

Schedule of Meeting Times:

WKAC 1080 AM Sunday 7:30 AM
Speaker, Robert Emerson
Study Sunday 10:00 AM
Worship Sunday Morn 11:00 AM
Worship Sunday Eve 5:00 PM
Singing every 2nd Sunday evening
Study Wednesday 7:00 PM

Preacher / bulletin editor:

Kris Vilander, (256) 472-1065

E-mail: kris@haysmillchurchofchrist.org

Website: www.haysmillchurchofchrist.org

“For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.”

— Romans 6:23



Servants during June/July:

Songleader: Larry (26); David (7/3), Peter (7/10), Stanley (7/17), Larry (7/24), David (7/31)

Reading: David; Robert (July)

Announcements: Marty; Stanley (July)

Table: Mike B, Robert, Larry, Mike M; Marty, David, Peter, Mike B (July)

Wednesday Lesson: Kris (29); Larry (7/6), Stanley (7/13), Kris (7/20), Larry (7/27)

Lawn Mowing (week starting): Larry (26); Robert (7/3), Kris (7/10), Marty (7/17), Stanley (7/24), Larry (7/31)

Area Meetings:

Isbell (6/19-22); Midway (6/19-24); Tri-Cities (6/19-24); Hillsboro Heights Moulton (26-30); Centerview (6/26-29); Gooch Lane (6/25-7/1)

Hays Mill church of Christ

21705 Hays Mill Road

Elkmont, AL 35620

The Bible . Examiner

“Examine everything carefully...” —1 Thessalonians 5:21 NASB

Volume 5

June 26, 2022

Number 6

Confusing Mercy With Justice

By Matthew W. Bassford

The other Sunday, I was approached by one of the younger sisters at church. She had a couple of questions. They involved hypotheticals that many of us have encountered before. What about the tribesman in the Amazon jungle who never gets to hear about the gospel? What about the man who is on his way to be baptized when he gets in a car wreck and dies?

I gave her my usual answer about not letting hypotheticals and things that happen to somebody else distract us from what we should do, but she didn't seem satisfied with that, so I promised her I'd consider the subject further. True to my word, I gnawed on the questions until my subconscious bit off something.

Eventually, I saw that even though these two questions are aimed at different doctrinal positions (the necessity of the gospel versus the necessity of baptism), they both operate the same way. Both are an appeal to our sense of fairness. We intuitively feel that if somebody dies without having heard the gospel and goes to hell as a result, it's unfair. If somebody sincerely intended to be baptized but dies before being able to and goes to hell as a result, it's unfair.

The problem, though, is not with the doctrine in question. It's with our intuition. “Fair”, after all, is a dressed-down synonym for “just”. We feel that it is unjust for God to punish the sinner who never heard or to punish the penitent sinner who never managed to make it to the baptistery. However, we need to be suspicious of that feeling. Not only is it incorrect, it is ultimately fatal to the Christian system of faith.

Let me explain. Neither in Hypothetical 1 nor Hypothetical 2 is a sinner being unjustly condemned. God gave both of them the same things He gives all of us: life, free will, ample evidence of His existence, and a sense of right and wrong. Despite these gifts, the people in both hypotheticals chose to sin.

According to the first three chapters of Romans, such sin incurs the wrath of God, and it does so justly. As Paul puts it in Romans 6:23, the wages of sin is death. It is just for such people to spend eternity separated from Him, as it would be just for all of us to spend eternity separated from Him. That is what we all deserve.

However, in the case of Christians, God has chosen to be merciful. He showed us mercy in two ways: in sending


His Son to die in our place, and in giving us the opportunity to hear and obey the gospel. None of us are entitled to His mercy. It is utterly and completely undeserved.

As a result, neither of our sinners has any standing to complain that God has been unfair to them. They don't have any right to expect His mercy. They are entitled to His justice, and God will be scrupulously fair to them as He is to everyone. They could have chosen to do right, they had all the information they needed to make that choice, but they chose evil instead. They will be judged accordingly.

If this is not true, if sin does not invite the just judgment of God, God does not have the right to judge any sinner. Any attempt to preserve His right to judge anyone will devolve into a standard-less exercise in line-drawing. If the one who never has heard is entitled to mercy, what

about the one who heard an incompetent preacher? If the one who dies on the way to the church house is entitled to mercy, what about the one who dies on the way to a Bible study that would have convicted him? The more these questions unfold, the more obvious it becomes that our cheap sympathy for sinners (as opposed to Christ's precious sacrifice) has overwhelmed God's right to judge righteously.

