



Dear Brother Faull,

I have a question for you regarding the head coverings for women from the text in **1 Corinthians 11**.

I am one who presses to have a solid answer on any Scripture when I am confronted or questioned.

The passage of **1 Corinthians 11** concerning the wearing of the veil, and the issue of short hair and long hair, has been one that I have had a hard time to nail down.

MR. FAULL'S ANSWER:

My wife used to wear a covering at church because I felt that is what it taught. We caused trouble everywhere we went even though I did not push it because I was not sure I was right.

It made women angry with my wife because they felt condemned for not wearing the covering and accused her of thinking she was better than they were.

It made men jealous of me because my wife would wear it thus stating she was in subjection to me, and their wives would not wear a covering. It caused so much trouble, I was thinking, "Surely I am wrong", so I had her stop wearing it.

There are some things to keep in mind:

- Paul thanked them for keeping the ordinances or traditions as he delivered them.
- This was not Jewish tradition for Jewish men wore and still wear caps in worship assemblies.
- The covering is not her hair because two different words are translated, "covering": *katakalypto* verses 5, 6, 7, 13, *peribolaion* verse 15.
- "The angels" in that passage refers to remembering what happened when they did not keep their proper place. It is not that the angels might molest the women if they did not have on a veil.

- From what I read, it was not necessarily Greek custom. I suspect that it was Christian tradition and revelation by Paul amidst a Church that lived among those immoral and promiscuous women who cut off their hair to show themselves as prostitutes.
- His main message is, 'If you are not in subjection to your husband, you might as well cut off your hair (be immoral) because you are no better than a prostitute.' It is the same as if you were shorn, or a prostitute. That is still the key message of that passage.
- The nature he refers to is not animals for males are the most ornate, like the Lion. He means, "Isn't it just the nature of things that men have the short hair and long hair glorifies a woman?"
- Men who have long hair are shamed and women are glorified for their long hair. It is not that it could not be cut at all but that she is to look like a woman and he, the man. When hair is shorn or sheared, it is not just trimmed but almost made bald.
- Obviously, this is in the assembly that she is to have the covering. If she must always wear it then a man can never wear a hat.
- If the woman's hair is the veil that he speaks of, then it follows the man's covering would be his hair and he must be bald!!!
- The long hair of women and short hair of man is only an illustration that the nature of things is for the woman to be covered, and so it is the woman who should cover her head and not the man.
- The "no other custom" and "no such custom" thing is difficult and I cannot be dogmatic about it. This is why I would not try to reintroduce the custom.

It would be pure arrogance on my part to teach and test or judge women on whether they do this when I am not even sure that I am right. Others should not be judged on my suspicions of what a passage means.

Let me say this, "What if it had never been stopped? What if the covering still meant, 'I am in subjection to my husband'? What would my wife have felt like going to a

church with other women who had coverings and she had to walk in uncovered because she divorced me? How would she have felt? Would it make a woman stop and think?

On the other hand, traditions or ordinances teach. When the symbol disappears, the teaching disappears. When the woman takes off her wedding ring it is because the marriage vows carry no weight.

When the Lord's Supper is missing, it is because the teaching of His Blood for our salvation has lost its significance. If there is no symbol, there is no teaching.

What if we still did it? People would ask, "Why do your women wear coverings in the assembly?" Immediately Christian teaching would be given.

Women are to be in the divine order. God, Christ, man, and woman. Women are subject to their husbands. At the end of the second war, the covering or hats came off and hairstyles changed. With it, the teaching of subjection of the wives to the husband and the pushing of women's lib became popular.

I have asked the women in several assemblies if their husband asked them to wear a covering would they do it. I have not known over a couple who answered "yes".

I have seen women who did come to camp meetings with coverings on and they were whispered about, made uncomfortable, and they never returned. That is a shame as they were just following their conscience and not insisting that others wear them.

The thing to keep in mind is, wearing one does not make a woman submissive any more than wearing a wedding ring makes one faithful.

