



The Grace Proclamator and Promulgator

“To testify the gospel of the grace of God.” Acts 20:24

PUBLISHED AS A MISSION PROJECT OF PILGRIMS HOPE BAPTIST CHURCH

Vol. XI, No. 6

June 1, 1995

Page 1

KNOWING THE ABSOLUTE NECESSITY OF THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST

By Wayne Camp

Philippians 3:10 That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death.

Hebrews 2:9-18 But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me. Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

The text for this message is Hebrews 2:9-18 and it is literally filled with evidence that supports the theme of this message, *The Absolute Necessity of the Humanity of Jesus Christ*. The fact that he was made a little lower than

the angels shows his humanity. There is no way God could be made lower than the angels for he is God of the angels. This must speak of the humanity of Christ. If he was to be made lower than the angels, as prophesied by David (Psa. 8:5), he must be man. Moreover, he was “*made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death.*” It is obvious from this verse (v-9) that the reason for his being made lower than the angels, or made man, was in order that he might die. God cannot die. The eternal Word who was with God in the beginning could not die. He must be made man for the suffering of death. Had he been less than a complete man having a complete human nature he could not have died.

This proposition is further established in the next clause of verse nine. “. . . *that he might taste death for every man.*” This clearly establishes the necessity of the humanity of Christ. He must taste death for his people if they are to be saved. There is nothing about his God-hood that could suffer. There is nothing about his God-hood that could die. He must be made man if he is to taste death for men.

The humanity of Christ is further established in the statement, “*For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one.*” The context (See. HUMANITY, CONT. P.6 , L. Col.)

EDITORIAL

THE INSPIRED WORD WRITTEN BY MEN INSPIRED BY THE HOLY SPIRIT

By Wayne Camp

2 Timothy 3:16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.

2 Peter 1:21 For the prophecy came not in

THE GRACE PROCLAMATOR AND PROMULGATOR (USPS #000476) is published monthly (subscription free) by the authority of Pilgrims Hope Baptist Church, 3084 Woodrow, Memphis, TN 38127. Second class postage paid at Memphis, TN 38101.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE GRACE PROCLAMATOR AND PROMULGATOR, 3084 Woodrow, Memphis, TN 38127

COPYING PRIVILEGES

Any articles or messages in this paper may be copied and used as the reader sees fit unless otherwise specified before or after the article or message. Our desire is to disseminate the gospel of grace as widely as possible.

EDITOR'S ADDRESS, PHONE NUMBERS AND E-MAIL ADDRESSES

The editor, Eld. Wayne Camp, may be reached at the address given above, or at his home address. His home address is: 2065 Tompkins Lane, Millington, TN 38053-5107.

Church Phone at Home: (901) 876-5015

Church Phone: (901) 357-0215.

Home Phone: (901) 876-6053

Compuserve Address: 73632,1267

America Online Address: WayneCamp

Note: An answering machine is on all three numbers. They will answer on the fourth ring. We do not monitor our calls before answering.

PLANNING TO MOVE? If at all possible, please notify us three weeks in advance of your change of address so that we may keep your paper coming. It costs us 50 cents to get your new address from the Postal Service and that may take long enough that two papers are returned at a cost of \$1.00 before we get the correction. This will mean you miss one or two papers. Your help in saving us this expense will be appreciated.

IF YOU ARE IN MEMPHIS we invite you to attend our services:

Bible Study 10:00 A. M. Sunday

Worship Service 11:00 A. M. Sunday

Evening Service 5:00 P. M. Sunday

Mid-Week Service 7:00 P. M. Wednesday

You Are Welcome!

time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

There is another new idea circulating via the pulpit and papers. I had not heard this idea until the last year or so. This *new* idea is that God, in giving us his word, did not inspire men; he inspired his word. This is really nothing more than a play on words to try to bolster the idea that the KJV is an inspired translation without admitting that the Church of England translators had to be inspired if it is an inspired translation. There is no way around the fact that this is a translation made by Church of England translators. Men who hold to the true Baptist position on

the church could never agree that the KJV *translators* were inspired. This would be a direct contradiction of those things we hold to be true as to the work of the Holy Spirit in local New Testament churches. So, to bolster the idea that the KJV is an inspired translation without admitting the COE translators were inspired, a *new* position has been assumed.

As mentioned before this *new* doctrine is, "The Scriptures are inspired, but the men who wrote them were not inspired." If one denies that the men who wrote the original manuscripts were inspired, he can then argue inspiration and infallibility for the KJV translation without admitting inspiration for those COE translators. Translators, by the way, who confessed there were doubtless some errors in their translation that would need correcting.

The argument is, "The Scriptures were inspired, the men were not inspired." This position is asserted on the ground of 2 Timothy 3:16. *All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.* I have no trouble with believing that the Bible is inspired. The problem I have is this *new* assertion that the men who wrote even the original manuscripts were not inspired. This is contrary to the majority of men who wrote more than 20 years ago. I am not sure this position goes that far back; I have only heard or read it in the last year or so. When I first read it, I thought, "I have never heard that before. Another new doctrine has been born out of necessity, (necessity to prop up another doctrine that is not very old) not divine revelation." Many times I have heard men of God preaching and they would refer to those "*inspired men*" who penned the Bible. Never, in 44 years as a Christian and nearly 38 years as a Baptist preacher and 13 years as a Seminary teacher and president, did I read or hear this *new* idea until the last year or so.

There have always been folks who held that the men who wrote the original manuscripts were not inspired, but they also denied the Scriptures were inspired. They did not put the wrest on Second Timothy 3:16-17 that I am hearing and reading recently.

DOES II TIMOTHY 3:16, AS FOUND IN THE KJV, SAY THE SCRIPTURES ARE INSPIRED?

