

# Seek The Old Paths

*"Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths...and walk therein."*

(Jeremiah 6:16)

Vol. 4, No. 9

September 1993

## Who Is Causing Division? Or, Who Is Out On A Limb?

*Garland M. Robinson*

The same old tired and misused expressions keep on surfacing from the digressives against the faithful: "You are sowing discord," "you're causing division," "why won't you fellowship everybody" "you've gotten yourself out on a limb," "you're in a dilemma," etc., etc. Such expressions are no better now than they have ever been. It is a jeer inspired of the devil intended to cause one to "back off" and let up the pressure against error. However, the faithful must not let up! God doesn't give us a license to relax when the going gets rough and the liberals start whining.

The ploy used today is the same as that used by wicked Ahab well over 2,500 years ago. Elijah was accused by Ahab of stirring up trouble in Israel.

*"And it came to pass, when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, Art thou he that troubleth Israel? <sup>18</sup>And he answered, I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the LORD, and*

*thou hast followed Baalim" (I Kings 18:17-18).*

Elijah the prophet was a faithful man and diligently proclaimed God's Word. The "sting" of his preaching was felt by Ahab

---

***Those who veer off to the right hand or the left are the troublers in spiritual Israel today. The troublers are those who wish to fellowship everyone and turn a blind eye to the many errors in which they and others are involved! They are the ones who cry for "unity-in-diversity" which is just as false as false can be.***

---

and, as a result, Elijah was hated because of it. Surely, those among "Ahab's camp" didn't like to be around Elijah. You can only imagine the sneers and taunts

that were uttered under breath when Elijah would approach. Ah, here comes that troubler! Watch what you say. Don't let him know what we are doing or he will start preaching about it and we don't want to hear that! Are not these same sentiments expressed today?

Elijah was not the trouble maker! He simply proclaimed the "whole counsel of God" as all faithful preachers do (Acts 20:26-27). If you find a preacher that will not condemn error and those involved in it, in public and private, then he is not a faithful preacher (cf. Eph. 5:11; Rom. 16:17; II Timothy 4:2-4)! He is the one causing trouble in the kingdom. Such like him are the ones troubling the church — not those faithful servants who call attention to error and those upholding it.

Those who veer off to the right hand or the left are the troublers in spiritual Israel today. The troublers are those who wish to fellowship everyone and turn a blind eye to the many errors in which they and others are involved! They are the ones

*(Continued on page 4,  
OUT ON A LIMB)*

# Peter Was A “Proof-text” Preacher

John T. Polk, II

***God knew what he had meant in the Old Testament and inspired Peter (and the other Apostles) to explain it for those who missed it the first time.***

The first recorded Gospel sermon preached by Peter (and the rest of the Apostles) in Acts 2 was replete with Scriptural reference: vs.17-21 is a quotation of Joel 2:28-32; v.30 alludes to the statement found in Psalm 89:35-37 which again is attributed to David; vs.34-35 quotes from Psalm 110:1, also written by David.

Peter proceeded to show that the events in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth (Acts 2:22) prove that He is the Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36). The conditions of salvation are laid down because of the Christ he preached (Acts 2:38), and the response of the crowd was gratifying (Acts 2:41-42). Peter had proved that Jesus is the Christ (whom the Jews had long anticipated) by (1) specific prophetic reference; and, (2) present procedures of Christ's life which had fulfilled the prophecies.

These questions come to mind: Of what validity would Jesus' miracles and claims have been if there were no prophetic prediction preceding such? What anticipation among the Jews would there have been? What claim could He have made that His miracles would have been substantiated? In other words, if the Old Testament had not preached the Messiah prior to His actual coming, who would have believed Him (cf. John 5:46-47)? **Why did Peter quote from the Old Testament to prove who Jesus was if, in fact, those Old Testament passages were not direct, specific ref-**

**erences to the Messiah?** To phrase it another way, what good does it do to quote a passage to prove a point if the passage cited does not refer to the point for which it is offered as proof? Peter warned against “wresting” (Greek, “to torture, twist awry, put to the wrack”) the Scriptures in II Peter 3:16. Did he condemn his Pentecost practice? Indeed not! But he did if the contention is true that the Psalms cited were neither written by David nor were Messianic references as written. **The Living Word Commentary on Psalms** by Anthony L. Ash and Clyde M. Miller (Sweet Publishing Co.) makes this claim.

