

# Expository Files



Jon W. Quinn, Warren E. Berkley - Editors

---

*October 2004*

*Issue 11.10*

Front Page

## *Intelligent Design and Unintelligent Intolerance*

*By Jon W. Quinn*

This is rather interesting. Many evolutionists of the “Universe is a random accident without purpose” persuasion insist that intelligent design theories are not scientific. Why? Well, because its proponent scientists do not “publish peer-reviewed articles.”

But that is not so. “Peer-reviewed” articles by “intelligent design” scientists have been published... at least when they can get by the censors. You see, there are many that do not want and will not permit such articles to be published if they can stop it. But they cannot stop them all, even though they try.

Dr. Stephen Meyer recently had an article titled "The Origin of Biological Information and the Higher Taxonomic Categories" published in “Proceedings”. In it, Meyer argues that the theory of intelligent design explains the origin of the genetic information in early animal forms better than current materialistic theories of evolution.

Evolutionists objected claiming the article was “substandard” but the editor of “Proceedings”, which, by the way, is published at the National Museum of Natural History at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC, confirmed that the article was put through the standard peer-review process and that the three reviewers were eminently qualified. But now that journal’s editor and the publication itself is under attack as well.

You see, evolutionists typically contend that the evidence for their theory is so strong that there is no room for further questions or inquiry. All opposing views are squashed. They will unreasonably contend that if not published and reviewed, then it cannot be science, but then if it is published and reviewed, then it still cannot be science if it does not fit with their prejudice.

Dr. Meyer himself has noted the double standard being applied to his article. "Until a few days ago," he says, "Darwinists have argued that intelligent design isn't science because it hasn't been published in peer-reviewed journals. But now that an increasing number of scientists are making their case for design in scientific publications, Darwinists are ready to disown peer review -- temporarily, I'm sure."

Everyone seems to know the story about the Medieval Church hierarchy's mistreatment of Galileo. That was sad. But similar behavior is seen today, and borrowing the words of the ancient prophet Nathan, we redirect them to the evolutionist today doing the same thing and we say, "Thou art the man!"

***"Your People Shall Be My People, And Your God, My God"***

***(Ruth 1-4)***

***By Jon W. Quinn***

It was about 400 years from the time that Israel entered Canaan and received the land that God had promised them until the first king was anointed. This period of time was known as the time of the Judges, so called because the leaders of the people were called "Judges". During the period of the judges Israel was steeped in sin, often degraded and immoral. The Scriptures describe the moral and behavioral standards of the times as "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judges 21:25). Now, some folks have pretty high standards anyway, but others don't.

For example, the main characters followed in the book of Ruth are not like most of the people we find in the book of Judges, even though the time coincides with the latter years of the Judges. Ruth and Naomi displayed the characteristics of love, industry, generosity, chastity, and the desire to worship the God of Israel. Both women were blessed by God. If I were going to sum up the meaning and value of the book of Ruth, it would be that

it shows us a wonderful example of righteous loyalty to a friend even in adverse circumstances. Later, in the New Testament, we would find that brothers and sisters in Christ are to have these same characteristics toward one another and toward God.

### Self Sacrificing Love

Naomi's life would have been dark and solitary without Ruth. Naomi was widowed and had lost two sons. She was left with two daughters-in-law in a foreign land. She decided to return to Judah from Moab where she had been living (Ruth 1:6-7).

She was also concerned for her daughters-in-law. She did not want them to feel compelled to accompany her to her own country. Her concern for Ruth's happiness caused her to earnestly request she return to her mother's house, explaining that she had no more sons to give (Ruth 1:8-13).

But Naomi's concern for Ruth was equaled by Ruth's concern for Naomi. But more than that, Ruth, though from Moab, had come to the point where she desired very much to become a worshiper of Jehovah. Ruth was therefore willing to turn from known comforts to embrace the uncertainty of the unknown (Ruth 1:14-17).

God expects us to have concern and love for others. (Galatians 6:2,10). The book of Ruth shows us God has always highly valued selflessness, compassion and generosity, even in times where there was little of those characteristics to be found on the earth (see also Matthew 15:3-6; 22:37-39; 23:23).

Also, God expects us to care for family members. Men and women of faith have and understand these kinds of loyalties (1 Timothy 5:3,4; 16). We understand that Naomi and Ruth were related by marriage; but today Christians are related by blood (of Christ). Certainly we should care for one another (2 Corinthians 8:9; 9:6-8; 10,11).