What! Haven't you always heard that verse used to show the inspiration of the Scriptures? I would call your attention to the fact that the verse, *as translated in the KJV*, does not actually say the Scriptures are inspired. But, it says "all Scripture *is given by inspiration* of God." It is the *giving* that the verse says is inspired. "*By inspiration*" is an adverbial prepositional phrase modifying the verb *given*. It is not an adjective prepositional phrase as it would have to be to modify Scriptures. An adverb, or an adverbial phrase, answers the question, *when, where, why, how, in what manner, or, to what extent.* The verse, as found in

the KJV, is telling us *how* or *in what manner* the Scriptures were given. They were given by inspiration. It is saying that the *giving* of the Scriptures is through the inspiration of God. As translated in the KJV the verse *does not* affirm that the Scriptures were inspired but that the *giving* was inspired.

In the Greek, however, it is different. The Greek clearly sets forth the Scriptures as God-breathed rather than the *giving* being inspired. *Πασα γραφη θεοπνευστος* = "all Scripture God-breathed." *Theopneustos* (*θεοπνευστος*) is a verbal adjective (a participle) and modifies the noun, *γραφη*, which is translated "Scripture." In the Greek, the verse does say the Scriptures are God-breathed, or inspired.

In the KJV it is the *giving* that is inspired. In the Greek it is the *Scriptures* that are inspired.

We have no disagreement on the Scriptures being inspired. Even though those of us who, from time to time, appeal to the Greek have a better case for supporting that than those who believe the KJV improved upon the original manuscripts. If you believe the KJV is better than the Greek you must believe it is the *giving* of the Scriptures that is inspired, rather than saying that II Timothy 3:16 teaches that the Scriptures are inspired.

WERE THE MEN WHO PENNED THE SCRIPTURES INSPIRED?

How did we get this book we call the Bible, the Scriptures, and the Word of God? Did God simply breath it and it fall from his nostrils or mouth upon the scrolls on which the original manuscripts were written? Did he write them with his own personal finger as he did the tables of stone on which the Ten Commandments were written? Or, did God choose men and inspire them to write his inspired word? The Scriptures were written by men who spoke as they were *moved* by the Holy Ghost. **2 Peter 1:21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.**

Peter declared that *holy men of God spake as THEY were moved by the Holy Ghost.* The Greek word used here is *PHERO* (*φερω*) which means "to bear, carry . . . signifying that they were 'borne along,' or impelled, by the Holy Spirit's power, not acting according to their own wills, or simply expressing their own thoughts, but expressing the mind of God in words provided and ministered by him" (W. E. Vine).

Thayer says the men were "moved inwardly, prompted" by the Holy Spirit. Does not this sound as if the men themselves were inspired and thus what they spoke/wrote was inspired. God first moved on the men and then the men wrote what he moved them to write. They were the inspired instruments giving us the inspired word.

The English word *move* has one definition that pertains to the word as used in this verse. According to my

Unabridged Webster's it means "*to prompt, actuate, or impel to some action.*" Consider the meaning of the English word *inspire*. According to the same dictionary it means "*to influence or impel, to prompt or instigate (utterances, acts, etc.) by influence.*" According to my dictionary, which is a reputable authority, the word *move* and the word *inspire* mean basically the same thing as used in the KJV. I also have a Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary and it gives the meaning of *inspire* as follows, "*to influence, move, or guide by divine or supernatural inspiration, impel, motivate.*" On the word *move* this dictionary gives as one of the meanings, "*to prompt.*" As used in this connotation, the words *move* and *inspire* have basically the same meaning. Strictly arguing from the English, II Peter 1:21 supports the premise that the men were inspired as well as the Scriptures which they wrote. If you will not allow me to appeal to the Greek, I have proved the premise with the English.

The context of II Peter 1:21 proves that Peter was arguing the men were inspired. The English word *move* as defined in two dictionaries, both of which are recognized as authoritative on the meaning of English words, supports the proposition that those holy men of God were inspired to write the inspired word. The Greek word *phero* (*ferw*) supports the position that the men who wrote the Bible were inspired, as well as what they wrote. "*In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.*"

Commenting on the expression, *moved by the Holy Ghost*, John Gill wrote that the Holy Spirit, "illuminated their minds, gave them a knowledge of divine things, and a foresight of future ones; dictated to them what they should say or write; and moved upon them strongly, and by a secret and powerful impulse stirred them up to deliver what they did, in the name and fear of God."

It is apparent that Charles Spurgeon believed the writers of the original Scriptures to be inspired. Consider this statement by Spurgeon. "I do not hesitate to say that I believe that there is no mistake whatever in the original Holy Scriptures from beginning to end. There may be, and there are, mistakes of translation; for *translators are not inspired . . .*" (MTP, Vol. 35, p. 257). It is obvious Spurgeon believed the writers of the original manuscripts were inspired thus they were without mistake. On the other hand, he declared that translators are not inspired, and that there may be mistakes in translations. In fact, he said there are mistakes in translations.

Consider also these words from Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown Commentary, "'Spake' implies that, both in its original *oral* announcement and now even in *writing*, it has been always the *living voice* of God *speaking* to us through His *inspired* servants . . . including *all* the *inspired penmen*, whether of the New or Old testament." Matthew Henry wrote, "Esteem and reverence your Bible as a book written by holy *men, inspired*, influenced, and

assisted by the Holy Ghost.”

A. H. Strong, writing on the inspiration of the Scriptures indicates his conviction that the men were inspired in their writing, “The writings of *inspired men* are the record of a revelation.”

A. Hovey wrote, “Inspiration was an influence of the Spirit of God on those powers of men which are concerned in the reception, retention and expression of religious truth—an influence so pervading and powerful that the teaching of *inspired men* was according to the mind of God.”

J. L. Dagg wrote, “The truth that the Bible is from God, is not only testified by *the inspired men* who wrote it, but it is established by many other decisive proofs, some of which we shall proceed to consider.” Again he wrote, “Though the Bible was written by *inspired men*, they are to be regarded merely as the instruments chosen, fitted, and employed by God, for the production of this work.” And again, “The authority of the Bible is *independent*. It was not conferred on it by *the inspired men* who wrote it; nor does it derive any from the persons who have transmitted it to us . . . The *inspired writers* referred the authority of what they wrote to God; and here it must rest.”

