

Is it consistent to be a 'Partial Charismatic' Preterist?

by [Ed Stevens](#)

Editorial Note: This article continues our response to Joseph Balyeat's "[Critique of KC's Review](#)," found on pages 4 and 5 of last issue (July-Aug-Sept, 1992). [The first five sections of his objections to the full preterist view were dealt with in that last issue](#). This is the second installment in our three-part response. To quickly refresh one's memory of Balyeat's original comments regarding the charismatic issue, we have reprinted just [that section of his critique](#) on the opposite page (page 4). Please read that before continuing.

For our readers who come from a charismatic background, please understand that I accept you as my fellow brothers/sisters in Christ. I may feel it is inconsistent Biblically to be both preterist and charismatic, but I don't believe it is necessarily a hindrance to one's spiritual relationship with God. Please don't tune me out yet. Let me explain why I think it is inconsistent. If you don't agree after studying my comments here, it won't make me think any less of you as a fellow Christian, and I hope you won't think any less of me either.

Some within the charismatic movement have told me there is a serious re-study of eschatology going on within the movement. Some preterist ideas are being discussed. They don't call it preterist, though. It is better known as "Kingdom Now." Some have told me that a well-known charismatic preacher in Atlanta is deep into a study of the "Kingdom Now" idea. I certainly do not wish to hinder or discourage their further study of the preterist view. If they feel they can be both preterist and charismatic at the same time, then so be it. I do not believe it is consistent, however.

Contrary to Balyeat's accusation, I have no "anti-charismatic bias." I am not "anti-charismatic," but simply "non-charismatic." I am open-minded on the issue. I just haven't seen any convincing evidence yet. And it is not that I haven't been looking. I attended services at Pentecostal and Assembly of God churches and associated with several people in Campus Crusade for Christ who were charismatic. I had extensive discussions with an instructor at a Pentecostal theology school. I even got invited to attend a two-week training retreat for anyone interested in "learning" how to speak in tongues. It was the sheer absurdity of that idea (learning something that was supposed to be given miraculously) which sent up red flags immediately in my mind and told me something was amiss. At one of the healing services I attended I saw a lady go forward and supposedly "get healed." At another service a few weeks later she went forward again to get healed of the same problem. Both times she went away claiming she was healed. And the healer up front declared to the audience on both occasions that she was healed. At none of the "healing services" I went to did I ever see anything that resembled the kind of miracles the Bible talks about. These and other very similar "experiences" were the beginning of my deeper examination of the charismatic movement. The rest of the story will have to wait till another time. Here are some books I have found helpful regarding the charismatic issue:

- Camp, Franklin. *The Work of the Holy Spirit in Redemption*. Birmingham, Alabama: 1974. [It is now out of print, and the author left explicit instructions before he died not to have it reprinted, but it is available in many theological libraries.]
- Gardiner, George E. *The Corinthian Catastrophe*. Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan: 1974.

- Jividen, Jimmy. *Glossolalia—A Study in the Phenomenon of Tongue Speaking*. Star Bible Publications, Fort Worth, Texas: 1971.

Let's get right to Joseph Balyeat's questions and concerns regarding the charismatic gifts.

Are the Charismata “well attested” in Church History?

I have not found the continuation of the charismata to be as “well-attested” in the early Christian writings as Balyeat alleges. Most (if not all) of the claims of the later church writings about miraculous events associated with various Catholic personages are a little too frivolous to credit to the working of the Holy Spirit. Balyeat claims the continuation of the charismata is well-documented in early church history. He mentioned some second and third century church writers who quoted earlier writers who stated the gifts were still being practiced down to their day (Eusebius, *Eccles.Hist.* 4.18 and 5.7). But it is questionable what time they are referring to. Eusebius quotes both Irenaeus and Justin in regard to the continuation of the charismata. Some of these quotes, when compared with the original texts they are supposedly quoting seem to be confused. And, they do not mention definite names, places or dates. They are mere assertions without verifiable historical documentation. And they don't claim to be confirming any new revelations that should also have been given at the same time. The question is whether these “miracles” were just counterfeits, God's providence at work, or the same kind of charismata that the NT saints saw. Jimmy Jividen's book referred to above has some helpful insights on this point:

In the first century men were too close to the genuine apostolic gift to allow the ecstatic utterance that characterized the pagan cults. After the death of apostolic men the *glossa* gift of the New Testament ceased. ...Writers began to mention the “gift of tongues” again in the middle of the second century. The first mention is probably found in Irenaeus... It is difficult to determine whether Irenaeus had actually heard men speak in “all kinds of languages” by the Spirit or whether it was something about which he had only heard. Nor does the passage indicate whether the “brethren” who possessed the gift were Montanists. ...The claim of the “gift of tongues” was common among the Montanists. ...The Montanists [claimed to have] had new revelation and these gifts that they claimed to possess [were supposedly] proof that their new revelation came from God. (Jividen, *Glossolalia*, pp. 62-64).

Chrysostom, still in the fourth century, was the first to refer to the cessation of the *glossa* gift. ...There are very few references to anything which can be understood as the gift of tongues in the early patristic writings. When it is mentioned, it is connected with the apostolic period, heresy like Montanism or as in the case of Irenaeus, unconfirmed hearsay. From the mention that is made in the patristic writings, it is clear that it was not the common practice. ...Augustine agreed with Chrysostom [that it passed away]. (Jividen, *Glossolalia*, pp. 65-68).

If the tradition of men conflicts with the clear words of Scripture, then it has to be set aside, no matter how compelling it may seem. What we must remember is that the Catholic church preserved (if not invented) some of these statements to buttress their mystical belief in (supposed) miracles like *Our Lady of Fatima*, the *Shroud of Turin*, etc.. It is also possible that some of the statements in the patristics about the continuance of the charismata were nothing more than references to non-miraculous talents and learned abilities being spoken of as “gifts.” Others were mere ecstatic utterances, like that associated with the Montanists. That is manifestly not what the NT speaks of when it refers to the miraculous (non-learned) gifts. Scott Foster (in his booklet, “*Speaking In Tongues*”) shows that some of the Christian writers of the first three centuries relegated the continuing practice of the “gifts” to heresy, especially in connection with the Montanists. So, you

can find just about any opinion you want in the patristic writings. The real proof has to be established in the Scriptures first. And, one of the Scriptures I like to spend a lot of time looking at in reference to the charismatic issue is the whole book of 1st Corinthians.

