

# **“Where Did The Terms ‘Right Wing’ and ‘Left Wing’ Come From?”**

I was reading Ecclesiastes 10:2 (“The heart of the wise inclines to the right, but the heart of the fool to the left”) and what struck me right away was this fits our right and left wings.

My question is, how did the political parties get their status of being considered left and right?

It turns out that the historical explanation for the political terms left wing and right wing are based upon the seating arrangement of the first French General Assembly. The proponents of the political ideas inspired by the Enlightenment were seated on the left. Those who supported the old regime were seated at the right hand of the president of the Assembly.

So early on, ideas that were something new and novel were associated with the left, and conservative ideas were associated with the right. Actually, the story is a bit more complicated than that, but to answer your question, the origin of left and right is found in modern politics rather than Ecclesiastes.

Thanks for writing. God bless you.

Kerby Anderson

© 2002 Probe Ministries

---

# **“My Racist Parents Disapprove of My Boyfriend”**

I am a Christian. I have had a boyfriend for almost three years. He is a wonderful guy...inside and out. He is a strong Christian and we have great chemistry and are very like-minded in our habits, finances, etc. I love him very, very much.

The only thing is that we are an interracial couple... with him being Chinese-American and me being white. There are some cultural differences in that his family depends on him for support...and that worries me. (That in the future, he will never leave his family so we can start our own family.)

Also, he loves his mother and sister dearly and I feel that he compares me to them...which I can never meet up. I can't help but to feel jealous for the way he loves and puts his sister on a pedestal. I compare myself to her frequently and it is killing my confidence.

Furthermore, my parents (they are non-Christians) strongly disapprove of our relationship because of his race.

I guess my questions are: 1) What does the bible say about interracial dating/marriage and 2) Should I obey my parents or give in to their racism?

I am just overwhelmed and have lost myself in all these problems. I know God will keep us together if it is in His will...but I could really use some godly truth and insight to all these things. Can you offer some insight into my problem?

The Bible makes distinctions between two kinds of people: believers and non-believers. It says nothing about interracial marriages. We have an article on that here: [www.probe.org/what-does-the-bible-say-about-interracial-marriages/](http://www.probe.org/what-does-the-bible-say-about-interracial-marriages/)

*Obeying* your parents is a command for children. Once we become adults, we are commanded to *honor* our parents. The difference is that once we're adults, we take our direction directly from God. We honor, not obey, our parents by listening to what they say and seriously considering it, and then doing whatever God leads us to do.

However, the cautions you express about your relationship are very serious and should be explored even if your parents were 100% for your marriage. You not only have a cultural difference, you have a situation where your boyfriend's relationship with his mother and sister could very well be more important than his relationship with you. That's why Gen. 2:24 (later re-emphasized by Jesus Himself) says that a man should leave his mother and father (both physically and emotionally) and cleave (i.e., stick like Superglue) to his wife. If a man's primary emotional connection is to his family of origin instead of his wife, the marriage will be in trouble from day one.

You need to have a very frank talk with him about his emotional priorities. It may well be that this is a matter of your perception and not his reality, because of your own insecurities. If you fight jealousy and insecurity NOW, there's a good chance it will only get worse. That's a part of finishing growing up that you need to deal with before you marry anyone, but spend some time finding out who you are and what your strengths and "gift package" are so that you are content with YOU. If you're content with yourself and able to accept yourself, you won't waste emotional energy comparing yourself with others.

One other thing: if your boyfriend's emotional warmth toward his mother and sister is actually healthy and he would truly have no problem putting you first, then the fact that he has a good relationship with them is a good thing. It's when men are hostile and disrespectful toward female relatives that there is a red flag. (The other red flag is when a man bonds more

with his female relatives than with his male relatives.)

I would suggest that you spend more time talking to him about this, especially your fears that he will never leave his family so you can start your own. There are many, many forces against marriages today. If you get married knowing that both families are not in agreement, you are adding a huge amount of stress to your relationship, because I can verify after 28 years of marriage that you don't just marry a person, you marry a family.

You need to read some good books on Christian marriage: [FamilyLife.com](http://FamilyLife.com) is a wonderful resource.

In the wise words of Dr. Laura, sometimes love just isn't enough. ☐

I hope this helps.

