

“Can Deacons Be Divorced?”

Please let me know what your thoughts are on the qualifications for deacons when the Bible speaks in 1 Timothy 3:12 about a husband of one wife. I know of a man that is serving as a Deacon that has been divorced 2 times and now he is married to his third wife. This has really bothered me. I have talked to a couple of people and they cannot give me answer, one of these being a minister. They say that if they go to Christ and ask for forgiveness that it is OK but I do not know what the scriptures say about being a Deacon. Thanks for your help.

I have served as an elder and as a chairman of the elders at our church and have spent a good deal of time studying the qualifications for elders and deacons. The general consensus of evangelical scholars on the phrase “husband of one wife” in both 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1 is that it means the husband of one living woman. That is, it allows for a man to serve as an elder or deacon if his wife has passed away and he has remarried. This would seem to allow for a man to serve in these church leadership positions if he has been divorced and remarried. This is where it gets tricky. Jesus seemed to allow for divorce in the case of adultery (Matthew 5:31-32) and Paul added an allowance for divorce if left by an unbelieving spouse (1 Corinthians 7:15). If a man seeking the office of elder or deacon had an unbelieving wife who left and divorced him, I would consider him eligible for office as long as he meets the other qualifications. However, if a believing wife and husband have sought divorce and the husband has remarried and is now seeking the office of elder or deacon, this would require a much deeper investigation into the circumstances. If the grounds for divorce were not biblical, then the subsequent marriages are suspect. I would not be inclined to allow such an individual to stand in church leadership because this would reflect poorly on their character and they may indeed be

married in the eyes of God to two women. Paul instructs a married woman who leaves her husband to remain unmarried unless it is to be reconciled to her husband (1 Corinthians 7: 10-11).

The question today remains when you have a remarried couple who have sought forgiveness for their sin, what then? They may be forgiven and brought fully into the fellowship of the church but that does not necessarily mean the husband is qualified for an official position of leadership in the church. Elders and deacons are held to a higher standard. If I were divorced while a believer, I would no longer consider myself eligible for official leadership in the church. I can still serve and have a ministry but not as an official elder or deacon. I believe each situation must be evaluated individually and in depth. A man who has been divorced must expect to be questioned thoroughly about the nature of the divorce and whether any sin involved has been fully repented of, if he desires to serve as an elder or deacon. Also please understand that different evangelical churches have come to different conclusions on this question.

I am not a theologian nor a pastor, but this is my opinion as I read the Scriptures and have had to deal with this question as an elder.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“Why Do the Gospel Accounts Contradict Each Other?”

I understand that if 4 people saw an accident, they would each have a different story. You said that was why Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John had slightly different accounts of the resurrection. But isn't all of the Bible inspired by God? Didn't He tell those four guys what to write? And also, some parts still seem a bit different... like inside of the tomb... how many angels were there and did they sit or stand? I know that's probably not very significant, but it still bothers me.

Yes, the four gospel writers are inspired of God and provide different but not contradictory details of the life of Jesus. Inspiration does not mean they must have identical accounts. Inspiration means they have different but not contradictory accounts. When put together, they complement nicely and fill in details the others leave out. Let's consider the example of an accident. If one witness stands to the north side of the accident, he sees the accident from his vantage point. Now the other witness stands on the south side, the opposite side of the street, he sees different details because of his angle. Now would both men have identical accounts? Of course not, the one on the south side cannot see what happens on the north side of the accident nor can the man on the north side see what happens on the south side. However, when you put the two accounts together, you get a more complete picture of the accident. Both men include different details but they should not be contradictory.

That is what we have in the gospels. The writers include *different*, but not *contradictory*, details. Inspiration does not mean the four gospels must be identical in every way. That would be quite boring to read four accounts that are exactly the same. Each writer includes details he feels are necessary for the audience he is addressing. Matthew, writing to the

Jews, must include all the Old Testament prophecies, while Mark, writing to the Greeks, does not include many prophecies but writes on the action of Jesus' life. Is that a contradiction? No, it's just that each writer included details he felt were necessary and left out others he felt would not be necessary for his audience. Alleged contradictions are explained when one studies the accounts and puts each event of Christ in its chronological order.