**I. As to authorship,** they say,

“many scholars argue that these New Testament references are simply reflecting the Jewish tradition that associated the Psalter as a whole with David, “the sweet singer of Israel.” By this method, to say “David said” was to say material was from the Psalms, regardless of the true author” (pp.18-19).

Of Psalm 16, Ash says, “The text itself gives little clue as to its authorship” (p.72). Miller says Psalm 89 was not necessarily “written by a king” (p.310), thus obviating David; and of Psalm 110 he says, “the psalm as a whole was written **about** a king rather than **by one**” (p.367). If, as the commentary claims, David

certainly did **not** write Psalms 16,89,110; **and Peter** merely taught the “first century use of tradition which was fully in accord with the customs of the times” (p.19); **THEN there would be little doubt but that Peter taught without Holy Spirit inspiration on that point!** But would our “scholars” tell us what else of his sermon was also merely a reflection of human tradition? Every word Peter uttered in that sermon was of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:1-4,7-8,14-21,40), according to the Scriptures.

**II. As to the purpose of the Psalms,** the authors say,

“the OT must first be understood in terms of its own people and times. This means that certain psalms which the NT cites as fulfilled in Christ were yet not intended as predictive by the Old Testament” (p.29).

If the writers of the Old Testament, the people to whom they spoke, and the readers of their writings did miss the original import of some of these passages, are we to assume the God who inspired them did also? God gave the plain statements about the Messiah and those who were misguided on the subject were those who thought the Messiah passages were bound by context and thus applied to local events and people! This misunderstanding is preserved today. Ash declares of Psalm 16:10, “Howev-

er Peter may have been guided by God in applying this text, the psalmist is not teaching resurrection here” (p.75). Miller says of Psalm 89, “God’s promise to David is found in II Samuel 7:1-17 and is elaborated in this psalm (vs.19-37)” (p.311). On Psalm 110, he says, “Perhaps verses 1 and 4 are prophetic oracles concerning David” (p.367). **In other words, according to Ash & Miller, Peter took passages out of their original meaning (for the psalms he cited had no reference to the point he was making) and merely “applied” them to Jesus (and falsely so, JTP, II).** Thus, if the commentators are true, Peter is the false one!

God knew the test of a true prophet (Deut. 18:20-22) was whether or not what he specifically referred to in the future came to pass. He inspired men so that their specific references to Jesus Christ would be unmistakable when fulfilled, yet in language understandable to the times in which it was given. God knew what he had meant in the Old Testament and inspired Peter (and the other Apostles) to explain it for those who missed it the first time. Ash and Miller have missed it again. Peter’s texts are proof, for the verses cited were meant to teach what he said they did. He only used Messianic prophecies to preach the Messiah. To argue with inspired men over the authorship of Bible books is foolish, not scholarly. When God interprets Himself, no “scholarship, school, sheepskin, or study” qualifies anyone to question it (cf. Rom. 9:20).

The commentary by Ash & Miller questions the inspiration of the Bible with its mis-handling of its truth. If cars can be recalled because something about them is unsafe, so should commentaries.

*Rt. 2 Box 868  
Dover, TN 37058*

# SHUCKING OFF THE DEBATE GENERATION

*Mac Deaver*

***To some of them the idea of confrontation is unloving and so unnecessary. The atmosphere in which some of these young people have grown up has been one of no strong preaching, little or no exposure of denominational falsehoods, and of an increasing liberal attitude in ethics.***

In the January issue of the **Christian Chronicle**, one of our preachers was quoted as saying, “In the brotherhood, there is a giant ground swell to cordially share what we believe is right and shuck off the debate generation.”

It is so unfortunate that many of our brethren are completely out of touch with the Biblical concept of defending the gospel, fighting the good fight of the faith, warring the good warfare (Phil. 1:16; I Tim. 6:12; 1:18; II Tim. 4:7). Some of our “soldiers” have become public relation propagandists whose winsome ways are invested in the creation of a better image of the church within the minds of the world. Their spiritual wrath is felt only by those who see Christian soldiering as involving the exposing of heresy and the calling of men to real repentance.

