



Diakrisis (Australia)

‘But strong meat belongs to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern [diakrisis] both good and evil’, (Heb.5:14)

PO Box 1499, Hervey Bay, Qld. Australia, 4655.
E-mail: taministries@bigpond.com Ph. 0411489472
Website: www.taministries.net

Newsletter of TA Ministries Vol.3, No.58 July / August 2017

TA Ministries is a non-denominational faith ministry,
teaching, informing and equipping the church.
Editor: Terry Arnold (Dr.Th; MABS; Dip.Bib.&Min.)

The editor may not necessarily agree with all the views expressed by subscribers in this newsletter.

We welcome comments or items contributed by readers. Unless otherwise requested, these may be included in following newsletters at the discretion of the editor.

Articles in this newsletter may be copied or reproduced provided it is in context and proper credit and references are given. We encourage distribution of this newsletter that others might be *taught, informed and equipped*.

This Newsletter is distributed bi-monthly *free* of charge. The cost to this ministry is approximately \$20.00 per subscriber annually. Any donation to help with these expenses is received with gratitude.

John Mackay Conference

Recently the Hervey Bay Bible Church had Creation Science speaker John Mackay speak over two days. The conference included such topics as: Climate change/global warming?; sea levels rising?; six day creation; evidences of creation...and more.

John Mackay brought many fresh evidences and facts to these subjects. The Mp3 has four sessions with Powerpoint notes. Available for donation for costs.

Contents

- P.2-4** Editor’s Comment
- P.5** Bible Inspiration?; What’s the Real Terror? Islamic Extremism or Islamic Naivism?
- P.6** The New ‘Missional’ Gospel
- P.7,8** Eschatological Fallacies
- P.9-12** Lest We Forget - Ridley and Latimer
- P.13-20** Comments & Questions

Editor's Comment

There is no doubt that the 21st century church is in apostasy - a falling away from doctrines and the faith they once had, indeed the 'faith once delivered' (Jude 3). It may well be the greatest and last falling away. The fact is most western denominations do not believe what they formerly believed - which is 'apostasy' by definition. Most denominations have done back flips on what they used to teach. In issues such as women in ministry, same sex and even the sovereignty of God in salvation, the beliefs have been all but reversed and have divided and crippled some churches. The true Gospel has been buried or lost amidst social and political agendas which now abound. The Laodicean church of revelation chapter 3 is a picture image of what the church is today.

I find it amazing that some Christians think the church is healthy and revival is occurring or is just around the corner. Statistics in the west show the opposite. Church attendances are falling year by year. Some mega churches may be growing, but across the board numbers are reduced each year. The church is simply failing to impact society for good. Most pastors I have spoken to admit that few are being saved and rather people are crossing from church to church. The numbers of people making confessions of faith and then falling away is ever large. The average age of congregations is now much older, except perhaps in some larger Pentecostal/Charismatic churches which attract the young with entertainment, music and fanciful preaching which tickles ears. Already the Hillsong phenomena with its sensual and temporal health, wealth and potential gospel and with popular music, has touched the hearts of many.

In some countries (especially Great Britain) churches are closing and mosques are every increasing. Religions such as Buddhism are growing. The picture is bleak for Christianity. This is not made any better when big name church leaders and TV preachers are regularly falling in open sins. This is the real state of the church in full apostasy. If the coming of the Lord is not close one should shudder to think what the modern churches will be like in a decade from now?

Of course there is a remnant. And it is a remnant. I know of several towns in Australia where people are struggling to find Bible believing churches with sound doctrine, Bible preaching and teaching, and a church prepared to stand on the infallible word and against the tide of popular opinion.

The responsibility to remain as a remnant outside of apostasy rests somewhat with leaders of the church. But the ultimate responsibility to swim against the tide is with each individual. At the judgement seat of Christ we will have no excuse. We have the Word of God freely given to use. We have the promise of the Holy Spirit to discern the true from the false.

Man's responsibility

Firstly responsibility lies with the mind and the heart of man. *'The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?'* (Jer.17:9).

Continued next page >

It has to be transformed and governed by the renewing of the mind (Rom.12:2; Eph.4:23). If the word of God falls to the side, the mind and the heart will wander and follow the next influence. And what stronger influence than the world and its post modern philosophies which assault the mind and the heart every day?

Leaders Responsibility

Leaders involved in leadership roles whether in local church or para church institutions have a responsibility to *‘preach the word...reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine’*. How little do we see this happening today by church leaders? But why is this important?: *‘For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables’* (2Tim.4:2-4).

Do leaders really believe we are in that time?

Elders Responsibility

A primary responsibility is incurred upon elders in local churches to *‘Take heed...to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he has purchased with his own blood’*. This is the primary responsibility of elders in pastoring. But why is this important? - Because the church is that *‘which he has purchased with his own blood’!* Here we have the Gospel of redemption and the high price that was paid for it!

Do elders today see the gravity of this?

Then there is another reason also: *‘For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch...’* (Acts 20:28-31).

Do leaders really believe we are in that time?

To ensure that elders more likely understand the gravity of this calling, the qualifications for a pastor/elder are restrictive. These qualifications pertain to *character*. 1 Timothy 3:1-7 - Overseers *‘must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach’*. God’s elder must be without public fault in sustainable charges that would cause ‘blame’ to tarnish his character. He must be a faithful husband dedicated to one woman. His character must be self controlled, serious about the things of God, modest and ordered in his habits. He must have an open heart to strangers and an understanding of rightly dividing doctrine and the ability to impart that to others. *‘Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous’*. He must not be addicted to alcohol in any way and so to not cause any stumbling block to others. *‘One that rules well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity’*. He must be a man able to control his family under his roof so as not to be *‘accused’* of being *‘unruly’* ((Tit.1:6). *‘Not a novice...’*. He must be a man with experience and maturity in

all the above things. *‘Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without...’*. Again, his character must be above reproach.

