

“Help Me With My Adult Children!”

Hi Sue,

My name is _____ and I just read your article you wrote about [Dr. Laura](#). I just have to tell you, I am a Jew born anew (but I have been backslidden for years now). Maybe God led me to your article. I couldn't agree more with you. Dr. Laura just doesn't understand because she is still blinded like I was. And I was an example like the apostle Paul. One second I thought Jesus was a good man, the next minute, all I did was whisper his name in a moment of deep despair, and I knew he was the son of God and I believed.

The reason I decided to drop you a line is about my two boys who are 21 and 19. Trying to live on their own. I haven't been able to see them for 2 years now because I couldn't afford it after a bad divorce after 18 years of marriage.

I actually was going to write Dr. Laura, than I saw your article and I thought maybe you could give me some insight. I am now remarried, neither of us are living for the Lord but I did just buy a Bible because my husband is interested in all the scripture I do discuss with him.

The dilemma is, my boys just can't seem to buckle down and keep jobs and take on responsibility. They have no choice but to make their own way in this world, buy I still feel like I owe them even though I don't make much money. My husband and I got them started in their apartment and we told them now you work and pay for all the things you need, however, the youngest I think has gotten into drugs and hardly works, so the older brother was feeding him and paying all the bills. Of course this is ridiculous but he now feels responsible. To make matters worse, the older son just called me to let me

know he got fired from his good job in the computer field. He said something about missing a meeting due to oversleeping. I don't believe he is telling the whole truth. They want to move closer to me but of course they don't have hardly a dime to their name. I am in such a despair because I desperately want to see my kids, yet I know I have to believe in a tough love belief if I want them to grasp reality. We cannot support them and we shouldn't have to. What does God's word say about situations like this? I am a little afraid to find out because I do feel like I failed as a mom and as a Christian.

Is there any hope for me? or for my kids?

P.S. I won't be mad if you do not respond. This is a little freaky that I am even asking a complete stranger for help, but I don't have a church home and I would like a Christian perspective. Thank you!

Dear _____,

First of all, I'm so glad to meet a sister in Christ who has deep-deep-DEEP roots in Judaism!!! ☐

Secondly, my two boys are 19 and 21 also, and I understand COMPLETELY where you're coming from. I think huge numbers of kids/young adults struggle, because of our surrounding culture that says adolescence means you're entitled to privileges without responsibilities. But, of course, real life doesn't work that way.

:::~::~:Putting my "Dr. Laura" hat on here::~:~::~:

May I suggest that the feeling that you "owe your kids" is misguided? You've done your best and now they're adults. (I know, 19 and 21 doesn't LOOK like adulthood as it did when we were that age.) You gave them the huge boost of putting them into an apartment, which is more than many parents could or would do, and said, "You are now responsible for maintaining this. You are adults, now act like it." And they responded, it

seems, by saying, "Don't wanna be an adult. I'm going to do whatever I want and not think about the consequences."

If you bail them out now you will be teaching them that someone else (YOU!!) will pay the consequences for their foolish and self-centered choices. And what do you think that will mean the next time? You can be sure they won't make MORE responsible choices!

Dr. Kevin Leman wrote a great book on child-rearing called *How to Make Children Mind Without Losing Yours*. It's really a book on "reality discipline." The whole concept is to use natural consequences—which is the way God set up the world, right? Consider His command: "If one will not work, neither let him eat" (2 Thess. 3:10). Those are natural consequences. Sounds like it's in the same ballpark as, "If one chooses sleep over work, let him have to settle for a less-satisfying job." Or, "If one will not work but takes drugs instead, let him discover there is no physical or financial support for that kind of selfish, immature mindset."

You say they want to move closer to you but they don't have money to do that. (And why not? Because of the choices they made?!) Well, guess what. In the real world, if we don't have money, that limits our options. Why do you think they want to move closer to you? So you can give them money and pretend they're little boys again! Not a good thing.

