



Should believers eat pork?

Yes, when convenient and with moderation. Because I Corinthians 8:8 says, "But meat commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse." Again, I Corinthians 10:25-27 says, "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no questions for conscience sake: For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof. If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake." And I Timothy 4:2-4 tells us some depart from the faith "speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving."

In Deuteronomy, what was proper for a Jew to eat and what was not?

You asked about the instructions in Deuteronomy about what was proper for a Jew to eat and what was not. Remember that was ceremonial law to the Jews and was

not intended for us now. According to Colossians 2:16,17, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days. Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." So you see that was only a shadow of things to come and that no one is to judge you concerning what you eat or drink or new moon or sabbath days. That was ceremonial command.

Were the apostles and other disciples of Jesus still living under the Mosaic Law?

I think they tried to be good Jews, but they surely could not rely upon the ceremonial law to save them.

If you read Acts, chapter 15, you will see that some of the converted Jews thought that they still ought to circumcise their boy babies, ought to keep the ceremonies of the law. And they had a council at Jerusalem to decide that matter and they decided no that they should not. And they sent messengers to the churches, lest they should offend Jewish Christians who had been so strictly taught to avoid things strangled and eaten with the blood (Acts 15:20) and to avoid fornication. But they were not to keep the ceremonial law.

The book of Galatians was written particularly answering this question showing that Christians were free from the law.

However, the change was only in the ceremonies. In Old Testament times people were saved by faith just like they were in New Testament times. Acts 10:43 says, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever

believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." And Romans, chapter 4, tells us that Abraham was saved by faith and that he is our example, and that circumcision came after Abraham was saved by faith, the ceremonies of the law simply pointed forward to Jesus like the Lord's Supper now points back to Him but they had no saving power.

Are we commanded not to eat blood?

You were saying that in Genesis 9:3 and 4 there is a definite command not to eat blood and "this was given a long time before the Levitical law was given." Yes, but it was given before Moses' law was given, but you will remember the ceremonial law of an animal sacrifice was already given. Abel had offered a sacrifice. I think it was a lamb from his flock. It pleased God. Noah offered a sacrifice when he came out of the ark, so we may be sure that the animal sacrifice was already given. And the meaning about reverence for the blood was simply that they should know it represented the Lord Jesus who would come. So there was a special reason then, all during the time of the animal sacrifices, not only after Mount Sinai and the Mosaic law, but before that when they had animal sacrifices also—there was a special reason to hold the blood as a sacred reminder, a symbol. Now, instead of animal sacrifices, we have the Lord's Supper and so there is not the same meaning to it as there was then.

I personally have not eaten blood, and I don't think we should and I don't think it is necessarily proper, but we certainly ought not to take

the extreme precautions that the rabbis take now about the blood for it is a part of the ceremonial law, as I understand it.

Should a person (especially a Christian) eat rattlesnake meat?

I personally would not care to eat rattlesnake meat, I think, but I know of nothing in the Bible that forbids it.

In the ceremonial law, in Leviticus 11, God forbids the Jews to eat certain kinds of meat as ceremonially unclean. That includes, verses 29-31 tell us, "creeping things," and would no doubt include the snakes. But that is ceremonial law, not moral law. A Jew could not eat pork, for example, nor catfish, not because they were not good but because they had a spiritual meaning. But now, since Christ came, we are told that God has "quicken" us who are saved, "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" (Col. 2:14-17). So the ceremonial laws are not now binding, just as circumcision is not for us, just as the animal sacrifices are not for us.

(Dr. Rice answers 607 more Bible questions in detail—294 in the volume, *Dr. Rice, Here Is My Question...*, and 313 in *Dr. Rice, Here Are More*

Worldly Church Members

The churches are full of men and women who have no power at all. Where did they lose it? It was when they formed an alliance with the world.

I would rather be alone with God than be with the whole world without God. I do not believe that a man ever got a thing by sacrifice of principle that did not bring ruin.

—D. L. Moody

Did You? Have You?

"I never heard anyone state, 'I was undone and outcast but I read Tom Paine's *Age of Reason* and I was saved from the power of sin.' Did you?"

"Never have I heard of one who declared, 'I was in darkness and despair and knew not where to turn until I read Robert Ingersoll's *Lectures* and found liberty and peace.' Have you?"

