

# NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS

\*\*\*\*\*

*Present Truth Publishers*

274 East Veterans Highway  
Jackson NJ 08527 USA

\*\*\*\*\*

## *Most Recent Reprint from PTP*

### *Plain Papers on Prophetic and Other Subjects*

*W. Trotter*

This book has been a highly regarded standard work. This printing also includes most chapters from Trotter and Smith, *Lectures on the Second Coming*. The book is 8 1/2 x 11, almost 300 pages, hard-bound in Buckram, and includes Subject and Scripture Indexes.

Price: \$30.00; plus postage for one in North America is \$3.00; 10% postage on all orders over \$20.00. Foreign postage is higher.

## *Newly Printed:*

### *The Seven Set Feasts of Jehovah*

Now in pamphlet form with additional material, including a day by day chart (except for the hiatus) -- 64 pages, R. A. Huebner.


Price: \$4.00; plus postage for one in North America is \$3.00; 10% postage on all orders over \$20.00. Foreign postage is higher.

### *Christian Giving: Its Character and Object*

Consists of a paper by A. H. Rule, a Paper by A. P. Cecil, and comments by J. N. Darby and C. H. Mackintosh – 32 pages.

Price: \$4.00; plus postage for one in North America is \$3.00; 10% postage on all orders over \$20.00. Foreign postage is higher.

Web site: [presenttruthpublishers.com](http://presenttruthpublishers.com)



May/June 2003  
Vol. 18, #3

---

## CONTENTS

---

An Affirmation of the Lord's Human Personality . . . . .	81
The Christian's Heavenly Place and Calling Eviscerated by Messianic Judaism –Acts 20:7 . . . . .	99
The Sovereignty of God in John's Gospel . . . . .	114
Does a Broad Path Indicate Broad-heartedness? . . . . .	120

## *An Affirmation of the Lord's Human Personality*

(Continued)

### *Every Word, Work, and Way of the Lord Jesus Had a Divine Spring*

Replying to an evil paper on the Lord's humanity (written by B. W. Newton) J. N. Darby wrote:

Mr. N. goes beyond scripture in saying (p. 35) that "To say that there was in His humanity a divine spring of thought and feeling, is to deny His real humanity." Was His humanity then without a divine spring of thought and feeling? Had he said it was not of or from His humanity, I should have nothing to say; but to say there was none in it unsettles the doctrine of Christ's person. There was the fulness of the Godhead bodily; and the divine nature was a spring of many thoughts and feelings in Him. This is not the whole truth; but to deny it is not truth. If it merely means that humanity has not in itself a divine spring, that is plain enough; it would not be humanity. I am equally aware that it will be said that it was in His person; but to separate wholly the humanity and divinity in springs of thought and feeling is dangerously overstepping scripture. Is it meant that the love and holiness of the divine nature did not produce, was not a spring of, thought and feeling in His human soul? This would be to lower Christ below a Christian. Perhaps this is what Mr. N. means in saying He was dispensationally lower than the church. If so, it is merely a roundabout road to Socinianism . . .

To turn, then, to scripture, we are told of the sinless infirmities of human nature, and that Christ partook of them. Now, I have no doubt this has been said most innocently; but, not being scripture, we must learn in what sense it is used. Now, that Christ was truly man, in thought, feeling, and sympathy, is a truth of cardinal blessing and fundamental importance to our souls. But I have learnt, thereby, not that humanity is not real humanity, if there is a divine spring of thought and feeling in it; but that God can be the spring of thought and feeling in it, without its ceasing to be truly and really man. This is the very truth of infinite and unspeakable blessedness that I have learnt. This, in its little feeble measure, and in another and derivative way, is true of us now by grace. He who searches the hearts knows what is the mind of the Spirit. This is true in Jesus in a yet far more important and blessed way. There was once an innocent man left to himself; the spring of thought and feeling being simply man, however called on by every blessing and natural testimony of God without: we know what came of it. Then there was man whose heart alas! was the spring, "from within," of evil thoughts and the dark train of acts that followed. What I see in Christ is man, where God has become the spring of thought and feeling. \* And, through this wonderful mystery, in the new creation in us, all things are of God. That, if we speak of His and our humanity, is what distinguishes it . . . Sinless humanity, sustained in that state by Godhead, is not the same as sinful humanity left to itself. If it be said it was in the same

circumstances, this is a question of fact, and to what extent? And here we have to guard against confounding relationships and circumstances. Thus deprivation of paradise is stated by Mr. N. as one thing which the blessed Lord had in common with ourselves. As to circumstances, it is quite clear it was so; but as to relationship to God -- was Christ deprived of paradise as we are as guilty outcasts from it? Clearly not.

[\* Did He hereby cease to be man? not at all. It is, though "according to God," in man and as man these thoughts and feelings are to be found. And this extends itself to all the sorrows and the pressure of death itself upon his soul in thought. He had human feelings as to what lay upon Him and before Him, but God was the spring of His estimate of it all. Besides, the manifestation of God was in His ways. We had known man innocent in suitable circumstances; and guilt, subject to misery; but in Christ we have perfectness in relation to God in every way, in infallibly maintained communion in the midst of all the circumstances of sorrow, temptation, and death, by which He was beset, the spring of divine life in the midst of evil, so that His every thought as man was perfection before God, and perfect in that position. This was what marked His state as being down here this new thing.]<sup>1</sup>

Thus, though Christ's death on the cross was a human death, we do not separate it from the value and glory of His Person. His sufferings, death, and bloodshedding had all the value and glory of His Person as their value and glory. This is because of the *unity* of the two natures in Him. Indeed, it is so preciously stated in 1 John 2:2:

and *he* is the propitiation for our sins . . .

Thus, the propitiation is commensurate with the value and glory of His Person. Every word, work, and way had a divine spring, and could not be human words, ways, and acts as if they were apart from the unity of the two natures. All that He did and said had a divine spring, and all was done in the power of the Spirit. There was no, and could be no, exception. Christ was not two persons. Fully man, and of course fully God, yet there is one Person. This the mind cannot comprehend, cannot scrutinize, yet by faith we receive the truth into our souls that He is God and man (fully so) in one Person, and our souls bow in worship.

### *Affirmation of Human Personality in Christ by F. E. Raven's Opposers*

J. HENNESSY

Among some quotations he included in his valuable paper, J. Hennessy cited this:

A late writer, Dr. T. C. Edwards (*Davies Lectures*, 1895, "The God-Man"), has thus written:

All the writers of the New Testament represent Jesus Christ *as a man*, an

---

1. *Collected Writings* 15:147-150.

*individual* man, as well as *the* man, as truly a man as Paul or Peter . . . Personal acts are ascribed to His humanity, such as prayer . . . human nature without personality of some sort would seem impossible and inconceivable. It is like assuming all the separate elements of humanity without the *suppositum* which gives them personal identity and continuance. **Scripture, for instance, plainly teaches that Christ had two wills -- a human, as distinct from the divine will -- and that is the doctrine of the church.** If He, being a person, in any real and perfect sense became human, then He became a human person. The incarnation gave a divine person human personality, but He has not ceased to be a divine person. It only changes the condition. As the Logos does not cease to exist in the Trinity by becoming the Logos incarnate, so He does not cease to be Logos incarnate by becoming man.<sup>2</sup>

Who is going to accuse J. Hennessy of being a Nestorian for such teaching? Moreover, as we will see below, two wills in Christ is the teaching of the orthodox on the Person of Christ. Under the heading THE HERESY OF THE DOCTRINE OF NO HUMAN "I" IN CHRIST INCARNATE, he quotes from JND's "Christological Pantheism," in which JND labels the denial of a human "I," i.e., a human *ego*, as heresy and **Monothelism**. Of course it is heresy. In effect, it denies true manhood in Christ's Person.

#### W. T. WHYBROW

In his *The Truth of Christ's Person: Is It Taught by Mr. F. E. Raven*, W. T. Whybrow has a heading that reads, "TO SAY THAT CHRIST HAD NO HUMAN PERSONALITY IS HERESY." Notice also that the notion of charging opponents with Nestorianism seems to come from FER:

Mr. R. considers that to reject his teaching on this subject approaches very near to heresy, and infers a dual personality. But he may remember Nestorius was anathematized because he taught that there was a separate basis of personality in the human nature of our Lord, that He was, in fact, a double being.<sup>3</sup> It is Mr. R. who now would view Christ as man, *distinct and apart* from what he is as God and divine. And in avoiding the Scylla of Nestorianism he has fallen into the Charybdis of an impersonal humanity . . . There is no human personality, but only human condition. This is the High-church doctrine of the incarnation. It is strange that Mr. R. should have imbibed it, coupled, indeed, with other thoughts, which they and most Christians would repudiate with abhorrence. It is this, too, that Mr. Darby so strongly condemned in his article on "Christological Pantheism" {quoted previously, above} . . . (pp. 12, 13).<sup>4</sup>

The High-church doctrine to which he refers was not, however **Apollinarianism** (FER's evil teaching) but similar to what is called **Monothelism**. While Apollinarianism necessarily involves the idea that Christ had no human will and

2. *An Answer to . . . What is Ravenism?* p. 26. Boldfaced emphasis added.

3. {Actually, it is disputed that Nestorius himself did really hold that, though some followers did.}

4. His paper is reprinted in *The Eternal Relationships in the Godhead*, pp. 91-97, available from Present Truth Publishers.

no "I" of humanity, Monothelism allows a human soul and spirit, but no human will. Thus, both evils deny human personality in the Person of Christ.

#### G. J. STEWART

Since the Lord had a human soul, He had a human "I." The "I" is in the soul. Responding to Ravenism in *The Man Christ Jesus*, G. J. Stewart wrote:

If the Lord were not personally Man He could not die for men. If HE had no human soul, no human personality, His blood could not make atonement for the "soul," in which lies the "I" of individuality and responsibility . . . (p. 4).

Yes, the will and the "I" of manhood is in the soul, and Christ had a human soul. A soul without that would be an impersonal soul, not a human soul.

#### THEO DAVIS

In *On the Human Personality of Christ*, p. 3, the writer says:

To those who urge He cannot be two persons {and we agree on that, but}, the same faith would say I believe He is a Divine Person, I believe He is a human Person, I believe He is One Person. I cannot explain or understand, nor do I expect to do so, remembering "No man knoweth the Son but the Father" (Matt. 11:27).

#### ANONYMOUS

A copy of F. E. Raven's 1895 paper, *The Person of the Christ*, was printed with footnotes to the various paragraphs, the footnotes objecting to the doctrine of the paper and asserting the human personality of the Lord in a number of places. The writer of the footnotes concluded with this:

The following Scriptures prove without the shadow of a doubt the personality of Jesus as man, and consequently by the sturdy evidence of the facts, the falseness of F.E.R.'s rationalistic conclusions that, because Jesus is personally God, He therefore cannot be personally man.

Matt. 26:39 -- not as I will, but as thou wilt.

Matt. 27:46 -- my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? . . .

We know what this anonymous author meant by "the personality of Jesus as man," not only because being personal, man includes a will and an "I," but also because the writer supplied definitions taken from a Dictionary:

Person -- A human being as including body and mind; an individual. Any being having life, intelligence, will, and separate individual existence.

Personality -- That which constitutes a person; conscious separate existence as an intelligent and voluntary being. The attributes, taken collectively, that make up the character and nature of an individual; that which distinguishes and characterizes a person.

This shows that the writer regarded the Lord Jesus as having a human will and a human "I," but not in "separate existence," of course, which would mean that there were two persons.

## W. KELLY

**The Soul is the seat of human “will,” and “I” (ego), and Thus of Personality.** Commenting on what constitutes manhood, W. Kelly pointed out that the soul is the seat of personal identity and that soul is the *ego*; that is, the *I*:

Again, our Lord in Luke 24:39, compared with 37 (and see Matt. 14:26), explains “spirit.” “A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have,” even when risen. He had a “spiritual body,” and was not a mere “spirit,” though a quickening spirit. Granted that angels are spirits, but so is man when disembodied, whether the Lord Himself before He rose (Matt. 27:50; John 19:30), saints (Acts 7:59; Heb. 12:23; Rev. 22:6, as rightly read), or the unbelieving (1 Pet. 3:19). Soul (ψυχή) is the “ego” or “I,” the seat of personal identity, and therefore predicable of men alive or dead, as in ver. 20, etc., for the former; or Rev. 6:9; Rev. 20:4, for the latter; while πνεῦμα expresses the spiritual capacity, inseparable from the soul, wherein is the working of the will. They compose the inner man, as the body is the outer.<sup>5</sup>

And, of course, where the seat of personal identity is, there, he pointed out, is the *will* as well as personality:

In man, personality, self-consciousness, will, is in the soul; capacity is by the spirit. Each has his own soul, and so is personally responsible. The spirit is faculty or power; and so John Baptist was to come in the spirit and power of Elias, not in any other’s soul but his own.<sup>6</sup>

That is man’s constitution. Such was he in innocence, as in Adam unfallen, and such was man’s constitution after the fall -- only that there was added to him the knowledge of good and evil as well as what we call the old nature, called “sin in the flesh” in Rom. 8:3. The constitution of manhood is true of Christ’s manhood, but we must bear in mind that He had manhood in a holy state intrinsically, free of any taint of evil; and, in fact, *impeccable* -- that is, *He could not sin*, not only because of the Godhead in Him, but also because of the holy state of that humanity (cf. Luke 1:35). Christ had a human soul.

