



TRUTH ON TOUGH TEXTS

EXPOSITIONS OF CHALLENGING SCRIPTURE PASSAGES

WWW.THESCRPTUREALONE.COM

FROM SOLA SCRIPTURA PUBLICATIONS

ISSUE 126 (Sept./Oct. 2020)

CULTURAL RELEVANCE AND THE SUNDAY EVENING SERVICE

SELECTED TEXTS

A FEW YEARS AGO, I READ TWO BOOKS THAT DEEPLY impressed upon me how the culture has been allowed to seriously affect the Church. Both written by Dr. T. David Gordon, professor of religion and Greek at Grove City College, and published by P&R Publishing, they are titled: *Why Johnny Can't Preach: The Media Have Shaped the Messengers*, and, *Why Johnny Can't Sing Hymns: How Pop Culture Rewrote the Hymnal*. Having taught many courses in the humanities and "media ecology,"¹ Gordon knows what he is talking about.

In the first book, Gordon observes that the culture has affected preaching in two ways. First, the gargantuan amount of information in today's world has turned us into *skimmers* instead of *readers*. "We are no longer careful, close readers of texts, sacred or secular," he writes. "We scan for information, but we do not appreciate literary craftsmanship. Exposition is therefore virtually a lost art."² Second, the same is true of writing skills. Technology, starting with the long-ago invention of the telephone, caused us to no longer "compose our thoughts as frequently or carefully as we once did." And look where we are today! "We have become a culture of telephone babblers."³ And how much worse it has become with "texting"! We no longer actually spell much of anything, rather we use acronyms and inane abbreviations. Gordon then makes a statement that rebukes the "we-have-to-be-culturally-relevant" obsession that drives much of today's Church life and ministry:

It is simply too much to expect that a typical member of such a culture can be quickly trained to deliver well-composed thoughtful sermons. . . . For a minister today to preach a basic average sermon by early twentieth-century standards would require a lifestyle that is significantly counter-cultural.⁴

In the latter book, Gordon makes another observation that irrefutably proves the culture's effect:

My father's generation did not demand that all hymns be written in a big band idiom, and mine did not demand that they be written to sound like Eric Clapton or The Who. So why do we now find something unique in the history of the church: a considerable number of people who appear to believe sincerely that it is not merely permissible, but in some sense necessary or

preferable to jettison hymns that previous generations employed? Why?⁵

In other words, people of the World War II era would never have dreamed of going into a church and saying, "I'm looking for a church that has a Benny Goodman or Glen Miller style of music." But that attitude is *exactly* what we see today. Style of music defines, dominates, and drives most of our churches, and it is usually pop music, and even rock music, that people want. *But this phenomenon has never before existed in the history of the Church*. Does this not tell us that something is amiss? Does it not tell us that the culture is running the show (and is it not indeed a "show")?

Well, after several years of observation, I am convinced that the culture has greatly contributed to another development in the Church—the *jettisoning of the Sunday evening service*. Ah, but we can hear the objections now, as they are blasted over the same PA system that blares our pop music: "The Bible doesn't command a Sunday evening service," or, "That attitude is just legalistic," or, "We have Christian liberty in such things."

So, how do we address this? On the other hand, is addressing it even necessary? Does it really matter? Is it okay for the Church to be so "tuned-in" to the culture that there is little that differentiates the two? Let us first examine today's ever-increasing obsession with "cultural relevance" and then consider how that has affected our Sunday evenings. As we do so, please keep in mind that this is heart issue more than anything else. Let us ask ourselves: "Does my heart *favor* the *culture* or is it *fixed* on *Christ*? We will note this several times, especially in our conclusion.

What Is Cultural Relevance and Is It Biblical?

What does the term "culture" mean? Broadly speaking, it is the sum total of human endeavor, including: language, arts, sciences, technology, customs, values, and assumptions. Now, if by "culturally relevant" one means, "We must use the Bible to speak to the culture because Scripture is always relevant to the culture's needs," then we could not agree more. But what the vast majority of people mean by this term is, "We must make the Bible and the Church relevant to the culture because it constantly changes."