Sue Bohlin

© 2002 Probe Ministries

---

## **“Help Me Counter My Prof's Teachings on Horse Evolution”**

I'm a senior at \_\_\_\_\_ in Agricultural Business Management. In one of my Range classes the professor has laid the foundation for the entire class on evolution. Using the common picture of horse evolution (hyracotherium to equus) he is saying that rangeland plants and systems have co-evolved with large ungulates. I'm struggling on just how he can give the theory of evolution such validity, the difference between adaptation and evolution, and finding information that I can

use to refute some of his ideas. I don't want to argue with him but just want a chance to exchange ideas. If you can direct me to any information or resources on this specific topic, I would appreciate it. Thanks.

The best source of information on the horse series can be found in Jonathan Wells book, *Icons of Evolution* (2000) from InterVarsity Press. He has a full chapter on the subject as well as a chapter on Archeopteryx and the bird-like fossils. The book is easily obtainable at Amazon.com and some Christian Bookstores. Wells has also responded to some of his critics and negative reviews on the Discovery Institute's website at [www.discovery.org](http://www.discovery.org). He also has other material at Access Research Network, [www.arn.org](http://www.arn.org). I would check on both sites for other helpful material.

Respectfully,

Dr. Ray Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“Can You Recommend Good Books on Intelligent Design?”**

Grace and peace to you, Dr. Bohlin:

I am a returning college student and a home-schooling parent. In my classes I find myself facing animosity toward those of us who reject evolution. I want to be able to defend myself in class as well as prepare my children to do the same. I want to be able to say to my children and in class, “I believe [THIS], because [of THIS]; and here's the difference.” I know there is good information available on Intelligent Design and

Creationism, but I simply do not have the ammunition of knowledge and information that I desire.

Unfortunately, with so many works available, I am at a loss as to where to begin. Thus, could you recommend a few? Are there any that force evolutionists to base their critical examinations mainly (or exclusively) upon emotional arguments? (I.e., points that naturalistic “science” cannot honestly ignore or refute.) Alternatively, could you recommend an assortment that, when combined, thwart the mass of evolutionist droning? (And a good order in which to read/study the works.)

I honor you for your desire to become more knowledgeable in this important arena. I wish there were more Christians like you.

Below is a brief annotated bibliography in the order I feel they should be read by someone just starting out.

*1. For an overview of the many issues and publishing events surrounding this question, you can start with the Probe book *Creation, Evolution, and Modern Science*, (Kregel, 2000) which I edited. This will introduce you to several topics without going into too much depth. [This link](#) will give you some more information.*

*2. *Darwin On Trial* by Phillip Johnson (IVP 1991). Phil Johnson has emerged as the leader of the Intelligent Design movement and here lays out in logical manner some of the important evidential problems with evolution as well as the all important academic and educational problems. [See this related article.](#)*

*3. *Reason in the Balance* by Phillip Johnson (IVP 1995). Here Johnson lays out just what is at stake in this naturalism vs. theism clash within the culture in law, science, and education. Not his most popular book, but by his own admission, his most important book. [See this related article.](#)*

4. *Icons of Evolution* by Jonathan Wells (Regnery, 2000). A superb expose' of the ten most popular evidences for evolution in high school biology textbooks. The evolutionary and educational communities are falling all over themselves trying to explain or discredit this book. They are looking more and more foolish as time goes on. [See this related article.](#)

5. *Darwin's Black Box* By Michael Behe (Free Press, 1996). This is a narrower work explaining the necessity of intelligent design in understanding the molecular workings of the cell. Not as technical as you think. I have a good review of it in *Creation, Evolution and Modern Science*. [See this related article.](#)

6. *Intelligent Design* by William Dembski (IVP, 2000). Dembski shows how important Design is within a broad perspective across disciplines while also demonstrating the academic rigor of a design hypothesis. [See this related article.](#)

7. *Defeating Darwinism* by Phillip Johnson (IVP, 1997). A short book for students, parents and teachers highlighting the critical thinking skills needed to weave through the mine fields of the creation/evolution controversy. [See this related article.](#)

8. *The Wedge of Truth* by Phillip Johnson (IVP, 2000). Johnson's latest book, providing an update and analysis of the current controversy and an explanation of overall strategy (*The Wedge*). Insightful and quotable as always.

There are other books to help you in specific areas and anthologies to offer more technical perspectives of important aspects of the controversy, but these should get you started.

There are reviews of books 2-7 on our website in the science section. URLs listed at the end of each description.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“How Do I Treat People After a Church Split?”**

Over the past couple years at my church some people had left for various reasons and I found myself really wondering how you're supposed to react to them after they've left and you see them out in town, on the street, etc. I had a close personal relationship with some of those people and on the other hand, I witnessed some ridiculous bouts by some of those people who left. Yet it seems that after they were asked to leave (or left themselves), some of the church members still invited them over and at the same time would invite the pastors, their families, or other members of the church body to the same outings as if nothing ever happened. How do I treat those people now when I see them and not disrespect the Lord in my actions and in my heart?

