

### THE REFLECTOR

April 1983 Volume 23 o Number 4

606-140 

0 0

0 0 0 0

#### YOU ARE INVITED TO ATTEND A

SERIES OF

# GOSPEL MEETINGS

CONDUCTED BY THE FULTANDALE CHURCH OF CHRIST 2005 ELKWOOD DRIVE

APRIL 24-29 BILL HALL

7:30 pm

A CORDIAL WELCOME **AWAITS ALL** 

## A VOLCANO CAUSED THE PLAGUES?

by Edward O. Bragwell, Jr.

In the latest issue of Reader's Digest. (April 1983), there is an article on page 133 entitled "The Biblical Exodus: Fact or Fiction?" The article basically tries to determine if and when the Exodus actually occurred. It also tries to explain "naturally", the event surrounding the Exodus such as the plagues, the parting of the Red Sea, and the "pillar of cloud" and "pillar of fire." All these events are supposedly the result of a volcanic eruption. The plagues are explained in this manner:

"Geologist note that such phenomena following major eruptions are similar to those of the Ten Plagues. The waters of Egypt may have turned red, killing the fish and driving frogs on shore. Ash in the skies could have plunged the land into darkness for three days and caused the rain to fall as hailstones. High winds could have carried in locust that destroyed the remaining crops, leaving the animals to starve. Insects, breeding in the rotting carcasses and new swamps, might have brought disease to cattle and humans. Death could have been so rampant as to amount to the killing of the 'firstporn' of every human and animal in Pharoah's flock." (Emphasis mine - eb)

Man, in his infinite wisdom, seems to ever be searching for a way to deny the workings of the all powerful God, and explain them away as just another natural event, a coincidence. Miracles of the Bible are explained away as if they were the same thing as the cheap tricks of modern day "magicians" or "faith healers". many other wonderous activities of our God recorded in the Scriptures are just cast aside as "fables". Why is this so? Because modern man has become so sophisticated that he cannot accept anything that involves a supernatural power or a power greater than himself. He is so steeped in humanism and pride in his own powers that unless he can observe things happening or explain what happens, he is not willing to accept it.

What it all boils down to is that those who try to come up with such explanations just do not believe the Bible. They will only accept those parts of the Bible that they can verify or somehow explain to their own satisfaction. And even them their explanations do not coincide with what the Bible says. Sure, then ten plagues "could have" happened the way that these people claimed. But the fact is — they didn't. The biggest problem is that it wasn't that death was so widespread that it was as if the firstborn of every household died. They did die. If it was just because death was os widespread, ho come the children of Israel escaped this widespread death. Surely, putting blood on your doorposts will not prevent you from suffering death in your household when death is so widespread naturally.

We are going to have to decide whether we are going to accept God's word and revelation as truth (John 17:17), or if we are going to reject His revelation as "fable" and come up with our own explanations. Please accept His word as truth. If we reject any part of it, then we must reject it all. After all, if we can't depend on some parts of God's revelation, how do we know that we can depend on any of it. And if we reject God's word we are without hope in this word and are "of all men most pitiable.

### "MEANINGFUL"

by James W. Ward

I've just about had it, with the word "meaningful". It 's a good word gone bad. It means "significant" or "full of meaning", but it has become a cover - up for sin and for emotionalism.

Nowadays, it's quite acceptable to commit adultery as long as the relationship is "meaningful". True, adultery is "full of meaning". It means someone has been un-true to his mate; it means someone is willing to sacrifice a home on the altar of personal gratification; it means someone won't obey God; it means someone is going to hell. Yes, adultery is "significant", all right -- significant for its sinfulness and destructiveness. However, I don't believe that's what most people mean when they call their "relationships" "meaningful".

Now, my wife and I -- and thousands of couples like us -- have a truly meaningful relationship. We've sealed our love by vowing to be faithful to each other; we've obeyed God by keeping the laws of this country; we endeavor day by day to be kind and helpful to each other; we work at rearing our children in the nurture and admonition of the lord; we strive in our marriage to glorify God. These are things that we have real "significance" -- because God said so. He is the one to give meaning to marriage, and any meaning men think they can impart to marriage is counterfeit.

