

# So Called Disputable Matters - A Proposition that there are None!

Steve Layfield

*The first one to plead his cause seems right,  
until his neighbour comes and examines him. [Proverbs 18:17]*

I'm prompted to write this as a 'Follow-On' piece from an essay in which I argued for the Unity of Biblical Truth. What specifically triggered me here was a radio broadcast (Feb 22<sup>nd</sup> 2017) by Nancy DeMoss Wolgemuth to whom I am much indebted for the spiritual help she has been to lots of women over many years – not least my own dear wife. For the most part I can endorse her encouragements, aimed principally at the fairer sex, to live lives of holiness before the Lord. The pertinent radio show is available [here](#). Like so many Christians today, Nancy gently seeks to persuade her audience to adopt a 'Total Abstinence' position regarding alcohol for what she, with doubtless very good intention, to be an application of 'The Higher Law of Love'. By this she means, "even though I am at liberty to exercise this freedom in Christ, I choose voluntarily to forego the freedom because of the possibility that I may offend my weaker brother/sister in Christ". Here's a couple of quotes,

*....There are three key passages in the Scripture, in Romans, and in 1 Corinthians, where Paul addresses various LIFESTYLE ISSUES that are not clearly spelled out in Scripture. The most common one he talks about is something that was an issue in the first-century church of eating meats sacrificed to idols. But in all these cases, they are issues in which some believers feel they have liberty and in which others say, "I cannot partake of this in good conscience."*

*These are GREY AREAS, so to speak, and Paul says, "How do you handle these? How do you deal with these?" Well, Paul basically lays out two principles for how we should deal with these kinds of issues, and both principles are an application of the law of love.*

*....When it comes to something like the freedom to drink temperately or moderately, am I passing judgment on someone else's heart, which I can't know? On their walk with God, which I cannot know?*

*I'm doing this today to challenge you to think hard about this, to challenge you to ask some questions you may not have considered. But when you come away and you say, "I have freedom in my heart before God to drink temperately," I am not God in your life. I'm not the Holy Spirit in your life. I cannot pass judgment on you. How are you doing on that?*

*"Let us not pass judgment on one another any longer, but rather . . ." And here's the second principle. Let me say the principle, and then I'll pick up reading in Romans 14. Don't place a stumbling block or hindrance in the way of a Christian brother or sister. Don't trip them up in their faith.*

The passages she references are drawn from Rom 14 & 1 Cor 10. Both are cited here in full:

## **1. Romans 14**

*Receive one who is weak in the faith, but not to disputes over doubtful things. 2 For one believes he may eat all things, but he who is weak eats only vegetables. 3 Let not him who eats despise him who does not eat, and let not him who does not eat judge him who eats; for God has received him. 4 Who are you to judge another's servant? To his*

*own master he stands or falls. Indeed, he will be made to stand, for God is able to make him stand.*

*5 One person esteems one day above another; another esteems every day alike. Let each be fully convinced in his own mind. 6 He who observes the day, observes it to the Lord; and he who does not observe the day, to the Lord he does not observe it. He who eats, eats to the Lord, for he gives God thanks; and he who does not eat, to the Lord he does not eat, and gives God thanks. 7 For none of us lives to himself, and no one dies to himself. 8 For if we live, we live to the Lord; and if we die, we die to the Lord. Therefore, whether we live or die, we are the Lord's. 9 For to this end Christ died and rose and lived again, that He might be Lord of both the dead and the living. 10 But why do you judge your brother? Or why do you show contempt for your brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. 11 For it is written:*

*"As I live, says the Lord,  
Every knee shall bow to Me,  
And every tongue shall confess to God."*

*12 So then each of us shall give account of himself to God. 13 Therefore let us not judge one another anymore, but rather resolve this, not to put a stumbling block or a cause to fall in our brother's way. 14 I know and am convinced by the Lord Jesus that there is nothing unclean of itself; but to him who considers anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean. 15 Yet if your brother is grieved because of your food, you are no longer walking in love. Do not destroy with your food the one for whom Christ died. 16 Therefore do not let your good be spoken of as evil; 17 for the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. 18 For he who serves Christ in these things is acceptable to God and approved by men. 19 Therefore let us pursue the things which make for peace and the things by which one may edify another. 20 Do not destroy the work of God for the sake of food. All things indeed are pure, but it is evil for the man who eats with offense. 21 It is good neither to eat meat nor drink wine nor do anything by which your brother stumbles or is offended or is made weak. 22 Do you have faith? Have it to yourself before God. Happy is he who does not condemn himself in what he approves. 23 But he who doubts is condemned if he eats, because he does not eat from faith; for whatever is not from faith is sin.*

