

When the current issue is available you will be notified.

Contending FOR THE Faith™

FOR THOSE WHO LOVE THE TRUTH AND HATE ERROR

THE USE OF HUMAN JUDGMENT IN COMMANDMENT KEEPING

Kenneth D. Cohn

Those that are faithful to God and His Son, Jesus Christ, are those who keep His commandments. The apostle Paul writes in 1 Corinthians 7:19* that **“Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but keeping the commandments of God is what matters.”** Jesus Himself castigated the scribes and Pharisees for making a show of commandment keeping while ignoring the weightier matters of the law. He said,

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you pay tithes of mint and anise and cummin, and have neglected the weightier matters of the law: justice and mercy and faith. These you ought to have done, without leaving the others undone. (Mat. 23:23-24a, See also Mat. 5:17-20).

The faithful child of God is to keep all commandments. Jesus made this abundantly clear when He said,

And Jesus came and spoke to them, saying, “All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth. Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age.” Amen (Mat. 28:18-20).

What are we to observe, i.e., keep? **“All things that I have commanded you.”** There are no insignificant commandments, as man would consider them, that may be ignored. To do so is sinful. In further emphasis of this point,

the apostle Paul wrote, **“And whatever you do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through Him”** (Col. 3:17).

If a commandment is not authorized by the last will and testament of the Christ, then it is merely a commandment of man. It is recorded in Matthew 15:3-9 (See also Mark 7:6-13) the answer that Jesus gave to the Pharisees and scribes:

He answered and said to them, “Why do you also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition? For God commanded, saying, ‘Honor your father and your mother’; and, ‘He who curses father or mother, let him be put to death.’ But you say, ‘Whoever says to his father or mother, “Whatever profit you might have received from me is a gift to God”—then he need not honor his father or mother.’ Thus you have made the commandment of God of no effect by your tradition. Hypocrites! Well did Isaiah prophesy about you, saying:

**‘These people draw near to Me with their mouth,
And honor Me with their lips,
But their heart is far from Me.
And in vain they worship Me,
Teaching as doctrines the commandments of men.’”**

Jesus said, **“If you love Me, keep My commandments”** (John 14:15). One cannot show his love for Jesus by keeping the commandments of men. In addition to expressing our love for Jesus by the keeping of His command-

(Continued on Page 6, Col. 1)

IN THIS ISSUE.....

THE USE OF HUMAN JUDGMENT IN COMMANDMENT KEEPING— KENNETH D. COHN.....	1
EDITORIAL.....	2

FELLOWSHIP AND FAMILY MEMBERS—DUB McCLISH.....	3
EXCEPT IT BE FOR FAMILY—BRUCE STULTING.....	4
QUOTATIONS FROM DUB McCLISH.....	9
McCLISH REPORT TO HIS SUPPORTERS.....	10
IF ANY MAN THAT IS CALLED A BROTHER...—DANNY DOUGLAS.....	13

Contending FOR THE Faith™

David P. Brown, Editor and Publisher
dpbcftf@gmail.com

COMMUNICATIONS received by *CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH* and/or its Editor are viewed as intended FOR PUBLICATION unless otherwise stated. Whereas we respect confidential information, so described, everything else sent to us we are free to publish without further permission being necessary. Anything sent to us NOT for publication, please indicate this clearly when you write. Please address such letters directly to the Editor David P. Brown, P.O. Box 2357, Spring, Texas 77383 or dpbcftf@gmail.com. Telephone: (281) 350-5516.

FREE—FREE—FREE—FREE—FREE—FREE

To receive *CFTF* free, go to www.cftfpaper.com and sign up. Once done, you will be notified when the current issue is available. It will be in the form of a PDF document that can be printed, and forwarded to friends.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES FOR THE PAPER EDITION

Single Print Subs: One Year, \$25.00; Two Years, \$45.00.

NO REFUNDS FOR CANCELLATIONS OF PRINT SUBSCRIPTIONS.

ADVERTISING POLICY & RATES

CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH exists to defend the gospel (Philippians 1:7,17) and refute error (Jude 3). Therefore, we advertise only what is authorized by the Bible (Colossians 3:17). We will not knowingly advertise anything to the contrary and reserve the right to refuse any advertisement.

All setups and layouts of advertisements will be done by *CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH*. A one-time setup and layout fee for each advertisement will be charged if such setup or layout is needful. Setup and layout fees are in addition to the cost of the space purchased for advertisement. No major changes will be made without customer approval.

All advertisements must be in our hands no later than one month preceding the publishing of the issue of the journal in which you desire your advertisement to appear. To avoid being charged for the following month, ads must be canceled by the first of the month. We appreciate your understanding of and cooperation with our advertising policy.

MAIL ALL SUBSCRIPTIONS, ADVERTISEMENTS AND LETTERS TO THE EDITOR, P. O. Box 2357, Spring, Texas 77383-2357. COST OF SPACE FOR ADS: Back page, \$300.00; full page, \$300.00; half page, \$175.00; quarter page, \$90.00; less than quarter page, \$18.00 per column-inch. CLASSIFIED ADS: \$2.00 per line per month. CHURCH DIRECTORY ADS: \$30.00 per line per year. SETUP AND LAYOUT FEES: Full page, \$50.00; half page, \$35.00; anything under a half page, \$20.00.

CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH is published bimonthly. P. O. Box 2357, Spring, Texas 77383-2357 Telephone: (281) 350-5516.

Ira Y. Rice, Jr., Founder
August 3, 1917–October 10, 2001

Editorial...

TRUTH IS TRUTH AND WILL ALWAYS BE TRUTH, NO MATTER ANYONE'S IGNORANCE OF IT, OR ATTITUDE TOWARD IT (John 8:31, 32; 17:17 1 Cor. 13:6)

The article with which this issue of *CFTF* is concerned begins on page three of this paper. For the sake of transparency and fairness we have printed it for our readers.

As readers of *CFTF* know, we first addressed what it teaches in the March 2019 *CFTF*. Regardless of suggestions by the author that I and others should have known about his article and the sentiments expressed therein since at least 2011, I and several others did not know of the same and were jolted to the core when we read it, especially when we considered the author of it, our beloved brother and co-worker of so many years, Dub McClish. As to how far and wide his article was spread he wrote:

...brief articles on my Facebook page and 35+ other individual and/or group Facebook pages that graciously permit my posts. I try to post such brief articles about once a week, both for the teaching potential of their content, and also as a means of directing readers to my Website (www.thescripturecache.com). I posted my article, "Fellowship and Family Members" (attached), on said Facebook pages on March 4, simply as another of my brief writings, which I had originally written for and published in the November 13, 2011, Northpoint church bulletin, *The Lighthouse*. Also, in my weekly Saturday morning letter of March 2, I included the article and encouraged its reading (See Dub McClish's email to his supporters, first column, last paragraph, p. 10).

Thus, as is true of anything posted to Facebook and other places on the internet, it was dissipated about as publicly and permanently as anything can be. Since it is in the internet international system, it is there for the world to see forever.

What about the subject of Christian fellowship and the scriptural withdrawal of the same from impenitent brethren (family members or otherwise) who are overtaken in a trespass, or who have apostatized completely? I have never believed what the article teaches regarding withdrawing "spiritual fellowship" (as brother McClish defines, uses, and practices the same) from impenitent family members, and how the article permits faithful family members to treat erring impenitent family members who have been overtaken in a trespass and are, thus, separated from God (Gal. 6:1).

COMPLAINING BUT NO REFUTING

In the April 12th Zoom video conference referred to in brother McClish's email to his supporters (page 11), not once in almost two hours of meeting, did he attempt to refute our response to his article in the 2019 March *CFTF*. Again, he

(Continued Page 15)

FELLOWSHIP AND FAMILY MEMBERS

Dub McClish

Perhaps no Christian family has escaped seeing a family member depart from the faith, either in doctrine or behavior (or in both). When a husband, wife, son, daughter, brother, or sister falls away or becomes involved in doctrinal error or support of a false teacher, what are the faithful family members to do? Can one at the same time be true to the Christ and also true to family commitments and relationships? Must one cease all association with one's kindred?

Relative to the husband-wife relationship in which one has been disfellowshipped, the following question was asked of the late Guy N. Woods, and his answer follows (*Questions and Answers*, Vo. 2, pp. 33–34):

QUESTION: “Paul forbids fraternal association with a withdrawn person, ‘with such a one no not to eat’ (1 Cor. 5:11). What is a faithful Christian wife to do when her husband is withdrawn from?”

ANSWER: It seems clear that Paul was not alluding to a relationship involving husband and wife in the passage cited. The laws of God are never in conflict; all truth is harmonious with itself, and the principles under which God ordains we are to live are never contradictory. Wives have duties to their husbands—whether they are Christians or not—and these duties harmonize with the obligations as Christians, as well. Marriage relationships were designed of God to take precedence over all other relationships; any situation later arising must be understood in the light of this fact. The Christian wife should therefore continue to live with her husband and use her influence to bring him to repentance. 1 Peter 3:1, though not directly applicable to this matter, nonetheless indicates the principle involved.

I agree with the above, with the following exception: It goes too far to say without qualification that “Marriage relationships were designed of God to take precedence over all other relationships.” Paul made it clear (1 Cor. 7:13–16) that if one's ungodly partner refuses to tolerate his/her faithful Christian mate and abandons the marriage, the faithful mate is not obligated to prevent his/her departure. (Note: Such a departure does not give the faithful mate the right to remarry, unless the departing mate has committed (or later commits) fornication/adultery [Mat. 19:9].) It has long been my view that, from the context in 1 Corinthians 7, the departing one is one who finds the godly life of his/her mate so repugnant (and perhaps limiting to his ungodliness) that he/she abandons the “restraints” of the relationship. I have also long believed that the option Paul gives in verses 15–16 is one designed to allow the faithful mate to escape a relationship that might cause the loss of his/her soul through the temptation to keep the relationship intact by yielding to ungodly demands of a godless mate. I realize that this passage deals with a Christian married to a non-Christian, but I see no reason why it would not apply as well to a Christian married to a disfellowshipped Christian or one who has become a reprobate, even if not disfellowshipped. He is no more in fel-

lowship with God and faithful saints than is an unbeliever.