We are expected to serve God before all else. We wonder what had Ruth seen in Naomi's character and her relationship with her God that caused her to be so loyal? She saw something in Naomi's God... not a God of wood/stone... and she was ready for that (for a description of Ruth's ex-god contrasted with Jehovah-see Jeremiah 10:3-3-6;10; 11-12). Think:

what can people see in your relationship with God that might have a similar good effect on them?

### Industry and Generosity

Naomi and Ruth arrived back in Judah destitute. Ruth requested she be allowed to go to the field and glean heads of grain (Ruth 2:1,2). The owner of the field, Boaz, took notice (Ruth 2:4,5; 8-12). Ruth shared the grain she gathered with Naomi (Ruth 2:17-18).

We are to be industrious and provide for our own needs (Proverbs 21:5; 31:30,31; 1 Thessalonians 4:11; 2 Thessalonians 3:11-13). But we are also to share our blessings with others (Ephesians 4:28; Acts 20:35; Matthew 6:33). Though they live over a thousand years before Christ comes and establishes His church, the account of Naomi and Ruth again provides solid good examples of living by faith and demonstrating so many of the qualities that it would one day take to become good Christians.

### Blessings

"So Boaz took Ruth and she became his wife; and when he went in to her, the LORD gave her conception, and she bore a son" (Ruth 4:13). Everyone expressed happiness for Naomi and Ruth. People tend to be for the underdog, and when valiant courage wins over great odds it is a thrilling thing (Ruth 4:14-16). Again, all this is another step toward the fulfilling of the final promise to Abraham to send One, a descendant of Abraham, who would bless all the nations of the earth (Genesis 12:1-3). Ruth became the great-grandmother of David, through whom would come the Messiah (Ruth 4:17).

Ruth's unselfishness had been rewarded by God, and so shall ours be (Hebrews 6:10-12; 19). Those pleasing in the sight of God are always a source of blessing to others (Matthew 5:16; 1 Peter 2:12).

Ruth was dedicated as she followed Naomi (Ruth 1:16). It is this kind of loyalty that will make one a good disciple (follower) of Jesus. It is a loyalty that will assume any risks; accept whatever losses are called for, and steadfastly follow on (Matthew 16:24).

***"So What?" to the "Somewhat"***

**(Galatians 2:6)**  
**By Edward C. Barnes**

"But of these who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me: (Galatians 2:6 KJV)

BY WAY OF EXAMPLE, THE apostle Paul teaches us how to handle those people and things which by the world's standards seem so impressive. In Galatians Paul recounts two trips he made to Jerusalem following his conversion; the first trip, three years following his conversion (1:18), and the second fourteen years later (2:1). No doubt he had heard great things about Peter, James and John, apostles of the Lord and pillars in the Jerusalem church (2:9). They were great men of faith and Paul refers to them as "apostles before me" (1:17) "them which were of reputation" (2:2), and "those who seemed to be somewhat" (2:6). Paul, however, was not unduly taken with the reputation of these apostles as others apparently had been. For, he says with reference to his conversion ". . . immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me." (1:16-17). When he finally went up to Jerusalem three years later he only visited with two of the apostles, Peter and James (1:18-19). Also, in describing his visit fourteen years later he points out that those who were "somewhat" (i.e. had the reputation of being important) did not matter to him, were not accepted by God on the basis of their "person" (i.e. who they were, having been of the original twelve and personal companions of Jesus) and furthermore they had added nothing to his ability, authority or success as an apostle (2:6-8). And finally, Paul had actually confronted and opposed the apostle Peter for wrong doing ( 2:11ff). In effect, Paul had declared "So What?" to those who were "somewhat."

"So what?" The phrase sounds like the wisecrack response of a disgruntled person trying to justify some unworthy desire or request, but actually the expression "So what?" can be turned around and used as a powerful verbal bullet when fired off with authority in the appropriate situation. The words compose a serious question that we ought to be asking with some regularity. As adults we don't sound out the question "So what?" as often as we should, partly because the phrase is associated with the quarrels heard between children. However, children and teens should not be allowed exclusive rights to such a profound concept as that expressed by "So what?".

Why is "So what?" so significant? Why should it be given a more prominent place in our daily conversation? Because, if used in the right context and with the right attitude it can shed the light of truth and reality on many of the false assumptions of our society. Much of what people are so wrapped up in today, the shallowness, materialism and selfishness of modern living deserves a big "SO WHAT?"

