

# John 6 Avoidance Example #4,698, and Deuteronomy 18 Fulfilled in Jesus Confirmed

sermonaudio.com

*The Dividing Line 2015*

By Dr. James White

**Preached on:** Thursday, March 12, 2015

**Alpha and Omega Ministries**

P.O. Box 37106

Phoenix, AZ 85069

**Website:** [aomin.org](http://aomin.org)

**Online Sermons:** [www.sermonaudio.com/aominorg](http://www.sermonaudio.com/aominorg)

James White. And welcome to the Dividing Line just a little bit late. It's called a Bill Gates delay. We reset the machine an hour ago then we decided to reset it right before the program again. How many updates? Well, I know three restart, recycle like 13, I think it's like 13 updates and three starts and stops and there you go. It's Microsoft. What do you want? There you go.

Anyways, we're here and you're there and it's good to have you with us today. Last program, we went almost two hours and I did not get to the second article that I had announced I was going to be getting to, so today I want to address the John 6 article from Leighton Flowers, and then I want to address some statements from Zakir Hussain. For those of you into the study of Islam, that will be relevant to you, and if for some reason I am concise, if for some reason I am concise and quick and so on and so forth, then we'll open the phone lines and talk to you but the chances of that are... I notice Rich isn't even bothering to set things up because it's sort of like of, yeah, concise, quick, right, sure. Yeah, we do have a studio audience. Hello, studio audience. How are you? Love, love the hairstyle, dude. Right on, I mean, that's the way to go. You never have to worry about things like shampoo, anything like that. You do have to worry about shaving cream. Do you use shaving cream? I just use plain old soap, just regular old soap. I mean once you're this old, if you cut it off, you know, ah, it doesn't really... How often do you nick yourself, though? I'm about twice a year. Catch the ear or something, bleeds like anything. You don't nick yourself. No? Oh, you just wait. You just, you just wait, buddy, 'cause you catch the ear it doesn't know how to stop bleeding. It's like you get shot or something. It's bad. It really is but that's life. That's life.

Speaker. This is scintillating.

James. Yeah, it is a fascinating conversation we're having, isn't it? Yeah, I appreciate the excitement there. Anyways, now Adobe wants to do something, but I'm not going to let Adobe do anything because it'll take over the entire system when I do so. Yeah, a fellow on Twitter says the update today is bad and took about an hour to restart my computer. There you go. So you're not the only one that experienced it and I guess yours probably went faster than other people's did. So that's good.

All right. John 6. I love the title of Leighton Flowers' article "John 6 – "Down from Heaven": Why Context kills Calvinism." Given how often we have demonstrated the acontextual nature of so much of non-Reformed argumentation and especially exegesis... Oh, come on, Jay, [unintelligible]. What does this look like to you? See, see the... you can't see it in the thing there. That that that's a Mac. This is a Mac. The computer on my desk is a Mac but that guy, if he switches well, he can't switch camera angle today, you cannot switch camera angle today, Rich. That guy across the window is a PC guy. He's still in the, "Oh, you Mac guys are terrible" cult. And yes, it says the cult. So don't look at me. I don't need to repent. I've already seen the light. Okay, it's it's Reese Pierre who needs to see the light and we'll go from there. So don't, don't tell me about that.

Why context kills Calvinism. I remember my hermeneutics professor saying at the beginning of every class, text, context, they pretext for proof text. Well yes, we've all heard that before. Context tells us the history of the setting, the audience and thus helps understand the intention of the author. The grammar can inform us what interpretations are allowed, but the author's intent is best discovered in the overall context. Well, that's certainly true, and that's why it's so beautiful to weave the context in John together and you see the themes especially coming to the fore in John 6, 8, 10, the shepherd and the sheep, "you're not of my sheep"; 17, "the Father has given people to the Son," and I want you to listen carefully, folks, because as much as this is....you know, sometimes some of our listeners, we've gone through so many failed attempts to get around John 6. I mean, it's just sort of a hobby of ours to collect all these amazing explanations that people come up with which generally involves creation of some context outside of John 6 which is imposed upon the text so that the words can't have the meaning that they had obviously to the people who heard them when they were first uttered. We've done it so many times that you might be, sort of your mind might be wandering or something. There is an important result of Leighton Flowers' interpretation here because fundamentally what he's going to be saying is this is only about the apostles. This is only about the days of Jesus. There was a temporary judicial hardening of the Jewish people at that time, and if you follow the link at the bottom of this to his other article on John 17, "Have you been given to Christ by the Father," he identifies that as the disciples alone.