## **2. 1 Corinthians 10**

*....14 Therefore, my beloved, flee from idolatry. 15 I speak as to wise men; judge for yourselves what I say. 16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? 17 For we, though many, are one bread and one body; for we all partake of that one bread. 18 Observe Israel after the flesh: Are not those who eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? 19 What am I saying then? That an idol is anything, or what is offered to idols is anything? 20 Rather, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to demons and not to God, and I do not want you to have fellowship with demons. 21 You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot partake of the Lord's table and of the table of demons. 22 Or do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than He? 23 All things are lawful for me, but not all things are helpful; all things are lawful for me, but not all things edify. 24 Let no one seek his own, but each one the other's well-being. 25 Eat whatever is sold in the meat market, asking*

*no questions for conscience' sake; 26 for "the earth is the Lord's, and all its fullness." 27 If any of those who do not believe invites you to dinner, and you desire to go, eat whatever is set before you, asking no question for conscience' sake. 28 But if anyone says to you, "This was offered to idols," do not eat it for the sake of the one who told you, and for conscience' sake; for "the earth is the Lord's, and all its fullness." 29 "Conscience," I say, not your own, but that of the other. For why is my liberty judged by another man's conscience? 30 But if I partake with thanks, why am I evil spoken of for the food over which I give thanks? 31 Therefore, whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God. 32 Give no offense, either to the Jews or to the Greeks or to the church of God, 33 just as I also please all men in all things, not seeking my own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved.*

Nancy appeals to these passages to make the case that whilst it might be OK for herself (& Christians generally) to drink alcohol (i.e. the disputable thing) she will choose NOT to do so perchance there might be an individual who sees or learns of her liberty and who then follows her example of indulgence but is unable to exercise proper self-restraint. It all sounds very noble and honourable, doesn't it?

My contention is that 'That is not what Paul was addressing then' AND moreover, 'That is not the truly spiritual response to the problem identified → i.e. the brother/sister who has a legacy of weakness in relation to alcohol (or any obsession/addiction), etc'.

What Nancy has done 'surreptitiously' – though in all likelihood innocently enough – is to SUBLIMINALLY introduce the notion that there are two distinct categories of issues: those that are DISPUTABLE and those that are MORALLY CERTAIN. This, I contend, is an illegitimate way to think which does violence to Scripture and overturns centuries of learning. Who gets to decide what is disputable and what is non-disputable? What are the criteria for determining the appropriate category? Does it not leave wide open the door of opportunity for the 'loafer' to come in and excuse himself on a whole range of frontiers by appealing to 'greyness & obscurity'? The passages cited are very much quoted by advocates of the 'Disputable Matters' paradigm. But are they justified in making their appeal to these passages? I say they're not!

First, let me seek to clarify what the Apostle IS addressing in these important passages. I want to be brief, hopefully not too brief!

In Rom 13:11,12 – immediately preceding – Paul writes, *"And do this, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now our salvation is nearer than when we first believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand. Therefore let us cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light."*

Here Paul alludes to the time-frame in history in which he/they find themselves. It is the climax of the ages; a new era is dawning. The OT is giving way to the NT phase of redemptive history. Many of his readers/hearers find themselves in a unique period when the Old Jewish state is about to fall & Christ will marry a new bride – the New Jerusalem, an international organic unity comprising Jews & Gentiles from every nation under heaven, etc.

Crucially, therefore, the CEREMONIAL aspect of God's Law was to give way to the reality of 'The Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world.' The shadows would yield to the substance. The reality, which had been extensively prefigured and prophesied over generations since the dawn of time, had arrived!