**FER Denied a Human “Will,” And “I” (ego), and Human Personality in Christ.** Here is a lengthy quotation from W. Kelly’s *F.E.R. Heterodox on the Person of Christ*:

Now who does not know that a person among men consists of both parts and unity? There are spirit and soul and body; and yet they constitute the person. There may be temporary dissolution of the outer tie by death; there will surely be their unity in one person for eternity. But for the true believer Christ’s Person is distinguished from every other by the infinite fact of God and man united thus. These are in Him for ever indissoluble, though no saint doubts that He is Son of God and Son of man. Whatever His profound emotion in spirit, whatever the conflict when He prayed more earnestly, and His sweat became as great drops of blood, that Man was

5. *The Preaching to the Spirits in Prison*, London: Race, pp. 120, 121, n.d.

6. In *The Soul - Neither Mortal Nor to Sleep*.

inseparably God; and as from His conception, so fully in His death and resurrection. Thus had His every word, work, thought, and suffering divine value. It is not the Son alone, but “Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.” The man Christ Jesus is not only the one Mediator, but the true God and eternal life; the sent Servant, and the “I AM”; Christ of the fathers as according to flesh, yet He that is over all, God blessed for evermore. Amen. . .

F.E.R. talks of . . . “two totally different *ideas* coalesced in one person!” Yes, it is not truth, but “ideas” for F.E.R. Is this to “abide in the doctrine of the Christ”?

It is to join Apollinarius of Antioch (the son). He too made the Logos simply form Christ’s Person, as F.E.R. does, and was therefore justly branded as an antichrist; so Nestorius was for dividing the Person, and Eutyches for confusing it: all of them, strict Trinitarians. For if the Logos had not been united to the soul as to spirit and body in the Christ, Christ was not and is not very Man as well as very God. *Without that union there must have been two distinct {separated} personalities, the divine and the human. It is the union of both in one Person which alone secures the truth according to scripture.*<sup>7</sup> F.E.R. with shameless self-confidence vaunts his idea, which is plain heterodoxy. He does *not* “bring the doctrine” of Christ. The Son did not change His Person, but took up manhood into unity, and this in soul as in body.<sup>8</sup>

In some such way deadly false doctrine befalls such as venture to pry into what is only known to the Father and immeasurably above man’s ken. The Apollinarian heterodoxy prevails largely at present; as the error which led to it is a relic of heathen philosophy, accepted by early Fathers such as Clement of Alexandria, and exceedingly common among “thinkers” now as at all times. It pervades Franz Delitzsch’s Psychology and its English analogue, The Tripartite Nature of Man. They (and F.E.R. follows them) make the self-conscious “I” or individuality to reside in man’s spirit. But scripture abundantly proves its seat to be in the soul.<sup>9</sup> The spirit is inner capacity *as to* which man is responsible to God; but the soul is that *in* which he is so; and the body is the outer vessel which displays the result, whether by grace for God’s will or by self-will in Satan’s service.

To the soul belongs the working of the will, and now also since the fall the instinctive knowledge of good and evil; so that one is enticed into fleshly lusts which degrade man, as well as into reasonings of the spirit and every high thing that lifts itself up against the knowledge of God. Hence we read of soul-salvation or “salvation of souls” as in 1 Pet. 1:9. Hence Ezek. 18:4, “Behold, all souls are Mine,” and the regular use of “souls” for persons in both O. & N. Testaments. For the self-conscious individual, the responsible person, is in the “I.” It is the “I” in

7. {Emphasis added to draw attention to the union of two personalities in the Person of Christ.}

8. {Take note that we have already observed JND’s statement that the Son did not change His Person, that He remained the Son and the Word, but humanity was taken into His Person.}

9. {He is pointing this out because in the Apollinarian view (FER’s view), the “I” is regarded as in the spirit of a man. In Christ, such say, the Divine was the “spirit” of the body; that is, the self-conscious “I.” Rather, the self-conscious “I” in man is in the soul. It is clear that W. Kelly held that Christ had a human, self-conscious “I.” And, there is no reason to doubt that he believed that Christ had a “divine-human personality,” as F. W. Grant stated it.}

self-will without God; the “I” when converted to God, but in bondage of spirit; and the “I” when Christ’s deliverance is known in peace and liberty; as for the latter we see in Rom. 7, 8. Read also Gal. 2:20 . . .

Beyond doubt the union of God and man in one Person is the wondrous and unfathomable One revealed, not for our comprehension, but for unquestioning faith, love, and honor as we honor the Father. He is thus at once the weary man and the only-begotten Son that *is* (not “was” merely) in the Father’s bosom; the Son of man here below that *is* in heaven, and the “I am” on earth threatened by the Jews with stoning because He told them the truth. He must have been the Logos to have been what He was here as man. His soul was united to the Logos: else the Person had been doubled or severed, and He could not be true and complete man. He cried, Let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt. There was His holy will; and it was right to lay it before His Father, but in entire submissiveness to His will and glory; of which none but a divine Person was capable. It was not therefore the Logos superseding the spirit (still less the soul), but perfectly associated with the soul in His one Person. He was true man and true God in the same indivisible Person. In Him dwelt and dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Yet it is deep pain to feel compelled to speak out plainly, on such a theme not only before others liable to stumble, but in the sense of one’s own danger of offending against God’s word in defense of what is dearer than life, and far beyond man’s thought . . . <sup>10</sup>

#### F. W. GRANT

##### An Open Letter to F. E. Raven. F. W. Grant wrote to FER:

Your very illustration of how He was *not* Man in the sense that He was God is that He was *personally* God, but man in condition.

You had said this also before, and the question has been thereupon put, “Why is He *not personally* man?” and you reply, “He is personally the Son. You cannot have two personalities in one” (p. 132).

This makes it plain also what you mean by “He could not change His person.” We all believe that in the sense in which, no doubt, J.N.D. said it. When the Word became flesh, He was still the Word; the eternal Son in manhood was still the Son . . .

The glorious “Man” that Scripture presents to us has disappeared. **Divine-human personality** you must own is not in your mind; and what this means every Christian heart should be able to say. <sup>11</sup>

Yes, your Christian heart should be able to say it is fundamentally evil teaching.

**Comment on Heb. 2:14.** W. Kelly has already been quoted at length concerning this verse, in a footnote under the heading HE TOOK OUR

10. *F.E.R. Heterodox*, London: Weston, pp. 122-127, 1902. This may also be found in *The Bible Treasury*, New Series 4:78-80, “F.E.R. Heterodox on the Person of Christ.” See also *The Bible Treasury*, New Series 5:62, closing paragraph.

11. *Open Letter to Mr. F. E. Raven*, of Sept. 28, 1897. Boldfaced emphasis added.

NATURE. Here is a comment on this verse by F. W. Grant:

It must be noted here, as it often has been, that while the children are said to be partakers of flesh and blood, -- this “partaking” being a real having in common, a participation of the most thorough kind, - - in His own “taking part” another word is used which implies limitation. It does not indeed show the character of the limitation: but the difference between the words makes us necessarily ask what, in fact, that was: and the answer comes to us immediately, that while **His was true humanity in every particular necessary to constitute it that**, <sup>12</sup> yet humanity as men have it {i.e., the *state* in which they have it}, the humanity of *fallen* men, was *not* His. Here there must be strict limitation. We must add, as the apostle does afterwards with regard to His temptation, “sin apart.” Sin, with the consequences of sin, He could not take. Death could have no power over Him, except as He might submit Himself voluntarily to it, and this He did; but it was <sup>13</sup>obedience to His Father’s will, and no necessity of His condition, as it is of ours.

#### The Son Assumed Humanity Into His Own Person.

. . . the manhood He has assumed He retains forever: He has assumed it into His own Person, and it is part of Himself. <sup>14</sup>

#### P. A. HUMPHREYS

Quoting from the Ravenite *Notes of Addresses and Readings at Quemerford, May, 1895*, P. A. Humphreys wrote:

Some one remarked “Mr. Darby says in the Synopsis on Colossians 1, Christ is God and Christ is man; one Christ. Mr. Raven’s reply was: “Yes; but you must be careful how you take up an expression like that. In Person He is God; in condition He is man.”

(Reference to the Synopsis shows that what Mr. Darby does say is: “Christ is God, Christ is man; but it is Christ who is the two.” A flat denial of Mr. Raven’s theory.)

However, a questioner asked: “Why is He *not personally* man?” The sophistical nature of Mr. Raven’s reply needs little comment to any simple-hearted believer. It was: “He is personally the Son. You cannot have two personalities in one . . .”

The pretense that the truth leads to the doctrine of a dual personality (“two personalities”) {i.e., two separate personalities} is mere dust for the eyes; every believer can see the truth of the unity of our Lord’s adorable Person, God and Man, but one Christ who is both, can involve no such absurdity. <sup>15</sup>

12. {“In every particular” includes a human will and a human “I.”}

13. *Numerical Bible, Hebrews, in loco*. Boldfacing is added.

14. *The Crowned Christ*, p. 23.

15. *Remarks on a Paper Entitled “The Person of the Christ,” by F.E.R.*, Sept. 1895.

## A. C. ORD

I am quite aware of, and accept the ordinary orthodox statement of two natures in one person . . . the simple faith that Jesus was God and man in one person can be easily accepted as plain and vital truth; but the moment you *deny* personality in the Man Christ Jesus, you run into a thousand difficulties and errors. What is really denied is Christ's individuality as a man.<sup>16</sup>

This extract from Mr. Darby's paper "Christological Pantheism," applies with equal force to Mr. R.'s {F. E. Raven} doctrine upon "The Person of Christ" and to those teachings of which it was written. Christ's human personality is, we shall find, denied by the teaching of the tract before us, as really as it was by the doctors of whom the foregoing sentence was written. To insist upon "Christ's *individuality*"<sup>17</sup> as a man," is not to teach "two individualities," nor does "the simple faith that Jesus was *God* and *Man* in *one person*" in any sense involve "a dual personality." In Him Godhead and Manhood are united in His holy and blessed Person; God in person and Man in person: yet but one Person -- "the Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever."<sup>18</sup>

To acknowledge the truth of the *mystery* of the incarnation is necessarily to own His *humanity* in its proper position as essential to His *Person*, as having now become Man. To us the fact that He became "*in person*" man, (i.e., by taking manhood into union with Himself) is, next to the atonement, which indeed it underlies, the most precious and fundamental truth of Christianity.<sup>19</sup>

We believe that Scripture, by the enlightening power and grace of the Holy Spirit, teaches in the most unmistakable manner, to the simple soul, these unfathomable truths concerning the Person of Christ, and that, although *no change* has taken place in His eternal Being and Nature, no change of the Person -- He is the same Person, the Son -- yet that this Person *has become*, in assuming humanity, that which He was not before -- He has *become Man*: nor do we confound this truth with that which is inseparable therefrom, and is indeed collateral therewith, namely, the *status* or *condition* or *form* of humanity He took . . .