Just as the Scriptural fellowship withdrawal of a husband by the church does not sever the marriage bond or nullify the responsibilities of his faithful Christian wife, assuming this couple have children and the husband also has fleshly siblings, neither does the withdrawal nullify the parent-child relationship nor the fleshly brother-sister relationship.

It must, however, alter the attitude toward him of all family members who are faithful to God, so that he well understands that they do not approve of his behavior and/or doctrine and that there will be no spiritual fellowship with him until he repents. Those who quote 2 Thessalonians 3:14 (i.e., “have no company with” the apostate) as an absolute with no exceptions, including family members, have simply quit reading too soon. The next verse qualifies have no company by saying we should not treat such a one as an enemy, but should admonish him as a brother—which requires some sort of personal association/contact. If this procedure applies regarding our behavior toward a marked Christian who is not a fleshly relative, should it apply any less to one's fleshly family members? I do not see why it should.

So what are parents and grandparents to do if their children and/or grandchildren abandon the faith when they get away from home? What is one to do when a brother or sister in one's immediate family is involved in error? What is an adult child to do if his father or mother apostatizes? This quandary challenges one's best wisdom at times. Do we summarily, without exception, denounce them and tell them they cannot cross our threshold again until they repent? Do we slam the door in their faces to any further family gatherings and meals? Should we allow them to come, but make them eat in another room? Would doing such help or hinder the possibility of our ever reaching them?

Should we not make some allowance for dealing with such matters on a case-by-case basis, depending at least to some degree on the kind of sins involved (e.g., should a family member who has embraced agnosticism be treated in the same way as a child molester)? Certainly, we must unmistakably register our disapproval of their misdeeds and do what we can to admonish, teach, and persuade them to return, whatever their sin. However, if we summarily cut them off (as some advocate) with an absolute keep-no-company approach, what hope then have we of persuading and restoring them? I suggest that there is some room for judgment in dealing with this painful problem.

Having experienced this grief in our own family, our approach has been (and continues to be) somewhat of a middle ground. We have let the offenders know (in the strongest terms possible) our disapproval of and disagreement with their behavioral and/or doctrinal errors. These conversations have included pointing out the fallacies of their behavior and/or doc-

(Continued Top Of Second Column, Page 9)

EXCEPT IT BE FOR FAMILY?

Bruce Stulting

Speaking to the Ephesian elders at Miletus, Paul said, **“For I have not shunned to declare to you the whole counsel of God”** (Acts 20:27). One cannot claim to declare the whole counsel of God while refusing to teach part of His will. Furthermore, one cannot claim to declare the whole counsel of God while completely avoiding His will on any given subject. Corrective church discipline is a part of the whole counsel of God, and thus must be declared.

Although corrective church discipline is the topic of many verses in the Bible, there are four major New Testament passages that plainly set forth the will of God on the subject: (1) 2 Thessalonians 3:6—**“Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us”**; (2) Romans 16:17—**“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them”**; (3) 1 Corinthians 5:11—**“But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat”**; and (4) 2 Thessalonians 3:14—**“And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.”** All four of these passages are part of the whole counsel of God that must be declared.

It is lamentable that corrective church discipline has, for the most part, become a thing of the past. Few congregations practice corrective discipline and, if they do, it is not done properly or it is not applied consistently. There are many complications associated with this action. Discipline often involves more than one person. Family members, and others, often react improperly to the one disciplined. Many elders and elderships lack sufficient courage to carry it out. Because of the perceived difficulty, corrective discipline has been sorely neglected.

It must be understood that the Bible does not excuse us from carrying out corrective discipline just because it is emotionally difficult and unpleasant. However, no honest Bible student will deny the importance of church discipline. They recognize that it is an integral part of God’s plan to save man. The Lord has given detailed instructions on this subject that are easily understood and not open to interpretation. Furthermore, He expects the pattern set forth in the Scriptures to be followed.

CORRECTIVE DISCIPLINE IS AN URGENT MATTER

One area of concern in practicing corrective discipline is in the timing of it. How much time should pass from the discovery of sin, the marking of the sinner, and avoiding the erring impenitent brother/sister? There are no explicit statements in the New Testament that deal directly with the exact moment when this action is to be taken. Therefore, the timing falls into the area of human judgment and must be done in the most expedient way possible. However, we are not left without some guidance from the Scriptures.

In determining the timing of corrective discipline, one must consider the seriousness of the matter and what is at stake. It must be remembered the one in need of discipline is lost in sin and headed for hell. James stated, **“Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins”** (Jam. 5:20). Thus, it is evident that corrective discipline is an urgent matter and must be carried out in a manner that is swift and effective. Also, other passages dealing with the timing of the disciplinary action taken must be understood in light of the urgency of saving a lost soul. One brother correctly stated the following regarding the timing of discipline:

Generally, it would seem to be the course of both prudence and longsuffering to say that more than one visit (at least two or three) should be made to the persistent sinner with the aim of bringing him/her to repentance if at all possible. If this does not produce repentance, then the whole church should become involved in prayer for and persuasion upon the sinner. If, after a reasonable time, repentance is not forthcoming, the sad task of withdrawing fellowship should take place.¹

We must practice patience, forbearance, and longsuffering (Jam. 5:7, 10-11, 19-20). However, care must be taken not to allow patience, forbearance, and longsuffering to digress into tolerating sin (that is never sanctioned by God) or to become a mask for unwillingness to act—more on this later.

The impenitent church member must be marked and avoided when efforts to restore fail. The church is not left without instruction regarding the manner in which faithful Christians are to treat wayward brethren.

The faithful are to have no company with them (2 The. 3:14; 1 Cor. 5:9-11). The wayward are to be marked [look at, to fix one’s eyes upon or direct one’s attention to] and avoided (Rom. 16:17). The degree to which association is to be withheld is seen in Paul’s directive of **“with such an one no not to eat”** (1 Cor. 5:11). However, we are to con-

tinue to love and treat them as brethren (2 The. 3:15). When brethren contact wayward church members to bring them to repentance, they must admonish them as a member of God's family (2 The. 3:15).

The brother from whom we quoted previously correctly stated:

To summarize these instructions, the one being disciplined is to be so marked and identified before the whole church that he is clearly recognized. The church's sweet fellowship and cordial attitude is to be withheld from him, both on a spiritual and social level. The faithful are not to do or say anything to him that would lend encouragement to him in his sin, but are rather to admonish him as an erring brother to repent each time they see him.²

Corrective church discipline is far more than a public announcement to the saints of the sad decision to withdraw fellowship from an impenitent erring child of God. It is also to be lived out in our interaction with the one being disciplined.

EXCEPT IT BE FOR FAMILY?

The inconsistency of some never ceases to amaze this writer. This is certainly true regarding the subject under consideration in this article. And, it is especially true regarding the author of two quotes previously referenced. In the context of eating with wayward family members, this same author stated:

Having experienced this grief in our own family, our approach has been (and continues to be) somewhat of a middle ground. We have let the offender know (in the strongest terms possible) our disapproval of and disagreement with their behavioral and/or doctrinal errors. These conversations have included pointing out the fallacies of their behavior and/or doctrine, along with strong appeals for their repentance and return to faithfulness. We have left no doubt in the minds of such ones in our family, as beloved as they are to us in the flesh, that we are not in spiritual fellowship with them in any sense or degree and that we will/can not be, until they repent. We do not, however, bar them from family gatherings that surround them with those whom they know are diametrically opposed to their ungodly behavior and/or damnable doctrines. We believe it would be counterproductive to our aim of restoring them if we cut them off from the only avenue of continued contact we have with them (i.e., love of family ties) and that they have with godly people.³

From the forgoing, it is obvious that the brother intends only to mark the one in sin, but not "avoid" the sinner in any meaningful way. This partial application of church discipline fails to teach and practice the whole counsel of God.

There is no justification for treating family members (whether by blood or by civil law) differently than any other church members in the practice of corrective church discipline! It is impossible to reconcile "The church's sweet fellowship and cordial attitude is to be withheld from him, both on a spiritual and social level" and "We do not, however, bar them from family gatherings...." Whether intentional or not,

if the author of the previous quotes is not attempting to make an exception for one's own family members regarding corrective church discipline, where the Bible makes none, what must he to say as much?

Consider the force of the following statements from Scripture regarding those who are subject to corrective discipline: (1) every brother that walketh disorderly—2 The. 3:6; (2) them which cause divisions—Rom. 16:17; (3) any man (in sin) that is called a brother—1 Cor. 5:11; (4) if any man who obeys not our word—2 The. 3:14; and (5) whosoever transgresseth—2 John. 9. Notice that these are all universal terms that apply to everyone who fits the description without exception. Anyone (including family members) who are so classified and refuse to repent must be marked and avoided to the extent demanded by the Scriptures. Anything less is compromise and results in sin.

It has also been suggested that family members ought to be given an indefinite amount of time before action is taken. As to how much time is to be determined by the faithful family members. The one who said in one quote, "at least two or three" visits should be made and then withdraw if repentance is not forthcoming, said in another article that one may allow weeks, months, and even years without marking and withdrawing. The advocate of these views just noticed is assuming that the timing varies, "depending at least to some degree on the kind of sins involved."⁴ However, there is no indication that some sins are treated in a more lenient way than others. It is poor hermeneutics that arrays one passage against another. As Jesus stated, "...the scripture cannot be broken" (John 10:35).

CONCLUSION

Those who refuse to practice corrective church discipline as taught by the New Testament not only place the souls of sinners in jeopardy, but also place their own souls in danger (Jam. 5:18-19). Furthermore, their doctrine allows sin's corrupting influence to remain in the church (1 Cor. 5:6). Also, they flagrantly disobey plain commands and in doing so demonstrate a lack of love for Christ (John. 14:15). As the apostle John wrote, "**By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous**" (1 John 5:2, 3). The light of the church is dimmed in a world of darkness (Phi. 2:15). Allowing sinners to remain undisciplined, gives the world reason to criticize the church (2 Sam. 12:14). It destroys what God intended corrective church discipline to accomplish in bringing the impenitent erring church member to repentance and keeping the church free of the leavening influence of sin. "**Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump**" (1 Cor. 5:6; Also see vs. 7, 8; Gal. 5:9).