...He also must be able to expose false doctrine and false teachers (Tit.1:9-11).

Para Church Institutions Responsibility

Institutions outside of the local church that have any effect on the local church must also bear some responsibility for some of the apostasy we see today. Most Bible colleges in Australia would now be considered ‘liberal’ rather than biblical. Many have adopted ‘progressive’ views of scripture - the word of God is changing in how it is applied. Subjects such as women in ministry, same sex and other public issues have afflicted the church in recent decades. But where do the mainline colleges stand on these public issues? Many sit on the fence of compromise. Others adopt the worlds philosophical views of simply denying the age old word of God and its absolutes.

At the bottom of the falling away from what was once held is the issue of inspiration and the sufficiency of Scripture. And this is where I am most scathing of colleges and para church institutions. The apostasy is largely because of lowering views on inspiration and inerrancy of God’s word. It is obviously no longer sufficient in the light of the many new self help, self needs orientated programmes and the worlds psychology which the modern church and colleges have adopted. Sola Scriptura has been all but lost.

Individual Responsibility

However, ultimately the buck stops with the individual. One can blame the elders and para church institutions for the falling away of the church to some extent, but in the end we are individually responsible to know our Bibles and to *‘prove all things’* (1Thess.5:21). One cannot rely on elders and colleges to show us the right way. At the judgement seat of Christ we will not be able to blame anyone else or any institution for what they have taught us in error. We alone as individuals are responsible. *‘Study to show yourself approved unto God, a workman that needs not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth’* (2Tim.2:15). There is no excuse.

This by-monthly newsletter *‘Diakrisis’* is also not the answer. It might inform, teach, equip and even stir, excite and encourage people to study, but it is not the Bible and is not inspired and thus inerrant. It might lead people to truth in the Word but it is not the Holy Spirit leading *into truth*. It can correct, expose and warn, but it is no substitute for the studying of the full orb ed view of God in scripture.

We urge readers to leave churches that are following in apostasy and support churches that are striving to teach Biblical doctrine. But also we exhort our readers to be ‘watching’ and to be ‘found worthy of the kingdom’.

Terry Arnold

Bible Inspiration?



Fewer than 1 in 4 Americans believe the Bible is the literal word of God, the lowest...in a 40-year trend. Fewer than 1 in 4 Americans (24%) believe the Bible is 'the actual word of God, and to be taken literally...'

26% view it as 'a book of fables, legends, history and moral precepts recorded by man'.

The percentage of literal believers has gradually decreased for about 10 years from the mid-1970s from almost 40%. In a stark contrast, the percentage who define the Bible as just stories has doubled - most of the increase happening since 2014. The figures indicate that the greatest swing is happening among young people...Americans across all the age groups still accept the Bible as a holy document, but are not as focused on God's direct role in it. This may mean people are more willing than previously, to believe that the Bible is open to interpretation. (Apostasy Alert May/2017)

What's the Real Terror? Islamic Extremism or Islamic Naivism?

The Aussie Prime Minister Mr Turnbull...and media reports...have told UK victims of terrorist attacks, that we are praying with you and supporting you... Mr Turnbull: 'Who do you recommend we pray to?'...to Allah?...the Aboriginal Biامي?...Hindu gods advertised on the backs of Aussie council buses? Or to Jesus Christ...Without telling us who to pray to is naïve in the extreme! What should we be praying? ...for the Muslim Mayor of London?...Islamic culture teaches him it's ok to lie to Christians or Jews or anybody in Islam's way? This can make for a real problem trusting anything Sadiq Khan or Muslims say!...Should we be grateful to the cartoonists in our local news media who...portray Islam as a non-violent religion, even quoting the Quran which says 'whoever kills an innocent shall be as if he has killed all mankind' (Q 5.2)...But what is the Muslim definition of 'innocent'? ...Here's what the rest of the chapter's about. Quran 5:51 states: 'O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies....And the proceeding Q 4:56 states: '...those who disbelieve in Our verses - We will drive them into a Fire. Every time their skins are roasted through We will replace them with other skins so they may taste the punishment...' Who do Muslims regard as the innocent or the guilty? Anybody who denies Allah is The One True God for starters, so anyone who says Jesus Christ is God is very guilty, plus any Jew who rejects the Quran as Holy Writ or refuses to bow the knee to Muslim armies! By definition all of these are not innocent, they are guilty, and the Quran teaches such guilty heretics should be put to death.

Do you really want to solve the problem of Islamic Extremism? Then stop practicing Islamic Naivism!

(Full version in 'Evidence News' 8/June/2017 Creation Research by John Mackay)

The New 'Missional' Gospel

In recent years there is noticeably the term 'missional' used to describe a style of mission outreach. The term appears to have been adopted especially by the 'Emergent' church, a more liberal modern arm of the church which adapts Christianity to a postmodern society. In many denominations 'missional' philosophy has developed into disaster relief, feeding the poor, or building structures to supply needy people with food and shelter. The approach is first to '*shine the light of Christ*' into communities in need with the hope people will somehow get the Gospel. Works are seen as a means to an end.

But I have never understood the philosophy of how anyone can get saved by my behaviour in 'shining the light of Christ' without hearing the Gospel? '*...how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?*' (Rom.10:14).

The activities in this 'missional' approach are not primarily about Bible studies, church or worship activities. Whether the Gospel is shared or not, the activities become the focus. The deception of this is that certainly Jesus cared for peoples needs and we need to have works which show our faith (James 2:14-18). Out of the love of Christ and compassion we might visit the unsaved sick, tend to the orphans and provide needs to the destitute...

However, is this the cart before the horse? What is our primary 'mission' in missions? Do we tend to bodies and felt needs without the Gospel being a *primary* focus? Did Jesus die to have us do these works; or did he die that we might be saved and then take that message by the Spirit to others? Is he not building his *church* on earth?