Now, of course, the disciples were given by Christ the Father but the result of this interpretation, folks, is that one of the most precious grounding, encouraging truths of biblical soteriology is taken away from you in the service of the almighty autonomous will of man. That's what you have here. Jesus taught all that the Father gives him will come to him. Once you create an artificial context that says, "Yeah, I'm going to get all the disciples," and has nothing to do with after that, then throw the rest of John 6 out. All those other promises, they're just about the disciples. Place in heaven, go to prepare a place for you, that was the disciples. John 3 [unintelligible] Disciples. Now he may not go that far, but what consistent basis does he have to not go that far? The cost of attempting to turn the biblical narrative about the autonomous sovereign, free God and his creatures who are redeemed by him to his honor and glory, into the story of God creating autonomous creatures who then do all this stuff, the cost is huge. The cost is massive. And if you have ever found yourself rejoicing, as I certainly have, in the keeping power of God, rejoicing that the Son has come down from heaven not to do his

own will but the will of him who sent him, and this is the willingness that all that has been given to him, he loses none of it but raises it up on the last day, and that I'm one of those that has been given, it is in his hand, he is the perfect Savior. If you've ever rejoiced in that, well, I guess you need to recognize the only way to rejoice in that consistently is to be a monologist because once you're a synergist, once it's a cooperative thing, all bets are off. Christ will do his part. He'll do his best but if he doesn't really have that ultimate authority to save to the uttermost, if it's all up to us as to whether we're drawing near, it's our will, we are the autonomous preachers it's a very, very, I don't know how there is any assurance in that system. I really don't. I can't see how there's any consistent assurance in that system.

Back to the article. The sixth chapter of John is one of the top three most contested passages in all of scripture regarding the doctrine of salvation along with Romans 9 and Ephesians 1. Well, again as much as Leighton doesn't appreciate this, that just shows me that in his mind Calvinism is the thing because I deal with Roman Catholics all the time and these would not be the texts. And there's, you know, I don't know how many hundreds of millions of them. Deal with Muslims all the time, not those texts. To say that these are the three most contested passages in all the scripture regarding the doctrine of salvation means that in his mind the primary thing in the doctrine of salvation is Calvinism.

So as students of scripture, let's put our hermeneutical training to work and answer the major questions about the context of this hotly contested chapter. Ironically... Well, listen to the information provided by Professor Flowers and ask yourself a simple question: is this actually the context of Romans 6? What would give you the context of Romans 6? Think about that in your mind for a moment and then listen to what is actually presented.

The audience is a bunch of unbelieving Israelites looking for the food and the 12 apostles. What do we know about the Israelites of this day? A. They have become calloused, otherwise they might see with their eyes, see with their ears, understand with their hearts and turn that I should heal them, Acts 28:27. They were not born calloused.

[coughing] Excuse me. That's gonna happen a few times today, allergies. Told you about it. Don't worry about it. But sure is bugging me. It's giving me a headache too. You cough that many times during the day it's sort of like, "Oh, eye is about to explode."

They were not born callous, but over time they had grown hardened in their religious self-righteousness which prevented them from hearing, seeing, and responding to the revelation of God. B. They are being judicially hardened or cut off or sent a spirit of stupor so as to seal them in their callous condition. Why? To accomplish a greater redemptive purpose to their rebellion, crucifixion, and grafting Gentiles in the church, Romans 9 through 11. Noticing some real broad claims here?

C. Jesus is not attempting to win them over or have them come to faith in great numbers, as we see in Acts 2 when Peter preaches. In fact, the support of God's judicial hardening of Israel, we see Jesus actively instructing his apostles to not tell others who he is,

Matthew 16:20. Jesus purposely speaks in parables in order to prevent their coming to faith and repentance, Mark 4:11; Matthew 13. If anything, Jesus is actively provoking the Jews with very difficult teachings. In this chapter, he tells them to eat his flesh and drink his blood without explanation. Clearly, he is not attempting to persuade this audience to stick around, he is provoking them purposefully. Is this contextual information relevant when attempting to understand the author's intention with regard to the natural inability of mankind from birth? I certainly would think so, given he is addressing a large group of people nicknamed the elect of God who are being actively blinded by God from seeing the truth. Now need I point out the huge number of assumptions being made here? I hope not, but I also hope that you're all recognizing so far we haven't even touched on the actual context of John 6 which is sort of required going to John 5 and then looking at what happens at the beginning of John 6. But anyway.

Notice the judicially hardened Jews are not the only ones present when Jesus is speaking in John 6, the 12 apostles are also in the audience, and in fact, they are the only ones who stick around after Jesus is done provoking the crowd with his pro-cannibalistic sounding sermon. I'm reading it... yeah. Yeah, I know. Yeah, missing by a mile but we'll get to that in a second. Why didn't the 12 leave too? It is almost as if they were drawn to him through persuasive teachings and miraculous signs. Remember, unlike the other Israelites in the audience, they had watched Jesus walk on water, control the weather, heal the blind, feed the masses, and had personally explained to them the meaning of the mysterious that the world had not yet been given. Of course, these folks, especially the ones that come across the lake, had actually seen the miracle of the feeding of the 5,000, but those Jesus are entrusting with the truth from Israel are only a select few at this time while he is on earth. The rest are being hardened in their already calloused, self-righteous, stubborn condition, not a condition from birth due to the fall, as Calvinists impose onto the text, as if any of this is relevant to that, but a condition of their own doing, a condition God is using to accomplish a greater redemptive good for all, which of course, raises all sorts of questions about, "Well, what if they didn't do that, then God couldn't have done that." It's that old sovereignty thing and, you know, God's knowledge of what he's going to do and part of his decree. If you don't have a decree then it all gets, you know, you can't really affirm any of it.

