and what we can expect when we ignore God’s commandments. On the other hand, they promise God’s blessings upon obedience to them. Note that God’s requirement of obedience to the law and the justified man’s obedience to the law “is no evidence of his being under the law and not under grace.”

Thus, no matter how much we might love the law, and work to keep it by God’s grace, we receive God’s blessings not according to a covenant of works, but according to the covenant of grace. Having done all, we are still unprofitable servants, worthy only of death. (Luke 17:10)

7. Neither are the aforementioned uses of the law contrary to the grace of the Gospel, but do sweetly comply with it, {#Ga 3:21} the Spirit of Christ subduing and enabling the will of man to do that freely and cheerfully which the will of God, revealed in the law, requireth to be done. {#Eze 36:27}

God’s requirements upon man to keep the law does not go contrary to the grace of the Gospel. Rather, God’s requirements comply with his grace. The Spirit of Christ working in us gives us the desire to freely and cheerfully do the will of God as required by the law. (Philippians 2:13) However, whether we have that free and cheerful desire or not does not change God’s requirements to keep his law.

- **CHRISTIAN LIBERTY**

Again, seeing no need to reinvent the wheel we refer to the 1689 Confession, skipping over Chapter 20, “Of the Gospel, and of the Extent of the Grace Thereof,” we go to Chapter 21: “Of Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience.”

Are those of us who say that a Christian is still required to honour and obey the ten commandments legalists and trying to rob Christians of their liberty in Christ? We answered the legalism charge from chapter 19, now let us address the robbing liberty charge.

“Of Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience”

1. The liberty which Christ hath purchased for believers under the gospel, consists in their freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemning wrath of God, the rigour and curse of the law, {#Ga 3:13} and in their being delivered from this present evil world, {#Ga 1:4} bondage to Satan, {#Ac 26:18} and dominion of sin, {#Ro 8:3} from the

evil of afflictions, {#Ro 8:28} the fear and sting of death, the victory of the grave, {#1Co 15:54-57} and everlasting damnation: {#2Th 1:10} as also in their free access to God, and their yielding obedience unto Him, not out of slavish fear, {#Ro 8:15} but a child-like love and willing mind. {#Lu 1:73-75; 1Jn 4:18} All which were common also to believers under the law for the substance of them, {#Ga 3:9,14} but under the New Testament the liberty of Christians is further enlarged, in their freedom from the yoke of a ceremonial law, to which the Jewish church was subjected, and in greater boldness of access to the throne of grace, and in fuller communications of the free Spirit of God, than believers under the law did ordinarily partake of. {#Joh 7:38-39; Heb 10:19-21}

Biblically, the Christian Liberty which was purchased by Christ consists of freedom or liberty from:

1. The guilt of sin.
2. The condemning wrath of God.
3. The rigour and curse of the law. The key word in Galatians 3:13 is redeemed. Thus, Christ has rescued us from the consequences of transgression in the world of woe; he has saved the redeemed from the punishment so richly deserved for their sins, being made an atonement for our sins. (Barnes' Notes & Adam Clarke.) In other words, the work of Christ does not free us from reaping what we sow here in this life, as the antinomians would have us believe. Christian Liberty here consists of liberty and freedom for the redeemed from the eternal wrath of God against their sins.
4. The power of this present evil world.
5. The bondage of Satan, and from fear, we might add. (2 Timothy 1:7.)
6. The dominion and power of sin.
7. The evil of afflictions. That is, we now see God's hand in the afflictions that come our way, so we can rejoice in them, rather than be beaten down by them. We now know those afflictions form us into the image of Christ. (Romans 8:29.)
8. The fear and sting of death, and the victory of the grave.
9. Everlasting damnation.
10. Christian Liberty means we have free access to God; it means that we willingly yield obedience unto him (obey his law-word, the commandments).
11. Christian Liberty means we lovingly obey his commandments that are both written in our hearts and in his law-word. (Exodus 20:6, Proverbs 3:1, 4:4, 7:2, John 14:15, 15:10, &c.) We obey with child-like love and willingness, and without "slavish fear" – that is, fear of being beaten with many stripes if we do not obey his every word. However, we are required to obey every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God regardless of how we feel about it. (Matthew 4:44.)

The above points of liberty and freedom were common to the believers from the time of Adam, but Christian Liberty has been expanded in the New Testament. Christians now have "freedom from the yoke of a ceremonial law, ... with greater boldness of access to the throne of grace" with "fuller communications of the free Spirit of God," which believers before Christ did not "ordinarily partake of."

2. God alone is Lord of the conscience, {#Jas 4:12; Ro 14:4} and hath left it free from the doctrines and com-

mandments of men which are in any thing contrary to His Word, or not contained in it. {#Ac 4:19,29; 1Co 7:23; Mt 15:9} So that to believe such doctrines, or obey such commands out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience, {#Col 2:20,22-23} and the requiring of an implicit faith, an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience and reason also. {#1Co 3:5; 2Co 1:24}

Liberty of Conscience is defined as a conscience free from the doctrines and commands of men that are contrary to God's Word, or are not contained in it. (Matt 15:6, Mark 7:13, 1 Peter 1:18) Christian Liberty certainly does not release us from God's lawful requirements, such as modest apparel on both men and women, women avoiding careers outside of their homes, women not seeking after commonly associated men's occupations, (Deut 22:5) and other violations of the instructions found in his law-word.

Example: A good number of years ago when my oldest daughter was in a Christian school, her volleyball team went to a neighboring town for a game. Before they were permitted into the building where the game was being played, they were handed a list of about 25 conditions that had to be met before they could go into the building. I do not recall what my wife said was on the list, but I do remember that she said that very few of the points could be supported from Scripture. "Holiness" efforts beyond what is required by the Word is an attempt to be holier than God. Christian Liberty frees one from trying to be more holy than required by his word.

Christian Liberty frees us: My dad was a work-a-holic. (He was an excellent welding and fabricating contractor, and a lay pastor. He often said the hardest thing he had to get used to was a welder saying he had to go back and fix some leaks in his welds on a high-pressure steam line. When my dad started welding in the early 40s, no one fixed their own leaks. If a weld leaked, you were fired, and someone else fixed your leak. I can count on one hand the number of times I can remember he took time to really be with his family. However, he always had a work-shop at the house, and always had some kind of a project going. My earliest memory was a hand cranked forge where he welded metal with a hammer on an anvil; there he taught me the basics of welding. I was probably in the second or third grade.) From that home environment I went into the service where we usually worked 5½ - 6½ days a week,

12 hour days. When I got out of the military, I united with the Mega-Church movement, 1965-1983. In this movement, we were taught that if we would spend all our time “serving God” --- building numbers for the local church --- God would take care of our families. That philosophy fit right in with the way I was raised, so I got caught in that trap. Obviously, that trap is a great lie of the devil, and seeing families fall apart in that movement, the Lord opened my eyes. When I tried to shorten my days in the “ministry work” to maybe 10 to 12 hours, 6 days a week, and then to maybe 5 or 5½ days so I could spend time with my family, my conscience troubled me greatly.

Christian Liberty consists of being freed from the corrupted conscience that tries to place things upon us that are not in the word of God, or that dismisses the “general equity” of the laws found in his law-word. Christian Liberty consists of being freed from the doctrines and traditions of men – “any thing contrary to His Word, or not contained in it.” Sadly, many consider areas they do not want to submit to the law-word of God as no more than the “commands of men”. Thus, freeing their conscience to do what seems best to them under the guise of Christian Liberty.

The Confession deals with the problem:

3. They who upon pretence of Christian liberty do practice any sin, or cherish any sinful lust, as they do thereby pervert the main design of the grace of the gospel to their own destruction, {#Ro 6:1-2} so they wholly destroy the end of Christian liberty, which is, that being delivered out of the hands of all our enemies, we might serve the Lord without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our lives. {#Ga 5:13; 2Pe 2:18,21}

We are told here that those who, under the pretense of Christian liberty, pursue the fallen desires of the heart have perverted the design of grace to their own destruction. Actually, “they wholly destroy the end of Christian liberty”. The purpose of Christian liberty is to free us from our enemies—that is, the world, the flesh and the devil. Godly liberty also frees us from the guilt brought upon us by our environment and upbringing. Its purpose is to enable us to serve the Lord by obeying his law-word without fear, and to live a righteous life according to that law-word all the days of our lives.

Legalism: God’s requirements upon man to keep the law does not go contrary to the grace of the Gospel; rather, God’s requirements comply with that grace. The

Spirit of Christ working in man gives him the desire to freely and cheerfully do the will of God as required by the law. (Philippians 2:13.) However, whether we have that free and cheerful desire or not does not change God’s requirements to keep his law.

Christian Liberty: It is not New Testament justification to do whatever does not violate the Christian’s conscience. Christian Liberty is the freedom from the power and control of sin that would hinder our doing those things pleasing in his sight – that would hinder our loving obedience to the law-word of God.

My, how far Christianity has departed from what is given in his holy word. Sadly, the “Reformed” community has fallen victim to the same error as have the Antinomians — that is, let your Christian conscience be your guide. Many who claim Christian Liberty fail to remember that the conscience is corrupted by sin, and subject to the surrounding social pressures.

THE KITTEN

Whoever said the Creator doesn’t have a sense of humor? Dwight Nelson recently told a true story about the pastor of his church. He had a kitten that climbed up a tree in his backyard and then was afraid to come down. The pastor coaxed, offered warm milk, etc.

The kitty would not come down. The tree was not sturdy enough to climb, so the pastor decided that if he tied a rope to his car and drove away so that the tree bent down, he could then reach up and get the kitten.

That’s what he did, all the while checking his progress in the car. He then figured if he went just a little bit further, the tree would be bent sufficiently for him to reach the kitten. But as he moved the car a little further forward, the rope broke.

