

THE WORD OF TRUTH

OTIS Q. SELLERS, Editor

January, 1956

VOL. XIV, NO. 4

Table of Contents

- * **The Supreme Court**
- * **A Reply To John A. Verleur**
- * **From "The Differentiator"**
- * **We Have All Been Wrong**
- * **Repent and Repentance**
- * **Slandering The Truth**
- * **Questions and Answers**
- * **The Editor To His Friends**

The Supreme Court

In the United States when a matter of law is disputed it may be necessary to take it to the Supreme Court and seek an opinion or ruling. The nine Justices who preside over this court have the final say in all matters related to legal questions in dispute.

Among those who profess to "fear God and tremble at His word" many disagreements as to what the Bible teaches are bound to arise. When this happens there are no divinely appointed Justices to whom we can go for a ruling upon the matter. However, since God has spoken there is a divine revelation to which we can appeal, and to which all must go if "the truth" is their sole desire and goal. The true follower of Jesus Christ is a man who honestly seeks to settle things by the Word of God.

In the previous issue of THE WORD OF TRUTH (Vol. XIV- No.3) I stated that it is my belief that THE EARTH, NOT HEAVEN, IS THE FUTURE HOME OF GOD'S REDEEMED. It was fully anticipated that the article on this subject would evoke a vast amount of comment. This has happened. In fact the article has stirred up many to think, to search, and to examine anew the foundations for the popular belief that heaven is the future home of God's redeemed. They have been surprised at what they have found in their Bibles. Many have declared to me that they are now convinced that the whole idea of heaven being our future home is based upon tradition and not upon the Word of God, and while this idea is read into certain passages, the teaching cannot be found there by honest interpretation.

Certain letters that have come to me as a result of my article have revealed that quite a few proclaimers and defenders of the idea that our destiny is to be heaven have rushed into the battle in behalf of this belief, but they are not found bearing the sword of the Spirit, the word of God. Some seem to have hastily plunged into the fray hoping to pick up weapons from the Word as they

advanced, but they have arrived at the scene of battle with no true weapon, with which to fight. A mad scramble is now taking place as they seek to reinterpret certain texts so that these will seem to say that heaven is our future home.

So the battle has started. And while it is to be hoped that it will be fought by honest men using logical arguments from the Word of God, my experience to date tells me it may be otherwise. Some men are not even going to try to settle this by the Word of God. They do not relish the idea of taking it to the highest court. They shrink from bringing their beliefs and teachings to the light of the Bible.

Does it not seem strange indeed that a doctrine that is so fervently held by both the world and the church should be so lacking in Scriptural support? One would think it would be a simple matter to rush into the argument with hundreds of plain passages wherein it is unequivocally declared that heaven is the future home of the redeemed. But even though many have made the search, such statements have not been found. So far, the defenders of this idea have had to fall back upon a few disputed texts from the writings of Paul in which they claim they find their teaching. The texts they are now using as proof texts are admittedly obscure, the exact message they declare has been debated for centuries, but now they are being brought forth as irrevocable proof that we are all going to heaven.

The teaching that heaven is our future home will not be found in the Bible. It will be found in thousands of songs, both secular and sacred, but it will not be found in the Word of God. In the last verse of most songs the singers announce they are going to heaven, but no such announcement can be found in the sacred Scriptures.

I am happy indeed about the widespread interest my article created. It will be my purpose to keep this interest alive. By means of frank, fair, and open discussion we should be able to determine whether the Bible teaches that we are going to be in heaven or to live upon the earth. However, let it be noted, nothing related to this debate is ever going to be settled by personal abuse and ridicule. I know from past experience that I can take all this that men may hurl at me. I will roll with the punches and come back for more. But this is all fruitless and futile and nothing is ever settled by it. Men may batter me to pieces, but they will not have proved that our future home is heaven. Their partisan followers may cry with glee and say, "He sure gave Sellers a beating," but nothing will have been settled as to man's destiny. If this question is ever settled, it must be done by careful examination of all that God has said upon the subject. Therefore, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20.

According to *Young's Concordance* the Hebrew word for heaven (*shamayim*) occurs 419 times, and the Greek word for heaven (*ouranos*) occurs 284 times. By means of a concordance the student can examine every passage in which these words occur. He can note carefully what the passage says and assemble all the facts. If he is willing to do this, I am convinced that when he is through he will say that the idea that heaven is the future home of the redeemed did not come from the Word of God. He will not find this popular belief declared in any passage where the word *heaven* occurs.

Since the publication of my article two major articles dealing with it have appeared in other magazines. These two articles reveal two diverse spirits. One is a good example of how matters in dispute should be dealt with the other is an example of fallacious reasoning and of the error of applying emotion instead of logic. After careful consideration the decision was made to publish and deal with both articles. They reveal an interesting contrast.

The End

.....

A Reply To John A Verleur

After careful consideration it has been determined that it will be well to publish in full and to reply to a criticism that appeared in the publication *The Morning Star*. This was written by John A. Verleur. It was published under the title, "Heaven, Not Earth, the Future Home of God's Redeemed Who are Members of the Church Which is His Body." This is supposed to be an answer to my study which appeared in the previous issue of THE WORD OF TRUTH, but it is what my friend Carl Elleby would call "an answerless answer." The article brought me quite a bit of amusement, and I hope it will do as much for my readers. The article speaks for itself, but I will inject my comments as we go along.

First of all, let us notice the title. A strong declaration is made in it, but once the declaration is made it is not brought up or referred to again, Mr. Verleur declares that heaven is the future home of only part of the redeemed, those who are members of the church which is His body. Since he does not define this term, we are left in the dark as to just when a heavenly destiny became the expectation of God's redeemed. Does Mr. Verleur begin this special company at Pentecost, or with Paul, or after Acts 28:28. It is my understanding that he believes God's present calling began at Acts 13 with the ministry of Paul. If this is true then he must start this heaven bound company there, and this will require that he find proof of his position in those epistles written by Paul, or in his spoken messages recorded in Acts. Paul used the word *heaven* thirty-two times in his epistles (including Hebrews) and no such teaching can be found in any of the passages where this word appears. However, let us get to his first paragraph and see what Mr. Verleur has to say in behalf of his position and in refutation of mine.

Mr. Sellers is the author of a number of fantastically written articles, and is an interesting man to meet. Among the present day Bible magazine writers he may be classified as a Walt Disney, since he has fabricated some interesting concoctions, such as a Pre-Millennial Kingdom, and a number of others, among which is his latest, "The Earth, not Heaven, the Future Home of God's Redeemed." (The Word of Truth, Vol. 14, No.3, July, 1955),

I make no objection to anything said here, but I ask the reader to note that this paragraph sets the tone for Mr. Verleur's entire critique. I am set forth as an odd bird "among present day Bible magazine writers," a "Walt Disney," "a fabricator of interesting concoctions." He shows at the start that he has no intention of dealing with my teaching, nor with the opposite teaching which he announced in his subject. The man Sellers becomes the subject and all his arguments are to be strictly of the *ad hominem* type, that is, arguments in which attacks upon the person will be substituted for solid arguments from the Scripture. This will be seen clearly in his next paragraph.

Of course, Mr. Sellers is impervious to the criticisms which he so fervently craves in this emotionally laden and loaded article. Tiresome personal pronouns-first person singular, dogmatic assertions, unproved conclusions devoid of premises, trite statements that drivel and drool about disdain for tradition, and pious platitudes about his open-mindedness to the truth, flavor this six-paged thesis which he labels "the result of all the years devoted to the study of the Word."

Every reader of the above lines will admit that not one word of the paragraph has anything to do with the matter in dispute. There are no arguments *pro* and no arguments *con* in it. My answer to the first statement will be a simple denial. I am not impervious to the constructive criticism which I always invite from those who are sincerely interested in the recovery of truth. All who know me will know that I am not impervious to criticism. My article was not "emotionally laden and loaded," as he declares. As to the use of personal pronouns, permit me to say that THE WORD OF TRUTH is not

an official organ of any group or party. It is an independent voice. The studies that appear in it are not the creedal beliefs of a group. They are the personal convictions of an individual. I write from the personal standpoint, since these things are believed personally and taught personally. In view of these facts, the personal pronoun will continue to appear in my writings when, as, and if needed.

In my article there are no "dogmatic assertions" as Mr. Verleur asserts, neither are there any "trite statements that drivel and drool about disdain for tradition," and not one "pious platitude" can be found in the entire study. Furthermore the study is not a "six-paged thesis" as Mr. Verleur says - it is over seven pages in length. Neither did I say that my article was "the result of all the years devoted to the study of the Word." Mr. Verleur would have his readers think I had given my whole life to the writing of one short article. What I did say, and I repeat it here, was that the belief that the earth, not heaven, is the future home of God's redeemed, is not a conclusion that was arrived at hurriedly. It (my present belief) is the result of all the years that I have devoted to the study of the Word of God. These are the facts and I repeat them here. Even though Mr. Verleur has badly garbled what I said, he will later accuse me of "twistifications."

Some readers may think that Verleur's reference to a "six-page thesis" is a mere typographical error, but I am not willing to grant this. I feel it is a false statement deliberately made for the purpose of setting up my article as a target at which he will later hurl a barbed spear which he has in all probability saved for just such an occasion. This barbed spear can only be hurled at some thing which involves the number six, so he will make my seven page study to be six just so he can use his barbed phrase. More on this later, after he has thrown his spear. Let us go on to the next paragraph. Maybe he will get to the subject.