The book of Proverbs has LOTS to say about this issue, and I'm going to give you the privilege of digging out what applies to your situation. Look at it as a treasure hunt! <smile>

It's okay to strengthen your spine, Mom. Your kids will be better off for it, and so will you. It's okay to bite your tongue and not be "Mommy to the rescue." It will help them accept responsibility for themselves if no one else will. And no one else should—they're adults now!

I do hope this helps. You are SO RIGHT about needing to adopt

a “tough love” stance. Everybody will be better off for it down the road; your part is to trust in the Lord’s strength and not your own as you take that position of loving your kids wisely by helping them grow into their adult responsibilities by letting them feel the full consequences of their choices.

Warmly,

Sue Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“Can You Recommend the Best Christian Colleges for My Son?”

Dear Dr. Bohlin,

I read your article on line at Leadership U. and would respect your opinion on a matter of concern to me. I am especially impressed that you managed to keep the faith while studying genetics and molecular biology.

My son will be starting college next year. He is homeschooling, but I guess he does well academically because he got 1600 (perfect score) on his SAT. He wants to go to California Institute of Technology and study physics eventually, but wants to first go to a Christian College of good reputation for one or two years to meet other Christian young people and to become really well grounded in the faith before going to Cal Tech. (I personally hope for him to meet a godly, Christian girl for a wife.)

Hopefully, it would be a college committed to an orthodox,

fundamental, conservative Christian doctrine, and have at least more than, say, 1000 students.

What are the best Christian colleges, in terms of the quality of the students and the quality of the teaching?

Can you make any suggestions, any recommendations of Christian colleges?

Your request is a reasonable one and I commend you for seeking advice. I would also suggest you ask others who have sent their kids to Christian colleges for their opinion. Our older son attends John Brown University, a Christian college of about 1,100 students in Siloam Springs, Arkansas. It is a sound Christian university dedicated to teaching a Christian worldview. Their engineering department is top-notch (our son is in digital media), I understand, and very rigorous. I would presume their physics department is up to those standards. I also recommend Taylor University in Indiana, Westmont College in Santa Barbara, California and to a lesser extent, Wheaton College in Illinois. Any of these colleges would offer significant scholarship money for your son. But you already seem a bit leery and that is good. A college is only as good as its faculty and they are never universally excellent either in scholarship and teaching or in their adherence to a thoroughly Christian worldview. For instance, a number of the biology faculty at these institutions are theistic evolutionists and would not be receptive to many of my articles. However, I know some of the biology faculty at Westmont and they are not theistic evolutionists. I know of only one at Wheaton for sure. A student must be equipped to know what they believe and why even in a Christian university.

Clearly your son has been given a gift with his intelligence and I respect his desire for Cal Tech. We need more Christian young people with the talent and dedication to pursue the best education they can get to qualify them to impact the academic community for Christ. There is a strong growing movement away

from a strict materialism, particularly in astronomy and physics. The intricate workings of God's universe are more and more being seen as something that is beyond being explained by chance. So much so that being a Christian in these fields is not as difficult as biology and geology.

I would strongly recommend your son attend our weeklong Mind Games Conference outside of Little Rock, Arkansas this summer regardless of where he goes. This conference is billed as our national conference and repeatedly draws national merit scholars and valedictorians from local and distant Christian and public schools. He will be among peers. There are also several college students who attend who can help with advising from their own experiences. Our web site can give you some details for this conference (probe.org/student-mind-games). Also look at my article on [Campus Christianity](#) to get an idea of my practical advice for students (it is usually the final session of a conference for students).

Concerning a wife, a good Christian wife can also be found among Christians from a secular university who understand the challenge to their faith at these institutions. This can be a very maturing experience. Our younger son is at the University of North Texas and growing in his faith in a much more vital way than our son at John Brown. Each student is different, and their needs are different. If our sons were to switch colleges they would both be profoundly unhappy. By the way, I met my wife at the University of Illinois in Campus Crusade for Christ. □

I hope you find this helpful.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“Why Did the Book of Jacob Get Changed to the Book of James?”

By what authority did the translators of the KJV (and other translations) change the name of the book of YAAKOV (Jacob) to JAMES? The original Greek states this author's name as “IAKOBOY”, or Jacob in English. Thank you.

