admonish men to act -- "Be strong," "put on," "that ye may be able to stand." "we wrestle," "take unto you the whole armor," "stand," "taking," "take," "pray," etc. Paul's emphasis here is our appropriation of the spiritual armor in Christ, and I think that this is the LEXEXXEMPHASESXEE emphasis of the programs. One may say that here in the lessens man's part is emphasized; but there is nothing wrong with this for the lessons do not deny God's part. Nay rather, they are predicated on God's part. I cannot myself here but feel that the criticism is unfounded. One may start with either Ged's part or man's part so long as in the end Ged is seen to be the one wholly and finally responsible for salvation, sanctification, and glerification (Remans 8:29-30) -- this is Calvinism. But here again, these lessons would be untrue to their purpose if they were a Sunday School treatise on dogmatics, therefore, it is not proper to criticize them on these grounds. To do such is farx like a woman walking out of a meeting of the Ladies Missionary Society saying, "The speaker didxmax talked about sending clothing to Africa; he never once presented the Biblical basis for missions nor the Scriptural and dogmatic rationale showing that the heathen who do not hear are lost. He never even mentioned faith missions, nor ecclesiastical separation on the mission field." You see, it is not incumbent on every Overcomers Sunday evening series to exposit the entire field of dogmatics. This-is-the-responsibility-ef-the-ever-all-ehureh----PROGRAM ASKS: "WHAT IS SIN?" AND REFERS TO THE CATECHISM!!! Item 4: Specification C: Here the charge is that the sentence on page 15,

par. 2, line 5 is false, viz., "With Christ in the heart and over the heart, the maintenance of a clean heart becomes a glorious possibility."

Opinion. Our Confession, Chap. XIII, sec. 2, and the Scriptures, Phil. 3:12-13; 1 John 1:8-10, make it abundantly clear than that no Christian can in this life so perfect his sanctification that he attains unto sinless perfection. Even the allegation of the real and actual possibility of such perfection is in error. Yet the Scriptures point us to the hely goal of seeking in all things to please & ada #xxxadx #Cfxx dana x 22 xxxxx didxxxxx as the Father is perfect (teleios); Matt. 5:48, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." So the Latin fathers said that a man in Christ is, "Posse pecare et posse non peccare" ("Able to sin and able not to sin"). Yet the actual attainment of this theoretical possiblity of degmatics is never seriously countenanced in Scripture, for the best not us yields to the Old Nature far too often. Thus even Paul had to confess, confess his falling short of the mark asxRankxkkax (Phil. 3:12-13). The 82nd Q. of the Shorter Catechism denies that any "mere man" is able to attain to sinless perfection.

Yet Lev. 11:44-45 says, "Ye shall be hely for I am hely." It does not admonish us to be "fairly hely" or "moderately hely." This standard, however, we can not meet inxenexement except as we stand in Christ (Romans 3:20). We are legally justified in God's sight by Christ's finished work; yet we are not, the best of us, undefiled in actuality. We must daily confess our sins so as to remain in perfect fellowship with God (1 John 1:9).

Now what of the sentence in the book on p. 15? In my judgment the sentence EXXXX gives a false impression. Perhaps what the writer meant was that it was and is possible with Christ for a young person to live a "Christian life" "clean" in a relative sense when compared to the sinful lives of the worldly youths of today. This is probably so, and thus the writer used the word "clean" rather than "perfect" -- that is, she did not say that a perfect heart was a possibility, but only that a clean heart was a possibility. Yet the words of the sentence mislead. I suggest that all the words after the comma be striken, with and the following be inserted, "let us strive to please Him in all things (Cf. Jn. 8:29)." A special rubber stamp