The tree went “bonging!” and the kitten instantly sailed through the air — out of sight.

The pastor felt terrible. He walked all over the neighborhood asking people if they’d seen a little kitten. No. Nobody had seen a stray kitten. So he prayed, “Lord, I just commit this kitten to your keeping,” and went on about his business.

A few days later he was at the grocery store, and met one of his church members. He happened to look into her shopping cart and was amazed to see cat food. This woman was a cat hater and everyone knew it, so he asked her, “Why are you buying cat food when you hate

cats so much?”

She replied, “You won’t believe this,” and then told him how her little girl had been begging her for a cat, but she kept refusing. Then a few days before, the child had begged again, so the Mom finally told her little girl, “Well, if God gives you a cat, I’ll let you keep it.”

She told the pastor, “I watched my child go out in the yard, get on her knees, and ask God for a cat. And really, Pastor, you won’t believe this, but I saw it with my own eyes. A kitten suddenly came flying out of the blue sky, with its paws outspread, and landed right in front of her.”

Never underestimate the Power of God and His unique sense of humor.

THE OLD PATHS

As my wife and I continue to use the AV, we are distressed as we try to follow these “new” translations. We have found that by simply changing a few, or more than a few, words, they change the sense of the passage. Some outrightly change the teaching of the whole of the passage, or maybe the whole of Scripture. We have yet to understand how these “new translations” make the scripture easier to understand. We have found that the changed words many times confuse or even hide the sense as found in the AV. I believe that those who want to understand the AV English will find that understanding.

In the midst of my *Judeo-Churchianity* research, I found that there are many times sinister motives behind the various new translations. Biblical truth is being intentionally and gradually phased-out or replaced with the new translations, e.g.,

“There is also pressure to impute to the New Testament charges of ‘hate,’ with inevitable calls for the suppression of the Gospel of John or Matthew, or, failing that, the deletion – or distortion through dishonest translation – of those passages which offend the religious heirs of the Pharisees today as much as they did 2000 years ago. In a 1995 speech at Hebrew University, Cardinal Joseph Bernardin of Chicago blamed the Gospel of John for ‘inciting anti-semitism.’ He initiated a dialogue concerning the possible need for its redaction or suppression. The rationale for censorship of certain ‘offensive’ passages, or even the gradual phase-out of ‘obsolete’ versions of the New Testament, such as the Douai-Rheims and King James,

is the temporal chauvinist appeal to the phantasmagoria that due to the so-called ‘Holocaust,’¹⁷⁹ we have now entered a revolutionary new age, where we are duty-bound to scrutinize every traditional Western thought and action of the past 2,000 years in the light of whether or not these thoughts or actions may have contributed to making the ‘Holocaust’ possible. History, art, politics, culture and language itself are deemed worthy and legitimate solely by the degree to which they represent a panegyric to Judaism. This sense of having entered a new order in relations with Jewish power and ideology has been brought about by the immense influence of the gargantuan, modern infotainment culture and ‘news’ media network.”

Hoffman, Michael, *Judaism’s Strange Gods*, pp. 104, 105. The Independent History and Research Company. Footnote 179 in the text “From the Greek, holokauston, ‘wholly burnt,’ which is an apt description of the victims of Allied bombings in Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Dresden; and of the Israeli air force bombing of Lebanon in 1982, which killed 17,000 Arab civilians (cf. London Evening Standard, June 12, 2000)”

That is to say, the historic Christian New Testament as found in the AV and in the Douai (Catholic version) must be gradually phased-out with new translations in order to protect Judaism’s view of history. Satan does not care how long it takes to destroy scripture, even one word here and there. “Jews” dominated the list of editors in Scofield’s book; Scofield’s notes placed “Jewish millennialism” as a major plank in otherwise orthodox Christian doctrine.

[Parentheses] However, we must compliment Scofield—he foresaw the serious results of Judaizing of the church a century ago:

“It may safely be said that the Judaizing of the Church has done more to hinder her progress, pervert her mission, and destroy her spiritually, than all other causes combined. Instead of pursuing her appointed path of separation from the world and following the Lord in her heavenly calling, she has used Jewish Scriptures to justify herself in lowering her purpose to the civilization of the world, the acquisition of wealth, the use of an imposing ritual, the erection of magnificent churches, the invocation of God’s blessing upon the conflicts of armies, and the division of an equal brotherhood into ‘clergy’ and ‘laity.’”

Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth, p. 12. See “Death of the Church Victorious,” by this author. “C. I. Scofield” chapter 91, pp. 322ff.

We must agree with Scofield “that the Judaizing of the Church has done more to hinder her progress, pervert her mission, and destroy her spiritually, than all other causes combined.” However, the Word violently disagrees with his removal of the Old Testament for any kind of justification for Christianizing the world. [End]

All of that to say this: The AV and the Douai (Catholic version) must be gradually phased-out with new translations, new words, in order to compromise

God's word, and to protect Judaism's view of history. The speed with which the historic Christian New Testament as found in the Majority Text, the Textus Receptus and the Douai (Catholic version) has been abandoned since the turn of the twentieth century is truly amazing. Moreover, as we try to closely follow in the AV the various translations used in messages, the translations at times seem to present a new religion by simply changing a few small words.

My encounter with the idea of quiet subversion (of scriptures) reminded me of a 1987 article by R.J. Rushdoony:

TRANSLATION AND SUBVERSION

The publication of a new translation of the Bible should be an occasion for rejoicing. The availability of Scripture in a new language, or a fresh rendering in "modern dress" for people already possessing the Bible, can be of great importance in propagating the faith. The faith, this indeed is the central motive in many contemporary versions, but by no means all. At least two other motives are important factors on the contemporary scene: first, a financial motive and, second, an anti-Christian religious motive.

The Profit in Bibles

A profit motive is, in its place, a godly aspect of life, by no means to be condemned unless it transgresses the laws of God. Without faith, every aspect of life is under condemnation, all life then is out of focus, and things, in themselves pure, become impure in the hands of the ungodly.

As is well known, the Bible is the consistent best seller. The annual sale of millions of copies makes it therefore a phenomenal sales item. Its potentiality as a moneymaker is thus enormous, almost staggering to the economically minded imagination. But one very serious drawback exists: the Bible, in its most popular English form, the King James Version, is not subject to copy-right. Any publisher can print it and enter into a highly competitive field where the margin of profit must be kept very low for competitive reasons. The handicaps thus are very real, although several publishers have regularly counted on their Bible sales for assured profits. Is it any wonder, therefore, that publishers, among others, have come to recognize the tremendous potentialities of a copyrighted Bible? A copyrighted Bible is thus a major bonanza to publishers and a

financial and prestigious asset to scholars participating as translators and editors. Not every new translation has been a moneymaking scheme, but many of them have clearly had this motive as among their central ones. It is no wonder that new versions are thus often front-page news; the advertising and promotion behind a major version makes it a financial asset to many media. Possession of a copyright is again a major affair and, in one recent case, was a subject of legal battle. Thus, the Revised Standard Version is copyrighted by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, and first published by Thomas Nelson and Sons in New York, Toronto, and Edinburgh. Because many evangelicals regarded this version as "modernist" in character, in 1962, a "study" edition was put out by the A. J. Holman Company of Philadelphia, with 59 evangelical scholars giving their evangelical "imprimatur" to it by means of brief introductions and articles. The unstated fact is that, with every copy and every edition, the profit goes to the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ. The National Council has thus a source of income now entirely apart from any donations by member churches. It has an invested interest in a particular Bible. The use of this Bible is thus promoted in a variety of circles. It is used for responsive readings in hymnals and in Sunday school lessons. The Holman Study Bible was given away as a subscription premium by Christianity Today, ostensibly a voice of evangelical Christianity. "New Bibles" are big money and their by-products are likewise profitable. They are used in newer commentaries by permission to further their popularity and concordances suggest their durability. With all the money at stake in new versions, is it any wonder that people are urged, to their confusion, to believe in the necessity for new versions?

Revision, Translation, or Paraphrase?

It might be well to note here a further area of confusion. The Revised Standard Version claims to be a revision of the King James Version, i.e., not a new translation but merely the King James corrected and modernized. Oswald T Allis, in *Revision or New Translation* (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1948), has called attention to the fact that it is closer often to a new translation by unconservative scholars. In Recent Revised Versions, Dr. Allis extended

his critique to the New English Bible.

New translations, moreover, tend to follow radical readings of erroneous or “wastebasket” texts in preference to standard readings. With each new version, the number of departures from the Received Text is steadily increasing.

The sales value of these new versions, judging by some promotional material, seems to depend on new and novel readings. There is, in the minds of some buyers at least, a premium on newness and on departures from the “old Bible.” With some, there is almost a hopeful note that the newer Bibles might gradually convert “Thou shalt not commit adultery” to “Thou shalt commit adultery”! New versions, of various qualities of good and bad, are purchased by many persons almost as fetish objects and remain unread.

But many of the new versions are not translation. They are paraphrases. What is the difference? A translation is an exact and literal rendering of the original Greek or Hebrew into English. A paraphrase tries to put the original thought into modern thought forms. One of the most popular liberal paraphrasers today is J. B. Phillips. A paraphrase can be a very valuable help at times, but it can never substitute for a translation. Thus, Edgar J. Goodspeed renders Matthew 5:3, “Blessed are the poor in spirit,” as “Blessed are those who feel their spiritual need.” This is brilliant and telling; it gives us a vivid grasp of the meaning, but unfortunately Goodspeed, while giving us a few such gems, also neutralizes many of the basic theological terms of the New Testament with weak paraphrases.

The King James Version is not a paraphrase. It is both a revision of earlier translations in part and a new translation in its day.

