

## Why Fundamentalist Protestants are Wrong on Dispensationalism and the OT Law

By Steve Ray

Dear Jerry:

I haven't heard from you in quite some time and I was thinking that it's my turn to take you out to lunch since you paid the bill at Zingerman's last time. Things are going very well for us and I hope they are for you as well. We are involved with two families who are coming back to the Church, one from Temple Baptist (where two other families are carrying on serious discussions with us) and another family that has been hopping around various Evangelical churches.

I also met a guy in Illinois, a graduate of Trinity Evangelical Seminary in Deerfield, Illinois, that just converted to the Church. He had an article in *This Rock* magazine entitled *Breathing Catholic Air*. Do you remember reading it several months ago? We correspond over CompuServe and he is spending the night with our family on Wednesday. I am amazed and delighted at the flood of people into the Church, with a good percentage of them being ex-Evangelicals.

There were a few things I would like to ask you. First, have you had an opportunity to read *Early Christian Writings*? And did you get the multi-volume set on Church history by Philip Schaff? I also have Schaff's three volume set *The Creeds of Christendom*. It starts with the various creeds employed by the early Church and contained in the New Testament and then includes all the creeds all the way up to and through the Reformation. Very helpful work. I haven't finished reading *There Really Is A Difference* but when I do I will get it back to you with a short critique, if I have time. If I can't finish it soon, I will get it back to you and buy my own copy.

I ran across a curious verse the other day when I was looking up some information on the charismatic gifts Christ gave the Church. By the way, do you believe in the gifts? If I remember right, when we went to Calvary Baptist (where you go now) they did not. They thought the verse in 1 Corinthians 13:10, "But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away," referred to the passing away of the charisms when the New Testament was canonized. If this was the best argument against the continuation of the spiritual gifts that could be retrieved from Scripture, I always thought it was a rather weak argument (Endnote 1). I don't see anywhere where Scripture says the spiritual gifts (Rom. 12; 1 Cor. 12, 14; Eph. 4) would be discontinued or self-retiring. It amazes me still that Fundamentalist love to claim the biblical high ground by claiming to be the "literalists" and yet they pass over major portions of Paul's epistles, the word of God, and act as though the verses are either irrelevant or no longer the word of God.

You may find it interesting that the charisms are very evident in the Church after the apostles, since the apostles left no word that the gifts would cease. Tertullian (c 160–c. 225) encourages the new converts into the Church to "ask the Father, ask the Lord, for the special gift of his inheritance, the distribution of the charisms." (Irenaeus [c. 130–200

AD], Disciple of Polycarp) (Endnote 2) says it would “be impossible to enumerate the charisms throughout the world the church has received from God.” (*Against Heresies* 2:32, 4). Origen also speaks “the rain . . . of the divine charisms.” (*Commentary on the Psalms* 64:11). It is quite evident from the history of the early Church that the spiritual gifts remained. I find it curious that the Fundamentalists disregard them, dismissing (or even rejecting) the gifts and provisions of the Holy Spirit.

However, that is not what I was going to ask you about. While I was doing some reading on this topic, I came across a verse in 1 Corinthians 14:34 that made me think of you. It says this: “Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law.” I thought this was a strange verse in light of your Dispensational tradition. Do you know when the Dispensational view came into vogue? It was actually the result of a charismatic meeting in Scotland, which I will discuss later. *The New Dictionary of Theology*, edited by Furgeson, Wright and J. I. Packer (IL: Intervarsity Press, 1978, pg.200–201) says, “The systematization of modern Dispensational Theology owes much to J. N. Darby and the *Scofield Reference Bible*.” Notice that the word systematization is just a fancy word for doctrinal development. This is a new doctrine, not found in the Church, not even in the early Church. It is a newly invented doctrine of the nineteenth century. It came into being simultaneously with the invention of the doctrine of the Rapture (Endnote 3).