Anyhow, with that context in mind, let us look at the text. Time out. What context? You all see what just happened? This is how you set up ignoring what the words actually say. You create this alleged context by pulling together this thing that says... Now that was not the context of John 6, okay? If you want the context of John 6, you actually have to look at the text of John 6 and the text of John 6 begins with the feeding of the 5,000 and then Jesus sends them away. They want to make him king. He sends the disciples away. He comes then walking on the water, immediately there then at Capernaum, and now other disciples have crossed the lake, they've entered the synagogue in Capernaum. They're actually seeking Jesus. They are called God-seekers. Well, Jesus-seekers, at least in this context. That's the context. Now what he's done here is tried to create this idea that there is this judicial hardening of Israel that makes possible the redemptive work of Calvary, but because of his commitment to synergism and autonomy, he has to say that what's going on here is not a part of the decree of God or God accomplishing something, but

what's going on here is the righteous hardening of people who had hardened themselves. And so they're going to be hardened so that the redemptive acts can take place but there is a specific people, the apostles, who are being chosen out of Israel and they're going to be given these truths and so what Jesus is actually talking about is just the disciples and the judicially hardened Jews, and hence it's only about them and there is no application to be made beyond that. It's just about them. Doesn't have anything to do with today because there is no judicial hardening of Jews and so there's no, you know, any of that stuff.

So let's continue on. Now, I just simply point out that's you're pretending that you're given the context of John 6. What you've done is you've created a very easily refutable, by the way, theological narrative that you're now going to use to filter John 6 through. That's not context. That's a pretext. Okay, very clear. Very obvious. Just straightforward. With that context in mind, let us look at the text. Then we have provided for us verses 35 through 44, for some reason this says 43, but 44 is included as well. And wow, what a strange people cannot come to me unless the Father who sent me draws them to me and I'll raise them to life on the last day. Let's hope a decent translation is used in the debate that is actually understandable, but since there may be people in the audience who have not worked through John 6, let's work through it together. Very quickly, I don't have time to... I'm just going to go through it quickly.

Jesus said to them, "I am the bread of life. The one coming to me shall not hunger, and the one believing in me will never thirst." So coming and believing present tense participles. Notice hungering and thirsting, this is going to define the eating the flesh of the Son of man, drinking his blood. The whole cannibalistic idea is absurd in light of the context that defines eating and drinking as coming and believing in verse 35.

Verse 36, "But I said to you that you have seen me and you are not believing." Here is absolutely key which evidently is completely skipped by Professor Flowers. The context is the explanation of the unbelief. Why have they seen? They've seen the miracles. They are seeking after Jesus. "You have seen me and you are not believing." That's the statement of verse 36. By the way, I should be feeding this if you want to have it there. I mean I, ah, yes, very good. But I said to you. Oh sorry, verse 36.

"All that the Father gives me will come to me and the one coming to me I will never cast out because I have come down out of heaven not in order to do my will, but the will of the one who sent me." So here you have the explanation of why it is these men are unbelievers, "All that the Father gives me will come to me." Now how would that be an explanation of their unbelief because coming to Christ, believing in Christ, these are synonymous actions, as we will see. "All that the Father gives me will come to me." Well, that explains why they are not coming. That explains why they are not believing. Because they've not been given by the Father to the Son. "And the one coming to me, I will never cast out." Now if he was saying this only to the apostles and was contrasting the apostles to everybody else, that would at least be supportive of the Flowers thesis. But that's not what you have here. I suppose I'll leave the Flowers thesis off for the moment until we actually read it. I mean, I've already read it. You can go read it if you want to, but we'll leave the reputation part out until later. "The one coming to me I will never cast

out." Why? "Because I've come down from heaven not to do my own will but the will of the one who sent me." So the Father and the Son have the exact same will in the accomplishment of the salvation of God's people. It's a direct parallel to John 10:3.

And so verse 39 says, "What is that will of the one who sent me? In order that of all that he has given to me," and notice the use of the neuter there, gathering the whole group together, "of all he's given me, I lose none of it," singular, "but raise it up on the last day." Now notice that the purpose of the will of the Father that is expressed here, ties all of those who are given to Christ up and promises their resurrection at the last day. So whatever that resurrection at the last day, that's receiving eternal life. So this is speaking in very expansive terms. It's not speaking in minimalized terms that are relevant only to the 12. What about everyone else who is going to be raised up in the last day? They seem to be included in what Jesus is saying. Well, that's true because, "for this is the will of my Father in order that all the ones seeing the Son and believing in him might have eternal life, and I will raise them up on the last day."