Bless your heart. This is an incredibly painful experience, isn't it? I'm so glad you wrote, if for no other reason that to hear from someone outside the situation for whom known personalities don't complicate things.

I think it's good to remember the big picture of what the Lord desires for us. The very biggest picture is the second commandment, to love our neighbor as we love ourselves. Love God, love people—that sums it all up. Secondly, to remember what the Lord Jesus said about our relationship with other believers in John 13:35—“By this all men will know that you



are My disciples, if you have love for one another.”

Third, consider Philippians 2:1:

*“Therefore if there is any encouragement in Christ, if there is any consolation of love, if there is any fellowship of the Spirit, if any affection and compassion, make my joy complete by being of the same mind, maintaining the same love, united in spirit, intent on one purpose. Do nothing from selfishness or empty conceit, but with humility of mind regard one another as more important than yourselves.”*

So His desire for His body is that we love each other because that’s how we bring glory to God and validate our discipleship, that we pursue unity out of humility and service.

Even after a church split, even after people leave churches for fleshly reasons rather than God-ordained ones, even after people still retain unforgiveness and ungodly attitudes toward people with whom they used to worship, the message of the New Testament is that we are ONE BODY regardless of where we attend church. What God desires is that we love one another no matter what has happened.

If I were in your shoes (and I do have some experience with people in the above categories), when I encounter these people I would choose to remember that God wants us to love each other. That means choosing to be cordial and loving and kind even if the feelings aren’t there (because if God commands it, He provides the way to obey). Yes, ugly things happened. God knows all about it, and it doesn’t change His word that tells us to love one another.

I think it’s a good idea to stay forward-focused, remembering that you will spend eternity being connected with these people as part of the Body of Christ, rather than continuing to see life through a rear-view mirror.

I hope this helps.

Sue Bohlin

Probe Ministries

---

# **“Is Hypnosis OK or a Problem?”**

**I was told by a man who is a new Christian that he quit smoking this past fall through hypnosis. I know that hypnosis is not a good thing, but could you tell me a little more about it so that I can know how to answer in the future?**

Although hypnosis may be useful in some situations, there are a number of potential dangers as well. In what follows, I have simply cut and pasted from a teaching outline on hypnosis. The outline comes from a chapter on “Hypnosis and Hypnotic Regression” in John Weldon and John Ankerberg’s book *Encyclopedia of New Age Beliefs*. It’s important to realize that Weldon and Ankerberg are looking at hypnosis primarily as it relates to the occult and New Age Movement. It MAY be possible for a Christian therapist to make some beneficial use of hypnosis in treating patients. However, I am honestly not knowledgeable enough in this area to know for sure. At any rate, one must certainly be careful, for as Weldon and Ankerberg point out, there are many potentially negative effects arising from the use and/or abuse of hypnosis. Here are a few sections from my outline:

## **Hypnosis and Hypnotic Regression**

**I. So what is hypnosis anyway?**

*A. It is a deliberately induced condition of deep mental relaxation, or trance (i.e. an ASC), in which a person becomes highly suggestible and potentially capable of being dramatically manipulated.*

*B. When the ASC has been achieved, “various therapeutic maneuvers in the form of suggestions or other psychological interventions are performed and are called the practice of ‘hypnotherapy.’” (310) C. Its New Age and occult applications include: psychic development, spirit contact, automatic writing, astral travel, etc. For instance, Harpers Encyclopedia of Mystical and Paranormal Experience declares, “Self-hypnosis is used...by mediums and channelers to communicate with spirits.” (311)*

## **II. What about hypnotic regression? What is that all about?**

*A. This usually involves using hypnosis to take a person back in their past to uncover buried memories and resolve hidden conflicts.*

*B. In New Age and occult applications, such regression may go back into a person’s alleged “past lives.”*

## **III. How does hypnosis claim to work?**

*A. No one really knows for sure! There is still no generally accepted scientific theory about it.*

*B. “Daniel Goleman, who has a Ph.D. in clinical psychology from Harvard University, observes, ‘After 200 years of use, we still cannot say with certainty what hypnosis is nor exactly how it works. But somehow it does.’” (310)*