If the focus is not first the Gospel and if there is no clear presentation of the Gospel, then is the Great Commission being obeyed? '*Go you therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen*' (Matt.28:19,20).

In the last few decades the departure from this command has been a 'missional' approach involving emphasis in works and needs. *Missions are fast becoming relief agencies, political agendas, educating the masses, feeding the poor, digging wells for water supplies.* The problem with this is that we allow Satan to prod us into ineffective actions. Actions that burn us out, exhaust funds, and in the end achieve nothing for the kingdom.

What happens to the people we feed, cloth and rescue from injustices, if they are not saved from their sins? Are we to focus on the temporal concerns at the expense of the spiritual death that lingers in every unsaved person? How will food, water, health, education and justice help in Hell?

Churches must focus and have all their activities to the Gospel as foundation. Are we placing the Gospel foremost in the people we minister to? If there is no Gospel there is no 'mission'.

Terry Arnold

Eschatological Fallacies

Fallacy

The teaching of a literal Millennium is recent teaching and not in early church history. The Reformers and Puritans were also 'A-Millennial.

The Facts

We are aware many of our readers may either be of the 'a-millennium', 'Pre-millennium' or other views. But in answering this fallacy we are here firstly interested in historical facts since the fallacy statement above is historical.

The Church Fathers: The above fallacy is a common error that is quickly dismissed with a study of church history of the first few centuries. Although there are differences among the Fathers in some of the details, *most of the early church fathers who were influenced by the apostles and their method of interpretation, tended to be pre-millennial* in their view of the Lord's coming and reign. The following early Church Fathers and apologists are some of an extensive list too numerous to print here: Clement of Rome (90-100AD), Polycarp (70-155/160), Papias (70-130/155), Ignatius (98/117), the Author of Epistle of Barnabas (70-132), Justin Martyr (100-165), Tatian (120-180), Irenaeus (120-202), Hippolytus (236), Tertullian (150-225), Cyprian (200-258), Commodian (200-270)...

They were in fact called 'Chilliasts' after the Greek word for 'one thousand'. The fact is that Pre-millennialism was the predominant view for the first three centuries. This is freely admitted by those who study early church history. Even 'A-millennial' (meaning 'no millennium') teachers admit *'The most striking point in the eschatology of the ante-Nicene age before the Council of Nicea is the prominent chiliasm, or millenarianism, that is the belief of a visible reign of Christ in glory on earth with the risen saints for a thousand years, before the general resurrection and judgment'* (Schaff)

The departure from this apostolic and Jewish interpretive method came in the post Nicene church. In the 3rd century Clement of Alexandria and Origen propagated an allegorism in interpretation. Greek Philosophy became more influential and interpretations of the Bible took on an intent to express 'deeper' meanings than what could be seen in the text objectively. Even A-millennial teachers admit that Origen neglected the obvious grammatical and historical sense of Scriptures. Many commentaries and interpretations 'spiritualised' scriptures and some became quite mystical and bizarre. There was a shift from Pre-millennial interpretations to more A-millennial views. This lasted for about 1,000 years until some Puritans and others began to revive earlier chilliasts view.

The Puritans and Reformers: Many will argue that the Reformers and Puritans were 'A-millennial in their views. This is not entirely true. Puritans could be named and quoted, such as Increase Mather, who had a Pre-millennial view of the tribulation and rapture. Indeed the Puritan Charles Spurgeon stated: *'There are better times coming, when the religion of Christ shall be universal: when He shall reign from pole to pole, with illimitable sway, when whole kingdoms shall bow down before Him, and nations shall be born in a day; and in the thousand years*

of the great millennial state there will be enough saved to make up all the deficiencies of the thousands of years that have gone before. Christ shall be master everywhere, and His praise shall be sounded in every land. Christ shall have the pre-eminence at last...' (Spurgeon, Autobiography, Vol.1, P.175)

And again...*'But persons are curious to know what kind of dispensation the Millennial one is to be. Will the temple, they ask, be erected in Jerusalem? Will the Jews be positively restored to their own land? Will the different nations all speak one language?...We do not profess to understand the minutiae of these things. It is enough for us to believe that a latter-day glory is approaching...our Master is to reign over the wide, wide world, and to win it for himself.*

...Just as under the legal dispensation there were types and shadows, but the mass of the people never saw Christ in them, so there are a great many different things in this dispensation which are types of the next...Just as the enlightened Jew partially foresaw what the Gospel was to be by the law, so may we guess the Millennium by the present...' (Spurgeon - 'Heaven', 1Cor.2:9,10; Dec.16,1855).

Certainly many were 'A-millennial' and did not resurrect the 'Chiliasm' of early centuries, yet they did resurrect important doctrines such as Justification, salvation by grace alone, etc. If they failed to resurrect pre-millennialism, then they similarly failed to resurrect biblical doctrines on baptism, the Lord Supper, church leadership, etc. Many clung to doctrines clearly non scriptural, not 'sola scriptura' and traditions carried over from Rome. Zwingli confessed regret at having to practise infant baptism so as not to cause 'offense'; similarly Luther because it was a 'long standing tradition'.* Many believe the Reformers were so busy 'reforming' salvation doctrines that eschatology doctrines were left behind.

Apart from the fallacies of the history of Millennialism, more importantly - what does scripture teach? 'Pre-millennium advocates would point to numerous Biblical texts which have the Messiah ruling as king in Jerusalem on the throne of David as a fulfilment of God's covenant to Abraham (Gen.12:1-3), to Israel as a nation (Dt.20:1-10), and to David (2Sam.7:10-13). They would point to Jerusalem as the capital (Zech.8:3). One passage which is difficult to A-millennialism is Zechariah 14:1-9. Here the Lord will return to the Mount of Olives, *the same location from which He ascended into Heaven*. Is one ascension to be 'literal' and not the other on His return? Isaiah's account of the same event has the Lord returning to this same 'Mount Zion' (Is.31:4,5).