No one that I know is justifying unrighteous temperament or sinful brutality as the church goes to war. But there is a sort of “sweet spiritedness” among our brotherhood cheerleaders that betrays the spirit of war and which indicates that these would-be soldiers fail to understand the serious distinction between the opposing forces. Instead of the picture of two opposing armies clashing, one gets the impression

that some among us rather view the situation as one involving a walk in the park on which the two sides merely discuss some differences which are of little or no consequence at all. This second picture painted is completely foreign to New Testament authorization.

It is sad to think that some among us think it better to remove ourselves from a debate mentality and to pursue peace without it. The good soldier of Christ Jesus fights in order to secure peace. That is very different from ceasing to fight in hope of peace. The first method is authorized; the second is man-made compromise.

I’m afraid many among us are now ignorant of battles earlier fought by which the cause of Christ prospered. So many now are unimpressed with and unthankful for those tremendous clashes with error that caused the church to be recognized and understood (to some degree) by outsiders, and better informed and strengthened within her own ranks. Our brethren had preachers among them who were able and willing to speak the truth publicly and to expose any error. And thousands have been encouraged by such grand efforts in personal attendance, in reading and studying the published

debate books, in hearing and watching the tapes. Only God knows the good accomplished in such public discussion.

But now, boys and girls have grown into manhood and womanhood many of whom have never attended a public religious discussion, have read no debate books, and have listened to and watched no tapes. To some of them the idea of confrontation is unloving and so unnecessary. The atmosphere in which some of these young people have grown up has been one of no strong preaching, little or no exposure of denominational falsehoods, and of an increasing liberal attitude in ethics. And, many of this younger generation have been instructed by older false teachers among us to avoid religious confrontation. One preacher among us recently wrote, "You will never find God through self-examination, because he is a God of love. You will find him only when you love unselfishly."

And so the church is moving closer and closer to an identifying with the denominations. Some among us are already speaking at denominational gatherings and becoming a part of Protestant organizations, extending the right hand of fellowship to non-Christians and to Christians who have gone astray. More and more the brethren are getting the idea that the churches of Christ simply constitute a part of the Lord's church. And when someone raises his voice and pen in protest, he is viewed perhaps as greatly ignorant, sectarian, and perhaps as a well-intentioned but nevertheless troublemaker, or perhaps as a troublemaker whose motive and attitude are automatically suspect. The protest of this "disturber of the peace" is viewed with more contempt than all the heresies of all false religions combined. Some brethren will now hold spiritual hands with the Baptists, Methodists, and others, but will refuse to endorse the

protest which calls this compromising into question.

And there is another thing that is generally refused. Many liberals among us evidently refuse to admit that they have any responsibility to defend publicly in confrontation what they teach and/or preach. They have not generally recognized this obligation, even though the Bible makes it plain that truth is to be defended (Jude 3; I Peter 3:15; Phil. 1:16). Would they like to say that what they preach is not a part of the gospel (and thus doesn't have to be defended), or do they want to say that the obligation to defend the truth is not a part of the gospel? They can't afford to say either, but what will they say? They may try to rationalize their unwillingness to publicly confront opposing views by suggesting that debating (1) does no good, (2) does some harm, (3) evidences a disposition on the part of the participants which is out of harmony with the disposition of Christ. In reply to these possible rationalizations let me say that (1) it is right to obey God in the demand that we defend the truth and is wrong to fail to do so, (2) when we obey, we are not and cannot be wrong, and (3) Jesus was himself the greatest debater the world has ever known.

7401 Glenhaven Path  
Austin, TX 78737

## CONTRIBUTORS

Charles L. Dinkins.....	\$15
L. H. Howze.....	\$15
L. O. Word.....	\$25
Stanley D. Crews.....	\$10
William L. Word.....	\$25
Bob Heflin.....	\$25
Ferris W. Havard.....	\$5
Verona Church of Christ.....	\$50
Bardwell Church of Christ.....	\$50

## OUT ON A LIMB

(Continued from page 1)

who cry for "unity-in-diversity" which is just as false as false can be. There can be no Biblical unity when there is Biblical (doctrinal) error. Those who have "lockjaw" are the ones who have gotten themselves out on a limb. They are the ones who are in a dilemma. Dear faithful brethren, don't let the compromisers "turn the tables" on you and make you feel like you are in the wrong. This is what Ahab sought to do but Elijah was too wise for that. So must we be also.