Mr. Sellers is a likable man to meet. Psychologically he may be classified as an introvert, for he is dreadfully insecure as most of his writings indicate. This insecurity is cloaked by an extroversion which appeals to the Athenian minded people for whom he writes a most desirable thing. He has now come to the stage where he can only peddle his novelties to the gullible ones who have been drugged and doped with "Thus Saith Sellers" pills.

It seems I am still the subject. Verleur seems to have read someone's book on psychology which makes him feel he is now qualified to analyze and pass judgment on his fellow workers in the Lord's vineyard. He says I am an introvert who acts like an extrovert and that I am "dreadfully insecure." These are words and ideas that belong to "human wisdom" and they are not the language of the Spirit of God. Even if all this were true of me, and it may be for all I know, what does it have to do with the question of whether the earth or heaven is our future home. Does the truth depend upon the psychological makeup of the man who teaches it? Furthermore, since he has brought it up, what kind of a man would Verleur have me to be? Should I become a "dreadfully secure" extrovert and cover it all with a cloak of introversion? Let Verleur speak up and tell us just what the true Christian character is. And as an aid to understanding, let him point out a few contemporary examples. Since he has analyzed me, maybe he will analyze himself and give us a report.

Standing upon his eminence he would have his readers think that he has inside knowledge of my affairs and the present range of my influence. He announces that I "have now come to the stage where he can only peddle his novelties to the gullible ones" whom I have "drugged and doped." This is interesting information, and for the comfort of those who do not like me, I am sorry I cannot confirm it. This is just wishful thinking on Verleur's part. The facts are that certain people in several cities whom Verleur thought were safe behind his personal iron-curtain have deflected and embraced the very ideas he is trying to refute. This is what has stirred him to write so fervently and personally. But let us go on to his next paragraph. Maybe he will come to the subject. .

It is hoped our readers will not frown at these opening statements, for Mr. Sellers is a jolly good fellow for whom we really have a lot of pity. In fact, the prayers of God's people should be

doubled and tripled for this brother whose six-page article shows very clearly the number of man to be that of inadequacy and incompleteness.

I am sorry, gentle reader, but I am still the subject. Having taken me up, Verleur is loathe to put me down. I suppose I should feel honored that this man has a lot of pity for me, but it leaves me unimpressed. His request that the prayers of God's people should be doubled and tripled for me is just so much filler for the page. Double nothing is still nothing. Having made this request he then hurls the barbed dart for which he has already prepared the minds of his readers. He needed this number *six* in order to make a play upon words, so, presto, my seven page article becomes six pages just so he can say that my "six-page" article shows very clearly the number of man to be inadequacy and incompleteness." Mathematics is supposed to be an accurate science, but it becomes very inaccurate when handled by Mr. Verleur. However, let us read on, even though the opening words of the next paragraph tells us he is not going to get to the subject.

Before dealing with a few particulars, please permit us to venture a wee bit of prediction. No, Drew Pearson has not been consulted, and that fact alone may prove us to be 100% correct. However, we predict that the article written by Me. Sellers will do more to open eyes to the teaching of the Word than it will do to close eyes. Sober thinking involves thought capacity as a saved person. After they read this article Christians everywhere will go back to the Book and refuse any longer to be counseled by the wild speculations of pseudo Bible teachers. If this is so, Mr. Seller's article will do much good, and will be included in the "all things" of Romans 8:28.

I do not know what Drew Pearson has to do with the question whether earth or heaven is our future home. I suppose he is brought in to help fill out the article and to postpone that inevitable moment when Verleur must come to the subject. The reader should note here that this paragraph stultifies everything he has already said. Previous to this he has used such terms as fantastic, fabrication, emotionally laden, dogmatic assertions, unproved conclusions, trite statements, drivel and drool - but now he predicts that my article will "open eyes" and send Christians back to the Book etc. If this is true, I will have accomplished by one article the major purpose in my life, However, I am not quite so sanguine. But of this I am sure. If any do turn to the Word they are going to find that the idea that heaven is our future home will have to be dismissed as nothing but sentiment and wishful thinking. But let us go on to the next two paragraphs of Mr. Verleur's answer.

Mr. Sellers commences by jumping in the very middle of the muddle. Unscientifically, he does not first state the problem. Apparently, he has never been taught to think along the methods of true research. There are no clear statements of delimitation. Definitions of terms are not used, and Mr. Sellers apparently is not acquainted with the Hebrew or the Greek except from lexicon usage.

Not a word is spoken about traditional views except an awkward brush-off, a few pet phrases about "the immortality of the soul," "Platonic philosophy" and something about the Greek "Elysium," In one breath he equates Christendom with Christianity in stating that "Christendom took the Biblical word 'heaven' to describe the place where they imagined the souls went at death."

These two paragraphs are a good example of "chopping up another man's steps to get lumber for a ladder on which to raise yourself." Verleur would build up his prestige here in the hope that his readers will more readily accept what he has to say. In other words Verleur is telling his readers: "Sellers is unscientific, I am scientific; he has never been taught to think along the methods of true research, while I have been taught to think correctly; he makes no clear statements of delimitation, while I always make clear statements of delimitation; he does not define his terms, while I always define my terms; he is not acquainted with Hebrew or Greek, but I am very proficient in these languages: Verleur realizes he is spreading it a bit thick and hastens to correct any misunderstanding in his next paragraph. Let us read on.

We trust the statements made in our opening paragraphs will not be interpreted as emanating from those who pose as great and erudite scholars. To the contrary! We are, however, chagrined to read imposing generalizations from those who have a penchant for neologisms, always trying to bring out things that are new but not necessarily true. Our dear friend Sellers often finds himself in this category and has thereby proved to be a teacher untrustworthy in the sacred task of disseminating the Scriptures. *O tempora, O mores!*

It is good that Verleur added this paragraph, for I am sure his readers could get no other idea but that he and his fellow-editor were posing as great and erudite scholars. In the previous paragraph he tells his readers that Sellers is no scholar - here he breaks down and confesses "Neither am I." Having written my epitaph as a teacher of the Scriptures, Verleur cries out *110 tempora, 0 mores!* This from the man who said my article was "emotionally laden and loaded."

For the benefit of those who may have forgotten some of their high-school lessons it needs to be said that the little bit of Latin Mr. Verleur has used is generally supposed to mean, "Alas for the times, alas for the manners!" At least that is what it is supposed to mean, but just what it means here in Verleur's cry of anguish, I do not know.

Mr. Verleur knows that many people are impressed and easily persuaded by what they cannot understand. This is why the Catholic priest always uses Latin, but the people are never encouraged to learn that language. If they learned the language they would know that the priest is in reality not saying anything. Mr. Verleur throws this bit of Latin into his discourse to lead his readers to think he has made some great pronouncement, but when it is translated it is just silly and meaningless. But let us go on, for in the next paragraph Mr. Verleur begins to quote from my article.

Under the caption, "God's Family in Heaven and Earth," our brother writes: "Paul's statement in Eph. 3:15 has been called upon to give testimony against my teaching. Weymouth translates this 'from whom the whole family in heaven and on earth derives its name.' The word 'name' here signifies nature or character. The cherubim, seraphim, and angels get their character from God, for they are called sons of God. The two (angelic beings and human beings) make up the whole family in heaven and earth. There is no teaching in this passage that the destiny of any man is to be in heaven or the super-heavens."

Yes at long last Mr. Verleur comes to my article which he claims to be answering, but let us take a close look at what he does with it.

My studies in the subject which Mr. Verleur is supposed to be reviewing have appeared in three articles under the title of "God's Earth," "The Believer's Destiny," and "Earth, not Heaven, is the Future Home of God's Redeemed." These studies made up about 950 lines of type in THE WORD OF TRUTH. In his answer Mr. Verleur selects one ten line paragraph, ignores all else, and would lead his readers to think that he has answered and refuted my position. He did not dare to publish too much of my material for fear that some of his readers might find it not to be fantastic, but to be the answer to many problems and the solution of many difficulties. This has already happened in the case of some of his close friends, and it will happen to more. But, be that as it may, let us go on to see what he has to say about this ten line paragraph which he has quoted.

How interesting! How tragically interesting! How interestingly tragic! The *ipsi-dixit* (he said so) of Sellers. The finding of "years of Bible study." Happily, he states, "Of course, 1 could be wrong." He really means to say, "1 never have been wrong, but 1 can be wrong, but even if 1 am wrong 1 am still right" Some may smile, but we have yet to discover in Mr. Seller's writings any admission of mistakes other than "changes."

Reading this I cannot help but say, "Come, come now, Verleur, it is not that bad! Brace up! Control yourself! Do not beat your breast like that! I have read my simple paragraph several times and can find nothing in it that would elicit any such emotional outburst as this. Cease your anguish, and I will try to clarify the matter."

That paragraph of mine was extraneous to the entire subject. I would not have brought Eph. 3:15, into the discussion if it were not for the fact that one teacher used it as positive proof that I am wrong and that heaven is the future home of some men. I quoted Weymouth's Version to show one scholar's opinion as to what the Greek said, and then went on to suggest a possible interpretation of the passage. I did not bother to go into details since I felt and still feel that Ephesians 3:15 gives no testimony as to whether the destiny of any man is heaven or earth. However, this extraneous paragraph is the one Mr. Verleur selects and uses as a straw man to pummel and maul. In the end when he suggests an interpretation, he says the same thing as I said but uses different words. More on this later. Permit me to say though in answer to Mr. Verleur's statement, "He really means to say," that I do not mean to say anything of the kind. And as to his charge that I never admit any mistakes, I will challenge him in return to show us in his writings where he has ever admitted error, mistakes, or changes. Let us go on to the next paragraph of Mr. Verleur's critique.