There is a general evangelistic promise that extends to all people in all ages. Anyone who looks upon the Son and believes in him, not just the disciples but anyone who looks upon the Son and believes in him has eternal life and I will raise them up on the last day. So the ones given by the Father to the Son and those who look upon the Son and believe in him, same group. Same group. You cannot differentiate them. You cannot distinguish them. The same group. And so if you have looked upon the Son in faith, the promise of your salvation is found in the obedience of the Son to the Father, and that he will always do the Father's will. That really is the foundation of all of our salvation. It's not my faithfulness. It's not my autonomous will. It is the security of knowing that the Son will always do what is pleasing to the Father. There's your foundation.

Now there's grumbling in verse 41. Verses 41, the Jews grumble about him. "Is this not Jesus," so on and so forth. Verse 43. Jesus answered and said to them, "Do not gongyzete met allelon. Do not grumble amongst yourselves. Oudeis dynatai elthein pros me ean me ho Pater ho pempas me helyse auton. Kago anasteso auton en te eschate hemera. No one is able to come to me unless, ean me, the Father, the one who sent me draws him and I will raise him up," the two "hims" are the same. "I will raise him up on the last day." Who's raised up on the last day in verse 44? The one who is drawn by the Father to the Son. But previously it was that who looks and believes, previous to that given by the Father to the Son. They're all the same group. They're all the same group.

It is impossible, it is artificial to make distinctions at that point, and to say that there is any others, and I would have continued on to verse 45, "It is written, it stands written in the prophets and they shall all be taught by God; everyone hearing from the Father and learning is coming to me." So that hearing and learning, those are things that you do when something is presented to you. This is describing what the drawing of the Father is. The opening of the ears, the learning of who Jesus is, this is all divine revelation of the human soul, and everyone hearing and learning from the Father is coming to me. Everyone. Do we hear and learn from the Father? If you limit who is being spoken of here to the disciples, you just might as well put... do you know what this does? It puts it

in the same category as Jehovah's Witnesses because Jehovah's Witnesses look at the New Testament and go, "That's about the anointed class, not about me." And so now John becomes something that, "Oh, isn't that special what the disciples had? But it's not about me."

All right, so what's the argument then that is given? Well, you have the quotation that says Calvinistic believers often emphasize verse 37 as it relates to verse 39 to prove that the author intends to teach Calvinistic doctrine, that is, that God has preselected a particular number of people to irresistibly drawn to faith while leaving all others without the ability to respond willing to respond, I assume this is supposed to be willingly to the revelation of God. As if God is under some obligation by grace to make them capable because they're fallen in Adam, but I doubt there's a belief in that kind, that strong form of original sin with the... well, of course, there isn't. Anyways. However, I'd like to draw our attention to the context clue given in verse 38. "Everyone whom my Father gives me will come to me. I will never turn away anyone who comes to me because I have come down from heaven to do not my own will but the will of him who sent me. And it is the will of him who sent me that I should not lose any of those he has given me, but I should raise them all to life on the last day." Boy, I really don't like that translation, whatever it is. Jesus is clearly speaking contextually of what is happening while he is down from heaven. While on earth, God has clearly sent Christ to accomplish a specific part of his redemptive will. Is that will to be a great evangelist like Peter in Acts 2 and win thousands to faith? Clearly not. God's will is for Jesus to come down from heaven and train a group of preselected Israelites, those given to him by the apostles, to carry the gospel to the rest of the world and establish his church after he's raised up. Interestingly enough, he quotes John 12:32 there. Keep that in mind, it's going to come up a little bit later on.

Now, is it true that in God's sovereign decree, he elected the apostles, gave them unto the Son? All of that's very true. But is there anywhere that John says that what Jesus' actual mission in coming to earth was simply to train a group of preselected Israelites to carry the gospel to the rest of the world and establish his church after he is raised up? No. Not quite.

Yes, Sir? You've given up? You threw in the towel, huh? You got nothing. Cal has thrown in. That's all over with, Okay.

Calvinists are taking something Jesus is addressing in his actual first century context and applying it to their holistic, systematic view of salvation for all God's elect throughout all time. This is an example of proof texting. Well, Professor Flowers, I hope you never quote John 3:16 because that's in the gospel of John too. Is that proof texting? Oh, wait a minute, I happen to know you do quote John 3:16. Oh, that's about something else. Really? That's about something else. How about John 10? The sheep? How about John 14, preparing a place for you? That was originally spoken to the disciples, only about them, right? Oh, it's amazing what happens when you try to rip the sovereign freedom of God out of the text of scripture. It becomes a royal mess. It really does.