Matthew records one angel, Luke and John record two. The answer is this. Where there are two there must be one. Get it? There were two angels at the tomb but Matthew only writes about one in his account. Is this a contradiction? No, because where there are two, there must be at least one. Luke includes two, but Matthew only includes the one that spoke with Mary. He keyed in on that one and left the other angel out. Luke and John include the other one. We do that in our reporting. If Clinton and Gore appear on the podium but only Clinton talks and Gore says nothing, some newspapers will say "Clinton appeared and said such and such" and not mention Gore. Other papers will say, "Clinton and Gore appeared and Clinton stated ..." Is there a contradiction? No, just some reporters mentioned one person while another chose not to.

Hope this helps. Keep studying the word!

Patrick Zukeran
Probe Ministries

"Where is the REAL Eyewitness

Account of the Resurrection?"

I read your article ["Evidence that Jesus Didn't Become the Christ Till Centuries Later?"](#) You cited two or three historians but no eye-witness accounts. I wonder if you can provide me with an eye witness account of someone (e.g. Pontius Pilate) who was alive at the time of the resurrection and within five years wrote an account of that (considering people forget details and add details with time). I understand that the gospels cannot be taken as eye-witness accounts as the first one wasn't written till maybe 40 years after Jesus' death, and supposedly the original copy doesn't exist.

Along with most other conservative scholars, I actually do believe that the Gospels contain eyewitness testimony about the life, ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus. Many conservative scholars hold that the Gospel of Mark was written as early as the 50's or 60's of the first century. Furthermore, there is evidence from Mark's passion narrative that he may have relied on a source dating to within seven years of Jesus' crucifixion.

It's true that we do not have the original manuscripts of any New Testament book. However, we have copies dating to the early second century and later. Also, it's worth saying that we don't have the original manuscripts for ANY book of the ancient world (not Plato, Aristotle, Tacitus, Pliny, Josephus, etc.). The New Testament manuscripts that we do possess are both earlier and more numerous than is true for any other book of antiquity.

Finally, about a non-Christian eyewitness source dating to within five years of Jesus' death. There is none. The earliest non-Christian writings we have are probably those of Josephus, the Jewish historian, who was writing near the end of the first century.

Shalom,

Michael Gleghorn
Probe Ministries

“Can We Trust Wescott and Hort’s Work on the Greek Text?”

I have heard much of the KJV-only debate and have read Probe’s articles [“The Debate Over The King James Version”](#) and [“Which Version Of The Bible Is Most Accurate?”](#). I thought I had this issue settled in my mind until I heard Pastor Chuck Smith say that Wescott and Hort seemed to be unsaved based on comments he quoted from their writings. I need to know if the beliefs of Wescott and Hort are compatible with that of evangelical Christianity and where a “layman” can obtain source information that can be trusted and understood.

The question of Westcott and Hort’s orthodoxy has come up a few times in the past, but I haven’t pursued it. If they were the only New Testament scholars who endorsed the text which underlies the newer translations, we might have reason to hold them suspect. But they aren’t. Conservative scholarship has been behind the newer translations such as the NASB, the NIV, and the ESV (English Standard Version).

A helpful Web site which has a number of articles on the subject of textual criticism is www.skypoint.com/~waltzmn/.

Rick Wade
Probe Ministries

“Can You Recommend Good Literature on Angels?”

I was intrigued to read your website article on angels. I myself have been studying the occurrences of Angels in history and would like to know if you can recommend any literature from the Church, or recommended by the Church on such matters.

I have to admit though that I have come to the philosophy, after a bad dream/visitation by an evil, guttural sounding, disembodied voice telling me that my books would not help me, and at the time they were all references to the New Age fallacy and how to spot the lies, that we need to know more about the New Age cults so that we can not only test our own faith, but see how stupid most of these New Ager's ideas are.