It is interesting that those who refuse a literal interpretation of 1,000 years (millennium) in the *prophetic* book of Revelation will inconsistently accept *literal* years in the *prophetic* book of Daniel (70 Hebrew 'weeks' = 70 sevens = 490 years). The book of Daniel was regarded by the Jews and early Christians as a clear guide of future Gentile nations from the captivity date to the finishing with God's kingdom. This matches the book of Revelation with its antichrist, his dealings with Israel, the 3.5 year period of wrath, '1,250 days' and the Millennial Reign. With such *literal detail* in Daniel it is any wonder *the early church believed in a literal millennium!*

* 'The Reformers and Their Stepchildren', P.190-220; 200-220.

Mike Claydon & Terry Arnold

Lest We Forget - Ridley and Latimer

Nicholas Ridley

Nicholas Ridley was born in Northumberland and later educated at Cambridge. He excelled in education and became the head of Pembroke College, where he received his Doctor of Divinity. Soon after he was appointed chaplain by King Henry VIII and bishop of Rochester, and afterwards translated to a bishop in London during the reign of Edward VI.

His sermons attracted many listeners. He had a reputation for high character, forgiving and humble. He was habitual in prayer - each morning until about 10am. He then studied hours each day, then more prayers at 5pm. and again before bedtime at about 11pm.

One of the Roman Catholic bishops of the day was Bishop Bonner, who was later instrumental in having many Protestants martyred. Yet Ridley would have Bonner's mother and sister and other relatives at his table and treated them as his own relatives.

Hugh Latimer

Hugh Latimer was born in Thurkesson, in the county of Leicester. At the age of 14 he was sent to the University of Cambridge. He received a Master of Arts degree in 1514, was ordained a priest in 1515 and received a Bachelor of Divinity degree in 1524. For his final degree his thesis was a *Refutation of the Reformation then emerging from Europe*. Latimer was a devout follower of the teachings of Roman Catholicism and regularly upheld their doctrines.

However, a Protestant man Thomas Bilney convinced Latimer to listen to Bilney's testimony of faith. This had a profound affect on Latimer and led to his conversion to Biblical doctrine. After this conversion he became evangelistic and desired greatly to preach. He began to speak against the Romish doctrines and especially the tradition of the Latin language in prayers and Masses. He soon came into conflict with many other priests and Catholic leaders. But Latimer was an eloquent speaker and debater as even recognised by his enemies.

In 1529 he was banned from preaching in the churches of the university. Yet Latimer continued to openly speak of his new faith. Mr. Bilney continued to fellowship with Latimer and one of the places where they walked together became known as 'Heretics Hill'.

One Catholic priest, Bockenham, publicly refuted Latimer's desire for an English Bible. *'If that heresy should prevail there will be an end of everything useful among us. The ploughman, reading in the gospel that no man having put his hand to the plough should look back, would soon lay aside his labor. The baker, reading that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, will in future make us nothing but very insipid bread; and the simple man finding himself commanded to pluck out the right eye and cast it from thee, England, after a few years, will be a frightful spectacle; it will be little better than a nation of blind*

and one eyed men, sadly begging their bread from door to door'.

On the next Sunday Latimer said he would reply publicly. Bockenham sat in front of the preacher Latimer. Latimer took up the arguments against him one by one and then finally said *'This is how your skilful guides abuse your understanding. They look upon you as children that must be forever kept in leading strings...Boldly examine the scriptures, and you will easily discover the absurdity of the teaching of your doctors...As for the comparison drawn from the plough, the leaven and the eye...is it necessary to justify these passages of scripture? Must I tell you what plough, what leaven, what eye is here meant? Is not our Lord's teaching distinguished by those expressions which under a popular form conceal a spiritual and profound meaning? Do not we know that in all languages and in all speeches, it is not on the image that we must fix our eyes, but on the thing which the image represents? Latimer then cast a piercing* Latimer then cast a piercing glance at the priest *'if we see a fox painted preaching in a friars hood, nobody imagines that a fox is meant, but that craft and hypocrisy are described, which are so often found disguised in that garb*'.

On these words the friar left in haste.

Latimer at times became involved in helping the less fortunate. In one instance, he took on the case of a woman who was accused by her husband of murdering their child. Latimer gained the pardon for the mother. These acts further infuriated his persecutors.

In 1528, Latimer's enemies eventually had him summoned to appear before Catholic Cardinal Thomas Wolsey for heresy. But because Latimer was a strong supporter of the king in opposition to the Pope he was set free of further action at the time. Latimer continued to preach against Roman doctrine and especially the doctrine of Mary and Purgatory. He was again summoned to appear before Warham, archbishop of Canterbury, and John, bishop of London. They demanded he subscribe to certain articles of faith, which it seems he agreed to, perhaps because they did not violate his own faith. He escaped his persecutors again. (Some believe he compromised with papal doctrine here or explained them away in some way).

Increasingly Latimer drew crowds with his sermons. Surprisingly, partly due to the influence of friends in high places, he became bishop of Worcester in 1535. He continued for many years to do his duty even at times before the king. Privately he spoke prophetically of difficult times to come under another reign in England.

In 1539, he opposed Henry VIII's 'Six Articles', with the result that he was forced to resign his bishopric. But when King Henry's son (Edward VI) reigned, Latimer was restored to his ministry, as the English churches moved more in favour of the Reformation doctrines. Latimer became the king's court preacher.

'Bloody Mary'

However, when Edward VI was removed from the throne and Queen Mary succeeded, England fell into the grip of Roman Catholic power. Mary quickly

set about to repeal any Protestant laws made. Mary became known as ‘Bloody Mary’ because of the hundreds of Christian later slaughtered and burned under her reign for refusing to accept the Roman doctrines. She terrorised Protestants, murdering as many as she could. Her soldiers would spill the person’s blood, then take their Bibles and dip it deep into the blood. A few of those Bibles have been preserved and are known as ‘Mary’s’ Bibles’. (Scientists have confirmed that the dark stains on the pages are human blood).