Why was the church so naive in not recognizing the cessation of the gifts at A.D. 70? I do not believe everyone failed to recognize the cessation. But it seems likely that the majority did, just like they missed the significance of many other things:

- the Ebionites failed to recognize a “change of law” had occurred (Heb. 7:12)
- some Nazarene sects of Christianity rejected the deity of Christ
- the Montanists failed to realize the Paraclete came before Montanus
- most failed to recognize **ANY** kind of coming of Christ at 70 AD

The church was naive about a lot of things in the late first and early second centuries, and these are but a few examples. Not until Montanus came along claiming to be the Paraclete did some begin to question the continuation of the charismata. Montanus claimed to be the Paraclete (“Comforter,” KJV or “Helper,” NASB) and that he was speaking new revelations directly from God. What is amazing is the staggering number of people who went along with it, including even Tertullian. Many look back to that era as the time when everyone understood the whole plan of God perfectly, when in fact they may have had very little grasp of the issues we are dealing with. Even apostle Peter said he had a difficult time understanding matters regarding the last things (2 Pet. 3:16), as did all the prophets and the angels (1 Pet. 1:10-12). Our understanding of redemption and all its related aspects (such as eschatology) are getting better and better as time goes on, not worse and worse. Understanding did not start out perfect and degenerate from there. That’s why it is improper to place much weight on the understanding of the early church fathers. They blew it in many areas.

How could they be so uninformed? How could they continue believing the charismata were still available when they actually weren’t? Perhaps some of the factors might be:

- 1) Their continued expectation of an imminent return of Christ. Since many of them had a materialistic expectation of Christ’s coming and He had not returned that way, they kept believing it was still future. And since both Peter (Acts 2) and Paul (1 Cor. 1) had told them the gifts would continue until the return of Christ, they must have assumed the gifts were still there.
- 2) The continuing Roman persecution did not allow them to focus much on theological studies.
- 3) The extreme way in which the church separated itself from anything that was even remotely “Jewish” after 70 AD left the church with little or no understanding of the OT Jewish connection to the charismata. So, they simply went right on assuming that the gifts were still there, having no grasp of the OT Jewish background for understanding their cessation at 70 AD.

What men have claimed since seems best explained by either the providence of God, psychosomatic phenomenon, trances, self-hypnosis, fakery, emotionalism or other similar things that all the cults and world religions engage in.

The Nature and Purpose of the Charismata

The question is, were all the gifts present throughout church history in every generation, or only “prophecy?” And what was the nature and content of the prophecy that the church historians spoke of? Was it further revelation and prediction related to the scheme of redemption, or was it merely moral and ethical exhortations like today’s so-called “gift of prophetic utterance?” What is the Biblical definition of true prophecy?

Balyeat also says he has “witnessed other miraculous gifts (including prophetic utterances).” What kind of “prophetic utterances” has he personally witnessed? Were these “prophecies” of the inspired, revelatory and predictive kind (like the first century), or were they merely moral and ethical exhortations like any emotionally worked-up preacher could deliver from the pulpit on any given Sunday? If they are not of the “inspired, revelatory and predictive” kind, then they are not true “prophecy” by Biblical definition. If they are of this inspired, revelatory and predictive nature, then he owes it to the Christian community to publish what new inspired revelations and predictions he heard. We need to know. We need to add that information to our Bibles, because by necessity it must relate to the Scheme of Redemption. At least the Mormons are consistent on this point. They rightly sense that a prophet’s (i.e. Joseph Smith) sayings and writings (both) must be inspired and worthy of being canonized.

There is a difference between the moral and ethical ministry of post-Biblical “prophets” (from the second century down to this day), and the inspired, revelatory and predictive prophets of the Biblical era. Biblical prophets were unquestionably miraculously endowed, but what we see in following centuries doesn’t bear the same stamp. Just like the spurious apocryphal books were not canonized because they lacked the characteristics of inspired books, so the modern “charismata” lack the characteristics of the true first-century type of gifts and therefore have to be rejected.

The whole book of First Corinthians is where I would concentrate my studies (along with the book of Acts). Those two books clarify what the miraculous gifts really were, as opposed to the so-called gifts today. I have known a lot of charismatics, and have been to “healing services” and services where “prophecies” and “tongues” were spoken. What I found interesting is that one of the so-called “prophets” was recorded on cassette tape. That “prophecy” was played back to several so-called “interpreters” (who supposedly had the “gift of interpretation”) and every interpreter interpreted it radically different. Is God a god of confusion? Of course, you will say that either the interpreters or the prophet (or both) were fakes, and that the fact that there are counterfeits doesn’t disprove the existence of the true ones. Well, the miraculous gifts in the first century were so obviously miraculous that attempts to counterfeit them would have been just as obvious. The fact that the “gifts” today are being so easily counterfeited doesn’t lend much credence to the contention that the true ones are still around.

What is interesting is that the charismatic experience is found among almost every denomination, the Catholic church, the cults, and even foreign religions (such as Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism). It was known in the ancient mystery cults of the Greek pantheon. But the gifts that Paul and the Corinthians were given were obviously different than what we are seeing today and what the other religions then and now are experiencing. The so-called “prophets” and “tongue-speakers” among the various groups are saying conflicting things. I have heard Catholic tongue-speakers teach Catholic doctrine and Baptist tongue-speakers teach Baptist doctrine – both supposedly speaking from the same “Spirit of God.” How can the same Spirit give such signs to confirm the teaching of so many radically different doctrines? That certainly would make God an author of confusion. Does He want us to follow all these conflicting messages from the various “prophets” today?

There is no difference between the way Catholic charismatics, Protestant charismatics, cult charismatics (or any others I have seen) practice their craft. I can just hear someone saying, “Well only one of those groups is speaking the truth – the rest are deceived.” Which one? How do you

know? All of their demonstrations of the charismata look alike, and they all claim the Spirit is speaking through them. Yet each is teaching something different. The gifts in the first century were so obviously miraculous that there was no question about their validity. I have yet to see such a tongue or prophecy today. All the stuff I have seen is not only counterfeitable, but being duplicated by every religious group both inside and outside Christianity. Very unconvincing.

