

## Clean and Unclean Meats

1. "Didn't the Jews in Bible times have a distinction between animals they could and could not eat?"

Yes, not only concerning dry-land animals but also concerning fishes of the waters and fowls of the air.

2. "Just what meats could they eat and not eat?"

A. Land animals: They could eat the ox, sheep, goat, hart, roebuck, fallow deer, wild boar, pygarg, wild ox, and chamois (Deut. 14:4,5). They were not to eat the camel, hare, coney, and swine (Deut. 14:7,8), nor any animal with paws--the entire cat-family (Lev. 11:27), and not the weasel, mouse, tortoise, ferret, chameleon, lizard, snail, and mole (Lev. 11:29,30).

B. Fishes: They could eat any fish that had fins and scales but none that lacked them (Deut. 14:9,10).

C. Fowls: They could not eat the eagle, ossifrage, osprey, glede, kite, vulture, raven, owl, night hawk, cuckow, hawk, little owl, great owl, swan, pelican, gier eagle, cormorant, stork, heron, lapwing, and bat (Deut. 14:12-18). Four-footed fowls that creep were not to be eaten (Lev. 11:20) although they could eat the locust, bald locust, beetle, and grasshopper (Lev. 11:22,23).

3. "Did these distinctions begin with Moses?"

A. No. In the days of the flood there was a distinction (Gen. 7:2) which we presume to be the same as that later given in the law of Moses.

B. The distinction existed in Noah's day primarily with reference to what animals could be sacrificed

## CLEAN AND UNCLEAR MEATS

clean animals (Gen. 8:20).

4, "Are we still under these distinctions today?"

Not according to the following New Testament passages:

A. Mark 7:18,19. In Jesus' explanation of what He had said to the Pharisees about defilement, He gave teaching that purged or made clean all meats. This was new covenant teaching expounded ahead of time. Jesus made all meats clean!

B. Acts 10:11-15. This sheet contained all manner of beasts unclean to a Jew as evidenced from Peter's reply to the voice. When he refused to kill and eat those animals and fowls that had been unclean throughout the Mosaic dispensation, the voice said, "What God hath cleansed, that call not common." Notice the words, "What God hath cleansed." Then God has cleansed every animal and every fowl on which Peter had looked even as He is now pleased to acknowledge the cleanness of Gentiles through Christ, a lesson being taught by this object lesson on Simon's housetop. Some try to side-step the issue by saying it was the lesson involved (the cleansing of the Gentiles) that God was talking about, but God used an object lesson to fit the Gentiles' case (something that had once been unclean has now been made clean).

C. I Tim. 4:1-5. One of the doctrines of then-coming apostasy was commanding to abstain from meats which God had created. When needed today no species of meat is to be refused from a religious standpoint. We do not have to eat everything, but we may as far as divine legislation is concerned, for "every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer."

## 14 SUBJECTS SCRIPTURALLY STUDIED

5. "Why then did God give these distinctions in Old Testament times?"

A. God thereby demonstrated His authority to tell man what he could partake of and what he could not. When they thought of food, they had to remember what God had said. Notice too they were not even to touch that which was unclean (Lev. 11:8). In like manner the New Testament says, "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and TOUCH NOT THE UNCLEAN THING: and I will receive you (II Cor. 6:17). The Old Testament Jews were in a physical covenant with God while we are in a spiritual covenant with Him. They were a physical nation entered by physical birth, they had a mark in their flesh (circumcision), and they were promised an earthly land (Canaan). God therefore told them of these physical things that they could not eat. We today are a spiritual people, the new covenant is entered by spiritual birth, we have spiritual circumcision, and we are going to a heavenly land. God has therefore told us what to embody in our spiritual lives and what to leave alone as unclean. Yes, God has this authority, and we are to respect His distinctions. Touch not the unclean thing!

B. In those days God gave the Jew the really good things and withheld those animals that were not so good. Who wouldn't rather eat beef than a mouse? Who wouldn't rather eat a pigeon than a vulture? And God to this day gives us the good things and withholds the bad. Rom. 12:9 says to abhor that which is evil and to cleave to that which is good. How the devil works to get people to think God is heartless and mean in His prohibitions, leaving us nothing that we can do. But He has left us much that we can do--everything except those things that are not good.