To illustrate, this has been going on for decades in Bible

translation theory. A striking example is the infamous TNIV (*Today's New International Version*), which removes any kind of male-oriented meaning in the English (i.e., gender-neutrality) even when the original Hebrew or Greek unambiguously indicates such meaning. This is clearly culturally driven and is more appealing today than when it was originally published (NT, 2002; OT, 2005). Who could have ever foreseen how well this would fit into today's insane gender issues? And if I may interject further, did you know that the 2011 NIV (which replaced the 1984 edition) uses much of the "gender neutral" language of the TNIV? As I have written in a previous TOTT,⁶ it continues to amaze and appall me how any Christian who is concerned with what Scripture actually *says* can continue to use and support the NIV. But it has actually gotten far worse than that.

I still recall an article I read in the April 7, 1996 edition of *The Denver Post*. During an interview, a Christian bookstore salesman said, "There's a Bible for every person and background." He then estimated that their store stocked 300 versions, including a range of "niche" Bibles for targeted audiences. For example, in *Path to Victory: A Sports New Testament*, "baseball pitchers Orel Hershisser and Dave Dravecky reveal how the Lord helped them through the middle part of the batting order." Not only are there Bibles for sports fans, but ones for families, intellectuals, couples, singles, students, and even environmentalists.

Then there are the Bibles that "employ earthy, conversational language to reach their readers." The *Black Bible Chronicles* is an Old Testament published for street kids by African American Family Press. It's written in familiar language that is "reminiscent of rap music." It describes Cain getting "bent out of shape" and killing his brother and how God "busts" him. In Leviticus 19:20, where God speaks of fornication, this "Bible" says, "It's bad to do the wild thing without a blessing from the Almighty. You have to be hitched." Then there is *The Comic Book Bible*, *The Golfer's Bible* (CSB version), *The Green Bible* (NRSV), and other "niche" Bibles. Most recently (2013, Thomas Nelson), *Revolve* (NCV) is a New Testament for teen girls formatted like a teen magazine, complete with a plethora of stock photos of pretty, happy-looking girls as well as sidebars such as "Guys Speak Out," "BLABs" (Q&A) that ask such questions as, "Is making out a sin?" and quizzes such as, "Are You Introverted or Extroverted?"

But please think about this: Does not the whole "relevant" concept virtually destroy biblical sufficiency. Why? Does not this approach (which is, let's be honest, simply a marketing strategy to sell "bibles") send the clear message that the Bible would not be "relevant" to teen girls, sports fans, street kids, environmentalists, or any other group without the appropriate emphasis? In other words, "Thus saith the Lord," or "Here is what the text says," is clearly not enough. We have to help God make His Word relevant. My Dear Reader, I know it is a strong word to use and that many recoil when they hear it, but what other word can we use for such an attitude toward Scripture other than *heresy*?

There are many other ways this "relevance" has taken over the Church. As noted in another recent TOTT,⁷ entertainment is a major emphasis. "Since entertainment is an important part of our culture," it is argued, "the Church

must offer this as well." Another example was how the Church, in order to be relevant, was drawn into the culture's emphasis on totally secular psychology, therapy, and "analysis." Thankfully there were those who saw what was happening and emphasized true Bible-based counseling.

But have we stopped to consider "culture" biblically? What was the original culture? God blessed [Adam and Eve], and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it. . . . God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good" (Gen. 1:28, 31). *Everything* was good. What kind of glorious culture would *that* have been? But because of the Fall, we don't get to see that. On the contrary, Genesis goes on to describe the culture(s) that did arise and how people were affected by it. Likewise, we are all tainted by the culture to one degree or another and must fight constantly against it. Indeed, we must not be culturally *relevant* but culturally *resistant*. And God forbid that we bring it into the Church!