We fully accept and, by grace, tenaciously hold the truth both of the eternal and unchangeable personality of Christ, and of that which is expressed by the words "form or condition" in their connection with the Person of Christ. The truth of Phil. 2, that He who subsisted in the form of God, emptied Himself, and assumed a servant's form, is only rightly apprehended when the truth of His human as well as Divine Being is acknowledged. The truth, that the personal identity of the One who was in the form of God and who assumed a servant's form is unchanged, is absolutely essential to the truth of His Person. It cannot be too strongly insisted on. But together with it the truth must be maintained, that He whose personal identity is

16. {*Collected Writings* 29:212.}

17. The italics are not necessarily in the originals, throughout the quotations; nor the capitals.

18. "*The Man Christ Jesus*" 1 Timothy 2:5 Remarks on a Tract Entitled "*The Person of the Christ*," Present Truth Publishers, p. 1.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

unquestionably unaltered and unalterable, who was, when He became Man, the same Divine Person that He was from eternity, yet this *Person* is He who became something -- "was made flesh" -- He *Himself* became "something which He was not before."<sup>20</sup>

That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God {Luke 1:35}

was spoken of His humanity, as conceived by the Holy Ghost. So indissoluble and inscrutable is this union. But it is plainly seen that the incarnation in this sense has no place in Mr. R.'s system. On the one side is a Divine Person in a *condition* of humanity: on the other God Himself -- the Son -- become Man in Person. Will saints reject the truth of the latter for the unreality of the former? If Christ is not personally MAN there is no redemption.<sup>21</sup>

Let us observe one more quotation, noting it carefully regarding the dilemma for the human mind that will not accept the truth of the union of God and man in one Person. The reasoning condemned by A. C. Ord is the same character of reasoning engaged in by those who hold the **Monothelite** heresy, or one of its variants, that Christ could have only one will and one "I":

The mystery of the union of manhood with Godhead in the Person of Christ, yet in the absolute unity of that Person, leads Mr. R. to reason that there must be either a dual personality {i.e., two separate personalities}, or that He had not true humanity united to Godhead. He has chosen the latter heresy {of these two heresies} : and, because reason can see no escape from the dilemma, he charges his opponents with the former {i.e., what is known as Nestorianism}. Faith bows to the truth of God as revealed in His Word, and refuses either avenue of escape to the difficulty discovered by unbelief. Christ's manhood is as real as His Godhead. Yet, on the one hand, there is no dual personality, nor, on the other, is His manhood merged in His Godhead by fusion or identity. There is but One Person, who is both God -- really and truly God in Nature and Being and Person, and who is also Man -- really and truly Man in Nature and Being and Person.<sup>22</sup>

### *No Two Distinct (Separate), or Dual, Personalities in Christ*

We just saw that A. C. Ord wrote:

Yet, on the one hand, there is no dual personality, nor, on the other, is His manhood merged in His Godhead by fusion or identity.

And, we have already observed that W. Kelly said:

Without that union there must have been two distinct personalities, the divine and

20. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 26.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 20, note 44.

the human. It is the union of both in one Person which alone secures the truth according to scripture.<sup>23</sup>

F. W. Grant said:

**Divine-human personality** you must own is not in your {FER's} mind; and what this means every Christian heart should be able to say.<sup>24</sup>

These quotations affirm that there was one personality in Christ. Just as He is one Person, so there is one personality. Just as in the one Person there is the human and the divine, so in the one personality there is the human and the divine. It may be expressed this way:

PERSON:                    God-man

PERSONALITY:    divine-human

The soul of the manhood entered Christ's personality and, of course that soul of manhood had a human will and a human "I" (ego), i.e., human personality. This both **Apollinarianism** and **Monothelitism** deny, each in their own way.

A. C. Ord wrote:

For, as *Nature* is inseparable from "*person*," it is plain that to deny that He is "*in person*" man, is to deny that His humanity is true human *nature*.<sup>25</sup> ♦

May saints be aroused, and see to it that they are not robbed of Christ in all that He is as a real, true *Man*, yet God withal; the expression bodily of the substance of the Godhead. Inscrutable in Person as incarnate, having united Godhead and Manhood: human as well as Divine as to His Person, having become ("*in person*") Man, and thus God and Man, but in One Person: accomplishing the work of redemption, as the Man who united in His own Person all the value of His Godhead with the humanity that He took that He might give Himself up: exercising Priestly service towards us in virtue of having taken human *nature*, in which He could suffer and be tempted, and by means of which He is "able to sympathize with our infirmities": receiving Divine attributes as Man, even in humiliation, and going back as the risen Man into the Divine glory {John 17:5}.<sup>26</sup> ♦

The denial that He is in *Person* Man, as well as God, robs His work -- the work of "the *Man* Christ Jesus" -- of all its atoning value by separating it from His Person. By His Manhood alone the work of redemption could not be accomplished. His Godhead is needed to give value thereto. It is the work of *His whole Person*: the infinite value of His Godhead Being in a taken nature -- God

23. F.E.R. *Heterodox*, p. 124 (*The Bible Treasury*, New Series 4:79).

24. *Open Letter to Mr. F. E. Raven*, of Sept. 28, 1897. Boldfaced emphasis added.

25. "The Man Christ Jesus" 1 Timothy 2:5 Remarks on a Tract Entitled "The Person of the Christ," Present Truth Publishers, p. 26.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

and Man -- being essential to the working out of atonement. He brings all the value of all that He is -- He in whom was life -- into His humanity. This glorious Person -- the Son of God -- the Man Christ Jesus -- unites all the infinite worth of His Divine Being with the ability which was required for one who offers Himself to God as a sacrifice in death to accomplish redemption. He gives Himself up in all the infinite meetness and holy perfections of His inscrutable *Person* "for the putting away of sin by His sacrifice."

The two errors mentioned, undermine the truth of life and propitiation so blessedly brought together in 1 John 4:9, 10, "God sent *His only begotten Son* . . . that we might *live* through *Him*," and "God . . . sent *His Son* a *propitiation* for our *sins*." The whole fabric of the glad tidings is overthrown with the denial of these truths. The *Person* of Christ having been touched *nothing* is left untouched.

Are saints *willing* to give up *the truth* of the PERSON of Christ -- His *whole* Person -- for the systematized error of men? or will they not rather awake to the significance of this shameless rejection of Divine truth, and in a day when men "will not endure sound doctrine," be found through God's mercy among those who "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints?"<sup>27</sup> ♦

### *Orthodox Statements on Christ's Person Affirm the Divine-Human Personality of the Person of Christ*

Orthodox Christians of different ecclesiastical connections affirm the human personality of the Lord Jesus Christ, "the man Christ Jesus." Indeed, this affirmation is part of what it is to be orthodox. Below are some examples. Notice how they affirm that the truth of the human personality of the Lord Jesus is the common confession of all the orthodox on the Person of Christ.

First of all, there is a matter we should be clear about. The Son of God did not unite with some human person that existed. That would have resulted in two persons. His humanity never had an independent existence apart from the union in Him of the two natures. In connection with the subject of human personality, Emery H. Bancroft stated it concisely this way:

It was a human nature that found its personality only in union with the divine nature. In other words, it was human nature impersonal in the sense that it had no personality separate from the divine nature and prior to its union therewith.

By the impersonality of Christ's human nature we mean only that it had no personality before Christ took it, no personality before its union with the divine. It was human nature whose consciousness and will were developed only in union

27. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

with the personality of the Logos.<sup>28</sup>

Beware of someone who says that the Son took impersonal humanity and lets the matter stand thus without adding that humanity in the Person of Christ was personal humanity. There may be hiding in this the denial of the “consciousness and will” in His human nature. Concerning the “consciousness and will,” L. Berkhof wrote:

The fact that the human nature of Christ, in and by itself, has no personal subsistence {as if an independent man}, does not mean that it has no consciousness and will. The Church has taken the position that these belong to the nature rather than to the person.<sup>29</sup>

Francis Turretin (1623-1687) observed:

That is, did the Son of God . . . join together with himself in unity of person, not a person, but a human nature; not by conversion and transmutation, but by assumption and sustenance, so that the Son of God was made the Son of man and our mediator and is truly God-man (*theanthrōpos*)? . . . we affirm it.<sup>30</sup>

. . . two wills are ascribed to him (“not my will, but thine be done,” Luke 22:42). Nor does it follow that there are two wills because the will belongs to the nature, while willing belongs to the person . . .<sup>31</sup>

Wayne Grudem points out this:

At this point someone may object that if we say that Jesus had two centers of consciousness and two wills, that *requires* that he was two distinct persons, and we have really fallen into the error of “Nestorianism.” But in response, it must simply be affirmed that two wills and two centers of consciousness *do not* require that Jesus be two distinct persons. It is mere assertion without proof to say that they do. If someone responds that he or she *does not understand* how Jesus could have two centers of consciousness and still be one person, then that fact may certainly be admitted by all. But failing to understand something does not mean that it is impossible, only that our understanding is limited. The great majority of the church throughout its history has said that Jesus had two wills and centers of consciousness, yet he remained one person. Such a formulation is not impossible, merely a mystery that we do not now fully understand. To adopt any other solution would create a far greater problem: it would require that we give up either the full deity or the full humanity of Christ, and that we cannot do.<sup>32</sup>

John Murray wrote:

That is to say, we may not be able to devise a precise formula that will guard the unity of his person, on the one hand, and the integrity of the humanity, on the

28. *Christian Theology*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 102, 153 (1961).

29. *Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, p. 322, 1979 ([1939, 1941]).

30. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* 2:320, Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed,

31. *Ibid.*, p. 313.

32. *Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 561, (1994).

other . . .

. . . the *oneness* of his divine-human person . . .

There are two centers of consciousness but not of self-consciousness.

The Son of God did not become personal by incarnation. He became incarnate but there was no suspension of his divine self-identity. In these terms his self must always be defined. Jesus was God-man, not, strictly speaking, God and man.<sup>33</sup>

In a chapter on “Christ’s Unipersonality,” William G. T. Shedd wrote:

That the two natures constitute only one person, is also proved by the fact that in Scripture human attributes are ascribed to the person as designated by a divine title; and divine attributes are ascribed to the person as designated by a human title. This interchange of titles and attributes<sup>34</sup> in respect to one and the same person proves that there are not two persons, each having its own particular nature and two classes of attributes in common . . .

Similarly, there arises in the person of the God-man two general forms of consciousness . . .<sup>35</sup>

It should be kept in mind that there cannot be two centers, or forms, of consciousness without there being two wills and two “I”s.

Benjamin B. Warfield said:

What is meant is that our Lord took up into His personality a human nature . . .

Nevertheless, from the beginning to the end of the whole series of books {of the NT}, while first one then the other of His two natures comes into repeated prominence, there is never a question of conflict between the two, never any confusion in their relations, never any schism in His unitary personal action; but he is obviously presented as one, composite indeed, but undivided personality . . .

The mysteries of the relations in which the constituent elements in the more complex personality of Our Lord stand to one another are immeasurably greater than in our simple case {of spirit, soul, and body}. We can never hope to comprehend how the infinite God and a finite humanity can be united in a single person; and it is very easy to go astray in attempting to explain the interactions in the unitary person of natures so diverse from one another.<sup>36</sup>

Charles Hodge had this to say in regard to the **Apollinarian** and the **Monothelite** heresy:

The Apollinarians were led to the adoption of this theory partly from the difficulty of conceiving how two complete natures can be united in one life and consciousness. If Christ be God, of the divine Logos {i.e., the Word}, He must

33. *Collected Writings of John Murray* 2:137-139, Carlisle: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1977.

34. {See *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 10:49.}

35. *Dogmatic Theology* 2A:316, 320, Minneapolis: Klock and Klock (1979 [1889]).

36. Article, “Person of Christ,” in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, pp. 2340, 2347, (1949 [1939]).

have an infinite intelligence and an almighty will. If a perfect man, He must have a finite intelligence and a human will. How then can He be one person? This is indeed incomprehensible; but it involves no contradiction . . .

The {Monothelite} controversy turned . . . on the question whether there is one only, or two wills in Christ. If only one, then, as the orthodox asserted, there could be but one nature, for will is one of the essential elements or faculties of a rational nature. To deny Christ a human will, was to deny that He had a human nature, or was truly man.<sup>37</sup>

In keeping with all the orthodox on the Person of Christ, Robert L. Dabney spoke of the human will of Christ this way, in regard to the temptation (testing):

It is the unanimous testimony of the apostles, as it is the creed of the church, that the human nature never had its separate personality. It never existed, and never will exist for an instant, save in personal union with the Word . . .

While the human will of Jesus was rendered absolutely incapable of concupiscence by the indwelling of the Godhead and its own native endowment . . .<sup>38</sup>

Charles Lee Feinberg wrote:

Did He have one or two wills? The answer given to the Monothelites has never had to be changed. In order to be truly God, Christ had to have, and did have, a divine will; similarly, to be truly man, He had to have, and did have, a human will. Both wills worked harmoniously in obedience to the pleasure of the Father, the human will ever in subjection and following the divine.<sup>39</sup>

Let us conclude with William Cunningham:

Christ had been from eternity God over all; He assumed human nature into union with the divine. The divine nature of course continued unchanged, because it is unchangeable. Did the human nature also continue unchanged, distinct from the divine, though inseparably united with it? Christ is uniformly represented to us in Scripture as being *prima facie* a man -- a full partaker of human nature in all its completeness. If it be asserted that He had not human nature in its entirety and perfection, or that anything essential to human nature was wanting in Him, the *onus probandi* must lie upon those who make this assertion; for the obvious import of the general declaration of the incarnation, and the general bearing of the representation given us of Christ during His abode upon earth, plainly lead to an opposite conclusion. There is no evidence whatever in Scripture that Christ wanted anything whatever to make Him an entire and perfect man, or possessor of human nature in all its completeness; and, on the contrary, there is direct and positive proof that he had every essential property of humanity . . .