I read one book that said Jesus was really a spaceman and another that Angels were Aliens, but I didn't take any notice, leading me to realise that if you want to live in a world of stories rather than in truth you will never be saved no matter who tries to help.

The other main worry that is filling my life at the moment is that the Churches are starting to follow the new age ways as well. Is this the end of popular religion as we know it?

Thanks SO much for your note.

I have to admit though that I have come to the philosophy, after a bad dream/visitation by an evil, guttural sounding, disembodied voice telling me that my books would not help me, and at the time they were all references to the new age fallacy and how to spot the lies,

Oh man!! What exceptional evidence that demons are intrinsically involved in this whole issue and behind much of the angel mania!! I'm sorry you had to go through that. I don't know if anyone has ever given you any direction on dealing with that kind of visitation, but if it ever happens again, God has given us powerful supernatural tools for fighting spiritual warfare. In case you haven't heard of this, I'll go ahead and share; if it's old news, just hit delete!
:::::smile:::::

If you have trusted Christ as your savior, you have the authority to speak to demons (out loud) and say, "The blood of Jesus protects me, and in Jesus' name you have to leave!" I personally know this is effective. God's weapons are, indeed, powerful for pulling down strongholds (2 Cor 10:4).

that we need to know more about the New Age cults so that we can not only test our own faith, but see how stupid most of these New Ager's ideas are.

Amen, and amen!!!

The other main worry that is filling my life at he moment is that the Churches are starting to follow the new age ways as well. Is this the end of popular religion as we know it?

There have always been attacks on the orthodoxy of the truth throughout the history of the church. That's why Peter was so concerned about identifying and rejecting false teachers. No, it's not the end of popular religion as we know it, because God will always preserve His church and His truth. But you're right to be concerned about the movement of some churches toward New Age garbage; for instance, churches who teach "A Course in Miracles," which was channeled by a demon!

would like to know if you can recommend any literature from the Church, or recommended by the Church on such matters.

Yes. Billy Graham's book *Angels* is a classic. Another excellent book is *Angels: Elect and Evil* by C. Fred Dickason. There may be more good ones that have come out in the past several years, but I know these two for sure.

I hope this helps, and the Lord bless you and keep you.

Sue Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“You Can't Say Edgar Cayce was a Failure as a Prophet!”

Your comment about Edgar Cayce being an “abysmal failure” as a prophet is a completely subjective view of his work. There are those who believe that the things of which Mr. Cayce spoke are true. Also, because you can not have a truth without it being believed and it having both epistemic certainty as well as facts to back it up, you can not say as a “truth” that he was a failure as a prophet. Even Nostrodamus was off in many of his predictions, yet he was accurate in what he said.

Thanks for your e-mail. Lou Whitworth, the author of the article you read about Edgar Cayce, is no longer with Probe. Please allow me to reply in his stead.

You begin by stating:

Your comment about Edgar Cayce being an “abysmal failure” as a prophet is a completely subjective view of his work. There are those who believe that the things of which Mr. Cayce spoke are true.”

Although I would probably not have chosen to use the adjective “abysmal”, the claim that Cayce was a failure as a prophet is actually not subjective. It is based on the objective authority of God’s Word in the Bible. The Bible actually sets up an objective standard for determining whether someone is, or is not, a true prophet. This standard is nothing less than 100% prophetic accuracy. In Deuteronomy 18:20-22 we read the following:

“But the prophet who shall speak a word presumptuously in My name which I have not commanded him to speak, or which he shall speak in the name of other gods, that prophet shall die. And you may say in your heart, ‘How shall we know the word which the Lord has not spoken?’ When a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord, if the thing does not come about or come true, that is the thing which the Lord has not spoken. The prophet has spoken it presumptuously; you shall not be afraid of him.”

In light of this passage, the Christian reasons as follows:

1. Edgar Cayce uttered certain prophecies, or healing remedies, that were not accurate.
2. God’s word says that a true prophet is always accurate in what he predicts.
3. Therefore, Edgar Cayce was not a true prophet of God. Biblically speaking, he was a false prophet.