You are correct in your awareness of the Old Testament designation “Yaakov” (Hebrew) and the New Testament designation, “Iakboy” (Greek).

Tracing the etymology of a word is a fascinating endeavor. And as it is translated from language to language, or even its development within a language, spelling and pronunciation often change. Beyond the Greek and the Hebrew, this word went through several stages of the Latin language (i.e., Old Latin, New Latin, Late Latin), and there were further influences of the word through the barbarian tribes that overran Western Europe in the fourth and fifth centuries. In England this involved two distinct blending of languages—the first by the Anglo-Saxons (Angles, Saxons, and Jutes), who overlaid their language on top of the (1) Latin & (2) Celtic (two dialects: Brythonic and Goidelic) amalgamation as they conquered much of England between the fifth and seventh centuries, and second, by the Norman/Vikings, who overlaid their language upon all of that during the eleventh and twelfth centuries!

One of the reasons the English Language is such a rich one is because of the blending of these linguistic strains which created totally different words for identical things: for example: lamb-mutton, brotherly-fraternal, etc.

The words *Jacob* and *James* come out of this matrix. Jacob follows the French/Norman tradition (Jacobin, for example), and James comes out of the Anglo-Saxon tradition.

The use of “James” in the King James Version was not something they had to think about. It was already imbedded into their language as the equivalent of “James” or “Jacob.” Since this translation from Greek and Hebrew involved putting the text into readable and understandable English, they chose the popular word already in circulation.

Actually, three common English names come out of this: James, Jacob, and Jack.

Hope this answers your question.

Thanks for writing.

Jimmy Williams, Founder
Probe Ministries

“God is One, Not Three”

Many questions remain unanswered [concerning the article [“What Difference Does the Trinity Make?”](#)]. Why just three? Is not three not big enough also according to your own logic to contain all that God is? Is he not only Father, Son, Spirit as well as healer, brother, provider, salvation etc.? The list goes on as you well know. Consider this—that it pleased the Father that the fullness of the Godhead dwelt in him (Jesus) bodily. Again your logic would say that Jesus would not be big enough to contain all that God is. Why bring human logic into this at all? It is human logic that cannot contain all that God is. The Father of Jesus is the Spirit since it was the Spirit that overshadowed Mary. God is a spirit according to

Jesus himself. All things were created by Jesus according to Colossians. God robed himself in flesh according to John 1:14. Why do you have a problem believing that Jesus is God? Jesus told Peter to baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit in Matthew. Peter then according to his instruction baptized in Jesus' name on the day of Pentecost. You are mistaking all the attributes of God for persons of God. There is no scripture to justify you claim that God is more than one person. You quoted "Hear ye O Israel the Lord our God the Lord is one." There are no other Gods besides me. there is none like me. I alone created the heavens and the earth. Do not let logic cloud your reasoning. God is not logical in human terms. His ways are above our ways. God/Jesus both said I am alpha and omega. Once you get a revelation of who God is and the duality of the man/God Jesus you will understand that God cannot be relegated to any number of persons but one.

Thanks for your patience in waiting for me to reply to your email regarding my article on the Trinity.

Many questions remain unanswered [concerning the article "What Difference Does the Trinity Make?"]. Why just three? Is not three not big enough also according to your own logic to contain all that God is? Is he not only Father, Son, Spirit as well as healer, brother, provider, salvation etc.? The list goes on as you well know. Consider this—that it pleased the Father that the fullness of the Godhead dwelt in him (Jesus) bodily. Again your logic would say that Jesus would not be big enough to contain all that God is.

With regard to, Why just three? I'll have to say, because that is all that biblical revelation gives us. Your question centers on a confusion between the ontological Trinity (who God is) and the economic Trinity (what God does). The orthodox formulation of the Trinity is concerned with who God is, not what he does. Therefore, your categories of healer, brother,

provider, salvation, etc. could not be designations of the persons within the Trinity, for to an extent all of the Godhead is involved in all that the Godhead does.