Let us quietly and objectively examine this paragraph our sage has written, and notice inconsistencies and errors which should well cause informed Christians to look with a great deal of suspicion at any further twistifications that may be forthcoming in "The Word of Truth."

We can rejoice that Mr. Verleur has determined to be more quiet and objective. After the outburst of the previous paragraph, quietness and objectivity are to be desired. But he announces that he is neither going to deal with my position or present his position. "Let us examine this paragraph" in his request. We will see what he does with it.

Inconsistency: Mr. Sellers states in this same issue, page 64, that the Ephesian epistle "is not yet understood." Yet this man has the temerity to attempt an interpretation of a passage from an epistle which he does not, by his own admission, understand, and to foist this upon those who are equally (or so he infers) in the dark. It is like saying, "No one understands calculus. Here is a solution to a problem in calculus that I do not understand. But although I do not understand, and therefore am dumb in this matter, yet I should like to pass on my stupidity for wisdom, and trust that you, who also lack understanding, will accept my findings." This want of understanding issues in the following glaring errors:

Yes I did say, and I repeat, that the Ephesian epistle is not yet understood. And I will go a step further and say that having read some of Mr. Verleur's writings on this epistle, I know that he does not understand it. However, this does not mean that either of us must keep silent about Ephesians. I do not understand electricity but I am sure I could teach a beginner fifty true facts concerning it. A competent physicist could present ten thousand facts about electricity, and yet he would admit he does not understand it. That is why research and study never stops concerning electricity. But research and study of the Bible does bog down when men refuse to confess that they do not yet understand the highest truth of God's revelation. But let us go on to examine the six errors I am charged with.

Error No. 1. Weymouth's translation is used as an interpretation. As a matter of fact, Weymouth does not strictly translate. He interprets and interpolates. This passage reads: Out of Whom (the Father) every family in heaven and earth is being named." (The verb, *onomazo* "is named," is used in the third person, present indicative passive).

In answer to this I say "Guilty as charged." Of course all I am charged with is using Weymouth's translation as an interpretation. It is news to me that it is an error to do this. Verleur declares that Weymouth does not translate but interprets. It would seem then that I did right in using it as an interpretation. Verleur is hard put to find errors, but maybe the next one will be more serious.

Error No.2. Mr. Sellers goes off on a tangent, as he so often does, and begins to speak of a "name." In this passage, he says, name signifies nature or character. This is partly true, but it only expresses the truth fragmentarily. In the Old Testament, the people of "the Name" (Shem), were the people of God. As such, they belonged to God's family, and received His blessings and riches in virtue of the Name (Shem). A little reflection here shows that "every family" (see note in Companion Bible) in the two places mentioned, heaven and earth, received authority, position, blessings, etc. from God, and as such is incorporated into his family.

I make no claim to understanding the obscure argument Mr. Verleur presents here. The error I am charged with seems to be going off on a tangent. Since my statement was well within the limits of the subject mentioned in the sub-title, it cannot be said that I went off on a tangent. And even if this were true, it would be nothing more than a literary fault. It would not be an error which would "cause informed Christians to look with a great deal of suspicion" upon my ministry, as Mr. Verleur declares.

I am further charged with the error of having said that *name* in this passage signifies nature or character. Mr. Verleur admits that this is partly true. Of course it is, and he should have noted that this is the part of the truth I am presenting. He goes on then to present some obscure theological jargon by which he would mystify all his readers and lead them to think that he has said something y.rhen in reality he has said nothing. He brings to mind the squire in *The Vicar of Wakefield* who confounded his opponent by asking: "Whether do you judge the analytical investigation of the first part of my enthymeme deficient secundum quoad, or quoad minus."

Verleur brings in the *Companion Bible* in order to add prestige to his arguments by linking the great Dr. Bullinger with them. He probably feels assured that no one will check this out. I probably would not have done so myself if it had not been for the fact that the interpretation which I suggested came originally from the writings of Dr. Bullinger. In *Figures of Speech*, page 636, he says:

Eph. 3:15 - "Of Whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." Here, the R.V. has rendered the figure literally "every family," which is not sense but in the margin has put "Gr. *fatherhood*." "Every" here is used for "the whole," and means every part or member of the whole: i. e., the whole family as made up of every principality, and power, and angel, and archangel "in heaven" (verse 10), and of Israel and the Church on earth. All are of or from one Creator and. Source (Heb. 2: 11).

Verleur did not present a very good case for his charge of error in that paragraph. Maybe he will do better in the next. We will see.

Error No.3. He declares: "The cherubim, and others, get their character or nature from God, for they are called the sons of God." Presumably, then, the actions (whatever they were at the moment), on the part of the "sons of God" (Bene Elohim) of Genesis six were characterized as emanating from God. Also, our Lord Himself is called "the Son of God." Did He receive His "nature" from God? Be very careful here Mr. Sellers, or you may slip into the deadly Arian and Sabelian heresy of the past (and present).

In this trumped up "error" Verleur stoops to the device of extending my remarks. I refuse to accept his extension of my position, and I reaffirm what I originally said. If a being is a cherubim or an angel, he is that because God made him that. He gets his nature or character from God. He did not evolve into an angel or cherubim. What he does mayor may not be of God. If any angel, cherubim or

human becomes a son of God, he becomes such because God made him so. I do not believe that the acts of the sons of God recorded in Genesis six emanated from God. Verleur knows this only too well, and I charge him with deliberate misrepresentation in suggesting that I may believe this. He knows only too well that I believe that God is never the author or instigator of wickedness and that He is never found in complicity with it. He knows of the fight that I have made against this awful teaching. Yet he would try to tar me with the brush of the Arian and Sabelian heresy. It is strange indeed to what lengths Verleur must go in order to concoct the six errors he charges me with. His next charge of error is just as absurd.

Error No.4. It is easy for Mr. Sellers to miss the point in this extremely interesting passage. He states: "The two (angelic beings and human beings) make up the whole family in heaven and earth." He wants us to believe that there are no human beings in heaven, only angelic ones; and no angelic beings on earth, only human ones. Then the Man Christ Jesus, fully Man and God, is not in heaven; or else. He does not belong to the family of God. But the Man of the Ascension (O.T. Man of God's Degree!) is in heaven, with a glorified human body, and of which (nature) we have become the Church which is His Body.

Since Verleur is answering something which he says in this paragraph and is not dealing with anything which I have said, no answer is needed from me. I must say though that I do not want anyone to believe that there are no human beings in heaven. I want them to believe that Elijah and Enoch are there and that the Man Christ Jesus is there. I do not believe that any of these will remain forever in heaven. Elijah will return to "restore all things" and the Lord Jesus will be personally present upon this earth for a thousand years. Since the error set forth here exists only in Verleur's mind, we will go on to the next.

Error No.5. According to Mr. Sellers a person can belong to God's family on earth, and then upon death cease to be a member of God's family, since death annihilates everything. Mysteriously, and by resurrection, man becomes incorporated again into the family of God, following a little "sleep and slumber." However, in this Ephesian passage, the wonderful truth is revealed that God's family is either in one or two places: either heaven or earth (no ,hell). Read the passage again; slowly, prayerfully, carefully! "Out of Whom every family IN Heaven and Earth IS BEING NAMED," There are only two places: Heaven or Earth. Then Paul, having died, and a member of God's family, is either in heaven or on earth. If he is on earth, where is he? If not on earth, there is only one place left for him to be, in heaven.

Verleur's imagination is leading him to see errors where none exist and to manufacture them as needed. He assays to speak for me, but I can speak for myself. It is not "according to Mr. Sellers" that a person can belong to God's family on earth and then at death cease to be a member. When did I ever say this? Where did I write it? I do not believe that death annihilates everything. In fact I do not believe that death annihilates anything. Let us look carefully at the last part of the above paragraph in which Verleur sets forth some of his beliefs. But let us substitute the name of David where he has used Paul and we will see the fallacy of his belief. Verleur says: "There are only two places: Heaven or Earth. Then DAVID having died, and a member of God's family, is either in heaven or on earth. If DAVID is on earth, where is he? If DAVID is not on earth, there is only one place left for him to be, in heaven."

I am confident that the "informed Christians." to whom Verleur has already referred will see the fallacy of his reasoning when it is applied to David. Peter emphatically declared, "David is not ascended into the heavens." Acts 2:34. What Peter said of David as to his present whereabouts, I would also say of Paul. He is both dead and buried. See Acts 2:29. Both David and Paul will arise from the dead and stand in their lot when God raises the dead.

The final error that Mr. Verleur attributes to me is so absurd that I will merely quote it and let it fall from its own foolishness.

Error No.6. We quote again from the article in question. "There is no teaching in this passage that the destiny of any man is to be in heaven or the super-heavens." But then neither is there any teaching here that the destiny of any angel, cherubim, or seraphim, by parity, is on the earth.

I am sure every reader agrees. And yet the man who wrote that bit of inanity goes on to say:

Mr. Sellers knows how to thoroughly confuse the issues at stake. The errors briefly outlined above show the fallacy of his teaching with regard to the future home of the redeemed who are members of the Church which is His Body.

So, there it is. He has disposed of me in fine fashion. But wait a minute. He has found a little tar left over, that he would like to smear on me. He will infer that I am about ready to become a member of the Jehovah's Witness group. There is about as much ground for this inference as if he had suggested that I am about to cast my lot with the Catholic Church and become a priest. Here is his final paragraph.

