

**LESSONS FROM THE FLOOD:  
DO NOT ADD TO GOD'S WORD (3 OF 4)**

*David Halbrook*

When you first got your driver's license, were your parents happy because now you could run errands for them? Did your momma ever send you to the grocery store with \$5 for a gallon of milk? Would you have dared to buy a candy bar with that money? Of course not—you dare not add to her grocery list without her permission!

In preparation for the flood, God told Noah, "Make yourself an ark of gopherwood..." (Genesis 6:14). God chose gopherwood, so all other woods were sinful to use in making the ark. If Noah used this wood plus any other type of wood, he would have added to God's instructions.

Acts 11:26 tells us that saved people were "called Christians." The word "called" in this verse means a divine call, so God chose to call saved people "Christians" (like God chose gopherwood). Since God chose "Christian," why have men added Catholic, Baptist, Methodist, and other religious names which God never chose? Even a well-known Baptist preacher said "I hope the Baptist name will soon perish..." (Spurgeon Memorial Library, Vol. I, p. 168). Like Noah, be content with God's choice, and do not add to it.

-- *Editor's Note*: The simplicity of Christ has not lost its power but on whom will it work, if we are not bringing it to the attention of people we daily meet? Whether with our *Arkansas Weekly* article or some other way, give someone an opportunity to learn the gospel this week. Do you have time?

Church of Christ—Quail Valley  
4104 E. Harrison St.  
Batesville, AR 72501  
Office- (870) 793-6700

Evangelists:  
David Halbrook 569-4491  
Lenoard Westbrook 612-8409

# The Exhorter

Acts 11:23 *Exhorted them all... cleave unto the Lord*

Church of Christ--Quail Valley

October 9, 2011

[WWW.QVCOC.COM](http://WWW.QVCOC.COM)

## ***SEVEN SLIPPERY SLOPES OF SABBATARIANISM (4)***

*Steven J. Wallace*

THE NEW TESTAMENT NAMES SOME OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS, THEREFORE ALL ARE BOUND TODAY?

The above reasoning is really too slick and slippery for Sabbatarians to stand on; it allows more than they will accept. Sabbatarians do not want the whole law; their main contention is to keep the Ten Commandments today and especially the Sabbath. Yet they most certainly deny the following line of reasoning. Paul referred to the law, "*For it is written in the law of Moses, 'You shall not muzzle an ox while it treads out the grain.' Is it oxen that God is concerned about?*" (1 Cor. 9:9). What if we should contend that since Paul quoted from the Law of Moses that all the Law of Moses was binding upon Christians today? Sabbatarians would oppose such, yet this has been brought forth by their camp regarding the Ten Commandments. However, we must either accept their logic until its end or reject it all. If it is true regarding the Ten Commandments, then it must also be true regarding the whole law. The Law of Moses is not binding upon Christians today. It cannot be kept perfectly by man; it doesn't give life but gives condemnation; it identifies and clarifies sin but doesn't give full release and forgiveness from it. Peter spoke of those who tried to bind it upon disciples of Christ saying, ". . . *why do you test God by putting a yoke on the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?*" (Acts 15:10). Paul penned, "*You have become estranged from Christ, you who attempt to be justified by law; you have fallen from grace. . . this persuasion does not come from Him who calls you*" (Gal. 5:4, 8). And again, ". . . *you also have become dead to the law through the body of Christ . . . But now we have been delivered from the law, having died to what we were held by. . .*" (Rom. 6:4, 6). What law was Paul speaking of? He identifies it in verse 7 as the Ten Commandment Law, "*I would not have know sin except through the law. For I would not have known covetousness unless the*

law had said, ‘You shall not covet.’” This was the tenth commandment (Exod. 20:17).

Simply because there are some similarities between the Law of Moses and the Law of Christ doesn’t mean that Moses’ law is binding on Christians today. The Australian constitution cites words of the first amendment of the United States of America. Though it has incorporated elements of the US constitution, it would be absurd to suggest that Australians must be accountable to US law. The state of Washington has the same maximum speed limit law as California, but California law doesn’t apply in Washington and vice versa. Neither do we obey the speed limit in Washington because of California’s speed limit.