Archaic Language

One of the charges consistently leveled against the King James Version is that its language is archaic and obsolete. The answer is a simple one: it is intended to be. In 1611 the King James Version was as “out of date” as it is today. Compare the writings of Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, King James I, and John Lyly with the King James Version and this becomes quickly apparent. The translators avoided the speech of their day for a basic English which would be simple, timeless, and beautiful, and they succeeded. Their version spoke from outside their age and tradition with elemental simplicity. Their wisdom here exceeds that of their successors. Nothing

seems more ridiculous than an outdated “modern” translation. Let us examine William Mace, 1729, as he rendered James 3:5-6:

The tongue is but a small part of the body yet how grand are its pretensions! A spark of fire! What quantities of timber will it blow into flame? The tongue is a brand that sets the world into a combustion; it is but one of the numerous organs of the body, yet it can blast whole assemblies. Tipped with infernal sulphur it sets the whole train of life in a blaze.

In 1768, Dr. Edward Harwood’s Liberal Translation of the New Testament, i.e., a paraphrase, rendered Luke 15:11, “A certain man had two sons,” as “A gentleman of splendid family opulent fortune had two sons.” This is clearly an extreme instance, but it does illustrate a point: if we consider our age and its requirements as normative, we can involve ourselves in absurdities. And such absurdities are not missing from the various versions. The critic Dwight Macdonald has called attention to some of these in the Revised Standard Version in a New Yorker article, “The Bible in Modern Undress.”¹ Macdonald comments on the RSV by way of a conclusion, “Whether it will be any more successful in replacing the K.J.V. than the 1885 version remains to be seen. If it is, what is now simply a blunder — a clerical error, so to speak — will become a catastrophe: Bland, favorless mediocrity will have replaced the pungency of genius.”²

The issue is not that the Bible should speak our everyday language, for this involves debasement, but that it should be understandable and here, all arguments to the contrary notwithstanding, the King James speaks a language which, while sometimes difficult because the matter itself is so, is more often simple, clear-cut, and beautiful. Some modern versions are very helpful, but none equal the King James in its clarity and memorable beauty. The greatest single demerit of the King James Version is simply this, it is not copyrighted and, hence, no organization and no scholar can profit thereby.

A Trustworthy Translation

The question of a trustworthy translation is all-important, especially since novelty is increasingly characteristic of many new translations. Which translation is a trustworthy one?

At this point, it needs to be noted that all translations face certain perplexing problems. The meanings of certain Hebrew words are uncertain, and the exact

identity of many plants and animals subject to debate. With these details, we are not concerned. The marginal readings of a good edition are helpful in clarifying meanings or giving alternate translations at difficult points.

The important question is in another area. What text of the Bible is being translated? In answering this question, let it be noted, we are departing from virtually all accepted scholarship. This however does not trouble us for, after all, the major break with “accepted” scholarship comes with acceptance of Christ as Lord and Savior, and the Bible as the inspired and infallible word of God.

Since the days of Westcott and Hort, textual criticism has applied to Biblical textual criticism a rigorously alien category of thought and “an essentially naturalistic method.”³ This scholarship assumes man to be autonomous and ultimate rather than God; and it requires all documents to meet the same naturalistic tests with respect to their nature and history. Nothing which is not true or possible of Homer’s Iliad can be posited thus for the Bible and its books. Moreover, this method is applied to the Bible with a certainty and omniscience lacking in the determination, for example, of composite author-ship in Shakespeare’s plays, where we often know he had collaborators.

As Hills has pointed out, the doctrine of the sacred origin and preservation of Scripture is a part of the “General doctrine of the Scriptures concerning the controlling providence of God.” “He worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will” (Eph. 1:11). This providential preservation of the text, Hills has maintained, as an expert in New Testament manuscripts, is to be seen in the standard text of the New Testament translated in the King James Version.

It is not our concern here to enter into the intricacies of textual criticism, nor are we qualified to do so. But we are qualified to assert that most current criticism, both “conservative” and “liberal” rest on a radically non-Christian philosophy which cannot bear other than implicitly or explicitly anti-Christian fruit.

Another Religion in New Translations

Are the variations in the new translations simply minor differences in wording or do they conceal a new religion? To answer this question, let us examine Genesis 1:1,2, first of all in three older translations: the

King James (Protestant), the Douay (Roman Catholic), and the Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic Text of the Jewish Publication Society (Old Testament, 1917, 1955, 1961); then let us examine The Torah, the Five Books of Moses (Jewish Publication Society, 1962) and the Doubleday Anchor translation, prepared by “more than 30 Catholic, Protestant and Jewish scholars”:⁴

King James: In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

Douay: In the beginning God created the heaven and earth. And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved over the waters.

Approved Version, Jewish Publication Society, 1917: In the beginning God created the heaven and earth. Now the earth was unformed and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God hovered over the face of the waters.

Torah, 1962: When God began to create the heaven and earth — the earth being unformed and void, with darkness over the surface of the deep and a wind from God sweeping over the water — God said, “Let there be light”; and there was light. (v. 3 included)

Anchor. When God set about to create heaven and earth — the world being then a formless waste, with darkness over the seas and only an awesome wind sweeping over the water — God said, “Let there be light,” and there was light. (v. 3 included)

As Edward J. Young has noted in “The Interpretation of Genesis 1:2,”⁵ this passage has been used to try to introduce mythology into Moses’ account.

The conservatism of the first three translations, especially the first two, is apparent. These are, of course, older translations. In the King James and the Douay, Genesis 1:1 and 2 are three separate sentences and the first sentence is a separate paragraph. Now paragraphing is a form of interpretation in itself, as is sentence formation. To set “In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth” in a separate form is to declare in effect that this sentence is either an introduction to the account of creation, or a summary statement of creation, or both. It declares God to be the Creator, and then the details of the acts of creation are given to us.

But in the Torah and Anchor versions, verse 1 is made into a subordinate clause, “When God began to create the heaven and the earth,” and “When God set about to create heaven and earth.” This now ceases to be a completed statement of fact. Instead, we are now told what the condition of the universe was “when God began to create,” namely, that at least one segment of it was “a formless waste” and, as we learn subsequently, this “unformed and void” earth was not created but developed by God. As a result, instead of Biblical theism, we have the ancient pagan dualism, the co-eternity of God and matter. The great void of being, the unformed chaos of matter, always existed, in this philosophy, and God did not create it; He merely acted on it, with varying degrees of success. Thus, in the new “translations” of Genesis 1:1,3, we have substituted for Biblical theism an alien religion! We have a god very different from and sharply limited in contrast to the God of Scripture. Translation here has become the vehicle of a new religion, the instrument of the proclamation of “other gods,” an instrument of idolatry.

The net result of this new “translation” is, to repeat, another god than the God of Scripture. It is a god similar to that of illuminist tradition and of Masonry. The Cardinal of Chile, in *The Mystery of Freemasonry Unveiled*, described this god aptly:

The god creator, or the god of Masonry, is not the God Creator of Christians. The Architect constructs the building with materials which he did not make, but which he finds already made; the Creator constructs the edifice of the world, not with foreign or ready made substance but with materials which he himself made from nothing.⁶

It should be noted that the Torah Version gives the older accepted readings as footnotes.

In the Torah Version, “the spirit of God” in v. 2 becomes “a wind from God” and in Anchor it becomes “an awesome wind.” The Holy Spirit is thus eliminated from creation.

In the Torah Version, Genesis 1: 26 reads: “And God said, ‘I will make man in My image, after my likeness.’” The footnote adds that this is literally, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” This change is justified on the grounds that the Hebrew plural form here are simply “plurals of majesty” But the fact remains that the Hebrew text gives a plural form and that Elohim, a plural noun for God, literally Gods, takes, when used

for Jehovah, a singular verb. Many Christian scholars have rightly seen in this an evidence of the plurality of the Godhead and of its unity, a definite witness to trinitarianism. Modern translators may disagree; but they have no right to mistranslate the text, which as admitted, reads, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” Such novel and unwarranted renderings of words can be destructive of meaning and of doctrine. Thus Genesis 3:14 reads, respectfully, in Joseph Bryant Rotherham, in King James, and in the Torah version:

Rotherham, 1897: And enmity will I put between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed — He shall crush thy head, But thou shalt crush his heel.

King James: 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.

Torah, 1962: I will put enmity Between you and the woman, And between your offspring and hers; they shall strike at your head, and you shall strike at their heel.

In the Torah Version by changing the number of “seed” or “offspring” from singular to plural, the reference is radically changed in this prophecy. It can no longer mean Christ, who is singular, but refers to the plural off-spring of the woman, to the faithful, or to Israel. We are thus pointed to another Savior.

By such changes, often too slight for many readers to detect, new meanings are read into the Scripture, and another bible and other gods appear on the scene. And each new version, irrespective of its source, seems bent on surpassing the previous ones in its adoption of novelties.

An important consideration for Christians in evaluating new versions is this: consider the source. Can unbelievers, modernists, men with left-wing records, and men faithless to their ordination be expected to produce good fruit? Our Lord said it clearly:

Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.

A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. (Mt. 7:16-28)

1. Dwight Macdonald, *New Yorker*, Nov. 14, 1953, vol. XXIX, no. 39, 183-208. 2. *Ibid.*, 208. 3. See Edward E Hills’ introduction to John W. Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the*

Gospel According to Mark (Jenkinstown, PA, 1959), 40f. and 66; and Edward E Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, (Des Moines, Iowa, 1956). 4. *Time*, September 27, 1963, 48 and 50. 5. Edward J. Young, *The Westminster Theological Journal*, May 1961. 6. *The Mystery of Freemasonry Unveiled*, 72. (Reprinted from the journal of *Christian Reconstruction*, Vol. 12, No. 2, 1989. Chalcedon [Faith for all of Life] PO Box 158, Vallecito, CA 95251.)