Francis Turretin wrote, “The question is whether in writing they were so acted upon and *inspired* by the Holy Spirit (both as to the things themselves and as to the words) as to be kept free from all error and that their writings are truly authentic and divine. Our adversaries deny this; *we affirm it*.” Again, “Nor can we readily believe that God, who dictated and inspired each and every word to those *inspired (theorneustois) men*, would not take care of their entire preservation.”

T. P. Simmons, writing on the subject of Divine revelation and dealing with some of the objections raised against it, was explaining Psalm 58:6. ***Break their teeth, O God, in their mouth: break out the great teeth of the young lions, O LORD.*** Bro. Simmons wrote, “We have here *David’s inspired sanction* of God’s final judgment of the wicked.” In explaining *verbal inspiration* Simmons wrote, “Verbal inspiration means simply that those chosen to write the bible were preserved from error in what they wrote.” Later, Simmons gives more salient and conspicuous evidence of his conviction that the writers were inspired. In examining an alleged contradiction in the words of Stephen with a passage in Genesis, Simmons says, “Even if a contradiction could be made out here, it would prove nothing against inspiration, for Stephen was not one of the *inspired writers*.” It is evident Simmons believed the writers of the Bible were inspired as well as what they wrote.

I am not the only person who believes the writers of the Bible were inspired. In fact, I had never heard the contrary opinion until recently except by men who denied the inspiration of the Scriptures entirely.

It was when these holy men of God were borne along

and impelled, when they were moved and prompted inwardly by the Holy Ghost that they wrote the Scriptures. And, I have given the testimony of several who held this position in support of the idea that the men were themselves inspired; that is how they were able to write the inspired word.

How were the Scriptures given? Holy men of God spoke as *they were moved by the Holy Ghost*. The truth is, Dear Reader, the translation of II Timothy 3:16 in the KJV, gives more support to the men being inspired than the Scriptures being inspired. Let me hasten to assure you that I believe both the men and the Scriptures were inspired. But, when men write that the men were not inspired but the Scriptures and use II Timothy 3:16 as found in the KJV to support their view, they are faced with a problem. As I have pointed out already, the KJV translation of II Timothy 3:16 declares the *giving* of the Scriptures to be inspired and they were *given* as holy men of God were born along and impelled by the Holy Ghost.

What saith the men who wrote those original manuscripts? Did they consider themselves inspired? Did they consider other writers of Scripture inspired?

Consider the words of the Psalmist David concerning his being moved upon and prompted inwardly to write the word of God. ***2 Samuel 23:1-2 Now these be the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said, 2 The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue.***

Note that David was a man raised up on high by God. He was especially anointed of God. He said that the Spirit of God spoke by him. He said that the word of God was in his tongue. This sounds like David was inspired; he was moved within and prompted to write as the Spirit of God bore him along. He was not writing from his own initiative nor according to his own will. He was inspired by the Holy Spirit. The Lord’s word was in his tongue and in his mouth before it was ever the written word. The Lord spoke by him and inspired him to record what he had said by him. Note those words of David carefully. ***“The Spirit of the Lord spake by me.”*** That sounds as if David believed he was inspired by God as well as what he spoke and wrote.

It seems from Peter’s address on the day of Pentecost that he thought of David as a man inspired by God. ***Acts 1:16 Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus.*** How did the Holy Ghost speak by the mouth of David? He took hold of him, bore him along, breathed upon him, moved upon him, prompted him inwardly, causing him to speak the very words of God, not what he willed of himself. ***“The Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake”*** Perhaps, if the reader

objects to my saying, on the basis of the words of Peter, that David was inspired, you will at least admit that the *mouth* of David was inspired since the verse says, ***“The Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake . . .”***

It appears the woman whose child Elijah raised from the dead was of the persuasion that Elijah was inspired by God. ***1 Kings 17:24 And the woman said to Elijah, Now by this I know that thou art a man of God, and that the word of the LORD in thy mouth is truth.*** Notice again that the word of the Lord was in his mouth before he recorded it in his book. It, according to this woman, was the very word of the Lord and was truth. ***“Thy word is truth”*** (Jn. 17:17). At the least, the woman thought the *mouth* of Elijah was inspired. God was speaking by his mouth. The word was in his mouth and was truth.

Consider Peter’s opinion of this matter as expressed in another sermon recorded in the book of Acts. ***Acts 3:18 But those things, which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.*** Again, the word is in the mouth of the inspired man and then written in the book. Inspired men with God’s word in their mouth through the moving, impelling power of the Holy Spirit spoke and wrote. He then moves, impels, and bears them along as they are writing his blessed word.

Take notice of the words of Paul in his epistle to the Ephesian congregation. ***Ephesians 3:5 Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit.*** These holy apostles and prophets received revelation directly from the Holy Spirit. God gave us his word through specially chosen men. He revealed, or unveiled his word to them by the Holy Spirit of God. He so inspired, compelled, impelled, prompted and controlled them by the Holy Spirit that what they wrote God does not hesitate to call his very own Word. He so inspired, prompted and impelled those specially chosen and directed men that what they wrote was precisely and perfectly what God intended. God revealed it to these chosen, Spirit controlled and impelled men and they recorded it so that we may read it. The Bible is God-breathed but through whom did he breath it?

That the men are inspired as well as their writings is evident from Paul’s declaration that the Holy Ghost spoke by Isaiah the prophet. ***Acts 28:25 And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word, Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers.*** How did the Holy Ghost speak, according to Paul? The Holy Ghost spoke *by Isaiah*. Did the Holy Ghost speak by an inspired man or by an uninspired man?