When junior, for example, comes home and says, "All the guys are wearing big, baggy blue jeans, why can't I . . ." (You know, the type that hang down around the knees and can only held up by suspenders attached to the trailing edge of their T-shirts.) In response, mom and dad should come back with, "So what?" Or, when sis says, "But all my girl friends' folks are giving them fifty bucks to go the Brittany Spears concert", mom and dad should answer, "So what?" Not in an effort to end the conversation, but for the purpose of beginning the process of thinking about the moral values and standards (or the lack thereof) behind the activity in question.

Some of the habits (many of which are encouraged by friends as well as TV) of young people, and adults alike, are void of any redeeming value. Even though the world may think certain attitudes and activities are important (i.e. somewhat), on closer examination, we find that there may be nothing solid behind them in terms of the healthy moral and spiritual development of the child or adult. And for this reason they deserve a big "SO WHAT?" Habits and attitudes that we are developing and activities that we are asked to engage in should all pass through the crucible of "So what?" So what's the value, so what's the purpose, so what's the authority behind it, so what's the good it's going to do me, so what's the end result?

This is not to say that every activity that is engaged in for the purpose of recreation and pleasure should be avoided. It is not a sin to have fun or goof off once in a while, or do things that bring pleasure, but it is wrong to sin in the process. So when contemplating the value of a particular activity which to the world is esteemed to be "somewhat" ask yourself "So what?" as a method of examining whether the activity is worth your time as a Christian.

***Abhor & Cling***  
***Rom. 12:9***  
***Warren E. Berkley***

***EF 11.10 ~ April 2004***

The gospel of Christ was given by God not only to provide forgiveness of sins, but to put within us the power to live right (Col. 1:27). Part of that is to develop a healthy but intense abhorrence of sin. There cannot be a neutral or indifferent attitude toward any sin or error. But also, there must be an equally intense desire to learn and do what is right. In the words of Paul, “Abhor what is evil. Cling to what is good,” (Rom. 12:9).

*Whatever this means, it is my duty as a Christian.*

*Whatever this means, I must do this on a daily basis.*

*Whatever this means, I must do this even if nobody else does it.*

*Whatever this means, I can improve in my personal participation.*

### ***Abhor what is evil***

This word “abhor” means to dislike, abhor, have a horror of. Clinton Hamilton said: “The idea is that the ill will toward, dislike of, and horror of evil is so intense as to cause one to shrink back from it.”

This is not just an expression of negative opinion. This verse is not fulfilled by mere criticism of sin, or sympathy with others who speak against sin and error. This is your personal opposition to all that is evil, in every way that opposition can and should be expressed.

There is an intensity about this. And that intensity is based on your close association with God. God’s disapproval is duplicated by His children! We are offended because He is offended. And because we abhor evil, we refuse to participate in it.

Here’s one way to test yourself. Read those passages in the New Testament where specific sins are described. As you read each one, monitor how you feel about it, your reaction.

“...sexual immorality, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, evil-mindedness...whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, violent, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, undiscerning, untrustworthy, unloving, unforgiving, unmerciful,” etc. (Rom. 1:29-31). *What is your reaction?*

If we truly abhor what is evil, the thought of these behaviors will be personally repulsive to us. The idea is that the ill will toward these things will cause us to shrink back from them. “The fear of the Lord is to hate evil,” and “you who love the Lord, hate evil,” (Prov. 8:13; Psa. 97:10).

### ***Cling to what is good***

The word “cling” is translated, in some versions, “cleave.” That means to be attached to; devoted to. This is attachment to that which is right in the eyes of God; that which God takes pleasure in.

What is your reaction when you read passages in the New Testament like this: “...love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control...,” (Gal. 5:22,23). *Do you find these things attractive?*

**Our attraction for what is right should be just as strong as our abhorrence of what is wrong!** And both should be based on our alignment with God and our interests in His values. Just as we are repulsed by those things that are wrong, we should be attracted to and compelled to learn and practice those things that are right, holy, good and eternally valuable. ***Abhor what is evil*** – needs to be combined with ***cling to what is good***. Good character cannot exist without this.

It may help for us to consult Psalms 119. What is prominent in the passage is, the writer’s praise for the Word of God. This passage is inspired and skillfully presented. It is easy to read and see in this passage the excellence of the Word of God.