He took a reasonable soul, possessed of all the ordinary faculties of the souls of other men, including a power of volition {i.e., will}, which is asserted in

37. *Systematic Theology* 2:400, 404, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973 reprint.

38. "The Hypostatic Union," *Bibliotheca Sacra* XCII, p. 422.

opposition to the error of the Monothelites . . .

That word {of God} plainly represents Christ to us as being and continuing a true and perfect man, after the human nature had been assumed into union by the divine.<sup>40</sup>

## Conclusion

The purpose of this article is to affirm the human personality of the Lord Jesus in the face of the heretical denial of His human personality that has continued for over a century -- an heretical denial in the form of denying (1) that He had a human "I" and a human will, and (2) claiming that He had an *impersonal* humanity.

We have read the sound words of J. N. Darby affirming the human personality of our Lord -- that He had a human will and a human "I." We have read the sound words of W. Kelly, F. W. Grant, and others, who opposed F. E. Raven's denial of human personality in the Person of Christ. And, we have read similar affirmations of the human personality of the Lord Jesus from a selection of authors in Christendom who are considered to be orthodox on the Person of Christ. Well, then, how is it with you and me? Let us hold fast the truth of Christ's Person:

affirming His manhood: spirit, soul -- with a human "I" (ego) and human will -- and body;

affirming the union of two personalities, the divine and the human, in One Person;

affirming His "divine-human personality";

affirming that He is in person Man and in person God, yet One Person, the God-man.

The wonderful truth is that the Son of God *took humanity into His Person!*

## Appendix: Several Extracts from A. C. Ord Concerning the Unity of the Two Natures in Christ as Expressed in Scripture

Faith knows and delights to recognize "both what is human and what is divine" in the blessed Person of Christ. But this distinguishing, now generally advocated by rationalistic writers, is most dangerous ground to get upon, and it is wholly false

40. *Historical Theology* 1:312, 313, London: The Banner of Truth Trust, (1969 [1862]).

to say that the Gospels ever do this. On the contrary, as we have said, they ever keep Him before us in the unity of His Person. No doubt they present, as has been stated, sometimes more of the divine and sometimes more of the human; and doubtless some acts are more characteristically divine in their nature, and others more characteristically human. But even in specifically human acts, to attempt to draw the line, even as to these, or to *exclude* what is divine from them, and *vice versa*, is not permissible; and if reverence and faith and love for that blessed One are allowed to have their place, such an attempt will be at once checked. Take, for instance, the Lord touching the leper. No doubt it was with a human hand that He does so; but that blessed hand conveys divine virtue and power, and dispels the leprosy in a moment. And the words, "I will, be thou clean," expressive of divine title and authority, coming forth from human lips, and a heart filled with infinite love, accompany His touch, which in any other than His would have involved defilement. So when "the whole multitude sought to touch Him," the Spirit of God adds, "for there went virtue out of Him and healed them all." Even in death (which is an act of a specific human character), we have seen that the divine purpose and nature (Heb. 10), not only gave all force and meaning to the assuming the body prepared for Him, but characterized the wondrous offering of that body on the cross; so that God could find His infinite pleasure and satisfaction in it. No man could take His life from Him. He had power to lay it down, and power to take it again. In a similar way we are not only told, that, whilst voluntarily submitting to it for our sakes, He could not be holden of death, for He was the Prince of Life; but He gives His flesh for the life of the world, and he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever. This life in Him overcomes all the power of death, and this is here extended distinctly to His humanity.

In this His divine title and exemption from death, save by His own act, as well as His resurrection power, appear. He adds, "Therefore doth My Father love Me, because I lay down My life, that I might take it again"; i.e., it was the voluntary nature of this act, and loving obedience to His Father in it, that constituted its value.

Thus, though we do not call divine acts human nor human acts divine, the Scripture shows us that, in His acts, the human and divine combine or mingle. If this is denied, His blessed Person is divided, and all the value of what He does, and is, is lost. This does not imply any confusion or transformation of the human into the divine, or the divine into the human; but it implies a union intimate and perfect, in His blessed Person, which will be our joy, as it is the ground of our confidence, throughout eternity. An union which is impenetrable and unfathomable, but because of which it could be said, when He was on earth, "The Son of man which is in heaven."<sup>41</sup> ♦

First, as to the union of the divine and human natures in His glorious Person,

41. *The Collected Writings of A. C. Ord*, Present Truth Publishers, pp. 107, 108.

we affirm that this unity is everywhere implied or expressed in Scripture.

Secondly, as to the names, titles, or designations that He bears, we assert that they all, without exception, include or carry with them Divine attributes.

Thirdly, as to the relations, positions, and offices, between God and man, which He fills, we declare that they all, and in every aspect, imply and involve the whole glory of His Person.

Fourthly, as to the work of expiation which He has accomplished, we appeal to every Christian that the thought as well as the reality of what He was, as God, in accomplishing it, must always and of necessity be brought into it.

Far be it from us to pretend to comprehend or explain the mode or manner of the precious and all-important union of the divine and human natures in the Person of Christ. The very thought of thus subjecting that ever blessed Person to such intrusion of the human mind is abhorrent to us. Love and loyalty alike forbid the thought of thus dishonoring, by irreverent curiosity, Him whom faith, whilst allowed to gaze on His perfections, contemplates with holy adoration and worship. But whilst owning that in the depth of His Person this Holy One of God is altogether unfathomable,<sup>42</sup> yet we may bring forward the universal testimony of Scripture as to *the fact*, the necessity, and the display of this unity; for all this is distinctly revealed to us.<sup>43</sup> ♦

Ed.

42. Even in our own persons we have an illustration of this incomprehensibility, for we also are constituted of two natures, body and soul being united in one person. But *how* these two natures, the physical and the spiritual, are united, or how they mutually act and react upon one another is beyond our power to conceive or fathom; and though the natures are distinct, to separate them in practical actions is impossible. I take up a child in my arms and embrace it; a man would be a fool to say "You did this with your body, not with your spirit" for, being but one person, none can say how far my spirit entered into the action. If we are thus baffled, and get out of our depth in attempting to penetrate the mystery of our own being, how much more, *without making a parallel*, must this be the case with the infinite Person of the Son of God. {Emphasis added.}

43. *Ibid.*, p. 135

*The Christian's Heavenly Place and  
Calling Eviscerated by Messianic Judaism*

## Chapter 1

### *Acts 20:7: Its Bearing and the Distortion of It by Messianic Judaism*

#### *Breaking of Bread at Troas*

*(Continued)*

It therefore appears from the account in Acts 20 that the saints on that particular occasion came together in their ordinary and customary manner for the purpose of breaking bread on the first of the week.

It is true that, in earlier days, the disciples at Jerusalem broke bread more frequently. But they or at least many of the saints were specially found there then, as visitors unfettered by secular duties, rather than as residents; and in the love and joy of their hearts they took advantage of their opportunity, and day by day kept the feast at home (that is, in private houses in contrast with the temple).

And they continuing daily with one accord in the temple and breaking bread from house to house (at home) did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart (Acts 2:46).

But at Troas we have the practice not of Jewish but of Gentile believers, and that as occurring under no such exceptional circumstances, but amid the general routine of their daily lives.

From both instances it is ours to profit. At the institution of the Supper, the Lord Himself made no restrictions. "This do in remembrance of Me," was His own word to the apostles of the circumcision; but nothing did He lay down as to the frequency of participation. Neither when making a special revelation to the apostle of the

Gentiles, <sup>1</sup> did the Lord define the interval that should separate the observances of the feast of remembrance. From His silence on this point therefore it may surely be gathered with the utmost certainty that He has left it to the love and fidelity of our hearts to respond to His own expressed desire by eating bread and drinking wine as often as circumstances will allow. And this we have seen was the practice in early days. In Jerusalem at the first the saints were able to break bread at home daily. In Troas the custom was to gather for that purpose on the first of the week. Considering both examples, we conclude that they were under neither the incitement nor the restriction of any rigid rule, but that they met together as often as was possible.

It must however be observed that the first of the week affords the most suitable occasion on which to celebrate this feast. What can be more fitting than that the Lord's Supper should be eaten on the Lord's day? To both the supper and the day the Lord has prefixed His title in a distinctive way, thus marking them out as His in a special sense (1 Cor. 11:20; Rev. 1:10). If the use of this term (*κυριακός*) elevates the supper above any ordinary meal, as the apostle argues in 1 Cor. 11, contrasting the "Lord's supper" with "their own supper," it is none the less true that the Lord's day is in a similar manner distinguished from every other day of the week. Notably it was upon this day that the Lord arose. How salutary therefore that the joyful associations of His resurrection should be mingled with and tempered by the solemn remembrance of His death. It was also upon the first day of the week that the Lord twice appeared to the apostles when gathered together (John 20:19, 26); while upon the same day of the week the Holy Ghost descended at Pentecost to form and indwell the church of God on earth. So that there is no lack of reason for the settled custom of breaking bread on the Lord's day as shown to exist at Troas.

So much for the occasion or time upon which it was usual for them to gather together; let us now consider their intention in so assembling. This is lucidly and definitely expressed in the scripture before us,

and on the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed to them.

Their professed object is thus specifically declared to have been "to break bread." And this is stated without word or comment, which would certainly have been added had there been anything peculiar in this celebration.

It is well to note that, though Paul himself was there, his presence was not allowed to overshadow the claims of the Lord. For it was avowedly the breaking of bread that brought them together, showing what supreme control it had over their hearts, and that even the ministry of the great apostle himself ranked but as a secondary matter. No doubt the bulk of the saints were there; and after announcing the Lord's death, advantage was taken by Paul to discourse to them in a farewell fashion, "being about to depart on the morrow."

---

1. As recorded in 1 Cor. 11:23-26, which was written before the event in Troas occurred (Acts 20).

It cannot but be believed that, in the previous week, the active and zealous servant of Christ used every opportunity to impart the truth to the brethren both in public and in private. But now he was on the point of leaving them -- perhaps to see their faces no more. And the apostle loved them every one as a father loves his children. As he spoke, his heart swelled with that tender anxiety for their spiritual welfare peculiarly characteristic of Paul; so that he prolonged the word till midnight. Blessed season of refreshing without doubt! But the Holy Ghost is particular to record the facts in such a way as to leave it unmistakable that the saints, without in the least undervaluing apostolic gift, met together, not to hear the farewell discourse, but to break bread.

But another point deserves consideration. The correct reading, without question, is as already quoted, "when we were gathered together" &c., not "when the disciples came together" &c. The emendation is by no means unimportant and rests on ample authority. The action of gathering together is not referred to the local saints only, but the expression implies that the visitors also joined. Paul and his company were as much concerned in the assembling together as the disciples in Troas. In the revised form of the text there is not the slightest ground for the unworthy assumption that the band of labourers were themselves relieved from the responsibility, not to say privilege, of breaking bread, nor for the equally baseless inference that the Lord's Supper is a mere matter of local arrangement. On the contrary, the coming together was the united action of the whole assembly of God in Troas including the travelers.

In reference to the expression, "when we gathered together," it should not be overlooked that while "we" is often used in the Acts to indicate Luke's own presence in connection with the events he is narrating, on the other hand "we" is the invariable word used in the New Testament to introduce what is characteristic of the whole of the saints of God, corporately or in the aggregate.

Thus, when Paul writes in Rom. 5:1, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God," can it be doubted that "peace with God" is the common portion of every soul justified by faith? So throughout the epistle the standing of believers is taught in a similar way. The apparent exception of "I" in Rom. 7:7-25 proves the rule; for there the apostle takes up the case of one not brought into the knowledge of true Christian privilege but groaning under the law. Hence "we" would there be unsuitable, as the verses are not descriptive of the normal condition of the saints of God; consequently "I" is used to set forth what is a transitional state rather than the proper position of a soul in Christ.

So in 1 Cor. 15:51, 52, to select another of the instances which occur almost in every chapter of the Pauline and catholic epistles.

Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.

Here it is evident a revelation is made by the writer himself an apostle and prophet,

concerning the whole and not a portion of the saints of God. It is manifestly not true of the Corinthian assembly nor of Paul and Sosthenes that they should not all sleep. They have all been put to sleep by Jesus long since. But the apostle had no such contracted thought, in saying, "We shall not all sleep," as to limit its application to his contemporaries. He expressed the common privilege of all the saints, inasmuch as there is no necessity for them to pass through death. In like manner, in writing to the Thessalonians, he says, referring to the coming of Lord, "we which are alive and remain shall be caught up" &c., (1 Thess. 4:17). Here as in the epistle to the Corinthians, he contemplates the saints who would be on earth at the Lord's return, without at all implying as some destructive critics suppose, that he had a mistaken assurance of being alive himself. The truth taught is that the general hope and cherished expectation of the saints of God was to be, that they might be not unclothed but clothed upon with their house which is from heaven (2 Cor. 5:2, 3).