OT CEREMONIAL Law had set up all sorts of strictures around it (i) eating & drinking, (ii) the observation of supplementary 'sabbath days' (iii) the wearing of certain clothing, (iv) various washings, etc. Genuine saints, contemporary with Paul, would understandably wonder AND DIFFER regarding when the NT simplicity would displace the rigours of such OT CEREMONIAL legislation.

The exercise of conscience then concerned not so much the ethically ambivalent nature of the activity but rather the ambivalent comprehension of (a) just which covenant law (Old or New) they were living under and, more to the point, and (b) when the detailed CEREMONIAL requirements of the OT economy would fully cease. A thorough familiarity with the OT Scriptures and the prominent place given over to the rehearsing of these details will confirm what I am saying.

Concerning Romans 14, John Calvin writes,

*It appears, however, evident, that he meant nothing else than that the weak should not be wearied with fruitless disputes. But we must remember the subject he now handles: for as many of the Jews still clave to the shadows of the law, he indeed admits, that this was a fault in them; he yet requires that they should be for a time excused; for to press the matter urgently on them might have shaken their faith.*

*... He had spoken before of scruples in the choice of meats; he now adds another example of difference, that is, as to days; and both these arose from Judaism. For as the Lord in his law made a difference between meats and pronounced some to be unclean, the use of which he prohibited, and as he had also appointed festal and solemn days and commanded them to be observed, the Jews, who had been brought up from their childhood in the doctrine of the law, would not lay aside that reverence for days which they had entertained from the beginning, and to which through life they had been accustomed; nor could they have dared to touch these meats from which they had so long abstained. That they were imbued with these notions, was an evidence of their weakness; they would have thought otherwise, had they possessed a certain and a clear knowledge of Christian liberty. But in abstaining from what they thought to be unlawful, they evidenced piety, as it would have been a proof of presumption and contempt, had they done anything contrary to the dictates of conscience.*

Matthew Henry writes in a similar vein,

*There was a difference among them about the distinction of meats and days; these are the two things specified. There might be other similar occasions of difference, while these made the most noise, and were most taken notice of. The case was this: the members of the Christian church at Rome were some of them originally Gentiles, and others of them Jews. We find Jews at Rome believing, Acts. 28:24. Now those that had been Jews were trained up in the observance of the ceremonial appointments touching meats and days. This, which had been bred in the bone with them, could hardly be got out of the flesh, even after they turned Christians; especially with some of them, who were not easily weaned from what they had long been wedded to. They were not well instructed touching the cancelling of the ceremonial law by the death of Christ, and therefore retained the ceremonial institutions, and practised accordingly; while other Christians that understood themselves better, and knew their Christian liberty, made no such difference.*

The other relevant passage addressing itself to this same concern is found in Colossians 2:11-12. There we read,

*'In Him you were also circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, 12 buried with Him in baptism, in which you also were raised with Him through faith in the working of God,*

*who raised Him from the dead. 13 And you, being dead in your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, He has made alive together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses, 14 having wiped out the handwriting of requirements that was against us, which was contrary to us. And He has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross. 15 Having disarmed principalities and powers, He made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them in it.*

*16 So let no one judge you in food or in drink, or regarding a festival or a new moon or Sabbaths, 17 which are a shadow of things to come, but the substance is of Christ. 18 Let no one cheat you of your reward, taking delight in false humility and worship of angels, intruding into those things which he has not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, 19 and not holding fast to the Head, from whom all the body, nourished and knit together by joints and ligaments, grows with the increase that is from God.*

Here St Paul affirms that Christ's passion & resurrection effectively abolished the CEREMONIAL aspect of God's Law that could never in any case provide in itself necessary atonement. Jesus, *'having wiped out the handwriting of requirements that was against us, which was contrary to us... ...has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross.'* Thus, it is suggested that the New Covenant dispensation began at the cross – signalled, perhaps, by the veil of the temple being torn in two. The closing verses provide a check against the possibility that certain believing Jews might seek to hold on to their OT ceremonies well after their expiry. The 'false humility' referenced here might well represent a gentle indictment against the tendency of the traditionalist factions within the newly enlightened gospel community for parading their piety by retaining in its external form an unhealthy close-tie with various old testament festivals. The same pseudo-spirituality prevails today in various 'Messianic-Jewish' groups.