Calvinists, okay, what Calvinists, should be an "s" there, unintentionally fail to see is that Jesus while here on earth in the flesh, is actively and judicially blinding Israel by means of parables, a spirit of stupor, and provoking language while only drawing to himself while on earth a remnant of preselected Israelite messengers to carry out the purpose for which Israel was elected from the beginning to bring the light to the rest of the world. In other words, Jesus' audience in John 6 is made-up of his preselected apostles from Israel. Well, there was that Judas guy. And the already calloused Israelites who are being judicially blinded by God from seeing the truth. You realize what this means, don't you? That no one who heard these words was ever saved. How do you know that? Not sure how that church grew the way that it did at Pentecost and afterwards. I think all sorts of folks who had eaten of the feeding of the 5,000 or had heard the words of Jesus once the Spirit came, the gospel is preached, were saved. I can't prove it, but somebody was being saved. The term eisegesis is floating through my mind here. In other words, Jesus' audience and John 6 is made-up of his preselected apostles from Israel and Judas, and the already calloused Israelites who are being judicially blinded by God from seeing the truth. Nobody else evidently. Nobody else. Well, they all walked away, didn't they? They did all walk away at that particular point in time but nobody was saved later. Everybody, all those, everybody to all the feeding of the 5,000, Jesus was just doing that teaching just to judicially blind them all. No preparation for anything future. No, no, no. No, because we've got to find a way around John 6. So yeah, they were all judicially blinded as was Judas, I guess.

The reason his audience walks away is not because God rejected them from before the foundation of the earth, as if there was something about that, as Calvinism presumes. Well, if you let the whole Bible speak and Ephesians 1 and stuff put all together. By no means, God has consistently expressed desire for the repentance and faith of the Israelite people. And then you have, you know, the standard Matthew 23:37; 2 Peter 3:9; 1 Timothy 2:4; the big three. You know, been there, done that. Oh, Ezekiel 18. Oh, let's throw that one in for the fun of it. All acontextual. They are walking away because God has sealed them over in their already rebellious condition for a time, for a time, in order to accomplish his redemptive plan as was prophesied. Israel is not rejecting God. I guess, then they could have been unhardened later on, maybe. I guess. Who knows? I mean, we're just making it up as we're going along anyways. Israel is not rejecting God because God rejected them. Quite the opposite, God is temporarily hardening those in their callous condition in order to accomplish redemption for all, including them. So if they had followed Jesus, then there couldn't have been any salvation, I guess.

So what is the intent of John 6? Is it as the Calvinist teaches that God has condemned all men over to a totally disabled condition from birth due to the sin of Adam, and only irresistibly draws out a preselected number of people for salvation, leaving the rest out of any hope of response to his own appeals for reconciliation? When you have to express the other side in that kind of language, you know that the person doing it is afraid of letting the other side actually express it in their own language because they don't really have a strong argument against it. It's just how it is. But is that what it is? Or is the intent of John 6 to tell us the narrative of Jesus' provoking Israel in their hardened unbelief while drawing out for himself a remnant of divinely appointed messengers to take the



gospel into all the world, drawing all to himself after he was raised up? Then quoting John 12:32, "When I lift up from the earth, I will draw everyone to me." Well, remember I told you he quoted John 12 up above and I said, you know, keep that in mind because it seems to be rather inconsistent to quote it up above in John 12 in regards to carry the gospel to the rest of the world and establish his church after he's raised up, John 12:32. But John 12:32 is talking about Greeks, right? And John 12:32 is talking about the cross, right? So are you really saying that the cross is a universally attractive thing or is the meaning of John 12:32 obviously that both Jews and Gentiles will be drawn by the cross, which is repulsive to the natural man? When it says all men, it's not every single man because it is plain as the nose on anybody's face, that for the vast majority of humankind the cross is repulsive. The cross is the sign of weakness, of failure. It's foolishness according to 1 Corinthians 1. The stench of death in the nostrils of those who are perishing.

Now of course, the synergist has no real... again, the categories of those who are being saved and those who are perishing [unintelligible] have no meaning for the synergist because they're all based upon man. It's man's choice to be one of the two. But in 1 Corinthians 1 we see that those categories are based upon God's choice, God's election, God's freedom. And what you end up with when you try to come up with a non-sovereignty based gospel message is always gobbledygook, which is what you've ended up with here.

So a text that not only teaches the sovereignty of the Father but the perfect ability and power of the Son in saving all that the Father gives him, a text that shows the unity of the Father and the Son, the ability of the Son to fulfill the Father's will and hence becomes the very foundation of the security that the believer has in Jesus Christ, I'm sorry if you're a synergist you can't claim it for yourself because, well, it was only about the disciples. So all that stuff about the Son coming down from heaven to do the will of the Father, all that was was not about salvation for anybody past the disciples. No, no. No, no. No, it was just about that remnant of Israelite teachers, messengers, and Jesus accomplished that but now synergism, it's we've got to do our part. There you go.