This, of course, is not to deny that Edgar Cayce may have uttered some prophecies and healing remedies which were accurate. But since he also uttered some false prophecies, God’s word indicates that he was not a true prophet. The same reasoning would also apply to the prophecies of Nostradamus. As you yourself pointed out, “Nostradamus was off in many of

his predictions”.

There is another passage of Scripture which seems particularly relevant to Edgar Cayce. Remember, even Cayce at times wondered about the true source of his special powers. In Deuteronomy 13:1-4 we read the following:

“If a prophet or a dreamer of dreams arises among you and gives you a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder comes true, concerning which he spoke to you saying, ‘Let us go after other gods (whom you have not known) and let us serve them,’ you shall not listen to the words of that prophet or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God is testing you to find out if you love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. You shall follow the Lord your God and fear Him; and you shall keep His commandments, listen to His voice, serve Him, and cling to Him.”

This passage is especially interesting in light of Cayce’s own comments concerning his powers:

“The power was given to me without explanation...it was just an odd trait that was useful in medicine...That’s what I always thought, and against this I put the idea that the Devil might be tempting me to do his work by operating through me when I was conceited enough to think God had given me special power” (Edgar Cayce: The Sleeping (False) Prophet).

Since Cayce was quite familiar with the Bible, he had every reason to be suspicious of the source of his power, especially since he made predictions which did not come true.

But please let me also briefly address your description of truth. You write:

“...because you can not have a truth without it being believed and it having both epistemic certainty as well as facts to back it up, you can not say, as a “truth” that he was a failure as a prophet.”

I would simply have to disagree with this statement for two reasons:

1. I can imagine many examples of something being objectively true and yet not being believed by anyone, not possessing epistemic certainty (a very difficult criterion to meet, by the way), and not even having any independently verifiable facts to back it up! For instance, suppose an angel appeared to an unbeliever and told him to repent of his sins and to put his faith in Christ for salvation. Suppose this was an objective experience, capable of sense verification (sight, hearing, touch, etc.) by anyone who happened to be present. But suppose no one was present but the unbeliever – and after having this experience, he concludes it was merely a subjective hallucination! Furthermore, suppose everyone who hears this story accepts his interpretation; namely, that the event was simply a hallucination – not an objective experience. Finally, suppose that the angel leaves absolutely no physical trace of his appearance – nothing to confirm that the appearance had been an objective event in the external world! In this case, it would be absolutely TRUE to say that an angel had appeared to this man, etc. However, no one actually BELIEVES this to be true (including the man who experienced it), it LACKS epistemic certainty, and there are NO independently verifiable facts to support that this event actually happened. The only evidence that this event actually occurred is the man's memory, which he believes pertains to a hallucination – not an actual visit from an angel. In spite of this, however, it would still be TRUE to say that the event actually occurred in the real, mind-independent, external world of the observer; it was completely objective. Such examples could be multiplied, but you get the idea.

2. Since there are good reasons to believe that the Bible is the Word of God, I think that one can legitimately conclude that Cayce was a false prophet by biblical standards. And if this is true, then Cayce was ultimately a failure as a prophet

according to the standard of the Ultimate Judge of all such matters, namely, God Himself. The Bible gives us God's standards for determining whether someone is, or is not, a true prophet. Cayce failed to meet these biblical standards. Therefore, the Christian has good grounds for believing that Cayce was not a true prophet.

I know that there are indeed those who believe that the things which Edgar Cayce spoke in his trances are true. But I hope you can see why biblical Christianity must reject that belief.

I wish you all the best,

Michael Gleghorn
Probe Ministries

“The Real Problem in This World is People Like YOU!”

I just wanted to let you know I found it offensive how you describe satanism, buddhism, witchcraft or other religions as a “problem.” The real problem in this world are the people who believe their religion possesses the right to rule the entire planet and they are right and everyone else is wrong...do we try to change the world to reject christianity? In most cases (except the nutballs) no. But the tyranny of christianity finds it to be necessary to try to change everyone to its ways. So much for tolerance...is it any wonder I converted?