Jimmy Jividen comments on the nature of today's so-called "tongue-speaking":

Glossolalia has been interpreted as divine help for missionaries in communicating to those of a different language. ...missionaries being sent out by Pentecostal groups who expected God to give them the gifts of tongues when they arrived on the mission field. After several costly and disappointing attempts, this practice was discontinued. "Tongue speaking" has been associated with Mormonism since its beginning. Early Mormons often thought that the gift of tongues would aid them in the conversion of the Indians. ...Although one still hears of claims of missionaries obtaining the gift of tongues to aid them in their work, it is always vague references in far off places. (Jividen, *Glossolalia*, p. 15).

The New Testament gift was language. If glossolalists today possess this same gift, it would be simple to identify it. Modern communication and transportation could take tapes of glossolalia speech around the world to be examined by the greatest language experts. A number of recent studies have been made of the glossolalia speech, but none indicate that the speech is "language" unknown to the speaker. (Jividen, *Glossolalia*, pp. 45).

What gifts did they have in the NT era? We will not list all the gifts here, but rather cite some references where such can be obtained: Mark 16:17-18; Rom. 12; 1 Cor. 12-14; and Eph. 4. It is important to note that included in this list is *apostles*, inspired *prophets* and miraculously gifted *evangelists* (cf. 1 Tim. 4:14), all of which we must still have today if any of the gifts are still around. Do you know any apostles today who were with Christ from the beginning of His earthly ministry, who are eye-witnesses of the resurrection and directly commissioned by Him to preach the gospel endowed with the accompanying signs? That's the credentials of a true apostle (cf. Matt. 28:18ff; Mark 16:16ff; Acts 1:22; 2 Cor. 12:12). Nobody like that is alive today. The fact that a temporary gift like apostleship is mentioned along with the other gifts implies that they all were temporary. Otherwise there would be some distinction made as to which ones would cease and which ones would continue. 1 Cor. 13 and Ephesians 4 both teach this temporary duration idea "until the perfect comes" and "until we all attain to... a mature man... the fullness of Christ."

What about demon-possession and the gift to cast them out as mentioned in Mark 16? Notice the statements made by the evil spirits recorded in Matthew 8:29 (and parallels): "*What do we have to do with You, Son of God? Have you come here to torment us before the time?*" What time? They were not expecting to be put into the place of torment until the time of judgment (cf. Jude 6; 2 Pet. 2:4; 2:9; 3:7-13). From these passages (and the 70 AD "time indicators" in them) we can see that the demons were finally put down and put away for good at 70 AD. Since the casting out of demons was one of the charismatic gifts, it would seem logical to assume that the other gifts ceased at the same time, since they all stand or fall together.

The Providence of God

Balyeat says he has "personally witnessed and participated in many medically-attested miraculous healings..." I have also known people whom God healed providentially in response to the prayers of the righteous. But, I have never seen a miraculously-empowered prophet (like the apostles or Jesus)

raise the dead, cure a leper, or restore sight to someone born blind. There is a difference between the on-going providence of God and miracle-working prophets. God has always providentially worked in the lives of His people, but not always through miraculously-empowered individuals. There were periods of prophetic activity associated with the unveiling and fulfilling of God's plan to redeem man. During these periods the prophetic gifts flourished.

It is easy to see why some confuse the providence of God with the charismata. There were gifts of healing which did pass away with the rest of the gifts. But God (when His people prayed to Him) had always providentially healed people, whether it was during a period of prophetic activity or not. During prophetic revelatory periods, some additional healings were performed through God's spokesmen so that their message would be believed. But God has always healed people independently of the prophetic periods. So, don't confuse any healings today with the miraculous gifts. We are talking about two different things – the providence of God which has always been around, and the miraculous gifts which were a temporary phenomenon designed to reveal God's scheme of redemption and bring it to consummation. Perhaps the best way to understand the actual healing that is taking place today in answer to prayer would be along the lines of James 5:16 – *“Therefore, confess your sins to one another, and pray for one another, so that you may be healed. The effective prayer of a righteous man can accomplish much.”* Note it doesn't say that only the miraculously endowed person could heal the sick. God can heal providentially in response to our prayers. God was working and has continued to work providentially for us, but the gifts like the apostles had did not continue.

The Purpose of the Charismata?

A couple of the big questions here are: What purposes did the charismata serve? And, have those purposes been fulfilled?

Apostle Paul says the tongues were *signs* to the unbelieving (1 Cor. 14:21, 22). He alludes to Deuteronomy 28:49 (cf. Leviticus 26) and Isaiah 28:11; 32:4; 33:19 to buttress that point. The unbelieving in this case are the Jews who had rejected their cornerstone (Isa. 28:16), and they are headed for destruction (Isa. 28:13-22). The foreign languages they would hear were signs of their impending judgment. But the righteous of the nation would escape the consuming fire (Isa. 29:6; 30:27,30; 33:11, 14) and enjoy the spiritual blessings of the kingdom (Isa. 30:15-21; 30:26; 32:1-3, 15-18; 33:6, 15-17, 20-24; 35:4-10). The tongues were not the kind of signs the wicked (nor the righteous) wanted to see, since it meant destruction on their nation. The question is, once that destruction was over, would it make sense for the signs of that impending destruction to continue? Isaiah, in the passages noted above, would answer a resounding “no.” For more discussion along these lines, see George E. Gardiner's book, *The Corinthian Catastrophe* (Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, MI: 1974) and Scott Foster's book (mentioned elsewhere in this paper). The charismata were signs of Israel's impending doom, and not meant for perpetuity. They passed away after the consuming fire of Jehovah devoured His enemies. Could the Spirit and fire Isaiah speaks of (*Spirit*: Isa. 32:15; 44:3; 63:10-11; *fire*: Isa. 26:11; 26:11; 27:11; 33:11-14; 43:2; 64:11; 66:15-16, 24) be related to the baptism of the Spirit and fire that John the Baptist spoke of (Matt. 3:11)? If they are, the Spirit's gifts were directly connected with the fiery destruction of A.D. 70.

Let's look at some other purposes behind the charismata:

- For the purpose of equipping and building up: *“And He gave some as apostles, and some as prophets, and some as evangelists, and some as pastors and teachers, for the equipping of the saints for the work of service, to the building up of the body of Christ; until we all attain to the*

unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a mature man, to the measure of the stature which belongs to the fullness of Christ.” (Eph. 4:11-13) Notice the time limits put on these gifts (“until we all attain...”). Has the church reached its mature state yet? Do we have a complete revelation (“knowledge”) about Christ? Do we have the fullness of Christ yet? Is the body of Christ finished being built yet? Compare this with 1 Pet. 2:5, 10. Has this building been finished yet? Are they still suffering and waiting for Christ to perfect, confirm, strengthen and establish them? Keep in mind Peter said it would only be “a little while.” (Is this a “time indicator”?)