I found it intriguing that even Renald Showers (the Protestant author, whose book you loaned me) admits in the section *The History of Dispensational Theology* (page 27) that, “Dispensational Theology did not exist as a developed system of thought in the early Church . . . the Church leaders did not develop these recognized principles into a system of thought. They were not Dispensational Theologians. The first person on record to develop a genuine dispensational scheme in a systematic fashion was the French philosopher Pierre Poiret (1646–1719).” Jerry, what did the early Church and all Christians (including the apostles) believe all these years? Why did those with the apostles and in the generations following never discover this theology? Why did God hide it from His people for 1600 years?

On page 28 Showers continues to trace the doctrinal development through the last few centuries. He includes J. N. Darby of the Darbyites, but neglects to mention Margaret Macdonald and her private charismatic revelation in Port Glasgow, Scotland in 1830. Usually Protestants consider doctrinal development to be a “Catholic practice,” the practice of adding man-made doctrine to the pure word of God that is easily self-interpreted and needing no development. But here we have a wonderful example of Protestant doctrinal invention: Dispensationalism and the Rapture.

Even within your own ranks there is much confusion on the overall scheme of the dispensations and in defining the Dispensational periods and interpretations. According to the same dictionary of theology I quoted earlier, “The most extreme view is that of E. W. Bullinger (1837 - 1913) who commenced the church age with the ministry of Paul after Acts 28:28, held that Paul’s prison epistles are the only Scriptures addressed primarily to the church, and denied that water baptism and the Lord’s Supper are for this

age.” It seems no one can agree on the end of this age, nor exactly how it will end. It is only the Catholic Church that has had a consistent, biblical and solid theology on these things. It has carried on the teachings of the apostles. I am more impressed each day as I study the Scriptures and the teachings of the Church.

But back to 1 Corinthians 14:34. If the law is discontinued and abolished: moral, legal, ceremonial, etc. as you contend, why does Paul, the great emancipator from the Law, bring it up here in reference to Church government? Please note that the Greek article is used in this clause making it the articular construction (Endnote 4). Therefore, he is using a technical term referring to the Law. Paul appeals to the Law in an absolute way as binding on Christian behavior. He appeals to the law again in 9:8 and 14:21. He is appealing to the Law as an authority, not as a corpse from a bygone era. For a man who is no longer concerned with such matters, this is strange behavior. Harry Ironside doesn't touch this phrase in his commentary on 1 Corinthians, and I don't blame him. You must dismiss this passage (a blip verse) to adhere to the strict Dispensationalists position. Of course, anyone can dismiss one verse if it is outweighed by others. I know. I used to do it. Now as a Catholic, I don't have to reason against Scripture like I did in my Fundamentalist past.

Your book *There Really Is A Difference* (Endnote 5) states that “. . . Christians today are not under any aspect of the Mosaic Law, even the moral aspect. It should be noted that the Mosaic had three aspects (civil, ceremonial, and moral), it functioned as an indivisible unit . . . If a person is under the moral aspect of the Law, he is required to keep all the civil and ceremonial regulations as well.” Why does Paul repeatedly appeal to the Law (even when writing to Gentiles) regarding the silence of women? If you read Romans 2 carefully, you will see that Renald is incorrect in his assumptions. Paul is referring to the Law for those who are not Jews, who, though they don't have the written Law, do have the Law written on their hearts. Paul is not including the ceremonial or civil aspects here, is he?

The moral Law reflects the holy character of God and is eternal, (Endnote 6) binding on all humans, in all periods of time. The moral Law is not dispensationally discardable for it is the reflection of God's character written on stone and on the heart. It is transferred from the stone tablets and placed in our hearts:

Ezekiel 36:25 “Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you.

26 A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh.

27 And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.”

The moral aspect of the Law is a reflection of this holiness, and the other aspects (civil and ceremonial) enforced the moral law until Christ came. Now Christ has come and we no longer need the civil and ceremonial aspects of the Law to enforce it, we have the

Spirit of Christ who enables us to obey the law, obey it in a more perfect and spiritual manner. We have new wine in a new wineskin. This is the heart of the “Christian dispensation” which has been understood from the apostles and down through the centuries to be the New Covenant.