Thank you for writing.

I find it interesting that you call our information “offensive” when you had to search it out and come to our server to find it and read it. There's a big difference

between something being *different* from what you believe, and being *offensive*. If someone deliberately hurls obscenities or causes nauseating odors within a few feet of you, that's being offensive. But stating what we believe, especially when there is very good evidence that it is true, isn't offensive—even though you have the right to *take offense* at it. But that is your choice, one you have the right to make.

That said, let me address the content of your letter. I get the sense from the hostility of your e-mail that, quite apart from what you read on our website, you have been on the receiving end of some very unloving, disrespectful, manipulative messages on behalf of Christianity. If that is the case, let me say I'm sorry, and let me try to assure you that people who truly understand the person and message of Jesus Christ understand that no one can be coerced into being a Christian; it has to be a freely made choice. We understand that any attempts to "rule the entire planet" are foolish and completely misguided, because God doesn't work that way—He honors the dignity and choice of the people He made and loves very much.

I will admit, though, that yes, we do believe Christianity is right and all other religions are wrong, but it's not because we're so smart or so prideful or so arrogant. We believe it because there's strong evidence that it is true, it's our personal experience that it is true, and it is the world view that is most consistent with reality. We also believe it because of revelation: the belief that God has spoken to mankind and has shown us what is ultimately and eternally true, and we're just agreeing with what God said. If Christianity were a man-made religion, as all other religions and faith systems are, then it WOULD be arrogant and self-serving to believe we are right and all others are wrong. But true Christianity is about relationship, not religion, about a love affair between the one true God, who loves us and courts us.

Because we do believe in absolute truth, and we believe that God has pierced the space-time continuum to show these truths to man, then it makes sense that other religions which deny these truths would be a true, cosmic-grade “problem,” because those who trust in them are misguided, deceived, and headed for an eternity separated from the only One who can give them—give you!!—life.

Were you around when Jim Jones caused a holocaust at his cult compound in Jonestown, Guyana in 1978? He had hundreds of disciples drink Kool-Aid laced with cyanide. If one person had gone around warning the people not to drink the Kool-Aid because it was poisoned, that person would have been labeled a “problem,” when actually the problem was the Kool-Aid (as well as the mind of the cult leader). I think there is a legitimate parallel between the Jonestown tragedy and what we are saying about other religions. I pray you will be intellectually honest and investigate whether the “spiritual Kool-Aid” you’ve been drinking is pure, or poisoned. And I pray you will be able to get past the hurtful, unfortunate experiences you’ve had with people who claim Christianity and check out the true Person of Jesus Christ. See if He’s the real thing. You may find that what you converted FROM isn’t true Christianity at all, but a sad, sad parody of it, that deeply grieves the heart of God.

Sue Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“You’re An Absolute Idiot As

Far as Your Knowledge of Yoga Is Concerned!”

Would you please let Michael Gleghorn know that he is an absolute idiot as far as his knowledge of yoga is concerned—especially Iyengar yoga?

It is a sign of ignorance to talk about something that one knows nothing about. If more people in this world practiced yoga, as opposed to organized religion, this world would be a much better place!

Hello,

Sue forwarded your letter to me. Thanks so much for writing! I guess I never do anything halfway; if I'm going to be an idiot, I'm going to be an “absolute idiot”—partial idiocy just wouldn't satisfy me! :o)

I'm sorry you didn't enjoy [my response on yoga](#). I guess you won't much like [my upcoming radio program](#) on the subject either. Just so you know, I did try to quote primarily from authoritative yoga sources (including the Iyengar website and various yogis, swamis, etc.). Furthermore, before sending that reply to my correspondent, I had Brad Scott (formerly of the Ramakrishna Order) read it for accuracy. He thought it quite good.

Most likely you disagree with my personal perspective on yoga. That doesn't surprise me. I certainly don't expect everyone to agree with me.