THE GREAT AMERICAN HEARTACHE

WHY ROMANTIC LOVE COLLAPSES ON US

By Jonathan Leeman, 10/24/18

Modern people love. How many romance movies and love songs could we name? Love sells. Love is enticing. We devote a holiday to it every February, and our children give each other stale heart-shaped candies in celebration. Yet, what is love? The world tries to show us love one way; God, another.

The world draws our eyes into the bedroom — at least these days it does. Love finds its pinnacle in a bed, says Western culture: two lovers embracing, staring into one another's eyes, having cast off the world, enjoying all the delights of togetherness. The camera need not turn to parents or to children. It's Wesley and Princess Buttercup ("The Princess Bride") living happily ever after. The couple is the center of the universe. Love in this first picture is finding whomever or whatever completes me. It depends on self-discovery and self-definition, and consummates itself in self-expression and self-actualization.

This is love as Westerners have understood it at least since novels and poetry of the eighteenth and nineteenth century capital "R" Romantics. Nathaniel Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter* is typical. A man and a woman love one another. The laws of society and religion stand in the way. The man, a pastor, is crushed by those laws. But the woman casts them off and discovers true freedom and life.

Love as a Black Hole

That's been the great American love story ever since: him and her, or him and him, or her and her against society, against mom and dad, against religion, against the world. Love doesn't judge, we say. Love sets free. You can justify anything these days by pointing to love. "If they really love each other, then of course we should accept . . ." "If God is loving, then surely he wouldn't . . ." Heart plus heart equals marriage, declares the bumper sticker. Never mind the fact that such love imposes its own judgments and enacts its own laws.

Yet a brand of love that shines the spotlight exclusively on the couple in bed, divorced from all other relationships, perhaps intentionally childless, perverts biblical love into something barren and stagnant. It's a universe that eventually collapses inward on itself, like a black hole.

We might even say that Romanticism's story of love can't help but culminate in homosexuality, where the self seeks to complete and complement itself only in itself, its mirror image, two tabs colliding, two positively charged ends of two magnets, incapable of uniting or creating a new life. The rallying cry of "diversity" celebrates the ironic lack thereof in a same-sex partnership.

The world isn't interested in the God who is love. It's interested in love as god. Which is just another way of saying that it's interested in love of self because self is god.

Love Grows and Fulfills

The Bible also has an answer to worldly self-love. It offers a picture of love, or rather, several. It, too, starts with a bed. Adam beholds Eve and calls her bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. They, though two, become one.

Yet the camera pans back, and we discover that that bed is set in a garden, where the couple's union produces a world of rose bushes and apple orchards and a mess of children's shoes by the front door and swing sets and skyscrapers. Biblical love, it would seem, involves an expanding universe. It's not stagnant like a bed all by itself. It has forward motion and a story to follow. It's generative. It's fruitful.

The Bible's camera pans back further still, ultimately taking in all creation, all history, and God himself. The first snapshots of love in the bed and the garden and the parent, snapshots available for viewing by all humanity, are meant to draw humanity's gaze upward to even more magnificent portraits of love.

Love Is Not God

Father, Son, and Spirit together provide perfect picture and definition of love. God is love, and that means all love is from him, through him, and to him.

In this picture, God is uppermost in his own affections. The Father most loves the Son and Spirit. The Son, the Father and Spirit. The Spirit, the Father and Son. He is not the monistic God of Islam, who, before the creation

of his world, would have had no one to love and so could not be love. Our God is the one God in three persons, who, in eternity past, shared a perfect and infinite love among these three persons. Self-love and other-love, giving and receiving — somehow — merge in this God who is love.

God is love, and God most loves God because there is nothing better, nothing purer, nothing higher than God. The Father loves the Son for his righteousness, the Son loves the Father for his goodness, and the Spirit loves both for their glory. You cannot have the love of God without having all the other attributes of God's character — his righteousness, his goodness, and more.

Love doesn't exist somewhere out there in the universe independently of God. Rather, love is a personal quality of God. It is a description of his character. It's part and parcel of everything else about God.

That the World May Know

It turns out, however, that when God is uppermost in God's affections, the universe doesn't collapse; it expands, leading to another set of images of love. The divine Father seeks out a bride for his Son. When he finds her, he loves her with a covenantal love. It's like the wealthy man who loves the daughter-in-law not because of what she is in herself, but because she is now united to his son. "All this is yours and I am your father," the older man smiles to his daughter-in-law on her wedding day, pointing to the vast extent of his estate.

The groom's name, of course, is Jesus Christ. He doesn't say, "Her bone, my bone; her flesh, my flesh." Instead, he says, "Her sin, my sin; my righteousness, her righteousness" (2 Corinthians 5:21). God loves sinners, in other words, by drawing us into the sweep of his triune, God-centered love. So it's not just that God loves us. It's better than that. It's that God incorporates us into his love for himself — "so that the world may know that you sent me and loved them even as you loved me," as Jesus prayed to the Father (John 17:23). Once again, giving and receiving merge in the ultimate win-win.

True Love in America

A last picture of love can be spotted among God's people, the church. As we love one another as Christ loved us — mercifully, forgivingly, obediently — we show the world that we're his disciples (John 13:34–35). We show the world what true love looks like.

Inside the church, we help each other practice loving God, neighbor, even enemy. We help each other internalize his commandments — one of the most important indicators of our love — so that we too can become purveyors of heaven's life (1 John 5:3). We strategize to proclaim the greatest message of his love, the gospel (Romans 5:8).

Loving our fellow church members and our non-Christian neighbors means loving them with respect to God. That's how Augustine put it. If we don't love spouse, children, job, neighbor, and self with respect to God, we don't really love them.

True love for others — to conclude with a definition — is a burning affection for people to know God. We want them to know his goodness and his righteousness and his law and his glory because nothing is greater, nothing is better. Do you want to know what love is? Then look to God, his gospel, and his people.

Jonathan Leeman is an elder at Cheverly Baptist Church in suburban Washington, DC, editorial director for 9Marks, and the author of *The Rule of Love: How the Local Church Should Reflect God's Love and Authority*.

https://www.westernjournal.com/?ff_source=Email&ff_medium=newsletter-WJ&ff_campaign=dailyam&ff_content=western-journal

BAPTISM

In my research for "*Judeo-Churchianity*," I encountered the following under Baptism in the Jewish Encyclopedia. The Jewish editors would have been impartial observers:

Baptism: "A religious ablution signifying purification or consecration. The natural method of cleansing the body by washing and bathing in water was always customary in Israel (see Ablution, Bathing). The washing of their clothes was an important means of sanctification enjoined on the Israelites before the Revelation on Mt. Sinai (Ex. xix. 10). The Rabbis connect with this the duty of bathing by complete immersion ("tebilah," Yeb. 46b; Mek., Bahodesh, iii.); and since sprinkling with blood was always accompanied by immersion, tradition connects with this immersion the blood lustration mentioned as having also taken place immediately before the Revelation (Ex. xxiv. 8), these three acts being the initiatory rites always performed upon proselytes, "to bring them under the wings of

the Shekinah” (Yeb. 1.c.)” The article continues by pointing out that circumcision and immersion or bathing in water, was a sign of conversion to Judaism. Christianity dropped circumcision but retained the bathing in water. “The original form of Baptism—frequent bathing in cold water—remained in use...” As bathing in water was seen as initiation into the Jewish religion, Christians used bathing in water as initiation into the Christian religion. <http://jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/2456-baptism>

Interesting. According to the Jewish Encyclopedia, the new Gospel Church adopted the Jewish practice of immersion. It did not identify “baptism” as a continuation of circumcision from the Old Testament. Moreover, neither the Jews nor the Christians immersed the subject until after the proselyte professed unity with his new religion.

Here is the order given by Paul:

10 And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power: 11 In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: 12 Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. (Col 2)

Note Paul’s order. Circumcised heart, i.e., conversion, and then buried with him in baptism. Paul’s order in vv.11, 12 matches the order of proselytization to the Jews’ religion of his day. I think we must say that Paul’s order had to follow the Jews’ accepted order, or the Jews would have rejected Paul’s doctrine that required a circumcised heart which changed one’s life before he could be immersed as a convert to the Christian religion.

The Jewish Encyclopedia tells us that under the Old Covenant, purification, conversion and sanctification was connected with washing or bathing, immersion. What would have been the Jewish response if Paul reversed the order and changed the mode associated by the Jews with conversion, or proselytization to a different religion?

Paul was speaking to a Jewish society that already had their idea of proselytization. What if he had placed the natural method of “religious” cleansing, washing or bathing, before the sanctifying faith that spoke of the cleansing? Moreover, the Encyclopedia makes it clear that the first century church made no connection between circumcision and baptism. Moreover, it also

made it clear that immersion, or bathing, was the sign of being cleansed.

John’s baptism: John’s baptism had to be in the context of the Jewish belief concerning proselytization, or the Jews would have rejected him:

7 But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? 8 Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: 9 And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. (Matt 3)

“Fruit worthy of repentance (καρπον αξιον της μετανοιας). John demands proof from these men of the new life before he administers baptism to them. “The fruit is not the change of heart, but the acts which result from it” (McNeile). It was a bold deed for John thus to challenge as unworthy the very ones who posed as lights and leaders of the Jewish people. “Any one can do. (ποιησατε, #Ge 1:11 acts externally good but only a good man can grow a crop of right acts and habits” (Bruce))” (Robertson’s NT Word Pictures)

The Jews were coming to him to be immersed according to their idea of proselytization to another religion. But they came with no proof of a heart change.

Question: How and from where did these practices of infant sprinkling originate if, according to the Jewish Encyclopedia, they were not from the first century church?

Dispensational Lunacy

GREAT DISPENSATIONAL EXCITEMENT GENERATED BY TRUMP-CYRUS

This writer is continually amazed at the ease with which professed Christians so willingly part with their money to fund various clearly unbiblical and antichrist causes.