We hold no hard feelings toward this good, but confused man. If he desires to cast his lot with the Jehovah's Witnesses, who teach like errors, that is his responsibility. It is our responsibility to show to our readers the falsity of such muddlements. We hope to continue this critique in some future issues, dealing with the question of life after death. God's Word has recently been opened to us regarding these things and we would like to share our findings with our readers. Questions and comments will be welcomed.

I will be glad to read all Mr. Verleur has to say about life after death, but I do wish he would not change the subject. What about the declaration he so boldly made in his subject? Where is the proof that heaven is the future home of God's redeemed who are members of His Body?

I feel it will be appropriate to close this article by quoting the sentence that immediately precedes Mr. Verleur's critique in *The Morning Star*. "The best reformers the world has ever had are those who have commenced on themselves." Having made this statement he starts right in on the next page to reform me.

The End

From "The Differentiator"

. One of the interesting magazines which comes to my desk is called *The Differentiator*. This is a bi-monthly published in Great Britain. The Editors are Mr. Alexander Thomson of Edinburgh, Scotland and Major R. B. Withers of Cornwall, England. These men are Christian individualists, and on certain subjects they radically disagree. Major Withers believes there is to be a rapture before the tribulation and Mr. Thomson believes that the tribulation will be the experience of one generation of believers. Their debate concerning this in the pages of their publication has made interesting reading.

It is my understanding that both of these men believe that God's present calling of believers began at Acts 13 with the ministry of Paul, and that they are universalists in regard to their beliefs concerning the destiny of man. In the past year or so I have had some personal correspondence with Mr. Thomson, and this has been profitable and illuminating. He is frank, open, and honest. If we met face-to-face we would probably disagree on many interpretations, but I know that Mr. Thomson could disagree without being disagreeable. I am sure I could do the same.

In the October 1955 issue of *The Differentiator*, under the title "We Have All Been Wrong," Mr. Thomson saw fit to make a brief examination of some of my statements which were made in the last two issues of THE WORD OF TRUTH. Not a trace of crooked thinking, not a single fallacy of logic, not one dishonest trick, not one emotional appeal can be found in his review of my teachings. His searching analysis will serve to advance and clarify the truth.

Since my teaching is quite controversial, I feel I owe it to my friends to let them know what others are saying about my ministry. This will help them form their own judgments. Mr. Thomson's article will be published in full, exactly as printed in *The Differentiator*. My brief comments will appear at the end.

We Have All Been Wrong

By Alexander Thomson

In the February, 1955 issue of THE WORD OF TRUTH. the Editor, Mr. Otis Q. Sellers, indeed sprang a big surprise upon readers interested in biblical terminology. He presents what he calls a "real challenge."

Undoubtedly, he is thoroughly correct to declare that the common Hebrew word *mispbat*, generally rendered "judgment," does not mean this. He says it is connected with arrangement, order, system. I can confirm from my own experience over twenty years ago that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to concentrate the real meaning of this Hebrew word into a single English term. Mr. Sellers is quite correct to insist that the meaning of this very important word should be cleared up.

It is always a grand thing to learn new facts. We ought to be ever learning, assimilating more and more of divine truth. Beyond a doubt there is still a great deal for us to learn from the Scriptures.

Yet it gives one a shock to learn that certain words, to which for hundreds of years a particular meaning has been given, really in fact mean something considerably different. For example, Mr. Sellers would say that the Greek word hitherto rendered "repent" (*metanoeo*), really means *submit*, while repentance is *submission*. The Greek word *aion*, we are informed, does not mean an *age*, nor does it primarily refer to a period of time. The Greek word hitherto rendered "repent" (*metanoeo*), really means *submit*. The Greek word *sozo*, usually said to mean *save*, is now said to mean to *bless*, but Mr. Sellers qualifies this by adding that this word is applied only to such blessings as have in them the aspect of deliverance and preservation. So we arrive at the thought of "bless-deliver" or "bless-preserve." The word for *head* (*kephale*) is said to be a mathematical term which really means *sum*. There is certainly some justification for this.

Mr. Sellers claims that he has carefully and long tested the conclusions at which he has arrived. Until he makes public his findings I am not going to say he is right or wrong. We must be able to learn new facts from any quarter. The sect which can only learn from its own leaders is hopelessly decadent. God has spread His gifts throughout all bodies of believers. No sect, no leader, has any monopoly of these gifts, although many, in practice, have far more worship for their leader than they have for God.

I also might put forth a challenge, along the same lines as Mr. Sellers. Let some biblical scholar stand forth and prove by a demonstration that the Greek word *charis* means *grace* and also *thanks*, and also that *eucharistia* means *thanksgiving*. God's grace towards us is surely not in the nature of thanks? Those who claim here to be strictly concordant become quite discordant, but fail to observe they have become so.

Charis means in reality *agreeableness*, an attitude of goodwill or kindly goodwill towards another; while the Eucharist ought to be an expression of our agreeableness towards God. I might put matters this way. Suppose I send a copy of *The Differentiator* to some one who belongs obviously to another "camp." He might express his thanks. But is he likely to express his agreeableness?

For these reasons I ask that meantime, until we can express either agreement or disagreement with Mr. Sellers, let us at least exhibit the spirit of agreeableness, not prejudice.

At the same time, I might mention some possible difficulties he will require to face. Repentance or change of mind, is generally connected with, or implies, sins. Submission, however, is a very different thought. "I have not come to call righteous ones, but sinners, to repentance" (Luke 5:32). True, a change of mind or of attitude would imply submission, but would submission without such a change of mind be sufficient?

Then again, five times in Revelation we read of repentance *out of* (Greek *ek*) fornication, deeds, works, murders, thefts, etc. (2:21; 2:22; 9:20; 9: 21; 16:11). The preposition in the Greek in each of these cases (out of) is illuminating, because it seems to imply not only the change of mind, but a decided change of mind for the better; a change of mind, and a complete change of behavior, out of their evil ways. Rev. 16:10-11 tells us literally that the Kingdom of the Wild Beast became darkened, and mankind gnawed their tongues *out of* misery, and blasphemed the God of heaven *out of* their miseries and *out of* their ulcers; and they do not repent *out of* their actions.

But suppose instead of reading here the word repent, we read submit, "and they do not submit out of their actions." Submit to what or whom? How is one to produce idiomatic sense?

Somewhat different is Acts 8:22, where Peter says to Simon, "Repent then, from this thine evil." Here the Greek preposition is *apo*, from. We can change our minds from one attitude to another. But how could Simon *submit from* his evil projects?

In II Cor. 12:21 another preposition is found, *epi*, on or over. Paul had found many of the Corinthians not repenting *upon* or *over* their immoral actions. What would be the sense of saying they had not submitted *upon* these actions?

Again, there would be something lacking, something out of place, did we read in Luke 17:3-4 submission instead of repentance.

Coming to the Greek word for body, *soma*, it might be rather ambiguous did we render this *substance*. In modern Greek this word means only body. In the time of Homer it meant a dead body or carcass.

Substance is really a Latin term, and is partly defined as "the essential part: body: matter: property: foundation, ground, confidence." Literally, it means that which stands under

In the Concordant Version Concordance, *soma*, BODY, is defined as "the organic substance which composes a human being or animal," etc. Undoubtedly a body must consist of substance, but substance is not always a body. The body has individuality, and is organized.

When the Holy Spirit descended on to Jesus in bodily appearance as if a dove (Luke 3:22), what is obviously meant to be expressed is not so much the substance or matter which composed the bird, but the *outward form* or appearance of the *body* of a dove. The word body speaks of form, shape, activities, entity, personality, and individuality; all of which might be absent in mere substance.

Even if the word substance were the proper term to use for the Greek word *soma*, even if it were the true thought, we should require to re-translate it into a more appropriate English term before it could be understood. Suppose we were to read at James 2:2-3 of the "perfect man, able to bridle the whole substance also," or of the horses whose whole substance we can steer by means of bits in their mouths, who would tumble at once to the proper idea? Or who would follow Romans 7:24, if thus rendered, "Wretched man - I! Who will be rescuing ME out of this substance of death?" Paul has just been writing of his mind, and his members. Does one's substance include the mind of the flesh?

What will happen when the word for "body" is in the plural? For example, Rev. 18:13 finishes with "and (cargo) of horses, and of coaches, and of substances (?), and (buying) human souls." (Note: in verses 12 and 13 all words in the accusative case are governed by the word "buying" in verse 11, while all words in the genitive case are governed by the word "cargo" in verse 12. At that time human souls will be bought, but bodies will be transported). The various articles named are the *substances* which the merchants will trade in. But "cargo (or cargoes) of substances" here would sound very much out of place, and ambiguous, especially when coupled with human souls.

Cremer's Lexicon gives as the meaning of *soma* "the entire material organism." He emphasizes the significance of *man's body* as a necessary and constituent part of human nature. As the "vessel" of life it is the medium through which the life is manifested, and with its organism, the members, it serves as the instrument through which the soul (*psuche*) works. The Church is the "organism vivified by Christ as its Spirit." Regarding Col. 2:17, he says it is unnecessary to give a special sense to the word *soma*; ("which (collectively) are a shadow of the future things, yet the body is the Christ's.")

True indeed, some versions do here use the word substance. The recent R.S.V. reads "but the substance belongs to Christ," while the New World rendering is very similar, "but the reality belongs to the Christ." Moffatt reads as does the R.S.V. Way, Hayman, 20th Century, Dewes, all read substance. Dr. Wand reads "The solid reality has arrived in Christ."

Mr. Sellers informs us that the Greek word *ouranos*, the Hebrew word *shamayim* (both meaning heaven), and the English word *heaven*, all have reference to that which is lifted up, heaved, or exalted, and that the word *heaven*, in the singular can and does mean God. He avers that the word heaven is a contraction of "the heaved One."