The writer of Hebrews understands this as well. Hebrews 10:16 “This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them.” Notice the covenant that will be made. The Law will not just be on tablets of stone, they will be written in our hearts so we can obey them by the Spirit. Here in the “new dispensation” we see words used like covenant and laws as though they mean something for the Christian.

In the same vein I would ask you about an episode in the Apostle Paul’s life that may have eluded you. As the champion of grace (which he certainly was) and the “abolisher of the law,” (Endnote 7) this incident is very curious and I would like to know what you think of it. I am not advocating we imitate him, I am simply asking what you think of this incident What is your judgement? It is recorded in Acts and I will cite the passages in total for your convenience.

Acts 18:18 “And Paul after this tarried there yet a good while, and then took his leave of the brethren, and sailed thence into Syria, and with him Priscilla and Aquila; having shorn his head in Cenchrea: for he had a vow.” Paul then travels through Asia and on to Jerusalem where the incident continues.

Acts 21:23, 24, 25 “Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; Them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law. Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until that an offering should be offered for every one of them.”

Here we see Paul joining, actually encouraging, four other men who were under a vow. The reason being to show the inhabitants of Jerusalem that he “keepest the law.” Now why did Paul do this? Some may say that Paul was just persuaded to take this action out of fear, or out of a desire to “be all things to all men” in order to win them to Christ. But we see it was not the men in chapter 21 who convinced Paul to perform a purification ceremony of the law, he had actually done this on his own as we see in Acts 18:18. He had already taken the vow weeks or months previously.

Do you know where the Law speaks of this ceremonial vow which Paul practiced by shaving his head? It is in the Law of Moses, recorded in Numbers 6. It states,

1 And the **LORD spoke unto Moses**, saying,

2 Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When either man or woman shall **separate themselves to vow a vow of a Nazarite**, to separate themselves unto the LORD:

3 He shall separate himself from wine and strong drink, and shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink, neither shall he drink any liquor of grapes, nor eat moist grapes, or dried.

4 All the days of his separation shall he eat nothing that is made of the vine tree, from the kernels even to the husk

5 All the days of the vow of his separation there shall **no razor come upon his head**: until the days be fulfilled, in the which he separateth himself unto the LORD, he shall be holy, and shall let the locks of the hair of his head grow.

13 And this is the **law of the Nazarite**, when the days of his separation are fulfilled: he shall be brought unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation:

14 And he shall offer his **offering unto the LORD, one male lamb** of the first year without blemish for a burnt offering, and one ewe lamb of the first year without blemish for a sin offering, and one ram without blemish for peace offerings,

15 And a basket of unleavened bread, cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, and wafers of unleavened bread anointed with oil, and their meat offering, and their drink offerings.

16 And the priest shall bring them before the LORD, and shall offer his sin offering, and his burnt offering:

17 And he shall offer the ram for a sacrifice of peace offerings unto the LORD, with the basket of unleavened bread: the priest shall offer also his meat offering, and his drink offering.

18 And **the Nazarite shall shave the head** of his separation at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shall take the hair of the head of his separation, and put it in the fire which is under the sacrifice of the peace offerings.

19 And the priest shall take the sodden shoulder of the ram, and one unleavened cake out of the basket, and one unleavened wafer, and shall put them upon the hands of the Nazarite, after the hair of his separation is shaven:

20 And the priest shall wave them for a wave offering before the LORD: this is holy for the priest, with the wave breast and heave shoulder: and after that the Nazarite may drink wine.

21 This is the law of the Nazarite who hath vowed, and of his offering unto the LORD for his separation, beside that his hand shall get: according to **the vow which he vowed**, so he must do after the law of his separation” (Bold added for emphasis).

Isn't this an intriguing passage from the word of God? If the Bible scholars are correct, by the time this event in Paul's life took place, the book of Galatians had already been written, and he writing the book of Romans while on his journey back to Jerusalem, very possibly during the very period of his Nazaritic vow.