C. In the days of the law, when man was offering animal sacrifices to God, man was not given the clean

## CLEAN AND UNCLEAN MEATS

animals to eat and allowed to sacrifice the unclean ones. No, when a man went to sacrifice to God, he had to take one of the very animals he himself could eat and sacrifice it to God. And today we need to realize that God wants a clean sacrifice, a holy sacrifice, a sacrifice well-pleasing to Him. No wonder Rom. 12:1 says, "Present your bodies a living sacrifice to God, holy, acceptable to God."

D. At the time that Dr. Charles Weiss was director of the Clinical and Research Laboratories of Mt. Zion Hospital of San Francisco, he saw from his vantage point another reason: "When we recall the absence of facilities for refrigeration and sterilization of food during Biblical times, we must regard the dietary laws instituted by Moses as nothing less than life-saving. Many of the land and water creatures whose use as food he prohibited were either commonly infected or subject to infection. The pig is frequently infested with flukes, trichina or with pork tapeworm. Rabbits may be infected with a disease known as tularemia. Shell fish are frequently contaminated with human sewage and typhoid bacilli. All of these were placed on the forbidden list, thus avoiding epidemics of food infection and food poisoning" (an excerpt from an article in "Scientific Monthly" by Dr. Weiss).

6. "Are there some today who still cling to those Old Testament laws about meats?"

Yes, most seventh-day bodies do. But that does not make it right. We do not need to fear that we are doing wrong by eating meats that were forbidden under the Old Testament. We have seen that God has cleansed all meats so that we can eat in full assurance of faith--faith that comes by hearing, hearing by the Word of God (Rom. 10:17).

In closing let us not forget the spiritual ful-

## 14 SUBJECTS SCRIPTURALLY STUDIED

fillments in our lives today of those dietary laws of the Old Testament.

### QUESTIONS

1. Name 3 land animals that were considered "clean".
2. Name 2 land animals that were considered "unclean".
3. What fishes were considered "clean"?
4. Name 5 fowls that were considered "unclean".
5. Were they allowed to eat locusts?
6. What purpose did the distinction between "clean" and "unclean" animals and fowls serve before the flood?
7. Cite 2 New Testament passages that show we are no longer under those distinctions.
8. Give 2 reasons why God made those distinctions for Old Testament times.
9. What religious people still hold to those distinctions?

## Footwashing

1. "Since we as a people do not practice footwashing, it bothers me everytime I read Jesus' words, 'If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet' (John 13:14). I don't know how to get around this verse."

A. We shouldn't try to "get around this verse" any more than we would any other verse of Scripture. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (II Tim. 3:16).

B. We want to understand the exact intention of God in each passage of Scripture.

2. "How do you understand this verse to be taken?"

This statement is part of John 13:1-17. A study of these 17 verses leads one to conclude that Jesus was washing His disciples' feet as an object lesson to impress the apostles with a much needed truth.

A. For sometime the apostles had been discussing among themselves the matter of which would be the greatest in the coming kingdom. Jesus had already set a little child in their midst and used the child as an object lesson to teach them about humility (Matt. 18:1-4).

B. At the same supper where He washed their feet Luke's account that says nothing of the footwashing says, "There was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest" (Luke 22:24). Jesus did not disregard their discussion. He said to them at that time, "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be

## 14 SUBJECTS SCRIPTURALLY STUDIED

so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth" (Luke 22: 25-27). How appropriate for Him to exemplify what He was teaching with this object lesson of washing their feet!

3. "If this be Jesus' intention, could you show this by going down through the passage and pointing it out?"

A. In v. 7 Jesus said to Peter, "What I do thou knowest not now" (Peter knew Jesus was about to wash his feet); "but thou shalt know hereafter" (in other words there was a lesson to be learned from what He was doing). Now in v. 12 (after He had completed washing their feet) Jesus asked, "Know ye what I have done to you?" They could have said, "You have washed our feet," but they awaited Jesus' explanation.