When such action becomes necessary, we must not be ruled by mere sentimentalism and emotionalism toward the one in error of life or teaching. We must not go on giving him our

cordial fellowship, friendship and hospitality as if there were no change in our relationship to him. Such will but encourage him in his sin and will identify us as partakers in his sin. We must rather be ruled by the solemn and sad duty that is laid upon us by God's Word to consider him as the Gentile and the publican (Mat. 18:17), yet not forgetting to **"admonish him as a brother"** who needs to repent (2 The. 3:15).⁵

End Notes

(1) Dub McClish, "Corrective Church Discipline" in *1 and 2 Thessalonians, and Philemon, Studies in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, and Philemon*, edited by Dub McClish (Denton, Texas:

Valid Publications, Inc., 1988), p. 293.

(2) Dub McClish, "Fellowship and Family Members," *The Lighthouse*, weekly bulletin of Northpoint Church of Christ, Denton, TX, November 13, 2011.]

(3) Ibid., p. 2-3

(4) Ibid., p. 2

(5) "Corrective Church Discipline," p. 199

—925a Fish Hatchery Rd
Huntsville TX, 77320

(Cohn, Continued From Page 1)

ments, we also show our love for our brethren by keeping His commandments, as written by the apostle John in 1 John 5:2-3, **"By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep His commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments. And His commandments are not burdensome."**

Notice that John says that His commandments are not burdensome (**grievous**, *KJV*). Albert Barnes, in his commentary, has this to say about the burdensomeness of His commandments:

Greek, "heavy" – *bareiai* ; that is, difficult to be borne as a burden. See Mat. 11:30. The meaning is, that his laws are not unreasonable; the duties which he requires are not beyond our ability; his government is not oppressive. It is easy to obey God when the heart is right; and those who endeavor in sincerity to keep his commandments do not complain that they are hard. All complaints of this kind come from those who are not disposed to keep his commandments. Indeed, THEY object that his laws are unreasonable; that they impose improper restraints; that they are not easily complied with; and that the divine government is one of severity and injustice. But no such complaints come from true Christians. They find HIS service easier than the service of sin, and the laws of God more mild and easy to be complied with than were those of fashion and honor, which they once endeavored to obey. The service of God is freedom; the service of the world is bondage. No man ever yet heard a true Christian say that the laws of God, requiring him to lead a holy life, were stern and "grievous." But who has not felt this in regard to the inexorable laws of sin? What votary of the world would not say this if he spoke his real sentiments?" (from *Barnes' Notes*, Electronic Database Copyright © 1997-2014 by BibleSoft, Inc. All rights reserved.)

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

In the March 2019 issue of *Contending for the Faith*, there appeared two articles about fellowship and family relationships. Those two articles should be read in conjunction with this article. The objective of these articles was to rebut the notion held by some that the exercise of judgment when it comes to family members respecting withdrawal

of fellowship because of unrepented of sin allows sharing of meals, receiving them into your house, greeting them, and otherwise not treating them as a heathen and publican. This view holds that an unrepentant family member may be treated differently than an unrepentant non-family member. After letting the unfaithful family member know that their behavior (or belief) is sinful and that they are not in "spiritual fellowship" with the faithful family members, then the faithful and unfaithful family members may continue to participate in family gatherings and meals. The keep-no-company approach, so the reasoning goes, would be counterproductive to the aim of restoring them. It then is simply a matter of judgment as to the degree to which fellowship is withdrawn and the type of fellowship to withhold (spiritual and/or social, although such types per se are not known in scripture). Seemingly, it all hinges on judgment. My judgment may be different than yours because of different dynamics. Because of these different dynamics, it may be that an unfaithful family member "spiritually" withdrawn from may never be excluded from any family gathering. It allows for some rather unusual and inconsistent treatment of the erring. For example, an unrepentant family member and an unrepentant non-family member could both attend a congregational meal. If one ascribes to the differential treatment of the two classes of sinners, the faithful family member could sit down to eat with the erring family member but not the erring non-family member. What if the erring family member is a third cousin once removed. Does this differential treatment still apply?

OBJECTIONS RAISED TO SUCH ARTICLES

Three recurring objections raised to the two articles referenced above are (1) that the view to which we objected was first published more than thirty years ago, therefore, why are we objecting to it now when we did not thirty years ago, (2) that we did not object to the alternative treatment of non-repentant family members even though we were well aware of the particulars of these family matters, and (3) that the different manner in which unfaithful family members are treated is not an "either-or" (i.e., the faithful family member may not continue to "eat with" the unfaithful

family member, the so-called keep-no-company approach) but a “both-and” matter (i.e., the faithful family member may continue to “eat with” the unfaithful family member depending on various factors on a case-by-case basis). In response, first we have not read all that has been written by any author and it is presumptuous to assume that we have. As surprising as it may be to some given the nature of the paper, we are not aware of all the writings of even our closest friends in the faith.

Second, we are not aware of all the particulars of family relationships. Even with the advent of social media, I dare say that our readers are not aware of the family matters of the authors of the two aforementioned articles nor should they be. However, when we see pictures posted on social media of certain family gatherings characterized as joyous that include unfaithful family members, we do wonder. Then when such family gatherings (faithful and unfaithful) are explicitly justified in writing in Facebook discussion groups and the like, then it becomes unavoidably clear why such family gatherings of the faithful and unfaithful are held and condoned.

Third, it is admitted that corrective discipline is not always administered immediately in all cases for the very simple reason that discovery and analysis must first take place. One should not be surprised how deceptive the sinner can be nor how difficult it is at times to sort it all out. Respecting the eldership on which I serve, when it is plainly declared to us that a member has rejected God, Christ, and the Bible and is now an avowed atheist, marking that individual has been immediate. The same immediate disciplinary action has been taken against members who admit that they are in sin or are presented with irrefutable evidence that they are in sin and will not repent. Indeed, we contend that it is to be expected that the unfaithful family member in a “both-and” matter will receive a markedly different treatment compared with a unfaithful, non-family member under a strikingly similar set of facts and circumstances. We further contend that if a form of leniency (that we cannot find in scripture) is practiced, then it must be extended to all who may be subject to corrective discipline, family member or not. It is quite reasonable for the unfaithful non-family member receiving the more stringent treatment to cry foul pointing to those unfaithful family members receiving the more lenient treatment as the guide. The scriptures, therefore, treat each sinner worthy of corrective discipline fairly, impartially (without respect of persons), and not arbitrarily or capriciously.

Whether we should have known what was written thirty years ago, or twenty, or ten years ago, or that we should have been more keenly aware of the family relationships of others is irrelevant to the justification of this alternative form of corrective discipline. Since the writing of some seven years ago was recently posted to several Facebook

discussion groups and other media sources as an updated version, there is no doubt as to its meaning, application, and impact, or the necessity of our response.

OBLIGATIONS AND OPTIONS

Every divine commandment places an obligation on the faithful to obey. Judgment is the exercise of one’s ability to take the available evidence and objectively form an opinion and devise a wise plan of action. Human judgment may never hinder, prevent, or limit in any way the duty to obey the commandment. Human judgment must be exercised to some degree in any act of obedience. It operates in the area of expediency, i.e., which options are available to carry out the command and of these options, which one is deemed most advantageous to carry out the obligation. If there are five (pick your number) options available, human judgment must decide which option is likely to carry out the obligation in the most advantageous and quickest manner (especially when urgency is a factor). Jesus said, **“I must work the works of Him who sent Me while it is day; the night is coming when no one can work”** (John 9:4). As Paul put it, **“now is the day of salvation”** (2 Cor 6:2b). Obedience to God is an urgent matter.

In the verse previously cited (Mat. 28:19-20), Jesus said to: **“Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you.”** The obligation is to **“Go”** and **“Teach.”** The method of travel is not specified nor is the method of teaching (although the subject matter is specified). Accordingly, human judgment is permitted in selecting the most expeditious method(s) of travel and teaching given the facts and circumstances. We are to engage in the five acts of worship on the first day of the week in the worship assembly of the saints, but there is no indication in the obligation as to the place or time. That is a decision of human judgment.

FELLOWSHIP WITH ERRING BRETHREN (OR HOW NOT TO)

The faithful child of God cannot in any circumstances fellowship sin and be pleasing to God. Should we make some allowance for dealing with individuals differently depending on the type of sin involved? Yes. The weak brethren of Romans chapter 14 or 1 Corinthians chapter 8 are not to be treated the same as Alexander the coppersmith (2 Tim. 4:14-15), Hymenaeus and Philetus (2 Tim. 2:17-18), or the men compared with Jannes and Jambres (2 Tim. 3:8-9). Weak brethren are expected to grow. The writer of the Hebrew letter castigated his readers because they did not grow (Heb. 5:12-13).

Sin has always been dealt with swiftly and decisively. When Peter had come to Antioch, Paul withstood him to his face before all because of his hypocrisy (Gal. 2:11ff). When

Simon the sorcerer tried to buy the gift of laying on of hands, Peter rebuked him immediately (Acts 8:9-24). When Elymas, the false prophet, (Acts 13:6ff) withstood Paul and Barnabas, Paul immediately struck him blind. When Jesus told His disciples that He must suffer many things, He rebuked Peter sharply when Peter denied that such would happen (Mat. 16:23, Mark 8:33). What these examples demonstrate is that the normal corrective discipline always took place immediately, or at least very quickly.