If I were you, I would tell people that the thrust of the passage is that God has a divine arrangement of God, Christ, man, woman. To get out of that order and demand no distinction, or deny this God-given arrangement is rebellion. Refusal to submit to one's husband is as bad as whoredom.

Since a covering in the assembly demonstrated one was in subjection, then if a man who is created in the image of God wears one would indicate that he was in subjection to someone else other than Christ.

I offer this to be helpful. The answers are my opinions and where I am today. I would be willing to be taught otherwise since I do not know it all.

One thing I know. Only by pride cometh contention (division). Pride could be the only basis I would try to demand my sisters-in-Christ do what I think, when I am not even sure I am right about the matter.



44 Years Later, He Knows Better!!

Martin Luther King, Jr. was a believer in a personal God. However, Martin denied the creation account of Genesis, thinking it was unscientific and

that evolution was the enlightened view.

He denied the Bible was the inerrant Word of God, but rather contained contradictions and was old worldview in its origins.

He denied the deity of Christ but affirmed that what is true of Jesus can be true of every man who submits his will to God's Spirit.

He denied the virgin birth of Christ as unscientific. He denied the bodily resurrection of Jesus from the dead. It was only the disciples' desire, not reality.

He denied the stories of the Bible as historically true but they do contain great moral lessons for us. He denied that Jesus was literally coming to earth again.

He denied a future judgment. He denied that there was a hell and did not believe in a Heaven as Christians view it.

He denied that Christianity was the only one true religion, and felt it was indebted to all the other religions.

He denied the validity of the Church and felt it blocked the way of salvation more than anything did.

Martin is greatly admired by those in the Unitarian, Universalist, and modern Emergent churches. Many mainline denominations have sought to declare him a saint.

In spite of his denials of the Biblical account of Creation, the Word, the Deity of Jesus, His virgin birth, His miracles, resurrection, and coming again, as well as His Church, His Heaven and hell, he continues to be called a Christian Theologian.

One is considered politically incorrect, a racist, and anti-progressive to point out Mr. King's theology. They think it is even un-Christian to state what Martin believed.

Because he was a great speaker and could verbally express the correctness of the black man's plight and what should occur for them, does not make him a great religious leader and Christian theologian. We shall not seek to speak of his plagiarism, adulteries, and Marxism. We will leave that to others. We prefer to deal only with his religious claims.

Martin Luther King, Jr. went to meet his Creator and the judge of the Universe on April 4th, 1968, at only 39 years old. He had a dream. His theology is a nightmare.



Dear Brother Faull,

I have a friend that is having a great deal of difficulty giving himself to the Lord because of the following questions.

If God knew the outcome of the future of Lucifer, why would He create him, knowing that he would be His

archenemy and would tempt the world to sin and be mostly successful?

Why are we still being punished or under the curse for what Adam and Eve did?

Why does a loving God allow children to be born crippled or with such things like blindness, or heart problems, etc.

MR. FAULL'S ANSWER:

Point One: Why would God create the devil knowing that he would become the tempter?

This is very easy. If you give a spirit freewill, he can sin. If he does sin, he can lead others into sin. One can choose to be such a hater of God that he can seek to destroy others. You cannot have an up without a down, a valley without a mountain, or cold without hot. If one can be holy, he can choose to be unholy.

God did know what Satan and man would do when given freewill. He sets before us death and life, good and evil, Heaven and hell. He planned before the foundation of the world to send His Son into the world because unlike your friend, He is smart enough to know you cannot offer freewill without some choosing evil and thus death.

I did the same thing when I fathered children. I knew on one hand that they could become Hitlers, Stalins, Dahmers, and King Sauls. But I fathered them. They have choice. They could die of cancer, aids, fire, drown, and thousands of other misfortunes such as starvation. But I fathered them. They could be the tempted or the tempter but I fathered them.