Why bring human logic into this at all? It is human logic that cannot contain all that God is. The Father of Jesus is the Spirit since it was the Spirit that overshadowed Mary. God is a spirit according to Jesus himself. All things were created by Jesus according to Colossians. God robed himself in flesh according to John 1:14. Why do you have a problem believing that Jesus is God?

I agree with you that human logic cannot contain all that God is. We are dependent, created creatures and His ways are indeed higher than ours. I wouldn't exactly say that the Spirit is the Father of God, but that the entire Trinity participated in the Incarnation. And finally, I don't have any problem believing that Jesus is God. He is God. The Scriptures plainly teach this and it is one of the most important aspects that motivated the development of the doctrine of the Trinity.

Jesus told Peter to baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit in Matthew. Peter then according to his instruction baptized in Jesus' name on the day of Pentecost. You are mistaking all the attributes of God for persons of God.

If you are arguing against the Trinity based on Peter's call, that would be insufficient evidence. Granted, Matthew's formulation is unique, but its uniqueness in no way disqualifies the Trinity. Early in the same speech Peter says, "God has raised this Jesus to life and we are witnesses of the fact. Exalted to the right hand of God, he (Jesus) has received from the Father the promised Holy Spirit and has poured out what you now see and hear." Peter clearly had more than Jesus *only* in mind on the day of Pentecost.

There is no scripture to justify you claim that God is more than one person. You quoted "Hear ye O Israel the Lord our God the Lord is one." There are no other Gods besides me. there is none like me. I alone created the heavens and the earth.

If by this you mean that there is no single Scripture that says, "God exists in Trinity: one God, three persons who are coequal and coeternal," you are exactly right. There is also no Scripture in which Jesus says, in as many words, "I am God." However there are clearly passages where Jesus claims to do things that only God can do. Likewise with the Trinity, we are collecting Scriptural "data" by which we can conclude that the Father is God, the Son (Jesus) is God, the Holy Spirit is God, yet God is One (Deut. 6:4). That's just doing theology, an inescapable process for anyone who reads the Bible.

Do not let logic cloud your reasoning. God is not logical in human terms. His ways are above our ways. God/Jesus both said I am alpha and omega. Once you get a revelation of who God is and the duality of the man/God Jesus you will understand that God cannot be relegated to any number of persons but one.

I disagree with you. While God is not reducible to the point where we can understand Him, He does "make sense" or "make Himself known to us." He is, to some degree, understandable and we know this because He has condescended to make Himself known. We understand things through our rational faculties. This does not give us comprehensive knowledge of God, but it does give us intelligible knowledge of God. As far as your conclusion goes, the two natures of Christ are precisely what motivated the kind of theological reflection that lead to the doctrine of the Trinity. Finally, God is not relegated to anything. God has revealed Himself and we must respond to what He has said. If you're holding to a mono-personal God, the burden of proof is on your side. The church as confessed the

trinity for over 1500 years and it has done so for good reason.

Thanks for your interest in dialogue, and thank you for reading the article. I hope that this has been of some help or interest to you. Feel free to write back. Keep reading and thinking.

Greg Crosthwait

© 1999 Probe Ministries

“Why Would God Send the Prophet Dante to Hell?”

I heard about an angel that brought the prophet Dante to hell and showed him all ten levels of hell. What is this? Why would God send a prophet of God to hell? Weren't prophets like saints?

Dante was not a prophet, he was an Italian writer who lived in the middle ages. He only imagined the ten levels of hell. A lot of our ideas about hell actually came from Dante's classic piece of literature *The Divine Comedy*, but it is only the work of a man's imagination and has nothing to do with what God has told us is true.

Sue Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“How Should A Christian Think About Alcohol?”

There are people who I am close to that believe having an occasional drink (keeping in mind that they aren't drinking to get drunk) is okay.

Personally, in the short amount of time I've been alive, I have seen nothing but bad things produced from drinking alcohol (whether the purpose is to get drunk or not). Which is why I have made the decision to stay away from it. My fiancée has a different opinion. I know I can't push my convictions on others, but if we are to “become one” (which is what God has communicated to us both) then how is it possible for one of us to drink (just a little) and the other not drink?