Bishop Ridley and Latimer immediately became marked men. Ridley was first sent to the Tower of London, but later confined to the common prison of Bocardo, along with Latimer and a third, archbishop Cranmer. In 1554 Ridley was separated from the comfort of his friends and placed in a house until his martyrdom.

Ridley wrote many letters while imprisoned which clearly show his mental resolve and that he might follow those who had already been martyred. He continued to refute his enemies and the ‘abomination’ of the Popery. He also exposed the lukewarmness of the clergy.

When Mary came to the throne Latimer was brought before the Council, where he endured the mocks and insults by Roman Catholics who hated what he believed and the effect he had on the populace.

While in the Tower of London Catholic commissioners Bonner and Gardiner ‘examined’ all three men - Latimer, Ridley and Cranmer. Latimer argued strongly that the doctrines of the ‘Mass’, Transubstantiation’ (the change of the bread and wine into the *real* body and blood of the Lord) were unscriptural. Latimer finally added, *‘I thank God most heartily that He hath prolonged my life to this end, that I may in this case glorify God by that kind of death’*.

All three men were later transported to Oxford.

Ridley, on the night before execution, had himself shaved and called his supper a ‘marriage feast’.

The Execution

On 16th October 1555 they were taken to the place of death on the northside of the town, opposite Baliol College. On that day they prayed together earnestly.

Dr. Ridley was dressed in a black furred gown. Latimer wore a long shroud which hung down to his feet. Ridley, as he passed Bocardo, looked up to see Cranmer, but Cranmer was engaged in a debate with a nearby friar.

When they came to the stake, Ridley embraced Latimer strongly, and said: *‘Be of good heart, brother, for God will either assuage the fury of the flame, or else strengthen us to abide it’*. He knelt by the stake, and after praying together fervently, they had a short private conversation. A Dr. Smith then preached a short sermon against the martyrs, who would have answered him, but were prevented by another Dr. Marshal, the vice-chancellor. Ridley took off his gown and tippet and gave them to his brother-in-law, Mr. Shipside. He also gave away many other ornaments to his grieving friends.

Continued over >

The two men then had iron chains placed around their waists. Ridley asked for his to be fastened secure. A brother tied a bag of gunpowder about his neck and gave some to Latimer also.

Ridley then requested a Lord Williams to advocate with the Queen the cause of some poor people he knew that they would be granted leases.



www.alamy.com - FF9FXR

thee even unto death...' Ridley appeared to suffer longer and more painfully because of the executioners poor handling of the lighting of the fires beneath him.

Gardiner's End

One of the Roman Bishops who had interrogated and had Ridley and Latimer sentenced was Bishop Gardiner, the Winchester high Lord Chancellor of England, who was well known as a cruel persecutor of Protestants. He was responsible for many protestants being imprisoned and martyred for 'blasphemy'.

On the very day that Ridley and Latimer were burned Gardiner later sat down with a joyful heart to dinner. He had only taken a few mouthfuls when he became acutely ill and was carried to his bed. He survived 15 days in torment before death.

Lest We Forget

Today a single plaque stands at the spot in Smithfield, England, where hundreds of Protestants were slaughtered in the reign of Mary. Few today even care to investigate the history of the Roman church in its bloody endeavours to entrench its faith - it is like no other religion in history for the sheer numbers it has martyred. In the dark ages of religious history, 100 million men woman and children lost their lives as martyrs for Jesus at the hands of the Vatican.

Lest we forget the great sacrifice men like Ridley and Latimer endured so that we could have a free Bible and the message of free grace.

Terry Arnold

Your Comments and Questions

(Views expressed here are not necessarily those of the editor)

Dear Terry, I am being given copies of the 'Herald of Hope'...I am enclosing an article which reminds me of Dave Hunt's teaching. Can you look at this...

(G.S., Qld)

Editor's reply:

The article sent from *Herald of Hope* (*HofH*, June 2016) is one of many articles by Editor John Ecob and a Vince Wall, refuting 'Calvinism'. Although we do not claim the term 'Calvinists' for ourselves, in 2015 we were shown a series of articles on the same subject and were dismayed at the errors and lack of scholarship. We attempted to show Vince Wall he had serious misrepresentations and historical errors in this issue. (See *Diakrisis* 2015 May/June and then letters from readers received on that in July/August).

The *HofH* has a history of errors on this topic. In *Diakrisis* Jan/Feb 2007 we refuted an article '*Who are the Elect*' where the history of the Synod of Dort (1618) was *reversed* by stating that '*Arminianism was a reaction to Calvinism*'. The opposite occurred. The 5 points of the Synod of Dort were actually a *refutation* to the *5 points of Arminianism*. And John Calvin had been dead for nearly 50 years! We tried to privately correct editor John Ecob on several points - but in a terse reply he dismissed us as '*Reformed*'. Ecob also stated '*Unsaved man can do good works but these obtain no merit for salvation*' - which flatly contradicts many scriptures (eg. Is.64:6).

In 2015 more *HofH* articles appeared by Vince Wall. In Dec/2015 he claimed: '*The Synod of Dort affirmed five basic tenets of Calvinism which is known as TULIP: 1. Total Depravity 2. Unconditional election 3. Limited Atonement 4. Irrresistible Grace 5. Perseverance of the Saints'.*

What readers were not told is '*TULIP*' was not invented until the 20th century, 300 years after the Synod of Dort and 350 years after Calvin's death! We challenged him on this. He replied: '*Make sure you have your facts right when accusing others of error...A little research into TULIP will show you it is not as recent as the 20th Century as you claim. Spurgeon had TULIP preached at the inaugural ceremonies of the Tabernacle in London, 1861)...The preachers...Total Depravity by Evan Probert; Unconditional Election by John Bloomfield; Limited Atonement by Spurgeon; Irresistible Grace by James Smith; Perseverance of the Saints by William O'Neil*'.