What may we learn from the fellowship passages that were cited in the two articles of the March issue of *CFTF*? Let us examine a few. In the fifth chapter of 1 Corinthians, we read it had been reported to Paul that a man had his father's wife. We do not know how long it took the report to reach Paul nor how long it took his response to reach the Corinthian brethren. We do know that Paul said to take care of the matter (deliver such a one to Satan) the very next time that they were gathered together which would not have been longer than a week. They were warned **“not to keep company with anyone named a brother, who is sexually immoral, or covetous, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner — not even to eat with such a person a brother.”** There was no consideration given to the possibility that the action may be counterproductive for the very reason that it was not considered to be counterproductive. We do know, however, that the action resulted in the man's repentance.

In 2 Thessalonians 3:6-15, Paul commands the brethren, in the name of (by His authority) of our Lord Jesus Christ, that they withdraw from every brother who walks disorderly. Furthermore, if anyone does not obey their word in this epistle, note that person and do not keep company with him, that he may be ashamed. When are they to be “noted”? When it is determined that they do not obey the apostle's word in this epistle. How long does that take? For some brethren, a very long time.

In Titus 3:9-11 we read,

But avoid foolish disputes, genealogies, contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and useless. Reject a divisive man after the first and second admonition, knowing that such a person is warped and sinning, being self-condemned.

This passage says to reject a divisive man (**heretick**, *KJV*) after the first and second admonition. How long between the first and second admonition? Weeks, months, years, never? No, it is just long enough to determine that the first admonition did not have its desired effect. And that is not a long time.

In Romans 16:17, the brethren were urged to note those who cause divisions and offenses, contrary to the doctrine which you learned, and avoid them. What is the mechanics of “noting” them? Jesus said **“Therefore by their fruits you will know them”** (Mat. 7:20). What does it mean to

“avoid them”? The same as **“rejecting a divisive man”** and **“withdrawing”** from every brother who walks disorderly.

Finally, in 2 John 9-11 we read,

Whoever transgresses and does not abide in the doctrine of Christ does not have God. He who abides in the doctrine of Christ has both the Father and the Son. If anyone comes to you and does not bring this doctrine, do not receive him into your house nor greet him; for he who greets him shares in his evil deeds.

What is the timing of this action? It must be before the transgressor comes into the house. Furthermore, the transgressor must be recognized for what he is and before a meeting takes place so that no greeting is extended. How long does this take? Not long.

OBEDIENCE DELAYED IS NOT A COMMANDMENT OBEYED

Probably the most well-known passage in the Bible is John 3:16 (**“Judge not that you be not judged”** in Matthew 7:1 would be a close second). Jesus says there, **“For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.”** The purpose of this belief in Jesus Christ is so that one would not be condemned in the judgment to come. Jesus further says in verses 17 and 18,

For God did not send His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He who believes in Him is not condemned; but he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

Disbelief in Him is a sin. If one does not believe in Him, he is condemned already. Disobeying a command is a sin. Unrepented of sin works the same way as disbelief. Every evil deed (disbelief or disobedience) is already condemned. If one will not repent of his evil, he has already been sentenced. A delay in the sentencing until judgment lulls the unbeliever into thinking that there are no divine consequences to his error. Time is not on the side of the sinner. When one delays in his duty toward wayward members, including family members, he contributes to their divine condemnation.

The writer of Ecclesiastes writes in chapter 8 verse 11, **“Because the sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil.”** The esteemed commentator Matthew Henry has this to say about this verse.

It is true of all sinners in general, and particularly of wicked rulers, that, because sentence against their evil works is not executed speedily, they think it will never be executed, and therefore they set the law at defiance and their hearts are full in them to do evil; they venture to do so much the more mischief, fetch a greater compass in their wicked designs,

and are secure and fearless in it, and commit iniquity with a high hand. Observe, (1.) Sentence is passed against evil works and evil workers by the righteous Judge of heaven and earth, even against the evil works of princes and great men, as well as of inferior persons. (2.) The execution of this sentence is often delayed a great while, and the sinner goes on, not only unpunished, but prosperous and successful. (3.) Impunity hardens sinners in impiety, and the patience of God is shamefully abused by many who, instead of being led by it to repentance, are confirmed by it in their impenitence. (4.) Sinners herein deceive themselves, for, though the sentence be not executed speedily, it will be executed the more severely at last. Vengeance comes slowly, but it comes surely, and wrath is in the meantime treasured up against the day of wrath. (from *Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible*, PC Study Bible Formatted Electronic Database Copyright © 2006 by BibleSoft, Inc. All Rights reserved.)

TREATMENT OF FAMILY MEMBERS

In each of the examples given there is not one mention made of treating family members any differently from any other brother in Christ. Yet, we know that there are continuing obligations owed to spouses, dependent children, and destitute parents. So then, how does one reconcile the two seemingly conflicting treatments. These are not in conflict with each other. It is indeed possible to satisfy the fundamental obligations owed to a dependent child, dependent parent, or spouse, for example, and yet not eat with him (also an obligation). The method falls into the realm of expediency, i.e., how best not to eat with the erring one, how best to treat them as a heathen and publican, and still fulfill the most fundamental familial obligations. To say that it cannot be done is to say that the obligation to withdraw fellowship is unattainable, too hard, or must be redefined in a way that neutralizes the shame that the erring one must experience in order to bring about the desired repentance and keep the church pure.

CONCLUSION

We must be mindful that the scriptures respecting fellowship principles have two groups in mind, the faithful and the erring. If the faithful fail to apply the obligations mandated by scripture, it works spiritual harm to the erring. Additionally, it works spiritual harm to the faithful by virtue of disobeying an obligation placed on them as to how to treat the erring one. Let us cast aside any notion that we can modify by word or action in any way the plain teaching of fellowship principles and still be pleasing to God even when it affects the dearest on earth to us.

*All scripture references are taken from the *New King James Version* unless otherwise noted.

—31311 Chelsie Pl
Magnolia, TX 77354



(McClish, Continued From Page 3)

trine, along with strong appeals for their repentance and return to faithfulness. We have left no doubt in the minds of such ones in our family, as beloved as they are to us in the flesh, that we are not in spiritual fellowship with them in any sense or degree and that we will/can not be, until they repent. We do not, however, bar them from family gatherings that surround them with those whom they know are diametrically opposed to their ungodly behavior and/or damnable doctrines. We believe it would be counterproductive to our aim of restoring them if we cut them off from the only avenue of continued contact we have with them (i.e., love of family ties) and that they have with godly people.

—908 Imperial Drive
Denton, TX 76209



Quotations from Brother McClish's chapter in the Seventh Annual Denton Lectures book, *Studies in First and Second Thessalonians and Philemon*, (1988).

1. Lamentably, some weak and unstable souls, who operate more on the emotional than the rational level, may actually give comfort and encouragement to the sinner in his sin, all the while criticizing the elders and the remainder of the church for being so "self-righteous" and "judgmental." The very day the withdrawal of the erring brother is announced, such fickle and shallow souls may take him out for lunch in direct defiance of Scriptural mandate (1 Cor. 5:11) [p. 195].
2. The church's sweet fellowship and cordial attitude is to be withheld from him, both on a spiritual and social level. The faithful are not to do or say anything to him that would lend encouragement to him in his sin, but are rather to admonish him as an erring brother to repent each time they see him [pp. 193-194].
3. Generally, it would seem to be the course of both prudence and longsuffering to say that more than one visit (at least two or three) should be made to the persistent sinner with the aim of bringing him/her to repentance if at all possible. If this does not produce repentance, then the whole church should become involved in prayer for and persuasion upon the sinner. If, after a reasonable time, repentance is not forthcoming, the sad task of withdrawing fellowship should take place [p. 193].
4. When such action becomes necessary, we must not be ruled by mere sentimentalism and emotionalism toward the one in error of life or teaching. We must not go on giving him our cordial fellowship, friendship, and hospitality as if there were no change in our relationship to him. Such will but encourage him in his sin and will identify us as partakers in his sin. We must rather be ruled by the solemn and sad duty that is laid upon us by God's Word to consider him as the Gentile and the publican (Matt. 18:17), yet not forgetting to 'admonish him as a brother' who needs to repent (2 The. 3:15) [p. 199]. ❖❖❖

BROTHER MCCLISH'S NOTIFICATION TO HIS SUPPORTERS

**Kenneth D. Cohn on behalf of the
Elders of the Spring Church of Christ**

This May 2019 issue of *Contending for the Faith* paper is a companion to the March 2019 issue that dealt with the doctrine propagated by brother Dub McClish. His premise is that family members (however inclusive or exclusive that may be) who are unfaithful and unrepentant may be treated differentially than would be required for unfaithful and unrepentant non-family members. He first taught this doctrine in the Seventh Annual Denton Lectures book, *Studies in First and Second Thessalonians and Philemon* (1988), pages 348-349. He published an expanded and revised version in the November 13, 2011, Northpoint church bulletin, *The Lighthouse*. He recently posted this article to his website as well as to 35+ other individual and/or group Facebook discussion groups and pages (thescripturecache.com). The stated purpose of such postings was to teach others and to direct them to his website.

I do not know of anyone that the elders of the Spring Church of Christ or the owners of the *Contending for the Faith* paper have esteemed more highly for his work's sake than brother McClish. He has suffered greatly at the hands of unreasonable and wicked men. It may have been the case that he needed no one to fight his battles for him, but we gladly joined forces with him in such efforts. Although it grieves us greatly, we must oppose error whatever the source.

Any doctrine that implies a false doctrine is itself false. If his doctrine respecting an alternative treatment of unfaithful, unrepentant family members is supported by the doctrine of Christ, we invite him (or any of those who he says agrees with him) to prove from the scriptures that what has been written in the March and May issues of this paper is false. If it can be done, then we will gladly repent of what has been written and publish such in this paper. But, as far as we know, it has not been attempted.

It may be argued that we should have known of his previous postings of his article. We did not know about it, nor do we believe it to be a reasonable expectation that we should have known about it. Such objection is treated in my article attached hereto.

I do not know that we have distanced ourselves from other faithful brethren who have indicated any degree of agreement with brother McClish on this issue (other than Phil Smith, the minister at the Northpoint church, who declared his agreement with this doctrine, even then tangentially) simply because we do not know who they are.

