

God commanded . . . God is not a God who . . . the Gospel. Therefore I would say that the principle of both would be true. That we cannot lay down a general law that excludes either the wonderful peaceful statements of the N.T. or the definite commands of God in the Old Testament. But if it is a matter of the exact interrelation on them, then they be taught, to be very careful . . . on them. Among the early Christians you found many who refused to serve . . . , (9) but I think that you find as a rule the reason they refused to serve was Russia was at a state of war with the Detailed Benerator who worshipped the . . . , idolatry. I believe there were many ~~many~~ soldiers in the early centuries in Caesar's army who refused offers to defend him because as soldiers they did their duty and then that was all, but as officers they had to take special oaths in the name of the emperor, the god of his people. I've forgotten the exact details.

Someway I don't like this statement, the New Testament proves from the Bible ?
To me its vital truths, the New Testament makes it sincere because the things have already ? ?
~~happened~~ happened, and makes it more clear. Certainly Abraham saw ~~Ann~~ Christ before his death, Abraham was saved through Christ. And certainly Paul ~~p~~ bases his great argument of the means of salvation by the way Abraham was saved. You are not saved because you keep the law. Abraham had never heard of the law. But Abraham was saved because of the faith he had. That was Paul's big argument.

Well then, after these main divisions again then. I don't see any break between the end of 56, and the beginning of 57. I don't see any reason to believe it whatever. I see 57 continuing, and I see in the middle of verse 13 isn't it, but you have up to that time it is entirely rebuked. Entirely pointed out sin and punishment for this sin, and from thereon, for a number of verses it is entirely God's blessing that is to come. There you have two sections dividing in the middle of a verse, and the two sections are closely related, and so it would seem to me that they are two parts of one whole, but whether that whole ends at verse 19 or 21, is not so clear. I incline to think at verse 19, although 20 and 21 may be an epilogue, still in the same chapter, but not a continuation of the blessing of that section. But that division, there is a division based on very Then in 58 he begins the rebuke again, and in 58 it is a rebuke for formalism, and this rebuke for formalism is continued, until you get down to the end of verse 5, in which he is pointing out before now we knew nothing, and then from verse 6 on he is pointing out that which wins God's