In my research for this article, I ran across one titled, "7 Steps to Create Culturally-Relevant Ministry."⁸ The writer goes into great detail explaining his seven *opinions*: identify neighborhoods; build a profile; define the culture; practice fluency; develop plans; strengthen resolve; and model relevance (i.e., "execute your plans"). How interesting it was, however, to read a 609-word article about *church ministry* that contained not a single verse of *Scripture*! Thankfully, at least one reader was discerning and posted this comment:

Is this the same marketing plan Jesus implemented in John 4? Too bad there were no church growth consultants to help our Savior meet the needs of the disciples who abandoned him. Just preach the gospel! It and it alone is relevant for saving souls. Corporate worship is not to win the lost but to feed the sheep. I find it interesting that none of these seven steps are found in Paul's letters to Timothy. [I] guess we've improved on the wisdom of the apostles.

Writing to a local church that was surrounded by a culture very much like our own, what did Paul command? **Be not conformed to this world** (Rom. 12:2). Interestingly, **world** is not the commonly used word *kosmos* (world system or order), rather it is *aiōn*, an age or time period. **Conformed**, then, translates the fascinating word *suschēmatisō*, a compound made from the root *schēmatisō*, to fashion, and *sun*, together with. The full idea, then, is to "not only conform to the external form, but to assume the form of something, to identify oneself essentially with someone else."⁹ Further, this is "the act of an individual assuming an outward expression that does not come from within him, nor is it representative of his inner heart life."¹⁰ So, Paul's command is that Christians (and by extension the Church) not be fashioned and molded into the image of the age *because* this violates the very transformed heart that results from becoming a Christian (2 Cor. 5:17).

Let us be honestly discerning here: "cultural relevance" is simply a synonym for "conformity." Further, being culturally relevant is to be a follower instead of a leader, and much of the Church today is following instead of leading. We are to speak Truth *to* the culture, not chase after it or copy its message and methods. Yes, culture changes, but

man never does. His need is exactly the same now as it was at the Fall.

Finally, what is really at the core of cultural relevance is the modern idea that the Church's mission is to appeal to the unchurched. But where is that idea even implied in Scripture? The Church was founded for *believers* and is where they gather to worship and be equipped for ministry. Frankly, a local church that appeals to unbelievers is not a New Testament church. We turn now to our main theme.

Scripture and the Sunday Evening Service

It is interesting (and more than a little distressing) that some Christian leaders and writers make such statements as, "Scripture does not really address, much less command, a Sunday evening service." Well, if I may respectfully submit, that is imprecise at best. No, there is no "Eleventh Commandment" (or Commandment 4a) that says, "Thou shalt have a Sunday evening service." But to say that Scripture does not address this question is tantamount to the very popular notion, "Well, there are just some things the Bible doesn't deal with." But that is an attack on biblical sufficiency—every single problem or question we might have is answered in *word* or *principle* in Scripture. If we are not governed by that standard, we are a ship without a rudder and will drift on the Sea of Relativity.

So, what does Scripture indicate here? Again, there is no text that *directly states* this practice, but there are some that *distinctly suggest* it.

First, what is really implied by the fourth commandment (Ex. 20:8–10)? The idea of **sabbath day [rest]** is often emphasized (*shabbāt*, from the root verb *shabat*, "to cease or rest"), but the *primary* principle is in the word **remember**. This is *zākar*, which occurs some 238 times, 57 of which are in the Psalms and means not only to remember but also "to think of or pay attention to." This underscores that remembrance was a major aspect of worship (e.g. Pss. 22:27; 45:17; 63:5–6; 77:11). Indeed, remembering all that God has done is to worship Him. One **day** each week, therefore, was to be kept **holy** (*qādāsh*), that is, set apart, set aside for worship. So critical is this fourth commandment, that the first three are fulfilled in man's relationship to God only by this one, in that man is both "a worker and a worshipper."¹¹