Throughout the Bible it talks about wine; Jesus drank wine. How is the wine from back then different from now (if it is different)? Is it okay to drink alcohol upon occasion (New Year's, weddings, celebrations)? What do you believe about people that are called into the ministry that drink (on occasion)? I would appreciate any advice or references that you could send my way.

Let me give you some thoughts which hopefully are an accurate assessment of the question from the Bible's point of view.

First of all, the Bible never indicates that drinking wine (as well as other liquids with alcoholic content) is a sin. You have mentioned the fact that Jesus drank wine. In fact, He was accused by His enemies of being a “wine-bibber,” or wine-drinker; that is, He was habitually observed doing this. Jesus admits that He has. When He compares His ministry lifestyle with that of John the Baptist's He says, “John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, ‘He has a demon!’ The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, ‘Behold, a

gluttonous man and a wine-drinker, a friend of tax-collectors and sinners!'” (Matthew 11:18,19).

We actually have an account in John 2 where John describes the wedding at Cana (which Jesus and the disciples attended) and lays out in detail the fact that the hosts had run out of wine. You know the story. At His mother's request for Him to help, Jesus ordered the servants to fill up seven huge clay pots with water, which He turned into wine.

Was this grape juice, or wine? The context tells us which. After this newly-created wine was served, the headwaiter came to the bridegroom and complimented him: “Every man serves the good wine first, and when men have drunk freely, then that which is poorer; but you have kept the good wine until now!” (John 2:10). Every bartender knows instantly what this man is saying: “Serve the good wine first, and then, when people have become affected by it, and their taste has been dulled, serve them the cheap, inferior wine.”

Another instance which lets us know that these ancient wines contained alcohol is confirmed from the lips of Peter on the day of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit has just fallen upon the believers and they were empowered miraculously to speak in other languages. Since there were Jews present from all over the Mediterranean world (cf. Acts 2:9-11) all of these different people who spoke different languages heard the gospel spoken in their own tongue. They are amazed at this and some of those present suggest that these Christians are drunk (2:13). But Peter comes to their rescue and says, “Men of Judea, . . . let this be known to you, and give heed to my words. For these men are **not drunk** as you suppose, for it is **only the third hour of the day!**” The Jewish day begins at 6:00 A.M., so it is only 9:00 in the morning and Peter is reminding them that it was too early for them, or any other men, to be drunk yet.

Fermentation is also implied in our Lord's discussion about

not pouring new wine into an old wineskin (Matt. 9:17; Mark 2:22; Luke 5:37). The process is as follows: You kill a sheep or a goat. You take the skin of say, the hind leg. You tie the bottom tightly so it won't leak, and you have a nice flask. The skin is new and pliable, a "green skin." You bring freshly crushed grape juice from the winepress, and pour it into your wineskin. Then you tie the top. Inside, the grape juice ferments and becomes wine. Since the skin is pliable, it expands and the pressure builds up inside. Then it is hung up in a cool place, a cellar, just as wine is attended to today, and two or three years later, you drink it. During that storage time, the skin, in its expanded state hardens, and becomes rigid.

Jesus' point is that you would never take this old wine skin after you have drunk all the wine in it and recycle the wineskin with more new wine. The fermentation process would burst it. The application Jesus is making alludes to the fact that what He is proclaiming, the New Covenant, cannot be contained in the old "wineskin" of the Jewish Law system. The book of Hebrews personifies this same vivid contrast between the Old Mosaic Law system and its replacement with the Gospel of Grace found in Christ Jesus.

I hope with the above, we have proven our point that the wine in the days of Jesus did the same thing to those who drank it as it does to those who drink too much wine today.

Some Christians who do not wish to believe that there is any alcoholic beverage mentioned in the Bible and seek an alternative have suggested that "new wine" (*gleukos*) actually means "grape juice." However, this is the exact word used in Acts 2:13 associated with their accusation of "drunkenness."