I write from within a Christian worldview perspective. If you don't share that perspective, it's not surprising that you would not agree with some of my remarks. The worldview upon which most of yogic philosophy is based is utterly incompatible with biblical Christianity. If you've accepted

yogic philosophy, we would doubtless differ on a great many issues (e.g. the nature of God, of man, of salvation/liberation, the uniqueness of Jesus, what happens after death, etc.). If one of these competing worldviews is true, the other must be false. For many reasons (virtually every article on Probe's website addresses these reasons in one way or another) I'm a completely convinced Christian. I therefore do not want to see my brothers and sisters in Christ led astray by embracing what I honestly believe is a false worldview. And that is really my main objection to yoga. It's certainly nothing personal against those who practice it.

I certainly wish you well, but since you refer to me as an "absolute idiot" I'm hardly convinced that the world would be a better place if more people practiced yoga. I would hate to be called such names by the majority of the world's inhabitants! :o)

Grace and peace to you,

Michael Gleghorn
Probe Ministries

“You’re a Christian Fundamentalist Narrow Thinker”

First of all, I am not a member of the A.R.E.. Your dissertation on Edgar Cayce is what one might expect of Christian Fundamentalist narrow thinking. Anything that you don't understand becomes "satan motivated" or "demonic." Why God, if there is one, would ever want to look into or back on

such a planet and people such as us, I fail to understand. People like you have been programmed to be set in your ways and interpretations by your families and up-bringing to point that you see nothing beyond your King James Bibles (flawed, contradictory and controversial).

Whether Edgar Cayce is valid or not, it is people like you that will influence free thinking and considerations. I could go on, but by now I am sure that you will attribute my words as inspired by those terrible demons that are so conveniently at your disposal whenever anything threatens your way of thinking.

Thanks for writing. No, I don't think your words are inspired by demons at all, but I do wonder why you would take the time to write without offering something specific that you object to in the article on Cayce.

Yes, in some of our analyses we are definitely narrow-minded. There is a time and a place for that. I want engineers, for example, to be extremely narrow-minded when it comes to measuring and figuring all the numbers that go into making a bridge, because I want it to hold up when I go across it. I want airplane designers to be extremely narrow-minded about what it takes to get a jet to fly and to come back down in one piece. And when it comes to the spirit realm, I want to know what is true and what isn't, because there's a whole bunch of activity in that arena that affects human lives.

I'm sorry for whatever has happened to make you doubt that God exists; it would seem that SOMETHING went wrong somewhere for you to experience such hostility. By the way, when I went from not believing in God to realizing there was plenty of evidence not only for His existence, but for His love for me, that was the opposite of narrow-minded thinking. On the contrary, it broadened my world beyond anything I thought possible.

But thank you for writing.

“Your Perception of Hinduism is Inaccurate”

Rick Rood’s learned and well organized article on [Hinduism](#) is an excellent attempt at giving an idea of the basic features of the religion to non-Hindus.

I am a nominal Hindu with a great deal of Christian influence. I find a few inaccuracies when he talks of the religion under, “A Christian Response”. I appreciate that Hinduism is too vast a religion to be grasped accurately in all its aspects by any one man. However the perception that the Hindus’ concept of God’s grace could be a Christian influence and related comments are inaccurate. Most of the rituals, Pujas that the Hindus perform are to seek God’s grace and deliverance, apart from asking for material favors! Further the concept of performing “Prayaschitta” or atonement for your wrong-doing and asking for forgiveness is very much a part of Hinduism that came from ancient times. Of course, there is also the concept of the one who is wronged giving a “shaapa” (curse) to the wrong doer.

While there are a lot of differences between the two religions, the final destination individually and as a society appears to be the same.

And, by the way the Christians can relax. Though Hinduism is gaining popularity in the West there is no provision in Hinduism to “convert” non-Hindus! The Indian Christians are considered part of the Hindu culture and you find many Hindus

like myself believing in Christ, though not in the same manner as the practicing Christians.