He did not make robots or puppets. He gave freewill which means there would be pain, death, and sorrow on this earth. If your friend fathered children he answers his own question.

Point Two: Forgiveness removes guilt, it does not remove consequence. I played with matches and burned myself. That was the consequence. What my father gave me was the punishment.

After the punishment came the forgiveness, but the consequence remained after the discipline and the

forgiveness. The songwriter says it beautifully, "Be of sin the double cure, save from wrath and make me pure".

God does not just forgive us but empowers us to become pure. But that takes time for us to perfect holiness in the fear of God.

If all problems stopped immediately after baptism, temptation and the consequences of our sin were immediately removed, and we had no time to be overcomers of our habits and temptations, we would not be pure by choice and that would not be good.

Faith is the victory that overcomes the world and pure religion helps the widows and orphans in their affliction, and keeps itself unspotted from the world. When a drunk is baptized he still has his red nose and problems with his kidneys. The loose woman still has the bad reputation. The smoker's lungs are still darkened. The thief is still suspected. The porno watcher still has those images in his memory bank.

Salvation is from the guilt and power and eternal consequences of sin, but the physical effects are still there. David's sin was blotted out, but God said the child would die. He had given cause for the enemies of God to blaspheme and trouble would haunt his family. His sons had to wrestle the same sexual sins that he did. Ammom, Absalom, Solomon, Adonijah, had his bad example and it showed up in each of them.

Point Three: As I said above, sin leaves consequences. The whoremonger and loose women get VD and children are born to them that are blind, deformed, etc. The sins of the fathers physically pass to their children for several generations.

Number two answers this one too. Man dies because Adam and Eve sinned. We die because they were driven away from the Tree of Life, which is for the healing of the nations. Curse, pain, sorrow, and death are the results of sin and until we eat again of the Tree of Life, there will be these curses upon all mankind.

If Christians never had problems such as kids gone bad, cancer, heart trouble, disease, pain, starvation, then men would become Christians but not over repentance for sin, or love for God. They would become a Christian, go to Church, and live decent, as they would see that is the premium due on their insurance against those calamities. They would be hypocrites for safety from them. Impure motives would abound if all problems ceased upon becoming a Christian.

I do not sin because it is against God's Law. I do not sin because it breaks God's heart. I am not intentionally sinning because God would hurt me, but because I would hurt God. I have no idea if these will help, but these things are clear as day to my thinking.



Dear Brother Faull,

Regarding **Matthew 19:11-12**:¹¹ But he said to them, "Not everyone can accept this teaching, but only those to whom it is given."¹² For there are eunuchs who have been so from birth, and there are eunuchs who have been made eunuchs by others, and there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Let anyone accept this who can."

The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989), **Matthew 19:11-12**.

I read on your site where you mention the earlier verse in Matthew, however, why did you stop?

Here Jesus speaks of eunuchs who are born that way. A eunuch in the first century was the 'one who has charge of the bedchamber', often a castrated male but also a homosexual male. Clearly here Jesus is telling us that homosexuality is an inborn trait.

I also noted that your entire argument was based on an English translation of the Biblical text, rather than on the actual Koine Greek.

Many Greek scholars do not agree with the translations commonly in use, particularly the King James and New King James versions. If you want your argument to have merit, you really need to go directly to the Greek.

That is what I did.

MR. FAULL'S ANSWER

So the word "Eunuch" means homosexual? I get it now!!! "Some are born (homosexual). Some are made (homosexuals) by men, and some became (homosexuals) for the Kingdom of Heavens sake. If you're able to receive this idea of being homosexual, receive it."

How did I miss it? It is so plain. That is what you mean to say is it not? This is such absurdity. And why do you want it to be translated that way? Is it not to merely come up with the idea that homosexuality is acceptable to Him who said, "In the beginning He created them male and female?" And, "A man is to leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and they two shall become one flesh."