CONCLUSION

What could any hope to gain by advocating this new doctrine; the *new* idea that the inspired book was written by uninspired men? The idea that God put his word in the

mouth of uninspired men seems to be some “new light”, does it not? This idea certainly detracts from the glory and integrity of the original manuscripts. Some (certainly not all) of those who hold to the perfection and infallibility of the KJV translation also hold that it is an improvement upon the Greek. Some even hold that it is the final step in the purification of God’s word. No one had a pure Bible before the KJV. Each translation was a purifying step until the KJV and it was the final and supreme authority, the only perfect presentation of the Word of God.

In order to uphold the infallibility of the KJV translation, and deny the inspiration of the translators, some men have found some *new light* on the matter. They are affirming the inspiration of the Scriptures, including the KJV, while denying the inspiration of the writers whom God moved and impelled along as they wrote the original manuscripts.

Brethren and Sisters in Christ, I believe the *word is inspired* and the *giving of the word is inspired* and the *men who gave it from the breath of God were inspired*. Deny the inspiration of the writers of the original and it opens the way to deny the perfection of the originals. Some, who are the most tenacious proponents of the perfection of the KJV, have denied the perfection of the original manuscripts. They proclaim the KJV as an improvement upon the originals. They proclaim the KJV as the “seven-times-purified” Word of God and list the steps of purification.

If I err, let me err on the safe side. I would rather proclaim the perfection and inspiration of the originals; I would rather proclaim the inspiration of the giving of the originals; I would rather proclaim inspiration for the men who wrote the originals; than to proclaim the perfection of the KJV or any other translation while denying the perfection of the originals and declaring that no one had a perfect Bible until A. D. 1611 when the Church of England translators completed the KJV. I would rather proclaim the purity of the original manuscripts than to proclaim that the A. D. 1611 KJV is the only perfect Bible and then contradict that by using a 1769 revision in the pulpit and in my writing.

Yes, for those who may not know, there are those who proclaim the A. D. 1611 KJV as the only perfect Bible and then don’t use it in the pulpit or in their Scripture quotations in what they write. They use a 1769 revision of the 1611 version. Why was a revision needed if the 1611 was a perfect translation? Can you improve on perfection? If not, why use a revision when the “perfect” 1611 is still available? I have one.

I use the 1769 revision. I love the Bible. I prefer the KJV. I preach from the 1769 revision of the KJV. Other than my Greek NT, I rarely refer to anything else in my study, my writing, or my preaching. So, I am not into KJV 1611 bashing.

But, I will defend to my dying breath the veracity, the perfection, and the inspiration of the original manuscripts.

I will defend to my dying breath the inspiration of those holy men of God who wrote those original manuscripts. Yes, I will proclaim that God's word has been so preserved that we still have Divine authority with us when we preach and proclaim his word. By comparing the most ancient manuscripts and translations with various translations we can know which are spurious and which are reliable translations. We can rest assured of being able to proclaim the word of God today. I have no trouble and no hesitation of declaring, "Thus saith the Lord," if I am reading from Tyndale's translation from which at least 80% of the KJV was copied, if I am reading from the KJV 1611, if I am reading from the 1769 revision of the KJV 1611, or if I am reading from another reliable translation. Yes, modernists and infidels have produced some spurious versions. I do not deny that. But, that does not mean we should reject all translations except the 1611 KJV.

I have never heard anyone, anywhere, preach from the AV 1611 KJV. I have heard many preach from the 1769 revised KJV. I close with these questions, **"If the 1611 AV is the only non-spurious, infallible Word of God available today, why do you preach from a revised KJV? If the AV 1611 is the only non-spurious, infallible Word of God available today, and if you were to go to a foreign country where the folks did not speak English, how would you preach to them, since all translators, except the KJV translators, produce spurious renderings of the Word of God? If the 1611 AV is the only non-spurious Word of God today, would you dare let a translator tamper with it by translating it into another language when you read it in your preaching?"**

(HUMANITY, Cont. From Page 1)

indicates that he is speaking of one nature. They are all human. I remind you again, there is a difference in *human* nature and *sin* nature. I realize that we use them synonymously but, strictly speaking, when it comes to Christ and his relationship to his people, we must make a difference. Adam had a human nature before the fall. He had no sin nature, however. Adam had a human nature after the fall. He also had a sin nature.

Christ and his elect are "*all of one*" nature. For this reason he is not ashamed to call them brethren. They are united, all of one. This union goes far beyond our all being of one nature, but it certainly does include that. He was made one with us in his incarnation so that he could suffer for us and he is not ashamed to own his elect as his brethren.

The next expression in the verse which speaks of the humanity of Christ and its necessity is in verse 14. ***Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. (Hebrews 2:14).*** As indicated, this verse does not simply show the humanity of Christ; it shows the necessity. Because we were flesh and

blood, he partook, in his incarnation, of flesh and blood also. As God he had no need for blood. And, being pure spirit before taking a body of flesh and blood, he had no blood. It was because the elect were partakers of flesh and blood that he partook of the same. Thus he was qualified to serve as our close-kinsman, our *Goel*.

But, the verse goes further. Another reason he partook of our flesh and blood was in order that he might, through his own death, destroy him who had the power of death. Again we see the fact asserted that as God he could not die. There is no aspect of his God nature that could die. He must be man if he would go through the experience of death to destroy Satan.

There is further evidence supporting the humanity of Christ in this passage. Consider these words, ***Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God.*** In all things it behoved Christ to be made like his elect. They are human; he must be human. They are flesh and blood; he must be flesh and blood. The only exception was in the matter of sin. He was sinless. He did not have a sin nature but was made like us in his human nature.

The reason given in this verse for the necessity of his being made like us in all things is that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest. The high priest must be one of the people for whom he serves. Christ took on himself our likeness and was made one with us, made like unto his brethren in all things, so that he might fill the office of high priest to offer up his sacrifice to God for us. Had he not been one of the people, he could not have made the sacrifice for the sins of the people.

In the first message in this series we saw that we must know Christ as God if we are to know God at all. In the second we saw that we must also know him as man. I pointed out that this knowledge of Christ both as God and man is essential to salvation. To deny either is damning in its effect. To deny the deity of Christ is condemnation and spiritual death. ***John 3:18 He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. John 3:36 He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.*** To deny the humanity of Christ is antichrist.