B. In their culture it was a servant's role to wash the feet of another--the lesser served while the greater was served. Jesus was reversing that role--just as He said in Luke's account ("He that is greatest among you...is...he that doth serve...I am among you as he that serveth"). He said that what He had done was an example to them--that instead of arguing among themselves who was going to be the greatest, they should serve one another in various ways as servants of one another--just as Paul said, "By love serve one another" (Gal. 5:13). Sometimes they might serve one another by washing their feet and sometimes by doing other things for them.

4. "Can you prove from the text that Jesus was not instituting a church ordinance of footwashing but teaching them to serve one a-

## FOOTWASHING

nother in various ways in everyday life?"

Yes, that is easy to show.

A. Notice the last verse in this passage (v. 17): "If ye know these things...", then what did He go on to say, "Happy are ye if ye do IT (footwashing)?" No, "Happy are ye if you do THEM" (plural)—various things!

B. Whenever and wherever we take the servant's role and minister to the needs of others, we are following the example of Jesus. There are so many ways we can "wash feet", so to speak, and it is the part of the Christian to do so at every occasion: "As ye therefore have opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith" (Gal. 6:10).

5. "Do those churches that observe footwashing as an ordinance do it exactly as the Bible teaches?"

Let us notice three ways they deviate.

A. Jesus washed dirty feet because they needed washing while people today who participate in a public footwashing are washing feet that are clean. In Bible days their shoes were of a sandal-variety, and their roads and paths were dusty. They had to wash their feet often. It was just such dusty feet that Jesus washed that night. But when footwashers go to their services today, they wash their feet before going--they wouldn't think of taking off their shoes and socks or stockings and have others see their feet dirty. In their service, then, they wash feet that are already clean.

B. They wash feet in a public service while Jesus did it privately. The Passover was not observed in the temple but in homes. Each family had its own passover meal (two small families could observe it together--



## 14 SUBJECTS SCRIPTURALLY STUDIED

Exo. 12:3,4). Jesus and His apostles, living together as a group as they did, formed a family-type group there in the upper room. The apostles were to teach the converts to observe all things. Jesus commanded them (Matt. 28:20), but there is no record of their ever teaching any church to observe footwashing.

C. Some who wash feet as a church ordinance wash only one foot while Jesus washed both feet of each person (John 13:6-10). If we regarded this as a divinely-instituted church ordinance and not as an example and object lesson, we would not think of washing only one foot of a person.

### 6. "What about I Tim. 5:10?"

A. Some, of course, think this proves that John 13:1-17 is to be taken as a church ordinance. But does it? We shall see.

B. That verse is part of a section about aged widows who should receive financial support from the church. Such a widow was to be of a certain age (at least 60--v. 9). She was to have been the wife of one man (v. 9). She was to be a woman well reported of for her good works: one who has brought up children, lodged strangers, washed saints' feet, relieved the afflicted, and diligently followed every good work. Where do you do the above things--in the church service or just anywhere in everyday life? Everything mentioned is something done at home or in the community as a matter of everyday life and not something done merely in a church service.

In closing let us get the true meaning of John 13, realizing that we are to do far more than merely wash somebody's clean foot in a church service. We are to render loving, humble service to one another whenever we can and wherever we can. This will demonstrate that we are indeed disciples of the Lord Jesus and are doing as He did.

**FOOTWASHING****QUESTIONS**

1. Why should we not try to "get around" John 13:14?
2. What had the apostles been discussing among themselves?
3. What earlier object lesson had Jesus used in teaching them about what they were discussing?
4. According to Jesus' teaching, who is greater—the one who serves or the one who is served?

## Drinking

1. "We all know that drunkenness is a sin, but what is wrong with social drinking or having a beer now and then just so long as a person doesn't get drunk?"

A. First of all let us establish from the Bible the sinfulness of drunkenness. This is seen in both Old and New Testaments (see Deut. 21:20; Prov. 25:20, 21; Prov. 20:1; Isa. 5:11 and Hab. 2:15 for Old Testament verses and I Cor. 6:9,10; Gal. 5:19-21; Luke 21:34 and Rom. 13:13 for New Testament verses).