The Book of Acts furnishes us with THREE clear examples of how this principle was applied during the crucial period during which the old wine-skins (Old Covenant) was giving way to the new wineskins (New Covenant). Luke includes these passages to help us understand the temporal ambivalence that prevailed in those early years:

(i) In the first passage (Acts 15:1-5) Paul had Timothy circumcised. This we are explicitly told was to appease the anxieties of the Jewish saints in Derbe & Lystra. It was 'hard' enough for those believers to accept the decree made by the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15) as it was disseminated throughout the empire; Paul would make its reception as acceptable as possible out of love for those living in that season of overlap.

(ii) In the second passage, (Acts 18:18) Luke tells us that St Paul *'had his hair cut off at Cenchrea, for he had taken a vow'*. Once more, the context makes clear that part of Paul's motivation here was to win the ears & respect of those to whom he was ministering. In the same chapter, we are told that he is ministering to both Jews & Greeks (i.e. non-Jews). We are told in v6 that some of the Jews reviled him until in v12 we read that a concerted attack upon him was made by the Jews. He was (falsely) accused of *'persuading people to worship God contrary to the Law (of Moses)'*. These are strong indicators that Paul was hard pressed to reassure his audience that his message was wholly compatible with authentic OT teaching. It appears then that Paul was practicing what he elsewhere preached, i.e.

*'and to the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might win Jews; to those who are under the law, as under the law, that I might win those who are under the law; to those who are without law, as without law (not being without law toward God, but under law toward Christ), that I might win those who are without law; to the weak I became as weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.'* [1Cor 9:20-22]

(iii) In the third exemplary passage, (Acts 21:17-26) Luke recounts the return of Paul to Jerusalem & his meeting with James & ‘all the elders’. Among the *‘thousands of Jews who had believed’* and who were *‘zealous for the law’* we are again told what the focus of concern was: Paul was alleged to have been *‘teaching Jews who were among the gentiles to forsake Moses telling them not to circumcise their children nor walk according to Jewish customs’* (v21).

Once more, Paul, mindful of the temporal complexity – i.e. that the Old Covenant administration of the gospel was yielding now to the New Covenant administration – suffered the tender consciences of newly awoken Jewish saints to maintain their CEREMONIAL traditions whilst insisting that their gentile counterparts were to be free from any such CEREMONIAL entanglements.

As if to underscore the point, Luke summarises in v25 the holy & honourable conclusion drawn by the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15), *‘But concerning the Gentiles who believe, we have written and decided that they should observe no such thing, except that they should keep themselves from things offered to idols, from blood, from things strangled, and from sexual immorality.’*

It is of crucial importance then to see that it was NOT AT ALL the MORAL aspect of God’s Law that was under review in any of these incidents but rather the CEREMONIAL elements only. For as Paul elsewhere declares as plainly possible, *‘circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but keeping the commandments of God is what matters’*. (1Cor 7:19)

-----

In 1Cor 10, Paul addresses a similar but different matter. Here he warns against the danger of an enlightened Christian troubling the conscience of a fellow brother/sister who is partially ignorant. Specifically, the ignorance pertains to the metaphysical reality signified by the sacrificial elements (meats, idols, etc.,).

Unlike the previous concern (Rom 14) there does appear to be an abiding wisdom to be gleaned from this instruction. (see vs 23, 24 especially). Here, the tender-hearted Christian will exercise discretion when partaking of ALL that God has made [“for the earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof”] until those within his orbit are (metaphysically) more fully enlightened.

But should this cautiousness be urged upon Christians today where the issue is arguably ‘ethical ambivalence’? Are there any genuinely grey ethical issues which deem them ‘Disputable’? Perhaps there are. But I fear there is an alternative attendant danger: that we too easily simplify our judgements & offer ‘simplistic’ or else ‘carnal’ wisdom – according to the principles of this world and not according to Christ.