There is nothing in the word of God which has been the source of more error than the person of Jesus Christ. Some have denied that he was God. Others have denied that he was man. Some have claimed he was a created God while others claimed he was a mere phantasm and not literally man. Some have denied that he had a real human body while others have admitted that he had a human body but denied that he had human blood or a human soul and mind. Some have argued that he was actually two persons while others have said he was one

person who was half God and half man. Some of those who denied that he had a true human body have denied that he really died. Some have argued that there is only one person in the Godhead and that this one person known as Father, Son, and Spirit became incarnate and suffered on the cross. It is evident that such a study as we are in is extremely important and should not be entered upon lightly, frivolously, or hurriedly. **John 17:3** *And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.*

In the message last issue we saw the absolute necessity of the deity of Jesus Christ. In this, as previously stated, we will see the absolute necessity of his being man. In this message I will not be seeking to prove his humanity as I did in the second message of the series. Having shown his humanity to be a biblical doctrine, I will be showing the necessity of his being man. The first two points will be negative. First, *We will see why as God only he could not perform the work that was necessary for our salvation.* Secondly, *We will see why he could not and did not take on him the nature of angels to fulfill the work given him by the Father.* Thirdly, *We will see the absolute necessity of his taking on him our nature, our likeness, and why it behooved him in all things to be made like us.*

CHRIST JESUS MUST BE MAN FOR, AS GOD ONLY, HE COULD NOT PERFORM THE WORK THAT WAS NECESSARY FOR OUR SALVATION

God had an alternative to the Word being made flesh; he could have consigned us all to hell as he has the fallen angels, but he did not do that. Thank God! He did not do that! I do not know why he consigned all the fallen angels to eternal punishment without providing a way of salvation for them. I do not question his sovereign prerogative to do that. Nor do I know why he did not consign all of Adam's fallen posterity to hell forever. He had the sovereign prerogative to do so had he willed to do so. But, in his own wisdom and will he determined to save a portion of this unworthy offspring of fallen Adam. But, if God is to maintain the integrity of all his attributes and glories, certain standards must be met in the saving of sinners.

If God would save any of Adam's fallen posterity it was necessary that the Word be made flesh. **John 1:14** *And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.* Why was he made flesh? Why must God become man also?

As God only he could not mediate on the part of man for he could not lay his hand on man. **Job 9:32-33** *For he is not a man, as I am, that I should answer him, and we should come together in judgment. Neither is there any daysman betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both.* A mediator is not a mediator of one; he is the mediator of two. He is a go-between. If Christ would serve as mediator between God and man he must be able to lay

his hand on both God and man. As God he could represent the Godhead; but he must be man if he is to represent men. Thus, he must be made flesh; he must be truly man.

As God only he could not serve as our kinsman redeemer for he was not related to us. **Ruth 3:9-13** *And he said, Who art thou? And she answered, I am Ruth thine handmaid: spread therefore thy skirt over thine handmaid; for thou art a near kinsman. And he said, Blessed be thou of the LORD, my daughter: for thou hast shewed more kindness in the latter end than at the beginning, inasmuch as thou followedst not young men, whether poor or rich. And now, my daughter, fear not; I will do to thee all that thou requirest: for all the city of my people doth know that thou art a virtuous woman. And now it is true that I am thy near kinsman: howbeit there is a kinsman nearer than I. Tarry this night, and it shall be in the morning, that if he will perform unto thee the part of a kinsman, well; let him do the kinsman's part: but if he will not do the part of a kinsman to thee, then will I do the part of a kinsman to thee, as the LORD liveth: lie down until the morning.* Doing the kinsman's part! That is one reason why he must be made man. He must be our very near kinsman. This passage shows that a redeemer must be a near kinsman. Further, it also shows that this redeemer must be as near a kinsman as possible. As God only there is no way this near-kinsman relationship existed and the Eternal word could not fulfill it. As God only he could represent God but since the Saviour must be the covenant head of his people he must be of the same nature as we. **Psalms 89:19** *Then thou spakest in vision to thy holy one, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people.*

As God only he could not serve as our great High Priest because only a man can serve as a high priest. **Hebrews 5:1** *For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins.* As high and holy and wonderful as the eternal Word was in his Godhood, he could not qualify as our high priest because he was not a man. As high and holy as he was in his Godhood, he had nothing which could be offered up in sacrifice to God. He must have a body that could be offered up as a sacrifice. He must have blood that could be shed for the remission of sins. He must have a soul that God could make an offering for sin. All of this necessitated his being made man.

As God only he could not render obedience to the law for he was the lawgiver. I am not suggesting that as God he would have violated the law, but he alone could set the principles of law. These principles of the law were based on his eternal righteousness and he need not be subject to the law because he was the standard for the law. If he would place himself under the law, he must be made man. Therefore, he was made of a woman and made under the law. **Galatians 4:4** *But when the fulness of the time was*

come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law.

As God he could not die and he must if he would deliver us from death. Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. The penalty for breaking the law was death and he took on him our guilt for breaking the law of God, therefore he must die. As God he could not die. There is no way men could have killed God. Death is out of the realm of possibility for God. I remember an experience I had a little over 30 years ago. A man who was a member of a sister church (in the same city) to the one I pastored at the time called me up in rather exercised state of mind. His pastor, a very good friend of mine, had announced that morning that in the evening service he would be preaching on the subject, ***Some Things God Cannot Do.***

The brother was really upset and said, "God can do anything! The very idea that this preacher would say he can't."

I had an idea of what the Brother was going to preach but did not say so. I just calmed him down and suggested that he wait and hear the sermon. I assured him, "When the pastor is finished tonight, you will probably agree with him."

But, Dear Reader, there are some things that God cannot do. God cannot sin. God cannot lie. God cannot be unfaithful. God cannot deny himself. ***God cannot die.*** If Christ would save us from our sins he must be capable of dying. The Eternal Word must be made flesh if he would be able to die and give his life a ransom for his people.