- To seal for the day of redemption: “*And do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, by whom you were sealed for the day of redemption.*” (Eph. 4:30) Notice the “day” they were sealed for, and compare with Luke 21:28. Has that day of redemption come yet? If it has, do the gifts still need to be sealing us for it?

- To serve and edify others (not just puff up oneself), and bring glory to God: “*As each one has received a special gift, employ it in **serv**ing one another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. Whoever speaks, let him speak, as it were, the utterances of God; whoever serves, let him do so as by the strength which God supplies; so that in all things **God may be glorified** through Jesus Christ, to whom belongs the glory and dominion forever and ever.*” (1 Pet. 4:10, 11) Where is the emphasis in some of the TV healing shows (with their diamond rings and other materialistic symbols)?

- To testify that the apostles’ message was according to God’s will: “*...how shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation? After it was at the first spoken through the Lord, it was **confirmed to us** by those who heard, God also **bearing witness** with them, both by signs and wonders and by various miracles and by **gifts of the Holy Spirit** according to His own will. For He did not subject to angels the **world** [Gr. oikoumenhn] **about to come** [Gr. mellw], concerning which we are speaking.* (Heb. 2:1-5) Notice the past tense on “confirmed” and the imminency of the coming world. And keep in mind that in the previous chapter (Heb. 1:2) it mentioned that at the time of writing Hebrews it was in the “Last Days” (plural), a term which Balyeat says is a 70 AD time indicator. By the past tense used here, this passage indicates the “gifts of the Holy Spirit” had accomplished their mission. They were ready to cease. All of the apostles (except John) were either dead or would be soon after the book of Hebrews was written. There were no more apostles around revealing new things to us that needed to be miraculously confirmed. All of John’s books were finished before 70 AD, making it possible for the gifts to cease. Does Balyeat date any NT writings after 70 AD?

Have these purposes been fulfilled? If so, the gifts are no longer needed, and have passed away.

Some Implications

In regard to the gift of prophecy, it wasn’t just the apostles who had the gift of speaking/writing by inspiration of the Holy Spirit (several of our NT books were written by non-apostles). However, since the apostles seem to have been the only ones who could pass the gifts on, the gifts would have ceased when they and all they passed it to had died. If the gifts are still around, especially the gift of prophecy, then the gift of writing by inspiration is still around also (since it was one of the gifts). We should still be getting more prophecies/revelations from God. The Bible would not be finished yet, nor would the scheme of redemption be fulfilled yet. It would be ludicrous to speak of the final revelation and fulfillment of all prophecy happening at 70 AD if prophecy continued until today! We should have thousands of inspired books in the NT by now. The Mormons are the only ones today who are consistent (but consistently wrong) on this point (with their Latter Day revelations of

Prophet Joseph Smith added to the Bible - the book of Mormon). They claim inspiration for Smith's writings and add them to the Bible.

If the gifts have continued, several things would seem to be true:

- All of the gifts would continue, not just some or one of them (including inspiration, revelation and prediction).
- This would mean that the canon of Scripture is not closed. More inspired revelation is being added constantly. There should be more than 66 books in our Bibles.
- The scheme of Redemption has not been completed. The purpose of inspired scripture is to reveal the plan of God. If more inspired revelation is still being given, the plan of God must not be finished, and all things are not really "summed up in Christ and in His church" like the Scriptures would have us believe. The real evidence against modern charismata must come from the Bible itself. The fact that prophecy was ALWAYS related directly and inseparably with the Scheme of Redemption has been a stumblingblock to believing the gifts are still around. If the gifts are still here, then the scheme of redemption has not been consummated, and the mystery is still being revealed. Then maybe Joseph Smith, Mary Baker Eddy and all the other "latter day prophets" were right. At least they were consistent in producing the logical extension of their belief in modern day prophecy (more "inspired books"). There is no way around the implications of this. If there are "prophecies" today, then they are inspired in the same way those in the first century were, and if written down (and should be written if they are inspired) would be considered additional canonical books of the Bible (just like the Mormons do with their book of Mormon). I haven't met a charismatic yet who has more than 66 books in his Bible. A preterist (believing the scheme of redemption has been consummated and that all prophecy has been fulfilled) will definitely have a difficult time being consistent in claiming modern-day gifts. It's like being pulled from opposite directions at the same time (you go nowhere, but get pulled apart). In one breath you say the gifts are still here and that God is still revealing His scheme of redemption, and in the other breath you say that it is all finished being both revealed and consummated. You can't have it both ways.
- All of the gifts would have to be historically visible in every generation of the church. Apostle Paul said: "*I thank my God always concerning you, for the grace of God which was given you in Christ Jesus, that in everything you were enriched in Him, in all speech and all knowledge, even as the testimony concerning Christ was confirmed in you, so that you are **not lacking in any gift**, awaiting eagerly **the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ**, who shall also **confirm you to the end**, blameless in **the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.**" (1 Cor. 1:4-8) Notice the emphasis here. The Corinthians were to continue being confirmed by these gifts (and not lacking any of them) until "the end" and the "revelation of Christ" which would happen in "the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." If the gifts are still around, the Corinthians are "not lacking any of them" and are still "awaiting eagerly" (after almost 2000 years) *the end* and *revelation* of Jesus. Charismatics must produce the evidence that these gifts have been manifested throughout history. It won't do to say that the Holy Spirit didn't give to those living in apostasy, or that men refused to seek them. The Corinthians had as many problems as any church ever did, yet they were not lacking any of them. And there certainly were many righteous down through the centuries who sought to have the gifts, but didn't get them. It is not enough to point to some ecstatic experience that someone had and claim that the full panoply of gifts were still around. Ecstatic experiences have been commonplace throughout church history as well as pagan religions throughout history. Who were the dead persons raised, the lepers cured, the born-blind given sight, the interpreters of visions and dreams like Joseph, Daniel, John or Paul; or the new scripture revealed in each generation? Let's have some names, dates, places where the Biblical type of miracles/gifts were manifested. The kind of miracles that Jesus and the apostles performed were beyond question. The names of the people along with dates and places were given.*

Their miracles were upon the **dead and incurables**, and their healings were **instantaneous and complete**. They were so obviously miraculous there was no doubt. If it can't be checked out and verified historically, it has to be questioned. The kinds of emotional, ecstatic and psycho-somatic things that are done today can be questioned very easily. I have seen some who claimed to have been healed "partially" or after a gradual recovery period. Is this the kind of "partial charismatic" idea Balyeat believes in? Where is the instantaneous and complete healing by a miraculously empowered healer like the apostles and prophets in Scripture?