The author of Hebrews says, *‘For though by this time you ought to be teachers, you need someone to teach you again the first principles of the oracles of God; and you have come to need milk and not solid food. For everyone who partakes only of milk is unskilled in the word of righteousness, for he is a babe. But solid food belongs to those who are of full age, that is, those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.’* (5:12-14). Here, we exhorted to see that it is Scripture that we are to cultivate skill with in order to discern right from wrong. Now there are most certainly difficult cases that we encounter where it is not at all clear how we should proceed. Corrie Ten Boom’s response to the German Police has challenged many Christians to wonder whether the telling of a lie might be justified in order to salvage a life. Does Scripture provide us with principles for determining a hierarchy of ethical ideals by which we might discern the mind of God? I believe it does. 2Tim 3:16 assures us that Scripture *‘thoroughly furnishes us for every good work.’* Whence, the psalmist meditated day and night on the Law of the Lord to determine the path in which he would walk. In Psalm 32, we read, *‘I will instruct you and teach you in the way you should go; I will*

*guide you with My eye. Do not be like the horse or like the mule, which have no understanding, which must be harnessed with bit and bridle, else they will not come near you.'* Here again, the implication is clear: don't be led & directed along by 'hollow hunches, mindless maxims, fluffy feelings or spurious sophistry; rather be subject to the sacred counsel of Gods in Scripture. To be sure, at times this might well entail a degree of wrestling, prayer and shrewd counsel with others who've been on the road much longer. But it is the Christ-honouring way to proceed for, '*man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God* (Matt 4:4).

My wife & I reflected together on two or three practical examples, starting with the issue that initiated our curiosity - alcohol. Let's look at them in turn:

1. **Alcohol**

The case is made that, 'a brother/sister who have been saved from a life of drunkenness & alcoholism might well be made to stumble again if they saw fellow believers indulging say wine with a meal – or worse still, left alcohol within easy reach, etc.'

Here, the trouble/problem is subtly transferred from the person to the substance.

According to Scripture, SIN is the problem. The real source of the trouble is one or more of the following: (a) actual chemical dependence (addiction) which may be addressed by gradual weaning, reducing the dose, etc (b) intemperance (lack of self-control), (c) greed, (d) obstinacy, (e) irresponsibility and of course (f) covetousness, etc.

Now, the promises of God available in Scripture are legion such as 'If you abide in Me and My words abide in you, you will bear much fruit (Jn 15); set your minds on the things of the Spirit and you will not fulfil the lusts of the flesh (Rm 8); I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me (Phil 4). Many unwittingly seek to negate these precious promises and by so doing effectively patronise the Lord. Rather, 'Let God be true and every man a liar.' (Rom 3:4).

2. **Surfing the Web!**

The internet is awash with trash – pornography, bolshy-blogs, viral videos, temperamental trolls, frivolous folly, etc. Wisely do parents monitor carefully their children's access to it. Given what Scripture tells us about our hearts it is no wonder that most clay-footed saints have ventured too near at times to 'the pleasures of sin' which as allurements lie within such easy reach. Apportioning blame for this present sorry predicament is complicated. A generation ago Mary Whitehouse would certainly have stood her ground in the public square challenging the scorn & rancour of the popular, progressive SJWs. Much blame, I reckon, lies at the door of the evangelical constituency for having abandoned its remit of being 'salt and light' in society – especially for having abandoned the notion of 'universal objective morality' enshrined in the Decalogue by which we must MEASURE and quantify the value and worth of ALL things.

However, there is unquestionably a large measure of responsibility upon each one of us to surf the WEB accountably. What are we to do? Avoiding all connectivity seems impractical; my own experience of living through years when late-night TV presented similar sinister opportunities taught me that our 'Let's not have a TV in the house' policy merely served to heighten the desire & inflame illicit passions.' There's a number of relevant passages in Scripture that seem to address this specific problem. Negatively, we are explicitly warned against formulating petty rules the design of which is like walls of a monastery – i.e. to keep the world at bay. Hence we read in Colossians Ch 2:20-23, '*Therefore, if you died with Christ from the basic principles of the world, why, as though living in the world, do you subject yourselves to regulations— "Do not touch, do not taste, do not handle," which all concern*

*things which perish with the using—according to the commandments and doctrines of men? These things indeed have an appearance of wisdom in self-imposed religion, false humility, and neglect of the body, but are of no value against the indulgence of the flesh’.*