God is eternally the same and the death of God would make him mutable. It must be as man that he dies for he cannot be mutable. Has he not said, ***"I am the Lord, I change not."***

God is from everlasting to everlasting and cannot die. As man he could die; but as everlasting, eternally the same God there was no way he could die.

God does not even slumber or sleep; he certainly could not die. ***Psalm 121:4 Behold, he that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep.*** How could one who has never even taken a nap die? How could one who has been eternally awake die?

As God alone he could not have shed his blood for as God alone he has no blood. ***Hebrews 9:22 And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.*** God is a Spirit and spirits do not have blood. The only way the Eternal Word who was God could have blood to shed was to assume a human nature and thereby have blood to offer. ***Hebrews 2:14 Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.*** If he would perform the office of Goel (Kinsman-Redeemer) he must be of the same blood as we are. He must have blood to redeem so he took part of the same with us.

If I pursue this point any further, I will cover my last point as part of the first. These things should give us enough to see why God did not set upon a plan to redeem and save his people except through the incarnation of the eternal word in human flesh.

WHY CHRIST DID NOT TAKE ON HIM THE NATURE OF ANGELS TO PERFORM THE WORK GIVEN HIM BY THE FATHER

He was not suffering for angels therefore he did not lay hold of their nature. ***Hebrews 2:16 For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham.*** Angels are not related to man in nature and he could not have been our kinsman redeemer if he had laid hold of the nature of angels and been made like them.

We needed a brother and no angel could be our brother. ***Song of Solomon 8:1 O that thou wert as my brother, that sucked the breasts of my mother! when I should find thee without, I would kiss thee; yea, I should not be despised.*** An angel could never have met this need expressed in this verse.

Christ must be the firstborn among many brethren and as an angel he could not have been. ***Romans 8:29 For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.***

The remission of sins required the shedding of blood and angels have no blood to shed. ***Hebrews 9:22 And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.*** An angel can go through a block wall and not be harmed. If an angel had blood it would greatly limit his activities and he might not be able to minister to those to whom he is to minister. Therefore, Jesus did not take on him the nature of angels.

Had he taken hold of the nature of angels he could not have fulfilled every jot and tittle of the law for that would be impossible for an angel. An angel is a non-sexual being and the law required circumcision.

As an angel he would have had no parents and the law required one to honor his parents. This is just another reason why Jesus did not take on himself the nature of angels. An angel would not suffice as a Saviour.

WHY THE ONE WHO WOULD SAVE US FROM OUR SINS MUST BE MADE IN OUR LIKENESS AND HAVE A HUMAN NATURE LIKE OURS

If it could have been done any other way, is it not logical that an all-wise God would have done it that way, rather than ask his Son to come into the world to suffer all that he suffered? This seems to have been the thrust of one of Paul's statements to the Galatians. ***Galatians 3:21 Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.*** If there had been another way then Christ's death was in vain. ***Galatians 2:21 I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by***

the law, then Christ is dead in vain.

The weakness of law required that Christ come in the likeness of sinful flesh. **Romans 8:3** *For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.* God required that man obey the law. He must keep every jot and tittle of it. But, no man had ever been able to do that since the fall of Adam. The corruption of our nature by the fall rendered us incapable of rendering an acceptable obedience to the law. Jesus said to the rich young ruler, **"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments."** God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, not in the likeness of the flesh of unfallen Adam, but in the likeness of sinful flesh. He was not tainted with sin, but had all the sinless infirmities of sinful flesh. He was in the likeness of sinful flesh, yet without sin himself. God would have his law obeyed and kept by man. Therefore, he sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh to keep the law in that nature and, thereby, justify all who are united with him in his suffering and death.

The man who would be our High Priest and Saviour must have something to offer in sacrifice. **Hebrews 8:3** *For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.* It is in his fleshly nature that Christ suffered. But, that suffering is rendered infinite because of the union with the divine nature in his mediatorial work. Christ was mediator between God and man. This mediation required he be both God and man. But, he must suffer and be put to death in the flesh because his God-nature could not suffer.

He offered his human body which was taken on for that very purpose. **Hebrews 10:5** *Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.* **Hebrews 10:10** *By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.* God is a spirit and as God the Word did not have a physical body that could suffer. The word must be made flesh.

He offered up his complete human nature—body, blood, and soul—to God. **Hebrews 2:14-15** *Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.* It might be well if we remind ourselves at this time that the Bible often speaks of the blood of Christ when his complete suffering is included. The same is true of his body. It is also true of the cross. We need to be careful that we not limit these words too much. When Paul wrote, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross" he did not have that wood cross or stake on which Jesus died in mind. He had everything that Christ accomplished, the finished work of

Christ, the complete redemptive work of Christ in mind. Another evidence of this is seen in a comparison of Mat. 20:28 and I Tim 2:6. In Matthew we are told that Christ gave his *life a ransom* for many. In I Timothy we are told that Christ gave *himself a ransom* for many. Both verses have the very same thing in mind. When verses declare that Jesus gave his blood that we might have eternal life and others declare that Jesus gave his flesh that we might have eternal life, they are speaking of the complete sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

If he would sanctify us he must be all of one nature with us. **Hebrews 2:11** *For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.* Since death came by man, God required also that the resurrection out of the dead must come by man. **1 Corinthians 15:21** *For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.* Since by one man's offense many were made dead; God decreed that grace must come through the channel of a man. **Romans 5:15** *But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.* Since condemnation came by a man, justification must come by a man. **Romans 5:16** *And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.* **Romans 5:18** *Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.*

Since death reigned by one man, righteousness must also reign by one man. **Romans 5:17** *For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)*

Since many were made sinners by the disobedience of a man, those who are made righteous must be made so by the obedience of one man. **Romans 5:19** *For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.*

He must take the nature of man if he is to destroy the one who had the power of the death of men. **Hebrews 2:14-15** *Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; 15 And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.*

If he would experience what we experience he must do so in our nature. **Hebrews 4:15-16** *For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.*

He must have a life that he could lay down in death and that required a human life; not divine life. *John 10:18 No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.* If he would suffer it must be in human nature, not divine. If he would lay down his life, he must have a human life to lay down because he could not lay down his divine life.