So here we have Paul, with the letter to the Galatians behind him, taking a vow, and while in the midst of his Mosaic Nazarite vow, he is writing the book of Romans. He shaves his head and burns the hair and presents an animal sacrifice which is waved before God by the Jewish priest to complete his Mosaic vow and his purification. I am not trying to make any particular point here. I am mostly concerned with how a Dispensationalist explains this without saying Paul made a mistake or violated his own writings while he was writing them. He was sure setting a bad example for the early Christians whom he was trying to free from the last vestiges of the Law. Why does Paul appeal to it, and partake in it, if it is passe? Please let me know what you think of all this.

Another passage which seems to show Paul's confusion with the Law or at least confusion from the invented Dispensationalist view of it is Ephesians 6:1 2 where Paul again seems to imply a need to obey the Law. He even reiterates that there is a reward for obeying the Law, promised by the very Law that is supposedly from a bygone era. The verses say, “Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honor thy father and mother; (which is the first commandment with promise;) That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.” Now why would Paul want to draw the family's attention, especially that of the children, to the Law, telling them they can receive the promise that the Law offers for obedience to the fourth commandment of Moses? Paul seems to be contradicting his own theology, unless of course it is just the Fundamentalist tradition that makes it appear so. The Church that understands the covenants of God has no problem with any of these verses.

Remember the letter I sent several months ago about the Law and how the New Testament doesn't obliterate it, it refines and deepens it? For example, in the Old Testament we are told “Do not murder,” but in the New Testament we are told to love our neighbor? in the Old Testament we are forbidden to commit adultery, but in the New Testament we are commanded to love our wives? Paul gives us his own version of this in Romans, the very book Luther said freed us from any obligation to the Law. Here we see this same principle of obligation to the moral Law stated again,

“Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his

neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law” (Rom 13:8–10).

Do you see in this a dismissal of the Law, making it irrelevant, or do you see an expectation that we are to obey the Law on a higher level now that we have the Spirit to enable us? We are commanded to love, why? To fulfill the Law. This is very simple and I wonder sometimes why Fundamentalists always add new traditions of negation and make matters so disjointed.

Another queer passage, from the mouth of our Lord Himself, which I would like you to comment on is in Matthew 19.

And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? 17 And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. 18 He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, 19 Honor thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. 20 The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? 21 Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me. 22 But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions.”

It is recorded that Jesus watched the man walk “away sorrowfully,” and did not call him back. Now what could He have said to comfort the young man? He could have said, “Well, you really don’t have to obey the Law, you really don’t have to give everything away, you only have to believe. Get on your knees now and confess me with your mouth and you will be saved forever and enter into eternal life.” Why didn’t Jesus say this? What would you have said to the young man if you had met him in his sorrow on the road a few moments later in the day? What strange things for Jesus to say if the Law is so useless. But maybe that was during a different dispensation and Jesus didn’t take the time to tell the young man that if he would just come back in a year or two, after the death and resurrection, he could then be saved by faith alone.

Am I advocating a Gospel of works? Am I promoting a Gospel whereby we can come to God based on our own merit and good work to find His favor and salvation? You know I am not. We have spoken too many times for you to think this. Even in the Council of Trent, where the Church responded to the Reformation, the Canons Concerning Justification state the following: “If anyone says that man can be justified before God by his own works, whether done by his own natural powers or through the teaching of the law, without divine grace through Jesus Christ, let him be anathema.” (Endnote 8)

Earlier in the Sixth Session on Justification the council said, “But though He died for all, (Endnote 9) yet all do not receive the benefit of His death, but those only to whom the merit of His passion is communicated; because as truly as men would not be born unjust, it they were not born through propagation of the seed of Adam, since by that propagation

they contract through him, when they are conceived, injustice as their own, so if they were not born again in Christ, they would never be justified, since in that new birth there is bestowed upon them, through the merit of His passion, the grace by which they are made just . . . in whom we have redemption and remission of sins.” Remember you told me about your high stack of Catholic books that never once taught “the very heart of the Gospel”? I wonder if you just neglected to find out what the books actually said, or whether you just accepted all the “rags and tatters of stale slander and muddleheadedness,” as Chesterton says. Before anti-Catholics slander their brothers and sisters in Christ, it would behoove them to find out what the Church really teaches and not just blindly follow the caricatures that are so carelessly and dishonestly bandied about (Endnote 10).