The Bible still says, "**And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather prove them**" (Eph. 5:11). Ahab fellowshipped the prophets of Baal. It must not be so among us. "...If sinners entice thee, consent thou not" (Prov. 1:10). "**Enter not into the path of the wicked, and go not in the way of evil men. Avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it, and pass away**" (Prov. 4:14-15). "**Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple**" (Rom. 16:17-18). "**Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds**" (II John 9-11). Should we cut these verses out of the Bible as, apparently, the liberals want us to do?

Who is out on a limb? It's not those who are "contending for the faith" (Jude 3)!

# Another Grace Only Sermon!

Charles A. Pledge

On a rare occasion when I was returning from a preaching engagement involving driving on Sunday rather than preaching, I visited a congregation in another state. It was a small congregation and later I understood why. The members were very friendly and there were about as many visitors as there were members present. The preacher preached a sermon which was supposed to have been from the third chapter of Galatians. However, I was at a loss to find in that chapter, or elsewhere in the book, where he was getting his points and conclusions. All the Baptist sermons I ever heard, either before or after my conversion to Christ, or all put together, could not have formed a stricter Calvinistic sermon than did his.

Using the NIV, the preacher attempted to show that it was just by believing that we enjoy salvation. However, he realized he couldn't square that with the rest of his sermon so he just backed off that and tried to inveigh against law keeping. Then he got to his main point — salvation by grace only.

The preacher began his main point by using an illustration of writing a check. He said, "If I write a check and learn I don't have the funds to cover it, I just rush to the bank and deposit the necessary funds." "That is the way it is with grace," the preacher declared. "Every time we are short, God just deposits a little more grace in our account." He said that just as God credited Abraham's faith to him for righteousness, so he deposits grace in our account and credits us with righteousness. Had he quit at that point it would have been bad enough.

Emboldened by his own remarks the preacher declared,

"We don't have to worry about doing all these things people generally are concerned about doing. **None** of these things have anything to do with our righteousness." That seemed to excite him so he again declared, "All we do is nothing but filthiness. It is only by God's grace that we are righteous. Nothing we can do has any connection with that righteousness." "We don't have to worry about moral bankruptcy," he declared, "because God has enough grace to cover all those things. We don't have to worry about being bad or good." As if to intimidate all present against trying to obey God he said, "If you keep one commandment of law with a view of pleasing God you are obligated to keep all the law." "This," he said, "would be earning your righteousness."

The crowning point of his Calvinistic speech was when he said, "Christians obey God only because they are grateful to God for the righteousness God has given. We obey because we believe these things, and that is the only reason we obey God."

Had John Calvin himself been present, he could not have done a better job of presenting raw Calvinism of salvation by grace only. "We only believe because of that grace," so said the man. Space forbids a line by line rebuttal of his speech but we want to emphasize four points where he misrepresented the facts of salvation.

1. **The preacher exhibited a gross ignorance of spiritual law.** The simple fact is that God's word has always been and shall always be spiritual law to which men are amenable to obey. Isaiah defined that law in Isaiah 2:2-3: "*And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD'S house shall be estab-*

*lished in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.*" Notice the last part of verse three: "*Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.*" This is Hebrew parallelism. That is, the writer is saying the same thing twice in different words. He says the law is the word and the word is the law. They are one and the same. God's word has existed since the creation of Adam in the garden. His word spoken is His law! Law is that which is given to **rule and govern**. God's word is that which God intends to rule and govern man. Can't you just visualize God saying to Man: "I give you this word to rule and govern your life. If you keep one statement of it you must keep all of it to live. If you don't obey the first statement I will deposit in your heavenly account all the grace you need to cover your sinful acts so you won't have to worry about being good or bad. Just do as you please and my grace will cover it." That is exactly what that preacher taught and what every genuine Calvinist teaches. The question is, is it any more reprehensible to God when said in a Baptist church building or a building owned by our brethren?

2. **The preacher exhibited a terrible ignorance of grace.** He implied that grace is that treasure that just outweighs sin. If you sin, God will deposit grace, was his idea of grace. No, grace

isn't deposited. Grace is that lovely disposition of God to show mercy to the poor sinner who will meet his terms and accept his conditions of mercy. Grace is that wonderful character of God who loved us when we were dead in sin. Grace is that unspeakable quality of God that prompted him to willingly send his only begotten Son to earth to die for us sinners, providing an atonement that could reconcile us to our Father. Grace is often used figuratively to indicate a gift, or demonstration of grace. But grace is never, except in the imaginations of Calvinists, referred to by God as something he deposits on our behalf so we don't have to worry about sinning.