Thank you very much for your message regarding the article on Hinduism, and for taking the time to read the article. It is certainly not an exhaustive description of the Hindu religion and its comparison to the Christian faith. But I tried to give a brief summary.

I noted your comments with regard to the contrasts between Christianity and Hinduism mentioned in the article. I thought I would just briefly respond to your comment on "grace," and also on "forgiveness."

I appreciate what you said about Hindus seeking grace through religious activities. By this I take it that you mean that Hindus believe that they can obtain the help of a deity in relieving themselves of negative karma and moving toward enlightenment. I suppose that this kind of divine help or assistance could be described as "grace" in a certain broad sense (though I think you will see some important distinctions below). I appreciate also your comment about a Hindu worshiper asking for forgiveness (which I would take to be a remission of bad karma).

I wonder if you could help me, however, in understanding the way in which you are using the word "grace." As I understand the Hindu religion, spiritual progress always requires the effort or striving of the worshiper, whether it is through action or ritual, knowledge or meditation, or devotion to a deity. In the Christian faith, spiritual discipline and works of love and service are also very important. But these spiritual activities are never considered the means of one's attaining salvation. They really are the fruit or result of attaining salvation. Actually, this salvation is not attained, but obtained as a gift through faith in Jesus. I'm sure you are familiar with the statement in the New Testament by the Apostle Paul, "For by grace you are saved, through faith; and

this is not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not as the result of works, lest anyone should boast" (Ephesians 2:8-9). This statement puts grace and works in totally different categories. In fact, it states that salvation is a gift, not to be achieved, but to be received through faith in Jesus. I'm interested to know if you perceive the same contrast between the Hindu way of striving (working) to make spiritual progress toward enlightenment, and the Christian way of receiving the free gift of salvation through faith in Christ. One of the most beloved statements of Jesus that highlights this contrast is as follows: "Come unto me all who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest" (Matthew 11:28)!

The reason that this free gift of salvation is tied to faith in Christ comes into clearer focus when we consider the second issue you noted in your message . . . the issue of forgiveness. In the Christian faith, when God forgives someone their sins, it means that He freely releases the person from the judgment and penalty that his sins have brought against him. This judgment or penalty for sin is defined in the Bible as "death." "For the wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23). The death referred to here is not merely physical death, but spiritual death which is eternal separation from God: "Your iniquities have separated you from your God; your sins have hidden his face from you, so that he will not hear" (Isaiah 59:2). This judgment on sin is necessary, because the Bible says that God is a "holy" God: "Your eyes are too pure to look on evil, you cannot tolerate wrong" (Habakkuk 1:13). Furthermore, the Bible says that it is impossible for us to be released from God's judgment on sin by working our way out of it, or striving to overcome it: "No one will be declared righteous in his sight by observing the law" (Romans 3:20).

How, then, does Jesus come into play here? By giving his life as a sacrifice for sin, taking on himself the judgment we deserve and paying the penalty that we owe to God: "For even the Son of Man (Jesus) came not to be served, but to serve,

and to give his life as a ransom (payment) for many" (Mark 10:45). This is why God is free to offer his forgiving grace to anyone who acknowledges his sin and need for forgiveness, and receives this gift by trusting in Jesus and what he has done for us: "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Romans 6:23). The "eternal life" referred to here includes God's forgiving grace, but also so much more . . . a life in fellowship with God both now and forever. But apart from what Jesus has done for us, this "eternal life" could never be made available to us.

By the way, here is one additional contrast worth noting between Hinduism and Christianity. As I understand the Hindu religion, the goal of spiritual progress is ultimate union with God, a melting of all distinctions between self and ultimate reality. The essence of salvation or eternal life in the Christian scriptures is not union with ultimate reality, but communion with God . . . person to Person!

Thank you, _____, for taking time to interact with me on some very important issues. I commend you for taking seriously the spiritual journey we all are on in life. May I also commend to you a word from your own M. K. Gandhi: "I shall say to the Hindus that your lives will be incomplete unless you reverently study the teachings of Jesus."

Respectfully,

Rick Rood