There was a link to another article, "Have you been given to Christ by the Father," which tries to derive this from John 17, and once again what you just need to understand, I don't have time to go into that, what you need to understand is if you've ever read John 17 and you have read about Christ's high priestly prayer and his intercession, up until when Jesus says, "I pray for those who will believe because of their word," everything that's before that, irrelevant to you. Not relevant to you. Only about the disciples. Now, obviously there is a historical fulfillment of the special calling of disciples in their apostolic ministry in the giving of revelation, and so on and so forth. But thankfully, down through the history of the church, people have recognized that Jesus' words in the gospel of John, especially given that John is one of the last to write, are meant to be that incredible comfort and treasure that people have always found them to be. And that we can, as believers, rejoice in the fact that the Son will always do the will of the Father, and that is the very foundation of our own standing with God. When you try to get away from the freedom of God in salvation, you end up with a man-centered salvation that does not have

as its central purpose the glorification of God. Big price to pay. Big, big, big price to pay to try to get around the clarity of John 6.

Move on from there in the last 20 minutes or so because we have to go a few minutes long as we get started a little bit late, I wanted to respond to some statements. Oh, goodness, 13 tweets. Yikes. Brother Flower says I'm not representing him. Nothing I said suggests those present may not have been saved. Again, you are not representing me correctly. Okay, so the only two people, the only people in the audience are the judicially hardened and the disciples. So the temporary judicial hardening taken off later on once the crucifixion takes place, so maybe they can be saved later on. I think I did actually raise that as a possibility. It's still grossly artificial. You never prove that from the text. You impose that on the text completely. It is so artificial, Sir. And it is so plain to many of us that it's just because you won't let the words mean what they mean because they will not let you be a synergist. They will not let you control the power of God in salvation.

I never said it was only about the disciples. Well, that is an overstatement. I've read it pretty much directly. Didn't he say that? Do I have to open it up again?

Speaker. I was, that's how I thoroughly understood what you were reading and apparently we need to, I don't know, read him as he reads John 6 maybe so we can....?

James. No, we don't want to do that. No, we don't. No, no, no. Don't want to do that. So the context one more time. Just for his teachings. All apostles are also in the audience. God's will. Training a group of preselected Israelites. Proof texting. So we failed to see the judicial blinding and the drawing of the remnant. And in other words, Jesus' audience in John 6 is made-up of his preselected apostles from Israel and the already calloused Israelites who are being judicially blinded by God from seeing the truth. I think that's what you said, isn't it? Yeah, that's what you said.

Speaker. Apparently there was another paragraph that wasn't actually on the page.

James. Yeah, well, okay. All right. Zakir Hussain did a debate a few months ago. I played a clip from it. We used it as an illustration of examining synoptic parallels and recognizing in that situation that Matthew was telescoping, Mark was not telescoping. Mark uses three times the number of words that Matthew uses, so on and so forth. I want to address another issue and this one's a little troubling to me because some of you will remember that Zakir Hussain is the young man that I debated in the East London mosque a week after the Benghazi attack, and the subject of that debate was, "Is Muhammed prophesied in the Bible?" Which means that what we're going to listen to today I've already addressed with Mr. Hussain, and have pointed out the problems with this presentation to Mr. Hussain.

Now unfortunately, I do not recall the Christian representative in this debate thoroughly answering this question, thoroughly answering the presentation here. It's possible that he's just never heard this presentation before. I don't know. But I think it is important that we listen to what Zakir Hussain is saying and be prepared to answer this because hopefully

you are familiar with the fact that in Deuteronomy 18 we have a prophecy, a prophecy that is rather important because according to the New Testament it is fulfilled in Jesus Christ. And when we look at Deuteronomy 18 and we look for context, we need to define some certain terms. In Deuteronomy 18:2, and I'll go ahead and put the text here, Deuteronomy 18:2, talking about the Levites, and in Deuteronomy 18:2 it says, "They shall have no inheritance among their brothers. Yahweh is their inheritance as he promised them." We can't bring up anything? Okay. So verse 2, let me...there we go. Make it a little bit larger. Okay, the Levites shall have no inheritance among the countrymen. Yahweh is their inheritance as he promised them. So among their countrymen, what does that mean? Well, this means 12 tribes of Israel as verse 5 makes very plain. Go down here to verse 5, "For Yahweh your God has chosen him and his sons from all your tribes to stand and serve in the name of Yahweh forever." So these men have been chosen out of your tribes. The tribes of whom? The tribes of Israel. So countrymen, tribes talking about Israel. This is the Israelite people that is being discussed. So among your brothers, out of all your tribes versus the same thing, Israelites, not anyone outside the specific 12 tribes of Israel. And then in chapter 17, verse 15. I won't bring it up right now because I need to keep moving here but, "You may indeed set a king over you whom Yahweh your God will choose, one from among your brothers you shall set as king over you. You may not put a foreigner over you who is not your brother."