The big “hubbub” over the move to recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital and move the US embassy there has sparked new “prophetic excitement” in both the Christian and Jewish communities, which will no doubt be quite profitable for both. Trump is seen as “Cyrus” by Jews, Christian Zionists and Dispensationalists, and his move to Jerusalem is seen as the foundation to build a Third Temple. **“New coin minted to fund**

building Jerusalem Temple. Backers say ‘house of prayer for all nations source of true peace’ The recent effort that created the commemorative ‘Trump-Cyrus Coin,’ sporting images of President Trump and ancient Persian King Cyrus, is now minting a special edition. [The] 70 Year Redemption Coin to raise funds to build Jerusalem’s Third Temple as a house of prayer for all nations.”

(<http://www.wnd.com/2018/04/new-coin-minted-to-fund-building-jerusalem-temple/>)

What can we say about the total denial of Jesus Christ by professed Christians who join in such an evil, totally antichrist endeavor?

“It is absurd to speak of Jesus Christ with the tongue, and to cherish in the mind a Judaism which has now come to an end. For where there is Christianity there cannot be Judaism.”

(Ignatius, c. 30-c. 107, *To The Magnesians*, The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume I, p. 63. Emp. added.)

What more can one say about those professed Christians who support and finance the evil endeavors of the antichrist? What more can be said other than what is clearly laid out in Galatians, Hebrews and 1, 2 & 3 John?

Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the LORD, The temple of the LORD, The temple of the LORD, are these. (Jer 7:4)

The great excitement among those who identify as Jews and Dispensational Christians over the building of a Third Temple brings us to this 2005 article by Thomas Williamson,

NEXT EVENT ON THE PROPHETIC CALENDAR? TEMPLE IN JERUSALEM WITH ANIMAL SACRIFICES

There is a lot of preoccupation in some Christian circles with the prospect of the construction of a Jewish temple in Jerusalem, with animal sacrifices that would revive the ancient Old Testament rites of worship.

The main proof text for a future literal temple with animal sacrifices is Ezekiel 40-48, which is held to be a description of such a literal temple to be built during the Millennium. However, there is nothing definite in Ezekiel’s account that would place this temple in the Millennium period.

Some interpreters have regarded Ezekiel’s temple as a description of what the Jews could have constructed after their return from Babylon in 538 BC, had their sins not prevented the complete fulfillment of this prophecy

(Ezekiel 43:10-11).

Others have found Ezekiel’s prophecy to be a reference to the progress of the Gospel in the Church Age, with the spread of the Gospel predicted under the figure of waters flowing out from Jerusalem (Ezekiel 47, compare with John 7:38 and Revelation 22:1-2). (See Patrick Fairbairn, *Expositions on Ezekiel*, pp. 424ff. Ed.)

Even the literalist interpreters of Ezekiel’s temple do not insist that everything will be fulfilled literally. Scofield describes the sin-offerings of Ezekiel 43:19 as non-literal, saying, **“Doubtless these offerings will be memorial, looking back to the cross, as the offerings under the old covenant were anticipatory, looking forward to the cross.”**

The editors of the New Scofield Reference Bible have gone even further, proposing that **“The reference to sacrifices is not to be taken literally, in view of the putting away of such offerings, but is rather to be regarded as a presentation of the worship of redeemed Israel, in her own land and in the millennial temple, using the terms with which the Jews were familiar in Ezekiel’s day.”**

Since it is permissible to take the reference to animal sacrifices as non-literal and symbolic, using terms which ancient Jews could understand, it is definitely permissible to go one logical step further and say that the Temple itself is non-literal as to its fulfillment, and that there will be no literal Temple on earth during the Millennium.

There are many persuasive Scriptural reasons for believing that Ezekiel’s Temple prophecy will be fulfilled in a non-literal manner.

1. Ezekiel presents the priesthood of the temple as being conducted by Levite priests, Ezekiel 43:19, 44:10, 15, etc. However, we are told in Hebrews 7:11-18 that God has permanently set aside the priesthood of the descendants of Levi, in favor of the priesthood of Christ, a non-Levite.

2. The system of Temple, priests and animal sacrifices was part of the Old Covenant which, according to Hebrews 8:13 was about to vanish away (which took place at the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD).

3. The priests of Ezekiel’s temple must be circumcised, Ezekiel 44:9, but under the New Covenant, circumcision is not required, Galatians 5:6.

4. We are told in Hebrews 9:11 that Christ has become the high priest of a better tabernacle, non-literal, non-corporeal, not made with hands, located not on earth but in heaven (Hebrews 9:24). Christ now ministers for us in heaven, in *“the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man,”* Hebrews 8:2. Any temple built on earth would be phony, not the “true tabernacle” and therefore should be rejected by believers.

5. The Old Testament sacrifices and temples were only shadows and figurative representations of the true heavenly Temple and once-for-all sacrifice of Christ, Hebrews 9:24, 10:1. Christ has taken away the old system of animal sacrifices, Hebrews 10:8-10. We are commanded to go forth from the camp of Judaism with its literal sacrifices, Hebrews 13:11-14, and to concentrate on the heavenly Jerusalem, not the literal one on earth, Hebrews 12:22, John 4:21, Galatians 4:25-26. To draw back to the old Temple and sacrificial system would be an act of apostasy, Hebrews 10:26-29, 38-39.

6. Here is the clincher: Revelation 21:22 teaches that there will be no Temple in the Millennium: *“And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.”*

To escape the force of this statement, some Temple enthusiasts say that this portion of Revelation is about the eternal state, not the Millennium. To do that, they have to spiritualize the references to kings of the earth (21:23), nations of the saved (21:24), and the healing of the nations in 22:2 - how would anyone possibly need to be healed of anything during the eternal state?

Others say that there will be a Temple down on the earth during the Millennium but not up in the New Jerusalem suspended from heaven. This notion ignores the clear teaching of the epistle to the Hebrews, that the earthly temple has been permanently outmoded and set aside by Christ’s high-priestly ministry. Since the time of Christ’s death on the Cross, there has been no need for an earthly Temple (Matthew 27:51, Hebrews 10:11-12, 13:10).

The notion that a literal temple will operate in Jerusalem during the Millennium is based on pure speculation and does dishonor to the supreme value of Christ’s once-for-all sacrifice at Calvary. Nowhere in the Bible are we commanded to work for the construction of such a Temple - our orders are to plant New Testament Christian churches, not Jewish temples,

Matthew 28:19-20, Acts 1:8.

What About the “Tribulation Temple?”

Some expositors, while holding to the concept of Ezekiel’s Temple being built as the “Fourth Temple” during the Millennium, also believe that there will be a “Third Temple” during the Great Tribulation period preceding the Millennium. Some go farther and say that Christians ought to be helping to get such a Temple built in Jerusalem, or even that Christ cannot return until such a Temple is built. Does the Bible teach any of this?

One supposed proof-text for a Tribulation Temple is **Daniel 9:26-27**, which describes the destruction of the *“city and the sanctuary”* in conjunction with the “cutting-off” of the Messiah. This was already fulfilled when the Romans completely destroyed Jerusalem and the Second Temple in 70 AD. Dispensationalist interpreters agree that 9:26 refers to Herod’s Temple which was destroyed in 70 AD, but then they insert a 2000-year gap between 9:26 and 9:27 and postulate a “sanctuary” in 9:27 which would be the Third Temple.

To separate 9:26 and 9:27 in this manner, and have them to refer to 2 different temples 2000 years apart from each other, is a fanciful and nonsensical method of interpretation. **Besides, there is absolutely no mention whatsoever of any sanctuary or Temple in 9:27. How can this be a proof-text for a future Third Temple when no Temple is even mentioned?** Clearly, 9:27 is only a continuation and expansion of the events with regard to the Second Temple of 9:26.

To make Daniel 9:27 refer to the destruction of a Third Temple is to wrench this verse out of its context of events in the time of the Messiah’s first advent. Nowhere in Daniel’s prophecy is there any hint about a Third Temple - he is prophesying about the Second Temple which was still in the future when Daniel wrote. Some have claimed the “sanctuary” of Daniel 11:31 as a Third Temple, but almost all commentators, even Scofield (see Old Scofield Reference Bible, page 918) accept this as a reference to the profanation of the Second Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 BC.

How about **Matthew 24:15**, describing the “abomination of desolation” in the “holy place?” Does this refer to the Third Temple? This verse does not mention any temple at all. Since the Jews regarded all of Palestine, and especially the environs of Jerusalem, as holy, the approach of the Roman army near Jerusalem

could have been regarded as a fulfillment of this predicted abomination. This would make more sense than to ask the disciples to watch for the abomination within the walls of the actual Temple, where it could not have been seen except by a few priests.

Even if the “holy place” does refer specifically to the Temple, then it refers to Herod’s Temple - it was this Temple that the Apostles asked Christ about (Matthew 24:3), not some hypothetical future temple. Compare Matthew 24:15 with the parallel passage in Luke 21:20, and it is evident that this “abomination of desolation” took place during the Jewish War of 67-70 AD, and that the approach of the Roman army was the signal for all Christians in Jerusalem to flee the city. There is nothing about a futuristic “Third Temple” here.

Nowhere in Matthew 24, or anywhere else in the Bible, is there a hint that Herod’s Temple, once destroyed, would be rebuilt or that Christians should expect or seek such a building program. So why do we make such a big deal about something that is not even in the Bible?

How about **2 Thessalonians 2:3-4**, which describes a “Man of Sin” who will sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God? Some take this as a reference to a future Antichrist who will sit in a future literal temple in Jerusalem. But there is no mention of Jerusalem in this passage, and the identification of the “Man of Sin” with a future Antichrist is pure supposition.