He must have a soul that could be sorrowful even unto death and that required a human soul. *Matthew 26:38 Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me.* He must have a soul that could be made an offering for sin and only a human soul could be made an offering for sin. *Isaiah 53:10 Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand.*

If he who is in the form of God and equal with God in every divine perfection and attribute would die for men he must take upon himself the likeness of man. *Philippians 2:5-8 Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: 8 And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.*

If he would give his flesh and blood for our eternal life he must take on him that flesh and blood. *John 6:51-56 I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.*

If he would open the way into heaven for his elect he must do so through the veil of his flesh. *Hebrews 10:19-20 Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new*

and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh.

If he is to be a prophet he must be raised up from among his brethren. *Deuteronomy 18:15 The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken. Deuteronomy 18:18 I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.*

If he would be king of the Jews and one day sit on the throne of his Father David, he must be descended from David, and therefore a man. *Romans 1:3 Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh. Luke 1:32 He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David.*

CONC: So much more could be said on this subject. He must be God, as we saw last issue. But, it is so important that he also be man. I will remind you of three of his great offices, all of which required him to be man. He is the Prophet of all prophets and as prophet he must be raised up from among his brethren (Deu 18:15, 18). He is our great High Priest and as such he must be taken from among men (Heb. 5:1). He is king and to sit on David's throne he must be the seed and son of David (Rom. 1:30). He could not be prophet, priest or king if he had not been man. It is essential that we know him as man. It is exceedingly important that we understand and appreciate all that he did for us in becoming man. *Great is the marvel, great is the wonder, great is the graciousness, great is the mercy in the great mystery—God was manifest in the flesh.*

Landmark Baptist College Gearing Up For Fall of 1995

The college offers a four and a two year program in theology and education. Our purpose is to develop and strengthen a genuine spirit of the workman that will reverence our Lord and unashamedly proclaim the gospel.

LBC offers a program tailored to your need:

Bible College

Bible Institute

Bible Correspondence

The college feels the doctrines of Sovereign Grace, the Local Church, Evangelism, Pre-millennialism, and the integrity of the KJV must be preserved.

For further information write to:

Landmark Baptist College

P O Box 431, Granbury, TX 76048

Phone (817) 279-6430 Fax (817) 279-6430

A ministry of Oak Trail Baptist Church, Granbury, TX

Eld. Garland Johnson, Pastor

REVIVAL SERVICES

Raleigh Springs Baptist Church

5322 Banbury, Memphis, Tennessee

June 15-18, 1995 7:00 Nightly

Eld Paul Brown, Evangelist

David Lee Family, Guest Singers

Eld Jack Duplechain, Pastor

Phone: Home (901) 372-2799 Ch Office (901) 386-9701

America Online Address: JDuplachai

Bouquets & Brickbats

FLORIDA: Love your paper! Don't know how we got on your list—but sure am glad.

My pastor said he would like a subscription to your paper—so please put him on your list.

PASTOR GIVEN ISLAND!!! (Retreat)

By Clark Smith

(Member, Landmark Baptist Church, Anchorage, Alaska)

The Landmark Baptist Church of Anchorage, Alaska for the past ten years has been so blessed by the hard work of their Pastor, that they rewarded him with a ticket out. No it wasn't a one way ticket, but rather a 2 week vacation to the tropical Island of Kauai, of the Hawaiian Islands. The church is greatly appreciative of her Pastor and are ever so thankful the Lord has given a man that will stick it out year after year.

No, 10 years is not a great deal of time, but when 13 preachers have come and gone in the same amount of time, previous, it is truly a blessing to see some "stick to it". If churches all over, would see the great worth of their Pastors, and understand the unbelievable burden they carry, perhaps God would reward his people more, as they reward His called man. It is such a small insignificant thing to do compared to what the man of God blesses the church with. Really, it shouldn't even be mentioned as any great thing but should be a matter of course for churches to regularly count their Pastors worthy of receiving "double honour".

Oh what a shame to muzzle the ox, that is laboriously treading out the corn, just because of his love for the sheep and the Shepherd. We put the muzzle of ingratitude, irreverence, unthankfulness, and thoughtlessness, on our Pastors and then complain that he's got the easiest job in the world.

I have never been a Pastor, but I don't need to be one to see that these men pour themselves out for us, go where we won't, do what we don't, say what hurts, suffer what we can't imagine, and for no other reason than God has placed in them the calling to "feed my sheep". It sure isn't for the money, especially if our Pastor's salary is any indication of an average wage! When we, as a church, are not always considering ways we can bless our Pastor as he does us, then we have failed to comprehend who and what the Pastor is.

May churches everywhere, that have called godly men as their Pastor, not take these men for granted, but rather take their hand, even if it is just once in a while, and say, "I love you Pastor, and appreciate you so much, and I thank you for what you are doing for me, and for allowing me to be blessed of you."

Pastor Tullos we pray you get a good, long, much deserved

rest, and return unto us to do all the things that only you can do for the church, in and through Christ.

Praise the Lord for our Pastor Leaders!

NORTH CAROLINA: Thanks many times for sending the GP&P. It is always a "special event" when it arrives.

Hope your health is improving after the surgery. I wish you the best of all God's blessings. Thank you again for your influence in my life.

WYOMING: Would you please send *The Grace Proclamator & Promulgator* to this brother beginning with the May, 1995, issue.

ALABAMA: We appreciate so much getting your paper & we read it & enjoy it so much—May the Lord bless you in this work & I know he does—as so many people are helped in the study of God's word. This is our address change.

OKLAHOMA: I would like to receive your monthly *Grace Proclamator and Promulgator*. I was greatly blessed in a recent issue which was given me by a friend.