In John's first epistle this form of expression is remarkably prevalent, as might be expected in a communication addressed, not to any local assembly, but to the whole family of God in its broadest and most general aspect. "We know" is a formula which constantly occurs.

But surely enough has now been said<sup>2</sup> to indicate that "we" is a recognized mode in the New Testament of enunciating what is universally true in the assembly of God. And it is submitted that in Acts 20:7, "When we came together to break bread," there is an example of this use. The coming together, and the breaking bread were the habitual practice of the church in Troas, and, if there, in all the churches. See 1 Cor. 4:17; 7:17; 11:2, 16.

In accordance with this too, we find in 1 Cor. 10:16, 17, where the principles of distinction between the Lord's table and the table of demons are laid down, that similar language is used.

The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread [and] one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.

The unity of the "we" is expressly declared -- one loaf, one body. It is the general truth that is in question, and would apply in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Troas, as much as in Corinth. But in 1 Cor. 11, where the apostle takes up the particular malpractices of the Corinthian assembly in regard of the Lord's Supper, "ye" is used.

---

2. It will hardly be necessary to point out that the apostles sometimes use the plural pronoun in reference to themselves and their fellow laborers. There is nothing of particular import in this, as there is in the usage above mentioned. On the other hand, the apostle sometimes alludes to his own personal attainments; as "For me to live is Christ" (Phil. 1:21). "Be ye followers of me, even as I am of Christ" (1 Cor. 11:1); so in 2 Cor. 12. This he predicates of his own experience, vouching nothing for others.

When ye come together therefore, this is not to eat the Lord's supper (1 Cor. 11:20).

Here the local misbehavior is the subject, and not universal practice.

In Acts 20:7 therefore, as it stands in the corrected text, it is taught that it was the established custom of the assembly of God to come together on the first of the week for the express purpose of breaking bread. The words can mean nothing else; for none will seriously contend that "we" includes only Luke and those with him and that it was the party of travelers who came together to break bread, while the others gathered to hear Paul's discourse.

It has already been noted that the gathering together of the saints at Troas (Acts 20:7) was the united action of the assembly in that town. And the phraseology employed is such as indicates a common and habitual custom of the church of God. This indication is certainly obscured in our ordinary version through the use of the third person for the first. But the revised and other critical translations restore the true force of the passage by rendering a better text "when we were gathered together to break bread" (v. 7), and again, "in the upper chamber where we were gathered together" (v. 8).

These words are sufficiently precise to establish that we have here a spontaneous action in concert of the assembly; while not a syllable implies that they were specially summoned to hear Paul's parting instructions and exhortations. In further confirmation of this view, it may be not without profit and interest to refer briefly to similar expressions used in this very book.

The assembly in Jerusalem was certainly not specially convoked on the occasion recorded in Acts 4:31. On the contrary it was so much the habitual arrangement for them to be together at that particular time, that Peter and John, on being dismissed with threats by the Jewish council, went direct to their own company where united prayer was made to God.

And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together (συνηγμένοι as in Acts 20:7, 8: cf. Acts 4:31).

In contra-distinction from this instance of formal and customary meeting we find that, when Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch after their tour of service in the gospel, they "gathered the church together" and "rehearsed all that God had done with them" (Acts 14:27). Again, when Barnabas and Paul with Judas and Silas returned to the same place with a certain communication from the assembly at Jerusalem, it states "when they all gathered the multitude together, they delivered the epistle" (Acts 15:30). In like manner, Paul calls together the Ephesian elders to Meletus (Acts 17:17).

Here then are three instances of special gatherings of the saints by invitation, and each is distinguished by that form of expression we might expect from the stated and usual gatherings of the saints in their corporate capacity.

At Troas therefore we are undoubtedly taught that the visitors gathered together

along with the whole assembly to break bread, just as Barnabas and Paul had previously done for a whole year at Antioch (Acts 11:26); and those who deny this wrest the scripture to the damage of their own souls and of the souls of others.

But turning to another kind of perversion of the truth there are those<sup>3</sup> who will have it that breaking of bread has reference to the love-feast or the social meal eaten by the early Christians and not to the Lord's supper except as a minor adjunct; but not so those who are bound by the clear and unequivocal language of scripture.

The usage of the phrase "breaking of bread" in the Acts is surely convincing in itself. Speaking of the Pentecostal assembly, the record is

and they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers (Acts 2:42).

This use of the term along with "the apostles' doctrine and fellowship" and the "prayers" forbids our reducing the breaking of bread to common social intercourse or even the lovefeast. Indeed it is expressly distinguished from ordinary meals in the verses that follow.

And they continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favour with all the people (vv. 46, 47).

So that breaking of bread cannot be confounded with eating meat on this occasion; and it is the evident intention of the Spirit that they should not be so confounded.

In the passage, Acts 20, the same distinction is maintained. In v. 11, after the Eutychian episode, Paul returned to the upper chamber, broke the bread, ate, and conversed till break of day. This does not sound like the Eucharist as it is often supposed to be,<sup>4</sup> which is invariably referred to as the action of the whole assembly.

3. Such as Bengel *in loco*, "Itaque credibile est, *fractione pantis* hic denotari convivium discipulorum cum eucharistia conjunctum, praesertim quum esset tam solennis valedictio."

4. "The bread . . . points to the Eucharist" says Canon Cook on this passage in the *Speakers Commentary*. London, 1880. [The article {the} has no such force there if anywhere, being inserted or omitted on its regular principles. If the writer present aught objectively before the mind, the article is used; if predicatively, it is withheld. "The" bread in Matt. 26:26, if rightly read, would have meant what was there on the table; but the best edd. with the best MSS have it not, which then conveys simply that the Lord took "bread." So it is in Mark 14:22, Luke 19:19, and 1 Cor. 11:23. It is yet more pertinent to notice that in Acts 2 where the Lord's supper is twice referred to (42, and 43), one statement has, while the other has not the article. Our English usage here is like the Greek. We speak of "the breaking of the bread," when we designate it formally as the well-known Christian institution; but we say if we desire it that certain Christians were "breaking bread" at home. Acts 20:7, as well as 2:48, contradicts the Canon's notion, both being anarthrous {both without the "the"}. Ver. 11 simply shows that, after the incident, Paul *made a meal* of "the" bread. It was the same loaf; but γ. would not be used of the Eucharist, nor would the singular follow that solemn act. On the other hand we see "the bread" employed, and "the breaking of the bread" as the phrase (Luke 24:30, 32) where it was a supper to make Himself known, not the Eucharist. In every way the statement of Canon Cook and of others too is indefensible. [*Ed., B.T.*

(continued...)

Compare v. 7, “when we come together to break bread”; and 1 Cor. 10:16, “The bread which we break.” But in v. 11 it is Paul who breaks the bread, as he does in Acts 27:35, after the fourteen days’ fast on ship-board. Here the apostle, after his discourse and before his long journey which was to commence at dawn, partakes of the loaf to satisfy his hunger; so that eating in this case is not participating in the feast of remembrance, but taking a meal as in Acts 10:10; in connection with which “conversing” is appropriately used, in distinction from the more formal discourse that had gone before.

Page’s note on the passage therefore <sup>5</sup> is quite groundless.

They had come together “to break bread”; this would have taken place naturally at the end of Paul’s discourse but for the interruption; he now therefore resumes the interrupted order of the meeting by breaking the bread.

This comment contains at least two assumptions which are without the slightest scriptural warrant. He assumes (1) that although the saints came together expressly to break bread, the act of remembrance was as a matter of course put aside for the purpose of listening to Paul’s farewell discourse; so that, according to such exposition, to eat the Lord’s supper was but a nominal reason for gathering. And it was quite “natural” too for the feast to be supplanted by ministry of the word, not necessarily introductory to the solemn observance, but as in this case a final charge in view of the apostle’s immediate departure! Such a theory is without the support of a single word of scripture. It is never of the Spirit of God to displace the claims of the Lord by the claims of the church, or of the very foremost of the apostles. If the ministry of Paul was needful to the saints, the breaking of bread was due to the Lord. Nor would the apostle himself be a party to setting aside in any way what he had insisted upon in his recent epistle to the Corinthians.

He could find no word of praise for the assembly at Corinth in respect of their observance of the feast; indeed he sharply rebukes them for the very thing for which misguided men contend as the truth. For it was at Corinth not at Troas where we find the saints allowing social intercourse to stultify if not to destroy the solemn character of the remembrance of the Lord.

What! have ye not houses to eat and drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not? (1 Cor. 11:22).

They truly came together in one place, but it was not (in effect) to eat the Lord’s supper (1 Cor. 11:20). For, although their professed object in gathering was as at Troas to eat the Lord’s supper, on account of the flagrant disorders that prevailed that object was nullified. So that, as the apostle tells them, they came together “not for the better but for the worse” (*ibid*).

It is true that there were in the young Corinthian assembly the excesses of

4. (...continued)  
{W. Kelly}.

5. *Acts of the Apostles* (Macmillan 1886) p. 213.

drunkenness and gluttony but the principle enforced is that the Lord’s desire on the night in which He was betrayed is paramount to all besides. And this principle effectually disposes of every human arrangement that tends to enfeeble the transcendent claims of the Lord’s supper, whether it be an agape or a liturgy or a sermon apostolic (or otherwise).

The second assumption in the quotation made above is (2) that as a matter of course Paul breaks the bread -- that is, in an official capacity. This like wise is without scriptural support. We have seen that the reference is to eating to appease hunger, and not to the feast of remembrance at all (v. 11).

But so far from affording ground for presidency <sup>6</sup> at the table of the Lord, scripture teaches that there all saints meet as one for the remembrance of Him. The Corinthians in their levity were introducing class distinctions at the supper, and even of a worldly character: the rich ignored the poor; self, not Christ, ruled to their shame. The apostle gravely reproved them and told them plainly that, in bringing personalities into prominence, they made it “their own” supper and not the Lord’s.

The truth is that the breaking of bread is the action of the whole assembly of saints at which the Lord and none else presides, not even Paul or Peter. For the same one who declared himself not one whit behind the very chiefest of the apostles also confessed himself as less than the least of all saints. When it was a question of communicating the truth of God, he did so as an apostle and a prophet, as a teacher and a preacher. When it was a question of remembering the Lord he mingled with the rest. But it was the carnal desire for formalism that introduced the figment of ministerial administration in sub-apostolic days to the immeasurable loss of all concerned. What the Lord designed to bring the souls of His own in contact with Himself (“This do in remembrance of Me”), man thus perverts by setting up a medium between the soul of the saint and the One he remembers. Surely every child of God should resist such an innovation and all else that would hinder or mar the true character of the hallowed fellowship at the table of the Lord. W. J. H.

\* \* \* \* \*

[NOTE. Is it not instructive to notice that the correction of abuse (which the apostle effected by recalling the Lord’s supper in its true order, aim, and character as revealed expressly to himself) is introduced and closed, before the subject of the Holy Spirit and of His varied action in gift is entered on? No one would think of so treating either the one or the other according to the traditional practice of Christendom. For men are apt unconsciously to read and interpret scripture according to their ecclesiastical habits day by day. It is clear that God has written His word so as to be a standard of truth, to let us know what His mind was from the

6. [Presiding, or taking the lead, is quite proper in its own place, as we may see in Acts 15:22, Rom. 12:8, 1 Thess. 5:12, Heb. 13:7, 17, 26. Indeed, it was the prime duty of elders (1 Tim. 5:17), not necessarily teaching, but ruling or presiding. Only scripture nowhere mixes it up with the Lord’s supper, the nature and order of which exclude it there.- *Ed. B.T.*]

beginning, and thus to counteract that slipping away from His will, which is even more easy and inveterate in the Christian profession than it was in the previous Jewish one. The leveling of God's order is religious rebellion. This was at work actively at Corinth against the apostle himself. Similar evils have developed more and more to this day. All the more are the faithful called to own and honor His good pleasure.

And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers,

&c. God has not abdicated His rights. But this other weighty matter is distinctly and designedly separated from the due and divinely appointed celebration of the Lord's Supper. The disorder therein was not made the charge of elders even, or of any other official, but pressed home on the conscience and spiritual feelings of the saints themselves. Meanwhile the Lord, Whom they forgot, did not forget to chasten the guilty that they might not be condemned with the world.