*Blessed are the undefiled in the way,  
Who walk in the law of the LORD!  
Blessed are those who keep His testimonies,  
Who seek Him with the whole heart!  
They also do no iniquity;  
They walk in His ways.  
You have commanded us  
To keep Your precepts diligently.  
Oh, that my ways were directed  
To keep Your statutes!  
Then I would not be ashamed,  
When I look into all Your commandments.*



*I will praise You with uprightness of heart,  
When I learn Your righteous judgments.  
I will keep Your statutes;  
Oh, do not forsake me utterly!*

This was written in praise of the excellence of God's Word. Concerning the study of our text in Rom. 12:9 – "Abhor what is evil. Cling to what is good," there are these helpful statements in Psalms 119.

**Verse 104** – "Through your precepts I get understanding; therefore, I hate every false way." Through precepts given by God, we are able to "get understanding." As a result, we are motivated to "hate every false way."

**Verse 128** - "Therefore, all Your precepts concerning all things I consider to be right; I hate every false way." The totality of God's will (all His precepts concerning all things), the writer considered "to be right." The personal outcome was to "hate every false way."

**Verse 163** - "I hate and abhor lying, but I love Your law." Here is a specific. Lying is sinful. We learn that as we read and study the precepts of God and become familiar with the mind of God. So we hate, we abhor lying. And just as we are intense and serious about our hatred of lying, we are intense and serious about our love for the law of the Lord (which is nothing but the truth). All of this in Psalms 119 should shed good light on the duty of thought and life Paul brings to our attention – "Abhor what is evil. Cling to what is good." There is a holy kind of hatred we should have toward every form of evil, every false way. Along with that there is a holy love, desire and attraction we should find in what is good. "Abhor what is evil. Cling to what is good."

**Who Perfectly Illustrated This By His Life?** Jesus Christ abhorred what is evil; Jesus Christ clung to what is good. This is evident when you read Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. And it is taught in the prophecy written in Psalms 45:6,7. "Your Throne, O God, is forever and ever; A scepter of righteousness is the scepter of Your kingdom. You love righteousness and hate wickedness; Therefore God, Your God, has anointed You with the oil of gladness more than Your companions."

**The fulfillment of this? Heb. 1:8,9.** "But to the Son He says: 'Your throne, O God, is forever and ever; A scepter of righteousness is the scepter of Your

kingdom. You have loved righteousness and hated lawlessness; Therefore, God, Your God, has anointed You with the oil of gladness more than Your companions.”

Jesus is qualified to be our leader by virtue of His Deity, His Death and His Character; His holy, sinless life. He loved righteousness and hated lawlessness. He was not indifferent to evil. He spoke against evil. He refused to participate in any evil. And that should be my disposition, if I’m a follower of Christ, a child of God. Loving righteousness. Hating lawlessness. Good character is not possible without this! Abhor what is evil – cling to what is good. This is our duty of heart and life. This is the attitude we must maintain daily. We must do this, even if nobody else does. And each one of us can improve, can make progress in abhorring what is evil and clinging to what is good. It all begins, with your obedience to the gospel.

***Not a Matter of “One’s Own Interpretation”?***  
***(2 Peter 1:20)***  
*David McClister*

Have you ever had a discussion about some Biblical passage or topic in which the person with whom you were speaking abruptly ended the conversation with the words “That’s just your interpretation”? Or maybe they said “Well, that’s just your opinion” or “You’ve got your opinion on that, and I’ve got mine.” If you have talked to others about the Bible much at all, odds are good you have had such things said to you, perhaps often. The pluralistic religious landscape in our country is quite full of this concept.

Have you ever used 2 Peter 1:20 as a reply to that? Peter said “But know this first of all, that no prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one’s own interpretation.” Some people think this statement by Peter is the perfect retort to “that’s just your interpretation.” On the surface it appears that Peter is saying that there is no such thing as “your interpretation” or “my interpretation” of the Bible, there’s just what the Bible says and that’s that. No one, the passage says, is allowed the comfort of a private, personal interpretation of the Bible. The Bible is not to be read in such a way that it is made to conform to our opinions and assumptions; instead, we must conform to what it says.

But is that really what 2 Peter 1:20 is saying? Let's take a closer look at this whole business.