Some regard the Man of Sin as a personage in the First Century AD, associated with the time when the Second Temple was destroyed. Many interpreters over the years have regarded this passage as a reference to the Pope and the institution of the Papacy, which has been enthroned in St. Peter’s in Rome over the centuries, pretending to be the vicar of Christ.

It is also important to realize that the reference to “temple” here may not be a literal building at all. The Greek word naos in 2 Thessalonians 2:4 is the same word that appears in John 2:19, 1 Corinthians 3:16-17, 6:19, 2 Corinthians 6:16 and Ephesians 2:21, and in all of these cases the word naos or temple is clearly not a literal building. Naos is variously used to refer to Christ’s own literal body, to the bodies of individual Christians, and to Christians as a corporate body, as in 1 Corinthians 3:16-17 and Ephesians 2:21. This being the case, it would be possible for the Man of Sin to fulfill the prophecy of sitting in the Temple of God by

insinuating himself among God’s people, without the necessity of constructing a literal temple for him to do his dastardly part.

The Temple in Revelation 11:1

The fourth “proof-text” for a Tribulation Temple is **Revelation 11:1**, which depicts John as measuring the temple of God and those who worship therein. The temple he measured is described in the present tense, as something that existed in John’s time, with worshippers present. This would be a clear reference to the Second Temple which was still standing when John wrote, which was soon to be destroyed by the Romans in 70 AD after a military campaign lasting 42 months (Revelation 11:2).

Alfred Edersheim, discussing John’s familiarity with the Second Temple in Jerusalem, says, **“These naturally suggest the twofold inference that the Book of Revelation and the Fourth Gospel must have been written before the Temple services had actually ceased, and by one who had not merely been intimately acquainted with, but probably at one time an actor in them.”** Any of John’s readers, at the time that he wrote Revelation 11, would have understood John as referring to Herod’s Temple, not some unknown future temple.

Adam Clarke’s commentary states, with regard to Revelation 11:1, that **“This must refer to the temple of Jerusalem; and this is another presumptive evidence that it was yet standing. . . . The measuring of the temple probably refers to its approaching destruction, and the termination of the whole Levitical service; and this we find was to be done by the Gentiles, (Romans,) who were to tread it down 42 months; i.e., just 3 years and a half, or 1260 days.”**

Those who take the temple of Revelation 11:1 out of its historical context have come up with some strange and dubious notions. Some have said that the temple represents the “Gospel Church” (Matthew Henry) or the “True Inner Church” (Henry Halley). Historicists say that Revelation 11 was fulfilled by the events of the French Revolution in the late 18th Century.

Those who see this as a future “Third Temple” add a lot of fanciful and imaginative details that are not found at all in this “proof-text” or anywhere else in the Bible: the temple to be built exactly where the Mosque of Omar is now; Christians urged to support the construction of this temple; the temple to be consecrated with ashes of

a red heifer; the Antichrist to disrupt temple services after 3 ½ years and kill 2/3 of all the Jews. There is no Scriptural basis for any of this.

Even those who insist that the Temple of Revelation 11 must be a future temple will have to admit that the exact location of this temple is not specified, and there is no hint that Christians are to seek the construction of such a temple. Why would we want to help construct a temple which clearly, throughout Revelation 11, is an object of God's displeasure and judgment? And even if we adopt the futurist view of Revelation 11, what evidence do we have that God wants that temple built right now, as opposed to 100 or 1000 years from now?

As we have seen, there are widely divergent conjectures on the meaning of Revelation 11:1. Obviously, we cannot build an entire doctrine on one such isolated and highly disputed text.

We can sum up the Scriptural evidence for a Third Temple by saying that there is no such evidence. Tommy Ice and Randall Price, in their book "Ready to Rebuild," admit that **"There are no Bible verses that say, 'There is going to be a third temple.'"** Their case for a Third Temple is built on tradition, supposition and pure speculation, not on any clear teaching from the Word of God.

Do We Have a Duty to Make Bible Prophecies Come to Pass?

Some, who have accepted the teaching with regard to the Third Temple to be built in Jerusalem, have concluded that Christians should be actively seeking to help build such a temple, in order to fulfill "Bible Prophecy." But is there any principle in the Bible that teaches that it is our duty to make sure that ancient Bible prophecies are fulfilled in our time?

This desire to make Bible prophecy come true is a very selective thing. Those who believe in a Russian invasion of Israel and a Revived Roman Empire are not lobbying for our government to send weapons and military assistance to Russia and Italy in order to make the prophecies come true. In these cases, they seem to believe that God is competent to make these things happen without any help from us mere mortals.

But when it comes to anything that is perceived as helping Israel or bashing the Arabs, then there are many Christians who are full of zeal to persuade our government to go all-out to fulfill "prophecy" in the Middle East, as if God really needed our help. (They

are so zealous about this that they even want America to help re-fulfill prophecies that were already completely, literally fulfilled in ancient times. For example, God already gave to Israel all the land that was promised them from the River of Egypt to the Euphrates - see Joshua 11:23, 21:43-45, 2 Samuel 8:3, 1 Kings 4:21, 8:56, 2 Chronicles 9:26 and Nehemiah 9:7-8, 24. But the prophecy enthusiasts say that is not good enough, and that we must help Israel fulfill the prophecy again, even if we have to plunge the entire world into war to do it).

But when Christ predicted the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD (Luke 19:43-44, also Luke 24) did He command Christians to write letters to the Emperor and to their Senators and Centurions, lobbying for them to come and destroy Jerusalem? No, He did not. It was not the job of Christians to make prophecy happen back then, nor is it our job today.

We are not commanded to fulfill any supposed "prophecies" about building any Temple in Jerusalem, nor to help Israel to ethnically cleanse the Arabs from Palestine so that such a Temple can be built. Not only does the Bible not teach that we are to help build the Temple, but it is not clear that there will ever be such a Temple.

Those who want to help literally fulfill Ezekiel's temple prophecy do not take all of that prophecy literally. They have no desire to fulfill Ezekiel 47:22-23: *"And it shall come to pass, that ye shall divide it by lot for an inheritance unto you, and to the strangers that sojourn among you, which shall beget children among you: and they shall be unto you as born in the country among the children of Israel; they shall have inheritance with you among the tribes of Israel. And it shall come to pass, that in what tribe the stranger sojourneth, there shall ye give him his inheritance, saith the Lord God."*

The temple enthusiasts have no desire to help fulfill this prophecy, because that could mean recognizing the civil and property rights of the Palestinians, which they do not wish to do. Instead, they call for the expulsion of the Palestinians from their homeland, and for their land to be stolen from them without compensation. They would rather express and fulfill their racial hatred for Arabs than see this portion of Ezekiel's prophecy literally fulfilled.

If someone talks to you about building the Temple and expelling the Palestinians so that "prophecy" can

be fulfilled, read Ezekiel 47:22-23 to him, and ask him what he is doing to help divvy up Israeli real estate and deed it over to the Palestinians, in order to literally fulfill Ezekiel's prophecy. If it is really their duty to make the prophecies happen, ask them what they are doing to promote the national greatness of Egypt (Isaiah 19:25) and the Arab world (Genesis 21:18).

Must the Temple Be Built Before Christ Can Return?
(Which, by the way, the Talmud teaches. Ed.)

Some prophecy teachers seem to think that Christ cannot return until the Temple is built. Consider, for instance:

“The Jewish Temple must be rebuilt before the return of Jesus Christ.” - Jack Van Impe.

“The Temple is the last sign that needs to fall into place before events irreversibly speed toward the return of Christ.” - Hal Lindsey

“Both the Old and the New Testaments say there is no possibility for Jesus to come except that there is a temple waiting for Him.” - Jan Van Der Hoeven, founder, International Christian Embassy.

If what Van Impe, Van Der Hoeven and “Shallow Hal” Lindsey say is true, then the doctrine of the imminent, any-moment return of Christ has been a big mistake. Instead of an imminent return of Christ, we now have a Christ who cannot possibly return until the Temple has been built.

Instead of a Christ who has all power in heaven and earth (Matthew 28:18), we now have a poor, weak, helpless Arminian “christ” who is marooned in heaven, who wants to come back to earth but cannot because he is impatiently waiting for the Temple to be rebuilt.

Actually, the Bible does not say that a Temple must be built before Christ can return. Nor does the Bible teach that the building of the Temple, or talk and rumors about a Temple being built, are a sign of Christ's return. The Bible teaches that there are no signs of Christ's coming, Acts 1:7, Matthew 24:36-42, 1 Thessalonians 5:2.

Christians Who Support Temple Mount Terrorists

While Christians demand (and rightly so) that Muslims stop their financial support of terrorists, some Christians are giving generous financial support to Jewish terrorists who are plotting to blow up the Mosque of Omar in Jerusalem so that a Jewish Temple can be built there, to “fulfill prophecy.”

Christian Zionist leader Terry Reisenhoover of

the Jerusalem Temple Foundation explained, in an interview with journalist Grace Halsell, that he was raising money from American Christians, to be used by Stanley Goldfoot to blow up the mosque in Jerusalem. “He's a very solid, legitimate terrorist,” Reisenhoover said of Goldfoot. “He has the qualifications for clearing a site for the temple.” Reisenhoover stated that Goldfoot does not believe in God, but this atheistic conviction did not hinder Goldfoot from making a fund-raising appearance at Chuck Smith's Calvary Chapel in Costa Mesa, California.

Reverend James DeLoach of Second Baptist Church in Houston, Texas told Halsell that he was a good friend of Goldfoot, and that \$100 million was being raised for Jewish terrorists, who he described as “doing God's will.” According to DeLoach, some of the money was being used to provide legal defense for Jewish terrorists. These terrorists were being prosecuted by the Israeli government which has always strongly opposed the activities of the Temple Mount terrorists.