We replied: '*Spurgeon did NOT preach TULIP in the 'inaugural ceremonies in the Tabernacle'! (April 1861). The internet sites might add 'TULIP'...But you obviously have not read the sermons. The points preached by Spurgeon and his co-preachers were: Message 1 'Election' by John Bloomfield (It was NOT titled Unconditional Election); Message 2. 'Human depravity' by Evan Probert (It was NOT titled 'Total Depravity'); Message 3. 'Particular Redemption' by Spurgeon (It was NOT titled 'Limited Atonement');*

Message 4. 'Effectual Calling' by James Smith (It was NOT titled 'Irresistible Grace'); Message 5. 'The final perseverance of believers in Christ Jesus' by William O'Neill. Spurgeon never used or heard of a 'TULIP'. TULIP was not invented until nearly 300 years after Dort!...There is in fact not a single reference to TULIP until the 20th Century...Do you now acknowledge this error regarding TULIP and its history?...Are you prepared to look at this seriously and represent historic 'Calvinism' correctly...'

The reply was again disappointing: *'None of my articles set a date whatsoever for TULIP if you read them. Apologies: Spurgeon had the Doctrines of Grace preached which (spurgeon.org) preface with the doctrines of TULIP as Spurgeon wanted other pastors to expand the doctrines of Calvinism'*.

In the same series of articles Wall linked the 'Tulip' 5 points with Calvin and Augustine and then stated that 'Calvinism' was *'rooted in Catholicism'*. However, none of these had any '5 points' and never heard of 'TULIP'. It was actually Arminius who originally came up with '5 points' which the Synod of Dort (1608) refuted with their own 5 points - and those 5 points were NOT 'TULIP'! And Catholicism is decidedly Arminian - it rejects sovereign election, predestination and the final 'perseverance of the saints'.

There were also other errors in confusing historic 'Calvinism' with hyper-Calvinism. Wall stated: *'Calvinism unashamedly teaches that all the damned go to the Lake of Fire because God did not elect them to go to Heaven'...**'God indiscriminately favours the elect whilst hating the non-elect even before they are born'*. Wall and the HofH know (and have previously been refuted) that this is not historic 'Calvinism' but 'hyper-Calvinism'.

It gets worse. Wall says: *'If we adopt the Calvinist view...then the Gospel message must entirely change...that's...another gospel'*. We then (in 2015) challenged Vince Wall to examine our Gospel and find fault in any part! Our book *'Eternal Questions'* clearly sets out the same Gospel as the 'Calvinists' of old. Did Spurgeon and the great divines preach *'another gospel'*?

In this new 2016 article now sent to us - again, Vince Wall has *knowingly* repeated the errors. He also denies orthodox predestination, stating it is only a predestination *'to glorification'*. He says *'nowhere does predestination apply to the unsaved'*. This is a strawman. Predestination in scripture is never about the unsaved and most 'Calvinists' do not apply it as such. Wall also denies there is any issue of election in Romans 9 with a convoluted eisegesis of 'nations' and 'foreknowledge'. He says 2Thess.2:13 *'God has from the beginning chosen you to salvation'* is not about election, predestination or salvation but 'glorification' at the 'rapture'! Then he claims 'Calvinism' will make you *lose your faith*. If that is so then what do we make of almost all the historic church leaders, reformers, puritans, martyrs who would all be today be classified as 'Calvinists'?

Here now is a most important and last point: *This is nothing short of literary dishonesty*. It is also false teaching and failure to correct errors! We continue to abhor the *dishonesty* and the *misrepresentation* of these doctrines that Spurgeon and others vigorously taught.

Your Comments and Questions

(Views expressed here are not necessarily those of the editor)

Hello Brother Terry, below is a link to a message on healing from a healing evangelist called Bosworth. It teaches ALL SICKNESS should be healed.

(A.H., NSW)

Editor's comment:

I have not read the book but from memory Bosworth is in the long line of faith healers in the early Pentecostal movement. He is lesser known than some of the others but of the same brush. The book I am told appears to be sound for about half of it until he begins to teach all the reasons why people do *not* get healed - the excuse is usually 'sin'. This to me is a cop out and a lack of understanding of the GIFT of healing as it was in the first century. That gift had NO failures at all - none by Jesus, none by the apostles. Simply put, Bosworth did not have that gift as it was in the first century - and that is the only way to have the gift - no failures; full healing done at will; and healing '*all manner of diseases*' as the scriptures teach. That would include things like Downs Syndrome. Try bringing the modern faith healers to these people and they will retreat! Their 'healings' are always done in 'church' or healing meetings and then they leave town. We had a recent one come to our town, hosted by the local Assembly of God. A Deon Hockey claimed to have healed people of deafness, paralysis and stage 4 brain tumour and given new bones to people. (He has a video of a lady standing in a meeting claiming healing from her stage 4 brain tumour. But how would anyone really know this at the time?). We spent many early years forensically and medically investigating many claims by such people and did not find one single documented healing miracle. Most were in fact stories handed down, some outright fraud, many misdiagnosed. Yet pastors never wanted to check. But ask these healers to come with you to the hospital, to the cancer wards; ask them to have a doctor check their stories of healings and watch the retreat. These healers are charlatans, counterfeits of the real apostolic gift.

Peter explicitly stated it was not any power he had or holiness, including confession of sins, to heal the man he did heal. While confession of sins is a command, it has nothing to do with getting divine healing. Many people Jesus healed had sin. The Centurion's servant, who was probably not a Jew, got healed. Jesus never told anyone to repent, go reconcile or be reconciled, forgive, get right with God, confess their sins, do penance, make restitution, pray some more, go help others, read the Bible or any other thing to get healed. Jesus never said that He could not heal until you stopped sinning. Yet this book apparently says all this and more. It's false teaching which takes away from true evangelism, salvation and *the true Gospel!*

If you look on our website and go to the healing section there are a few articles there on 'healing' which cover these aspects Bosworth taught.