The New Testament does incorporate nine of the Ten Commandments. It forbids having other gods, idolatry, cursing, murder, adultery, stealing, lying, covetousness (1 Cor. 8:4; Acts 19:26; Col. 3:8; Rom. 13:8-10; 1 Cor. 6:9-10; Eph. 4:10; Col. 3:9; Eph. 5:3). We are bound to these laws, not because they are in the Old Testament Decalogue, but rather because they are Christ’s. It also tells us to honor our parents (Eph. 6:1). But regarding Sabbath keeping, it says “*Therefore let no one act as your judge in regard to food or drink or . . . a Sabbath day—things which are a mere shadow of what is to come. . .*” (Col 2:16, 17, NASB)

- To read the rest of this series, visit: [www.sunnysidechurchofchrist.com/id11.html](http://www.sunnysidechurchofchrist.com/id11.html)

---

## ***TWO MEN HAVE AN UNFAITHFUL CHILD***

*John Gibson*

Bill and Fred are both faithful in their attendance and active in the work of the local church, but unfortunately both men have a grown child who does not serve the Lord faithfully. The spiritual lives of Bill and Fred seem similar in many ways, but when it comes to dealing with the unfaithful child there is a big difference.

When Bill is asked about his son, he is honest in describing the situation and urges everyone to do all they can to help restore his son to faithfulness. On the other hand, if anything is said to Fred, he immediately becomes defensive and makes excuses for his son. While Bill wishes people would be more direct in dealing with the soul-threatening sin in his son’s life, Fred continually worries that someone is going to say the wrong thing to his son and “offend” him.

There are a lot of “Bills” who understand the danger their erring children are in and seek the help of all. But tragically, there are far too many “Fred’s” who seem so worried about the feelings of their children that they make excuses for them, cover up for them, perhaps try to keep people from even finding out about them and become resentful toward those who do try to help.

When people are overtaken in sin fellow-Christians have an obligation to restore them (Galatians 6:1; James 5:19, 20). As parents, we must make certain that we do not stand in the way of those seeking to restore the erring. To carry it even further, are the parents themselves excused from the obligation to “restore such a one”? It has to be truly heart-breaking and gut-wrenching for a parent to see the church withdraw from one of their children (see 1 Corinthians 5:1-13; 2 Thessalonians 3:6-15), but a parent who has the proper faith in God and a true love for his child rejoices that others care enough about their child to follow God’s plan. Though painful, they trust that the desired end is that “his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus” (1 Corinthians 5:5).

Let us love our children; seek to train them when they are young and then remember two things if they should choose not to remain faithful:

1. We must love Jesus (and His teachings) even more than our children (Matthew 10:37).
2. Our love for our children is a very shallow love if it does not extend to their souls.

Parents, please think carefully about this painful subject. Do not ever allow your love, pride, embarrassment, shame or anything else to stand in the way of that which is needed to bring your child to repentance.

([www.pepperroadchurch.org/2011/05/25/two-men-have-an-unfaithful-child/](http://www.pepperroadchurch.org/2011/05/25/two-men-have-an-unfaithful-child/))

---

## ***EPISCOPALIANS DEBATE JESUS & SALVATION***

*David Halbrook*

In January of 2010, Katherine Schori, presiding bishop of the US Episcopal Church, debated a fellow Episcopal bishop in Dallas, Tx. What difference in belief resulted in a debate? Whether or not Jesus is essential to salvation--and the “presiding bishop’s” position was that Jesus is NOT essential!

When men create churches based upon man-made teachings, this is the result. By man’s rules having a disbelieving, a female, or a never-married bishop is okay. Scripture says otherwise (1 Timothy 3:1-7)? Does that matter to you?

Jesus has never been head (leader) of the Episcopal Church, nor of the Roman Catholic Church, nor of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church because they each are founded on teachings that contradict His. Read the Bible to identify: His church, who belongs to it, and how/when they belong to it. That is all we want to be—a church of **Christ**, people led by and belonging to Him. Why be more, why be less?