Must Be Confirmed Today?

Some charismatics believe all the gifts can function today and that God still gives new revelation today, but they say the revelations still have to be confirmed by the whole congregation because of the possibility of it being distorted or corrupted by the frailty & sinfulness of the speaker. This raises a question about the church at Corinth (1 Cor. 14). The gifts were present in all their variety, even though they were a tremendously decadent church in many ways. There was no partial supply of the gifts even though they had so many problems. They were "not lacking" any of them. Surely they had as bad a case of "corruption" and fleshly "frailty and sinfulness" as any church in their day, yet that didn't stop them from having all the gifts. The Galatians also had problems, yet they had the gifts (Gal. 3:2-5), as did the saints that Peter wrote to (1 Pet. 4:10). If the gifts are present today, we should have everything those churches had. And if the same kind of gifts they had are still around, why aren't charismatic churches today following the procedures mentioned in 1 Cor. 14:26-35? And, if the revelations today have to be "confirmed by the whole congregation" before they are considered a revelation, it assumes there are some revelations today which pass that test. Where are they? Why haven't they been added to our Bibles?

The Paraclete's Work

In John 16:13, Jesus explained to the disciples what was about to happen in regard to the Spirit. He says the *Paraclete* (helper, comforter or advocate) would come after He left, and would disclose to them what was to come and guide them into all truth. If the Helper is still here, He is still giving those gifts. And conversely, if the gifts are still being given today, the Comforter is still here. And if the Comforter is still here, Christ hasn't returned. And, if the Paraclete is still here, we don't have all truth yet, since His mission was to guide us into all truth. Scripture would have to be still in the process of being revealed. Then what would passages such as Jude 3 (once for all delivered) and Rev. 22:18 (don't add to it) mean?

If the gifts are still around today, then the *Paraclete* has not guided us into all truth yet, and the church is still in an incomplete and immature state. But this would fly in the face of inspired statements made by NT writers. The church had reached maturity. It was a living entity that could stand up in the face of persecution and tribulation. The gates of Hades did not prevail against it. The Holy Spirit by the miraculous gifts had carried it (like Noah's ark) through those storms. Now we "know fully" all the truths the Spirit was promised to guide us into, don't we??? Or do you believe there are more revelations yet to come? If there are more yet to come, then Rev. 22:18f will have to be seriously reconsidered. I believe the present canon of the NT is sufficient and "complete." I believe the church reached its state of maturity at 70 AD and "laid aside" the miraculous help it needed to get through the tribulation. It was "whole" and "complete" and "mature" now. It didn't need them anymore. They ceased. They passed away. To believe otherwise one must believe the Paraclete is still revealing more scripture and that redemption is not complete. Don't Daniel (9:24ff)

and Zechariah (13:1-6) both state that “vision and prophecy” and “the unclean spirit” would cease by the time the destruction came? So we have both OT and NT passages which indicate a cessation would occur.

All or None!

Balyeat stated that he has witnessed healings and the gift of prophetic utterances. Are those the only gifts he believes are still around, or merely the only gifts he has personally witnessed? If he believes all the gifts are still around, then why can't he call himself a “full charismatic”? And if he doesn't believe they are ALL still around, then consistently he would have to deny that ANY are still around. By what Biblical criteria does he determine which gifts passed on and which ones are still around? And when did “some of them” pass away? How does he know? Where does scripture say only some of them would cease and not the rest?

Doesn't 1 Cor. 1:7,8 imply they would all continue until Christ's coming and the end? Based on this and other passages, I am convinced that all the gifts stand or fall together. If any of them are around, they all must be (including the gift of inspiration), especially in view of the idea that “God never changes.” This means that the gift of inspiration must still be around also. More inspired scripture should still be produced today? Do you have more than 66 books (excluding the apocrypha) in your Bible? See Dan. 9:24ff (the sealing up of vision and prophecy). According to this, the canon would be completed in the days when the abomination of desolation was set up (70 AD). All prophecy would be finished being both revealed and fulfilled by that time. This strongly implies the gift of inspiration passed away at 70 AD. If that gift ceased then, they all must have.

What does it mean to “not forbid” (1 Cor. 14:39) the exercise of the gifts? Do Paul's exhortations to seek **all** the gifts apply today? Are only some of them still available? Which ones have ceased? When did they cease? How do you know they ceased? What Scripture substantiates that partial cessation of only some of the gifts? These are questions a “partial charismatic” person needs to seriously address.

I just don't see how a “partial charismatic” position is Biblically defensible. To limit the operation of the Spirit today to only a subsection of the gifts, or to some “non-miraculous indwelling” idea sounds very much like “quenching the Spirit” (1 Thess. 5:19-20). We either have both the Paraclete and all the gifts from Him, or we don't have either. Franklin Camp's book, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, has effectively shown the inconsistency of holding to the idea of a “non-miraculous indwelling” of the Holy Spirit today. The Paraclete finished His work and Christ has returned. We now live in the heavenly places with Christ, and He indwells our hearts and lives in us.

These implications of the charismata still being around today ought to make us examine things a little more closely before jumping onto the charismatic bandwagon or believing that only a few of them are here and not all of them.

How Long Would The Gifts Continue?