## **IV. Does the Bible have anything at all to say about the practice of hypnosis?**

*A. “Hypnosis may be related to the biblically forbidden*

*practice of 'charming' or 'enchanting'; to the extent this relationship holds true, the practice should be rejected."*  
(310)

*B. Christians are to be "filled" and controlled by the Holy Spirit. To the extent that the hypnotic trance opens one up to the influence of other spirits, it has the potential to be quite harmful.*

**V. What is the susceptibility to hypnosis in the general population?**

*A. About 10-20% of people cannot be hypnotized.*

*B. About 10-20% can be easily hypnotized.*

*C. The remainder fall somewhere in between.*

**VII. Granting that hypnosis MAY be helpful and useful under some circumstances, we might still ask whether it is a necessary part of the psychotherapeutic process?**

*A. One psychiatry textbook states, "Everything done in psychotherapy with hypnosis can also be done without hypnosis." (314).*

*B. But if this is really so, we may ask whether the potential risks are worth the potential benefits?*

**X. What are some of the documented potential dangers of hypnosis?**

*A. Perverse motivations to satisfy ulterior needs on the part of the therapist or patient.*

*B. It may increase a patients overdependence on the therapist.*

*C. Traumatic insight when repressed memories are uncovered.*

*D. Precipitation of a psychosis.*

*E. Sudden panic reactions occasioned by the experience of hypnosis.*

*F. Complications from miscommunication.*

*G. Unscrupulous use of hypnosis.*

*H. Difficulty in waking subject and unfortunate effects of incomplete waking.*

**XI. However, it must be admitted that in the Jan. 1987 *American Journal of Clinical Hypnosis*, it was concluded that “other than in a few rare and isolated instances, hypnosis has proven to be one of the safest tools in the armamentarium of the healing professions.” (317). The dangers of hypnosis are usually attributed more to the therapist than to hypnosis itself.**

**XII. W & A suggest five variables to be considered when evaluating the risks of hypnosis:**

*A. The religious, ethical, and philosophical orientation of the therapist.*

*B. The emotional history and condition of the client.*

*C. The degree of technical expertise and past experience of the therapist.*

*D. The motive and purpose for engaging in hypnosis.*

*E. The hypnotic state itself.*

**XIII. Dr. Shafica Karagulla, M.D., a neuropsychiatrist and member of the prestigious Royal College of Physicians. . . warns against possession from hypnosis in her *Breakthrough to Creativity*. . . She warns that hypnosis can open ‘. . .the**

door to your mind which can be influenced by other intelligences, some greater than your own. In such a passive state, an entity can get in and obtain control over you.' (328).

**XV. Christian scholars are divided over whether the use of hypnosis is permissible for Christians.** "One of the leading Christian authorities on the occult, the late Dr. Walter Martin, accepted the medical practice of hypnosis, while warning against its occult use. Noted psychiatrist Paul Tournier, on the other hand, is opposed to any use of hypnosis" (332).

**XIX. Can you think of any biblical prohibitions against hypnosis?**

*A. It may be generally prohibited in a passage like Deut. 18:10-12 (e.g. divination, witchcraft, sorcery, casting spells, mediums, spiritists, etc.). But of course this is not entirely clear.*

I hope this information helps you in your understanding of hypnosis. While it's not a clear-cut issue, Christians should probably be very careful (and prayerful) before either recommending or receiving hypnosis.

Shalom,

Michael Gleghorn

Probe Ministries

---

# **“Help Me Understand Eating Clean and Unclean Meats”**

I am a freshman college student. A New Testament class professor said that Paul, James and Peter disagreed with the eating of clean and unclean meats. Now I know of the vision with Peter, which he says some scholars say is only for the fact that they should preach to Gentiles as well as Greeks. Now, is there anywhere else that says they may have not been disagreeing or that one case won out over the other or if one had more information from God? Should we be wary of this subject as Christians? Because that would mean we were eating “wrong” all this time (for those of us who do eat pork and other things like that). Does this have any relevance to our spirituality as Christians? Am I just thinking too hard?

Thanks for writing. The dietary laws set forth in passages such as Leviticus 11:1-47 and Deuteronomy 14:1-21 were temporary laws given by God only to Israel. These laws are not applicable to Christians today under the terms of the New Covenant. This is not only made clear in Peter’s vision, recorded in Acts 10:9-16, but it is stated explicitly by Christ Himself in Mark 7:14-23. Notice in particular what Jesus says in vv. 18-19. In part, this text reads, “Do you not understand that whatever goes into the man from outside cannot defile him; because it does not go into his heart, but into his stomach, and is eliminated?” Then notice the parenthetical statement which concludes this verse: “Thus He declared all foods clean.” In other words, the dietary restrictions given by God to Israel have been nullified. Christians today are not bound by such laws. Today, the Old Covenant under which Israel operated is obsolete (Hebrews 8:13).