Brother McClish characterized our video conference

with him, which conference included the Spring elders (except Buddy Roth, because of his health), and three others who disagreed with his doctrine (through no persuasion on our part, I might add) as an attack. We object vigorously with this characterization since the purpose of such conference was to seek his abjurement of this doctrine. In that we failed.

We know about certain brethren that have written or spoken with brother McClish about their disagreement with his doctrine, some of whom have had to withdraw fellowship from their own unfaithful, unrepentant family members. They wished his doctrine was true, but they knew it was not. One fifteen-year-old Christian young lady, who highly respected and admired brother McClish, was almost in tears when she read brother McClish's article to her dad. She brought it to her dad's attention and he brought it to our attention. She simply could not believe that he would advocate such a doctrine.

Brother McClish wishes to limit his doctrine to family members. We do not believe that there is any logical way to do so. In fact, we cannot see why Memphis School of Preaching, Forest Hill Church of Christ elders, Apologetics Press, Inc., or any one of their acolytes would not demand, rightly so, to receive the same treatment from brother McClish that he extends to his own unfaithful and unrepentant family members. As has been demonstrated numerous times, one cannot limit the application of a false doctrine.

In the interest of full disclosure, we attach hereto the notification brother McClish sent to his supporters, his email to the Spring elders, and their return email.

—31311 Chelsie Pl.
Magnolia, TX



Brother Dub sent the following email to his supporters.

From: Dub McClish <dubmcclish@gmail.com>
Date: May 18, 2019 at 5:33:05 PM CDT
To: Dub McClish <dubmcclish@gmail.com>
Subject: A sad announcement
Reply-To: dubmcclish@gmail.com

Dear brethren,

You are receiving this letter because you, along with nine others, are financially supporting my work and helping to supply my livelihood each month. Some of you have been doing so for several years, both generously and faith-

fully. Some of you have stood by me when others sought to destroy my work, my influence, and even me, personally through the years. Truly, words cannot convey my gratitude for your encouragement in both word and deed through good times and bad. I have long thanked God for you in my daily prayers. I have never asked anyone to support me out of blind personal loyalty, and I'm unaware of any of you who have done so. Your dedication is to our Lord and His Truth, and your support for me has sprung from your trust in me as a faithful preacher and teacher of His Word, both in my words and in my daily living. I assure you that I do not take that confidence lightly.

I come to you now with what appears be another crisis on the horizon that involves me—and therefore, indirectly, you. As all of you know, the elders of the Spring congregation have long administered my support funds. I have had a close and amiable association with these brethren and the entire church there for more than three decades, and they have received and handled my support funds for almost fourteen years. These are brethren whom I highly esteem in so very many ways—truly, brethren beloved. Their trust in and esteem for me has been reciprocal in every respect as well. However, that wonderful relationship is now apparently on the very precipice of being shattered. The brethren at Spring have already begun distancing themselves from me and from other faithful brethren who have indicated any degree of agreement with me in a controversy that reared its head a few weeks ago, as briefly explained below.

These tragic events began with my posting of one of my brief articles on my Facebook page and 35+ other individual and/or group Facebook pages that graciously permit my posts. I try to post such brief articles about once a week, both for the teaching potential of their content, and also as a means of directing readers to my Website (www.thescripturecache.com). I posted my article, *Fellowship and Family Members* (attached), on said Facebook pages on March 4, simply as another of my brief writings, which I had originally written for and published in the November 13, 2011, Northpoint church bulletin, *The Lighthouse*. Also, in my weekly Saturday morning letter of March 2, I included the article and encouraged its reading. I did so in all innocence and without any thought of directing it at any person. I never received a whisper of question or criticism from any of the current Spring elders concerning the article until my recent circulation of it (although I believe each of them was on the bulletin mailing list when it was initially published). I had no inkling that any of them might disagree with what I wrote until I opened the April issue of *Contending for the Faith* and saw that all but two of its twelve pages were devoted to strongly worded articles directed at me and my article. These articles were written by brethren David Brown and Kenneth Cohn (both elders at Spring). I was shocked, hurt, yea nonplussed that these beloved brethren, even if they disagreed with my article, would so choose this medium and method-

ology to inform me of their displeasure.

They followed this attack by asking me to participate in a video conference with them, which occurred on April 12; they also invited three other men besides themselves who were in agreement with their opposition. This conference lasted almost 2 hours, during which they were insistent in no uncertain terms that I should recant my position and publicly retract my article. The meeting closed with my telling them I would consider what they had to say, reconsider my position, and respond later. I spent the next few days praying and questioning my position. I also sought counsel from other esteemed and respected brethren in search of some objective evaluations of my article; I certainly did not want to promote error, either in doctrine or practice. Further, it stressed me greatly to envision the harm to the kingdom another division between faithful brethren would portend. My discussions with various brethren in person, by phone, and by email exchanges reassured me that I had neither taught any error in my article or in my practice as I have dealt with apostate family members. I could thus not bow to the demands of these brethren at Spring—as dear as they are to me—without engaging in hypocrisy, which is not in me to do.

Therefore, on April 20, I wrote the Spring elders the letter I have attached. As you will see, I told them I could not, in good conscience, retract my article, for I was not convinced that its content was erroneous. I offered to write a brief clarifying statement for the venues on which I had circulated it previously, which I did on the Facebook pages on April 23 and included as part of my Saturday mailing of April 27. They have made no direct response to date, either to my letter to them or to the circulation of the clarifying statement. Soon thereafter, however, I began receiving letters and phone calls from brethren who had never before been concerned about my article, begging me to recant my position in the article. One dear brother even produced a 12+ minute video “sermon” obviously aimed at me, which he posted on Facebook.

This past Wednesday, I (and at least some of the brethren who support my article) received indications that the Spring elders have begun distancing themselves from me. It breaks my heart that this is so. I was also told by a brother who is not at Spring, but who is in agreement with them in this issue, that the May issue of *Contending for the Faith* will likely be devoted to “exposing” me as a false teacher and announcing Spring's withdrawal of fellowship from me. As the ripples of this controversy have already caused the cancellation on Wednesday of the Bellview Lectures, slated for early June—doubtless for fear that this controversy would dominate the discussions, both private and public. The broader effect of alienating faithful brethren is as unnecessary as it will be disastrous in dividing our forces to fight the devil. If you have questions about my brief account of these matters that have developed over the past few weeks, please don't

hesitate to call or write me; contact information is part of my email "signature."

A further practical effect of these developments obviously relates to my support. The very least action the Spring elders will take will be to refuse any longer to handle my support funds. In anticipation of that action, my brethren here at Northpoint have graciously consented to be recipients of my support, beginning immediately. I pray that you will see fit to continue your support, as you have so consistently and liberally done over a long period of time. I am still the same person in conviction and practice that I was when you began helping supply my needs. You deserve a share of the credit for in any good that I may have done in that span of time. I am still at work seven days a week, constantly seeking to improve my Website and to post Biblical articles on Facebook pages in an effort to instruct readers with the Truth. Once more, I thank you for your superb support. I will attach new address labels, hoping you will find them convenient. Godspeed in your continued faithful service to our Savior.

Yours in the Cause,

Dub



Brother McClish sent the following email to the Spring elders after he had sent the above email to his supporters.

Dub McClish <dubmcclish@gmail.com>

Sat 5/18/2019 6:44 PM

- You;
- BROWN-DAVID;
- ROTH-BUDDY;
- WEST-JOHN

To my beloved brethren,

Because of the developments of the past few weeks, I cannot imagine that you can continue in conscience to receive and administer my financial support. In anticipation of this discontinuance, I have therefore earlier today requested to my supporters that they immediately begin sending their support to my new congregational sponsor. Words cannot fully express my appreciation for your providing this assistance for me and my work over these almost 14 years. I especially express thanks to Ken for the many hours and extra work he has given to assist me. I continue to love you all as my brethren, and I'm grieved beyond measure that this alienation has occurred.

Yours in the Cause,

Dub



The email beginning at the top of the second column was sent on behalf of the Spring elders in response to the pre-

ceding email.

Kenneth Cohn

Sun 5/19/2019 9:50 PM

- BROWN-DAVID;
- ROTH-BUDDY;
- WEST-JOHN;
- dubmcclish@gmail.com

Dub,

Sent \$200 today.

As you quite correctly surmised, we cannot continue to receive and administer your financial support, nor can we continue the support that we have been contributing monthly. All will cease immediately.

There is no one for whom we have had greater affection than you demonstrated on several occasions by the battles that we have waged on your behalf oftentimes side-by-side. We entered the frays partly because we were standing by a dear and esteemed friend, but also because we were defending the truth of the gospel as well. You will recall that Spring made a sizable contribution to Northpoint for you all to secure the building in which you now meet. We helped Northpoint primarily because of your connection with these brethren. We do not believe that you have had any more devoted friends that we have been.

However, we cannot abide your doctrine taught in your article "Fellowship and Family Members" which we believe and have demonstrated in recent rebuttal articles to be false. Furthermore, we will continue to do whatever we are able, great or small, to persuade brethren of the falsity of your teaching.

We, as well as many other brethren, are greatly distressed that you of all people could hold such a position and that you felt it necessary to teach others by publishing your article on different social media and other forums. We do not wish to oppose you, but we must since we believe you hold to a doctrine that is contrary to the doctrine of Christ. We are divided, and if you continue to uphold your doctrine expressed in your article, we must remain divided.

If we receive any additional funds designated for your support, we will promptly remit them to you. If you wish some alternative disposition of such receipts, let us know. We will honor your request to make a \$100 contribution to the Kenya work.

Wishing you only the best in Christ, on behalf of the Spring elders, I remain

Faithfully yours,

Ken

—31311 Chelsie Pl.
Magnolia, TX

“IF ANY MAN THAT IS CALLED A BROTHER...”

Danny Douglas

The language of the Bible is so plain that the honest seeker of the truth, who rightly divides the word of truth, and accordingly labors in it will come to a proper understanding (cf. 2 Tim. 2:15; Eph. 5:17). For example, the plain expression, “any man,” may be readily understood and appreciated by the earnest student.