Your Comments and Questions

(Views expressed here are not necessarily those of the editor)

The KJV and 'Inspiration'?

[The following excerpts from a series of e-mails. Editor's replies in bold, brackets] Terry...I know what the KJV is based on and believe in it's inspiration...The Spirit translated the Greek into English [The KJV is not 'inspired'! It is a *translation* done by men who themselves stated it was not inspired and could be improved. The originals cannot be improved - those were 'inspired'. The 'Spirit' does not 'translate' Greek into English! This is dangerous teaching. The Spirit has already 'Breathed out' ('inspired') it in *original* languages...Humans (not the 'Spirit') *translated*. I agree the KJV is accurate but it is not 'inspired' text...Do you accept this correction?]

...The original texts are clearly and absolutely inspired. However, the whole world does not speak those languages, as even Pentecost demonstrates, there was a need of supernatural assistance to hear the wonderful works of God for those that spoke other tongues (languages). [That was inspired and written down as inspired in the original texts; but then translated].

If inspiration has no part in translation then the best translation is the most scholarly - i.e. the person that understands the original and the target languages the most would produce the most accurate translation...I am sure that this is incorrect...because without true understanding of the Word [they] may not make the correct decisions...where an illuminated understanding of the meaning is also required to help pick the right word or phraseology.

[Now you are confusing *Inspiration* with *Illumination*. There is no more Divine Inspiration. There is still Illumination. Inspiration did not happen after the 'holy men of God' wrote down the words for the Bible. God is not adding any more inspiration since. Illumination continues from the indwelling Holy Spirit but NOT inspiration. Inspiration is from man to paper - man wrote what God wanted written; illumination is from paper to heart - man receives what God has written. You have confused the two. The translators were NOT '*holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*' (2Pet.1:21)! *The translators were not under inspiration*. The KJV translators themselves stated as much!...]

...When I say the KJV is an inspired translation...What I mean is that the Spirit must guide any translator to illuminate and preserve the meaning of the original in the other language. [This is not inspiration! Inspiration is 'God breathed' - (a unique Greek word '*theópneustos*' only in 2Tim.3:16). It is an extreme position to say a translation is inspired...and confuse it with illumination?]

...All translations that are done by those that are not saved, irrespective of their scholarly knowledge are to me flawed. [All translations whether done by saved or unsaved are somewhat 'flawed'...It is human translation, not inspired original text...Translators in the same room will not likely come up with exactly the same translation even over one passage. The KJV translators

had several ‘companies’ and ‘revisions’ between groups before a final translation...University *unsaved* scholars could also translate ‘accurately’]

...Then there is the other end...people claim to discern the meaning and ignore word for word translation, equivalency are open to flaws...despite being born again. [Now you are saying there are ‘errors’ in translations done by saved people? If so, then where is your ‘inspiration’? There are NO ‘flaws’ in God’s inspiration! And which KJV is ‘inspired’ - the 1611 or the 1769?] The KJV...had God’s hand in both it’s accuracy and in preserving it. [Agreed. But you now confuse ‘preservation’ with ‘Inspiration’. Do not attribute Inspiration to men when it be given to God in what he originally gave ‘holy men as they were moved...’ The KJV translators themselves rejected this!]

Now I’m not a KJV only person - I do refer to other translations...more as commentaries and...tools that allow me to compare the original text with the KJV. [Why ‘compare’ other versions if the KJV is ‘inspired’?! Do you see the contradiction here? Inspiration is 100% accurate, sufficient and leads directly to inerrancy. If the KJV English is inspired then...why do you use other versions? And then why bother with any ‘original text’?]

*For you to state the KJV is ‘not inspired’ to me creates a significant doubt...in that what can we trust...if God does not preserve and reliably translate his word into other languages? This error to me is even more serious than me saying KJV is inspired! [I actually have a high view of the KJV and have defended it in battles over the years!...To say I cast doubt on the reliability and preservation is simply untrue...I simply understand inspiration but also how accurate this KJV really is! He has *preserved* the originals in faithful copies with evidence of exactness like no other manuscripts on earth. We have an article on our website ‘The Battle For the Bible’ which shows the arguments for the accuracy, preservation of the Bible and majority texts (which KJV represent). That article shows a high view of the manuscripts which KJV came from. What ‘error’ would there be in this?]*

*...The KJV is not inspired in the same way the original texts are inspired. Yours is a highly defined, limited, strictly intellectual ‘theological’ sense of inspiration (God Breathed as you explain)...the Spirit has a hand and plays a part in translation in preserving God’s word. The KJV to me is reliable for the following reasons... [The editor agreed with *all* these reasons]*

*You call it illumination...in a set of intellectual definitions. My apologies for using the wrong term...Most believers wouldn’t understand the distinction you made in stating translations aren’t inspired [If explained I think they will?]...You cast doubt on the ability of God to preserve his word in translation...[On the contrary, I have written at length *FOR God’s preservation of his word!*] How could any believer ever know the difference without learning Hebrew and Greek?...who determines the right meaning from our limited understanding? [You don’t need to know ‘Hebrew/Greek’. Get an interlinear (KJV) and use the many ‘tools’ available and *STUDY!*]*

I am not against study or tools, but much was impossible...until centuries later. Saints relied upon...illumination and preservation of the Spirit in the

translation...not upon understanding of translation or original texts. So while we are privileged to have more capability now, we don't need to rely upon it...

[Hundreds of years ago they did not have the Bible to the common people who were largely illiterate. Then later mostly one version. Today this is not the case. We have education, much literacy. The two eras are so different. But had the people had the tools in earlier years the Spurgeons, etc would have recommended they use them! Again, you do not need to know Greek. If people studied their Bibles they would be far more educated in scripture and doctrine! I also have never said we 'need to rely on it' (tools). I previously have said 'Bible teachers' would know and use the tools to great advantage]

...Perhaps you are relying too much upon such intellect and scholarship here, rather than the illumination of the Spirit?