There is a striking addition to that, however, in Leviticus 23:3. It calls this **day a holy convocation**. The Hebrew behind **convocation** (*miqrā*) indicates an assembly and a public reading, usually for religious purposes. The Passover, for example, included a holy convocation on the first and seventh days (Ex. 12:16; cf. Num. 28:18, 25–26; 29:1, 7, 12). Likewise, Ezra read from "the book" (God's Law) to an assembly of God's people so they could understand (Neh. 8:8).¹² In fact, the root of this word (*qr*) "denotes primarily the enunciation of a specific [word] or message. In the case of the latter usage, it is customarily addressed to a specific recipient and is intended to elicit a specific response (hence, it may be translated 'proclaim, invite')."¹³

Further still, in both passages we find the word **day**. This, of course, is *yôm*, which in more than 2,200 appearances refers to a normal 24-hour period (Gen. 39:10). This is all the more clearly demonstrated in the Creation account by the qualifiers first, second, third, etcetera being coupled

with "evening and morning." So, should not our entire **day** (not just *morning*) be committed to worship and the Word?

Now consider the NT counterpart. While the *letter* of the Law (the Sabbath) is no longer in force, the *spirit* of that Law remains just as strong. The first day of the week, the day of our Lord's resurrection, became the Church's day for corporate worship (Jn. 20:19; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10). Church Fathers from the first two centuries—such as Justin Martyr, Barnabas, and Ignatius—also prove this beyond the slightest doubt. Oh, what a fulfillment the Lord's Day is! In the old economy, they worked *toward* their Holy Day; in the new we work *from* ours. And that day is not for *work*, much less one for *worldliness*, rather one for *worship*. And again, should this not be the entire day? Should not our heart be set on that?

Second, as we all know, the OT serves to give us "examples" (1 Cor. 10:11) and is for our "admonition" (Rom. 15:4), so why would this not be true on the present issue? Consider Numbers 28:1–8, which specifies both morning and evening sacrifices in the temple worship, one lamb in the morning and another at twilight. So, worship was morning and evening. Let us ask honestly: should we today do any less to reflect the finished work of Christ that all those sacrifices pictured?

Third, Psalm 92:1–2 again reflects the above practice when it speaks of morning and evening worship: **It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto thy name, O Most High: To shew forth thy lovingkindness in the morning, and thy faithfulness every night**. Please notice the word **good**. The Hebrew *tôb* has a huge range of meanings: good, pleasant, beneficial, precious, delightful, right, well-pleasing, fruitful, morally correct, proper, and convenient. As one authority submits, the Creation narrative of Genesis 1 best expresses all these aspects of meaning when God declares each facet of His handiwork to be good.¹⁴ So, let us ask again: if it was **good** (and all those other meanings) then, why is it not **good** today? In fact, in view again of Christ as the fulfillment of all this, why is it not now even *better* than good?

Fourth, Acts 20:7–8 is another suggestive text. Addressing the believers in Troas on **the first day of the week** (the Lord's Day, not the Sabbath¹⁵), Paul **preached** and, because he intended to **depart** the next day, he **continued his speech until midnight**. It is significant that Luke's method of time tracking is not Jewish (sundown to sundown) but rather Roman (midnight to midnight). He not only used **midnight** in verse 7 but also **break of day** in verse 11. This indicates a pattern of Sunday evening meeting (as well as the Lord's Supper in the evening, by the way). This should once again remind us all the more that this is the Lord's *Day*, not just the Lord's *Morning*, and that once again our heart should be set on that.

History and the Sunday Evening Service

Some leaders and writers insist, "The Sunday evening service, not to mention the mid-week service, is a recent development." During World War II, for example, many men and women worked seven-day weeks to meet war-time production needs. The Sunday evening service enabled them to attend worship since they couldn't come on Sunday

morning. Thus, this service grew in popularity. Others point to the fact that some denominations, and other church traditions, focused on equipping the believers in one service and then another one on reaching the lost. Thus the Sunday evening service became distinctively different than the Sunday morning service. Some called this “the evening evangelistic service.” (It is a little baffling where they get this idea from Scripture.) Still others view the evening service growing out of the agricultural phase of our history. Farmers worked their land six days a week but on Sunday came to a morning service, then had dinner on the grounds, and then had a second later afternoon service before returning home. So, all these reflect that the evening service was a recent development born out of tradition.