Jesus said, “...If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me” (Luke 9:23). In John 12:26, He said: “If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be: if any man serve me, him will my Father honour.” The Master also taught: “I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture” (John 10:9). Down through the ages men have appreciated these words which mean that any person, regardless of who he is, may come to the Savior for salvation! Indeed, these words speak loudly of the impartiality of God, Who is no respecter of persons (Acts 10:34-35)! Truly, “any man,” whosoever he may be, can become a follower of the Son of God on the Savior’s terms.

Yet, what is true of the privileges of God’s love and the water of life freely open to all, is also true regarding the responsibilities of living the Christian life. Christ has specific instructions concerning those in the church who fall into sin.

Regarding the withdrawal of the faithful from the disorderly, the apostle Paul plainly states:

Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us (2 The. 3:6).

“Every man” is without exception. If any man fails to continue to walk in step with inspired tradition, that is, the doctrine of Christ (2 John 9), he is to be withdrawn from.

There is also such an example in First Corinthians chapter five, which applies to any person who falls into sin. There existed a case in the Lord’s church at Corinth, a brother who became involved in incest. He fell into fornication with his father’s wife (1 Cor. 5:1-2). As a result, Paul instructs the church how to deal with him:

For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. 5:3-5).

They were to do this for the purpose of saving the fornicator’s soul in the Judgment. This action was therefore, to bring him to repentance (2 Cor. 7:10).

Moreover, it was to be done in order to purge the body of Christ of wickedness and to remove the evil leavening influence from among them. Paul declared to them: “**Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us:**” (1 Cor. 5:7). They were to: “**put away from among yourselves that wicked person**” (1 Cor. 5:13). This was to save the congregation. To continue in fellowship with those in sin would have caused the church at Corinth to become infected with evil, in that, “**a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump**” (1 Cor. 5:6; Gal. 5:9).

If the church at Corinth had not put away that wicked person from among them, God would no longer have had fellowship with them. Thankfully, they did follow Paul’s instructions Divinely given by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 5:3-5; Mat. 28:18; Col. 3:17). Later, in the Book of Second Corinthians, Paul commends them for repenting and going ahead and following the Lord’s commandments on this matter (cf. 2 Cor. 7:8-12). Furthermore, their action did bring the fallen brother to repentance, as the second chapter of the Epistle indicates (cf. 2 Cor. 2:1-11).

Fellowship with darkness brings separation from God, Who is light, and in Him is no darkness at all. John plainly declared:

This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth (1 John 1:5, 6).

Christians are forbidden to have any fellowship with darkness at all. Fellowship with darkness and fellowship with God at the same time is an impossibility (cf. 2 Cor. 6:14; Eph. 5:11). The body of Christ must be kept pure and holy, as Paul informed the Ephesian Christians:

Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish (Eph. 5:25-27).

Before the Corinthians took the proper action toward the fornicator, Paul forbids them to have any social interaction with him at all, or for that matter, with any brother in Christ who is living in sin, and has not repented. He plainly states:

I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators: Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater,

or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat. For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person (1 Cor. 5:9-13).

This command to have no social interaction with fallen members of the church, did not apply to non-members. Otherwise, Paul said: **“ye must needs go out of the world.”** In other words, there are occasions when such interactions must take place with those who are outside of the church. Yet, such refusal to company with fallen members is absolutely necessary or Christ would not have commanded it!

Christians are strictly forbidden to keep company with those members of the church who have fallen into sin and have not repented. With apostolic authority, Paul plainly stated: **“But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat”** (1 Cor. 5:11). Paul emphasizes that Christians are not to keep company with brothers and sisters in Christ who are in fornication or in any other kind of lawlessness (cf. 1 Cor. 5:9, 11). This means that Christians are not to mix and mingle with them, or be mixed up with them (*Vine*). The reason for this is very plain, that they may feel the shame for their sins. This is in line with Paul’s admonition to the brethren at Thessalonica: **“And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother”** (2 The. 3:14-15). These things are not to be done because we are against the fallen, but because of our love for them. Yet, if brethren ignore these commands, how are the fallen to be ashamed and to feel the effects of their sin?

Members of the body of Christ do not have an option or room for opinion in these matters, because Paul spoke these things with the authority of Christ, that is, by the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, regarding the withdrawal of fellowship from the disorderly, which includes the refusal to eat with them and to company with them at all (cf. 1 Cor. 5:3-5; 2 The. 3:6).

By refraining from any social interaction whatsoever, we do not mean that they were forbidden to speak to the fallen regarding their sinful condition. We are to strive to save their souls from death (Jam. 5:19-20). Yet, they were not to sit down and eat with them, which is suggestive of fellowship and harmony. They could not enjoy such association with one who had turned against their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and why would they want to?

Here are some questions for those who would maintain that there are exceptions to Paul’s injunction here, regarding eating or companying with the fallen.

After Paul wrote these instructions (1 Cor. 5:9-13), what

if a festive or family occasion arose, such as a holiday or a wedding, would any of the fornicator’s relatives in the church, if there were such, have been permitted to eat with him, prior to his repentance?

Would his own father, if he were a member of the Lord’s church, with whose wife the fallen brother was committing fornication, have been allowed to sit down and enjoy a meal with his incestuous son, based on Paul’s words in verse eleven? Could he have done such a thing with the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ behind it?

What if several months or years had passed, and the fallen brother had never repented, would the members at Corinth, in time, have been able to enjoy a meal with him, especially if they had once been good friends or were his relatives?

Another question is this, if the punitive action of forbidding social interaction, such as in eating together, were removed, would the withdrawal have had the same painful effect of bringing the fallen brother to sorrow, as, in fact, it did have, based on Second Corinthians chapter two? *Obviously, eating with and having company with the fallen does not indicate disfellowship, but rather fellowship with those with whom God no longer has fellowship!*

Paul obviously wrote these strong, powerful, and painful words to the Corinthians, out of his love for them and his love for Christ, the church, and the souls of men. In fact, he would later say: **“For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be grieved, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you”** (2 Cor. 2:4).

If we do not do all that the Scriptures command regarding the fallen, even if it involves family and close friends, are we really manifesting the love of Christ toward them, and our love for Christ toward Him?

We are to love Jesus Christ above all others, as He said: **“He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me”** (Mat. 10:37-38).

In representing the will of God, Paul was grieved with the church that they had not properly dealt with the brother in incest, before they took the proper action (1 Cor. 5:1-2). When brethren and congregations do not fully follow God’s will in dealing with the fallen, including the command to refuse company and eating with them, is the Lord not grieved with us today?

—704 Azalea Drive
Mt. Pleasant, TN 38474



(Editorial, Continued From Page 2)

has made no effort publicly to refute what we wrote in said paper. In his email to his supporters, he reports that he reconsidered what he had wrote, prayed about it, and consulted with others. Those with whom he consulted said he had done no wrong in what he wrote. Thus, he continues to believe and teach what he did in said article. Sadly, brother McClish or those brethren that told him he had done no wrong are unwilling thus far to tell us how they decided who was wrong and who was not.

On many occasions, I have witnessed brother McClish challenge, expose, and refute error that others have taught. Moreover, over the years on a number of these occasions, I have been involved with him on doing the same. Further, no one can successfully say that he is not an accomplished writer and very able to express himself as well as refute error. But, and again, at this writing, as far as I know, he has not attempted verbally or in writing to show that what was written in the 2019 March *CFTF* was wrong.

Brother McClish has assumed that because he printed his article in a 2011 church bulletin that we had read it. Then, when we told him in said *Zoom* internet video meeting that we had never read his views on said subject until we read them in his March of 2019 article, he responded with what in effect was, “Brethren, you’ve got to be joking.” Strange that one can expect us to take his word concerning how sincere, honest, and innocent he is in printing said article (and I know of no reason we should not), but he continues to be amazed because we only became aware of it in March 2019. If ever there was an article I wish I had read when it appeared in 2011, it is brother McClish’s *Fellowship and Family Members*, for I would have dealt with it then.

PUBLICLY ADVOCATED ERROR MUST BE PRECEDED BY A PRIVATE PERSONAL VISIT?

Where does the Bible teach explicitly (in just so many words) or implicitly that publicly advocated error must be preceded by a private personal visit with the one who public-

ly advocates it? In fact, when brother McClish has exposed the error of others, at times they sought sympathy because he had not come to them privately before publicly refuting it.

A LOGICAL FALLACY—AN APPEAL TO EMOTIONS

(SEE CHARTS AT BOTTOM OF PAGE)

What brother McClish has done thus far with great emphasis is play the “emotional card” of “the martyr” to win his “argument,” such as it is. For those of us who have labored with him for the cause of Christ, exposing error, and striving to bring the erring to repentance, his approach to what we have written is unlike the way he has met what he considered to be error in the past. Rather than attempt to refute and expose what he considers to be erroneous on our part, he appeals to people’s emotions.

Brother McClish has repeatedly engaged in the logical fallacy of appealing to the emotions (also known as the appeal to pity) of those he addresses. Emotional appeals do not rely on facts or evidence; rather, they rely on playing on the emotions of others. Thus, when one engages in the same, he is seeking to win his case by appealing to the emotions of those he addresses. This is what he has done in his letter to his supporters.

A prime example of the foregoing is brother McClish’s view of our *Zoom* internet video meeting with him, referring to it as an “attack” on him. If said meeting was an “attack” on him, then Jesus attacked Peter (Mat. 16:21); Paul “attacked” Peter (Gal. 2:11ff); Peter “attacked” Simon, the former Sorcerer (Acts 8:13-24). We have attacked his doctrine, but only in seeking to gain him. We have done no more with brother McClish concerning what he teaches in said article than brother McClish has done in dealing with others, even and especially brethren, when he exposed their errors. Furthermore, he knows it. Again, he uses “snarl” words when referring to us and our actions, but he chooses words that purr like a kitten or whimper like a puppy in referring to himself and his conduct.



appeal to emotion

- **You attempted to manipulate an emotional response in place of a valid or compelling argument.**
- Appeals to emotion include appeals to fear, envy, hatred, pity, pride, and more. It's important to note that sometimes a logically coherent argument may inspire emotion or have an emotional aspect, but the problem and fallacy occurs when emotion is used instead of a logical argument, or to obscure the fact that no compelling rational reason exists for one's position. Everyone, bar sociopaths, is affected by emotion, and so appeals to emotion are a very common and effective argument tactic, but they're ultimately flawed, dishonest, and tend to make one's opponents justifiably emotional.