With these thoughts I regret I must totally disagree. Our word *heaven* has nothing to do with the verb *heave*, as is commonly stated. In the Old Angle tongue the word was *heafon*, but the old word for heave was *hebban* (like the German *heben*). The word *heaven* is related to the Old Norse *himinn*, and German *himmel*. To heave is connected with the word *heavy*. Kluge & Lutz suggest the word heaven or *himmel* is related to a primitive Teutonic word *haiman*, meaning clearness or brightness, which would be a very natural explanation. Others suggest *heaven* meant originally a covering or ceiling. In the Old English tongue the ceiling of a house was called *hus-heofon*, "house-heaven."

The Greek term, *ouranos*, has no connection with the word *heave*, nor does it mean that which is seen when we "look up." In Greek the word has for ages also been used as meaning the palate, the *roof* of the mouth. The root is said to mean a "covering," and some say a watery covering.

The Hebrew term, *shamayim* does not yet appear to have been explained. Strictly it ought to signify *desolation*, if we relate it to similar words in Hebrew.

Whatever the word heaven may signify, Mr. Sellers is quite positive that "The Earth, not Heaven, is the future home of God's redeemed" (The Word of Truth, July, 1955, page 49). At least this is refreshingly outspoken. Yet he also states that his ears are not closed to any arguments against his teaching on this matter.

A lady once said to me, "If there are no dogs in heaven, I'm not going there." So far, I have not heard that she has been invited to go thither.

Apparently Mr. Sellers is not going thither either, even though myriads of other believers mean to arrive there. Very truly he points out that many statements in the Bible, which seem to refer to the time "When we all get to heaven," do not refer to heaven at all. Undoubtedly, too much has been taken for granted. Even Eph. 1:3 says nothing whatever about a *journey* to heaven, or a *home* in heaven.

During a good part of the past twenty years I have had to spend much time upsetting theories and teachings based upon wrong renderings of Greek or Hebrew. It always seems very harsh to upset someone's fine dream, especially when the other party cannot follow the rules of grammar in these languages. That is why I have always urged that the teacher or the exegete must learn sufficient Greek or Hebrew to keep him from broadcasting error. In Divine revelation, a great deal hinges upon the niceties of grammar and the accurate meaning of the words employed.

I am glad that Mr. Sellers did not pass over Phil. 3:20 in silence. He says this verse "has been rushed in as a reinforcement in a futile attempt to hold the line against the teaching that earth is the future home of the redeemed." He quotes the old rendering, "for our conversation is in heaven," as being supposed to prove that Paul expected to be in the superheavens. Books such as T. 1. O. Davies' "Bible English" (1875) will tell us that three hundred fifty years ago, the word conversation taken from the Latin Vulgate meant "the whole manner of life" (Psalm 50:23; I Peter 3:2; II. Peter 2:7, King James version).

We know, unfortunately, what politics are. We know what policemen are. The Greek word *polis* means a city, and the government of cities and of countries requires *police* and *politics*.

Now in Phil. 3:20, and here alone, Paul uses a term *politeuma*, while a verbal form of the word is found at Acts 23:1 and Phil. 1:27.

Mr. Sellers says Paul, in Phil. 3:20, is telling believers how they should walk - "Our manner of life already exists (is inherent) among the heavens," which is in harmony with Christ's words, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven."

That something already exists I am sure is true, but it is no *manner of life* that is the subject here. The Greek word for that idea would probably have been *politeusis*. Something is already existing, and has been all along existing "in heavens," that is, in a certain locality in heaven, not "in *the* heavens," as though it meant all the heavens.

But it is not our manner of life or our behavior that has been existing in heaven. It is rather our political HOME-LAND, our community, our commonwealth, our citizenship, our civic state, or, as Webster & Wilkinson have it, our life of common interest, duty and privilege. They say "Politeuma is opposed to 'who are disposed to the terrestrial things' (v. 19); the citizenship we prize; that which we value as existing from the very first (*huparchei*), in contrast with the rights and privileges which the Philippians enjoyed as citizens of Rome."

Wordsworth says: "For our civic state and life subsists in heaven. *Heaven*, and not *Earth*, is the place in which we have our citizenship. We are strangers and pilgrims here. Our home is heaven. Others seek for *glory in their shame*, and *mind* only the *things upon earth*. But we seek the glory that is above. The Apostle means something more than that 'our city or country is heaven;' for men may dwell in a city or country, and yet have no share in its privileges. We have our *politeuma* or *civil status*, *already pre-existent* (*huparchon*) in heaven. We were citizens of heaven *before* we became citizens of earth. Christ our Head and King, has ascended thither, and is there, and we, His members and subjects, are there also."

Apparently Mr. Sellers thinks that it is *out of the heavens* that we are expecting a Saviour, to come to the earth. That is quite true, but it is not quite what Paul says in Phil. 3:20- Let me quote from the Revised Standard Version: "But our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior." FROM IT; from *what?* It is out of our *commonwealth* or homeland that we are ardently awaiting Him. The Greek makes it very clear when it reads *ex hou*, and not *ex hon*, that is to say, "out of which" (singular), not "out of which" (plural). The word for heavens is plural, while the word *politeuma* is in the singular.

Now it is absurd to say that the Lord is to appear out of our "manner of life." He is awaited ardently out of *our* politeuma. Therefore our politeuma is a *country*. Yes; it is our real HOMELAND.

Probably all the versions except the R.S.V. are wrong here. They read as though the Lord was to come *out of* heaven, or they are ambiguous, and hide the fact that it is out of the politeuma that He is to come. Of course, our politeuma is in heaven. But it is out of our own part of the heavens that He will come for us. Exen Rotherham (1872) is not clear; "For *our* commonwealth *in (the) heavens* takes its beginning, out of which a Saviour also are we ardently awaiting."

If the Church of God is to spend its future existence on earth, we must see much stronger proofs than Mr. Sellers has yet produced.

-Alexander Thomson.

The Editor's Comments

Mr. Thomson's entire article is like a fresh breeze. I appreciate his criticisms and suggestions. Each topic he takes up will be discussed further in THE WORD OF TRUTH. The reader is referred to the article in the current issue on "Repent and Repentance" in which Mr. Thomson's suggestions and criticisms are considered. This study was at the point of final rewriting when Mr. Thomson's article appeared and I was able to incorporate my remarks on his suggestions into it. My readers and friends will know that both Mr. Thomson and I desire to discover the truth. In later issues I hope to write more on the word *body*, the word *heaven*, and also to deal at length with the interpretation of Phil. 3:20. For the time being let me say that if any man is to have his future existence in heaven, I will have to see some stronger and more logical proof than any man has heretofore produced.

Repent and Repentance ***What Do These Words Mean***

In many religious circles great anguish of soul is demanded before faith in Christ can be exercised. Some people are able to produce such emotion at will, and the demand for anguish is easy for them. Others cannot produce it no matter how hard they try, so the way of salvation is barred to them. In such circles the validity of one's salvation is often measured by the anguish that preceded it, and sorrow of heart is considered to be a meritorious work.

Since the human heart has long been misled to believe that there is atonement for sin by being sorry for it, the ideas set forth above find fertile soil in the human breast. Teachings such as these are

often supported by Bible texts in which the words *repent* and *repentance* appear. A false meaning is read into these passages, and this false meaning is well supported by the translation of the Greek words that represent the two words of our study.

The words *repent* and *repentance* have come to mean a physical and emotional act of great contrition. This is their commonly accepted meaning, and a meaning that is well established. We can do nothing about this, and we do not want to do anything about it. But we can deny with all the strength of our beings that the Greek words *metanoëo* and *metanoia* mean "repent" and "repentance."

The word repentance means sorrow for sin, but there is one simple and direct statement in the New Testament which shows that the Greek word translated "repentance" cannot mean sorrow for sin. This is found in 2 Corinthians 7:10 where Paul declares that "Godly sorrow worketh repentance." In this illuminating statement, "godly sorrow" is the cause and repentance is the effect. If *repentance* means godly sorrow, then we would have Paul saying that "godly sorrow works godly sorrow." Repentance here cannot mean godly sorrow.

Dr. Archibald T. Robertson, whose reputation as a Greek scholar is well known, has often quoted Dr. John A. Broadus, his father-in-law and a scholar of equal rank, as having said: "The translation of *metanoëo* by "repent" is the worst translation in the entire New Testament." Robertson goes on to say: "The trouble is that the English word 'repent' means 'to be sorry again from the Latin *repenitet* (impersonal). John did not call on the people to be sorry, but to change (think afterwards) their mental attitudes (*metanoëite*) and conduct. The Vulgate has it do penance and Wycliff has followed that ... This is John's great word (Bruce) and it has been hopelessly mistranslated. The tragedy of it is that we have no one English word that reproduces exactly the meaning and atmosphere of the Greek word." (*Quoted from Word Pictures in the New Testament*).

When, as Robertson says, we have no one English word that reproduces exactly the meaning ,and atmosphere of a Greek word, this is usually because the Greek word is more flexible and says more than we can say with a word used to translate it into our language. This forces us into the difficult situation of using as a translation some word that comes close to expressing the Greek and then using other related words as the context of various other occurrences demand.

However, the English word *repent* does not even come close to expressing the Greek word *metanoëo*. In fact it sorely misrepresents the word as almost every scholar had admitted. Yet this word has repeatedly been used by translators and expositors, even though they admit it is wrong; Broadus going so far as to say it is the worst translation in the New Testament.