But that opinion is demonstrably inaccurate. The simple fact of the matter is that historically the Sunday evening service is *not* recent (unless you define “recent” as 500 years ago). As one writer well puts it, “The Sunday night service has not always been the ‘poor kid on the block’ of Christian worship, which it sometimes seems to be today.”¹⁶ A century and a half ago, for example, Charles Spurgeon held both morning and evening services at the Metropolitan Tabernacle in London, and both were packed. (That evening service continues to this day.)

That brings us to the Puritans of three centuries earlier. Frankly, if we ignore the Puritans, as many do today, we do so at our peril. Their *dedication* to Truth, their *devotion* to Christ, and their *demonstration* of spirituality and purity teach us much if we will but listen. Despite what they lacked, their legacy is rich, and we would do well not only to *remember* it but also in some ways *return* to it. The present issue is a case in point.

Recognizing that the Reformers did not go far enough, the Puritans believed the “Reformation must be carried to its logical conclusion, and that the break with Rome must be clear cut and complete.”¹⁷ What was really needed was a “reform of reformation,” John Milton wrote. Their passion was simply to *purify* (hence “Puritan”) what they viewed as a still tainted Church. For them, the list was long of the things that still existed in the Church with no biblical basis. Ritual, vestments, “holy days,” the “Church calendar,” and much more were on their hit list because they were holdovers from Catholicism. Instead of worship revolving around ritual, they rightly believed it should be centered in Scripture. So,

for the Puritans, Sunday was *the* day of Christian worship and scheduling several meetings for preaching and prayer and spiritual edification on that day was seen by them as the best way of making it above all others the “Lord’s Day.” So the practice of holding at least two relatively unstructured preaching services on Sunday came to America with the Puritan colonists.¹⁸

A fascinating incident occurred at the Synod of Dort in 1618, the primary purpose of which was to address the Arminian controversy and establishing the Doctrines of Grace as the biblical position. Also addressed, however, was the concern over the “second service” on the Lord’s Day (which in the 17th-century was usually the afternoon service). Prior to that, the second service had always been a

notable feature of the Dutch Reformed churches. Since the very beginning, “this service has also been associated with catechism preaching.”¹⁹ Such doctrinal teaching in the second service was deeply rooted in those who came another century before. Through Luther, “the Sunday catechism service became institutionalized in Lutheran churches in Wittenberg and the Upper Rhineland. Zwingli had similar services in Zürich,” as did Heinrich Bullinger, who in his “Order for Preachers” specified that in addition to the morning preaching service, pastors “should hold common prayer and preaching also every Sunday at three, when vespers were previously held.”²⁰

Calvin’s Geneva was particularly striking. There was the usual morning sermon at 9:00 AM, catechism at midday, and another sermon at three o’clock, which was an exposition of Scripture. In that service, in fact, he “preached on the Psalms from 1549 to 1554; thereafter until his death in 1564 he preached on the same book morning and afternoon, Paul’s letters until 1559, and then the Gospels.”²¹ Additionally, there was a sermon on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. This pattern, in fact, was the guideline for all the churches. What a contrast to our day! While they had six messages a week, many today want only one (and only then if they have nothing else “more important”).

But even in that day attendance was a “heart problem.” As one observer at Dort noted, part of the problem was “reclaiming the country people on Sundays from the sports or from their work.”²² Doesn’t that sound familiar? After much deliberation, the attendees agreed that the second service must not be neglected. In fact, this issue was taken so seriously that they directed the second service to be held even if the only people present were the minister’s own family!²³

So it was that for decades the Sunday evening service was an integral part of not only *Church* life but also people’s *personal* lives. Why? Because that is where their heart was. There is simply no denying that the *advent* of the Sunday evening service is not a recent development, rather its *abandonment* is the recent development. That brings us full circle back to our earlier consideration.