Balyeat wanted us to deal with his “real concerns” and “hard questions,” and since he mentioned Acts 2 as being one of those, we will take a look at it. One of the first things that came to my mind when Balyeat mentioned Acts 2 is the fact that it uses the term “last days” (plural) which Balyeat says is a 70 AD “time indicator.” This passage also suggests that the gifts would continue till the

Great and Notable Day of the Lord, whatever that “Day” (singular) is. Is that the last “day” (singular) of the “Last Days” (plural)? The gifts were to be poured out and active in the Last Days. If the gifts are still here, we are still in the Last Days; and if we are still in the Last Days, the gifts have to still be here. The gifts and the Last Days go together. But, if the Last Days ended at 70 AD (as Balyeat has already suggested), then the gifts must have ceased then as well. If Acts 2 is talking about 70 AD being the time of the Great and Notable Day of the Lord which would see these things fulfilled, then this passage cannot be used to stretch out the continuance of charismatic gifts into our day as most charismatics use it. Balyeat needs to tell us what the “great and notable day of the Lord” is (Acts 2:20), and how that relates to the “last days” mentioned in the context (Acts 2:17). Notice the rest of Joel 2:32 which Peter does not quote (Acts 2:21): *“And it will come about that whoever calls on the name of the Lord will be delivered; for on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem **there will be those who escape**, as the Lord has said, even among the **survivors** whom the Lord calls.”* If this “great and notable day of the Lord” is the end of the world, what is all this talk about “those who escape” and “survivors?” Who could escape or survive that? It seems rather obvious that Joel (and Peter) are talking about 70 AD. If so, charismatics cannot use Acts 2:17-21 to bolster their continuation of the gifts past A.D. 70. That great and notable day of the Lord is past.

A related passage which also uses the “Last Days” time indicator is the book of Hebrews (Heb. 1:2 and 2:1-5). In dealing with the purpose of the gifts above, we noted that their purpose had been fulfilled by the time the book of Hebrews was written. Acts 2 looks forward from the beginning to describe what role they would play, and Hebrews looks backward from the end to note that their function had been completed.

When Would They Cease?

Scott Foster has some interesting things to say in regard to 1 Corinthians 13, concerning the terms “done away” and “cease”:

Here Paul is making the argument for the ending of these three gifts: knowledge, prophecy, and tongues. It is interesting to note the qualifiers he uses in this text. Although arguing for the ending of all three, he specifies how this will happen by the structure of the passage. He contrasts knowledge and prophecy with tongues. He states that knowledge and prophecy will be “done away” (v. 8). Why? Because they are “partial” (v.9). When? When the “perfect” comes the “partial” will be done away (v.10). Of tongues, Paul simply says, “they will cease.” (v.8) He does not say that tongues are “partial” or that they will be “done away” when the perfect comes, only that they will “cease.” This is made clearer by observing the contrasts Paul uses: “partial” and “perfect;” & “done away” and “cease.” ...Thus, knowledge and prophecy would be rendered inoperative by a process of completion, while tongues would simply cease in and of themselves. ...Although they could end at different times, the illustration of verse 11 seems to group all three within a somewhat limited time frame. ...All three, tongues, knowledge, and prophecy seem to be grouped in with the “childish things” that must be “done away” with by the time maturity, completion, or manhood is achieved. Thus tongues may cease at a different time than when knowledge and prophecy are “done away,” but they all must end by the time of the “perfect” or complete. What is the “perfect” that causes the “partial” to be “done away?” It cannot be the second coming of Christ as Gromaki noted, “...the word *teleion* is never used in the New Testament to depict the second coming, the millennium, or the eternal state.” Also, the apostle would not use a neuter form to refer to the Savior but a masculine article and adjective. To what then is the “perfect” or “complete” of 1 Corinthians 13 referring? ...“knowledge” represents a partial and incomplete (revelational) stage. ...“perfection” refers to the canon of scripture... Thus, because of the limited number of New Testament scriptures available, and the fact that these scriptures were not yet complete, God used supernatural

knowledge and prophecy in the early churches to help them mature and grow. When the canon was complete, however, the need for these gifts disappeared, as Paul has testified. (Scott A. Foster, *Speaking In Tongues*. Covenant Ministries, 1985. pp. 54-59).

Face To Face Now?

Here are some of the questions Joseph wants us to answer: *How do we see Christ “face-to-face” now since 70 AD? Do we really see Him that clearly now? Is it really talking about seeing Christ “face-to-face,” or something else? Has “perfection” come yet? Why doesn’t the “coming of perfection” apply to “a future final Great Day?” Doesn’t this preclude any and all miraculous giftings in the church throughout church history?*

Seeing “face-to-face” **THEN** (in their future) is contrasted with seeing “through a mirror in an enigma” **NOW** (in their present). It is talking about how vaguely they understood the kingdom in their present time as opposed to the clarity with which they would understand Christ’s work after the perfect state arrived. Things were obscure and only partially understood during that period of transition from Pentecost (30 AD) to Holocaust (70 AD). The mission of the Paraclete was to teach them all things, bring to their remembrance what Christ had taught, bear witness to Christ, guide them into all truth and disclose what was to come (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:12-15). Obviously that mission was not fully accomplished at Pentecost when the Spirit’s presence was first manifested. It would take a whole generation before that mission could be completed (perfected or matured). The gifts from the Paraclete were for the purpose of accomplishing that mission. That’s what the “perfect” means (the state of completion or maturity that the church was in transition toward – according to both 1 Cor. 13:10 and esp. Eph. 4:13ff). If the gifts are still around, that mission has not been fully accomplished yet. That would mean we still don’t have a complete disclosure of everything the Paraclete was supposed to reveal. More Scripture would have to be forthcoming, and the scheme of redemption would still not be fully revealed. Something would still be lacking. So I ask Balyeat (or any other charismatic), “Where are the additional books of the Bible that have been revealed since the first century?” What has been revealed in our century about the scheme of redemption and “things to come” that was not revealed to the first century saints? If we haven’t received any new revelation since the first century, then the Paraclete finished his mission, and the gifts ceased then. The revelation is perfect/complete (not partial any longer), and the church has been brought safely through the gates of Hades (the tribulation) into the mature/complete/perfect status. We now know who Jesus is and what His mission was. We see it clearly now (face-to-face). It is no longer a mystery or enigma to us.