Homosexuals strive to sanctify their relationships by calling them "meaningful". Again, there's plenty of meaning in homosexual acts, all of it sinful! These deeds signify that someone has changed the order of nature, that someone had rather have the "recompense" of error than a crown of life. Homosexual acts are sinful; men can't change that by calling them "meaningful". Men don't have the right to change the "significance" that God has imparted to an act.

Religious people have done their share to dilute the meaning of "meaningful". Several years ago I read a news article about a Methodist preacher who substituted hamburger and Coke for unleavened bread and fruit of the vine, in the Lord's Supper. His rationale was: "I refuse to continue something that has lost its meaning". God gave the meaning to unleavened bread and fruit of the vine; how did they lose that meaning? Who imparted any significance to hamburger and Coke as a memorial to Christ? The Methodist preacher? By what right? Unleavened bread and fruit of the vine have not lost one bit of meaning as far as God is concerned. Hamburger and Coke are emblems for people who worship only their own bellies.

Worst of all, our own brethren started chanting "meaningful". They have decided that, "two-songs-a-prayer-another-song-and-preaching" is not "meaningful". And what do they propose to make worship more "significant"? How about dimming the lights? Or holding hands? Or closing your eyes? Or sitting in a circle? Or looking up instead of down as you pray? Or any combination of the above?

Now I don't mean to suggest that brethren are covering up sin with the word "meaningful". But they have confused it with "emotional". They think that by changing the <u>outward</u> they can make the <u>inward</u> more meaningful. But God gives the meaning to every act of worship, and anything we impose on the act changes it. Pat Farish, commenting on the Lord's Supper, said, "Basically, it requires concentration on the significance of the thing being done; and the nature of concentration is that it shuts out externals". Let's not confuse "meaningful" with "emotional".

Why don't we let God's things have God's meaning? Otherwise, they really have no meaning at all. Help keep down the necessity of "meaningful" articles like this.

#### SHORT SKIRTS AGAIN

by Bill Hall

Newspaper items are stirring fears -- and a recent shopping trip seems to confirm them -- that short skirts are making a comeback. Sears is prominently displaying them in our area. When we look back and think of what good Christian women were deceived into wearing in the late 60's and early 70's, we can hardly believe it. Most were caught unprepared, were led into the shorter skirts little by little, and in end were wearing what they never intended to wear when the style first started coming in. In fact, we suspect that many who were so deceived now look back and wonder how they were led into such a practice. Their actions were not indicative of loose morals. They were just following the styles. They were wrong in what they were doing, but theirs was far more likely a problem with the "pride of life" than with the "lust of the flesh."

It was a bad time for the church. The appearance of women, even in worship periods, was a disgrace. Good men who were seeking to keep their hearts and lives pure, frequently found themselves in embarrassing situations. Propriety prevents any further description of the shamefulness that existed.

Will history repeat itself? Maybe not! Maybe-just maybe!—the public as a whole will refuse the shorter skirts, but we cannot count on it. Maybe some religious organization will wage such a war against them that society in general will be led to reject them, but we surely would not count on that. There is really only one course of action for the Christian woman to take. She must determine always to be a good example of modesty, shamefastness, and sobriety. She must determine to please God in her dress no matter how peculiar she may appear to be in the eyes of the world or even of some other Christians. She must determine how a length of skirt that is in keeping with modesty and decency. She must determine not to go beyond that, no matter how much out of keeping it may be with the length of skirts as dictated by fashion. She must determine not to be "conformed to this world," but to be "transformed by the renewing of her mind" (Romans 12:2). There was really little excuse for women to be caught unprepared now.

Is God really concerned with the way Christians dress? He is concerned. "In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefastness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; But (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works" (I Timothy 2:9,10).

But wait! Don't put this article down yet. Procrastination may lead to non-decision. Why not go ahead and face the fact that the devil is working through the immoral and godless fashion designers of our day to trick you into selling your soul? Why not make your decision right now? Then stick by it whatever may come or go with styles.

THE REFLECTOR is published monthly by the church of Christ meeting at 2005 Elkwood Drive, Fultondale, AL 35068.

Mailing Address: 3004 Brakefield

Dr. Fultondale, AL 35068

Editor: Edward O. Bragwell, Sr.

Second Class Postage P A I D Fultondale, AL 35078