All right, so this is the context then that we have when we look in Deuteronomy 17 and 18, among your brothers equals Israelites. It's not foreigners. It's not Ishmaelites. It's not Edomites. These are Israelites. And so we go down to Deuteronomy 18:15 and here's what we have. "Yahweh your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your countrymen. You shall listen to him." Now, is there anything in the context that would cause us to go, "Oh, that must be somebody from Arabia. That must be something other than an Israelite." No. Everything in the context would indicate that it is, in fact, specifically someone from amongst them. And then verse 18 says, "I will raise up a prophet from among their countrymen like you," speaking to Moses, "and I'll put my words in his mouth and he shall speak them all that I command him. It shall come about that whoever will not listen to my words which he shall speak in my name, I myself will require it of him."

Now in the context of Deuteronomy, there is no question this is talking about a Jewish prophet, a man from the countrymen of Israel. There is no other contextual meaning. You are playing with the text if you do anything else with it than that. Now some of you might be aware of the fact that according to the New Testament, this is fulfilled in Jesus. We look at Acts 3 beginning at verse 22 and we have, Moses said, "The Lord God will raise up for you a prophet like me from your brothers. You shall listen to him in whatever he tells you. It shall be that every soul who does not listen to that prophet shall be destroyed from the people and all the prophets who have spoken from Samuel to those who came after him also proclaimed these days. You are the sons of the prophets and of the covenant that God made with their fathers saying to Abraham, 'And in your offspring shall all the families of the earth be blessed.' God having raised up his servant, sent him to you first to bless you by turning every one of you from your wickedness." Who is this servant who has been raised up? Peter is proclaiming this is Jesus. This is Jesus. And so

in fact, that's specifically said right here. "The times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord, that he may send the Messiah appointed for you, Jesus, whom heaven must receive until the time for restoring all things about which God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets long ago." And where is all the places he did that? Deuteronomy 18:15, 18, 19 and so on and so forth.

Now this was plainly a part of the [unintelligible] that existed in the days of Muhammad. The author of the Quran knows nothing about the content of the [unintelligible], so he doesn't know anything about this. The early followers of Muhammad likewise did not seem to have any first-hand knowledge of the content of the New Testament text. And I remind you of the story, I believe and I'm not sure if our friend is out there at the moment, but I believe if I recall, was it... let's see if I can get some help from the studio audience. The story about, I thought it was Umar who was reading the Christian scriptures. No, he was reading the Torah and when Muhammad saw him reading the Torah his face changed color and he said, "Is not what I have given to you sufficient for you?" My recollection is either Qurtubi or Tabiti as the source of that. I don't think it's in Bukhari or Muslim. Bukhari, it is in Bukhari. Okay, thank you. Obviously our studio audience knows something about this. There is the story told, I just narrated it for you, that one of the early followers of Muhammad upon reading, if I recall the Torah, Muhammad's face changed. He was angry. And as a result, most Muslims do not spend a lot of time reading the scriptures, the Old and New Testament. And this is certainly true of the early followers. And as a result, they wouldn't know that Peter preached these things as he does here in Acts 3. So that ignorance of the fulfillment is at least understandable in those days, and it's very interesting to note that when you look at John 8, there's also stuff going back. John 14. We'll get to that in a moment.

So with all that in mind, with that as the background, let's listen to what Zakir Hussain said and I need to turn this down from 1.6 because that would sound silly. This is slightly sped up just simply so we have more time. There is some comments that Zakir Hussain made. We need to plug things in earlier.

Zakir Hussain. One of the great reasons Christians should accept the Quran is because the Bible commands you to. In the Book of Deuteronomy 18:18, God speaks about raising the prophet from the brethren of the Israelites who will be like Moses, and he will also be a mouthpiece for God, and any person who does not listen to this prophet will be destroyed. This prophecy was not fulfilled before Jesus as the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament confirm. Moreover, Jesus cannot be this prophet as Deuteronomy 34:10 says, "And there shall never arise again in Israel a prophet like unto Moses." And since Jesus was from amongst Israel, he is ruled out.

James. Well, there you go. There's the argument. Jesus is ruled out because of Deuteronomy 34:10. Well, that's interesting. Was it Deuteronomy 34:10? Let's take a look at it. Why don't we put it up on the screen there. "Since that time no prophet has risen in Israel like Moses whom Yahweh knew face to face, for all the signs and wonders which Yahweh sent him to perform in the land of Egypt against Pharaoh and all his servants and all his land, and for all the mighty power and for all the great terror which

Moses performed in the sight of all Israel." Let's go back to verse 10 and let's listen to what Zakir Hussain said again.

Zakir Hussain. Cannot be this prophet as Deuteronomy 34:10 says, "And there shall never arise again in Israel a prophet like unto Moses." And since Jesus was from amongst. Israel, he is ruled out.