I would suggest you get two new books by Bob Sungenis. One is entitled *Not by Faith Alone*. It will help you understand the Catholic teaching, something you should have learned before you abandoned the Church. Also read *Not by Scripture Alone*.

Do you have a copy of *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* from which the above quotation is lifted? Was this foundational and pivotal book within your stack? This is a book foundational to the Church’s doctrine over the last four centuries and somehow, along with the new Catechism, you seemed to have missed it. Notice also the discussion of “born again in Christ” and “new birth that is bestowed upon them by the merit of His passion.” Sure doesn’t sound like salvation by works to me; it sounds like the Gospel of Grace.

We see from Galatians that “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: 14 That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. 15 Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man’s covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.” It is not the law that saves us, but faith in Christ. This is a Catholic doctrine. Protestants are picking apples off a tree they didn’t plant. Notice also the word covenant.

The Law is not the means of earning favor with God apart from Christ. But does this mean the Law is nothing, that the moral nature of God, as revealed through the words of God in the Old Testament and the Law, is no longer the moral nature of God? That we can live free of the moral restraints that the Lord reveals in His Law? By no means. Can we live in obedience to Christ and His Law without the work of the Holy Spirit? Never! Are the “good works” from ourselves? Never! Any good works we may accomplish, are accomplished only by the Grace of God, through His Spirit. So do we get the credit for our good works? It is God who gets the glory for they are His work of grace operating in us. So why do anti-Catholics say we try to earn our salvation by our own good works? “For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of [his] good pleasure.” Philippians 2:13 We are to work out our salvation with fear and trembling, so says Paul.

Remember what Jesus said Matthew 5:17 “Think not that I am come to destroy the law,

or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.”

Jesus and Paul (not to mention James, Peter, etc.) do not attempt to render the Law null and void, they even raised the ante. I again remind you of our Lord’s words (do Dispensationalist dismiss his words in order to keep their traditions?):

Mt 5:18 “For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

19 Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

20 For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.

21 Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment:

22 But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.”

These are very strong words and I hope more people are listening. And what does John say in his first epistle, “By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous” (1 John 4:2 3). Are these commandments something other than the moral character of God as revealed in the Scriptures? Love God, Love our neighbor, love our wives, etc.? Where do we find these commands first written? The Law is the moral character of God revealed in black and white, when Jesus comes they are produced in full color.

We are just gleaning the surface, there are so many more passages we could call upon. Jerry, I am concerned for you, especially since I know you are a man of integrity, concern for truth, and a man that loves God and desires to do His will.

I pray for you and your wife daily and hope you and I can get together soon for another lunch. Give me a call, or I will call you sometime in early February.

May the grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord be with you. In the Blood of the Lamb,

Steve Ray

\*\*\*\*\*

**Endnotes:**

1. The Greek word for perfect, as used by Paul in 1 Cor. 13:10, and 17 times total in the New Testament, is teleion, and never refers to, or implies the canon of Scripture. It refers to the return of Christ and other things, but not to the canon of the New Testament.