As we continue to insist that Muslims stop supporting their terrorists, maybe we can set a good example for them, as Christians, by cutting off support for our own Jewish terrorists, too. The support that some Christian fundamentalists are giving to these radical extremists is resented by Israeli officials and is ultimately harmful to the cause of Israel (as well as being an extremely bad testimony for evangelical Christianity).

David Brickner, executive director of Jews For Jesus, has summed up the Temple Mount question by saying, **“When it comes to Jewish people and the rebuilding of the Temple, I can assure you that most Jews couldn't care less about that. It is only a small subset of Orthodox Jews who are interested in rebuilding the Temple and they are far off from accomplishing that. Ultimately, I believe in the sovereignty of God. I believe that we can't hurry His agenda nor can we help Him fulfill prophecy. His word will be accomplished and in the meantime we should get on with being obedient to the Great Commission.”**

Conclusion: Forget Temple, Build New Testament Churches

A tremendous amount of time, money and attention is being devoted to the Jerusalem Temple by some modern-day evangelical Christians. Sermons are being preached, books and videos are being produced, money is being raised to help get the Temple built and to lobby

our government for a foreign policy that is conducive toward that purpose.

There is a notion that the impending construction of the Temple will soon usher in Christ's return and bring an end to all our earthly problems and trials. Naturally, this type of escapist thinking is popular with the masses, but as we have seen, there is no Scriptural basis for it.

Time has proven that preparations for the construction of a Temple are not a sign of Christ's coming. Some time ago, Scottish preacher John Cumming published a book called "The End: Or, the Proximate Signs of the Close of This Dispensation" in which he cited ongoing fund-raising to rebuild a Jewish temple in Jerusalem as a sign of Christ's Second Coming within a decade. He published that book in 1855. Christ didn't come within that decade. What does that tell us?

We need to get off the "Temple Mount" kick and concentrate on the real work that our Lord has assigned for us in the Great Commission: preaching the Gospel, baptizing converts into New Testament churches, and discipling them. All of this current brainwashing and propaganda on behalf of a Jewish temple does not help to disciple Christians; rather, it only propagates "Jewish fables" of the type that Paul tells us to reject, Titus 1:14. (From Northern Landmark Missionary Baptist, January, 2005)

ANIMAL SACRIFICE

Many Orthodox Jews and Fundamentalist Christians actively support the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem. The Christians who agitate for this restoration do so because they believe it is God's will that sacrificial religion be restored. They see the resumption of Temple worship as a sure sign of the Second Coming of Christ. <http://www.essene.com/HumaneReligion/AnimalSacrifice.htm>

THE NEW DARK AGE

Dark Age Greeks tried to make sense of the massive ruins of their forgotten forbearers' monumental palaces that were still standing around. As illiterates, they were curious about occasional clay tablets they plowed up in their fields with incomprehensible ancient Linear B inscriptions.

We of the 21st century are beginning to look back at our own lost epic times and wonder about these now-nameless giants who left behind monuments that we cannot replicate, but instead merely use or even mock.

Does anyone believe that contemporary Americans

could build another transcontinental railroad in six years?

Californians tried to build a high-speed rail line. But after more than a decade of government incompetence, lawsuits, cost overruns and constant bureaucratic squabbling, they have all but given up. The result is a half-built overpass over the skyline of Fresno — and not yet a foot of track laid.

Who were those giants of the 1960s responsible for building our interstate highway system?

California's roads now are mostly the same as we inherited them, although the state population has tripled. We have added little to our freeway network, either because we forgot how to build good roads or would prefer to spend the money on redistributive entitlements.

When California had to replace a quarter section of the earthquake-damaged San Francisco Bay Bridge, it turned into a near-disaster, with 11 years of acrimony, fighting, cost overruns — and a commentary on our decline into Dark Ages primitivism. Yet 82 years ago, our ancestors built four times the length of our single replacement span in less than four years. It took them just two years to design the entire Bay Bridge and award the contracts.

Our generation required five years just to plan to replace a single section. In inflation-adjusted dollars, we spent six times the money on one-quarter of the length of the bridge and required 13 agencies to grant approval. In 1936, just one agency oversaw the entire bridge project.

California has not built a major dam in 40 years. Instead, officials squabble over the water stored and distributed by our ancestors, who designed the California State Water Project and Central Valley Project.

Contemporary Californians would have little food or water without these massive transfers, and yet they often ignore or damn the generation that built the very system that saves us.

America went to the moon in 1969 with supposedly primitive computers and backward engineering. Does anyone believe we could launch a similar moonshot today? No American has set foot on the moon in the last 47 years, and it may not happen in the next 50 years.

Hollywood once gave us blockbuster epics, brilliant Westerns, great film noirs, and classic comedies. Now

it endlessly turns out comic-book superhero films or pathetic remakes of prior classics.

Our writers, directors and actors have lost the skills of their ancestors. But they are also cowardly, and in regimented fashion they simply parrot boring race, class and gender bromides that are neither interesting nor funny. Does anyone believe that the Oscar ceremonies are more engaging and dignified than in the past?

We have been fighting in Afghanistan without result for 18 years. Our forefathers helped to win World War II and defeat the Axis Powers in four years.

In terms of learning, does anyone believe that a college graduate in 2020 will know half the information of a 1950 graduate? (Or even what a sixth grader learned in the late 1800s. Ed.)

In the 1940s, young people read William Faulkner, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Pearl Buck and John Steinbeck. Are our current novelists turning out anything comparable? Could today's high-school graduate even finish "The Good Earth" or "The Grapes of Wrath"?

True, social media is impressive. The internet gives us instant access to global knowledge. We are a more tolerant society, at least in theory. But Facebook is not the Hoover Dam, and Twitter is not the Panama Canal.

Our ancestors were builders and pioneers and mostly fearless. We are regulators, auditors, bureaucrats, adjudicators, censors, critics, plaintiffs, defendants, social media junkies and thin-skinned scolds. A distant generation created; we mostly delay, idle and gripe.

As we walk amid the refuse, needles and excrement of the sidewalks of our fetid cities; as we sit motionless on our jammed ancient freeways; and as we pout on Twitter and electronically whine in the porticos of our Ivy League campuses, will we ask: "Who were these people who left these strange monuments that we use but can neither emulate nor understand?"

In comparison to us, they now seem like gods.
(Copied)

RECESS FOR ADULTS

'Adult Recess' Is Booming, Because Being a Grown-Up Is Hard.' "People are reliving schoolyard memories with tetherball, hopscotch and Lincoln Logs, despite sore muscles and tweaked knees"

<https://www.wsj.com/articles/adult-recess-booms-because-being-a-grown-up-is-hard-11566226699>

'Poor little govt. workers': Therapy dogs head to

Capitol to comfort impeachment-stressed staffers.
<https://www.wnd.com/2019/11/poor-little-govt-workers-therapy-dogs-head-capitol-comfort-impeachment-stressed-staffers/>

We must now question if there is even an adult in the room? Christianity is gone, and so are dependable, hard-working responsible adults. We live among practicing juveniles who may have the physical characteristics but not the emotional characteristics of a responsible adult. The disastrous government education system has destroyed two generations. And these juveniles fight over who will be in charge.

LLOYD SPRINKLE

It is with great sadness for this writer, but with great joy for Lloyd Sprinkle, forward this to you:

Fellow Compatriots in the Chaplains' Corps and Friends of the Cause:

The SCV Chaplains Corps has lost a chaplain and friend in Pastor Lloyd Thomas Sprinkle (1939-2019) on September 26. He was the founding pastor of Providence Baptist Church which has hosted the National SCV Chaplains Conference for a number of years and since Lloyd's retirement the host of the conference has been Pastor Andy Rice. Lloyd was very active until laid aside with illness. He also founded Sprinkle Publications that republished many seminal Southern Christian books which included great biographies, Southern theological writings, and histories covering Church History; he was a SCV local camp chaplain; he and his wife Jackie were very active in the Blue Ridge Christian School; they both were active in the music for the National Chaplains Conference; and there were many other worthy endeavors. Lloyd loved Thomas Jonathan "Stonewall" Jackson and the publishing business began as a result of the republication of Dr. R. L. Dabney's *The Life of General Stonewall Jackson* that went through numerous reprints. So I draw the following quote relating to Jackson's last words from that book in memoriam to our brother, "Let us cross over the river, and rest under the shade of the trees." Dr. R. L. Dabney writing of these last words explained:

Was his soul wandering back in dreams to the river of his beloved valley, the Shenandoah, (the "river of sparkling waters,") whose verdant meads and groves he had redeemed from the invader, and across whose floods he had so often won his passage through the toils of battle? Or was he reaching forward across the River

of Death, to the golden streets of the Celestial City, and the trees whose leaves are for the healing of the nations? It was to these that God was bringing him, through his last battle and victory; and under their shade he walks, with the blessed company of the redeemed.

We shall miss our brother but you will not be missing us as you rejoice with others around the throne of God and of the Lamb. Yes, he rejoices in his Saviour with Jackson and Lee and Dabney and many other Southern Worthies. Some may reject the Biblical accuracy of that last sentence. Paul when writing to the believers at Corinth noted, "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.... For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known" (1 Cor. 13:9-10, 12). Paul in this passage contrasted our present knowing with future knowing. Now we are limited in knowledge but in glory we shall have complete knowledge. That being true we shall know one another. We will know as we are known. The old Welsh preacher was right; his wife interrupted him in his studies by asking him, "John Evans, do you think we shall know each other in heaven?" The disturbed minister replied, "To be sure we shall. Do you think we shall be greater fools there than we are here?" We are one in Christ and therefore in communion with one another in glory!