"Never did I hear an atheist telling that his atheism had been the means by which he had been freed from the bondage of drink and set in holiness and happiness. Did you?"

"But I have heard many testify that when as hopeless and helpless sinners they had turned in their need to the Son of God and cast themselves upon Him for forgiveness and for victory over sin, that He set them in freedom as worshipers at His pierced feet."

—Evangelical Tract.

Questions... Each book is a veritable encyclopedia of Bible knowledge; more helpful and practical information than one could obtain in a whole seminary course in Bible Doctrine. Volume I is \$5.95; Volume II, \$6.95. You may order both for just \$12 postpaid from Sword of the Lord, Box 1099, Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37130. Postage on single copies, 15%.)

does. No, if a man is a good enough Christian to be right on the matter of inspiration, he ought to be a good enough Christian to control his tongue. The Bible says plainly:

"Make no friendship with an angry man; and with a furious man thou shalt not go: Lest thou learn his ways, and get a snare to thy soul."—Prov. 22:24,25.

And again I Corinthians 5:11 tells us we are not to eat with "a railer" any more than with fornicators, adulterers, drunkards, etc. So we invite letters provided you write like a Christian, provided you work for fellowship and truth instead of slander and abuse.

One missionary who gets out a tract on this matter used my picture illustration on its cover for which I paid a Christian artist in Glen Ellyn, Illinois to draw for my pamphlet on *Verbal Inspiration*. Don't you think one who makes a great to-do about the Bible should be ethical and Christian? When one is a railer, a slanderer, or otherwise does not act or speak or write as a good Christian his doctrine is likely to be carelessly or ignorantly wrong, as in this matter.

Some Questions for King James Fans

By Evangelist John R. Rice

We love the King James Bible. We use it in all our sermons, our books and pamphlets published in millions of copies, in the weekly SWORD OF THE LORD. We recommend it as best for daily use. We have memorized some thirty chapters and thousands of other verses in it. We have seven large commentaries on Genesis, Matthew, Luke, John, Acts, Corinthians and Revelation all based on the King James text. We have written comments on every chapter in the Bible and almost every principal verse in five years of work, all in the King James Version. My Reference Bible now in preparation by Thomas Nelson Publishers uses the text of the King James Version. So I am a friend of the King James Version. I have probably done more to promote the King James Bible than anyone else in America in many years.

But there are people who fanatically insist that the King James Version was perfectly translated with no errors; if there is a single error in the translation we have no trustworthy Bible. They say God is obligated to have such a perfectly translated Bible which is exactly true to every word of the original autographs. They are wrong, foolishly and perhaps ignorantly wrong, and they are often guilty of railing and unchristian talk and foolish, slanderous statements. Now I shall ask all of these to answer some honest questions.

You need not write to argue with me about it unless you answer these questions. If you don't face these questions honestly, then I am not interested in discussing the matter with you, of course.

1. *What accepted Bible commentary, what statement of faith, of any church or denomination states that the King James Version is without error in translation?*

There is not one such commentary or statement of faith or statement by a reliable authority that the King James Version is without an error in translation. Not one in the world!

I have a tract before me by

Brother E. L. Bynum of Lubbock which claims to be "a resume of Dr. Otis Fuller's book, *Which Bible?*" I have that book also before me. The tract says, "We as evangelicals believe the Bible to be the verbally inspired Word of God, inerrant—namely without error. THEN—we ask, is there one version extant among the multiplicity of versions which is without error today? If there is not then we worship a God who is either careless or impotent to keep His Word pure thru the ages."

In the first place, that statement, claiming to be a resume of the statement of Dr. Otis Fuller in the book, *Which Bible?* is not correct. It misquotes this good man. Dr. Fuller overstates the case in his book, *Which Bible?* and is somewhat accountable for all the radicals who rush into controversy on this subject. But he plainly says on page 33, about the translators of the King James Version,

"No reasonable person imagines that the translators were infallible or that their work was perfect, but no one acquainted with the facts can deny that they were men of outstanding scholarship. . . ."

All right, the translators of the King James Version were men of outstanding scholarship and quality and character. But "no reasonable person," says Dr. Fuller, would say what Brother Bynum quotes him as saying. And we think it is almost blasphemous to say that if God didn't guarantee every word translated in the King James Version to be correct, then He is "either careless or impotent to keep His Word pure thru the ages." God could have preserved all the original manuscripts, but did not. God is not either "careless or impotent" if He does not do just as some extremist or radical demands.