B. Let us not forget that people do not get themselves either into drunkenness or alcoholism except from a social drinking or beer-drinking beginning. Some years ago your writer was conducting a meeting in the northern Ozarks. The community knew the stand of the church against alcoholic beverages. While we were calling in the community, two different men on two different calls voiced their thoughts about the matter, both being careful to affirm that drunkenness was wrong but that they couldn't see anything wrong with social drinking. I complimented them for their thoughts about drunkenness and then went on to ask, "Have you ever been drunk?" Both of them very sheepishly answered that they had been drunk "a few times". I told them that this is one of several reasons for not taking a social drink, that my total abstinence has kept me from ever being drunk while their social drinking had not totally kept them from drunkenness.

2. "But doesn't Eph. 5:18 forbid only drinking to excess, not sensible drinking?"

You might get that impression on that verse from the King James, but most versions do not translate the Greek word "asotia" that way. American Standard: "Be

## DRINKING

not drunken with wine, WHEREIN IS RIOT, but be filled with the Spirit." Revised Standard: "Do not get drunk with wine, for THAT IS DEBAUCHERY; but be filled with the Spirit." New English: "Do not give way to DRUNKENNESS and DISSIPATION that goes with it, but let the Holy Spirit fill you." W. E. Vine's "An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words" supports the thought that Eph. 5:18 is not upholding the idea of controlled-drinking (social drinking) but is outrightly condemning drunkenness: "Asotia denotes prodigality, profligacy, riot." Vine further points out "asotia's" relationship to asotos" (wastefully) translated "riotous living" in the Prodigal Son parable (Luke 15:13) and to "aselgeia" (lasciviousness, outrageous conduct, wanton violence). So there is really no comfort from Eph. 5:18 to those advocating social drinking.

### 3. "But didn't Jesus turn water into wine at the wedding feast?"

A. You should know that the Greek word "wine" in the New Testament is "oinos", a word that has a wide range of meanings and usages. Fred Miller in his very useful work entitled, "Thinking on Drinking," points out that just as the Septuagint translators in their translation of the Old Testament translated 11 different Hebrew words into 1 Greek word "oinos", so the New Testament used "oinos" whether the drink was alcoholic or non-alcoholic. Therefore the context must determine which it means in each case.

B. There is reasonable proof that the "oinos" (translated "wine") at the wedding feast was non-alcoholic, and if this is true it affords no argument for social drinking of alcoholic beverages. Suppose the wine at the Cana wedding feast had been alcoholic, if they had devoured all that was on hand, and then Jesus made them a vast quantity of additional alcoholic wine which was so much better than usual wine (according to

## 14 SUBJECTS SCRIPTURALLY STUDIED

John 2:9,10), what would surely have happened to some of those in attendance? Some of them would have drunk themselves into drunkenness. No, Jesus would not have done anything that would have caused them to become drunken. I can't believe it.

C. Note--few people know just how much additional beverage Jesus made when He turned water into wine that day. There were six waterpots; each contained two or three firkins (John 2:6). Six waterpots containing two firkins apiece would be twelve firkins. Six containing three firkins apiece would be eighteen firkins. Now when we learn that a firkin was nine gallons, that would mean if those six waterpots held two firkins apiece Jesus made one hundred eight gallons of beverage, and if they held three firkins apiece He made one hundred sixty-two gallons! That much FREE wine that was pronounced super-good by the taster would surely produce some cases of drunkenness in Cana.

4. "But didn't Paul tell Timothy it would be all right for him to drink a little wine?"

In I Tim. 5:23 he told Timothy to take a little wine all right, but how and why? Was he condoning social drinking or advising Timothy medically? There is a great difference. Many medicines today have alcoholic bases, and none of us objects to taking medicine as needed. And the setting of the verse under consideration is that of a medical need ("for your stomach's sake and your often infirmity"). There is a difference between "taking a little" alcohol medically (do we give medicine by the "glass" or by the "spoonful"?) and drinking a beer, or two, or three! Note too that the fact that Paul told Timothy to do this shows he was not accustomed to drinking alcoholic beverages.