**3. Third, the preacher indicated a total misconception of salvation as a gift.** His concept of salvation demanded total freedom from obedience to God. Any obedience could not be construed by God as having any connection with righteousness, he declared. In the first place he has to deny plain passages of Scripture where God links obedience to his will with salvation from sins. In Hebrews 5:8-9 we read: *"Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him."* That is what God says. Jesus himself declared in Matthew 7:21: *"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven."* Just alleging that we believe is not going to get us into the kingdom of heaven. We must do the Father's will!

A gift is just that — a gift. A gift never ceases to be a gift regardless of the conditions and terms the giver might attach to receiving the gift. If one chose to give a million dollars to one who would meet ten conditions, when the conditions were all met the

million dollars would still be a gift. The recipient would not have earned it. This is what Jesus taught in Luke 17:7-10: *"But which of you, having a servant plowing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, Go and sit down to meat? And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink? Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not. So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do."* Notice he said, *"When we have done all those things which are commanded you say, We are unprofitable servants."* That is the emphasis under the Law of Christ. Obedience is not designed to earn salvation. Salvation is a gift. But obedience to God's commandments is the meeting of the terms and conditions God attached to the gift of salvation. Let's look at an inspired example of this fact.

In Romans chapter six, Paul emphasizes in verses 16-18 that the Roman Christians had obeyed from their heart the form of doctrine delivered unto them. Did their obedience curse them as the preacher under consideration declared that "law keeping" did to those who kept it? Hear Paul on Romans 6:23: *"For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."* The Roman Christians had obeyed the form of doctrine and at that point were freed from their sin (vs.17-18). Were they cursed for obeying? No! They were blessed! Why? Because God saved them. They, at their obedience (meeting God's terms), received the gift of salvation.

What a wonderful redemption

God has provided for all men. In love, he gave His Son to die for us. In mercy, he offered all men the atoning power of the blood of Jesus if they would meet his terms of obedience to the gospel of Christ. Never, at any point, does God ever indicate there is nothing for man to do lest he earn his salvation. To the contrary, on every hand, obedience to the will of God is encouraged with the view that this is the only proper response a sinner can make toward God in order to receive the gift of salvation.

Christians obey God because they believe, that is true. But biblical faith and the kind of faith this man urged are two entirely different qualities. His concept of faith is that it is a leap into the dark to grab something, we know not what, but having grabbed it we hang on and in gratitude for whatever it is we have grabbed, we work the commandments of God. Biblical faith possesses, as one of its chief characteristics, conviction. Christians obey God because we are convinced God is always right in every matter; we trust his integrity. It is true, that out of gratitude to God for all he has done, we will strive to the fullest extent of our ability to serve him in every way possible (Heb. 12:28). (**Grace** in this passage is a figure of speech where the cause is stated for the consequences worked; our gratitude for all the gifts of grace).

We would that all men would think more upon the amazing quality and extent of God's grace. If only every Christian could grasp the extent of the blessings God grants us every day, we would serve more. If sinners can open their eyes to the marvelous grace of God in the temporal world around them, many would be constrained out of gratitude to turn to God. It is by grace we are saved, Paul affirms to the Ephesians (2:4,8), but not by grace only. There is a difference. Let's always be aware of the difference.

Let's offer God the praise of our lips and the service of a sincere and grateful heart. But let's never, ever, underestimate the place faithful obedience to God's word has in our salvation. Oh yes, and point number four.

4. **The preacher completely misunderstood the faith of Abraham, or else deliberately ignored that faith.** God credited Abraham's faith toward justification. But when did he do that? James tells us when that occurred in James chapter two. It isn't necessary to go into detail in that chapter for it makes itself evident. Abraham obeyed the command of God and the Scripture was fulfilled which said he believed God. James 2:21-23: *"Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God."* The brother in question ignores all God tells us about the faith of Abraham. God counted his faith unto him for righteousness. When? When he obeyed God. But the brother mixed his figures when he said "just as God deposited his faith for righteousness, so he deposits grace into our account for our sins." What a difference! And the brother thought his mixture would be overlooked! Where is the parallel action?

Let our Calvinist preacher brother ponder what God says, not what some Neo-Pentecostal, Calvinistic paraphrase of the Bible seems to him to teach. Let our brother accept what the Bible sets forth and quit slandering faithful brethren who are devoted to the Lord and strive to show their faith by their obedience just as Abraham did.