He should have said "He made them male and female and homosexual who should leave their father and father

or mother and mother (as the case may be) and cleave unto his or her significant other and become one family."

Is that really what Jesus meant?

Every nation, race, and religion, for all the years since creation, has condemned it, but you have negated it by an alleged knowledge of Greek.

The Biblical Greek text says "*eunonchas* (Strong's number 2135) from *eune* (bed) and 2192 *echo* (hold)". The Greek dictionary says "a castrated person (such being employed in oriental bedchambers), by extension an impotent or unmarried man. By implication, a chamberlain (state-officer), a eunuch."

I am fully aware that the homosexuals are trying to change the meaning of the term. They must give new definition to words and in these new meanings to words, they can push their agenda.

It is so sad to me, and I mean you no harm, but it breaks my heart that sincere folk like you are being fed these wrong definitions of words.

Thank you so much for writing and I pray that God will spare your life so you may seriously do some thinking about His Word.

It does not make any difference which translation you use, the sin is condemned in both the Old and New Covenant Scriptures.

Please do not be deceived.

1 Corinthians 6:9-11 is worthy of your consideration. "9 Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, **nor abusers of themselves with mankind**(*), 10 Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. 11 And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

Please have a good day. I wish you well.

(*) New Translations say "homosexuals".

REPLY FROM READER

I don't WANT to translate it that way. That is merely the CORRECT translation.

I am more interested in translating the Bible correctly than trying to make it fit any traditions.

However, Jesus was talking about "eunuchs", some are born with no interest in women, they are natural eunuchs and what we now refer to as homosexuals, some are

made eunuchs through castration, and some choose to fore-swear women and become self-made eunuchs.

My only agenda is to promulgate a correct translation of the Bible, Old Testament and New Testament. In the last 100 years archaeologists have found a huge number of manuscripts from the first century, mostly parts of the New Testament but also extra Biblical material, that have given us a much better grasp of the correct translations of the Greek. The Dead Sea Scrolls did that for the Old Testament in Hebrew, as well.

The idea that the Bible condemns homosexuality is simply not supported by Scripture based on what we now know.

I am sorry if this disturbs you.

By the way, until the last 400 or 500 years, almost all nations and cultures accepted homosexuality. In fact, up until the 18th or 19th century the very concept of homosexuality was unknown, that is when the word homosexual was invented.

May the Lord be with you.

MR. FAULL'S FINAL ANSWER

Oh how deceived you are not only about the Bible, but History.

The word "homosexual" was not a word till 1896 or so. That, of course, does not mean they did not exist. Read how the citizens of America drove them out of the colonies and the Indians were driven out of their villages for their sodomy. It was then called "buggerism".

I do not know what Greek book you're using but I want one too, so please give me the name of the Greek Lexicon you're using and your historical proofs you refer to but do not prove. You challenged me to look at the Greek. I already had before I wrote the article.

I already gave you Strong's definition in the last letter. Here is Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament words. It says it is "an emasculated man", "a eunuch".

Then it gives **Matthew 19:12** as the example. In the third instance in that verse, "one naturally incapacitated for, or voluntarily abstaining from, wedlock". C. "One such in a position of high authority". **Acts 8:27,39** This is the noun definition.

Under Verb form A, "To make a eunuch", in passive voice "were made eunuchs" probably an illusion by the Lord to the fact that there were eunuchs in the courts of the Herods, as would be well known to His hearers."

Now I suggest you go to Thayer's, and any other Lexicon, and find out that they say the same. Someone is lying to

you. Name who it is as your authority. I see no reason I should accept your word for it. I named you two Lexicons that were sitting on my desk at the time I wrote the article.

By the way, how do you make a man a homosexual? I know how you make a eunuch but I do not know how you make a homosexual.

Also, how would becoming a homosexual benefit the Kingdom of Heaven?

Why do you just want the first mention of a eunuch in that verse to be a homosexual and the other two mentioned in that same verse to not be homosexual? Your bias is showing.