Hope this helps!

Shalom,

# **“Why Doesn’t the New Testament Violate the Command Not to Add to Scripture?”**

Revelations 22:18 states that, “I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book; if anyone adds to them, God shall add to him the plagues which are written in this book.”

I have heard this verse used to explain why the Book of Mormon is not to be considered a later divinely inspired revelation. However, in Deuteronomy 4:2 and Proverbs 30:6, these same warnings about adding to God’s word are stated, so why wouldn’t the New Testament fall into the same category of unacceptable additions to the Bible? Why is it an acceptable addition and revelation when the Book of Mormon—or, for that matter, the Koran—is not?

I personally believe that Revelation 22:18 should be interpreted more narrowly as referring only to the content of the book of Revelation. In other words, I don’t believe John is necessarily forbidding (or excluding) the possibility of later revelations from God; he is rather simply warning against adding or subtracting anything from the book which he has just written. I think the wording of verses 18-19 supports this view. Notice how often John specifies “this” book (i.e. the book of Revelation), and the book of “this” prophecy, as the content of what should not be added to or subtracted from. Thus, I don’t think John’s warning necessarily forbids



additional revelation from God in OTHER books; he is simply warning against tampering with what is written in his own. What he has written is the word of God and it should be kept pure and undefiled. Of course I realize that not everyone will share this view, but this is what I think John intended the verse to communicate.

I would basically take Deut. 4:2 the same way. Moses is writing the word of God, and God does not want His message polluted with the additions and subtractions of sinful human beings. He wants His word kept just as He gave it and not altered to suit human fancies or inclinations. What this forbids is purely HUMAN additions or subtractions; it does not mean that God cannot give additional revelation in the future. Indeed, if that were so, not only would the NT be called into question, but the remainder of the OT would as well (for Deuteronomy is the last book of Moses)!

Finally, I think Proverbs 30:5-6 also fits this interpretation. Verse 5 begins, "Every word of God is tested." In v. 6 we are forbidden to add to HIS words. God may reveal additional truth to man at some later time, but man is not to take it upon himself to add to, or subtract from, what God has already revealed.

So what about the Book of Mormon, or the Koran? Why not accept these books as additional revelation from God? My answer to this is simple: whatever the source of these books, it is NOT the God of the Bible. How do we know this? Because both books teach beliefs and practices which are CONTRARY to the Bible. The "God" of Mormonism and the "God" of Islam are NOT the same God as the God of the Bible. In addition, not only do Mormonism and Islam teach a different doctrine of God than that revealed in the Bible, they also teach a different doctrine of man, sin, the afterlife, salvation, etc. If we apply the law of non-contradiction to these different "revelations" we see that while they can all be false, they cannot all be true. Furthermore, if one of these IS true, the

others must be false (because they contradict each other on essential beliefs and practices). See the point? If the Bible is truly the word of God, neither the Book of Mormon nor the Koran can qualify as His word.

It is for this reason that I think the Book of Mormon and the Koran should be rejected as later “revelations” from God; not because of Revelation 22:18.

Michael Gleghorn  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“What Is the Job Description of a Deacon?”**

Greetings! I would like to receive some godly insight as to the job description of a deacon.

I have heard from the pulpit of my church that a deacon has the duties of counseling others within the church, as well as teaching. Is this biblical? Please give scriptures. The preacher stated the deacon is ordained but the Bible says that a deacon is appointed. The preacher stated that a deacon can counsel people, making reference to Jethro appointing men to help with counsel to free up Moses... These men, weren't they elders and not deacons?

Thanks for your question! The term “deacon” comes from the Greek term *diakonos*, and simply means “minister” or “servant”. It is used often in the New Testament in the general sense of one who serves. However, in a few passages it is used to refer to those occupying a particular position of service in the

early church (see Phil. 1:1 and 1 Tim. 3:8-13).

The qualifications for serving as a deacon in the church are spelled out in 1 Tim. 3:8-13. Neither counseling nor teaching are specifically mentioned as duties of deacons, nor is the ability to do so stated as a requirement for becoming a deacon. While an elder must be able to teach (1 Tim. 3:2), this requirement is not specified of deacons. Nevertheless, since deacons were to hold "to the mystery of the faith with a clear conscience", it seems that a certain amount of biblical and theological knowledge may have been required to serve as a deacon. This may indicate that, if necessary, a deacon should be both intellectually and spiritually prepared to minister in such a capacity. However, this is not explicitly stated.