In the Roman Catholic versions of the Bible they have translated these Greek words by "do penance" and "penitence." Protestants have strenuously objected to this, and rightly so, yet they have saddled themselves with a translation of these two words which means the same thing. They may differ with the Catholics as to how one does his penance, but they are demanding penance when they call upon people to repent.

Many have recognized that something needs to be done about this, but they have gone from one error to another by saying that the Greek means to change one's mind, making it simply to be a mental change. This has satisfied many since it relieves them of the "do penance" aspect usually associated with this word. However, this meaning cannot be gained either from the elements of this word, nor from its usage.

In Volume XIV, Number 2 of THE WORD OF TRUTH I made the declaration that the Greek word translated "repent" in the New Testament means *submit* and that repentance is *submission*. In regard to this I asked my readers to believe that I do have sufficient Scriptural reasons for believing this, and promised that at a later time a study would be given providing more details and giving

reasons for this belief. This will be done in this study. If we can enter into what the Spirit of God meant by these words, then we will know what it was that John the Baptist demanded of his hearers (Matt. 3:2), what it was that the Lord demanded when he gave the same message (Mark 1:15), what it was that the Apostle Paul proclaimed when he made use of the same words (Acts 20:21).

The Greek word in the New Testament which is always translated repent, repenteth, or repented is *metanoeo* (pronounced metano-EH-o). The word always translated "repentance" is *metanoia* (pronounced met-AN-oy-ah). A third word which occurs six times and is also translated "repent" and "repented" is *metamelomai* (pronounced meta-MEL-o-mai). This word is in no way related to the first two. Since these words are the subject of our study a full concordance will be given of all three.

Concordance to *Metanoeo*

Matt. 3:2 ---And saying, *Repent ye: for the kingdom*

Matt. 4:17--and to say, *Repent: for the kingdom*

Matt. 11:20-because they *repented* not:

Matt. 11:21-they would *have repented* long ago

Matt. 12:41-because they *repented* at the preaching

Mark 1:15 --*repent ye*, and believe the gospel

Mark 6:12 --and preached that men should *repent*

Luke 10:13--they *had* a great while ago *repented*

Luke 11:32--for they *repented* at the preaching

Luke 13:3 -- hut, except ye *repent*, ye shall all

Luke 13:5 -- except ye *repent*, ye shall all

Luke 15:7 -- over one sinner *that repenteth*

Luke 15:10- over one sinner *that repenteth*

Luke 16:30- from the dead, they *will repent*

Luke 17:3 -- and if he *repent*, forgive him

Luke 17:4 -- saying, *I repent*; thou shalt forgive

Acts 2:38 -- *Repent*, and be baptized everyone

Acts 3:19 -- *Repent* ye therefore and be converted

Acts 8:22 -- *Repent* therefore of this thy wickedness

Acts 17:30-- all men everywhere *to repent*

Acts 26:20 --that they should *repent* and turn to God

2 Cor. 2:21-- and *have not repented*

Rev. 2:5 --- *repent*, and do the first works

Rev. 2:5 --- except thou *repent*

Rev. 2:16 --- *Repent*, or else I will come

Rev. 2:21 --- gave her space to *repent* of her

Rev. 2:21 --- and she *repented* not

Rev. 2:22 -- except they *repent* of their deeds

Rev. 3:3 --- and hold fast, and *repent*

Rev. 3:19 --- be zealous therefore, and *repent*

Rev. 9:20 --- *repented* not of the works

Rev. 9:21 --- Neither *repented* they of their

Rev. 16:9 --- they *repented* not to give him glory

Rev. 16:1 --- and *repented* not of their deeds

Concordance to *Metanoia*

Matt. 3:8 --- fruits meet for *repentance*
Matt. 3:11--- baptize you with water unto *repentance*
Matt. 9:13 --- but sinners to *repentance*
Mark 1:4 --- preach the baptism of *repentance*
Mark 2:17--- but sinners to *repentance*
Luke 3:3 --- preaching the baptism of *repentance*
Luke 3:8 --- fruits worthy of *repentance*
Luke 5:32 --- but sinners to *repentance*
Luke 15:7 --- which need no *repentance*
Luke 24:47 --- and that *repentance* and remission
Acts 5:31 --- for to give *repentance* to. Israel
Acts 11:18 --- granted *repentance* unto life
Acts 13:24 --- baptism of *repentance* to all the people
Acts 9:4 --- with the baptism unto *repentance*
Acts 9:4 --- with the baptism unto *repentance*
Acts 20:21 --- *repentance* toward God, and faith
Acts 26:20 --- do works meet for *repentance*
Rom. 2:4 --- goodness of God leadeth thee to *repentance*
2 Cor.7:9 --- ye sorrowed to *repentance*
2 Cor. 7:10 --- worketh *repentance* to salvation
2 Tim. 2:2 5 --- will give them *repentance*
Heb. 6:1 --- of *repentance* from dead works
Heb. 6:6 --- to renew them again to *repentance*
Heb. 12:17 --- found no place of *repentance*
2 Pet. 3:9 --- all should come to *repentance*

Concordance to *Metamdomai*

Matt. 21:29 --- afterward he *repented*, and went
Matt. 21:32 --- *repented* not afterward, that ye
Matt. 27:3 --- *repented himself*, and brought
2 Cor. 7:8-1--- *do not repent*
2 Cor. 7:8 --- though I *did repent*
Heb. 7:21--- The Lord sware and will not *repent*

The passages listed in the three Concordances above represent sixty-four mistranslations, sixty-four misrepresentations of the truth of God. In this we have an outstanding example of the blinding and binding power of tradition. The fallacy of using the word *repent* as a translation of *metanoeo* has been admitted by almost every careful expositor who has dealt with it. Yet it seems that no one dares to break away from it and be done with it. Robert Young, in his excellent version, made a bold move, but he substituted the word *reform* which only serves to cloud the issue still further and misses the truth as far as does the word *repent*. There is nothing in the elements or the usage of *metanoeo* that suggests it could mean *reform*.

As stated before, many expositors resolve the difficulty by making repentance to be a change of mind. However, honesty forces us to admit that "repentance" does not mean a change of mind, neither can the Greek be made to mean this. I do not feel we would be saying anything that is worth saying if we should render Matthew 3:3 by: "change your minds for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" or "Have another mind for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

There is a bit of erroneous thinking usually connected with the word *repent* which has greatly helped to obscure the whole matter. Mr. Alexander Thomson has inadvertently brought this into his brief review of my teaching. He says, "Repentance, or change of mind, is generally connected with or implies sin." This is the same as if one would say that sacrifice is generally connected with or implied sin. By selected examples it would be easy to prove this to be true, but it will break down if every occurrence of *sacrifice* is considered (See Heb. 13:15-16). And while it may be true that the English word *repentance* is always connected with sin, this is not true of the Greek word *metanoia*. Furthermore, who would defend the proposition that a "change of mind" (if that is what repentance means) is always connected with or implies sin.

The favorite phrase of the "hot gospel" preachers, "Repent of your sins," is not to be found anywhere in the Word of God. This phrase would start men out on a useless effort, since *repentance* will not cleanse a man of the least of his sins. It is as ineffectual as the water with which Pilate washed his hands.

In dealing with the words *metanoeo* and *metanoia* I have suggested that the words *submit* and *submission* be used as basic translations. Many students who follow my ministry have tested and adopted this suggestion and have found it workable and profitable. But the words *submit* and *submission* also have their limitations and they seem to present insurmountable difficulties when used in certain passages where *metanoeo* and *metanoia* are found. Mr. Alexander Thomson has pointed some of these out. However, he was forced to base his criticism upon a limited understanding of my position. I am confident he will modify some of his suggested difficulties once he has the complete picture.

Since no one word in English will express all the meaning that is in the Greek word *metanoeo*, it is necessary for us to adopt three closely related and congruous words in order to express the truth in all contexts. These words are *submit*, *yield*, and *ease*.

Some who are bound up to the "one translation for each word" fallacy may object to this, but I refuse to accept the bondage of any such impossible and unworkable theory. Anyone who has ever attempted to turn Greek into English will know that there are many words in Greek for which there is no exact English equivalent. Therefore we must use several words that are basically related, even though not strictly synonymous, in order to express the truth.

Take, as a pertinent example, the Greek word *gune* (pronounced goo-NAY). A mere beginner in the Greek vocabulary would know that this word means *woman*. However, the moment we begin to translate we find places where the word *woman* will not fit, and we need the word *wife*. In fact, there are many places in the New Testament where it is debatable whether *wife* or *woman* should be used, but this cannot deter us from making use of both words.

Even so it is with the word *metanoeo*. To express this word we need the words *submit*, *yield*, and *ease*. These words are related, they are congruous, and they will do the work. The reader will understand here that the word *ease* is used in the sense of unburden or disburden. This is a very important word since all sin and guilt are usually viewed in Scripture as heavy and oppressive burdens.

In harmony with the facts presented, I would translate or paraphrase certain passages as follows:

Matthew 3:2. Submit, for the government of the heavens has drawn near.

It has long been imagined that John was declaring here the whole duty of man toward God, a veritable plan of salvation to those who came to him into the wilderness. This has caused men to try to read more into this first occurrence of *metanoeo* than is actually there. John the Baptist came

proclaiming the nearness of heaven's government. When a government moves in upon men they can either submit or resist. John's call fit the situation of his time. He called upon men to submit, to offer no resistance, to make no move, to wait for further orders or instructions. They were to yield their minds and their persons to the power of another.

Some will object that more than this was expected of men, that submission was not sufficient. This is most certainly true, but it need not be read into or added to the word *metanoeo*. Submission was the initial step, but it was the one all important step that must be taken before any further advance could be made.