On the other hand, while drinking wine is not a sin in the Bible, getting drunk definitely *is*. There is an extended passage in the Proverbs warning people about the danger of wine:

*Who has woe? Who has sorrow?
Who has contentions? Who has complaining?
Who has wounds without cause?
Who has redness of eyes?
Those who linger long over wine,
Those who go to taste mixed wine.
Do not look on the wine when it is red,
When it sparkles in the cup,
When it goes down smoothly;
At the last it bites like a serpent,
And stings like a viper.
Your eyes will see strange things,
And your mind will utter perverse things.
And you will be like one who lies down in the middle of the
sea,
Or like the one who lies down on the top of a mast.
They struck me, but I did not become ill;
They beat me, but I did not know it.
When shall I awake?
I will seek another drink. (Proverbs 23:39-35)*

Drunkenness is mentioned many times in both Old and New Testaments in a negative light. Get a concordance and look under "drink" and "drunk." You'll see what I mean. Drunkenness is also included in the list of the works of the flesh in Galatians 5:19-21. It is also mentioned by Paul in the context of Christian leadership in the Church. One of the qualifications for elders is "not *addicted to wine*" (1 Timothy 3:3). This is repeated in Titus 1:7. I take it that there is a distinction between drinking in moderation and addiction. I don't think Jesus was addicted to wine, do you? But He drank wine. And here is where it gets "fuzzy." When do you pass the point when you qualify as either drunk or addicted? I think the question that needs to be continually asked if one drinks is "**Do I have it, or does it have me?**" And there is a danger here, as we saw in the Proverbs passage above. We could ask

the same question about money, or television, or food, or travel, or sports, or exercise, and on and on. The Bible seems to call for *moderation*, for an awareness that things can *gain control* over us which will be detrimental to our life, our family, our ministry.

Most of us would like for the world to be black and white. Clear-cut. No gray. But gray is a biblical color. All of these things I have mentioned above fall not in a “yes/no” pattern, but a “maybe/maybe not” pattern. We could place these into an area we might call “doubtful things.” The signature passage on this is Romans 14. And I think this passage speaks directly to the communication you have described you are having with your fiancé. Let’s look at some verses:

“Now accept the one who is weak in faith, but not for the purpose of passing judgment on his opinions. One man has faith that he may eat all things, but he who is weak eats vegetables only. Let not him who eats regard with contempt him who does not eat, and let not him who does not eat judge him who eats, for God has accepted him. Who are you to judge another man’s servant?” (14:1-4)

Use the word “wine” or “alcoholic beverage” and “drink” and re-read the passage. Both parties have a responsibility. The one who “eats” is not to look on the other with *contempt*. The one who does not “eat” is not to *judge* the one who does. God is able to bless both people though they do different things.

“One man regards one day above another, another regards every day alike. *Let every man be fully convinced in his own mind*”(v.5). It is okay to hold different positions on some of these things, and neither should judge the other.

But Paul brings in another factor: “Therefore let us not judge one another any more, but rather determine this—that no one is to put an *obstacle* or a *stumbling block* in a brother’s way. I know and am convinced in the Lord Jesus that *nothing is*

unclean in itself; but to him who thinks anything to be unclean, to him it IS unclean" (13,14).

"For if because of food (or drink) your brother is hurt, you are no longer walking according to love. Do not destroy with your food him for whom Christ died. Therefore do not let what is for you a *good* thing be spoken of as evil, for the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. . . So then let us pursue the things which make for peace and the building up of one another. Do not tear down the work of God for the sake of food (or drink). All things indeed are clean, but they are evil for the man who eats (drinks) and gives offense. It is good not to eat meat or to *drink wine*, or to do anything by which your brother stumbles. The faith which you have, have as your own conviction before God. Happy is he who does not condemn himself in what he approves. But he who doubts is condemned if he eats (drinks), because his eating (drinking) is not from faith; and whatever is not from faith is sin. . . .Now we who are strong ought to bear the weaknesses of those without strength and not just *please ourselves*. Let each of us please his neighbor for his good, to his edification. For even Christ did not please Himself" (14:15-15:3).