James. It doesn't say what Zakir said it says, does it? It says "since that time no prophet has arisen in Israel like Moses." This is written in Deuteronomy. This is written hundreds of years before Jesus. Huge difference, isn't there? Since that time up to this time, the compilation of all of Moses' writings being put together, which is, you know, the more liberal scholars would say hundreds of years, more conservative scholars like me, much shorter period of time, in either case, this is written long before. Minimally, minimally, most liberal, well, most liberal. You can't say that. I mean, liberals can come up with anything. But in even the common liberal perspective, you're talking minimally 500 years before Christ. Probably more like 800 years before Christ. So all it's saying is between Moses and 800 years before Christ, no prophet has arisen like Moses. It does not say "shall never." That is not a valid translation of the Hebrew. That's not a valid translation of the Greek Septuagint. That is just simply a completely misrepresented citation of the text. I can only hope, Zakir, that you got that from some secondary resource and didn't check it out because that would be like me misquoting the Quran to try to make a point that Muhammad couldn't possibly be a prophet. You don't want to do that. You don't want to do that. But there is a little bit more to listen to here.

Zakir Hussain. Moreover, Jesus himself said that this prophet will come after him and John 14:15 and 16 Jesus speaks of someone to come after him who will testify to who he is. If you read the text carefully, you can see that this person is, in fact, the prophet like Moses who shall speak what he hears and shall be told what to say, which doesn't sound like a Holy Ghost is 100% God. Christians claim this text is regarding the Holy Ghost, but it's clear that it's not the Holy Ghost. Also, did the Holy Ghost guide Christians into all truth and testify regarding Jesus? The answer is no, as any book on church history shows that Christians were at each others throats for centuries upon centuries trying to figure out things like was Jesus just a man, or was he just God, or was he both?

James. Now, clearly Zakir has come to recognize that this kind of argumentation is effective for people who are already convinced that you're telling the truth, but it is not effective if you're actually attempting to communicate to the other side. Notice the rat a tat, tat, throw this stuff, this stuff, the answer is this, when actually that's an extremely controversial statement. I mean, John 14 and John 16 are specifically about the Holy Spirit. They say that. John 14 and John 16 are Jesus' promise to his disciples that they will be indwelt by the Holy Spirit of God. If that is Muhammad that is being spoken about, then that was not a promise to the disciples themselves. That would not be a promise to anyone for 600 years, and even then, Muhammad doesn't dwell in anybody's heart. Furthermore, Muhammad didn't know anything about what Jesus actually taught or said and therefore he did not bring to mind the things that Jesus had taught and said and did not fulfill the promise of John 14 through 16. There are few texts. Well, ironically,

given Zakir's defense of this, about the only worst text to try to force into this is Song of Solomon 5:16. But once again, I understand why the Muslim has to do what he has to do because the Quran says that we find Muhammad in our scriptures and the reality is we don't. And it's not because we ain't looking, it's because he ain't there. But any honest reading of John 14 through 16 in its context will never lead you to the conclusion that it's talking about a 7th century Arabian prophet.

And by the way, the presence of the Holy Spirit in the church is not a guarantee that there will not be controversies in the church. The Holy Spirit was in the church and yet the apostles had to write against numerous heresies and falsehoods. Is the fact that Muhammad has come and given the Quran kept Islam unified, Zakir? You all on the same page on everything, Zakir? How about them there Shiites and the [unintelligible] and all the rest of the guys? So that would mean that Muhammad doesn't fulfill it, right? "Oh well, but we know who Jesus is." Not really. Not really. I mean, there's so little about who Jesus really is in the Quran that how can you really say you have any type of in-depth knowledge of Jesus? You cannot create a meaningful full Christology from the pitiful references in the text of the Quran. You couldn't do it. There's just not enough there. Not enough there.

One other thing and then we'll wrap it up because we're pretty close to about an hour, I think. We got to started about five minutes late, something like that.

Zakir Hussain. I'm going to leave Paul aside for a moment, and now I might touch up on him in the rebuttals, but I'm going to stick to the gospels for now. Biblical scholarship mentions that Mark was the first gospel to be written around the year 70 CE with Matthew and Luke copying from Mark and changing things to improve the image of Jesus around the years 80 to 85 CE.

James. Now notice this is biblical scholarship. Well, I could sit here and say the Quranic scholarship says that the Quran was collected over the period of time from 630 to 705, that there was plenty of evidence of substantial alteration in 705 AD, as well as under Uthman in the 650s, and this is Quranic scholarship and I'll just base all my arguments upon that. Why not? Why not? Every assertion being made here is easily disputed, but this rat a tat, throw it all out there, don't substantiate anything approach, it doesn't move the conversation forward, it just simply makes your side go, "Rah, rah," and the other side go, "Eh." It doesn't accomplish anything, and it's unfortunate. I wish that there was something better I could say about that.

There's a lot more to be said about that but we have gone about as far as my voice will go, let me go today anyways, and pretty much right at an hour, I think. Pretty close. So thanks for listening to Dividing Line today. Lord willing, we will be back, yep, next week on Tuesday. There won't be much left of me on Tuesday. Lord willing, I blogged about that, put stuff on Facebook about that, but hopefully there will be something of me here on Tuesday to meet with you. If not, we'll have a best of or something, or who knows. We'll see you then. God bless.