Positively, we are to cultivate a godly mindset by actively fixing our attention on heavenly things – the kingdom of God, etc. Hence we read in Colossians Ch 3:1-4, *‘If then you were raised with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God. Set your mind on things above, not on things on the earth. For you died, and your life is hidden with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life appears, then you also will appear with Him in glory.’*

In a similar vein, the same Apostle urges in the climactic eighth chapter of his letter to Rome (verses 5-8), *‘For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, nor indeed can be. So then, those who are in the flesh cannot please God.’*

Doubtless John Owen et al would have much to say far more practically helpful than my counsel here. Prayerfully keeping short accounts with God is essential. I reckon, a key component to the successful overthrow of carnality & destructive temptation afforded by careless & unprincipled exposure to the WEB is the GODLY excitement intrinsic in an optimistic (postmillennial) culture-wide appreciation of the gospel of the kingdom. How vital it is then that the Christianity promoted & taught in the Church corresponds with the full-orbed gospel that fills the pages of Scripture & overturned the mighty power of ancient Rome!

### 3. **Chess!**

My dear wife JUSTIFIABLY wonders at times whether my appetite for internet Chess (or any chess for that matter!) is over-indulged. I’m certain she’s right to draw my attention to this besetting failure. If truth be told, I’m a sucker for ‘just one more game before bed-time’. The game is utterly enthralling, full of cool combinations and aesthetic beauty. But my tendency to over-preoccupation with Chess is no different, in principle, to her predilection for Jewellery manufacture with beads or the next episode of a Crime Detective Mystery book/film, etc. I reckon, we’re all fickle-hearted and liable to give over a disproportionate amount of time to what most might consider an innocent ‘past-time’. The past-time activity, it seems to me turns idolatrous when it displaces time we ought to have spent pursuing our duty towards God and/or others. The sin, in this case, is once again, intemperance and irresponsibility. The folly it represents arises from our failure to comprehend the true worth and value of each moment of our time and our eternal accountability to invest our God-given time and talents profitably for the cause of Christ in the augmentation of His kingdom. We are commanded to ‘redeem the time.’ (Eph 5:16) Wesley allegedly said, ‘Leisure and I have parted.’ But God says He, ‘has given us richly, all things to enjoy’ (1 Tim 6:17). I know perfectly well when I have over-indulged my passion for chess by playing for an extended period. I hope, with the passing of years, and the solemn approach of God’s righteous Judgement, I shall yet learn how to better moderate my desire and channel my energies into those pursuits that more definitely serve to advance the crown rights of Christ in the world. Our own Minister helpfully, comments frequently, ‘The correction to ABUSE is not NO USE but RIGHT USE. Amen.

## Conclusion

I have sought to show in both this article and the previous one that there are no legitimately DISPUTABLE matters. Bob Dylan was surely right when he declared back in 1979, “there ain’t no neutral ground”. Van Til urges us to believe that, since there are only two sorts of people – covenant breakers and covenant keepers, there is a distinctively Christian way of doing everything. Scripture tells us to *‘do all things to the glory of God.’* (1Cor 10:31)

A modern, pseudo version of the Christian message seeks to minimise these distinctives. But everywhere in Scripture, the contrast is stark: light and darkness, sheep & goats, wise & foolish builders, gatherers & scatterers, for me & against me, the righteous & the wicked, etc.

Moral licentiousness is widespread in the contemporary (evangelical) Christian scene. The absence of clear declarations affirming the universal moral character & application of the Decalogue is as loud as thunder. Moral directives are not incompatible with the gospel. Faithful gospel preaching will very strongly maintain & promote the Law of God found throughout the pages of Holy Scripture. Those pushing a worldview of moral greyness are subtly guilty of antinomianism. They are to be called to account for their lawless attitude.

*‘Everyone who makes a practice of sinning also practices lawlessness; sin is lawlessness.’* [1John 3:4]

The tragic consequence of invoking neutrality in the guise of ‘disputable matters’ is that before long, all matters become disputable and the antithetical character of Biblical truth is subtly undermined. I’ll give the final word to God Himself, *“If the trumpet shall make an uncertain sound, who shall prepare Himself for battle?”* (1Cor 14:8)