The fact is that few of God's children are conscious how great and wide the departure is from the only standard of authority. Thus do we often hear of the church teaching this or that. How opposed to scripture! The church is taught and never teaches. The word of God comes to the church, and to all the church (not to one only), never from it: and for this God employs His servants. It is ministerial work, not at all the church's place. But the Lord's supper is essentially the church's feast, wherein ministers, however eminent, merge as saints, and the Lord alone is exalted in the communion of His infinite love and the incalculable indebtedness of each and all to His death.

The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not communion with the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread, one body; for we all partake of the one bread (1 Cor. 10:16, 17).

Sin once leveled all where difference vanished; so does grace now in the remembrance of Him. It is good and right to own the Lord in every servant He sends; it is as least as good, if not better still, even here below to enjoy that blessed and holy supper, where such distinctions disappear in remembering Him Who died for our sins, and Who deigns to give His real presence in our midst.

[Ed. B. T. {W. Kelly}].

(W. J. Hocking in *The Bible Treasury* 20:246-248, 261-263).

\* \* \* \* \*

### *Further Remarks on the First Day of the Week*

One would think that in Acts 20:7, "the first day of the week," is plain enough for anyone to understand. One would think that "the first day of the week" means something different than "seventh day of the week." The Messianic Jew, Dr. David Stern, wrote:

But what was meant by "the first day of the week"? (p. 297)

This is really an unbelieving question. He does not want it to mean exactly what the words explicitly state. He really wants it to be the seventh day, the Sabbath. He is a Sabbath-keeper and therefore undermines the Lord's day. In Acts 20:7 we see what the practice of the early Christians was and this sets aside a major element of Messianic Judaism, and so the text must be Judaized, transmuted into the seventh day. It hardly seems credible that persons do such things, but this has had a long history among non-Jews also. So he discusses whether Saturday night is meant or Sunday night is meant. The fact is that it does not matter because the text explicitly states:

And the first day of the week, we being assembled to break bread . . . (Acts 20:7).

What night it was is not the issue. The issue is: what day of the week did they assemble to break bread? Whatever night it was, it was *the first day of the week*, not the seventh day. If it had been the seventh day, the text would have said:

And the seventh day of the week, we being assembled to break bread . . .

Had that been said, it would be pressed that that is what the text explicitly states. But it explicitly states otherwise and so Messianic Judaism will not have it that way. He says:

In various places this commentary notes the Christian Church's tendency to expunge Jewish influences, and I think an instance arises when the present verse is understood to refer to Sunday night (p. 298).

He claims that "the Christian Church" has expunged Jewish influence in this text. The inverse is true. Judaizing Messianic Judaism is influencing his mind to place the Jewish Sabbath into the text. And this is a remarkable sample of the thrust of his whole book. It represents a major, systematic, Judaizing distortion of the NT. Acts 20:7, he says, in effect, refers to the seventh day. Thus we see that in this system, no text will stand in the way of the program of Messianic Judaism.

We may quite assuredly understand Acts 20:7 to refer to "the first day of the week"! The Spirit of God expressly directed us to which day of the week it was that the disciples broke bread, but this does not suit the Judaizing. Not surprisingly, he thinks that Rev. 1:10 means the Day of the Lord (of Jehovah). That conveniently gets rid of any connection of "the Lord's day" being the first day of the week. Let us hear a little more of his reasoning on Acts 20:7:

A Saturday night meeting would continue the God-oriented spirit of *Shabbat*, rather than require believers to shift their concern from workaday matters, as would be the case on Sunday night.

I do not find the New Testament commanding a specific day of the week for worship. There can be no objection whatever to the practice adopted later by a Gentile-dominated Church of celebrating "the Lord's Day" on Sunday, including Sunday night; but this custom must not be read back into New Testament times. On the other hand, Messianic Jews who worship on Saturday night rather than

Sunday can find warrant for their practice in this verse (p. 298).

**First**, he has rejected the statement of the Holy Spirit in favor of his own reasoning; namely, that Scripture teaches that the practice of the early disciples was:

And the first day of the week, we being assembled to break bread . . . (Acts 20:7).

Do you really have trouble understanding so simple a sentence? Dr. Stern's Judaizing alchemy cannot transmute the Spirit's statement into the seventh day of the week. He has read his desire into the text; and necessarily so, otherwise a main pillar of the system is gone. No one is reading "the first day of the week" back into the text. No one found the seventh day in the text and read "the first day of the week" back into the text. Really, this is pitiable and distressing. To allege that Messianic Jews have warrant from Acts 20:7 to have the Lord's supper on the Sabbath is as utterly absurd as to say that breaking bread on "the first day of the week" has been read back into this text when the text states that:

And the first day of the week, we being assembled to break bread . . . (Acts 20:7).

Regarding a "Saturday night meeting," if we suppose this was in the dark hours of our Saturday night, that would actually be the start of a new day if Luke was using Jewish time where the day is from sunset to sunset. If this is the case, then it was, from the Jewish reckoning of time, the first day of the week.

**Second**, where and when did the Spirit of God authorize him to pronounce that "There can be no objection whatever to the practice adopted later by a Gentile-dominated Church . . ."? when, according to him, such a practice is not found in Scripture. *Messianic Jews* have warrant, he alleges, from Acts 20:7 for a Sabbath celebration of "the Lord's supper," but it is alright for others to do so on a different day -- without God's warrant, but *he* gives *his* permission. When did God authorize him to be generous with His matters? Is that faithful stewardship? (1 Cor. 4:1, 2).

**Third**, what is his Scripture authority for speaking of some as "celebrating 'the Lord's Day' on Sunday," when he holds that Rev. 1:10 refers to the day of Jehovah spoken of by the OT prophets? -- thus eliminating from the NT any reference to "the Lord's day." On Rev. 1:10, see below.

**Fourth**, his statement, "whatever the practice adopted later by a Gentile-dominated Church," is false for two reasons:

1. It assumes his false view of Acts 20:7; and thus, with the truth of the early practice in the apostolic days transmuted into Sabbath observance, he incorrectly states that the Lord's day observance "was a practice adopted later by a Gentile-dominated Church."

2. The historical record was fully and carefully reviewed by the ex- Seventh Day Adventist, D. M. Canright, in his chapter, "Why Christians keep Sunday," tracing back to Justin Martyr (AD 140) and Barnabas (AD 120) to John on Patmos (AD 95) and the early disciples (Acts 20:7) the observance of the Lord's

day.<sup>7</sup>

The practice of the observance of the first day of the week, then, is an unbroken chain from the apostolic era to the present. Yes, Paul used the occasion of the Sabbath day in his evangelizing (Acts 13:14-43, 44-52). This does not prove the notion that Paul was a Sabbath-keeper, or that He partook of the Lord's supper on the Sabbath. The allegation that it does prove that rather indicates the lack of evidence to prove what is alleged.

#### THE LORDLY DAY AND THE LORDLY SUPPER

**The Lord's Day not the Day of the Lord.** Dr. Stern alleges that Rev. 1:10 speaks of the day of the Lord. W. Kelly remarked:

*the*: The criticism [by J. Kelly, *The Apocalypse Interpreted*, 1848] on ἐν πνεύματι is a mistake from inattention to the idiomatic differences of the two languages. The authorized version is quite right, "in the Spirit," *not* "in spirit;" see on a different theme 1 Cor. 12:3,13. Eph. 2:22, &c. On the other hand, if the Greek had been τῷ πνεύματι, it might have been rendered "in spirit," as it is very properly in the authorized version of Matt. 5:3, &c. i.e. "in *their* spirit." The presence of the article, as another has ably shown, does not prove the Holy Ghost to be in question: it may or may not be. In this the article is supplied or omitted, according to the general laws of its usage (*The Prospect* 1:184).

*Lord's*: I am aware that the late Dr. S. R. Maitland, followed by a very few others, ventured to deny that the expression ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ refers to "the Lord's day," and to argue that it means "the day of the Lord," into which he supposed the prophet was carried forward in spirit. The fact is, however, that, first, the expression is pointedly distinct from the prophetic phrase, ἡμέρα κυρίου with or without the article (for it is used either way according to the exact shade of thought intended); secondly, it is the form constantly and regularly used from the earliest ages to express, according to Christian feeling, the first day of the week, as Jews would say, or Sunday, as Gentiles said. Hence Justin Martyr, wishing to defend Christians and their faith before heathen, uses their term, but in a sort of apologetic way, τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρα. (Apol. i. 67, ed. Otto, 1842, i. 268-270). Where no such motive operated, the phrase of St. John is employed, as in the alleged Epistles of Ignatius to Magnesians, ix., μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες; so also in Clem. Alex. Strom. v. vii. 12; in Iren. Fragm. vii., ed. Bened. 342, and in Euseb. H.E. iv. 23, 26; v. 23. There is no need to multiply later references, nor to prove that it was so understood by the Latins or by those who spoke in other tongues. It is as certain as any such matter can be that the meaning is "the Lord's day," and

7. *Seventh-Day Adventism Renounced After an Experience of Twenty-Eight Years by a Prominent Minister and Writer of that Faith*, Nashville: Goodpasture, 1948 reprint of the 14<sup>th</sup> ed. The book has another chapter, "Did the Pope Change the Sabbath?," meeting another false allegation. The book deals quite thoroughly with the falseness of Sabbath-keeping.

nothing else.<sup>8</sup>

**Disparaging the Lord's Day.** The effect of Sabbath-keeping<sup>9</sup> is the disparagement of the Lord's day. It is worse than that, but it has that effect. W. Kelly wrote:

For the "Lord's day" is not at all the same thing as the day of the Lord (*ἡμέρα Κυρίου*)." The same expression (*κυριακός*) was used with regard to the Lord's supper, because it was not a common meal, but a holy and divinely instituted memorial of the Lord. So the Lord's day is not a common day, but one specially set apart, not as a command, but as the expression of the highest privilege, for the worship of the Lord. The sabbath was the last day which Jehovah claimed out of man's week; the Lord's day is the first day of God's week, and in a sense, we may say, of His eternity. The Christian begins with the Lord's day, that this may as it were give a character to all the days of the week. In spirit the Christian is risen, and every day belongs to the Lord. Therefore is he to bring up the standard of each day that follows in the week to that blessed beginning -- the Lord's day. To bring down the Lord's day to the level of another day only shows how gladly the heart drinks in anything that takes away somewhat from Christ. The man who only obeys Christ because he must do so has not the spirit of obedience at all. We are sanctified not only to the blood of sprinkling, but to the obedience of Jesus Christ {1 Pet. 1:2} — to the obedience of sons under grace, not to that of mere servants under law. The lawlessness which despises the Lord's day is hateful; but that is no reason why Christians should destroy its character by confounding the Lord's day, the new creation-day, with the sabbath of nature or of the law.<sup>10</sup>

The Lord's supper is the Lordly supper and the Lord's day is the Lordly day. It was even the day to which the Apostle directed the saints to prepare their giving of their substance unto the Lord (1 Cor. 16:1, 2). Indeed, the sacrifice of praise and the sacrifice of giving are found together in Heb. 13:15, 16. This does not surprise those who know what the words "the first day of the week" in Acts 20:7 mean. Actually, anyone who has learned to count knows what "first" is and that it does not mean "seventh."

#### SEVERAL FEASTS OF JEHOVAH POINT TO THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK

The Lord's day, the first day of the week, was the day Christ fulfilled the type of waving of the first fruits waved before Jehovah on **the next day after the Sabbath** (Lev. 23:11) by rising from among the dead on the day after the weekly Sabbath.

8. *Bible Treasury*, New Series 9:375.

9. We do not accept the spiritual alchemy of Christendom that transmutes the Sabbath into the Lord's day so that the Christian is to keep the Sunday-Sabbath. This comes from theology that wants to apply the 10 commandments to the believer and therefore having to account for the entire 10, the alchemist spiritually alchemizes the seventh day into the first day. It is Judaizing! The Christian is dead to the law (Rom. 7:4), not under law (Gal. 5:18), but he is under the law of the Christ (Gal. 6:2) and is to walk according to the rule of the new creation, whether he is a believing Gentile or one of the Israel of God (an ethnic Jew who is saved). See Gal. 6:15, 16. Both are to walk according to the rule of the new creation.

10. *Lectures on the Book of Revelation*, London: Morrish, p. 19, n.d.

Pentecost was also **the day after the Sabbath** (Lev. 23:15, 16).<sup>11</sup> Thus was linked together the day of Christ's resurrection and the day on which the omnipresent Spirit *came in a special capacity*, sent from both the Father and the exalted Christ consequent upon His exaltation in glory, to form the body of Christ (John 16:13; Acts 2:32, 33; 1 Cor. 12:13). This points to a new order of testimony (the two wave-loaves, made of the same grain as the sheaf of the first-fruits, Lev. 23) before God takes up Israel in the future when He brings them into the bond of the covenant (Ezek. 20). Israel is not now, nor are Christians, in the bond of the covenant. The new covenant is for the new Israel when they have the new priesthood under the new Melchizedec order of Christ when He is priest upon His throne and builds the new temple (Zech. 6:13).