2. I love this quotation, so I add it again in this context. **Irenaeus of Lyons** says this about himself, “For, when I was still a boy, I knew you (Florus) in lower Asia, in Polycarp’s house, when you were a man of rank in the royal hall, and endeavoring to stand well with him. I remember the events of those days more clearly than those which happened recently, for what we learn as children grow up with the soul and is united to it, so that I can speak even of the place in which the blessed Polycarp sat and disputed, how he came in and went out, the character of his life, the appearance of his body, the discourses which he made to the people, how he reported his intercourse with the Apostle John and with the others who had seen the Lord, how he remembered their words, and what were the things concerning the Lord which he had heard from them, and about their miracles, and about their teachings, and how Polycarp had received them from the eye-witnesses of the Word of Life, and reported all things in agreement with the Scriptures. I listened eagerly even then to these things through the mercy of God which was given me, and made notes of them, not on paper, but in my heart, and ever by the grace of God do I truly ruminate on them” (Eusebius *History of the Church* 5,20,5-7).

3. The word Rapture is **not** found in the Bible and comes from the Latin rapio which means “caught up.” The Pre-Trib rapture was unheard of before the 19th century when “. . . a young Scottish lassie named Margaret Macdonald had a private revelation in Port Glasgow, Scotland, in the early part of 1830 that a select group of Christians would be caught up to meet Christ in the air before the days of the Antichrist. An eye-and-ear witness, Robert Norton, M.D., preserved her handwritten account of her pre-trib rapture revelation in two of his books, and said it was the first time anyone ever split the second coming into two distinct parts or stages . . . Margaret’s views were well-known to those who visited her home, among them John Darby of the Brethren. Within a few months her distinctive prophetic outlook was mirrored in the September, 1830, issue of The Morning Watch and the early Brethren assembly at Plymouth, England. Early disciples of the pre-trib interpretation often called it a new doctrine.” John N. Darby (1800 - 1882) the founder of the Darbyites, a schism of the Plymouth Brethren, admits in a letter to a friend on July 24, 1834 (*Letters of J.N.D.*, pgs. 25-26) said in regards to Macdonald’s revelation of a pre-trib rapture, “. . . it would not be well to have it so clear, as it frightens people . . . but the thoughts are new, and people’s minds work on them, and all the old habits are against their feelings . . .” (*The Incredible Cover-up* by Dave MacPherson, student of Wheaton College; OR: Omega Publications, 1980).

According to the Protestant *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, edited by Walter A. Elwell (MI: Baker Book House; 1984, under the subject heading Rapture of the Church it

says, “It was the contribution of John Nelson Darby to eschatology that led many Christians to teach that the return of Christ would be in two stages: one for his saints at the rapture and the other with his saints to control the world . . . Darby’s ideas had a wide influence in Britain and the United States. Many evangelicals became pre-tribulationists through the preaching of the interdenominational evangelists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.”

Why do Protestants rail against “alleged” doctrinal development among Catholics, and then turn around and with no discrimination whatever, believe in a hitherto unheard of doctrine called the pre-trib rapture, which was “revealed” in a private revelation through a young Scottish girl in 1830 and developed further by J. N. Darby and the Darbyites. For those who claim this is a doctrine of the early Church, produce your evidence! Those who believe this invented doctrine have no business charging the Catholic Church with “inventing doctrines,” for to do so is to fit the proverbial “kettle calling the frying pan black.”

4. In the Greek language nouns with no articles (anarthrous construction) describe the quality of the noun; whereas nouns with articles (Articular construction) point to or identify a specific object.

5. *There Really is a Difference: A Comparison of Covenant and Dispensational Theology* by Renald Showers, (NJ: The Friends of Israel Gospel Ministry, Inc. 1990, pg. 187).

6. I would recommend A. W. Tozer’s *Knowledge of the Holy* and Frank Sheed’s *Theology and Sanity*.

7. Which we would differ on, based on Fundamentalists forcing *Romans* and *Galatians* into a Catholic vs. Protestant debate, when it was meant to be no such thing. I have included a discussion on Paul’s argument in *Romans* for your information. I may have already sent it to you in the past, and if so I am sorry for the redundancy.

8. From the Greek and it means cursed, damned, or strongly censured.

9. 2 Cor. 5:15

10. Much of what I read and hear from anti-Catholics would fall under “bearing false witness” and I think folks ought to be careful