You're looking for a verse that says people are born that way. He never made them that way in the beginning and in the Old Testament He forbade it and called it "an abomination".

Also, I would like to know which of the hundreds of translations ever have translated it that way? Name one except perhaps some new one put out by the Metropolitan abomination.

Dear Brother Faull,



Regarding John's baptism. I understand it was for repentance but **Mark 1:4b** says "...for the remission of sins".

I understand those baptized of John had to be baptized later for the right reason, so those who were baptized of John, were their sins forgiven?

MR. FAULL'S ANSWER:

Yes they were.

Mark 1:4 However, they never received the Holy Spirit for He was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified until his ascension. This is why they needed to be baptized again. See **Acts 19:1-5**

Let's suppose I tell my employees that their families are invited to Ponderosa for dinner and that I will pick up the tab. I give them a wooden token to show the cashier.

One of the men's wives just can't imagine she can eat all that food free. He assures her that I have given him a token for her and she just has to turn in the token to eat freely. She does so, as do all the others who have tokens. Later I come in and the cashier tells me the token amount comes to \$900.00. I pay it after she ate, but she enjoyed the benefit before it was paid.

The people baptized of John believed on Him who was to come and received the forgiveness of sin. They could not pay it. The blood of bulls and goats cannot take away sins.

Water could not pay it, just as the token is not inherently a sufficient value to pay for the whole meal. It was just the means of showing that they had faith in my promise that I would pay it and they were claiming the free gift.

On the cross Jesus said, "It is paid" or "It is finished". Jesus paid the cost of our sins. "It is paid" is the meaning of the expression. So they enjoyed the remission of sins for they had faith that the Lamb of God would pay the cost by His death.

John foretold the Lamb of God that would take away the sins of the world. Likewise, the others in the Old Testament who had faith in a coming Savior believed by their sacrifices, that a Lamb was coming who would pay the cost of their sin.

Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. All who are ever saved have appropriated forgiveness by faith, just as we do today when we are immersed.

They did it by prospect, we by retrospect, so we are all saved by faith in Christ's shed blood. Only those who believed God and were baptized by John's baptism received the forgiveness of their sins.

Note carefully **Luke 7:29-30**, "29 And all the people that heard *him*, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. 30 But the Pharisees and lawyers **rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him.**"

Those who did not bring the token to the Ponderosa did not get to eat free that evening. Those who were not baptized of John did not appropriate to themselves the forgiveness for which the Lamb of God later paid.

Those who were baptized by John, when they learned who the Lamb of God was, had to submit to Christian baptism to appropriate His Spirit.

If they did not believe Jesus was the Lamb of God, then their sins were not going to continue to be forgiven, nor would they have his Spirit, unless they were baptized by His authority or in His name. I trust this helps.



With grateful hearts we wish to give thanks to the many individuals and congregations who have sent in donations to further the Summit School of Preaching Program!

Dear Brother Faull,

(This question below comes from one who I believe is a preterist who believes Heaven and earth are figurative and fulfilled in 70 AD at the destruction of Jerusalem. They then try to do the same with II Peter 3:10.)



What is your point?...Did not Christ, Himself promise that Heaven and earth would pass away? Thus, unless you are arguing that there was no promise in Scripture for Heaven and earth is to pass away, you make no sense and thus the only real issue would be how Heaven and earth is defined in Scripture that was to pass

away and the timetable for when Heaven and earth would pass...Christ did promise that it would pass right???

MR. FAULL'S ANSWER:

Not in **Matthew 24**, He did not. I am sorry that you cannot see that Jesus is not saying that Heaven and earth will pass away before all these things happen. He is saying it would be easier for Heaven and earth to pass away than for those things not to happen.

For example, can you see the difference between saying, "I will die before I marry you" and saying, "It would be easier to die than to marry you"? Are those the same things? No, they are not.