### *Where the Messianic Judaizing of the Lord's Day and the Lord's Supper May Lead*

In a book by Barney Kasdan, a leader of "one of the largest Messianic {professed Jewish Christians} congregations in the world," we read:

How often one should celebrate the "Lord's supper" has been debated. The key phrase for understanding the answer is contained in 1 Corinthians 11:26: . . . Some churches interpret this to mean as often as you drink a ceremonial cup. That could be every Sunday, once a month or any other designated time of celebration. My personal view is that the most natural interpretation from the context is to partake of the cup every Passover . . . Our Messianic congregation celebrates the Lord's supper every year at our Passover Seder.<sup>12</sup>

The "most natural interpretation" is nothing less than blatant *eisegesis* (placing into the text) to force Judaism into such Scriptures. As someone said:

Wonderful things in the Bible I see,  
Things that are put there by you and by me.

The taking of what some call the Lord's supper once a year on a first day of the week is very deplorable. But here, even the day itself is switched to suit Judaizing, their "service" being held on whatever day Passover may fall. In Rom. 14, the weak brother is one who has scruples about some things Jewish, scruples concerning some things from a system once sanctioned by God for the first man (in the persons of the Jews) while under trial. With that, patience is called for. Not so with this most reprehensible Judaizing. It is not a scruple, or a mistake. It is part of a Judaistic system, warned against in Gal. 4:10. There is but one day, and one day only, presented in Scripture for the Christian. It is the Lord's day, the first day of the week, the day upon which He rose from among the dead. Just imagine how it would

11. See *The Seven Set Feasts of Jehovah*, available from Present Truth publishers.

12. *God's Appointed Times*, Baltimore, Lederer Publications, pp. 29, 30 (1993).

be brought forward by supporters of this Judaizing if the apostle had written, “I became in [the] Spirit on the Passover.” But I do not say that all Messianic Jews do this.

Mitch Glaser, “minister-at-large with Jews for Jesus, San Francisco,” misused Gal. 2:24 and Col. 2:16-17 this way:

The feasts and laws of the Lord were a tutor (Galatians 3:24) to lead the Israelites to the Savior. The apostle Paul described the Hebrew calendar as a “mere shadow” of what was to come. He wrote . . . (Colossians 2:16-17). The apostle was not condemning those Jewish Christians who wished to continue celebrating the Jewish holidays. Rather Paul asserted that the festivals lead to Christ.<sup>13</sup>

None of this is true:

But before faith came, we were guarded under law, shut up to faith [which was] about to be revealed. So that the law has been our tutor up to Christ, that we might be justified on the principle of faith. But faith having come, we are no longer under a tutor; for ye are all sons by faith in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:23-25).

The law was not for the purpose to lead Israel *to* Christ. That is not the teaching in these verses. The law was a tutor *up to* a certain point. The law is no longer that tutor. *Faith* has come. That is, a new way of God’s dealing with man has been introduced. The tutor has been displaced. The law said *do* and *do not*. Faith says *Christ has done* what I need for salvation. This is appropriated by faith. Col. 3:16-17 says:

Let none therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in matter of feast, or new moon, or sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body [is] of Christ.

The writer must think this is the apostle’s authorization to engage in those things. The writer wants it that way, because he wants the shadow. He may say that he has “the body” also; but as the shadow is used, it affects the apprehension of the body -- which has displaced the shadow. The fact is the apostle is here condemning the use of the shadows. The way to have no one judge him (of Judaizing) is by avoiding the use of the shadows. W. Kelly remarked:

Verse 16 deals with a Judaizing character of evil.<sup>14</sup>

“The body [is] of Christ” means that He has brought in a new order to which those shadows point. It is true that there is something also for the new Israel under the new covenant, which covenant will be put into force in God’s appointed time for Israel in the future, when Messiah reigns before His ancients in glory. Meanwhile, Jewish converts need to take their place in a practical way with the order in force now, just as Gentile converts need to do. Ed.

13. *The Fall Festivals of Israel*, Chicago: Moody Press, p. 11 (1987).

14. *The Bible Treasury* 6:102

## *God’s Sovereignty and Glory in the Salvation of Lost Man*

### *Chapter 3*

## *The Sovereignty of God in John’s Gospel*

(Continued)

### *6. The Son Chooses*

#### JUDAS “CHOSEN” FOR SERVICE, NOT SALVATION

There are several references to choosing in John’s Gospel. The first one involves Judas:

Have not I chosen you the twelve? And one of you is a devil. Now he spoke of Judas . . . (John 6:70).

Choosing Judas was not a choosing for salvation but for service. The Lord Jesus knew from the beginning who would deliver Him up (John 6:64) but chose Judas anyway. Judas, being what he was, was to be used in God’s ways for bringing about the cross. All the twelve were “with me from [the] beginning” (John 15:27). So it is clear that the Lord knew Judas’ case when Judas was chosen. Well, of course! One of the things that is shown in John’s gospel is the Lord’s omniscience.

Speaking anticipatively, in view of His giving Himself on the cross, the Lord said to the Father:

When I was with them I kept them in thy name; those thou hast given me I have guarded, and not one of them has perished, but the son of perdition,<sup>1</sup> that the scripture might be fulfilled (John 17:12).

Judas was lost. It is quite clear that he was not one of those given by the Father to the Son:

[As to] those whom thou hast given me, I have not lost one of them (John 18:9).

The eleven were “clean” as we learn in John 13, where we see that Judas was not clean:

1. JND has a footnote to the word perdition: ‘Perished’ and ‘perdition’ are verb and noun from one Greek root: they show what Judas belonged to.

and ye are clean but not all (John 13:11).

Acts 1:17 also bears on the point that Judas was chosen for service (not salvation):

for he was numbered amongst us, and had received a part in this service.

The Lord Jesus had said that His sheep hear His voice and that He knows them (John 10:27). But Judas was only a professor without possession, and is of the class noted in Matt. 7:21-23, where He says of those, "I never knew you." He could not say that to Judas if Judas was one of His sheep. He would have to say to Judas, 'I knew you once, but I do not know you anymore.' Such would fit the notion of conditional security of the Arminians. But there is no such thing as Christ's knowing those whom He has chosen, and then subsequently having to say to them "I never knew you." The Lord warned that many fit in this class of mere profession without reality. They never were His, spite of their pretense -- and even their claim to have worked miracles!

#### I KNOW THOSE WHOM I HAVE CHOSEN

I speak not of you all. I know those whom I have chosen; . . . (John 13:18).

. . . but I have called you friends, for all things which I have heard of my Father I have made known to you. Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and have set you that ye should go and [that] ye should bear fruit, and [that] your fruit should abide . . . (John 15:15, 16).

Judas was not among the elect -- really, he never was among the elect, never was chosen as these Scriptures speak of it. "I speak not of you all" (John 13:18) was said when Judas was present. Judas, having received the morsel, left (John 13:30). When the Lord spoke the words in John 15:15, 16, Judas was not there. "Have set you . . . [that] ye should bear fruit" is His divine action, as is His choosing them and affirming that they did not choose Him. Thus is their will excluded in the choosing.<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, of these elect ones, the Lord said:

If the world hate you, know that it has hated me before you. If ye were of the

2. N. Geisler made a remarkable attempt to circumvent the true force of this. He wrote:

The context here favors it being a reference to Jesus' choice of the Twelve to be His disciples, not God's choice of the elect to eternal salvation. After all, Jesus is speaking to the eleven apostles (John 15:8; 16:7). In addition, the word "chosen" by God is used of persons who are not the elect. Judas, for example, was "chosen" by Christ but was not one of the elect: "Jesus replied, 'Have not I chosen you the Twelve? Yet one of you is a devil!'" (John 6:70) (*op. cit.*, p. 72 [73, 74]).

One part of the context is that Judas was absent. Moreover, He had already spoken of the choice of the twelve to be His disciples in John 6, with the clear notice that it was not sovereign election to life or fruit-bearing because Judas' true state is noted. The context here is fruit-bearing and that He had "set you that ye should go and [that] ye should bear fruit." It was a certainty from which Judas is necessarily excluded. The context is sovereign choosing and sovereign appointment to fruit-bearing. The context is also vv. 18, 19. Judas could not be said to be "not of the world" (v. 19). It is the eleven of whom it is said, "chosen you out of the world" (v. 19). That the word *choose* can be used in more than one context does not negate any of this.

world, the world would love its own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, on account of this the world hates you (John 15:18, 19).

Judgment is pronounced on the world because light came (i.e., Christ came) "and men have loved darkness rather than light" (John 3:19; see 12:31). It was part of the testing of the first man to see if he was recoverable. And so these that are chosen by Christ are those given to him by the Father, out of the world (John 17:6). Such are not of the world as He is not of the world (John 17:14).

What about the rest of men? Is there a parallel choosing, or election, that prevents them from coming to the light? Where in John is there even a hint of such a thing? The rest of men are left where they were, in their self-willed refusal of the light. They are left in their responsibility -- never met.

### 7. *The Believer Sees the Son and Hears His Voice*

#### WE SEE THE SON BECAUSE HE OPENS THE SPIRITUAL SIGHT

Those opposed to the Lord said, "What sign doest thou that we may see and believe?" The question is about seeing with physical eyes, no doubt. In connection with the Lord's healing of the man born blind (John 9), a physical thing with a spiritual lesson in it, the Lord said this:

(39) And Jesus said, For judgment am I come into this world, that they which see not may see, and they which see may become blind. (40) And [some] of the Pharisees who were with him heard these things, and they said to him, Are we blind also? (41) Jesus said to them, If ye were blind ye would not have sin; but now ye say, We see, your sin remains. (John 9:39-41).

Here we pass to the matter of spiritual sight. The unbeliever is blind, as we saw in considering John 1.

. . . in whom the god of this world has blinded the thoughts of the unbelieving, so that the radiancy of the glad tidings of the glory of the Christ, who is [the] image of God, should not shine forth [for] them (2 Cor. 4:4).

Surely John 9 has the lesson that the Son of God is the One who opens the eyes of the blind -- and the lesson is applied in vv. 39-40. Even in v. 5 He pointed out that He was the light of the world. He opens the eyes to see the light. It is His action. Fallen man does not have the faculty to "see." This is imparted by the Son of God. Here is the will of the Father about this:

For this is the will of my Father, that every one who sees {beholds} the Son, and believes on him, should have life eternal; and I will raise him up at the last day (John 6:40).

And he that beholds me, beholds him that sent me (John 12:45).

This also is not a mere physically seeing the Lord Jesus. Again, it is connected with Himself as light, as the next verse shows:

(45) and he that beholds me, beholds him that sent me. (46) I am come into the world [as] light, that every one that believes on me may not abide in darkness (John 12:45, 46).

He imparts the faculty of spiritual light and we behold both Him and the Father.

**WE HEAR THE SON BECAUSE HE OPENS THE SPIRITUAL HEARING**

So faith then [is] by a report, but the report by God’s word (Rom. 10:17).

The Son uses the Word of God instrumentally in causing the spiritually dead to hear His voice. And with that hearing there is faith. John 5:24 says:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, that he that hears my word, and believes him that has sent me, has life eternal, and does not come into judgment, but is passed out of death into life.

A person is here seen in a state of spiritual death. The dead cannot hear. The spiritually dead are caused by the Son of God to hear. Hearing His word is hearing the Word of God. It is the result of His power put forth to quicken the spiritually dead as He brought dead Lazarus to life by the word of His power. Lazarus did not have the faculty of hearing, nor did he respond to the voice of the Son of God as an act of his own ‘moral free will’ towards God. In connection with the Son’s speaking life into him, he heard. So is it with God’s implanting a new nature into the sinner’s soul. Then the person has *life, sees and hears and has faith* -- believes.

God did not supply dead Lazarus with prevenient grace so that he of his ‘free will’ was capable of responding to Christ’s offer of life. Well, of course there was no ‘offer of life’ to Lazarus on Christ’s part. It was rather the Son’s voice of power and command.

As the Lord implants the faculties of spiritual sight and spiritual hearing, so He opens the heart (Acts 16:14).

*The Believer is Secure in the Hand of the Father and of the Son (John 10:28-30)*

**“CONDITIONAL SECURITY” CONTRADICTS THE WORDS OF THE SON**

It is not true that both moral free will towards God and the eternal security of the believer is taught in the Word of God. Yes, eternal security *is* taught, but not the other. Moreover, holding both things is like claiming that one obtains salvation by exercising his moral free will towards God, but he is not able to exercise his moral free will in changing his mind and deciding not to be saved. Once saved, such a one cannot use his alleged free moral will to become unsaved. Is it because he loses his moral free will? Such is the meaning of believing both teachings. The Arminian is at least consistent in his error when he says that a believer may become an unbeliever.