[Every time I study the Word I sense illumination by the Spirit. And why is 'intellect' and 'scholarship' so bad? (as you have attacked in now several e-mails). The authors of your KJV Bible were great intellects and scholars, of which I would not even hold a candle to...Jonathan Edwards was one of the greatest intellects of all time, some say on a par with Einstein! God blessed him and used him in great revivals!...

The correction on Inspiration stands and I await to see you will not waver on this but outright state the originals only are Inspired; the KJV translators were not under inspiration; the translation is not inspired or perfect, despite it being a doctrinally exacting, accurate, preserved, faithful, consistent to the originals, the majority manuscripts...]

[Last e-mail] I accept your correction on inspiration. [I] hadn't accounted for the differences between translations and the original text. 'Not inspired in the same way' was my admission the Spirit has a role in preservation and illumination in translation, rather than inspiration...I did not understand the distinction. I did state the Spirit translated the Greek to English, which I acknowledge is error re inspiration - what I meant behind that was the Spirit did have part in the translation in illumination and preservation...You are also offended by references to 'intellectual', let me also apologise for that as well...

Dear Terry, Thank you for the ministry and labour of teaching, encouragement and calling-to-discernment. You are a blessing to my family and indirectly the Church we attend...Our retiree-pastor...This is a problem for our limited congregation, as [our ministers] have been unpaid - apart from incidental expenses. This has allowed giving to a score of gospel ministries - but never enough to support even a part-time pastor....

The elderly congregants want faithful preaching of the word to continue. ...Very few churches have remained faithful to keeping the cross and call to sanctification...Ideally we'd like a retired (Baptist?) Minister who has a passion to preach, rather than 'pastor'. We have been persevering in prayer that God would bring 'the right person...that the witness - and teaching - should continue.

(M.W., NSW)

Your Comments and Questions

(Views expressed here are not necessarily those of the editor)

Terry, I got this off the Net concerning Seventh Day Adventism (SDA): 'What did Ellen White believe regarding the Godhead? Ellen White never used the term 'trinity', although she did refer to the 'three living persons of the heavenly trio' (Evangelism, P.615). She believed in the full deity of Christ, stating that 'Christ was God essentially, and in the highest sense. He was with God from all eternity, God over all, blessed forevermore' (Review and Herald, April 5, 1906). She referred to the Holy Spirit as 'the Third Person of the Godhead' (Desire of Ages, P.671). Her comments in 'Evangelism' (P.613-617) suggest she believed the Scriptures taught the existence of three co-eternal divine persons.

Did Ellen White believe the Holy Spirit is a divine person? Yes, but at times she used the pronoun 'it' when referring to the Holy Spirit. Several statements regarding the personality of the Holy Spirit are collected in 'Evangelism' (P.616, 617). In 1906 she wrote, 'The Holy Spirit has a personality, else He could not bear witness to our spirits and with our spirits that we are the children of God. He must also be a divine person, else He could not search out the secrets which lie hidden in the mind of God. 'For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God' (1Cor.2:11) ('Evangelism', P.617)...See also the PDF document: 'Ellen White's Trinitarian Statements: What Did She Actually Write?' (G.J., Qld)

Editor's Comment:

Many are fooled by SDA teaching (many websites do not tell you they are SDA). The SDA's do NOT believe in the *full* deity of Jesus when they have him as the archangel Michael (eg. '*Patriarchs and Prophets*', Ellen G. White, P.761). It's what they don't tell you and what is *added* to major doctrines. They will say they are saved by Grace alone if asked. But it's the wrong question. How do they *keep* that grace is a better question? They are, by teaching and practise saved by keeping the law, which is the Galation heresy.

The problem first is also with Ellen G White and her prophecies - which many are clearly false. She also plagiarised (stole) much of her works from other authors and then stated they were her own and in some instances 'from God' as prophecy. The book '*The White Lie*' is worthwhile reading which documents hundreds of pages of copying from other authors, in many cases word for word. This ministry also has articles on our website concerning the false prophecies and teachings of Ellen G. White and Adventism.

The roots of the movement are steeped in false prophecies of the second coming (William Miller) and then Ellen G. White's false prophecies and forgeries. From there you can trace a salvation subtly disguised and confused with law and works. But it's not what they say, but what they don't say, and what is subtly *added* to the true Gospel of grace.

Your Comments and Questions

(Views expressed here are not necessarily those of the editor)

Terry, I have so appreciated the articles in Diakrisis and your Biblical wisdom during our phone calls in the past. I pray God will continue to give yourself and other contributors, discernment in both the Scriptures and the events happening in this present world scene. Continue to fight the good fight.

*Yours in Christ,
(L.D., Qld.)*

Dearest Terry, Latest Diakrisis- brilliant. Love and prayers as you continue to ‘..earnestly contend for the faith...’ - Jude vs.3. Blessings always.

(K.L., Brisbane)

Request E-mail Version of *Diakrisis*

If you are currently on hardcopy (mail delivery) for this newsletter you may like to consider receiving it by e-mail. If so, please advise us by e-mail. This will assist us in distribution and costs. The e-mail newsletter is distributed earlier (up to 1 week) before the hardcopy. A link to download Acrobat Reader is provided. You can print the newsletter in the same booklet format as the previously mailed version.

Subscription Form

I am interested in receiving the *free* monthly
TA Ministries newsletter ‘*Diakrisis*’ by
hardcopy - by *e-mail* - (tick boxes)

Send this form to:
TA Ministries
PO Box 1499,
Hervey Bay, Qld, 4655, Australia

Name-----Address-----

E-mail-----Phone-----

Signed-----Date-----

I enclose \$----- as a donation for costs and postage.

For transfer deposits: National Bank, Hervey Bay, BSB 084 705 Account No. 02737 1856