In Mark 1:15 the call was to "submit and believe the gospel." Paul preached "Submission toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 20:21). Later Paul testified that he had preached to the Gentiles "that they should submit and turn to God and do works that were worthy of submission." (Acts 26:20). Peter told the men of Israel to, "Submit and turn about" (Acts 3:19). The additional statements made in these proclamations show that to submit was always the initial step and only the initial step. Much more was required, but this was set forth by means of additional statements, it was not included in the word *submit*.

Luke 17:3-4. If your brother should sin, rebuke him, and if he submit, forgive him. And if he should sin against you seven times in a day, and if he should turn about seven times in a day saying to you, I am submissive," you shall forgive him.

If we keep in mind that these words were spoken to his disciples, this passage presents no difficulty. These men could bind a matter on earth and it would be bound in heaven (Matt. 16:19) and they were to be given the power to remit (forgive) or retain sins (John 20:23). These words of our Lord are not just simple instructions as to how a man shall deal with a brother who has wronged him. These are judicial principles given to guide those men who would sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes.

We today have no right to *rebuke* any sinner, and neither can our forgiveness be made to depend upon his submitting to our rebuke. We must be gracious one to another. Submission to those who rule under God will be one of the great principles demanded of all kingdom subjects. We lose nothing in the truth of Luke 17:3-4 when we read *submit* instead of *repent*.

In all occurrences of *metanoeo* and *metanoia* in the four gospels we should read *submit* and *submission* in place of *repent* and *repentance*. But when we come to certain passages in Acts and the epistles other words are needed.

Acts 8:22. Ease yourself, therefore, from this wickedness of yours.

This translation is in harmony with the context of this passage and it is true to the Greek. The great burden of guilt which Simon the sorcerer had brought upon himself by attempting to purchase power from God is seen in the words of Peter when he said, "you perish and your money perish, for thinking you could buy the gift of God." But, in mercy, Peter calls upon Simon to ease himself, that is, to disburden himself of this great load of guilt which is now upon him. Peter also pointed the way that he might get rid of: it. "Be supplicating the Lord." If from the Lord he found forgiveness, then he would be rid of the "gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity."

This answers Mr. Thomson's objection that one cannot *submit from (apo)*. True, we cannot say it this way in English, and that is why we need the related word *ease* in dealing with this passage.

2 Corinthians 12:21. I shall be mourning for many who have previously sinned and have not eased themselves of the uncleanness, and prostitution, and wantonness which they have committed.

The occurrence of *epi* (upon) in this passage is a problem for all students, no matter how one renders *metanoeo*. There seems to be an idiomatic use of *epi* here by which the one article combines the three datives. We cannot translate this literally. We must say "of."

Revelation 2:21. And I gave her time so that she might yield, but she is not willing to ease (unburden) herself from her fornication.

This is the first of five passages in Revelation where *metanoeo* is used with *ek* (out of). The other passages are: Revelation 2:22 "unless they ease themselves from her works;" Revelation 9:20 "eased not themselves from the works of their hands;" Revelation 9:21 - "neither did they ease themselves from their murders;" Revelation 16:11- "and eased not themselves from their deeds." If we keep in mind that *to ease* means to *unburden* or *disburden* we will see the strength of the above renderings. There is little that we can do with *ek* except to translate it "out of" and understand it to mean *from* but this is of no value. Let us translate it "from."

The After-Mind

In order to fully understand the ideas which have been set forth, it will be necessary for the reader to meditate upon the true and full significance of the words *submit* and *submission* of *yield* and *yieldedness*. Any dictionary will give good definitions of these words, yet we need to think them through.

Joshua called for complete submission and yieldedness on the part of the children of Israel when he demanded, "choose you this day whom ye will serve," and he revealed his own complete submission by saying "as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." Joshua 24:15.

Ruth revealed complete submission to Naomi when she said, "**Whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God.**" **Ruth 1:16.** No matter where Naomi went, no matter where she resided, no matter what circumstances arose, Ruth would be with her. Nothing but death could separate Ruth from Naomi. The mind or purpose that she had before she knew what the circumstances were to be would be the same mind or purpose after the circumstances were known. This is what a Greek would call "the after-mind." This is true submission.

If one should say, "I will go tomorrow if it does not rain," he is declaring that his present mind is to go, but in case of rain his mind will change so that his after-mind will not be the same as his fore-mind. If someone in authority should reply to him and say, "Make up your mind, either to go or not to go, rain or shine," he is demanding that he have the mind today that he will have tomorrow. He is demanding the *after-mind*.

Submission to another implies that we will have the same mind after that one has spoken as we had before. This is the meaning of *metanoeo*. Meta is after, and *noieo* means to exercise the mind. *Metanoia* is aftermindedness.

In John 2: 23, 24 we read of certain men who had the *fore-mind*, but did not have the *after-mind*.

Now when He was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day, many believed in His name, when they saw the miracles which He did.

These men had a belief or a mind toward Christ that was the result of seeing the miraculous. A faith that is founded upon miracles is one that is apt to change when persecution or tribulation arises because of this faith. The mind before the trouble may not be the same after the trouble appears. Thus we are told:

But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man.

He knew that these men did not have the *after-mind*, so he did not commit himself to them.

In Luke 8:19 we read of another who seemed to lack the *aftermind*..

And a certain scribe came, and said unto Him, Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.

This was indeed his mind at the moment he spoke these words, but there is a doubt if this was his *after-mind*. Was his *presentmind* also his *future-mind*? Did he have the same mind after the Lord revealed His poverty? We cannot say for sure, but it seems we never hear of him again.

A complete lack of this *after-mindedness* is seen in a statement found in John 6:66:

From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him.

Our Lord had spoken certain words that demanded acceptance or rejection, but the mind or purpose that was there before was replaced by another mind. They had been his disciples, but they ceased to walk with Him.

As an example of true submission, consider the example of Daniel. It was his purpose not to defile himself in Babylon, and to maintain his prayer contacts with the God of Israel. But supposing he is faced with the issue of being cast into a den of lions? Will he maintain his integrity? Yes - for his present-mind is also his future-mind. He has the after-mind. No den of lions can change his purpose.

Paul provides us with an excellent example of true submissiveness. "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" This is his sincere question. It is evident that he stands ready to do whatever the Lord may say. No matter what the Lord says, he will do it. His mind before the Lord speaks will be the same after He speaks. Even the vision of all that he is to suffer does not alter his mind. Truly, this man had the after-mind. He was submissive.

The divine record of Paul's life and ministry reveal a godly sorrow for the sins he committed before he met the Lord on the Damascus road. This godly sorrow worked true submission unto blessing. It was a submission that he never regretted. In this connection Paul uses the word *metamelomai*, a word that means *regret* but which has little to do with our present study.

Permit me to close this study with a direct word to the reader. Is your personal attitude toward God one of submission? Do you have the *after-mind* in relationship to the truth He has revealed in His Word? Can you honestly say, "Show me the truth and I will believe it?" Let us keep in mind that when the true meaning of *metanoeo* and *metanoia* is understood, we find in them truth that applies to our walk in this the dispensation of the grace of God. To have the *after-mind* is truth for today.

The End

Slandering The Truth

When Paul presented truth concerning the kingdom of God in Ephesus, some who believed not spoke "**evil of that way before the multitude.**" Acts 19:9. They could not answer him, so they slandered his message. No doubt but that some took their slander as an answer to Paul and a refutation of his message.

If a man loves a truth he does not like to see it slandered. If he feels that God has given him a certain truth, he feels also that it is to be proclaimed and defended. It will ever be my purpose to do both.

On numerous occasions Mr. Oscar M. Baker, Editor of "Truth for Today" has denied that there is to be a pre-millennial kingdom, a rule of the heavens over the earth before the second coming of Christ. This is certainly within his rights and I make no objection. However, he has now reversed his position, admits that there is to be a pre-millennial kingdom, but declares it will be Satanic. He even goes so far as to call it "a kingdom of or from the heavens," says it is "a time when the heavens will rule," but calls it "the counterfeit kingdom."

His article in "Truth for Today" (No. 83, June 1955) is entitled, "The Counterfeit Kingdom," and in it he says: "Just as David's Kingdom was a type of the Millennial Kingdom, just so was Saul's kingdom a type of the pre-millennial kingdom."

A statement such as this may appeal to those who know little about Old Testament history, but it will never find any reception in the minds of those who know the facts. I shall always be amazed at how men can make statements for which there *is* not one shred of proof, and yet that statement will be accepted by many as the absolute truth. No statement could be farther from the truth than that "David's kingdom was a type of the Millennial Kingdom." One passage from Scripture is enough to show how utterly false this is.

And David said to Solomon, My Son, as for me, it was in my mind to build an house unto the name of the Lord my God: But the word of the Lord came to me, saying, Thou has shed blood abundantly, and hast made great wars: thou shalt not build an house unto My name, because" thou hast shed much blood upon the earth in my sight. Behold, a son shall be born to thee, who shall be a man of rest; and I will give him rest from all his enemies round about: for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quietness unto Israel in his days. I Chronicles 22: 7-9.

These words give the true picture of David's kingdom. It was characterized by war and bloodshed. His throne was set in an oriental court that reeked with intrigue, treason, lies, and murder. David himself was not clean from some of this. During his reign he had to flee from Jerusalem due to a rebellion brought about by his son, Absalom. There was nothing in his kingdom from beginning to end that could be considered typical of the millennium. Yet Mr. Baker arbitrarily makes David's kingdom to be typical of the millennium just so he can make Saul's kingdom to be typical of that which will precede the millennium. He does this in order to support his idea that the pre-millennial kingdom is to be Satanic. Thus, he makes Saul's reign to be typical of the premillennial kingdom, David's reign to be typical of the millennial kingdom, and, wonder of wonders, he makes Solomon's kingdom to be typical of that which follows the millennium, the new heavens and new earth.