## DRINKING

5. "But wouldn't it still be all right for a moral, upright person in the community to drink socially as long as he didn't drink to excess?"

A. All admit that drunkenness is wrong. All must admit that many who intend only to drink moderate amounts actually give in little by little to become heavy drinkers and ultimately drunkards or alcoholics. If every person who drank socially ultimately became an out-and-out drunkard or alcoholic, many not lured into social drinking would have nothing to do with it. Who is it, then, who is drawing people into social drinking? It is those looked upon as moral people who drink but do not become alcoholics or drunkards. It is not bleery-eyed, vomiting, dirty drunkards who cause people to begin drinking. It is the socialite who does. And is there a Bible verse that applies here? Rom. 14:21: "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to DRINK WINE, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." Those who are socially drinking but not becoming drunkards or alcoholics are actually the ones who are the stumbling blocks to those who take up drinking and later become alcoholics.

B. When you consider the fact that the known alcoholics in the U.S. today exceed the combined populations of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Delaware, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, New Mexico, Alaska, and Hawaii (13 of our states!), it doesn't seem that we should have to argue with anybody about the folly of drinking any kind of alcoholic drinking. And when you consider that around one-half of our highway deaths today are in some way involved with alcoholic drinking, it is time that we become totally against any drinking of alcoholic beverages.

## 14 SUBJECTS SCRIPTURALLY STUDIED

## QUESTIONS

1. Give an Old Testament verse that shows drunkenness to be wrong.
2. Give a New Testament verse for the same.
3. What possible danger does a social drinker subject himself to that a total abstainer does not face?
4. The King James Version translates the Greek word "asotia" as "excess". What different information on this Greek word was presented in the lesson?
5. What Greek word is translated "wine" in the New Testament?
6. How broad or general is this word in actual use?
7. What shows that the wine Jesus made at the wedding feast was not alcoholic?
8. How does I Tim. 5:23 not uphold the idea of social drinking?
9. How is Rom. 14:21 an argument against social drinking?
10. The known alcoholics in the U.S. today equal the combined populations of how many states?
11. How many of our highway deaths today are in some way related to alcoholic drinking?

## The Ten Commandments

1. "The Ten Commandments are given twice in Moses' writings (Exo. 20 and Deut. 5). Why is this?"

A. The Exo. 20 listing was when the children of Israel first came out of Egypt. You will remember that that generation was forbidden to enter the promised land because of its unbelief.

B. After that original generation had died off, the lawgiver Moses rehearsed the law (including the Ten Commandments) to the new generation that had grown up during the generation spent in the wilderness. This is why the list is also found in Deut. 5. The word "Deuteronomy" means the "second giving of the law".

2. "Recount the giving of the Ten Commandments."

A. God first spoke orally from Mt. Sinai on that unforgettable day when the Israelites were called to the foot of the mount in order to hear the voice of God.

B. Then God called Moses up into the mount to receive these commandments chiseled in stone.

C. When coming down with the stone tablets forty days later, Moses found the people worshipping a golden calf. (He had been detained in the mount for more than a month writing down all the other laws by which the people were to be governed, thus causing the people to think he had died. Having known of God only through Moses' leadership, they idolatrously made them the golden calf to have something to worship.) Upon seeing the people in this idolatry he threw the stone tablets to the ground and they broke.

D. God commanded him to bring up two more stone tablets on which the commandments could again be written.



## 14 SUBJECTS SCRIPTURALLY STUDIED

E. When the ark of the covenant was made as one of the pieces of furniture for the tabernacle, these two stone tablets were put into it (Heb. 9:4).

3. "Is there any natural division of these commandments?"

A. Most Bible students divide the Ten Commandments into two groups: (1) the first four commandments (no other gods, no images, not to take God's name in vain, and remember the sabbath day) having to do with the Jews' attitude toward God; and (2) the last six commandments (honor parents, not to kill, not to commit adultery, not to steal, not to lie about another, and not to covet that which is another's) having to do with the Jews' duties to one another. This division is clear enough to be seen at a glance with the possible exception of the fourth commandment (the one about the sabbath). That commandment definitely belongs to the first group, for the sabbath was a special sign between God and Israel (Exo. 31:12,13).