7 West Colorado  
Sheridan, WY 82801

**First Annual "LABOURERS TOGETHER WITH GOD" LECTURESHIP  
ENSLEY CHURCH OF CHRIST**

57 East Hannah Circle • Pensacola, FL 32534 • Phone (904) 476-1417 or 479-4405

**September 19-23, 1993**

**Theme: Labourers Together With God - Director: Kenneth Burleson**

<b>SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1993</b> .....		
10:00 am	Labourers Together .....	Jessie Powell, Jr.
11:00 am	Opposing the Grace Only Doctrine .....	Jimmy Bates
6:00 pm	True Repentance (Fruits of Repentance) .....	Windell Fikes
7:00 pm	The Gospel Vs. Gimmickry .....	Dan Bailey
<b>MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1993</b> .....		
1:00 pm	Preaching the Plan of Salvation .....	Calvin Pugh
2:00 pm	Opposing the Doctrine of Impossibility of Apostasy .....	Mike King
3:00 pm	Opposing Mechanical Instruments of Music in Worship .....	Melvin Sapp
7:00 pm	Marriage, Divorce and Re-marriage .....	Walter Pigg
8:00 pm	Opposing the New Hermeneutics .....	Garland Robinson
<b>TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1993</b> .....		
1:00 pm	Fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22-23) .....	Kenneth McClain
2:00 pm	Opposing the Works of the Flesh (Gal. 5:19-21) .....	Duwayne McNaughton
3:00 pm	False Labourers, Use of Modern Versions & etc. ....	James Boyd
7:00 pm	Evangelism (TV, Radio, Papers & etc.) .....	Ken Burleson
8:00 pm	Does II Jn. 9-11 Teach Guilt by Association? .....	James Boyd
<b>WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1993</b> .....		
1:00 pm	Fellowship .....	Garland Robinson
2:00 pm	The Home As God Would Have It .....	Max R. Miller
3:00 pm	Labourers Worthy of Their Hire .....	Charles Blair
7:00 pm	Calling Sin, Sin .....	Gilbert Gough
8:00 pm	True, Biblical Love .....	Charles Blair
<b>THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1993</b> .....		
1:00 pm	Have Biblical Miracles Ceased? .....	L.E. Wishum
2:00 pm	Opposing Calvinism in the Church .....	Tom Franklin
3:00 pm	The Role of Women in the Church .....	Gilbert Gough
7:00 pm	Training Labourers .....	L.E. Wishum
8:00 pm	"Labourers Together With God" .....	Max R. Miller

**Ninth Annual UPPER OHIO VALLEY LECTURESHIP  
LOVERS LANE CHURCH OF CHRIST**

STUBENVILLE, OH

**OCTOBER 7-10, 1993**

**Theme: "Great Issues Facing The Church"**

<b>THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1993</b> .....		
7:00 pm	Denominational Doctrines Affecting the Church .....	Joe Gilmore
8:00 pm	The New Testament is Our Pattern .....	Raymond Haygood
<b>FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1993</b> .....		
9:00 am	Respecting the Silence of the Scriptures .....	Joe Gilmore
10:00 am	The Threat of Immorality to the Church .....	Ray Beadnell
11:00 am	Are We Saved by God's Grace Alone? .....	Garland Elkins
12:00 noon	LUNCH	
1:30 pm	Saving Our Children in the Midst of Apostasy .....	Fred Davis
2:30 pm	Dangers of the Modern Versions .....	Robert Taylor
7:00 pm	Remaining Faithful in the Midst of Digression .....	Garland Elkins
8:00 pm	Speaking the Truth in Love .....	Robert Taylor
<b>SATURDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1993</b> .....		
9:00 am	Militantly Standing for the Truth, Opposing the Wrong .....	Jay Yeager
10:00 am	Are We Under Any Law? .....	Garland Elkins
11:00 am	Unity Based Upon Authority .....	Robert Taylor
12:00 noon	LUNCH	
1:00 pm	The Church in Transition (A Review and Expose') .....	Wayne Coates
2:00 pm	Can We Understand the Bible Alike? .....	Russell Kline
2:00 pm	Ladies' Class .....	Martha Bailey
DINNER		
7:00 pm	The Second Incarnation, #1 .....	Curtis Cates
8:00 pm	Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage .....	Thomas Eaves
<b>SUNDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1993</b> .....		
9:00 am	Keeping the Church Pure .....	Thomas Eaves
10:00 am	The Second Incarnation, #2 .....	Curtis Cates
11:00 am	Digression Update, '93 .....	Wayne Coates
12:00 noon	LUNCH	
2:00 pm	The New Hermeneutic .....	Thomas Eaves
2:00 pm	Ladies Class .....	Lucy Hagood
3:00 pm	The Bible Only Makes Christians Only and the Only Christians .....	Will Montgomery