Let's begin with the more general matter of different interpretations. To some people, "interpretation" is actually a bad word because it has unnecessarily become associated with subjectivism and the pluralistic mentality which asserts that the Bible is basically unintelligible, that opinions (interpretations) are all we can hope to have when it comes to the Bible and religious matters, and that since the Bible is unintelligible in the first place, all opinions (interpretations) about what the Bible means are equally valid. Some interpretations of the Bible may have such an attitude behind them, but the fact is that we cannot escape the business of interpreting the Bible. Even those who claim that all they do is let the Bible speak for themselves engage in an interpretive process (although they are probably unaware of it themselves).

Is the Bible basically unintelligible? Not at all. The Bible is eminently understandable. It makes this very claim for itself (Eph 3:4). But the question *everyone* who picks up a Bible eventually faces (whether they address it explicitly or not) is: what does this mean? The moment we begin to inquire about the meaning of any part of the Bible, or even of the Bible as a whole, we have asked the first question in the process of interpretation. And when we begin to say "I think the Bible means this" or "I think this passage is saying that," we have produced an interpretation, like it or not.

Engaging in the process of interpretation is not an evil thing. I will reassert that everyone who picks up a Bible and wonders to any degree what the text means is already involved in an interpretive process. Anyone who has any opinion about what the Bible teaches has arrived at an interpretation of the Bible. The real question is: is this the right interpretation? Is my interpretation correct? Is the interpretation at which I have arrived the one that makes the very best sense of what is written? Does the interpretation I have produced fit the Biblical data without distorting it in any way (that is, without twisting words, without leaving data out, without reading foreign ideas into it, etc.)?

Consider, if you will, that the interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures was one of the key issues upon which Christianity was founded. The early Christians, who had learned from Jesus himself, believed and taught that the Hebrew Scriptures spoke of the demise of the Levitical sacrificial system

centered in the tabernacle and temple, that those Scriptures predicted the coming of Jesus of Nazareth into the world, that they predicted his death, burial and resurrection, and that they spoke of the resurrected Jesus as the king over God's kingdom. Many of the Jews disagreed with that vehemently. That is, one of the greatest differences between Judaism and Christianity was their interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Christianity is itself an interpretation of those Scriptures, and it claims to be the right interpretation.

Interpretation is unavoidable when handling the Bible, and the early Christians themselves were interpreters (whose interpretation was viewed as radical by the Jews) of the Jewish Scriptures. Peter was not, therefore, condemning interpretation wholesale in 2 Peter 1:20. Read Peter's letters and what you will see there is an interpretation of the life of Christ. Because Peter was an apostle guided by the Holy Spirit, we can be assured that his interpretation of the story of Jesus was correct. But it was an interpretation nonetheless.

So what does 2 Peter 1:20 mean (note that this is itself an interpretive question!)? Consider the context. Peter is there talking about the prophets of Old Testament times. This is clear from verse 19, in which Peter says "we have the prophetic word made more sure." What Peter means is that Jesus was the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies, and Peter himself was an eyewitness to this very fact. It was not that Peter had heard that Jesus fulfilled prophecies, but that Peter knew it from his own experience with Jesus.

How were the prophets of old able to predict with such astonishing clarity and accuracy the things about Jesus? Peter tells us plainly in verse 21: "no prophecy was ever made by an act of human will, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God." The Spirit of God revealed these things to them. They were not making guesses about the Messiah. In fact, they were not even making educated guesses. What they predicted was not a matter of them arriving at some interpretation of events they saw in their own day. This is what Peter means when he says "no prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation."

For example, the prophet Isaiah predicted the Babylonian captivity of Judah at a time when Babylon was not a military or political threat to anyone, nor was there any indication they would be some time later. In

Isaiah's time the *Assyrians* were waging wars of conquest over all of the Ancient Near East. If Isaiah had been guessing, or interpreting, what would happen to Judah based on the things that were going on around him, he would have predicted that the Assyrians would take the kingdom of Judah into captivity. But he did not. He accurately predicted that the Babylonians would do that, and that is exactly how it unfolded in history. This is because Isaiah was not interpreting the events of his day, looking for patterns in current events, as he spoke about the future of Judah. What he said about Judah he said from the Holy Spirit of God.

2 Peter 1:20, then, is about the prophets and how they made their predictions. It is not about the more general issue of interpreting the Bible. 2 Peter 1:10 is not about whether anyone must or can interpret the Bible.

So the next time someone says "that's just your interpretation," instead of quoting 2 Peter 1:20 to them, invite them to investigate which interpretation (understanding, or reading) of the Bible is the right one.