There is no partiality with God. This is my chief objection to Calvinism. How can it be just for God to condemn an unbaptized infant who has done neither good nor evil, simply because of who their ultimate ancestor was?

However, God's impartiality is a knife that cuts both ways. If God is just in condemning sinners, He must be just in condemning all sinners. Only the death of Christ and the faith of those who trust in Him allow God to do anything else. 

Let Your Women Keep Silent...

By Lanny Smith

I have not written anything on 1 Cor 14:34,35 in a while, so I thought I'd do so now. The text says, "Let your women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive, as the law also says. And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for women to speak in church," 1 Cor 14:34,35 NKJV. If Paul was inspired of God, (cf v37), then it behooves us to know exactly what is meant here, and how to apply it.

When considering these verses, one extreme is content to basically ignore what is said here, and put no restrictions upon women at all—even "in church."

There is no attempt to properly apply these verses in our day, due to some alleged societal ignorance, male-dominated culture, or sexism. Thus, women may preach to men, and serve as elders or deacons in a local church. But this view is untenable (cf 1 Tim 2:8-15; 3:1-13).

The other extreme takes the words "women keep silent in the churches," and "it is shameful for women to speak in church" as absolute statements, devoid of any context. Those holding this view argue that women may not teach a Bible class of women or children; or even so much as make a comment or ask a question in a Bible class. I believe the

truth is somewhere between those two extreme views.

First, Paul did NOT impose an absolute silence upon women. Women are commanded to sing in church; and singing is a form of "speaking" and "teaching," Eph 5:19; Col 3:16. Women are to confess Christ before others, which also involves speaking, Mt 10:32; cf Acts 8:37. And women may confess their sins to others, which will involve speaking, Jas 5:16. While I have heard of churches who would take women outside of "the assembly" to hear their confession of Christ or of sin, I think most can see the utter absurdity of such a view.


Second, the words "keep silent" and "speak" are defined by context. Notice: "If anyone speaks in a tongue," v27; "let him keep silent in church," v28; "Let two or three prophets speak," v29; "let the first keep silent," v30. In this context, it is clear that what these speakers were doing was publicly and formally addressing the gathering. It is in this very context that he says, "Let your women keep silent in the churches," v34. And this context (along with the previous paragraph showing that women are permitted to sing, confess Christ, or confess sin) makes it very clear that what is forbidden here is being the speaker, teacher, or leader of an assembly where men are present.

Third, the women's speaking is contrasted with being "submissive." Note: "for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive," v34. However, it is possible for someone

to speak while maintaining submission! For example: in public schools, students can ask and answer questions while maintaining order and submission. Hence, Paul is saying that women are not to speak beyond the point of being in submission (cp 1 Tim 2:11,12).

Fourth, the phrase, "let them ask their own husbands at home," CANNOT be an absolute. What if she doesn't have a husband? What if she is not "at home," but merely on the way home? Can she not ask the preacher? Can she not ask the elders? Can she not ask her mother? Of course, she can! This brings us back again to the context. The reason that asking their husbands is singled out is that these women were interrupting and/or disputing with their husbands while they prophesied (study vv29-35 very carefully). This showed that they were not "submissive," v34, were acting in a "shameful" way, v35, and therefore were out of "order," v40.

Fifth, the speaking being done by the women was called "shameful." However, we have already noted that it is not always shameful for women to speak in church. In other words, it's possible for women to speak in a way that is NOT "shameful" (e.g. Eph 5:19; Col 3:15; Mt 10:32; Jas 5:16). It is non-submissive speaking that is "shameful"—things like preaching to men and/or contending with men.

I hope these brief thoughts help you to put 1 Corinthians 14:34,35 in its proper context. 

Remember in Prayer

Alice's sister, Anne, is at Vanderbilt suffering from seizures. Stanley's sister-in-law, Pam, is undergoing testing due to serious tremors. Robert is to wear a heart

monitor again; remember the Emerson's, Beddingfield's, and all those with chronic health issues, including Carolyn Dennis, Dot Hice, and Joyce Smith. 