APPEAL TO EMOTION—EXAMPLES

“Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, if found guilty, my client faces 20 years in prison. But I ask you, can you in good conscience send a devoted husband and father of four children, a man who has dedicated his life to providing for his family, who has participated actively in his church, and who given over 10% of his income to charities, to prison for such a lengthy of time that he will not be able to watch his children grow up or support them financially through their college years”

WHAT'S THE PROBLEM?...WHERE'S THE FALLACY?

- 1. THE DEFENDANT'S CHARACTER IS IRRELEVANT TO THE QUESTION OF HIS LIABILITY.**
- 2. COUNSEL IS APPEALING TO THE JURY'S PITY INSTEAD OF OFFERING A LOGICAL ARGUMENT TO SUPPORT HIS CLIENT.**

I do not think that Jesus provoked good feelings in Peter when the apostle was rebuked by our Lord for saying to Jesus what he did in Matthew 16:21, 22. Our Lord sharply said to Peter, **“Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men”** (Mat. 16:23). Peter meant well, he was sincere, innocent, and one of the three apostles closest to our Lord. But none of those things mattered when it came to the truth regarding what Jesus was obligated to do. Without the death of Jesus, not even well-meaning Peter could have salvation. Certainly Jesus was Peter’s friend and no greater friend could one have. That being case, why did Jesus sharply rebuke Peter? It is because truth always takes precedence over feelings, or anyone, or anything else. What Peter told Jesus did not work to help Jesus do what God ordained that He must if man was to be saved from his sins. Feelings and emotions must be under the control of the truth. Indeed, what Peter said to Jesus was contrary to the will of heaven and thus could come from only one source—Satan.

Only a few verses earlier, without doubt, our Lord made Peter feel good. Of Jesus Peter confessed, **“Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God”** (Mat. 16:16). Because Peter confessed the truth about Jesus, our Lord said to Peter, **“Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven”** (Mat. 16:17). Our Lord’s blessing and rebuke of Peter was not done to make Peter feel good or bad, but because of the truth involved in both instances.

Paul said that love (*agape*) **“Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth”** (1 Cor. 13:6). In all the component parts of love given by Paul, it is the truth that matters most. Without it the other elements of love cannot be defined and regulated (John 14:15). Thus, when the truth of God’s Word is involved, the feelings of man must not be spared, but they must take a back seat to the truth (Acts 2:23, 36, 37; 8:13-24).

THE ONLY RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE

The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth of God’s Word is the only basis for proper unity among God’s people, regardless of the topic (2 Tim. 2:15; 3:16, 17; Jam. 1:25; John 12:48; Jude 3). I need not remind brother McClish of what John 17:20-21, 1 Corinthians 1:10, and Colossians 3:17 teaches, for he has preached and written on it as much as anybody living today. If scriptural unity is to be had and maintained then **“let us walk by the same rule”** (Phi. 3:16). However, if the author of *Fellowship and Family Members*, or any who agree with said article will show where we are wrong in what we have written in the 2019 March *CFTF* or this issue of *CFTF* we will repent of it and make the proper acknowledgements as required by the New Testament. But for those who are so concerned about souls in danger, nothing has been done by the author of said article or those he says agree with him to refute what we have proven to be the case with the doctrine set out in his article.

“KNOWING THEREFORE THE TERROR OF THE LORD, WE PERSUADE MEN” (2 COR. 5:11)

When I preach, write, or in anyway teach the Bible, I intend to persuade people regarding what the truth is on any topic. Paul set the example for us concerning our teaching in 2 Corinthians 5:11. Further, I intend to expose error (2 Tim. 4:1-5; Jude 3). As far as I can tell from what the Bible says, that is the reason for teaching the Bible no matter the topic or the venue used to teach it. So, when the article regarding *Fellowship and Family Members* was published, shall we not conclude that brother McClish intended to persuade men to believe and act as he wrote? Assuredly he did. Specifically in said article he seeks to persuade people to believe and practice what he advocates regarding family members who have erred from the truth and are in need of being restored to the faith. In other words, he is writing in said article about people from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship. If we do not desire to persuade people so they can be changed from error to truth or to reinforce the truth, why would any of us write what we believe the Bible to teach on that, or any other Bible subject? In his email to his supporters brother McClish said, “I am still at work seven days a week, constantly seeking to improve my Website and to post Biblical articles on Facebook pages in an **effort to instruct readers with the Truth**” (bold mine, DPB). So, I know that he intends to persuade men with his articles, even with article *Fellowship and Family Members*.

CHARGE!

Although I doubt brother McClish will believe it (and I am sorry if he does not), but after he published his article in March 2019, some contacted the Spring eldership about what he taught. They did so without any influence from the Spring elders, but because they knew the Spring eldership administered his support funds and they wanted to know what we were going to do about the matter. Since brother McClish said things to the effect that Spring is “leading the charge” against him, we now ask him (1) to show how we have misrepresented what he teaches, or (2) how we have mishandled the Scriptures in dealing with what he advocates in his article, or (3) how we have been illogical in our efforts, or (4) how we have been wrong in any way in dealing with what he believes and teaches in said article. Indeed, he knows that in times past in his efforts to refute errors that those he opposed his doing so charged him with what he has now laid at our feet.

We are sure that the Judaizing teachers in the First Century church considered Paul to be leading the charge against them as he refuted their doctrine. Indeed, of Paul the unbelieving Jews said, **“For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes”** (Acts 24:5). Because they said Paul was **“a pestilent fellow and a mover of sedition among all the Jews**

throughout the world, and a ringleader of” any “sect” does that prove their charges against Paul? It takes more than charges to do that.

Regardless of when or how brother McClish has been approached, he continues to freely confess that he thinks the Bible teaches what he wrote in his article. Indeed, he advocated in said video discussion that it does not have to be an “either/or” matter but it can be both—you do it the way you want to do it and we will do it as we think it should be done. But alleging something to be thus and so does not prove it (1 The. 5:21), much less prove that we taught error regarding such in the March 2019 *CFTF*. He and those who believe as he does on this matter have not made the first effort to refute what we wrote in the 2019 March *CFTF* concerning what is taught in *Fellowship and Family Members*.

CORRECTLY THINKING IT THROUGH

1. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that God withdraws His fellowship from church members who are “**overtaken in any trespass**” (Gal. 6:1—*ASV*, 1901).
2. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that God does not withdraw His fellowship from church members who are “**overtaken in any trespass**” (Gal. 6:1—*ASV*, 1901)
3. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that brethren who are “**overtaken in any trespass**” are brethren who have not repented of their trespass(es).
4. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that it requires only one sin for people to be alienated from God [for God to withdraw His fellowship from them—“**overtaken in any trespass**” (Gal. 6:1—*ASV*, 1901)] (1 John 3:4; Jam. 4:17; Rom. 3:23; 6:23; Gal. 6:1).
5. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that the only thing involved in withdrawing “spiritual fellowship” is for faithful family members to inform their impenitent erring family members of their sins, warning them of the eternal consequences of dying in sin, and pleading with them to repent.
6. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that once faithful family members have withdrawn “spiritual fellowship” from impenitent erring family members, the faithful members are scripturally authorized to continue keeping company with them, eating with them, receiving them into their houses, and not treating them as heathens and publicans.
7. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that as long as faithful family members have withdrawn “spiritual fellowship” from impenitent erring family members, the faithful family members may continue to keep company with the impenitent erring family members by eating with them, etc.
8. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that the individual Christian is authorized to withdraw from an erring impenitent brother only after a faithful congregation has formally withdrawn fellowship from the brother who refuses to repent.
9. **True or False** Family members only consist of those who

are related “by blood.”

10. **True or False** Family members also consist of those who are related by civil law (“in-laws”).
11. **True or False** When a congregation of the Lord’s people withdraws fellowship from erring impenitent members, all faithful members, excepting faithful family members, must not eat with them, company with them, receive them into their houses, bid them God speed, but must reject them, avoid them, and treat them as heathens and publicans.
12. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that only the faithful family members are permitted to determine how long they will keep company with, eat with, etc. those family members who have had “spiritual fellowship” withdrawn from them.
13. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that in seeking to restore erring church members from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship that faithful church members may only associate with them for the purpose of restoring them to faithfulness to God.
14. **True or False** The New Testament authorizes by direct statements, implication, and example.
15. **True or False** There are no direct statements in the New Testament authorizing faithful church members to engage in fraternal social activities with impenitent erring church members from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship.
16. **True or False** There are no implications in the New Testament authorizing faithful church members to engage in fraternal social activities with impenitent erring church members from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship.
17. **True or False** There are no examples in the New Testament authorizing faithful church members to engage in fraternal social activities with impenitent erring church members from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship.
18. **True or False** There is at least one direct statement in the New Testament authorizing faithful family members to keep company with their erring impenitent family members (those who are “**overtaken in any trespass**” (Gal. 6:1—*ASV*, 1901).
19. **True or False** There is at least one implication in the New Testament authorizing faithful family members to keep company with their erring impenitent family members (those who are “**overtaken in any trespass**” (Gal. 6:1—*ASV*, 1901)).
20. **True or False** There is at least one example in the New Testament authorizing faithful family members to keep company with their erring impenitent family members who “**overtaken in any trespass**” (Gal. 6:1—*ASV*, 1901).
21. Only family members are authorized by the New Testament to keep company with their erring impenitent family members (those who are “**over taken in any trespass**” (Gal. 6:1—*ASV*, 1901)—from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship) after said faithful family members have withdrawn “spiritual fellowship” from them.