Not Intended To Be Permanent

The point that must be remembered in reference to 1st Corinthians 13 is that the gifts WOULD cease. They were not to be a *permanent institution* in the church. They were only for the immature state of the church during the transition period (30-70 AD), to get them through the tribulation until the Kingdom was firmly established. They were “signs” to the unbelieving Jews especially (as well as the Gentiles) that God was behind the development of the church. Once that church reached maturity and could stand on its own, the gifts would cease (the last enemy “death” was conquered, the gates of Hades did not prevail, but instead Hades was done away with). This happened at 70 AD. Nowhere is this better predicted than in the First Corinthian letter itself, starting with chapter one where Paul talks about the fact that the Corinthians would not lack any of the gifts until “*the APOCALYPSE [revelation or coming] of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall also confirm you to THE*

END, blameless in THE DAY of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Cor. 1:7, 8). Chapter 13 is a commentary on these statements and tells us exactly when the gifts would cease and what had to occur before they would cease (the maturation of the infant church). It had been born at Pentecost, but it was not mature until 70 AD. Ephesians 4 elaborates on this same theme. Just like in the wilderness wandering for 40 years, a new generation had to grow up to maturity and be prepared (established, completed, perfected, matured) for inheriting the Kingdom blessings. The older generation had proven themselves unworthy of the kingdom (promised land) by killing Jesus and persecuting His followers, so they would perish in the wilderness of the 40-year transition period from 30-70 AD.

Partial versus Complete

1 Corinthians 13:8-10 says “partial” things would CEASE when the state of completion (maturity or perfection) arrived. The Greek word in 1 Cor. 13:10 for “perfect” is *teleion*. According to *The Analytical Greek Lexicon*, the meaning here in 1 Cor. 13:10 is, “complete, entire, as opposed to what is partial and limited.” Here are the other places in the NT where this Greek word is used: (*Matt. 5:48; 19:21; Rom. 12:2; 1 Cor. 2:6; 13:10; 14:20; Eph. 4:13; Phil. 3:15; Col. 1:28; 4:12; Heb. 5:14; 9:11; Jas. 1:4, 17, 25; 3:2; 1 Jno. 4:18*). It is from the root word *telō* which means “end.” The root word is used several times in Paul’s writings as well: (*1 Cor. 1:8; 10:11; 15:24; 2 Cor. 1:13; 3:13; 11:15; Phil. 3:19; 1 Thess. 2:16*). Paul uses the word “perfect” in the sense of completeness and maturity. The question is, what had to be completed or brought to maturity (or perfection)? He answers that right in the context. He says at the time he wrote (57 A.D. or before) they still did not have a “complete” understanding of everything Jesus said they would get (cf. John 16:13 - “guide you into all truth”). They only “knew in part” then. But the time was coming when they would “know fully.” The tongues and prophecy had only given them part of the revelation. Paul compares their status with that of a child who was growing toward maturity. When this child reached maturity, it would have the full revelation of truth that the Spirit was supposed to give them.

Has Paul mentioned this “perfect” time elsewhere in this letter? What about 1 Cor. 1:4-8? The Corinthians were being confirmed and “enriched in all speech and all knowledge” by the gifts as they were eagerly awaiting “the APOCALYPSE of our Lord Jesus Christ,” the “END” and “the DAY of our Lord Jesus Christ.” The word “end” here is *telō*. The confirmation process being carried out by the charismatic gifts would continue until this “end.” This word is used two more times in 1 Corinthians in the sense of “end” (cf. 1 Cor. 10:11; 15:24). One of these (1 Cor. 10:11) has a 70 AD “time indicator” in it (“end of the age”), the same phrase found in the gospels referring to A.D. 70. Without using the evidence from 2 Corinthians and Paul’s other books, just within this one book there are numerous references to this “end” for the charismata. It seems pretty clearly to point toward a cessation at 70 AD. What is more, notice the other eschatological events that are associated with this “end”: the apocalypse of Christ, the day of Christ, the ends of the ages, His coming, delivering up the Kingdom to the Father, abolition of all rule and enemies including the last enemy **death** (defeated by the resurrection – cf. 1 Cor. 1:7, 8; 10:11; 15:24). These events are nothing short of comprehensive fulfillment of God’s plan of redemption. And the language used points to something near at hand when Paul wrote.

Are Gifts Irrevocable?

Some defend the continuance of the charismata today on the basis that the “gifts and calling of God are irrevocable.” This is based on the text in Rom. 11:28, 29, where it says in reference to the nation

of Israel, “From the standpoint of the gospel they are enemies for your sake, but from the standpoint of God’s choice they are beloved for the sake of the fathers; for the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable.” (Rom. 11:28, 29) These words come shortly after Paul’s statement that “all Israel will be saved.” Apostle Paul was clarifying the status of both the Jews and Gentiles in the kingdom that was in the process of being consummated. Some Gentiles believed the Jews would be excluded from the kingdom because of their disobedience, but Paul shows that:

...the validity of Christ’s gospel was grounded in the fidelity of God to His covenant people Israel. But if Israel is excluded from her own salvation, God’s faithfulness to His promise is invalidated, and therefore, what is to be gained by the inclusion of others (Gentiles) into that which has already failed? Unless God’s promise to Israel is fulfilled, “the gifts and the calling of God” are proven to be revocable... (Max King, The Cross and the Parousia, p. 471).

The gracious things God had promised to the Jews and called them to accept (the better things of the kingdom) could not be revoked. It is NOT talking about the charismatic gifts here. It is simply affirming that God would be faithful to the promises He made to the OT fathers. Those promised blessings were irrevocable. God keeps His promises. This text cannot be used as an argument for the continuation of the charismata today. It is dealing with a completely different issue. Besides, wouldn’t it be a little contradictory for the Bible to teach in several places that the gifts are only temporary and would cease, and then say they are going to persist in the church forever?

Does God Change?

In our discussions by phone, Balyeat said some non-charismatics tend to reject the charismatic view because they believe the gifts are no longer applicable in the present dispensation/age. He reminded me that Christ doesn’t change from one age to the next (Heb. 13:8). There is a continuity all the way through Biblical history. Therefore, if the Church/Kingdom age started out with miraculous gifts, we should expect it to continue with them. He alleges the full preterist view tends to force a discontinuity within the Church/Kingdom age when it suggests the charismata are no longer given after 70 AD. He says it is not correct to believe God has changed dispensations and therefore the gifts are no longer applicable.

Incidentally, this is a strong argument against a “partial charismatic” position. If there was never to be any change in the continuation of the miraculous gifts, then **all** (not just some) of the gifts must still be available, otherwise God has changed the way He is dealing with us, right? All the gifts would still have to be available throughout Christian history, just like they had in the first century (including the gifts of inspiration, revelation and apostles, etc.). At least the Mormons are consistent on this.