What we have in this wonderful passage gives both freedom and restraint. God has provided many wonderful things for the human race, including wine "to make glad the heart of man" (Psalm 104:15). Yet we have additional responsibilities to behave in such a way that we might not offend another's conscience. There is what we might call the "Law of Love" which would make us careful not to exercise our freedom at the expense of someone else's expectation of us. A second law might be called the "Law of Expediency." Paul says, "All things are *lawful*, but not all things are *expedient* (I Corinthians 6:12)" In other words, if I have freedom to have a glass of wine, I still have to look to the leading of the Holy Spirit to help me decide whether it would be expedient in a

particular context for me to exercise my freedom.

So _____, I would suggest that you and your fiancé get together and look at this material and have a good discussion about it. I would not make this issue the pivot upon which your shared life together will turn. If he wants a glass of wine at a meal at home, you do not have to have one too, but you also should not judge him for having one. If it becomes something habitual, and seems to be gaining greater control, I think you have a right to talk to him about it and express your concern. "Becoming one" in a marriage is not something based upon both people thinking the same things or doing the same things. It is about being open to one another and sharing your lives. It is possible for him to have a glass of wine and you deciding not to.

The word "becoming" is most important. It is a process. It takes many years for a couple to become one. Couples who have "pulled in the harness" for thirty or forty years together are the ones who best exhibit this "oneness," since they know each other so well, and have fought their "fights," and made their adjustments to each other, and there is a harmony between them that has been hammered out over their married life.

You are just embarking on that great journey called marriage. Realize that you both bring what you are to the relationship. You will discover that you are very different people. Sometimes those differences will bring friction. You will rub on each other. This is part of the process of any meaningful relationship. Your differences should not be considered a threat, but rather a union which should be viewed as complementary, rather than competitive. Someone has said that marriage is like a tennis match. But it's not singles; it's doubles! You are both on the same side of the net giving all *you've* got—each of you, to make your relationship and your marriage a winner.

I hope this helps answer your question, _____.

Warm regards in Christ,

Jimmy Williams, Founder
Probe Ministries

See Also:

- ["Is It OK for Christians to Drink in Moderation? Didn't Jesus Drink?"](#)
- ["Jesus Contributed to Drunkenness!"](#)

"You Are Gods"?

I have heard New Agers claim that even the Bible makes the claim that we (people) are gods. They use the words of Jesus in John 10:34. This verse has always puzzled me. What did Jesus mean when he quoted this scripture?

Thank you for your question. Let me see if I can shed a little light on it.

The contexts in both John 10 and the Old Testament Psalm which Jesus quoted (Psalm 82:6) are very important in understanding our Lord's answer to the Jews which were about to stone Him. As they pick up stones, Jesus says, "I've shown you many good works from the Father; for which of them are you stoning me?" They say, "For a good work we do not stone you, but for blasphemy; and because you, being a man, make Yourself out to be God." (John 10:32-33).

Then Jesus refers to Psalm 82:6 and says, "Hasn't it been written in your Law, 'I said, you are gods'? If He called them gods, to whom the word of God came (and the Scripture cannot be broken), do you say to Him whom the Father sanctified and

sent into the world, 'You are blaspheming'; because I said, 'I am the Son of God'? If I do not do the works of my Father, do not believe Me..." (John 10:34-37)

Now let us look at Psalm 82 to determine its context and the theme/purpose of the Psalm. The entire psalm is a scathing rebuke aimed at unjust judges in contrast to the just Judge of all the earth. In reality, Asaph, the author of the psalm, is crying out for God to do something about the corrupt judges of his day; they show partiality, they neglect caring for the downtrodden, the weak, the afflicted, etc. Then in verse 6, God Himself speaks, and says:

*"I said, 'You are gods (Elohim),
And all of you are the sons of the Most High."*

Some observations:

1. The words, "Elohim" (God)," and "Yahweh" (Lord), are the two major names of God in the Old Testament. It is Elohim that is used here in verse 6.