Some believe that the office of deacon originated in Jerusalem by order of the Apostles (Acts 6). Although the Greek term *diakonos* is not used of the Seven in this passage, they do seem to have performed at least some of the duties typically associated with the office of a deacon (e.g. the distribution of food in vv. 1-3). If the office of deacon originated in Acts 6, there may be some basis for official ordination to this office in v. 6. The dictionary on my desk defines ordain, at least in part, in this manner: "officially appoint or consecrate as a minister in a Christian church". Thus, depending on how one defines the terms "ordain" and "appoint", they could be used somewhat interchangeably.

Also worth noting, if Acts 6 does refer to the appointment of the first deacons, there were two who had ministries which were much more extensive than may have been required of deacons. Stephen was quite a teacher, preacher and debater (Acts 6:9-10 and Acts 7), while Philip was quite an evangelist (Acts 8:4-5, etc.). While such gifts may not have been required to serve as a deacon, it seems clear that one who possessed gifts of teaching, evangelism, counseling, etc. could serve as a deacon. Since the requirements to serve as a deacon were primarily moral in nature, anyone meeting these

requirements could serve as a deacon, whatever their spiritual gifts might have been.

As for the account of Jethro counseling Moses in Exodus 18, my own view would be as follows: First, while Jethro did counsel Moses (v. 19) to appoint judges to assist him in handling disputes between the people (vv. 21-26), he is actually described as a "priest" (v. 1) and not a deacon. Second, in my opinion, the Church (including its offices of elder and deacon) did not formally begin until the Day of Pentecost as described in Acts 2. While the men appointed by Moses to help judge the Israelites may have had moral qualifications similar to those required of both elders and deacons in the New Testament, nevertheless, strictly speaking I do not think that they should be understood as such in the context of Exodus 18. It makes sense that there should be similar moral qualifications required of those who would lead God's people, but I do not think we should view the "judges" in Exodus 18 as "elders" or "deacons" in the New Testament sense. The former were leaders of Israel; the latter are leaders of the Church. There are certainly similarities between the two, but there are differences as well.

In summary, let me briefly answer your questions this way: First, while a deacon may be competent both to counsel and to teach, neither are specifically required of deacons in the New Testament. Second, there could be evidence for the ordination (or appointment) of deacons to their official task in Acts 6:6. Finally, while the example of Jethro, Moses, and the appointment of judges in Exodus 18 certainly offers some important principles for understanding the necessity of appointing spiritually and morally qualified leaders to assist in the effective ministry of the Church, nevertheless, I personally do not think we should equate the ministry of these "judges" of Israel with that of elders and deacons in the local church. Strictly speaking, if the church began on the Day of Pentecost in Acts 2, I think we should primarily glean

our understanding of the qualifications and requirements for serving as elders and deacons in the local church from those New Testament passages which specifically address this issue (e.g. 1 Tim. 3:1-13; Tit. 1:5-9; Acts 6; etc.).

Hope this helps. God bless you!

Michael Gleghorn

Probe Ministries

---

## **“The Author of the Pentateuch was Moses, Not Ezra, Right?”**

First I want to thank you for your article [Did Moses Write the Pentateuch?](#). Would you please elaborate on, or provide scriptural references or other reference sources that would identify the “basis” upon which Baruch Spinoza suggests that Ezra may have been the author. I know who Ezra was and I have read this in several commentaries but it has not been made clear as to how this conclusion is reached.

Spinoza was ejected from synagogue teaching because of his pantheistic world view and naturalistic approach to Biblical criticism. His scientific criticism of the Bible made him an early leader in the modern movement of higher criticism.

In his 1670 work *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* he argued that since the Pentateuch refers to Moses in the third person and includes an account of his death it could not have been written by Moses. By appointing Ezra as the author (which is later accepted in the documentary hypothesis promoted by Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen in the 19th century) it helps to push the composition date of the Old Testament into a later time

frame. This has been a goal of many liberal theologians who have sought to debunk prophetic revelation by proving the authorship to be after the fact of events being predicted.

Gleason Archer, in his survey of the Old Testament, notes that ancient authors commonly referred to themselves in the third person. Xenophon and Julius Caesar both wrote in this manner and conservative scholars have long acknowledged that Joshua probably wrote the account Moses death.

I hope that this is helpful.

For Him,

Don Closson  
Probe Ministries