Culture and the Sunday Evening Service

Flying in the face of both biblical *precedent* and historical *pattern* concerning the Sunday evening service is today’s *protesting* against it and *pandering* to the culture. How has culture affected the evening service? Actually, the more accurate question would be: how has it *not*?

Sports, for example, dominate American culture and often conflict with church meeting times. For many families, Sunday afternoon and evening sports (whether as participants or just viewers) are a staple of life.

Community, school, civic, social, and family gatherings are another way culture has invaded. I am old enough to remember when such things would never have been scheduled on a Sunday or even a Wednesday evening. Today it isn’t even a fleeting thought, and many Christians forsake the assembly (Heb. 10:25) because the culture demands it.

Do we even have to mention our culture’s obsession with entertainment? People are wired for it in every area of life, and it drives much of church ministry. So, there is no way a solid, biblically-based Sunday evening service is go-

ing to compete with all the available entertainment options.

Another staple of our culture, pragmatism, has also affected the evening service. After all, if such a service does not deliver what we want it to (more people), and since it is poorly attended anyway, then there is no reason to have it.

Is it not truly striking that as spirituality continues to decline and many Christians demonstrate greater need for spiritual knowledge and edification, church leaders are responding by providing fewer opportunities? What is this saying to the people we are supposed to be leading? Further, what does it say to our children and subsequent generations?

Thankfully, some leaders are discerning this cultural calamity. Scottish pastor Alistair Begg and his friend, fellow Scotsman and theologian Sinclair Ferguson, hold Q&A sessions together from time to time. On several occasions a question has been asked concerning church size and attendance. Begg recounts Ferguson's reply:

Almost inevitably, Sinclair says the test of a church in terms of its hunger for the Word of God is in the evening service, which, of course, nobody likes to hear. . . . One of the indications of the hunger of North America for the Word of God is to be conveyed in the darkness of church buildings after 4:00 on a Sunday afternoon. . . . The same people who are prepared to say, "Speak, O Lord and plant your truth deep in my heart," apparently don't want to get too serious about it.²⁴

Begg goes on to mention that this often starts with the pastor himself, who doesn't want to preach to smaller crowds. Other concerned observers of this trend also rightly point out that many pastors simply do not want to prepare two sermons. But if I may lovingly ask, "Is this not what God has called us to?" Frankly, if other things are preventing us from having adequate time to prepare to preach and teach the Word, then some of those other things need to go. Our number one responsibility is to preach and teach the Word. *Nothing* should interfere with that.

In a very real sense, then, the Sunday evening service is a counter-cultural act, an act of defiance to the reckless, rebellious, and relativistic spirit of the age. It is also a statement about the centrality of worship and the Word and a testimony to the world of our priorities and passions.

Now, in closing let me be honest. In spite of all we have seen, I must admit that none of this can be called *definitive*, but neither can we say that there is no precedent or pattern that *demonstrates* it. So, as we have noted several times, in the end, the core of the issue is that it is a matter of the heart. Why do we want to worship less instead of more? Why do we want less fellowship with God's people? Why do we not want as much of God's Word as we can get? Why is this not part of our "first love" (Rev. 2:4)? What is more important? What are we doing with that time? Why is it that we want two or three *physical* meals per *day* but want only one *spiritual* meal per *week*? And if those questions are not

enough to get us thinking, then here is one more: *Can anyone honestly submit a single good thing that has come from jettisoning the Sunday evening service?*²⁵

Dr. J. D. Watson, Pastor-Teacher, Grace Bible Church
Director, Sola Scriptura Publications, a ministry of GBC