Ron Rumburg

Personal note: About a year after Bettie and I married, I resigned my church in Linden, Indiana, and we moved to Front Royal, Virginia. From there we started attending Lloyd Sprinkle's church in Harrisonburg, Virginia. After a period of time, Bro Sprinkle asked me to teach in the first service. (That Ten Commandment series is posted on Sermonaudio.com/providence.) After a short period of time, he encouraged us to move to Bean Settlement, WV to see if we could start a work for the Lord there. From the time we started attending Providence Baptist Church in Harrisonburg until the time we left West Virginia, Brother Sprinkle and I rode together to attend a preachers' fellowship in Roanoke, Virginia. It was about a three hour drive each way, and we spent a lot of time of discussing theology, and solving the world's problems. It was a great time of fellowship, obviously. We were the same age. After about 8 1/2 years, theological issues forced us to resign from the

WV church, which was about the time Bro. Sprinkle had his stroke. I then had the privilege of being able to fill his pulpit for a few months until we moved to Ohio.

Though his presence will be missed, the books he published will reach far into the future. He told me several times that his goal was to have the most enduring binding that he could obtain. Those of you who might have *Sprinkle Publication* books know that the binding on those books certainly speaks of Christian excellence, and should last many years of hard use.

THE TRANSFER OF WEALTH

MANUFACTURING IS NOW SMALLEST SHARE OF U.S. ECONOMY IN 72 YEARS

(Bloomberg) -- Three years after Donald Trump campaigned for president pledging a factory renaissance, the opposite appears to be happening. Manufacturing made up 11% of gross domestic product in the second quarter, the smallest share in data going back to 1947 and down from 11.1% in the prior period, a Commerce Department report showed Tuesday. Figures before 2005 were for full years only. The latest number compares with 13.4% for real estate, 12.8% for professional and business services and 12.3% for governments, according to the figures on GDP by industry. Once a powerhouse of the U.S. economy, making up about a quarter of GDP in the 1960s, the manufacturing sector has steadily declined in importance. Trump promised to deliver "victory" to factory workers by bringing production jobs back to the U.S. While manufacturing has added about half a million workers on the whole since Trump took office, states like Pennsylvania and Wisconsin that helped him win in 2016 are now losing factory jobs amid a persistent trade war with China and a weaker global economy. The administration's protectionist policies have disturbed companies' supply chains, stymied investment and slowed hiring. Tariffs on billions of dollars worth of Chinese products helped tip the manufacturing sector into recession earlier this year. Some recent figures suggest stabilization but it remains fragile. Wednesday's third-quarter GDP report is forecast to show the economy grew at the second-slowest pace of Trump's presidency. On Friday, data may show manufacturing jobs dropped 55,000 in October from the prior month, largely reflecting the walkout of thousands of General Motors Co. employees.

Bloomberg, 10/29/19. Read more at: <https://www.bloombergquint.com/>

Many of us remember in the 1960s when we were being told about the intentional, systematic changing of the US from a wealth-producing nation to a consumer-oriented nation country. Since WWII, our “prosperity” has been and is being built on debt, as we have shipped more and more wealth-producing industry overseas. The bankers are the only ones “prospering” as they continue to transfer wealth from the people to themselves with debt and interest.

PERSONAL

It is amazing how fast time is moving. I remember Rushdoony saying time speeds up during a period of God’s judgment. It seems our time has been taken up with medical appointments.

A kidney stone suddenly interrupted our lives. It was bad enough to send me to the ER vomiting. (Next time I am asked if I ever considered suicide, I will have to say “Yes.”) The stone was large enough I had to be admitted to the hospital and put to sleep for its removal. I was kept overnight, and thinking I could pass water OK, I was sent home. However, all I could pass was blood clots. That sent me to the ER the next day, and they put in a catheter, which I kept for almost a week until it quit bleeding. The Urologist said that he saw how large the prostate was, and he suggested laser surgery to open it up. So, in two weeks I went in for that procedure which also created a vast amount of bleeding, ER, and catheter again for several days.

Before the kidney stone, I had to have a basal cell carcinoma removed from the left side of my nose. Stitches were removed a week later, but one stitch did not dissolve properly. The doctor who removed the stitches noticed another basal cell carcinoma on my upper left cheek, so they scheduled me back in. This time, eight stitches were required to close it up.

I am still getting shots in my left eye every four weeks, and the swelling behind the retina seems to be reducing.

I have been working on “Judeo-Churchianity” at every opportunity. But it seems like I am interrupted regularly which makes it quite difficult to set aside uninterrupted time. Here are the chapters I have ready to put into my DTP program: **1)** introduction, **2)** a new history, two parts, **3)** the growing prestige of Judaism, **4)** Jewish and Christian millennialism, **5)** who is a

Jew, **6)** Jewish philosophy and principles. Chapters waiting for final proofing: **1)** day of atonement, **2)** the Kabbalah, **3)** messianic Jews, **4)** King Joseph’s letter, **5)** the Passover, **6)** the Talmud, **7)** the Torah, **8)** the religion of Judaism, **9)** theological warfare, the battle of Gog and Magog. Prospective chapters: **1)** Zionism, **2)** the Ashkenazi Jews, **3)** Yahweh, the Jewish god. I do not know the order of the chapters except for Introduction and the first chapter will be “Who is a Jew.”

The subjects will be so contrary to what is Politically Correct teaching in the average church and understood by the average Christian that I have used a wearying amount of documentation from many recognized scholars in their various fields of endeavors. Some of the original documentation includes the 10,000 page Talmud --- the oral law from the time of Moses that was not written down until the third century --- and the 1140 AD Kuzari. A lot of the material has only been translated into English since 1900.

There is an overabundance of material that demands attention in the area of our concern, but it must be cut off somewhere. The Lord has made the vast majority of the research material available simply for the effort of downloading.

I had hoped to have something ready to publish by the end of January, but that seems to be an unreasonable goal without rushing through the project. Brethren, pray for us as we move in the direction the Lord has placed before us.

A PERSONAL WARNING--DEADLY VACCINES

I had a successful surgery, and my follow-up was 10/28/19. As the nurse was checking me in and going over meds &c, she asked me if I wanted a flu shot. I emphatically said no and, surprisingly enough, she said she did not blame me. And then she told me of one of their patients, an older lady, who had taken her flu shot this year, and has been unable to walk since that shot. And then the nurse said that it looks like they are trying to kill us to solve the overpopulation problem. (That office does not offer flu shots.)

She also admitted that vaccines are dangerous, and we are not being told of the many people who are being injured or even killed by them. She said neither she, her children nor grandchildren have been vaccinated. And

then we discussed the problem with the public pressure on vaccination: most doctors will not work with children who have not been vaccinated. I suggested to her that she do a simple search on aluminum in vaccines, and she would be shocked at the amount of aluminum that is being injected with the vaccines, particularly into babies, and very young children. (It has been shown over the years that ingested aluminum is very damaging to the nervous system. With the increase of aluminum cookware has come an increase of Alzheimer's disease.)

The Biblical Examiner
5130 Danville Rd
Lynchburg, OH 45142

Address service Requested

RELIGION IS DEFINED AS "MAN'S ULTIMATE CONCERN". CHRISTIANITY—
MAN'S "ULTIMATE CONCERN" IS OBEYING GOD'S WORD, AND DOING ALL
THINGS FOR THE GLORY OF GOD. HUMANISM IS DOING ALL THINGS
FOR MAN'S GLORY AND WELLBEING. IF THE ULTIMATE CONCERN IS THE
LATEST SPORTS SCORE, MAKING MONEY, HAVING A GOOD HOME, NEW
CAR, MAKING SURE OTHERS LIKE YOU, &C., THEN THOSE THINGS ARE
ONE'S RELIGION NO MATTER HOW LOUD HE PROFESSES CHRIST. FOR
A PASTOR, IF HIS ULTIMATE CONCERN IS KEEPING A GOOD NUMBER OF
FOLLOWERS, KEEPING A GOOD INCOME, OR MANY OTHER MOTIVATIONS,
THAT IS HIS HUMANISTIC RELIGION.

THE RELIGION OF ENVIRONMENTALISM

THE WORSHIP OF WEEDS

NBC News asks Americans to confess their climate-change sins

(DAILY CALLER) -- NBC News is asking Americans to confess their climate change sins, though at least some people have taken the opportunity to troll the news company.

"Even those who care deeply about the planet's future can slip up now and then. Tell us: Where do you fall short in preventing climate change?" reads the introduction to NBC's "Climate Confessions" project....

<https://www.wnd.com/2019/09/nbc-news-asks-americans-confess-climate-change-sins/>

WAIT ... CHRISTIANS CONFESSING TO PLANTS?

David Limbaugh sees idolatry in a seminary's recent chapel service. David Limbaugh By David Limbaugh, 9/19/19.

A bizarre incident at Union Theological Seminary illustrates why many Christians believe that internal forces, not external ones, represent the greatest threat to the church.

Students at this seminary prayed to a collection of plants in its chapel, which triggered a raft of criticism on Twitter. The school defiantly defended its action in a series of tweets.

"Today in chapel, we confessed to plants," the school tweeted. "Together, we held our grief, joy, regret, hope, guilt and sorrow in prayer; offering them to the beings who sustain us but whose gift we too often fail to honor. What do

you confess to the plants in your life?"...

<https://www.wnd.com/2019/09/wait-christians-confessing-plants/> 'Poor little govt. workers': Therapy dogs head to Capitol to comfort impeachment-stressed staffers

We pray that you will have a good and Thanksgiving to the Lord with your family.

All articles by Bro Need, unless otherwise noted.

Visit our bookstore:

<http://biblicalexaminer.org/Book%20store.html>

E-MAIL DOES NOT KEEP UP WITH YOUR NEW
ADDRESSES.

Please remember us in your prayers and giving

VAXXED, the movie

Check out https://www.vaxxed2.com/?cid=76fa494d-cb3e-4f7e-9f80-2b2ee0f2ffa8&utm_campaign=6850d100-7c3f-4c75-8390-329792b1184b&utm_medium=mail&utm_source=so