*Used by permission of the author; see other material at <http://www.palmettochurchofchrist.org/>*

Topic Page

***He Needed a Faithful Father***  
***(Topical Page)***  
***By Jon W. Quinn***

After the death of Solomon in 930 B.C., the kingdom divided. The northern tribes rebelled against the house of David and established a new nation which continued to be called "Israel". The southern kingdom continued to acknowledge the authority of the house of David; they were called "Judah".

It all happened during the reign of Rehoboam, the son of Solomon. The split of the nation into two smaller nations left both much weaker. We often refer to Rehoboam's bad decision to follow the counsel of his young friends rather than that of the wiser counselors of his father as the reason for the division of the nation. And it is true that Rehoboam is responsible for his decision and the consequences of it, but it was not there that the division had begun. The wheels had been set in motion during the reign of his father, Solomon.

The Division of the Kingdom Had Been Prophesied

God had spoken to Solomon and told him of consequences that would result if he became an unfaithful king. The Lord said, "As for you, if you walk before Me as your father David walked, even to do according to all that I have commanded you, and will keep My statutes and My ordinances, then I will establish your royal throne as I covenanted with your father David, saying, "You shall not lack a man to be ruler in Israel.' But if you turn away and forsake My statutes and My commandments which I have set before you, and go and serve other gods and worship them, then I will uproot you from My land which I have given you, and this house which I have consecrated for My name I will cast out of My sight and I will make it a proverb and a byword among all peoples." (2 Chronicles 7:17-20).

Also, the prophet Ahijah had prophesied to Jeroboam "He said to Jeroboam, 'Take for yourself ten pieces; for thus says the LORD, the God of Israel, "Behold, I will tear the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon and give you ten tribes (but he will have one tribe, for the sake of My servant David and for the sake of Jerusalem, the city which I have chosen from all the tribes of Israel), because they have forsaken Me, and have worshiped Ashtoreth the goddess of the Sidonians, Chemosh the god of Moab, and Milcom the god of the sons of Ammon; and they have not walked in My ways, doing what is right in My sight and observing My statutes and My ordinances, as his father David did. Nevertheless I will not take the whole kingdom out of his hand, but I will make him ruler all the days of his life, for the sake of My servant David whom I chose, who observed My commandments and My statutes; but I will take the kingdom from his son's hand and give it to you, even ten tribes. (1 Kings 11:31-35).

#### The Ultimate Cause of the Division Was Solomon's Apostasy

Two independent kingdoms were formed. Jeroboam was king over Israel (10 tribes) in the North (1 Kings 12:20) and Rehoboam was king over Judah and Benjamin in the South (1 Kings 12:21).

While we understand that Rehoboam was not simply an innocent bystander, we see that his reign is adversely effected by his father's spiritual failures. This did not make Rehoboam not responsible for his own decisions, he was (1 Kings 11:9-13). But the actions and attitudes of his father adversely effected Rehoboam.

Solomon was a very wise man. He was a good governor and the nation prospered under him. But during the middle of his reign, he began to

compromise his faith and convictions. His many political marriages undertaken to cement alliances with other nations brought great influence upon him from his pagan wives, and they influenced him to turn to idolatry. It was in that failure that the seeds of division had been sown.

Parents will effect their children's future, and Rehoboam, though responsible for his own errors, needed faithful parents to look up to. Rehoboam did not get that from his father Solomon. I do not know how to make the message any plainer than that.

**Will We Effect Our Children As Badly as Solomon Effected His?**

I doubt that Solomon planned on having such an adverse effect on his son. His moral and spiritual failures slipped up on him. That happens when proper attention is not given to the Lord and his will in our lives. Solomon had given such matters their proper place at one time, but somewhere along the he had lost his way (1 Kings 11:9-13).

Why did Rehoboam listen to the unwise counsel of his friends to increase the tax burdens of the people (1 Kings 12:9-11) instead of the wise counsel of his father's counselors and decrease the tax burden (1 Kings 12:6-8) (any similarity between this and modern day political issues in our own nation are purely coincidental). Was it pride? Was it a lack of respect of his father, perhaps due to his father's own spiritual failures? Whatever it was, the end result was the same. National disaster and civil war.