Hundreds of false ideas have been established by simply declaring that one thing is the type of another. In most of these so called "types" a little thinking would expose the fallacy, and honest investigation would be their doom. If, as it is 'said, David's kingdom typifies the millennium, and Solomon's kingdom typifies that which follows the millennium, then what does the divided kingdom of Rehoboam and Jereboam signify? This followed Solomon's reign. Furthermore, it would be well to remember that Solomon's kingdom failed because he got involved with 700 wives and 300 concubines. (I Kings 11: 14). It would be most interesting to hear Mr. Baker deal with the typical significance of this detail. I do not believe that any of these kingdoms are typical of anything so far as the order of things to come is concerned. We will only create confusion if we try to make them to be types.

The idea that Saul is a type of "the beast" or "the antichrist" will never stand for a moment if the history of Saul is carefully read. Read I Samuel, chapters 9 to 15. Note carefully I Samuel 9:16,17 and 15:10,11. God made Saul king over 'Israel. Mr. Baker ignores all these facts so that he can make Saul a type of "the beast." His article is a good example of the way the Word of God should not be handled.

The End.

Questions and Answers

Concerning I Corinthians 15 :23

QUESTION: Your treatment of 'Christ the firstfruits' in your pamphlet on "The Resurrections" was most welcome. The more I consider it the more attractive it becomes. Can you add more to this? Can you illustrate this in some way that will make it more clear?

ANSWER: Yes, I can. There is a divine sign-post here that points to the true meaning of *aparche christos*, showing that this term here cannot mean the Lord Jesus Christ. It is as if I should say, "Most American automobiles are made by three great corporations: Ford, Chrysler, and General Motors." Now, if someone were to take this statement and interpret the word "Ford" as meaning a man, a lone individual, it would be a deliberate ignoring of the context. It would show that he had made no honest attempt to understand what I have said, and is, therefore, twisting my words to create confusion. Of course he could easily bring a thousand-and-one proofs that the word "Ford" does mean a man, and that "Ford" is a man, but the fact would remain that "Ford" is not a man "Ford" cannot be a man in this sentence. 'A safeguard and signpost was erected by the use of the word "corporation;" therefore, this statement must be read in that light, and the ellipsis must be supplied from the context by understanding it as, "Ford Corporation, Chrysler Corporation, and General Motors Corporation."

The statement of I Corinthians 15:23 is parallel in character with the one made above. Paul says "Every man will be made alive in his own company." He then sets forth three companies: (1) the *aparche christos* company, (2) the company of the dead. that are Christ's at His *parousia*, (3) the *telos* company. If these terms had no context it could be said that *aparche christos* speaks of the resurrection of: the Lord Jesus Christ, a single individual. However, a safeguard and signpost was erected by the use of the word *tagmati*, translated "order" but meaning company. Even if it is insisted that this should be translated "Christ the firstfruit" it will still mean "Christ the firstfruit company," and cannot mean the lone person of Christ. The context here cannot be denied and ignored. If the truth is our desire we will recognize the word "company" and give it its proper place.

Concerning Post-Millennialism

QUESTION: Mr. Oscar Baker in his magazine, "Truth for Today," states: "About two centuries ago a man by the name of Whitby wrote a book in which he claimed that there would be a period of enlightenment and prosperity before the coming of the Lord. This was the beginning of the post-millennial teaching which is so prevalent today. It is the attempt, a fruitless one, of man to bring in the kingdom without the King. Man wants the blessings but not His person. Man does not want to meet Him." Do you know anything about this Whitby or his teachings?

ANSWER. I believe I do. The reference is to Daniel Whitby (1638-1726), an English theologian who contended, correctly, that the millennium is yet future, but who also contended, erroneously, that it would be brought about and set up on the earth by the present Christian agencies. He believed that the church through the preaching of the gospel would convert the world. He did not teach a "period of enlightenment and prosperity, before the coming of the Lord," for his teaching was that the world would become Christian as the result of the church conquering the world through Christ. Neither Whitby nor B. B. Warfield and James Off who followed him believed in any sudden, supernatural intervention that would result in the kingdom of God becoming a reality upon the earth. Nevertheless, their theories about Christ conquering the world and setting up His kingdom upon earth appealed to many. This idea is held and taught throughout the *Southern Baptist Convention* today. I was a pastor for five years within the boundaries of this Convention, and regularly attended a weekly ministers' Conference where only one minister was a pre-millennialist and the rest of forty or more were post-millennialists. I was that one pre-millennialist, therefore, I am quite familiar with the post-millennial teaching and I know that it bears no relationship to my teaching concerning the kingdom of heavens. I do not believe in any church-made or man-made millennium, or that present gospel agencies can do one whit toward bringing in the kingdom of God upon the earth. I believe that God's government is going to be set up by sudden and supernatural intervention, and that a long period of divine government will be the portion of this earth before the second coming of Christ. A millennium of divine government will follow and result from the second coming of Christ. I repudiate any attempt to link my teaching with that of Whitby, or to connect it with the post-millennial ideas that are prevalent today.

Concerning God's Next Act

QUESTION: Do you dare to tell us that after 1900 years of the most terrible sins, God is not going to pour out His wrath upon mankind before He brings in His reign of peace and righteousness?

ANSWER: In kindness permit me to say that a question such as this is emotional and not logical. It demands in advance a certain answer and serves notice that the answer is going to be rejected. The question would infer that certain men who live upon the earth just before God brings in His reign of peace and righteousness are going to be punished for the sins that men have committed who lived before them. We must remember that most of the sinners who lived during the past 1900 years are no longer upon the earth and would escape any punishment that God poured out upon the earth. When God does pour out His wrath upon men it will be to punish them for the sins they committed, not to punish them for the sins of those who preceded them.

The End.

The Editor To His Friends

****We have never attempted any ministry that has been appreciated as much as our tape-recorded ministry. And yet we have never done anything that was quite as difficult to keep in operation. When we had only a dozen outlets it operated quite smoothly, but since the number has increased to more than sixty, the whole system of distribution has bogged down. It is exceedingly simple to make the master tape, and there are many who think that all we need to do is start this circulating and let one send it to another until all have heard it. But it is not this simple, for if we did

it that way the sixty-fifth person would get it in about five years. We have tried making eight copies of each master tape and sending these to circuits of five or six, but it seems that the last receiver on these circuits gets the tape about six or eight months after it is sent out. Since some were in it from the start, and others are only starting, the later ones want all the earlier messages. This increases and complicates the problem of distribution.

We have ever tried to do all our work in a manner that will involve the least possible cost, and that is why we have used the present methods of distribution. However, our experience tells us that it will not work, so an entirely new system has been worked out and will be put into operation early in 1956. In the future, sixty-five copies will be made of each master tape. This work will be done by a professional recording company. A copy will be sent from our office to each receiver and when the listener has finished with it he will send it back to us. Each spool will contain two studies and we hope to send out a spool each month.

In order to perform this ministry certain standards will have to be maintained. Some want fifteen minute messages, others want thirty and forty minute messages, and others think that every minute on the tape should be used up making a message sixty-five minutes in length. We are always glad to know of your desires in this matter, but you will realize we cannot satisfy all. Nevertheless, we do hope we can serve you more faithfully in the tape-recorded ministry in the year to come.

****My Bible-teaching ministry tours are made across the country each spring and fall. Each trip follows about the same pattern, inasmuch as the messages are given in the same places, ministering to about the same people. An elaborate and detailed report of each tour would be tiresome to my readers, and it might involve me in the mistake of trying to report each tour in a more spectacular manner than the one before. Nevertheless, a brief report of the Bible Conference tour made during September and October seems to be in order. The Conferences began in Springfield, Missouri on September 7 and ended in Houston, Texas on October 23. Between these two points and times meetings were held in Peoria and Rockford, Illinois; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Chicago, Illinois; Michigan City, Indiana; Muskegon, Kalamazoo, and Grand Rapids, Michigan; Buffalo, New York; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Fort Worth, Texas. Sixty-one messages were given in these thirteen places. In all places visited I sensed a deeper appreciation of the ministry than ever before. The response was satisfactory in every place, with one exception where local circumstances cut into the attendance. Audiences of various sizes listened eagerly and earnestly to the studies presented. Unlimited time was given for questions and discussion which was as profitable to the teacher as to those who were taught. Arrangements have already been made for meetings in all the above-mentioned places next spring, but announcements of dates and places will have to wait until later when arrangements are complete.

****The Southern California Area Meeting of THE WORD OF TRUTH MINISTRY will be held on Sunday, February 26, at the WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY CLUB AUDITORIUM, 540 South Catalina, in Los Angeles, California. There will be meetings at 10:45 A.M., 3:00 P.M., and 7:30 P.M. The speakers will be Herbert H. Baudistel, John C. Ribbens, and Otis Q. Sellers. Mark this date on your calendar and plan to be with us for the entire day.

****I wish it were possible for me to provide all the ministry that my friends desire, to deal with all the subjects they want me to deal with, and to write all the articles they would like to have in print. "Will you have that in print?" is a question that someone asks at the end of almost every message, and the answer has to be that I can make no promise. I want to do everything I can to be of help to God's people in their desire to know the Word, but there is a limit to what one can do when he labors to uncover and present the truth in God's Word.

End Vol. XIV, No. 4