In these verses He is not saying Heaven and earth will pass away before these things happen. He is saying it would be easier for Heaven and earth to pass away than for My words to fail. It is not a promise or declaration that Heaven and earth will pass away, but it is a comparative proposition. One would be easier than the other would.

All that He spoke before up to **verse 34 in Matthew Chapter 24** would happen in that generation. It would be easier for Heaven and earth to pass away than for the words He had said thus far not be fulfilled.

Likewise He said, "It is easier for Heaven and earth to pass, than one jot or tittle of the law to fail." **Luke 16:17**

That is not a promise that either the Law would fail or Heaven and earth would pass away. It is contrastive.

Other Scriptures may affirm the earth and its lusts will pass away, etc. but these verses are not saying they will. They are simply affirming the truthfulness of the Law and His own Words. Elsewhere the Word does promise a passing away of Heaven and earth literally. So to make the Heavens and earth of **Matthew 24** figurative is without justification.

UNDERSTANDING THE GRACE OF GOD

(Printed in the Christian Guest's Fall 1982 Edition)

Grace is a word that is coined today to mean something that it does not ever mean in Scripture. It has come to mean, "license". It is thought to imply "freedom from restraint" or "no holds barred", to one's personal desires. This is an unfortunate twist to the beautiful Biblical concept.

Grace is really a two-sided coin. To neglect to flip the coin, is to fail to see all of its beauty. One side of the coin is "forgiveness from sin"; the other side of the coin is "deliverance from sin".

God's grace both redeems us from the guilt and the power of sin. God's grace not only "covers", but it "controls" the sin in our life. It not only "remits" the guilt, but it "restrains" sin from ruling over us. Obviously, these concepts are much different from "license" or freedom to do as we wish."

Imagine a criminal being brought before a judge and being found guilty of a crime. However, the judge graciously says, "I'm going to suspend the sentence, even though you do not deserve it."

Does this mean that the man has the freedom to repeat the crime? Of course not! The judge graciously showed mercy, not license. Obviously, his grace could be mistaken for "license" by the ignorant, but it was bestowed to prompt redemption of the man, not repetition of the sin.

Picture a man who, as an employee, failed at his job. The foreman confronts him with his unsatisfactory work. The foreman shows him the flaws in his workmanship. Instead of firing him, he gives him another chance. Was this grace a license to repeat the poor quality of workmanship? No, but rather an opportunity to make a change and make the product good.

Suppose a soldier was caught asleep on guard duty. He is worthy of death. The captain, in grace, forgives him. Is this license to sleep the next night in which he is on guard duty? No, he has merely been shown mercy that he may make a better soldier.

Obviously, if the criminal willfully steals again, or the employee willfully makes an inferior product, or the soldier takes a pillow on guard duty with him, there has been no change or repentance. The judge, who continues to always forgive the criminal, becomes as guilty as the criminal. The foreman becomes an incapable manager and would deserve being replaced because of his poor quality control. The captain, who would tolerate the willful sleeper, becomes a friend of the enemy and deserves to be court marshaled himself.

Is God an unjust judge? Is God a partner to those who sin against Him? Can God be accused of being on the devil's side? The answer is an emphatic "No!" However, those who preach that grace is "license", makes God guilty of these charges.

God's grace covers our sin by what Jesus did on Calvary.

In our illustrations, we speak of grace as a man. If the Biblical concepts of grace were used, the judge would fulfill the sentence for the criminal.

Biblical grace would have the foreman going in on his own time and making the products right. Biblical grace would be the captain taking the punishment and being shot for the sleeping private.

God sent His only Son, so justice could be done and mercy could be shown. He is not content to be the "justifier" of men. He Himself must be just.

Listen to **Romans 3:24-26**: "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare. I say, at this time His righteousness: that He might be just, and the justifier of him, which believeth in Jesus."

Grace then forgives us of our sin. It forgives our cursing, our murder, our adultery, our divorce, our lying. But this is only one side of grace. Biblical grace goes further than removing the guilt. It will empower us not to repeat it. We will not again willfully curse, murder, commit adultery, divorce our mate, or lie.