But, using the first century practice of the charismata as a precedent for justifying the continuance of the gifts today (since “God doesn’t change”) is not following correct interpretive procedures. It doesn’t acknowledge the changes that would accompany the “end of the age” and the arrival of “the age (about) to come,” nor the arrival of the state of perfection or completion. It assumes no change is possible nor permitted.

Is Change Possible?

There are some who have gone to both extremes on this issue. Some hold tenaciously to the idea that there can be absolutely no changes, while others believe everything has changed and that Christianity is a totally new system with little or no relationship to the Old Testament. I believe there is a more realistic (and Biblical) alternative to both these extremes. Some things (i.e. God's nature and His eternal plan to redeem man) never change. Other things do change. For instance, in Hebrews, it is stated that: "...when the priesthood is **changed**, of necessity there takes place a **change of law also**." (Heb. 7:12, NASV)

Many places in both the OT and NT talk about the **newness** (Is. 40:31; 41:1; 41:15; 42:9; 42:10; 43:19; 48:6; 62:2; 65:17; 66:22; Jer. 31:31; Ezek. 11:19; Ezek. 18:31; Ezek. 36:26; 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; Eph. 2:15; Heb. 8:13; 2 Pet. 3:13; and Rev. 21:5) and **better** things (Is. 56:5; Ezek. 36:11; Heb. 7:19; Heb. 8:6; Heb. 9:23; Heb. 10:34; Heb. 11:16; Heb. 11:35; Heb. 11:40) which the New Covenant was bringing. The words "new" and "better" imply some sort of change. Did it change God's nature or plan to bring those new and better things into reality? Of course not.

When the Israelites crossed the Jordan into the promised land the manna ceased. They started eating the (new and better) milk and honey from the land of Canaan. Does that mean God changed His nature just because He no longer gave them manna? What needs to be remembered here is that God had a plan to redeem man. All the changes that came throughout the Biblical narrative were directly related to that plan of redemption. God didn't change, nor did His plan. But He did make a few changes in the way He dealt with man (all of which were planned from the very beginning). There was a change from patriarchal covenants to a nationalistic covenant, and finally to a universal covenant. There was a change from a physical/ceremonial/sacrificial system to a spiritual reunion with God. But God and His plan never changed.

Numerous changes were involved in consummating God's plan of redemption. God spoke "to the fathers in the prophets in many portions and in many ways" until He finally consummated His plan through His Son (Heb. 1:1,2). He dealt with man in "many ways" to accomplish this plan. And, one of the ways (or signs) that God used to fulfill His covenant promises to the fathers of Israel was through the miraculous gifts. Once that change from the physical system to the spiritual system was completed (or perfected), the gifts would cease (cf. 1 Cor. 13). But again, God didn't change, nor did His plan change. Those remained constant throughout redemptive history. There is no discontinuity with the promises God made to the patriarchs and the nation of Israel. *All the seeming discontinuities are resolved by their connection to the redemptive plan of God.*

Another facet of this "change" idea is seen in the NT mention of "this age" and "the age (about) to come." Jesus and the apostles talked about "the end of this age" as something that would happen within that generation. Some changes (in the change from one age to another) were definitely contemplated by both Jesus and the apostles. It is not something "full preterists" and "non-charismatics" have dreamed up. When Jesus talked about the Paraclete and when Paul talked about the coming of the "perfect," this change from one age to another was directly connected.

Conclusion:

The "full preterist" view is the only one that can consistently maintain a non-charismatic position today and still harmonize the three passages of Acts 2 (Joel 2); 1 Cor. 1 and 1 Cor. 13, which speak of several different interrelated eschatological events associated with the cessation of the gifts.

I believe a charismatic position, even a partial one is inconsistent for a preterist, but I don't see it as a matter of grave concern. If I am ever going to be convinced to become a charismatic, there will

have to be real miracles (like raising the dead) administered by real inspired and endowed prophets like they had in the first century. Ecstatic and psychosomatic experiences just won't cut it. Show me how the plan of redemption is still in progress of consummation and why we need additional revelation. Has Christ consummated all things in Himself and His kingdom, or not? I'm willing to examine the evidence, but so far I haven't seen anything that makes me want to reconsider my present position. God's providential care for His creation is certainly still in operation, as it always has been, but the sign miracles given during periods of revelatory activity connected with the consummation of redemption are another matter.

They had the *temporary and partial* indwelling and empowering of the "comforter." But we now have something even better, the *permanent fullness* of Christ Himself. The Holy Spirit's work is done. Christ has returned. We live in Christ's presence, and He dwells in us.

It is like the manna in the wilderness. Once they crossed the Jordan river into the promised land, the manna ceased. They didn't need (nor want) the manna to continue. They had the better things (the milk and honey) to eat. Now that Christ has brought His kingdom, we have the better things and the better country. We are not still wandering in the wilderness of confusion (over lawkeeping) and the tribulation. Why would we want the manna (the Paraclete) when we've got Christ Himself (the true Milk and Honey) present with us? Has Christ returned, or is the Comforter (the Paraclete) still with us? Which would you rather have, the hope or the fulfillment of that hope? The partial temporary things of the Paraclete or the abiding presence of Jesus Christ?

I'm willing to admit I might have misunderstood these things. But, if I have, I have grossly misunderstood the whole Biblical fabric of the scheme of redemption. The charismatic gifts were too intimately intertwined with the consummation of the Scheme of Redemption in the Last Days. There are too many things about the preterist interpretation that would conflict with a charismatic continuance today. If the charismatic gifts are still here, then we are still in the Last Days and Christ failed to consummate things when He promised to. Failure of the "imminency" time statements would demolish all credibility for the NT.

In view of these important consequences, I urge my charismatic and "partial charismatic" brethren to more closely examine the implications of the preterist approach to Scripture. Perhaps it will help clear up the problems they seem to have with consistency.

[Next issue will present our response to the last two sections \(seven and eight\) of Balyeat's critique](#) concerning his charge that the "full preterist" view cannot be "correct" since it is "inconsistent with the overwhelming majority of opinion in the early church." We will deal specifically with the creeds and early church doctrines of the first four centuries up to and including the first four major ecumenical councils and their creedal developments. We hope it will be helpful and interesting to our readers. We welcome all responses to this series, especially from brother Balyeat, and we hope to publish some of those interactions in future issues if and when they develop. Please let us hear from you.