Eternal security is bound up with the fact that a person is born again by an act of

God’s will, as we have seen (John 1:13; James 1:18). God initiates and God maintains:

. . . he who has begun in you a good work will complete it unto Jesus Christ’s day (Phil. 1:6).

In John’s Gospel we see the hands of the Lord Jesus working in unity with the Father, whether the text refers to His physical hands or whether it is figurative. For example, John 8:6-8 shows Him writing with his finger, on the ground. He who in John is presented to us as the great “I am” is Jehovah, who wrote the law with “the finger of God.” In John 8 He maintains the law against those who wanted to pit Him against Moses so as to have a ground of complaint, yet acts in grace to the woman, defeating their evil scheme. To His own He presented His hands and His side (John 20:20-27). The Father has given all things into the into the Son’s hand:

The Father loves the Son, and has given all things [to be] in his hand (John 3:35; see John 13:3).

And that is where the believer is:

(27) My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; (28) and I give them life eternal; and they shall never perish, and no one shall seize them out of my hand. (29) My Father who has given [them] to me is greater than all, and no one can seize them out of the hand of my Father. (30) I and the Father are one (John 10:27-30).

Let us consider an illustration concerning the difference between viewing this according to eternal security and “conditional security.” Here is something from A. Roach in a letter dated July 13, 1979:

I shall contrast here what Scripture says with what Arminianism says.

JOHN 10 SAYS	ARMINIANISM {IN EFFECT} SAYS
I give eternal life	Christ is wrong, you can lose it; it is not eternal
Never perish	Christ is wrong -- you can perish
None can pluck them out of my hand	Christ is wrong. You are stronger than He is and can wiggle out of the strongest hand in the universe
None can pluck out of my Father’s hand	Christ is wrong again, for weak as you are you are stronger than the Father’s hand and can pluck yourself out

It is strange that Arminianism will allow that the devil cannot take you out of Christ’s hand but you who are considerably weaker than the devil can take

yourself out. This isn't even rational. *It is an absurdity.*

#### THE WOLF CANNOT SEIZE US OUT OF THE HAND OF THE FATHER AND THE SON, NOR CAN ANY OTHER

But what Scripture does anyone have for saying that the devil cannot seize the sheep out of the hands of the Father and the Son? Perhaps John 10:28, 29? The word *seize* is the same word as in John 10:12:

but he who serves for wages, and who is not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, sees the wolf coming, and leaves the sheep and flees; and the wolf seizes them and scatters the sheep.

The wolf can seize the sheep and scatter them but he cannot seize them out of the hands of the Father and the Son. Indeed, no one can do that. No, not even oneself, because oneself is "one" of those designated in these verses: "no one can seize them out of my hand."

#### THE SON KNOWS THE SHEEP AS HE KNOWS THE FATHER: JOHN 10:14, 15

(14) I am the good shepherd; and I know those that are mine, and am known of those that are mine, (15) as the Father knows me and I know the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep.

Those spoken of in Matt. 7:21-23 were never known by Christ and so cannot refer to persons once saved and then lost again. There are no such persons. Here we have His knowing those that are His. This means much more than that He happens to know which people are His among the world's population. This is a knowing in accordance with the words, "as the Father knows me and I know the Father." This is not speaking of being acquainted. It is divine knowledge of One Another. And the good Shepherd has divine knowledge of those that are His; and they have divine knowledge of Him. This has been implanted into them by Himself and this knowing will subsist eternally, just as in the case of the Father and the Son knowing one another.

There is a knowing between the Shepherd and the sheep as there is between the Father and Him. This refers not to the measure of knowing but to the *character* of it. Moreover, this knowing is *the knowing the person*, not merely knowing *about* the person. As Paul said, "I know whom I have believed" (2 Tim. 1:12). He knew the Person. This is exceedingly precious to our souls. The world knows Him not (John 1:10; 17:25; 1 John 3:2). There is a divine knowledge that we have. See John 6:69 and 1 John 2:13, 14; 5:20.

There were unbelievers that He addressed (v. 26). Why did they not believe?

. . . but ye do not believe, for ye are not of my sheep, as I told you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them . . .

They did not believe because they were not of His sheep. If they were of His sheep they would hear His voice. They were spiritually dead. Like dead Lazarus, they did not hear. How could dead Lazarus hear? He heard the voice of the One who is the

resurrection and the life because that One gave Lazarus hearing. It was a divine action:

(24) Verily, verily, I say unto you, that he that hears my word, and believes him that has sent me, has life eternal, and does not come into judgment, but is passed out of death into life. (25) Verily, verily, I say unto you, that an hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that have heard shall live (John 5:24, 25).

And this is what produces the new life in the soul. It was not the result of an alleged human act of their will. They were dead and in need of quickening (cp. Eph. 2:1-5, where the *two correlative terms* are used: *dead* and *quicken*). It is a divine, sovereign action of the Son, as also in the case of dead Lazarus, who is such a wonderful illustration of these blessed powers of the Son as both the resurrection and the life (John 11:25). And this is why the sheep have eternal life. This is why they know Him. This is why they hear His voice. He has sovereignly brought this about apart from human faculty or human agency.

No wonder that we have such words regarding the security of the sheep in John 10:28-30. No one, no demonic being, nor any one else, including of course oneself, can seize the believer out of the hands of the Father and the Son. And what is bound up with this expression of the divine preservation of the believer is the Lord's statement:

I and the Father are one.

Thus is the blessed and infinite unity of purpose of the Father and the Son brought before us as bearing on the divine preservation of the believer. This is an example of John 5:19-20:

The Son can do nothing of himself save whatever he sees the Father doing: for whatever things *he* does, these things also the Son does in like manner. For the Father loves the Son and shews him all things which he himself does . . .

See John 17:10. The Son does not act independently but only does what He sees the Father doing; and the Father shows the Son *all things* that He Himself does. Here we see the action of the divine Persons carried out in infinite unity. This involves omnipotence and omniscience. And this undergirds the preservation of the saints. However it may not have been intended, the idea of "conditional security" libels the Father's and Son's omnipotence and unity of purpose. The only condition is Their ability to preserve the saints, and that ability is unquestionable. That any professed Christian dreams that he has the inherent ability to keep himself saved is absurd; but that is just what "conditional security" pretends is possible.

(To be continued if the Lord will)

Ed.

## *New Pamphlet*

### *The Discipline of Children*

Short and pointed 16 page pamphlet, 4" x 6."

**PRICE:** 75 cents.

**POSTAGE** for all orders to PTP: \$3.00 on orders under \$20.00 in North America; 10% postage on all orders over \$20.00. Foreign postage is higher (see catalog for foreign postage schedule. A catalog may be down-loaded from [presenttruthpublishers.com](http://presenttruthpublishers.com)).

**GENERAL DISCOUNT ON PTP PUBLICATIONS IS:**

10-24 pieces of one item:	20%
25-99 pieces of one item:	30%
100 and up pieces:	40%

## *The Girdle of Truth*

This magazine was published in the late 1850s and early 1860s. It is available from PTP in one massive volume containing nine volumes of the original *The Girdle of Truth*, four pages of the original to one page of this 8 ½ x 1 1 book. It is bound in library Buckram, hard cover. The printing is very readable in good-sized type.

The pages are printed as image files of the original and thus the reader will have the original pagination of all nine volumes of the original.

It is not expected that when the present small stock is gone, that there will be another printing.

**PRICE:** \$68.00.

**POSTAGE:** see above

## *In the Beginning and the Adamic Earth,* *by W. Kelly,*

first published in *The Bible Treasury* in 1891 and as a book in 1994  
The position taken in this book has been called the "Gap Theory," referring to the space of time between Gen. 1 verses 1 and 2. However, the view presented does not require that a 4 billion year evolutionary process took place during that interval, as many websites opposing this view claim is involved in the "Gap Theory."

A belief in a 4 billion year evolution of life commonly involves the "big bang" theory of the origin of the universe. Really, it is implicit in this theory to believe in the eternity of matter and that matter goes through cycles eternally (unless it spontaneously generates). Yes, some Christians say that God caused the big bang -- to get around the eternity of matter. Just the same, a "big bang" is a "big nonsense" theory, or worse.

Heathen cosmogonies have order arising out of chaos. The "big bang" has order arising from an explosion. How many design engineers wish they could have accomplished their work of designing equipment by using little explosions. It would have saved much planning and effort. Oh, it is objected, time, sufficient time, is needed. Well, the Greek god Chronos (the god of time) had to do his magical work in connection with the "big bang." It took him a mere 4 billion years to produce humans who believe that an explosion can bring about order and the appearance of design. So a great temple, labeled evolution, has been built to Chronos, the god of time; and in this temple men, fettered by biological, paleontological, social, and psychological theories fathered by the notion that man has developed from an animal ancestry (the product of the explosion), pay homage to the explosion and to Chronos. And in that temple the product of the explosion is now investigating the explosion! Perhaps the explosion created Chronos. Perhaps the explosion is god, the evolver of all things.

Man is a kind of evolver and would like to be a creator; but he would make the true Creator into an evolver (as in theistic evolution) -- or throw out the idea of God altogether (as in atheistic evolution). Faith finds its assurance in the written Word of God, a refreshing and important contrast from the speculations of men.

The earth's crust has been basically formed catastrophically in contrast to the uniformitarian idea involving Chronos' work. It is true that recent uniformitarianism has made some room for some catastrophes that it is thought can be accommodated into the uniformitarian scheme -- such as the alleged dinosaur extinction some alleged 65 billion years ago -- as long as the over-all scheme is maintained. On the other hand, the "young earth" advocates place the catastrophism all (essentially) within the flood of Noah's day. But it may not be correct to place all catastrophism into that great event. There may have been a number of creative acts of God, and a number of catastrophes, between Gen. 1:1 and 2.

W. Kelly's book rejects the idea of Chronos' work, and evolution, drastically reducing the time-scale but without attempting to force all into the Flood era. W. Kelly's book has been reprinted as a large pamphlet to reduce the cost. The price is \$4.00 plus postage of \$3.00 on orders under \$20.00 in North America; 10% postage on all orders over \$20.00. Foreign postage is higher.

# *Types and Symbols of Scripture*

*This is an 8 1/2" by 11" hardbound book in buckram cloth. The articles are drawn from various sources and part of the Table of Content is given below.*

<b>Introductory Notes</b> . . . . .	<b>ii</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b> . . . . .	<b>iii</b>
<b>Some General Considerations</b> . . . . .	<b>1</b>
Is Scripture Typical? A Word on Interpretation . . . . .	1
Types Are of Different Characters . . . . .	2
Resemblances and Contrasts . . . . .	3
Types and Their Teachings . . . . .	3
What About the Mystery and the Types? . . . . .	5
<b>Types of Christ</b> . . . . .	<b>7</b>
Direct Types of Christ with Scriptural Proofs Annexed . . . . .	7
Indirect Types and Figures of Christ . . . . .	8
<b>Scripture Imagery</b> . . . . .	<b>11</b>
<b>Outlines of Lectures On the Tabernacle of Witness, T. Newberry</b> . . . . .	<b>127</b>
<b>The Temple</b> . . . . .	<b>199</b>
<b>The Temple of God</b> . . . . .	<b>203</b>
The Two Temples . . . . .	203
The Worship . . . . .	204
The True Worshipers . . . . .	205
<b>David on His Throne a Type, C.E.S.</b> . . . . .	<b>207</b>
<b>Christ the Substance of Every Shadow</b> . . . . .	<b>217</b>
<b>Inspired Prophecy, W. Kelly</b> . . . . .	<b>219</b>
Chapter 1: Its Nature . . . . .	219
Chapter 2: Its Object . . . . .	227
Chapter 3: Its Occasion . . . . .	231
Chapter 4: Its Sphere . . . . .	233
Chapter 5: Its Language . . . . .	237
Chapter 6: Some Old Testament Prophecies Referred to in the New Testament . . . . .	241
Chapter 7: General Remarks . . . . .	243
<b>Symbols, J. N. Darby</b> . . . . .	<b>247</b>
<b>The Symbols of The Apocalypse Briefly Defined</b> . . . . .	<b>251</b>
<b>Extract from The Catholic Apostolic Body, Or Irvingites, W. Kelly</b> . . . . .	<b>263</b>
<b>Subject Index</b> . . . . .	
<b>Scripture Index: Old testament</b> . . . . .	
<b>Scripture Index: New Testament</b> . . . . .	

Price: \$30.00 plus postage (in North America, \$3.00 up to \$19.99; 10% on all orders over \$20.00. Foreign postage is higher.