NEW JERSEY: I have been a reader of the *Grace Proclamator* for a few years now and have found this church paper to be interesting and informative. I'm writing to you now with several questions and a request. Regarding the recent article *A Plea For Charitableness*, by J. E. Huffman, I did find this article to be helpful. There are areas that we as independent Baptists can disagree on and yet be in fellowship. I have been saved for twelve years, and was baptized by an independent Baptist Church. I am a local church Baptist and have studied ecclesiology for almost ten years. Some of my teaching came from Baptist writers like B. H. Carroll and Louis Entzminger who taught soundly on the local church but held that all the redeemed would be in the Bride. I'm not sure whether I agree with their conclusions on the Bride, however, their teaching on the origin, nature, and ordinances of the church is very sound. I'm curious to know how you feel about fellowshiping with Baptists who hold strictly to a local body, but also to a future universal bride? B. H. Carroll is very well respected for his views and his defense of the local church in his booklet *Ecclesia—the Church*.

EDITOR'S NOTE: I very strongly believe in the local church and that the bride will be composed of faithful members of true New Testament churches, not all the saved. I am aware, however, that many whom I consider sound Baptists, may hold to different views than I on the composition of the bride.

This is a subject that falls into an area that is by no means as conclusive as such matters as the local nature of the church, baptism by immersion, wine for the Lord's Supper, etc. I have, and will continue to fellowship with brethren who hold strictly to local church doctrine but may vary in their opinion of who will compose the bride. While I hold that only faithful members of local NT churches will compose the bride, I see Paul saying to the church at Corinth, *2 Corinthians 11:2 For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present [you as] a chaste virgin to Christ*. Considering the condition of many of the members in this congregation, one wonders if Paul's declaration was limited to only the faithful or if it included all the saved members of that congregation. While Paul's statement definitely ties being in the bride to being a part of a local body, I don't know if we can take it to a narrower circle than that.

My major problem with the universal bride is that it is so

much like the universal church and I cannot see that doctrine. Also, it makes church membership and faithfulness of little worth in the ultimate outcome, though rewards should not be our motive in service but special blessings do give some incentive for service.

Thanks for the offering and I will deal with your requests as soon as possible.

TENNESSEE: I appreciated the article that Bro. Huffman wrote on charity, and I hope that a lot of people heard the heart felt cry in this article. I know it is easy to forget that we are different, and that we believe differently . . . I also appreciate you for allowing him to print this in your paper . . .

TEXAS: [Editor's note to a reader in Texas] I received your letter concerning the article by Bro. Jarrel Huffman. I do not publish the names of correspondents, **but**, neither do I publish letters in which the writer does not reveal his identity. If one is not convicted enough about what he writes to sign his name, I do not publish his letter, be it a bouquet or a brickbat.

MISSISSIPPI: We greet you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and pray that God is blessing you and the church there.

I want you to know how much I appreciated the tapes you sent, they were certainly a blessing. I received many responses about them. I really believe that God used those sermons to help a lot of people who really needed it at that time. If you ever feel led to make more, feel free to send them to me and I will most gladly put them on the air down here.

MARYLAND: I am requesting at this time for you to remove me from your mailing list NOW.

I do not wish to receive your letter any more.

A note to your leaders, I did not request to be placed on your distribution list, one of your members put me on the listing. And I told him to remove me A.S.A.P. Please act NOW!!!!!!
Respectfully

MISSISSIPPI: I am writing in regards to the article in your paper entitled "*A Plea For Charitableness*". Let me ask you, is it "God honoring" and a "Christ-like spirit" to accept, condone, or overlook as not really important any doctrine which opposes the Word of God? Or are we only to restrict our opposition to matters regarding doctrines of grace and the local church? Are we, in the name of being "charitable" and "magnanimous", to accept, condone, or overlook as simply a "pet theme" any doctrine a brother might hold which contradicts the Word of God?

Are we in the name of being "charitable" and "magnanimous" to accept, condone, or overlook any doctrine that might be presented as long as the one presenting this view is in agreement with us on the doctrines of grace and the local church? Could there not be such glaring errors in an individuals "pet themes" that would cause us not to be able to fellowship with them. This does not mean that we do not love them as brethren, it simply means that we can not condone their belief on certain subjects and therefore cannot have these men to fill our pulpits.

Many who have "changed their minds" on matters of eschatology have their own form of "phariseism". Many not only imply, but openly state that they have reached their new position because they have received more "light" than others; they have grown in grace more than others. Some have even stated that they "feel sorry" for those of us who have not "changed our minds" because we have not grown as much as they have or we have not received the "same light" as they have.

Why should a person be considered as not growing simply because he does not change his position on matters of eschatology? Are we to consider a person to be growing simple because he changes his mind on matters of eschatology? Does this mean that the more he changes his mind the more he is growing or does it mean he is easily led astray by every wind of doctrine? I have known some men who change their mind every time they read a new book. Does this mean they are growing more that we are or does it mean that they are very unsettled. I know of some who have "changed their minds", being led away by another preacher. They do not really know what they believe, but they believe the other preacher and must depend upon the other preacher to tell them what they believe. But, they "changed their minds"? Does this mean they have "grown in grace" and have received more "light" than others who will not be so easily led around by other preachers? Again, I see in this "mind set" "a touch of phariseism". No one is growing unless they change their minds on eschatology!

It is not "peer pressure" that causes us not to "change our minds", but rather a belief that God's Word is right and those who would "spiritualize" it to suit their fancy are wrong. I resent the implication that because I have not "changed my mind", I have received insufficient light. Or that I have not grown in grace, or that I have not studied for myself. This attitude of those who have "changed their minds" does not sound "charitable" to me, but rather a spirit of arrogance and superiority. Again I say, it is nothing more than "Phariseism."

**POSTMASTER: Please send address changes to:
The Grace Proclamator & Promulgator
3084 Woodrow
Memphis, TN 38127
(USPS #000476)**