NOTES

- ¹ "Media ecology" theory is the study of media, technology, and communication and how they affect human environments.
- ² T. David Gordon, *Why Johnny Can't Preach: The Media Have Shaped the Messengers* (P&R Publishing, 2009), 49.
- ³ *Ibid*, 63, 67.
- ⁴ *Ibid*, 67-68.
- ⁵ T. David Gordon, *Why Johnny Can't Sing Hymns: How Pop Culture Rewrote the Hymnal* (P&R Publishing, 2010), 42-43.
- ⁶ Issue #85 (Sept./Oct. 2013), "Translation Accuracy and the NIV."
- ⁷ Issue #122 (Jan./Feb. 2020), "The Church's Task: Edification or Entertainment?"
- ⁸ <https://centerforchurchleadership.org/2017/05/09/7-steps-to-create-culturally-relevant-ministry/>.
- ⁹ Colin Brown (Ed.), *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Zondervan, 1975, 1986), Vol. 1, 708-10.
- ¹⁰ Kenneth Wuest, *Word Studies*, comment on Romans 12:2.
- ¹¹ G. Campbell Morgan, *The Ten Commandments* (Baker, 1974), 44.
- ¹² Warren Baker, Eugene Carpenter, *The Complete Word Study Dictionary: OT* (Chattanooga: AMG Publishers, 2003), #H4744.
- ¹³ R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), entry #2063d.
- ¹⁴ Baker and Carpenter, #H2896.
- ¹⁵ See TOTT #42, (Jan. 2009), "The Sabbath of Sunday?"
- ¹⁶ Harold E. Raser (former Professor of Church History, Nazarene Theological Seminary), "The Sunday Night Service: Where Did It Come From?" in *Preacher's Magazine* (Olivet Nazarene University), Volume 57, Number 01 (1981), 10.
- ¹⁷ William Stevenson, *The Story of the Reformation* (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1959), 145.
- ¹⁸ Raser, 12 (emphasis in the original).
- ¹⁹ Donald Sinnema, "The Second Sunday Service in the Early Dutch Reformed Tradition" in *Calvin Theological Journal* (Calvin Theological Seminary), CTJ 32 (1997), 298-333.
- ²⁰ *Ibid*.
- ²¹ T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin's Preaching* (Louisville: John Knox, 1992), 59-64, 150-52.
- ²² John Hales, *Golden Remains of the Ever Memorable Mr. John Hales of Eton College* (London: Printed for Tim. Garthwait, 1659), 4.
- ²³ *Ibid*, 4-5 and Sinnema.
- ²⁴ Retrieved from YouTube under the title, "Whatever Happened to the Evening Service?"
- ²⁵ Recommended reading: <https://www.challies.com/articles/whatever-happened-to-evening-services/>

JUST RELEASED: Pastor Watson's two-volume work, *The Christian's Wealth and Walk: An Expository Commentary on Ephesians*. If you purchase both volumes directly from SSP, the set is only \$32.00 (a shipping donation is entirely optional). Just write to us at: Sola Scriptura Publications; P.O. Box 235; Meeker, CO; 81641.

TRUTH ON TOUGH TEXTS

A Ministry of
Grace Bible Church
P.O. Box 235
Meeker, CO 81641
www.TheScriptureAlone.com
dwatson@thescripturealone.com
A F.I.R.E. Church
www.FireFellowship.org

This monthly publication is intended to address Scriptures that have historically been debated, are particularly difficult to understand, or have generated questions among Believers. We hope it will be an encouragement and challenge to God's people to carefully examine and discern Truth. While the positions presented here are based on years of careful biblical research, we recognize that other respected men of God differ.

If you have a question that perplexes you, please send it along so we might address it either in a full length article or in a "Reader Questions" issue. Other comments are also warmly welcomed, and letters to the editor will be published.

This publication is sent free of charge to anyone who requests it. To aid in the ministry, donations will be greatly appreciated, but never demanded. If you know someone you think would enjoy TOTT, please send along their address.