Again the question, and do not write me on this matter (and I hope you will never say a word to anyone else on the matter) without answering this question honestly: What authorities, commentaries, statements of faith of widely accepted Christian leaders say "that the

translators were infallible or that their work was perfect"? That is not sensible and it isn't true.

2. *Where in the Bible does God guarantee that any translator of the Bible, anyone who copies the Bible, anyone who preaches the Bible, or anyone who teaches the Bible, will be infallibly correct?*

There is no such Scripture. The doctrine of infallibility of the translation in the King James is not a Bible doctrine; it is a manmade scheme by some partly ignorant and some partly influenced by bad motives. But unless you can answer this question, don't write me about it, nor approach anybody else about it.

3. *If the King James Version is the only perfectly translated Version, without errors, in the English language, then what about the Bishop Bible and the others that it superseded in the English language?*

If God was under obligation to make a perfect translation of the King James Version, in 1611, then you mean God was either unwilling or unable to guarantee the translation before the King James Version, before 1611? If God was under obligation to make the King James Version perfect, then why would He leave English-speaking people for 1600 years without a translation they could rely on?

4. *If God has obligated Himself, as some fanatics say, to make one translation in English, that is, the King James Version, perfectly translated without error, then would not God be obligated to furnish such a translation in every other language also?*

The doctrine won't stand unless it stands for every language where the Bible is translated. Of course, that doctrine is not in the Bible. Men made that up. God's Word is "for ever settled in heaven." That is true. And we have God's Word in the King James translation, well translated and reliable and trustworthy, but God did not guarantee there would be no mistakes by the translator.

Now face this: if you claim God is under obligation to have a perfect translation available for us who speak English, He is under obligation to have a perfect translation for others. Does He or not? Do you claim the same for Germany? for France? Japan? What are those translations? Please don't write to argue with me about this unless you answer this question honestly.

5. *What about the translation in Acts 12:4 that Herod was*

"intending after Easter to bring him [Peter] forth to the people."

And the Greek word in Acts 12:4 in all the Greek texts is "passover" instead of "Easter." There was no "Easter" then, not in the received text or any other. This church celebration which varies a month or more from time to time had not been taken from the heathen religions and made into a Catholic festival then, and the word was not even in existence when that was written in Greek!

Now, is it no mistake to say "Easter" when God said "passover"? Is that perfect?

6. *Again, in Revelation 22:14 the King James Version teaches that one is to be saved and go to Heaven because they "do his commandments."*

It says, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." In that the translation is not correct and that is not really what the Greek says in the original manuscript. The true Bible does not really teach salvation by keeping commandments. In that case if Erasmus, who selected and collected the Greek Received Text, had it that way he was mistaken and the translators were mistaken. I think the correct translation is, "Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city," as it is given in the American Standard Version. But I know that to teach salvation by keeping commandments is contrary to Scripture as truly translated.

7. *One great edition of the King James Version of the Bible left out the word "not" in the commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and had it, "Thou shalt commit adultery."*

Did God protect that version from error? In the first hundred years the King James Version has had many corrections and revisions. If it was right before, it did not need the corrections. If it is perfect now, then it was not perfect then.

Why Cannot Fans and Extremists About the King James Version Be Good Christians Also?

It is a sad thing that those in some heresy often err greatly in matters of righteousness also. They write mean letters; they make slanderous charges; they ignorantly jump to conclusions about people; they have suspicions and innuen-

SUBSCRIBER SERVICE For prompt service include the address label when writing about your subscription

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

STATE _____

ZIP CODE _____

MAIL TO: SWORD OF THE LORD
Box 1099, Murfreesboro, TN 37130

NEW ADDRESS/ OR NEW SUBSCRIBER

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

STATE _____

ZIP CODE _____

ATTACH LABEL HERE

TO SUBSCRIBE Mail this form with your payment, and check new subscription renew my present subscription

SUBSCRIPTION RATES Good in all 50 States

1 year \$7.00

2 year \$12.00

Payment enclosed bill me later

If you're moving, please let us know four weeks before changing your address. If you have a question about your subscription, place your SWORD address label here and clip this form to your letter.