God's grace will provide a way of escape. God's grace will make us over-comers. We are "freed from sin", not "freed to sin". God's grace will make it possible to obey Him. The criminal "that stole will steal no more, but rather labor, working with his own hands the things which are good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." (**Ephesians 4:28**)

God's grace will take an Onesimus, who was unprofitable as a worker for Philemon, and empower him to be profitable to Paul.

The soldier who lacked self-discipline is empowered to "watch and be sober". God's grace not only forgave us of our sin, but sent His Spirit into our lives to help us share, to successfully labor, and to be alert against the enemy.

It is time we realize that God's grace is not license. There is no forgiveness without repentance. There is no grace shown to a Christian who willfully sins, neglects his stewardship, or sleeps on duty, except that God will chasten him to bring him to repentance.

If this chastening is despised and one does not become a partaker of His Holiness, he will not see God. In fact, we are told that we will fail of the grace of God.

"See then that ye refuse not Him that speaketh from Heaven." (See **Hebrews 12:5, 10, 14, 15, 25**)

We are therefore told that we must not continue in sin that grace may abound (**Romans 6:1**).

It is possible to receive the grace of God in vain. (**II Corinthians 6:1**).

We are cautioned against doing despite to the Spirit of grace by willful disobedience (**Hebrews 10:29**).

It is possible to turn the grace of God into lasciviousness and deny Him who redeems us (**Jude 5**).

Grace then is not license. It is freedom from the guilt of our sin, when we fall. The Christian falls into sin. He does not lay down in it.

A man had two sons. He sent the younger to get the cows and bring them up to the barn. The boy went after them, but his mind got sidetracked as he zigzagged his way through every mud hole he came to. He literally looked for the mud holes, thus failing to bring up the cows.

So the older son was sent. He avoided the mud holes and went out of his way to sidestep them, because he was ready for a big date. Even though he was careful where he stepped, he still spoiled his shoeshine.

That's the difference between the Christian and the worldling.

Paul wrote Titus about the grace of God. Notice carefully what is revealed here about grace.

"For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ; Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." (**Titus 2: 11-14**)

Now what does the grace of God that bringeth salvation do?

- × **First:** It teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts. And on the contrary, it teaches us to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.
- × **Second:** It redeems us from all iniquity and purifies

for God a peculiar people who are boiling over with good works.

- × **Third:** It looks for that blessed hope and glorious appearing of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ.

Grace doesn't remove responsibility to be obedient to God. The Grace of God merely helps us:

- × Learn of Jesus (It teaches us to deny ungodliness).
- × Live for Jesus (Living soberly, righteously, and zealously).
- × Look for Jesus (He is our God and Savior, who gave Himself for us).

Grace then is not a "sin permit". It is true freedom.

Jesus said, "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." But on the other hand, He said, "If you continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." (See **John 8:31-36**)

Are you His disciple? Are you truly free?

If so, may the peace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.

--George L. Faull, 1982

Please Contact Us If You Desire Any of the Following:

- ➔ **Summit Theological Seminary Catalog** (Free)
- ➔ **Voices of Victory Tape, CD and Article Catalog** (Free)
- ➔ **Information on Annuities and Retirement**
- ➔ **Sermon Subscription:** Audio Tapes at \$12.50 or CD's at \$16.00 a month. (These are mailed out every 2 months to save on postage, making it \$25.00 every 2 months for Tapes and \$32.00 for CD's.)
- ➔ **One Year's Subscription of the Gospel Unashamed**
\$5.00 a year, which is mailed out quarterly. You will receive 4 issues a year. Or, GOSPEL UNASHAMED on the Internet for **FREE**. (Please send your name, contact number and email address.)

SUMMIT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
2766 Airport Road - Peru, IN 46970
(765) 472-4111
summit1@myvine.com
www.summit1.edu