B. It is this natural division that fits so well with Jesus' statement that the two great commandments were to love God with all one's heart and to love one's neighbor as himself (Matt. 22:36-40). Sometimes people think these two commandments were two of the Ten Commandments, but they were not. Instead they summarized the Ten Commandments and all the other laws. Notice the way that Paul summarized the last section of the Ten Commandments in the commandment to love one's neighbor (Rom. 13:8-10).

4. "Sometimes people say that all a person has to do to be saved is to keep the Ten Commandments. Is this right?"

A. No, we are not living under the covenant of which the Ten Commandments were a part.

## THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

B. The Ten Commandments did not involve all the religious duties of the Jews who lived under that covenant. In addition to the Ten Commandments they had many laws to keep concerning sacrifices, feast days, tithing, civil laws, and many other things not found in the Ten Commandments.

C. The next time somebody says that all a person has to do to be saved is keep the Ten Commandments, ask him or her to name the Ten Commandments. In the majority of cases such people will get mixed up just trying to name them.

5. "You mentioned that we are no longer under the Ten Commandments. How is that?"

A. The law of Moses of which the Ten Commandments were a part was terminated at the cross (Col. 2:14).

B. Jesus announced in the Sermon on the Mount that He had come to fulfill the law, which would pass away with its fulfillment (Matt. 5:17,18).

C. Heb. 10:9,10 says Jesus took away the first will or covenant in order that He might establish the second (two wills would not be in effect at the same time). Therefore, the first covenant passed away in order that the second one (the new covenant) might go into effect. Since the new covenant went into effect fifty days after the resurrection (on the Day of Pentecost), the former covenant that contained the Ten Commandments had to be taken out of the way at least by that time.

6. "Does this mean it is all right to kill or steal since the Ten Commandments are done away?"

No, for those same commandments are found in various places in the New Testament. In one form or another all the Ten Commandments are found somewhere in

## 14 SUBJECTS SCRIPTURALLY STUDIED

the New Testament except the sabbath-commandment. God has retained of them what He wants.

7. "Don't the Seventh Day Adventists and other seventh-day bodies hold that the Ten Commandments are still in effect?"

A. They contend that the law of Moses ended at the cross except that part which was engraven on stone (the Ten Commandments). This position would perpetuate the sabbath-commandment.

B. But when Paul talks about the law having been done away, notice that he particularly mentions that part which was engraven on stone--the Ten Commandments (II Cor. 3:7,11). Col. 2:14 talks about the blotting out of ordinances, and he goes on to mention the sabbath (on the stones) along with the ceremonial laws (not on the stones). They have all been done away with by Christ!

C. But they do not really keep the sabbath themselves, for when the sabbath-law was in effect, they were forbidden to kindle a fire on that day (Exo. 35:3), but they do today. Furthermore, those who broke the sabbath were to be killed (Num. 15:32-36), yet they do not kill those who do not keep it.

In conclusion, let us be fully convinced that one cannot fulfill his divine obligations by merely keeping the Ten Commandments. If one can be saved by merely keeping the Ten Commandments, he can be saved without believing in Jesus, without loving God, without repenting, without controlling one's temper, without helping the needy, without loving one's mate, without being a good parent, without praying, and even while living the life of a drunkard, for there is not one word about any of these in the Ten Commandments. You can see then that the Ten Commandments were never given to be a complete guide to any people but were a group of important, easy-to-remember obligations for

## THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

the Jews during Old Testament times.

### QUESTIONS

1. In what 2 chapters are the Ten Commandments listed?
2. Why are they listed twice?
3. How long was Moses up in the mountain to receive these commandments in stone?
4. What wrong thing did the people do while he was gone?
5. After the tabernacle was made, where were the Ten Commandments kept?
6. Into what natural divisions do the Ten Commandments fall?
7. What is wrong with the teaching that all one has to do to be saved is keep the Ten Commandments?
8. Which 1 of the Ten Commandments is not found in the new covenant?