2. Its meaning in Psalm 82:6 does not imply that men are gods. It rather refers specifically to the fact that God has appointed judges to act in a dignified, God-like manner in the discharge of their God-appointed responsibilities.

3. Actually, the word "Elohim" is also used in verse 1 of both God and men:

"Elohim (God) takes His stand in His own congregation; He (God) judges in the midst of the Elohim (corrupt judges who are acting like Gods—said in sarcasm)."

Notice in John 10 that Jesus reminds these accusers from the first half of Psalm 82:6 that God is the one who appoints the human judges with their awesome responsibility: "Ye are gods." He goes on in the second half of the verse to remind them that sons are supposed to resemble their Fathers: "And all of you

are the sons of the Most High.” Neither the judges in the psalm nor the Jewish leaders confront Him were reflecting this.

4. In jurisprudence there are two types of authority: *de facto* and *de jure*. The Most High God (Elohim Himself) has *de facto* authority. It is an un-derived authority. He has it because He is God. *De jure* authority, on the other hand, is derived, or delegated authority. And delegated authority makes one responsible to the one who did the delegating! The second half of verse 6 is a solemn reminder that these judges are called “Sons” of God, because they are to represent faithfully a justice which reflects their “Father,” the Judge of all the earth.

5. Now the words of Jesus in John 10 make a lot more sense. If you or I had come to earth as the Messiah, we would probably have been moving about and taking every opportunity possible with people to verbally emphasize who we really were: Elohim. But Jesus didn’t do that. He chose rather to imply His identity through the miracles, through the Parables, through His actions. It was as if He was careful that a person came to the conclusion that He was Elohim solely of their own accord, and with no pressure or persuasion on His part, though He was eager for them to come to this very conclusion.

6. Notice that in the dialogue in John 10 with these angry Jews, Jesus could have taken the “bait” and said, “I am Elohim!” But He doesn’t. He claims identity with the second half of Psalm 82:6, the one that models a relationship to His Father exactly like what God is desiring from the judges in Psalm 82. Even though Christ is Elohim, He functions during the Incarnation in a *de jure* capacity to the Father and faithfully carries forth His responsibilities to His Father: accomplishing His mission to redeem the human race (John 3:16).

I hope this answers your question.

Jimmy Williams, Founder
Probe Ministries

“There is No Satan, No Hell, and No People Born Bad”

I believe after 25,000 hrs of study and research, that WE should teach more about Creation and nature, along with philosophy and science, at a early age.

Western man starts his voyage of life thinking, he/she is bad, a sinner and always going to hell with Satan. There is NO Satan. There is no hell. These are for all serious realists a level of evil conciousness. Our children are not born into a world of sin. No more than a new born fawn, calf, bird etc. etc. We all have the knowledge of knowing right from wrong. In the Eastern cultures, primarily the Buddhist, teach their young that they are good boys/girls.

The orthodox churches take hold of one's spirit and give it fright and scare. The conformist and orthodoxy are nothing more than a industrialized money making venture. Now our new president wants to give our tax dollars to the same groups.

Somewhere, somehow America must change. This earth will probably be here for a very long time. When we think on terms of eternity, infinity and the finite, let us teach the truth about nature and clean up this planet, and the young minds. We continue to tell our youth of how bad they are, they believe this. No, this gives them the license to murder, child molest, rape and a total criminal behavior. What would one expect, but our terrible bad society. Every generation this grows worse.

I'm not sure why you sent us this recent message except perhaps as a mild rebuke of our Christian Theistic worldview. Let me just point out that setting yourself up as an authority by stating the number of hours you have studied this subject and simply stating your position as categorically true with no attempt at argument or persuasion conforms to the standard practice of propaganda and not rational discourse.

If you want to challenge something specific on our site, please write us stating what you disagree with and why and we will respond as best we can. I'm afraid your e-mail as it stands accomplishes little more than an opportunity for you to state your opinions to no one in particular. Therefore, there is no reason to specifically respond to any of your speculations.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin, Ph.D.
Probe Ministries