22. **True or False** The New Testament authorizes only faithful family members to keep company with their erring impenitent family members (those who are “**overtaken in any trespass**” (Gal. 6:1—*ASV*, 1901—from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship) after said faithful family members have withdrawn “spiritual fellowship” from them.
23. **True or False** All we do in service to God must be authorized by the New Testament (Col. 3:17)
24. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that before corrective church discipline can begin faithful church members must learn about those brethren who have erred from the truth (“**overtaken in any trespass**” (Gal. 6:1—*ASV*, 1901)—from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship).
25. **True or False** Any doctrine that implies a false doctrine is itself false.
26. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God, as defined and discussed in the following scriptures, are not to note those children of God from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship [they have been “**overtaken in any trespass,**”—Gal. 6:1] (Rom. 16:17; 2 The. 3:14; Phi. 3:17, 18).
27. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God may keep company with other children of God from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship [they have been “**overtaken in any trespass,**”] (2 The. 3:14; 1 Cor. 5:11).
28. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God may eat with other children of God from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship [they have been “**overtaken in any trespass**”—Gal. 6:1] (1 Cor. 5:11).
29. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God may receive into their houses other children of God from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship [they have been “**overtaken in any trespass**”—Gal. 6:1] (2 John 10).
30. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God may rebuke their erring family members as long as they desire, exhorting them to repent, but continue to interact socially with them as if God had not withdrawn His fellowship from them [as if they have not been “**overtaken in any trespass**”—Gal. 6:1] (2 John 10, 11).
31. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God are required to treat their erring impenitent family members (those “**overtaken in any trespass**”—Gal. 6:1) as heathens and publicans [tax collectors] (Mat. 18:17); Regarding the treatment of heathens and publicans, see my article on in the March 2019 *CFTF*, p. 6, bottom second column, point number 6).
32. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God may keep company with their impenitent family members [those “**overtaken in any trespass**”—Gal. 6:1] without sinning (Rom. 16:17; 1 Tim. 6:5; 2 Tim. 3:5).
33. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God do not sin when they keep company with their impenitent family members [those “**overtaken in any trespass**”—Gal. 6:1] (Rom. 16:17; 1 Tim. 6:5; 2 Tim. 3:5).
34. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God do not sin when they fail to reject their impenitent family members [those “**overtaken in any trespass**”—Gal. 6:1] (Tit. 3:10).
35. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God do not sin when they eat with their impenitent family members [those “**overtaken in any trespass**”—Gal. 6:1] (1 Cor. 5:11).
36. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God do not sin when they receive their impenitent family members [those “**overtaken in any trespass**”—Gal. 6:1] into their houses (2 John 10).
37. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that faithful children of God do not sin when they fail to avoid their impenitent family members [those “**overtaken in any trespass**”—Gal. 6:1] (Rom. 16:17).
38. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that when one refuses to keep company with impenitent family members (those “**overtaken in any trespass**”—Gal. 6:1), the faithful family members are not necessarily counting him as an enemy but admonishing him as a brother (2 The. 3:15).
39. **True or False** When faithful members reject a “**heretic**” after the second admonition, they are not necessarily counting him as an enemy but admonishing him as a brother (Tit. 3:10).
40. **True or False** When faithful members reject a “**heretick**” who is a family member after the second admonition, they are not necessarily counting him as enemy but admonishing him as a brother when they continue to eat with them (1 Cor. 5:11).
41. **True or False** When faithful members avoid impenitent members, they are not necessarily counting them as enemies but admonishing them as brethren (Rom. 16:17).
42. **True or False** When faithful members avoid impenitent family members, they are not necessarily counting them as enemies but admonishing them as brethren (Rom. 16:17).
43. **True or False** When faithful members treat impenitent members as heathens and publicans, they are not necessarily counting them as an enemies but admonishing them as brethren (Mat. 18:17; 2 The. 3:15).
44. **True or False** When faithful members treat impenitent family members as heathens and publicans, they are not necessarily counting them as enemies but admonishing them as brethren (Mat. 18:17).
45. **True or False** When faithful church members do not bid God speed to impenitent church members, they are admonishing them as brethren (2 John 10, 11).
46. **True or False** When faithful members do not bid God speed to impenitent family members, they are admonishing them as brethren (2 John 10, 11).

47. **True or False** When faithful church members do not receive impenitent members into their houses, they are admonishing them as brethren (2 John 10).

48. **True or False** When faithful church do not receive impenitent family church members into their houses they are admonishing them as brethren (2 John 10).

49. **True or False** When faithful church members do not eat with impenitent church members, they are admonishing them as brethren (1 Cor. 5:11).

50. **True or False** When faithful family members do not eat with impenitent family church members, they are admonishing them as brethren (1 Cor. 5:11).

52. **True or False** When faithful church members keep company with impenitent church members, they are admonishing them as brethren (2 The. 3:14; 1 Cor. 5:11).

53. **True or False** When faithful family members keep company with impenitent family members, they are admonishing them as brethren (2 The. 3:14; 1 Cor. 5:11).

54. **True or False** When faithful church members note impenitent church members, they are admonishing them as brethren (Rom. 16:17; 2 The. 3:14; Phi. 3:17, 18)

55. **True or False** When faithful family members note impenitent family members they are admonishing them as brethren (Rom. 16:17; 2 The. 3:14; Phi. 3:17, 18)

56. **True or False** God leaves it up to faithful family members who have withdrawn “spiritual fellowship” from their erring impenitent family members regarding how long they may continue to keep company with the erring impenitent family members—eat with them, receive them into their houses, and not treating them as heathens and publicans.

55. **True or False** The Scriptures teach that when a congregation withdraws fellowship from an erring impenitent member that the faithful members must immediately cease to keep company with them, eat with them, receive them into their houses, but treat them as heathens and publicans.

56. **True or False** The so-called withdrawal of “spiritual fellowship” as defined and explained in the article, *Fellowship and Family Members*, when consistently applied to corrective church discipline, makes null and void the totality of the New Testament’s inspired directives pertaining to corrective church discipline as taught in Romans 16:17; 2 Thessalonians 3:14; Philippians 3:17; 1 Corinthians 5:11; 2 John 10, 11; Matthew 18:17; 1 Timothy 6:5; 2 Timothy 3:5; Titus 3:10 and 2 Thessalonians 3:15.

“ANY DOCTRINE THAT IMPLIES A FALSE DOCTRINE IS ITSELF FALSE.”

FIRST SYLLOGISM

MAJOR PREMISE: All doctrines teaching that faithful members of the Lord’s church may eat with erring impenitent church members from whom Christian fellowship has been scripturally withdrawn are false doctrines.

MINOR PREMISE: The doctrine taught in the article *Fellowship and Family Members* is a doctrine that teaches faithful members of the Lord’s church may eat with erring impenitent church members from whom Christian fellowship has been scripturally withdrawn.

CONCLUSION: Therefore, the doctrine taught in the article *Fellowship and Family Members* is a false doctrine.

SECOND SYLLOGISM

MAJOR PREMISE: All doctrines concerning withdrawal of fellowship that teach faithful family members to violate the principles taught in: Romans 16:17; 2 Thessalonians 3:14; 1 Corinthians 5:11; 2 John 10, 11; Matthew 18:17; Romans 16:17; 1 Timothy 6:5; 2 Timothy 3:5; Titus 3:10 regarding their erring impenitent family members (who are “**overtaken in any trespass**”—from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship) are doctrines that are false.

MINOR PREMISE: The doctrine taught in the article *Fellowship and Family Members* is a doctrine that teaches faithful family members to violate the principles taught in: Romans 16:17; 2 Thessalonians. 3:14; 1 Corinthians. 5:11; 2 John 10, 11; Matthew. 18:17; 1 Timothy 6:5; 2 Timothy 3:5; Titus 3:10 regarding their erring impenitent family members [those who are “**overtaken in aany trespass**” [Gal. 6:1—ASV, 1901]—from whom God has withdrawn His fellowship).

CONCLUSION: Therefore the doctrine taught in the article *Fellowship and Family Members* is a false doctrine.

THIRD SYLLOGISM

MAJOR PREMISE: All doctrines that teach there is another way for Christians to show to others they have withdrawn their fellowship from an erring impenitent child of God other than by obeying the teaching of: Romans 16:17; 2 Thessalonians. 3:14; 1 Corinthians 5:11; 2 John 10, 11; Matthew 18:17; 1 Timothy 6:5; 2 Timothy 3:5; Titus 3:10 are doctrines that are false.

MINOR PREMISE: The doctrine taught in the article *Fellowship and Family Members* is a doctrine that teaches there is another way for Christians to show to others they have withdrawn their fellowship from an erring impenitent child of God other than by obeying the principles of: Romans 16:17; 2 Thessalonians. 3:14; 1 Corinthians 5:11; 2 John 10, 11; Matthew 18:17; 1 Timothy 6:5; 2 Timothy 3:5; Titus 3:10.

CONCLUSION: Therefore, the doctrine taught in the article *Fellowship and Family Members* is a false doctrine.

If the premises in a syllogism are true and the syllogism is valid the conclusion is demanded.

—David P. Brown, Editor

Contending For The Faith
P. O. Box 2357
Spring, Texas 77383-2357

CFTF RADIO

[www/contending4thefaitth.org](http://www.contending4thefaitth.org)

☞ 24 HOURS A DAY ☞ 7 DAYS A WEEK ☞ BIBLE LESSONS WITH DIFFERENT SPEAKERS, PROGRAMS AND TOPICS, ☞ ONLINE 27 LESSON BIBLE STUDY COURSE (READ LESSONS ONLINE, SUBMIT ANSWERS ONLINE, AND SEEK ASSISTANCE WHEN NEEDED).

◆ COMPATIBLE WITH MOBILE DEVICES WITH INSTRUCTIONS ON WEBSITE ◆

LET THE BIBLE SPEAK

TV Program presented by Spring Church of Christ

on *Houston Media Source*

View on:

AT & T U-verse Channel 99 ♦ Comcast Channel 17 ♦ TV Max Channel 95

Suddenlink Channel 99 ♦ Phonoscope Channel 75

or online at: HMSTV.org

Times will vary each week ♦ Check station listing for schedule