So that was then, and now is now. We fill the roles of parents and children. We are now the ones living our lives before God. It is our children who are being influenced by us. They are seeing in us examples of strong faith and commitment, or spiritual weakness and failure. The Bible says, "For He established a testimony in Jacob and appointed a law in Israel, which He commanded our fathers that they should teach them to their children, that the generation to come might know, even the children yet to be born, that they may arise and tell them to their children, that they should put their confidence in God and not forget the works of God, but keep His commandments." (Psalm 78:5-7).

In the New Testament we read, "Fathers, do not provoke your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord." (Ephesians 6:4). We also read of the good effect godly parents (and grandparents) can have on their offspring. Paul wrote to Timothy, "You,

however, continue in the things you have learned and become convinced of, knowing from whom you have learned them, and that from childhood you have known the sacred writings which are able to give you the wisdom that leads to salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.: (2 Timothy 3:14,15; cf. 2 Timothy 1:5).

Parents! Will we live for the Lord as the examples of faith we ought to be before our children and all, or will we conceal the wonderful things God's grace has provided us in compromise and neglect? "We will not conceal them from their children, But tell to the generation to come the praises of the LORD, And His strength and His wondrous works that He has done." (Psalm 78:4). Let us prepare our hearts and be faithful to our God! "And not be like their fathers, a stubborn and rebellious generation, a generation that did not prepare its heart and whose spirit was not faithful to God." (Psalm 78:8). It does not take a "Solomon" to clearly see what our choice ought to be.

## **The Plan of Salvation**

### **By Jon W. Quinn**

~~~~~

#### **Plan #1 - God's Plan**

Announced by the apostles, inspired by the Holy Spirit, to new believers in Christ who asked what they must do:

"Repent, and let each of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sins and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (ACTS 2:38)

#### **Plan #2 - Man's Doctrine**

On the back page of a tract, sinner were urged to pray this prayer to be saved. This prayer is not found in the Bible; nor were alien sinners commanded to pray for their forgiveness.

#### **The Sinner's Prayer:**



"O' Lord, I accept that I am a sinner and that Jesus died for my sins. I now accept Him into my heart as Lord and Savior asking for your mercy and forgiveness in His name. Amen."

The editors of Expository Files are happy with plan #1 and thankful to the God of all grace for it. We cannot recommend Plan #2 at all, but will change our minds when this prayer can be shown to us in the Bible.

Final Page

### ***Robbed, Broke But Thankful***

Warren E. Berkley

During my tour of duty in the United States Army I was occupied as a musician. I was a member of the 158<sup>th</sup> Army Band at Fort Knox, Kentucky in the 1960's, and some of my work involved stage band performances on base and in nearby Louisville. On a few occasions we played at events in The Brown Hotel in downtown Louisville. It was an elegant place with southern charm right in downtown Louisville.

We would begin around 9 pm and finish after midnight. We played 50's style jazz and big band music while military officers visited with local political leaders, celebrities and Kentucky Colonels.

After the job, we would load up our equipment in an Army truck parked in the alley, then board an Army bus for the trip back to the base. This meant, walking through the alley behind The Brown in the early dark hours of morning. Our Sergeant always told us to walk with a buddy or in groups, due to the danger of late night criminal activity in downtown Louisville.

One morning, around 2 am, I was walking through that alley with my buddy, "Stick," (we all had nicknames; I was "Berk.") As we walked toward the bus, a huge man stepped out in front of us and stopped. He was holding (and tapping in his hand) a foot long lead pipe, that had electrical tape wrapped around one end for better grip.

We stopped. I closed my eyes as tight as I could, my body shook and I waited for the blow while praying. Stick was cool. **Then the giant said, "Do**

**you guys want this pipe?”** Stick said, “that’s just exactly what I’ve been looking for.” Quickly, we pooled our resources and bought that pipe for less than \$20 (all we had). The “pipe salesman” carefully gave Stick the pipe, said “thank you” and we walked on to the bus without harm.

We told the story and the other soldiers on the bus reacted. They considered us to be victims of extortion. We lost our money to a thief and only had pipe to show for it. We didn’t care that our peers believed we had been ill-treated. We were thankful to be safe and have our lives. (I was thankful I was with a friend who was so quick of thought and tongue!)

Many years ago, Matthew Henry, a well-known Bible scholar, was once robbed of his wallet. Knowing that it was his duty to give thanks in everything, he meditated on this incident and recorded in his diary the following:

*Let me be thankful, first, because he never robbed me before; second, because although he took my purse, he did not take my life; third, because although he took all I possessed, it was not much; and fourth, because it was I who was robbed, not I who robbed.*