## "LORD, PLEASE DON'T EVER BE NEGATIVE"

Gary Colley

The Lord Jesus Christ is the pattern or example in all spiritual matters. There are some however who seem to give the Lord this place only in lip service when it comes to preaching. They are so "positive" the words "no", "except", and "not" are not a part evidently of their vocabulary...that is unless it be a negative word and attitude toward those who preach the Truth and expose error. This idea has critically infected some, paralyzed others, and weakened "nigh unto death" many congregations. The balanced preaching of Jesus, Paul, and Peter is traded for the "positive" preaching of Peale.

The sermon on the mount preached by Jesus has both positive and negative teaching. Our "positive" friends however would probably inform Jesus that He made a large mistake with His "negative and narrow" preaching; that the church surely would not grow if He didn't stop being so "negative." **CAN YOU BELIEVE THE LORD SAID:**

- 1) "If ye forgive not...neither will your Father forgive your trespasses" (Matt. 6:15).
- 2) "...be not, as the hypocrites..." (Matt. 6:16).
- 3) "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth" (6:19).
- 4) "No man can serve two masters...Ye cannot serve God and mammon" (6:24).
- 5) "Judge not, that ye be not judged" (Matt. 7:1).
- 6) "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs" (Matt. 7:6).
- 7) "...broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat" (7:13).
- 8) "Beware of false prophets" (7:15).
- 9) "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven..." (7:21).

What would be the response to such preaching today?? Perhaps, "Lord, please don't ever be negative...we all know the church won't grow with that type of preaching...and please, don't suggest that I turn and read again II Tim. 4:1-4!"

8900 Manchaca Rd.  
Austin, TX 78748

## MAILBAG



"Only eternity can tell the great amount of good that **Seek The Old Paths** will have accomplished as the pure truth of Christ and His gospel is published abroad" ...*Franklin, NC*. "In these pages I always expect

to see the truth, regardless of the issue. May God continue to bless you and the brethren at Corinth" ...*Trezevant, TN*. "My wife and I appreciate so much your stand, along with the church at Corinth, for the Truth. We try to pass these papers to others as often as possible to help teach others and edify the brethren. Very sound articles in this day and time of liberalism and apathy in the church are very much needed. We need more papers such as this. Express my appreciation to the elders, preacher and all who participate in its publication" ...*Murray, KY*. "I enjoy reading the paper very much and is a real good out spoken paper. So keep up the good work" ...*Pontotoc, MS*. "I enjoy the paper. Stay on the STAND! If what we have in Christ is not worth defending its not worth having" ...*Fulton, MS*. "I am now past 94 years. I read through the day and at night a lot. I appreciate your paper and read every word! We have too many who has left the Truth for error. If anyone can read for himself what the Bible says, I can't see why they can't understand. The truth is our only guide. Keep up the good work" ...*Tupelo, MS*. "I am a widow of 80 years old. I sure enjoy reading **Seek The Old Paths**" ...*Pontotoc, MS*. "We appreciate your good work" ...*Meridian, MS*. "**Seek the Old Paths** is such a good gospel paper. It should be in every home. It is the gospel preached as I have heard it all my life and obeyed it when I was seventeen years old (now 87). Keep up the good work" ...*Kilmichael, MS*.

**Seek The Old Paths** is a publication of the **East Corinth Church of Christ** and is under the oversight of its elders. Its primary purpose and goal in publication can be found in Jude 3; II Timothy 4:2; Titus 1:13; Titus 2:1; II Peter 1:12.

Editor: **Garland M. Robinson**  
Associate Editor: **Jimmy Bates**

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. Postage  
P A I D  
Permit No. 253  
Corinth, MS

EAST CORINTH CHURCH OF CHRIST  
1801 CRUISE ST.  
CORINTH, MS 38834-5108

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED