

I want to say a few introductory remarks before we start. I've never taught this course before. In fact I've never given a course in Systematic Theology before. What I perhaps have always wished ^{THAT I MIGHT} about. I had the ~~ology~~ ^{ology} ~~in~~ Seminary, and there were many things that I liked very very much, but there were certain aspects, certain attitudes which seemed to be inconsistent with other attitudes and I was rather irritated by it, when I was a student. I was not half so irritated in Theology class as I was when I was in Church History class. We had a professor in those days from Princeton Seminary who could take the most interesting subject in the world and make them dull and dead and everytime I went to his class I came away having a longing to teach Church History myself. But it wasn't my field. The Lord had called me to Old Testament studies and so I never considered going ahead with Church History but when a need arose I stepped into it and I was very happy to have the opportunity to do it, because I had felt when I had Church History that it could be done so differently, then it was. I did not feel quite that way about Systematic Theology, for the Systematic Theology I had in Seminary was far better handled then Church History that I had in Seminary. But there were many points where I had the feeling that there were certain great fundamental structures in the theology which the professors were very properly stressing and that there were certain other places where they were inconsistent, where they took attitudes where they contradicted these. I remember the course began with a session in Rationalism and of ~~Mysticism~~. ~~And~~ Mysticism. And as we went along I had the feeling at times that the Professor himself felt he was a rationalist, and I think its a danger we must avoid, and I don't think we should pretend to be when we really are not. Then through the years I taught in more then one institution and there have been quite a number of people who have taught Systematic Theology and I heard discussions and I discussed it with them. And there are certain emphases that seem to me so vital it seems to me ~~to be brought~~ sometimes to be brought out quite fully and other times not so fully.

So I did not expect that I would myself sometime teach Systematic Theology. I've been thinking about it but for a quarter of a century because of my feeling that the course ought to be the tactful seminary course. It ought to be something that gives the people a vital drive and clear understanding. And it will be tremendously important in your whole Christian service. And so while I had not expected to teach this course and I rather regret having to take the time for it, yet I rejoice in the opportunity ~~namde~~ of trying to do in it that which I think ought to be done, which I pray the Lord will make me capable of doing. Now that does not mean at all that I'm stepping into a field in which I do not feel myself qualified. I certainly do not feel that I am a specialist in Systematic Theology, but ~~theology~~ ^(it) Systematic Theology is the systematic presentation of the truth of scripture. And I've been studying the Old and New Testaments all my life and I've putting great stress on the Old but constantly referring to the New Testament passages. I had the feeling when I was in Princeton Seminary that a great many of our graduates ~~immediate~~ ~~day~~ ~~after~~ ~~receiving~~ ~~what~~ ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~best~~ ~~sound~~ ~~theological~~ ~~anywhere~~ ~~orthodox/training~~ ~~available~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~world~~ ~~at~~ ~~that~~ ~~time~~ ~~went~~ ~~out~~ ~~and~~ ~~became~~ ~~leaders~~ ~~of~~ ~~Modernist~~ ~~groups~~. Perhaps not of Modernist teaching but of Modernist groups. I saw that in many cases. And I was bothered about it because it had one restraint. But as I thought about it in those days I came to the conclusion that one reason for it was that they got a ~~an~~ very thorough training in Hodge which was very very excellent. And then they got some training in exegesis, some training in languages, but the connection was not made really clear in the minds of all. And so they went out saying Hodge teachings this and Hodge teaches that and Hodge teaches the other thing and when they came into stress and strain and contact with other teachings ⁱⁿ which they had confidence which didn't agree, they went back to Hodge for the answer. And if they didn't find that Hodge fully satisfied them they were not ~~not~~ trained ⁽⁵¹⁾ ~~to~~ go back of Hodge

to the source from which Hodge gets it. And I feel that any theology that is true theology must be a thoroughly ^{Biblical} ~~good~~ theology, a theology ^{which} ~~that~~ is a gathering together of the teachings of the Scripture, and presenting them in systematic ^{that} order. And so if that can be made not nearly clear enough ~~perhaps~~ ~~from~~ you ~~do~~ hear me say it, write it on a piece of paper but clear it up. It is a part of your being, the conviction that it is this Bible and what it teaches that is the vital thing and it is important that we be able to prove it from the Bible. Not ~~merely~~ merely from Hodge, or from Scofield or from Chafer or from Warfield or from any other. That would be one of the greatest accomplishments that we have had.

Dr. Robert Dick Wilson used to tell me about Dr. Warfield. I myself was very sorry not to have known Dr. Warfield. He died ~~before~~ a year before I went to Princeton Seminary. But Dr. Wilson told me that Dr. Warfield specialized in Semitics. He went to Germany and he studied in Semitics and he became thoroughly trained in Semitic languages and the study of the problems of the Old Testament. Then he came back to this country and he had rather expected to teach Semitics in ~~the~~ Western Seminary near Pittsburgh but there was no position open right then and he took a pastorate and he was in this pastorate for a year. But while he was there he studied New Testament a great deal, and at the end of the year he was called to Western ~~the~~ Seminary to teach New Testament. So he went there and he taught the New Testament. He wrote a book on Textual Criticism of the New Testament. He took up the books of the New Testament one by one in exegesis and when he just about got through the New Testament ^{he} ~~was~~ was called to Princeton Seminary to be professor of Systematic Theology. And he had the background of the Old Testament study in specialization and after years of teaching the New Testament and working ^{often} thoroughly in it I have ~~always~~ ~~wished~~ ~~from~~ that Warfield had been called to Princeton Seminary two years later. Because if he had he would have ~~completed~~ the New Testament in careful exegetical work. ^{m(7/5)}. I find that ~~his~~ his

Theological writings ~~whom~~ with whom he is dealing was mostly in the ~~programs~~ Prophets and ~~was most~~ in ~~the~~ most of the subjects he is very very excellent. But when he gets into the field of eschatology and particularly when he gets unto the book of Revelation I feel that he goes absolutely haywife. And someone said of him once that one has the feeling of a great mind preoccupied with other matters and trying to dismiss an unfamiliar subject with his little connection with it. ~~(8)~~ Well, I don't see how you can read his writings on Revelation and get any other (8).

Such these other writings but if he had only a year or two more of the New Testament work he would have taken up Revelation not as something on the side to finish up the change in his big field of Systematics in which he was doing such a wonderful job, but as a specific study in itself to go at it with the same scientific method ~~as~~ that he used in the other books of the New Testament that he would have had the time to go at that and I have no doubt that ~~he would have had~~ with thorough, scientific exegesis. So that I feel that for as far as undergraduate work in theology is concerned, or let us say one year of graduate work I feel that I am fully qualified for that. But if it came to the second year of graduate work, I think that a person needs more specialization than I have taken as yet.

The catalog tells of the four courses of Systematic Theology and it tells what is in each. We have in past years more than once had two classes ^{together} together. That's not a new innovation at all. We've done it a number of times, in the past. We have two together. Some of you have had Systematics ^{one} ~~one~~. Some of you have had one, two, and three. Four can be taken as a subject by itself. It can just as well follow one as it can follow three. There are interrelations wherever you start back and forth. The many of our creeds like the Westminster Confession follow the order which Hodge's Theology follows. The Doctrines of God, Man, Christ, ~~and~~ Soteriology, Eschatology. It is a logical order. But some of our creeds like the Heidelberg Catechism start with man and his need and go from man and his need to God who supplies the need.

S-1. 2/1/57. (10)

This course starts with Justification and there is nothing more important of in theology, nothing more important in the whole field ~~in~~ Christianity than Justification. Its our basic difference between the Roman Catholics and Protestants in Justification. They believe in the Deity of Christ. They believe in his death for man's sin. They believe in the great factual matters of the teachings of the Scripture. But as to how God saves us we believe they have made a very serious error. If you make an error at that point its like having a great wonderful electric plant over here which is producing the finest of electricity with tremendous power in it and having the wire broken half way between there and here. It wouldn't give us a bit of light, or a bit of heat in this building. Justification is (11)

human being the vital thing or the other is of no value. Its no value without the other. ^{But} ~~And~~ the other is of no value without it. And so its a good place to start our second semester. Now I notice that the catalog says ~~humanism~~ systematic theology 3, ~~an~~ election, the covenant of grace, the person of Christ, the work of Christ, the application of redemption, justification, adoption and sanctification. Exegesis on the basis of the original language. Memorization ~~from~~ of relavant portions of the Westminster Shorter Catechism. Prescribed three hours, third year, first term. While four starts with the moral law, the victorious life, the ~~sacraments~~ sacraments, general eschatology, and the doctrine of premillennialism. I don't think we can start where ~~we~~ the course says (11) for I am informed that the class of three this time, did not give the last three subjects given in the catalog. Justification, adoption, and sanctification. We will have to start that with justification and we will be rather hampered in having to go more rapidly to cover all the material of four and that in addition. ^{yet while} And ~~though~~ I'm sorry to be hampered I'm a little ^{bit} happy about it because we're starting with the basic fundamental central matter of Protestantism. And so vital to all Christianity.

S-1. 2/1/57. (12½)

And so I'm glad to start our course with justification.

Some assignments have been posted for next week. We will ^{HAVE} not a meeting of any sections in this class before next Thursday. So that means for the full first/week of the semester we have no section meeting, so we will expect six hours of study along with the three hours of lecture. And I have an assignment up there which is a rapid survey ~~assignment~~ assignment. I know that some of you ~~can~~ could put twenty hours in doing it the way you'd like to do it. But that's not the purpose of this assignment. The purpose of this assignment is to get certain vital essentials and I do not want you to ~~do~~ ^{put} more assignments than the six hours on the three assignments. I've given two hours to cover eighty pages. But the way I've asked you to cover it is, just reading the first sentences of each paragraphs and some of the paragraphs so you can read all three if you have time. I'm asking you to make an outline on the basis of those ^{which is a page and a half} with what is necessary. There is one section/which begins, "There are certain very important facts in this area." That's the first sentence in the next reading. Naturally we will ~~not~~ have to go to see what the author says. That full section of a page and a half you will have to read and is perhaps more important than ~~the~~ all the rest of the 18 pages.

But now before we take up in our discussion together (Change here to S-2. 2/1/57). ^{them repeated} Some of you have heard ~~of these things~~ many time. Others of you may not have them very well in mind. But they are so very vital that I think we should take a day or two in getting a clear understanding regarding them, or in reviewing them if you haven't. And so I would call A under this introduction, WHAT IS SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY? And it easy to spell out a text. That is what we will do with this. No. 1. WHAT IS THEOLOGY? No. 2. WHAT IS SYSTEMATIC.

The No. 1. WHAT IS THEOLOGY? Theology is the science of God. That is what the word means. Science of God. Originally the science of God : - 2

that is, in the ^{recent} middle ages, included everything. ~~It~~ After all God made the tree so the study of trees is the study of theology. God made the ocean so the study of the ocean is a part of theology. God made electricity so the study of electricity is the part of theology. And the word was used in the Middle Ages to include everything. Just as the word Philosophy ~~included~~ even as recently as a hundred years ago included everything that we today call science.

But the word theology has become restricted much nearer to its etimological meaning, the Science of God, but not completely to it by any means. We do not when we say theology simply mean the study of God Himself, nor do we mean, as the Middle Ages did, the study of God and everything He has made, but we mean the study of God and that which is vital in our relationship with Him. We mean the study of God in His relation ^{to} ~~with~~ His creatures, in particular his relation ^{the} to human being whom He has formed. We mean those things that make a difference as to the continuing relation of man's creatures with Himself and their ultimate destiny. So a very great part of theology is concerned with works in not ~~human~~ ~~man~~ directly ~~to~~ God, but concerns/God's/relation to us, or even with our relation to Him. But we should keep in mind the etimological origin of it in centering God, ^{Its} ~~the~~ ~~emphasis~~ emphasis is God. It is God's relation to us. It is not like the study of how we can get ourselves warmed. We need the fire to get warm. There is a similarity. But the emphasis is on the other end. The great God in relation to man rather than man and his deeds. We would certainly give an other title ^{if} ~~is~~ that was the emphasis.

Now is it right to have such a science as the science of theology, the science of God? What can we know about God? How can we have such a science as the science of God? There could very easily be a good scientific name originated for the science of the study of the ^{side of the} moon that is away from the earth. We could make a science but we would be very foolish. Not because we do not believe that there is another side to the moon. We believe there is another side to the moon. And we believe that that other side of the moon has solidity. We believe that there is solid matter there, we believe that

there is color there, but everything we believe about it is simply a guess on what we can see on this side of it. No human being has ever seen the other side of the moon. No human being has ever been to the other side of the moon. No one has as yet found any way of bouncing any radar waves off any thing and on to the moon, and back on to the other thing, and back on to the earth in such a way as to give us any knowledge whatsoever about the other side of the moon. And so you could build up a wonderful science about the other side of the moon but it would be pure imagination and inference. These are very very slight evidences.

If we did not have the power of speech it would be very difficult to have a science of psychology. Maybe it would be Behaviorist

(4 $\frac{1}{2}$) but I think that we would find that it would be a very inefficient and science. Suppose that I had never seen any of you before. And I were to sit down and try to write a study of the minds of the people in this class and none of you would say a word to me. I would just look at you. I would look at one face and I would see ~~him~~ enthusiastic interest. I would look at another and I would see bewildered confusion. I would look at another and I would see dead blackness. And yet the strange thing is what when I get these examinations I may find completely that in all three ~~cases~~ my inference from the face was ~~all~~ wrong. I've had that experience.

The first class that I ever taught had a fellow in the class who looked if as ~~though~~ he was so disgusted and lacked interested of everything that I ever said, that I just wondered why he ever bothered to take the course. And then I got a final examination that had every ~~an~~ question answered absolutely perfectly, with a clear understanding of all the points, and not only a clear understanding, but as he had reflected over them and expressed in brief language with no unnecessary words. I've gotten some of my finest exam papers/^{from him} that I've ever had from any~~one~~ body in my life. He completely

belied the expression that his face gave. If I were to have an understanding of him I would have to hear him talk and get certain conceptions of what went behind that face.

Well, now the science of God. Is God like the other side of the moon? There are those who say, There isn't any God. You've never seen Him. You've never touched Him. You have no evidence that there is any such a thing as a God. There are those who say that. And we can't say, Look, here He is.

Do we really have a basis on which we can really have a science of God? Now there are those today who talk a great deal about theology and what they mean by theology is religious experience. There is something that we can find. Here is a person who had a - When I was in college I remember some of the students in the course of philosophy took William James book on the Variety of Religious Experiences. He would take all the experiences of people and then he would analyze them. I remember one girl saying to me it had such a terrible affect on her life, the study of that book, because she said, she would study the scripture and she would be just having a wonderful time in devotional experience. And now is this experience C or is it D? Now just what category would this experience fall into and what are the determining causes that put me into it. And she said that it made every thing so mechanistic.

Theology is not the study of human experience, but human experience enters into it. And it is a part of the material on which we can construct a theology, but it is a very small part, just as the expressions I see on the faces of those in front of me would be a part of the evidence on which I could construct an understanding of your psychology. But it would be a very small part. I must have something to lean upon. Christians believe that we have something. Christians do not believe that we can get into the mind of God and see everything there. We can't do that with any human being. The Psychoanalyst claims to take a person and put him on a couch and let

S-2. 2/1/57 (8)

him talk for three hours a week for two or three years but the best you get is a subjective meaning and understanding. psychology but even then you'll have to admit there are a few things you just don't understand. And he will say that for most people he ^{can't} ~~can~~ understand their psychology because he just doesn't have time to. Most psychoanalysts will say its a waste of time for them to spend 15 or 20 hours with ~~him~~ a person and try to give them ~~psychanalytic~~ ^{psychological} treatment, because they can't get it into their minds to see what is there. Well we can't get into the mind of God. We can't put God on the labratory table and dissect him. We can't examine him ~~under~~ under the microscope. We can't experiment with him. We can't begin to.

And so a science of God cannot be like a science of man, like a science of chemistry, although it is like one in this regard, that even with all our experimenting we can't come to the understanding of it either. There are still facts that are moving about them. We only go a certain distance in our understanding. But Christians believe that we can go a very considerable distance. Some people try to take the easy method and try to jump clear past thinking that we have certainty on everything about God. But there is no scriptural basis, I believe, for doing so. I think there is much to know about Him, and a great deal we do know. But there is enough that we can know about God, Christians believe, to entitle us to have a science of theology.

Two. Systematic. This word can be interpreted in either one of two ways. And so we'll put a small a and b under two, Systematic. It can be interpreted a - systematic theology simply as an adjective describing theology meaning the systematic study of theology. Some theologians don't like the term, systematic theology at all. One reason is that they say that it ~~is~~ a mistake to use systematic is that this implies that the other courses given in the seminary are not systematic. They think that all seminary courses should be systematic. Therefore why call one of them systematic. I believe that that criticism is unjustified. I believe that it is true that from this sense of the word because by systematic theology we systematize. But the reason we apply that term to this in particular is because

we are systematizing a larger area, then we are in other courses. So it is a systematic arrangement. It isn't that it is systematic and others aren't, but we are taking up subjects and arranging them in a systematic fashion. All of it we get from various ^{sources} ~~sources~~ rather than limiting ourselves to a limited field. We have the science of physics and we have the science of chemistry and they used to be entirely distinct sciences, and a person who was a specialist in physics knew absolutely ~~nothing~~ in chemistry. And a person who was a specialist in chemistry knew nothing about physics. Or very very little. But now both sciences have gone further than they have before and we have found that there are very important principles that apply to both of them. And there are principles which are so vital that neither of them can be understood without them, and stay interrelated in their action. We also need a new name which would be physics and chemistry put together, because the two do make one science actually and we cannot really understand either one of them without knowing a very great deal about the other. Now we can take up the Old Testament, and we can study it and we can learn a tremendous amount about God from the Old Testament. We can take up the New Testament and we can learn a tremendous amount about God. But at point after point each sheds light upon the other and to take these points and put them together in ^a ~~the~~ way systematic theology as compared to old testament and new testament is in a way like a physics and ~~and~~ chemistry science would include both physics and chemistry. It gathers them both and puts them together in order to get a system, to get a conclusion as to facts which are found in both of them. But You have to deal with each separately to get the vital facts that deal with this.

It takes up the various points of knowledge which we get from these books. Particularly those which are not simply historical facts in the past but present facts of existence or present facts of methods in which God works or future activities of God in which he has revealed to us facts and it systematically gathers from both parts. And so the term, systematic theology is not a bad term, I think at all for them, with this understanding. But there is more to the word than that.

A. It is the systematic arrangement of facts.

B. It is theology as a system. As a systematic theology. It is seeing the interrelation between the different doctrines and the different teachings and the different facts of theology in a way which is impossible to do in other segments of the seminary course. Studying it as a system - the human body is a system. You could not have a study of the science of the head and another study of the science of the feet. You can specialize in these, but you must know something about the other. There's a system that works together. You pinch the foot, and something feels bad up in here. You touch somebody on the back all of a sudden and his head just flops around. The head and the body are related. There is a system which works together. In theology every part of theology has an intricate relationship with every other part, but much closer than others. There's a system. The same is true of course of chemistry and physics.

(Changed Records. S-3. 2/1/57.)

But like in the other truths there is a danger of carrying it too far. And that is a danger which we must guard against. If we did not recognize the importance of systems, we would be in a bad situation. It is very vital. But if we carry systems too far, we are also in a very bad situation. I remember once hearing an American woman in an American church, ^{FROM A} the family half English and half German. And she attended the church. She was a very nice woman in many ways. But I remember ^{SINCE} hearing ^{SOME GOOD} her speaking about going to a certain part of the town. And there she said very common people were ~~when~~ (1). And the same young woman I remember once ^{after hearing} ~~heard~~ someone speaking about something a lawyer was saying. Oh, she said, that must be right. Aren't lawyers bright people. I gathered that she was a victim of overgeneralization. And when she got older she got over it. But all do it to some extent. This is a part of town in which I've met many people that I didn't like, which didn't have much in common with me. They didn't have much intelligence. Therefore everybody there

had anything good ~~about a man~~. We met some people ^{there} ~~like that~~ who didn't amount to anything. ^{So the others won't either.} There are some people who claim that they have the ability as soon as they meet someone to know whether that's a fine person, or whether they aren't. I found out years ago, (I think I was in high school) that I did not have that ability. That I could meet a person and be thoroughly unimpressed with him. After a week or two I'd find that he was ^{one of} the finest persons that I had ever known. And I could find a person and after awhile see that we had very little in common. I think I was fortunate though, for I think there is an overgeneralization, which we are always apt to fall into. I think I was in second grade or third grade when there was a boy who used to pick on the other boys. He was very mean at that time. I don't know what happened to him later. But his first name was Harold. I think it was 15 years before I could like ~~mmm~~ a boy named Harold. I thought that anyone who had ~~a~~ the name Harold, there must be something wrong with him.

Overgeneralizations are very easy to fall into. We get a system, and everything must fall into our system. But we can't work it that way. One thing about Calvin was outstanding. Calvin took facts from the scripture and he systematized what he found in the scripture and then he did what everyone must. One the basis of what he found, he ^{IN}ferred other things. But he made it a rule, never to feel any certainty about any thing that he inferred from the teachings of passages of scripture unless he found the other thing itself clearly stated in the scripture. And I think that is a very vibrant rule to take, in that way few inferences can be wrong. As a system, you can take a few gods and make a system out of it. You can take the same gods and make another system out of it. You have to have the system ~~am~~ checked at many points before you are sure that its details are correct. It is very important that we do not take the approach; here is this system, you ought to hear this system, here is this one, and here is this one. I found something wrong with this system, and cancel it out, and I found something wrong with this system, so I'll cancel it out. Wherever I ~~mm~~ find something wrong with the system, the whole system is cancelled out. You can not go that way, because every system, I don't care who made it, who

gets it, has points in it which are clearly taught in scripture and it is wrong to cast it aside, and everyone has points in it which represents human inferences from the scriptures and maybe entirely wrong. If you ask anyone a few years ago, what makes an apple fall out of the tree, he would say because the stem weakens and there is nothing to hold it up. You would say what's the difference? It was held up. Why, if it wasn't held up, it would fall down. Everything falls down, ~~everything~~ Everybody knows that. Everybody knew that anything will fall down if there is nothing to hold it up. Everybody knew that before. The whole race was absolutely unanimous upon it, and there was a wonderful system. A system of ideas that anything, when it is up, falls down. And a great part of the understanding of the world was based upon that system.

And they said, of course the world can't be round, for when you got to the other side of the world, you would fall off, ~~you~~ because you would fall down. Then when ^{Newton} ~~Grisham~~ and Kepler made their studies of the heavenly bodies, and they found out the way the planets moved, and studied their data and tried to explain it, they got all their data together, and they made a whole system of curves and systems of how things moved, but why should it ever move that way? And so Isaac Newton had ² ~~an~~ facts. He had the fact that you can travel around the earth, which had already been done in his days. And he had the facts that the heavenly bodies moved in a certain way. He had thousands of mathematical statements made by careful studies over a period of a century about that. And he was trying to explain each of these facts separately. And then he looked at them together and wondered whether there was any connection between them, in any way in which they could throw light on each other. And then one day he saw an apple fall, which thousands of people had seen happen thousands of times. But when he saw it the thought struck him, making this fact in relation to the other ^{two} facts. And then he ~~saw~~ took these three facts and he made a system out of them, and ~~he~~ the system which he made has helped ever since. The system that they don't just fall, but they are attracted to one another. That mass attracts mass. In proportion to ^{its} ~~which~~ mass, I think he said and in ^{inverse} ~~inversely~~ ⁽⁶¹⁾ ~~proportion~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~distance~~ or is it the square of the distance?

But its the direct . I forget the exact formula, but the principle is the vital thing. The formula is interesting. Einstein very slightly varied the formula and some people say that Newton is out of business. But the whole principle is Newton's and Einstein is ^{merely} ~~only~~ very slightly (7). But he took the facts and made a new system which explains them, because another fact was introduced which didn't differ with the old system.

In theology it is very important that we recognize systems. But it is very important that we don't carry in the systems beyond clear evidences, and that we are always ready at all points of our system where they cannot be specifically checked with the scripturá to alter them, if new discoveries and facts show that a change in that point in the system, and sometime it may take a very sweeping change. I talked to a man once. He talked to me about two hours. That was a good many years ago. And there was another man who was criticizing him, and he didn't like it. And about every five minutes of the two hours he would say, What does so and so know about the reformed faith. He would throw that in every so often, and I couldn't see what the other man had to do with the thing that we were discussing. But he was discussing with me his idea of the defense of the Christian faith. And he said to me, the unbelieving philosophies had this, and this, Christians acted this way and this, and every five minutes he would put in a word about this man, and so I ignored that, so that made static his argument. And he went on, and finally he got to the point where these people had held this, and he had taken this, and logically he had decided that he had the final answer and method in determining this. I said to him, now you had this anti-Christian view, and Christians brought the answer. You had this one who brought an answer, and you had this one, who brought an answer. Now, I said, you have present views and you think you have the answer. Well, now I said, maybe the anti-Christian will take a little slightly different technique and another answer will be needed just as it ~~was~~ has been in this course that you have mentioned. Well, he said, what else could it take? This is the ultimate which has been agreed upon. I couldn't follow that at all in that reasoning.

He had brought his system to the point where he had to find a system. But each of the twenty or thirty ~~men~~ who preceded him must have thought that they had the final system. To see the system as a system of theology, to see how justification is related to the deity of Christ, how it is related to the sin of man, how it is related to the character of God. How all these things inter-relate is tremendously important. But when we think that we have a ~~system~~ system that explains all the facts, of the universe, and if something doesn't fit into certain points of our system, it is wrong to throw it out on that basis alone without examining it further in scripture is a dangerous thing.

I picked up a book on apologetics some years ago. I ~~picked~~ picked up this book and I read in it this statement. If a person leaves New York on the train, headed for Chicago, and he finds that he is on the train which is headed for Florida, the thing that he must do is go back to New York. He must go back to New York and start again. I thought, what a silly foolish statement. Why ruin a good book by putting a silly foolish statement like that in it? If I went from New York on a train, thinking I was going to Chicago, and when I was coming into North Philadelphia, I noticed my train was headed for Florida, I'm sure that I would get off at the North Philadelphia station, and take a train from there to Chicago. I wouldn't think of going back to New York, to take another train.

The idea that you have to go back to your starting point is utter nonsense. Yet a book by a great scholar, with some excellent things in it has that statement in it which carries this idea to an absurd point. You might say why bother

(10 3/4), but the sad thing is that there is probably no book on theology ever written by any man, who ~~has~~ did not to some extent fall into this error, because it is an error of mark (11). And I'm not mentioning it as an attack on any individual but as a warning that we give the point of systematization its vital significance in theology, but that we avoid carrying it beyond its true point. Because every point (11 1/2) and you will say I don't know of anyone who has written extensively on theology who has not at some point or other, made this mistake of his human fallible idea of what possibly could be contributed to the

point of insisting on matters which can not be actually proven from the scriptures. But some go much further into this error. And I will fall into this error. Everybody does. But lets be watching for it.

Let's not go to the other extreme, too. Well, so much for a very brief summary of

A. What is Systematic Theology,

MEANS

B. THE ~~MEAN~~ OF GAINING KNOWLEDGE IN THIS FIELD.

That is very, very important, in any one ~~area~~ area. We know that there can be such a thing as the science of theology because it is possible to gain knowledge in this field, of theology. But what is the means of gaining knowledge in the field of theology? There are various means which are used by different people.

One suggestion is that an authoritative human being states and we should accept. An authoritative human being states the fact and we take it. You'll remember the little boy who was asked, Give four ways in which we know the earth is round. Well, he said, daddy says so, mother says so, teacher says so, and big brother says so. Those were the four ways he knew the earth was round. Well, you laugh at it, but that's the way most of us know the earth is round. Most of us have never find other ways then the ways we've been told about. But often they haven't sunk very deep into our conscience. I was told that it was round most of my life, but I didn't sense it until I went to South America. And one day at noon in mid-winter, there, ~~wasn't it summer~~ which is mid-summer here, I was walking out in the hills, and I looked across and I saw the Atlantic ocean. And I said, Now where is the Atlantic ocean, to a fellow from Brazil, there. And I looked at the Atlantic Ocean and I said that's in the South, and if I turn this way I can get back on the trail to where I want to go. He said, That would be south, and I said, No, that's not the south, the south is over there. And there was the sun, ~~not~~ very high in the heavens that noon, of July, and in the opposite direction was the south. I said, How can that be? And I said, How can that be? The sun is north and (14)

~~and in the opposite direction~~

And I said, How can that be,

and I was in Philadelphia.

bright

that they will be with some/young Catholic students, who achieve marks and take up medicine and law, and delve into it, and see the interrelations and understand it. And yet, when it comes to religion they will present all the evidences of our Christian view points, but they will say, O yes, but the priest knows and he says this. The church declares and that's it. And their minds seem to be im (1/2). I've heard many a man tell me that. They seem to be impervious to arguments. They just take it as given, and they just take it. The ~~processes~~ processes, the precesses, some human beings censor. Well, that's an all right method to get it, if the person giving it, is the Lord Jesus Christ. But I would even hesitate to take it that way, even from the apostle Paul. The apostle Paul was inspired of God in writing certain things absolutely free from error, but I'm sure that there are many ideas he was unsure of. And the prophets of the Old Testament, Peter tells us wondered and pondered what manner ^{or what} ~~and manner~~ of time the Spirit ~~and manner~~ of Christ which was in them did signify that each of them had the ^{idea} ~~light~~ before them. They had ~~an~~ many matters revealed to them, but they had many other matters which they did not know and they might easily fall into error. It is dangerous to take anything on the word of another human being.

When I was teaching at Westminster, my last year there, there was a young fellow there who said to me, Oh, I listen very closely every time Dr. Machen prays, I wonder what is right to say in prayer and what isn't right to say in prayer. I never heard Dr. Machen address Jesus directly in prayer. He always prays to God, so I know we must not do that. And the next time I prayed in chapel, I prayed very deliberately to Jesus. Jesus is God. There's no reason in the world why we should not pray to Jesus.

You can learn much from a great godly man like Dr. Machen. But don't take ~~him~~ him as your model. Don't take him as your guide. Don't take him as your supreme authority because he is falliable like all other human beings. I've always said, If you take me as your authority, you may find I ^{may} ~~will~~ lead you astray, ^{Test} ~~an~~ every thing I give you by the Word of God. And if you get into the habit of wanting to take me as an authority, when you get away from me, you won't have me to take as an authority, and you will be in a frame of mind, which I think is dangerous. And you'll pick somebody else

for an authority. And you may pick up the wrong person. You may be led astray. I think it is a very dangerous thing to take a man as an authoritative human being as our source, be it the Pope, or Dr. Machen, or anybody else.

And so I don't think we gain knowledge ~~mg~~ in this field from an authoritative human being, (number one), or (two) from the voice of the church.

2. The Voice of the Church.

Now these two are very closely related, and yet there is a difference. The voice of the church. That's not where we get our knowledge in theology. The church may be completely in error, as it has been for various times. The voice of the church is not the voice of God.

We began our introductory section of Systematic Four with (a) what is Systematic Theology? We discussed first theology, and then the matter of Systematic. I wish in a way that I had taken more time in that. I think it is very vital, so I think I'll just take one minute for it. Under systematic we notice that it is a systematic arrangement of facts, which I did not perhaps make altogether clear, that I meant not as a historical fact, but of the evidence regarding the permanent facts or future facts. That is to say we read in the Old Testament something about Abraham, in relation to God. We are interested in Abraham and his life and his activities and what he learned about God interests us tremendously. Over in the New Testament we learn something about Paul and his relation to the Lord. We're interested in Paul, how God used him, and what he learned about God is of tremendous interest. But neither in the study of Genesis nor in the study of Romans do we specifically take the subject what he learned about God, and put the two together. That needs a separate period when we are taking up the subject of God and what we learn about him, or of the love of God, or of justification, or some particular point. And it is good to take a particular point like that and see what Abraham learned about it, and see what Moses learned, see what Elijah learned, see what Paul learned, and put them together. And so in systematic theology we are arranging not the historical events which are tremendously important, but ^{WHAT} we learn through them,

or what was explained by them, and we put those together on each particular subject. And thus it is no more systematic than the other subjects, but it is taking certain subjects and tracing them through. And it is necessary that this be done somewhere.

And then (second) we looked at Systematic as a system that there is an interrelation. And I warned you against thinking that the fact that we have a system means that we can fill in the parts that are not clearly explained in the system. That we must be very careful about, because it is very easy to fill in wrong

(6) and I feel that we are utterly wrong to be dogmatic about anything that is not clearly taught in scripture. It is a great error and one which we must avoid. We must not however, go to the other extreme and fail to realize that the great truths are interrelated and they are so interrelated that an error ^{on} ~~of~~ one of them may upset your whole idea ^{on} the other and throw it out of focus. Now it may not. We must not assume that it does. But we must investigate to see whether it does in each one. And some will tremendously, and some will not at all. You can take a man and you can amputate both his arms and he will still be a man, and he can still live if he has others to help him. He cannot live, a man without no arms by himself. It is impossible. But when others can help him he can live and you can take out both arms and both legs. And if he still has help from others he can continue to survive and can have a useful part in life. You can take off his eyes and he can get along with help from others. But if you take out his heart, he cannot. If you take out one kidney he can get along. If you take out two, he can't. There are very many small parts of his body which are absolutely essential to its functioning as a system. There are other parts which you can get along without quite nicely. Then there are many parts which you can get along without but which will greatly hamper the system.

I have known people who have said that all theology is a system and you change the slightest little thing, and everything is destroyed. That I think is utterly unwarranted, and untrue. Yet I think that there are many points at which an error will upset many other points if one does not (8) them. So I think each one of them has to be examined on its merits and we must be careful not to go to either extreme in our (8) on this point.

Now, we began to look at B. How we secure knowledge in this field. And I expressed to you the first point under that in a negative way and I think I'd like to put a heading above it.

Negatively. That is to say, how do we secure knowledge in this field. Let's look at a few ways in which we don't. Negatively, No. 1.

1. Not through the statements of an authoritative human being.

Now when I say this I'm not speaking of the scriptural ~~passage~~^{source}. Scripture is a source by itself. But I am speaking of the idea that we get dogmas, we get ~~thought~~^{thought} taught systematic theology, we get teaching because some authoritative human being tells us what it is, or presents it to us and it is ~~human~~ New, but he puts his authority on it, and therefore we must accept it. And I can say that this is not a view that is held officially by any branch of the professing Christian Church. That the source of systematic theology or of dogma is the statement of an authoritative human being. There may be many protestants who think that Roman Catholics believe that the Pope can ~~make~~ build up systematic theology, and you must take ~~what~~ what he says. There may be many ignorant Roman Catholics who think that that is what their church holds. But the official position of the Roman Catholic Church is very very different from that. According to their claim ~~and~~ our knowledge of dogma, our knowledge of theology comes from two sources. From the Bible which has been passed down ~~from~~^{to} us since the days of the apostles and from the Church traditions which they claim have been passed down orally. Now the objection which we raise is that there is no proof that there is any such thing. There is no way of proving that there is a tradition passed down since the days of the apostles and there is very strong evidence against any such claim.

But their claim is that there is such tradition, and that their dogma rests upon the Bible, and the tradition, and they claim that the Pope of Rome is infalliable, as a teacher of the dogma which has been passed down. Not as a founder of any dogma. They claim that when he speaks ex cathedra to define a doctrine, he can do so infalliably. They do not claim that he can produce a dogma. They do not claim that he can add to knowledge, in the field of systematic theology. They only claim that he can correctly

define it. And I think that the only case is 1870. In 1870, a Pope defined a bishop infalliable, excathedra, defined a doctrine that Mary was born without any human part in her conception. The immaculate conception of Mary. That was 1870, and since that time, I believe that only one instance has there been that a pope has ~~defined~~ ^{defined} a ~~doctrine~~ doctrine excathedra. And that was about ten years ago or eleven, when the Pope defined the ~~sub~~ doctrine of the assumption of Mary. In this case the Pope wrote to the bishops all over the country, and asked their opinion whether it would be wise to define this ~~sub~~ doctrine. He asked their opinion whether it would be wise to define. It doesn't look as if he was busy propounding dogmas or defining it. And if a man is divine established to be the correct explainer of doctrine, it is strange that before he would explain the dogma, he would ask a few hundred bishops, if it was wise to do so. But he asked them whether they thought it was wise, to define this doctrine. And he says that most of them said that they thought it would be wise. And he was not introducing a new dogma, because in Rome, there is a great festival of the assumption of Mary which has been observed for at least six or seven hundred years. There are churches in many parts of the world which have been built in the honor of the assumption of Mary. There are pictures of Mary in Venice and in Rome of Mary being assumed up into Heaven, which were painted three or four hundred years ago. It is a belief that has been held by various sections of the Roman Catholic Church for many many years. But had not been stated in any of their creeds. But it has been held. And the claim that is being taught today is not that they are adding a doctrine, or discovering something new. It is that this is part of the tradition which has come down from the time of the Fathers. That's the claim that is made. Actually it is a myth that grew up in the middle ages. It was before the actual Reformation when it grew up and was accepted, ignorant by many people.

So now ~~the~~ with churches which were in honor of the Assumption of Mary and with festivals in honor of her, but no man discovered the creeds of the doctrine, the question was, Is this actually a doctrine which the church has always held, but which was never stated in a creed, and it can now be defined as a doctrine. Not to be added

not
 as a doctrine, ~~an~~ to be something new about dogma. And under those circumstances there was a great attestation with all sorts of celebrity or which the Pope defined a doctrine and actually all he did was to say that this doctrine was true.

S-5. Was she taken into heaven without the body, or was her body taken up into heaven after she died. Which was it? And so the statement that the Pope who is today living may, not ten years ago, is being carefully studied to try to figure out what he meant and no body thinks of asking him what he meant. He is the infalliable teacher who can define the doctrine, but he doesn't tell anybody what he meant by it. He made the statement so casually that nobody can be sure what he did mean? And he did it on purpose because the views that have been accepted by the Roman Catholic scholars carry on this myth which developed in the middle ages. There are two forms of the myth.

One is that Mary died and is buried, and a day or two after she was buried they came to look at her body and they opened up her coffin, and did not find the body there, but a lot of beautiful flowers. There is a picture in some of the churches in Italy showing the apostles looking into the coffin and seeing the beautiful flowers there and the body has disappeared, and she died. And of course, she was buried there, and they all knew she was buried there.

And there is another legend that she was taken right to heaven without dying. And the Pope has not decided between the two legends. It is very interesting that right after the Pope made his declaration, I just happened to pick up the Philadelphia Inquirer, and read in it the precise statement that he made. It was about two or three

(1½) long. Her very body was taken right into heaven. And then I was at a meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, and a man there who specializes in this field, who specializes in the field of Roman Catholic Theology in general was giving a paper on the Assumption of Mary doctrine. And in the discussion ~~that~~ afterwards he expressed his uncertainty as to whether the doctrine meant whether she was taken up, or whether she did not die, and expressed the desire to know exactly what the Pope ~~was~~ had said on the matter, and it so happened that I had read it a few days before in the

Philadelphia Inquirer, and was able to give him the answer that the Pope did not say. But that he very hazily avoided it. Well, now you can see how very far that is from the claim that there is an authoritative human being who can give us dogmas. And ~~in~~ the Roman Catholics do not hold that. The Protestants do not hold it but there are many Protestants who act ~~as~~ if they did hold it. And to hold a statement from Calvin, or from Hodge, or even from some man who is living today is the answer to a problem. That is not a Protestant approach or a Christian approach to matters. To take any man as the authoritative presenter of God, the authoritative definement, or the authoritative source of it.

Calvin with a wonderful mind, and great spiritual perception studied the scripture and stated what he found there and gave us a wonderful statement. And others have done the same, but no two writers have agreed on all of the minor points. No two writers. And the statement of any man is of value inso far as he has correctly observed it from the scripture, and only so far, and no man has altogether understood it. Every one of us has the right and the duty up to the extent of his training to go over the scripture and see whether the statement of any man is correct or whether it is false. That we believe is stated ^{practically} in every Protestant book on theologysomewhere but it is ignored in most theology books somewhere else in the book where the attitude is taken ^{on} on some particular thing that ~~from~~ from this particular thing we follow something else $\frac{1}{2}$ rather than what does the scripture say about it. I'm not criticizing anyone for saying that, I'm only pointing out the weakness of human nature. Its an error that we all make. And so it is well to get a clear understanding and guard ourselves against it.

We had a student who graduated from here, who went to another seminary which is some distance removed from here, who worked for a doctor's degree. I talked to him after he was there for a year or two. He said to me, you know, the two or three of us who are here, who have had the Faith training, are very very grateful for the training we got in exegesis of the scripture. Of knowing how to go through the Bible, and see what it means when it talks about a subject. He said, There are many fine students in this place where I am now attending, many fine students with a very great

desire to serve the Lord, but we have not found any who have training which can enable them themselves to go through the scriptures and say, This is what the scriptures says. He ~~says~~ said, They work very hard. They are given subjects, to explain this verse in the Scripture. What do they do? They look up thirty, or forty, or fifty authorities. This man, this man, this man, and this man say it was this, this man, this man, this man, and this man say it was this, this man, this man, this man, and this man say it was this. Now we compare the different views of the different men and see which has the most authority to back them. Or which seems the most reasonable to us. And the fact of the matter is that you can cut through nine ~~hundreds~~ ^{tenths} of that (6) by simply going through the Scriptures and seeing exactly what it says. Because Christian commentators and Christian theologians have copied one another and sometimes erroneously.

When I, before I came to Faith Seminary, was teaching in another seminary, one time, the man who was assistant professor of New Testament, reported to the faculty that in looking over his examination papers he had found the paper of a very good student, most of which was correct but had included in it three errors which he had done, and then he had found the paper of another student, who was not nearly as good a student, but his paper was very very largely correct except it copied exactly the same errors that this good student had. Those same two errors were in it verbatim plus two other errors. And then he found another paper which had these same five errors in it, plus two more. And he recalled that the three fellows had sat next to each other when they were taking the examination. And the evidence was quite clear that this person had written, and this person had copied him as well as he could see, but in copying he had copied his three errors and had two of them, and the next one had copied him ~~hadman~~ as well as he could see and had copied the five errors and made one or two of his own. The proof was quite clear of that. I do not believe that there is a theological seminary in the world, I don't care of how any size, I don't care of how orthodox, it is, of how fine the teachers are, I don't think there is a theological seminary in the world with as many as 42, in which in a period of six or seven examinations there has not been at least one student copying from another. I don't think there is. It is a shame to say it, it is a shame to be (8)

on the truth of our Christian character, but it is a fact, and I say it from sad experience of getting letters from fine people, fine in so many ways who will write to me and say, I graduated from seminary eight years ago. I have some great sorrow that has come into my life, and I'm thinking over my past of where I've done wrong. And I realized that in this class, and in this, and in this examination I copied and I shouldn't have. I've had that experience. And I don't think that standing here, looking over everybody's shoulder would solve it. But I think that if other students were to realize how wrong it is that as a student's attitude to it all, I think that is the only way it could be solved. And I wish we could do it. But I don't think it was any worse than other seminaries in that regard. I think it was better. As I believe that our ~~seminaries~~ seminary standards were higher than other seminaries.

But I'm merely giving that as an illustration of the fact that when it comes to writing books of theology or of exegesis, there is probably no man living or dead, who ever wrote a book who did not include some material from others. If the book is of any length, and he has done everything in the original, a great part of it is taken from others, and everyone who has, has taken something from the other man. But the sad thing is that I have found some things that are obviously mistakes. There is one thing that is so obviously a mistake that anyone who knows a little Hebrew, he should be able to see that it is a mistake, and yet some ~~gn~~ very great scholars have got it in their books. They've simply copied. Some very great scholars who I'm sure with one minute's reflection, would see that there is nothing to it. I've come across one or two things like that.

And so when I say that it is very important that we don't get our systematic theology because an authoritative human being has stated it, I am striking at the great error of the approach of all of us. If I make a statement of systematic theology, it is based either on my careful study of scripture, or upon what I've heard somebody else say, or what I've read in a book somewhere, or what I perhaps incorrectly remember from somewhere, and I am anxious to know what I think. But I am anxious that nobody accepts what I say simply because I say it is so. But only because you have

(10 $\frac{1}{2}$), from the scripture that it is the truth.

Well, then that it is the statement of an authoritative human being that establishes a dogma is something that no church believes, but that some churches and individuals act as if they believe at ~~many~~ various times. So I warn against it. You will find Calvin, Hodge, Warfield, all of our greater Theologians who give us the (11) give us some that are correct, and some that are ridiculous. I won't say that all of them give something that is ridiculous, but ~~there~~ ^{it is} ~~are~~ rare men who doesn't, who somewhere in his life gives something that is ridiculous. No authoritative human being is our authority in Systematic theology.

NUMBER TWO. Not through the Decision of a Church body.

Berkof (?)

I have a book here by Professor Lewis Berkouwer of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

He is a professor ~~and~~ in Calvin Seminary there. The Introductory volume of Systematic ~~and~~ Theology. And Professor Berkof says very many excellent things. He has some fine material, and he makes it very, very clear at various places in his book, that he believes that there is only one source of theology. That is the Bible, and anything that can be ~~proved~~ disproven from the Bible, is per se not true, and yet he has other sections in it, in which he assumes the view that it is the church that makes the theology. I am mentioning this, only because it is so easy to fall into this error. He says in here as to relation ~~between~~ ^{of} dogmas to dogmatics, he says he likes to call it dogmatic theology himself, rather than systematic theology. And he says, (Number one) Dogmas arise out of the necessity of the believing community. Under that head he says, Dogmas can not be made to order. They can not be produced by individual theologians nor from scientific theology in general, and then he pulls upon the community of believers from without. Chances are that dogmas so proposed and constructed would not really express the faith of the Church. Consequently it would not strike a responsive chord in the communal life of the believer, and consequently would not be recognized as authoritative. They are born only in periods of intense spiritual light, of widespread and earnest reflexion on the truth, and deep religious experience.

It is only when the church thinks deeply on the truths of the scripture, where under the stress of religious controversy, he has learned to see the truth properly and clearly. And when definite convictions have become the common property of the

religious community, and thus a unity of opinion is formed, it is only then that you will be ready to confess and feel the inward results an irresistible urge to give expression to her favor.

(S-6.) by the sin from which we will never be free until we go to be with the Lord. He makes a difference between theology and dogma. He says that theology is dogma in the process of being formed, a doctrine in the making. When it becomes a dogma it has authority and this is the ^{expression} ~~authenticity~~ of the living God, and the Church. I don't think there is any warrant for such an attitude.

The theology is what we learn about God from the scripture, or nature. We can not learn a great deal from nature. Everything we can learn from nature, we can also learn from scripture. So it is sufficient to say that ~~what we can learn from the scriptures~~ ^{it is everything} which we can learn from the scriptures, but ~~we~~ recognize that even without the scripture there is some we would know. But that through the ~~the~~ intense spiritual life of the Church, written dogma becomes dogma, and becomes authoritative, I see no warrant in the Scripture anywhere for that sort of an idea and I think that

(1) he clearly says here that anytime a dogma is found to be contrary to scripture it must be considered to be wrong, it must be abandoned. I believe that we should go a step further and say that anything the scripture teaches is true, and we should not, for a second seek any other source except scripture for our knowledge of a science of God. Not through the decision of a church body, or through the experience of a church. Here in my notes I got ahead of myself. I had those as two separate heads. I said Two, not through the decision of a church body, three, not through the ~~decision of a church~~ experience of a church.

It should seem quite obvious that votes do not establish truth. The United Nations may vote that the Soviets have not murdered anyone in Hungary. But that does not affect the question of whether they have or have not. Fact is not determined by vote. And a church may decide by a vote that in this community of believers, we wish to restrict the membership to those who hold a certain agreement on a certain viewpoint. That is one way. But to determine dogma or to determine fact by vote of a (2/5)

church body is something utterly without warrant in scripture. The Israelites might very well have had a vote to decide which of the ^{spies} ~~men~~ were right, the ten or the

(3) If the spies voted, ten said it was foolish to go into the land, two said it is a wonderful land and God can give it. The minority was right. But even if the overwhelming mass of them had voted that it was wrong to go into the land, the majority would be wrong. Caleb and Joshua were right. Votes do not ever determine truth. There must be some other means.

It is not through the decision of a church body that true dogma can be determined. It is not through the experience of the church. Now this matter of the experience of the church is perhaps where a verbose statement would come in better than under the vote decision of a church body. He spoke of it as being a period of intense thought, and so on, I used to hear years ago some wonderful men that I admired very very much saying this: This is not a creed making age. We must stand by the great creeds of the reformation and not temper with them because this is not a creed making age. I can see no warrant whatever for such a statement in the scriptures. I think it is true to say that in the early part of the 17th century, there were Theological students who spent many more hours in the scripture than is done by most today. And when the King James translators came together, everyone of them could read the commentaries of the Rabbis, in the Hebrew. And they could read the commentaries of the medieval theologians in the Latin. And they knew the opinions that these various men had expressed, in the Hebrew and in the Latin. When they took up a verse they knew the various thoughts that people had advanced. They were trained. You could not today find a group of scholars who are as well trained in Biblical matters as the men who made the King James version. We simply are not training scholars of that type today. That is, there may be an individual wonder, but not a large group of them, such as they had then. We don't have them.

And when the Westminster Assembly met, you had a group of men who attended meetings that had made other creeds, and you had creeds that had been argued over and thought about a great deal in the previous fifty or seventy five years before, with which these men were thoroughly familiar. And these men had been working and studying

over the matter of how to express these doctrines which they found in the scripture. And these men met there, and day after day they argued over every word and every comma of their confession and of their catechisms in order to get it to express exactly what they found in Scripture. And as a result, today we have something which was written by a group of men highly trained in that field and you wouldn't find a group as large~~ly~~ as that as highly trained, today. And a group that had given a great deal of thought to this problem and ~~had~~ did it with great care. And (6) it is worthy of great respect. But it is because of the care and the work they put upon it, the amount of time they had thought about it, and the amount that they had read of the opinions of others and considered them pro and con. Not because it brings out of a certain age, or of a certain consciousness of the Church that it is a wonderful statement.

And I feel that anytime anyone today should make a statement that is clearly better than the statement there, we should adopt his statement. But I think it very unlikely that a group of people today, would spend that much time. There's not that much careful scholarship on that particular matter. And I believe that we should hold to something that has been very carefully worked out insofar as we find it to be right, but it is not an authority in itself. Its~~s~~ authority comes entirely and exclusive from the Word of God, which is put forth to represent and to give in brief form that which its authors found in various sections of the Bible.

That the idea that ~~the~~ was a creed making age and this isn't, that was an age when people took careful time to study; that was a time when there was much discussion about these problems, that was a time when parliament got a large group of Theologians together and supported them for a period of years while they were working carefully over how to express these things in careful concise language. But that that age has any right to impose its ideas upon us, I find no warrant whatsoever in scripture. There is one source in which we can get ideas in systematic theology and that is the Bible.

So it is not through the experience of the Church, but the unfortunate thing is that so many, many men like Berkhof, who hold the reformed position, that the Bible is the only source of theology, along with his clear statements to this fact, ~~makes~~ statements like the one I quoted from him that the dogma comes out of the living consciousness of the Church and all that, and these statements sound like, though

they are actually different, they sound like the statements that other theologians make, but which gradually goes over from this idea to other ideas, that it is the subjective ideas in the church which determine proof. And (8½) speaking in Princeton Theological Seminary says, The Bible came from the of the church and if the church can put a book in the Bible, the church can cancel it out. How do I know whether John belongs in the Bible or not. The church has put it in, the church can take it out. In other words, it is the church that is the authority. The Roman Catholic Church talked as if the Church was the authority, but in their precise statements about any doctrine, they will insist that it is the Bible and the tradition upon which they base their views. They will of course in their general talks speak about the Church.

Cardinal Gibbon used to say in his book, which used to be so wide spread in this country, and the book of the Christian religion, he said, God never intended that the Bible should be the Christian's rule of faith, independently of the authority of the Church. And you can find plenty of statements like that from Roman Catholic writers but you notice how he says it. He doesn't say, You just take it alone. God never intended the Bible to be the Christian's rule of faith. That's the (10) definitely. He said, The Bible to be the Christian's rule of faith independently of the living authority of the Church. If you pin this down, he would say, the authority of the church is to interpret the Bible. But of course he would say nobody (10) to interpret the of the church. But that is a view that they don't actually hold but which in their popular writings is presented and which is certainly the actual view although not the official view.

Number four. ~~Now~~ Now this is important. How do we gain knowledge in this field.

No. 4. Not Through Examining the History of Dogma.

In some seminaries more time is spent in studying the history of dogma, then is spent in careful study of exegesis of the Word of God. What did this theologian believe, what did that theologian believe, what did the others believe? How and where did these statements develop? How were they presented? What changes were made? This is all most interesting. It is an interesting subject. But it has no authority in

determining what the truth is. I think that anyone who has studied it, will admit that it has no authority. And yet they will study it as if it has authority. And they will put their great emphasis upon that.

The history of dogma is of interest. But why is it of interest? It is of interest because men have given their time to studying the Bible. And therefore, what they have worked out as they spent time on it, is worthy of our careful consideration, lest we overlook something through not putting enough time on it that somebody else has come across by putting more time on it. But God has given us the Holy Spirit to illumine our minds, as we study the scriptures. But he has never promised that he will illumine our minds in this age to the extent that we see truth, that we will see truth which is not already stated clearly in the scripture.

Number four, then, not through examining the History of Dogma.

Number five, not through studying the History of Philosophy.

I was at a very fine Christian college a few years ago. There was a dean in that college, who though highly trained in chemistry, was finding his interest in chemistry coming less and less. And his interest in Christian work becoming more and more. ~~He~~ He is now the president of another. But he was talking to me and asking How can I learn more about the meaning of Christianity? He was a real Christian and a fine man. He is now the president of a Christian college. But he would be a better President of a Christian college, if he had gotten a good theological training. And he seriously considered it for awhile, leaving the college, and coming here, and taking out course. But he had a family and he was established in a situation. And had learned to live on a scale, he had been dean of the college. That made it hard to settle down. He seriously considered it, but he didn't quite go through with it. And then, the next year I saw him, and he told me he was attending a course in that institution, in homiletics and he was trying to do something there in trying to learn about theology, and I expressed to him the great importance of learning exegesis. Learning to get into the Bible and see what it means exactly. Well, he said, I was speaking to professor so and so here, a professor in that school who had pastored a church nearby, on the side, and a full time teacher there, and he said he had told me, to understand theology, what

I really need is a good course in History of Philosophy. Well, I tried to tell him, and I believe he got the point that our understanding of Christianity is not derived from the history of philosophy, but from the Word of God. And every ~~unitan~~ protestant somewhere in his ~~unitan~~ writing will say, that the Word of God is absolutely important for a knowledge of Systematics.

S-7. - human reason to try to explain the universe. And raised one theory after another after another. The Christian's standing on the Bible, has the duty to look at their views, compare them with the Bible. Say no, that's/ ^{wrong} the Bible doesn't say that. ~~unitan~~ ^{Yet} that feature of that is right and agrees with the Bible. That ~~fother~~ ^{ideas} feature is wrong. The Bible is the norm. Not the shifting ~~attitude~~ of fallible men as they have tried to explain the universe on the basis of human reasoning alone.

And so I think it is important that/ ⁱⁿ systematic theology, we do not ~~gain~~ our knowledge in this field by the study of History of Philosophy. We get our attention called to/ ^{it} probably by studying the history of Philosophy. But the answer to the problem must come from the Word of God and from no other source if we are to carry on this work.

And Number six, Not Through some Esoteric Process.

Not through some esoteric process. Now the Holy Spirit can act as He will. The Holy Spirit did teach the writers of the Bible, ~~gave~~ them the revelations. We have no evidence that the Holy Spirit does that today. And we ~~certainly~~ have no evidence that he gives new truths to anybody today. The truth God wants us to have is in the word of God. The Quakers were founded with the belief that the Holy Spirit would talk to your minds, and would move you and give you thoughts, And they, in their early assemblies, would stand up, and speak, and give wonderful Christian messages, as they studied the Word of God, and presented what they found in the Bible. And they were called Quakers, their own name were Friends. They were called Quakers because they told people they must shake and quake with fear because the ~~unita~~ wrath of God was coming with the judgment of God.

But as time went on they put their stress on this inner voice. The time came

when the inner voice became the vital thing and the scripture was left to the side. And there are today some groups of Quakers which are thoroughly evangelical. But they are very few. And with most of the Quakers today, it is the subjective thoughts of the fallible, human wicked heart that is their base of authority and the Bible is cancelled out.

There is no other source of authority except the Bible. And it is important that we keep that clearly in mind. God may give you a wonderful understanding of truth. But check your understanding by the Bible. Don't be too sure because an idea should come into your head from some way, that it is right. The Devil could put ideas in your head. As well as the Lord.

So much negatively, now positively - how do we secure knowledge in this field?

Positively - Number one. We secure knowledge of theology in exactly the same way as we secure knowledge in other fields of science. I have another sentence in that, but I'll read that over.

Positively - Number one. We secure knowledge of theology in exactly the same way as we secure knowledge in other fields of science. It is only the type of material that is different. We secure knowledge of theology in exactly the same way as we secure knowledge in other fields of science. It is only the type of material that is different. Now this is a statement that I make positively, firmly, ~~unambiguously~~ strongly. It is the foundation of my idea of Systematic Theology. But you will find very few up here that will agree, who will be ready to say yes to this statement in the way that I have put it. But if we do not, I do not believe that we have any solid basis for Systematic Theology. I believe that to such extent that we depart from this, we are basing our doctrines ~~on~~ in part on the fallible, sinful thoughts of human beings, rather than on a solid system. ~~Nonpmb~~

Now, how do we gain knowledge in science, ~~the~~ in any science. We do it in three ways. ~~Now how do we gain knowledge in science? By~~

A. By Induction. Small a: Induction; small B: Deduction; small c; revelation. These are the three ways that we gain knowledge in any science. Now most people instead of revelation will say communication, but they mean the same thing.

Induction is the way we gain knowledge in science. The big advance in science today over the middle ages is the thought of the greater stress put on induction. Induction has always been the source of our advance in any science. We take facts and we look at them and we compare them. We look at the facts and we see what comes out of the facts. We have brute fact. Existence is filled with brute fact. We take these brute facts, and we study them, and we seek an explanation for them. That is induction. We gather facts, and that is the primary source of advance in science and I believe also in Systematic Theology.

b. Deduction. Deduction in my opinion has been tremendously overemphasized, right back from the time of the Greeks. The common statement in the syllogism is "All men are mortal, Socrates is a man, therefore Socrates is mortal." There has probably never been a book written in logic that has not given that particular illustration. But good is that? All men are mortal. Socrates is a man. Therefore Socrates is mortal. We learn new facts about Socrates, do we? How? We have a statement: All men are mortal. Where do we get that statement? The only place I believe that we can get it is to examine every man, to see if he is mortal. If we examine every man and find that he is mortal, then we can make the conclusion that all men are mortal. But when we do that, we haven't learned anything new by saying that Socrates is a man, because if we haven't examined Socrates ~~when~~ at the time that we examined all men to see if they are mortal, then we have no right to make the statement that Socrates is mortal.

How do we know that all men are mortal? Well, every man that you have seen is. Therefore all men are mortal. You might say that all men have five fingers. Every man that you have seen has five fingers. Well, then someday you will find someone who has six. Or you'll find one who has four. There are occasional deviations in various parts. All men are mortal. How do you know it? It must be stated either upon induction or revelation. What deduction does is to take something already known, and to see how it applies to a specific thing. It does not add knowledge on any text, but it helps you to understand better the knowledge you already have. It helps you to plot the knowledge that you already have.

If when you mean that all men are mortal, that all men will die, that is a false

statement, because our Lord may come back and take ~~∕~~ a lot of us to Heaven without dying. And those men then will not die. If by all men are mortal we mean that all men have bodies that are ~~decaying~~ in process of decay, the fact that all men that we see die, it seems to be evident that all men will die. But the Lord can change that. ^{if he chose.} ^{/?} Look at Job. He thought that he could be the first one (7½)
^{change} ^{useful} it would. Deduction is a good tool in applying what we already know, but it adds no new knowledge. Induction is the way in which we add knowledge.

But c: Communication. Communication from someone who already knows is the source from which we secure 90% of the knowledge which we have, because no one of us has the time or the ability inductively to learn 10%, granted 2% of the truth that we know. So we learn it by communication. And the greatest scientist in the world, ~~who~~ has learned a great~~am~~ part of what he knows by communication from other sciences and the greatest scientist in the world in his present thoughts secures the knowledge from other scientists' inductive study through communication. And so revelation or communication is the source from which we ~~namam~~ secure the greater part of our actual knowledge. And no - ^(8½) in any field, any knowledge which is not reachable to him, we must get the data which can not be reached by us, we must get our knowledge of it by revelation or by communication. And that is what makes communication ^{or} ~~a~~ revelation. ~~It~~ ~~is~~ so important.

Now, imagination and insight are very important in any science. Making hypotheses and testing them. But they must be tested. And in systematic theology we must make hypotheses, we must use imagination and insight, but when we test what we find, by the data, we are able to say it is right or wrong, and only then. ^{But} ~~MM~~ only then - I thought I saw somebody shake his head as I spoke of induction, but I feel that it is true, even if you should vote unanimously that I was wrong. But I would be glad to discuss it with anybody individually anytime. But that is not ~~the~~ very important to our present study. That is sort of to the side. The vital point, which I gave in number one, and number two, I'll give you tomorrow morning.

Take a pencil and paper please and write out the principal points of differences between the ~~Reformed~~ ^{Reformed} and Luther's views of justification. Just list them, don't discuss them. Now this should ^{have} come out in just reading the first sentence in each paragraph that I assigned to you. You don't need to discuss them. Just list them.

Now we were speaking yesterday about how we secure knowledge in this field. We mentioned negatively, Not through the statement of an authoritative census, authoritative human being, not through the ~~decision~~ ^{decision} (11) of a church body, not through the experience of a church, and here I came into sharp conflict with the statement made by Professor Berkhof, of Calvin Seminary of Grand Rapids, in which he in discussing the origin of dogma, said "Dogmas arise out of the necessity of the Believing Community". And he quotes with approval from [?] Raine (12). And he says [?] Raine is more reformed in his thinking when he ~~says~~ first points out the doctrine, (dogmas) are derived from scripture, and then he says I do not think it is the scientific interest which primarily follows out Christian doctrine. Nor is it an obligation to comply with the ^{formal} conditions of science which this activity properly obeys. Nor do I think that the scientific impulse ~~representative~~ has been historically the creative influence in this department. Doctrine is maintained to arise not primarily in obedience to ~~scientific~~ scientific interest or impulse, but out of the necessity of the believing mind. I have no criticism of what [?] Raine says here. But Berkhof uses this statement to introduce statements which I do not think are good.

Berkhof continues, "Dogmas can not be made to order. They can not be produced by individual theologians ~~as~~ nor by scientific theology in general, and then imposed ~~from~~ upon the community of believers from without. Chances are that dogmas so constructed and ^{proposed} ~~imposed~~, would not really express the fate of the church, and would not strike a responsive chord in the communal life of believers and consequently would not be recognized as authoritative. Why wouldn't people recognize them as authoritative? Because they wouldn't strike a responsive chord in the communal life of the believer. Because they wouldn't really express the fate of the church. Surely, it is the indication thereof, that it is the experience of the church which causes dogmas or doctrines to arise. Now Raine says that "Doctrine arises not primarily to obedience

to scientific interests or impulse. And I will agree with Rainee that the interest is stimulated by the needs of people at different times. That is what stimulates interest undoubtedly. But as to the authority and to why they are recognized as authority; if the Church is truly Christian, it will recognize whatever scripture teaches and it will not recognize as authoritative what the scripture does not teach. And insofar as other causes enter into it or touch upon it, it is disastrous -

S-8. The British invaded and came from the North by land and when they came, they say that some of the defenders waved and said, "You are coming the wrong way. You are supposed to come from around there." The British paid no attention but walked straight in from the ^{side} ~~un~~guarded ^(1/2) and captured them. And then the interesting thing is that after they held Singapore, for a hundred years, the British spent, I think, at least a hundred million dollars to fortify Singapore, against attack. The Japanese marched upon the land. I think exactly the same way the other ^(1/2)

The British didn't tell them they were coming from the wrong direction and to go back, but what they would have done or not, they wished that all that

(3/4). They had taken for granted that this is the way it was to be done. And actually what you have to find out is not what is the way that meets the desires of the Christian community, but that which is in line with truth. In line with truth you have to fortify both sides. You have to be prepared from all directions. And if you are not constantly studying the word to see what the truth is, for your new situation your theology will very soon become quite out of date. You are living off the knowledge of a past generation instead of from the fresh material of the Word of God.

Now I'll take a second just to look at our little quiz that we had. About half of you came too late for the quiz, which I'm sorry in away and glad in away, because you did not make a mistake on it, by not being here to take it. But I find that a good many of these are exactly right and the first one says that the Reformed View of Justification and the Luthern view are essentially the same. And that is very good listing of the points differing between the reformed view and the Luthern view. The only thing I don't like about it, I don't like the word essential.

Because it is not necessary. And that is found quite clearly by Hodge in the beginning of his paragraph here, in the chapter we assigned for yesterday. The first paragraph you'll remember, gives the Westminster Confession definition. The next one says, The Heidelberg Catechism says, and then the second Helvidid ~~am~~ ⁽¹²⁾ confession says, the fourth paragraph said, "These are the most generally received and authoritative standards of the Reformed Churches with which all other reformed symbols agree." The Luthern confessions teaches ~~nam~~ precisely the same doctrine on the subject. And then he continues with a lot of Latin. One Luthern, and the next paragraph another Luthern confession, and then the next one ⁽¹³⁾ and then precisely states the Luthern doctrine on this subject in these words, and then the Form of Concord said conclusions that the Luthern and the Reformed are precisely identical. And so when I asked you to simply state the points of difference it should be a very simple thing to do. There are no points of difference. And that is a point I think it would be well for us to have in mind about justification.

It is not a point of difference between Protestant denominations. As far as I know they all hold to the identical view on it. Because on this point they all follow the scripture and it is one of the points where scripture is most clear.

Well, we were looking at c. How we secure this knowledge, and we noticed negatively, that all the various suggestions of how to secure knowledge ~~of~~ and doctrine or dogma which are other than from the word of God are false. And every Protestant book on the subject will some where say substantially that. But unfortunately most of them contradict it somewhere else, like Berkhof does. I'm not singling him out to criticism, because most books do that.

I was talking to Dr. Killen last summer, when he had just come back from his study in the Netherlands. And he told me that how very, very grateful he was for the training he had received here in the matter of inspiration, because he said he thought that we here had a ~~unique~~ ^{unique} contribution on that. And as far as I can gather, a unique contribution is what I have now been stressing, that the Bible is the only source of our doctrine. That ~~it~~ is the sole source and the only ^{entirely} dependable source.

Now
~~And~~ that sounds very simple. but in actuality it is an inflection, like most every group. They give lip service to the Bible and then they pay attention to the tradition of the elders. What did so and so think? Or what did the leaders of our church believe? ^{Or} ~~And~~ what is the general consensus of the people in this particular group. Or something like that instead of what does the Bible say. And it reminds me of the situation regarding the Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholics will say in their books, it is the Bible that is the source, and the Bishops will add to it. The Bible and this alleged addition are the source they will say, and yet a friend of mine, who had a good friend in a Roman Catholic Seminary said, they were very strict on this dogma and that dogma, and that dogma, but they left a lot of latitude to inspiration. He said, well you can have your theory of inspiration and it doesn't matter too much, but some Catholic folk will admit all kind of scientific errors are in the Bible. Now I don't think any of their official books will, but some of their approved books will do that. Because, though they claim their doctrine is founded on the Bible, the stress is upon dogmas, something by themselves, instead of on the Bible as the source of it. And that is the way with many Protestant groups.

And Dr. Killain ^{KILLIAN} told me how one of the Professors of the Free University was on the boat with him coming over, and wanted ~~me~~ him to help in translating ~~him~~ some material ⁽⁶¹⁾ into English, and he said the material here had theories of inspiration which just destroy the foundation of our relationship to the Bible. He thought it was extremely dangerous, but this ~~man~~ was orthodox in the doctrine, and ⁽⁷⁾ I was, and yet destroyed the foundation a little. And the minute you begin to build upon something definite, you are beginning to destroy the foundation if you take away the ⁽⁷⁾ from the real source, of doctrine or dogma which is simply doctrine.

Berkhof said, "Theology is study on the way to becoming dogma; the dogma is something that has been imposed on the Church. There is no scriptural warrant for that. What is truth? That is what systematic theology decrees. What do we learn that we can depend upon? And you'll find that in nearly every group, once you take your attention away from the Bible, and you give it to the position of the elders, you get into the situation that the Pharisees were in. When they were denying ~~th~~

much of the Word of God, by their traditions, and every group gets ~~in to it,~~ in to it, I don't care what group, but it is a danger to be guarded against, by constantly going back to the source and building our theology upon it.

I said then positively, that we secure knowledge of theology in exactly the same way as we secure knowledge in other fields of science. Some body might say, How did we come to learn about the atom bomb. Was it because of scientific interest? No, it was because of war. It was because Einstein wrote a letter to Roosevelt, and Roosevelt put a billion dollars into it. It was because of the extra needs of war, and the need of the situation of the desire to make the world safe for democracy, ~~because~~ It was because of that, that the atom bomb came into existence, and without it, we may not have had an atom bomb. Well, that is true, that external circumstances quickens interest, but it if the scientist working on the atomic bomb had been interested in proving their theories of it, in such a way that would please the political leaders, in stead of going to the fact and inductively studying them, to see what the real truth was, the probabilities are that it would have taken much longer to have gotten the atom bomb if we had ^{stopped} ~~stopped~~ (9¹). And the same is true in theology. Our interest may be quickened and will be by situations which ~~will~~ turn our attention in a certain direction. But I will say, that for every bit of good that is done in having our attention turned to situations and needs, ^{by} ~~the~~ the situation around us, there is a greater harm done, by the fact that our attention is turned away from clear statements of the scripture. Because situations around us, ~~and the~~ ^{or our} background, of our prejudices, keep us from looking fairly and squarely at the fact and what they actually state. So I personally think it is tremendously important for us to stress this that it is exactly the same way in which we get ~~with~~ materials in other fields of science. We get the data and study them.

And in science there are three primary ways of gaining knowledge; deductive, inductive, and revelation. And I shocked one or two, who I don't think are here this morning, yesterday, (maybe I shocked them so they couldn't get back) but by saying we do not get new knowledge by ~~deduction~~. But I don't think they quite caught what I said. I did not mean to deny that ~~deduction~~ ^{helpful} is a very and important tool of thought. But

what I meant to say is that it is not a means of getting new knowledge, but a means of better understanding the knowledge we already have.

When we say that Socrates is mortal because all men are mortal, we must already know that all men are mortal. We have that knowledge already or the syllogism is worth nothing, and where did we get it? The knowledge that Socrates is mortal is not new knowledge, ^{if we} ~~We~~ already know that all men are mortal. It is a good means of arguing. Socrates is mortal. You don't believe it. Look at that fine man, that wonderful brain. He's not mortal. Well, you believe all men are mortal, don't you. Oh, sure. Well, isn't Socrates a man? Yes. Well, then you will admit that he is a mortal. Oh yes, I see it now. Thus you get the thought across to someone. It is a useful tool in arguing. It is useful in opening up that which is already known. But it must reflect back on something which is known in some way. And if you take for granted or assume that all men are mortal, you are simply using a method that has simply been the ruination of science and of theology. Of assuming something without proof. Because all assumptions need to be examined, to see whether they are true or not. There is no assumption that can be said without proof.

And so by deduction you do not get any new knowledge. In the field of science our knowledge comes by induction, by looking at the facts, comparing them, seeing what is there, and drawing conclusions from them. But in science most of the knowledge any individual has comes by the third method, by communication through revelation. And some of the knowledge that enters into every field of thought comes from this area. It is very unlikely that anyone within the next thirty years would have discovered the atom bomb in America, if they had not received communications of previous discoveries ~~of~~ already made in Europe. Communications of other things occurred elsewhere, were brought in and used in connection with that which

(13). Communication or revelation is necessary in order to get data which are not acceptable proof.

And that leads to point number two. Theology differs from other science only as regards the acceptability of the nation. The difference between theology and other sciences is not that it is in another sphere, and different method of logic apply., or

any other thing of the kind. It is that the data are not ~~acceptable~~ to ordinary inductive purposes, in such a problem. That is the only difference. If you want to learn about this side of the moon, the data are easily ~~accessible~~ ^{acceptable} to you. And yet it would not help you. And there are other methods. Radar. Various means can be used for this side of the moon. They are not good enough to know everything about this side of the moon.

S-9. And outside of Princeton, and I saw ahead of me a young girl with bobbed hair and jaunty manner, and I guessed her to be about 16 or 17 years of age. Then I passed by and I saw the other side. I saw her from the front and she was at least 60. And the appearance in the front and the back were completely different. That ~~assump~~ ^{assumption} from the back, and assumptions and inferences from the back were proven to be completely and entirely wrong. Now the moon may be exactly that way. We look at the moon from this side and we assume that it is just the same on the other side. Personally I do not know why the moon doesn't show its other face to us. Most - I wonder if it has anything to hide? Because almost all other bodies go around and they - like our earth does, they turn on their axis. We see different sides of them. But the moon always keeps one side turned toward us. And as it goes around and round the world, taking about 28 ~~years~~ days to go around, ^{it turns around} at exactly the same rate as both of us, but it is just the one side that we ever see. And what's on the other side is a mystery that no human being knows the answer to whatsoever. We can not study it by any inductive ~~thought~~ process. And a deductive process is quite worthless. It does not tell us what is there. We do not know, anything about it. And if anybody gets a space ship big enough that he can fly from here to Mars, I will be most interested, if he comes back, to ask him, whether he glanced around and saw the other side of the moon, and saw whether it was like this side or not. That would be more interesting than what he learns from Mars. Because we can tell more about Mars, than we can about the other side of the moon. The data are just not accessible to us.

And if someone were to fly to Mars and were to look around and see the other side of the moon, what he would tell us would be worth more, than all the theorizing and

the imaginings and inferences and speculations which could possibly be made, about the other side of the moon. There are a great deal of philosophies that are, I believe, like a group of men who had never been to China, haven't talked with anyone who had been to China, never seen a book written by anyone who had been to China, or to go to a high hill on the edge of the Pacific Ocean and look ~~across~~ out at the ocean, and look across there at the waves and the clouds, and ~~as~~ as they looked begin to argue whether there was a country across the Pacific ocean and if so, what it was like. What directions do its rivers run? Is it flat? Or is it mountain? Is its coast straight or is it filled with little indentations? There are thousands (3)
 ? ? ?
 who do that, we could relate the differences between various continents. Are there people there? If so, what kind of a language do they speak? Many many questions you could ask, and you could look at the waves and you could look at the clouds, you could argue and you could discuss, and you could use a tremendous amount of brain, in making up theories, but your theories would be worth absolutely nothing.

One word of communication would be worth more than all the theories put together. And it is exactly that way when we get into knowledge of matters related to the universe where we can't reach. What happens after death? Nobody ~~had~~ ^{of us has} ever been there? Nobody has any way to know, of his own experience what happens after death. Where did we come from? We can tell that there is a God from the wonderful science of reason, of order in nature, of causation in the universe. There are abundance emphases that there is a great and powerful being controlling this universe. But is he loving? Or is he brutal? What are his purposes? What are his plans? What kind of being is he? There is ~~an~~ absolutely no way we can tell, because we can not get to him through example. We can not hold him still, to look him over. There is no way inductively, that we can find out, more than a tiny bit, about God, about the universe, about the future life, about the origin o f all things.

I was interested some time ago to hear of the claim made that it can be proven that is, creation can be proven because science has now shown that the universe is expanding. And it is expanding at such a rate that you figure it back to the time when all the universe was in one little spot, where it began shooting out in all

directions from (5) and you figure out how long it is and perhaps a ~~huh~~ couple of billion of years or more, until the time when all the universe was in one little point. And therefore there must have been a creation when it started. The argument was given at the meeting, and then, Carl Henry, who is the editor of this new magazine, "Christianity Today", spoke up and he said he questioned the validity of the argument, because how does anyone know that the universe has been expanding two or three billion years. How do we know he said but that it is like an accordion which expands awhile and then contracts awhile. And of course, the fact is, ~~huh~~ that we don't. Unless one of us was there to make the same sort of test that proves it is expanding. To make the same test a billion years ago to prove that it was expanding and not contracting, it is purely a guess that this which is today has gone on, unchanged through all this time. It is purely a guess and an inference. And there is no reason which can prove anything as where the data or not is acceptable, where we cannot touch the data. And so we ~~can~~ have to have revelation or communication, because there is no other way to get the data. And of course it is exactly the same way if you want to learn about some other subject and you can't go there, you have to get communication, or revelation.

The Philosopher Kant wrote an article about London, in which he showed an insight into the city of London, and in circumstances far beyond ~~what~~ most people of his time could have shown. That wonderful mind ~~made~~ applied himself to the data about London, and made some very fine inferences about it. But it was all based upon what he read, because he was never there. He got his material entirely by communication. And material gotten by communication can be just as valid and just as good as material gotten by actually being there. A man who is an expert on various types of languages that I know nothing about, can sit in a library here in this country and know far more about the languages of India, than I would know by taking a trip to India. He would be getting his information by communication. But he would have the ability to study this

(7 3/4) in a way that I would not have in that particular field.

I can walk through a great tropical forest and ~~I~~ when I got out I wouldn't know a tenth as much ~~as~~ about tropical botany as a man who studies it in a museum here, if he had

a particular training in that line. He may get nearly all of his information by communication.

So that is the vital difference between theology, and physics and chemistry or geography, or some other science that the data are not accessible to us except by revelation or by communication. And it is why I personally think that beyond a certain introduction to its main problem, further study of the detail of unbelieving philosophy is for most people, a way to nowhere (8 $\frac{1}{2}$), because it is using empirical thinking and analytic brain power to deal without a basis in ~~the~~ a field. It has tries to make theories in the universe leaving out of consideration that data that are needed to understand that theory.

I've already covered what they say in number three; Data ~~is~~ Otherwise Inaccessible Can Only be Secured by Revelation.

And Number Four: We have such a revelation. That is the basic Christian belief. It is not the basic matter for salvation. That is involved in our study of justification. You can be justified without having any clear understanding. I think what Mr. Springer said yesterday was very, very excellent. That God will take you where you are if you go as far as you can. I think that was very excellent. A person who has no means of learning Christian truth may be saved with very little knowledge. Its just simply putting your trust in Christ and knowing nothing about it. But a person who has the ability to get ~~the~~ some other knowledge and refuses to get it, I do not think he can be saved in that way. I think that for most people, salvation requires some understanding, of what Christ has done. It is the rare case when a person is saved without any knowledge. It is all that is actually needed, but God expects us to have such understanding as we can get.

Christians believe that the Bible is a revelation from God. We believe that the Bible is the revelation from God, and that the Bible contains the revelation from God. People often say that it is ~~the~~ a modernist statement that the Bible contains the revelation from God. Well, the modernist uses it and if that's all we believe, it is a modernist statement. But they - there is a sense in which it is perfectly true. The - God revealed $\$$ certain things, and the Bible contains what God revealed. But the

Bible also contains certain matters which men observed. Paul said, "The Cloak that I left at Troas, bring with thee." Is that the word of God? Has God revealed to Paul that he has left his cloak at Troas? instead of Ephesus? Maybe he did. We have no proof. Maybe he didn't. Maybe Paul knew it. Maybe Paul intentionally left it.

Sarah won't need it, so (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) when you come this fall you bring it with you. Maybe he knew it as there. We don't know.

But any way, the account of David killing Goliath was not a revelation of God. It was written no doubt by someone on the spot, who saw it happening. It is an account of what people saw. So the Bible contains a revelation from God. It contains much ~~in~~ which is the revelation ~~of~~ from God, but it contains much that the people of God believed. But we believe that the Words of the Bible are inspired and kept from error. So that as a result of this all of this becomes a revelation. And thus, though part of it is given as a revelation from God, and part of it is ~~given~~ human observation. All of this, as a result of the words being inspired becomes a revelation. I don't know of any ~~revelation~~ inspiration except inspiration of words. Ideas are not inspired, they are revealed. But words are inspired. But as a result of the words being inspired, and kept from error, it now becomes a revelation from God.

And so that leads us to Number Five. The Revelation becomes a Source of Material for Inductive Study. And so our same method which we use in science, the method of induction, becomes the method which we can use in systematic theology. The method of induction. We find that God dealt with Abraham in a certain way. There is a fact. The fact is capable of an explanation in various ways. We find that he dealt with Noah in certain ways. There is a fact. The fact is capable of explanation in various ways. These two facts ~~make~~ two elements in an inductive chain of reasoning and we compare with this view and this other view and we build up an inductive argument, it, by from which we learn of the character of God and of His goodness. There are matters of the Bible which are simply communicated directly. God makes a statement. He gives us the answer, but in addition to that there are an infinite number of things which can be worked by an inductive study, exactly as has been done in any science, we study in the Bible, by seeing what the emphasis is here, and what it is here, and what it is here, and then putting them together, checking them together, and comparing them,

making hypotheses 0---

S-10. 2/6/57.

Make your hypotheses, check your hypotheses, by examining them.

Number six. The Bible under the Leading of the Holy Spirit, is the only source for Knowledge of Theology. This is admitted by practically all Protestants' books of theology but then is forgotten by most of them. Others substitute it as the source for their ^{knowledge of} theology, a search of their ^{fortune} (1/2). It is only the Bible which is a source. A true ~~and~~ valid source for theology. And when these sound, Christian people talk about the ~~principles~~ Christian consciousness with the attitude of the church being a source of dogma it is only a little step over to the modernistic ^{of} emphasis making subjective ideas of the human mind become the source for religious conclusion and to get off into all the ^{phases} (1 1/2) of modernism. The best way to keep from falling into that is to keep from taking the first step. We must keep our feet firmly grounded on the fact that the Bible alone is the source for knowledge in the field of theology.

Now, Number c. This was b. How we get knowledge in this field. C. What is the purpose of our course? And I believe that we will accomplish our purpose much better, if we have in our mind precisely what it is.

And so I have put our purpose under three heads. Our purpose in this course. Number one. It is to gain a balanced knowledge of the vitals and essentials of Christianity. That is the first purpose of our course. To gain a vital knowledge of the vital essentials of Christianity. And I am anxious that you get a very clear understanding of the vital essentials. I think that this is much more important than our other ~~purposes~~ purposes though they are very much important. In this chapter that I assigned for yesterday, on justification, there was one page which is perhaps worth all the rest put together. This one page where he says, Points included in the above statement of the ~~doctrine~~ doctrine, is a wonderful clear statement of what the Bible teaches on justification by faith. He gives it ~~under~~ under six points. Then he continues from there to take up the points in relation to the weight of which

they are attacked or discussed or the amount of the evidence. But that is necessary to do it in that way. But for the clear understanding, if you master everything on this page, and done nothing else in the whole chapter, you would be better off, then to have a fair knowledge of the rest of the chapter. And there is little knowledge of this which we simply take. To get a balanced knowledge of the vital essentials of Christianity is like giving a compass to a ship. It will keep us from being led away into all sorts of harmful wrong direction. And I think that is a more important purpose for systematic theology than most any other, and I have always felt was given its proper place in most courses of systematics in which I had any connection.

Most of them I felt have gotten so interested in minutia that they have allowed, the objective of seeing that everyone gets this balanced knowledge of the vital essentials to be pushed aside to some extent. And I would like to be sure that everyone gets the vital knowledge of the basic assumptions of these very vital subjects that are in our course this term. Justification, sanctification, the law, the sacraments, and eschatology. That's a tremendous number to cover for one term. In away I wish that we ~~had~~ ^{had} ~~could~~ followed ^{and} (4¹/₂) in the catalog that justification and sanctification were already covered, but in another way I'm glad to start with justification, because there is nothing in theology which is more important than justification. And to be sure there is a balanced understanding of justification if almost worth anything else in the course put together. And if you master that one page there, I would think that is worth almost a seminary's course. That one page. It is a very, very valuable page. I'm afraid our time is up. We'll continue there tomorrow morning.

2/7/57.

We will meet tomorrow at eight o'clock and I believe that I mentioned that Church Government would meet at the regular time. We will not give an assignment for tomorrow. We will post an assignment for next week. If anyone would like to get a start on the assignment immediately I'll tell it to you now, but fotherwise we'll have it up by noon. I imagine that none of you will get started before noon.

Yesterday we were speaking about the - in our introductory section we began c, which is the purpose of the course. (The first assignment for next Tuesday is to take the third volume of Hodge and to look at the chapter headings in the front, and see what you can say about the relationship of each subject matter to justification. You'll do that with the third part of Hodge, then the second, then the first. The reason why I gave it in that order is because there is most of it in the second. Next most in the third, and some in the first. Now this is a matter of what you know or what you recall, what you understand, to write a brief statement of the relationship if any to the other. Now ~~now~~ some will seem to have no relationship, some to have the most relationship, and some in between. In connection with that, if you happen to think and know of a verse of scripture that brings out this ~~main~~ relationship then indicate it, if you don't, then don't spend time looking for it. And then, as you look through the table of contents, sometimes you'll see a mention of justification there. If within the two hours you find it, if you have time to look that up, ~~if you don't find it~~ and see what the main thing is alright, if you don't alright. You see what the point is. Its to get an idea of the system of justification and its relationship as well as you can from looking this over. This is a two hour assignment.)

Now c we are looking at, the purpose of the course. And here I think that many people studying systematic theology fail to get anything like the value they should from it, because of the fact that they do not see clearly in mind ~~the~~ what the purpose is. And I think if you keep the purpose in mind, you will get much more value out of the study. And so I'm listing the purpose under three heads. And I believe that if, instead of saying, here are some things I want you to get in mind to write on the test, or here's a book I have to cover, here are three objects that I wish to obtain. I think that if you say that, you will find you will accomplish far more, and that it will stay with you much longer.

And the first of these, as I mentioned yesterday is to gain a vital knowledge of the vital, essentials of Christianity. It is amazing how many students there are who go through seminary and get the material, have a pretty good idea of it, and then after they finish, they go out, and they start their ministry, and then sometime, in

the course of their ministry, one particular doctrine of the scripture, grips their heart and goal in a marvelous way. And they begin preaching it and stressing it, and driving it home, and that is excellent. It is grand to have the great doctrines of the scripture gripped by the heart and soul. But how often as they do that, they go on to stress that one doctrine out of proportion to all others, and without realization of its relationship to the others. And the result is that they get an unbalanced presentation. Which gives the people a great deal that is very excellent in what they get about that one doctrine, but which gives people a distorted idea of others, and makes of them, unbalanced Christians. Sometimes they are unbalanced with the great emphasis on something that is extremely important and something which is very vital in its proper place, but which becomes harmful if it is so emphasized. And that should be avoided if one has a clear, balanced knowledge of the vital essentials in their relation one to the other, so that when you gather appeal with tremendous zeal with one doctrine over another you will immediately recall its relationship to others, and stop and present it in a balanced way and take time to see the great bearing of the others too. I think I mentioned to you ~~mmmmmm~~ already, the student in the class, who when they studied about God the Father, felt that that was everything. God the father, and true, it is tremendously important. And then they came up with God the son, and he thought that God the Son was everything. Then they took up God the Holy Spirit and he felt as if the Holy Spirit was so important that nothing else really mattered. Well, he did not emphasize the importance of any of these more than they should be emphasized. Each person of the Trinity is so important that in comparison nothing human matters, but in which they all agree on important aspects of a great truth, and it is very vital that we keep our balanced understanding and ideas, and that is one of the reason that our catalog stresses the memorization of the relevant portions of the Westminster Catechism, because the Catechism because the catechism was made by men who had spent many years of very careful study of the Bible and of the doctrinal views of their days, and of the disputes that ~~they~~ had preceded and of the various creeds that had been written, and it is amazing how frequently you will find in just two or three words in it in a part of the catechism that you just

repeat over and perhaps not think of, you stop, and you look at those two or three words, and you find that they give you a balanced attitude to something that can become of tremendous significance.

People get ~~me~~ all stirred up over a little thing, it is true. And then they stir it up to such a point that they twist it all out of proportion and put other truths into a higher position. And you'll find that these men who wrote the catechism were familiar with that difficulty. They had seen it happen. And they saw what happened from it. And they avoided it. And so the catechism is a wonderfully balanced presentation. And that is why it is good to have a clear definite idea in brief compass such as this gives. Usually ~~we~~ we memorize from the shorter catechism. In this particular case this doctrine is so vital that I felt it was important for you to know the additional ideas that are expressed in the larger catechism and we will learn a little less from the shorter catechism with others. But on this particular point I think it is very vital that we have both. And if you fully understand the meaning of that answer there in the larger catechism, you have something that will give you a balanced view.

S-11. For the reason that they have an entirely different system in their teaching of theology. At least they did twenty years ago. A friend of mine used to teach there and he told me this was their adopted course. "The system that they had there, was that when a man was made professor of systematic theology, he began to teach introduction in systematic theology, and he might take two or three years on that. And then he would take up the doctrine of God, and then he would take six or seven years on that. It would take him at least twenty years to go through systematic theology. In the class he would take up each doctrine just as thoroughly as he could, studying everything he could find, delving into all the realms that could be fashioned as far as he could see, and going into it very very thoroughly into that doctrine. Thus a student in the three year course, if he came in when the professor was new there, he would have the three years of Introduction in theology and what is the basis of the right approach. If he came in three years later he would have

three years on the Doctrine of God. Still ~~much~~ later he might be further on. And if the professor was there for 16 years, the whole three years might be on Justification. But then by himself he would take the - Ho[d]ge or whatever book was there and he would study the rest of the views of theology and take it upon himself, in order to pass the examination. And thus, he is supposed to get his balanced knowledge from his own studies. But he gets his understanding of methods of dealing with theological problems by hearing a highly trained specialist take one small area of theology and go as far as possible into that area. I think it is very valuable for one to have that training. But the newest student, at least with the background of our American education, I am not sure that he would get a sufficient well-balanced knowledge of the vitals simply from your own study. And in our American system, we try to get more of a quick serving in every department, so that we will cover it as a whole. And that is so vital, that I would rather we got that, and nothing of this subject ~~man~~, then to get some and not enough of the other. But for theologically trained men they should have a good grip of the subject. But you can't get nearly as much as you could under that Dutch system, because there is no subject which you can take up in theology but what if we went thoroughly and fully into it, our Theological course would take 20 or 25 years, instead of taking 3. And the result is that we have to work in a cursory manner, at various sections.

Under that system ~~the~~ people came out highly trained on the particular small part of theology that they were dealing with in that period. Under our system people should come out with a balanced knowledge of the whole and with a knowledge of a little bit further on the whole field. But they've never had the opportunity to take just one and deal very deeply with it, and get a real thorough training in that. But when it comes to the secondary points of theology, those points on which denominations may differ on, which highly trained men differ, on these points you cannot know all you have to learned in a seminary course, but you do not need to know all about this, but there may be certain points that may become of tremendous importance to you. It may become of tremendous importance some time in your ministry. It may become a vital center of discussion and agitation and perplexing in the

particular problem with which you have to deal with. And when that time comes, you can't go back to the seminary and find the ~~main~~ tradition of it, because we can't cover the tradition on it on all fields. We could only cover the tradition on one field. And we can't know what particular field would be of particular use for you at some future time. And so for everything beyond this basic foundation, the vital thing ^{isn't} ~~is~~ how many of the secondary details you learn, but the vital thing is how much you learn of the method of getting detail, of making a judgment, of finding what the evidence is on which we can base a proper decision. And that's why a good bit of my stress is simply of not just giving you my results, but in giving you training, and getting results yourself. Dealing with problems and finding the answer. And in a good many of these sections I am assigning you before we meet the problem, the study of certain areas, because the training in methods you get there, is almost more important than anything I can give you except for a thoroughly balanced knowledge of theology, which is of supreme importance.

But we will be interested in any particular problem which is taken up and will take time in going into it as far as we can, and get through the course. If we looked at it fully, we'd spend twenty-five years instead of three. But we will look as far as we can within the limits of the time, but I will be glad to take an occasional problem and go into it quite a distance rather than to go into it a tiny distance in the problem, because we'll get that much better training from it. But in all other secondary matters we go into, I am much more interested in the training you get in method than in your knowing precise results. As I have said hundreds of times, ever since I began to teach it, I am not particular concerned with ~~what~~ whether you accept my view on almost any particular subject, but I am greatly concerned for the purpose of the class that you know what it is and what ^I ~~you~~ base it on. And even more than that, that you know how I get it, and how you can learn ~~main~~ ^{something of the} methods so that you can make your own judgments on all these points.

Now, so much for Number two, ~~How~~ to secure training in dealing with Theological Problems. Number three is important I believe then number two although it is closely related to number two, ~~what~~ It is not as important as one, but it comes rather close.

Number three is - To Determine the Proper Attitude Toward those who differ with us, on points of theology. Now you see how important that is. Number one, you have your balanced knowledge of the vital essentials of Christianity, so that when you are preaching over a period of time, your general relationship will be that you will give others a balanced understanding. And in your own personal life there will be this balanced understanding. But this one is of tremendous importance to anyone living in this world today. What is your attitude and relation to those who differ because everybody will differ to some extent. No ~~many~~ two of us have exactly the same theology. And you will find many who differ very very widely. And yet with whom you have a good bit to do. ~~many~~ But to determine the proper attitude toward other Christians and groups, in Christian work is tremendously important, in practical problems. And for that problem it is necessary to divide it strictly into two parts. Because it makes a tremendous difference in your attitude.

A. Is on vital points of today and B. is on secondary ~~matter~~.

I have known people who could immediately spot one half of one per cent of Armenianism, in another man's views, could see the tiniest bit of unreformed attitude in him immediately, and yet could walk straight up to a modernist and never recognize that there was anything in the world wrong with him. I have known people like that. What I mean to say is this. It is important that we differentiate between the vital points and the points which although ~~man~~ are important, are not so vital. And my observation and experience through the years have led me to believe that an over emphasis on secondary matters, almost invariably lead to more emphasis on primary matters. We should give proper attention to secondary matters. But we should sharply distinguish between the most vital matters and the ~~man~~ secondary matters. A person's attitude to the deity of Christ, his attitude towards the Bible, (whether it is absolutely dependable and free from error), these are basic things. If a person agrees with and on these, we should ~~man~~ ^{be able} (I don't say that we always can) to sit down with them, and calmly and prayerfully consider those matters on which we differ. And we should be able to work with them in many areas of certain activity, very effectively. If we agree on these basic matters, of the full belief in the deity of

Christ, and of the absolute willingness to take anything that is absolutely taught in the Bible, and accept it; take the Bible alone and ~~apply~~ a final, determined, judgment on any point of (10) doctrine. If we agree on that, if we agree on inspiration, we should be able to work other things out. If we don't agree on that, we have no solid basis. We have no basis on which to come together.

A very strong modernist in Wilmington, came to see me one day, and he asked me to join with him in getting out a petition, to keep a saloon from being established half way between his place and our place.

And that is a matter on which we both could work together. We could both readily express our opinion that it was harmful to ~~have~~ have a saloon. But he talked to me, and we found ourselves in agreement with one point of the Saviour. We couldn't work together on that, because our foundations were quite different. It would be impossible for us to work together in any effective or satisfactory way. And it is important that ~~we~~ we learn what the vital points are. To me this matter of justification is one of the most vital points that there are, because it is the practical point at which our Christian work finds expression as far as it relates to the one who is not a believer. This is the entrance into the Christian life. This is the point at which they come into Christianity. And the Lord did not leave them upon this world. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson used to say, God did not leave you in the world to explain all the things in the universe, He didn't tell you to go into all the world and explain ~~all the problems~~ to all the people all the problems of theology, or all the mysteries of the world. He said, Go into all the world and preach the gospel. And the problem is to how to preach, How they can be justified, How they can be redeemed.

Now a person may have an orthodox view on justification, but seldom mentions it. But if a person has a vital passion to make this known, there is something upon which we can agree and accept even though our understanding of Abraham's relation to God, might differ radically. So it is very important that we get a clear knowledge of these vital points, so that we see their tremendous importance in our relation to other

Christian workers and see that we have a proper understanding of the right attitude to take on secondary matters. And as far as our attitude on secondary matters is concerned, it seems to me that there are two considerations that we can take on either account.

The first is: How important is the matter? On which there is difference of opinion. How important is it, and a second point is, How great is the diversion - How great is the emphasis of the other person on the point of diversion? In a certain area, another man and I can agree on 60% of the secondary matter. We agree on the vital ~~4~~ points; we agree upon 60% of the secondary matter. We have 40% diversion of secondary matters and yet we can work together for a well defined doctrine on which we ~~and~~ can work together in harmony. Another man and I can agree on 98% of secondary matters, but on that 2%, he thinks that's so tremendously important, he's gotta ^{to} be fighting hard, and pushing on that all the time, and I cannot accomplish a great deal with him. You see, the emphasis is sometimes almost as importance, as the amount of divergence.

S-12. - secondary matters. But not to emphasize them to the point where they become blind to tradition of the true Christian and to the hindrance of effective co-operation in the world of the Lord. I feel this way in particular about rites and ceremonies. One man believes in baptizing by sprinkling, another prefers to pour the water, another prefers to put a person completely under water. There is a group that practices immersion by turning a person backward three times into the water. There's another group that pushes them forward three times into the water. And there are all these different methods of baptism. But the vital question is what do you believe? If you believe in justification through grace and if you believe that the Holy Spirit baptizes a person into the kingdom of God, and you are representing this in some form, a divergence on the form isn't a thousandth as important as your agreement on the vital things upon which Christians believe. If you don't agree on the vital things, you can ^{HAVE} find exactly the same thing.

You can have two churches which are very very strict on the type of immersion, two ~~blocks~~ blocks apart in the city, and one has a minister who is a thorough fundamentalist who presents the word of God and leads souls into the kingdom. And two blocks away there is modernist who doesn't believe in any doctrine of the scripture except one, the importance of immersion. And these two people, two blocks apart, agree absolutely on this rite, on this form, on this mold, and as far as I'm concerned, the person could baptize in the method now used, or ~~any one~~ any one of a hundred others that he should desire, and as far as I'm concerned it wouldn't make the slightest difference in my co-operation with him.

Now if that is so, if these matters of rites and ceremonies are secondary, we should think them through, and see if the Bible teaches something definite, and if it does, express it, but I do not see that we should fight over them or that we should give a proportion of our time to them and make them take a lot of time ~~that~~ and could be spent on presenting the great truths of the gospel. And I think this is very true in another sphere. There is one word that I wish could be ~~hmmight~~ dropped from the English language altogether. And that is the word - dispensationalism. I know people who think that unless a person is a dispensationalist, he is absolutely no good. And I know other people who say that if a person is a dispensationalist he is absolutely good. And my observation is that if you get any six people together, you will get a definition of dispensationalism which is utterly different from the definition, absolutely different. Personally, I ~~have~~ held to the dispensationalism of Charles Hodge. Charles Hodge has a section on the dispensations in his second volume, under the Covenant of Grace. He has a section, The different dispensations.

He says, the first dispensation, from Adam to Abraham; the second dispensation, from Abraham to Moses; the third dispensation, from Moses to Christ, is a page and a half. And then, he has the gospel as a dispensation. Now he gives these four dispensations and he has a discussion about them, about the comparison between these different dispensations. Now you look in a Scofield Bible, and you will find a clear statement in the beginning of it, that the way of salvation is the same under all the different dispensations. And that is what Hodge says here in his section on the

continuity of the covenant of grace, that we are saved in exactly the same way as all the different dispensations. Every true Christian believes that. Some say things that sound as if they didn't. But if you push them down you will find that every Christian has to believe it. There is no name under heaven whereby a man can be saved except by the Lord Jesus Christ and no one ever was saved in any other way. All Christians believe that. But that there are dispensations of the covenant of grace, all Christians also believe that. And Hodge very clearly states here differences between different dispensations. Now in the Scofield Bible you take the statements given there of the different dispensations given there, and you will find that practically everything that Hodge says is given in slightly different words in the Scofield Bible. There is an occasional statement there which is quite extreme in a particular direction, but usually when you find such a statement, you find it contradicted by another statement elsewhere in the Bible which shows that at that particular point there is perhaps an effort to spread some particular truth and so Scofield stated it in an overly strong way and contradicted the clear teaching of the notes as a whole.

Their system of dispensation isn't spoken of, taken as a whole, as a system, and the system in (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) theology, is very, very close. Now a person may take some aspect of it, and stress it one way or another. One may say, there are no dispensations. Everything is just one even level. If that's the case, then we should certainly be for it, and we certainly should be carrying it throughout all the Old Testament. There is no question there are dispensations. And every Christians act as if there are dispensations. Every Christian does. And on the other hand you can go to the other extreme, and say divide it up, and say - that's only for Israel, that's only for these people, and so on, and of course, that's clearly taught within the scriptures, and it is in the notes of the Scofield Bible, which brings out that all scripture is for all people. So some of it has greater immediate reference as to one time as to another time.

There are areas which people go into on this side, and areas on this side, on about six or eight different lines, which you could mention, on which some people would say, Dispensation is this, and some would say, dispensation, and others,

it is this, and each of these, is about six or eight different points, on which you can go too ~~man~~ far this way, or too far this way, and the exact point in the middle, is very, very hard to find. And I don't think that it is necessary that we find the exact point. But I think that it is vital that we find the general area, in which we should stay. And as a rule, if you take these following leaders of these different groups, and see how they word their statements, you will find they are in the area, one will be a little further this way, and one will be a little further this way, but the emphasis he gives, his students would take and carry it where he would never think of going. And the emphasis one gives here, is carried way over there, where he would never think of going. And then you have two students over here, and you get the men from whom they learned it, and they are about here, and they are both right within the reasonable area of the interpretation. I've had that experience many times.

And so, I would say, there is a word that has lost its meaning, if it ever had a meaning. And I wish it wouldn't be used for categorizing people. It is remarkable how often on many of these doctrines, you will find a person, you will immediately label him or her in a certain category. Well, they may belong to that category, but there is also a good chance that if you talked to them, you will find that they have a ~~hint~~ certain little external of that category, but when you get into it, you will find that actually, their views are very, very, very close to your own.

And so I think that to learn on what matters are right, and what is secondary, is one of the most important things in theology, and then to learn on secondary matters, what our attitude should be. Some people think that dispensationalism means a view that people were saved by works instead of by grace in Old Testament times. I don't think that any true Christian believes that, but some talk as if they do. But how is that view defined. It developed because a great number of orthodox people, including many followers of Charles Hodge, who understood his doctrines on the whole ~~man~~ theory of it, many people who were very orthodox in their beliefs, preached the ψ law of God in such a way that they were quite misunderstood. And the people got the impression that in their zeal to get a correct understanding of God's will for the type of life, which we are living ~~in~~, they meant that this is the way to be saved. And of course, that was

a very, very serious error. We are not told to preach the Law of God. We are told to preach the gospel. The law has its vital place. But the gospel is what we preach. And one of the great causes of the modernism today, is the great amount of ethical teaching in the last generation, which was good preaching, by all the orthodox men, but by men who did not put their stress where it should be put. And a result of that, was that thousands of people, who should have heard the gospel, never heard it. And then, some people who did not have a great deal of education, really started preaching the great teaching of salvation by ~~an~~ faith. And they began preaching it, and by trying to put their stress on grace, rather than law, some of them fell into the error of relegating the law to the Old Testament, and saying that people were saved in that time by keeping the law, but today we are saved by grace. The truth is, we were always saved by grace, and the truth is also that we are always told what kind of life, we should live.

But as Hodge points out, there is a difference in emphasis before Christ's coming, and after it. And the statements he makes are very different from the statements which are (10 $\frac{1}{2}$). Now I say that anybody who stresses salvation by faith, and stresses how we can be saved in these days is doing a very great service to the cause of Christ. Let's say, Here's a man and this man believes that in the days of David the way of being saved, was by keeping the law. But of course there is no scripture whatsoever to go on to. But people were raised that way. And I believe that people were saved then, as they are today through the grace of Christ by faith. We have ~~the accounts of the apostles~~ different (11) but he believed very, very thoroughly that what the world needs today is how to be saved by grace. I believe it, too. Well, why can't we work together? We both believe that the most important thing in the world is to get the people the message to grace. We're not preaching to the people ~~and~~ of David's time. . We're not trying to win to salvation the people of that time. Supposing his idea was completely wrong of how people are saved today. We're not preaching to the people of David's day, we're preaching to the people of our day, and the vital thing is, How are we saved, today? If theologically, he and I had a tremendous difference in our interpretation of how

people were saved in David's day, but our objective and our central purpose is to reach the people of today, and we are absolutely agreed upon what we are to do today. Here's another man, he has clear ideas of how people were saved in David's day. He's absolutely true in theology on that point, but where is his emphasis today? He's putting his emphasis on the details of the law of God. He believes the right idea of how people are saved, but he hasn't got the emphasis on the right place where it should be. On salvation by grace. I can't work nearly as well with him, even though theologically, he's way ahead of the other. Now, I feel that if you have a correct idea of these matters, you will be able to work with anyone who stands on the vital principles of the Gospel. But your manner on the secondary points will reflect that as time goes on, he will learn from you. He'll be interested in ~~this~~ your approach on this, and you will have a far better affect on him, than if you say, Oh, that dispensationalism is no good. Now that's just one example. There are hundreds of examples in which we should say, What is the vital part in this on the points of theology on which there is a difference. And, if it is vital and primary, we should draw a sharp line. We can not work with one, who does not accept the deity of Christ, and does not take the Bible as His foundation. And it is pretty hard ~~f~~ to work with such a one, who does not accept justification by faith as his great goal. But a person who agrees on these, we should give him the blessings we have to correct understanding. We should help them and lead them rather than fight them on the secondary points. Well, so much for ~~Number one~~ Introduction.

Now, we go on to Number one, Justification.

S-13. There is no more important subject in Christian activity, than justification. In our Christian activity other subjects are important as they relate to this one. This is of as great importance as any other. And so I ask you to go through it, looking at the purpose of the various paragraphs, and you will notice in the first paragraph that justification is defined in the Westminster Catechism, and it gives it to you in English. Then, the Heidelberg Catechism says, and that gives it to you in the Latin, and if you did not translate that, you'd simply note that he gives the Heidelberg, and then he gives you the second Helvidic ~~m~~(~~is~~), and then he says, these are the most

generally received and the authoritative statements of the reformed churches with which all other reformed symbols agree. The Luthern confessions teach precisely the same doctrines on this subject. Well, after Hodge says that, you may not bother to read the Latin in the next four paragraphs, which gives you various Luthern confessions. And I don't think that just from reading this, without reading the Latin, you're qualified to say this, that the Luthern confession and the Reformed agree on this, but you should be qualified to say that, Hodge says they agree. And I think that we can take this on Hodge's word. But if you want to be absolutely sure on this, you just study the Latin carefully, or look them up in a book that gives them in English, and compare them, but he says that is the meat of the two pages.

First, the definition which we learned from the catechism. Second: "All reformed creeds agree, he says, and the Luthern Confessions teaches precisely the same doctrine." In other words, justification is not a matter of argument between people of reformed persuasion, and Luthern. It is in fact, a ^{primary} ~~primary~~ Protestant doctrine, the primary Protestant doctrine, of the Reformation. So ~~important~~ its importance is very, very great. And then you will notice he says on page 117, he said, "Points included in the above statement of doctrine," and there he gives you six points, all of which are included in the definition which we've learned, but in order to understand the definition you have to read it. That's the most important page in the chapter by far.

But under importance, I will mention as Number one, The Great Emphasis in the New Testament. And I'm giving you some assignments to get the New Testament teaching on it, but even more, to see how it is interesting. How all through the New Testament there is a constant stress on this. How we can be justified through Christ. How is Jesus introduced in the very first place in Matthew 1: 21. That he shall save his people from their sins. Now of course that figures that that is more than justification. But ~~the~~ justification is the first vital thing which it speaks of. And John is first introduced on this earth by John the Baptist's statement, "Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." That is our primary emphasis in the New Testament. The taking away of our sin. Now we divide the taking away of our sin into two parts, justification and sanctification. But the first of these must be justification.

And then I have listed here, quite a few other verses showing its great stress in the New Testament, until you get into the book of Revelation where Revelation 5: The great hymn of praise, "He was the lamb who was slain through whom we are redeemed." The tremendous emphasis in the New Testament.

I won't bother to read you these verses or to give them/ specific references, because ~~they~~ we're working ~~in~~ directly on that line.

Number two under its importance. It is the great doctrine of the Protestant Reformation. This was believed by all the great Christians before the reformation, but it was never quite clearly expressed before, as Martin Luther expressed it. Luther did not originate it, Others knew it, others told it. But ~~in~~ its great importance, to hold on it, and it was the preaching of this great doctrine brought on the Reformation. Justification by faith alone. Its the great, outstanding doctrine of the Reformation.

Number three. It is important because it is the key that opens the door to eternal life. Justification by faith is the key that opens the door to eternal life. We learn about God, the great doctrines of God, and apart from this, they have no relevance to us, except to tell us of the great ~~judgment~~ judge whom we must fear. We learn of anthropology, and we see our sin, and the terrible condition we're in, with nothing but hopelessness ahead. And then we find the key that takes us from this into the other thing, and from there on, we have the blessings that we have, but the entrance to it, comes through this, justification by faith.

2/8/57. We were speaking of the importance of justification. And under that head, we noticed first, Its great emphasis in the New Testament. I have a list here of maybe thirty verses picked more or less at random. As you've gone through it, in connection with the assignment, you've probably noticed a great many more. Anything that is so stressed is of tremendous importance. Number two, we mentioned that it was the great doctrine of the Reformation. It was the realization, I won't say the discovery. It was known before. But it was the realization of justification by faith and what it means and what justification means really, that made the tremendous change in Martin Luther's life. And it was his presentation of it that made the great Reformation movement all over

Europe. Three, I mentioned that it is the key that opens the door to eternal life. That everything in theology finds its central point in this. In theology you have your study of God, but from the standpoint of a human being, you're interested in his relation to you. And his relation to you is one of three things. It is either the relations which you connected with your getting into the condition of being lost, the relation which is connected with your being justified, or the connections with the results that flow from justification.

Justification is the center as far as the man is concerned, of relation to God. All the study of anthropology is a study of man's lost condition, and how man got into this condition. How he got into the situation that needs justification. The study of soteriology is the study of how we are justified and what results flow from it. Eschatology and everything that follows is something that would be of no value to us, if we did not enter into true justification. You might say in away, that a very poor illustration would be an automobile factory, where these parts are made here, and these parts are made here, and those parts are made there, and they all come together from different directions, and they meet at this point. And then it goes on. And there is more to be done after. But here is the point where it becomes an automobile. Where the motor, and the chassis, and the different parts are put together. ^{It becomes an automobile.} / If you don't have that, all the painting, and all the transportation, and all the things in the world after that would be of no avail. And ~~the machine~~ before ⁽⁶⁾ of the all the different parts would be valueless to us. It is of great interest, matters about God, and his powers, and his attributes, his ~~autonomy~~ autonomy and so on, but ~~to~~ to us, the big thing is - Are we under his wrath or are we the children of his favor? Justification is the point where everything comes together, and then expands out. It is the central foci. And consequently, if someone doesn't have a correct understanding of this point, everything else is of little avail.

Now when I say a correct understanding, it must be understood, that I mean from the viewpoint of effective Christian service. I do not say that a man must have a correct understanding of this towards salvation. There are people who are saved with very, very little knowledge. There are people who have tremendous knowledge and they

are not saved. But it is far more likely that a person ~~whm~~ is saved, who has the knowledge, then someone who does not. Dr. Springer was very wise when he said three days ago, that the Lord holds us responsible for our ability. When we do the best that we can, He will take hold from there, when we get to the end of ~~your~~ usefulness. But we have sense to use the best that we have. He can't expect us to use just a little.

And in the Roman Catholic Church, as Hodge points out in his chapter on justification, there is a presentation of the facts about Christ, and his power, and his atoning death, and so forth. And when these facts are presented, there is always the possibility that the Holy Spirit may take these facts and give them the realization that simply through faith in Christ they can be saved. My guess is that within the Roman Catholic Church, there are many simple people who are saved. But the unfortunate thing is, that with the teaching that denies justification by faith, the more intelligent people are apt to be led away from it rather than toward it.

A correct understanding on this is the key that opens the door to eternal life. Its just the key. The door is of tremendous strength and importance. What's in it is important, what's behind it is of importance, but this is the ^{focus} ~~focus~~, this is the point of entrance. It is so vital that my own personal conviction is that every term somewhere ought to have a clear explanation. It may only take a minute or two. But every time I hear a friend who doesn't bring it out, I feel that it is the central theme that should be there.

Number four, Without It, Nothing Else Would be of any Help.

We won't need to go into details of this, but for completeness I will mention this. A - small a. We are all sinners. Small b. We deserve eternal death. Small c, we could not possibly save ourselves. Small d, Not even the most ethical man in the world, not even the finest Christian in the world, could earn eternal life by his own goodness. How important this is - justification. When a Pope dies, thousands of priests, all over the world, hold hundreds of masses for his soul, in order to try to get him into heaven. So far short is he recognized to be from that which will give him eternal life. Not even the most ethical man in the world, not even the finest Christian in the world,

could earn eternal life, by his own goodness. The goodness of some of us, will be to the lowest part of this black board. The goodness of others will be up to the top margin. You look at the two, and you say, how much higher that one is. How much higher can you be than that one. Some are four or five times as high. You look down from Mount Everest and you can't see the difference between them. And that is about the difference ~~between~~ ~~between~~ ~~the~~ between them. The differences of goodness in human beings and the relation of any of them to the standards that God requires, if we were to earn eternal life. One man has won five thousandth of the goodness that God requires, another man has won one thousandth. Isn't that wonderful. One has won five times as much as the other. But I think they are both very small.

Not even the finest Christian man could earn eternal life, by his own goodness. Justification is the key that opens the door.

Number five. It is the Foundation of Christian Life, and the Touchstone of Christian Freedom.

S-14. Not many years ago I attended, many for the course of 20 or 30 times in a winter I attended the sermons of a man who worked very hard on them and who studied the scripture very, very carefully. And who presented scriptural teaching on one point after another in most excellent fashion. And yet, I came away from the sermons almost every time with a feeling of disappointment. Because, all of the great blessings which he described, and all the vital matters which he jumped over, every single one. In my opinion, the sermon would have been twice as good, if he would have ended up with showing its vital point to justification. If he would have ended up with a simple, clear mention of how one could receive these blessings. If you have a group with any number in it, if you have a hundred people there, you don't know how many unsaved are there. But if you have just ten there, you don't know who there is in the group, that has said certain words, but never received the actual truth of what justification means. You don't know with any group who there may be that needs to know how to be saved. To really know it. Or really understand it. And the people who are saved, their Christian life will be enriched if they see the relationship to this. I've had

that experience over and over. I've been listed up high by a sermon, and thrilled b it, and then had the feeling as if it was exactly the mind of a head level. When it stops without showing clearly how these blessings come, and of what justification is. I see also, that that makes the difference between a lovely ethical sermon and a Christian sermon, whether it is closely, and clearly, and definitely related to this point somewhere in the sermon. Prefably I believe that it should be included somewhere in the sermon. It doesn't need to be dragged in because it is definitely related, in everything that can be presented.

Well, b. What justification is.

Hodge gives, on pages 117 and 118, six points. And those six points pretty well cover what it is. And the other important matters about it. I'm taking the first three of them under the head, What It Is. And making the third one, partly negative, and partly positive, and thus making it more interesting under this demonstration.

What justification is. Number one. Justification is an act. Hodge gives that as his first point. It is an act. It is a point on which the Roman Catholics, we think utterly ignore, the teaching of scripture because the scripture is so very, very clear on this point. And it is a point on which many, many Protestants fail to see, the vital teaching of the scripture. Hodge did not spend much time on this particular point. But I think this particular point is worth a great deal of profit. It is an act. Justification. Hebrew 1: 3. "Once for all he purged our sins." It's something that has occurred, and it is done with, It has either been applied to us, or it has not been, applied to us. "As many as received him, to them he gave the power." It is a definite thing. "He that believeth on him, is not condemned, he that believeth not, is condemned already." Are you an educated person? Well, there is a gradation. ¶ A person, who has had one day of school, has had a little of education. And after he's had a year or two he thinks he knows a great deal. By the time he's had ten years of university work he finds that he knows very little, of all there is to know.

It is a relative matter. I used to be amused at Dr. Machen. He mentioned somebody, he said, ah, he's no scholar. What does he know? But, one time, I said, Dr. Machen, it is wonderful to hear a scholar like you give an opinion on this matter.

Would you call me a scholar? Would you really call me a scholar? And he was using the term, I thought with a different gradation. He took people way down here that didn't have the knowledge enough to be in the general class, but to think that he ^{of scholars} felt he really was a scholar, well, he never really quite had the training. He brushed them ^{the training} off. Perhaps he came as near as anyone in America. But it is a relative ~~matter~~ matter how much basic training you've had.

My little boy comes up to me, and tries to force me to do something, and I just ^{in strength} ~~push him away~~ take one hand and push him away. I'm a giant, compared to him. I imagine Mr. Springer could just push me away in the same way. And probably the strong man in the circus could push him away. It is a relative matter. Sanctification is a relative matter, on the whole. It is a process in which we can move forward and constantly keep moving forward as long as we are in this life. But justification is something entirely different. You either are or you are not. Are you on the ground of Faith Seminary, or are you not on the ground of Faith Seminary? Are you a registered student here, or are you not a registered student here? The illustration of many, is of merit. People say, are you saved. Well, I hope so. I think so. I may be. Well, are you married? Well, they either are or they aren't. It is one or the other. This is an entirely different category from those which are relative. And that is a hard thing for the average person to understand. Because he sees the tremendous ethical differences between individuals. And he will see how one will go this far, and one is here, and one is there, and it is hard for him to realize that this is a definite part of this matter.

Is a man a citizen of the United States or is he not a citizen of the United States? He may have taken out his first papers. He may be taking courses. He may even have received, even passed all the examinations, but ~~until~~ until the judge declares him a citizen of the United States, he is not a citizen of the United States. There is a definite point, when that transition is made, in his experience. I was reading yesterday [?] in Time Magazine about a director of protocol in the White House. And what a problem he had four years ago, when there was a dinner for the retiring vice president and the new vice president. And ~~Frank~~ Barkley was Vice President. According to spot reporters, he

stood ahead of all the ~~representatives~~ senators in Congress. Nixon had been a senator but resigned, so he was not a senator. He had been elected vice president of the United States, but he was not yet vice president. He was not yet sworn in. He did not have any right to the standing of the position of vice president. There is a certain instance in which the man who was not a vice president becomes a vice president. And justification, we may not know the instance when it happens, but ~~as~~ it is definite, one either is or he is not.

Personally, I am a skeptic about the attitude ~~that~~ that a person should know the instance. I think there is a great deal he can know particularly about him self. There are many people who can tell you, that on the 27th of July, at 4: 23 in the afternoon, I was saved. Well, they know exactly just when it was. ~~W~~ But there are some other people who will say, I was in a great service and I went forward and I got a new understanding that I never had before and my life has been entirely different. Many people think that's when I was saved, but I don't believe that I was saved then. I believe that I was saved before that. And they will give you good evidence of why they were saved before that.

And I think it is very ~~aggravation~~ ^{difficult} ^{most} for us to ~~insist~~ know the very instance of when we were saved. But this I would say, it is possible for a man to know that that has been done. And I think that everyone has the duty of making it clear on that point. Where as, I was blind, now I see. When did the change take place, I know not when. But that the change did take place, I should ~~make~~ absolutely sure. It is an act. It is a definite, decisive change.

Isaiah 61: 10. It is not absolutely specific on it, but I think it brings out the idea quite definite on it, "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord. My soul shall rejoice in my God, for he has ~~made~~ clothed me with the garments of salvation. He has covered me, with the robe of righteousness." He has put the garments on, or he has not put the garments on. It is a definite act.

Acts 13: 39. In Acts 13: 39, the apostle said, "And by him all all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." You're not half as guilty. There was somebody who made a ~~CARTOON~~ (11) which

somebody else from Faith Seminary thought was quite humorous and perhaps they agreed with it, and thought it was a good joke on the rest of us, and put it up. I don't know. Whatever it be, it was put up on the bulletin board in the seminary about 12 years ago down in Wilmington with the comment underneath it. The cartoon was a picture of a person in water. And water came up to about here I guess, and their head and their hands were sticking out above. And underneath it said, "Waters of Baptism." And above it, it said, "Not just part of you, but all of you, should be put under." And then, underneath, this note was written, "I challenge anyone to illustrate this truth equally as well with sprinkling." And the thing that saddened me was that the person who wrote the note underneath it had no idea evidently of the meaning of baptism, anymore than the person who made the cartoon. If this had been an illustration of consecration, if it had been water of consecration, it would be very good. Waters of consecration, we need to consecrate our all, our brains, our eyes, our hands, our teeth, everything to the Lord, not just part. We should offer ourselves entirely in a living sacrifice. If it was a picture of sanctification, we need to seek blessing to put this aspect on every aspect of our being. But the cartoon as worded had no relevance whatsoever, as waters of baptism, because baptism indicates anything, it indicates the complete undivisible act of being changed from being one who is outside the company of God, to one who is in union with Christ and there is nobody, there can not be from any point whatsoever, as partial baptism. I don't think that the purpose of baptism is to illustrate this particular point which I am referring to. And consequently I don't think that it has anything to do with what the best mode of baptism is. But I would say this, as far as this particular matter is concerned it (14) illustrates it far better than immersion. Because one is baptised or he is not. It is a completely, indivisible act. We cannot be ~~partially~~ partially baptised, we cannot be partially justified.

S-15. And number two, it is an act of grace. It is an act of grace. We of course in our sermons have heard this so much that it becomes a phrase that is almost meaningless. But it is something that we cannot say too often, because it is very, very difficult for

the ordinary person to grasp, and probably it is beyond us to grasp. It occurs as one act. But to fully grasp it, it would probably take us all of eternity. A friend of mine went into a fine orthodox church where they had been having good, sound preaching. He went in there to preach. And he preached on the fact that salvation is a free. It is a free gift of God, and there is nothing that we can do to earn it. And he preached on it every Sunday night for eight ~~month~~ nights. And on the eighth night, he noticed a man in the front row, he was one of the officers who had been there every Sunday night and whom we all believed was saved. And he came up to me after the meeting and he said, I've got a new idea and I want you to preach it. I've got the idea that salvation is free. And he was for eight successive nights trying to drive that thought home. And I am sure that this man had ~~had~~ heard this thought expressed in good theological language hundreds of times. But he had never fully sensed it. ~~■~~ The thought had never come to his realization. And that is the truth of the great mass of professing Christians. That salvation is not something that we can attain. We can't win justification. God doesn't see something good in us, and on the ground of that, he justifies us, but it is an act of God's free grace, and that alone.

II Timothy 1: 9. "Who has saved us, and called us with a holy calling." Not according to our works but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before ~~this~~ ^{the} world began." That's predestination for you. It was given to us in Christ Jesus before the world began. It's the lamb slain before the foundation of the world. It's an act that occurred before the foundation of the world in the plan of God. But which was made manifest in the death of Christ. And which is applied to each of us when we yield.

It is an act of grace. Titus 3: 5. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." It is not anything that we have done, anything that we have, anything that we are. It is purely an act of grace.

And then Romans 3: 24, "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." There are many, many verses that bring this out, but oh how hard it is to get it to the consciousness of the average person. And how

hard it is to get the realization of it ourselves.

that it is all of his grace and not at all of our goodness. It is an act of God's free grace.

And then, number three, what Hodge gives as one point, I am going to break up into three points, because Hodge states, it under one point, but in giving the one he gives the two others that it is not. As many people have thought that they were what it is. And so I want to break it up to be sure that we have it absolutely clear. Number three, he gives a third of a page to, As to the nature of the act, it is in the first place not an efficient act, or an act of power. So I've called this, Not an Act of Power. Now of course, God's power is involved. It is involved in many places. But in this matter of sanctification, or of justification while power is behind it, and it is the result of power, in its relation to us, it is not an act of efficient power. It is not an ~~efficient~~ act. It is not an act that introduces a subjective change in the person justified. It is not an infusion of righteousness, which takes those who were bad, and makes them good. This is done in regeneration and sanctification, which are concomitant or following events which are related to justification. But they are not the cause of our salvation. They are a part of our salvation. But the vital point, the key to eternal life, is this which is ~~not~~ not an efficient act of power at all. It is something in an entirely different field. That is very important to understand. The courses at the University of Chicago and the president of the University of Chicago, ~~at that time~~ at that time (before that he was professor of New Testament in the Divinity School), I remember Dr. Machen said, that Burton's book on Galatians was a book what had a tremendous amount of valuable material in the study of the Greek forms, and of the syntax and of many points, but he said that Burton missed the whole point of Galatians. Translating the word justified as "Make ~~righteous~~ righteous". That he makes us righteous. And that of course denies the whole foundation of the doctrine of justification, and makes it an act of power, instead of (7). It makes it an act of making a change in us. God makes changes in us, but he does not save us through those changes, or ~~and~~ on account of the changes. They are concomitant and successive, to this which is the entrance, the key to salvation. The justification,

which is not an act of power.

Number four, it is not simply pardon. Hodge expresses it this way. In the second place, it is not a mere executive act, as when a sovereign pardons a criminal, and thereby restores him to his civil rights or to his former state in the commonwealth. Justification is not simply pardon. Well, why doesn't God simply pardon? You will hear many people ask that question. They will say, if God is as good as you think he is, why does he punish people. Why wouldn't he just open up, and let everybody go free? Why would anybody be subject to punishment? And if God would simply pardon everybody, why wouldn't he? The fact is, there are certain principles in the universe, which are rooted in the character of God, which God must act in relationship to. The rulers of the universe must be just. He must use some sense of justice. The Holy God must punish sin. He must show before the world, an attitude of hatred and reprobation of sin. He must ^{be} just if he is going to pardon us. He must not only be the justifier to them that believe in Jesus, but also must be just. He must be just and the judge. And he is not just if he just arbitrarily pardons.

When I was a senior in high school, there were two buildings, which had a little connection between the two, but an open space and a connection over there. And there was this building and the other building over there, and then this passageway between them. That's the first and second floor. And on the second floor there, I had a very boring class in history, because the professor had the craziest habit of just walking out of the room and leaving us for awhile. And he would leave us for 20 minutes to a half an hour for almost every hour that we were sitting there. And he would see us before, and after, but in almost every class he did that. I don't know why he did it. I guess he was just lazy. But anyway that is what he did.

And there we were, on the second floor in this room, and the fellows sometimes thought it was a bit boresome, and didn't have anything to do. And I got a bit tired of it, and towards the end of the year, we were getting lazy and once or twice just walked out and wandered around myself to the library or somewhere and came back after a bit. Well, one time, I had walked out that way, and when I came back, there was a very irate man in the room. He was Professor Smithson, the teacher of Physics, who was

the best teacher in the high school there. He really made them work. I remember more from what he gave us that year, then from all the rest of them put together. But he was in the room on the second floor, in the next building, and it was a warm spring day, and the windows were all open. And one of these fellows had picked up a piece of chalk, and had thrown it ~~through~~ through the window, and it went into his window, and there in his room, there landed this piece of chalk, which very evidently came from this room here. And when I entered the room, Mr. M Smithson was standing up very irately talking to the class, and demanding that they tell them who had done that. And they said, the man who did it, left the room. He ~~demand~~ demanded that the man confess, and they said, the man who did it left the room. And while they were admitting this, I came ~~in~~ walking in. Well, shortly after I came walking in, another person came ~~in~~ walking inside ^{And I} ~~(the)~~ Had made a statement about the Bible in his class, which was not important, but I had been foolish enough to correct him. I think he got dogmatic, and I think that he said, that Moses made the sun stand still, or something like that, and I said it was Joshua. And he said I was wrong, but finally looked it up, and found out that I was right, but that's not a good way to win a professor's graces. To correct him on something, particularly outside of the field that he is dealing with. Well, Smithson said, I'm going to find out who threw that chalk and if he is a senior he won't graduate. And so the next day he got me and the other fellow who came walking in shortly afterwards. I had no idea. All I could say is that I did not throw it. Well, they say, the fellow left the room, and you left the room. You must be the one who threw it. Very good proof. In that particular case it wasn't. He said, you must have. Well, I said, I didn't throw it. Nobody in the class would say who threw it. All they said, was that none of them had, that someone had left the room. He had this other fellow and me with him, he would take us out of almost any class. At any time of the day, you could expect him to open the door and say, he wanted this other fellow and me to come out. He would spend 15 to 20 minutes trying to persuade us to confess, which one of us had done it. I think that he thought I had done it. I don't know why he thought that. I don't think that I could have thrown a piece of chalk that far. He was quite determined that I was the one, but he still had a little suspicion that it might be the other fellow. So he kept

telling us what would happen, and that we would not graduate, if we had thrown the chalk. Well, I thought that was a crude punishment for having thrown a piece of chalk, but if he had with it, lying about it, and denying it, perhaps it would be an altogether proper attitude. I don't know. And he kept talking to us day after day, till finally one day when we were together, this other fellow said, Would you really like to know who did it? He said, Yes. He said, Well, I'll go get the fellow. So he went into another class and brought out a fellow, who was a pretty good friend of mine.

S-16. You have to in any place, have rules which you enforce impartially. It is difficult to get the rules as they should be. But most important of all, is to make them impartial. And for God to say, this is so terrible that I am going to send to hell those who have sinned. Just an arbitrary thing, that I'll save you, and I'll save you, and pardon him, and pardon him, it would destroy the whole basis of God's justice. And it is unthinkable that God would do such a thing. Yet, that is the view that is held by many, many individuals and many students about justification. If God just decides to pardon, well, why doesn't he just pardon everybody? It is just an arbitrary, executive act of sovereign, that can do whatsoever he wants to do. And it is very important for understanding this matter of justification, and in fact, of our whole Christian teaching, to realize that justification is not simply pardon, it is not a mere executive act. As Hodge says, It is an act of God, not in his character of sovereign, but in his character of judge.

(Check)

So number five, It is a forensic Act. It is a forensic act.(1 3/4). Now I am not sure that that word is used in popular presentation, but the average person is not familiar with it. But it means is a judicial act. It is an act related to justice. It is an act that secures justice. It is the act of a judge rather than of a sovereign. It is a declarative act in which God pronounces the sinner just or righteous. That is he declares that the claims of justice, so far as he is concerned, are satisfied. And that he cannot be justly condemned, but is in justice entitled to the rewards or promises or due to perfect righteousness. It is a forensic act. An act which relates not to our state but to our standing.

I go down to the bank and I step in there and I ask them to cash ~~t~~ a check. And the girl looks at me, and she says, Have you an account here, and I say yes. She says, Well, I can't seem to find any record of it. I may have a big account there. But as far as she's concerned, I have no standing. Its happened to me like that. I had no standing. I needed some cash. She had no information to hand me the cash. How would I establish any standing there. And I hadn't been to that bank much, and I was in a loss as to what to ~~say~~ do, and I was in a hurry, and I looked over and I saw the manager come by. And I said, Mr. Robinson, and I turned and he saw me, and he ~~said~~ said, Oh, hello. He stepped over and shook my hand, and we were very friendly. He knew me. He had taken my account. Well, my standing as far as that girl was concerned had changed completely, very quickly. I had the standing there as one who was a depositor in the bank. I might have thousands of dollars in my pocket, or at home somewhere, or at some other bank. My state might be one of great wealth. But my standing in that bank was nothing until I was identified as a depositor.

It is justification. The other matters ~~are~~ ^{our} states ^{our} ~~an~~ actual conditions of wickedness, ^{or} of a little bit of righteousness, or of more than righteousness has great importance in its own field. But as to the question of whether we are saved or lost, it is our standing and not our state, which matters. It is a forensic matter. Dr. Luther is often misunderstood and criticized. I wish I had the quotation from him. I do not recall exactly where it is. But he is criticized by those who claim that he is antinomian. They say, Luther doesn't care what kind of life you live. They try to make him out as a wicked sinner, but there is no evidence to that whatsoever. And when you get into it, you find that Luther lived a life that was way above the standard of most of us. He was a good man. Some time to make him out as a ~~h~~ drunkard. They didn't have sleeping pills in those days, and so he used to take a ~~d~~ glass of beer before going to sleep in the hopes that it would put him to sleep, and that's probably almost all the ~~and~~ beer he drank. He was a man, who from almost any standard, was a very very high standard man. But Luther had an upbringing of - the one very good thing in the Roman Catholic ~~attitude~~ attitude is the stress put upon God's justice. The stress upon His holiness and the penalty for sin. And he had that in his background. And he

had been terrified of God's wrath which he knew must come to him as a sinner. And in Luther's later days the devil used to bring this before him. His shortcomings, and his failure. How can a man such as you are, be saved? And Luther once spoke in strong language, as he liked to do to take a point and get it across. He said, Oh, you say that I am a sinner, I've done it once, I'll do it five times. You say that I've fallen into this, I'll fall into it five times. You say I shouldn't step here, I'll go way into that direction. And still I'm saved. And what he meant was, Not that he was going to deliberately do anything that would be contrary to God's will, because he never mentioned that. But he meant, if you think my salvation depends upon my ability to walk this straight path, I'd just show you that if I was way over here, I would stay just as much as I am here now. But it is not my state that determines my salvation, but my standing. It is not what I have done, but it is what Christ has done that determines my salvation. It is a forensic act.

On page 154 to 155, Hodge quotes from a writing which is found in

(7 $\frac{1}{2}$), under the writings of Anselm. Anselm, the noted scholastic of writer of the middle ages, but Hodge says it is doubtful certainly whether this is actually from Anselm. But whoever wrote it, is is a wonderful statement. Doth thou believe that thou canst not be saved, but by the death of Christ. The sick man answered yes. Then let it be said unto him, Go to them, and wilt thy soul abideth in thee, put all thy confidence in this death alone. Place thy trust in no other thing. Commit thyself wholly to this death. Cover thyself wholly with this alone. Cast thyself wholly on this death. Wrap thyself wholly in this death. And if God would judge thee, say, Lord, I place the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between thee and ~~thy~~ my judgment. And otherwise I will not contend or enter into judgment with thee. And if he shall say unto thee that thou art a sinner, say that I place the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and my sin. If he shall say unto thee, that thou hast deserved damnation, say, Lord I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and all my sins. And I offer his merits for my own, which I should have and have not. If he say that he is angry with thee, say Lord, I place the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and

thy anger. There is a statement from some ~~centuries~~ ^{centuries} before Luther. A statement that very clearly brings out, that it is not our ~~state~~ ^{state} ~~faith~~ that determines our salvation, it is our standing. It is not an act of power that changes us. We want that. We desire that. We should have that. But we are not saved through that. It is not a simple pardon. God says, I am going to be good to this person. You can go free and you've got to suffer. No. It is a forensic act, where his merits are put for our merits.

S-17. 2/12/57. (Test in beginning of class hour. Is justification an efficient act? Tell how or why.) I pointed out to you that in the very beginning of Hodge's statement on justification, he first gives the creeds and shows that the reformed creeds and the Luthern creeds teach precisely the same doctrine. And then after listing these various creeds and quoting from Jonathan Edwards, a ~~an~~ ⁱⁿ ~~page~~ ^{page} statement of about a page ~~of~~ ⁱⁿ English on it, then he gives points included in the above statement of doctrine. And this is a very excellent statement of the doctrine. Page 117 through 118. And we are looking at these points, though putting ~~the~~ some of them together. No. one was that it is an act. And that is extremely important. It is an act. The second, that it is an act of grace, and third, I have made it third, it is not an act of power, not an efficient act. (I guess on account of the ~~ide~~ ^{idea} this morning about half of our class if late today.) It is an act of power in the sense that the power of God was tremendously displayed in it. Campbell Morgan has a good story, which illustrates this. He told how that he was having evangelistic meetings in Wales. And he said, he was trying to show that salvation was a free gift of God. That it was justification, that God did it with nothing on our part. It was his goodness alone. And one of the miners said he couldn't understand it, I just can not see it. I can't see how I can be saved without my doing anything. It just doesn't seem possible. And Campbell Morgan talked with him, he said, and presented the scripture, and finally he said, the man said, Oh, now I see it, he said, when I am down in the mine, he said, I'm half a mile down below this earth in the mine. And he said, it is time for me to come up. He said, I step into that little car down there, they call it the skip, the mine skip. The little car. Half a mile down in the mile.

He said, I step into that thing. And he said, it gets to the top and I get out. And he said, it doesn't cost me a cent. I just step into that thing, and it pulls me right up. It is not an act of power, it is not an efficient act. He doesn't do anything to bring himself up. But he said, it costs the company an awful lot, to put in that hoist to pull that up.

God puts tremendous power into justification, but it is not an act of power, in the sense that the power, which goes into justification is not applied directly to us. What we mean by justification rests upon God, but it is not an act of power, in that it doesn't mean that he takes that power, and he makes a change in us. Its not an efficient act. That is, an act that accomplishes something within us. There is much accomplished in us. But this is not justification. It is the result of justification. Justification itself is not an efficient act. It is not an act of power. It doesn't produce any subjective change in the person justified. It does not affect a change of character. Making those good who were bad, those holy who were unholy. These points are stressed by the apostle Paul, a great deal. It is not justifying is not making good. That Hodge says is done in regeneration and sanctification.

And then our ~~fourth~~ fourth point, which is Hodge's second sub point under his third point, is that it is not simply pardon. He said, it is not a mere executive act, as when a sovereign pardons a criminal. It is not simply pardon. It is not that God says I'm going to be good to this fellow. He's not very bad, so I'm just going to let him go. I'm going to forgive him for it. If God did that he would not be a just God. There would be no justice in the universe. And God must be just. And Paul says in Romans 3:24-26. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of ~~the~~ sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare at this time his righteousness; that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." God must be just. And God is just, because he does not simply pardon. He justifies. It is not just a mere executive act of God as a sovereign. It is, number five, a forensic act. It is an act of a law court, not an act of a sovereign. It is an act of imputing to us the righteousness

of Christ.

It is an act of changing our state, our standing, not our state. It is an act of taking those who deserve only punishment, and putting them in a ~~man~~ class where they deserve God's blessings. Where they deserve eternal life. Where they deserve absolute acquittal. Not pardon but acquittal. And it is thus, a forensic act. Now, it is the apostle Paul, above all, who makes this clear. In II Corinthians 5: 19 through 21, he sets it forth especially clearly, ~~that~~ "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them - - For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." This does not mean that God ~~took~~ took Christ and put sin into him, so that he became a sinner. He was made sin for us. Christ was not a sinner. He was perfect. He was free from sin. But he was made sin for us, in that our sins were reckoned unto him. They were imputed to him. And this is that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, that his righteousness might be imputed to us.

Romans 3: 22, following, brings it out very clearly. "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." It is his righteousness imputed to us. Then verses 24 through 26 which I read to you. Romans 4: 5. "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly," not him that pardoneth the ungodly, not him that maketh righteous the ungodly, but him that justifieth the ungodly. There are so many verses that bring this out so clearly. Romans 5: 17 and 19. "Much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." And Romans 4: 6 through 8. "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin."

And so we have these verses and many others that bring out clearly that

Justification is a forensic act. An act of a law court. An act of reckoning to us Christ's righteousness. Not an act of imputing Christ's righteousness into us. Justification is a forensic act wherein God reckons to us the righteousness of Christ and therefore frees us from punishment which our sins deserve and gives us the right to eternal life. Regeneration is the act of power, which God performs toward those who are justified. Whereby he proceeds to change ~~us~~ ^{them}, and to make them such as he wishes ~~them~~ ^{them} to be. Now anyone who he justifies he regenerates. But he does not save anybody because they are regenerate. He saves them because they are justified. And in saving them, he regenerates them. Now we will look into that more a little later. I can give a brief statement at this time. But we will spend a bit more time on it later. It is very important to get the difference.

We are not saved because we are regenerated. We are saved because we are justified. And being saved ~~if~~ we are regenerated. Hodge gives as proof that it is a forensic act, he gives ten heads under this. I'm going to condense them. I'm going to simply list about six of them. But since I've used a number five for forensic act, I'm going to use letters for these.

Small a. And the first evidence that it is a forensic act is explained by Hodge, and in almost all other books that deal with the subject. Although some of them put it more clearly than others. It is so obvious an evidence, and yet so vital an evidence that it certainly should come first. a. The terms used. The terms used for justification in the scripture are a clear evidence that it is a forensic act. The word (the Old Testament Word) righteous tsaddiq (צדק), and the New Testament word, dikaiois, righteous, these two adjectives, both of them, are used in the scripture in two senses. They are used in the scripture in the sense of being good. And they are used in the sense of being considered good. ~~(good)~~ ^{true}. That is ~~meanings~~ of both of these adjectives. It is that, Hodge brings out on page 119. The lower half of the page. A very good description of it. When we say a man is righteous, we usually mean that he is ~~uprighteous~~ ^{upright}, and he is honest. At the same time these words can be used to express not moral character, but the relation which a man [?] to justice (צדק). They can be used in either sense. The more common sense of tsaddiq or of dikaiois, the adjective, is to describe a man's state

rather than his standing. Though they are all used of standing. But when you get the hiphil of tsaddiq of the verb relating to it, the hiphil, you would naturally expect that the hiphil would be to be made righteous. That would be true in a deed

S-18. That which would seem to be the natural~~ly~~, etimological usage, is not actually the way the verse reads. You say in English, to justify, if you are a preacher, and you are dealing in technical jargon, you mean exactly what the etimologically word means. You mean, to make it straight. When the printer has some type, and he wants to put it to the press, he justifies him, that he makes the edge to break. That is the only case I know of, where the word justify is used in that sense. In every other case in our english, we use the word justify to mean to cause to reckon justice rather than to cause to be actually justified. That is we take word justified. You can take it either one of two ways. That it means to cause to ~~make~~ justice, or that it is caused ~~manam~~ to be judged, with just meaning considered to be just by others. Having that relation to us. You can take either approaches. That is, you can put the shift in the adjective or you can put it in the positive relationship. But wherever you consider it as being in, it is there. And our English word, Justify, there are many, many instances in our ordinary speech which show that which we mean. Now of course our English verb shows nothing about what the Hebrew verb means. But it illustrates it. And there are plenty of instances of it from the Hebrew, the hiphil of the word,

(2). We read in Deuteronomy 25: 1, for instance, if there be a controversy between men and they come into judgment, then the judges may judge them, and they may justify the righteous. That doesn't mean the judge takes the righteous man and makes him good. It means that it makes him as one who is before the law considered as one who is innocent. They justify him and that is as if it was his deed. They justify the ~~nigthamm~~ righteous and condemn the wicked. In Exodus 23: 7, we read, "I will not justify the wicked." In Isaiah 5: 23, we read about the wicked leaders of Israel, who justify the wicked for a reward. Now if this means to make them just, for their reward, anybody deserves a reward, that could do that. You take a bad little boy, a delinquent, and you say, here's a man who can make that boy good. Is there

anything wrong with giving him a reward for making the little boy good? It is a most desirable thing to anybody who can take a delinquent boy and make him a good boy, deserves a reward.

But Isaiah criticizes the leaders of Israel, because they justify the wicked for a reward. They take those who are wicked, and they make them to appear to be righteous, so that They make them have a standing as righteous, ~~even though the~~ people consider them good. That is what the Hebrew word tsaddiq (~~righteous~~) means. I believe in almost every case. Now if there are one or two cases where it questions that, there are not more than one or two in the sense that some ~~does not mention~~ ^{arise} it in scripture. And I don't think there are any ~~one~~ cases where there is serious question. There's not more than one case of Dikaioō, where there is serious question of the fact that the word that means exactly as the same as our English word Justify, to consider ^{right} (~~righteous~~), to rectify, or to put it in another way, to make one have that quality of being right before the law, to be just before the law. The usage of the term - we read in Luke 10: 29, "He, willing to justify himself," Luke 16: 15. "Ye are they which justify yourselves before men." Matthew 11: 19. "Wisdom is justified of her children." Wisdom children doesn't make wisdom righteous. But wisdom children shows that wisdom is righteous. They give evidence to the fact. Galations 3:16, "A man is not justified by the works of the law," which means of course not that the words of the law changes and makes us righteous, but that the works of the law cannot be presented as proof of his righteousness. Well, the terms used are the first and primary evidence of the fact that it is a forensic act.

But I think almost as vital, almost as strong an argument, as the term used for justification, is the second argument of which Hodge presents. The fact that justification is described as the opposite of condemnation. It is not described as ~~making wicked~~ the opposite of making wicked, but the opposite of condemning. And condemning is not making wicked, but declaring to be wicked, and declaring to deserve the results of wickedness. This, of course, is brought out very strongly, in the third chapter of the gospel of John. There are many other cases where it is. But in John 3 it is repeated over and over, that "he that believeth on the Son is not condemned, he that believeth not is condemned, already." 6

There is the contrast between the one who is not condemned, and the one who is condemned. It is a forensic act. And Hodge gives references on page 122 here, in a great many cases, where the two words are put in contrast. Like in Romans 8: 1. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." In verse 33 to 4, he says, "Who shall lay ~~an~~ anything to the charge of God's elect, it is God who justifies, who is he that condemns." Christ died for this man. Therefore, there is nobody who can condemn him. Christ has paid the penalty. It is a forensic act. Condemnation is used in contrast to justification.

Job, 9:20. "If I trust upon myself, my own mouth shall condemn me." Job 24:17, "Wilt thou condemn him, who is most just?" To condemn is to declare wicked. Not to make wicked. To justify is to declare righteous. Not to make righteous. Now we normally declare a man righteous, because we have proof that he is righteous. But in scriptural justification, we declare a man righteous, because the righteousness of Christ is imputed to him.

C. The parallel with such judicial terms as ~~imputed~~ to impute.

The blessedness of the man to whom God imputes righteousness without works, to ~~who~~ ^{to} imputes, ~~through~~ reckoning to his account, a judicial term. And Hodge's third and fourth points, The argument from ~~an~~ ^{equivalent} forms of expression, and the argument from the statement of the doctrine. I think that they can be put under the one, that the parallel with such judicial terms as to impute makes clear that this is a forensic act.

And then d. The fact that justification is so clearly and constantly related to the merit of Christ. It is his righteousness on the ground of which, we are acquitted or saved. It is his merit on the ground of which we have eternal life. His merits are [?] ~~equipped~~ (9) to our economy. If it were a mere pardon, there would be no point in stressing his great merit. If it is simply a dogma, arbitrary act, Christ's merits have nothing particular to do with us. It is the fact that on account of his merit, we can be freed from the result of our sin. That shows that it is a forensic act. We will learn more about that under the next head, the (9½).

Next we go on to small e. The fact that God's justice is represented in scripture as unchangeable.

We notice in Romans 3: 26, that God shall be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Christ. The right stress laid upon the scripture of the terribleness of sin. That penitence must inevitably follow sin. Of the righteousness of ~~him~~ God, that he can not look upon sin, shows that there must be a forensic act, involved. Now there could be a forensic act involved, of course, whereby God would make us completely righteous and because we are completely righteous, he would acquit. But that is not the scriptural presentation. That he would merely pardon us would be contrary to all the scriptural teaching, of the terribleness of sin. But the scriptures teaches that He reckons to our account the righteousness of Christ. And so His unchangeable justice is satisfied.

F. The results from it requires a complete acquittal.

The results which flow from it, justification, requires more than a mere pardon. It requires an acquittal. We are represented as securing peace as a result. But pardon does not give peace. It would only remove the outward, or arbitrarily penalty. It is peace, not only because there is pardon, but because that pardon was dispensed on the ground of a full satisfaction of justice. The blood of Jesus Christ cleans us from all sin, by the removing of guilt, and thus producing a peace that passes all understanding. I referred you to what Luther said, when the devil said, "How can you be saved? Look at all these sins you committed. And Luther said, Yes, I am a wicked man. But he said, if I committed twice as many sins, the goodness of Christ is sufficient, to save me. One is righteous enough to come up to the platform here, another is righteous enough to come up to the top of that briefcase. The righteousness that ^{God} Christ requires

(12). The difference between our righteousness or lack of it, can have no affect upon our justification before God. It is purely the righteousness of Christ, which is so tremendously greater, that anything that we ever did.

I believe that the best expression of where the ^{peace} ~~peace~~ comes from (of course, we can get the ^{peace} ~~peace~~ by referring to God - we could feel that) but that's not the scriptural teaching. The scriptural peace is one in which we have a right to know that we have full peace with God, and we can have peace of mind, because we have the peace with God. And we have that. I think it is well expressed in the

teachings of Anselm ?

(13). The sinner says yes, but the death of Christ completely atones for it. The merits of Christ sufficiently paid my debts. In him, I am completely free. You have the right to step up to a bar, without no fear or no hesitation. Because you are ^{not} coming on the claims that you have attained a certain standard equivalent. the most kinds of Protestants will ~~and almost times on the people~~ realize, how far ~~them~~ short their sanctification comes, of the place demanded by God. The person who is truly sanctified realizes that some of you may have made great strides, and yet it very, very little compared to Christ's righteousness.

S-19. And Satan gets a man here and there, and we're going to look at ourselves, and our state of justification. But if we look at what Christ did for us, we are entitled to peace immediately. For even though we fall a thousand times, we know that we can pick up and go on, because we are justified, and it is his righteousness, in terms of relation to God. And so the fact that from justification we get completely acquittal, we get piece, we get reconciliation with God. Pardon along with that reconciliation. The man who is reconciled is more than a pardoned criminal, he is a man who is secure because he is free from the law and all its demands. The righteousness of the law; its righteous requirements have been fulfilled in him. He is so united with Christ, as to become a partaker of his righteousness. Justification conveys a title to eternal life. Pardon is purely negative. But justification gives us the right to eternal life, because we are united with Christ. And his merits are imputed to us. And some statements that I read to you yesterday, bring this out, I think, very, very well. In fact, I think I'm going to read it to you again. It is found on the bottom of page 154. Now they say that it is of doubtful authorship, but I must say, from what we know of Anselm, who studied the theory of atonement, and who brought out so clearly that man was ransomed through the atonement, that he was freed from the power of Satan through the atonement. It seems to me that Anselm is just the man to have written such a thing as this, and it is contained in Anselm's works.

"Dost thou believe that thou canst not be saved, but by the death of Christ? The

~~sick man answered, Yes. Then let it be said unto him, Get to thy place, and let thy soul abide in thee, but all thy confidence in this death alone, place why~~

sick man answereth, Yes. Then let it be said unto him, Go to, then, and whilst thy soul abideth in thee, put all thy confidence in this death alone, place thy trust in no other thing, commit thyself wholly to this death, cover thyself wholly with this alone, cast thyself wholly on this death, wrap thyself wholly in this death. And if God would judge thee, say, Lord, I place the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me, and thy judgment, and otherwise I will not contend, or enter into judgment with thee. And if He shall say unto thee, that thou hast deserved damnation, say, Lord, I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between thee and all my sins;"

About 1530, there was written in Italy a book on "The Merits of Christ's Death." And 40,000 copies of it were distributed, throughout Italy. And then when the inquisition decided that Protestantism was reaching into Italy, and many were being won to it, they began to take the leaders, they called heads of great monastic orders, they called bishops, they called leaders of the Church, they called anyone who was suspected of believing in this ~~magman~~ doctrine. Before the inquisition, many of them were killed, others fled the country, and they sought out these books on The Merits of Christ's Death. And there were 40,000 of them in circulation, but they sought them out so carefully, that it was believed until recently, that there wasn't a single copy left in existence, until someone found this one remaining, single copy. But all those copies, they were hunted down and destroyed. And that was the theme, The Merits of Christ's Death. It is not for any righteousness that we have, but it is through what He has done, and that alone, that we have salvation.

Well, then, justification is a forensic act.

Let's move on to C, which I think is very important. How God Justifies. B was What is Justification, C, is How God ~~Justifies~~ Justifies. Now in the statement which Hodge makes on page 117 to 118, number 3, is as to the nature of the act, which we've been discussing under B. C, how God justifies. I'm going to put the next three of Hodge's points under this. His three points are that ^{first} the meritorious ground of justification is not faith, we are not justified on account of our faith considered as a ^{virtuous} ~~virtuous~~ ⁽⁵¹⁾ or a holy act ~~which~~ or state of mind. Nor are works of any kinds the ground of justification. Nothing done by or wrought in us, satisfies the

demands of justice, or can be the grounds or the reason of the declaration that justice as far as it is concerned us is satisfying. The ground of justification is righteousness of Christ active and passive, including his perfect obedience to the law as a covenant, and his enduring the penalty of the law in our stead, and in our behalf. The righteousness of Christ is in justification imputed to the believer. That is set to his account. So that he is entitled to plead it at the bar of justice, as though it were personally and inherently(his own.

3. is the condition of justification. God does not impute the righteousness of Christ to the sinner, until he, through grace, receives and rests ~~upon~~ on Christ alone for his salvation. ^{Faith} Grace is not the ground. It is the condition. ^{Faith} Grace is the instrument, not the ~~cause~~ ⁽⁶¹⁾ ~~reason~~. Now, we will look at those, How God justifies them, and I will arrange them under a few heads,

Number one, the negative. Justification is not the result of any^t works that we put forth. It is not the results of any works that we put forth. This is so stressed in the scripture, that we can not~~emphasize~~ probably overstress it. It is not the result of any works that we put forth.

Romans 3: 28. "Therefore we conclude that man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." Titus 3: 5 to 6. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us. $\text{\textcircled{M}}$ By the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the holy ghost, which he ~~shed~~ shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Philippians 3: 9. "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is through God by faith." So justification is not the results of any works that we put forth.

Now under this, I will mention the three leading, opposing views, which Hodge takes up under each of several categories, and discusses at length. This is a good place to introduce it. We will call small a. the Pelagian Error. The Pelagian Error. Pelagius held that Jesus Christ by his death, brought grace which is helpful to us. He held that Jesus gives us His wonderful grace, and it is very beautiful to us.

We need it. But that which determines whether we are justified or not, is the righteousness which we have in ourselves. Do we develop the spark of divine that is in us. ^{and built it} Do we add it/up and make ourselves good? Now ~~we~~ we should do our best to live as well as we can. We should do our best to increase the righteousness. "The author of ~~Hebrews~~ Hebrews says, "You have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against him." But you can resist unto blood, and you can accomplish five times as much as you could, by resisting unto blood, but you ~~can~~ never get enough to win God's favor. These have their place for sanctification, in your being made the best servant. But the best you can be made is not a tenth enough to win God's favor. It is justification on the merits of Christ, not on any works that we perform. And so the Pelagian error, is one which most, even some who in their teaching, lean pretty far in Pelagian direction, are apt to admit that actual Pelagianism is really not Christianity at all.

The Pelagian view is that when Paul says, that ~~when Paul~~ we are not saved by the works of the law, he meant that observing Jewish rites and ceremonies were not essential to salvation. That we are not made righteous or good by external ceremonial acts, but by the works, morally good. That is the way that Pelagius interprets Paul. But we feel that if you read Paul carefully, you will find that he is not merely saying that Jewish ritual won't save a man. He is saying that even the best obedience that we can give to the moral law will not save us. That any righteousness which we can get in this life is not sufficient to save us. That even if from this minute on, I live an absolutely, perfect, holy life, I will not be nearer salvation, because in the past there was upon me sin, and wickedness which deserves eternal death. And so the Pelagian error which was so common in America, until quite recently, when ^{the bulk} most of our Protestant churches were teaching ethical terms and giving the people the impression that what was desired was to live a good life, and you might merit God's favor. Now the futility of that, is that a great bulk of the modernists, are going over to the vague statements ~~of~~ ~~an~~ neo-orthodoxy, instead of to the ethical clear Pelagian teaching as to the meaning of salvation.

But justification by human righteousness is impossible. And Pelagianism is

far from true Christianity.

Now, we go on to b. The error of the Romanists. Hodge says the doctrine of the Romanists is much higher than the Pelagian doctrine. It is much higher. Now, when Romanism ~~began~~ ^{began} is a hard thing to say. But I believe that it began at the Council of Trent. I believe that the Roman Catholic Church, as a church, began then, because before then, there were various views held upon the body of Christians, and there were individuals who held the views advanced at Trent, but there were other individuals who held views that were identical to the views held by Luther. But these errors go back on a long tradition, and was not a universal tradition by any means, but a long tradition. But the view that is held, is much higher, as Hodge points out, because the full deity of Christ, is recognized, and it is maintained that apart from His blood there is no possibility of salvation. In the statements which are included in the services, though unfortunately so much of it is in Latin that a great number of the people will not understand it, but in the statements which are included in their observances, in the statements which the Priests must read, themselves at least, there is sufficient of definite Scriptural teaching that I have no doubt, that there are some people that the Holy Spirit takes the truths and applies it to the heart, and brings the person to the truth of justification, apart from any teaching by others.

(13 $\frac{1}{2}$) indicates of the view ~~that~~ of Christ's death.

The word of God is made of no affect by a tradition that has overspread these teachings, and has made it difficult for the people to get its proper significance. And the Romanist view is that no one can be saved except the merits of Christ be upon him, and that these works, merits are applied by infusion into him. Infusing into them righteousness as a result of what Christ has done. And that a person is justified because this -

Arminius

S-20. - was a very good man, and a very great scholar. But a man who has the rather typical testimony of taking whatever you hold, and carrying it to a conclusion. There are very few who have qualified in going near to ~~his~~ his statements to which he went. But there was a group who followed him after his death, and pronounce ^{The Name} a view

being
 a remonstrant was presented in Holland, and from that the group came to be called
 The Remonstrants. And the Remonstrants presented the view that when we say we are not
 from
 saved by works we mean works of the law as distinguished ~~between~~ works of the Gospel.
 And it is our ϕ evangelical obedience which saves us. God looks upon us and sees our
 faith, and ~~we~~ accepts that faith in the place of the perfect righteousness which is
 demanded by the Adamic law. The faith that we hold to be the instrument of justification
 they take to be the grounds of justification. The faith and evangelical obedience that
 the standard of God is lowered to the point where we can meet it. That we can be
 saved as a result of obedience.

Now James ~~is~~ Orr says in one of his works, that the views of John Wesley, the
 views of evangelical Methodism, are about half way between Arminianism and Calvinism, and
 a little on the side of Calvinism rather than of Arminianism. And that's John Wesley's
 book of spiritual songs. And in this book of spiritual songs, he has a hymn which I'm
 going to read to you briefly these two verses. Joy in earth as in John Wesley's book
 of spiritual songs.

Joy in earth, and heaven to bless the Lord our righteousness,

The mystery of redemption this, this the Saviour's strange desire,

Man's offense was counted his, Ours His righteousness Devine, (The imputation of His
 righteousness), In Him complete we shine, His death, his life, is mine.

Fully am
~~holy~~ and I justified free from sin, and mortal creeds,

Guiltless since for me He died, Righteous since He lives for me.

That is the ground of our salvation. There is nothing good in us, not even our
 faith. God doesn't look and say, What a good man, he's got faith in people to be
 saved. There's a man who lacks this quality, this good work. He's not saved. Faith
 is the instrument, not the cause. Not the ground of our justification.

2/13/57. - through redemption in Jesus Christ. We read in Romans 5: 9, "Much
 more then, being now justified by his blood," in Romans 3: 24 we read, "Being
 justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is ~~in~~ in Christ Jesus."
 Galatians 3: 13. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a

curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree."

Isaiah said, "All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned everyone to his own way, and the Lord has laid on him, the iniquity of us all." To these references we ~~mmmm~~ might add, to mention II Corinthians 5: 21, Acts 13: 39, Phil. 3: 8, 9. There are so many that could be added, but it is extremely important, that we have a solid and definite understanding as this, that ~~mm~~ it is the righteousness of Christ which is the ground upon which we secure justification. It is no merit in us. And this stresses the same thing or part of the same thing in another way, but it is important enough to stress in a ~~mmmmmm~~ separate head.

Number three. Jesus bore the penalty of our sins upon the cross. This is a part of the righteousness of Christ. The satisfaction for the guilt of sin. Jesus bore the penalty of our sins upon the cross. Matthew brings this out, Matthew 20: 28, for he says, "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." Dr. Machen used to make much of the fact, that after the critics tried by higher criticism to cut down the amount of the New Testament which can be used as an evidence of any supernatural beliefs of the early Christians. Throw out the gospel of John at least. Throw out Matthew and Luke and go mostly ^{build} on Mark. Throw out most of the gospel of Mark as later interpolations. He said, after it goes through a seven fold (6½) of criticism, and they boil it down to the lowest, small nucleus that can be accepted as an original writing, if there be any nucleus at all, (The professor in Crosier used to hold that there wasn't any nucleus at all), but those who think that there is anything presentable, there is practically always left this same verse, as left in Mark. That the son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. A simple ethical teacher, there's no point in this verse, there's no meaning to it. It is Jesus bearing the penalty of our sins, on the cross. We've already mentioned many statements by the apostle Paul, because he is the one who so constantly stresses this that Jesus took our sins and nailed them to his cross. That it is through His blood, that we are saved. He is the satisfaction for our sins. I'll just mention one verse from Paul now, in view of all the ones that we have looked at, that our relation,

I Timothy 2: 5-6, "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a ransom for all". The same word as ~~in~~ Matthew, Mark, and Luke uses.

Well, we might look at one of John's epistles, I John 1: 7. "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us, from all sins. He is the propitiation for our sin. He says that, two verses further on. Well, we haven't said anything about Peter yet. So let's look at Peter. Look at I Peter, 3:18. "For Christ ~~hath~~ also hath once suffered for ~~man~~ ~~sins~~ ~~man~~ sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." Or I Peter 1: 18 to 19. "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." If any man is to be saved from his sins, he can only be through what Jesus did on the cross. Jesus bore the penalty of our sins upon the cross.

Number four. The Righteousness of Christ is imputed to us. The righteousness of Christ is imputed to us. Now this of course includes primarily the death on the cross, it contains the ransom for us, but it goes even beyond that. The righteousness of Christ is imputed to us. Romans 5: 16 to 19. "And not as it ~~is~~ was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so, by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

The righteousness of Christ is imputed to us. Romans 8: 1. "There is therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," No condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. His righteousness is imputed to us. Now this word impute probably

used to be a rather common word. Today we don't use it much except in theological connection. The word is found - I don't know if the word is reckon - reckon is perhaps near it in modern English, and yet it is not exactly it. What does the word impute mean? It means to ascribe to, to reckon to, to lay to one's charge. We do use it commonly, I think, in this connection. We say we impute a good motive to a man, or we say that we impute a bad motive to a man. We do not mean that we make him good, or we make him bad. But we mean that we reckon him as having a good or bad motive. We consider him in this way. Paul carried it a bit further when he told Philemon to impute to him the ~~debt~~ debt of Onesimus. If he has robbed you, lay that to my charge. Paul wants to take on himself, what Onesimus had done to wrong Philemon.

I Samuel 22: 15. Let not the king impute anything unto his servant. II Samuel 19:19. Let not my Lord impute iniquity unto me. Leviticus 7:18, "Neither shall it be imputed unto him who offered it." Leviticus 17: 4. "^{Blood}~~What~~ shall be imputed unto that man.~~what~~ He has shed blood." It is recognized that the man is a murderer. The murderer is to be reckoned to his account. It is to be imputed unto him. Psalms 32: 2. "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity." Romans 4: 6, "Unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works." The righteousness of Christ, Paul teaches us, is imputed to us. And consequently, we receive from God, that which his righteousness deserves. It is ~~like~~ in a way like a man who comes into a bank, and he says, I would like ten thousand dollars, and they say, "Who are you? I don't you. Your account isn't known." He has no right to receive ten thousand dollars. But he presents to them, a certified check from another bank which is well known to them, signed by officers who they know they have there, for ten thousand dollars. And immediately ~~to~~ they impute to him the ten thousand dollars. They reckon it to him. We present the evidence that someone else who has that -

he ?
S-21. They changed it. And now they are trying to find out what kind of a gives. Of course, it was done that way, so they had the genuine signature, the genuine certification, but the amount and everything on it had to be changed, in that statement. We need to fear nothing in that connection with which

Christ has certified. When his righteousness is imputed to us, and when God declares that it is, a man may be deceived, and think that one who says it has been imputed to him really has it when he does not. But the Lord knows, and if we know that we are His, we know that that which he imputes to us, we can present with absolute ~~manfully~~ certainty, and receive for it, remission ~~of~~ ~~us~~ from the guilt of our sin, complete reconciliation with God, and all the blessings that he gives, on the ground solely of the righteousness of Christ, which is imputed to us.

So, we go on to number five. Number five, Faith is the Instrument through which we receive justification. (Question on Number four: How it preserves his justice that the penalty for guilt is based, but to carry that a step further and say that the righteousness of Christ, and his perfect obedience to the law, and his ~~manful~~ purpose in carrying out the will of God, included ~~that~~ in that (2) those who are united with Him. Well, most things like that are a mystery, and we cannot completely prove anything like that, but this, I think, can be seen to be quite reasonable. - - - Yes, but how can knowledge take the ~~place~~ ^{case} of Philemon? Here comes Onesimus to Philemon. And he brings a letter from Paul. And Paul has said, "If Onesimus ~~has~~ robbed you, put that to my account. Now Onesimus, let us ^{Philemon} say ~~that~~ ~~he~~ looks at Onesimus and he says that's scoundrel ~~and~~ (3) there, He ~~is~~ certainly put that stuff with mine, and he walked out with it. and he says, I just can't quite believe him. But here is Paul ~~who~~ to whom I owe my very life. Here is Paul, I would do anything in the world for him. And Paul says, If he ~~has~~ wronged you, put that to my account. Paul says, Receive him, as you would receive me. Now under those circumstances, Philemon may have his fingers pretty much crossed by ^{Onesimus} ~~the Message~~. He may ~~manfully~~ quietly say to two or three of the other servants, You kind of keep your eyes on him. And if you see him begin to get near the cash box, just kind of hang around so he'll know you are there. Don't say anything. I wouldn't for the world have Paul think that I am not trusting this man. That he put trust in me. I wouldn't displease Paul for the world. I'm not going to say anything about that ten dollars that he ~~is~~ took, and ran away, but about those tasks - - - that he let undone. Paul says, Put that to my account. And with all I owe to Paul,

I'd do fifty times as much for Paul. I'm certainly not going to reckon that against Onesimus. Now, if it should prove necessary to get rid of Onesimus, we'll find some way to do it, that Paul won't even hear of. But we're not going to do anything against Onesimus here and now, because Paul says, Reckon it to my account. And we will hope that Paul is right, that Onesimus will change, that he is changed, and we may find that, a year or two from now, we can say that we are giving Onesimus credit for his own good news. But it is just hard to believe, having known him, to take the chance.

Well, now, that is the man, Philemon, not knowing the future of the man. He can't tell what Onesimus is going to become like. He may think that Onesimus may have pulled the wool over Paul's eyes. He can't prove it. He has only human eyes. But he would be willing to reckon Onesimus to Paul's account, and to impute to Onesimus, the righteousness of Paul, not in the sense that he wouldn't watch the man, that he would leave too many things, that Onesimus could grab if he took a notion to. But in the sense that he would give to Onesimus the privileges, of giving him a chance and of treating him well, not punishing him for what he has done, giving him every chance in the world to please him. That would be imputing to Onesimus, the righteousness of Paul, on a human level. God is in a different situation, because God can have a knowledge, and an understanding, and the power that of course Paul or Philemon -
proper ?

(6). But I think that is within a few limitations, but it is thought that
Onesimus ?
to impute to him the righteousness of another man. It doesn't mean actually that we consider that the man is righteous. It means that we treat him as one who is righteous. It means that we give him the results that would come to him, if he were
millionaire,
righteous. If John D. Rockefeller were to come to the estate of some other ~~millionaire~~
we can well imagine that he would say, Well, when I was on Rockefeller's estate, he had everything to be happy there. He had the big wonderful ball ~~game~~ ^{court} that I played on anytime that I felt like it, and his swimming pools, and his horses available to go riding, and all that, and now Rockefeller is honoring me with coming to me. And I'm just going to do everything that I can to make him happy. Now, if, supposing I were to drop in at that estate of the millionaire. He would say, Well, the fifth

assistant to the sixth assistant, to his third secretary would say, Now, who are you, didn't you see the sign ~~mf~~ that there would be no trespassing. And I would say, ~~y~~ yes, but I thought that so and so would like to have me enjoy his estate. Well, I'm sorry, but there's a sign that shows the way out. That would be all that was to it. But supposed I stepped up there with a letter from John D. Rockefeller, to this other fellow, and he said, Mr. So and so, he said, Mr. So and so, I surely enjoyed my time with you. It was a great pleasure to have you with me on my estate last year, and I had a good time with you. Well, he said, here is my good friend who is going to be in your ~~e/~~ area. And it would make me very happy if you would entertain him while he is around there. I'm sorry that I can't be there, but I'm sending you him, to pay you a visit. Well, you can imagine that he would impute to me, the standing of Rockefeller, and he would put everything at my disposal. He ~~y~~ probably wouldn't spend as much as his own time with me, as he would with Mr. Rockefeller, but he would put all that he had there, at my disposal, for the time of my visit. He would be imputing to me, the standing of the other man. That would not mean that he would consider me as being ~~an~~ in the category ~~m(B)~~ of the other man.

The illustration is given by those who oppose the idea of imputation. They say you can not consider that an Ethiopian is white, with a white garment on. And Hodge gives a very good answer. He says, That's right. But a man who has a suit of armor on him, a spear does not pass. In other words, the white garment does not change what is inside of you, but it changes the affect on the outside. ~~Hummmmm~~ ^{In fact} I think that the ~~is a better~~ white garment illustration ~~hmmmmmm~~ now then those who made it ever dreamed it was. Because, if I understand correctly, you go out here, and you are wearing a black coat, a black suit, and you hear a signal that a Russian plane is down here a little ways, and they got through without our realizing that they were coming, and all of a sudden, when our eyes were on the Middle East or somewhere else, this plane got through our defense. And so they say, get under cover where you are instnatly, as fast as you can. And if I recall ~~exactly~~ what I read, if I were to take a white sheet and put it over me, that white sheet would protect me from the radiation. And I believe that in Nagasaki, there were some people who had a white suit on, or a white, long flowing garment on,

and there were some black figures over them. And the radiation ate right through their bodies through those black figures. But where the white was they were protected. Now I may have that in reverse. It was sometime ago, when I read the illustration. I read the fact, but I think it is an illustration. Justification is not a matter of our state but our standing. And that it is not unjust to transfer the standing to another person provided that you have that which can be transferred. If Jesus Christ were just an ordinary ~~man~~ mortal, it would be ridiculous to speak of transferring his standing to us. Its absurd. You can't transfer it. His own righteousness is needed for Himself. But if Jesus Christ is the Son of God, if he is the Infinite God, His righteousness is enough to save the whole world. And His righteousness can be transferred to Our standing. Now that in itself, does not change our condition. ~~It~~ If it were that Philemon would have found that Onesimus was a ~~man~~ scoundrel he would have to get rid of him. And if it were that God should discover eventually that it was absolutely hopeless. He couldn't make or work it out, why that would be a bad situation. But the infinite God never justifies without ~~also~~ ^{also} proceeding to regenerate. But he does not justify us on the ground that of the fact, that he is going to reform us ^(11 $\frac{1}{2}$) ~~in~~. He justifies us by ascribing to us the righteousness of Christ. - -

The sin of Adam is imputed to all those who are in Adam. We are sinful by imputation, but not only by imputation. We are also sinful, by our own, individual choice. We are sinful in the first place because Adam, our representative, fell, and the sin of Adam is imputed to us. But we are sinners in addition to that, because we inherited from Adam, the sinful nature. We are sinful because we inherited all the sin and wickedness from our forebearers. Everyone of them. But we are sinful in ourselves, because every ~~man~~ single one of us, has himself, chosen to be unjust. And I personally, I think it is very foolish to argue about the imputation of sin, or our obligation to Adam, with an unsaved person. I would say this, the scripture teaches it. The sin of Adam is imputed to us. We are ~~man~~ lost as a result of Adam's sin. That is clearly taught in the Scriptures. But supposing that is not the case. Each one of us must admit, that time after time, he has individually and personally, done what he knows he shouldn't have done, and not done the things that

he should have done. Every one of us, individually and personally, has sinned. And everyone of us, personally deserves punishments at the hand of God. We have that sin upon us, and that sin alone would be enough to merit our condemnation. But that is a result that flows from the other. Now you don't have to convince the sinful man, that it does flow from the other. It is sufficient to show him that it is there. And we can see that it is there.

S-22. But to those who are justified, in every case God proceeds to sanctify by regenerating us, and giving us a new spirit, and then proceeding to develop that spirit, so that more and more of the righteousness of Christ becomes a reality in us. And the sin of Adam, doubtless works itself out more and more, as the years went on in the race, in the development of the universe, and God, by the spirit, will develop the character of us, more and more, until we are conformed to His image. But that is not the cause on which He justifies us. He justifies us, because He imputed the righteousness of Christ to us, and then he proceeds to change us into that, which we are already, ? so it isn't (1) but it is not the cause of regeneration.

- - - We are forgiven through Christ, for all sins, past present and future. Christ died for our sins on the cross even though these sins were not yet committed. He died for them and he bore the penalty for them. And the sins which we will commit in the future, are laid on Him, just the same, as those in the past.

Now that's one place where we differ from the Roman Catholics' view. And even some in the ~~past had a similar~~ early days of Christianity, had a false understanding on that. You remember Constantine. Though he presided in Christian assemblies, he presided in the Council of Nicae, and was considered as the first Christian of the Empire. He postponed his baptism until the day before his death, because he was afraid that he might sin, after his baptism. And that would not be included in that which was (34), imputed to him. But that we do not believe is the Scriptural view. "He that believeth on Him, shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." ~~THESE ARE~~ In our state we will gradually be sanctified and proved, and sin less and less. But in our standing, we are immediately purged before God, and

all of our sins, past, present, and future, are included. And so when we fall we should be very sorry, because we did not please God. And we should resolve that with God's help we will move forward more rapidly in the task of sanctification. But when we fall, we need not be concerned, we need not get all excited over our justification. We must say, It is under the blood. Christ died for us. We pray Him to keep us, from doing it any more, but we do not ~~need~~ need to be all upset about this, because it is under the blood.)

But we must go on to number five, and number five is a point on which there is great danger of misunderstanding. ¶ If we are agreed upon what we looked at so far, five is almost inevitably thought of, but there is great ^{danger of} misunderstanding, and it is good for us to get our ideas quite clear on it. Number five, Faith is the Instrument through which we receive justification. Faith is the instrument through which we receive justification. I ~~want~~ want to run a big machine, and here's a big machine here. And there is tremendous power over there in the dynamo. And the machine doesn't run. I sat down at my sound-scriber the other day. I turned it on. Nothing happened. I looked down and found that it wasn't connected. The connection had worn through. The connection, the instrument, through which we receive it, that connection doesn't put any power into it. That connection doesn't make it go. That connection is not a thing of power, that pushes that thing and makes it go. It merely is the instrument through which the power comes. And it is true that the power is not there without the instrument. But I can get a little connection for a dime with which I can connect the power which will run a tremendous machine. It takes tremendous power to move it. But then the connection must be there. But the connection is ~~not~~ not the power. It is not the ground, it is the instrument. The instrument through which we receive justification.

So we will break that up into three heads, ~~and~~ but the third will be the same as five. The first two the negative ones, Small a under five. Faith is not a work on account of which we are justified. It is not a work that deserves God's favor, and which therefore receives His justification. There is one form of expression which occurs occasionally in the Bible, which seems to favor the view that if God looks at us and sees us doing this work of faith, he gives us merit for us. That is a view that is held, in certain portions of Roman Catholic theology. God looks upon the

faith and rewards the faith, because it is a good work.

I was talking here the first year, some of the fellows from across the street came over and went through the building, and I talked to them briefly about their life, and experiences, and one of them happened to make the statement, that every Saturday morning at ten o'clock we are to do an act of contrition. Every Saturday morning at ten o'clock, you should repent for you sins. It is an act which you can perform, of contrition which is glorifying to God. Now, maybe he did not mean it the way those words sounded, but we can see how the words can sound, and there are some persons in Roman Catholic theology who carry that implication. The man ~~and~~ performs his acts of evangelical obedience, and God gives him credit for it, or it sounds like that, when Paul says in Romans 4: 3, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." And the same phrase is used in verse 22, of chapter four, and Galatians 3: 6. And ~~those~~ those would sound as if, here ~~it~~ is an act of righteousness, for which God gave Abraham credit. And yet the whole argument of Paul here is, that it was not any work that Abraham had done, but it was God's promise of grace as a result of which Abraham received these blessings. And then we should note that ~~Scripture~~ Scripture never says we are justified on account of faith, which would be dia with the accusative. They all would say by or through faith, which is dia or ek with the genitive or dative. It is not on account of but by or through faith that we are justified.

Abraham was not justified for his works but by faith in a redeemer. And these two or three phrases of Paul must be taken in connection with the context, that it was the righteousness of Christ which was imputed to Abraham, not the wonderful thing that Abraham had faith. But faith was the instrument and in addition to that, when Abraham believed ~~in~~ God's promises, Abraham had already been with the Lord for many years serving Him. If he was not then justified, he had certainly been justified a long time before. If these were works for which he was ascribed, it would certainly not be that he received his salvation for these works. And I believe that we are justified in Christ, that faith is not a work for which we are justified.

(Question. Galatians 3:6. Well, they are the same phrases used in three places. Well, some say it was one state, but the one state, was three times repeated. Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Galatians 3:6. "And know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse." "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of The Spirit through faith. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as one one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.")

Faith is not a work on account of work we are justified. B. Faith is not the ground of our justification. The ground of our justification is Christ. It is an act of God's free grace. It's not looking at a good man. See how much faith he's got. That is not the ground of our justification. It is - look at this righteous man who died on the cross. This one who is the Son of God. This one who bore our sins. This one who lived in absolute righteous obedience to God, and whose righteousness is imputed to us. Faith is not the ground of our justification. And then c. Faith is the instrument through which we receive justification. That was our five, but I put one negatively and one positively. Perhaps I should have varied the phraseology a little there, but I didn't! I made it the same. Faith is the instrument through which we receive justification. It is the positive in answer to the negative there. Hodge has a number of good discussions on this, in this connection. He says, "What Abraham believed was that the seed of the woman, the sorrow, the promised redeemer of the world was born of him. He believed in Christ as His saviour, as his righteousness, and deliverance. And therefore he was accepted as righteous, not for the merit of his faith, and not on the ground of faith, or by taking faith in lieu of righteousness, but because he received and trusted in Christ

alone for his salvation. There's a very good statement at the foot of page 168.

S-23. We therefore are justified not by what Christ did, but by his life in us, which is truly and properly ours as the life that we derive from Adam is our own. We must stand before God to be justified or condemned, to be accepted or rejected on the ground of what we are. We have nothing to offer but our own subjective, inherent character, such as it is. ^{Hodge says of that,} The man is to be pitied who dares to do this. We say that we have nothing to offer to God, but our own subjective, inherent character, such as it is. And those same ~~to have proceeded further~~ ^{on} (1) the line of righteousness would be the first to recognize how far short all that they have obtained in life comes, of being worthy to offer to Christ. Nothing in my hand I bring, simply to thy cross, I cling. His blood the finest wine, which (1). It is when a man like John Wesley says, what any man who has proceeded very far in the path of righteousness says, Hodge ends, It is better to agree with Paul who renounced his own righteousness, his own goodness, every thing pertaining to himself, ~~nothing~~ ^{everything} subjective, and trusted ~~in~~ only and confidently in the righteousness of Christ received by faith.

2/14/57. C. was the instrument through which we receive justification, small d, is the faith that justifies us is not mere knowledge. Now that word mere, is very important there. There are those who think that if you know all that the Bible teaches that is what is vital in life. Well, it is very vital, for the person who is going on with the Lord. It is important that he understands the word of God. And that he learns more and more from the word about God, his character, his purposes, and as a result, more about how he wants us to live, and what he wants us to do. The greater our knowledge of Christian things, the more helpful is this to us as an element of progress in our Christian life. But how about justifying faith? How much does one have to know to be justified? It is easy to talk to someone and find they have a very wonderful knowledge of the teaching of the scripture and yet find that they don't believe any of it. Mere knowledge is not sufficient at all. Knowledge is important,

but faith is beyond knowledge. How much knowledge is needed actually? I think that we must say that a Christian who wants to glorify the Lord, wants all the knowlege that he can get of what God's will for him is. And we won't say, how little knowledge we can have and still be saved? We'll say that we want all the knowledge that we can get. But I will say that God does choose to save some with very, very little knowledge. With ~~him~~ perhaps the very slightest idea that here is one, Jesus, who offers them salvation, and they take it. I don't think that is the common thing. I think that is a rare thing. But, if the Lord intends to use one in His service, he is quite apt, either to have that man have more knowledge, to be saved, or to give him more clearly in that ~~man~~ (4½).

But justification per se does not require a great deal of knowledge. It is not mere knowledge, and any amount of knowledge, will not saved, if there is not something more to save than that. So small e. The faith that justifies is not mere assent. It is not mere assent. A young fellow came to seminary ~~once~~, in order to get knowledge of Hebrew and Greek to help in interpreting the word of God. He was told by his father, who was anxious that he come here. He was quite intelligent in the high school, days. But in those days we had a smaller student body then we had the last $\frac{1}{2}$ few years, and we could go out of our way for special cases more then it is possible to now that our student body is so much larger then it was in the early years of seminary. And the father was anxious that the young fellow come to gain knowledge of languages for interpretation of the scripture. Well, we soon found that the fellow had a great knowledge of Biblical teaching. But, it wasn't long before the students in the class began to discover, ~~as~~ ^{to know him} as soon as they had gotten ~~an~~ a bit, that although he was a very, very good student, and nice fellow, he did not give assent. He knew it all. He knew the teaching. But his mind was filled with questions as to whether it was true or not. And after a few months when he concentrated on languages, and he made good progress, because he had a very good language mind, he went on with his high school work, and continued with other things, and a few years later, I saw a book published anonymously by him, ~~carrying~~ tearing the Bible to pieces. He did not give assent to these things. He did not accept them as truth. Now, when we say that we believe in

we believe

one God, we don't mean, merely mean that Christianity teaches that there is one God. We mean there is one God. And it is a great step forward over having just knowledge, to have assent to it. To believe that these things are true. And it is a vital element in saving faith, to give assent.

But mere assent will not save anybody. James says, "Thou believest that there is one God, thou doest well, the demons believe and tremble." And you can believe that Jesus Christ died to save sinners. You can believe that. You can give assent to that. But that does not save you. You have to believe that the primary fact of the religion are true, to be saved. But whether you have to give assent to all the great central doctrines against, is a question for salvation. If a person is going to go on in the Christian life, it is vital that they accept what God's word says. And that they are ready as they go forward, to take it as the answer to almost every point. And we find people in every denomination, in every group, in every Christian group, who hunt through the scripture, to find evidences ~~from~~ to support the views that they have already adopted instead of hunting through to see what God actually teaches. We find plenty of men who do that. (8)

To give assent to the teaching of the Scripture is a vital thing, but it alone will not save, and it is possible for a person to have doubts in his mind as to a great part of the Christian teaching, and still to receive justifying faith. Now if he does, I believe the Spirit will lead him on, to give assent to the others. We had a case one time. I was in a seminary, and there was a man second to me in the leadership of this seminary and there was another man who was a student, coming up for a master's degree. The man went on later to become the head of the Bible department in a very fine Christian institution. But when this fellow came up for his master's degree, in his examination, it came out that he was not sure whether a man was lost if he did not accept verbal inspiration. He wasn't sure of that. He was not sure if a man was lost, who had certain doubts as to certain vital aspects of Christian truth. Now this other professor didn't think this fellow should be given his master's degree. He thought that that was extremely dangerous. The ~~angmanh~~ attitude that the fellow was taking on that point. I didn't agree with him at all. I do not feel that it is necessary that one

give his ascent to even so vital a thing as the full, inerrant inspiration of the Scripture in order that he may be saved. I think that it is necessary that he give ascent to it if his life is to be used of the Lord, in the most effective way.

I don't mean that this student questioned the doctrine. He believed it himself. But he found men, who he had reason to think were saved, who did not believe it and he was not ready to say, these men are lost because they do not accept it. And I will not say it either. I will say that a person whose life is going to be used of the Lord as it ought to be, should give ascent to these doctrines, ~~and~~ ^{and} I think in most cases will. I think the Spirit will lead him and will clarify it himself. But I believe that justifying faith includes a certain amount of ascent and it properly should include ascent to all the great doctrines of the Scripture. And if that full ascent is not there, it should come later as one studies, if he is truly saved. But I do believe that there are cases where ~~ascent~~ with a very small amount of consent, there is still a true faith, as the Lord saved the individual.

(Question: I often ~~think that~~ state, I think the Lord that people are inconsistent in their arguments. (11)). Because there are many people who if they consistently and logically carry it out, a good many of their teachings, they would be way over there, and on the other hand if the consistently logical ~~carry out other parts they~~ (11) should be way over there, I could say it this way, ~~im~~ There is no person living who is accurate. . There just isn't. And in God's sight it is what is really ~~important~~ vital to us and where we put our emphasis, rather than that we have all the answers to all the matters. As far as effective service for the Lord is concerned, the more we understand the great doctrines and the greater our ascent to them, I think, that along with other things, the more the Lord will use us. I will say that, if a person is going to be really used of the Lord to the utmost, he certainly should believe in the Virgin Birth. I would say that if a person logically studied the Scripture and promises to do the Lord's will, he certainly should believe the Virgin Birth. But I do believe that there are individuals ~~men~~ who had that teaching, who are truly saved, who got their minds very much confused from that point, and who have denied the Virgin Birth, and yet can be a true Christian, but I believe that they are,

in this point at least, they are moving in a direction that will lead others away from Christ. It believe that it is a situation, which is heading away and will lead away there others, and so ~~it~~ will not ~~immediately~~ be many who will believe, but I am not saying ready to say that I can tell that a man is saved or lost, on whether he believes the virgin birth or not. There will be people who will give ascent to the virgin birth, who are lost. And there are a few people who will not give ascent to it who are saved, but I doubt if there are many, because it moves rapidly on from that so that others who are influenced by that are definitely outside the ~~historic faith~~ (13). But the faith that justifies us is not mere ascent, a certain amount is needed, but it is questionable how much we can tell how much is needed in a particular instance. Let's give all we can and let's not say, Lord, how little can I believe and still be saved? Of course, if you ~~say~~ say that, I doubt if you are saved at all. But mere ascent, you can ascent to everything, of orthodox Christian belief, and that will not be enough to save you.)

F. The Faith that justifies. Involves Trust.

The faith that justifies involves trust as a primary ingredient. One man studying about a bank, who knows all about its assets, and its liabilities, who knows where ~~his~~ ^{its} money is invested, ~~he~~ knows exactly what is the capabilities of its officers. He knows how much ~~is~~ of its deposits are insured, he has a great knowledge of the bank, and he has a great admiration for its direction. But he feels a little bit that he wants to keep his money ~~some~~ where he can be sure it is safe, where he can depend on it.

A-24. ~~All~~ All of our trust, combined with the actual integrity of the bank will make you ^{that} a lot safer, with a tremendous amount of the bank, and consequent .
But if the bank is not good, it shouldn't be part of the ~~the~~ bank. But we must have trust, if Christ is to perform that which he has accomplished. But this trust can be combined with very little knowledge and very little ascent. I think the Lord can lead on, but we can't say how much is necessary, though some of us have justifying faith, but there must be trust as a primary ingredient, but to believe in (there are many a minister who has said, "Well, I believe in the gospel. I've signed all these creeds. I'm

absolutely sure of the deity of Christ. I haven't a doubt in the world. And yet he is always preaching ethical sermons, and political sermons. Sermons that have nothing to do with these doctrines. Now if he believes that the word of God is the only way of saving people, if he believes that coming to know Christ and believe in Him, will make the difference between Heaven and Hell, how can he possibly preach on matters that have nothing at all do with it. How can he give one sermon in which he talks about the blessings and the goodness to be found in Christ, and not somewhere in the sermon, show that the man who doesn't have these, can get them.

If we really believe these things they will empower to action. They will affect us. It involves trust in the primary ingredients.

Small g. This faith is one that unites the Believer to Christ.

This faith is one that unites the Believer to Christ, and receives him in all the aspects of His ~~man~~ person and work. This faith is one that unites the Believer to Christ, and receives him in all the aspects of His person and work. It is often spoken in scripture, to receive Christ - To as many as received Him, to them he gave power to become the sons of God. You cannot simply trust Christ to keep you from hell and not be interested in what His will is for you in this life. That is not a justifying statement. A person ~~must~~ ^{does} not have to know a great deal about what it means, but he must desire and intend to receive Christ for all that he is and all that He wants us to be in this life. It is an instrument that unites us to Him, in a close walk and receives him in all the aspects of His person and work, not merely as Saviour but also as Lord. Not merely as the Divine creator, but also ~~as~~ as the human standard. Not merely as a human standard, but also as a Divine saviour, and Lord.

There is an illustration that can very well be given at this point, which could have been given equally as well under the ~~same~~ discussion of imputation, which I believe is very helpful in bringing out the meaning of imputation. Here is a dumb woman and here is a big estate over her. And there is a man who owns that big estate. And this woman has no claim over it, what is in that estate, she has absolutely no claim. No rights to its content, no right to its material, no right to control over

it in any way. But the man who owns this big estate, marries this young woman. And now all that he owns, is imputed to this woman, because she is united with him. And now she has authority over the whole estate. She has authority over the material, over the property, of his home, and if the man dies, a large portion of the estate will go to her. This has been imputed to her. It is directed to her, because of the actual relationship into which she has come to the owner of the estate. And when we believe in Christ we are united with him, in all aspects of his person. And so his righteousness ~~has~~ can very properly, which belongs to Him, be imputed to us and reckoned to our account. And God sees us as possessing His righteousness.

This faith that believes then is not, merely giving ascent to something, or coming forward in a meeting, or raising your hand. It is a trust and a relation which relates the believer to Christ so that there is a personal union with Him, in all the aspects of His person and works, and as a result, His satisfaction on the cross, is in our stead, we are crucified to Him, we are united with Him, also His righteousness, His Godly righteousness, and His obedience, His Godly obedience, is imputed to our account.

Small h. This Faith is a Living Faith.

Jesus said, If you have faith as a grain of mustard seed, Now what does that mean, to have faith as a grain of mustard seed? The mustard seed is tiny, isn't it? But it is not simple. It is very far from simple, it is complex. It is living. You can not make a grain of mustard seed. You can't do it. /? No scientist could make a grain of mustard seed. People can sympathize organic materials which have been produced by living organisms, but they cannot make a living organism. There is something in it. There is life. You implant that little grain of mustard seed into a plot of ground, and some of it can grow a great deal. And the mustard seed cannot grow without the seed. It is a living faith which can change you. It is not merely a mechanical thing. There is life in it.

James saw the great misunderstanding of what faith is, and he did not attempt to find a precise scientific jargon which ~~man~~ ^{all} would accept, and in which he would follow. Such had not been invented then in theology. We have to invent in scientific ~~the~~ technical matters of speech, but we constantly change them, as we get new knowledge and

better understanding. And James spoke in the language of his day, as Paul spoke in the language of his day, and you can get a verbal contradiction between James's statement that we are saved by works, and by Paul's statement that we are saved by faith. And yet if you read carefully, in James, you find that there is no contradiction whatever. But James is pointing out that which Paul already believes. That the faith that saves is not a mere assent to a proposition, but a declaration of certain words, ~~a~~ or a voting of an orthodox belief. But that it is a faith that leads to action. We are not saved by the action. We are saved by the righteousness of Christ imputed to us. But ~~w~~ if we have that kind of faith, it will lead to action, inevitably. And if it doesn't lead to action, it is not there.

Hodge says in one of his lectures, that if a person says he has faith, for justification, and no faith for sanctification, you can be quite sure that he has no ~~firm~~ faith at all. Faith is not merely something that is an attempt to escape hell, by saying, Yes, I'll take his gift, of ~~a~~ escaping from Hell, and that's all. Faith is being united with Christ in a living relationship. And Martin Luther was so impressed with the vital importance of this doctrine of justification by faith, because there is no ~~more~~ more vital doctrine than this, because without this you have nothing else. He was so impressed with this, that he was constantly trying to bring this truth to people's minds, and when people would say to him, Yes, but James says you are saved by works, Luther said, Ah, the epistle of James, I'll throw that in ~~amongst~~ the ~~river~~ (9½), which is the river that flows from Rome. And another time, he said, Ah, James is an epistle of straw. And it is a bit unfortunate that a man who had such, who was such a great teacher of truth such as clear understanding, as Martin Luther, should have used rather extreme language sometimes of getting points across, because those two statements of his have been used as a foundation of a whole teaching today that is ~~an~~ utterly erroneous. That Luther did not accept James as an inspired portion of the Word of God. There is absolutely no evidence whatever, that Luther did not consider James as part of the canon, and there is the strongest evidence that he did consider it, as part of the canon. Luther's attitude towards the Word of God, was, that let everything else be destroyed, I will stand by this.

He said that you convict everything in my works, that is in addition to the word of God, and if you want me to recant I'll gladly do it, ~~if I'm making a mistake~~ because I may be mistaken. But what I have said, that is simply presenting the teaching that is in the Word of God, I must stand by, because the Word of God, is God's truth. Well, if ~~he~~ he took that attitude to the Word, well, it must be important what is contained in the Word, and Luther got out addition after addition of the New Testament, working over the translation of the New Testament together with as much accuracy as he could, during the long life, spending hour after hour, year after year, working on and improving on his translation of the New Testament, and every addition he ever got out, contains the epistle of James. So there is absolutely no doubt that Luther considered James as part of the inspired work of God. There is absolutely no question on it. But these two statements, I'm not sure when he made them, whether they were in the table talks, which were rapid talks, in which a person ~~was~~ picked up in the person of his conversation at the table, and wrote down, ~~and~~ ^{or} whether they were included in sermons he wrote. But he ~~and~~ certainly ~~he~~ did not mean by them that James was not part of the Word of God. He meant that here is an epistle which the Romanists tried to use to deny the great Pauline teaching of justification by faith. That is what the Romanists were trying to use. But he thought it was the Word of God, he included it in his book, he certainly must have understood that it did not contradict Paul, but he wasn't going into details. He just threw it off, in this way, gently.

But I believe that, toward the end of his life. Luther wished that he had put a little more stress on the teaching of the epistle of James, even though he was also right in putting the great stress on the major emphasis, because Luther toward the end of his life was perturbed by the number of people who ~~ascended~~ ^{may have} gave ascent to the Words of the Gospel, but gave no evidence in their lives that it was truly there. ~~And~~ Once he left Wittenberg and said, I'm never coming back again. I'm just never going to come back, because of this hypocrisy, of the people saying, Yes, I believe this and this, with no change in their lives. He was utterly overwhelmed and discouraged time after time. But of course anybody is going to be, that lives in this world, where Satan is in control, and you ~~will~~ will see the finest people led astray by Satan. Anybody

is going to be, but James is giving an invaluable ~~an understanding~~ ^{understanding}, which is to some extent cutting it down, with his stress on the importance - that the Faith that saves is not merely an ascent, but that it was a living faith.

Now small i. How is This Faith Secured?

This justifying faith. How do we get this justifying faith? If somebody says now I'm going to get busy, and I'm going to work hard, and I'm going to get this justifying faith, and consequently, I will have this justifying faith, which the Lord will see and will bless, and I will be saved through it. Where does justifying faith come from? And so under that we say, Number one in Parenthesis: Faith is a Gift of God. Faith is the instrument through which we receive justification but faith is a gift of God. There is abundant evidence to this, Romans 12: 3. Paul says, "As God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." I Corinthians 12: 4. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit."

S-25.

Number two.

"Faith comes by hearing God's word." Romans 10: 17. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Acts 4: 4. "Howbeit many of them which heard the word believed." We can have a part in giving people faith, by presenting them a part of God's word. And it is very unlikely that God will ever give them faith if they don't hear God's word. But we can't be sure that he will give it to them as a result of our preaching. He may and may not.

Number three. Faith is the work of the Holy Spirit.

Galatians 5:22. "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith," The Holy Spirit imparts faith.

Number four. Our Faith ~~is~~ increases by ~~our~~ Fixing our Eyes on the Promises of God.

You do not get faith by saying I want to build up this name, or by saying I must have ~~my~~ faith. You remember the story that Doctor Killain told about the man that, they said to him, if you have enough faith you can get over your cancer. If it keeps on, it shows that your faith is incomplete. So he ~~it~~ tried to convince himself that the cancer had left him. I won't admit that there is a possibility that it hasn't, I won't believe that it has, I know that I'm rid of it. It kept getting bigger and bigger on his face,

and he kept trying to cover it up, and he said, No, I'm going to have faith that the cancer is leaving me. You don't get faith that way. We get faith by fixing our attention on the promises of God. Because it isn't the faith, but it is the strength of the one, in whom there is faith, that saves us. There is such a thing as faith-healing that can be done by the faith in the image of the Lord, ~~with~~ ^{a certain} faith in ~~any~~ kind of water, faith in the power of a man; any kind of faith can heal up to a certain point. But that is not justifying faith in God. A man told me in New York, that when they are testing drugs for people, they have to be very careful they don't know whether they are getting the drug or not. But they may have faith in it, and it may have such from the faith. But that is purely a psychological manifestation and a psychological ^{not} manifestation will save a person. And a psychological manifestation will not bring God's favor. It may make our life a little happier. It may give us greater ~~comfort~~ comfort. It may help us to go on in our life more easily. It may even heal us. But it is not that which gets God's favor. It is not the faith, but it is the power of God. It is His will which saves. And so to have more faith, we must think more of God's great power and we must think more of God's great body. And put our attention on him. Faith is merely that which ties us to His promises.

So that to say that God saves those who have faith, and He doesn't save those who don't, and therefore we deserved His salvation, because of our ~~faith~~ faith, is certainly a character of the scripture. We cannot be saved without faith, but faith is secured as the gift of God. It is secured by hearing God's word. It is secured by His spirit working within us. It is secured by our paying our attention to the promises of God. So it is all of His grace.

Small j. Thus we see that Faith is not a Work for which God rewards us, by Saving Us. But it is a channel through which He gives us, His free gift. Now this was five, that Faith is the Instrument, through which we receive Justification, I've been a little uncertain whether ^{the Time of} ~~by means of~~ justification, needs to ~~be~~ ^{be} made a separate head, like C, or whether it could be put under How God Justifies us.

Make it 6. the Time of Justification.

In a way, it isn't how God saves us. Yet it is dealing with that, and I don't think

that it is quite important enough to have a separate head. Most of the various books on theology do not have a special section on the time of justification. But Berkhof has several pages on it - on the time of justification. And I had a question asked yesterday in the class that made me feel that this was a little more ~~important~~ important than I had felt it was before. I do not intend to deal with it specifically, but I feel that it is vital that we should.

Number 6. The Time of justification. Now Berkhof tells on pages 517 and following of his theology how there are theologians who say that justification takes place in eternity. He said the antinomians held that justification as there, took place in eternity or in the resurrection of Christ. And some reformed theologians also speak of justification from eternity. So he has two or three pages of the grounds for justification from eternity, and then objections against the doctrine of justification from eternity. He has five grounds and three objections. By that way the majority would rule that it is, wouldn't it? Five grounds and three objections from the grounds of the doctrine of justification. Then he takes up second, justification in the resurrection of Christ. Because after all we read that he was raised for our justification. And he says that the idea that sinners are in some sense of the word, justified by the resurrection of Christ, was stressed by some Anti-nomians, is taught by those reformed theologians who believe in a justification from eternity and also is held by some other reformed scholars. This view is based on the following ground: and ~~he~~ then he gives three grounds for that, but he doesn't give any objections to it. Then the next one he calls justification by faith. Which seems to me hardly a consistent arrangement. No, a & d. No, I'm wrong. He says c. Three is just a c. ~~in~~ He says, in II Corinthians 5: 19 we read, - - Here, I turned over the page now, there is no sense in me trying to give you the exact words now, I want to give you what I believe to be the correct explanation.

When are we justified? Are we justified from eternity? Are we justified at the atonement, at the death of Christ? Are we justified at the resurrection of Christ? Are we justified when we believe? Are we justified at death? Well, now, the Roman view is that we are justified at death, (when we leave purgatory). Justification is a

process, and we get more just in there, ~~from~~ until we are more justified, until we reach ~~the~~ eventually it. ~~point~~ Till then we have a first justification when we are justified, when righteousness is infused into us, and we are justified, and then we are sinned, and we are gradually remedied out of it, and so we are gradually more justified, and eventually we may reach that point where we are justified. ~~When~~ I think that we can say that justification does not come later than the time when one believes in Christ, because Jesus said, as ~~many~~ many as received him, to them ~~gave~~ he the power. He that believeth is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already. We took that up under, It is an Act. But ~~by an act~~ (10) I don't think we mean that necessarily in every individual case God performs this particular individual act at this specific instance, here and now is the instance he is justified and he wasn't before this. ~~W~~ I don't think that we quite draw that ~~from it~~ (10). I think that we must understand it in this way.

Think ~~a~~ of a man who is hoping to have a son. Now this man does not yet have a child. Maybe he isn't even married. But he is hoping to have a child. And he is anxious that this son does not have ~~a~~ as much difficulty in life, as he had. And consequently, he says, I am going to work and save and ~~from~~ ~~plan~~ (10¹) in order that he might be able to go to college. I couldn't get this education. I want him to get it. I'm going to make this available to him, So he gets busy and he works. When does he perform the act? of giving his son a college education? Well, he is working on it when he is preparing for it, he is saving the money, even though the son has not yet come into existence. Then he has the money. He has accumulated it. He takes this money and he puts it ~~in~~ in trust. He puts it in trust, for the ~~purpose~~ purpose of giving his son a college education. And this money is put in trust. Well, that's when he ~~gave~~ gave his son the college education. Now the man dies. And the trust is there. And when he dies the son is just a little boy. Then the time comes, when the son is of age, he is given the money, with which he can get the college education. ~~God~~ ~~moment~~ from all eternity, decreed and willed that Christ should provide for salvation of God's children. That was provided in the decree of God from all eternity. And though someone may want to say to me, I'm justified from all eternity, there is a sense in

which it can be said. And I think that ~~the~~ it is picking at hairs to say ~~when~~ that we are or we are not. There is a sense in which we are, but it is not the complete sense. Because the justification from eternity is based on the death of Christ, which is what secures it. It is based on the determination that Christ would give his life, and it would have no effect beyond this.

Then Christ gives his life for us on the cross. He lives His life of righteousness here, and he gives his life upon the cross, and he pours out His blood for us, ~~and~~ the price point is established. The power is performed, the ransom is paid. Everyone who is in Christ, Jesus bore his sins upon the Christ. He substituted for us then. And so our sins have been paid for them. And our justification was secured, when he was on the cross. Now he was raised for our justification. I don't think that means we are justified because he was raised. But he was raised to show us, he was raised to indicate that the sacrifice was accepted, that the debt was paid, that our justification was secured. I think it would be much better to say that we are justified at the sacrifice, then at the resurrection. The resurrection does not ~~make~~ our justification any more definite, but it ~~seems~~ assures itself, it gives us proof.

Well now, this is like the trust fund in the bank. It ~~is~~ is there for us. It is designated for us. It is intended for us. It has been earned at great cost. It is there for that purpose and for no other purpose. But ~~when~~ we are united with Christ through faith, it is definitely imputed to our account. And so, ~~and~~ justification is complete when we are united with Christ. It is complete. We are justified.

C-26.

The act has been performed. The act actually was performed in the death of Christ. But the act is applied to us when we are united with him by faith. And in the view of the fact that we can not tell how much knowledge is required for his justification, you can not say that a person, with a very small amount of knowledge, ^{when} may have placed his trust in Christ, and been united to him, and may be justified from that moment on. And later on, he has a great experience of consecration and he thinks that now he has been saved, but maybe he was saved at ^{that} an earlier time. We cannot tell, in a great many cases

when a person is united with Christ. But we should be able to say we have been . We are united with Him. The act is complete. Or we are not. Now after that, we sin, and we confess our sin, and we receive pardon for that. We do that many times. But those pardons which we receive, are on the virtue of the act, which has been already passed. They are concluded in our initial justification. But the time of justification I think it is good to have a clear understanding of the difference between justification being an act, and sanctification being a process, is ~~the~~ ^{that} justification is something that is complete at the beginning of our Christian life. And sanctification is something that is only complete at the resurrection. And as far as our own individual, subjective experience is concerned, sanctification is something that proceeds over a long period, but justification so far as we are concerned, is something that, the minute we receive any of it, we receive all of it. ~~But~~ It is one united thing. And sanctification is a gradual process. But as far as God is concerned our justification has various aspects. Because it was upon the cross, that ~~the~~ eternal plan of God was accomplished on the cross. It was completed on the cross. If we are in Him, we are justified. But in our actual relationship, it is as soon as we believe.

D. The results of Justification. Capital D.

And the first result of justification is the remission of sin. The remission of sin. That's the first result of justification. And this, ~~us~~ remission of sin, there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. There is no condemnation. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is a complete removal ~~a~~ of the guilt and penalty of all sin, past, present, and future. Strong points out with ~~hmmmm~~ horror that a man may be, that the statement which he refers to hyper-calvinism says, that the truly elect person is justified when he is rioting in debauchery and wickedness. Strong raises his hands in horrors at that. And I think that the statement can be understood so as to warrant the horror of him. Because the person who has been justified will not thrive in debauchery. The person who has been justified will be seeking to follow Christ. But the person who is justified may fall into sin, he may fall into very serious sins. And if he does fall into very serious sins, he is still ^{as} justified by Christ as he was before.

But the statement can be used in such a way that is entirely good.

We are justified from all our sins, past, present and future. He is the lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world. And he takes away all of our sin. We have repeated instances of coming to him, of repentance, and of seeking his pardon, and of securing it, but it is already provided in His justification.

2/20/57.

Our very last head was the Time of Justification. And we notice that there has been a bit of discussion amongst the ~~kind~~ time of justification, but that actually, there are various times that can be said to be true. Because while justification is an act, and it is a thing that either is, or is not, yet it has various relations in time. There are those who say we are justified from eternity, before the foundation of the world. And this is a true statement, because God determined before the foundation of the world, who would ^{he} save. He determined to justify us. I gave the illustration of a man who was not even married. But who determined that his son would receive a college education. And set together the needed funds to make that possible. Of course, in God's case, there is the power to carry out anything he determines. But the ~~scripture~~ scripture says, The determination is before the foundation of the world. And since God has the power to carry it out, there is a sense in which it can be said to be justified before the foundation of the world. Then we noticed that the man who says this, he is going to give his son a college education, gathers the money for it, and puts it in a bank for this purpose. And he might be said to have provided a college education for his son, even though the son is now only five years old. And when Christ lived his perfect life, and gave Himself on the cross, and paid the penalty for our sins, he then paid the debt fully, provided our justification, and in a sense it can be said that our justification was secured. Well, the scripture definitely said it. It is true. Our justification was secured. And in a sense we can say that we were justified. Certainly, the justification was secured by the life and death of Christ. He was raised for our justification, we read, but I believe that that means that His resurrection gives proof for our justification. It is not His resurrection that justifies us. It is His atonement that justifies us. And then the son reaches the

age, when he is ready to go to college, The father may be dead by this time, but there is the money in the trust fund available to give him the education. And when the believer is united with Christ, through faith, there is the justification fully provided for through what Christ has done, which is reckoned to his account. The righteousness of Christ is imputed to him.

And so, if we believe on him, we are justified. If we do not, have not yet accepted him, we ~~have not~~ might be in the situation of a man in prison, who has been ^{has} freely pardoned, but not been told of it. He is freely pardoned, he is not subject to staying in the prison, but he does not know he has the right to go out. So that in a subjective sense our justification begins the instance that we believe. But in an objective sense we are ~~a~~ justified as soon as God decides that he is going to justify us, or certainly just as soon as he provides the justification through the death of Christ.

Now we go on to Capital D. And Capital D is the Result of Justification.

I don't think that I need to take a long time on the result of justification, because while they are tremendously important, we have touched very well, in the course of our other discussion on most of them. There is one aspect, we have not specifically mentioned.

But the first result of justification is Remission of Sin.

It is hard to know which scripture to select for this, because there is so much. I could give you a dozen verses, and you could find fifty more. You open to almost any part of the New Testament Scripture and you can find a statement about our being justified freely from our sin. You find statements about the fact that Jesus' death paid the ransom for us. There are so many of these we've already touched on, that perhaps I don't need to label one specifically under this point. But if I should ask you to discuss this, you should have evidence of it in mind. But there are so many, and you have put many down in your assignments. But remission of sin is the first immediate affect of justification.

Number two is the same thing only ~~made~~ a little more ^{sweeping} ~~complete~~ in the statement.

Full satisfaction of the law's demand. The first result of justification, the sin

question was dealt with. We are giving as the second one that it is entirely done.

~~the~~ Full satisfaction of the law's demand. And certainly Romans 8: 33 - 34 is an outstanding verse, particularly presenting this point. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? That's a tremendous sweeping statement. All the law's demands are satisfied. Well, this certainly would be a rather silly thing to say, if it depended on ~~it~~ ~~being~~ (12¹/₂) infused within us, or dependent on the excellence of our state, or dependent on the distance we have travelled in the direction of sanctification. Because there is no mere human being who has ever lived, who has ever reached such a stage in his life, that would justify such a statement as this. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." The words it is are in italics in verse 34 and are given with a view to clarify it. Who is it ~~he~~ who condemns? Why, Christ died for all our sins.

There is an excellent illustration of this point in Numbers 23. In Numbers 23, we have Balaam speaking about Israel, and he has been asked to condemn Israel. And, in Numbers 23: verses 19 through 21 we read, "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good? Behold I have received commandment to bless: and he hath blessed; and I cannot reverse it. He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel: the Lord his God ~~is~~ with him, and the shout of a king is among them."

S-27. And reads us the account of Jacob, and then say to it, "There is no iniquity in Jacob." See what people will think, if they are thinking at all. There's no iniquity in Jacob. Certainly Jacob was a trickster and a fraud and a clever schemer. He was full of iniquity. And ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~case~~ of course in this case, he is simply not just speaking of Jacob as a man, but of Jacob as a nation, and you read on, in the second verse, and you read how, the Israelites fell, and how they fell into the most terrible

sin (in the next chapter) and how God destroyed many of them for their sin, and yet Balaam says, "as the spirit of God leads them, the Lord is not a man that he should lie. He has not beheld iniquity in Jacob. Neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel." It seems that the Bible contradicts itself. It says that God sees all things. And it describes the terrible sin and wickedness of Jacob, and the Israelites. And then it says that God has not beheld iniquity or perverseness in Israel. It is an undisclosed contradiction, if we do not enter into the understanding of it. This distinction that we are finding between the state and the standing.

The state of Israel is a state of sin. A state of perverseness. A state of iniquity. The standing of Israel is that God has elected Israel; God has chosen Israel for salvation; God has determined that Jesus Christ shall bear the sin of Israel on the cross; that the righteousness of Christ shall be imputed to Israel, and God purpose^{is} to bless Israel and he does not see iniquity in Israel. As far as Israel's standing is concerned, but as far as Israel's state is concerned, even the best have a long way to go. There is not a better man who lived, then the man Moses. And the scripture tells us of his wonderful character and his wonderful qualities, and yet in the end when God deprives him of that which he desires more than anything else, in the world, God says because you sinned against me, I am going to do this to you. I think that the Lord does that among other reasons to make it very evident that even the best of us, fall very short of deserving anything good from Him.

that

The standing of Israel is one ~~whom~~ God says he is going to bless: He sees no wickedness; no perverseness. But the state has a long way to go. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? says the apostle. Well, who shall? You get to know any Christian a little bit intimately, and you find ~~them~~ in them sin. I don't care who the person is. The finest people you'll ever meet, have got down underneath, these characteristics, that are coming up in their consciousness, and are leading them to do certain things, that you just can't understand. I've heard people say, Well, the ungodly wouldn't act this way. The worldly man wouldn't. Well, they are utterly wrong. The worldly man would do things five times as bad. But no matter how fine a man he is, there is still this barrier in him, that is not yet sanctified.

And when you get real excited about it, and you just think you can't stand it anymore, there is a good answer for that. Look at yourself. Really look at yourself, and you may be entirely free from the fault that is bothering you and the other person, but you have probably got some things that are a lot worse. But the chances are, the probabilities are, that the very ~~thing~~^{fault} that you are accusing the other person of, you ~~and~~ have yourself. Because most of us are blind to our own faults, but are in some ways particularly wide eyed to the faults of others. Most of us are. And so to say who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect, well we can bring charges against any Christian, as far as their state is concerned, but this refers to their standing. They are justified from all sin, just as God saw Israel, as those for whom he was dying. God allowed Balaam to make this wonderful statement, I have not seen Iniquity in Jacob, nor perverseness in Israel.

The full satisfaction of the law's demands. Complete payment of the penalty of sin, past, present, and future. Well, Hodge has a very good discussion of the fact that the Christian does sin, and needs forgiveness. And he seeks this forgiveness and he receives it. But as Hodge explains this forgiveness, it is already secured through the death of Christ. It is already secured through him, and we have a right to come and claim it, as what he has provided for us. On the bottom of page 163 in Hodge, he says, "The sins ~~which~~^{which} are pardoned in justification include all sin, past, present, and future. It does indeed seem to be a solecism that sins should be forgiven before they are committed. Forgiveness involves remission of penalty. But how can a penalty be remitted before it is incurred? This is only an apparent difficulty arising out of the inadequacy of human language. The righteousness of Christ is a perpetual donation. It is a robe which hides, or as the Bible expresses it, covers from the eye of justice the sins of the believer. They are sins; they deserve the wrath and curse of God, but the necessity for the infliction of that curse no longer exists. The believer feels the constant necessity for confession and prayer for pardon, but the ground of pardon is ever present for him to offer and plead. So that it would perhaps be a more correct statement to say that in justification the believer receives the promise that God will not deal with him according to his transgressions, rather than to say that sins are

forgiven before they are committed.

This subject is thus presented by the Apostle: believers 'are not under the law but under grace.' (Rom. 6:14.) They are not under a legal system administered according to the principles of retributive justice." When he has committed sin, he realizes that he has offended his saviour, and prays for forgiveness, but he knows that he can claim that forgiveness in the death of Christ. He knows that Christ's death has already justified him. But his standing is thought of as being perfect before God.

Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? He is completely covered with the robe of righteousness. And then number three, Peace with God. Peace with God. This is something that all the world needs. And it can be secured in no other way. There was a - who was it who told me he was a chaplain in the army in the last three or four days - telling me that he was talking with a Roman Catholic ~~chapman~~ Chaplain, and he said that this man said to him, Well, I don't know. You may have a much higher place in heaven than I have. ^{You may be much more sincere than I am.} Some Buddhists may have a higher place than either of us. He may be more sincere than either one of us. Now it is hard for me to think that this man, as he quoted this he was furious he said, but it is hard for me to believe that that would represent a true Roman Catholic view, that the Buddhist would have a higher place, than one who has not been baptized in the name of Christ.

But certainly, this man said to him, there may be some folks who are in hell. ^{but} And I don't know if many would go that far, ~~because~~ on the basis of their theology, it would be very hard to deny the possibility that some of them would be in hell. And I think that every ~~the~~ Roman Catholic theologian would admit that there are probably bishops, leaders of the Church, who will be in hell. According to their theology none of them have any way of being certain. You do not know whether you are going to be saved or not. Because in the end it depends if the righteousness is fused in you, and it comes up to a point where you can be saved. Whether you get sufficiently purged from your ~~sins~~ that you can get into heaven. How can there be peace with God when there is constant ~~wonderment~~ wonderment, (if ~~you~~ one stops to think about it, as he certainly should, if he realizes God's justice at all, and his

own sinful condition. How can he have peace with God? And if he has it now, will it not be broken the [next minute when he sins in a way as he looks at himself, very clearly will recognize that he deserves the wrath of God.) But Paul says in Romans 5: 1. "But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:" The world desires peace. Peace of mind, that people are longing for, and do not have that. Many Christians do not have it. But they should have. It is our right to have. It is our possession. And it is our right to claim our possession. Because if we are justified we have peace with God, through the Lord Jesus Christ. And we should have a peace in our heart, and in our life, and in our whole attitude.

Peace with God, is not a result of our sanctification, not of the state to which we attain, but to the standing which has been given to us as a free gift of God.

And then number four. Restoration to God's Favor. Restoration to God's favor. Romans 8 again. It is a clear teaching of many passages, but I think that it is brought out most specifically in Romans 8: 32. I'll start with 30. "Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" Restoration to God's favor.

You come to a man who is in prison, for some terrible crime that he has committed, and you give him a pardon. The governor says this man has been in prison quite a long time, I'm not sure that there is any help to society in keeping him there longer, although it is true, that he did murder those people in the most brutal way, but on the other hand, there were circumstances, perhaps he flew into a violent rage, under the circumstances that came up, and many other people would have. Perhaps there was a certain amount of self defense that entered in, I don't think that society will be in danger if we give him a pardon. The governor gives the pardon. And he turns it

over to some official, and ~~he~~ they take it to the warden, and the warden says to the man, You are pardoned. You can go free. ^{But} ~~if~~ you don't expect him to be entertained at the governor's house for dinner or be an overnight guest. The governor gives him a pardon. He thinks that is a safe thing for society, but if he is going to do any more murdering, the governor would just as soon not be in the neighborhood. He does not put any confidence in him. He does not feel that he wants to be on any friendly terms with him. He has a sigment attached to him;

S-28.

Justification frees us in the person of Christ. It gives us a standing.

And then Number five, Title to eternal life.

Title to eternal life. There are many verses that bring this out. But Titus ~~and~~ 3:7 is perhaps as clear as any of them, where we read ~~that~~ "that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." The title to eternal life is given us. That ~~and~~ of course is God's favor. "He that believeth on the Son hath life." It is the title that is given to us. Eternal life is ours if we are justified by Christ.

And then, Number six. Number six is sometimes theologically treated as an entirely separate head, but I'm going to put it under here, because it is, after all, a result of justification. Adoption to Sonship.

Adoption to Sonship. Sometimes it is said that the doctrine of adoption is purely Pauline. I don't think that that is quite a true statement. I think we can say this, that the word adoption occurs in Paul's writings far more than it does anywhere else. But then Paul is the apostle whom the Lord tried to develop the whole teaching of justification far more than the others. Certainly the doctrine of adoption is taught elsewhere. John 1: 12. "But as many as received him to them gave he the ekousia to become the sons of God." Now he did not say dunamis. ~~(and)~~. It does not say, "to those that believeth on him he gave the dunamis," the power. That they could get busy, and win themselves the sonship of God. He gave them the

infusion of righteousness that they should develop themselves to the point where the people would say, My this must be a son of God. Look at his wonderful character. He gave them the ekousia. He gave them the authority. The word is commonly translated authority, in the scripture. Sometimes it is translated right. Occasionally it is translated power, but where it is translated power it means adorned. Here is a strong governor, and he has the power to build a new executive mansion. Here is a ~~man~~ man, and he ~~gives~~ has the power to lift up a heavy stone, and ~~hands~~ put it in the place in the wall of that building. The strong man has the power to do something physically. The governor has the authority to order that it be done, but we can use the word power in English to mean authority or to mean strength. In Greek, the two are distinguished. The word dunamis is power, from which we get our word dynamo. But ekousia, is authority. The centurion said, I'm a man under authority. I understand that Jesus can say this, and it is done, because he has the authority. ~~I~~ I can say to this man, ~~and~~ Go. Now the centurion may be a fairly weak fellow, and this man may be a big husky fellow, who could lift the centurion up, and throw him over the wall, but the man has other men there who can carry out his bidding, and this man wouldn't ^{dare} try to do that. He will carry out the command, not because the centurion has power, in the sense of physical strength, but because he has authority. And that is the word that John uses in John 1: 12. "But as many as received him, to them gave he the right, the authority to become sons of God," even to them that believe on His name."

This is the way we become Sons of God. It is true that this right is given to us as a part of justification. Paul brings it out of course, most clearly. He is the only one who uses this word

as a claim to be a son.

(5).

It is putting us into a position, a position of being a child of God. I do not know of any case where it is specifically said that regeneration, or the new birth makes us a child of God. Our character is so changed that it is a new creature, old things are passed away. We are a new creature, but there is no passage that I have ever found, which specifically connects that up with relationship with God whereby we have a claim on him, as such. But Paul very specifically in a number of passages presents it, and develops this teaching of adoption, that we receive the adoption, that we who were

children of God in the sense of creation that he has made us, we are part of this universe, we have fallen into the control of Satan, we were children of Satan, and Paul tells how God has through these acts of Jesus Christ, has given us the adoption, and it is through this that we cry, Abba, Father. It is through this that we have not merely the restoration, to God's favor. Not merely a title to eternal life, but an actual relationship to God, whereby we have a claim upon it, as ^a ~~a~~ the Son upon the cross. We adopted into the family of God, by virtue of our justification.

And so it is a standing that we have, which gives us the robe of righteousness, which gives us the position of the sons of God. We have all these things, not because God looks upon us, and sees what a wonderful state of mind we have, but because Jesus Christ won it for us on the cross, and we have simply to receive, to appropriate it. Basically there is nothing wrong with it, but it merely the appropriating formula, it is merely the relationship, it is merely the way that God gives it to us. He gives us the faith to receive it.

Well, this adoption, there are, Paul uses the word in Romans 8: 15 and 23, Romans 9: 4, Galatians 4: 5, and Ephesians 1: 5. And once he speaks of the adoption being complete only at the coming of Christ, in Romans 8: 23, ~~He says that to them~~ one of these. Because we realize the full results of adoption, in the coming of Christ. But it is a result that has already been secured through our being adopted into the family of God, as a part of our justification. Christ's righteousness is imputed to us, and we are placed as sons and given the indwelling spirit, as an earnest, as a sign, as an evidence, ~~that~~ that we are adopted into the family of God.

Now let's go on to e. And E will be Objections to the Biblical View of Justification. Objection to this view that it is now what we do, but it is in His son that it is complete, that it is an act, that it is a forensic act, that it is imputed to us, that it is ours, completely, regardless of the condition of which we are. And there are three main objections that have been raised against that. And they are discussed in Hodge on page 171, and following.

The first of these, the first, most obvious, and most persistently urged is that: (A question was raised here in class: No, our legal standing is entirely

the result of our adoption, by justification. But there is a very important point there that perhaps would come under this first objection, just as well. And that is this, that God never justifies one without regeneration him. That the one whom God justifies, God has eternally sanctified. And if justification is really there, sanctification will come, too. But we - our favor before God is not on the ground of our sanctification. Regeneration is the first step in sanctification. And our standing before God, is not on the ground of our condition, but on the ground of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. But to those to whom he imputes it, among all the things that he freely gives us, one of them is, the setting about the

(11) of bringing ~~him~~ our state in conformity with our standing, but that takes up all of our time.

(Question: Do you say that we are saved when we are justified or when we are regenerated? Answer: The word saved is a word that is used in scripture in a rather loose sense, in general, I think properly, the word saved covers the whole topic, and it might be said that no one is really saved until Christ returns and we have the resurrection of the bodies, salvation is complete. On the other hand we might be said to be saved when God's plan and eternal counsel were being wrought, and certainly we can be said to be saved when Christ died for us, and assured our salvation. Salvation is a subject that properly covers everything. But we are justified when Christ died for us

We are consecrated men

(12).

We know that when we are justified we have Christ in us, and our salvation ~~is~~ has a very important (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) and so in common language we speak of a man being saved or lost. But what we mean by that is that this man, we know is one of those who is justified. We do not mean that he has ~~a~~ made a certain amount of process in his life.

(Question. No, eternal life is a result of standing, not of state. We can never win eternal life by our state.)

S-29.

The - It is unfortunate that the matter of regeneration does seem to require

considerably much for the correct understanding of justification, and in Hodge it comes as an earlier subject, ~~because~~ before the subject of justification, and before that was regeneration. And there is a long discussion there which half of you of course have not had. And so for their sake, for the vital relationship of justification, that we go into this, but I don't think right at this instant it is best to do ~~nothing~~ that.

Let's take this up as the first objection to it. The objections to justification. The first is that this doctrine of gratuitous justification through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, leads to licentiousness. That it leads to licentiousness. We are forgiven for all our sins, past, present, and future. Therefore, let's just go ahead and sin, as we feel like it. It leads to licentiousness. It makes a man absolutely free, from any responsibility. That is the allegation that is urged against it, by some who do not wish to accept it, and it may be that in this interpretation of it, into which some fall, it could lead to that result. But properly understood, the doctrine can not lead to that result, because as Hodge says in the first place, this salvation is deliverance from sin. How could one be delivered from sin, in order that he might live in it? Paul says, "How ~~am~~ shall we who are dead to sin live any longer therein," but perhaps a better argument is his second, that the very act of faith that secures our justification, secures also our sanctification. Those whom God justified, he also sanctified. We have two lines here. We have the line of standing. And we have the line of state. And the one whom God receives as a son, God deals with him as a son. The one whom God justifies, to whom God gives eternal life, God is going to make fit for it, and so if a man says that he is justified, and simply lies down in sin, well, we have pretty good reason to think that he is not justified at all.

On the other hand, we had better be very careful in how far we can go in judging whether the man is lying down in sin. I think we should be very, very strict in judging ourselves. If we find that we are tended to lie down in sin, tending to be careless ~~and~~ of God's law, we'd better stop and think, am I really justified? And the way to make sure is ^{not to get busy and} to try the best we can to obey this commandment, that is to go back to the first principles, and see if you have really received Christ, and have

been justified through him. And as I explain it to people who raise a difficulty about some people being saved, and some people being lost, and sometimes the lost seem to be finer people than those who are saved, I tell them that as far as state is concerned, the thing that God is interested in, isn't so much where you are, but in what direction you are moving in. And here's a man who is born into a wonderfully fine Christian family. And he has a back ground of wonderful efforts, and he is brought up with people who are unselfish and kind and decent in every way, and he grows up to be a wonderful gentleman. But he's got a heart of sin. And he is one who has never received Christ.

And here is another man who is brought up in a background of sin and wickedness, and he has all that background, and that penalty clings to him, and it is a struggle for him, to live a decent life. But he is one who is justified through Christ, and through whom Christ has given the victory, and enabled him to move forward, but the actual state that man has reached may not be one fifth as good as it would be in this other man. It seems to be such a wonderful character. But it is a character of inherent goodness from his environment that he was brought up in. And the one who is justified God does sanctify and he is moving in the direction of improvement constantly. But the one who is not justified, he is moving in the other direction. But justification is entirely on the basis of our actual standing.

2/ / 57.

How did the theologians in the seventh century use the word regeneration?

(Question that Dr. MacRae asked class.)

- but I think that I hardly got more than started, by mentioning ~~in~~ some of the beliefs of licentiousness, and then immediately from that got to speaking of regeneration, and there were a number of questions on the relation of regeneration (which seemed so much in point there) that I am inclined to think that it would be wise to (instead of continuing this at point, to make that f, and to take as g, the relation to other doctrines. I think that will make a little confusion in your notes, but if you'll just make a little line on the side of what we said

about objections, and consider that as starting f. Perhaps in view of the number of questions concerning regeneration it would be good to take that first. So that's why I gave you this assignment in Hodge, which is only a ~~few~~ very few pages, but which is very, very important, on this matter of regeneration.

E. The relation of justification to other doctrines.

I will speak very briefly about other doctrines, except regeneration and we will look at that very fully. The other doctrines, we think first of course of God and his attributes, and what is the relationship of justification to God's justice. It is so tremendously important. If we have a high conception of God's justice, as was said in Genesis, Shall not the judge of all the earth do right? Of course he shall, he can not simply of an arbitrary will push away the demands of his justice. I don't say that he cannot in the sense that he is physically unable, he cannot ~~wish~~ without being false to himself. He is a holy God, a just God, he must uphold true justice in the universe. Now people may not recognize his justice but they will come in time surely to recognize his justice. He must do things in such a way that there is fair justice involved, and when a holy law is broken, there must be a penalty exacted.

Then, God's love, the love of God and his justice, we find, coming into conflict. His justice requires that the sinner be punished. It requires eternal suffering, to pay the penalty of the sin of those who have broken his law, and turned against him. Those to whom Adam's sin is imputed, deserve eternal suffering, but aside altogether from that each one for his own sin deserves, for his own turning against God, for his own rejection, of that which is clear and plain. God commands him, and he rejects it. He avoids it. He turns away from it. And he deserves eternal punishment, but God's love desires his faith, and so justification reconciles God's love and God's justice, by himself bearing the penalty, himself paying the ransom, himself making it possible that he be just because the penalty is paid, and that his love find expression in ~~justification~~ justifying those for whom he has paid the penalty.

Next would be God's eternal decree, and in connection with that, we can say a word more about his justice. His eternal decree involves everything that comes to pass in the world. Therefore his eternal decree involves the recognition that man

will sin, and the determination to save some, his love in determining that He will save some of those who deserve eternal punishment, and ~~f/~~ when you say that, that makes it ~~h~~ necessary for an instant to speak again of the matter of justice. How can he be just? if God can save some and not all? Is it not absolutely necessary that God either, send all men to hell, and be equally just to everybody in so doing, or save all men from hell. Is it just for him to allow some to go to hell, and save others. And some get around that by saying that God saves those who deserve to be saved. That's the way they try to get around it. He saves those who deserve to be saved, he sends to hell, those who deserve to go to hell. But such an explanation loses sight of the nature of sin, the terribleness of the nature, and the justice of God that sin must be punished. That He must punish sin, and consequently that we all deserve hell, and there is nothing unjust in sending anyone to hell. But is it just to send some to hell, and not sending others? The principle is dealt with by the Lord ~~man~~ in a parable of a man who hired men to work in his vineyard. He hired the men to work in the vineyard. He invited them to come and promised to give them a denarius, for the day's work. It was doubtless a reasonable standard of pay for a day's work. Our English Bible is confusing there where it says a penny, for a denarius. At that time, whatever would be a good ~~f/s~~ day's wage today, that would be a fair translation. But since now a penny is something that we hardly glance at, in King James day it may have been a lot more. But it gives a ~~fin~~ a false impression. It is too bad that it takes a view point, and it changes the view point, to something that is far much less. It was a fair pay that he offered them. He asked people to work in his vineyard, he promised them their wages, which they would receive their wages, they were justly treated, and there is nothing unjust in the world in giving us the pay that is promised to us. It is entirely just, regardless of what he does with other portions of his money. But he invited these people and promised to pay them this amount, and then he hired others, some in the middle of the afternoon, some maybe an hour before the end of the day, and he gave each of them, a denarius. And the ones who had worked all day were indignant. They said, we had labored all day in the heat of the day, and we have only received as much as these who have worked for an hour. And

the question of the man that hired them was, Are you not paid the amount you were promised. You were promised a ~~ma~~ fair wage, and you were giving your reward for the day, for a fair wage. It is entirely and proper to give you a fair wage for your work. Now if he chooses to give others an extra gift, that does not make him unjust.

S-30.

"The wages of sin is death". And the wages must be paid. But the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. That is a free gift, and the fact that some people receive the wages they deserve, is not made unjust in others who receive a free gift. God is unjust if he remits the penalty of sin, our deserts.

But if God gives the penalty of sin, he is thoroughly just if he gives that to everyone who does not have something to present as a ~~reward and~~ before ^{if} him. And he chooses to give to certain ones who he selects on what ever basis he chooses, he selects there, there is nothing unjust about it. It might be a little unjust if he should select them, because he says they deserve more then the others, when as a matter of fact all of them deserve hell, but it is not arbitrarily, it is not works of righteousness which we have done, it is not exhibited in us, it is not that we have the right mental attitude, it is not that we show faith to him that leads him to give us such a ~~✓~~ favor. Faith is the instrument but not the ground. The ground is the death of the Lord Jesus Christ, upon the cross. It is because of what He did.

Well, there are those, of course, who say, this is unjust. It is unfair, because if God is ~~fan~~ fair and just then all will have an equal chance, and then it will be entirely the matter of who deserves to be saved. But the fact of the matter is, that from any view whatever, all do not have an equal chance. This argument which makes the scriptural view seem to be unjust, of course, will make any view unjust, because there is no individual in the world, in whom the place where they happen to be born, doesn't make a difference with whether they were (2 $\frac{1}{2}$).

And there is no individual in the world, in whom there are not a lot of seemingly accidental circumstances (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) that enter in, whether they hear or not. And there is probably hardly a person but whom the fact whether some other people prayed,

for them, doesn't enter in, to make a difference. And these other people prayed for them, and these people prayed for them, and didn't pray for somebody else who were lost. Now, is that fair? Is that just? If God finds one to pray for one person, shouldn't he find somebody else to pray for that other person, so that if God is thoroughly just, every body in the world would have an equal number of persons praying for them, or at least people of equal power with God praying for him. There is an equality we cannot get away from. There is an equality where some person has a circumstance in his life, which makes him ready to listen and responsive, while others do not have this circumstance. For some of us, things go along so easily, and things seem so nice. It doesn't seem to be worth thinking about God. And others have great trials and troubles and sufferings, that lead them to realize their own need. There are so many differences among individuals that if God is to be just, all must have an equal chance. Then we must say that, from any view whatever, God is not just. But that is not required to

(3 $\frac{1}{2}$) for God to be just. He is just if he gives the punishment, the wages of sin to all those who deserve it. And if he does not equip anybody unless that person has something to offer something that is a fair ransom and a fair recompense for his sins. If he does that he is just, and then as a free gift he gives the gift of faith, he gives the gift of ~~man~~ regeneration, he gives the gift of justification. Now it goes, of course, a great deal further than that, because anyone who hears the message and accepts it, is saved. Anyone whatever. And the one who has sinned against God, and is offered salvation through Christ, and rejects it, increases their sins tremendously. But the person who accepts Christ, does not add the least bit to their desserts, so that God could save them. It is not a good work, accepting Christ, that deserves God's favor. But to reject Christ is a real serious addition.

So, God's justice, then is involved in the relation to justification, that God may be just and the justifier to them that believe in Jesus Christ. And so God makes his eternal decree to save some and these decrees involve that God has planned everything from the foundation of the world, they involve specifically who is going to be saved. But it is not done because this one deserves it. It is not just the matter of blind arbitrary chance, liking pulling numbers out of a hat. There is

nothing in the Scripture to suggest that. But, it is for reasons that are good, that he has selected them. But such conclusions which disagree with this are contrary to the teachings of scripture. There are none of us, in ourselves, who can do anything good for him.

Then we have the Doctrine of man's fall. Which of course, is very important, in relation to justification, and for the understanding of justification, it is vital to realize that Adam sinned, and his sin is imputed to all those who are in Adam. This is very important for the understanding of the doctrine, but I do not believe that it is the right place of approach to the unbeliever. Because it gives the unbeliever too easy a chance to make excuses. To say, well, it is unfair that what Adam did, should be imputed to me. You can argue that it is fair, you can prove that it is fair, but it is much quicker and easier, to say that even if this were not so, you have sinned yourself, and so you deserve punishment.

So Adam's fall is very important in our understanding, but not necessary to prove to the unbeliever. It is an explanation by which he can understand the situation.

Then, the Person of Christ. This is tremendously important for justification. Jesus Christ is wholly God, else he could not possibly save us. If he is only part God, if he is only a glorified man, he does not ~~that~~ have that which would make it possible that he by his righteous life, and by his death, should atone for the whole world of sin. It would be impossible. He must be fully God, or he could not accomplish the work. So Christ's deity is essential and vital in relation to justification. But Christ's humanity is also equally essential and vital to justification, because if he is not one of us, he cannot take our place. It is unjust, that God should simply do these things. God gives the penalty and God pays the ransom, but God in the person of Christ who is true man, takes our place and paid the ransom. And so His humanity and His deity as they were argued in the Eastern church may ~~a~~ often seem to be to us, a matter of splitting hairs to get an exact understanding. But as we look into it, it is not just the matter of splitting hairs. It is vital, that we stand upon the Biblical teaching, that Jesus Christ is fully God, and that he is fully man, it is vital for the whole center of the Gospel, that God should be just and the justifier

of him who believes.

(Question raised here: You mean that he could offer it for one of us, if he was a person. Of course assuming that one to whom Adam's sin was imputed lives a perfect life, so that, for his own ~~act~~ ^{sin} for man, would he still need to ~~the~~ pay the penalty ~~of his~~ of his that is would His death still be required for his full salvation any way to make satisfaction, for Adam's sin imputed to him, or his deed, that he could give his life for one other. Well, certainly, not for more than that. And so in any advent, I would incline to present that for any he would certainly have to die, but certainly for more than one. Certainly it would be sufficient to save the whole world of believers. Man could not live the perfect life. It is not that Adam's sin is imputed to him, he is under the affects of Adam's sin, in his life, that he does sin. And a man does sin himself in his very words.

That is a problem that people have argued through the ages. Could he have sinned, or ~~he~~ could he have not sinned? As ~~a~~man he could have sinned, as God he could not have sinned. But as a God-man he was tempted in all points as we are, yet he was without sin. Now as to the exact meta-physical relationship, how much was due to the divine energy and how much was due to the humanity was ~~d~~ purified by the divine energy, it is pretty hard to draw the ~~line~~ line. The fact is, that he did live a perfect life. It is not that God came along, and he saw a human body, it wasn't simply God, it was a true man. He overcame sin, he showed what Adam should have done in the first place. He did enough to establish righteousness.

Adam was tempted by something outside of him, and he sinned. We are tempted by things outside ourselves, but we have the nature in us. Christ like Adam, was tempted by that which was outside of him. He was tempted as we are tempted. He was tempted by all the things outside, as we are tempted by them. But he did not have within him, the sinful nature, which would lead in the direction of sin, as we do.

S-31.

- he was really hungry, he was really in need.

Questions: con't.) But the temptation outside of him, he fell into. We would fall into it also. I think that this ^{GET AWAY FROM} because after all, he certainly did not and he did. But of course, from the inside, temptation, if you mean thoughts coming into the mind, certainly Satan was putting thoughts into the mind, certainly he had the temptation expressed to him, not merely in what he saw, but what was put into his mind. But nothing was already in the mind. You get into the human nature of the (1).

We certainly have to say that, but then we also have to say that he suffered, that he truly suffered, that he suffered agony, that he was tempted in all points as we are.) Questions were ended here, and the lecture was taken up again.

Then, Christ's deity and Christ's humanity, Christ's life of perfect obedience which we have already spoken of, and then of course the death of Christ. His life of his righteousness is imputed to us, but his death paid the ransom. His death gives the satisfaction, and this satisfaction is purely in legal terms. Its no idea that God had satisfaction in seeing men suffer, or anything like that. That of course is ridiculous. God the Father turns His face away from the suffering, ~~in~~ of Christ. It is not a matter of satisfaction that is pleasing God in that sense, but it is to ~~name~~ satisfy the demands of justice. It is ~~thoroughly~~ thoroughly and purely a forensic term, the satisfaction of Christ. He satisfies the demands of justice. His death was sufficient for all. His ~~own~~ death was sufficient to pay the penalty for all the world, of guilty sinners. Because he was the infinite God, suffering infinite sufferings, and suffering when he deserved (3 1/2) suffering in perfect ~~righteousness~~ righteousness, he paid the penalty for us.

Then of course, His resurrection. We are justified by the fact that he was raised for our justification. He was raised in order that we might see that we are justified. He was raised in order ~~that~~ to give us the evidence that the debt was paid, that the ransom was accepted, that the penalty was removed, that all who believe in him, are now justified by his death. And then of course, our union with Christ. Our union with Christ is the basis of our justification, because we are united with Him, and His righteousness is imputed to us, and we are clothed in the robe of

righteousness, and God sees us in Him, and therefore God can be just and the Justifier of Him that believeth in Jesus. Not for any works of righteousness that we have done, not because of any fine character that we develop, not because of any good attitude that we take toward God, but solely on the ground of Jesus' death, and of the righteousness of His person and life.

(Question: How then are we united with Christ? Answer. We are united with Christ, because of two phases. We are united with him, so that God sees us in Him, in His righteousness, in His Holy righteousness. His atonement applies to us, and His life and perfect righteousness saves ϕ us.

I don't believe the scripture presents it that way, although the term can be used in a broader sense to describe the outworking of the change within ourself, but in the justification, the union is simply the application of His merits to us so that we are in Him, even as we are in Adam.

As soon as you accept His death, for you, you are justified and His merits are applied to you. But before you ^{see} ~~do~~ that, you say, now here's a man who died ~~an~~ upon the cross, what does that have to do with me? You say well, he was the Son of God. He was the eternal Son of God, whom God had predicted would die upon the cross, for the sins of His people, and would be raised from the dead, the third day, and the fact that he was raised, proves that His claim was true, that He is the Son of God, and that what he said about ~~the~~ ^{his death} ~~m~~ (?) is the evidence that the Spirit ^{uses} ~~used~~ ^{faith} ~~in~~ in bringing us to ~~faith~~. But we are not saved because He was raised.

He proved it, but I don't think that that is what gives it. It's a proof. It's his life and his personal obedience, rather than his resurrection that is imputed to us. His righteous life is applied to us, which proves that we have eternal life. The resurrection proves that His death was effective. It doesn't make ^{and it} it, proves that his life ^{was} (8 $\frac{1}{2}$). A right to say truly righteous man as he was, death could not hold. The resurrection is a further evidence of the fact. It does not make the fact, a fact, but it gives it evidence.)

We have then, regeneration, sanctification, glorification, and then we have Christ's return. Now just a word on Christ's return. At Christ's return, that

which He has done for us is made complete. We are fully justified when we believe. But when he gives us the resurrected body, we have ~~mm~~ the complete outworking of that justification. We are now carrying in our bodies the result of our sin. But we have the gift of eternal life and the resurrected body is assured. It is promised. Just as our salvation ~~mmmm~~ through Christ was promised before the foundation of the world. And it was promised after Christ's death that it would be imputed to us. But the application of it to us, did not come until we believed. The full application does not come until the return of Christ. And so we are justified completely with ~~the~~ our receiving the resurrected body.

Now then there is regeneration, sanctification, glorification. And I asked you today to look over thoroughly these few pages of Hodge. Not in where he discusses in relation to other doctrines, or to opposition, to objections in which he explains what regeneration is. It is a subjective change. Justification is objective. Regeneration is a subjective change, wrought in the soul by the grace of God. It is called a new birth, a resurrection, a new life, a new creature, a renewing of the mind, a dying to sin, a living to righteousness, a translation from darkness to life. Or in theological language, regeneration, renovation, conversion.

And this next paragraph begins with the theologians of the 17th century, conversion and regeneration were synonymous terms. They used the term regeneration in other words to show the whole change that takes place within us. But it is customary more recently, as Hodge says on page 5, "By a consent almost universal the word regeneration is now used to designate, (not what it was used in the early church, simply ~~not~~ a change from being outside of the visible church or becoming a member of it, not what it was used for in the 16th, 17th century by ~~the~~ most of the Theologians to mean the whole matter of salvation including conversion, but to simply designate what we might designate the new birth, "the instantaneous change from spiritual death to spiritual life" a ~~p~~ spiritual resurrection. We use the term now to describe the beginning of a subjective change. The continuation of that subjective change we call sanctification. It is a change which takes a man who is dead in transgressions and sin, and makes him one who is perfectly Holy. That is the change, the subjective change. The objective

change is that a man who deserves eternal death, is made ~~mm~~ into one who can possibly be the recipient of God's favor, because the righteousness of Christ is infused into him. We have the objective change and the subjective change. Our salvation is wrought by the objective change. But our salvation works itself out in a subjective change. And so the subjective change, the (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) word is sometimes used in such a way, as to sound as though it covers the whole process of sanctification including glorification. In other ~~places~~ we β use it simply as the beginning of this ~~life~~ ^{process}. And the beginning of the process is a supernatural life. A man is dead in trespasses and sins, he can do absolutely nothing that is good, nothing that deserves God's favor, as Paul said, "The natural man receiveth not the things of God, neither can he know them." He must be spiritually born before he can receive the things of God at all. He is absolutely dead.

Now the man that lives ^{with} ~~when~~ ^{through eternity} Christ ~~returns~~ ^{is perfect}, and entirely free from sin. And none of us come near that state. ^{question} So the Christian is ^{when does the} ~~begin?~~ ^{change to Him.} When does it begin? When does the objective change begin? The objective change is wrought in Christ, by His death on the cross, and His righteous life. It is wrought by that. It is there for us. It is applied to us just as soon as we believe. Now those who believe are foreordained from the foundation of the world, that they will believe. God as Jesus Christ physically died on their behalf, and bore their sins on the cross. That is there to be imputed to them. Now that is given to us through faith. The connection was made.

S-32.

But when He had died for us, the credit is there, the righteousness is imputed for us. It is designated for us. It is intended for us. It will belong to us even though it has not yet been applied to us, and God can certainly ~~mm~~ apply it to regeneration. Theoretically, he could not give us regeneration, until some time after we are justified. I had a friend who went to Moody Bible Institute. He was a student, and he was disgusted. He said, You, know, they'll have a prayer meeting, and they will

pray for financial help, and then they'll go right over to the mailbox and they'll pull the letter out with the money in it, that gives them the help ~~in~~ they need. And he was disgusted. Well, doesn't God know that they are going to pray from the foundation of the world. Can't God answer that prayer before they make it so that they pray and they receive the answer? The fact that the answer is there becomes apparent after they make it, and it is an answer to the prayer. And it would not have come if they had not prayed. And nevertheless, God led, to the putting of that money in the envelope, and perhaps the mailing of it perhaps a week before they got it. God can answer our prayers before ~~in~~ we make them. And God can apply the merits of Christ to us, before we have a consciousness of a relationship to Christ through faith. So that you can not prove the fact is (2) that regeneration is a result of justification. It is because of the righteousness of Christ imputed to us. But that does not prove that chronologically the results have to come after we are conscious of justification. It does not prove that.

And on the other hand, Paul says, "The natural man receives not the things of God, neither can he know them." Can a man have faith before he is regenerated? At least, can he have saving faith before he is regenerated? It must be pretty hard to prove, that a man who cannot receive the things of God, because he is a natural man, neither can he even know them, could have saving faith in Christ, before he was regenerated. Now Berkhof in his theology has a very interesting statement about regeneration. He says, there are some theologians who say that regeneration is like the implanting of a seed. And ~~the phrase begotten~~ ^{again} ~~is sometimes used~~ (3) and that ~~it speaks of born again~~ sometimes, and it is like the implanting of a seed, and the seed may be implanted in the person, and it may be there unseen for a long time before it sometimes comes out in the visible new birth. Well now, to say that is true or false, ~~man~~ I think, is beyond our knowledge. I think we must say this, that justification is - by faith we are united to Christ, that regeneration is a work of God's alone, which the Spirit of God works when and where and as He chooses, which He does not work for any, except for those for whom Christ died, and those who are united with Christ through faith, but which He may work,

When he chooses, before or after the time when they are united with Christ. And so anyone who is saved, has first the election, the predestination before the foundation of the world. Everyone who is saved, Jesus Christ specifically died for, he died in our stead, he bore our sins on the cross. That is allotted to us.

Everyone who is saved is regenerated. God ~~regenerates~~ (4) them. He brings them to life, those who were dead in trespasses and sin. Everyone ~~if~~ who is saved, has been united by faith with Christ, and becomes conscious of justification because he knows that he can say, Jesus died for me, therefore though I am a guilty sinner, God sees me in Christ, and he is regenerated through him.

It is interesting to look at the third chapter of John, and to see how in that third chapter of John, Jesus speaks to Nicodemus and he says to Nicodemus, you must be born again. A man can't see the kingdom of God, unless he is born again. Nicodemus, you are a wonderful ~~man~~ teacher. You are claimed in all the laws of the rabbis, but what good does that do you? You've got to be born again. You've got to have a complete change. Nicodemus says, How can I be born again? I can't go back into my mother's womb and be born. Jesus said, Well, now, you believe, and you'll be born. That's not what he said. Jesus said, "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, that which is born of flesh is flesh, that which is born of spirit is spirit. He stresses the fact that a change which is a divine change, which can not be possibly ~~be~~ wrought by a human being, and nothing you can do ~~if~~ can bring it, it is necessary. But then he goes on to say, Whoever believeth on him, shall have everlasting life. That whosoever believeth on him, he does not mention regeneration again in the chapter. He goes on in the chapter constantly speaking of justification. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life. Justification is the ground on which regeneration comes. But regeneration is a divine act which we cannot give. And we cannot be conscious about justification, without regeneration. We cannot know the things of God.

Now whether a verse, Jeremiah, God said to Jeremiah, that he was prepared before his birth for his work. Jeremiah, God prepared his ancestors to make him such as he was to be. He prepared him from his youngest childhood for the work. When was

Jeremiah conscious of the work of God? Jeremiah was weak and he had his visibility from his troubles and prayed to God, and showed all kinds of attitudes and ideas that God had to change. But God had prepared him for the work. When did he begin the preparation. We do not know. We do not know when a man has received it. You can't say, I've been born again. You can say, I am justified because I've believed on Christ. You can say that everyone who is justified, God will regenerate. You can be quite sure that you should have been regenerated. But , how do you prove your regeneration? Well, I John tells us, "He that is born of God, sinneth not." Don't you ever sin? You can't prove that you are born of God. But you can prove that you believe on Christ. If you believe on him, you are justified, and if you are justified , God has ~~sanctified you, and~~ (7). That was His divine right to regenerate you, and He worked that when and where he choose.

He will not justify a man without carrying on the other line. Here is the objective line. We are united with Christ. We are justified. Here is the subjective line. So that one who is justified, God regenerated, and God sanctifies, and God glorifies, and God brings him into conformity with the life of Christ. But the one to whom he does that, he has justified in Christ, he has united with Christ, he has infused the righteousness of Christ to him. So we have the two lines, the forensic line, and the subjective line, and the forensic line, is the one upon which we must put our faith, because we have believed that we are justified in Christ. We can see from the proof of someone else, make a guess whether he is born again or not. But we can't see him well enough to be sure. We can ~~say that~~ hear him say that he believes in Christ, and we hope that he is sincere, and we constantly understand what he is doing, but God knows. I don't believe that we should ever say to a man, You have been born again. I question whether we should say to a man, you have been justified. But I believe we can say this, If you believe in Christ, you are justified. And if you believe on Christ, and if you are justified, you know that God will work a work in your heart. And He may have regenerated the man long ago. You don't have the proof.

Last time, in the latter part of the hour, I discussed a very important matter. I discussed the relation of justification to regeneration. And in the section later on, there was discussion of it, and that is one of the great values of the section that in stead of having to spend time here, with everybody present, in order to see whether two or three have a clear understanding of something, and in order to answer questions which may be bothering two or three, and which do not mean much to ~~me~~ others - which are perfectly clear to others, we have a chance to find out, just how much the definite understanding is, from the matters that we are dealing with. And since this is a matter that it is rather important that we have clear understanding, I'm going to make a special heading, F. We've been dealing with E, the relation of justification to other doctrines. And I'm going to make an F, a special consideration of the relation of justification to regeneration. And under this, number one. The meaning of the term, ~~Regeneration~~ Regeneration.

The meaning of the term, Regeneration. Regeneration, I think it is ~~me~~ rather important for us to realize is a term that was not used in the ancient church, in the sense which we use it today. In the ancient church, the term regeneration sometimes expressed an external change of state or relation. When a heathen became a Jewish proselyte, the Jews sometimes spoke of him as having been born again. When a man became a member of the church, he was born ~~a~~ into the community, into the visible church. And so it could very possibly be said, that a man was born again through baptism without meaning anything of what we would speak of as we speak of baptismal regeneration. Because it was simply meaning that baptism was that which made one who had not been a member of this church or this organization a member of it. He was born into the organization. The word regeneration is ~~is~~ used by some of the fathers in that sense. And it is used today in the language of the ~~fore-fathers~~ (13) of the Church of England in a sense that doubtless can be interpreted in that way.

The ~~fore-fathers~~ ^{↑ I} ~~was~~ ^{were} written in the 16th century. In the 16th century and in the 17th century ~~the~~ ^{the} word regeneration was not used the way we use it ~~at~~ today.

It was used either for the whole process by which God takes a man who is dead in trespasses and sin, and changes him into a man who is in perfect holiness able to

live with God forever. Or it was used as a synonym for ~~conversion~~. That was the usage of the time, those were the particular usages of the term of the time of the reformation and the next century when the Westminster Confession was written, among other great confessions. But by the middle of the last $\frac{1}{2}$ century, it had come to be quite universally used among evangelicals in a very specific sense, and is used now by practical all evangelicals in this specific sense. I do not mean that we have changed our understanding of the doctrine at all. It doesn't mean that the details of our salvation is any different than that of Luther & Calvin. It simply means that we use S-33. ~~term~~ in a little different way.

how to designate, not the whole work of sanctification, nor the first stages of that work comprehended conversion. Much less justification, or any mere external change of state, but the instantaneous change from spiritual death to spiritual life. Regeneration therefore is a spiritual resurrection and a beginning of a new life. Now the ancient church believed in this spiritual resurrection. The reformers believed in it. The men of the 17th century believed in it. But they didn't use this particular word to express that particular point, of Christian salvation. The particular point that we speak of as the spiritual resurrection, the beginning of a new life, the making of one into a new creature, it is the first step in sanctification, which we now call regeneration.

Number two. Regeneration is entirely a work of God.

This is extremely important. Regeneration is entirely a work of God. I have here a book, called "The Great Doctrines of the Bible," by William Evans, D.D. And it is very interesting to see how he takes a clear stand on this and then goes back of it, before he is done with it. And I think it is quite an extent a matter of the use of terms, and of course we know that Paul says, "We are saved by faith without works," and James says, "We are saved by works, because faith without works is dead." And yet they both believe exactly the same thing. And so we want to examine. Another man can use almost the same terminology we do, and ~~mean~~ ^{believe} the exact, & identical opposite. And a man can use terminology very different than we do, and mean exactly the same thing. It is good that we get a good idea of terminology. I'm not saying that what Evans teaches in his book is wrong, but I'm saying that what he is teaching

on this point, represents a logical slip on ~~at~~ one place, though most of it is very good. He has a section here, The Great Doctrines of the Bible, on Regeneration, or the New Birth, ~~na~~ He says, "It is of utmost importance that we have a clear understanding of this most vital doctrine. By regeneration we are admitted into the kingdom of God. There is not ~~of~~ other way of becoming a Christian, but by being born from above. This doctrine then, is the door of entrance into Christian discipleship. He who does not enter here, does not enter it at all. The nature of regeneration. Too often we ~~na~~ find other things substituted by man for God's appointed means of entrance into the kingdom of heaven.

Now, number one. Regeneration is not baptism.

Well, he has a discussion of that, which I won't take time to read you now, but number two, Reformation is not regeneration.

Regeneration is not a natural forward step in man's development. It is a supernatural act of God. It is a spiritual crisis. It is not evolution but involution, it is a communication of a new life. It is a revolution, a change of direction, resulting from that life. Herein lies the danger in psychology and in statistics regarding the number converted during the period of adolescence. The danger lies in the dependency to make regeneration a natural phenomenon, advanced step in the development of human life, instead of regarding it as a crisis. Such a psychological view of regeneration denies man's sin, his need of Christ, the necessity of atonement, and the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit.

Three. Regeneration is a spiritual quickening, a new birth.

Regeneration is the impartation of a new and a divine life. A new creation. possession
The ~~production~~ of a new thing. ~~na~~ By nature a man is dead in sin. The new birth imparts to him new life. See how this all fits with it being entirely a work of God. And I'll skip over a few pages here, where he speaks of the great importance of it, and of the tremendous force involved within it, till ~~at~~ we get to three. The meaning of regeneration. And there he says, number one. Regeneration is a divine work. We are born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. It was of His own will, He begat us. Our regeneration is

a creative act on the part of God. Not a reforming process on the part of man. And he goes on and discusses that point very well. But number two, and yet there is a human side through the works. And here I believe he is completely wrong. He says John 1: 12, and 13, bring out these two thoughts, the Divine and the Human in regeneration. Those who received him, that is Christ, were born of God. The two great problems connected with regeneration are the efficiency of God, and the activity of man. We've already looked at John 1: 12, and 13, and we have noticed that John 1: 12, is not speaking about regeneration but it is speaking about adoption, but as many as ~~name~~ received him, to them ~~gave~~ he authority to become the sons of God. They received him, and he ~~gave~~ them authority to bear us up ~~again~~, nothing of the kind. He ~~gave~~ them authority to regenerate themselves? Nothing of the kind. He ~~gave~~ them power to raise themselves from the dead? Nothing of the kind. This is not regeneration, but this is adoption. We receive him, and he gives us power to become the sons of God. Even to them that believe on his name.

Verse

~~John~~ 13 is a distinct verse from 12. And in verse 13, there are those who interpret it, as a description of Christ. They may or may not be right. There are those who point out that some of the earliest manuscripts say which was born instead of which were born. On his name which was born. And verse 14 continues, and the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. And they think that this is a description of the virgin birth of Christ. Which was born not of blood, nor of the will of flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. Now I'm not saying that that interpretation is correct, of verse 13. When the text differs as it does in this regard, I would not build an argument upon it. There are those who say, we shouldn't believe in the virgin birth. John knows nothing of the virgin birth. Only Matthew and Luke even mention it. Paul knows nothing about it. And an answer to that some say John exclusively teaches it in this verse. The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. Verse 14 says, how was he made flesh? which was born - his name which was born not of ~~an~~ blood, nor of the will of the flesh, ~~but~~ of the will of man, but of God. Maybe they are right. Maybe this is the virgin birth. But if it is not the virgin birth, if it describing the believer, rather than describing Christ, then it is still

distinct from what is said about them in verse 12. Verse 12 says He gave them authority to become sons of God. And verse 13, if it is a verse about the believer, which we cannot be dogmatic about, says, "They were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God," and can very well point to regeneration, as a distinct thing from adoption, described in verse 13. Those who are given authority to become sons of God, that is, those who believe in his name, of all of these, we can say, they were born of the will of God. Everyone of these God has regeneration. Now that is a possible interpretation, yet it does not fix with Evans' interpretation, ^{that} ~~Man~~ there is a human side to the work. There is not a human side to regeneration. It is strictly a divine work, anymore than a little baby can be said to have brought himself into the world, to have conceived himself, or to have had the power to make himself be born. There is no human side to regeneration.

Evans continues with two sub-heads, small a. Man is regenerated by means of the acceptance of the gospel. Now where is that ever said in the Bible. He said, God begat us with the word of truth. That's James 1: 18. God said he begat us with the word of truth. Does that mean by accepting ~~by~~ the message of the gospel, we regenerated ourselves? That's a big ~~stretch~~ stretch from what James 1: 18 says. He continues, We are born again, says Peter, of incorruptible seed, by the word of God. I Peter 1: 23. That's a big stretch from saying, that we regenerate ourselves, by believing, accepting the message of the gospel.

The third reference he gives is we are begotten through the gospel. I Cor. 4:13. Does the Bible say that God begets us through the gospel? Does it say that we beget ourselves ~~us~~ through the gospel? I Cor. 4: 15, says, Paul says, "~~Paul says~~, for though ~~we have~~ ^{have ye} ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet ~~we have~~ ^{we have} not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus, I have begotten you through the gospel." Is Paul saying, You are regenerated through the gospel. You were born again through the gospel. He says I have begotten you, through the gospel. Well, certainly, Paul is not making any claim that he regenerated these people, that through him they were born again, that they are his children, and therefore children of God, it is none of the kind. It is a very easily

understood figure, When he speaks of himself as their father in the faith, he means that they received their knowledge of Christ through him. And it certainly does not mean that he regenerated them. And therefore to take this verse, and say he is just begotten through the gospel as proving that man is regenerated by means of the acceptance of the message of the gospel, is going way beyond, and actually contrary to what the words are talking about. "I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved sons I warn you," Paul says. Were they becoming Paul's sons? Is that what we mean by regeneration? Certainly not. He continues, "These scriptures teach us that regeneration takes place in the heart of a man when he reads or hears the word of God, or the gospel message or both. They don't do anything of the kind. And because of the spirit working in the word, as well as in the heart of man, the man opens his heart, and receives that message as the word of life to his door. The truth is illuminated, as is also the mind by the spirit, the man yields to the truth, and he is born again. That's bringing an awful lot into these passages. "Of course, even here, we must ~~mm~~ remember," he says, "that it is the Lord who must open our hearts." Now, that's regeneration. When the Lord opens the heart. "Just as he opened the heart of Lydia, but the word must be believed and received by man." Yes, it must. But that's not regeneration. Regeneration is God's act, and only God's act.

He says, D. Man is regenerated by the personal acceptance of Jesus Christ.

This is the clear teaching of ~~h~~ John 1: 12 and 13. Well, we've just looked at John 1: 12 and 13, and we've seen that they do not say that at all. And he says, Galatians 3: 36. Let's look at Galatians 3: 26. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." There's the proof, that we have faith in Christ Jesus, and thus we regenerate ourselves, by having faith in Christ Jesus. But what does he say just before, what is the context? "before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a school-master. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." This is the doctrine. This is Paul's clear teaching, that those who are justified, God places as sons. He gives them the adoption. It has nothing to do with regeneration. He says, "When a man believeng in

the claims of Jesus Christ, receives him for all that his claims to be, that man is born again. A very good statement if you interpret being born again as meaning - we can look at that man and we know that that is a man who is born again.

S-34.

When a man believing in the claims of Jesus Christ, receives him to be all that he claims to be, God justifies that man, and as a result of justifying him, he gives him the adoption, and he places him as a son with the standing of a son. But that is not regeneration. He continues, "Man therefore is not wholly passive ~~(is)~~ at the time of his regeneration. He is passive only as to the change of his own ruling disposition. ^{Well} ~~But~~ isn't that what regeneration is? ^{ruling ?} The change of the human disposition. ^{his ruling} So if he is passive as to ~~the human~~ ^{passive ?} disposition, surely he is wholly fashioned. He continues as to the exercise of his disposition, he is active. Yes. In regard to the exercise of it, he is active. But the exercise of the new disposition that God gives us, is not regeneration. Regeneration is God giving us the new disposition. The exercise of it is altogether different. If I stepped down here to Mr. Wong, and I place ~~an~~ the table in front of him, ten one-thousand dollar bills, I place them there, and I walk off. I'd have given him ten thousand ~~dollars~~ dollars. It is my act of entirely giving that money to him. Now he can take that ten thousand dollars, and he can go out, and he can buy himself a fine customed built car, or he can take the money and he can give it to missionary work in Burma, or he can take the money and he ~~can~~ can use it as he chooses. But his using of it, is not the giving of that money to him. It is quite distinct, and something that follows.

Regeneration is the change of our ruling disposition. It is wholly an act of God. It is a divine work, in which man is in no sense a participant. I last night looked at all of the passages in the New Testament that I know of, of which I feel any certainty, or even fair probability, that they relate to regeneration. And I looked at all the passages, of which I feel any certainty or fair probability that they relate to justification. And I read perhaps ~~a~~ twice as many passages on justification as on regeneration, and some of them were passages of ten or twenty verses. There are

perhaps three times as many verses that deal with justification. There are certainly twice as many passages, that deal with justification, as that deal with regeneration. But those passages that deal with regeneration, never say, that we can regenerate ourselves or have any part in regenerating ourselves whatever. I have that under certain heads here.

Small a. Regeneration is always described as something done to us, never something that we can do to ourselves. It is a raising of a dead body. It is being ~~from~~ begotten. God begot us. We were born ~~again~~ through the power of His Spirit. Regeneration is not an act, that is represented by ~~a~~ anything that we can do, or that we can help in, that we can have any part in.

Small b. Dead bodies A dead body cannot help raise itself from the dead. Regeneration is always represented as dependent on God's will, and not due to any goodness in us. It is never described, as in any way, a result of our faith. Those are strong statements, but I believe that an examination of the passages will easily bear them out. That regeneration is always represented as entirely ~~a~~ dependent on God's will, and not due to any goodness in us. It is never described, as in any way, a result of our faith.

Small c. Regeneration is a secret act, of God. We have no certain way of proving another's regeneration, or of seeing that we ourselves are regenerated. We must ^{base} ~~base~~ our assurance of it, entirely on faith. Regeneration ~~is~~ does not occur as a result of our faith, but through faith in God's word, we know that those who are justified, though they are regenerated, and therefore we know that if we are justified before God, he has given us the place as sons, and we know that he has regenerated us. But we cannot look at ourselves and say, I see that I am regenerated. We cannot do that. The Christian, as he looks at himself, will see time and again, sin and wickedness, ~~and~~ an evil disposition in heart and mind, and the scripture is very anxious that we never put our confidence in that which we see in ourself. Look at that man, he's not regenerated, He's just going on in sin. But I've got the spirit of God in me, I've been born ~~again~~ from the dead, so I have no temptation in that direction. When you say that, you're in great danger when you begin talking in that way. You're in very great danger. The human being (6) who can not receive

the things of God, cannot apprehend them, he is entirely non-spiritual, he is given a spiritual nature. He is recreated. He is given the ability to see the things of God. But it is a secret act within the ~~man's~~ soul, it does not change the nature of the soul, it does not make that ~~man~~ which is obvious ⁱⁿ ~~with~~ the world to see. Here is a wonderful moral man over here. Oh, he is a great gentleman. He loves to be with us. He is kindly. He is helpful. He is gracious. Here's another man over here, who has loads and loads of sharp edges. Sharp edges, he is hard to get along with, he impresses you as being pretty mean, in many ways. He has many habits, that we don't like, and this ~~man~~ one is far superior then the other one. This man has wonderful human traits, which he has carried from his heredity or from his upbringing. And he is gradually deteriorating, though it is pretty hard to see the evidence of it. But it is there. Over a long period, he could probably give it. And this one, here, the spirit of God is in him, and is improving him, gradually, and sometimes you can't see it at all, but that's the direction in which he is going. You cannot prove, but you can say this, if this one from the heart, has accepted Jesus Christ, as his propitiation, as his sinbearer, this man is justified. Or this man, as he is justified. And the man who is justified, we know, because he is justified, we know that he is regenerated. It is faith in God's word, that the justified man is regenerated, that we base our confidence that any particular individual, ~~whom~~ including ourselves, has been born again.

You can not say, I feel that within me, I know I'm born again. You can't say it. And you can't see it in ~~something~~ body else, the evidence on which to base that. But you can say, If you believe on Christ, you are justified, and you can say, The man who is justified, God has regenerated.

Small d. We know that God has regenerated ~~man~~ all those who are justified. Through faith we can have assurance that we are justified. You see, there are a few steps to it. We know that we are regenerated, if God has justified us, and through faith, we know that God sees the merits of Christ, instead of our merits. We know that. And so we know through faith, that we are justified.

And that leads to Number three. We must carefully distinguish God's Part and man's part, in salvation. In salvation, there is a human part, and there is a divine part. Salvation is the whole ~~man's~~ process. The whole process whereby those who~~s~~ are in Adam sin, and sinners themselves deserve eternal death, with nothing good in them, become perfect sons of God, living with him through all eternity. We have been saved, we are being saved, we will be saved. Salvation is used for the whole process. And in the process there is God's part, and there is man's part.

Small a. Regeneration is entirely of God.

Like the raising of a dead body. There it lies helpless. It cannot move, it cannot think, it can do nothing. God raises it from the dead. Regeneration is a resurrection.

Small b. Sanctification. Regeneration is the first step in sanctification.

But we distinguish them, because regeneration is entirely of God, while sanctification is God and man together. We cooperate in our sanctification, we are active in our sanctification. But if we try to sanctify ourselves in our own strength we are going to have some pretty bad stumbles. The very secret of sanctification is to learn to lean on God's power. To learn to utilize what he has given us. To learn to work with him in sanctification. To bring out problems to him for him to solve. The great secret of sanctification is to use the divine Father. But we must use him. We are active. We work with God in sanctification, ~~which~~ which is a very vital part of salvation.

Small c. Justification. Justification is by God's grace. It is purely of His goodness, that we are justified. If he sent Christ to the cross to bear our sins, he paid the penalty, he lived a righteous life, he imputes his righteousness to us, justification is by God's grace. C. Justification is received by faith. Faith is the instrument by which we receive justification. It is not an instrument by which we receive regeneration. It is an instrument by which we receive justification. God's grace alone justifies. The result of what Christ has done, but our faith, the scripture clearly teaches, is the instrument through which, we receive it. So much for number three.

Number four. We must carefully distinguish between the Believer's judicial standing, and the Believer's qualitative state.

I have a judicial standing before the law. I am a citizen of the United States. And if something goes wrong with me, in a foreign country, I can call on the United States government to rescue me, and bring me home and they will do it. And they will not ask, is he a good man or a bad man? They will not ask is he a republican or a democrat? They won't ~~say~~ ^{ask} has he paid his taxes ^(13¹), has he kept the law? They will ask, is he a citizen of the United States? And that is my standing before the ^{eyes} of the law, and that gives me special privileges, anyplace in the world, as a United States citizen. That is my judicial standing. When I went to Argentina, I heard that in order to get into Argentina you would have to have a statement from the police. A ~~man~~ police statement that you were not a sinner. I went to the police, and asked for a statement to enable me to get to Argentina. When I got there, no body ever asked to look at the statement. I never showed it to a soul ⁽¹⁴⁾. But I got it. I was ready. I went to the police in Wilmington. I said, I would like a police statement, to go to Argentina. He said, right this way please. He took my fingerprints and my name and said go out there and wait. After an hour or so they came out and they had a statement prepared. We have no record that this man has ever been convicted of any crime.

S-35.

He did not say that people put trust in him. They said my ~~m~~ standing was that of one who had not been convicted of a crime. After my second year in seminary, I went out to Western Pennsylvania, and stayed with Robert Dick Wilson for a time. And there I was with him, at his summer home, and we were working on some Old Testament problems, and then I decided to go and visit my family in California. And I said to Dr. Wilson, I'd like to go over to the bank, and get some money. And I said, Would you give me a letter of recommendation for the bank. And he said, all right, he would. And I took his letter, and handed it to the bank, and they looked at my check, from a Los Angeles bank, and handed the money out to me, and I walked out. But I was amused because I had looked at the letter that he wrote. Did he say, Allan MacRae is a person of good character, dependable, reliable, honest, you can trust him? Did he say Allan MacRae, has an account in the Los Angeles bank, you can believe him, you can trust him, and give it to him? Did he say I was an old friend of his, who he liked

very much. What he said, was, Allan MacRae is a student at Princeton Theological Seminary. This will ~~main~~ introduce him. Robert Dick Wilson. That is what he said. I was rather amused at it. I told him so, when I got back. Well, he said, I put my endorsement ~~back~~ of you. I told him you were a student in the seminary where I teach. I put my endorsement ~~back~~ of you. If your check was no good, they would come after me. I had the standing there, the judicial standing of/^{one,}whom Dr. Wilson (2), Dr. Wilson's resources, Dr. Wilson's honesty was placed behind. And they didn't trust me. They trusted him. And they ~~gave~~ me the money, knowing that if I were not dependable, he would stand ~~in~~ back of me. I had a judicial standing there. They had no evidence whatever, of my qualitative state.

We must very carefully distinguish between^t the believer's judicial standing, and the believer's qualitative state.

Small a. Regeneration is always represented as a change of condition; it is never represented as a change of position. If we had the time I would read you all of these passages I have listed here. And you would find in them, that we are born again from the dead. We are changed into a new creature. We are transformed. We are renewed in our minds. But you would ~~find~~ not find that it said, We are made ~~the~~ members of the family of God, through being born again. You would not find that it is said, We are given the right to eternal life, because we have been born again. You would not find that a position as sons of God, is evidenced in the scripture tied up ⁽³¹⁾ ~~with~~ to the fact of regeneration. Regeneration is a matter of qualitative change of condition, not a matter of change of judicial standing. That is justification.

Small b. We can know our judicial standing; ~~from~~ our position as children of God is a direct result of our judicial standing. I think that's a better order for the words. We can know our judicial standing; our position as children of God is a direct result of our judicial standing. The judicial standing which we receive through justification is ~~from~~ that our sins are remitted, that we are freed from the penalty of law, that we have reconciliation with God, that we receive his favor, that we have a right to eternal life, that we are adopted as sons, and given the privileges of members of his family. All this is related to justification. Every thing to do with standing, is justification, and not regeneration.

Small c. We can never know in this life, ~~we~~ ~~can~~ ~~our~~ ~~precise~~ ~~qualitative~~ ~~state~~.

When I entered college, I heard this, that college is a great place of learning, because the freshmen bring so much knowledge in, and the seniors never take any knowledge out. And there is an element of truth in that. The more you learn the more ignorant you are, because knowledge is like an enlarging circle. And everything that you add to your knowledge, while it increases your direct knowledge, it increases your awareness of the existence of matters of which you do not know. And therefore, your contact with matters that you are ignorant of becomes - increases much more rapidly than ~~the~~ ~~your~~ ~~actual~~ ~~acquisition~~ ~~of~~ ~~knowledge~~.

When I was ~~speaking~~ ~~in~~ ~~his~~ teaching Hebrew in my first ~~church~~ ~~year~~, one of the students asked me to speak in his church and I did. And I went up to the little church that he had in North Philadelphia and I found that he had passed handbills all through the district in which it said, Dr. MacRae speaks Hebrew fluently, and knows all the ancient dialects and languages. He had probably heard me say two or three sentences of Hebrew in class, and he probably thought that Hebrew, Latin, and Greek are all the ancient languages that there are. As he went on in seminary, and increased his knowledge, he found ~~h~~ how many ancient languages and dialects there are, that Dr. Wilson knew over sixty of them, and still there were many that he did not know, he would have seen the absurdity of such a statement. He doubtless did, as he went on.

As we increase in knowledge, our ignorance increases, and it is exactly the same with our sanctification in this life. The man of this world thinks he is pretty good, because he doesn't know much of God's standards of holiness and of righteousness and of sanctification. He thinks that he lives a pretty good life. And the man who has become a Christian and has learned a little bit, about God's standards of holiness, and of righteousness, feels that he's arrived. But ^{as} ~~if~~ you go on with the Lord, and you'll learn more about the depth of sin in your own life, and more about the standard of holiness, and righteousness that God desires, you become more cognizant of your own ~~ability~~ ~~(?)~~. And so though you are constantly increasing in holiness, you are ~~an~~ increasing in your ~~own~~ realization of your own sinfulness. And consequently we can truly say that we can never know in this life our precise qualitative state. It

is a mighty good thing, not to try to judge. Look at that fellow. He's not much of a fellow, is he. Look at his wickedness, and meanness. I'm born again. I'm much better than he is. No indeed. I am born again. I have a perception of spiritual truth. I have a desire to go forward. I have certain things that he can never get, in a natural way. But he may have wonderful good qualities, that it will take many many years, before I will acquire. We can never know in this life, our precise qualitative state and the vital lesson of the Protestant reformation, that which Martin Luther stressed more than anything else, is that it is not works of righteousness that we have done, or are doing, or will do, it is not anything in us, of which God sees, and to which he gives his favor. It is purely Christ's imputed to us. It is by virtue of Christ's goodness, and not anything in us, that God blesses us. That is the vital lesson of the Protestant reformation, it is the vital center of Evangelical Christianity. And we express that it small d.

Small d. We must rejoice in our judicial standing and can go forward to possess our possession. In God's eyes we have the merits of Christ, and he wants us to go forward, to make that righteousness a reality in our lives. It belongs to us. It is part of our claim, of our standing that he has given us. And we want to make it a matter of state, of condition. We must rejoice in our judicial standing, and go forward, ~~am~~ to possess our possession.

Number five. We must seek constant improvement in our qualitative state, but never let our joy in the Lord be based on the measure of our success in this area, ~~we must seek constant improvement in our qualitative state, but never~~ but only on our standing through his grace.

~~Number five~~ I think there is a story of John Wesley at his death, I may be wrong, it may be one or the other, I haven't heard the story for years, I may be get the details. But it is something like this: Some one said to him, aren't you happy to come into the presence of Christ, whom you have ^{served} ~~ministered to~~ so faithfully. He said, I have no service of which to rejoice in the presence of Christ. I'm happy to rejoice in the presence of Christ who died for me. Well, isn't it wonderful that a good man like you, can think of the joy you can have, that ~~he~~ at his death, he can

know he will enter into the presence of Christ. ~~Imma~~ He said, I rejoice in Christ's death. Through ~~faith~~ which I am justified, I rejoice in what he did for me. I have nothing in myself in which to rejoice in this life.

And that is true of the finest Christian, that if you will look to yourself, no matter how far you've gone, you say look at all I've accomplished, look at what I've done, look at all my spiritual qualities, you're in a dangerous situation.

In the cross of Christ I glory, towering over the wrecks of time,
Only in him, can we make our boast.

Number six. ~~Mammmmm~~ Consideration of the time of our justification.

This is what we've already mentioned, but a recapitulation.

Small a. We are justified from all eternity. God predestined us to be saved through Christ.

Small b. We are justified by the death of Christ. He purchased us. He paid the penalty. It is in the bank for us. It belongs to us. He died as my substitute. I am justified with him, in his cross.

Small c. We are justified by the resurrection of Christ, in that he gives evidence that the ransom is accepted, the penalty is paid. The resurrection is an evidence.

Small d. We are justified when faith begins to act. It is then applied to us. The money is in the bank for me. It has been there. It was put there. It is in my name. No one else can take it. But I step into the bank and cash the check.

S-36.

- but when I go in and take it, it is actually applied to me, when faith begins to act.

Small e. Justification finds its expression in eternal life.

~~Imma~~ At the resurrection of Christ, our justification is evident to the whole world. It may only be evident to ourself. In fact, you can't tell somebody else he is justified. You don't know. You don't know how sincere they are, ~~and~~ what they say. Never tell somebody he has been justified. Say, if you believe in Christ you have been justified.

~~Small f.~~

Small f. Many of us can know the exact time when we became conscious that our sins were borne by Christ, and thus aware of our justification, and but most can not be sure of the precise time. However, anyone who believes can know that he has been justified.

2/27/57.

- we saw that.

Number two. We saw that regeneration is entirely a work of God. And under that small c was, ~~regeneration~~ regeneration is a secret act of God. We have no certain way of proving another's regeneration, or seeing that we ourselves are regenerated. We must base our assurance of it entirely on faith. And then we had d under that, and then number three, was, we must carefully distinguish God's part and man's part in salvation. And we looked there at regeneration and sanctification, justification, and the receiving of justification by faith. Then number four is very important. We said we must carefully distinguish between the believer's judicial standing and the believer's qualitative state. And we ~~k~~ noticed that there were two distinct lines. It is most tremendously important. The judicial standing and the qualitative state. And we summarized four in five. We must seek constant improvement in our qualitative state, but ~~but~~ never let our joy in the Lord be based on the measured of our success in this area, but only on our standing through his grace.

Then we began number six, which was consideration of the time of our justification. We've already covered that before. We are mentioning it here, in order to fit it in, and to relate it to regeneration. So you might say, perhaps, a review of the time of that our justification. Under that we noticed small a. ~~When~~ justified in eternity., Before the foundation of the world, God predestinates, those who he would justify. We noticed second, b. At the death of Christ, he won for us, our salvation. That Jesus paid the penalty on the cross, that he lived a life of perfect obedience, that he made the righteousness which is imputed to us in justification. So it is like the

man, for whose education, there is a sum in the bank waiting for him. His justification is earned and paid for at the death of Christ. We noticed c, that we are sometimes spoken of as being justified by the resurrection of Christ, but that means that the resurrection was the evidence, the proof that the atonement was sufficient, that it was accepted, that it was true.

And then d, small d. This justification which is predestinated ⁱⁿ ~~from~~ eternity, when God elected us to salvation, which is secured for us by the death of Christ, who suffered for our sin, it is applied to us when faith begins to act. When faith begins to act, then there is applied to us that justification which has been ours, ever since Christ earned it, and which God allotted to us, before the foundation of the world. And then e, as ~~man~~ to our justification, it is complete now. Our standing is complete, but it is this standing that procures for us eternal life. So you might say that justification is ~~made~~ made wholly evident when we have that place in heaven with Christ.

Small f, is that many Christians can know the exact time when we became conscious that our sins were borne by Christ, and thus aware of our justification, but most believers can not be sure of the precise time. However, anyone who believes can know that he has been justified. I think that is rather important, because it is very easy for us to become confused on this point. My own guess is that the number who can tell you just ~~man~~ when justification was applied to them, is a comparatively a very small part of the total number of Christians. After I got my first M. A. at Occidental College, I went to the Bible Institute of Los Angeles. And there I found a group ~~f~~ of people in the second year class, who were out preaching ~~and~~ on the streets, holding meetings in shops, and in car barns, and in other places, and I attended some meetings with them, and I was tremendously impressed with their loyalty to the Lord, and their depth of sincerity of their faith in Christ, of many of these people. And many of them told of stories of how they had come from different parts of the United States, and from other countries, and their previous witness for Christ, but then during that year, we had some very fine evangelists, who showed the sin of man in a most effective way, and along one time of the year, I remember they would have meetings

and one after another these people would come forward. One day there would be two or three, another day another two or three, they would come forward, and they would confess that they had never been born again, they had never been Christians before, and now they were receiving Christ. And I think that it is a common experience when we hear the message of Christ, and see our ~~sin~~ ^{selves} ~~as~~ sinners, and have a new step forward in the Christian life, to have every thing that we've experienced before, seem ~~to~~ so shabby, and so small, that we think that we have just been justified, and for the first time come to Christ. And it may be true in some cases. There are ~~individuals~~ individuals who received the word, who come forward in a meeting, who go through the whole expression, who have a feeling of joy in their hearts, which is purely a matter of repeating words and being carried along with a motion and would have never known the Lord, and later on they have a great experience where they ~~know~~ really know the Lord, and that's the time when they are truly justified, they were truly converted. But for every one like that, my guess is, that there are a dozen others, where people have really known the Lord, but they have a step forward in their Christian life. Or perhaps they've slipped back, just as we all slip back. Our ardor cools off, our closeness to Christ becomes a bit forgotten, and we slip into thinking of ourselves and of our own desires, and our own objections. We slip into little criticisms of other Christians, that are unworthy of this. We slip into attitudes. And then we have a step forward, when we see Christ in his fullness, and in his goodness, and we step out of what we were in before, and it just seems like a new life. Well, it is, compared with what we had just before. But it may not be in comparison to what we had quite a while before. It is very difficult in the case of the great majority of Christians to (10).

Now there are a few who come out ~~a~~ of a strictly non-Christian background, and the change is so sudden and so sharp, and so great that they never have any question of just when it was. But it is really amazing how often we find in a meeting, that somebody is wonderfully saved, after a life of real sin, and yet we find that they came out of a wonderful Godly family, and that in that family, they had experiences and gave testimonies, that made everybody think that they were real true Christians.

And maybe they weren't. Maybe they have now just been saved, but maybe then they were saved and had fallen into sin for a long period, and now they are coming back. I feel that you can not ~~if~~ be sure in the case of about 90% cleansing, but you can be sure that it has. And that ~~it~~ is the vital thing. And I don't think that we should worry about whether our past experiences have been real or not, about whether they have been a true case of being justified, whether we've really been converted to Christ in the past, whether we've really been living in union with Christ in the past, we can never get over that we have been in sin, and that we are in sin, and that our lives fall far short of what he desires of us. But we can make sure now, that we sincerely, and truly and from the heart, are united with Christ by faith, and rest our ~~hands~~ ^{hope} of eternal salvation on him, and what he's done, and not what we could. And I feel that that is of present importance, we can be sure that we have been justified. Some can say I was justified a 5th or 6th ~~a~~ time, or this is the particular time. We all should have many times in our lives when we have a wonderful step forward, because that's the way the spiritual life goes.

There are very few, like the growing of the apple tree, it just gradually grows, and even in the case of the apple tree, we have the buds coming out. We have comparatively great changes, which happen in a comparatively brief time, but in most cases our Christian life is ~~a~~ a wonderful experience with the Lord, and then we drift down, and then another ~~experience~~ experience, and we drift down. And to tell which of these experiences was our ~~initial~~ initial ~~of~~ being justified is often difficult, but we should have a conclusion. We can't always tell which one of them is the first step, but we can make sure that we have been justified. I don't think that any of can tell in the life of another person, that that person has been saved. The scripture ~~is~~ never says, you can ~~judge~~ judge another person's faith. You cannot judge another man's sincerity. The only test that we are given to test others by is by their spirit. And we ~~can~~ judge them by their fruits, in cases where we must know whether it is wise or unwise to take them as associates and co-workers in the Lord's work. But we cannot judge them by their fruit in such a way as to give us assurance of somebody else's salvation. But I'm sure that we can know about our own. That we can know that we are resting on Christ and Him alone for salvation.

spiritual that is good. Before we are regenerated as it was for that dead, ~~spiritual~~^{physical} body to move, but at the resurrection, raised him up, so that he had power and strength and ability, the regeneration takes one who is spiritually dead, and gives him life, so that he can act in a spiritual sphere. So ~~the~~ the resurrection of Christ, is an illustration of our regeneration. In another sphere, it is physical, not spiritual, but it is an illustration, and it is the proof, of what Christ, the truth of Christ's claim, that he was God, and was dying in our behalf, and therefore he proved that the regeneration of those who are elected in him, will appear.

But then in regeneration perhaps we have even more specifically then in justification. D. Is it important, because our justification is in the bank for us, until it is given to us. But regeneration can't use that terminology.

Small d. When God applies it to us. There is a time when this dead, spiritual individual is given regeneration, when he is made able to talk, to move, to have spiritual life. D, is when God applies it to us. When does he specifically regenerate us? There is a time when it occurs. There is no question about it. There is an instance in which he regenerates us. Now of course, if he took one who was absolutely dead and made him absolutely perfect, the whole world could easily see when that occurred. And there are instances when a person who loved wickedness of every sort, just has no use of any wickedness. When there is a such a full and complete change of his character, that it is (5) in just about every thing.

But in most cases, it is not as great and such a tremendous step forward, in his apparent outward appearance of his spiritual life. The change from death into life is as great a change as anything could be, but it is, in most of us, it is an infant who is born. I remember when my little boy came home from the hospital, when he was first born, and his mother put him up on the table, and held him up there, and moved his arms in such a way that he looked like a (5½). He was moving his arms this way, and you could just imagine you had a powerful man, but she was moving him there, she was holding him there, he couldn't stand up. He couldn't stand up by himself, he couldn't, he could move the arms but there was no

sense to it, no purpose to it. There was not much intelligence in it, but there was light. A sculptor could make the most beautiful little statue. A mechanic could make a wonderful little dummy that could walk, and perhaps make sounds like talking, ~~mm~~ He could do all kinds of things, and would have abilities far beyond what that little boy had. But that little boy has life, and potentiality, has something in it that that dummy could never have, that the human invention could never have. There is life there. But the life has got to be developed. The faculties have got to be ^{developed.} (6 1/4). And it may be difficult for the ordinary person to see the difference between the little baby and the little dummy, particularly if it pulls around, if all we see is the activity. So examine the nature (6 3/4.) But there is a tremendous difference. There is life there.

(Question: Dr. MacRae, this new life, it is because we have the Holy Spirit, is there any more than that? Answer. Yes, definitely. It is not without the Holy Spirit's activity we can do very little, but the Holy Spirit is not simply making us go through ^{motions} ~~mm~~. He ^{is sanctifying} ~~could~~ purify us, and ^{enabling} ~~enable~~ us so that we could act, under the illumination and the direction of the Spirit. Not simply that the Holy Spirit moves His life upon us. ⁽⁷⁾ ~~mm~~. There is a new creature. There is a new life. There is a resurrection. The Holy Spirit performs it, but it is a change in us.

Well, the application of regeneration is something that must come at a particular instant in human life,

E. The full proof of regeneration is when you have complete sanctification. The little baby has life, but the baby may die and it may lose that life, but the one who has been regenerated, we know that God who has begun a good work will carry it through to the end, and we know that everyone who has been regenerated, will be developed in to the image of Christ. As John said, in I John 3: 2, "Now are we the sons of God, and it doth yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall ^{so} appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." And there is a little life, that you can hardly see, but it is there, and it is real. It is going to be developed in every case, by the Holy Spirit, until you have one man who is perfect in the image of Christ. But that doesn't come in this life. But that is an

outworking, a continuation, of regeneration which is assured.

Small f. We have no way of observing when our regeneration takes place.

We have no way of observing. You can not say who has been regenerated, by what you observe. You can not say that you have been regenerated by what you observe. Because if you look into your own heart, you find that the old man is there, and he is very active and you've got a long ways to go before you are done with him, and with most of us, the overcoming of him, is a slow, long process, and as we improve in holiness, we also improve in knowledge. We are constantly becoming aware of areas within ourselves which we did not know before. And the one who is ~~originally~~ originally regenerated, sometimes immediately after regeneration, gives evidence of spiritual life, which makes you think, here was a wicked fool, low-down and good for nothing, and here is a perfect saint, just like this. But most people who do Christian work finds that it is very wise, not to make the mistake of taking the person who has just become a Christian, and praising him over the country as a wonderful example of God's grace and showing them, this wonderful perfect man, who has got a change God has made, because it is remarkable how in ^{instance} ~~instant~~ after instance, after instance, the man falls away. And sometimes they fall away and prove that the conversion was false. They never really were converted. But I don't think that is true in most of us. I think that in the majority of the cases, they slip back, and go through a long period of readjustment, because at first, they had a wonderful step in the new life, there was an appearance of a state of sanctification, which they had not yet reached. And over a period of time, you will find that they are improving in sanctification. But the little new born infant needs to learn to crawl, before he can walk, and he must learn to walk before he can run. And the one who has entered into the Christian life, it is good for him to give his testimony. It is vital that he should. But for him to be held ~~a~~ up as an example of what he has attained, of righteousness, it is dangerous because he needs the time for the new spiritual life to grow within him, and to be developed, to the point where he is not just something that is flashy and wonderful as far as it goes, but something that is soft and can be handled.

As far as regeneration is concerned we have no scriptural evidence where choice enters directly into regeneration. You can not regenerate yourself. A dead man cannot raise himself from the dead. A man can't cause himself to be born. It first enters in, in justification. We receive Christ as our Saviour, as the one who atoned for our sins. By faith, the instrument, we receive Christ, for justification, and having been justified, we know that we have been regenerated. And we know that as we go on in the Christian life, the fruits will become apparant, to us.

Number eight. Six and seven were the time respectively of justification, and of regeneration. Now let's put them together. Number eight. ^{Which} Which comes first? Justification or regeneration.

Small a. Both are in the plan of God. Did God in eternity say I'm going to regenerate that man and I'll justify him, or did he say, I'm going to justify that man and I'll regenerate him? We can't divide it. Both are in the plan of God. It was planned from eternity, to regenerate and to justify, each individual who is saved.

Small b. Both are secured through the work of Christ. Christ died in our stead, his death paid the penalty, we are justified through him, his righteous life is imputed to us, we are united with him.

S-38.

As to the application of justification and regeneration to an earthly life, three vital questions are asked. I'll mention the three questions, and then we'll glance at each of them. First, can God regenerate a guilty man? Second, can God justify a dead man? and third, can a dead man exercise faith? Can God regenerate a guilty man? Can God justify a dead man? Can a dead man exercise faith? I think on the first two we would have to say, Yes, to both questions. Can God regenerate a guilty man? Any man who God would regenerate is guilty. At least, he has been guilty at one time. For God, simply to take a man who is guilty and regenerate him, would have no meaning to us, because he would still be guilty, and deserving and requiring eternal punishment for his sins. But for God to regenerate a man who has

been justified is very logical and reasonable, but it is equally logical and reasonable, that God chooses to regenerate a man, whose justification is assured, The penalty for his sin is paid. The money is in the bank, ready to be given him. God knows the man will exercise faith, and through the instrumentality of faith, justification will be given to him. So the time of regeneration does not have to be based on the time of justification, though we are sure that the fact that the man is or will be justified, is a fact if God regenerates him. So God certainly can regenerate a guilty man if he chooses.

Two, can God justify a dead man? Well, certainly, why couldn't he? There was a man down in western Texas in the old days, who went to the Pecos (2 $\frac{1}{2}$), who was the justice of the peace, who was the law, went to the Pecos. And they found this man lying there with a gun in his holster, and several shots through him, and 15 dollars in his wallet. And they brought him before the judge, and they said, what shall we do? We've found this man. Well, the judge said, I will convict this man of carrying weapons without a license, and I'll find him 15 dollars. And so he took the 15 dollars he found on the man. Well, that typical story of the justice in those days, it would have been better perhaps for him to look and find who killed him. It would have been under the law. Conditions there, were pretty hard to do. But the question of the justification of a dead man is a question which often interests us. Was that man guilty or innocent? And certainly, a man who is after our death, it is very important before God whether he is justified or not. Whether we are living or dead doesn't greatly enter into whether we are justified. God could have justified us before we were regenerated or after we are regenerated. Our justification is dependent on whether Christ died for us.

But then three, Can a dead man exercise faith? Well, it is pretty hard to see how a dead man could exercise faith. It is pretty hard to see how one who has no spiritual life at all, could apprehend the goodness of God, to recognize Christ's offer and accept it. It is pretty hard to see that. So the third question, Can a dead man exercise faith, it is pretty hard to see how he could. So I think that we say, number nine, There is definite scriptural evidence that seems to point to a

temporal order of the two.

Number nine. There is definite scriptural evidence that seems to point to a temporal order of the two. A definite scriptural evidence that seems to point. You notice, I do not wish to be dogmatic on it. God can justify when he chooses. He can regenerate when he chooses. But he tells us that we are justified by faith, and he that believeth is not condemned. He tells us that. And so, we add, is there a definite order between justification and regeneration? There is no reason a priori why one should not be justified at the age of three, and regenerated at the age of 80, or regenerated at the age of three, and justified at the age of 80. There is no a priori reason. But there is a definite scriptural evidence that seems to point to a temporal order of the two. There are three passages to which I'll call your attention.

The first is I Corinthians 2: 14. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Well, then, can the natural man receive Christ? Can the natural man then accept Christ from his sins? Can the natural man exercise faith? They are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. We had a student here once, who had been with a Jew brought up in Czechoslovakia. And he told me that in Czechoslovakia, he had an aunt there who moved to the United States. And she had a business ~~(61)~~ in Czechoslovakia, that she asked him to take care of while she was here. And she took care of it for her. And while he was directing the business there, he said, she would write to him about the business, and he said that over here, she attended an evangelistic meeting, and she became a Christian. And ~~she~~ ^{he} said after that, in a period of a year or two, every letter that she wrote to him, about business, there would be a paragraph or two, telling what Christ meant to her. And he said, as he read it, what utter nonsense. What utter foolishness. He said, it was foolishness to him. He couldn't discern it, he couldn't understand it. He said that it sounded just like silly talk ^{to him,} ~~(71)~~. But then the time came when the Spirit of God touched his heart, and this sounded no longer like foolishness to him, but it sounded like

good sense to him. And he exercised the faith, and he also became a Christian. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

And then, John 6: 44. Jesus said, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him," but he said in verse 37, "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." If it doesn't sound like foolishness to you, if it sounds sensible to you, if you see your need, if you see that Christ can fulfill your need, if you desire to come to him, don't hesitate and say, Well, now, maybe I'm not one of the elect, maybe the Lord isn't drawing me, it would sound like foolishness to you if you weren't the elect. The fact that you desire it, the fact that it sounds reasonable to you, shows that he is drawing you, and if you can go to him knowing that, that him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out, no one can say he will not receive you, because he has said, everyone that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. But no man can come except the Father draw him. Now for you to stand back and say, Well, he isn't drawing me, I can't come, that's obvious. That's not. If you want to come, you can come, but if you want to come, it is proof that he is drawing you.

(Question: Regeneration is the outworking of justification by grace.)

Well, the third passage I would like to ~~draw~~ call your attention to is, Philippians 2: 12 - 13. "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." Sermons have been preached on that. Work out your salvation. Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. There's an exhortation, there's a command. There is something that we are called upon to do, and required to do. But read the next verse. "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." All right, God's working in me. I'm just going to sit back and forget about it. No! Work out you own salvation with fear and ~~trembling~~ trembling. We have a vital part. ■ But we can't regenerate ourselves. That's not our part. But we have a part to believe, and to receive him.

Number ten. (Question raised here: I don't think in the context he is, I think he is using salvation is the full sense of the whole process of going forward in the life of Christ. And this is not specifically speaking of regeneration, but it is an illustration of the principle. We have to grant you the context. You mean that this is some particular temporary situation, and not a general exhortation. Well, if it is, it would still be an illustration of the principle. But in the context he says, just before it he is speaking of our growth in grace, and he gives a comparison of Christ's character, Christ's humility, "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow," "Where, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure. Do all things without murmurings and disputings: that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God." It seems to me, in the context, both before and after, he is speaking of sanctification. He is saying that it is farther in the Christian life, then that life which regenerates the believer. Your point would be very good, I think, if he were speaking before about - what are you going to do about building your church? What are you going to do about reaching this difficult section of town. Some particular problem. But I don't think that he is. I think he is speaking about the whole [?] general [?] field (13) here. Judging by a quick glance of course.

(Question: That's your conclusion. Answer. I didn't say the conclusion. I said, it seems to point. I didn't say the proof. But that it seems to point.)

S-39.

You'll notice that I did not say these prove an order of regeneration and justification, ~~necessa~~ because we thought that apriori could come at either time. God could regenerate when ever he choose to. And justification could come when ever he $(\frac{1}{2})$. But in I Corinthians 2: 14 we read, "that the natural man receives not the things of God," and so it is hard to see how a man who is unregenerated could exercise faith. It would seem to be that it would be pretty difficult to state the conclusion, from verse 14 here, that whenever there

is faith exercised, that there is proof that there is already light. A dead man could be justified but if justification is by faith, how could a dead man exercise faith? To exercise faith, you see, he has to have life. "The natural man receiveth not the things of God, for they are foolishness to him." It's utter nonsense to the man whom God has not given spiritual life. So it would seem to me that the fact that a person exercises faith, that a person says, I want to trust Christ, I want to put myself in his hands, would be evidence that God had regenerated that person. It is pretty hard to see.

(Question: There are two distinct lines. And there's a line of justification, but it is all complete at the start, and here's a line of sanctification which was not, and regeneration is the start of sanctification. We believe that God will not regenerate anyone who he does not justify. But as to whether the first step of sanctification might take place before the first step in justification, that is, I think, just the same as the question, if we need money desperately, there is a certain great need here, and we pray the Lord for it, and tomorrow we get a letter from a man in Shanghai, sending in a check for the right amount, whether we can say that has nothing to do with our prayer, because the man in Shanghai mailed that a week before we began to pray, or whether ~~and~~ we can say God knows our prayer and God answers our prayer, and He may answer our prayer before we actually ask it, and yet it is an answer. It is specifically related to us. And our sanctification is specifically related to our justification, but as to whether temporally it actually begins before or after, wouldn't make any difference. God knows who will accept him, and our justification is secured when Christ died for us.)

(Question. That is a matter of sanctification. Or you can consider sanctification as the process of changing our condition has to have regeneration as its first step. It has to have.)

(Question: The actual justification and regeneration could conceivably happen independently of one another. But I don't see how faith could be exercised before regeneration. And when we have justification by faith, when we are united with Christ, it seems to be reasonable to include regeneration.)

(Question: No, justification depends on the act of Christ, on our part. That comes before our regeneration, very definitely. They, having ~~the~~ seen the whole thing, they had tremendous confidence, but when he was actually justified, I don't believe is stated. That could conceivably be when, he ~~had~~ first had tremendous faith to act. He ~~had~~ faith in him to act, and he ~~had~~ faith in him when he said the son would live, he ~~had~~ faith that he did. The whole account was true. And I think that we ~~have~~ our faith tremendously improved when we see the ~~essence~~ essence of God.)

(Question: I'm not sure in that particular case, whether the regeneration was performed. But now in that case, that Jesus said, your son will live, and the son began to ^{re-}cover at that very hour, but I would say that Jesus could have been, in response to the faith (7) and if Jesus Christ is not chronologically bound. Well, now that was the first of these passages. And you see how this seems to point to a temporal thing. That ~~we~~ ^{if he} can't know the things of God. They are ~~all~~ ^{if} are all foolishness to him, how can he exercise faith. Yes, we are justified by faith. So we are justified by the death of Christ, and once Christ died, there's the justification for us. There's the merit of Christ in the bank for us. But it is applied to us, when we receive it through faith. But how can we receive it through faith, before we are justified? Before we are regenerated? It would seem that the natural man can not receive the things of God, but the Holy Spirit regenerates us, and we can receive the things of God. Well, now, did he regenerate us that instance, did he regenerate us the day before, did he regenerate us ten years before? Did he regenerate us fifty years before? We can't prove that. But it would seem that when we exercise faith, it definitely proves, that we have been regenerated.

And then John 6: 44, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." Now that is specifically speaking of ~~man~~ a call, except the ~~Father~~ Father draw him. I think the other is more directly related to it, but the same principle is applied, that God is working before the man believes. But, him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out. So no body can say, Well, there is no use in ~~me~~ my thinking about it. I'm not regenerated. You don't know whether you

are regenerated or not. You have no way of proving that you have been regenerated. But you do know that if you will believe on Christ, you can be saved. And if you reject Christ, you are making your sin much worse than it has ever been before. Because that is ~~more~~ ~~and~~ the worse sin one can do - to reject Christ.)

(Question: We have to receive justification before we can be adopted. "To them that received him, to them ~~gave~~ he power to become the sons of God. To receive the adoption, after we are justified. But we do not receive power to regenerate ourselves. God regenerates us. We don't do it. We cannot, because regeneration is entirely an act of God. And it is not wrought through faith. We are justified, but we are regenerated by the power of God alone, as a result of what he did on the cross.

2/28/57.

Number nine: There is definite scriptural evidence that seems to point to a temporal order of the two.

Number ten: We can state the order of events in salvation as follows:

First. Election. Then on the line below, say atonement. Then on the line below that say vocation [?] ~~(111)~~. There is a general call to all men. There is a special call to the elect. Then, skip six lines. And below that write, Sanctification, and glorification. Now in the space you skipped, under vocation ~~(112)~~ a complex of events including the beginning of most aspects of our salvation: ~~and~~ including regeneration and justification. Then under that a little bit to the right, not straight in your line down, a little bit to the right, see I had you give six lines, so you'll have plenty of room left, under that write three in a column, the first of which write, regeneration, and below that conversion, and below that justification applied by faith. Then you have back on your regular line again, sanctification and glorification. You see, what we have is this, in the order of salvation, you have God's ~~(13 $\frac{1}{2}$)~~ elected those who are saved [?] trying to salvation. Then we have the promise and obedience to Christ which wins our salvation including all aspects of it. Then we have its application to ourself, and in the application, there are two lines. There is the line of justification which is complete at the beginning. It is a complete act.

Then the result is given to us, applied to us at the beginning of our salvation. Then there is the line on sanctification, connected with our standing.

S-40.

Therefore I put them over to the right a bit, in order to show that we do not speak dogmatically of the order within this complex as we do in what precedes the complex, and what follows. But it is pretty hard to interpret the complex, then being any other way, then in this order. Because justification is a forensic act of God. And he can apply it when he chooses, but he chooses to apply it in response to our faith, and so that's how it is done. And regeneration is an act of God's part, in which man does nothing. Man has no power of regeneration. Man can't regenerate himself. A dead body can't raise itself to life. One cannot cause himself to be born. Regeneration is entirely of God. But regeneration is done to those whom he either has justified, or knows he is going to justify. So thus far, we have nothing to prove which of the two must come first. But since justification is ^a ~~an~~ response to our faith, and faith is a spiritual act, and the natural man cannot receive the things of God, he cannot do anything that is good, it would seem to be involved, that regeneration precedes the exercise of faith. Faith is a gift of God. The scripture ~~is~~ clearly teaches that. It is pretty hard to imagine how this gift of God could precede the regenerating action of the Holy Spirit.

And so that is the order of events, with that which I mentioned first, the beginning and the end, absolutely definite, positive as to authority. And that this complex, being the start of two different lines, each of them is stressed by itself in the scripture, and the problem in the beginning of the Christian life, but it also says that the two happen at the same identical point. Theoretically God could justify us one year, and regenerate us fifty years later. Theoretically God could regenerate us one year, and justify us fifty years later. There is no way to prove, nor is there any insistence that God ~~must~~ chooses to save or (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) but it is very difficult to imagine how justification by faith could precede regeneration since it is part of faith, and faith is a gift of God. A dead man

can't exercise faith. And so it would seem that regeneration precedes justification, but I say it would seem. The rest of the context is clear. There are those who try to avoid this recognition that regeneration precedes justification, and I do not wish dogmatically to contradict that, but I do wish to say that I know of no argument, against regeneration preceding justification which would not apply with equal force to election preceding justification. It would not apply with equal force to that. If God has chosen us before the foundation of the world, if Jesus Christ died specifically as a substitute for those who were to believe on his name, if our names are written in the lamb's book of life from all eternity, then the problem is just as great, if there were no (4) as it is with regeneration preceding justification.

Number 11. If we believe in Christ, we can know that we are justified, and can rest on his finished work; if we believe in Christ we can know that we are justified and can rest on his finished work, if we know that we have been justified, we can then know, that we have been regenerated, and must apply ourself to working out what God has worked within us.

Work out your own salvation, for it is God which worketh in you. You cannot work it out, except Jesus working in us. We must work it out. It is a command, and it is necessary. But before we can work it out, we must have been regenerated, and he that believes on the Son, can know that he has been regenerated, even though he may not know when he was regenerated. (6)

If we believe in Christ we can know we are justified. Christ starts in John 3 speaking to Nicodemus, and points out to Nicodemus, the absolute necessity of the new birth. You must be born again. Nicodemus says, How can I be born again? And Jesus doesn't answer. ~~Nicodemus~~ Christ says, except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. Nicodemus says, How can a man ~~be~~ enter into a mother's womb, and be born again? Oh, that's ridiculous. Jesus said, The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, and you can not tell whence it cometh, and wither it goeth. So is

everyone that is born of the Spirit. Jesus doesn't say, If you're regenerated, you can go right through doors, and right through the sky, and be here and go to another place all of a sudden, and no body knows what's happening to you, ~~m~~ that's not what it says. What he says is that it is a secret act of the Holy Spirit. What he says is, You cannot see it, like if you were to go back into your mother's womb, and come out again and prove you were born again. It's not like that. It's not something you can see. It's not something ~~m~~ that somebody can say, Look, this man is now born again. ~~am~~ It is not like that, it is the secret act of God's Spirit. But then he goes on and he makes no more specific reference to being born again, in the chapter. But he talks about justification. And he says that as Moses lifted up the ~~manan~~ serpent in the wilderness, even so must the son of man be lifted up that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish but have eternal life. He ~~amam~~ said, God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He that believeth on Him, has a new birth. That's not what he says, - is not condemned. He talks about the forensic act.

All through the rest of the chapter he stresses this matter of pardoning sin, reconciliation with God, escape from condemnation. He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life. So that one who believes in Christ, has everlasting life, and can rest on Christ's finished work. But then the man who is resting on Christ's finished work, can know that he has within him, regeneration. He doesn't say, Oh, I don't feel like doing that any more. There's proof I've been born again. No, he says, I believe on Christ, and Christ died for my sins, so that I know I am. And knowing that I am in him, I can know that the new spiritual life is within me. I know that God has regenerated me. But he wants me to work out the salvation that he put in me. He wants me to work to improve myself, and soon to find ~~(old)~~ ^(old) my weakness and my insufficiency). I am not perfect so that I can overcome all sin. No, I am very weak, but I have the spiritual life within me, that gives me the longing for it. It gives me the desire, and I can look to God for victory over this sin, and victory over this sin. I can look forward in the line of justification.

Regeneration is not like justification, a complete victory that immediately

overcomes everything. It is a little tiny seed, which sometimes is very for ~~some~~ ^{a brief} time, and then seems to flicker out. It may not be flickering out at all. Which at other times is hardly recognizable for awhile. Yet there's a little seed there. And if their's life, if you have faith like a grain of mustard seed, that doesn't mean a tiny one, it means a living one, you can't make a grain of mustard seed. If you had a billion dollars, ~~million~~ to experiment with, if you had all of the organic matter in the world to use, you couldn't make a grain of mustard seed. It is living, it is life that comes from a grain of mustard seed. And if you have spiritual life in you, you have the new birth, you have the new nature, but you may not see it. It may be so tiny, but it is there. It is living. Justification is altogether different.

In justification, we receive full (11) and complete. It is either all there, or none of it is there. I picked up a book the other day on Power of Words. And in this book the man said, how in the middle ages, they thought that everything was this or that, this or that. That's all gone now. We know now that everything is relative. And of course he is entirely wrong in that, but there is an error into which people fall. This is a good man. I'll trust him with everything I've got. This is a bad man. I'll have nothing to do with him. There are very few people in the world who will say, that's such a bad man I will have nothing to do with him. There are very few people who do not have enough of the common grace of God, that in certain emergencies in life, you're a hundred times better off in life, to be with him, than to be alone. And there is no man in the world who has so much of God's special grace, that he is so good, that you can absolutely trust yourself to him. God wants us to learn that lesson. You can trust Christ. You can trust no human being to the full. Because any human being, the finest of all human beings, when you come up to a real crisis you'll find there is enough of selfishness there, which he may not even recognize, but is there working within him, that at the most unexpected point, it shows itself, and shows itself in bitter, meanness.

Somebody has said, No body is a hero, ~~an~~ until he is down, and that is false. Because any man, who is great, has so much greatness that anybody who has sense enough

to recognize it, can see it, and admire it. But there is a great truth in the statement, because anybody who is so close to the man as his child is [?] (112 $\frac{1}{2}$) is apt to come to the parts that aren't great, and is apt to see some of the meanness and some of the lowness that is in him, and is in every human being. So goodness is relative. There are men who are very, very bad, but they've got some goodness in them, and there are men who are very, very good, but they've got some badness in them. Goodness is relative.

Temperature is relative. We know there's an absolute zero, but the chances are that men will never see it. A thing isn't neither absolutely zero in a sense, or the greatest of absolutely the greatest of these, is somewhere in between a relative point. And if you get a little bit you get cold, and if you get a little bit lower, you die. And if we go a little higher and you get hot, and if you go a little bit higher and you burn up. It is all relative. And there are many, many things in life, which are relative. And when we try to say everything is hot or cold, or every man is either good or bad, we get into a confusion of thought, and the preachers of today who are stressing the importance of the conquest of the relativeness of sin are doing us a ~~man~~ real service, because it applies in so many areas of life. But when they go on to denying the absoluteness in the sphere in which we have to live, they do us a great disservice. Here is a worthless person, He's weak, he's poor in many, many ways, but he is a human being. And here is the most highly trained monkey -

S-41

(Question: The faith is a gift. It ~~can~~ ^{can} not come without it. No man can come ^{to me} ~~and believe~~ except the father draw him. The faith is a gift, without which he cannot come. When we say believe, we mean put your trust in a person. And I cannot see how the one who is not regenerated, can put his trust in him. But I know that the one for whom Christ did not die on the cross, the one who he did not substitute for, couldn't possibly believe in him. And I know that the one who was not elected before the foundation of the world could not believe on him. But I do

know that nobody on the earth can say, I cannot believe, for whosoever cometh may accept him, and he will reject nobody.

Number twelve, we must examine the relation of the orator selusus (2)
to evangelism. I've put a little Latin in here just for your edification. The
 orador selusus , the order of events in salvation, I called to you in number
 10. Number 12 we use the more technical term, the order of which, we must examine
 the relation of the orador selusus to evangelism.

Small a. If recognition of God's decree would cut the nerve of evangelism, such
recognition would equally destroy all other human initiative. God has decreed the
 moment when I will die. He decrees that before the foundation of the world. It is
 definite. I is absolutely definite. It is unchangeable. Therefore, if I'm in a
 hurry to get across the street, I'm just going to ~~h~~ run across, and never look to see
 if there is a car coming. What utter nonsense that would be. The Mohammedans, at
 least many of them, carry that out. It is dangerous to get into a Mohammedan taxi
 cab, because he says he has hair pin turns, 70 miles an hour, tears up and ~~a~~ down the
 hills. You say, well, we should go a little slower, we'll all be killed. He says,
 You can't be killed, unless, till the time comes. When you are ordained, (4) you
 cannot. So why worry? Well we laugh at him, because we know that is nonsense. We
 know that although God has ordained all things, we know that he has ordained the means
 as well as the ends. And our actions and our talk is a part of it, and we have a
 very real, responsibility for what we do. And we run across that street without
 looking, the chances are that we will be killed. If we work and study and train
 ourselves, we will get ahead, and if we don't we will not. And yet it is formed in,
 it is part of the plan of God.

It is ~~a~~ very important that we realize that we cannot ~~m~~ understand it. But
 there are many, many things that we cannot understand. How can I have a thought.
 You can't see it, you can't touch it. How can I have a thought, and if I have a
 thought in the middle of my head, can it ~~make~~ ^{make} my finger ~~sway~~ ^{move}. There are various
 theories about chemical action and different forms along the way, but there is a
 step there, from a thought in the mind, to the motion of a finger. There are many

steps there that no body understands, no body knows how they can be. Where am I? I look at my toe. Am I in the toe. Is that where I am? You can cut off the foot, and I am still here. Am I in the hand. The hand that gets hit and its hurt, you cut off the hand, and I'm still here. Am I still up here in the head. Well, you get a stomach ache, and you'll decide you are down in the stomach, too. Where am I? I can't be placed spacially. Your sphere is not spatial. It can not be placed spacially. But it acts in your body. You can't understand it. What is the use to try? How could Jesus be both God and man? We can't understand it. But it is true. In life we have great central facts, that we have to recognize.

Somebody told Carlisle about a man who after struggling with the problems of life finally had decided to accept the universe. ~~Then~~ Carlisle said, Yes, he'd better. And that is true. He'd better. Or he'll soon be in the insane ~~asylum~~ asylum, or he'll be dead. If we don't recognize the fact that there are more things in the heaven and the earth, then our philosophies dreams of, we don't have to state them to interpret them, but very often, the things which appear most complex to us, are very simple, if we know one little aspect which we just don't know. The men in the middle ages ~~and~~ could not understand ~~how~~ how the world could possibly be round. Because everything falls down, and if it was round, when you got to the edge, you would fall off. And that was perfectly good logic, and very reasonable. And yet, if he ever looked at an eclipse, he could see the shadow of the earth going over the moon. He could see the proof that the earth is round. He found proof that the earth is round, and he knew that things fall down, so how ~~and~~ could the earth be round? It was an absolutely, un-understandable thing, and ~~at first~~ ^{at first} ~~people~~ ^{people} said, well, the earth can't be round. If it was. We would fall off. That settles it. And then Newton found a very simple explanation. That things don't fall down. They are attracted towards the earth. And once you have that simple explanation, that we all learned since we were ~~mm~~ young, that to us it seems just as simple as a, b, c. Once you have that simple explanation, why, you don't have any problem then. Before it was a paradox, and even the paradoxes of life there may be very simple explanations which God may give to us, when we understand more fully.

But at present, we have to accept what we see. The facts, we evidently have to accept. And anything that has been taught in God's word, we must accept, and it is a fact that God has fore-ordained not only who is going to be saved, from the foundation of the world, but it is also a fact, that we have a power of choice, we have an ability and an initiative, we have a responsibility for our actions, and they are both facts. And if we unite either fact, we are getting a lopse-sided interpretation which leads ~~up~~ us into all kinds of error. We have to recognize both facts.

And so if recognition of God's decrees would cut the nerve of evangelism, then such recognition would equally lead me, when I wake up in the morning, when I feel kind of lazy, to say what's the use of getting up, the class will be taught. If it's God's will, it will be taught. If it is God's will that we have a class here, I'll be there. So why worry. And I think if I did that about three days, you'd all rejoice. But I think that about the sixth day, you'd begin to moan. And I think about the eighth day, ~~you~~^{they} would have a special meeting with the Board of Directors, and on the tenth day there would be somebody here to teach in my place. ~~Umhm~~ I can see exactly what the course's progress would be if I fell into that particular plan. And that is why, all through life, somebody says we must pray as if everything depended on God, and we must work as if everything depended on us. And I don't think that's a true statement. I think we must recognize everything depends on God. And we must recognize that everything we are connected with, has a very definite relationship with what we do and ~~in~~ how we do it. We must recognize both ~~in~~ facts as true. Somebody has said that he had a little cat, and he said that at night, he put the milk in the ~~and things~~ (10) and he mixed them together, and in the evening he let them stand overnight, and he said in the morning he went out, and he said he came into the barn with that pail, and he said immediately the cat gave a squeal. And he said he ~~was~~ liked to hear that squeal. And he liked to see that cat coming in gratitude, to get that which was prepared for him. But he said it was prepared the night before. But he gave that as an illustration of prayer. I don't think that was a ~~was~~ particularly good illustration. I think it has certain aspects in

it. It is true that God answers our prayers, long before we make them. He prepares the night before. He answers the prayer we make today. He prepares years ago, in line with the prayer we are making now. But he wants us to make the prayer, but not only does he want us to make the prayer, prayer does change things. Prayer does change things, and God responds to our prayer often long before we make them. And just about everybody who has been saved in ~~this~~ ^{this} world, a great part of it can be attributed to prayers of one. For the one who gave the message, or for the one who receives the message, or both.

Here is a fellow and he wanders into a meeting. He's a ~~gangster~~ gangster in Los Angeles. He's a gangster there, and somehow he comes to this meeting. And he hears an evangelist speaking, and he goes forward, and he receives the Lord and his whole life is changed, ^{and} from that time on, he's preaching the message to us. Isn't that wonderful, that that man made the choice, and decided to follow the Lord and turned to him. Isn't it wonderful. Isn't it? It is. But when you look into it, and you begin to find out, you find that he had a mother who prayed for years, and she was praying, and praying, and praying to God that her wandering son would be brought back. And you find that there were a series of events, that led that fellow, who didn't want to go near that evangelistic meeting. He had too much religion when he was a boy. He wanted to have nothing to do with it. - that led that fellow to somehow get into that meeting, he never wanted to go in. There was a series of events, that led to his being there, over which he had no control.

And the minister who was there that night, was just the one ^{adapt to meet} ~~whom~~ his particular need. There's a whole series of events that entered into that situation. And there was an awful lot of prayer back of it. And all these things enter in. And that fellow could have said, he could have gotten to the door, and said, I'm not going in. I'm turning away. And he could have increased his load of guilt. He could have done it. We can all turn away from God. And we make our sin worse, for the worse sin, is the rejection of Christ. And we all can say, Yes, I want to receive Christ as my Saviour, but when we do, we find that there are forces back of it. There are forces there, and it is God's determination, before the foundation of the world.

Small b. As a matter of fact, this is not ~~the~~ what happens.
if

I said that recognition would cut the nerve of evangelism, it would equally destroy all of human initiative, and b. as a matter of fact this is not what happens, and I thought we discovered it once yesterday, and I brought with me, Preserve Smith's History of the Age of the Reformation. And that is a very wonderful picture of the age of the reformation. Preserve Smith also wrote a life of Martin Luther, and a life of Erasmus, ~~Ma~~ and they are excellent books. He is professor of history in Carnell University.

S-42.

- the silly old views that Luther held. But still worse he hated the views of Calvin. And I brought that book with me. But in that book Preserve Smith tells us about the teaching of Calvin, and he tells about this crazy teaching of predestination. And this idea that only the elect can be saved. And this idea which he said, reduces us all to a bunch of sticks. Unless God touches us and gives us life, we are all absolutely helpless. As you read Preserve Smith, regarding this, you think, how foolish people can believe such nonsense. So they just lie in dust forever. And then we read the name page in Preserve Smith, and he says, How can these awful doctrines produce a world of men such as the world has never seen? He says, they went out and they conquered kingdoms, and they explored great areas, and they carried the message of what they believed, and then he tries to add psychology to his theme: how these people felt, that they were ordained of God to do this work. That God had chosen them, and that nothing could stop them, because they were doing God's ~~work~~ will. And he said the energy they put into it, and the work they put in, accomplished this. And he describes the French Calvinists, the Huguenots, and he says, of all types of French characters there is ~~nothing~~ ^{none} that compare with this, of the eloquence of these wonderful teachers, who were carried away with these doctrines. He says they are such terrible doctrines, which utterly destroy all initiative.

So as a matter of fact, it isn't what happens, It isn't what happens, this

recognition of God's decree, destroys initiative. It is a perversion of it, which does. It is possible to get into a frame of mind where you think the most important thing you can do is to get people to say that God's sovereignty is complete, and that he regenerates before he justifies, and that it is all of God, and if you can get people to subscribe to that formula, that's wonderful. And I know people that, would a thousand times rather get a good Christian person that believes in God to subscribe to their particular formula, though it was a good formula, then they would reach a hundred people that didn't know Christ, and bring them to trust in Christ. And that is an utter perversion of Calvinism. Because our understanding of these things is helpful to our service for God. And it is helpful for an affect on our lives. It is valuable perhaps. But our task is to bring men the message of salvation. And the task that Christ has set us here for is to bring the people the message that whosoever will believe on him will be saved. And that you are increasing your wickedness in turning away from him, and that you have merely to look and you can be saved. And we can know that those who do look, were elected before the foundation of the world. And I believe that we can know, that those who do look, have got the new life in them, which God implanted, maybe today, maybe yesterday, maybe forty or thirty years ago, in fact. And now that life begins to exert itself. The man receives Christ, but he never would except I bring it to him.

He is bound to because God has elected him to. But he never would if I didn't bring the message to him. And both cases are true. And my function in life, is not to try to philosophically explain how it fits together, but my function in life, is to present the message, and to reach the man, and to do the utmost that I can to bring the message of salvation to every one, because the one who appears to be the most impossible, and the most hopeless, and - what's the use of talking to that fellow, may be the very one that God has elected before the foundation of the world, and in whom the new life is working, and nobody ever dreamed, he may be. And he could be the most surprised man in the world to recognize it. And the person who looks as if he is such a good person, you just have to step up and say, Here, don't you want to understand the truth of God better, and believe on Christ, may be the

one who is going on in self-righteousness, living a mighty good-ethical life, but his self-righteousness, filled with pride, which is the worse sin of all, and absolutely impossible to lead to Christ. I can't tell. And my point is that every one should hear the message of salvation.

(Question. No, I wouldn't say that it is quite that way. I would say that, election in the specific sense, involves simply the matter of who is elected. But I would say that God's decrees involves everybody in that. And I would say election does not direct things forward, but it is related to the decree and the means to carry out the election. And I would say that when Paul said, How can they believe except they hear, and how can they hear without a preacher. He was not saying, Nobody can ever be saved, without a preacher. But he was saying, this is the normal way and usual. And I would say that in the overwhelming masses of the people, the person is brought to the Lord, because someone whom God has appointed carried the message, but God can cause a person to look up and see a cross, and they wonder what that cross means. And pass by a mission and pick up a piece of paper on the floor, and see the words that God so loved the world, and be saved. The modernist, the worse modernist in his preaching, can be used of God to save a soul through his reading of the scripture. The Roman Catholic service with all that is contrary to the word of God can be used of God to take a word or a phrase out of it, to save a soul. But that's not God's ordinary way of doing it. And in most cases, he has ordained that some other individual can believe if he hears the message.)

(Question. I would say this. That when I come up to the judgment seat of Christ, he will - well, let's not take me. Let's take someone who is more effective than I am. Take D. L. Moody. Did anybody ever lead more souls to the Lord than D. L. Moody? Well, D. L. Moody, we are going to say, oh, look at that man. Thousands and thousands he led to the Lord. Look at how God used him, and what am I compared to him. And I took Christ as my saviour under D. L. Moody. D. L. Moody, do you remember that day, when you were in a plane there, and you thought of speaking to that man across the aisle about the Lord, and you said, ah, I should, but I'm tired, And you didn't speak to him. And you remember that time when you left that meeting

and those people didn't get the word of salvation. And there were people there, that had come hundreds of miles, and just out of a little stomach upset didn't go and preach. And some of those people are going to hell, that might have been saved. And D. L. Moody will say, Yes, I didn't accomplish a tenth of what I should have. Thank the Lord that he enabled me to accomplish what I should. And if he says that, I'll say, I didn't accomplish a hundredth of what I should have. But we will ~~say~~ all say that what we accomplished came short of what we should have. And we have no good in us, we are all unprofitable servants. But on the other hand, he will say to you, Yes, you were a weak, pitiable creature, but you spoke to this man about Christ, and you spoke to this man about Christ. And we will all recognize that we are all terribly helpless, ~~we~~ because we don't accomplish a tenth of what we should.

Let me give an illustration here, that I think has an application. Here is a parent, who has a child, and loves that child tremendously. And the parent is coming down the street, and he sees ~~flames~~ flames coming out of his house. And these flames are coming, and shooting about, and ~~we~~ there is a flash fire there, and the child is lying next to it. And the parent rushes and tries to get in, but he just can't get in. The flames beat him back. He'd be burned to death, if he went five feet into the house. And he struggles - he tries, but he just can't get through that fire. And the child is burned to death. Is that parent for the rest of his life going to say, oh my, if I only hadn't been such a fool as to chat with that person for five minutes, if I'd only chatted three, I'd have gotten there in time to save my child. Isn't that terrible. If I had gotten up five minutes earlier that morning, think of all the things I might have done that would have been good. If I would have had my house rewired six months ago, when I thought of it, this probably would have never happened. Think of all the things that could have happened, if I had taken training as a youth in fighting fires, so that I would have known how to get in there. If he's a Christian he's not going to do that. ~~if he's a Christian~~ If he's a Christian he's going to do the best that he can to rescue that child, but if he can't rescue that child, he's going to say it is part

of God's grace to me. It is part of God's plan, and it is good, it was foreordained from the foundation of the world, and even though it is hard to understand, I know that it is part of God's plan. And the Christian who rests in the hands of God, and rejoices in whatever God does, but the Christian ~~am~~ works to accomplish what he knows is God's will to be done, and the Christian knows that they won't be accomplished, if I don't do my best, but the Christian knows that my best is part of God's plan.

(Question: God is not willing that any should perish but that all should come to the knowledge of the Lord, but those who do not come, it was part of God's original plan. D. L. Moody said, Do the best you can. There's the Lord to lead us. And there is one man who has come along, when a situation has been in just the right situation, and he has gone out and he has led thousands to the Lord. And there's another man who's come along, and has ~~m~~ worked just as true, and is just as able, and he has very little to show. In God's sight, he may have done a far greater work. We can't judge the person, but we can do our best, and look to God to lead us.)

(Question: On the one hand I have guilt for the sins I've committed. On the other hand God uses the wrath of which he's meant to praise him, and God can use that wicked act to bring good out of it, but that doesn't excuse me for it. It's all a part of God's will. If I start to lead a man to the Lord and I fail, maybe it's God's plan that that one shouldn't be saved, but on the other hand, maybe there's a man there he can use, tomorrow, or next month. I don't know. Maybe ~~his~~ plans are not to reach him. I don't know. That is, we are to do our best. We must work as ~~if~~ if everything depends upon it. But we must judge our work, in the realization, that it is God's work, ~~andmm~~ in us, and not what we've done.

S-43. 3/1/57.

We were speaking yesterday about the special consideration, and relation ~~of~~ justification to regeneration. And in a way I wish I could repeat everything we've said under that, because in some of the questions asked, they sounded as if they hadn't been listening the day before at all. I said the day before yesterday, that the scriptural teaching ~~is~~ that regeneration is entirely a work of God. There's nothing we can do to ~~regenerate~~ regenerate ourselves. It is entirely a work of God.

And then yesterday I spoke of, I was on number ten, was it? No, I was on number twelve, which is we must examine the relation of the [?] [?] ~~ordador~~ ~~seludas~~ to ~~evangelism~~ evangelism. And we mentioned under b there, as a matter of fact, this is not what happens. We mentioned Preserve^d Smith's ~~statement~~ statement, and I told you how I laid the book out on the table and forgot to take it. I think I'll take a minute now to read it to you. Let me give you the example of it, or the page of it. It's Preserve^d Smith, The Age of the Reformation, Page ~~166~~ ~~167~~ 166 to 167. Let me read to you what it says about Calvin's Doctrine. "Calvin's doctrine of the arbitrary dealing out of ~~salvation~~ salvation and damnation, irrespective of merit." In other words, the Biblical doctrine of justification. "The arbitrary dealing out of salvation and damnation irrespective of merit, ~~as~~ has often excited a moral rather than an intellectual revulsion. To his ~~own~~ ^{true} followers indeed, like Jonathan Edwards, it seems a delightful doctrine, seemingly bright, pleasant and sweet, but many men agree with Gibbon, that it makes God a cruel and rapacious tyrant, and William James says, It is ~~sovereignly~~ ^{sovereignly} irrational and mean. Even at that time, those who said that a man's will had no more to do with ~~his~~ ^{destiny} ~~death~~, than a stick in a man's hand, could choose where to strike or than a saddled beast could choose its rider, aroused an intense opposition. He goes on here quoting various views and then he says, "The God of Calvin," exclaimed Jerome Bolsec, "is a hypocrite, a liar, perfidious, unjust, the abetter and patron of crime, and worse than the devil himself." Sounds like Bishop Oxnam doesn't it? But here's the funny thing. After giving all this, Preserve Smith, about how terrible this doctrine of Calvin is, ~~says~~, ~~that~~ that people are justified because of Christ's goodness, rather than because of any goodness of their own, and that God in His ~~own~~ ^{own} sovereign will chooses to have Christ die for the suffering, for those who believe on him, after saying these terrible things that I just read to you about Calvin's view, he then proceeds to say, "But there was another side to the doctrine of election. There was a certain moral grandeur in the complete abandon to God and in the earnestness that was ready to sacrifice all to his will. And if we judge the tree by its fruits, at its best it brought forth a strong and good race." And he speaks a little further down,

"but the rank and file of the Huguenots of France, the Puritans of England, "the choice and sifted seed wherewith God sowed the wilderness" of America. These men bore themselves with I know not what of lofty seriousness and with a matchless disdain of all mortal peril and all earthly grandeur. Believing themselves chosen vessels and elect instruments of grace," (my it must be icy out, so many are coming in late.) "they could neither be seduced by carnal pleasure nor awed by human might. Taught that they were kings by the election of God and priests by the imposition of his hands, they despised the puny and vicious monarchs of this earth. They remained, in fact, what they always felt themselves to be, and elite, "the chosen few."

Now of course that is Preserved Smith, who is as I read to you about what he said about Calvin's doctrine, he has no conception what ever of Christianity. But from a man like that, to see what he says about the affect of the gospel, in people's lives, I think it makes it a most wonderful (4 $\frac{1}{2}$). Are we - I was simply filling that in for you on what I didn't have the book with me yesterday to read, under b. I gave you c, I believe. Small c, We do not know God's plan, as to precise events. I gave that didn't I? We finished b. As a matter of fact, this is not what happens,

Small c. We do not know God's plan, as to precise events, but we do know that our free agency is real, and ~~we~~ that we are responsible for the results of our action. We do know that. God has ordained from the foundation of the world, which of you are going to study these notes over, and which ~~one~~ of you are going to wait until the night before the exam to try to get that before the examination. God has foreordained that before the foundation of the world. But you are responsible for what you do about it. And we cannot understand how these fit together. But that doesn't say that they don't. I gave you the illustration yesterday about gravitation. Until Kepler had studied the stars for years, we had no basis on which, ^{to see how} the earth could possibly be round, and yet we could not fall off. But after Kepler, and ^{TIPAGRAM} (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) spent decades, studying the stars and seeing how they moved, Newton had the data on which to construct a new understanding of the universe, and to destroy the idea that everybody had universally believed, and if counting noses would establish truth, it

would have been established by a vote of a hundred to nothing, that everything falls down. And Newton proved that there is nothing to that. But that things are attracted to each other. And as the apple falls, the apple pulls the earth toward it, and the earth pulls the apple toward it. And they ~~move~~ move toward each other, a distance proportional to the comparative size of the two of them. The apple doesn't fall down, ~~but~~ but the two bodies move toward each other. And this explanation enabled us to understand the movement of the heavenly bodies, but it gave us a completely new understanding of the situation on the earth. And it made two absolutely contradictory things that fit together, that the earth could be ~~round~~ round, and yet men not fall off. Now there may be just as simple an explanation as that of how it is, that our free agency is real, and how it is that nevertheless, that God has fore-ordained all things to come to pass. There may be just as simple an explanation. And we do not honor God or his sovereignty in any way, by running down, or belittling the reality of man's free agency. The fact that he is responsible for what he does, and no man can say I couldn't have done it. I couldn't have done it, otherwise no one could see it. We are responsible, we could have differed from it. And that perhaps develops a little more under small d.

Small d. Life is full of choices, and man is responsible for his choice.

I've heard some people speak and present the sovereignty of God, and present the Calvinistic teaching of the Bible in such a way that, as I listened to them, (I'm going to have a big classroom by the end of the hour), and as I heard them presenting it, it had seemed to me that ~~when~~ their concept of life was that life was like a motion picture, and you sit here, and you see that picture, and you see something come in, and here a man looks all excited, and he looks scared, he looks determined, he goes through these emotions, but it is ~~it~~ all just a farce, it is all just an act. The next minute, he's coming there right behind us, and it doesn't mean a thing. Well, life, is not like that. It does mean something. Emotions are real, its choices are real, it is a real world we live in, and when we read that God is sorrowful, that God is grieved, that God is angry, it is real. It is not just a picture, ~~of a man~~ it is not just a man. But it is also true, and clearly taught in

the scripture, that we are responsible for our choices, and when somebody says, I can't help it, I have a will that tends toward evil. I cannot help it. I couldn't live a good life. I just haven't got it in me. I say, yes, it is true. You cannot live a perfect life, you are so held in the bond of sin, that you can't break it, and nevertheless, there are fifty times a day, when you know that you don't have to do that, and you do it, instead of this. There are fifty times a day, when you make a choice, and you make the wrong choice, and you know you are responsible for the choice you are making. Our choices are real, and we are responsible for them.

Jesus Christ was not just talking nonsense, when he said in Matthew 23: 37, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a gen gathereth her chickens under her wings and ye would not!" Jesus is not talking nonsense. He is pointing out the fact that these people have chose to reject him, and they are responsible for their action in so doing. It is real. The choices which we make. Even though, God knows in advance what these choices are going to be. And they are determined from all eternity, and you can pray to God, and you can pray with fervence and with feeling, and it depends on your prayer. Prayer changes things. And yet you can have the result of the prayer now, and a day later find that God was preparing for it a day, or a month, or even a year ago. He was preparing, to answer your prayer. But he would not have prepared the answer, and it would not have occurred, if you hadn't prayed. Our choices are real. The affects are real.

As James says in James 4: 2, "Ye have not, because ye ask not." And he is, of course, speaking there to the Christians, who does not avail himself of the power of God, but the thing principally was received, and is true of the unbeliever. That if the unbeliever does not live up to the light that he has. He rejects the opportunity he has. He rejects the Lord. It is true, but it is also true that God has foreordained from all eternity, those for whom Christ died, and that Christ died for those who he was substituted on the cross for. It is true, and yet is also true, that no one can say, I couldn't come. None of us would have

except the mighty power, has drawn him.

S-44.

Small e - recognition that it would seem to be taught that regeneration precedes faith, is no more destructive to human responsibility than recognition of God's decrees, for a substitutionary nature of Christ's atonement.

If you believe in a finite God, who made a world, and hoped ~~that~~ things would go along well, and ~~they~~ ^{he} could not help themselves, they've gone bad, and he was struggling along to try to do a good job of it, to see if he can help them a little bit, why then of course, you have an entirely different view on the Bible teaching. But if you have belief in a God who has planned it out, he's worked it in accordance with His mighty plan, then you have no difficulty in believing that God has predestinated us eternal life, from the foundation of the world, and who knows who are to come to Christ.

And then the other part of this, the substitutionary nature of Christ's atonement. There is a phrase which some people talk as if it is the most important thing in life to believe in it, and I don't like the phrase at all. Not that I differ with what the phrase teaches, but I think that the phrase is misunderstood, and misleading, and that is the phrase, Limited ^{Atonement.} ~~atonement~~. Now, limited atonement as it is interpreted by any sound theologian, holds that the death of Christ is sufficient for all. There is no one that I know of, who believes ⁱⁿ ~~that~~ limited atonement, who will not say that the death of Christ is sufficient for all. But they go on to say it is efficient for the elect. And that is just another way of saying that it is a ~~substitutionary~~ substitutionary atonement. Christ died on the cross to bear the sins of the one who believes. It is a substitutionary atonement. It is sufficient for all. Any can believe. Everyone has the opportunity of believing, but it is a substitutionary atonement. He died for those specifically who will believe on him. And their sins were borne upon the cross. So they can look back and see how, from all eternity, they were foreordained.

To my mind, when you say you believe in substitutionary atonement, you have

in them that are involved in the phrase - limited atonement. You believe that Christ was your substitute actually. Now this term - limited scares people. It gives a false impression. If you want to use a phrase like that, I think that you should definitely establish what you are talking about. He is a substitute, definitely, for those he substituted for. He bears our sins. There are two attempts to evade this. The first is the moral influence theory of the atonement. If we see what Jesus did, all the suffering he went through, if we see that, and our hearts are so touched that our lives are changed. It's a really a form of Pelagianism. (4). We see what wonderful things he's done, that he was willing to suffer and give himself like that, for us, and we see that, and as a result our hearts are moved. Well, the moral influence of the atonement is true. It does have moral influence, and it is one of the greatest arguments to lead a man to Christ. And more than that, it is one of the greatest arguments to lead up to serving, and to seek sanctification, as we think of what he did for us.

Moral influence is a real thing. But if there is only moral influence, then there isn't any moral influence at all. Do you remember the story about the woman who said, Do you want to see how much this knight ^{thinks of} means to me. Look here. She took her glove and she threw it down into the arena where the wild beasts were. And according to the story, the knight ^{risked} jumped down into the arena, to risk his life, grabbed the glove, jumped out again, flew it in the lady's face. Now that's the story. But it is a story, of a case, where here was a man who was willing to risk his life for this woman. And we admire him, for his loyalty, and his devotion to her, in being willing to to do that for her. To ^{risk} give his life, in order to save her gloves. But when she takes that attitude that he has towards her, and she uses it, with the idea that you just risk your life to pick up my glove, in order to show people how much you think of me. Well, we have tremendous regard to the man, for having that loyalty to her. But when she takes an attitude like that, we have no regard to her.

(6). That is, for the thing

highly of any act of sacrifice, it must have a purpose.

Here is a situation where I have tremendous need of something. It is very vital that I get this thing, and one of you makes a trip down town, and gets it for me, and comes back, and brings it up here, and gives it to me, and you've gone to a lot of time. You've gone to a lot of bother in order to do that for me. And I'm tremendously grateful to you, for doing it. Well, now here's a case where I say, I've got this copy here of Preserved Smith, and you know, I wish I had one other copy that is in red, because I have a mark in it where we left off. It's got a red cover, but it is green. Someone says, well, I'll go get it for you, and he goes, and he misses six classes, and he loses a lot of time, and puts himself way behind in order to go way out to get the red copy instead of the blue one, in which I have the mark there, which in ten minutes thought, I should certainly figure out, where it should be. Well, I say, I do feel so tremendously grateful to you. To sacrifice a lot, in order to do nothing to earn it. I may say he has a wonderful heart, but he doesn't have much of a head. ~~(7)~~. I may say that. I may say, I'd better be careful hereafter that I don't express little slight desires of mind in his presence, if he is going to go and do a fool thing like that. ~~h~~

If Jesus Christ went to the cross and died there, simply to show me how much he loved me, and didn't do a thing for me except that, it would be mad. ~~(7)~~. The moral influence of the death of Christ, depends upon their being ^{it} accomplishment. It must have accomplished something for me, and if it did, it has tremendous moral influence. It is most vital. But if it ~~am~~ simply doesn't do anything, it doesn't mean anymore to me than the death of any other good man, or even of a mouse.

(Question: II Samuel 23. the mighty men of David. They went out, and he felt very badly about it. He felt very badly that they had gone out. He admires their loyalty. He admires the fine attitude they showed by it. He poured it on the ground. Rather than to drink it, and give them the joy of seeing how they satisfied his thirst, by risking their lives. It was a wonderful example of loyalty. But it was a misunderstood thing they did. And David never intended that they should go out. And if people thought that David wanted us to do that,

. He had to show them his gratitude for it, for their attitude. But he had not shown them gratitude for their act. He regretted the act. And he did not want other people to think that it was the standard. And you can't expect a sinner to take a carefully thought out attitude as that, for the death of Christ. If he ~~and~~ died on the cross, for me, to do something for me, it should have tremendous moral influence on me. If he died on the cross simply to show me how much he loved me, but actually he didn't do anything... Here's a little child, and you say, now look, at all your mother has done for you. You should be good. And they think of all that their mother has done to help them. And you say, Look at all your mother's done for you. She went off, and she walked down here, and she got this hat for you, and all these others things. And she says, I didn't want the hat. Why should she go that far to be good to me? That's no reason why I should be good. And that would be the natural attitude of the little child, towards her parents who went to great efforts to do something for the child, that the child didn't see any purpose in. And it would be the same way to the sinner, who could see no purpose in it.

The moral influence of the atonement, presupposes that it's a real atonement. That's the difficulty with the so-called moral influence theory. That if there is just moral influence, there isn't moral influence.

Then there is the governmental theory of the atonement. The trouble with the governmental theory of the atonement is that ~~if~~ it is like the moral influence theory in that it is only a show. It is not real. But it is a tremendous step forward over the moral influence theory. We might say that the moral influence theory is the Pelagian theory, which questions whether it is true at all. The governmental theory is the view of Arminianism, and arminianism in the extreme form, which various views, real Christians have held. And certainly John Wesley was nearer Calvinism than he was to true Arminianism. But true Arminianism in the extreme form held a view of the atonement which, while it is far more Christian than the mere moral influence theory, yet does not meet the need.

The governmental view is - Here is God who wants to forgive people. But he can't do it because the lower law of the moral standing of the universe, will be wrecked.

And therefore God offers Christ on the cross, to display before the universe, the reality of His justice. He makes a great show of the reality of His justice, by bringing this suffering to Christ, and having done that He then can be just, and the justifier of them that believe on Jesus. Well, now how does it make a show of His justice? It just doesn't accomplish anything. If it doesn't pay the penalty for sins? And so it is a great step forward over the mere moral influence theory, but it does not meet what the scripture says, "He died for me. He bore my sins upon the cross. That he was made sin for me, and I now have the righteousness of God in me." It is clearly taught in scripture, a real atonement - the substitution of Christ. And the atonement then must be a specific bearing of the sins of those for whom he died. But it is not limited in the sense that there is anybody who can see, well, I can't help myself, because anyone can come to Christ. But no man can, except the Father draw him. The two are true. But to try to push the difficulties back and back, until you get back to an utterly disorganized universe, in which all is pure chance, ^{m(113)}, you don't find the , you find that the difficulties apply at each point. I don't say that this proves that you have to believe that regeneration precedes justification. I don't say that ~~and~~ at all. But I think that it does show that the objection to regeneration preceding, that it would make a man have no free choice, and therefore , is not a true picture. We know that anyone of us has a real and entirely free, but we, all of us have enough of real joy, that there is definitely responsibility for what we do that is wrong. And God makes our faith, which is a gift of God, the instrument through which he brings to us salvation. But justification would be the starting point of salvation.

S-45.

(Question: Free will in the sense that we are entirely free, is something that nobody has ever, ^{had} to doubt. We are bound ^m by a multitude of influences and tendencies , but we have enough that we

know that we are making progress which we ^{should be} We know that. And we can see when we make right choices that there are influences that enter our life which are not good. (Question) . But it's the same situation. God gives us power to make right choices. And God gives the sinner the power to accept him. We don't know to whom he's giving that power. We don't know. And we know that our preaching is going to be used to ~~man~~ give him that opportunity.

Small f. God's Word recognizes man's part in leading others to know Christ.

We looked at I Corinthians 4: 15, from which a false inference was drawn, but the book on a whole is a very good book. We noticed that he said, "Regeneration is through the gospel, because in I Corinthians, 5: 14, 4:15 rather, it says, 'begotten through the gospel'. But we read the whole verse, which so often eliminates ^{about} 1/3 of the difficulties that people find in the scripture, which are answered if you look at the whole verse. Here it was Paul who said, "In Christ Jesus, I have begotten you, through the gospel." He said, "For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." And we know that doesn't mean that Paul regenerated them. It is God who regenerates them, it isn't Paul. But Paul's presenting of the gospel, was so ~~man~~ vital a factor in the salvation of these people, that Paul uses this tremendous figure, when he says, "I have begotten you through the gospel." It shows the tremendous force of Paul's part in bringing the gospel. A part which God has provided and it was not the great goodness of certain people, that Paul came to them, and talked to them, and other people in other parts of the empire, Paul never came near. It's no goodness of them. It's no merit of theirs that God sent Paul to that particular place where he could present it.

In Matthew ~~28~~ 28, we were commanded to go out into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. It's a command which God gave. And God doesn't give commands just for the sake of getting people to go through motions. He did not say, "Go and go through some motions and explain all the mysteries in the universe, to the people, so that they'll have correct ideas." He said, to teach the nations to ~~man~~ observe all things whatsoever I have commanded. He said to make disciples of all the ~~an~~ nations.

Romans 10: 17 makes it very clear, We find that Paul says, "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." And yet we are told somewhere else that faith is the gift of God. Faith comes by hearing. And back in verse 13 we read, "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." But he says in the next verse, "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?" They can't call on him, till they've received faith, until they've believed. "And how ~~the~~ shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?" It is a definite part in God's plan. But we know that through the ages, there are some who have heard, and there are many who have not heard. We know that people have been sent with the message to certain areas, and not to others. And we know that it is our duty to go to every area. But we know that if we say that this man has made a correct choice, and these other men made a bad choice, and these other men had a fair chance. The evangelist didn't come to their town. We are going to get into a situation where there is more ~~unequality~~ inequality, more upturns, then taking the simple scriptural position, that God has chosen from the foundation of the world, those who shall believe, and has given them the power to exercise it.

But we are responsible to exercise it. And we are responsible to accept the Lord. Philemon 10, Paul says, that "I have begotten", he uses the same term about Philemon. My son in the faith. Yet Paul would be the last one to say that Paul had the power to turn anyone from darkness to light. It was God who regenerated him.

(Question: I would say that our choice is a real thing. It was a real thing, and we have real responsibility for it, and the result ~~whichever~~ if we choose this, will be different from the result, if we choose that. And yet I would say it is all a part of the plan of God.)

(Question: None of us has the right to give any of these things that are predetermined as an excuse for our not doing what we ~~should~~ should. Because everyone of us, time and again, chooses what we should, and doesn't choose what we shouldn't. We all deserve God's wrath. But God in His grace allowed Jesus to die for some of us, who deserved his wrath. And provided that he would send circumstances to our lives, whereby we would know about Christ, and that he would regenerate us, and would give us

freedom
 the power to see the spiritual truth, and ~~freedom~~ to choose. We are responsible but we are not deserving of merit, but are deserving of condemnation for our actions. It's difficult to see. It's just like the person in the Middle Ages. It would be impossible for him to understand how the earth could possibly be round and there would be people on both sides of it. If it was round and you got a little ways over here, you would have to cling on tight, so you wouldn't fall off. We would have to believe that, until we got facts from the scholars, to take a telescope, that nobody had known of before, and they gave the answer of how these two fit together perfectly, with the law of gravitation. Now we never knew that. And there are thousands of laws in ~~which~~ this universe that we don't know. If we just knew, it would make a lot of our problems easy.

But what we see, clearly thought, we can stand on it. And when two things that we see seem to contradict each other, all we can say is, we can't see them both clearly. There are other elements of it, which would make it perfectly clear. If somebody had been told two years ago, that you were going to sit in New York, and talk to someone in San Francisco, and hear their answer, ~~you~~ ^{he} would say, well, what kind of a fool are you? What kind of crazy nonsense is that? It is absolutely impossible. They never dreamed that people would go and stretch wires ~~a~~ clear across this country, and go from New York to San Francisco. And finally we got those wires put down, and we had our telegraph lines across. And people got used to that. And if somebody told them, Well, now, I'm going to talk without any wires at all, then they would have thought you are surely crazy. But there are factors in the universe which we didn't know about which make the seeming contradiction seem utterly absurd. And we both the facts, and we don't fully understand how they fit together. But God could put them together, and he clearly teaches that choice is real, and we are responsible for our choices.

The scripture clearly teaches that God has foreordained all things, and he does all things justly. But we can't see clearly how he does these things.

(Question: They're God's instruments. God uses them.)

(Question: And yet the strange thing is that when you get in contact with a philosophical teacher, and the people have gone far into science, very often you will find that the problem they have is not understanding

You mean to say, He says, that we choose and decide what we do. Why, I looked out the window, and I saw that one little bird had left the tree over here, and it flew out to another tree, and it turned around and came back. You mean that bird exercised a choice. No, it means that there were factors there, there were forces there, that made that. And it couldn't befor(ā1 $\frac{1}{2}$). And then he said, We're the same way. He says, Here's what I do. I can't help myself. And people get into one side or the other. And the strange thing is that people who think more of others often get more ~~and~~ ^{hasn't} ~~manipulated~~ into the fatalist side. The person who ~~has~~ much imputed to him, well, boy, I could step right out here, and do anything, if I just felt like it. He has that feeling. The whole world with his ~~own~~ hand, if he chooses, and he's got a ~~perfect~~ perfect free choice, and you say God has ordained things. Why, that's nonsense.

But then you take the person, who's gone a certain distance in philosophy and in science, and it is remarkable where they get to that other one, where they see so much farther out, and they see so many cases where people get all excited and make choices and they can tell in a glance ~~in~~ just what they are going to make. I can talk to ~~two~~ two students in college, and they'd say to me, Well, isn't my faith strong enough to go this far in seminary. I've got the faith. I can do it. It won't hurt me. And they talk that way, and so on. And yet, I can look at those five fellows there, and they can tell me what seminary they are going to go to, and four times out of five, I can tell exactly what they'll be saying when they come out. Exactly what their attitude will be. In an occasional case, it doesn't come out that way. But in cases after case, they submit themselves. They choose to submit themselves to ~~a~~ certain forces definitely intending not to be moved by those forces, but to ~~use~~ use their free will, and you'll find in the end, they are just as conscious of their freedom as they went in. But they ~~have~~ chosen to do that which practically everybody else ~~hadn't~~

(13). So some people look at ~~it~~ it from ^{can't} this view, and they see that, and some people look at it from that view, and they can't see this, but both are real, and both are true. And they are both part of God's plan. And we can't see how this fits together, but we mustn't stop over here, and not over

there, we mustn't stop over there, and not be there. We had a day of prayer speaker once who told of a man who preached and he preached the sovereignty of God, and God had ordained all things, and he said the Calvinists in the crowd were just so happy, and then he preached on how man was responsible and man must not ~~be~~ ^{choose} ~~in~~ wrong, and he must see what he is doing, and think these things out, and he said, the ~~Arminians~~ Arminians, they were all happy, but he said, actually the Calvinists should have looked happy both times. And I was impressed, the way he said that. Because, a Calvinism that forgets the reality of choice, is not a Calvinism at all. It is a Fatalism, it's ~~Mohammed~~ Mohammedanism, if you want, it is not Calvinism at all. It is not Christianity. Both are true. We can't see how we fit them together. But we must recognize both, for when we find a man, who we think is over this way, we can bring him over this way.

S-46.

And that goes on, to either the next point, or the one right after it.

F, is God's word recognizes man's part in leading others to know Christ, and G is - Small G. God has put us here to carry out His Will for us, rather than for the purpose of understanding all the mysteries of the universe. He has put us here to carry out His Will for us. Understanding is vital as the means to enable us to serve him effectively, not simply to satisfy curiosity. And there are plenty of problems we won't be able to answer in this life, or at least, not now, we may be able to answer later. And there are points of understanding which are very, very helpful to us in our Christian life, ~~in~~ that it is good to know about, but which when we elevate them, to ~~show~~ the place where they are the line of differentiation between us and others, they become a harm rather than a help. I think that that is one of the most vital things that we should learn in Systematic Theology. And it is a complaint that I've had ~~against~~ many a courses in systematic theology that I have had. That there is the stress in getting people to say the same words on certain features. And I've felt that they were good words, but not the stress on realizing what it was all for, and what it was all about. That leads to h.

Small h. Our responsibility in life, our responsibility is mainly in four areas:

Are we here in this world to understand the exact relationship of the nature of Christ. Well, it is good for us to know ~~mm~~ what we can about it, if it helps for the great purpose of our system. But what are the four main areas in which our areas go on. The first of those I would say is the most important of all, because it comes first. To make sure of our own justification. To make mighty sure that we ourselves are resting for salvation on the finished work of Christ, and not ~~am~~ on any good that we've done. Not on the wonderful choice that we've made. Not on the fine acts that we've done. Not on the good character that we have, or that he has given us. But that we are resting on that, and united with him, with the whole work of Christ. Not merely the death on the cross, but the whole work of Christ. Make mighty sure of our own justification, and we can never get away from the point where we need to come back. And if we don't do that, nothing else is worth anything, though we understand all the mysteries of the universe, and have not done this, it is worthless.

And then, two, is To make progress in our own sanctification. And it is vital that we know all the Christian truths that we can that will help us in our sanctification, but if it doesn't help in our sanctification, it is just a matter of ~~mondan~~ work. That is the place where we work, is in getting our sanctification. It is of God. We'll find that out later. But there is a place where we should put work and stress. And then the third and fourth are cognate to the first and second.

Three is To show others how to be justified. Not to argue with others about the exact understanding of the person of Christ, or about the exact understanding of the decrees of God, or of the limited atonement, but to show them how a person can be justified. God has put us here in order to win others. This message, that it is through faith in Christ alone, through what he has done, and fourth, To show others how to be Sanctified. And if the minister is preaching in order to tickle the ears of the people, give them a little happiness, and make them want to come back to church, he is certainly not doing the work of God.

A man came once to the Bible Institute in Los Angeles, when I was taking a course there, and this man came, and he spoke on doctrinal preaching and he said, You know, this big presbyterian church, he was pastor of, I think he was an orthodox man, He said,

You know, people came to me, and they said, Pastor, we wish you would preach some doctrinal sermons. Well, ~~he~~ he said, do you think I want to drive the people away? Well, they said, we would like to know what we believe. You should tell us something about it. Well, he said, I don't want to drive all the people ~~away~~ away from church. But they kept on after me, and so he said, I'll try once. And he said, You know what? I gave them a doctrinal sermon, and more people came. And so I think it is a good thing to give doctrinal sermons. And he was there, giving us a talk on doctrinal sermons, but I said, what ~~in~~ on earth is he in the church for? If he isn't there to bring the people the understanding of how they can be saved, and how they can grow in grace, he would be doing ~~in~~ a lot better, by being a lawyer or a dentist. It is good to explain all the truth that we can. And to understand all the truth that we can, but in most cases it must relate to these four areas, which are the principal areas, of the reason why God has us here on this earth.

3/5/57.

S Small h. Our responsibility is mainly in four areas. To make sure of our own justification, to make progress in our own sanctification, to show others how to be justified, and to show others how to be sanctified. These are the four areas in which understanding is particularly vital, and in which human activity is of most importance. We cannot justify ourselves, but to make sure that we are resting for our justification upon the only source, from which it could come. Upon Christ alone. Upon his blood. Upon his grace. Upon his gift. That is extremely vital. And worth our always coming back to. And indeed if we realize what he saved us from, we realize our sinful lost condition, then we will be filled with gratitude for what he did for our justification, to such an extent that we will be constantly to him. And second, our progress in sanctification, if we truly realize what he did from saving us from sin, then we will be so grateful, that we will be wanting to please him, constantly, by looking for ways by which we can improve and increase in sanctification. And this is a necessary part in justification, if we are saved, we will be seeking progress in sanctification. And these two are perhaps the most important tasks of the Christian. To understand the problems of the universe, is not what we are here for. We ~~and~~ will, of course, do all that we can, but of course, that is not what we are here for.

But for us to make progress in sanctification, for us to make absolutely sure that we are justified, is ^{his} ~~the~~ fundamental purpose in us. He uses us as his instrument in reaching others. But he doesn't need us. He condescends to use us. His fundamental purpose for each one of us is that we be justified, and that we be sanctified. And that is a purpose that can occupy a tremendous part of our time and trust and activity. But then in our service to others, in our relationship to others, ~~we~~ the two parallel purposes of this are the primary purposes of our existence on this earth as Christians. It is not our primary purpose here to convince people of the decrees of God. ~~It~~ It is not our primary purpose here, to give people a correct understanding of the person of Christ. It is not our primary purpose here to give them a correct understanding of the relationship between regeneration and justification. The more we know about these things, the more we may be able to serve him effectively. And the ~~more~~ more we may ~~in~~ avoid errors and misunderstandings in our lives, but if they are made an end in themselves, we are very extreme unprofitable servants of God. To get people to say yes, to a certain system of doctrine, is not what God has us here for. He has us here to find our own justification, to procure our own sanctification, to help others find their justification, to help the other person in sanctification. That is our purpose. And that is the primary issue in life. And our opposition to modernism, to apostasy, our ~~an~~ opposition to Roman Catholicism, and to all of the wicked movements of the day, is not because they have an erroneous idea, but it is because they are standing in the way of people receiving the message of salvation. And they are hindering people from growing in grace, and the teaching of sanctification.

It is one of Satan's clever devices to take something which is good, and to magnify it, to the point where it gets out of proportion. He will pull on - it is like a rope that you are pulling on opposite ends of. He will pull as hard as he can to get you into unbelief, to ~~you~~ get you to reject the scriptures, to get you to turning ~~against~~ the word of God, and to (11) with the overwhelming mass of Christian work. But then when he finds that he can't pull you that way, he just has to let go of the rope, and let you topple over the other way, to where your whole life is a great fighter for some point of doctrine, in stead of one who

is teaching people how to be saved, and how to grow in grace. The doctrines are tremendously vital as a means. But when they become an end in themselves, it is not . So I would rather a thousands time more see someone who is correctly understanding these doctrines, then to see him standing for modernism and opposing the word of God. I deplore a lot of the emphasis that he is so insistent that he is spending his life trying to get ascent to doctrine and what they mean, then trying to get people saved, and to show them how to be sanctified. And so this is very important to understand correctly, that I believe we will feel that we cannot have faith until God gives it to us. We cannot be justified until we are regenerated. Regeneration is an act of God, and act that comes through his free grace. And we could not receive it unless God in His eternal decree, had designated it to us. And we certainly could not be saved unless Christ died for us on the cross.

But those are matters which it helps us to understand ~~what~~ but it is not the thing that we desire.

~~WinnhamB.~~

Capital H. The Objections to the Scriptural View of Justification.

We've been looking at the relation of regeneration, of justification to regeneration specifically. But now, objections to the scriptural view of justification . Hodge has a section on this, section 9, which begins on page 171. And runs over to 179. In this section he has an excellent ~~argument~~ treatment of these objections. And these objections are the same today, as they were when he wrote. And the first of these objections is that it is said to lead to licentiousness. And that same objection is given in many other ways. But it is a very good objection for us to understand, so that we are not misled by it. Sometimes we meet one of those who believe thoroughly in the field of justification, and give others a false impression, and lead others to think that it does lead to antinomianism. We are free from the law. We are no longer under responsibility.

But when we break his law, and grieve his heart, it makes us very sorrowful, and we do the best we can to live as he wants us to live. Not out of fear that we will be punished if we don't, but out of a desire to please him. And so the doctrine properly understood does not lead to licentiousness, but leads to the very opposite. This objection ^{was} ~~is~~ just as strong, and just as much pressed in the days of the apostle Paul, as it was in Hodge's day, or as it is in our day. And Paul devoted two chapters to answer it, the 6th and 7th chapters of the book of Romans. And in Romans 6 and 7 he says, "Shall we sin that grace may abound. Of course not. Why it is ridiculous he says, that after Jesus Christ has given his life to save us from sin, that we would then lie down in sin. It is utterly ridiculous. Anybody who would do a thing like that can know that he is not one of those for whom Jesus died. The object ~~of~~ that this leads to licentiousness is an objection which is based upon an entire misunderstanding of the Protestant view of justification. It's an entire misunderstanding of it, properly understood it leads to the very opposite of licentiousness.

But it is the utter abandonment of any by God of being saved through keeping the law, of any thought that we received God's favor, on the ground of the good work that we do. Well, there is no teaching in the Bible anywhere that that's the way we are saved. The Bible never says that anybody was saved by keeping the law. It's through the grace of Christ that anyone ever was saved, or ever will be saved. That's the teaching of the Bible throughout, but oh, how easy it is for people to try to seek salvation through human efforts for the salvation that the Bible provides. It's salvation through God's grace alone.

And so a misunderstanding of this doctrine can lead to licentiousness, yes; just as a misunderstanding of Calvinism can lead to laziness. A misunderstanding of Calvinism can lead to lack of interest in the salvation of the lost. There was a young man up in New England who had a prayer meeting under a pile of hay in the rain. And they met there~~ly~~ and they had their prayer meeting, the hay stack prayer meeting we call it, and as a result they started the first foreign mission board in the United States, to take the gospel over to the Far East, and when they came to some of the leaders of the Church, and said that they wanted to do this. They said, Young man,

if the Lord wanted to convert the heathen he would do it without your help, or mine. It was an utter misunderstanding of Calvinism.

God can do whatever he chooses without your help or mine. But he does not choose to. He chooses ordinarily to use your help and mine. And God does not justify us to continue in sin. If anyone is justified we can know that that one has been regenerated, and if a person is lying down in sin, it is a very good ground for suspicion that he has never received Christ as Saviour. Though they ~~may~~ may understand the doctrine very thoroughly, it does not show that they are justified.

So this objection that it leads to licentiousness, as Hodge points out, first it involves a contradiction. Salvation delivers from sin. As Paul says, How shall we that are dead to sin ^{live} ~~being~~ any longer therein. Secondly, as Hodge points out, The very act of faith which secures our justification secures also our sanctification. It cannot secure the one without also securing the other. That is to say, we do not receive Christ, simply as a sin bearer. We receive Christ in His entirety. We receive Him as our Saviour and as our Lord. We receive Him in all His perfection, and all his righteousness (5). We are not simply justified by saying, Yes, I'll take it. Put that to my account, and that's done. We don't do anything of the kind. We take Christ as our Saviour, and our LORD, as our sinbearer, and our redeemer, and our guide. We receive Him in all His perfection. And that results in sanctification as much as it does in justification.

The very act that secures our justification, secures also our sanctification. And as Hodge says, thirdly, Our condition Paul says, is like that of a slave, belonging first to one master and then to another. Paul says, You were the servants of sin, and ~~now~~ now you are the servants of righteousness. And ~~in~~ he says, When you're the servants of righteousness, it would be absurd for you, to serve sin from which you have been made free. Now of course, that is something that the ordinary person ^{does} ~~must~~ not understand. He is a servant of sin, and he becomes a servant of righteousness, When he is justified. Why you say, I don't want to become any bodies servant. I want to be free to do what I feel like. Like you take my little boy, a couple of years ago, and you look at those letters in a book. I don't want to look at those letters. I want to look at those pictures.

Look here. This word means so and so. Don't you want to read this story? No, it's much more fun to hear mother read the story. It's much more. You read it to me. I enjoy it far more, when you read it. He wants to be free, not to bother with words. But you make him get down to it. You make him go through the tedious effort of learning those letters, of learning to read all of them. Now after he has been working at it for two years, now he picks up a simple book, and starts reading it himself. He's free to read when mother isn't there. He's free to read many things that ~~he~~ she wouldn't have time to read to him. He's beginning to experience the joys of reading. But in order for him to get that freedom, he had to ~~give~~ give ~~up~~ some of his freedom to be lazy and not bother to learn them. And that's the way with all of us. You want to be free from what you feel like. If we could get credit by doing half an hour's credit a week, instead of three, we would all be very happy. When we got through we wouldn't have the freedom. We wouldn't have something we could use. We wouldn't have something that is worth while. We are slaves. We are servants, all of us, of that set of habits ~~in~~ that we have developed.

We are servants of our environment. We are servants of our background. You take nine people out of ten, and you put them in a ~~a~~ certain situation. You know exactly what they are going to do. Because they are servants of that which has developed in their lives, and in which molds them and directs them, and we were servants of sin, but then we turned from sin, we were justified through Christ, we become servants of righteousness. Luther in here little booklet of the Bondage of the Will said that man is like a donkey. The devil rides him and drives him this way. God rides him and drives him that way. It depends on who is riding him. Of course, this is only on faith. God gives it to him deliberately. He speaks of the deliberateness of the Sons of God. But there is a very real aspect of truth in it. That he is changed from master to another. Christ said, Take my yoke upon you. Give up that yoke of sin, which is a hard yoke, which is a cruel yoke, which is a yoke that leads to misery. Give up that yoke and take my yoke. The yoke that is a blessing and happiness. But we are exchanging the service of sin for the service of Christ, for the glorious liberty of the Sons of God. And for someone to say he has switched

his allegiance, and is still giving allegiance to sin, is of course ridiculous.

Four. The fourth answer that Hodge gives here, is that the wisdom of God is not obvious to the natural man., and this objection that it leads to licentiousness, is based on the idea that man remains in a purely, worldly state of mind, in which he is just looking for what he ~~he~~ can get for himself, and in this state, his mind can only bring forth fruits unto death. But that the one in whom the Spirit within ~~man~~ dwells of the spirit can understand the things of God. And can see that the justification which he has received, inevitably leads to sanctification. In fact, one who has really been justified, is so impressed with the terrible thing he has been saved from and with his own utter ill dessert. He is so convinced with that, that he must do his best to serve the Lord. It cannot lead to licentiousness. So much for the first objection Hodge considers. It is said to lead to licentiousness. The second objection that Hodge deals with, is the claim that it is inconsistent with the grace of the gospel. This is a philosophical objection. We are saved by grace, but it is simply a matter of putting Christ's death to my account, and he secures my salvation, infalliably by his death, where his grace ends. How is God pardoning me? Would it better, if God, just as well forget it, his gospel.

That is an argument that may appeal to the natural man. But anyone who examines the teaching, sees very clearly that it is grace from beginning to end. But it is grace that is working through righteousness and justice. There is not only God, the justifier, of us. But God is just in so doing. It is a transaction in justice, but it is a transaction in which God did not have to enter. It was purely through grace that he chose us, Christ died for us, and he chose us.

The third objection that Hodge deals with is that God cannot declare the unjust to be just. I think that we've dealt with this sufficiently, in our general discussion, of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. God does not say that we are just, but he speaks of us forensically as though we are justified, because Jesus has borne our sins. It is a matter of the whole understanding of what justification means. And I think that we've gone into that sufficiently.

The fourth objection that Hodge gives to us, is one that is taken from Socinus,

the founder of Socinianism or Unitarianism. He considers Christ as a mere man. And so he says, God was under obligation to obey the law, like others, and so the righteousness ~~imputed~~ ^{imputed} to himself, could not be imputed to others. This would be true, if Christ was a mere man. But while Jesus was a man, like ourselves, able to represent us, ~~tempting~~ ^{tempted} in all points as we are, yet without sin; he was also God, the full and perfect one. He himself knew no sin. God made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. He had no obligation toward himself, and he was an infinite person, could take the obligation ~~on~~ ^{page ?} for us. His atonement is sufficient for all, and efficient for the elect. Men moved by the Holy Spirit, did not hesitate to say that the Lord of Glory was crucified and that God purchased the Church with his own blood. Acts 26 to 28.

Fourth argument was Christ's Righteousness due for Himself.

Then the fifth argument is one which we have already looked up in the course of our discussion, but which is so important, that it is worth our looking at rather carefully again. And Hodge has a very good statement.

S-48.

Who can lay anything to the charge of God's elect? Who can. Most of us do all the time. We look at a man who is a Christian, he believes in Christ, he is justified through him, we won't trust him for a minute. And we'll start in pointing out what a wicked fellow he is, and how low down he is, in many ways. We don't see that in ourselves. And here it is necessary to stress again, the fact that justification removes the guilt of sin, and secures us, and forgives us from sin. But we look to God constantly through our Lord, in each ~~individual~~ individual case, we look to him for our forgiveness, and we thank him for it, that it has ~~been~~ been given to us when we were justified.

I want to read to you, a page here of Hodge which is very excellent. It is page 178. "It must be admitted, or rather it is fully acknowledged that every believer feels himself unworthy of the least of God's mercies. He knows that if God were to deal with him according to his character and conduct he must inevitably be condemned.

This sense of ill-desert or demerit, is indelible."

- you touch more things you don't know. And therefore ~~now~~ you are more conscious of your ignorance. And that the same thing is true in righteous that you become, as you increase in righteousness, you become conscious of more areas in which you are a sinner. And you become more conscious of your ill-desert from God, as you increase in righteousness. And so the sense that we deserve nothing in God's hands increases as we grow in Christ. And if it is not increasing in us, it is time to stop and look at ourselves and find out what is wrong. Because ~~the~~ the true Christian realizes that nothing that he ~~is~~ has done deserves the merit of God. That it is purely a matter of God's wonderful grace working within us. This is a righteous judgement, Hodge says, which the sinner passes and cannot ~~pass~~ but pass, upon himself, the ground of his justification is not in himself. The believer acknowledges that in himself he deserves nothing but indignation and wrath, ~~is~~ not only for what he has been, but for what he now is. This is what he feels when he looks at himself. You find a great deal of self-righteousness among Christians. A great deal of looking down on those who are not so good as they are. But this self-righteousness is perhaps as ~~much~~ displeasing to God, as any sin into which we can fall. Because if we are really preceding in righteousness, we are realizing how utterly short, we come of fulfilling his demand for our life.

Here is a terribly wicked sinner, whose righteousness might be about two inches above the floor. Here is a wonderful Christian who might be a foot and a half above the floor. But the righteousness that God requires is up here at the ceiling. We are making progress in the right direction, but in God's sight, we have a very, very long ways to go. And the difference between us is not very great. The true Christian cannot fall into self-righteousness, or if he does, he is very repentant^{mmmm} (4½) of it, when he realizes it. He knows that within himself, he deserves nothing but indignation and wrath, not only for what he has done, but for what he now is. This is what he feels when he looks at himself. And as Luther said to the devil, the devil said, How can a man like you be saved? Look at your sin. Look at what you're doing. Luther said, I'll do ^{it} twice as much, and still I'm saved. Luther didn't mean

that he would thwart God's law. He would be the last person in the world to do that. But he meant as far as my justification is concerned, You're not going to get me all worried and flustered whether it's up to God's ~~man's~~ standard. I know that it is far short of any man. My justification is entirely from him. He knows that there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, That Christ has assumed the responsibility for answering him at the bar of God, that he constantly pleads his own ^{perfect} righteousness, as a reason why the deserved penalty should not be inflicted.

If punishment were not to be deserved, pardon would not be a matter of God's grace. And if not felt to be deserved, deliverance would not be received as a favor. The continued sense of ill desert on the part of the believer, is in no way inconsistent with the scriptural doctrine that the claims of justice in regard to him, have been satisfied by his substitute and advocate. "There ~~is~~ is a great difference, Hodge says, "between demerit and guilt. The latter is the liability in justice to the penalty of the law. The former is personal ill-desert. A criminal who has suffered the legal punishment of his crime, is no longer justly exposed to punishment for that offense. He however thinks of himself no better than he did before. He knows he cannot be subjected to further punishment; but his sense of demerit is not ~~thereby~~ thereby lessened. And so it is with the believer; he knows that, because of what Christ has done for him, he cannot be justly condemned, but he feels and admits that in himself he is as hell-deserving as he was from the beginning."

The fifth objection was that believers continue guilty, and liable to Punishment.

The sixth objection raised to it is that it only concerns the outward. That it is not getting at the question of a man's true character, but it is an outward method. And the answer to that is, if that is true, it does concern what is outward and objective. What is done for the sinner, rather than what is done within him. But this is actually ~~what~~ what the sinner needs. This would be an objection to justification, if justification stood by itself. But justification and sanctification inevitably go together. And the fact that justification ~~is~~ deals wholly with outward, does not mean that it is not necessary to deal with the outward, and in fact, is vital for the outward, at all with that (7 $\frac{1}{2}$). And consequently it is an

objection which is not a reason for giving up the doctrine.

So much for eight. Objections to the Scriptural Views of Justification. And so in order to avoid confusion, between ¹any and a roman numeral ^{one} II we will make the next, J. And J is Other Views of Justification. And when it comes to other views of justification, Hodge discusses these views of Osiander and Stancarus and Piscator. And I'm not going to bother you particularly about their particular views, although if you come into a situation where you are dealing, someone may come forth with a wonderful new explanation, which turns out to be just exactly the same as one of these, it is good to know where it is in Hodge, and turn to it, and find how he answers those particular objections. These were particular men who advanced explanations which don't stand up in the whole of scripture. Also, I am not going to take time with you, to discuss the ideas of justification of men like Barth and Brunner, and Tillich and men like this, if these men do not begin with a recognition that the Bible is our source of knowledge, how can we discuss with them views of what the Bible teaches. They have, from the very start, put themselves into a different area than we are. We can discuss with them whether the Bible is true or not, we can discuss with them whether we should believe in a great God who reveals himself. But when it comes to getting into details of their viewpoint, it is of interest in order to (9½) to show how insufficient the human reason is to decide such matters ~~mf~~ as this.

But when it comes to knowing what the Biblical teaching is, or what God suggests, there is one way of finding out, and that's to see what the Bible says. Not to see what some unbeliever says. The idea that the unbeliever may be very, very clever is very true, or they may be very stupid. But ~~mf~~ they prove nothing about what the Bible teaches. Let's say that you and I had never been to Australia, and had never read anything about it, and we begin to discuss what kind of climate they must have in Australia, we could have some interesting ideas on it, we could present a very clever idea of what life must be like on Australia, but if he doesn't have ~~mf~~ facts, the discussion is worth nothing but for mental exercise.

And the man who does not start with the fundamental proposition that the Bible

is God's word, and what it says provides the data for our understanding of matter^s within the religious and theological field, is starting to leave ~~90~~ 95% of the data out of consideration. And he may show a brilliance of intellect, but his conclusions are absolutely worthless in this particular field. He may guess some things about human nature, in dealing with individuals and one another, and gaining an attitude which would be helpful, ~~and~~ but when it comes to how one can be just before God, how can anyone who rejects ~~and~~ God's word, have any idea that would help on a subject like this? But there are two views of justification, that is, there are three views of justification that we need to know a little about.

There is first, the Pelagian view. We will call that number one under J. The Pelagian view. And the Pelagian view is very common today. But I don't believe that it is very common among what you would call real Bible believing Christians. The Pelagian view is that we must get busy, and work, and make ourselves better, and God's grace will help in that. Of course, that view is only held by Modernism. Human nature is fundamentally good, but we must improve upon it.

There was a man who was in .(12 $\frac{1}{2}$)
 And he was a very fine man. I was talking with him. And he told me how they had gotten a new minister, in a church in San Francisco. And he gave a sermon which was very excellent. But his sermon was this. The story of the prodigal son. Who was the wicked one in the story of the prodigal son? It is the elder brother. The prodigal son was the son of his father all the time. What he needed was to realize that his father (14). The elder brother made it difficult for him. We are the elder brother. We should make it easy, and tell people that they are all God's children. They simply have to come ~~back~~ back,

S-49.

- but it is often found within the Christian Church.

And number two. The Roman Catholic View. And the Roman Catholic view, is sometimes called semi-Pelagian, and sometimes semi-Augustinian, but according to the Roman Catholic view, human nature is utterly lost, man deserves no goodness of God.

He is completely wicked. It starts exactly with us. But then, it says, that in baptism, he is brought into the kingdom of God, and grace is infused in him, and that God sees the grace that is in him, and justifies him, for the grace that God has given him. And then, after he is baptised, the sin which can, but if he doesn't use the grace that God has infused in him, he can use the means of grace to win the grace to him. In the belief, in the doctrine of the scripture, it is a thousand times closer then the Pelagian view. But it slips at the vital point of altogether losing the Pauline message of justification by faith alone. Not what we've done, not what is infused into us, nor our deserving, nor our ability, not our relation to the Church, but it is the grace of Christ alone that saves us. And so it is a view which leads off and gives the people a realization of the terribleness of sin, and of the need of a saviour, much more than ~~(the)~~ the Pelagian view, but it gives a false satisfaction, a substitute for a true knowledge of salvation.

I imagine there are many people in the Roman Catholic Church, who take simple statements, and put their trust in it, and they are saved. But the more one learns about the doctrine, the less after he is saved, because it leads him away rather than forward.

(Question: Within the Lutheran church there are just as many modernistic ideas as there are in any other church, but the fundamental teachings, the that is, the teaching of the church contrary. absolutely to the

Well, then, that is the Roman Catholic view, and third there is the Arminian view. And the Arminian view is much nearer then the Roman Catholic view. The Arminian (or the Remonstrants), according to this view, Christ died as an example, to make a moral impression on the universe, of God's justice, that he was so insistent on justice, that he was willing to give His son, to show His ~~human~~ hatred of sin. And that a person might believe on Christ, and through belief on Christ, he would enter into the kingdom of God, but then that it was necessary that he win heaven, by evangelical obedience. By exerting a faith, by showing forth works of righteousness, not moral works, but works of obeying the gospel, of showing faith etc. Now this doctrine can get like the Roman Catholic's, perhaps more so, a person ~~(can)~~ with a slight understanding of it, and get from it the heart of the gospel a true Christian as he realizes it. and go forward and become . But as one learns more about it, one is apt to lose his

hold of this fundamental doctrine, of justification by faith.

James Oorsays

Wesley/was about half way between Calvinism and Arminianism and a little nearer to Calvinism than to Arminianism, but if you take the statement that Wesley made about the death of Christ, and his own utter ill-desert any thing in God's hand, he , even his life of sacrifice to the Lord, fit in with the Orr meant. as statement that James. Wesley, not so much Wesley, ~~was~~ some of his close associates reacted very strongly against the attitude of some individuals who felt that an understanding of the ~~man's~~ sovereignty of God was the most important issue in the earth. And they thought that through understanding, to understand ~~the~~ God's sovereignty, would be of course the thing that would be best so much, that man's responsibility would probably lead him to God. And Wesley and some others ~~also~~ reacted against that. but did not react

Whitefield was a very thorough going calvinist, and Whitefield and Wesley worked together in the closest of harmony, as long as Whitefield lived. But it was individuals who put their emphasis on being sure you dot every 1, and cross every T of the dogma, instead of putting the true heart of ~~the~~ Calvinism, and the true emphasis there. Who led some of Wesley's associates to react very strongly into the opposite direction. Wesley himself had a magazine ~~(the)~~ which he called the ~~Remonstrant~~ Arminian/ border. But actually it was Arminian in its reaction to hyper-Calvinism emphasis, but it was not arminian in his teaching .

Justification by faith alone, is the Protestant doctrine, and I think that we would find that everything that Wesley ~~is~~ said was definitely nearer this view than to the true remonstrant or Arminian view.

As Hodge quotes on page 195, from Wesley's book, "Hymns and Spiritual~~man's~~ Songs" . which is about as fine a statement of the ~~scriptural~~ scriptural doctrine of justification as I've ~~any~~ ~~many~~ ever seen ~~in~~ anywhere.

"Join, earth, and heaven to bless The Lord our Righteousness.

The mystery of redemption this, This the Saviour's strange design -
Man's offence was counted his. Ours his righteousness divine.

In Him complete we shine; His death, his life, is mine;
Fully am I justified, Free from sin, and more than free,

Guiltless, since for me He died; Righteous, since He lived for me."

How superior this is, to many of the jingles we hear today. Which brings out one truth of scripture and stresses it alot, but do not give you a coverage of scriptural doctrine as such.

M
3/6/57.

Yesterday we looked at various theories about justification, other than that found in the New Testament. And I want to stress again the great importance, of holding the Biblical view of justification. It is the entrance to the Christian life. It is that through which we receive eternal life, and without which, we cannot possibly have it. I think, right at this point, I ~~think~~ think I ought to mention the statement that had to do so much with the ~~development~~ development of the movement from which Faith Seminary proceeded. The issuance of the Auburn Affirmation, in 1923. Now, that Auburn Affirmation may seem very harmless. It is very carefully written. But as it speaks, it specifically denies the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. and that of course, undercuts the very foundation of our knowledge of anything in theology. How can we know that one is justified before God, if we do not have an absolutely dependable word from him that tells us what it is. All we can do otherwise is to see what people think, and study the shifting ideas of fallible and sinful men, or to see who is happy and who isn't, and see what sort of belief, they hold. But any philosophy of these things that is not based on the solid word of God is absolutely useless as far as giving us definite information in this field is concerned. But the Auburn Affirmation specifically denies the statement of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. as ~~a~~ adopted in 1923, that it is an essential doctrine of the word of God and ~~our~~ our standards that the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide, and move the writers of Holy Scripture, as to keep them from error. It exclusively denies that and once that is done, it ~~knocks~~ knocks the foundation out of any knowledge of how to be right with God.

Not only does it do that, it goes on to take up the other doctrines, among them specifically number three, It is an essential doctrine of the word of God and our standards that Christ offered up himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, and

to reconcile us to God. The Auburn Affirmation says, We hold most earnestly to these great facts and doctrines. We all believe from the bottom of our hearts that the writers were inspired of God. That Jesus Christ, was God manifest in the flesh, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and through Him we have our redemption. That having died for our sins, he rose from the dead, and is our ever living Saviour, that in His earthly ministry he wrought many mighty works, and by His vicarious death, and his un failing strength he is able to save us to the uttermost. Some of us regard the particular theories contained in the Deliverance of the General Assembly of 1923, as satisfactory explanations of these facts and doctrines. But we are united in believing that these are not the only theories allowed by ~~man~~ the Scriptures and our standards. As explanation of these facts and doctrines of our religion and all ~~men~~ who hold to these facts and doctrines, whatever theories they may employ to explain them are worthy of all consciousness and fellowship.

You see they affirm that the Bible is inspired, but they deny that it's without error. They affirm the incarnation, but they say the Virgin Birth is only a theory. They affirm the atonement, but say that the fact that Christ died as a sacrifice, to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God, is only a theory. And this is extremely important at this point, because if we do not have the substitutionary atonement, and salvation through what Christ did. We then are yet in our sin. You can present all the views and ethical sermons that you want, and you can give all the lovely pronouncements on peace of mind, and all the fine discussions of how our nation should deal better with other nations, but if you do not have the basic fact of the verbal inspiration of the scripture, and of the substitutionary atonement, and its results, its forensic justification, people are going to continue to go to hell. So it is a very, very vital foundation of our whole Christian testimony. And I thought that right at this point, that we're finished with justification and we are ready to start sanctification, that I have to mention this, and stress again the importance of a clear understanding of these points, ~~in~~ in order that we lead people rightly, rather than to lead them astray, and ^{HELP THEM FROM} to escape ^{FROM} the CORRUPTION FOR WHICH WE ARE

II SANCTIFICATION.

And first under that, we'll say, A. Sanctification - What it is.

And I asked my wife this morning, What is sanctification? And she answered, The process of being made like the Lord. I think it is a very good definition. The same thing is given more fully, of course, in the Westminster Confession, but this gives us a very simple statement. Sanctification is the process of being made like the Lord. Now the Westminster Confession says, it is "the work of God's free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin and live unto righteousness." This of course, explains to you more about the details of it.

There is an important thing to have in mind in the study of theology. Theology is not per se a word study of Biblical words. It is not that. Paul uses faith in one sense. James uses it in another sense. Paul and James teach exactly the same doctrine. But they use the words in somewhat different sense. If you try to use their usage of the word in the same sense, you don't get them contradicting each other simply, you get one or the other of them speaking nonsense. You cannot take the word Faith, in precisely the same sense, in Paul and James, and get sense out of it. They use the word in a slightly different sense, but in the context, each makes it absolutely clear, how we use it.

The word Trinity is not a Biblical word. We do not have it specifically in the Bible. But we have the teaching very clearly in the Bible, and we gather that teaching from different parts of the Bible, and we summarize it with the word Trinity. We have no one ~~meaning~~ ^{statement} in the Bible which gives us the full calculated formula of the person of Christ. Or which even gives it in brief. But we have the fact clearly represented. And so in our study of theology we take technical terms to indicate specific facts. It is very important in the study of the Bible to take specific Biblical words and find out exactly what those words mean, as used in the Bible. But for our understanding of theology, it is important to take words to designate specific contrasts which are vital in our Theology, regardless of whether the words

are always used in that same sense, in the Biblical usage or not.

Now in justification we didn't have this problem very much, because justification, while ~~as~~ it is used occasionally, in a sense different from our doctrine of justification, and is clearly pointed out in the context, when it does, that is quite rare. In almost all cases, justification, used as a term in the Bible means, "Caused to be considered as just." That is a use that is almost universal in the Bible.

But the word sanctify is different. And the word sanctify is used in the scripture in a number of cases where in the context the meaning is a very important meaning and it represents very important teaching, and is very vital to understand, but where it is not specifically related to the present matter we're taking up, the matter of sanctification, as the word sanctification has come to be used by the Protestant theologians. It expresses a very definite and clear concept, and it is a concept which ~~is~~ is contained very definitely in the scripture. And sometimes expressed by the word sanctify, sometimes given without the use of this particular word, and sometimes this particular word is used in a sense somewhat different. But it is always easy to be sure ~~of~~ of that from the ~~context~~ context.

Now I call your attention to III John. That is I John the third chapter, the second verse, begins with justification and continues to sanctification. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God," there's adoption. There is justification and it results in adoption. If we have believed in Christ, we are justified. And the man who is justified, is adopted into the family of God. He is a son of God. That is his position. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God." It is a fact, completed now. The standing is there. But he continues, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be." Does that mean we are going to become something better than sons of God? No, there is nothing better than sons of God. That is the highest position that a human being could ever attain to., to be a son of God. That is, he can't become a member of the trinity. He cannot become God. But to become a son of God is the highest position that a human being can ever attain, and that position is attained, as soon as we believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, he is justified, he is adopted into the family of God, he is made a son of God. So we are now the sons

of God, and so far as position is concerned, the only way we can go is down. There is no higher place to which to go. He is not continuing to talk about position, he is talking about condition.

Here is ~~his~~ our position, we are at the pinnacle, we are sons of God. It does not yet appear what our condition is going to be. But we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." Here is a condition, sons of God. A position of sons of God. A standing. State: We don't know what we are going to be, but we know that when he appears, we will be like him, and everyone that has this hope in him, works toward this. He purifies himself, even as he is pure. The process of being made like the Lord.

Romans 8: 29 is another expression of this fact in our lives. "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren." He has given us the position of being sons of God. We are justified. ~~We~~ But he has predestinated us, that we should be conformed. We shall be changed into the image of his son.

II ~~Corinthians~~ Corinthians 3: 18. "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." We are ^{gradually} changed into ^{his} ~~this~~ image, not instantaneously, like we are justified. We do not suddenly change from being wicked creatures, to being good creatures. From ^{being} those who are ~~doing~~ doing evil, to those who ~~are~~ God thinks are a hundred times more good. (9). We do not. We change from those who are servants of satan to being servants of God. We change from those whose position is headed for destruction, to those whose position is sons of God. But we change from glory to glory, as in an open glass, beholding the glory of the Lord. We are gradually changed into his image. Now these three verses, along with many others, present the clear Biblical teaching that there is a process through which every Christian passes. A process, by which, he is conformed to the image of Christ. He is changed from his present position, into a position which is like the Lord, enabled more and more, to die unto the Son, sons of sin, and to live unto righteousness.

And so that is a general statement of what it is. It is not a statement of what the word, Sanctified, specifically means, in a way that can fit the word in all cases. There are cases where it is very definitely used of this process. Now the word as used in scripture may be interpreted in such a way as to cover several things, including this. But in our present purpose, we are dealing with this specific development. Which is sometimes considered to be indicated by that word, other times it seems to be used without the use of that word. But we use this word as a technical word, for this process.

And so I want to give you under this definition now, under A. What it is. I want to give you five subheads, to clarify just what we mean by sanctification. These are pretty well covered with very meticulous statements about the definition on page 213 of Hodge. But I'm going to arrange them slightly differently. You'll just have to state them slightly differently.

First, Sanctification deals with condition, not with position. That we have already made clear, I trust, but it is extremely important. We have noticed that we have two lines of development. These lines are inter-related. But they are well thought of as distinct, because the principles in them are different. And the first is the line of position, or standing, which is a line of instantaneous change. This is the field of absolute. One is a human being or he is not a human being. There is no middle ground. One is an American citizen, or he is not an American citizen. There is no middle ground. Something exists or it does not exist. There is no middle ground. We are sons of God, or we are not sons of God. There is no middle ground.

Our standing is that of creatures lost and going to hell, or it is of those who are saved, and have eternal life already. It is one or the other. This line of justification is absolutely definite. It is either one or the other. And it is vital that we understand this. And that is the line of our position. Our standing is we are there or we are this. But this does not relate to position or standing, it relates to state or condition, and state or condition in this present life, is a relative time. There is no man who is entirely bad, there is no man who is entirely good, but we are all at various stages in between. And we cannot say that all those

who are saved, are in a certain area of goodness, and all those who are lost are in a different area, because there are people who are lost, who are ethically much more superior than some who ~~are~~ ^{are saved.} ~~are~~. There are people who are saved, who are ethically inferior to some men who are lost, but who are being sanctified. And there are people who are lost, who are much superior to men who are saved, but who are degenerating. It is a relative thing, and one in which every individual differs from every other individual. No two individuals are precisely the same.

S-51.

The wrath of God is abiding upon us, or we are sons of God, who now have eternal life. So this relates then to condition, ~~but~~ not to position.

And two, we have already dealt with in this, but it is important, that we have it specifically stated, that Sanctification is a process, not an act. There are many acts in sanctification. But justification is an act of God. We who ~~are~~ ^{were} lost, are justified. There's one act, instantaneously applied. Sanctification involves many acts. And so it can properly be expressed as a process. Sanctification is a process, not an act.

And three, I have stated, but it is good to have in the opposite, in this way. Sanctification ~~is~~ deals with that which is relative, not without that which is absolute, as in the case of justification. It is very, very important that we have that ~~distinction~~ distinction in mind. The tendency of many in any earlier time, was to make everything absolute. And today there is a tremendous reaction against that, and the denial there are any ~~absolutes~~ absolutes. The denial of all absoluteness leads to chaos. And the making of everything absolute leads to nonsense. But it is vital that we distinguish what is in each category.

Sanctification is in the sphere of the relative. Justification is in the sphere of the absolute. Sanctification cannot be absolute, and still be (2 $\frac{1}{2}$).

Number four, There are certain senses in which sanctification could be spoken of as absolute. Now the first of those senses, I think, is a long sense. That is, small a under that. When the term is used to mean justification it is used in a way,

to show that we are speaking about something that is absolute. Now the scripture sometimes uses it ~~in~~, in a way which may mean justification. That is because they did not have our technical, theological vocabulary before them to use. Our technical ~~vocabularies~~ vocabularies in any science are based on the state of our knowledge. Our material is put into words to convey ideas to the readers, at the time and at all subsequent times. And you will occasionally find a statement that sounds as if our sanctification is absolute, but which in the context, is ~~using~~ using the word sanctify to make holy, in the same sense as justify to make just. To give the position rather than the condition. And so when it is used in that sense, naturally it is spoken of as absolute.

But there is another sense, in which it is used, which is related to that, that sounds absolute. That is when it indicates that one is set apart unto God. To make Holy in the scripture means to set apart unto God more than specifically to make ethically righteous, that is, as a work. But as a teaching we can take out those statements which are dealing with the condition, and we find specific passages dealing specifically dealing with them, but there are usages of the word, which sound naturally, and it is understandable in this way, that it is signifying sanctified, in the sense that it is being set apart unto God. Now, of course, that is somewhat of a position. ~~But~~ But it is not strictly position, because it is not a matter of being given a position of safety or honor, of that of being put over, as though belonging to God, and upon whom he is working.

I'm merely mentioning this to avoid misunderstanding these passages which might seem to give you the impression of its seeming to be absolute here.

But now there is a third way that sanctification is used in a way that sounds absolute, and that is as referring to justification. - No, ~~my~~ excuse me, it is referring to regeneration. Regeneration is a matter of condition, rather than of position. And regeneration is a divine act which changes our condition. And regeneration is a divine act, which has a purpose or has not a purpose, in the case of every individual. Only we have no way, by itself, of proving that regeneration has occurred or not. We can see the results of regeneration. But we cannot see that that person

has been regenerated. We take that on faith, because we know that if they are justified, they have been regenerated. But we can speak of one who has been regenerated, that he has been sanctified, in the sense that there has been introduced into him, a new ~~principle~~ principle, which is not in those who have not been regenerated, and which while they may be very small, and absolutely impossible for anybody to observe, is a living principle. It may be like a grain of mustard seed. You put it in the ground. and you would hunt, and unless you have mighty good ~~the~~ eyes, you wouldn't ~~even~~ even notice it. You would pass over it. But it is there, and it has life in it, and it can grow, and if it ~~is~~ is not there, it cannot grow. And so ~~is~~ there is that way, in which you can think of it as absolute, that the person who is in the process of sanctification, has been regenerated, and this process is definitely there. It is absolute, but it is there, or it is not there.

(Question. I mean sanctification taken as a whole, because sanctification, I hesitated about that phraseology, but I couldn't think of a better one. Sanctification is not an act, in the same sense that justification is, because justification is one act. But sanctification is many acts. And there can be no sanctification unless it starts with one vital absolutely necessary act - the act of regeneration. But in the course of sanctification there are many other acts. And consequently, putting all the acts together, we call it a process. It is any process. There is hardly a process in the world where there is a gradual change, so gradual that you can not point out, the places where sharp changes occur. And so there are, in almost any process there are acts. But in this one especially there are many acts. But it is a process in the sense that it involves many acts, rather than simply being long.)

(Question: C under 4. There I said, as referring to regeneration it can be used in a way that sounds absolute, because regeneration is an act which has either occurred, or has not occurred. And these are they who are sanctified in the sense that they've been regenerated. It doesn't mean their sanctification is complete. It means that it has begun. And there is in God's sight, an absolute difference ~~between~~ between those in whom sanctification has commenced, by regeneration, and in those in whom it has not commenced. There is an absolute difference. But the difference as far as man

can observe is far greater between those who have come a long way, and those

(9 $\frac{1}{2}$), then it is between those who have started it, and those who haven't started yet.)

Now C then was referring to regeneration, and number four, that is small d. It can be spoken of as absolute, as referring to the completed sanctification which is assured and certain. It is assured and certain as part of God's plan. That is, you can speak of those who are sanctified in the sense that those whom God has determined shall be completely sanctified eventually, and between complete sanctification, and the lost, there is of course, an absolute difference. But between individuals along the road, it is strictly relative and no one reaches complete sanctification in this life. Well, so much for the moment for number four, which was that there are senses in which sanctification is spoken of as absolute.

Number five. Sanctification strictly speaking, refers to character rather than to the good works which are the fruits of character. There can be good works which are not fruits of character. And sanctification is not a matter of how many things a good person does, but it is a matter of what he is. And God is interested in the good things which we do. He is interested in the good works that we perform. But he is more interested in the development of the character which does, and will perform good works. Sanctification describes our condition ~~name~~ rather than our outward accomplishments. And that would enter into our further discussion, to have that in mind.

So much then for what sanctification is, which we called, capital A. Under, II, Sanctification. And then we look at B, It's importance. It is much stressed in scripture. ~~h~~ Some of our fundamental groups in their great emphasis on justification, or the beginning of salvation, and therefore, they tend to neglect this word, and emphasis comparable to the scriptural truth on sanctification. And in our Christian life there are the two main areas of our activity. There is the area dealing with justification, and there is the area dealing with sanctification. And just as you can't have justification without sanctification, and there is nothing more important for us to do then to lead others to believe and to be justified, but it is extremely

important for us who are ~~justified~~ justified to go forward in sanctification, and the scripture stresses this a great deal.

And so we simply mention number one. It is much stressed in scripture, and I won't give you a lot of references under that.

S-52.

- that we be his instrument in leading others to be ~~justified~~ justified. Be tremendously interested that we be his instrument in forwarding the sanctification ~~in~~ of others. But I believe I can safely say that God is more interested in the progress of each one of us himself in sanctification. That is to say, God can take care of the works of others without our part. He wants to use us, and he wants us to grow much in this field, and our doing it is an outworking of our sanctification, but as far as each of us is concerned, he has a work to conform us into ~~in~~ the image of God, and he is tremendously interested that that work be accomplished. And while God is greatly interested in the unselfish activity that you do for his part, he is even more interested in the development of your character that is produced and exemplified by your doing that work, then he is to the actual work. ~~It~~ It is the area ~~in~~ of our lives, in which most of our efforts sanctify. We are justified when we believe. We cannot make ourselves more justified. We cannot lose our justification. Part of our justification, gratitude for it, it has a great part in our lives, but there is nothing that we can do to change it. ~~It~~

But our sanctification is a matter that we are expected to work out. And everything that we do, has an affect in forwarding or retarding our sanctification, And so it is an area of theology, that is mighty important that we have clear thought about it. So much for number two, it is the area in our salvation where most of our efforts would enter.

Number three, It is a subject on which misunderstanding can do great harm.

There are many people who are justified, who have a very slight understanding of how they are justified. And it is a grand thing to bring them an understanding of the basis on which they are justified. It is important. It is vital. It is helpful. And

it is especially helpful in helping them to help others to believe on Christ and to be justified. But as far as our justification is concerned, it is done. It is accomplished, and if we have a simple misunderstanding on it, this view does not affect it. But our sanctification, being an area in which we should work, it is an area in which misunderstanding can greatly impede or slow up our accomplishment. There can be the misunderstanding that it does not matter, that God has justified us, and we can live anyway we want to. And of course, if a person carries that misunderstanding very far, it is pretty good proof that he has never been justified.

But a person who has been justified, who has a misunderstanding of it, will precede with his sanctification, but it may be very, very slow. An awful lot slower than it should be. Then again there are those who take the opposite view. There are those who say their sanctification is complete. They are now perfect in God's sight, as far as their condition is concerned, as well as their position. And when you get to know somebody like this, you are apt to find that the result of his thinking that his sanctification is complete, is to lower his standard of what God requires of character, and of attitude. To lower it to the point where, he fails to make the progress towards God, that he should make. Or to cover over, a few aspects of his character, which it is the Lord's will that he should open up and lay bear, in order that they may be sanctified.

And so misunderstanding in the sphere of sanctification can do more harm in our own development, in our own relation to God, than in most other areas of theology. There are other areas in which a wrong idea of the things of Christ is a very part of Christian belief, and its progress and it is vital that we get it. But in this area, it can impede and slow up that ~~the why~~ which is the fundamental reason for our remaining on this earth, and why we have been saved. And therefore, it is very important, that we avoid misunderstanding why a clear knowledge of the stated essentials of this matter, sanctification.

Now, Capital C. Sanctification is a process which usually involves struggle, and part of ones progress, and which is never complete in this life. Now that is a statement which enlarges the definition perhaps then this, and which ~~answers~~

enters a little bit into the field of the knowledge of how we proceed in sanctification, but I think that it is very good to get it in mind in this point. We find that even the apostle Paul tells us in Philippians 2: 12, that he had not as yet attained. No, that's not Philippians 2: 12, although the same thought is there. "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." 2: 12, then, tells them to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, and 3: 12, applies it to himself. He says, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which I also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." Then in verse ten, "That I may know him, and be made conformable unto his death - Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before. I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Even Paul had not yet attained. Even Paul had much progress to make.

There is a matter of struggle, a matter of stepping forward, a matter of definite ~~undamant~~ effort for accomplishment. Now you are studying Romans seven, and I trust that from the various commentaries you have looked at, you have all of you found something of the diversity of opinion about the last part of Romans 7. Is Paul talking about himself, or "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" or is he talking about the man who is not yet saved? Which is he talking about. Some commentators say one thing, some say the other. There are many who think that this is the description of the saved man. Its a struggle involved in his sanctification. If all commentators would agree upon this, I believe my statement here, I would not say a process that usually involves, but I would simply say, a process involving. But since there are some who say this must be a picture of the unsaved man before he is regenerated, since there are, I put in that word usually. Because I am sure that it will fit with the usual interpretation of Christian, that even if this seventh chapter doesn't describe the whole course of

their life, it describes a situation in which most of them find themselves at some time or another. Even if, some feel that it should be taken as primarily describing the un-saved, ~~man~~, while Luther and Calvin insisted that it described a saved man, and there are many others, in fact, the majority of them that feel that way, but there are some who feel the other way about it.

But it is an experience, which if it is not the experience of every saved man, is certainly at some time or other, the experience of practically every one, that he goes through this struggle as of striving to make progress in his sanctification, desiring something with his mind, but finding himself not getting the results that he feels that he ought to get.

II Corinthians 4: 16-18. Paul says, "For which cause we faint not: but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory:" Our affliction, we faint not, the inward man is renewed, day by day. He points out this process, this struggle, this effort to go forward in the Christian life. This effort is a matter of sanctification. There is no effort in justification.

Justification is a gift of God purely on the basis of the work of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is complete, absolutely complete, when we receive it. It is the robe of righteousness which is put upon us. It has either been put upon us, or it has not been put upon us. We just rest in the Lord. But sanctification involves a struggle in the case of most individuals and I think that we can say that in the case of all individuals who make progress in sanctification, there are at least areas which involve various severe choices. (12 $\frac{1}{2}$). And everyone that we find who has improved his condition into the image of God, will find points in his sanctification which involve a very great deal of struggle.

S-53, 3/7/57.

- and I originally wrote that without the word usually in it, then I inserted it, that it usually involves partly the account there are those who say they know Christians who just seem to make a complete change and they just have an easy, lovely spiritual life,

with no struggle. Well, I've never heard anybody tell me himself that that was his experience. But there are some who say that is the experience of others, and I thought that we could put in the word usually as a little bit of a guard, but it is rare. But there was another reason that I put it in. It was because there is considerable controversy about one of the most outstanding passages on the struggle of the Christian for his sanctification.

Romans 7: 15-24. I trust that all of you have read it by this time, studied that passage in three commentaries, and to give us the report on them, showing particularly what their general interpretation of it is. Now I came across a verse in Christian Evidence, of a difficulty of trusting secondary sources. I have a book here called Bible Knowledge, Part I. Romans 1 - 11. The All-Graded ~~man~~ Bible Series of Adult Lessons, published by the Scripture Press. And in this on page 87 it says about Romans 7: 15-24, it says, "^{Hodge} quotes the experience is ^{that} ~~man~~ of natural or ~~unsaved~~ ^{unsaved} man throughout, truly and deeply convicted of sin, but never regenerated." Now they don't give a reference to that place in Hodge. They simply say that is how Paul interprets the passage. How many of you used Hodge as one of your three commentaries? Now those of you who used Hodge, who found him teaching what this quotes keep your hands up. In other words, no one of you who looked at Hodge, agrees with this quotation that the Scripture Press gives.

There are several Hodes. When you say Hodge without any words with it, you usually mean Charles Hodge. There is also A. A. Hodge, and one or two others. But when it comes to theology, Charles Hodge is such an outstanding figure, you would certainly expect that Hodge alone would mean Charles. This has a bibliography in the back which says Charles Hodge, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. And you should also know that in the Systematic Theology, Hodge devotes a couple of pages to very strongly insisting that Romans 7 is the experience of the saved man, struggling against sin. And in his commentary on Romans which I have here with me he is very, very clear, and strongly insistent that ^{but} that is what it must mean, ~~what~~ he said, that there are real evangelical scholars who take it the other way, but he cannot see how they can get that conclusion out of it. He gives very strong reasons why he says it is the picture of the saved man.

And I have Luther's commentary here on Romans in which he speaks very, very strongly

in giving 11 different reasons, why we must feel that this is the saved man's experience, given in this last half of Romans 7. Calvin, Luther, and Hodge not only hold that, but give very strong reasons for holding it. Now there are some men, I suppose, and some others who are really evangelical who hold the opposite. But it is certainly held by the majority of good commentaries that this is a saved man.

I think we must say this, that most Christians go through the experiences described in Romans 7, the last part of it, and if you never had that experience, there is no guarantee that you won't get it, because most Christians do have that experience. In fact, I am inclined to say, that if a Christian doesn't go through that experience, he probably has not realized the true meaning of sin, as fully as he should. He probably will, if he gets to thinking about what Christ means, and what his life should be, he will have that experience. Now that is not the experience the Christian should always be in, but it certainly is an experience which most Christians sometimes go through. It should not be the state he is in, but it is the state which he goes through.

Sanctification is a process which usually involves struggle and is part of one's progress, and which is never complete in this life. Now I'm sure that nobody will question that last part. It is never complete in this life.

Hebrews 12: Surely he is speaking to Christians here. Hebrews 12: 1. "Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, (He doesn't say, accept Christ and be rid of your sin. I think the assumption here is regarding people who have accepted Christ and of whom he is speaking.) Let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us. Verse three, "For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin." You say, well, I can't help myself. Well, Paul doesn't say, well, just don't bother, it's all in Christ. No. He says, You have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin. And then in verses 14 to 15, he said, "Follow (the word is pursue, go after, catch it) Follow peace with all men, and sanctification, without which no man shall see the Lord." The word which is five times translated sanctification, in fact it's the only word in the Bible that is translated

sanctification, is here translated holiness. Follow peace with all men, and holiness. Whichever of the two ways you translate it. It is something that is to be followed after. To be striven for. The next verse, "Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled."

I Corinthians 9: 26-27. "I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air: But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." I keep under my body, I bring it into subjection. There is a struggle, there is an effort, there is an objective. I run, I fight, not as one that beats the air, I'm not just going through shadow boxing. You are fighting as one that beats the air, if you're struggling to get justification, because you simply believe in the Lord. And he has justified you. We trust him for all that he is, and all of your sins are forgiven in his righteousness, and for you to go through work and through effort, to strive to get forgiveness for your sins, is beating the air, because Christ has given it ^{to} ~~you~~ you, and it is your right to rest in it.

But when it comes to the handling of the physical, and mental, and moral factors of your personality, he has given you a tact. Use it, and master it. You should not be as particularly in the morning, I was, when I lay there, and knew I could get up, and wanted to get up, but just stalled for time, half an hour of fighting for the fact of getting up, the body was the master instead of I. It held me there. I did not keep it in subjection. I was subject to it. Well, now maybe the way I should have kept it in subjection, is to have gone to bed an hour earlier, so I wouldn't have been quite so tired. What ever the manner which we use, it is our responsibility to keep it in subjection.

Now we looked at Romans 7, and in Romans 7 we have a very vivid statement of a man, struggling against sin. I have not said that sanctification is a battle that we must step into and move quite suddenly. I said that it is a process involving sanctification. It is a process in which Christ will give us the victory, and we cannot cannot confuse it as a part in the struggle, and I think that was the meaning of Romans 7. That he finds his victory ~~in his resources~~ in the resources of Christ, not in ~~his~~ his struggle. But you must struggle, before you find that victory, or you won't realize it. And the struggle should

be the central part of the experience of the Christian. But that the victory is due to Christ, not to our struggle. I don't think that Paul is saying, This is my condition now, but I think that Paul is saying, this is an experience that I've gone through. For the present I am simply dealing with the fact that sanctification is not like justification, something which the whole ^{appearance} (14) is met and satisfied, by the direction and complete work of Christ.

S-54. 3/7/57. (0)

between
- as it seems, the ascetic view of the world, that says the world is evil, and all that ascetic people enjoy, are of the world, and of the flesh. We should get off by ourselves and contemplate God only, think of Him, and try to redeem ourselves from the sinfulness of the world, and to that, he just lies down in sin, and takes all the pleasures of the world that he can find there. It is by far the better of the two. But the stress, ^{not} merely from Romans 7, but from these other verses, and I think they are intensified in their effect from Romans 7, I think that we see that usually, I don't say that sanctification is usually struggling. I say that it is a process that usually involves struggle. By usual I don't mean every day, but by individuals, sometime or other, it involves struggle. And when the person says, ~~I'm fighting~~ I've arrived. I don't need to think of that anymore. Christ has given me His righteousness, and I don't need to worry about pleasures consuming my members. When he says that, sometimes he is like the man who is sitting in a boat just drifting along peacefully and calmly and all of a sudden the boat is caught in the current, headed for Niagara, and it is pretty hard to jump. It is not something to be taken for granted.

Philippians 2: 12-13. Philippians 2: 12, we looked at yesterday, "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation." Now that doesn't mean that you earn your justification. It doesn't mean win God's favor by merit. It doesn't mean that at all. But it does mean that there is in the life of every individual, there are points at which real struggle is involved, and at which we are to work out our salvation.

Philippians 3: 12. Philippians 3, now here we have Paul, this disciple, ^{VERY} ~~presently~~

important on the present point, and will be on the point that Mr. Wong raised. Paul in his missionary journey, was Paul a perfect example of what a sanctified man should be? Paul says, in verse 12, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after." I follow after. And this is the word that he used when he said he persecuted the church. He chased them as far as Damascus. He tried to get them. He used every effort to get them. He followed after, and here he said, "I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended; but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before. I follow after. Again, the word follow. In this case, it means, I press forward. This brings out the struggle idea more than the usual translation, the word follow. "I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." And then so in Paul's case there was a real struggle involved, even if Romans 7 is not talking about it.

Well, then in Acts 24: 16, Paul says, to Felix, "And herein do I exercise myself, to have always a conscience void of offence toward God, and toward men." He doesn't say, well, now isn't it wonderful, God has given me a conscience that is perfect. I'm sound, I'm pure. I'm free from all struggle. He says, I exercise myself, to have always a conscious void of offence toward God. These apostles were real men. They were men, like you and me. Jesus Christ was a real man, but he was without sin. The apostles were men like us. And they were men who had a struggle.

D. How we secure sanctification.
logical

The most presentation of how we secure it is this, and this, and this, through this. To lay out four logical categories and discuss each one of them, as a separate unit by itself, might give you a clearer, intellectual understanding of the matter, then we have hope that I might attain. But it, my giving this C before D, and my handling D the way I'm going to, is intended not only to give an intellectual understanding, but to try to give you an application of the problems that are in it. So in any one of these heads, please do not assume, that I completed them all. And if you think of something else, which is very fatal, or even more vital than what I've given you, mark it.

If anything that I give under D, seems to be unwarranted, that this is not so great as something else, but if you think that there is something else as important, or more so, mention it. But D, I'm starting with this, How we secure sanctification.

Number one. If we have really been justified, and have truly taken Christ by faith to be to us all that he offers himself, we can never be satisfied to continue in our sin. Pardon of guilt does not remove sin of demerit — ; contrition for continuing sin is increased, desire to become _____ in reality, but we are counted to be, _____ must be present _____ in every believer _____, even if sometimes we are _____. (11).

The person who has been justified, and who truly has God's favor, never ceases to glory at God's grace and justice. He will improve in his righteousness, and he will increase in boldness. But the becoming status is like the illustration we gave of knowledge. It is like discussing knowledge, it opens up to him more areas of sin that he hadn't realized. And so although he always rejoices in what God has done, he is always increasing in his marvel that God has been so good to him. He is increasing in his realization of how much the righteousness of Christ means to him justification. I read to you the last time, in the case of knowledge, that the removal of guilt does not remove the sense of what we were in. The realization of what we ~~was~~ really are, and though we are not held guilty for it, and that when the tempter comes, we can say, "Yes, but Christ died for me. This is under the blood. And we know that we have eternal life. Yet we know what we are ourselves, and we feel our demerit, and we constantly seek forgiveness.

I come to you and say that you are destined to eternal hell, but I'm going to give you a pardon. Here it is. Don't do what you did.

(13). A person who has that sort of idea, has an utterly false idea of the Gospel. _____. But a person who knowingly deserves hell, knowing that he is a sinner, knowing that in him there is nothing good, receives justification, and Christ's merit, a

accounted to him, and received Christ for all that Christ offered Himself to be, the saviour and Lord, and granted him _____ through all eternity. The one who _____ that,

to be in reality what

And so sanctification must inevitably follow, if the justification

S-55.

This may sometimes be unrecognized, but I believe that it is there in the plan.

And preaching on justification, as what it is, and what it means, and how undeserving we are, should bring the sincere mind of itself, even with no mention of sanctification.

Number two. Sanctification begins as a supernatural work of God's free grace that is the miracle of regeneration. Regeneration is a part of sanctification. Everyone who is justified, has regeneration. He has been regenerated. I would say that he must have been regenerated, or he couldn't have believed, to be sanctified. But apart from that we do know this, that the one who is justified, has regeneration. We know that. We can have faith in that even though it is not immediately visible, in a great many cases.

Paul says in II Corinthians 5: 17, "Therefore if anyman be in Christ, he is a new creature. Old things are passed away. Behold, all things are become new. And this is tied up right with justification here, and also continues in the next verse. "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation." So that regeneration begins the process of sanctification, and the beginning of it is purely, a supernatural work in which we cannot cooperate, we have no part in it, we cannot produce it, it is entirely a supernatural work of God's free grace.

Small a. The new birth is the introduction of a new principle, not the substitution of a hidden person. Paul's language about the old man and the new man, is sometimes misunderstood. That here is a person who is an entirely a different person. It is not the substitution of a new person, now as a new individual. It is not a change in the

substance of soul. It is an introduction of a new principle, but a principle which affects all parts of the human being.

Small b. The new birth does not eradicate the old nature. Some of the language about the new birth, such as ~~and~~ ^{old} things are passed away, all things are become new, could be so observed as to mean that the old nature is completely eradicated. It is chucked off just as the caterpillar chucks off a cocoon when it becomes a butterfly. But that is not the teaching of the New Testament. The new birth does not eradicate the old nature.

In Galatians 6, Paul speaks to Christians, "Brethren, if a man be over taken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such a man." Verse 3. "For if a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself. But what I particularly have in mind is verses 7 through 9. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." The new birth does not eradicate the old nature. There is still the flesh, and there is still the spirit.

The illustration has been given of two fields. In one of them, wheat has been planted, in the other it has not been planted. And these two fields stand there, and nothing more is done. And after awhile, you come and you look at the two fields. And as you look at them, from a little distance you don't see any distance in them. They are both full of growing stuff. But as you come up close, you see that there is a lot of wheat growing in the midst of the weeds. And in the other you see a lot of weeds growing but no wheat. They both have the weeds growing up. The weeds naturally grow. The wheat has to be planted, and the wheat grows, but the coming of the wheat doesn't stop the weeds from growing. So you have the two fields, and Paul says in Philippians 4: 11b. He says, "I have learned in whatever state I am therewith to be content." I have learned. Contentment is not a natural characteristic. Murmuring is. Murmuring and criticism are of natural to the natural man, as thorns are to the soil. Contentment is not man's natural propensity ~~and~~ ⁽⁷⁾. It must be developed by the Spirit.

We find in Galatians 5: 13-15, that the apostle said, "For brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love

but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." And Paul is talking to brethren. He is talking to those who are saved by Christ. And he says to them, Take heed that ye bite and devour not one another. If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. You have been called unto liberty, but don't use liberty for an occasion to the flesh. Contentment is not man's natural propensity. It must be developed by the spirit. But the weed of murmuring and criticism; the weeds of unholy contention; the weeds of purple magnification; the weeds of pride: they must be rooted out. The new birth does not eradicate them. It simply introduces a new principle.

And Jeremiah 4: 3 says: "For thus saith the Lord to the men of Judah and Jerusalem, Break up your fallow ground, and sow not among thorns." Now, the Holy Spirit, has sown the good seed. But we must break up the fallow ground, and get rid of the thorns.

The self ~~life~~ ^(self) life, and the spirit life are both present in the believer. There's one person. But the self life is there and the spirit life is there, in the believer, apart from the new birth only once is there. A young woman told me once in Chicago, she said, I've gone through a series of examinations by psychoanalysts, and she said, I went day after day after day through the most unpleasant experience a person has ever had in her life. Because he took all the lovely things I've ever done in my life, and he inquired into them, and looked into them, and saw, how back of everyone of them, there was a selfish motive. Now Paul said, whether Christ is preached of contention, or of love through Christ I rejoice. We rejoice when good results come, because other people do good things, even if they do them for evil purposes. But we cannot expect any favor from God when we do them for evil purposes or for evil reasons. And the ungodly men, the plowing of the wicked man is sin, Proverbs said. The ungodly man may do a lot of very, very lovely things. But he is doing it for selfish motives. But into the Godly man there has been introduced a new principle; the principle of the Spirit life, which is not present, until the new birth has occurred.

Number three. The justified person is called upon to fight against sin and to root out the deeds of the flesh. He is called upon this, to fight. The justified person

who has had the new birth, which is purely a supernatural act, he is now called upon to fight against sin. And to root out the deeds of the flesh. Is he called upon to do this, or has Christ done that in the new birth. Romans 12: 1-2. "I beseech ye therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, - and be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed." He does not say you are transformed. You've got the new birth. You are completely changed. No. You've got the new principle. You've got the new life. But he commands them, he exhorts them, be ye not ~~man~~ conformed to the world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God!"

Be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind - present your body a living sacrifice. I Corinthians 9: 27. "But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." He is called upon to fight against sin. If you can find any really, successful evangelist who presents the word of God, and shows the wickedness of sin, and leads people into salvation, and is marvelously affected, and if you can get a chance to talk to that man sincerely and kindly, and openly. And you ask him if he has struggled with sin, if he doesn't say yes, I will be tremendously mistaken. Because many a man who has been most effectively used of the Lord, in leading out to turn against sin, and to seek the grace of God, in their reaction that followed it, have had some of the most severe, and terrible struggles that any one has ever had. Now there are great evangelists who have let pride get to their head, and have lost out completely through pride. There are some who have lost out completely through the lust of the flesh. There are cases where you wonder whether they were ever saved.

But there are individuals who have been truly used of God, who have fallen into deep sin, and the Lord has brought them out of it. There are such cases, because, the fact that a man is a great worker for God, does not mean that he doesn't have his choice. And my own personal feeling ~~was~~ ⁽¹⁴⁾ would be to fall on numerous occasions on the force of his missionary journey,

which he ^{was} wanted

through the power of Christ.

Then we look at Ephesians 4: 21-24. There we read the command given to us, "If so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus; that ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Now if you just took this passage alone, you could almost think that it means, just change from condition to another. A complete, sudden, instantaneous change, and that's all there is to it. But we notice that he is writing to believers. He is writing to those who have been justified, and he is exhorting them to put off concerning the former behaviour, the old man which is corrupt, and be renewed in the spirit of the mind. Be renewed. And put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. It shows a stressing that which is Godly, and the putting off that which is ungodly.

Colossians 3: 5-15. We find a parallel passage to Ephesians, only a little more fuller, "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth." That doesn't sound quite as passive as put off the old man. That sounds a little more like fighting. "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry; for which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: in the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them." He tells Christians to get rid of these things. "But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds." You've put off the old man with his deeds, and yet you are told not to lie one to another. So putting off the old man with his deeds, does not automatically do away with lying. It is a step in that direction.

"Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him; where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all." Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man

have a quarrel ~~with~~ against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness. And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful." There are elements in this part here, that sound as if it was fighting against sin, rooting out the deeds of the flesh, but the stress here is more on what the aspects are, rather than on the struggle. But the struggle is certainly implied.

Hebrews 12: 1. "Seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us. Verse 4. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin." - which are rooted out.

I Peter 1: 13-16. "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ; as obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance; but as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy." And the word which is translated holy, is the same word as sanctify. "So be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, be ye holy; for I am holy."

I Peter 5: 8. "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom resist stedfast in the faith." It is interesting that that comes immediately after verse 7. "Casting all your care upon him, for he careth for you. Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary walketh about." You're to cast all your care on the Lord. You're not to be anxious. That doesn't mean that you aren't to be wide awake. It doesn't mean that you are not to be on your guard. It doesn't mean that you are not to be watching for the subtle activity of Satan which will increase your self-life, and which will take away from the spirit-life.

Now under this number three, in which we were called upon to mortify the deeds of the flesh, we find that two notes under it. And so we will call the first note, small a in parenthesis. (Small a). A process. In these passages, weight does not mean the body. It means the self life. I think that is rather important, to have in mind. There are those who have thought that by eating practically nothing, by wearing

by whipping themselves, by living out in the desert in discomfit, they were making their bodies so uncomfortable, that they were improving their spirit, and advancing in their spiritual life. Now making the desires of the body, the pleasures of the physical life, the great object in themselves, is apt to destroy the progress in the spiritual life. And it is far better to be an accessible part than to be one who allows these things to ~~man~~ crowd out the spirit. But these things are not in themselves wrong. And that is why we have to have a word of caution here. The word flesh here, is a natural word to use for this life, because when the self concentrates on the flesh, the selfishness is apt to be greatly increased and it is characteristic of the brutal types of selfishness, and of unspiritual life, and therefore flesh is a good figure for the self life. But it is very clear in scripture flesh does not mean specifically the physical as opposed to the spiritual. It is not the physical that is opposed to the spiritual. It is the selfish as opposed to the God-life. It is that which makes ones own desires and pleasures and object instead of making God's will an object. And God has put us into a world in which Satan has introduced sin, and wickedness, but it is a world, which was fundamentally created in beauty and in righteousness. And it is a world in which everything that is good comes from God. And he has given us a physical body, which if rightly used gives us real pleasure. And for us to eat simply in order to, because it is time to take the food in, and to get no pleasure out of it whatever, means that we do not assimilate the food as well as we would otherwise. There is, God has put a possibility of pleasure in the food, which if we savour and enjoy as we eat it, we ~~man~~ get more good out of the food. God has put it there for that purpose. But when we make it an end in itself, then it becomes evil, whether we eat more than we need, or whether we eat types of food which we know are harmful, it becomes evil.

And so flesh becomes a natural figure for the self-life. But we should remember that it is a figure and that when we read that the flesh, as against the spirit, we do not mean the physical as against the spiritual. We don't mean that which is material, as against that which is immaterial. There are wicked spirits and it is possible to be selfish, savouring the pleasures of the intellect, just as it is possible

to be selfish sav~~ing~~ouring the pleasures of the body. It is the self-life that is referred to as the flesh here. And it is the self-life that is (10 $\frac{1}{2}$)

And while the aesthetic is far preferable to that which goes in the opposite direction, to a long point, the right object is not in either of these directions. It is not the physical as against the spiritual, but it is the self life as against the god life. And so I think that is very important to have in mind. The man who is so convinced, that he cannot - one man said to me once, he said, you know I'm convinced that in order to serve the Lord right, I should never accept any honors or anything that would tend to increase my own pride. Well, he was right. Pride is a greater sin, then the sins of the flesh, and does more harm. He said, I should always take a low position wherever I am. I should never take a church which pays a salary which is enough to live on. And certainly not one that is more than enough to live on. But always take a meaning sort of position that I can find, and the lowest sort of position that I can.

I knew the person quite well. And I had great regard for him as a sincere Christian. But I felt in this particular point, he was taking an Adamic position, which is far better then the opposite position, but which was not in accordance with the Lord's will. I think that it is the Lord's will that he use his talents and abilities, to accomplish the utmost that he can. And if accomplishing the utmost that he can leads him into a position where he has more of this world's goods, or more of this world's honor, he should use it for the glory of God, rather than to refuse it as end in itself. I haven't seen the man for many years, but I heard years ago that he was president of a college out in the middle west, and I believe that it is a fine Christian college, although I don't know much about it, and so I hope that he kept his fine spiritual attitude that when I knew him, but on this particular thing, he looked at it in a bit more reasonable way.

But I think that is a very vital thing for us to understand, that rooting out the deeds of the flesh does not mean living an unnatural or an unnormal life. I think it means taking the natural pleasures of life, as the Lord gives those to them, and rejoicing in them, but not making them an end in themselves, as in any phase of them, it is God's will, that without them, we should rejoice in it as God's will, rather than letting it

upset us too much. The main principle of this is that God's words are not called upon us not to ~~which~~ live a normal life. It does not mean that God has called upon us to go around looking like scarecrows for fear that people might think that we have pride of adornment. We aren't called upon to do that. He has called on us not to make pride of adornment, an end in itself, but to use what abilities we have in this life for him.

S-54.

I may have given the illustration sometime in ~~which~~ this group before. It was a man I was talking with ~~about a year ago~~ ^{about a year ago} ~~someone had said~~ ^{someone had said} ~~that the sweetest sounds in the world are found in the person's own name.~~ ^(1/2) and I remarked to him, that ~~the sweetest sounds in the world are found in the person's own name.~~ ^{that the sweetest sounds in the world are found in the person's own name.} ~~and people just love to hear their own name. And he said, well; And this person said, Well, I don't think that's right. I don't think that it sounds sweet at all. And I said to him, Well, you know, I must say that as for myself, I've been to a place myself, that somebody had made reference to some activity that _____, that I had had a small connection with, I heard them start to tell about it, and my ears would pick it up, and would wonder whether they would mention me. And when I hear them mention me, I do get a feeling of joy out of it. Come to think of it, he said, I was over in New York in a meeting, and they were having some people in a particular line that he was in ~~(1/2)~~ ^(1/2), and they were a small group, but they were having a big discussion. And they said, Now we want to introduce a few of the celebrities here. Here's so and so who is now in this line, and here is so and so - and then they said we have so and so here who though an amateur in the line, is outstanding for what he's done in it. Would you stand up please. And he said, You know, it was big thrill. And he agreed that the statement was true. And I think it is.~~

And I think if properly used it is perfectly all right. I think that the Lord has implanted in us a desire for a proper recognition of our activity. And I think that he has known this life of our savouring and enjoying a reasonable recognition of what we have accomplished, but I do think that he is ~~displeased~~ ^{displeased}, when we, if we fail to get the recognition which we are entitled to, do not object. Don't say anything about it. That's the Lord's plan. He knows what is done and we won't worry whether people are paying

attention to it or not. I believe that is a difficult thing, but I believe that the Lord is pleased with us when we can take that attitude. And I think that he is displeased when we rush around, quietly, seeking to get credit for the work which we have done. But it is an illustration of the way you can have a feeling in your mind, buried down underneath, and you don't even know it's there. You don't have the slightest idea.

I remember when I was in high school, and there was a daughter, Francis Watson, and another fellow called Bruce Watson, who were unrelated. The annual, and I opened up the annual, and I saw a reference to something that Francis Watson had done. And it spoke very highly of what she had done. And just after that Bruce happened to come walking in the room. I said, Hello, Bruce, say I was just reading about you in the annual here. Is that so, he said, what is written about me. And he was quite excited about it. And I hunted for it, and when I found it, it was a reference to the other Watson. And you should have seen the look on his face. It was just about the worse blow a fellow could have got. To think that there was something in the annual about him, and there wasn't. Actually, it isn't important whether we get that sort of recognition or not. It is laid aside, and hardly anybody notices it.

You remember the time when Caruso was on Long Island, and his car broke down. So he went up to a farm house, and asked if he could use the phone, the phone for himself. And he wanted to be sure that they knew what a great man had come to them. And it was given, over the fence the mike ^(4 $\frac{1}{2}$), and he said, I am Caruso. Oh, the man said, Welcome to the Caruso. You could imagine how he felt. But it is interesting to - I've had a few experiences where I have known people who were very prominent in some line, just absolutely outstanding, like Caruso was in music, and when they come in contact with somebody where they expected them to recognize their greatness, and they haven't even heard of them. I've been in contact with a number like that. And there is hardly a man in the world, no matter how prominent he is, there are not probably a dozen people in the world, of whom it would not be true that 80% of the people in the world had never heard of them. There are probably not a dozen people in the United States, that even half the people in the United States would recognize, who they were.

It is such a transitory thing, and yet it is such a strong element in the psychological

nature, as I John says, The lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, he said, passeth away, and the world passeth away. But if you are with people very much, and have your eye open for these things, you will be amazed how you find that the most prominent people, the most advanced people, in sanctification, the finest Christians will show off their little, sinful attitudes that they are not even conscious of themselves. And in fact, the sinful actions that they have, is the very thing that will be the most absorbing of the few, but its not mere show, and if you're going to get along with them, you're going to have to learn how to avoid, and to stir around that, and not let it become a point of issue. For it is then, that the self-life, the sin-life is in every one of us, in this life, and it is never eradicated in the flesh, though we can make great progress. But it is necessary to find out where it is.

And so I put in this point here, that a Christian should learn to examine his motives, and to understand the subtle working of the flesh, because the self-life will come up in the most unexpected place, or all of a sudden, and you find yourself breaking out in strong and emotional reaction. So you surprise yourself and you wonder why you were.

I was telling you about one of the great Bible teachers of the country a few years ago. And I was talking with this man and he was mentioning various great men he had known, and I had known, some of them I hadn't known, and I said, Oh, by the way, I knew quite well so and so, and I mentioned another man who deceased some years before, a very outstanding Bible teacher. And this man said to me, after speaking so beautifully about these other people, he was the most terrible person. Do you know what he said about me once. And once the other fellow had rather run down his knowledge at a certain point. And he had done it in a certain rather slamming way, but that stuck in his mind, and that affected his attitude toward him. And it will come out when you get to know people.

Well, I don't think the Lord wants us to be looking critically upon others and seeing these faults in them. But I think that it is good for us to look upon others a little bit, from this viewpoint in order to then turn and look at ourselves, and to see how much of the same thing is in us, and if we can find, and root out these attitudes, I

in ourselves, it is a tremendous step forward in the sanctification that the Lord wants us to have.

Number four. Though man has a duty to strive for sanctification, the process is one and which is initiated by the Lord, carried on by the Triune God, and the completion of which is assured by Him, to everyone who has been justified through the grace of Christ. We have been talking about man's duty to root out the deeds of the flesh. Number four is quite in contrast to that. But number four presents what is clearly taught in the scripture. I had three parts in it, so I've divided it into three parts.

Small a. deals with the first part of this statement. We could make no progress, in sanctification if God had not first regenerated us. Now, we've already covered that sufficiently I believe.

Small b. Sanctification is said to be a work of God of Christ and of the Holy Spirit. You notice that I said in the main head, that it is carried on by the Triune God. Well, first, it is said to be a work of God. We find ^{evidence} ~~emphasis~~ for that in Acts 20: 32. "And now brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified." I Thessalonians 5:23. Paul says, "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly." The work of God. Jude 1 says, "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James to them that are sanctified by God the Father - sanctified by God the Father. It is a work of God the Father.

It is a work of Jesus Christ. Ephesians 5: 25, 27. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it. That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

S-55.

Christ sanctified the church in order that it might be without spot, or wrinkle. He does this by the washing of the word.

Hebrews 2: 11. Paul says, (He's just been speaking about Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels), "Both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are

all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." And if you are wondering if that is talking of Christ, or of God the Father, we read a little further, "For which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare they name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee." Jesus Christ says that to God the Father, Jesus Christ is he that sanctifieth. The quotation of what he says is taken from what place? How many of you know? That is a quotation from the 22nd Psalm. This says then that Jesus Christ is the one who sanctifies us.

I Corinthians 1: 30. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." Through Christ we are sanctified.

But sanctification is also spoken of in two places spoken of as the work of the Holy Spirit. It is spoken of as the work of the Holy Spirit, in II Thessalonians 2:13, where we read, "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." Through sanctification of the Spirit.

And Peter says a similar thing, where he calls the Christians to whom he writes, in I Peter 1: 2. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." So in these two passages it is said to be a work of the Holy Spirit.

Small c. in a parenthesis. God has decreed that the sanctification of everyone who believes in Jesus Christ will be carried to completion. I Peter 1: 4,5 says that we are reserved unto "an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you. Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." He is speaking of the aspect of our salvation, which comes at the resurrection, at the return of Christ, when our sanctification is complete.

I John 3: 2. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." We know that we are going to be perfect in sanctification. We know

that it will be complete at the return of Christ. So let's lie down and let the Lord take care of it. No, he continues, "And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." We marvel that the result of it is perfect, ^{so} ~~mmh~~ we can procede figuratively as rapidly as possible in the direction that God desires us to go, not worrying about whether it is going to get there, because we know that ~~he~~ ^{he} has decreed that we will get there, but he wants us to push along the way.

Philippians 1: 6. I hesitated a little about putting this in here. I certainly would not build the teaching on it alone. But along with the other verses, I think there is no harm in mentioning it, that Paul wrote to the Philippians, "Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." I'm inclined to think, that this verse could be correctly interpreted as meaning that God who has regenerated us, will continue our sanctification until it is completed in the day of Jesus Christ. I'm inclined to that, but I would not be dogmatic that that is the treatment of this verse. I'm inclined to think that, but it is clearly taught in other verses, and I'm mentioning this verse along with the others.

Colossians 1: 22. I'll start with 20. "And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself (that's justification), by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven, and you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, (that's justification) in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unproveable in his sight." He has reconciled you, means he has imputed to you the righteousness of Christ, but he is eventually going to be able to present you completely sanctified and unblameable and unproveable in his sight.

Number five. Sanctification, like justification, is secured by the death of Christ on the cross. The reference I just gave you from Colossians ties the two together, whether it would be enough to build this statement upon, might be questioned. And so I put that reference down, Colossians 1: 20-22, with a paranthesis around it. But we look at Romans 15: 16. No, I think that Romans 15: 16 should have been mentioned under, no, Romans 15: 16 is speaking of the sacrifices that we make, isn't it. That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the Gospel of God,

that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." There is sanctified by the Holy Ghost, but I'm not quite sure whether it is offering the nature of sanctification, or whether it is referring to their bodies which they offer as a living sacrifice. But if it is the latter, then it certainly fits under this category.

I Corinthians 6: 20. "Ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." What is the price we are bought with? The death of Christ on the cross. Therefore glorify God in your bodies.

Ephesians 5: 25-27, we were looking at just recently that Christ gave himself for the church that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, he gave himself for us. It is secured by the death of Christ on the cross. There are two or three other passages I won't take time for now, under this head, but I think that perhaps it would be well to mention the fact that all the righteousness that we have ~~receive~~ ^(are) are secured by the death of Christ. That it is the death of Christ which overcomes the power of Satan. It is the death of Christ which destroys Satan's power over us, which wins our salvation including all phases of it. And so all parts of it are related to the death of Christ.

(Question. Some say, the degree of sanctification that we obtain in this life, will determine the measure that we will enjoy Christ in the life to come. Answer. I do not believe that there is any such scriptural teaching. The scripture teaches that we will all be perfectly sanctified, at the time of the resurrection, at the time Christ returns. (Question. In other words, we will be like Christ in every respect. Answer. I will say this, very specifacally. Sanctification is not a means by which we earn merit. And if we are awarded in the next life towards the extent of our sanctification, that would make it a means of earning merit, which it is not. Our merit comes entirely through the death of Christ. We are justified through him, we've received eternal life through him. We are not here working for merit. But we are working to please the Lord who desires us to be sanctified. And striving to become that which he considers us in Christ. And to reach that goal which he has declared he is going to bring us. It is a matter that we love the Lord who saved us and gave us eternal life, that we want to get better.

(Question. There are some conclusions from it which I could call it. I think they are possible, but I don't think they are. There is so much that teaches the power and the treasures in Christ, that he presents it pure and without blemish, and so the scripture seems to present it as a great desire of God that we should present it in itself, apart from the service of Him. I am inclined to think that he is greatly interested in the work that we render, but that he is even more interested in the service that we render as a means of cleansing ourselves and advancing our spiritual life, then he is as it as a thing in itself.)

(Question. I believe that true sanctification involves unself service to others, I think that God is interested in the service that we give to others, but he is interested in the improvement of our own sanctification which comes through our interest in others, even more than he is in the help from others. That would be my conclusion from these passages, in which he speaks so very strongly of the need and desire, of our's, in sanctification. That is, Ephesians speaks of the treasures that he has in the saints. God is fitting a people to live with him for eternity. And our sanctification is a tremendous part of his joy in fitting us, for that which he desires us to be with him through eternity. Now it is true, that it would seem, that one of us gets ^{to} ~~in~~ here, and another here, and another here, and then he just puts us up there, and you would say what's the difference? Whether we get to here, to here, or to here, or not? But he teaches that it is different. Not that there is a great reward for it, or something like that. But there is a difference. He is tremendously interested, that we make the utmost possible progress in our sanctification in this life, and if the utmost possible progress ⁽³⁾ be made, be made by, then I think it would be his will to do that. But I'm inclined to think that in most cases there is greater progress through unselfish service to others, than there is in simply being a hermit. But that unselfish service to others, must be combined with study of the Word, and with definite progress in one's own sanctification, or is not nearly an accomplishment that it should be.

There are aspects of this, that are difficult for us to fully understand. In the plan of God there are things we can't understand, but there are other things that are definite and clear.

And I think that there is one thing that is very definite and clear, that God wants us to make the utmost progress in sanctification, and that he is tremendously interested that we do so, and though he considers us as complete in Christ, that he is very, very anxious to have our condition brought up to our state, and though - Now I take my little boy and I ask him what three and twenty five make, and he doesn't know whether it is twenty six or thirty two, and I could tell him in an instance and put it down, but when I enable him to get him so that he can do that himself, I am much more grateful and pleased, then if I just give him the result. And the progress that he makes mathematically now in a day, compared to with what I know of mathematics, is so infinitesimal, why bother with it, you might say. And yet it pleases me greatly to see him make progress. I'm tremendously interested in his progress, and I think that the Lord is tremendously interested in our progress. And the ultimate end is assured that he will accomplish it, but he is tremendously interested in the progress that we make right now. It is the thing at which we can work.

3/12/57.

Our last point was five. Sanctification like justification is secured by the death of Christ on the cross. Ephesians 5: 25-27. We had there the statement that Christ loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify it and cleanse it. His sanctifying and cleansing it, with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church not having any spot, or wrinkle, and that it should be holy and without blemish, is here stated as a reason why he gave himself for it. That is to say, the death of Christ on the cross, has as one of its great purposes the securing of our sanctification. All of the blessings which we received through Christ have been won to us by his death on the cross. And sanctification is much more an object from his viewpoint of his having died, than justification. Justification is the necessary prerequisite to sanctification. Justification from our viewpoint assures us immediately of eternal life and of accession to God, and so justification is that which looms straight before us, when we accept Christ, but he is not interested in dying, in order to save us, and to take us to heaven, as unsanctified, unlowly sinners. There would be no point in that. We would be unhappy in heaven. We would be very unhappy in heaven.

It wouldn't suit us. We wouldn't be adapted to it. His purpose is to save us, which includes sanctification and means our living with him forever, as justified people whose actual state has been brought up to the standing which he gives us now. That is our justification, and our sanctification are eventually to be the same. We're justified, we're considered righteous in his sight, but we are righteous. We are presented free from sin. But we are given the justification immediately, and sanctification is a process that takes place, and both of them are the result of his death on the cross. So we can say, and it is right that we should say, I believe that Christ died for me, and in him, I am saved, in him I am free from all the guilt of sin. God's looked at me, and sees me in the person of Christ, and he has given to me eternal life. That is right, and we should say that, and rejoice in it.

But it is also right that we should recognize that the condition which we are in, which could never win our justification, this condition is to be improved. And he did not die in order to bring sinners into heaven. He died in order to make sinners righteous. But he gives them the right to heaven immediately, giving them the freedom from guilt, and giving them the, his merits, imputing his righteousness to us immediately, but then proceeds to fit us for heaven. And so sanctification is secured through his death on the cross, and it is the very purpose of his death on the cross. He gave himself for the church that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. That he might present it to himself a glorious church. It denotes the whole body of those who have been saved through Christ. That is the church of Christ. And to present it without blemish or wrinkle, means that no one of its parts has blemish or wrinkle. It means that it is free from sin. That it is completely sanctified. That is the goal that he intends to produce in us.

And so this is secured by the death of Christ on the cross. Now there are two or three other references under this, but we have much more to cover this semester, so I won't give them now, but I think that the point is sufficiently established that if you should find other references about as clear that are given, and still others that are nearly as clear, there are many passages that suggest it, because it is a great truth of the scripture. That Jesus died in order to fill heaven with holy people.

But the present step in that direction is his justifying us entirely upon the merit of our Lord. But it is a step, and the other has been won by his death upon the cross.

Number six. Sanctification is said to be accomplished through God's Truth.

The passage we just read, that he gave himself for the church, that he might wash it with water, that he might cleanse it, it said, by the washing of water. Well, water there, what does it mean? It doesn't mean actual physical water, with which he cleanses us from sin, but it says that Christ gave himself for it that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. And so there is good reason to think that here, and in a good many other cases, water represents the Word of God, as that by means of which he cleanses us. And we find this brought out in a good many other passages. I'll call your attention at the moment to two.

John 17: 19. "And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth." Sanctified through God's word. Verse 17 perhaps brings it out almost as clearly, "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." And then Acts 20: 32. "And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified." Through the word of his grace which is able to build you up. To give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified. We use these words in the King James version. We hear them over and over, build you up, sanctify you. To some people as they read the King James version, it carries just as much meaning, as in the Middle Ages the Latin carried. They read the Latin over and over, and nobody understood it. And they heard the Latin read, they heard the Latin chanted, and some thought that it in itself (13). It is the meaning that brings the And we have the meaning in this beautiful literary style of the King James version. But it is the meaning that brings the blessing. It is not the word as a magical thing that brings the blessing. Putting the Bible on your table, will bring no blessing to your home, unless the Bible is taken off the table, and read, and used today.

But how does the word produce sanctification? Well, I thought that it would be helpful if we look up four ways in which the word produces sanctification. So we might

say that the Word produces sanctification in four ways.

Small a. The word is a mirror which shows us our sinful condition, and enables us to see our faults.

S-57. James 1: 25.

"But whosoever looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer of the word, this man shall be blessed in his deed." Now there is more than one step forward in this passage, but it does clearly bring out, the first step that the word of God shows us our need of sanctification. It is very easy for us to think that we have arrived. To think that we are pretty good. But if we study the word, study God's law, study the representation of the characters that God approved of, if we use it properly, we will find that it is like a mirror to us, and begins to show us our shortcomings and our weaknesses and our failures, and to show us how very, very short, we come short of God's will. We must repent of our sins, in order to be saved, and having recovered, we are justified, forever, but we are to continue on to look to Christ for him to cleanse us and give us victory over our life. And the word will show us our condition. It is very easy to take our standard of what a person should be, by how our neighbors are. I've found time and time again, you say, you've done this and it is wrong, but they say, so and so did such a thing. Yes, but so and so does the same ~~any~~ thing. And yet that is no worse than this that so and so does. God is not going to judge us by what we do, as compared to what somebody else does. He is going to judge us by how what we do; with what his perfect law is like. He's going to judge us by His standard of righteousness and not by the comparison with some other individual. And the law of God is a mirror to show us, the standard of God which He requires of us.

It is a very useful way in which the Scripture washes us, cleanses us, procures our sanctification, is by giving us an understanding of what we need, we will take ~~these verses~~ and meditate upon ~~in~~ them, think them through and don't think, now wouldn't this be a wonderful verse to give to so and so, think how much he needs that. Wouldn't this make a good sermon, wouldn't they be thrilled to hear me preach on this subject. Don't read the scripture for that objective. Get those purposes out of ~~it~~ it, but read it in order to say, how far does this show that I'm coming short. How far does my life come short

on this point? And if you do that, you are taking the first step in the use of the scripture, as an aid toward sanctification.

Small b. The Word is our only source for knowing what God's righteousness requires. That is the other side of the same truth as given in a. But you notice that I put in, our only source. As we compare ourselves with the word, we see our deficiency. But it is only from the Word that we can learn what God's righteousness requires. The question is not, is God's word ethical, but are our efforts in conformity to his word? How do we learn what is right and what is wrong? Only from his word. And how do we learn what sort of lives he wants us to live? Only from the word. Our own ideas, are partly derived from the Word, through our reading, and through other people's reading, and its affects upon them. They are also secured from the general habits of people round about. A very great part of it is from that. It is amazing how some of the truths that are so clearly taught in the Scripture over and over can be simply ignored in sections of the Christian church year after year. Even in good Godly sections where there is interest in the Word. They can read the thing over and over and never notice it. Something that is very conspicuous in the word, they never notice, and the reason is because to so many people, the word is a sort of a magical thing that it is beautiful to hear those words. But their ideas are derived from the ideas of other people, instead of what the Word presents.

Now what is it that God's righteousness requires of us. I thought I would summarize very quickly under five heads, it might be possible to put it under a better arrangement of five heads, but I think that these will summarize a great part of the teaching of the Word as to what God's righteousness requires.

So we'll put a one in parenthesis. God's righteousness requires cleansing from the sin described in the law. It requires cleansing from the sin described in the law. Jesus Christ said in Matthew 5: 17. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven," provided he does it before Christ's death, but afterwards it's a good thing to do. "But whosoever

shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven", provided he does it before his death, but after that they have no more to do.

"For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven."

I made an insertion in two parts of this verse which I think you will recognize as utterly unjustified, and yet there are those who seem to assume that insertion. Jesus said, "Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." It is wrong, absolutely wrong, to present the ten commandments, as a way to be saved. But it ~~is~~ ^{was} equally wrong to do so, when they were first given. They were never given as a way man could be saved. But they were given as an explanation of the type of righteousness which God wants these people eventually all to have. And they were given as an evidence of the fact that we fall so far short, that by means of the death of Christ could any of us come to Him. We are not to minimize his commands. We are not to talk as though they didn't matter. They do matter. They are tremendously important. It is a vital step in our justification, that we should bring our life into conformity to the commandment that God has given, and ~~is~~ stressed in his Word.

In Luke 18, 20. The ruler said to Jesus, "Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Jesus said, "Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother." But he didn't say that these commandments don't matter. You want to know what to do to inherit eternal life. Well, if you're going to ~~earn~~ ^{win} eternal life, you're going to have to obey all of these commandments perfectly. But you cannot win eternal life, Jesus has won it for you. But he has not won it for you as a sinner, but as one who is going to be made righteous, and be brought into conformity with the command.

Ephesians 5: 3-6, stresses the attitude of the Christians towards the negative commands. "But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints: Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, (now of course by jesting he doesn't mean simply joking, but he means indecent talking and he certainly includes a waste of time with carrying even innocent joking beyond the amount of time that he has any right to have) which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks. For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words."

And to Timothy, II Timothy ² 22a, he said, "Flee youthful lusts." It is his will that we should be cleansed from the sins, described in the law,

Number two. Improvement, not merely of external acts, but of internal motives. The first passage I read to you under one, where he said that I come not to destroy the law, or the prophets, except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of ~~the~~ the scribes and pharisees. They were so meticulously careful in the little externalities, it must exceed them because he went on to show that it is the thought and intent of the heart that matters before the Lord. Not whether you are thought of by the world at large as one who would never do certain things, but what are the inner desires and intents of the heart. He says, It said thou shalt not kill, but I say unto you, that whoever is angry with his brother, without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment. It is not the external act of killing which is judged by God, but it is the thought of the heart, the anger with another which would lead one to such an act, if he had the courage to carry it out, and was not simply kept back by motives, and fear from not doing it. It is just as bad in the Lord's sight.

"I say unto you that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, has committed adultery with her already, in his heart." It is the internal thought. It is the motive of the heart, which should be sanctified constantly and if we merely keep the external in conformity with God's will, and do not bring the internal motives and attitudes in conformity with his will, we are not given much progress in sanctification.

Number - small three in parenthesis. I'm not going to give you a verse for this

number three. There are plenty of evidences to be found. But I think that the point should be mentioned as a vital step in what God's righteousness requires of our sanctification. Number three, Freedom from anxiety and other manifestations of lack of trust in God. As we increase, and improve in sanctification, we increase in our favor and as our favor increases we do not get constantly irritated and nervous and anxious. If you've ever noticed anyone who is a good driver, he's a real good automobile driver, and he sits in a car with someone who ~~finaha~~ he feels has much less experience than himself in driving. And you notice him. "Why here comes a car. Look - look, is he going to turn, look at this -". You watch somebody's foot sitting beside you, who feels he is a better driver than you are. You watch that foot go forward as you approach a corner. You watch him, they're anxious, they're nervous, they're wondering what will happen. I remember when I was in college, we went from Sequoia National Park down into the flat lands of California there. And my father who was a retired physician, and another retired physician, somewhat older than he, sat in the back seat. And everyone would say - look, there is a car coming, look - look - look. All the way. It was hard for me to drive. I got to the bottom, and he said, "Well, you did a mighty good job, in driving here, but you ought to with two old hands bothering you all the way." But, you - he was joking of course. He knew how he felt when his wife talked the same way to him. I'm merely giving it as an illustration of the way you feel when you get in a car, where someone in whom you do not have as much confidence as you might. You're ~~mmmmmm~~ continually watching in fear that they will make a mistake. Note the difference when you get with someone in whom you have confidence. You sit there, and you talk. You are perfectly relaxed. You don't move in the slightest.

S-58.

When the first time we went over to Geneva, to the Second Plenary Congress of the International Council, everytime the plane landed, all of us, they sang Praise God to whom all blessings flow, as they landed. And I still think that's a good thing to do because in any plane something could go wrong. And it is only by God's mercy, any plane or anything else could get you anywhere. And I think it is good to remember God's

care on these occasions. I enjoyed that, as how we would land, and the plane would come down, they would all sing together, Praise God from whom all blessings flow. But after we'd made three or four of those trips, I remember that the last time, I went over, and when the plane came down, two or three people started singing and nobody else joined in. And somebody started laughing, and somebody said, Oh, they've never been on a plane before.

We need God's constant care wherever we are if we are going to be safe. But our attitude changes as we have flown enough to know that 999 cases out of a thousand, that pilot will be able without any difficulty to bring that plane down and to land safely. You don't feel like saying - oh my, are we going to land or not. You don't feel like watching to see that land coming, to see whether his landing gear hits it just right. You sit back and relax. You read, you talk, you pay no attention. Well, God wants us on the one hand to see his hand constantly and praise him for what he is doing. But as we grow in sanctification, we learn to trust him more to the extent that when the storms beat around us, and whenever everyone around us gets all excited, wonders what is going to happen, whether things are going to go on another five days, without everything breaking. We can sit back, and rest in the Lord, and go on vigorously in the task assigned to us, and not worry about things that we personally can't help, because we know there is God's hand. ~~handing~~ His hand is on the throne, and we can trust him. Do we really have that faith in God?

There was a man once, a great student, a wonderful man, a wonderful example in many ways. Well, I was sitting in his car, going to a place, and he missed a road. And he got on the road road, and he was due for a certain appointment. And oh my, oh, oh, oh, we're not going to get there, we're not going to get there, we're going to be late, we won't make it, and so on. He went all to pieces with anxiety. I was surprised, in that particular regard, the sanctification of that wonderful man, was so far short of what the Lord wants us to be. The Lord wants us to do our best, and wants us to feel very penitent when we do things in the wrong way, and to realize that punishment comes, for our errors. But he wants us, for the things that we cannot possibly help, to lean back upon his arms, and to learn to trust him.

And so I believe that the Lord sends tribulation and difficulty into our lives, to

teach us this lesson, to learn to trust on him. Whenever things go too smoothly, we come to trust ourselves, and feel that we are able to do things pretty well, and we're getting along nicely. And I believe that it is the Lord's will for our sanctification, that most of his people, shall time after time in their lives, find that they have reached the end of their ability and that it is his mercy alone that enables him to learn to trust in him and to follow him. That this lesson of the improvement of our state, to where we just rest on him, and trust him, and know that his will is best, and his purpose will be accomplished, that is a very important element in our sanctification. Number three. Now there are very many references we could give under this, but we are not going to give you any right now,

Small four in parenthesis. Four overlaps with three. You cannot separate this into watertight departments. But we can cover the subject in general with certain heads. and number four. Active development of the fruits of the Spirit. And I'm going to add a reference here. I gave you Luke 18: 20 awhile ago. And I want to give you a very small part of Luke 18: 20, that is of that context, because of the fact that the thought of that passage about the rich young ruler is so much more than Jesus' question. Have you kept the commandments? That is an essential feature. But that is by no means all. And in this particular case, when the man said yes I've kept all these commandments from my youth up, Jesus instead of starting to prove to him how wrong he was, went on to point out ~~that~~ another element of sanctification to show his position. Jesus heard these things. "Yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me. And Jesus did not mean by that to say that a person must give everything that they have if they want to be saved. He did not mean that at all. But what he did mean was that no earthly possession must in our eyes be worth mentioning in comparison with our desire to do his will.

The negative avoiding of infraction of the commandments is vital, but the positive advance in the development of the fruit of the spirit, is every bit as vital. So the reference I have put down here is Galatians 5: 22 - 24. "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: ~~that are such~~ against such there is no law." And then it goes back to the negative again. "And they

that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." The negative is necessary. The negative is vital. The negative is important, but the negative alone is nothing. I talked to a great professor of theology, a great orthodox man a few years ago, who had retired, and was living in a state many miles away from that from which he had taught. And there he was attending a church in that town, which was the most orthodox church in the town. And the minister was an orthodox man, and there was no other church in that town, which the professor would feel anywhere as near at home as he would in this particular church. But I said to him, How do you like this church? Well, he said, from the minister's emphasis there are four vital things, and the first of these is that a person does not drink liquor. And the second vital thing is that a person doesn't go to the theater. And, I forget what the third and fourth were now, but it evidently leads up to the impression from that emphasis, that there were a series of don'ts. And that was what the gospel consisted of.

There is a great tendency among fundamentalists to take a few negative things and sometimes to take these negative things out of context, so that it is not the basic areas one is thinking of, but some particular manifestation of that area. And to think that if a person, oh, yes, Thou shalt not smoke, I think was the first or second of that minister's commandments. But to take two or three things like this, and just so that a person doesn't do those, he is all right, well, God doesn't want us to do that which will lead to defilement of flesh or spirit. And it is vital. But we can do all that, and have nothing. Absolutely nothing. Christianity, sanctification is not simply a matter of negative, and many of these negatives that are so much stressed among Christian people, are rather mixed things which have a certain amount which are negative, and actually in some regards are without warrant, specific warrant in the Scripture.

But regardless of that, they in themselves, do not produce sanctification. The positive is absolutely necessary, or the sanctification is not there. I remember hearing a man talk about a professor in Germany, in some linguistic field, and he talked about this man who was such a wonderful professor, and yet he had fallen into some type of the lust of the flesh, and people look down upon him for it, though he had a very great mind. And then he talked about this one, and he got into this other type of the

lust of the flesh. And people looked down on his work. But he was a very great man. And he went on in the difficulties in his particular area. And then another man, who was in the theological field, spoke up, and he said, you know, our professors do not, any that I know of, have not fallen into that type of wickedness. No one of us. But, he said, when you get to know them, you find that jealousy, and the desire to get ahead of the other person, and some of those things, and he said they seem to be really worse than the GROSS ^{(10) MATTERS} manifestation, the viewpoint in your type of work, among the professors.

And the Lord is interested in our having not a ~~whole~~ cold, hard, negative attitude. I don't do this. I don't do that. I don't do the other thing. He's interested in our chief things, the vital righteousness of the commandments, but he is extremely interested in whether we are actively developing the fruit of the spirit, love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. And we can keep all the negative commandments, as well as we possibly can, and if we do not develop the positive graces that the Lord wants in the end, even though we have preached to them, and lead them to the Lord, we will consider ourselves as HAPPIER NO DOUBT (11). It is ~~the~~ vital and important in our sanctification.

Small five in parenthesis, could be considered a part of four, but it is so much stressed in the New Testament that I believe I should give it a separate head. The development ~~development~~ of true love to God and man. The instrument through which we develop in our [?] chrystalizing faith. Faith is the instrument by which we receive justification, and advance in sanctification. It is faith right down the line. But the development of true love as defined ~~in~~ ^{THE PRIMARY MOTIVATING (12)} characteristic of our lives, is - can nearly be said to be the central teaching of our sanctification. That we look at others, not for the purpose of picking flaws in them, but helping them, and of seeing the good in them. That our love to God is so great, that other things fall into insignificance. For as Jesus said, the two great commandments, Love the Lord with all your heart, soul and mind, and love your neighbor as yourself. On these, hang all the laws, and the prophets.

And I John over and over stressed this, the Lord's commandment, that you love one

another. The development of an attitude of character, it is vital that we stand for true doctrine. It is vital that we find infringements, and we stand solidly like a fence against that which would bring errors into the church of Christ. It is vital. But as far as our personal relationship with God is concerned, it is even more vital that we develop a character in our lives, which leads us when we first think of some other individual, automatically out of the heart, to immediately think of their welfare and to think of them even if they are injuring us, for our first thought towards them to be an outgrowing of love to them and a desire for their growth in Christ. It is very easy to imagine one has that feeling, when everything is going along smoothly. But when people in whom you have put trust, people whom you have loved in the Lord, people whom you have had confidence in, begin to turn against you, and to say all manner of evil about you, behind your back, and everyone who stands true to the Lord will have that experience sometime in their lives.

When that sort of thing happens, it gives one a chance to take his spiritual temperature and to find out what his real attitude is. There was a man who was working with a prominent Christian worker, a few years ago. And he said this to him. Oh, everyone you would mention to him, you know what he said, well, he's a wonderful man, but - oh, he's a great fellow, but -

S-59.

He said, it doesn't have life. But God does not ask us to criticize others. He has not appointed us to judge our brothers. He says, Judge not, that ye be not judged. By that he means, when it is not your function, to make a selection of someone else for a certain tap for which you must judge a bit, when it is not that specific, for you to judge others in regard to certain flaws in their character, is contrary to true judgment. But it is well, if you judge yourself, most precisely, and deeply, and hold scripture to you as a mirror, and see how you need to grow in sanctification. So much for b. The word is our only source in knowing what God's righteousness requires.

Small c. Through the Word, we learn how much God was willing to do to free us from our sin, so that our desire to be rid of sin, is increased by our contemplation of the life and death of Christ. We, in Protestantism have rightly reacted against the tendency of those who are not, of rather ignorant people, who venerate unto almost worshipping images, idols etc. And so our tendency is to do away with them altogether. But there is a real blessing that we can secure through contemplating pictorial representation of the death of Christ, and of his suffering. There is a real blessing that we can gain from it. In approaching them, not as something in itself to be revered, but something to remind us and to drive home to us, the fact of what Christ did for us, to make us realize how much we owe to him. There is a real blessing. It is far better to have nothing of that kind, then to give it a worship that belongs to God alone, but it is good, to do such a thing rightly, and of course, there is a very vital thing for the minister. Our protestant ministers do not particularly hold pictures up, but the minister who is affective, in leading his people is not simply a man who presents some logical teaching. He is one who gives them word pictures. He is one who appeals to their emotions, through making vivid to them, the true teaching of the scripture.

It is by contemplation of the death of Christ. Contemplation of what he did for us, that our sanctification is increased, because it strengthens our motivation, and our desire to serve him, and to follow in righteousness. And so we should make our sermons pictorial. And in our dealing with others, in our private dealing with them, it is important to give things logically, but it is more important, ~~hmmmmmmmmmmmmmm~~ in addition to that, that we give them a real feeling, and an emotional understanding of what Christ was, and what Christ did.

Small d. Through the Word, we learn the technique of sanctification, and thus the process can greatly be speeded up. It is the duty of the minister to lead the people to an intense desire for sanctification. He must first develop itself, and then he must lead the people to it. It is not enough to lead people to enter the Christian life. There are certain churches where I hear a wonderful presentation of the importance of justification and the beginning of the Christian life. And I would rather a minister give nothing but that, then that he gave everything else and left that out. But it is

not sufficient in itself. We enter the Christian life, it is vital that we go forward in the Christian life, and God desires that we should build up in ourselves, and in our people, an intense desire for sanctification, and that the minister should show the people how they can advance in sanctification, because the scripture gives us these descriptions.

Sanctification

Number 7. This was 6, ~~sanctification~~ is said to be accomplished through God's truth. Number 7. Sanctification flows from our union with Christ. If we are united with him, in his death to sin, we will be most desirous to share in his resurrected life.

Number 7. Sanctification flows from our union with Christ; if we are united with him, in his death to sin, we will be most desirous of sharing in his resurrection life.

Our union with Christ requires sanctification, and helps us forward in it.

Colossians 3:1-3. "If ye then be risen with Christ." Are you united with Christ. Well, if you are with Christ, "seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth."

You can understand all the theology, you can be a wonderful Hebrew student, you can have tremendous knowledge, but where are your affections? Are they set on things above, or are they tied up with things on earth, that they are constantly affecting you, and causing them to be the major thing in your life. "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." This is a very, very important part of this matter of sanctification. Are we dead, and our life hid with Christ in God? Our union with Christ, if we are united with him in his death, we will be most desirous to share in his resurrection life.

Ephesians 2: 6. We read there that even when we were dead in sin, God has quickened us together with Christ, by his grace, by grace are you saved, and has raised us up together, and has made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ. If we are united with him, we should be living with him, in his resurrection life. The whole thing is most beautifully summarized in Galatians 2: 20. Where we read this verse, that I hope you all know by heart, because it surely is one of the great verses of the New Testament. Galatians 2: 20. "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son

of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." The union with Christ, leading us, if we have been justified, through union with himself, to seek to live with him in his resurrection life.

II Corinthians 5: 15. "And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.

Galatians 5: 25. "If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit."

Sanctification flows from our union with Christ. And when we are tempted, when matters of ordinary advancement in our physical life or in our social life, where little things of this life become big to us, we can think, well those things died with Christ. Those things were buried with him. Those are part of that to which he died. And we can realize that we should be living in the heavenlies with him, instead of grounding them among that which he has saved us from.

S-60. 3/13/57.

We were speaking yesterday at the end of the hour about how we receive justification, or sanctification, and we were speaking about how sanctification flows from our union with Christ. If we are united with him, in his death, to sin, we will be most desirous of sharing in his resurrection life. The person who says, I have been crucified with Christ and so I'm justified before God forever, but I have no desire to live his life now, or to have him live in me, and I'm satisfied to go right on in sin. That person has never believed on him. That person has never been saved by Christ. Justification inevitably leads to sanctification, and if there is no desire for sanctification, there has been no justification. So if you find yourself quite content to go along in your own selfish way, and not to bother about other's welfare, and other's concern, about helping them, if you find yourself content when anything displeases you, and just brush it away and go on, and you feel that, the next time you start to sing, Jesus paid it all, or that he died for you, or something, stop and think about this. Sanctification flows from our union with Christ. If we are united with him, in his death, to sin, we will be desirous of sharing in his resurrection life, and stop and decide which is true, whether you really have not believed in him, and are not united with him, and your saying those words is just a farce, and therefore it is better to recognize the fact, and not waste

your time mouthing words that mean nothing, realize that you're not one for whom Christ died, and that you are heading for an eternity of misery, or to believe on him and recognize that you truly have been justified through him, and that you haven't realized enough what it means, and think about your union with him, and think about what he did for you, and then receive from him, the anxiety to share in his resurrection life, which you desire to have.

I will say, for instance, that if a person listens to a 55 minute lecture, in Systematic Theology, and if after 50 minutes of the 55 minute lecture, a person should decide that they aren't interested in hearing anymore of it, they didn't want anymore of it, they might conceivably sit back, and say I'm going to relax for five minutes, I'm not going to listen, I'm not going to pay any attention. And a person might conceivably do that, and we would say that there interest in systematic theology is an interest that amounts to a 50 - 50 - 50, not a 100 % interest, and that alone would perhaps be enough to get a person by the 80 mark in the course - it might be enough to get them the degree, but if a person feels that way, for them, instead of them, to sit back, and quietly trying not to disturb others, who might desire to get 55 minutes of the lecture, for them to obstentatiously to close a notebook, or rub their feet on the floor, or do something that would disturb others, or interfere with others, anyone who would do that, should think about this statement.

If we are united with Christ, in respect to sin, then we will be desirous of sharing in his resurrection life, and it will not occur to us to disturb others, and of keeping them from getting ^{their} what they want to get from the course. And so we must decide that there is no such a middle ground, it is either one way or the other. We either believe on him, and are justified, and we are desirous of sharing in his resurrection life, and we will think before we do things, that will disturb others, and interfere with their getting what they want, or else, its all a part with us, and we should realize the fact, and forget trying to go forward in the Christian life. Because our Lord said, ^{He} ~~EM~~ wasn't meant to obey him. ~~wasn't~~ Lord, Lord, have we not done these things in your name. We've preached in your name. We've gone out and we've done all these things for you. He said, I never knew you. And the fact that somebody has come forward in a meeting,

or has said words, or given testimony, that proves nothing of our union with Christ. It is possible, as the book of Hebrews shows, for us to go very far in front of the world in seeming to be Christians. But if within us that self life is mounting up, and causing us to want our way, in everything regardless of anybody else, then we can be sure that it is just a farce. I don't say that we should judge others, because only God can judge the heart and the finest Christians fall into terrible sins.

When somebody says I've got sanctification, I'll never fall into sin - you watch out. One of these day you may fall into the grossest - and there are great wonderful evangelists, who have been wonderfully used of the Lord, and who have fallen into such terrible and gross sins, that it has brought dishonor on His name. And then when they have repented of this with tears, it is rare indeed that God has used them. It is rare indeed. If you fall into that sort of sin, that gross sin, God may forgive you, you may have been a true Christian, but it is very unlikely. No matter how thoroughly you repented. But those of us who ~~am~~ don't fall into these gross sins, we all fall into the sins of selfishness, of the difference of putting our own life first, but if we are truly united with Christ, we are looking for him to lift us up into his resurrection life, and to take us away from that which is in us, which would lead us away.

(Question. I think that it's a vital point. I did not mean to say that God will never use a man to the utmost who has fallen into the grossest of sin. I think it entirely possible that a man, who is a true Christian, who believes in Christ, might fall into the grossest of sin, and that man might repent, and come back with tears, and God might use that man in a wonderful way. My guess is that there has been instances like that. But of this I'm sure, that for every case like that, you can find 15 or 20 where a man has repented with utmost of contrition, and where God has forgiven the man, and he is fully justified, but he is not greatly used again. And I have known of men who have fallen into gross sin, and they have always wanted to be used of God, later on, but it has just proven impossible, and real Christians have desired to help them, but it just hasn't worked. I believe they are fully restored in God's favor but not for service. Now that is true particularly of the grosser types of sin. I believe that there are other types of sin, that are, in God's sight, just as bad, if not worse, but from which people have come back more often, and have been greatly used.

Now in David's case, one thing that has always impressed me, is the latter part of David's life was very active. David came back from his sin out of his suffering and misery of the latter part, God enabled him to write some wonderful psalms, that are a great blessing, but as far as his external services and his ~~adaptation~~ acceptance in general, after David fell into this terrible sin, and was restored, and had full assurance of his salvation, after that, we have the rebellion of Absalom. We have David's terrible sorrow in that rebellion, and then we have his terrible sorrow over the death of Absalom, and then after he came back, we have that rebellion against him by this man who was cursing him, and we have one instance after another of misery in his life. And I believe that he was fully restored, as far as his relation to God is concerned, but after that he had an awful time, and it is possible that he wrote some wonderful psalms in his life, for that purpose, but it is such an impression

(11). I don't know. But I know that in the case of many of His workers, they've been laid on the shelf, and they were willing to give their life for His service, but it just didn't work out.)

Number 8. Sanctification requires that we learn to rest in the Lord, and to let him live in us, and through us. We've spoken a good bit about the importance of struggling against sin. The contest goes on. But to win the contest, we must learn to rest in the Lord, and to let him live in us, and work through us.

Galatians 2: 20, which we have mentioned several times, I feel is very important. I find myself mentioning it many times in prayer. "I am crucified with Christ." The justification, the union with Christ, "Nevertheless I live, yet not I but Christ liveth in me." I can struggle against sin, and I can fall, but Christ lives in me. And the life I'm now living in the flesh, I live by the faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. Sanctification is by faith, and justification is by faith. It is the life of Christ in us, which gives us the victory, in justification. To rest in the Lord, and to let Him live in us,

Colossians 3: 15. "Let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful." Let the peace of God rule in your hearts. Let him perform the victory within you.

II Corinthians 4: 10. "Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord

Jesus." We died with him. "That the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body." Not that we overcome sin by tremendous striving -

S-61.

He says it has never been a great practice in the Reformed Church. And I think that it is true that it has never been presented ^a great deal as a factor, but it certainly has been in peoples' lives. And so we won't say so much about this first [?] erroneous view, as we will about the second, yet we will give it our first head.

III. Erroneous Views of Sanctification.

Number one: Antinomianism. It was in the Luthern Church, in the early days, right at the death of Martin Luther, that there were one or two, who misread Martin Luther's extreme statement, and misled by one or two of them, they advanced as a doctrine, antinomianism. "Let us sin more, that God's power in us may be made manifest. Let us not worry about our life. Jesus has taken us over, and we are saved and justified. Now it doesn't matter because he is going to defend ~~(us)~~ us anyway. The Antinomian view: We are free from the law. That is a wonderful hymn. Free from the law, and yet it can be completely misunderstood, if taken in the wrong way.

I read in the paper one day, about 1926, about 30 years ago, that on a Saturday, I believe it was, that a lumberman went to the home of a preacher in Fort Worth, Texas. He stepped into the door, and the preacher pulled a revolver and shot him dead. And the next day the preacher preached, on, "There is therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Well, the paper made a great deal on the way he treated this subject the day after he had shot this man. This lumberman was heavily tied up with gambling, in the city. The minister was preaching excessively against it. The lumberman was very much irritated about what he was doing. He was losing money as a result of his preaching against gambling. And he phoned the man and he said I'm going to come over there and I'm going to beat you to a pulp. I'm just a big lumber fellow, and I'm going to beat you until there is nothing left of you. He gave him a terrific statement of what he was going to do, the man was scared for his life, of what the man was going to do, and he pulled out a revolver, and he was ready, the man comes to the door, and

he steps in with his fists out and he expected the man to either beat him to death, or to shoot him. After he shoots the man, he finds that he has no gun in his pocket, or no gun on him.

The sermon that he preached the next day, was a sermon that was written the week before, I imagine. Certainly the theme had been given to the newspapers two or three days before, and the minister had no thought of going to shoot this lumber man. But the way it was handled it certainly sounded as erroneous. "There is therefore no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus." The day after, having shot this man, and of course the papers tried to represent it with his murder, though I feel that the man should not have had a gun in his place. I think that he was quite wrong in it, but I personally don't think that it was murder in the sense of the word, when he did it. And the jury decided that it was self-defense, and to acquit him of it. But the thing of it is, this sermon, there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, was represented by the newspaper as if a man should go out and commit murder, and if he belonged to the Lord, he was free to do what he wanted to, And of course, that is definitely not the teaching of the scripture.

Now a Jesuit would say that you can reach conclusions which are very close, though they would not admit it. They would say that a thing that is for the Glory of God, and for the advancement of the Church, has a higher motive in it, which can overcome a great deal that is contrary to ordinary law. And the Jesuits are alleged to have committed murder, at times. I don't know if it true, but they certainly have stirred up mobs to commit murders, and to destroy churches, in Columbia, right in our present time. Feeling that the destruction and the injury done was overbalanced by the service to God of the destruction. Well, that is not the teaching of the Scripture. The Jesuits are alleged to believe that the ends justify the means. And I personally think that is a true statement. The ends justify the means. In fact, I think that the ^{means} ~~ends~~ are determined by the ends. If I take a knife, and I stab into one of you, that is murder. The end of it is murder. But if a surgeon takes a knife, and he cuts into you, in an attempt to remove a cancer, and it was a good deed. The means may be identical. It is the ends that determine the means. But if the moral law of God is broken, part of the

end that has been reached is the injury to the moral law of God. And therefore the end is definitely wrong, if it includes an infraction of the moral law of God. And an end which is just wrong, certainly ~~the~~ ^{the meanings} ~~the meanings involved in it~~ that are involved in it are wrong per se, because the means are to be judged by the ends.

And so this Antinomian idea that there is no condemnation. Do what we want to do. It has rarely been presented as a view point in a Christian Church, but it has been put in first ~~ammanam~~ somewhat some people say. Free from the law. We don't have to pay any attention to the law. We can do anything that we feel like. It's utterly wrong. But as Martin Luther said, Under the law, in the sense that I'm in trepidation, at every instance, whether I obey God's law or not, that is wrong. Our guilt is forgiven ~~amman~~ through Christ. We step ahead and follow Christ, and let His life work through us, and do our best to obey his law, but we are not under the law, in the sense that we are subject to condemnation. So Free from the Law is a wonderful song, and a wonderful scene. We are not subject to the law, in the sense that the little infraction that we do, is going to bring terrible misery on our part. The man made a mistake. A terrible mistake in shooting that man in the instance, I described to you. But I do not think that he needed to spend the rest of his life, sorrowing. If he had committed murder, I ~~amman~~ think that he should have. I don't think that he had committed murder. I think that he should have avoided such a mistake. I don't think that he should have made it. But I think that the mistake he made, was under the blood.

We are not under the law, in the sense that we are not subject to it for condemnation, but we are under the law of God in the sense that we must not give spite to the moral law of God, but must seek to carry it out in our own life, and in our activity. It was Amsdorf, in Germany who said, "Good Lord, they're hurtful to salvation." Well, they are, if you look to them for justification. But, certainly, the good works are the inevitable results of a sanctified life. Melancthon's answer was, "Faith alone justifies, but faith is not alone." And that's true. It is only the faith that justifies, but if it is saving faith, there is a desire and a determination to make progress in sanctification. This antinomianism is something that I would recommend that you think about, because it is an error of thought into which you can easily fall.

But I don't think that it is a presentative doctrine that we're so apt to run unto. But there are people who allege that certain teachers talking about that we are now in the age of grace, rather than the age of law, give the impression that now we don't have to follow any law. But my observation is that you take people who present material, that may give that impression, you will find the same teacher giving another talk on the importance of following the righteous teachings of God's word, and living lives, such as he wants us to have. And you'll find that's not their real meaning, that they are apt to be like Luther, who in stressing the importance of the fact that we are not under law, as a means of condemnation, gives the impression, that it doesn't matter a great deal. It does tremendously.

But one thing we must not get into that state of mind of my, oh my, oh my, I'm so scared that I will go over this way a bit, that I won't be saved. We are saved through Christ, and he has justified us, and he wants us to go on as more than conquerors, carrying out God's righteous law, because we have Christ in us, rather than following it as a series of precepts, that we watch every step. But we must not take an antinomian view of sanctification.

Now a view, as a view that is presented, you're more apt to run unto, is Perfectionism. And I did not quite like to give Antinomianism as to how little we say about it, as a whole heading, each to itself. And so I made that E. 1. And the rest of E will deal with Perfectionism.

So then E-2, will be Perfectionism. Discussion of the arguments given for it. Now there are a number of forms of perfectionism. Hodge lists some of them. And Warfield has two volumes in which he lists quite a number of others. He quotes the writer, gives their statements, tell how far the movement went, and goes into a great detail about it. We could spend a semester looking at the varieties of Perfectionism, and the view points taken by them, and their arguments. But they all have a few things in common, and what is important is that we see what is in common.

Perfectionism is the idea that sanctification like justification is an act rather than a process. That's what perfectionism is. It is the idea that at one step we reach sanctification instead of it being a process, and there are various ways in which it is

presented, and various combinations and theological view points. I talked with a student here, ten years ago, who came from a very outstanding Christian college, and he said, he knew one of the professors. He hasn't sinned for five years. He said he was quoting the statement of the man. And the view of the perfectionist is, We can receive the gift of God's holiness, just as we receive the gift of justification and then we are perfect. I remember hearing an evangelist, he said in a meeting, Is there anybody here who has never sinned, but has lived a perfect life? And one man raised his hand. And he said to the man, are you married? The man said, Yes. He said, Is your wife here? He said, Yes. He said, I wonder if she would stand up. She did. He said to her, Would you say that this man's life was lived perfectly before you, that he never committed sin. She said, I wouldn't want to say anything to displease ~~me~~ any fellow [?] (13 $\frac{1}{2}$). If you know a person, you know how their life is not perfect. You know that. And when we say we have reached sanctification. We have reached perfection, well, we are going contrary to human observation. You can think that you have it. But it will be mighty hard to convince you that somebody else has. And so this perfectionism has had many books written against it, many articles written against it, but it is my opinion that evil as it is, and unscriptural perfectionism, that there are certain -

S-62.

There is a real truth that that is an advance that we must not neglect. So I want to take a few minutes on perfectionism, in order to see its unscriptural nature, but also to see what is also stressed in connection with it, which it is very bad for us to overlook. Now in scriptural proofs adduced for the doctrine of perfectionism we might look at four types.

Number one. The Bible commands Believers to be Holy. It even says, Be ye perfect, in Matthew 5: 48. I Peter 1: 16. "Be ye holy; for I am holy." Matthew 5: 48. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." James 1: 4. I Peter 2: 21, urges us to follow the example of Christ, who did no sin. Now such people say such commands are unreasonable if we can not attain to them. And therefore, it must be that it is possible for us scripturally to be perfect, to live holy, sanctified

in Christ, or we would not have the command in scripture. Now that is an argument that doesn't work out, because similar commands are given to the unbeliever. They are commanded to keep the law. They are commanded to live a perfect life. This particular argument applies only from the Pelagian viewpoint, which holds that everybody, if he'll only use the man that is in him, can live a life that is acceptable to God. So this first argument is not the big one for us.

A second argument though, Holiness and perfection are often ascribed to believers in Scripture. They are described in the sense sense in scripture. There are quite a few references which seem to do this. I'll just mention them, I Cor. 2: 6, II Corinthians 5: 17. Ephesians 5: 27, Hebrews 5: 14. Philippians ~~5: 13~~ ^{3: 15.} Colossians 2: 10. I think that we can recognize that the scripture calls us holy because we are sanctified and God sees us holy. I mean that we are justified, and God sees us as holy, and he sees our sanctification as something that is certain to be complete. But I don't believe that it proves - if it proves it, if anyone, ~~if it proves it with~~ ^{the use of} these terms, it proves it of all ~~sanctification~~ ^{are used of all.} things, because they ⁽³⁾. "Ye are sanctified, ye are holy. Elsewhere they are sinful, and now they are holy."

(Question. Holiness is not a process. It's a person. If you take the thing literally, it's untrue. If you take what the man is driving at, it's true. That it's getting the life of Christ in us that is a part of that. But you can't take it as a straight literal statement from ^{But as an emphasis on a proper} ₍₄₎.

(Question. Yes, that's exactly right. That is the holiness of Christ. The righteousness of Christ. It describes the process of sanctification, and we are justified, it is applied to us. We have that [?] something . But our state, we will have it eventually yet ? but we don't get it. So that we immediately have it. We are receiving it, that [?] state .)

(Question. Hebrews 5: 14. It seems to indicate more of a process rather than an act. Answer. "Strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." It would suggest that they have arrived by a process, but the argument is that they have arrived. They have reaced it. The point of the perfectionist are ascribed to people, saying that these people have arrived.

That is the argument, but it is an argument, which I think usually results from not recognizing that such usages can refer to justification or to a sizeable step forward in sanctification, rather than the complete sanctification. That it means they're full grown, that they have made progress. They're fully equipped for their task, not that they have really attained, as Philippians 3: ¹² says, "Not as though I had already attained."

Number three. There are said to be Biblical accounts of Saints who have led perfect lives. Of course, the fact is, that you find that any saint, of whom much is said, you find some things that are rather imperfect, and you find that the finest people if there is much about them, they very often have very severe sins in their lives. That's the wonderful thing about the word of God. Of those who are fully described, we do find many imperfections in their lives. We have men of whom it is said, they followed the word holy with a pure heart ~~and~~ ⁽⁹⁾ and yet, we have told of them, of their sin, ^{interpret}. And we must be perfect in the light of that. There are a few cases where there is nothing said that really points out sin ~~and~~ ^{in Amh Joseph} perhaps, or in Job. But there certainly is in Noah, there certainly is in Moses, and you'll find that in most cases there is.

Number four. The Apostle John declared very explicitly, that those who are born of God, do not sin. And if we took these words in quite that sense, we would think that none of us are born of God. I John 3: 6, 8 and 9. "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him." Verse 8. "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." Now those verses sound mighty strong. They certainly sound as though we never sin, if we've been born of God. He remains in us, and we can't sin, because we are born of him. Well, if that's what it means, then none of us have been born of him. Because we all do commit sin. I John, the same book, tells us in 1: 8, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." "Whatsoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, . It's a flat contradiction.

To resolve the contradiction, I don't know how you can resolve it, and have believers perfectly sinless, unless uncourse, this statement in I John 1: 8, meant the unbelievers. I hardly think he would have said we, if he meant the unbelievers. But if it means that whosoever is born of God, never commits sin, well, then that means that all Christians do not sin. That does not show a state of sanctification which some have reached. That would show a reality of it that all Christians have reached, and if only those who are considered perfect are saved, that would certainly mean that most of us, not that we have received sanctification, but that we've never received justification. The fact is that these words are used presently, and it would seem reasonable to say that when he says he doth not sin, he means go on sinning habitually. He means makes a steady practice of continuing in sin. He is pointing out that the one who is justified, does not lie down in sin, but is anxious to secure the process of sanctification, that when he sins, he falls into sin, rather than to habitually go forward in sin. Otherwise, we do not get from these verses of John, a view of a second act of grace which moves a justified Christian forward to a perfectly sanctified Christian. These verses of I John, If they sin, that the truly born one never sins, they show it all as one act, not as two. ~~question~~

(Question. This person says he is able not to sin. Answer. Yes, he is able not to sin. Well, I think that if we are able not to sin, yet we sin, we are very conscious of it. I can't quite believe that a person who is able not to sin, and still sin
(13)
. That would be pretty hard to believe. I think there is a little truth underneath that we must not lose, but I think that if we carried the point,

S-63.

(Question. You mean that here it is dealing with justification, rather than sanctification. That may be true of some of these, but I don't think it would explain all of them. I think, now you take this verse. "Whosoever abideth in him, sinneth not." Whosoever sinneth - verse 6, whosoever abideth in him sinneth not. The man that sins is just not abiding, and he had better start in abiding. That's not what it says. It says, "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him,

neither known him." In other words, John here, he is able not to sin, and still he goes on sinning, it's proof that he's never seen him, he's never known him. And so this would seem quite definitely in this particular verse, to be speaking of sanctification, but to be speaking of continuously remaining in sin, rather than seeking to get out of it. Whoever abideth in him does not keep on sinning, he is growing in grace. Whosoever keeps on sinning, it's pretty good proof that he has never seen him, neither known him. Not that he is a Christian, not abiding in him, but he is one who has never seen him, neither known him.)

I John 2: 1. "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." I think surely he is writing there, that these things I write unto you, in order that you work toward that goal of never sinning. That ye sin not. You work toward that goal and now you sin much less than you would otherwise. You are avoiding this thing. You are avoiding that. That ye sin not, but if you fall, he says, if any man sin, we have an advocate with the father, who is the propitiation for our sins. So here he is speaking, not of the continual objection, but the ultimate objection - to reach a state of perfection, which we should reach. But not in this world. It would be wonderful if we could reach it, in this life, but it is just not possible.

(Question. Yes, that they should strive not to sin. That they should do their very best. That they should avoid everything that they can. But not as a promise that they can completely avoid it, anymore than to say that anyone of us are going to learn all the knowledge that we can. You just go ahead and become wise. You study hard and become wise. Well, you put in a week of hard study, and you will be a lot wiser, than you were at the beginning of the week. But you will be mighty far from complete wisdom. In fact, you'll be more ignorant at the end of the week, because you will know more things that you don't know.)

This fourth point then, I think, that these verses in I John are very important, correctly understood, and carefully studied. We don't want to look at them just to disprove perfectionism. We want to look at them to see what the apostle is talking about, and when we do, we find that he presents some mighty important truth to us.

But so much for three, for two, the arguments for perfectionism. Now, number three, Objections to the theory of Perfectionism. And now by perfectionism, I think we must say this. We are talking of two things. We are talking of perfectionism in the sense of sinless perfection, real, perfect perfection. We are talking to some extent of perfectionism in the sense of statements that seem as if people believe that they've acquired sinless perfection. Very often such statements are misunderstood. And we want to examine them very carefully, and not jump to conclusions too rapidly, regarding particular individuals, or particular movements.

But number one. Objections. The Bible very explicitly says, There is no one on earth who does not sin. This verse I read to you a few minutes ago, I John 1: 8, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and his truth is not in us." If we say we have no sin. And James 3: 2, "For in many things we offend all." We all sin. Romans 3: 10. But there are many other statements that make it very clear, that all sin in this life.

Number two. According to scripture, there is a constant warfare between the flesh and the spirit in the lives of God's children. We've looked at a good many verses on this already, on sanctification. I don't believe that I need to mention references right here.

Number three. Confession of sin, and prayer for forgiveness, are continually required. Bible saints are constantly represented as confessing their sins. We are told constantly to confess our sins. There are no exceptions there, that we don't need to pray for deliverance from temptation and from the evil one.

Perfectionists

Number four. The most important of all. The ~~perfectionists~~ themselves deem it necessary to lower the standard of the law, and to externalize the idea of sin.

That is to say there is no such a thing as an intelligent, real perfectionist. That is to say, an intelligent person who says he believes in perfectionism, if you get to discussing what he means, you'll find out that he means something different than perfection - that he doesn't mean sinless perfection. That he means avoiding conscious sin, or living up to the law as far as you are able, or some other definition. And Hodge and other sources give quite a number of definitions that people give of the kind

of perfection they obtained, but it is not sinless perfection. The individuals who claim to have sinless perfection, are very, very few. It would be better if some other word were used for it. But I do think that it is important that we seek to become as perfect as we can. It is much more important that we acquire holiness, than if we point out the error of somebody else who thinks he has acquired, and hasn't. He may be much more holy than we are. And even if his ideas are fallacious, God will bless him more for the progress he's made in holiness, more than for his ideas. Let us emulate the desire to acquire holiness.

S-64. 3/14/57.

We spoke yesterday about the arguments which are given for perfectionism, and we looked at the argument, we look at four main types of arguments to show that sinless perfection is possible in this life, and we, I think saw, the particular scriptural evidence advanced for this. Then we took up E-3, the objection to the theory of perfectionism. The fourth one was that it lowers the standard, and externalizes the idea of sin. It is one of the most important difficulty with any such theory. The theory that we can attain sinless perfection in this life. Let us leave off the word sinless for a moment. Let us say, that, with the idea that we can obtain any sort of perfection in this life, there is the danger of lowering our standards. Not the danger but the certainty. And so it is best that we do not use the word perfection. Now, in our name, we use the word perfection, but we do not mean by it, sinless perfection. We don't even mean by it, something which would really fit the word perfect if we attain it. They mean a great step forward in holiness. And that is an entirely different thing. And there is a tremendous danger that in our theological discussion, we can fall into needless discussion over terms. There is a tremendous danger of that, and a danger that I think we should avoid. In fact, Paul tells us to avoid arguments over words and endless genealogies.

It is necessary to say that in any theological argument, there are two opposite dangers in which we can fall. One is a danger of ignoring some tremendously important thing, because we express it in very similar language. Was Christ Homo-ousia, ~~ousia~~ or Homoi - ousia (3). Was he of the same nature as the Father, or was he of a similar nature? One letter, one Greek letter different, and yet ~~at~~ the whole matter of

redemption, the whole future of the Christian is determined on which of the two. There can be a very slight point which is tremendously important for our whole salvation. On the other hand you can have two different statements of the same truth, which are so different, that either one of them can pick the other statement all full of theological flaws. And yet these flaws are not present in the real thought and attitude of the speaker. What he is trying to say is right. And I believe that good things are often torn to pieces by theological arguments based upon words, rather than upon the real intent and purpose and emphasis of that which is presented. And so, if by perfectionism we mean that we are able to so live in this life, that nobody has any problems around in which they could criticize God, we have attained to that extent, it is terribly dangerous, because the New Testament repeatedly tells us we must go on from glory to glory, we must constantly improve, and the whole teaching about sanctification is that as we grow in grace, we learn more of what it means, and we see more areas in our life which needs to be brought into subjection to the mind of Christ, and if we feel so sure that we've attained that we aren't constantly looking for new areas we need to attain, our growth can be tremendously stunted.

And so the danger of thinking, the danger of lowering God's standard, (if I say in a way it's a theoretical standard, what does it matter what we think God's standard is or not? God's standard stands apart from us. It matters a great deal if it leads us to be satisfied with the points to which we have attained. Here is a man who in holiness can be said to be up to this point, and here's another whose holiness can be said to be up to this point, and this man towers far above this man. He's a far finer man in God's sight in every way. His sanctification has proceeded, he's had a great act of grace in his heart, which has enabled him to take a step up here, way beyond the other man. That's wonderful. But if this man up here, feels that he has attained so completely that he doesn't look for any possibility of going further. He's attained, and he's satisfied, and he's stopped here. The other man may come on, and in the process of sanctification, may go way beyond him, and in God's sight, the man who is moving, is certainly far superior to the man who thinks he has attained, and has ^{ceased} ~~stopped~~ to move.

So there is a danger of anything which leads a person to feel that he has attained perfection, even though he lowers the term perfection down to where it is not sinless perfection, to where it is only a fraction of perfection. But it is too bad that we use the word perfection. But the scripture does use the word perfection, in a lower sense sometimes. You can take any word and you can interpret it a different way. And that is true.

And so if a person says I've attained perfection. I've taken a step forward, and instead of moving from here, to here, and to here, I've taken a tremendous step forward, and I've attained perfection. And then he says, Now I was here, and now I take another step and I attain perfection, and he keeps on attaining perfection, and every step that he takes in attaining perfection, is another step forward. That's fine. Only the people can misunderstand the term perfection. And so there can be that which we would call Perfectionism, in which the term perfection merely means a great step forward and there is more to take. And there can be that which we call perfections in which we means we step as far as we can step, and there is no need in stepping further. And this is one of the greatest dangers of any perfectionist theory. It is lowering the standard of what God requires. As I say, we have to watch out in this matter of words, because to some people it can sound as if they're lowering it, and yet not actually lowering it at all.

(~~mp~~)

(Question. There has been such things, but whether there is at present, I don't know. As far as I can see, the whole emphasis on sanctification at our present time, is much less then it has been at most times in the past. There have been times in the past when most any magazine you picked up talked about some perfectionist group. Today I see very little. And I don't know whether it is in a decline now, or whether there are a very comparatively few groups now, and they are not so conspicuous. I don't know.)

(Question. That sounds like a very valuable emphasis.)

(Question - discussion was given in class here on the Nazarenes and their beliefs. Answer. Now personally I have had little contact, in fact, I would say no contact with the Nazarene Church. I have been in towns where every church was Modernist except the Nazarene Church, and the people were very happy with the Scripture teaching they were

receiving in that church. But I've had no personal contact with them. I'm not interested in this class in passing any judgment on any group as a group, but upon ideas that attend it. Now if a person wants to use terminology in such a way that by sinning he means a conscious presumptuous act against God, and by errors and mistakes he means something that he should not do, but that perhaps it is not quite in the character ~~of sin~~ (102) of sin. I think a person could use the terminology, but it is a very dangerous terminology and most people use it I think, would think that the errors and the mistakes were not important, and therefore it is not anything to worry about. I would think that it is very dangerous to lower the standard of the word sin, so that it does not cover anything of the teachings of God. Because, surely anything that displeases God isn't.)

Well, now one could so lower the use of the term sin, and yet in his own life, could be so striving to eliminate the errors and mistakes, that he would actually be proceeding in sanctification and another one could by this lowering of the term sin, take an attitude that, now I know I'm not sinning, and what difference is there to me if a mistake is made, he would be lowering the standard in a very dangerous way. So that I would think it entirely possible, for a person to use terminology and not to be actually lowering the standard, but I think it is a tremendous danger. And particularly the rank and file of people are going to be affected by this terminology, often in the way that the leadership doesn't realize. ~~And~~. And so, I'm speaking on, anything call calls itself perfectionism, or talks about becoming perfect, or about a person at one thought of getting victory over sin. And I am saying that there is a tremendous danger in our lowering our standard. And it should be very seriously guarded against.

Number five. There is a tendency in most such movements to overemphasize the human part in salvation. There is a tendency, I'm not saying that in every individual that would be the case. But it is a tendency we need to guard against, and to watch for. To overemphasize the human part in salvation. I think that a place where that comes in particularly perhaps is in the tendency to make a first experience the thing which is finally determining in our thinking as whether we are sanctified. Our Christian life flows as a rule by great experiences, but not always. And this is true of our justification and of our sanctification. There are many many people who have a wonderful experience of justification. They have turned from darkness to light, in a sudden great wonderful step

forward, and their conversion is something that they will never forget. There are other people who have had small experiences from time to time, and could never point to the time when they were justified. They never could. And some have had wonderful periods of consecration and they've given testimonies, as how they were saved at this time, and others can go back into their lives, and tell of experiences and have taken stands which lead us to believe that they were saved before. The vital thing is to be regenerated, but the regeneration God does when he chooses, and we don't see the regeneration. We see the conversion. Now God may regenerate, and the new life may show in an outflowing of faith, which will lead us to take a wonderful step forward, and have a great remarkable conversion, but the new life may show itself in a visible turn to God which is very slight, and nobody knows when it occurred, and there may have been many things through the years, which people did not recognize.

S-65.

You can't say you are saved because you had an experience. Now men may have a wonderful experience. But it isn't the experience that saves you, but your relation to Christ. And the vital thing is, are you in a relation to Christ which shows you are justified. That justification is received through faith. What I mean to say is, There is a danger in our magnifying a human experience to the extent of making it a ~~sin~~ [?] ~~qua~~ [?] non for others. And some have one, or two, or three, wonderful experiences, which casts a shadow over their whole life, and others have a great many small experiences. You might say that the norm might be that a person after regeneration would just gradually grow, and go up at a steady pace. That would be the normal thing, but it is a norm that nobody ever attains. In every case there is a great step forward, and then we gradually slip downward, and then there is another step forward. We say that one of us may have a tremendous experience of realizing God's grace, and that may be when justification is first applied to us. May it isn't. Maybe it was this before. But it is a wonderful experience. But the vital thing is, not what happened to us in the past, but what relationship we have to Christ.

Well, now, the same thing is true of sanctification. We can take great steps forward

in our sanctification, and there may be individuals who take one great step forward in their life, in sanctification, which is a tremendous step forward. But they can't say to somebody else, The only way you can be sanctified is to take one step forward, as I have taken, and they should be careful about thinking that their one step forward is all we need. They may need an other equally great one, or they may need a lot of little ones. The danger of thinking that my experience at conversion is the thing that is vital, that I get the great experience. It's grand to get the great experience. But the vital thing is our relation to Christ, not how we come into that.

Now I have here the second volume of Warfield's two volume series on Perfectionism. And in these two volumes he takes up various movements and one after the other, and the last chapter is on the victorious life. Have you in the last five years heard much about the victorious life? When I was in college there were many speakers all over the country presenting the victorious life. Dr. Trumbell, the editor of the Sunday School Times, was one of the leaders, of the movement. And the Sunday School Times was full of articles. I haven't noticed in the last five years, that I can recall, any articles in the Sunday School Times. In the articles here by Warfield on the victorious life, he just lays Trumbell and these others out. He speaks about, he takes Trumbell and he takes one thing after another, and lays him out, and then he refers to Trumbell's assistant, at the Sunday School Times, Mr. Robert C. McQuilken, and he says, "If we wish to notice to what length the notion may be carried, that the old man in us is unaffected by the intruding spirit, we have only to turn to Mr. Robert C. McQuilken, somewhat incoherent tracts on "God's Way of Victory over Sin." And then he goes on, and says that McQuilken starts his tract with saying, "If it isn't easy, it isn't good." And then he says, he ends it up with saying, "To live the victorious life is a difficult thing." So that's why he says it is incoherent.

But Trumbell just lays out this teaching here, but it would seem to me, I never had close contact with the teaching, but I had a fair amount when I was in college, of observation. And my personal impression is that the point which Warfield criticized, are dangers which must be carefully avoided. That they are dangerous in any system, that can lead in the direction of perfectionism. Dangers which must be carefully avoided.

But as far as my connection, my observation of them, they were dangers that were not necessarily in the actual teaching. They may have been in some of the statements, but they were dangers which could be avoided, and still be very useful and helpful matters of the teaching. Now for example, you take the statement, "If it isn't easy, it isn't good." Now, of course, that's a ridiculous statement. Many of the best things in life are very difficult, and Romans 7 makes it clear. We must struggle. But it is a ~~great~~ statement that has a great deal of truth in it, because we can struggle, and struggle, and struggle, in our own power, and we will never gain victory. And it is when we cease from our own work, and rest in the Lord, and look to Him, to work his perfect work in our lives, that we attain victory. And consequently, they say, easy does it. A man goes out, and he practices pitching a ball, and he goes through the most tremendous exertion and effort in practicing, learning how to pitch it well. But when the time comes when he is ~~anything but a~~ ^{playing the game,} when the pitch which is of tremendous effort, probably isn't a particularly good one. And the one that he simply pitches easily, utilizing what he has learned, is probably really a good lot. (7). The object of easy does it, in most anything that we do. And I think that this is especially true in the Christian life. We often take a lot of hard struggle to learn the easy thing.

Doubtless the wording (victorious life) of it changed, and perhaps the teaching changed in some places to avoid the proper criticisms that Warfield has made. Of things that were said, or tendencies which could be, or maybe were fallen into. And when a person takes a great step forward in sanctification he naturally feels so very, very happy in his step, that it is easy for him to magnify the importance of the step. And to get the impression that that is all that is needed. But he must realize that there are other steps to take.

I have heard, years ago, advocates of the victorious life movement, make the statement that Warfield had done the movement a great service by his argument, because he had pointed out dangers into which they might fall, which have been avoided later. Now it isn't my purpose here to pass a judgment pro or con, but to see what the scriptural teaching is, and why a thing is, and whether we are adhering to any particular movement, but whether we are following the scriptural teaching. The same thing is true

of Calvinism. It is possible for people to take certain vital teachings of Calvinism, which are true and to ~~make~~ ^{saying} the following of these words and/of these statements so very important, that you lose their inner meaning, and you lose the other important emphases of the Scripture. Some of which may be more important in practical life.

It is possible to do that and I personally feel that we should take the great help that Calvin gives us, and the wonderful teaching that are embraced in the system of Calvinism, but that we should see what are the practical aspects of it, that are vital for us to be stressed in our life. ^{Rather than} ~~That is~~ to make the observance, the following of a particular phraseology right down the line, to (10) of our Christian work. I think that it is a tremendous danger.

And I think that there is a same danger in relation to this. Here's a man who says, I believe in holiness. I believe that it is possible to live a perfect life. Look at me. I can never sin. Well, there is a ~~danger~~ terrible danger in it. Here's another man who says, I've taken a great step forward, in the Christian life, I've attained the standard of holiness, which I wouldn't have thought it possible ever to attain, but he says I stepped forward, I'm moving, and I don't deserve any credit for what I've attained. It's the work of God's grace entirely. I say praise the Lord for the step that he's taken forward. That he is looking forward to perfection. But here are two dangers, that are quite important. This danger of lowering God's standard. We think that we have made a wonderful step. We have attained. Paul said, "Not as though I've attained. I follow after." We have made a great step, but there are other great steps that we need to make. And here is the ^{/?} verse that I mentioned, the danger of putting the stress on the human aspect. Now that doesn't mean to forget the human aspect. Trumball said, "You let go, and you let God." and Warfield says, (11 $\frac{1}{2}$)

very strong in his argument. As if we could bring our sanctification, by our letting go. and our doing this wonderful thing of letting go, and then Trumball says, it is possible to be surrendered, and yet not victoriously. He said, "We let go, but we don't let God." And Warfield makes a great deal of how ridiculous this is, and says that we ~~cannot~~ could let God, and that we could stop God. And of course if we were to think of ourselves as we do this wonderful thing of surrendering, and to take this step forward

of saying

in holiness, but it isn't that much, if we don't do this other wonderful thing, /Come on God, you take over. Why, of course, that would be terrible, but I don't think that Dr. Trumball ever had that ~~impression~~ at all. I don't think that's what he meant

(12). Perhaps his words were not always used in the sense of the meaning he was trying to get across. Perhaps his ideas at some points conveyed ideas that were wrong. But in his main emphases I think that what he certainly had in mind was that we cease from our striving, and recognize the grace that is available in Christ, and that he wants us to partake of and to profit by it. I think that is what he is really trying to present. And I think that Warfield's treatment against it, is very, very good. And the pointing out of a danger, which must be avoided, but I think that if ~~his~~ ^{it's a} judgment of the man, of Trumball, that is a matter which we must weigh as a whole. We must make our own decision on any movement. Is this movement something that has enough good in it, that it is wise for me to give some assistance to it, and to profit by it. Is this movement that has enough bad in it, that it is good for me to oppose it, and to point out its danger to others. But I don't think we should make a judgment, this is such a wonderful movement this must be the (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) system, and comparatively

few of us will say, this is such a bad movement, that the ^{And whenever} ~~administration~~ it comes in

we must point it out, we must make our own judgment of how great the thing is.

(Question). I would say that a perfect life will never be a reality in the life of a believer, but the doctrine is more than a doctrine, to him that loves him, and whether we express that more by taking it victoriously, we are not victorious over . But that there is no need of our being constantly defeated by a particular sin, we go down, and we go down, and we go down, we can gain victory over these particular sins, by bringing it to God in prayer and confession, and living the risen life with Christ in relation to this thing, and we can have victory over any particular thing, and he wants us to become victor over more and more like that. And we could live a victorious life, in the sense that we are constantly increasing in our sanctification.

I think that it is very important that we don't misunderstand that as meaning we are living a perfect life, that we are living a life that is always victorious, I think that when one thinks and assumes that he is always going to be victorious is going to take a pretty bad tumble. And when he does take a tumble, if he is so convinced that he is victorious, he'll have to lower God's standard. I know a man, I believe he was the head of the Nyack school, and he had tremendous faith in the teaching of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. And his daughter, and he believed in Divine healing, and he was absolutely sure that the Lord was going to raise up his daughter. He was absolutely sure. He told everybody that the Lord had given him victory, and given him that God was going to raise her up. In no time the daughter died. And this man was so shakened, that he gave up most of what he was told before. I heard him later. What I heard of his early life was this, I heard him that it was ungrateful to her. But I knew him in his later time. Later on he was the teacher of Bible in a Presbyterian college out on the Pacific coast, and he was that for a number of years, and he had a pastorate out there, and he was very popular, but his whole attitude was one of not taking any stand whatever on the matter of the great truths of the Gospel. And he has given up all the. And I think that we must realize that God can heal. And that God may heal. I think that God wants us to pray for healing for our loved ones. But I think he wants us to say, thy will be done. And recognize that it may be His will not to heal. And we have no right to demand the healing, or to be sure of it. Paul prayed three times, for the thorn in the flesh, that it be taken away from him, and God did not take it away. We don't know what God's will is. But here is a teaching that we can be sure of, healing. We can be sure, the man firmly held, he found it wasn't true, and he gave up a great deal that was true in that. And I think that's the danger of our thinking that we are living the victorious life, and to be said that we have attained, we take a big tumble, we have to give up a great deal that is very harmful. ~~What~~ We are apt to fail to realize that it is a terrible good for us to fall. It is something that we need repentance for. The Lord, we need to seek his help. But we must realize that others came through, and everyone of us probably will ~~sometimes~~ two or three times in our lives. To take some bad tumbles,

and we take a lot of little ones. And we want to learn. A little child thinks he ^{learning} is ~~going~~ to walk. And he goes from here, half way across the room, and he's learned to walk. And then he takes a tumble, and before he really learns to walk, he is going to take another one. And before we are complete sanctified, we are going to take a lot of tumbles.

In between the tumbles, we should live victoriously. And we should try to live so close to the Lord, that there will be less and less of it. And we should recognize that it is not his fault, but our fault when we make them, and we should confess our sin. I think that victory runs, and defeat should characterize it, the life of a true Christian. I think that is right. But I think that we ought to be careful about feeling that we have obtained victory, to such an extent, that we fail to see that it is defeat that we actually have, because even though we have victory in many phases of life, each one of us is having defeats in other phases of his life.

Dr. (4) told me about two very wonderful Christian men, who were along in years. And the story is that these two men were at his place for a few days, and they took a couple of walks together. And he said that the first day they took a long walk together, and the second day they took a long walk together, and the third day they each took a long walk separately, and the fourth day they each took a long walk separately, and he saw this, and he said, say you and Jones don't seem to be walking together. I notice that the first couple days you took walks together. He said, Well, you know, he said, Jones is getting old. He talks so long. And you know, there are a couple of things that I wanted to tell him, and I couldn't even get a word in. And then he said he saw Jones. And he said, You and Smith never seem to be walking together anymore. And Jones said, Well, you know, Smith is getting kind of old. And he said, He reminisces so much. I had a couple of things that I wanted to say, and I just couldn't get a word in. He talked so much. Well, here were these two wonderful men, who had been greatly used of the Lord, and each of them could have profited greatly by listening to the other. And in neither case, actually was the fault half so much that he was talking a lot, as that he was impatience listening to the other fellow, because he wanted to talk. And no matter how far they got along in their Christian life, we will have that - the phases

we must overcome. There is more land to be conquered. There is much more progress to be made. And the danger in any terminology of holy or complete sanctification, or perfection, a great danger is that we lower ~~man~~ God's standard and the theoretical matter of what we call God's standard ~~isn't~~ the vital thing, the vital thing is that in lowering God's standard, we lower our watchfulness to see those areas in which we need to move forward and we need to gain a victory we didn't even realize existed before. Or perhaps a new temptation has come upon us, as we enter into the new experience.

I want to thank God because I had a wonderful experience. Well, maybe you had a wonderful experience, and you took a great step forward, ~~in~~ by God's grace. But the important thing is how your knowledge is of it. That is the vital thing. And the wonderful experiences are grand things, but there is a danger in any perfectionist movement, there is a danger of putting too much stress on human experience. It is a great danger which we must guard against, but not guard against it, by not trying to have it, and not caring whether we have it.

(Question. Whether his interpretations are correct, or not, would be hard to say. But I would say this, that the Lord wants us to have wonderful experiences of the Lord, in which we feel his grace so great in us, it is different from anything else we had in our life. But I think that we should go on. Strong quotes from a statement about Finney, because Finney was greatly criticized for his views of perfectionism, for his statements about perfectionism, and he made some statements which were very dangerous, in this direction. But it is interesting, to note, that though Finney said that it was possible to live a perfect Christian life without sinning, Finney never said, that he did it himself. He always said that he himself had not reached that point. He believed that it was possible, to live without sinning, but he confessed his own sin. Here is the statement about it. "Mr. Finney meant by entire sanctification (now you see, Finney said that it is possible to have entire sanctification). Now what did he mean by that? By that he meant, that "only that it is possible for Christians in this life, by the grace of God, to consecrate themselves so unreservedly to his service, as to live without conscious and local disobedience to the divine command. Now that's lowering the standard of God's righteousness, ~~NM~~ to say that it is ~~manmade~~ enough to live without

being conscious of wilful disobedience to divine command. God wants us to learn to become more conscious of what it is, that is displeasing to God. He wants us not merely to live without conscious and wilful disobedience, but to constantly increase the area of our understanding, and to go forward in it. So Finney in this statement of entire sanctification, is lowering the Divine standard. There's a danger in that. Let's notice it. It says here, "He did not claim himself to have reached this point. He made at times, very impressive ^{confessions} ~~statements~~ of his own sinfulness. He did not encourage others to make for themselves the claim to have lived without conscious fault. He held therefore that such a state is attainable, and therefore, that if pursued is rational.

I would say that such a state is attainable in the sense that God is going to bring us into that state. But not that it is attainable in this life. Because scripture gives us no warrant to think that it is. But that its pursuit is certainly rational. It is proper, and we should pursue it. And he also admitted that such a state is one not absolute but relative, ^{of} sinlessness. One can be very active, and very helpful and very pleasant in his emphases. I think that there were certain elements in his teaching that were dangerous. But many things that Finney stated were very helpful. And I think that the world profited greatly by the great truths that Finney presented, even when you offset it with the harm that is done by certain erroneous statements. that we resent.

Then was done by some individuals who sat back in a corner, and spent their lives criticizing Finney, but were not themselves advancing the increase in the number of Christians in the country, and not increasing them in an effective way. This is a danger we must guard against. The danger of overemphasizing our human part in salvation. It is just exactly the same thing again as the matter of faith in relation to justification. It is all of Christ. It is his grace. There is nothing that we do that enters into our justification, as a ground toward it. We're not saved because we're such good people, we have faith in him. Or because we're such sinful people that we put faith in him. Or that we're such good people that we see the truths of his claims and put faith in him. We're saved by his grace alone, and our faith is the instrument that he uses. But

we must do everything that we can to stimulate faith in others. We must do everything we can to show them the importance of faith, to lead them to have faith. And so it is largely a matter of how we look at it, rather than that we look at it rightly, as something that God wants emphasized, and stressed, and he is greatly pleased with it. Its the instrument ~~which~~ through which he gives it to us. Or if rather we take an attitude that we consider the faith that we have attained, or others attained, as a work, something that we do, ~~which~~ ^{for} which we receive Christ. It's a matter of attitude but the attitude can become tremendously important.

So there again the two statements can be so close, that you can hardly see the difference. Yet the one can be right and the other wrong. And yet, two statements can be so far apart, that they sound absolutely contradictory and yet part of it is moving forward, may be thoroughly agreed.

Number six. There is a danger of a separation of justification and sanctification.
 Trumball
 Warfield stresses that a great deal. He says that ~~some~~ consider a person as being justified without being sanctified. I don't know whether that is true of Trumball or not. I certainly don't think that was true of him in general. It may be true of certain statements. But I think that it is a danger to think that a person can be justified without starting the ~~process~~ process of sanctification. If we are not being sanctified, we've never been justified. I would say that definitely. There is a real danger in it. There is the danger in separating ~~me~~ them, the other danger is of confusing them. Of thinking that we are sanctified in the same way that we are justified, by one great step forward. I think that the vital thing is that we realize that God wants sanctification. And ~~human~~ to my mind the man who is ~~always~~ striving for holiness, and making progress, is in general far better, then the man who is afraid that he will strive for it the wrong way, and there is no use in striving for it. I think that the first one would be far, far better. I think that the Lord wants the stress on holiness, he wants the stress on sanctification, he wants the stress on going forward, and you've had a second great work of grace. You've had a work, and a great step forward in sanctification. I ~~say~~ ^{say} you praise the Lord for ~~him~~. But don't say that you may not have

They may have it. We can't set a pattern that everybody else has to go through. But we must strive for holiness. We must work for holiness. And we must seek to have right thinking on these lines, to avoid the dangers to which wrong thinking can bring us. That was E-3. Objections to the Theories of Perfectionism.

E-4. Conclusions regarding Perfectionism.

Small a. It's dangerous. Now there's three, I've mentioned quite a few already, but I'll just list three here. One. Lowering the standard of God's requirements. Two, It may lead to failures and misery. Now those two could be confused, but I mean by it, one, lowering the standard, the other one, failing to watch, that to think that we have attained better than we have, and not be on the watch where we are failing in the things we already know. Three. It may lead to false pride. Spurgeon met a woman, and she said, "I haven't sinned for five years." He said, "My you must be proud of that." She said, "Oh, I surely am." Well, that was a perfect way of trying to point out that actually there is sin in every one of us. That is the danger in any work of grace. The danger that we can become proud of it, but let's not avoid the work of grace, for fear that we might become proud of it. I think there is a danger in that, too. There is a real danger that we can fail to step forward for fear that we'll be proud of it. Let's step forward, for God, and brush away the thought.

is stressing.

Small b. The truths that it ~~suppresses~~. I think there are three truths there that are very vital, and there are groups that might be called perfectionists, are certainly stressing these things, and which we all ought to stress.

One. The Importance of Holiness. In avoiding a false notion of holiness, there is a danger that we avoid to give the proper stress on true holiness, and you cannot over emphasize this. Certainly, the - it is not as, someone says, that A.J. Gordon said (3) It is not an edifying spectacle to see a Christian worldling, throwing stones at a Christian perfectionist. He said that if the doctrine of sinless perfection is a heresy, the doctrine of contentment with sinful imperfection, is a greater danger. And I think that those are two very excellent statements. It is dangerous for a person to think that he has attained in living victoriously. It is dangerous. It is much more, then for a

Person to be content, without improving and going forward, and seeking every way he can to try to step forward in holiness. And so I think that the stress, I would say that any movement that just stresses holiness and sanctification, if there are dangers in it and errors in it, we want to point that out, and to avoid them, but to praise God for the stress and holiness, and sanctification, which may be made, and let's emulate that rather than to criticize the things that may be erroneous in the particular movement unless of course that it becomes so great that it is very, very harmful. But this is something that should be stressed, and praise God for those who stress it. The importance of holiness.

Number two. The need of further works of grace. I think that most holiness movements, most perfectionist movements, stress the need of holding works of grace. I think that we need to stress it. I don't think that we should say, that everybody has to go through the same pattern. One may have a great tremendous experience of conversion, which may be such a step forward, ⁱⁿ ~~that~~ his life, that all his life, is lived in the shadow of that. Another may have two, and one of which justification was emphasized, and in the other sanctification. I don't think that's the normal pattern. I think that the normal pattern is gradual growth, ~~in~~ from regeneration on. But I don't believe that anybody lives a normal pattern. As for most of us, we come to a road block, and we overcome the road block, by a great step forward in our knowledge of God. A great infusion of God's grace, you might call it. It may be so tremendous, that we lean more upon him, than we had before. But I think that we must look for these experiences, and know that with most of us, that's the way we're going to grow, and know that if we look upon our own sinful self, and agonize over it if necessary, and spend time waiting and tarrying for it, it won't hurt any of us, to take a good long glance, and call upon God to get the experience of grace that we all need.

3/15/57.

Yesterday under small b, we discussed one, The importance of holiness. We owe a ~~great~~ debt of gratitude to many a doctrinal view that is slightly erroneous, and even to some that are heretical. We owe a debt of gratitude, because sometimes they stress vital things in the scripture that others have tended to neglect. And in fact, very

often a heresy or a false cult arises partly because of the fact that people have neglected some vital truth in scripture. And some body sees that truth and gets all possessed with it, and presents it in a distorted fashion, or in a mixed up form, or out of relation, out of the proper relation to other doctrines, but the true orthodox Christians, are often culpable (7 $\frac{1}{2}$), when these false doctrines arise, that they have neglected some aspect of truth, which if they had probably taken care of it, there would not have been the occasion, for the development of the false cult, and unfortunately the reaction very often is to say no, that's wrong, this and this and this is wrong. Throw that out. Well, this and this and this are bad, but there may be a central idea in it, which we need, which is in the Bible, and which we should have had all along. Which we've been neglecting.

Now the importance of holiness, or of sanctification is one of the most important subjects in the whole Bible, because as I said at the end of our section on justification, three/fourths of the reasons (8) of our Christian work, revolve around making sure of our justification, or showing others how to be justified, or advancing in our own sanctification, or showing others how to be sanctified, and so, it is so tremendously important, that anything that stresses this importance, is very worth while.

And number two, I mentioned yesterday, the need of further works of grace. That is - there is a truth that we may neglect, from the fact of the great stress on the value and importance of the initial conversion, of justification being one act that is done forever, there is just a danger of our feeling, once we become Christians, we go on for the rest of our life, on that one great experience which we had. And God wants us to have many more experiences. Although there is nothing comparable to the entering of the Christian life, and making sure that we have the justification, but there ~~and~~ is much progress to be made, and many more experiences to be had, and so the emphasizing the need of further works of grace, is good. Where the perfectionist movement does harm is, not in saying, we've got to have a second work of grace, but of saying we have the second work of grace, and then we're done.

I used to like to hear Dr. R. A. Torrey, many times I heard him say this. "I've been asked if I've had the second blessing. Why yes, I have, and the third

and the fourth, and I'm up to about the sixth or seventh now. And I hope that there will be another ten or fifteen. And I think that is right. That God has many blessings for us, and some of them may be so tremendous in their affect on us, that they may seem to be almost as great as when we entered the Christian life. But we must always be looking forward to new manifestations in our Christian life, and always praising God for those we've had, but never think that because we've had one, it means that we've attained, and there's no more [?] ground. (10). And so here there's a great ^{truth} true stress by perfectionist movements, but a danger that in stressing it a certain point to deny it beyond that and get injury in the very thing that they stress.

Number three. The need of ceasing from our own works, and resting on Christ.

Some will ~~me~~ criticize that very strongly.

Let's go and let's pray.

He said, this is what you do. You let go. And then he said the second thing you do. And he said, there's Christ standing there, and you go and use it, and it's you that do it. Well, that's a danger in any manner of speaking. It can be interoreted as a work of ^{with a great reservoir of ~~thought~~ power}. But the essential meaning of course of that great lesson is for you to cease from doing it, and look to him and recognize that it is he who does it. Now after criticizing Trumball very strongly, Warfield praises a few words that Trumball says, and then he said, how does he come to have these in the midst of so much here, which he doesn't think is good. He says, because right at that point he was reading Frances Ridley Havergal ^{? ? ?} from his pulpit. And he says that Warfield holds her up as a great example of true evangelical teaching. And the thing that he quotes here, from her, is very, very good. He says, that if we ask ^{and} in wonder how we account for Mr. Trumball's lapse here, from the very cor cordis of his doctrine, his contention in season and out of season, for the extreme autocracy of the human will, which I think in stronger words ^{and}. He says, if we do, the next sentence reveals it to us. "We can and must, as Frances Ridley Havergal has so truly said, 'entrust to him our trust. And then he goes on to praise him in the paragraph here. And here he gives a quotation from Miss Havergal, which is very, very good. But Miss Havergal says, in her book, "Kept for the Master's Use," on page 20, "If Christ's keeping depends

depends upon our trusting, and our continuing to trust depends upon ourselves, we are in no better of safer position than before, and shall only be landed in a fresh series of disappointments. The old story, something for the sinner to do, crops up again here, only with the ground shifted from 'works' to ~~man's~~ trust. Said a friend to me, 'I see now! I did trust Jesus to do everything else for me, but I thought that this trusting was something that I had got to do'. . . . We can no more trust and keep on trusting than we can do anything else of ourselves." Warfield says, this is in direct contradiction to Mr. Trumbull's fundamental dogma - that Christ can act on us, in every instance of blessing, only on our opening the way for Him to do so, by an act of our own free determination.

But I don't think that's a fair interpretation of Trumbull. I think that what Trumbull is stressing in his phrase, "Let Go, and let God, is that we are to cease from our own works, and as he stresses it more and more different ways we can do that, you can take it and get from it the wrong impression, and perhaps some of Trumbull's readers did get that impression, and if they did, it is an ⁱⁿ ~~an~~ impression that needs to be controverted. Because it is not something that we can do, we can let Christ sanctify ~~(us)~~ certainly, but it is something that must be do, that we must cease from our own efforts ourselves, and realize that it is through his accomplishment that we are sanctified. You can easily go a little further,

that we're a mere puppet, and God pulls the string. Now that's not salvation at all. Man's responsibility is very real, and it is our responsibility to cease from our own work, and let Christ. Let Christ and ~~may~~ let Christ doesn't mean, come on Christ and sanctify me, nothing of the kind. To cease from our own work, and to realize that it is through him, and only through him, that we can have victory. And he wants us to have the victory. And I believe that it is much more important that we find out how to get victory in our life, then to get so involved in the points of theology, of someone else, who is seeking a way of getting victory -

S-68.

(Question. That is tremendously important. The person who lies down in sin, has

ceased from his own works, and does what which is utterly displeasing to God. A man who struggles against sin, is pleasing him, by taking a step forward. But then a person who realizes that his own struggles are fruitless, and that he can rest upon the power of Christ, and receive the victory through Christ, is going still further in pleasing Him. He is ceasing from his own vain works, in trusting in Christ, but he has to realize the need, he has to have seen the difficulty, I would have thought that he would have had to make quite a bit of struggle before he can. It is very difficult to put in precise words, and that's one reason we sing, "At Calvary". Because most of the things that could be said on sanctification, we could say in two or three days. . . and screen them . . . But we wouldn't see it, we would have to make the words over, ~~the meaning~~, because, it is so easy to go under . . . , but in its context, it is a great deal of comfort to them. It is our letting go, and letting him do the thing that we should be doing, that we must have been working on it, that we must keep (2).

(Question. I mean our effort to accomplish the work of sanctification in our own lives. We want to accomplish it, through him. We can get nearer it. It's like the definition of Pi is in geometry. Which ~~way~~ ~~is~~ would ~~be~~ the easiest way, for me to get across the surface, to walk across it, or to walk around it. Well, I'd say, to walk straight across. But now suppose there is a big hill in the middle and you can't get across, and you're late. How much further is it going to be for me to walk around it then for me to walk across it. Well, when I learn that it is approximately three times as far around, as it is across, ~~it's~~ ~~a~~ ~~great~~ ~~step~~ ~~forward~~. I've made a great step forward. But I haven't got it precise. When I find it is $3 \frac{1}{7}$ I've made a further step, but I haven't got it precise. When I learn that it is 3.14, there are still digits that I could add. And I could keep adding digits, I can go on and add several hundred digits. Everyone I add gives a more precise answer.

There is no way, in human language of expressing Pi, and have it precise. You can always add a ~~few~~ few more digits. But you get nearer and nearer to it, then when you started. And I think that this is similar, of our activity and Christ's activity. Everything is of God. Everything is decreed from the foundation of the world. Our salvation is entirely of him, there is nothing that we can do about it. He saves us.

It is entirely of Him. But he does it through faith. Now faith is not a work. It is the instrument through which he brings our salvation. But our sanctification is the work which we are to work out our salvation with fear and trembling. And we have an obligation, and we have a vital task. And we are told, that you have not struggled unto blood, We are told that it is our duty, it is our responsibility to make progress in sanctification. But he guarantees us that in the end, everyone of us will be sanctified. And when he wants us to make progress, it is by realizing our own inability, and more and more of leaning on his power, and letting his force run through us. We can get nearer to it, but we can never come up to it in this life.

Well, it may be that when we get to heaven, and see everything perfectly, there will be some factor, which we just can't know in this life, that will make it very easy to understand, and then it may be that it will be the triumph of God to move us forward. Well, we can learn more about it, and we can see that the man who sits back, and says well, the Lord saved me. There's nothing for me to do. Let's read the ~~man~~ latest novel. Well, he's not ceasing from his own work, he's ceasing from God's work. The man that steps forward and struggles hard, and tries in his own strength to advance his own sanctification is pleasing the Lord an awful lot more, then the man who just sits ~~back~~ back. But he is not struggling in the right way. And his sanctification is just an awful lot longer, then the person who learns that the way to progress in sanctification, is to find out what you need, and then to rest back in the arms of Christ, and let him do it for you, if he wants to.

But you can put the stress on the word ^{the} let, to point where it looks as if I let him do it, I'm doing it. Nothing of the kind. I trust in him, then I can trust in him for the trusting. I recognize that it is difficult to let him reign in me. And that is the essential truth of the victorious life teaching, that all of us become saints. That is the essential truth. And in presenting that truth, and in stressing that truth, they are rendering a great service, but if in presenting that truth, other to deny or to destroy, that is an injury. And a person must weigh it, the extext of its good and of the injury. Not to say that the whole thing is evil. And the good that is in there, is a tremendous good, and we want the good, and the good we must have,

but we must get the good, without the misunderstanding.

Capital F. Conclusion regarding Sanctification.

E. was conclusion regarding perfectionism. Hebrews 4: 9. "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his." It's obvious, from his. So there is a rest to the people of God. All right, he continues. "Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest." My, there's a good thing that there wasn't someone around to write on the error of Paul's statement. My, wasn't Paul going to pieces. But if you take Paul in the context, you see that he is stressing another side of it, too. There's a rest. We must cease from our own work. But we must labor to enter into that rest. So you can see that man had a responsibility. He had a tremendous responsibility. But his greatest responsibility is to cease from his works.

(Question. I think that is the condition in the earthly life. Chapter 4: verse 1. "Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." We either have eternal life, or we don't. So I don't think that means eternal life. But this is a matter of entering into the rest of Christ. He that has entered into his rest, he also has ceased from his own works. "Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief." We do fall through our (9½). But we must labor to enter into the rest. But to rest in God, we must cease from our own works.)

(Question. I believe that it is in the Christian life. Now of course there may be an analogy to that, but I'm inclined to think that it is following the example - that it is stressing the fact of our whole relation to him. I don't think that he would say, "Labor to enter into that rest" in the sense of being saved, because there's nothing we can labor for, in being saved.)

(Question. It means ceasing from your own work. And that's why Trumbull and Hannah Smith, says this in "The ~~Ammonite~~ Christian's Secret of a Happy Life", and these other books write so much trying to get this thought across. That we are to see God's wonderful favor, and what he requires of us and we are to long for it, but then we are going to have to say, now I'm going to correct this, and correct this, and we are

to see what this means, and then we are to have victory through Christ. And it is struggle, struggle, struggle. There is a real labor. There is a real effort. And yet we talk all the time and we say leaning on him is what brings these results, to utilize the resources of Christ, rather than struggling.)

(Question: That's a good part of it, but there is still more to it. There is a point where the actual situation comes, of leaning upon him, and not struggling in order to keep a - from having an attitude of bitterness towards that person, but resting back on Christ, and letting his love flow through you. And letting his ^{life} ~~light~~ be shown through your life, rather than struggling yourself.)

(Question. That's a tremendous and vital truth, but I don't think that's the whole reason of walking in the Spirit. I think that walking in the atmosphere of the Spirit, is a very vital thing, but I think that when it says, Walk in the Spirit, I think it means more than that. I think that it means, Let the Spirit come in and present the truth. Not simply that we remember what we read and try to carry out. But that we know Christ more intimately, and that we let the Spirit lead us on.

~~(Question. I think that's a tremendous and vital truth, but I don't think that's the whole reason of walking in the Spirit. I think that walking in the atmosphere of the Spirit, is a very vital thing, but I think that when it says, Walk in the Spirit, I think it means more than that. I think that it means, Let the Spirit come in and present the truth. Not simply that we remember what we read and try to carry out. But that we know Christ more intimately, and that we let the Spirit lead us on.)~~

S-69.

(Question. I think it's the proper thing to do. We should always ^{consult} ~~know~~ the Lord, on any new thought. ^{Baalim} ~~They~~ consulted the Lord, and the Lord said, No, don't go with them, and they went away, and they came back at an other time, They said, Baalim, we want you to come. He could have said, I already know the answer, to that. God doesn't want me to go. No, I can't come. But he looked at them, and said, "I can't do anything but what the Lord says, but you wait, and I'll see." And then the Lord said, Yes, but I think that ^(1/2). And there was no question about what the Lord said, there's no question that ~~that~~ Baalim knew that that was what the Lord said, because the Lord rebuked him, after he said, Go. He ^{asked} the Lord for an answer, and he got the answer he wanted, but he would have done a much more praise worthy act, if he would have said, "I will not say, until I learned the Lord's will." Was an ^{ACT} ~~deserving~~ condemnation, when he already knew the Lord's will? And for us

to say, I am going, when faced with a new problem, to say I'm not going to say anything about it until I find the Lord's will. Having learned ~~about~~ the Lord's will on the problem, then we say, well, now I have to pray about this thing, I don't know what to do. That deserves condemnation. Because we are putting prayer, ahead of obedience. And prayer ceases to be prayer, when it simply becomes an act, and you say, I want to pray. And so it is true, that it is very vital that we need to study the Word, and ~~constantly~~ constantly learn more about Christ, and that is actually more important than our actual (1 $\frac{1}{2}$). But it is a point, that demonstrates, what should be done.

That we are to walk under ~~the~~ the leading ~~(and)~~ where the Spirit is showing us, is ~~exercising~~ ^{exercising} his life in and through us, instead of in the flesh, where our human flesh was. It is a good part of us. But we are to decrease. We must increase and he must decrease in the government. We must decrease and he must increase in the government. (2).

(Question. Now that point which you make about about escaping, I think it can be carried to a point where it can become a, but I do think that this may be a very excellent point too. When you are faced with a problem, and to make a few simple questions you ask yourself, and ask yourself, you see your own particular shortcomings. Ask myself, have I been doing this today? Have I fallen into this regard? Have I made an error in this regard? A few. Not too extensive. To ask yourself each night, and to recall when you ~~asked God~~ haven't called God for forgiveness, and ask him to take control, so you won't do it the next day, and that way to be having a sort of an idea of your spiritual temperature, in these specific regards. And when you have gained the victory over them, there is some tendency, there is some temptation, there is some fault you have, and you have gained the victory, and you're not doing anything about it, and you cease to think about it even.

Then I think it would be a very good thing, to make a few questions like that, but say after it every month. Say it every month, because you may go ahead for five or six months, and you feel that you've won the victory over it. You completely forget it. And then all of a sudden, it appears. And before you realize it, you've gotten into it.)

(Question. Well, now here's an example. Let us say that there is a man, who has a tendency to murmur. Say he has a tendency to be discontent. And he has a tendency to strike out, in scathing statements about that which he is standing for, that which he really

loves. But he has a tendency to murmur and to strike out, and to say things which he means no harm by. He is just expressing the inner irritation of his heart. But to others it wounds them, and it crushes them, and does them an awful harm. And the fellow begins to realize it. And he says, now, I'm going to stop this. I'm not going to do this. Look I'm going to fight against this. I'm going to fight against that. And he fights. And he determines that he is going to stop that thing, which comes at him all of a sudden, and ~~mm~~ he doesn't realize it, and before he knows what he has done, and he comes up with some remark like that. Well now a person can speak that, and fight that, and fight that, and the Lord is far better pleased with him fighting it, than he was with him disregarding it, not realizing the harm it was doing.

But there is a further step. There is a step of saying, Now God, that is a part of the old sinful nature, that is part of that which is worked up in me, the sin nature, and I fight with it, and I struggle with it, but there is a better way to get rid of it, and that is to realize that that nature is ~~as~~ dangerous now. That the guilt of it is taken with him, and in my life I should consider it, and that I should get the Christ nature to flow through me, and just let him flow through, and when I'm tempted about, with some murmuring, or remark, or something that will do harm that way, in a way I never mean it to be, that I would get the exact state I was in

(6½). And instead of cursing ~~mm~~ glad, you're

instead of reviling, we should God's love, and we make that progress by keeping in mind, and doing.

. To cease from our own works in the sense of doing nothing about our holiness. It's terrible, to struggle against it, is pleasing to God, but then to cease from our further struggling, and let him work through us, ? ? ?

and that ~~mm~~ is It's very hard to put into ~~exact~~ precise words,

and that's why you can say, there are many splendid books on it, but you could take any one of them, and you can take a statement, here, and a statement here, and a statement here, that's taken out of context, and give an idea, that may be perfectly correctly. interpreted

but we must avoid those things . But to get this idea across, which is a definite Scriptural idea, in our sanctification, and to lean back, and to say, I'm not going to be irritated about that fellow. Look at what he is doing. And saying, I'm going to let the love of Christ flow through me, and

, not that I'm going to fight, but I'm going to let Christ flow through me. Until I get to the point, where it isn't. I think of that, oh, no, I mustn't feel that way. I'm just showing you that it is a struggle. I'm not struggling against it, but I'm leaning on Christ and he gives me victory.

(Question. Yes, it's to take him at his word, and lean on him. The danger in all those terms, is that the term may suggest we can get sanctification, like we get justification, as one act, and it's done, and it isn't. But the good thing about them all is to realize that we can get progress in each of our particular minds about sanctification. So that's a great truth.)

One. It is impossible to overstress the importance of sanctification.

That is very, very vital. It cannot be overstressed. We can understress some of it. This is something that is so very, very vital in our life, that as A. J. Gordon says, "It is not an edifying spectacle to see a Christian worldling, throwing stones at a Christian perfectionist. Now that's not to say that everyone who criticizes perfectionists is a worldling, by any means. But it is to say, is that God wants us to struggle for holiness. And when we get so tied up with the determination, to put our theology right on every, all the various spots, and we should do it, it's vital. But when we let that, take so much of our attention, that it becomes more important, then the sanctification and holiness of our lives, we are in a dangerous situation. And many a man falls into that. Satan tries to take us off into fanaticism.

And I think that is what is wrong with many Christians. Many true Christians are fanatics. And when we say fanaticism, we mean they've taken one aspect of Christianity, and they've stressed it out of relation to others. And one aspect of truth is to have a correct understanding of doctrine, but far more vital than that is the life that is growing in sanctification. Our doctrinal improvement should help in our sanctification. But if it becomes merely a matter of getting correct words, it becomes a handicap. And so we can not overstress the importance of sanctification.

Number two. If we are not making progress in sanctification, we had better make sure of our justification. That is an error of most perfectionist Christians that there seems to be, and sometimes is, the attitude taken, that you can be justified without

being sanctified. If you're not being sanctified, you have not been justified. But you may be, being sanctified to the extent that is not invisible to you at all. You may not feel it. Others may not feel it. I don't say that when you find you are having severe struggle with sin, the way to make sure you are justified is to get busy, and to work hard on these elements of sanctification. I say that if you do not feel that you are making any progress at all, stop, and get back to basic principles. Are you trusting Christ for salvation? Have you ceased from any attempt to have salvation through works, and base it purely on his finished work. And if you are justified, don't say that you are justified because you have had a great experience. It's not because of the great experience, wonderful as that is, that you are saved. It's because you are now trusting in Christ. If you have been united with Christ, you continue. If you have not, it's very easy to remedy that, but you must start now. And whether you have now been converted, and that previously looked like it, but it wasn't, or whether you were converted then, and fell into a lack of close fellowship with him, at some time, you may not be able to tell which of the two it is, but the vital thing is that you now make sure that you know that you are believing in Him. Just ask him. Salvation is free. It's a gift. So if you are not making progress in sanctification, stop and make sure that you are justified.

Number three. God wants us to learn to live closer to Christ, and constantly, to concentrate on his person and his work.

S-70.

Because it is, God wants us to learn to live closer to Christ, and constantly, to contemplate his person and his work. Progress in holiness, is not by saying, now look, this is something that I do, that's wrong, I've got to improve this, and improve that, just as if we are making a picture or something, and improve this section, and this section. You make yourself good. It's nothing of the kind. It is a process, through which we become ~~more~~ ^{more} and more like Christ. It is a process, by which we learn to live closer to Christ, and through living closer to Christ, we improve in every way. And he wants us to learn to live closer to Christ, and constantly to contemplate his person and his work.

Number four. We should expect great things from God. There are those who have a struggle with the alcohol appetite, and who all their life struggle against it. There are those. But there is many a man who has a terrible struggle with the alcohol appetite, and suddenly the Lord takes it away from them. And the Lord is happy to give us a wonderful gift of sanctification in particular aspects of our life that seems to be impossible, but he gives it just like that. But that's not saying that he will in every case. One of us may have one particular thing that he has to struggle against, all his life, which God leaves as a sort of a thorn in the flesh, to keep us cognizant of our dependence on him. But for every one of us, there are many elements in our life, which may seem to us impossible to accomplish, and they are, but which he will accomplish, if we just trust in him. If we learn to trust him and to look to him for deliverance. And it may take a long period of leaning upon the Lord, and following upon him, and looking to him, but it may be just as a great sudden (2)

And he wants us to learn to sit still, and see what the Lord will do, to see him come when we are at the end of our resources. He wants us to learn to expect great things from him. But he doesn't guarantee us in every aspect of our lives.

Someone has said that the thief on the cross, was saved and taken to heaven in order to prove to us that one doesn't have to do works of righteousness to be saved. He had no opportunity. He was taken just like that. Well, there was only one who was saved like that, to show us that that is mighty rare, and that isn't what we can expect.

God will work great and wonderful things in areas of our lives, but

it will be a long time . We should expect great things from God, and to learn to know more of his mighty power, by seeing what he does in us.

Number five. We should rejoice in everything, that God sends us. The sanctified Christian is a happy Christian. The Christian who is where God wants him to be, is a happy one. We are rejoicing in everything that He sends us. We are rejoicing in the joy, because they show us His love, and in the difficulties and trials, because they teach us, to live closer to him, and to advance, in sanctification. We should rejoice in everything, that He sends us, that in the joy, because they show us, his love, and in the difficulties, and

trials, because they teach us to live closer to him, and to advance in sanctification. Paul says, "In everything give thanks," and he means in everything. He does not mean in our falls, in our failures, but in everything that i

(Question. Work out your own salvation, with fear and trembling, for it is Christ that works in you, You cease from your work, when he does it. You work it out, by letting him do it. Romans 5: 3, 4, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our walking with Christ, by him we also have access by faith wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also." Do you glory in tribulations. When you get to something you don't like, do you glory in it? "We glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience." That was a wonderful statement, Mr. Douglas made on the day of prayer. He said, "The Lord sent me, to teach me patience." If you have somebody working with you, and try to do what is right, and being a real influence in many ways, and yet you find, that in some ways, they just irritate your thoughts. You can't hardly stand it. The Lord sent this to teach me patience, and I rejoice in it. If there is something that is a hindrance to us, and we can find a better way to get rid of the hindrance, then the Lord wants us to do it. But there are many things that hinder us, that we can't get rid of. There are sometimes good factors, that are with the hindrances would be to get rid of the factors, which are very important there. But they are there. It's the tribulation that the Lord hath sent to worketh ^{patience} ~~faith~~. And the working of the patience in our heart and soul, to rejoice in tribulation, and to be happy with what he sends, and to show forth his love in our life, may mean more to our progress, then it would be, to get rid of the hindrance.

We don't take the Roman Catholic idea of the (8), to try to make yourself uncomfortable. You'll find plenty of things in this life to make you uncomfortable, without taking the liberty to put it there. Philip II, the king of Spain, the one who built the Spanish Armada. What he bequeathed to his son was his whip, his scourge, that he used to take and whip himself, in order to reduce the flesh, and to make himself suffer, in order to bring himself in to conformity to the Lord. He doesn't want us to make ourselves uncomfortable, but he wants us to take the

discomforts that come, and to rejoice in them, for what he has given to us, to teach us patience, to teach us the love of Christ, so that, as he says, in verse 5, that "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Rejoice in all things, and to show it forth in our lives, and in our actions. I had a fellow ten years ago, that I flunked in a course, and he deserved it too. But he didn't think he did. But he came down the street one day, and he was (well, he would have graduated, and he didn't graduate, because I failed him in that examination, There was nothing in the world that I could do. But he wouldn't admit it.) But he came down the street, and, oh, his heart was just filled with irritation that he didn't graduate. And he looked across, and he saw me sitting in front of the porch, and he said, say, I'm just going to go over, and show a friendly attitude to Dr. MacRae, and let the love of Christ flow through me. And he did. He came back the next year, and he -

(9 $\frac{1}{2}$). The Lord wants ~~me~~ to us

Now in that case, I'm convinced, his irritation was entirely wrong. But whether our irritation is wrong or right, the attitude the Lord wants us to take is to let the love of Christ flow through us, and to recognize that tribulation worketh patience. The tribulation may be somebody else's means, and it may be due to our own failings. And may be due to anyone of a variety of things. But we can rejoice in the tribulation.

And this is a very important thing in sanctification, and it is important that we keep the commandments, it is important that we keep away from gross sin, but it is a thousand times more important, whether we show forth the love of Christ in our heart, then it is that we follow the three or four main taboos that are among a lot of Christians, to show whether you are a Christian or not. "Take the attitude of smoking. In our culture in America, at least in the North here, most of our fundamental saints smoke. And certainly, smoking is a dirty habit, and one that is harmful to the body, and one that we should not do. But there's many a Christian, in the South, or in other countries, who is a true Christian, and ~~me~~ through whom, the love of God, flows through his heart, who smokes. There are many of them. And there's many an American, fundamentalist, who would search around him, and distrust one, who ~~me~~ smokes. And yet the fellow who is smoking tobacco, may prove to be a far better Christian than he is.

And these points, for us to put them up as the a, b, c, to see whether one is a true Christian or not, is wrong. I don't say that we do this. But there is the tendency to do this. There's a danger in doing it. And it is the building up of these works in our heart which is the most important.

S-7. 3/19/57.

That is a very important thing in sanctification. That God wants us to learn to live close to Him, and when he sends us something good, we can rejoice, because he shows his wonderful love and care toward us, and makes us live closer to him. And when he sends us something that seems to us to be harmful, if we know that we are His children, and we know that we are justified, then we can know that if he permits it to come into our life, that there is a blessing for it. And so there is no reason, for the Christian, to be upset, or gloomy, or miserable, whatever happens. There's absolutely no reason, because it is all part of God's plan, for us. It is His plan for our good, to help us, or it is His plan, it is because of His love, that he wants to develop good qualities in us, which is part of his good plan to help us.

Number six. Roughly, Christians can be divided into four classes, in regards to sanctification
their justification. Now, I want you to understand that this is a very rough sort of a division. That is to say, - in justification there are two classes of human beings. Those who are justified and those who are not. There is the absolute difference. One is either a human being or he is not. One is either justified or he is not. It is also true of sanctification, that everyone who is justified, is being sanctified. And that no one who is not justified is sanctified. So there are the same two classes, but among those who are justified, there are no sub classes. We all are completely justified, or we are not justified at all. But as far as sanctification is concerned, it being a process, I think we can make a helpful division, of points along the way. But I think it is also vital to notice that in regards one part of a person life is in the first class, another area in the second class, another in the third class, and another in the fourth class. That is to say that while sanctified people may fall as a whole in one of these four classes, yet they may be, in regard to one of the areas of

their life in one, and one in the other. So let me give you the four types, or four areas, the four categories, first in general, and we will recognize that some people could explicitly, be put in one of the four. But then we will note, that as an actual fact, very few people would be entirely in one or four. Now the first class, is those who are justified, but who seem to be quite indifferent, about the matter of sanctification.

As I said, if a person is truly indifferent ~~with~~ about sanctification, we know that he's never been justified. If you are not growing in sanctification, you haven't been justified. But there are many who have been truly justified, who are what are said to be carnal Christians. They are not showing in their lives, and in their talk to any great extent, and in the outworking of their lives, any evidence that they have been justified. Now this we must say, unless these people are hypocrites, unless they have not believed in Christ, unless they are not justified, they ~~is~~ are being sanctified. But it is so slow, that we hardly see an evidence of it. We know that God will perfect their sanctification in time. We know that He is going to do something to shake them out of their lethargy. He may give them a terrible experience in their life. He may put them through some miserable tribulation. He may bring some great teaching, to them that will shake them out of it. We don't know what he is going to do, but we know ~~is~~ that he is going to do something, because eventually all who have been justified, will be completely sanctified.

So there is this first category, which the great majority of Christians, who truly believe in Christ, appear to be, but we cannot judge the people's sanctification. Some who appear to us to be quite indifferent, may actually be very much concerned, and making real progress, much more, than some who talk a great deal about it. But this is the first category.

Now the second class, is those who realize their sin, who realize their need, of improvement, who realize that if Christ died, that they, the ungodly, should be saved, and they are ~~innocent~~ ^{held} before God, as those who are completely justified, that mere gratitude, ought to lead them to do everything possible to overcome their sin, and consequently, they are in the experience, which is described in Romans 7. They realize that they should be making progress, and they are struggling to make the progress. Now they may be

struggling, and falling, they may try and fail, with the mind, they see how wonderful is the law, of God, but they struggle, and they fall, and they struggle again. And they fall. And they are defeated Christians. Now a defeated Christian is an awful lot better than someone who doesn't realize that there is anything to be defeated about. A man who is struggling against sin, and failing, has made very substantial progress, in his Christian life, over the man who isn't struggling at all. And so the second state is a very definite step forward from the first. The first is the stage of indifference. The stage of lack of interest. The stage of perfect peace, and calmness of mind. He knows that he is justified. He's absolutely sure of it. But he is ~~man~~ not pleasing to God of his present progress. He is far better, when he realizes his failure, and he steps out into the second class, and push, and fight, and struggle, and strive to overcome sin.

Then the third class. The third class is those who having struggled, against sin, and failed, having tried to make progress in their own strength and seeing that they can not, overcome it, have realized that the riches of Christ are available to us for our sanctification, as well as for our justification. And have given up their own struggle, and let the love of Christ, flow through them, and give them victory. And lean back on his grace. And are living not a defeated life, but an overcoming life. They are gaining the victory, because Christ is gaining it in them and through them. He is giving them the victory. Now there are some who struggle a terrible long time, in the second category, before they ever learn of the third category.

They learn to seek of the third category, the thought penetrates to them, they come to realize it. It becomes a reality to them. We all have these experiences. We say words over and over. We try to understand them. We do not penetrate it, we don't reach them, we don't get ^{what} ~~whana~~ they are. But we finally see it, and we've got it. And in the power of Christ, we gain victory over the sin that we know of. Victory over that which is in our conscience, and we have the victory in Christ.

The fourth step. The fourth step is those who in Christ have attained victory, to overcome Satan through him, now feel they have arrived, and they have nothing more to worry about. They have a justifiable pride in the progress that has been made.

They are now perfect. They can ~~a~~ look down from the vantage point, upon others, who have not thus attained. And this fourth, is a step of retrogression. It is the step where the victory that one has attained in some area of struggle, is used of Satan to blind him, and to lead him to think that he is better than he is. And consequently, he can even ~~th~~ develop pride in the fact, and worse than that, it can give him, a vain conscience, which makes him subject to the great danger of falling into gross sin, or falling into various things, into feeling that he is very religious.

Now undoubtedly, there are many of whom we can say that this man, in regard to his sanctification, is in the second category, or the third, or the fourth. I doubt if there are many, because the way of sanctification here, is that we become aware, of an area in our life, we were not previously aware of. We become aware of a possibility of ~~a~~ growing by Christ, in that area. We become aware of a short coming or a fault. And we become aware of any short coming, or a fault, or sin in our life, in that regard, we have stepped from the first category, into the ~~second~~ second. And then when we learn how to overcome that particular sin or error, through the power of Christ, we are stepping as regards that from the second into the third. But no matter how many areas we get into the third area, there are still other areas, that are still in the first, that we don't even realize. The increase in holiness, seems like the increase in knowledge. The more you gain of it, the more you realize, your short comings. And so as we go forward in one area, we become aware of other areas in which we are

(13 $\frac{1}{2}$), and so the greatest saint, and the most holy man that has ever lived, looking over his life, sees his shortcomings, and thinks of himself as indeed the chief of sinners. And he is. Because he knows more, and realizes more of ~~his~~ his sin, than does an ordinary person. He is the very chief of sinners. He is conscious of his sin, then the man who is not making the progress (14).

And so in more areas, he is moving from the first into the second, and he is constantly moving from the second into the third, but he is constantly aware, lest he move from the third into the fourth, in regard to any particular sin.

I have experienced it over and over and over, that I have found the secret to some particular aspect, of whether it be in sanctification, or something else in life, I have

found the secret of gaining victory in this particular regard, and it's been wonderful. And for a period of time one rejoices in it. And one then just takes it for granted. And you think, this is gone, this is past, we all do. And then you find out, all of a sudden, you are right back where you started. Because you have assumed too much, that you had the victory over sin, when God wants you to keep ~~your~~ resting in Christ. And not to say, well, I've attained in this, I can forget it. God wants us to lean on him for victory.

S-72.

We've got so much to do with our own progress in our own sanctification, that while we should be alert, to give other people the word of God, as a help, and to show them (First part of record bad. (0-2½)).

THE LAW.

Number three. The Law.A. under three. The purpose of the law.

And we will note that in our connection with our understanding about the law, and so under purpose of the law, we will put number one, Negative. And under that, a small

a. ~~Immmmm~~ Small a. It does not supplant the Abrahamic Covenant.

Galatians 3: 6-8. Paul shows that the law does not supplant in any way, the Abrahamic covenant.

Small b. It does not precede God's grace to Israel. Any idea that you want to be saved, here's the law for you, is absolutely without foundation. What happened is that God delivered the people out of Egypt, they had to pass over, he brought them up into the land and then when they came there, to Sinai, we read in Exodus 19: 3-4. He reminds them of what he does. "And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself." God's grace was always known. "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure (it doesn't say they will be saved) unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation."

So it does not precede God's grace to Israel.

Small c. It was not the condition of Israel entering the Promised Land.

Small d. It was not that which was to determine Israel's Continuance to be God's People.

Small e. It is not represented as the means of securing salvation. It was brought out very clearly in the footnote on page 93 ~~mm~~ of the Scofield Bible, where it says, that, under Exodus 19: 1. It is exceedingly important to observe: (1) that Jehovah reminded the people that hitherto they had been the objects of His free grace; (2) that the law is not proposed as a means of life, but as a means by which Israel might become "a peculiar treasure" and a "kingdom of priests". So much for one.

Number two. Positive.

Small a. It ^{gave} ~~gives~~ a comprehensive and detailed statement for the guidance of a nation as God's own people.

Small b. It showed the path of sanctification's blessing.

Small c. It represented in typical and symbolic form, great truths of God's nature and of God's plan, so as to impress them upon the minds and the hearts of his people.

Small d. It provided a step forward in God's revelation to the ~~individual~~,
?(writing)
(to the individual) by wiping his knowledge of the righteousness God requires.

Small e. It gave a measuring stick to show man his fear and unworthiness and acceptance of a Saviour.

Capital B. The Nature of the Law.

Number one. The law is a blessing, not a curse.

~~Deuteronomy~~ Deuteronomy 4: 7, 8. John 1: ~~17~~, 19 and 20. Romans 9: 4-7.

Number two. It is a sign of God's love.

Number three. It is not merely external, but spiritual in its intent.

Romans 2: 28, 29. "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." The law then, is a spiritual matter, not merely an external matter. And this suggests, the few great dangers of the law.

Number four. Few great dangers. The law, while giving greater knowledge, might by its very nature, lead to two harmful . These, I'll call a and b.

Small a. Externality. There is a very good illustration of this. The illustration was noted in a certain (14) who said that Jesus said to Peter, put up thy sword

Now this danger of externality, is a danger into which any of us could fall. It is one of the great errors, ~~in~~ into which the greatest men fall. It is wrong to light a fire on the sabbath. Therefore we can't press a light button to turn on the light ~~in~~ on the sabbath. But some say it is perfectly all right, because

. Now, I know a man who is a hyper-dispensationalist, who will never turn on the light on the sabbath. From Sunset, Friday night, until sunset, Saturday night, he won't do that. Whether, he just leaves the light on all the time,

S-73.

The danger is that we neglect the weightier matters of the law. And the law was never intended to be an external standard, that you do this, and you do this, and you follow this through, and this is the precise regulation, and that is it. The law is a spiritual matter. Circumcision is of the heart. It is that which is vital. It is the principle, of the law. And if we're going to live in accordance with God's law, we must find what are the principles, what is the spiritual meaning of it, what is the purpose of it? Rather than to say, here is a set of one, two, three precise regulations that if you exactly follow them, - you can not get regulations like that, it's just as many things in life. But you get the principles and you can apply them. And the law is spirit, is not an external thing, of precise limitations in physical acts. In fact, there is no act in itself, which is good or bad. I take a knife, stab it in to some body, and it is a bad act. The surgeon takes a knife, and he does precisely the same act, but it is a good act, intended on the purpose to that act.

And so this externality, is something into which we fall . Everybody falls.

It is one of the great errors of what Paul calls, the Jewish religion. He says that in the Jewish religion he went way ahead of everybody else, but it profited him nothing. But when he said, the Jewish religion ended in him, the Jewish misunderstanding of what the law really is. For here he said, "He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly." In other words, those who would follow, what he called the Jewish religion, were not really Jews at all. "He is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter." The Bible is verbally inspired. The words are given to us of God and are true. But that doesn't mean the important thing is the word. It doesn't mean that the important thing is that it would be like the woman who always knelt, when she heard the minister pronounce that beautiful word, Mesopotamia. It is not the word, that is a magical thing, that has a blessing. It is the ~~word~~ ^{?(thought)}, which is back of the word, which is vital. But the words are a divinely ordained medium to give us the thought, and we have to get behind the words and find what they are getting at. And to see what the thought is. And it is the spiritual intent. It is the principle, in the law, that is the vital thing, not the carrying out of precise, external, instruction. It never was, in the Old Testament, anymore than it is to the Christian.

Number two. Lack of freedom. And that is of fear, rather than of love. And that is a danger, into which the law ~~can~~ can easily lead, and it is a danger which must be carefully avoided. The idea that, oh my, if I make a mistake in this, if I fail, to accomplish this, God won't love me. You can give a child that attitude. It is not a right attitude. And modern books, ~~than~~ on the bringing up of children, stress the fact that you should never say to the child, that if the child won't be good, she won't love him. And if the ~~in~~ child just loses your love and your affection, if it doesn't

(4). You must not do that. You must show it in the midst of your punishment. YOU must show that. And God shows to us, God loves us and we are his children, if ~~in~~ we have been brought into his family, and we have been adopted into the family of God, we are his children, no matter what we do. And he loves us. And his love will follow us, no matter what we do. And we don't need to worry about losing his love, because of our mistakes, and of our errors, or of sin. But we do need to strive

to repay him. To show our gratitude for him. And to return to God a love of our own. And we know that if we fail, he may send chastisement to us, but the chastisement that he sends to us, as children, is not a for our sins. It is not a just punishment for our sins, because the punishment for our sin has been borne by Christ. But it is a means to drive us to a realization of what we need, and to help us, and it is a sign of his love. His very chastisement is not the just judge ~~making~~ meding out penalties, which he does do, to the unbeliever, but it is the loving father chastising the child to make the child happier, in the end, when he could possibly be without the chastisement. The one who receives no chastisement is not a child. As Paul says, If you're his child, you're going to receive chastisement. If you don't. If you let a child just grow up, wild and never had any training. You're not doing that child any good. You are doing the child a great injury. And there are many people who have seen their children get into terrible things in their later life, and it has been to a large extent, a fact that the people thought that they were showing love to their children, when they weren't showing love at all. They were showing weakness. True love for the child, will be that which is for the child's good. Not merely for that which the child craves for the moment.

And so God will send us chastisement. But he will not send us punishment for our sins. The punishment has been laid on Christ. He has borne it for us. And consequently the attitude of fear, which leads to lack of freedom, is not the attitude the Lord wants us to have. Some people say, if it is doubtful it is wrong. And I do not think that is a statement that is to be taken, and carried out fully. I think you might very well say this, that you draw the line between what is right and what is wrong, it would be mighty good if it falls within 10 % of that line, before you say, well, I'm just going to avoid that. And not follow that at all. But just because somebody else thinks that it falls, on his side of the line, you will find all kinds of crazy standards and the Lord wants us to study the standard and to see what is right or what is wrong, and not just say, because anybody doubts, therefore we should not do it.

Paul insists on his right to eat meats offered unto idols. He insists on his freedom to do it. He insists that no body has any right to order him, that he mustnot

eat meats offered unto idols, or to punish him for it, or to rebuke him for it. But he does say, if under certain circumstances, he finds that eating meats unto idols is going to injure my brother, then of course, I will not do it. The duty of kindness, and the interest in the welfare of others, is a more ~~high~~ value to him, than of enjoying it. It may not hurt me the least bit, to drink light beer and wine. It may not hurt me the slightest bit. It probably wouldn't. It might be relaxing. It might be helpful. There is nothing absolutely in the Scripture that is wrong in it. But in a world like ours today, in which there is so much heavily distilled liquor, which is very, very harmful, and when there are so many individuals who have a ~~uninhibited~~ free disposition to alcohol, that if they might get started, that thing is going to be terrific for them to resist, it's a very little thing for me to do, to abstain from touching light beer and wine, in order not to be a means of leading somebody, who may have a previous predisposition toward alcoholism. Not to take of that which wouldn't hurt him either, but to do what he inevitably might do, and I might draw a line to go on from them to that which is harmful, and injurious, and could wreck a life. And it's a mighty small way of showing love to someone else, for me to abstain from this, which I have a right to do, and so, anybody that says it is a terrible thing to touch light beer or wine, why it is ridiculous. There is nothing in the scripture to suggest such a thing, that a beverage that has a slight content of alcohol, it is per se wrong.

But in a world, with the rapid transportation that we have today, and with the strongly distilled liquors that we have today, makes it a temptation for those who have a weakness, it is a very ~~small~~ small manifestation of love to others for me to simply abstain from the exercise of my Christian liberty in this regard. And I think that we should try to understand, that the law is not a tight rope, that we must keep right here in order to win God's favor. It's not that at all. We want to step out, and to walk in the power of the spirit, and trying to follow as Christ leads, and to do that which shows love to God, and love to mankind, rather than constantly in fear lest we break some aspect of the law, or of regulation. These are two dangers into which many Jews fell, in Old Testament times, and in the times of Christ, and since. But they are all cases, of dangers which we must avoid.

Capital C. Types of Law.

And types of law is very well discussed by Hodge, in the section which I assigned. He gives four types, but I want to make them three. Simply because to me, it is a little ~~m~~ bit more easier to follow under three, though his ~~may~~ be more logical. But the three types of law, that I like to put it into are three moral, civil, and ceremonial. Hodge puts them under, first, laws founded on the nature of man, second, - (Correction -). 1. Laws founded on the nature of God. 2. Laws which are founded on the permanent relations of men in their present state of existence. Now that is a reasonable logical division. But they can be put under the head moral. That is, the moral law is that which in the nature of God, in the nature of the universe, in the nature of man, ~~in~~ as he is created, but whatever reason like that, it is per se or per se wrong. And that is the moral law. And the moral law, as long as man is constituted the way he is, can never be changed, so that which is conformed to the nature of God can never be changed, as long as God is God. The moral law is that which is right by its very nature, and Hodge puts it under two categories, and maybe he is right to put it under two. But I'm going to use the term moral for both of them, and since there is so much in common between them, in our understanding of them, I think there's no harm in putting them, under one.

Then the second, civil law, Hodge calls them a third class of laws, and they have their foundation in certain temporary relations of men, or conditions of society. I think that I would say that civil law is to a great extent, the application of moral law, in particular situations. And the situations ~~may~~ ^{may} change, and the civil law may change, but a moral law remains unchanged. And when we say, free from the law, Oh sinner believeth, we do not mean that we are free from the moral law. We mean nothing of the kind. We do not mean that we have to follow civil law. We don't mean ceremonial law is important to us. We mean that we are free from a situation in which we are under the judgment of the law for guilt, and for penalty. But we are free from that because Jesus has borne the guilt of it. And we are now in the realm of sanctification, trying to appease God, by keeping his law, rather than, trying to, thinking that we are justified by keeping it. We are justified and we are convinced

And so the third is ceremonial law. And the ceremonial laws are laws that God has given in order to drive home certain truths to us. It is external rites, ceremonies, keeping certain days, months, years. That is the ceremonial law of the Old Testament, and we have a ceremonial law of the New Testament. We not free from ceremonial law, in the sense that we have none, but the ceremonial law is changed from one which looked forward to Christ, to one that looks back to Christ. But the ceremonial law, is the law of means to drive home to our hearts and minds certain vital truths. That is the ceremonial law.

Now I think it is very helpful if we can apply

S-74.

Now civil law, the application of it, under certain circumstances, might make it necessary under certain situations, sometimes, to make a regulation which is not a moral law, but which involves the carrying out of the moral law. And that can vary from time to time, from situations. And then the ceremonial law stresses great truths upon our hearts. And as Christ said, "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath." And what did he mean by that? First there is moral law in the sabbath. Man is so created that he needs rest. And man needs to take time to worship God, time allotted especially and only to his duty to God. He must always be taking time, but certain times he must put aside entirely for his relation to God. There is a great moral law in the sabbath. And there is ceremonial law in the sabbath. The institution of the sabbath looks forward to what God is going to do, and his
 (1), reminds ^{us of} ~~what~~ God's plan, God's orderly ^{system} ~~plan~~, and the fact that he has a goal for us. And we put it at the beginning of the week, because of the resurrection of Christ. And we have our regular week ends to remind us of God's plan
 as Dr. ^{says,} the eschatological nature of the sabbath is the vital thing. It is to drive this home more often. It is ceremonial, and it is also moral. But there is a civil requirement, in connection with the sabbath, when the men work on their farms, working hard on the farms with physical labor all day, he said that on

the sabbath they were not to go a ~~a~~ certain distance. They were not to have heavy exercise on the sabbath. The sabbath was the day of rest from the physical exercise which goes on during the week. That doesn't apply at all, with a different situation, in which we have different types of transportation, and in which our time throughout the week, is not spent in heavy exercise. We need rest from mental activity, rather than from physical activity. We are not engaging in physical activity the way we were at that time. The civil application varies, but the moral principle is there, and the ceremonial principle is there. But it never was a means of being saved, and it is not now, a means of being saved. It was a means of showing gratitude to God,

3/20/57.

Yesterday, we were looking at D, and we were mentioning the third type, the ceremonial law. And we noticed that the ceremonial law, is a law which is not a matter of keeping that which is right, simply to show a certain character, showing love to one's neighbor, or to God, that it is not a matter of carrying out of these laws, in action, or of that which is necessary for co-operation among individuals, but that it is a matter of illustrating or driving home to the mind, certain vital truths, which the Lord desires his people to have impressed on their hearts, and upon their minds. And consequently, that these great truths are impressed to us, both series of regulations which are given in order that these thoughts, be driven home to people's minds, and this we call the ceremonial law. And there is a ceremonial law in the New Testament, as well as in the Old Testament. But there is a difference between them, between the ceremonial law of the New Testament, and the ceremonial law of the Old Testament.

And a secondary difference is that the ceremonial law of the Old Testament is very full, and detailed, and specific, and the ceremonial law of the New Testament is rather general, and on the ~~whole~~ whole, quite lacking in specific detail. And that ties right up with the major difference between the two, that the ceremonial law, of the Old Testament, had for its purpose the looking forward to the death of Christ. And the ceremonial law of the New Testament, has for its major purpose, the

looking back to the death of Christ. And consequently, those who look ahead to it try to impress upon the minds and hearts of the people these great truths, they did not know the details of that which they were presenting in symbolic form. And consequently it was very vital that the symbol be so detailed that it will not become changed in such a way that it would fail to fulfill its purpose. And so in the Old Testament, we have that great number of sacrifices, worked out in the most minute detail, just how they are carried out. We have the passover, with all the details about that. And you have so many different species of ceremonial law, with precise, specific, exact names given, otherwise there was a great danger that they might lose their ~~firm~~ fitness to carry out the purpose.

In the New Testament, the ceremonial law looks back to Christ, and we know about Christ. We know far more than the Old Testament people. The Old Testament people were looking forward, gradually learning a little about him. And so the tabernacle tells you certain great lessons about God, and about Christ. And it becomes interesting, the place where the different things are. And many facts about it impress upon your mind, the distance of God, the holiness of God, and yet the accessibility to God. With the fact, that he cannot be approached without blood. These and many other proofs all of them find their climax in the death and atonement of Christ., are stressed and driven home, in detail and extent of the ceremonial law, which is contained in Exodus, and Leviticus, and some parts of Numbers, and which the Old Testament people were very severely judged if they did not carry out.

Now recognition of this fact, enables one to understand one of the greatest problems which the critics raised against the Pentateuch. It is part of the ceremonial law, that the unity of God needs to be illustrated, that the fact that the sacrifice of the altar in one place. That the unity of the people of Israel be illustrated by that fact. And that it was easier, to maintain the correctness of the ceremony, if they are not scattered around in many different places, be performed in many different places. And so the Pentateuch is very specific, particularly ~~Deuteronomy~~ Deuteronomy. That the sacrifice would be performed in the one place that God would choose. And yet the critics point out that in the time of Samuel, a good man, Samuel, a prophet of God,

made a circuit through the land, and performed sacrifices at this town, and over at this town, and over at this town. He had a round which was made to sacrifice. And they say, if there had been such a law, so stressed, as Deuteronomy stressed, that it is necessary that the sacrifice be confined to one place, then, of course then Daniel would have kept that law, and the fact that, not a bad man, but a good man, a man who is represented as one of God's very own, performed sacrifices, ~~and~~ in many places ~~where~~ when Deuteronomy so clearly says that they shall come up to the one place where the Lord your God shall choose, out of all the land, that proves, they say, that there wasn't any such law in the country. And consequently we can know from that, that Deuteronomy was later than that time, and it is one of the finest thoughts ~~(9)~~ of the critical hypothesis, of the writing of the book at different times, along the evolution of the development of the ~~sacrifices~~ sacrificial plan of their religion.

And if one does not realize the nature of ceremonial law, this problem is absolutely unanswerable, if one does not realize it. How could Samuel ignore the strict command of Deuteronomy, if Deuteronomy is in Samuel's time. But if one understands the nature of ceremonial law, the problem is very easily answered. Because if one understands that, that in the land in the time when the Philistines had taken over, and Philistine bands were going through the land, and there were constant attacks, and in this long period before, there was a king established who would have the power to gather the people together, and to drive out the Philistines. And then a still stronger king, David, who could establish it permanently ~~against~~ against the Philistines, and really drive them out, that in that time it was either don't have any sacrifices, or else have the sacrifice where the people are, expecting the people to come up to one place, of course for the sacrifice. And so under those circumstances, Samuel recognizing the purpose of the sacrificial system, the purpose of the ceremonial law, it is not there, as a set of restrictions that it is right or wrong, and it is right if you do this, and wrong if you do that, but that ~~is~~ it is a set of instructions, ~~maintained~~ ^{where} by the purpose of ceremonial law can be accomplished, of driving home to peoples' hearts ~~a~~, and thoughts, these great, important themes in the Old Testament, looking forward to these general sacrifices, would take in the different places where they are, instead of

bringing them up to one place.

And it is only when, again they have the freedom from the Philistines, one central place where ~~where~~ they're safe, that the tabernacle can be reestablished in Jerusalem, and these teaching of the ceremonial law can be carried on. It was much better to have the ceremony carried forward, and the thought driven home to people's hearts and minds, without carrying it out in full, then it was to say, we can't carry it out in full, we'll have to leave it alone, and not carry it out at all. Now that is where the Jews ~~(MEN)~~ have erred, through failure to realize the whole ^{purpose} ~~fact~~ of the sacrificial system, that the author of Hebrews tells us that the blood of ~~Jesus Christ~~ ~~cheonasthmsmfommsahhmadm~~ (12).

People's sin is not taken away by conformity to the sacrificial act, but the sacrificial act looks forward to Christ, and it is vital that the sacrifice be performed. "Well, even from the misunderstanding that it could take away sin, they all state in the Old Testament about the vital importance of the sacrifices, and yet in Jerusalem,

. And through all these centuries, they, without recognizing the death of Christ, have done away with the sacrificial system, because the law is that it must be performed in Jerusalem, and they've never been able to perform it in Jerusalem. And so they've done away with it. And never had it since. And that is taking a restriction of the ceremonial law, to think that it is a mathematical formula, and here are these precise words, and if you just follow these precise words, and if you alter those words, that's heresy. And therefore, if we can't carry it out right, we can't carry it out at all. Well, that's not the purpose of the ceremonial law. It is far better to carry it out the best we can, then not at all.

That would be deliberately ignoring and for people to do things in an entirely different way as when David was going to bring the Ark into Jerusalem, and he took the ark, and he put it on a cart, and take it, ignoring the fact that the law in Exodus, it said that the ark must be carried, ^{cart} And he put it on the ~~ark~~, and started to carry it, the man who was walking ~~down~~ beside the ark, moved over to steady it, when it started to slip, and it looked as if it would

fall off, and the Lord struck the man dead. Not that the man had done any great crime, the man probably wouldn't have lived more than fifty years anyway, and maybe not more than a few months. He had to go to heaven sometime. He may have been a wicked man that the Lord was glad to remove from this earth, and he might have been a righteous man who the Lord was pleased to receive. We don't know. But the Lord, in striking this man dead, showed David, that his law was not to be taken lightly. And that this ceremonial law was given, as a something to be carried out in correct detail, because otherwise he would miss the meaning of it, the ceremonial law, and this particular aspect of it might not be so vital, and not having the New Testament to read, and understand it all, the full meaning of it all, God wanted these people to carry it out, but in detail, when it couldn't be carried out in detail, then he decided that Samuel should carry it out. It was the principle that was vital, not the precise detail. It was necessary to stress precise detail, at that time, because they were not in a position to know what the principles were, as later on. And so they had to be stressed, but to Samuel they were ignored for it was the period -

S-75.

That

The sacrifice was impressed on their minds. ~~the~~ sacrifice is necessary for

. And it was all impressed upon their minds, the fact that God must provide the key to salvation, it impressed on their minds their own wickedness, and their need of a saviour. It impressed on their minds various truths in the ceremonial law about God and about the person of Jesus Christ. And now we can have it impressed on our minds, better in another way. And so now the ceremonial law has been cut down.

Many Christians approach the New Testament as a set of precise ordinances, and if I do this exactly this ~~way~~ word, that is what God wants, and if I don't fall exactly this word, that is wicked, and it is true. It is verbally inspired, and every word is vital, to get the truth across to us. But the vital thing is to get the principle there, and apply it in our life, and not to even as much as to use a sword, because Jesus said, Put up thy sword. It is alright to take a revolver and shoot it instead.

It is the principle, not the precise detail of the way the principle is presented that matters. God's ceremonial law now is just as important for us as the ceremonial law was ~~important~~ for then. We're not saved by . Well, I won't say that it is just as important, because we have the New Testament. And we can get through to him, without the ceremonial law at all. And it is not to accept any ceremonial law, in a way, Thou shalt, thou shalt not, precisely that way then. We take the ten commandments, and all of the ten commandments, on moral law. And one of them, which has perhaps a ~~smaller~~ smaller element of moral law, then any other, though it has some. But it has a large element of ceremonial law. That is the commandment about the sabbath day. That has in it, a certain measure of moral law, that God, it is necessary for the human being, if he is to live rightly, to have regular periods of rest. And if the minister is spending Sunday rushing about from place to place, preaching the word of God, and doing God's will, and carrying out his activity, he is serving the word rightly in making this day a day of busy activity for the Lord. But if he also makes the other six days, days of busy activity for the Lord, he is rejecting the principle of the commandment about the sabbath, and failing to maintain in his life that regular alternation of rest and work, which the scripture requires, because it is necessary in the constitution of the universe, even God rested on the seventh day, in order to show that fact in this life, in the universe. It's not part of a law given at Sinai, and only relating to Israel, because it ~~didn't~~ didn't begin at Sinai. It was given at the very beginning, that God rested on the ~~Sabbath~~ Sabbath, and the people were judged, for gathering manna, on the sabbath day before the offer was given. It is part of God's universal law, this principle of the rest, one day in seven. And when the French Revolution decided, We're going to do away with everything we find in Christianity, and we'll have a ten day week, rest ~~only~~ one day in ten, it just didn't work. Because this is the way that God has made us. And so the minister is breaking the commandment, if he does not find another way of carrying out the regular alternation of rest and work, though in the circumstances of the work he is doing for the Lord, it is a

(4 $\frac{1}{2}$).

Now that's the moral stage, and that's a smaller part in the keeping of the Sabbath

day, then the ceremonial law.

(Question. Well, of course, we have always taken this position, in the seminary, the seminary work in a full time task, You take the people a hundred years ago. The seminary course in three years, and during that three years, the man of God was taught how to interpret the Word of God in the original, and how to present its teaching, and taught what is necessary, and it took three years. Today we have all the critical attacks of the last century that we have to meet. And we have to add that to what was required a century ago, in three years. Now we ought to do like, I think, like the Dallas Seminary does. We ought to increase our course to four years. That's what we ought to do. But it is impractical at present, for us to talk about such a change. At Dallas Seminary you have one man who rules everything. He decided, this is the thing to do, and he did it. He called his directors together, once in ten years, if he felt like it. He isn't there anymore, and Dallas Seminary isn't in that situation anymore. But that's what they were in then. You can't make a change like that, without other people agreeing with you, and it is ~~an~~ hard to get. But under the circumstances, we have to, if we give a three year course here, that is worth while, we have to make it a full time course. Now that means that the man of sufficient intelligence to get through college, who comes to seminary, and of course he has to have that to enter, such a man who comes to seminary, should be able in three years of doing work at the basis at which a man would do if he were at another school. He should be able to get through in three years.

Now we expect a Christian that goes to medical school, or a Christian who goes to law school, we expect him on Sunday to take his normal part, as a Christian should. But we should be able, on that ~~p~~ basis to get a great deal accomplished on Sunday. Now, if one of our students gets a pastorate, I have always urged, and preached it for 28 years, I have urged very strongly, that if a man takes a full time pastorate, that man then should be expected to consider his seminary course is on a $\frac{3}{4}$ (8) basis. And we have generally tried to insist, because it is necessary, that if the man does a full time pastorate work, and goes to seminary full time, he , and he doesn't get the good that he should. But if he spreads his work over, so ~~th~~ he is

taking less work, I think both benefit. Now I think that it is a very good thing. I'm always happy when he can do it. I always feel when our people graduate, that it was ^{if} $3\frac{1}{2}$ years at the rate we're going, instead of 3, I would feel that it was

($8\frac{3}{4}$) but every year, for the past ten years in regards to the graduates, I have felt that $\frac{3}{4}$ of them are not ready, and that it would take just about one semester more, not one semester of research of some special kind, but that more attitude, in every line they've been working on, to bring them up to the ~~minimum~~ point, where I felt they deserve it. And I've been quite pessimistic myself, as I've seen our graduates, graduate, for the past ten years, that I just felt that they haven't reached the point they should. I feel that three and a half would do it, I don't think that four are necessary. Maybe I'm wrong. But I feel therefore that it is absolutely necessary that we require the basis on which a law school or a medical school would. And that is six days of work a week, and then the one day, Sunday, can be the day of rest, with the normal amount of Christian work. Now I think it is excellent, if a man wants to put in a full day like the pastorate. It's excellent. And if a man will put in two days a week at that, that's all the better. But then he certainly should cut his course down some.

But the principle here, is the moral principle of the sabbath. The minister should carry out, he should have his regular day for rest. And he can get along without it, and he can go at a great neck pace, for seven days a week, for a certain length of time, and then he's got to break. And if he doesn't break physically, he may do something worse. His nerves may snap, to the extent, where his work would become unreliable, untenable, harmful, and he may get off into crazy notions, and ideas, because he does not have the confidence of mind, to make right. And it is the Lord's command, as part of his moral law, that he take his regular alternative rest, and work and it is hard to see. Well, now, that is a definite part of the law of the sabbath, but it is only a portion of it. And the ceremonial aspects in the sabbath law, is perhaps larger, then the moral law. So the moral law is definitely there.

And so we find that everyone of the other commandments is repeated very specifically and definitely somewhere in the New Testament. And the Sabbath Law might be

far , because Jesus said to the rich young ruler, you know the commandments, this, this, this, have you done this, and the implication is that it is according to all ten of them. But actually of course, Jesus only repeats three or four, but its repeating three or four as of a whole, rather than picking them out, . So it can be considered, and yet in the New Testament, you do not have specific references to the sabbath day, as you have in scripture, in all scripture, but you have the commandment given two or three times, Let no man judge you in respect to the sabbath day. And he goes on, of ceremony, which put it very definitely on the basis that the precise restrictions of all the ceremonial law, which in the Old Testament, had to be rigidly carried out, because it was vital that the ceremonial idea be gotten across, and in that case they are, by the New Testament they are clearly expressed, and the most vital thing is we get them from the word. "and the ceremonial law is vital in that light.

(Question. On the statement that the sabbath was ~~made~~ made for man, and not man for the sabbath, is this the principle then, that the sabbath was set aside so that man could rest on that day? Answer. Yes, Now I think that raises the principle quite well. Jesus didn't say, now what are you worried about the sabbath for, that's the old covenant and we're now in the new covenant days. He said the sabbath was made for man and not man for the sabbath. In other words, it is not a principle in the universe that must be maintained, such as thou shalt not murder, thou shalt not steal, that you must abstain from doing any work on the sabbath day, and this vital thing in the category was over. No! Those are principles of the moral universe which, if you break, you are destroying God's holiness. Now the sabbath is not that way. It is not so much that if you fail to get the proper, regular rest, it is not so much the breaking of God's holiness as it is a failure to do that which is necessary for your own wellbeing. And your own wellbeing is not necessary to be precise in your stress about the sabbath day, but it is a principle of the whole universe, and also the ceremonial purpose. Now this is the same way. It is made for man, not man for the sabbath. Man isn't here in order that this be carried out, but this is here in order to drive itself home to man's heart. It is like the sacrifice. When Samuel couldn't do it, in one place, it was far

better to do it, somewhere else, rather, then not do it at all. The sabbath, as Jesus says, pretty soon, the will profane the sabbath. How will they profane the sabbath. Why, they worked hard .
 They are breaking the law about working, because they are working very hard. But they are working how? Doing God's will and .
 But they are helping in carrying out the ceremonial law, and consequently, I would say it is God's will that an ordinary person shall arrange their work in such a way so that they won't have to work on the Lord's Day.

S- 76.

And you know one of the great reasons for the strength of Gandhi in India, and his tremendous influence may be the fact that he took this principle and he applied it, and he followed it so perfectly. Gandhi was there with people around him, doing all these busy activities and everything, and no matter how busy everything was, Gandhi took his one day in seven in which he absolutely rested. He made a rule on this particular day, I have to do this, and on this particular day, I have to do this, but on this particular day, he wouldn't even speak to a soul. He observed absolute silent on that day, and thus he could be in the midst of the busiest town there was, and he could simply retire into himself with absolute silence. And everybody understood that this was the day that Gandhi would not talk to anybody at all about anything.

Now of course that was not the Christian grace, or anything of the kind. Gandhi was not a Christian at all. But the principle here, of the good that man needs to take care of himself, in perhaps a further way then is required, and Gandhi did it.

(Question; well then on this principle then on, such as Sunday observance, a person is a layman, Shall we say that they go to church on Sunday morning. And then in the afternoon they feel like going out fishing. I know that some Christian groups would be against that form of relaxation, and I was wondering if that would still be observing the sabbath day, if the fish, or play tennis, or something like that. Would that still be observing the sabbath?" Answer. Yes, well, I think that the principle should be thought through rather thoroughly, and I would think that there are two

matters, that would enter into it. And one matter is this: The change from the ordinary activity to what? The person who is working on the farm a busy man who labors. They were not to walk more than half a mile. Their activity was to be restricted very rigidly, because it was a change, a rest, in their regular working life. Now for a person in seminary life, it is altogether different. And consequently, I would think that the relaxation in the form of getting rest, and change from ordinary life, would be carrying out the purpose of the sabbath.

I would think there is an other matter, we have to take in consideration, and that is this. That is our influence on others. And if we go into certain types of relaxation on that day, one thing that we do by that type of relaxation, is to get into a situation, where it is very easy to just go up to the surface, and come to temptation. Now take the person who decides to go to church in the morning rather than the afternoon. He says, We'll go out before church, and then we'll come later. The next thing you know, he doesn't go to church at all. There is a great temptation with that sort of thing, to neglect the worship of God, and church altogether, and then there is the other feature of it. That when one relaxes in certain ways on the sabbath, it gives the impression to people around him, of a lack of interest in Christian things altogether. So I would think that the idea that it is wrong to do anything that is amusing to yourself, or entertaining yourself on Sunday. I would think that it is not required in the commandment. But I would think that when one did that of which the relaxation consisted of, that it would be well for him to think of what possible injury that would involve.)

I believe that on the whole ceremonial law, the very fact that it is not given in such detail, as the Old Testament, I will say this, that God' wants us to understand the principles. I think that he always wanted his people to understand principles. I think that he always wants them to apply principles. I think that when Jesus said the sabbath is made for man, and not man for the sabbath, he was not announcing the beginning of a new dispensation. He was in the time before his death, when he said that. And he was giving a principle of universal believers, when he did that. A principle that was to be used in all dispensations. That it is the principle, and it

is not the carrying out of the precise, restriction, that is involved. And you see that very sincerely, in the government of the church, when in the Old Testament, the people of God worked together, in a little area, because God was keeping them together in that area, rather than sending them out to the world, where the system would become deluded, and destroyed, and injured. It was hard enough to keep them true right in that one little area. Under those circumstances we have a very rigid ceremonial law, and very rigid restrictions on the priestly office, and on the precise organization, right down the line. But now that we have the whole New Testament, and we have the understanding of the principles that are given, he sends us out into the world, and he gives certain great principles as to our relation to one another, and carrying on his work, and we are to apply those principles. But he does not give precise detail about the organization to any great extent the way he did then.

And thus we can't even find in the New Testament, a specific command anywhere, that a church shall have a minister. The word minister is an English word. You find words that mean minister, but they mean a servant. The man who is the head of the church is a servant. He is often called a pastor, and a pastor is a shepherd, and of course the word pastor applies much more for us, than the word minister. But he is called a minister. He is called a shepherd. He is called a pastor. He is called a bishop. He is called an elder. And he is called a messenger. ~~(6)~~ And these various terms, are applied, to the pastor, or to the minister, or to the messenger, or whatever you call them, but there is no one term, singled out, and the man is specifically designated by that one term.

Of course, the same applies to the group of men who control the local church. They are sometimes called bishops, and sometimes called elders. Both terms are ~~not~~ applied, but no one specific term applies. And when the deacons are originally instituted, in the New Testament, they are not called deacons at all. They just said

. And there are even arguments as to whether these were the deacons. But later on, we find deacons referred to as a settled physician, and we find people, the ~~requirements~~ ^{requirement} for a deacon specifically given, which are very similar to those of the elder. And the Lord wants us to take these principles, and carry them out, and

to apply them. And he does not give a set of regulations, one, two, three, you do this, and you do that, and you could carry out all these specific regulations, and have your heart very far away from the Lord. But he had principles to be carried out, and he had general methods given to apply those principles. And this applies very specifically to the ceremonial law. You take the way the Lord's supper is given through the ages in different churches. And the varieties are many. And why is there a variety in them. If the Lord wanted that everybody should come up in front and drink out of one chalice, he could have said it. If he wanted us to do this, in coming up that way, if he wanted that the wine should be fermented wine, he could have very easily made that clear. And there are some groups that are very strict on it. They say, it isn't wine. But the Lord did not make it clear, and in detail, because the purpose of ceremonial law is to ~~guide~~ drive certain thoughts into the mind, and we have these thoughts more fully, than they did.

And the vital thing is not the ceremony we carry out, but it is the idea that we get into the, not merely into the mind, but into the emotions, into the heart. And that we agree and trust upon ourselves. And when we have communion with Christ, it is important, it isn't that we use precisely this, or precisely that, or that we do it in this precise order, or that precise order, or that this particular person conducts it. That is not the important thing. But the important thing is that there is driven home to our hearts and minds, the communion with Christ, and fellowship with him, the union of him at his death, the partaking of his death, and receiving the life for it. And any manner which drives home the thought, is in accordance, and any manner which does not drive it home, is contrary to the teaching.

So this principle of the ceremonial law as our Lord so very clearly brings out, in that statement, the sabbath is made for man, and not man for the sabbath, and which is brought out in the great difference between the emphasis on ceremonial law, in the old and the New Testament, is very vital for our understanding. And in the Old Testament, it is possible to take those ordinances and carry them through literally, and have them be of no good at all. But the great extent that it has taken on, is because of the nature of the case, not yet has it in detail about the death of Christ.

Now what did the sabbath law present? It presented the thought that there was a goal. Rest is not merely suspended from work. Rest involves the of a work accomplished. And the joy and satisfaction attended on him. We stop. We contemplate the situation. We look back upon what has happened. We praise the Lord for it. We have a period of seven days, and the last of which is a divinely appointed rest. And we look forward to the end. We look forward to that which God is going to bring to pass. Dr. stressed it very much in his lecture. The eschatological part of the sabbath. The pointing forward, that through the week they're looking forward to that which is coming, to that which is ahead. And of course, since the death of Christ, we do not look forward, to the death of Christ anymore, we look back to it. But we do look forward to his coming. And so in the Lord's supper we remember ~~the Lord's death~~ the Lord's death, until he comes. And the early Christians moved their service of the sabbath, to the first day of the week, thus, joining with the sabbath, the remembrance of the resurrection. And the vital thing is that we remember the resurrection. That not just on easter, but every week, we remember God, Christ, the resurrection, and have this impressed on our minds, and eschatologically (13)

it still conveys the thought, that once is moving, but it also conveys the idea that the very week is found upon that we begin the week, instead of ending it. But there is still the ending involved, until he comes, but that isn't for us, in the sense that it was before, when everybody looked forward. But the principle, the three types of law is very vital to have in mind.

What is the moral law? Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. Well, it is wrong to say that which is not tied up with truth. Revelation tells us that all liars will find their place in the lake of fire. It is wrong to tell a lie. That should be taught, and I think that some of us have a great danger. We get the idea that it is a lot of fun to tell people a lie, and make people believe it. And, I think that if we lie so prepo

why there certainly is no harm in . But there is a line in between there, of injury, and we certainly need to be very careful. There is

a principle, let your yea be yea, and your nay be nay, so that when you say something people will know that what you are saying is true. And they don't have to realize that there is something in your meaning, which

. Joking is all right, but the line between joking and lying can become confused. And it is well to be careful about what you say. There is the principle then, that anything which is not strictly classed with truth is wrong. But in the Ten Commandments it is not given in that form. Revelation says, All liars will have their place in the lake of fire. But the Ten Commandments connects up with it a statement of a purpose to lie. Their false witness against their neighbors. There is a malicious purpose which we must watch for. And it is a vital moral thing,

S-77.

And so we have the moral principles involved, in the Ten Commandments, and this is part of God's moral law, and it is always vital and we are not going to be sent to hell, because we break it, because all of us ~~because we break it, because all of us~~ (1/3)

But then the civil principle, the application to particular circumstances, can vary from time to time and does. And a great deal of civil law in the Old Testament, all of which may convey principles which are vital to us, if we study the civil law and see how it fits that circumstance, it may be that we do the very opposite today. But if we, with the understanding of why that was done then, we see the purpose of it. And we understand its meaning. And we thus would be greatly benefited by the study of the civil law, of the Old Testament, even though we realize that the Civil Law, is not binding today.

The moral law is not binding on us. The civil law is not binding on us, because circumstances vary, and most of us have to realize the circumstances. The ceremonial law is not binding on us. Because it looked forward to Christ, and we have a new ceremonial law, looking back.

Now, I have a heading D. The Decalogue.

And under the decalogue, it was my purpose to only take one of the Ten Commandments,

in view of our shortness of time, and to stress that this morning, the sabbath law. Well, we've already done that. But the ~~main~~ study of the other commandments, I am assigning you to read in Hodge.

IV. ~~The Word of God as a~~ Means of Grace.

I'm not going to take the means of grace, and make them one big head. That could be done and that would be a very good head, but it could be sub-divided into smaller heads. And number IV is the Word of God as the Means of Grace. And that gets us into the whole principle of the means of grace. But as far as the word of God is specifically concerned, I'm going to take very little time, because we have dealt with it, at the beginning of our semester - the importance of the Word of God.

And the word of God as a means of grace in any kind of a magical sense, I think is very definitely wrong. Now, I don't say that the Lutherans believe in a magical sense, but they have a belief which can be so interpreted. The Lutherans stress the Word of God as a Means of Grace, to the extent that there is indissolably connected with the work and activity of the Holy Ghost, which inevitably comes when the word is read. And consequently the word of God is a means of grace per se. It seems like there is much in the New Testament that might sound like that. The washing of water of the word. They were born again by the Word of God. And the Word of God is used in the New Testament, in a way, that could almost lead us to think that the Word of God is like a great magical thing, we could take and go forth with and ~~accomplish~~ accomplish great things. Well, I think it is something we can take, and go forth with, and accomplish great things. But I don't think it is a magical thing, in the sense that it is something that has power in itself. I think the power is in the Holy Spirit, that uses the Word of God. And the power is in the thoughts of the word, which is very vital for us to understand. And consequently the Christian who lives with the word, and when he is grown

(4 $\frac{1}{2}$). But it is not a matter of hearing the word, but it is a matter of getting the ideas, and I think that is very, very vital.

St. Jerome made a wonderful translation of the Word into the language of the people, which he called the Vulgate, the Bible in the common ~~language~~ vulgar language.

A wonderful translation. But after people stopped talking Latin, the Roman Church tried to make people keep on reading the Bible when they read it in the Latin. Well, there is nothing holy in reading it in the Hebrew, or the Greek, or the Latin, or French. I had a man who would always read it in

Well, one translation may be better than another. But the important thing is getting the ideas out of it, and not the words.

3/21/57.

Let's change the wording in IV. Let's say, The Means of Grace. And we'll make the Word of God a sub-heading. Then we'll make A. under that, General considerations.

Large A. General Considerations. And here we must say is the vital difference, the most vital difference, between Protestantism and the attitude of the Roman Church, is the attitude towards the means of grace. By the means of grace, of course, we do not mean, the work of the Holy Spirit. We don't mean Christ's death on the cross. We do not mean, any act of God. God's sovereign decree. God's great act in our salvation. The act of the Holy Spirit in regenerating us, in applying justification to us. In advancing us in our sanctification. All these are the real means of grace, of course. They are the means that God uses, to bring us to Himself, and to fit us for membership in his kingdom. But we are using this term, the means of grace, in a narrow sense. We are using it in the sense, of the means we can use in order to advance in God's grace. Now, it is alright to use any terms in any sense you want, as long as you make clear the sense which you are using them in. This is a perfect way of using in interpreting the phrase, the means of grace, but if taken along without the explanation, it could seem to be any means whereby grace comes to us, when what it actually means here is the means by which we can forward our advance in grace. And that of course, is really our advance in sanctification. That is to say we often ~~now~~ include conversion here, under the means of grace. Conversion is our turning to God, it is very, very vital. It is a phase in which we are tremendously concerned.

But the means of grace as the Westminster Confessions expresses it, "The means of grace are the Word, the Sacraments, and Prayer. They are expressed thus as under three

heads. The Word of God, the Sacraments, and prayer. Someone has said that the outstanding visible difference between the activity of the Roman Church, and the Protestant Church, is that the Roman Church puts its stress upon the sacraments, and the Protestant Church puts their stress upon the Word of God. And in the Roman Church we have the altar in the middle, where the sacraments are performed. And historically, most of our Protestant churches have had the pulpit in the middle, where the Word of God is presented. Now there is a tendency away from that in many churches today. To put the altar back to the middle, but actually it doesn't make much difference what you have in the middle and what you have on the side. The vital thing is what you have in your heart, and what you emphasize in your attitude.

And a former teacher of systematic theology in this seminary, told me that as a young fellow he had a friend who was a Roman Catholic. And this man had a talk with him one day, and he said to him, the grace of God is given out through various channels. The very ~~type~~ pipe line through which it comes, and at every pipe there is a creek (10) which can turn it on, or turn it off. And that is the theory of the fact that you have to have the sacraments in order to advance in grace. Now the Protestant viewpoint is that the means of grace, the sacraments, prayer, even the Word, are means that help you but that the vital thing is the attitude of the Spirit of God, towards you, and through you. But he uses you, he helps you. But his grace is not something that you can turn on or off, or that any individual has a right for us, to turn it on or off. We do believe in God's providence, that those who fear the word can be saved, and while we believe that God can save one without his hearing the word, in the usual sense, we consider that to be rare. The normal means of which he brings someone to himself, is by bringing the Word of God to them, and how shall they hear without a preacher. And consequently we consider the Word of God as the normal means which is most vital to those that may enter, and so that we can advance in the Christian life as far as anything which we can take apart is concerned.

The means of grace we consider then as the Word, the sacraments, and prayer, and we do not consider them means of grace, in the sense that they are channels through which the grace of God, and without this we can not get it. We consider them as

channels, through which normally we receive the Word of God. We read, thus, in the question larger catechism, in ~~question~~ 154, or the shorter, question 88, the two are almost identical. I'll read from the shorter. "The outward, and ordinary means whereby Christ communicated to us the benefits of redemption, are his ordinances, especially the Word, sacraments, and prayer, all of which are made effectual to the elect for salvation." Then we have the question, how is the word made effectual as to salvation. And there the larger catechism is a little more detailed than the shorter. It says, the Spirit of God makes the reading, but especially the preaching of the Word, and effectual means of enlightening, convincing, and humbling sinners, of driving them out of themselves, and drawing them to Christ. Of conforming them to his image, and of subduing them to his will. Of strengthening them against temptation and corruption. Of building them up in grace, and establishing their hearts in and comfort through faith unto salvation. The Spirit of God makes the reading, especially the preaching of the word and effectual means of doing these things.

So that you could take that phrase, and interpret it as meaning, there is something magical in listening to the word. But I don't think that's what the writers meant by it. Not even what the Lutherans mean, when they say that the Word of God is a power in itself, ~~and~~ a power which the Holy Spirit is so tied to, that it has a power in itself.

Large B. The Word of God. The Word of God, from the Protestant viewpoint, is the outstanding means of grace. Now this phrase which was in here, that the Spirit of God makes the reading, but especially -

S-78.

More cases of preaching seems to be effective, than the reading of it. If you take the great number of Christians, you will find that more of them had their experiences of progress, and justification, and sanctification, as they listen to the Word of God preached, than those who have it as they read and study the scripture. But I think that is a great deal due to our laziness, more than anything else. I think that it is a fact of ~~human~~ ^{life} that we are so. And Paul said, "How shall they hear without

a preacher." Well, why did they need a preacher? Why can't they take the Bible and read it. Like the man said once to me, why bother to preach to people in this country. Anybody can turn on his radio, and listen to the gospel. Maybe they can, but they don't. And maybe anybody could take the Bible, and read it, which would be better than listening to any radio preacher. But they won't. And so God has commissioned us, to take his word, and to present in a vivid, illustrative way, to the people.

Many people seem to have the idea that preaching consists in giving a fine, intellectual interpretation. That is teaching. And that enters preaching, but it is not the purpose of preaching. The purpose of preaching is to take the teaching, and get them in the mind. To get them across. To drive them home. It is better to drive a little home, than to present a great deal, and have none of it driven home. And so, especially, the preaching of the word, is a means by which most Christians, have advanced in their Christian life, by the listening to the preaching of the Word. And consequently there is a duty upon Christians to put themselves where they will come under the influence of the preaching of the Word. And there is the duty to be careful what they listen to, and to listen to people who will preach the word, instead of preaching their own ideas. There is absolutely no merit, in simply going to a church. There is great merit in listening to the Word of God. But if the person preaches his own ideas, and not the Word of God, regardless of whether he is orthodox, or not orthodox, there is no particular means of grace. You're just getting some man's philosophy.

And so the Word of God is the ordinary means, the outward, and ordinary means of all these ordinances, especially the Word. And we read that the Word, that the Spirit of God makes the reading but especially the preaching, I think that we could take that in most cases due to the laziness of man. But I question whether a man will be a real great and effective servant, or whether he will make the progress in sanctification that he should, if he does not make an effort, to make the Word of God, through his own study, and his own reading, an effective thing in his life, even more so than his hearing it being presented by others.

As a means of grace, as something we take, and we use, surely the reading of the

Word of God, and more than the reading, the studying of the Word of God is the great means that God has given. And he's given us the entire word. And he doesn't mean for us to take a few verses, and to just simply understand them. . It's wonderful to have a few verses on motto around the home. It is very, very helpful. But it is not enough. We need the whole word.

and so the Word of God is an effectual means of salvation, means of redemption, means of advancing one's Christian life, because of the ideas it presents to us, and those ideas are presented in the Word in a way we should be able to get

(4). Now some Modernists group of the Bible, their Christian teaching is like a nut, in which we have the external shell, and we have to peer through the shell to get the kernel. And the way they mean it, there's a lot that's ~~much~~ untrue, which you get through to get the truth. It is utterly wrong. And yet there is an element of truth in the figure, that the word of God has got its real meat often buried so that it takes work to get it. I feel that if a person can get others to starting studying the Word themselves, instead of just listening to him, he would be doing one of the greatest service he can for their sanctification, for their growth in Christ. To get them to dig through the surface, the kernal of, perhaps the historical statements which are true, but which are not especially effective in progress in the Christian life.

I have known people who have spent days and hours, studying the chronology of the kings, studying the harmony of the life of Christ, studying all the external minutia of the Scriptures, and it's a very interesting thing. But I don't think it's a means of grace. As a means of grace its the external kernal, which they must get through to the spiritual tpeaching that is there for them, and if they stop with the external kernal, they're not going to grow in grace.

Dr. Allis remarked on how many critics there were, who all their lives pondered over the Old Testament, studying word by word, but studying it for the purpose of seeing the distinguishing marks of J¹, J², J³, and J⁴., D¹, D², D³, and D⁴, and so on. And they were studying the Word of God all the time, but not getting any of its benefits. Because they were studying in the wrong places, for the wrong purposes. And we can do that without accepting . (6). We can study it in a

way that is getting true and proper teaching from it, but not getting the teaching that is needed for the advance of our souls, and the upbuilding of our lives.

We spent the first week or so this semester, speaking on the great importance of the Word of God, and of the means of gaining knowledge. And that of course is entirely different from the Word of God, as a means of grace. And yet the two overlap sufficiently, that I'm sure that there is enough material under that which would come under this head, that we can (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) rush on, even though it might seem to underestimate the importance of the subject to do so. I don't think we want to underestimate the importance of the subject, for there is nothing more important.

But let's go on to prayer. Prayer as a means of grace. He mentions it third here, but I think it is very reasonable to take it second, because of the fact, that the two are more like each other in a way than the sacraments, and ^{yet} the sacraments in a way are more like the Word, then they are like prayer. So I think that either of the three in order would be quite all right. But we will not spend so long on prayer here. There again, I hate to do that. Prayer is a vital means of grace. And we're thinking of prayer now as a means of grace, and that fits in with the idea that I put off and express, but it doesn't. Prayer doesn't change anything in the universe. Prayer changes you. It's the affects on you that matter. ~~Um~~ Well, if you leave out the negative of that, I think that the positive of it is true. Prayer does change things in the universe. But the affects of prayer, ~~on~~ the man who makes the prayer is even more important, than the change that is made in the universe. Prayer petition is a vital part of prayer. And petition changes things in the universe. But petition is only one part of prayer, and prayer includes much more than petition. Prayer includes confession. Prayer includes thanksgiving. Prayer includes a large element of worship. Prayer includes praise to God. There are many elements to prayer (8 $\frac{1}{2}$). And so the element of prayer as affecting the universe, is only applied to a certain part of prayer. And although it is a true element, we must not overlook, that it is God's will that this thing must be advanced through the prayers of his people. It is definitely his will that this be done. We have a responsibility in prayer for others. He answers our prayers. He does things, that would not be done, if we did not pray.

Prayer is real. It is not just going through a . And all that is very, very vital, and perhaps one of the ways of which prayer is a means of grace, is that it increases our faith, through seeing our prayers answered. And through seeing how prayer changes things, increases our faith in God, and our condition of his reality.

Prayer is just as important, as the giving of money before the advance of any Christian enterprise. It is through prayer. Prayer is, if somebody would say, well, I won't give you fifty dollars, but I'll pray. Well, that's no way. If a person ~~may~~ takes that spirit, the Lord bless you, I'll pray for you, but I wouldn't spend any money on you. Well, his prayer won't help either. The prayer in my pocket would help me just as much as the gift of money would, or if it were money. If prayer is just a pious way of saying, well, I won't give you any money. I'm not that interested in your work. But if prayer is a, something that really costs us, because we're really mentally concerned, and we're interested, we can give as much as through prayer as we can through gifts. For afterall, the Lord owns everything, the cattle on a thousand hills is here. He can accomplish it if he chooses, and so prayer is the gracious way of helping one another. And we need the prayers of one another. When we are tempted to criticize one another, if we stopped and prayed instead, we might find that in the end, the thing that we feel like criticizing about, would be remedied much more quickly, and much better, then would any amount of criticism, or of derogatory .(11). If anyone were a true Christian, they need to pray for other Christians, and also need the prayers of other Christians. And it is good for us to notice what we should pray for, and why, and how we can help them through prayer.

But prayer as a means of grace, is doubtless the greatest purpose of prayer is that it is a means of grace, because the sufficient aspect, there is only one aspect, we have all the other aspects, and even in the sufficient aspect, it has the affects upon us, which is very vital. Prayer is a means of advancing in our sanctification. We study the word, and we learn what God says. We pray and we come into a personal relationship with him. But we can come into that relationship by reading the word, and hearing him talking to us. The Word is him talking to us, prayer is us talking to him. But as we talk to him, it puts us into a frame of mind, where the word becomes

more truly, his talking to us, and makes that more real, then it would, just reading words, we don't actually hear him talking to us. It

(12).

(Question. No. Not if we are believing in Christ, if we are related to him, our saviour, if our trust is in him, then our prayers can be effective. But the fact that I decide that I would like to have Eisenhower reelected, and I'm so anxious to have it, that I believe it will happen if I pray, and then it will happen. There may be others praying just as energetically for Stevenson. And the Lord won't necessarily answer the prayer.)

(Question. It is pretty hard to express it in words. I think that the vital thing to say is first to believe in his power, the second ~~thing~~ ^{believes} is (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)
And a ^{Spirit} believes what he will do is better. And then we pray, and believe the ~~Lord~~ will lead us to ~~what~~ what we think. And gives it in the form

but it was doubtlessly much in his will. It's not just prayers for our own personal desires. He gave the Israelites their desires (14).

S-79.

Question. But when that works, in the case where that has worked, there have been a lot of individuals concerned. I do believe that it is very vital, ~~mm~~ that we study what the Lord's will is, ~~mm~~ that we study situations, and we use our common sense, and we use our reason because that is very, very vital. Not to just jump to some conclusion. But I think that it is extremely important that we pray in advance. That the Lord will lead us, and that we be in a spirit of prayer. Now if they really found the Lord's will, then they went ahead and prayed, and the Lord granted their petition. But they didn't all do that. (Record very scratchy here.)

(Question: Yes. Well, I think that it is right. They made a real effort to find out what the Lord's will was, and then they felt that it was, he called on them to pray it through, and they proceeded to do it. And I think that

And I think that he wants us to agonize in prayer. He wants us to hold on God, to hold on to his resources. But I think that even in that he wants us to have the recognition that there is a possibility and it is always wrong to keep the thought of the title, even if we have to.

(Question. I think that we are believing, not only in his person and his power, but in his love. And if he is more interested than we are, in doing that, which is best, and we are believing in that, and believing that he wants us to pray, and if we are convinced that that is his will that this be done, we pray that he will work it out, and enable us, but I think that all this ~~unimpaired~~ witnesses, if I should be mistaken,

(3).

Question. I think I did it many years ago. (3 $\frac{1}{2}$). He never says no to a prayer, in which ~~unless~~ the man has truly sought his will on it. But I think that even the best man thrice, and you take Paul. Paul ~~was~~ besought the Lord to remove his thorn in the flesh, and the Lord did not do it. The Lord had a greater blessing to Paul by keeping it, than to remove it. Well, Paul had seen other people, who were somewhat used in the Lord's service, and he prayed and they were healed. And here he was, used as he was, to know how much more he could be used with that thorn in his side. It would seem absolutely clear that it was the Lord's will that it was

(4 $\frac{1}{2}$). But he was right. The man that is so used as Paul was, needs a thorn in the flesh, to keep him humble. He needs it, because the best of us can fall. And the Lord can send, us what seems to be a terrible thorn, and we'll get a great blessing. But Paul prayed thrice. Then he had the conviction that it was not the Lord's will to grant that prayer. I think that in most cases we'd better pray more than Paul, before we (5). Because very often, it seems it is a long time, before he answers that prayer.

But there are statements in the scripture, which stress that if you ask anything in my name, I will do it. And ~~the~~ ^{they} stressed this part of it, and it is vital that they should, because our faith is so small, with all of us. And we're so apt to fall short of what we should do, the way we should utilize the resources of God.

His desire to bless us, is far beyond our, any aspect of the law, but we are so ready to think of his blessings, simply from one viewpoint, one aspect, and consequently we're apt to push way ahead in this particular aspect, without realizing that other aspects must come along equally, if this is to be a blessing ~~unpnnnnnn~~ not a curse

(6). Well, prayer is a vast subject. I wish we could spend a long time, going into the ins and outs of it, but I just don't dare because of the shortness of the year.

(Question: I think it is a just ~~mandamony~~ criticism of the tendency of everyone, of a real danger, which we must avoid. I thought it was wonderful when Dr. Springer, ~~hm~~ after telling about his stand, and his fight, in everything, and giving us such a story and a message on it, ended up with those words, that if he let bitterness come into his soul, in this, it was absolutely useless. Absolutely worthless. Now we can't judge the other man's

(7). But we can judge ourselves. And he wants us to very, very strict in judging ourselves. And though I give my body to be burned, for the things I believe in, and have not love, it profited nothing. But the Lord can see whether I have the ^{love} ~~hand~~. And very often, the people ~~think~~ we think have loads of love, have got a beautiful form of piety, and not much underneath it. And some people, in which we do not see the love, have got a real passion, that we don't see, but that the Lord sees. I think that we've got a big job in watching out for ourselves in that regard. And when any man takes a stand for the Lord, and really steps out for him, his temptations become greater. His danger becomes greater, and therefore the need becomes great, for him to watch and pray for himself, and it is good for us to pray for ourselves.

But when I spoke of criticism, I ^{meant} ~~was~~ of course criticising a person

(8). I think that if any of us observe something, in someone else, that is a detriment to the Lord's will, I think it is a very wonderful thing that we pray to the Lord about the matter, and then we pray to the Lord whether it might be his will, that we should be used to help that person. And then we go to that person, and get them privately, where we are not holding them up before others, or injuring their work, of people that are really serving the Lord, by saying things criticizing them to others.

But try to get them privately, and present to them the burden we have. And we may be wrong in our burden, and we shouldn't feel badly, if it doesn't seem to be effective, or if they dash it aside, maybe on thinking it over, the Lord will convince them later that we were right. But we should go and do our part, in presenting to other people, personally. I've known people who to my face, have always been so kind and cheerful, and friendly, and just treat you as though they love you, and then I heard some of the things they were saying about me behind my back. And maybe half of the things that they were saying behind my back were true. And it would have been a real blessing to me, if they would have come to me, and said those things to me to my face, instead of saying them behind my back. They should keep quiet if they think I am serving the Lord, about preaching something behind my back. But to my face, they would ~~show~~ ^{have shown} a much greater spirit of love to me, ~~and~~ to have come to me, and to have said, Am I right in my feeling to you, that you are making this statement, that you are doing this thing wrong. And it might have been a wonderful means of calling my attention to things I wouldn't notice. But when people to your face are very friendly, in everything, and behind your back they are criticizing you, they are acting a lie to your face. That is never pleasing to the Lord.

But to come to someone and give them the burden ~~you have~~ ^{may have} the Lord/laid upon your heart, about him, it may be wrong, you may misunderstand him. But it may be right, and the Lord may use it anyway.

10½ (Question: To get any idea across, it often takes repetition, repetition, and repetition. And somebody will misunderstand it. There was a minister that I ~~never~~ had heard of, as a great God ly man, who was standing in the mission field for the word of God. That is what I always heard of him. Then he came over to this country, and he took a position in an apostate denomination, and he was with them, and he was throwing his support back of them. I never saw the man, and so I attended a service once, and he was at it. ~~When~~ And as he came out, I met him. And he was meeting person after person, and just in the course of half a minute, that I had there with him, I may have said something about, Oh, I wish we had your wonderful evangelical preaching that is absolutely separate from modernism, or something like that. Oh, I don't know what I

said. I've no idea. But I heard years later, how he was telling all around the country, how bitter I was. As soon as I met him, I came out with this terribly, bitter statement. And I had no idea of what it was. But he was just ready to pick up anything - I think that his conscience was hurting him, but he was doing it. And he was ready to pick up anything that he could, to criticize. But I don't think we should be afraid of that. I think that we should, in love, preach the word of truth. And people will misunderstand, they misunderstood our Lord, and they misunderstood Paul. We can expect to be accused of bitterness, and of all that. But we want to pray the Lord, that he will keep anything from our heart, that he will (12).
You will be misunderstood wherever you go.

(Question. I think you should do both, and I think that you have something, there. ~~as~~ I think that in that case it is fully understandable. You see that has, as I understand, it, for two or three years ago, that they had a meeting in New York, and they were anxious to invite Billy Graham to come to New York to hold evangelistic meetings there, and Mr. Bennet was actually in the group that was trying to get him there. And was anxious to have him, and they had perhaps a hundred outstanding evangelicals who were meeting together wanting to have a campaign in New York, to get him to preach there. And his advance man came, or maybe it was he himself, I'm not sure. But anyway, whoever it was, came and told him that they must get Bishop Oxnham into the movement, and they must get the Princeton Seminary people, and they must get the leaders of all the denominations, or he would not come. And then they took a general evangelical creed, and they said, Won't you have everybody who is active in the campaign, who has a leadership in it, agree to sign. Now, they said, if you'll do that, we'll remove all objections to any connection. I don't know if they were right, in going this far, but they did go this far. That they will sign this general evangelical statement, and he refused. He said, it must represent all these groups. Well, under those circumstances, the only thing they could do is to withdraw. And I think it was their duty to let other Christians know why they refused, so the people wouldn't put a great deal of time and effort into advancing something that they hope would be a great work of God, and then find out in the end, that it was on a basis which would make it a failure.

Only the Lord can see what ~~momentum~~ helps. I think they did. I used to think they didn't. The Lord sees their hearts. The vital thing is that we do what is right. It would be better, to do what was right, before the Lord in a spirit not of love, then to do what was against the Lord, and think that it is in the Spirit of love. Now, of course, one shouldn't do either. But what I mean is, the vital thing is that we stand for the Lord, and we stand for his truth, as far as our effectiveness in serving him is concerned. But then, as far as our acceptance on his part, is concerned, that his blessing on us is concerned, we must (1) for we can't judge. The Lord can. But we must judge ourselves, very, very keenly.

1½ (Question. We must pray to the Lord to give us a desire for the advancement of his part, to the point, where we rejoice in any advance, no matter what happens. But, I think we must pray the Lord very definitely, as far as to where he wants us to put our effort, that our effort be in where something will be built, that is worthwhile.

A little building, a little one-room building which is solid, and will stand the storms, is far better than to build a great cathedra, that is just built of paper, and when the wind blows, it falls over. You can't go by appearances. But we must put our effort where ~~where~~ we think the Lord will have it. And I think we have the duty to let others know why. But that is getting us off a little from the subject of prayer, and also comes closely with it. The Lord wants us to pray for them that persecute us, and revile us. He wants us to pray for those who are out of his kingdom, that they be received into it. That they turn. That they change. He doesn't want us to pray God's blessing on their ~~unholy~~ wicked works. I mean those who are outside the kingdom,

I got a letter from a man who was in the Presbytery of Los Angeles, in a Presbyterian of the U.S.A. church. He said, some of you people are attacking modernism. That's no way to win the modernists. Here are these ministers of these big churches, and you drive them away from us, by your attack on modernism. We should show a spirit of love, and win them. Well, the Lord was interested in the sheep, and the thousands of people that are being led astray, ~~and~~ by the preaching of these men. We want to lead these men to know the Lord, if we possibly can, but we want to warn these people against their evil ways. And it's just as important, (3), and he

doesn't want us to put our thought on the helping of the few people to the extent of injuring the great mass of the people. But to the few, toward even those who are instruments of Satan, he wants us to have a love in our hearts, that we should pray earnestly that some of them will be saved. We know they won't, but we wish they might. But we know they won't, but some of them will.

Prayer is a means that causes things to be changed, in God's universe. But prayer is even more of a means which causes us to be changed. And if we are going to know the Lord's will, so that we can pray in favor, and receive what we pray for, it is even more important that we pray that the Lord will give us hearts that really want to know his will. And that's one thing about prayer. We all say, many pious things in our prayers. and it is easy to say beautiful, beautiful statements. But the very fact of saying them, if you're not another hypocrite, if you mean it, the very fact of saying them, drives it into your consciousness, into your emotions, and is of benefit to you. It's like a sermon. If a sermon is a good sermon, and the man is not a hypocrite, he is preaching to himself, as well as the congregation. And he may get more deeply into it, and get more blessing from it, then even the congregation, then anyone of the congregation. And this may drive the message, ^{but} such that the preaching is a means of grace, ~~and~~ I think that the preaching is a greater means of grace, ^{to} than the preacher, then it is to the people who listen, because if he really gives it effectively, he's driving it home to his own heart. And as he comes down from the pulpit, he might ask himself, do I really mean what I've ~~said~~ been saying. It is a good thing when we pray to ask ourselves, Do I really mean it? Well, we do mean it if we're Christians. But we may not do it very deeply. And prayer brings us into closer fellowship with Christ. Prayer makes more deeper in us, in our minds, in our thought, in our consciousness, the determination that we want to have that, and that he wants us to have it. And so prayer is a very, very great means of grace.

But it is important that we realize that prayer is not measured by the time that it consumes. I've known people who have put hours, and hours, and hours a day on prayer. One man told me, I've heard ~~an~~ evangelists, I've heard great Bible teachers tell how many hours a day they put in prayer, and I was putting in more than any of them. And

then all of a sudden, ^{he} I just turned away from the Lord, ^{he} I turned like that. He lost his faith completely, he just could not believe in him. And the Lord won't hear us for our much speaking. And the amount of time that we put in prayer isn't what matters. It's the depth rather than the width, that matters. Now you can't have a lot of depth with no width. And in order to get considerable depth, it may be necessary to put in a lot of width. But it is the depth that matters, rather than the width. And when the Lord says, pray without ceasing, he doesn't mean, that you go off like a monk, into a cell, and you spend 15 hours a day praying. He doesn't mean that at all. He means that you get so into the attitude of prayer, that you are praying about everything, all the time wherever you are. And that you are giving a depth of prayer that continues. We are not to be like the heathen that will be taken for our vain repetition, and after that he gives us the Lord's prayer. And people repeat that in Latin, over, and over, and over, and over, and try to win the Lord's approval. How apt we are to do that.

Like in Colossians where he says, "Be not subject to ordinances ~~mmmm~~ touch not, taste not, handle not," to show that carrying out the Word of God, when the Word says, Be not subject to ordinances, such as touch not, taste not, handle not, to show that we're carrying out the Word of God, when the word says, Be not subject to ordinances, touch not, taste not, handle not, they were not misusing the ideas. They were using the ideas correctly. But in using scripture to back it up, they were taking it out of context, and were completely missing it in scripture. But it is so easy for us to do that. It is not the length of time we put in prayer, it is not the number of times we pray, it is not the repetitions of words. But it is the depth of prayer. But with length of time may increase your depth, and it may not. And it is a matter for us to study and to determine whether we are putting in time actually in what becomes vain repetition, or whether we are coming to know the Lord better.

So prayer as a means of getting ~~mmmmmm~~ things from God is a very real thing, and we need to study about that. We need that our faith shall be tremendously increased, in that regard. But prayer as a means of ^{an} grace, is/even more important thing, and we want to study that more fully, and to put more emphasis and more attention to it. There must be a balance between the study of the word and prayer. And a great deal of prayer

with a little study of the Word, soon becomes vain repetition. Prayer must be a guiding home to our soul, the thoughts that we get from the Word. And if we are not getting thoughts from the Word, the prayer will inevitably become a vain repetition. But the two must go hand in hand. And they are the most vital of the means of grace.

Now, D. The Sacraments. And the sacraments is a word that is not a scriptural word, and it is a word, the meaning of it has changed a great deal. The use of the word sacrament in ancient time was entirely different than what we use it for today. But it is a word, of which it's become ~~many~~ fairly clear, what we mean by it. That the sacrament is, we would say, an ordinance that is established by Christ. An ordinance that he has established, and which he uses to bring his grace to us. Here is the definition from the larger catechism. "Sacrament is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ in his church, which signifies he'll exhibit [?] in those within the covenant of grace, the benefits of mediation to strengthen and increase their faith and ^{and} , to oblige them to obedience, to testify ~~am~~ cherish their love of communion, one to another, and to distinguish them from those that are without." That is the definition in the larger catechism of the sacraments. It is a rather extensive one. The Roman Catholic definition is much simpler. I don't have the exact wording of it here, but the idea is that a sacrament is a visible thing in the external world, which is used to bring the grace of God to us, to receive it. ~~Protestants~~ ^{Protestants} believe that they have to be instituted by Christ. After all, why should they have to be? Christ might have told his disciples to institute them. That could be. But that is our Protestant attitude, because the Roman Catholics, have as many as seven sacraments. And from their definition, these seven are all sacraments. But from our definition, there are only two. In fact, from their definition we don't believe there are any.

S-81. S/22/57.

We are taking up now, D. The sacraments. Number one here is the meaning of the Word. And the meaning of the word as we find it etimologically is

I think there is a very important lesson here, though. Etymology does not determine the meaning. You go to a house somewhere, and you say, who lives in this house? And you find that a doctor lives there, who is _____, and he taught a class, and _____ is different from ordinary doctors. _____ . And then you find a house that is just opposite ~~mfmhiamhama~~ years ago. You'll often find that situation exactly. Houses change completely and in their purpose. Now the original masons may have built something into it for his purpose, which is unfitting for the new use. But there may be reasons why it perfectly fits the new use. But the knowledge of who built it and when, ordinarily doesn't throw much light, on the present use of the house. Now there are cases when it does. But there are many cases when it doesn't. And you can't take for granted that it does. And that is true of etymology. It is very often, an English word, and we don't know what it means, and you get its etymology, and check where it comes from, and usually it just opens up, so clear and interesting. It ~~if~~ throws a flood of light on it, and the result is, that some people get the impression, that with any word, get the etymology, and you'll know what it means. Well, it doesn't work that way. Because in many, many things, the etymology proves nothing. The word has perhaps completely changed to the opposite of what it originally meant.

Now this word *sacramento* in the classic is found to mean just a general

(2 $\frac{1}{2}$). Well, you could guess that from *sacrament*, from the word. Anything *sacrad*, and of course that doesn't tell a thing. Because I could just ~~make~~ say it is connected with ~~amhymammf~~ religion, and it is. No body would ever question that. But in legal proceedings, the money deposited by contending parties, was called a *sacramento*. And the reason for this seems to be that when forfeited it was applied to *sacrad* purposes. And therefore they would simply call it a *sacrament*. The money which the contending parties deposited.

Then in a secondary sense, it meant a judicial process. And in military use it would be the obligation of the soldier to the leader of the country. Then it came to be the oath by which he was bound. Well, now whether our modern use has come from its use of being an oath of something, I don't know. I rather doubt it. But it gradually

came to be applied to anything that was ^{hidden} sacred or that had a ~~different~~ meeting, and then it came to be applied to all religious ~~rites~~ rites or ceremony. In the vulgate, it's used as a translation of the word we translate mystery, in about a dozen cases. But in the middle ages, the term sacrament came to be used for special means of conferring grace, special instrumentalities through which grace came, a mystery, a holy ordinance. Something very special, but meant a special ~~means~~ means by which the grace of God came to us. And then the Reformation said of it, it is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, wherein ^{signs} by sensible ~~means~~ Christ and the benefits of the ^{New} covenant are represented, sealed, and applied to believers." Now that's the way the thoughts (4 $\frac{1}{4}$). So we don't need to get these precisely. They're in Hodge, and then ^{some} we'll give ~~this~~ more precise statements, before we're through.

But the term in Protestant use ~~is~~ thus, is not its original term, just anything sacred, it is not in early use any ceremony, it's come to mean special ceremony. And in the Roman Catholic Church there are seven sacraments. And Hodge says, It is difficult to know how they came to settle on the number seven. We find in the Middle Ages, we find them coming through this, and whether it was liking the number seven, and whether it was wanting to find ~~this~~ exactly that number, it is hard to say. There were about that number of ceremonies that seemed to them to be very special, but they fixed on an exact number of seven. And so among the Roman Catholics, the sacrament is taken as the specific seven sacraments which are the specific means by which the grace of God is brought to the people. To the present Roman Catholic Church, the sacraments is more important, as far as the people are concerned, than the Scriptures. The people as a whole, pay comparatively little attention to the Scripture.

If you will discuss it theoretically with the leaders, they will say that the Scripture requires special training, to understand. And we can't expect an ordinary person to understand it, but that it is the foundation. But as far as special value coming to the ordinary person, from the Scripture, the Roman Catholic Church does not emphasize ~~that~~ that at all. But they tremendously emphasize the sacraments. I read in a magazine just yesterday, that happened to be the reference to a former boxing champion, Tommy , who was quite prominent, some years in Philadelphia for many

years, and was an outstanding champion in certain areas of athletics, and it mentioned that he is now connected with a financial house in New York, and it said, he goes to mass every day. That was the statement given. He goes to mass every day. Now if a person every day went to a service in which the Word of God was expounded, they would learn a great deal about the Word of God. If a person every day went to a service in which the principle truths of Christianity were driven home with a forceful message, he would get these truths very deep into his heart. But when a person goes to mass every day, what does he get? He hears certain words, which are used in Latin, and chances, are Tommy doesn't know Latin. So the chances are that the meaning of those words do not impress themselves a great deal upon his mind. And along with those words he sees a priest going through certain forms. And lifting something up, and presenting it before the altar, and this cannot but drive home to his thoughts, to his mind, the thought of sacrifice. The thought of making an offering. The thought of presenting it. ~~It~~ It would surely drive that home to his mind. But I'm sure that the reason he goes is not because he feels that having this one simple thought driven home to his mind a great deal, is ~~the~~ ^a vital thought to him personally, but because he believes he receives definite, divine grace, through being present when this is performed. As the Roman Catholic Church says today, it is the unbloody repetition of the sacrifice of Christ. Now Protestants of course, find it difficult to avoid thinking there is some application of the verse in the New Testament, where it speaks of "crucifying the Lord Jesus Christ afresh", when you find in thousand of Roman Catholic Churches all over the world, every day, doing what they claim, is not simply the remembering of the crucifixion, but . The unbloody repetition of the sacrifice.

They are not simply reminding God of what Christ did, but they are offering up to God, the very body and blood of Christ. There is a repetition of it. Well, for a person who doesn't know Latin, there is - what value can we get out of it? A few simple ideas driven home to his mind, but the main thing to him would be that he feels that through being present, he receives definite grace, and this is the grace of God through him. Now that of course would be sacramento, in its original idea. I heard a man speak on the radio one morning. ~~He~~ He had an English accent. He was from the Church of England.

And he gave some thoughts about sin, and about the need of turning from it, and about how it wasn't enough in life to have simply the knowledge of the ordinary things in life, but that we needed something more, and he gave it, and he led up to evangelical truth, and then his conclusion was this - Have you been to holy communion lately? Have you been to Holy Communion? And that was his great climax. You need something spiritual. Have you been to Holy Communion? Now I didn't have the chance to hear him fully, what he meant. He didn't go on. I do not know, ~~impartant~~ or realize. He was a particular individual. But the way in which it was presented, it was difficult to escape the feeling, that there was a good deal of the plain idea that here you are, reading the spiritual, and you will get it by being present at his ceremony. That there is a ceremony, that will bring you the grace you need, rather than, that it is a spiritual relationship to a person, which might be helpful in a presentation to your mind, a person must see it in his mind, this, that it will be received through this being present, or partaking of this experience.

I have before me, the canon and creed of the Council of Trent. And the Council of Trent, as you know, three hundred years ago, adopted the view point, which is the standard of the Roman Catholic Church. And they, in their statement on the sacraments in general here, it is rather (11) rather extensive. Shaff has it here on page 119 following, it is volume two of his Creeds of Christendom. The first part of it deals simply with the number of sacraments. And as we mentioned yesterday, the question of the number is ~~not as important~~ ^{next to importance} as the question of the purpose. If the purpose is what the Roman Catholic Church holds it is, then the number becomes tremendously important. If the purpose is quite different than that, the number is not nearly as important, as it is from their viewpoint.

He says, "~~infamously~~ They say, if anyone ^{said} ~~says~~ that the Sacraments of the New Law, were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord; or, that they are more, or less, than seven, namely Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament: let him be anathema." That is a definite statement on the number of them, and a very strong adjugation on the one who will (12 $\frac{1}{2}$). You notice, it does not

say, deny the Protestant position, that Sacraments must be instituted by Christ, but it says, if anybody denies it, that all of these were instituted by Christ, and for some of these you'll have a hard time finding proof, that they were instituted by Christ.

Well, you would have to rest on tradition. There is no proof for it, because many of these ~~members have known the sacraments~~ no scriptural statements of anything that ~~that could be considered~~

as How about this extreme unction? Who established that? Well, the basis given for it is James, where he says if any is sick, let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, and anoint him with oil, and the Lord will heal ~~man~~ them. But they don't use it for healing. They use it for forgiveness of sin, at the end of life, and I've heard of priests becoming very angry, because they gave a man extreme unction, and then he got well. And he wasn't supposed to have extreme unction until he was ready to die.

And I heard, in Wilmington one afternoon, I turned on the radio, and I turned to a local Catholic program. And in this program there was a very clever presentation. They had a priest talking with an inquirer. And the inquirer said to the priest, Well, Father, I'm beginning to understand some of these things, what the truth is on it, but there is one thing I can't understand, and that's this extreme unction. How can a little pouring of oil on me, take away my sins. But I can't understand it. And so they went on to discuss it a little bit. And then the priest said, Well, now, he said, you believe that water takes away your sin, that . And the man said, certainly, of course. Well, he said, if water can take away sins, can oil take away sins. And the man said, Oh, I see it now. So he accepted it as being right. That was the proof. That was of that program. Well, you see what the proof of it is, that the water, or the oil takes away sin. Now, they wouldn't say that the oil is a substitute that takes away the sin, or that water is a substitute that takes away the sin.

S-82.

of washing away by the physical qualification, of water, or of oil, which is blessed by the , and was formed by one, who through the sacrament of

order, had conferred upon him, the power, to do this. The power to change the bread
 and wine, into the body and blood of Christ, the power to confirm the grace that comes
 through the . Well, that is the definite position which the Roman Catholic
 Church takes on this. That they are means of grace in the very literal sense, that the
 grace of Christ comes to us through that.

Now the Protestant position on this is expressed in many different Protestant
 creeds. But in the Westminster Confession and Catechism, we find a very excellent
 statement, which has been worked out, ~~summed~~ by this group of highly trained men,
 who took an extremely great amount of their time discussing everything in order to work
 to tell exactly what they had in mind. And you take the definition of the sacrament,
 which is given in the Westminster Confession of Faith, and ~~then~~ you read that the
 sacraments are the holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately
 and to
 instituted by God, to represent Christ and his benefits, confirm our interest in them,
 as to put a visible difference between those who belong unto the church, and the rest
 of the world, and solemnly to engage them to the service of God and Christ, according
 to his word. And there is nothing in that of its conferring per se a grace upon us.
 It continues. There is in every sacrament a spiritual relationship, or sacramental
 union between the signs that they signify, when it comes to pass that the names and
 effects of the one are attributed to the other. The larger catechism parallel to that
 says, Parts of the sacraments are two, the one an outward and sensible sign used to
 refer to Christ's own appointments, and the other one, an inward and spiritual grace,
 would
 (I think that the Roman Catholic would say, ~~which~~ use exactly this thus far.) thereby
 conferred - but the Westminster ~~and~~ Confession said, thereby signifying - and that's
 a tremendous ~~statement~~ difference. Thereby signifying instead of thereby conferred. I think
 that's a tremendous difference. And the larger catechism, the next question says,
 How do the sacraments become an effectual means of salvation? The sacraments become
 an effectual means of salvation, not by any power in themselves, or any virtue derived
 from the piety or intention by whom they are administered, but only by the working out
 of the Holy Ghost, and the blessings of Christ, by whom they are instituted.

Now these expressions I have read to you now, it seems to me, are thus far, are

chrystal clear, that a person who uses the expression, a sacrament is something which him to do, in order to give an outward, visible time, of a spiritual truth, which is not itself produced by the sign. It makes it clear from these statements I've read to you that it is the working of the holy Spirit that is vital, the blessing of Christ that is vital, and the sacrament is a manifestation to the world of our belief in these things. It signifies. As the larger catechism says, What is ^{the} a sacrament? The sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ in ~~his Church~~ ^{his Church}, to signify, ~~the~~ seal, and exhibit unto those that are in the covenant of grace, the benefits of his mediation, to strengthen and increase their faith, and all (4¹/₂), to oblige them to obedience, to testify and cherish their communion from one to another, to distinguish them from those who are without. Now that is the statement of the larger catechism. The statement of the shorter catechism has seems to have at least a possibility on the surface of having a little additional idea, which I don't find in any of these other statements. It says, what is a sacrament? A sacrament is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ; wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the New Testament are represented, sealed, and applied to believers." Now that term applied in the shorter catechism comes to you. I don't find any parallel/in the confession or in the larger catechism. [?] ^{statements} . And it seems to me, that term applied, would suggest that Christ and the benefits of the New ~~C~~ Covenant are received because we have the covenant. I don't think that constitutes what they mean, because there is nothing to suggest them in the Larger Catechism, or in the Confession. But the shorter is used more then the other, and the shorter has that word applied in it, and that, you know what the larger says, it signifies, seals, and exhibits, the smaller says, they are represented, sealed, and applied. Now that word applied, I don't say personally, I don't like, it may be that 300 years ago applied meant something different. But applied as we use it today, seems to me, is a little carry over of the Roman Catholic idea.

(Question. Section three, I believe is this. The grace which is exhibited in ~~the~~ or by the sacrament, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them. Neither does the efficacy of a sacrament, depend upon the time or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution which contains

together with a precept, authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy believers. There is a promise of benefit to worthy believers. Well, that is a much smaller statement, then to say that ~~the~~ ~~grace~~ Christ and the benefits of the new covenant, are false. A promise of benefit. Well, if there is no benefit, you certainly should give them up. I think that it certainly is beneficial. But next to benefit, God, is the application of grace, Well, of course, if grace is anything good, the Lord ~~is~~, ~~anything~~ any benefit is an application of grace. But if you take it in the sense which it could be taken in, (8¼).

And there has been, in Protestant history, great discussion, particularly in the first two or three centuries, and even now, there has been great discussion, about how great is the benefit of the sacraments. Which I think went back to what somebody said on the rather magical idea of , which was in the middle ages, and which is in the Roman Catholic Church today.

How great is the benefit? There have been reformed churches which have held, that a true church must have as its ~~mark~~ sign of being a true church, it must have that the Word of God is rightly proclaimed, and that the sacraments are administered, and that discipline, true discipline, is important. But I was reading a book on Church Government by a presbyterian leader, who said, these are the signs that are normally in a true church, but he said, the one ~~of~~ about the sacraments, is not an 9¼ , because he said, the Quakers had no sacraments. And yet there have been Quaker groups which have been as truly Christian churches, as any groups that have ever been. Now there are Quaker groups that have departed from the scripture, modernism has had a great toll among the quakers, but there have been Quaker groups which have been very, very loyal to the scriptures, in which Christ has been exalted. The very word Quaker means, we've bid them, we've warned them, to fear and quake of the wrath of God. That's what the word Quaker means. They don't call themselves Quakers, they simply called themselves Friends. But there have been Quaker groups, and also the Salvation Army. I had the impression there is a good bit of modernism, or at least an overemphasis on social service as an end in the Salvation Army as it is today. But certainly there have been periods, in the history of the Salvation Army, when they have been as Godly, fruitful

Christians, serving the Lord, and studying his word, and presenting it to others, as you would find anyone in the world. And the salvation army, as well as the Quakers, does not observe sacraments. Now that, you may say is simply an argument from observation, but it does seem that, if they were necessary, to a Christian Church, he would not object ~~am~~ to the blessing of the Lord on people

(10 $\frac{1}{2}$). They are desirous, highly ~~desirable~~ desirable for the church. It is vital that the truths be exhibited. It is a helpful way of driving them home to our minds. But is it a necessary way? Is it the way through which this grace comes to us. It is an excellent way to exhibit. It is intended to make an outward, visible ^{sign} ~~mark~~ of distinction between those who professed the name of Christ, and those who have not. But is it the necessary way? Now that is ^{ll} in a different way. But it could be interpreted, and would seem to me, most natural, in a way, that would lean a little further, then I would incline to, towards the Roman Catholic view on it.

While this third statement of the Confession, this third section of this chapter, of the confession, doesn't seem to me to necessarily suggest any thing going anywhere going near at all. The efficacy does not depend upon the piety and intent of him that is ministering. You see the Roman Catholic Church says, the one who administers must intend to do it. You see, the Roman Catholic Church says, you can go through all the forms, but if the one who is officiating doesn't intend to be effective, it won't be effective. And on the other hand, with the people, there has been a big discussion as to how much space is necessary among the people for the sacraments to be effective, and the position has been taken that all that is necessary, is that there be no intention, that it should not be - that if a person is willing to have what the sacrament is supposed to do, that is all that is necessary. They don't have to know what it is, but have that desire, that whatever it is supposed to do, it will do it. Now that is a different area of the types of ^{thinking} ~~reasoning~~, from our protestant view, but it is the type of thinking which is very easy for most any human being to fall into. The idea that the specific external act produces a specific effect in the spiritual world, and so most people have some of that in their approach, in thinking that the son came to earth.

But here we have the range of meaning of the word. It is that something is a

sacrament, something which ~~me~~ brings you the grace. You go to holy communion and you get the grace. You are present at the mass, and you receive this grace. Is it something like that? Or is something which is intended to take the truths of God, and to drive it home to your heart, and to your mind, to ~~a~~ impress itself upon you, but the vital thing is a transaction in the Spiritual world between you and the Lord to which this is only a help, rather than that is the means through which it comes. Well, I think it could be thought of in relation to that, to look at the Old Testament usage.

Number two. Old Testament Usage. And we do not here mean Old Testament usage of the Word, but we mean the Old Testament usage of the sense, and of course the sense has ~~the~~ to it, the ceremonial law. So under Old Testament usage, we'll say small a, small a. the purpose of the Ceremonial law. What in the Old Testament was the purpose of the ceremonial law? Well, we have in Micah, a statement which the critics say is partly contradictory.

S-83.

Wherewith shall I come before the Lord? And the critics say, the prophet stressed ~~manamant~~ sacrifice, and it presupposes sacrifice. Here's what the prophet says, Wherewith shall I come before the Lord? and to bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with ~~thousands of rams~~ thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is required of thee; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

What is it that the Lord requires? He requires a heart that is attuned to God's . He requires a soul that is related to the law. He requires a life ~~in~~ in accordance with God's love. That is [?] what Micah says God requires. Would it please God to bring all these sacrifices? Well, the critics over look the fact that the prophets, though they ~~make~~ statements like Micah does, the prophets speak of God's pleasure in the sacrifice. They speak of his determination to continue the sacrifice. They speak approving the sacrifices. But they condemn an attitude that considers sacrifice as

effective in itself. The Old Testament is full of statements about the wonderful house of God, that the Lord can establish, and of God's blessing upon the house at Jerusalem, and yet we find that Jeremiah criticizes the people for lying words, saying these are the House of the Lord. He says, you are saying lying words, and God is going to punish you for them. I do not see the verse. It's in the early part of Jeremiah. But it is a very strong statement. He said, "It is a lie. Put your faith on this as God's house." He doesn't mean that it ~~is in~~ ^{is in} God's house, but it means that your faith must be in God, not in the house.

The author of Hebrews looks as if he is getting something, not a new idea that he's gotten, but something that should be perfectly obvious, to the person who is considering the matter, in Hebrews, 10: 4. He says, "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." And yet the Old Testament has an elaborate system of sacrifices. But is the meaning of the sacrifices, that ~~the~~ ^{sin} has been taken away from us? Did the sacrifices cover up the sin? Did the fact that a person performed a sacrifice, make his sin no longer against him? The ~~blood~~ blood of bulls and of goats cannot take away sins, and the Old Testament prophets believed that as well as everybody else. The sacrifice impressed upon his mind the fact that the sin upon him was something that required expiation. That only blood could take away sin. That it is necessary that a man die, eternally, that his life be given for the sin that is upon us, but that God is going to (4) by the
sacrifice, which will take it away. It does not ~~do~~ ^{do} anything of itself, but it drives home to the minds of those who observe, the truths that God wishes

(Question. The fact that the constant need of atonement, but there wasn't a
. You can pay for this or that.)

5.(Question. There's a general thing, that when a man falls deeply into sin, when a Christian falls deeply into sin, he certainly must come with great repentance to God, and avail himself of the merits of Christ. And constantly every day, we are like the one whose feet need to be washed. We must constantly be bringing the sacrifice of the death of Christ, for ourselves, but the great repentance, but it is not

It's not written in the Old Testament, if you do this thing, if you bring this much it is all right. But you recognize the _____ of your sin, and you show it, by

(Question: It is a difficult thing to say how clearly they understood it. I doubt if in the time of Moses, they had a very clear understanding. But I think they knew this, that they were looking to the provision that God would make. That it represented God's provision. But precisely what that was, Peter tells us, the prophets looked forward, they were wondering what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. They were gradually getting to know more and more details about it, but Jesus said that Abraham saw the day and was glad. And I think that we can say that the more intelligent, had more understanding. The more intelligent ~~with~~ combined with the true Spirit of God, had more understanding. But I think that there ~~is~~ ^{was} something of understanding in every true believer. As Hebrews said

(6 $\frac{1}{2}$). But it was clear that here was an illustration of the _____ of the thing, and the need for a divine provision.

(Question: There's a statement, I think is worth looking at. God could have made it clear, if he so chose. Well, I would say that if God so chose, this next minute, he could change this world, so that everybody in it is a Christian. And we'll all glorify him. It's not necessary that we go and preach the gospel. The Holy Spirit could come to every heart in this world to make us Christians right now. We could have a world of no sin, no crime, or no wickedness. Everything in accord with God's grace. God could do that. We believe in the absolute omnipotence of God. But yet we believe that God has chosen to not use this complete omnipotence. There is the various explanations defined. There is the explanation, that he feels, he finds this a better way, and there's the explanation that he is bound by his nature, that there are things in the nature of the universe that must be followed. But the Catholics define it, that God has chosen to allow Satan to remain in control of this world, and to show us, that human effort, not even the preaching of the gospel, can bring a perfect world, that it must be by a sudden,

And he has chosen to make us

such, that everyone of us gradually grows. And you might say, now here's a lesson, I've been a Christian 50 years, and I've got a great marvelous understanding of God's grace, that I've never had before. It's certainly wonderful, the illumination I seem to get, after fifty years of being a Christian. Well, now, why couldn't God have just put that into simpler words, and put that into the Bible, so that I could have seen it earlier. But he could theoretically.

But actually God bows to certain situations in the nature of the universe which he has created. And instead of giving us, for instance, a creed, written in a divine language, of mathematical precision, in which all the great truths that we will get after fifty years of studying the Bible, could be expressed in perhaps ten pages of fine print, carefully worked out. Instead of that, he has given us a book which has gradually brought these ideas to people's minds. And so to say that God couldn't do it, he felt that way as something I wouldn't do. I would say that this was the way he originally planned, and that he has brought these great truths to us gradually. And he has strengthened us, we have gradually looked forward, we got this aspect, and that aspect, and the other aspect, until the consummation, when he gave us salvation. And we get more out of his Word every day. But the central truths of salvation, he gave enough to Adam to believe.

I don't think the clear statements of Paul were understood by the apostles. When he was crucified, I doubt if any of the apostles understood that it was fulfilled. It doesn't look like it. And yet he already told them that ~~it~~ he fulfilled it. It takes time to get ideas. And the Lord has chosen that it be accomplished.

11 (Question. Well, we can never tell when a man is forgiven? The Spirit of God condemning. But as to their having a relationship, it would be like the relationship of justification, for their having faith in Christ. They certainly had a much clearer understanding

too
(Not ~~it~~ clear here.)

Well, now that's A. The purpose of the ~~Sanmann~~ Ceremonial Law. Now we might look specifically at one. The institution of Passover . The institution of Passover . That is perhaps as outstanding as any portion of the ceremonial law.

The meaning of Passover. . It occurs over and over in the Old Testament.

It was repeated once a year. And what was the purpose of passover.

Well, Exodus 12, tells of it's institution. The institution is described, where God brought the people out of Egypt, and God could have taken these people in Egypt, and said, Here, I want you to be in Palestine. Here's a Jet Plane. Jump in, and thirty minutes you'll be in Palestine. He could have simply lifted them up and put them there, right like that. He could have certainly by his spirit taken every one of those people, and made them such as they would go on glorifying him forever. He could have given them an understanding, so that they would marvel at that. But he didn't choose to subject his action to the nature of the participant. In a universe where Satan is largely predominant. And he has chosen as a rule not to over-ride the universe. He has chosen as a rule to lead us along, and only at special times to come with such force, as to completely over ride what might be our personal decision.

But in chapter twelve of Exodus we find that God is going to bring the people out, and instead of simply going to bring them out, he gives them a ceremony. And he says to them that for seven days they are to eat unleavened bread. He says that in the tenth day of this month you shall take to everyone of you a lamb, Now, why does he give them ten days notice? Why doesn't he bring them right out? He says to Moses and Aaron, "This month shall be unto you the beginning of months." "In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb," and he says, the lamb must be without blemish, a male of the first year, either a sheep or a goat. And he says -

S-84.

They shall eat ~~the~~ the flesh in that night, roast with fire, they let nothing of it remain until the morning, thus you shall eat it with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, it's the Lord's passover. "For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt, I will execute judgment, And the blood shall be to you, for a token upon the houses where you are. And when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt.

So here we have a rather involved complex thing which is instituted. And this is instituted and commanded to be performed every year. And it reminds people of the fact that they were in Egypt subject to Pharaoh and his power, and God took them out. With a strong force, he delivered them. He reminds them more than that, that they would have been instituted with the destruction of pharaoh. They were instituted with ~~the~~ Pharaoh's wickedness, and it was only because the blood was on the door, blood of a lamb without spot, that they were passed over. It wasn't that the Israelites gathered from this idea that there was something magical in the blood on the door, and the kind of blood, this blood wouldn't be effective if the lamb had a blemish. It would effect the chemistry of the blood and it wouldn't make it effective for that. But they understood there was a lesson. There was a meaning. There must be a lamb without blemish. It must be slain. It must be ascribed, in order that the Lord shall pass over, and not give to you that which must be given to those who are affected. It's not that he loves you so much that he is just anxious to live ~~you~~ with you from them. It's not so much that you are better than they are, although they doubtless were better. But you are equally guilty, you would suffer, if you did not have the lamb without spot, and the blood of it attached to the door.

Well, it is taken first, it is exhibited a great deal. It is taking a certain great act, and it is reminding, and it is doing the stated thing each year. It must be done at this particular occasion, on the tenth day of this month. That is when it must be done. But in II Chronicles 30 we find, that when it has been neglected for a long time, and they had a passover, we find that they had another one a month later, which was at the wrong time. But God provided, even in Numbers I believe, there is a provision for it. That those who can not partake of it at the same time, have the opportunity a month later, because the precise details of it are not the important things. The important thing is the driving home to the minds of the people of the fact that God, they are guilty, and they deserve death, but that God makes a provision, and this provision we find is a lamb without blemish.

Do you think that there was much (3 $\frac{1}{2}$), when John looked upon Jesus as he walked, and he said, "Behold the lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the

world." That John knew that he was going to pass over. Don't you think that they had some understanding, all those who heard him, that this was a definite reference to the passover, even though they didn't fully understand how it fully applied to Jesus. The lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. A lamb without blemish, slain. And the blood ~~of the lamb~~ was applied to the door, and the people could be saved. There is this sacrament then, in the Old Testament, this sacrament that is performed at regular intervals; but is a recurring performance of this, to remind the people constantly of the fact that God must provide a lamb without blemish, if they are to be saved from his wrath. And that God has delivered them, from the terrible state of punishment which came to the Egyptians. God had delivered them from that, and that they can continue through every time, to rejoice, and praise him, and thank him, for what he did, but to recognize that a lamb is necessary.

B A P T I S M.

(Note from Passhaus - Several lectures were missed while the Sound Scriber was being repaired, and they have been transferred to tape-recording, and these will be transcribed later.)

We were speaking yesterday about ~~MOORE~~ IV - F, 5. And under that a was, Small ~~MOORE~~ a - the Fact of this Covenant Blessing is clearly taught in Scripture. And under that we looked at one. Paul describes Abraham as a Father of all who believe. I gave the references under that. Two, that Abraham had a responsibility for his children. And three, that God promises blessings to the children of his people. Then we went on to - Small b - The bringing of children into the world is not simply a by-product of man's wickedness, it is a positive command of God. And I think the correct understanding on ~~from~~ this point can spare Christian people from a great deal of misery and of mistaken attitude in life. The attitude that, it is not taught so much in our generation, but was taught in previous generations, quite largely, was the attitude that Christianity is a matter of Spirit, simply, and that everything that is of the flesh is wicked, is wrong, is harmful. I knew a man who, that is, a friend of mine knew him well, who used to look at his children ~~and~~ as the evidence of the fact of his and his wife's sinfulness. Well, I think that it is important that we have a clear understanding on this point, that this is not the teaching of Christianity. There is a phase of Buddhism that would hold this. There is an ascetic tendency in this direction which is stressed in certain elements of the Roman Catholic Church, which holds that ~~a,~~ the monastic life is the much higher life than is the family life, and that the priest is ascetic and thus, stands on a higher plane, than ordinary people. Now that is not the teaching of the Bible.

There are statements in the Bible which could seem to suggest that it is. We speak of the flesh lusting against the Spirit. But we find that flesh here does not mean the physical body, that it means the selfish life. It means that which tends to make pleasure from the physical body, be the end of all existence. Even if not constantly thought out that way. [?] God has given us the good things of life for our pleasure, but if they become an end in themselves, they become destructive to us. He has given them to us as by-products along the way to the doing of his will.

And one element of the doing of his will is the bringing of children into the world. He commanded the people in Genesis to multiply and to replenish the earth, and his command is a definite part of his word. And it may be right and proper for individuals to by-pass this command, for the sake of thinking that they can better carry out other commands of the Lord. Thus, there are men who have devoted themselves to missionary work, and they have felt they could do pioneer work better, if they did not take upon themselves the care and efforts of family life. And if the Lord is pleased with individuals giving up certain pleasures in life, for the sake of accomplishing his will better, but it is not the normal thing, nor is it always certain that one will accomplish the purpose better, by departing from that which is the normal and natural thing in life that God has established.

And so it is vital that we get a clear understanding on this point, and recognize that marriage, and that which goes with it, is not something that is evil, and to be eschewed, nor on the other hand is it to be, as our present age would make it, the be-all and end-all of existence. The only thing that matters about it, is neither one, but it is one of God's commands which is applicable in the majority of people, that they should perform this part of their service to him. And it can be a sanctified and holy thing, and a very wonderful part of life. And the bringing of children into the world is not simply a by-product of man's wickedness. But it is a positive command of God, and a command which properly followed, brings with it temporary pleasure, but also brings with it lasting happiness, and joy.

Small c. God does not command us to bring children into the world, simply in the hope that perhaps they may be saved. We may find also in the Scripture, in the New Testament, as well as the Old Testament, that God deals with people in families. That is not to say that each individual does not have a primary responsibility. It is not to say that anybody can be saved through anybody else's faith. It is not to say that we can avoid, we can in any way evade the direct responsibility of each one of us. But it is a fact that he does deal with people in families, and he gives us special promises, as families. We find this of course, very prominently, in the Old Testament, but we also find it very definitely in the New Testament. The Jews had the idea, that

the children, they were too young to understand anything. Here is the great teacher who has come. Here is Jesus, with his great teachings, and it is vital that we get the people there, who can understand him, and who can follow him, and when these children get older, well, they will be able to understand ~~him~~ these things, and get into them, but as far as knowledge is concerned, why we just don't bother particularly with the children. And so when the people came to - they brought to Jesus infants, we read in Luke 18; 15. They brought unto him infants, that he would touch them, and the disciples rebuked them. And Jesus said, No. He said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, because he said, when these children get older, they may be able to understand, maybe some of them will be saved, and then they'll be part of the kingdom of heaven, and so we shouldn't just brush them aside now. That's not what he said. He said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God. In other words he said, the children are not simply little heathen, who may someday be saved. There is something more than that, in the relationship of the children. The children of godly parents should be recognized as those who have a special blessing from the Lord, who can have special opportunities in him. Those who should be treated as a part of the family, not simply part of the heathen outside world.

Question

9 $\frac{1}{2}$ (~~QUESTION~~: I think what he was trying to show, was that the children aren't simply outside. They are a part of the ~~monumental~~ covenant.)

10 $\frac{1}{4}$ (Question: Well, we don't know who the enquirers were. My guess would be that the inquirers were people who were his followers.)

10 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: He draws the elect, but not of his favor, which is very important. But I think, that not only God's elect. I think that he does say that children themselves, are not simply little heathen, that someday we hope will hear the truth. I think there is more to it than that. But ~~it~~ it is true that the other element that you see, his death over here, and his life. I hardly think that these were his enemies who brought their little children, so that he would touch them. We are not specifically told who the enemies were.)

12 (Question: We are not at the moment, dealing with the question of who should be

baptised, but with the question of whether children of believers are simply born into the world, as little heathen, who perhaps sometime ~~from~~ ^{we} hope may come come under their preaching and be saved. But we are saying that there is a different relation than that taught in the New Testament. We are not to bring children into the world on that basis simply. Now, I would say this, if you take the basis I mentioned in b, then we will say that as some of the people said in the Middle Ages, if a person is holy, he abstains from everything fleshly, he goes into a monestary, into a convent, but the only advantage in there being anybody outside, that is married is, that ~~many~~ ^{some} children may be born who may have a chance to come into a convent, and to become holy by abstaining from that which is fleshly. That is the only value in it. That is the ~~idea~~ ^{attitude} that many had in the Middle Ages. I don't say it was the official attitude, but it was an attitude that was held by many people, especially by those in the monestaries.

Now that is not the Christian attitude. The teaching of the Bible is that it is God's plan that we should bring children into the world, and that everything connected with it, rightly used is holy. And is a part of his will for us. Now the attitude in c here. What about our children? Now we must say as a first definite point, that all Christians must agree upon, that a child can not possibly enter into heaven, unless he first receives Jesus Christ as Saviour. We must say that. That is a vital point. It is absolutely essential, and I believe that that point is involved, in circumcision, and in infant baptism. That is that they both show that the fact that a child is born, into a Christian family, does not save him, but that something else must happen. That it is necessary that he be brought into connection with the Word of God. But, while we ~~can~~ can say that the child must accept Christ as his saviour, I think that we can go beyond that, and say that the (15) is in a different category, then just the heathen. He's in a different category. That is the normal thing, for him to take part in -

And that is the assumption which certainly tends to be taken by members of all Christian groups everywhere, regardless of what they say. You will find very, very few, real Christians who look upon their children as, Well, maybe they'll be saved, maybe they won't. Let's hope they will. But we just can't tell. We have no more reason to think that they will be saved, than that the children in the ungodly families will be saved. It's entirely up to the child, whether he accepts or not. We all believe, that though it is up to the children whether they will accept or not, and if we do not accept we are lost, no matter where we are, or who we are, we also know that there are influences that God brings to us,

3(Question: Well, then I think that with my first point, you agree fully. I don't think that all. I don't think that baptising saves the infant, and I don't think that baptising saves the adult. No. What I'm saying under point c, is that children of believers are[?] under the blessings of Abraham. (4). I'm not saying that baptism places him under. I think that there is one of our vital points, in this whole matter of the sacraments. I don't think that any baptism places a man under anything, but that it represents to the world our belief, that one is under baptism. I don't think that baptising an adult brings ~~mm~~ ^{that} salvation, of the Disciple's Church. It's my impression, does hold that, that the so called "Disciples of Christ", they hold that a person, when he is baptised, he becomes a member of the family of God, he is regenerated, he is saved, and that he cannot be saved, without the baptism. It illustrates that something more is needed, and that simply, is the Holy Spirit, turning the child unto regenerating his heart Himself, and ~~regenerating his heart~~, and cleansing him from the uncleanness that he inherits from Adam.

5 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: Now, I'm just wondering. That is a vital subject that we want to discuss, but I'm just wondering, whether under this particular head we should. Let's just say a little about it. Let's stick to this point mainly, and go on to that later. But that is so vital, that I think that ~~mmmmmm~~ it is vital that

, I think more about it, then whether we baptise in one way, or another way, or at one time, or at another time, or whether we baptise at all. I personally think more about [?] it, then any of these, is of having a clear understanding, of what I

think is the true average , that they represent a spiritual , typically, but that they do not produce that spirit.

6½ (Question: I don't think that you'll find that that is taught clearly , and I sometimes wonder whether Calvin taught that clearly. I think that if you take Calvin's works, and examine them very closely, and take Zwingli's words and examine them very closely, you can find them so close together, that it is pretty hard to find what their differences are. But I think that Calvin stressed the fact of what the sacrament indicates, in such a way, that some of the words can sound as if, he thought that it was a sacrament . But I don't think that he thought that at all.

Now, the same thing is true to some extent, when we do it. While Luther insisted that this "is my body", and you are eating of Christ, he would even say, you chew Christ, yet Luther was convinced, we are saved through ~~faith~~ faith, and faith alone. We do this, because it is God's command, but it is not just a favor. But I do believe, that Luther, in his real teaching was at the opposite pole from the Romanist teaching that here is something, that, just as you turn on the electric light switch, and the light goes on, you perform the baptism, and the person is saved. And if you don't turn on the light switch that light won't come on, no matter how much you pray or think about it. Unless somebody else turns it on. And the Roman Catholics hold that, here is a child that was baptised. This little child is in a hospital. And a Roman Catholic nurse took some water and she said the proper words, and baptised the child, And the child had Protestant parents, and was brought up, and never heard another word, of what they believed, that that child is baptised. And that child has a chance for salvation, that it would never have otherwise. They believe that. Now that is making the act itself (9). And I don't believe that Luther believed that for a minute the child would hear, but that they believed that - when you get down to it, Zwingli's language was pretty close to what they believed. That it is a sinner.

But they believed, that as we perform this symbol of that which is directed to God's spiritual benefits, and to what he is doing for us, and we receive an increase in our spiritual life, and blessing, through having these thoughts strongly presented

to man. But it is our relation to Christ that matters, and not the explanation. That is more to show forth the Lord's death until he comes, that does that. But that the sacrament of the Lord's supper, conveys to us something which we could not have gotten if we hadn't performed that, I don't think it is true.

10 (Question: I do not think that the baptism of an adult makes a difference, ~~whether~~ in the way , but in order that , I think that both of them are simply visible, physical illustrations of something we believe, but which we believe not because of the fact, but because of the spiritual relationship ~~mm~~ we have.)

10 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: Does God make any difference between the children of believers, and the children of heathen? That is our present point. Our present point is that God does not command us to bring children into the world, simply in the hope that they may be saved, simply as little heathen, that we can hope may be saved, but that God gives us reasons to believe that he can bring children into the world, who we can be assured that he will be saved.)

The child of the believer is in the hands of God. The child is one who has inherited eternal death. But we bring him into the world, as Christians, believing that God is going to save that child. I don't say that a child is saved because he simply inherits salvation. I don't believe that at all. I don't believe that the faith of the parents is passed on to the child, in such a way that I could save the child. Not at all. But I do believe that a person has the right to bring children into the world, and look on those children, as children of the kingdom. Children of the covenant. Children, that if you do your part, are going to be saved, and children, of whom you can say, that God is going to enable you to do this.

14 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: I don't think that it necessarily is tied with a physical relationship, which it ordinarily does. I think that we can adopt children into the family, who will be called children of God.

bless, and he is going to bring children into the kingdom through that, but I don't think that we can be assured, that all the children are going to be brought into the kingdom. I doubt if he can even be sure which ones will be brought into the kingdom. You take an evangelist who goes into a heathen community. And he begins preaching the word. And some people come, and they take great interest, and they seem tremendously interested, and next thing you know they turn, and go the other way, and they never come to Him, and other people seem to be very indifferent, and in the end, you find them coming out, and they become real believers. And you can't predict which is going to. You cannot tell. But I don't think it needs to be that way of a ~~parent~~ parent toward his children. I believe that those children, we can half-feel, are not simply members of the heathen world, ~~but~~ that we will hope and pray, and struggle, and maybe they will be saved, and maybe they won't. I think that there is a very special blessing that God promises to his children, if the parents (2).

2½ (Question: I do believe that there have been some, and there has been many, who have been so busy with reaching the world, that they have neglected their own families, and they have failed to do what it was God's will they should do.)

4 (Question: What is the necessity of baptism? I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. I believe that he died for my sins, and that the Holy Spirit has cleansed me, from sin through me. What is the necessity of baptism? I say the same thing about the Lord's Supper. I feed on the Lord every day. I eat of his flesh, and of his cup every day. What is the necessity of my . The answer is, there is no necessity, for salvation. For an infant or an adult to be saved, or partake of the Lord's supper. There is no necessity. But there is a divine desire, , (5) that we should show forth his death until he comes, by performing a certain rite and ceremony, which are to show to the world, the belief that is in our hearts. It is a means of declaring to the world, our faith, and to one another. And it is used by the Holy Spirit to strengthen our ~~faith~~ ^{faith}, but it does not save us. There is no necessity of baptism of anybody for salvation.)

5½ (Question: You think that all Quakers are lost? Do you think that everyone in the salvation Army are lost? No, I believe that it is the Lord's will for us to do that.

to partake of the Lord's supper. I believe that the ordinary person who reads the Bible, will find that _____, and will find it. But I don't think it is necessary for salvation. I think that even if Moses had not circumcised his son, that God might have chosen to spare Moses' life, and God might have chosen to save that particular child. I think that he might have. I doubt if Moses would have used Moses the way he did.

7 (Question: Why is baptism necessary for church membership? . You'll have to think of the word church, and examine it now. The word church in its proper, physical sense is the body of Christ, which includes all believers, past, present and future. In that sense, baptism is necessary for church membership, but it is baptism by the holy spirit. And any believer has that baptism, and is a member of God's church. Now in the other sense in which the word church is used, it is a group of Christians, who associate themselves together, into a church. And in that sense, this group of Christians, would associate themselves together, have a duty to decide what the condition of their particular fellowship shall be. And the normal conditions would include baptism as necessary for membership in their particular church. But I believe that the Quakers, few today, but a thousands of them a few years ago, before Modernism came among them, I believe that the Quakers had many true Christians, thus as loyal to the word of God as any other church I've ever been in. And in those churches, people are members of those true churches which have never been baptised. I don't think it is the normal order. I don't think that it is what the Lord wants. But I think there are many things far worse.)

9½ (Question: Well, as to whether it can be compared to, my guess is that today there are in the United States, a few covenanter circles, which perform only adult baptism, and in which the baptism means _____. In which I would say 95% of the people are not, and to which the baptism meant no more then their

11 (Question: Just a minute now. Suppose this orphanage has a thousand children in it. And I run the orphanage. And I say, Well now I'm going to command all these children. (From audience: Well, we've got a hundred Christian workers up there.)

Well, then we have a hundred Christian workers, and each of these workers, has ten children there, to whom he treats as his own children, and brings up as his own children, and they receive the blessing of being his children. They are adopted, whether you are rich, or poor, or not. You can adopt a child and bring him up as your own. But you can't adopt a thousand children. You can't do that. Simply because you can't do your part for them. You can't be a father to them. (From audience: what number can you use them?) Here's what it boils down to. Was God saying anything when he said, in the Ten Commandments, when he said he is visiting his wrath upon the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing loving kindness to thousands of those who love me. Was he saying anything? And was Paul saying anything, when he said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Was he saying anything?)

14(Question: There are two great facts in life. There is the fact on the one hand, calvinist which the ~~mainstream~~ emphasizes. The fact - there is the fact that God has ordained from the foundation of the world, those who are to be saved. And we cannot increase the number. We cannot diminish it. God has ordained it from the foundation of the world. Those who are to be saved. That is the Calvinist teaching. And I believe it is true

Now there is the fact which the Arminians emphasize. The fact that nobody can be saved unless that person accepts the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour, and the fact that anyone can accept the Lord Jesus Christ as saviour. Nobody could say, I can't do this. Whosoever will may come. Anyone can come to Christ and be saved. The Arminians emphasize that. Now I say the Calvinists believe that, or should believe it, a true Calvinist believes it, just as much as does the Arminian.

S-58.

Nobody can possibly be saved, unless he in faith looks to Christ, and accept him, and be born again, and that anybody who rejects his love, deserves eternal punishment, even more then he did before, because he has rejected the son of God, and that nobody can ~~say~~ ^{say} ~~and~~, I cannot be saved, because anyone who will turn to him, can be saved, and

we have no right to say of him, or anybody else, you cannot be saved. We have no way to know that it may be God's will through us, to bring that one to salvation. Now those are two absolutely true facts. We don't see how they fit together. But they both are true. And we don't sit at a point at which we can see how they fit together, but we do believe they do. We believe that there is a fitting together. They are not contradictory, they are not illogical. They are both true.

Now here is a third point, in between them. The third point in between them is what about the children of believers? Do we bring children into the world, simply as members of the mass of unbelieving people, of whom God has ordained some to salvation, and some not to salvation, and no body on earth can tell who they are going to be, but we know that if we preach the word to them, some will be saved, and some will reject him, and we don't know; or, has God put the children of believers, in a special category, in which he gives them special blessings. That is the question. And the scripture has many evidences, which would show, that God has promised, special blessings to generations of them that love him. That he has put the children of believers, into a special category, so that we do not say, well, I didn't have any children. Well, wouldn't it have been wonderful, if I had got five children into the world, who would be with Christ forever. Yes. But what if I got six, and one of them was doomed to eternal suffering? Do you think that my parent's hearts would feel so happy about the joy of those five, that I wouldn't be in utter misery, to think of that child in ~~such~~ eternal suffering? Wouldn't I far rather never be married, then to bring a child into the world, to _____, wouldn't that be far better. How do I know but that all five of those children, are going to be those who will reject Christ, and be in eternal suffering? How can a Christian bring a child into the world, if he has no reason to believe that that child is going to be a member of the family of God, and be saved. That it is just hit and miss - whether that child will be saved, we just don't know. Wouldn't it be far better not to? Wouldn't it be far better to go into a monestary and pray for other people's children, then to risk bringing children into the world, to go into eternal suffering?

Now the scripture, it seems to us, does give assurance, that Paul didn't say to the Philippian jailor. "You believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you're going to be saved, and if you are saved, then there is a possibility that you may be able to bring the Word of God to these children of yours, and perhaps some of them will accept, and they may be saved, too. That's not what he said. He said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. He said, You come into the kingdom and you can bring your children with you. There is a way by which you can do it. There is an assurance, that you receive from the Lord, that your children, are going to receive Christ. Why did he say, And thy house, if he didn't mean it?

4 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: Well, I feel that it is important that we recognize that the Lord has promised blessings to the children of believers, and that he has commanded us to bring children into the world, who can, , not just to bring further heathens into the world, and hope that someday, some evangelist will come along and lead them to Christ.

5 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: In I Corinthians 7: 14, Paul said, "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband. Else were your children unclean. But now are they holy." What does he mean? Does he mean that there is a special relationship whereby the children of believers are whole, and these can have the assurance, but if we do our part they will be saved. Or if he doesn't mean that, what does he mean? Is it just empty words? Or does it have some meaning?

4/17/57.

I don't think the present subject is worth taking a great deal of our time. Because the gospel is a matter of the relation of the heart to Christ, and whether we are - have personally accepted him as saviour, and any ceremony is simply a showing forth to the world of our belief. And the vital thing is the belief, and not the ceremony. And therefore it is a shame to get tied up too much on matters of ceremony. And yet, if matters of ceremony are going to cause unnecessary breaks between Christian brethren, why, it is certainly reasonable, that we get a clear understanding of what is involved in them. Now I heard this last night, of a graduate of the seminary, who went out to take a church in the Middle West, and he - the church is one in a group of people that

only baptises adults, and only were immerstonists, and this man was glad to conform to that practice, and to how great an extent in his mind he thought that would be extremely desirable practice, I've never discussed it with him. I don't know. But, it certainly is the right of any group of people, it certainly is their right, to decide, that in our church we are going to perform our ceremony this way. And we're going to do it in these conditions. Anywhere, where you don't have a specific command in the scripture to the contrary, it is certainly their right to do it. And, so I would rejoice greatly in his going to take this church, and pray that the Lord will give him many souls there. But this I heard, that when the ordaining council questioned him, they spent three quarters of an hour, trying to make him say, that it was sinful to baptise infants. Now, I believe that the scripture commands us to baptise infants, but I do not think that the command to baptise infants is so clear, as to make any division between me and others who do not find a command carrying that stipulation farther. If they believe in salvation through Christ, and that is what is necessary for salvation, that is all that is necessary, and that's all that is necessary, I don't see why they and I, whether we are in the same denomination, or in different denominations, cannot work together, in the utmost harmony, for the things that are really vital. But if they say that I am sinful in doing what I believe is commanded in the scripture, there we have a difference of opinion, which could result either in one group of us deciding that the other group is not Christians, and we cannot work with them, and ~~thus~~ ^{thus} making a line between believers, which the Scriptures absolutely forbids, or else, it is a matter we should get into, and examine in the light of the scripture, and get a clear understanding on it.

Now, I personally am not terribly or never have been, as to whether those who pass through my classes agree on the lesser points of the scripture or not, with me. But I am vitally concerned that you learn to interpret the Scriptures in a clear objective way, not letting your prejudices determine your results, but being ready to say that whatever you find, you will follow, and if you find something different than I find, I have no reason to be concerned about it. I certainly can make many mistakes in the interpretation of Scriptures. But the main thing is that we agree on the big things.

But if you find that in the Scripture, that that which I think is commanded in the scripture is . That is a matter which brings untold times into the service of Christ. And if the matter is considered by some as important as that, I think it is extremely important, that you should understand why I say that it is . And if in the end you do not think it is commanded, I certainly will be very happy for you to do it in the way that you think is commanded. But I do think that the evidence is clear, that what I think is commanded, you should be ready to take at least, it is not sinful, but is a difference of interpretation, as to what is commanded. And the question we were discussing yesterday, is a point which, while I think that infant baptism logically follows from it, someone may disagree and say that infant baptism does not logically follow from it. There are many people in fact, who so think, people of good intelligence, are not ready to say that these people are wrong in their thinking, when they say that infant baptism does not follow from this. They have a perfect right to their opinion on it.

But the point that I am discussing here, it seems to me, is enough, whether infant baptism follows from it or not. So I really cannot see how anybody can ^{12 $\frac{1}{2}$} , without taking an attitude which .

It seems to me that the points I have made, that God promised blessings to the children of his people. That this point which has the bringing of children into the world, is simply not ~~the~~ a by-product of man's religion , but is a positive command of God, and to see that God does not command us to bring children into the world simply with the hope that perhaps they may be saved. It seems to me that that particular point,

, you can explain that particular point away, , you could explain what . In fact you could explain most anything away that particular point. Because that particular point is a very good one.

Now some go beyond that, at least in the matter of whether from that point

, and I agree upon that point, ~~man~~ there is a place for much difference, on this particular point, that children of believers, are different, From children of unbelievers, there is a way that God has given counsel of his blessings to them,

1 (Question: Bring up a child - and he will not depart from it). Answer. This is a promise that God brings to the parents about the child, that if the parent does his part, God will cause that certain results follow that the parents cannot tell, which is just as common to that extent. I don't agree that this is the only evidence, but I think that it is a very helpful evidence, in that connection. On this particular point, I don't see how we can have difference on this point. Whether infant baptism logically follows, it or not, we can , but as to whether this point is true, it does seem to me, that the scripture does teach this point very clearly.)

2 (Question: I was fully agreed, that a person can adopt a child and receive the full blessings of the Lord, that it would if it was his own child. I would fully agree with that. The only thing that I would disagree with, would be the idea that a person could adopt a million children. That is to say, I would think that the family relationship involves a personal interest and love for the child, such as one can't have all the children in the world. It is the personal relationship to it, it is the claims of God's promises for it, there is a personal dedication of oneself, to the task of bringing up the child, in the nurture and the admonition of the Lord. And I believe that God is pleased when a person includes in this family relationship, other children than those who are born in their body, and ~~the~~ person could take an orphan and could have a few children, and treat them as their own, love them as their own, and claim the promises of God for them as their own (3). I think that is a very definite point involved, but not the point that you think you can do it to so large a group that you couldn't possibly .

3. (Questions. Proverbs 22: 6 is a very good scriptural background for it. another important part of it is I Corinthians 7: 14. In I Corinthians 7: 14, the apostle is speaking of another problem. And in so many of these matters it seems that they are speaking of other problems, and incidentally we get light, but it may be very important light. Here he is speaking, about the problem, of a person, who is converted and ~~when~~ the spouse does not accept the Lord. We are definitely commanded, elsewhere in the Scripture, that we are not to marry those who are not Christians. That is contrary to God's command, to do that. And I don't think that this here gives any

excuse for us to go against God's commands. I remember when I went to Seminary years ago, a fellow would say, Well, I'm going to be a minister. And I should make my life count for the Lord in every possible way. But the idea that my wife is a servant of the church is nonsense. My wife is my wife, just as the wife of somebody who is in some other profession, and she doesn't have to be selected with the view of her ability to do the work of the Lord. She doesn't even have to be saved. I heard so and so , fellows who were real Christians . And I thought they were utterly wrong in that attitude. A person who is really devoted to the Lord, will above all things , in their marriage , that that is one who is also devoted to the Lord. It is more important than any other qualification that could possibly be found. And they are definitely disobeying the Lord, and cannot expect his blessing upon it, if they let any other matter loom larger in their eyes, then this particular qualification, in selecting a marriage partner.

But aske from a person who is going into definite Christian work, a person who is a Christian, has no right to consider themselves obedient to the Lord, and to marry one who is not a Christian. We are specifically ordered not to join together in an unequal yoke with those who do not belong to the Lord. But that's not the present problem.

6 (Question: That's what Paul presents right here. We'll look at it. The question Mr. Anderson raised, see, I went back to the question, back to the matter, Should a person marry an unbeliever? The scriptures says, Absolutely not. It is forbidden. There is no other qualification. Not voice, manner, or even looks that is a tenth as important, as whether one is really devoted to the Lord in selecting a marriage partner. But, now we have a situation. Here is a person who has disobeyed the Lord, and married one who is an unbeliever. Or here is one who having been married when neither was a believer, has now been converted. From either viewpoint, you now have a situation, where you have a believer, and an unbeliever. And Paul takes up that question, in chapter 7, verse 6, unto the married, I command, yet not I, but the Lord. In other words, he has the Lord's specific word for it. Paul is giving the Lord's command. He speaks as the Lord's representative. He is not saying here that

this is more important than if I gave it to you. He is saying, in this case it is interesting that I have a specific quotation from the Lord. But he says, "Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband." That would seem to me, to be the answer to Mr. Anderson's question. Let not the married one who is married to an unbeliever, depart from the other one. If they have disobeyed God's commandment, and married an unbeliever, they are now married to them. They have taken a solemn obligation before the Lord, saying they have no right to separate, on the ground, that the other one is not now a believer. But they have taken obligations upon themselves that they should have never taken. But they have taken it. And they are obligated before the Lord to fulfill it. Or if they were married, and they were converted after they were married, and the other one is not in sympathy, (8) they have no right to separate. ~~Unto~~ Unto the married, I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not one of them depart from the other. The wife from the husband certainly here let not the marriage be - the believing one depart from the unbeliever, which

. But he continues, but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband, and let not the husband put away his wife. See this makes it say that it is either one. "But to the rest speak I, not the Lord." He doesn't mean here, now this is just a human command. I'm going to speak to you. Don't pay much attention to this. I've just been quoting what the Lord said. No, he says, I don't have a specific quotation from the Lord's earthly life. I don't want you to think that I am saying that I do. And you wouldn't ever think it, except that he just had had it in the previous .(9) But he is giving the command of God, as God's apostle, but he is giving it from the wisdom God has given him now, not from a quotation from the Lord's sayings in his earthly life.

"To the rest speak I, not the specific quotation from the Lord, but definitely the Lord's command, If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away." It is forbidden to separate on the ground of the difference in faith. "And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him." Now we skip on to verse 15. Simply because we are looking at the main point of this now,

Before we look at the point which is connected with our present discussion. Verse 15. "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases, but God hath called us to peace." In other words, Paul makes it very clear here, that a person who is converted, has no right to separate from wife or husband, because the other has not been converted. A person who has married contrary to God's command, married an unbeliever, has no right to separate from this fellow, when they find, that the other is definitely out of tune with their teaching and their belief. They have a duty to fulfill.

But if the other one, the unbelieving one, is so disgusted with their Christian testimony, and their Christian attitude, and their unwillingness to do the deeds of the ungodly views of the world, then the other one, the unbeliever, leave them. That is a different situation. In that case, the apostle says, they are not in bondage. Which would seem to say, that it is a perfect thing before the Lord, to do their very utmost, to ~~make~~ ^{marriage} a success of the ~~marriage~~ into which they have entered. And they have no right to separate or to be divorced on account of the other to Christian things. The fact that the other is an unbeliever, the fact that the other is not in sympathy with their faith, anything like that. But if the other one, attains a divorce, if the other one separates from them, if the other one, leaves them, and they have done their very best, to keep them, and to ~~make~~ a success of the marriage, but the other one, leaves them, they are not then in bondage. They then, are free, under such circumstances.

But in connection with this, if such has a point in his favor, he touches upon the point, in which we are now interested. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband. Here is one who has not disobeyed God's command, or has disobeyed God's command, and is genuinely sorry for it, and wants to truly follow the Lord, or they have ~~been~~ married, and the one has become a Christian, and the other is not. Under those circumstances, the other one is in some ways sanctified by him. The marriage can be considered as a Christian marriage. There is a real hope that the other can be led to believe in the Lord, if they follow his ~~teaching~~, and if they try to do their part in trying to win the other, and pray for them. But the ~~marriage~~ ^{marriage} can be considered, as a truly Christian

marriage, The other is sanctified by them. Else he says, else were your children unclean, but now are they agiol. Well, what are the children then? If you consider that the other one is not sanctified by them, that this is simply an unholy union between a Christian, and a non-Christian, that is not a truly Christian marriage, then the children are unclean, but the children are not, he says, they are agiol. What does this word agiol mean? The word agios is used in the New Testament in the phrase of the Holy Spirit about 92 times. The Agios Spirit. It is used about 52 times, translated by the word ~~hmmmm~~ ^{?saint} as a reference to a Christian believer. He is writing to all the saints in Ephesus. He is writing to the saints, and we do not consider that, by saints, he means a few very holy people, who have been able to work miracles. But that we mean all the true believers in Christ. We call them all saints, and 52 times in the New Testament we find the word saint.

S-60.

Used in the New Testament ~~in~~ ~~the~~ of believers. The word is used of Christian believers, but not translated saints, in maybe 15 cases. I've looked at them all here. ~~if~~ ^{That} you should ~~offer~~ ^{offer} your ~~body~~ ^{body} a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God. That is true of the Christian believer, of the offering he makes. It is an holy offering. I Corinthians 3: 17. "The temple of God is holy, which temple are ye." I Corinthians 7: 34, "that she may be holy." We should be holy. Be ye holy as I am holy. The holiest prophet we should . Colossians 3: 12. "Elect of God, holy and beloved." We are a holy priesthood. Holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection. The word holy is thus used, 52 times, translated saints, and about 15 times, it is translated holy, rather than saints, but used specifically of Christian believers. This leaves maybe 30 quotations where the word is translated agios, in some other way. It is used of the holy city 5 times in the New Testament. It refers to the holy covenant, that God has made, Luke 1: 72. Jesus says, give not that which is holy to the dogs. Matthew 7: 6. We speak of a holy place in three places in the New Testament. A holy bride. Acts 7: 33, in Stephen's speech. The holy mount, II Peter, 1: 18. The holy name. Luke 20: 49. Use of God, in the verse

that I quoted, "As he is holy, so be ye holy." Of the holy scriptures, Romans 1: 2. The law is holy, Romans 7: 12. The holy commandment, II Peter 2: 21. The first fruit is holy. Romans 11: 16, speaking of God, ^{Paul is speaking of} all that he has produced, of the testimony of Christ. The first fruit is holy. It speaks of a holy kiss in four cases. II Timothy 1: 12, we have an holy calling. Holy conversation, in II Peter 3: 11. The kind of conversation that God wants you to have. The holy faith in Jude 20. Now there remains a few cases. I've given all the cases where it is definitely used of Christian believers. And I've given all the cases where it used of something other than a person in the New Testament.

Now it is used of people, other than, personalities of ~~man~~ present people, of the Christian believer, because it is used of the angels. And you wouldn't call them people. But holy angels, about six times. It is used of the holy prophets, about eight times. John the Baptist is called holy, in Mark 6: 20. Jesus is called the holy one of God in ^O . Revelation 3: 7, speaks of he that is holy. Revelation 6: 10 says, ~~the~~ Lord, holy and true. ~~in~~ verse 1 in Revelation speak of the Holy father. Revelation 22: 6, and Luke 2: 23, are, in those two cases, peculiar, I didn't take time to figure out the exact ^(3 $\frac{1}{2}$). I've mentioned all the other cases to you, in the New Testament, that I find in the Englishmen's Greek Concordance under agios, except the word with which we are dealing. Which is I Corinthians 7: 14. Your children, now are they holy.

But certainly, there is something about Christian children, that is very different from what we would say about all children in the world. They are children set aside, in a very specific way, when the same word is used which is used 52 times translated saints, for Christian believers. And another 20 or so times, it is translated holy, ^{Christian} of ~~man~~ individuals, or Christian activities. Maybe 15 times of God, of the Holy angels, the holy prophets. There are not more than two or three cases where it is uncertain just what the word does mean when we refer to it. But 98% of the cases, are clearly used of that which is devoted to God. That which belongs to him. That which is set apart, consecrated to him. That which has been saved through the Lord Jesus Christ. And here it is used of the children of Christian believers - they are holy.

Now what does it mean? I think this, we must all agree. It sets them apart from the children of unbelievers, ~~and~~ in some very remarkable way. There is some important aspect, in which Christian children, the children of Christian believers, are very different, in God's sight, from ordinary children.

6(Question: He has a very special place. There is a sense in which the unbelieving husband, the unbelieving wife, if they are willing to remain in the marriage bond, which the Christian should make no attempt to break, but you do everything possible to fulfill the requirements, if they are willing to remain

(6½)

there is a sense in which they are sanctified holy. Now that doesn't mean they are saved. It doesn't mean they are made Christians. It may mean that the saved one has a right to figure that if they do their part, in prayer, and in godly example, God will win them. It may or may not. But it does mean that they are given a very special blessing from God, that this be considered a holy marriage, a sanctified marriage. Else, he said, were your children unclean. But now are they holy. Some have tried to get around here, by saying that unclean here means illegitimate. Else were your children illegitimate, but not they are legitimate. But that is certainly not what it says. Because if they were both unbelievers, the children wouldn't be illegitimate at all.

He is saying to them, (7) married to a non-Christian, if you do your part, in the marriage relationship, and you don't depart from that, you try to carry it on, your children, shall have the same blessing, as if they were children of both Christians.

8(Question: I would say, those children give evidence of being saved. I would say that I hope they are. But I would say, it would take ten or twenty years, before there will be sufficient evidence for us human beings to have a pretty strong certainty. There is a strong influence in those parents that is going to come unto those children, then. And it is not impossible, that we will find, that the children were carried on by the personality of the (8 3/4), and they said yes, and thought that they had ~~announced~~ the beginning in their hearts. It's not impossible. Let's hope that they are saved. But I would say that one cannot, could claim, the Lord's blessing, and could

see it explicitly ~~mean~~ about the Lord's favor, but later

, but we can have a great hope that they are saved.

what he

9½ (Question: It seems quite clear to me that ~~mm~~ means ~~mmmm~~ is this. Here he is
? a Mayor's son. And they had a child. And the child is promised to the Lord. Now here is a case where one parent is an unbeliever. And the evidence is exclusive. And he says, Now, supposing that you get out, and married to an unbeliever. It would be wicked for me to be in this relationship. I should leave then. Well, he says, if, for you to be in that relation with them, that's considered that your child is unclean. As if
? the child was in a separate relationship. But no, he says, there is a sense in which the unbelieving husband, or wife, is sanctified by the believing husband or wife. Else, he says, would your child be unclean, but no, your child is clean. In God's sight the parents are considered, in this relationship to the child, as one who is holy. One who is set apart. Now, that may mean that we have reasons to say that if we are loyal to our marriage vows, and we do our best to live a holy life, not nagging them, or constantly harping on things, and making it disagreeable for them, but giving them a true marriage partner, in every way, along with the testimony by our good life, and our Christian graces in our heart, with an occasional word of testimony along with it, and of loyalty to the Lord, that they can not but respect, and constant prayer that God will bring them into a true faith. But whether he does that in every case, or doesn't do that in every case, he does say that he considers them as that. The figure is that he would consider the child, as though both parents were Christians. He says, your children are holy. We looked at the word agios and we saw that it is not a word that is used in a really general sense. It is a word of which there are very, very few cases, where it is used of anything, but that which is very definite, connected with true Christians, or a holy sense.

Well, now we don't have time to go into this thoroughly, since this is a survey course, but we just want to see that the main point of the present discussion is certainly and definitely proven, which is that Christian children are simply not just little heathen, that maybe they'll be saved, and we hope they will, and they are just in the same category as all other children, but that Christian children, children of

Christian parents, are in some way, in a different category, that in some way they have a special blessing, and a special calling from the Lord.

Our Sunday Schools are evangelizing agencies, We are to go out into the country and get all the children that we can, and then bring them back, and bring them in, and give them an hour or two of Christian instruction, in the hopes that they will be saved. And that is a wonderful work and the Lord wants us to do it. But I think that our Sunday Schools are more than that. I think that is just ^a ~~the~~ starting point. I think that the primary point is to take the children, of the Christian believers, and give those children of the Christian believers the instruction, that they are entitled to have, and to help the Christian ~~ministers~~ parents in bringing up their children, in the nurture and the admonition of the Lord. That is the primary purpose of our Sunday School. The evangelizing purpose is a wonderful thing, But the Sunday School is not simply institutions which look at this pagan world, which includes a million children here,

S-61.

Well, I think we must move along, and I would attempt to move on to the next point immediately, but since there are questions about this point, which I don't see why there should be, on this point, but since there are upon it, we will take the time to look at one or two other ~~Scripture~~ Scripture passages. I draw your attention to Acts 16: 31. And in Acts 16: 31, we have the promise which was given by Paul to the Philippian jailor, he said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And here is a definite promise, which has two elements. You believe, and you will be saved. We all agree with that. But Paul didn't stop there. He could have, ~~and~~ stopped there, but he didn't. He added other words, and those other words must have a meaning. And the other words, which he added, and which we find parallel in various other passages in the New Testament, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house." And he tells him that he can be saved through Christ. He had the right to claim that salvation, but also that he had the right, to claim the salvation of his house. Now, the members of the house

cannot be saved unless they personally believe on Christ. But no one can believe on Christ, unless the Holy Spirit gives you faith. It's absolutely impossible for anyone to be saved, unless God works a saving work in their hearts. And the Philippian Jailor is promised that he can believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and claim salvation for himself, through him, and also, he can claim through him, salvation for his house. Now I would like to give you a word of interpretation from this of this verse, from a sermon on a different text.

This is a sermon on Exodus 12: 3-4. It's called the books on my Sermon Notes. It is a sermon on the verse, "They shall take to them, every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house." And the author says, The lamb was to be eaten, all eaten, eaten by all, but eaten at once. The Lord Jesus is to be received into the soul, as its food, and this is to be done with the whole 3 $\frac{1}{2}$
 by each one of his people, and done just now. The whole subject of the passover is rich in instruction, and we'll confine ourselves to the particulars in this verse. But, the text reminds us of a primary privilege, one. That each man of Israel ate the passover for himself. Every man according to his eating, so we feed upon Jesus, each one, as his appetite capacity and strength enables him to do. Two. But the same delicious (4) shall be enjoyed by all families, a lamb for an house. All that each of the parents, and all the children and servants, to be partakers of Christ, by teaching, training, prayer, and holy example, this favor may be secured for the Holy Spirit will add his blessing. Let not these two favors be despised. Let no man be content without personal salvation, nor without the salvation of the whole house. We have both (4 $\frac{1}{2}$), in that famous text, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." That is a statement that Charles Haddon Spurgeon makes in his Sermon Notes, about this verse in Exodus, in which he also quotes from Acts 16: 31, and shows what he thinks it means, that it promises not simply, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and if any of your house believe on him they'll be saved too. Of course, if he just said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, that would convey that argument.

But that it goes beyond that. Spurgeon says, that we have two blessed promises in

this text. "Thou shalt be saved and thy house." He says, You are promised that you by teaching, training, prayer, and holy example do your part, and the Holy Spirit will add his blessing. And he says, Let no man be content without claiming the blessing, that God promised to the apostle Paul, not only that you claim your own salvation, but that you claim the salvation of your house. Now that doesn't just mean, you can claim the salvation of anyone you want to pray for. If it does, why don't we get together and pray for the whole world, and have everybody saved. Why don't we pray for everybody in Elking Park here? Why don't we just claim from God the promise and have everybody saved? We don't have any such promise to claim. You can not claim from God everybody in Elkins Park. You can't claim from God anybody in Lynswood Gardens. You can't claim from God everybody in Faith Seminary. You cannot guarantee that every member of the student body in Faith Seminary is saved. I have never in my life, seen in a group of fifty students anywhere, that thirty years later, there were at least one or two of them, who were denying the Word of God. And making fun of its precious teachings. I have never seen a group of fifty, that that was not true of.

There are those who appear to be among the most faithful of true believers, who we find out later were hypocrites all the time. Maybe they did not realize they were. They liked the beautiful character of the people they were associated with, and they repeated the same way. But it didn't mean anything in their hearts, and they were found in the end to be enemies of the cause of Christ. You can't claim everybody in Faith Seminary for the Lord. You can't do it. You have no promise that you can do it. But you do have a promise that you can claim, the members of your house for the Lord. You have that promise. "Thou shalt be saved and thy house." A person says, we can claim these two blessings from the Lord.

Now some of us don't claim, and some of us by holy example and teaching don't do our part, but we have the right to claim it. It is specifically taught in the Scripture, as Charles Haddon Spurgeon points out.

8(Question: Will that include servants? Answer. I do not think, in fact I am sure that you could not make a categorical statement that all servants of the household

will be included. I would say that specifically because there is a tremendous difference, in servants. You hire a man, you have him there five days, and you fire him. You have a man and he is never happy with you. But I believe that it is related to those who are ~~masters~~ servants of the household over a long period of time. Whether it does not, I'm not competent to say. But this we can say. It certainly includes the infants. There is no question that the household includes the infants.)

9.(Question: How far extra one can extend the thing out, how far one can legitimately extend it out, I don't know. But this we can say. It includes the children,)

10.(Question: What I'm saying, is that whether infant baptism follows from this, there may be difference of opinion, but on this particular point, it is so clearly taught in Scripture, that it is only a twisting, that could get rid of any doctrine, that can get rid of this teaching, that the children are holy of Christians. That the children are different. That a person has promises for his house. "Thou shalt be saved and thy house. He didn't say, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and the whole Roman Empire. ~~Thou shalt be saved and all~~ the people on the earth. He can't claim the promise of all the people on the earth. He can't claim the promise that the whole Roman Empire shall be saved. He can't claim the promise that the whole city of Philippi will be saved, because there is no such promise given. But he can claim the promise that his house will be saved, because that promise is clearly given. Now it is not that Paul put in words that have simply no meaning whatever, which said absolutely nothing, and also you would have to get rid of all these other passages of its teaching. But whether we go on from there, that is a point, where there can be legitimate difference of opinion. But on this point, this is clearly taught in the Scripture, as the bodily resurrection of Christ, or the deity of Christ. It is just as clearly taught in Scripture, this point, that your children are holy, they are different, from the children of unbelievers. That is specifically said, You shall be saved and your house. It is specifically said, and you can't push this out of it, unless you introduce methods, by which you can push anything else out. And that is why I hate to spend further time on this particular

point which is so clear. Now we go on from there, and we get to points where there can be difference of opinion, and we'll say frankly, somebody believes this, somebody believes this other, we have differences of opinion, let's go on. But I just don't like to see people, whatever they do about anything else, fail to recognize what the Lord says on this particular point, which regardless of whether we baptise infants, or whether we baptise anybody. This is not a matter of the physical performing of a ceremony. This is a matter of the Spiritual relation to Christ, which is vital for our lives. And we shouldn't let our prejudices about a ceremony, be used to try to explain away the clear teaching, regarding the clear blessings of God taught.)

Acts 11: 14, is a further evidence of it. It's not quite as clear, but it fits right in with it. He says that he shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved. He will tell Cornelius the words that Cornelius may believe, and claim the same promise given to the Philippian Jailor. "Thou shalt believe and thy house." It's exactly the same.

(From audience: Dr. MacRae, I believe that everyone here does agree with you - Well, that's why I would like to go on to the next point. I think that everybody does agree, except that some were afraid of what might follow and they were trying to think up arguments - .

14.(Question: Yes, I know one case like that. I know a Godly preacher, who had a son, and he brought the son up in the Sunday School, and he taught him the word of the Lord, the son gave every evidence of being a Christian, and he went to Wheaton College, but this son got into organized crime, and he became a wire tapper, and went into the depths of sin. And then he was in an evangelistic meeting, and he accepted the Lord, and was saved after years of wandering in sin, and all this time, his godly mother had been praying for him. He was saved. He said he was saved now, that he had never been saved before.

S-62.

If you will go into any great evangelistic meeting, and you will those who are truly saved, and those who have been, those who continued to show, to serve the

S-62. 4/17/57. (7 $\frac{1}{2}$)

401.

that

Lord. They don't have a great emotional show, and feeling, they make a great testimony and then they fall away, but they go on to be truly saved. And you take them, you will find among them some wonderful examples of the graces of the Lord. But you will find that probably 80 % of those who are truly saved, come from wonderful Godly families. That is a definite part that you will find, doubtless in every case. There is a special blessing that God gives to the children of believers, that can be claimed, by (1). That is the point I'm trying to make here. Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy. They are in an entirely different category. Thou shalt be saved and thy house. Not that thou shalt be saved and the whole Roman empire. Not that thou shalt be saved, and whoever else that believes shall be saved. But as Spurgeon says, there are two promises given. He can claim salvation, for himself. He can claim salvation for his house. Now of course they have to believe, too. But nobody believes except the Lord them, except that the Holy Spirit leads them. It is God's work that saves the sinner. But you can claim that work for yourself and you can claim it for your house.

4/18/57. (7 $\frac{1}{2}$)

I didn't announce any assignment for this week. There will be an assignment posted. Next week we have a test.

(9: We will now proceed with the subject that we are now dealing with. The sacraments. And under the sacraments we were on the subject of baptism. And then on that one, we had taken up the point of the blessing of Abraham, and we noticed a, the fact of this covenant blessing is clearly taught in scripture, we notice b, that the bringing of children into the world is not a by-product of man's wickedness or sin, but it is a positive command of God. We noticed c, that God does not command us to bring children into the world, simply in the hope that perhaps they will be saved, and under that we noticed that the attitude of the Lord toward the children in Luke 18, did not seem to be an attitude, well, here are some little heathen, and let's hope they are reached with the gospel, but here are some that we want brought in, some of them may be heathen, who need to hear the word, others may be those who are under the covenant, and need simply to be instructed. "Suffer the little children

to come unto me." We noticed Proverbs, the command, "Train up a child in the way he shall go, and he will not depart there from it. We noticed 1 Corinthians 7: 14, "that your children are holy". They are different. The word is ordinarily used in the strict sense, to mean the saints, to mean the saved ones. Now we do not think that it means, the children of believers are necessarily saved. But it must mean at least this, that they are different from those of unbelievers. There is something different, there is some way in which they are set apart. There is some way, very definitely, in which they are holy.

And we noticed that in Acts 16: 31, that Paul said to the Philippian jailor, he said, "Thou shalt be saved, and thy house." He didn't say, "Thou shalt be saved, and everybody else in the Roman Empire that accepts what I say. He didn't say, Thou shalt be saved, and everybody else that believes in Christ will be saved. He said, Thou shalt be saved and thy house. And we must pray for all men. We must pray for the whole population of the United States. We must pray for those behind the iron curtain. We must pray that God will pour out his Spirit, and will lead many into his kingdom. And we know that in response to our prayers he will bring many. But of particular individuals we do not have a promise. And there are many, for whom we may pray our whole life, and God will not choose to save them. And there are others whom he will choose to save soon. But we have a specific promise regarding our children, that we have brought into the world. "Thou shalt be saved and thy house." If we do our part he will do his part. We have a specific promise. They are in a different category. And whether you have any ceremony about them, or no ceremony about them, in this Gospel dispensation, it is not one-thousandth as important in my opinion, as whether you recognize the obligation of the parents, and the opportunities of the children, and do not become so concerned with the very vital fact of reaching the outsider with the gospel, that you neglect this very vital task, of doing our part with our children, so that you will have confidence that God will save them.

Now what I have down here as d, is pretty well covered in our discussion, under c, but for completeness I'll simply mention it. D, is, If we do our part we can trust God to do his.

E. Small e. Jesus commands to Peter, show the importance of feeding his lambs.

We notice that we have at the end of Matthew, that wonderful commission, Go into all the world - Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the father, and the son, and the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I've commanded you." These are not things that were written early, stressed this great vital duty of which there is no greater. The duty of going out into the world, and reaching the lost. There is no greater duty in scripture, then this. But John, writing long after, and giving words of Christ, which the other disciples had not mentioned, but which of course, Christ had said, and which were important, and of some of which, the importance became greater, as a person grew a little bit older. John gave these words, and here we have in John 21, we have the situation there, where the disciples had been fishing, and Jesus had come to them, and Peter, the evangelist, Peter, the man who represented Christ, Peter who threw himself out of the boat, because he had to get to Jesus as quickly as he could, Jesus said to Peter, Do you love me?

S-63.

And so at this point, he stresses the other aspect, that it be not neglected. And so we have in John 21: 15. We read that, "when they had dined, Jesus said to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yes, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs.

(1) has been so busy, going from one part of the country, presenting the gospel, and I'm glad that God will have a great crown of blessing for them, for what they've done. And I'm sure that he will reward them, for the way he has so nobly served, who never let them come under a certain, definite rebuke, because they had been so busy, carrying the gospel out to the unsaved, that they have completely neglected their own children. And their children have grown up as little heathen.

I remember one man saying to me, he said, People are always saying to me, Well, your father is a great Bible teacher, you of course know all about the different teachings. It is wonderful to have a man like you, here to speak to us. He said, that, when I hear that I just smile and go on. But, he says, I do not take the time

to explain to them, that my father was so busy going about the country preaching, and giving Bible messages, that he never taught us anything. And what I have learned, he said, I learned from my own study of the Bible. I learned from the various places I went. I learned from my study of Hodge's theology. I learned from the work that I have done, and I have practically nothing that I got direct from my father. Now this man, this man I'm quoting, is a fine Christian man, and a man who is doing a great deal of good. I think that he would do more, if he had some of the great emphases that his father has, that he does not have. In his case, it's wonderful that he turned out to be a real Christian worker. His brothers did not turn out badly, but not quite as well, but he told me how his father had neglected him, and the Lord said to Peter, Feed my lambs.

There is the work of caring for the little ones, who should be under the care of God's church, under the care of the teachers who brought us in. Under the care even of those whose kind of purpose is even evangelism. He repeated this command a second time, and he said, Feed my sheep, this time. Not only to the little lambs, he gives the instruction. Those who have been longer in the fold. They needed to go on. He repeated it a third time. He stressed the teaching activity of the church here, not just the evangelistic activity. Now I think that the evangelistic activity is more important. I think that there is nothing more important than that. But I think that it by itself is simply insufficient. It is not enough. I think that the church has a definite responsibility for the teaching and instruction and leading of those who are under its care. And the fact that Jesus began with the word lamb, suggests that fact. That those who are under the care of the Church include the little children. They are under its care. They are under its . (4)

That leads us on to f. Small f. Baptism illustrates ^{entrance} ~~infants~~ into the body of Christ. It indicates entrance into the visible church. It illustrates entrance into the body of Christ. Maybe I should have said more than that. Because if you use baptism in the sense of the Holy Spirit, Holy Ghost baptism, produces entrance into the body of Christ. We become members of the body of Christ, when the Holy Spirit comes into us, and cleanses us from sin, unites us with Christ, makes us members of

Christ's body which is the Church invisible. And without the baptism of the Holy Spirit, no one is a member of the Church of Christ. John's baptism indicated what Jesus would do, when he said, Jesus would baptise with the Holy Spirit. He baptised with water. And when we baptise with water, we are ~~symbolizing~~ symbolizing the fact, that if one has been united with Christ through the activity of the Holy Spirit, has been cleansed from sin through the activity of the Holy Spirit, he has become a member of the body of Christ. But we do not indicate that a man is a member of the body of Christ by baptism. We cannot tell who is a member of the body of Christ. We cannot make a man a member of the body of Christ. He is a member of the body of Christ if he has been baptised, by the Spirit. But we give him an earthly symbol to symbolize that, but by this earthly symbol, we indicate that he becomes a member of our visible church. He becomes a member of the people of God. Those who are under the direction and teaching of the Church of Christ.

Now the Roman Catholic error on this point pervades it, through its whole system. I was in Washington at a Chaplaincy meeting, where they had 80 people including maybe 30, 35 who were prominent Catholic leaders. And one man said to us, I suppose you think that your church is the true church. We believe the Roman Catholic Church is the true church. Well of course, what we believe is that the true Church is the invisible church. It is the body of Christ. That is the true church. And we do not believe that anyone is saved by being a member of a particular visible church. He is a member of the invisible church, and he is made a member through the baptism of the Spirit. But we do ~~not~~ believe the baptism ~~with~~ with water indicates his entrance as being received into the visible church. The church here on earth. And our visible church, are an attempt to correspond to the invisible church, but they never exactly do it. Every single one of them contain those who are not members of the invisible church, and some of them contain a tremendous lot of people who are not members of the invisible, true church of Christ.

When we baptise a man, we say nobody can enter Christ's church unless he has received the Holy Spirit, unless he has been cleansed from his sin, unless he has been united with Christ, no mere physical attribute, relationship, nothing physical

can make one a member of Christ. This something from above must happen to him. Something outside of himself in order for him to become a member of the Church of Christ. We do not declare that this man is a member of the invisible church of Christ, because we cannot say that. There is no way that we can tell. We can hope. We can do our best, which is to not recognize one as a member of the body, when there is serious reason not to question it. But we do symbolize the fact that no one can come into it, without this activity of the Spirit. But we indicate that we receive this man into the visible church. We admit him into the visible church, we put him under its direction, we put him under its teaching, we look to the Lord, to enable us to help him grow in grace, as a member of the visible church.

Peter

Peter

When ~~Ham~~ was in Caesarea. We read in Acts 10, that ~~Ham~~ was in Caesarea, and the Holy Spirit fell on Cornelius, and on his people. When the Holy Spirit had fallen on these people, Peter said, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, who have have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we?" There was the visible evidence that Paul had received them into his church. There was the visible evidence that the Holy Spirit had made them members of the body of Christ. Peter said, we can not be criticized for receiving them into the visible church, for giving them the water baptism. So he commanded them to be baptised in the name of the Lord. The Roman Catholics assumed that the visible church and the invisible church are one. They assume that baptism makes one a member of the invisible church, which of course it doesn't. It symbolizing it, the condition in which we can get into the invisible church. And they assume that the visible and the invisible are one, and so they consider that one belongs to the invisible church when he has been baptised. We recognize the distinction, the scripture clearly recognizes between the two.

Number six. The early Christians with their Jewish background naturally expected the Lord's supper, and the baptism to be closely parallel to the passover, and to circumcision. If it was not for this, it would be very hard to understand why we don't have more definite commands to us, in connection with the institution of these. "As often as you do this, you remember the Lord's death until he comes." Well, how do we know we'll do it at all. You go and do this. Well, there are only one or two

cases, where it is given, where there is much of a clear statement. We are to do it, but there is the ~~immediation~~ implication, in all the cases, that it is to be done. They were carrying on the practice. They had their regular ceremonies, which they performed. And they were doing it. Jesus said, as often as you do it, you remember the Lord's death. They had been looking forward to the Lord's death. They went on. They carried on the ceremony, which had been instituted at passover time, they carried on the meaning of passover, but we look back, instead of looking forward. Now of course, the errors that have come in about this, have an effect in the matter of the Lord's supper, ^{caused} has rent the Christian Church in two, and has had tremendous upheavals, and misery, and turned people's attention away from that which is vital in the gospel. As they have fought over the exact form in which the Lord's Supper should be performed, and they have assumed, the Lord's Supper was something magical which gave to us, a grace specifically. The passover didn't give us a grace. It looked forward. There was a spiritual grace, which was symbolized by this, and if we get rid of the Roman Catholic error about the Lord's Supper, we could have our divisions, and our dissensions about it, but we recognize that as the Jew, on stated occasion,

(14) symbolized Israel to look forward to the death of Christ, and his partaking of Christ. We look back to it. The passover lamb has once been slain for us. Now we partake of the Lord's supper. We remember the Lord's death till he comes, looking back to the passover, but it is the spiritual part there that is vital, and the details of its administration are not nearly so vital. They just accepted it as a matter of course they did it.

It wasn't one of the big things - now look here, this is God's command, you do this. They assumed it. They expected it. Well, the same thing certainly is true about circumcision. They were accustomed to a rite, that indicated their entrance into the visible church. They were accustomed to a rite which was performed on any outsider who became a Jew. They were accustomed to a rite which indicated cleansing. Which indicated that one became a member of the people of God. Jesus does not say, Now I want you to institute a new thing. I want you to institute that when you enter the church, instead of circumcision being the way it was in the past, it will be forgotten. But he said, Go into all the world, baptising them in the name of the

Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. When the Ethiopian Eunuch heard these things he said, Now, may I be baptised?

S-64.

That adds a little. It is more clear. Because we know what Christ has done. We see what we are connected with, more fully than before. But this parallel would naturally be expected. That you know that they had their three great ceremonies, The Jew becoming a Christian knew that these two ceremonies had two ceremonies that were substituted for them now.

1 (Question: Why did Jesus wait to be baptised? Because Jesus was born under the Old Covenant. He was a minister of the Old Covenant. He performed all rites under the Old Covenant. He also was the initiator of the New Covenant. And so in his earthly life, he did everything which was right and commanded, under the Old Covenant, but he laid the foundation for that in the New Covenant which looked back to his death. He couldn't look back to his death, until after he had died. He looked forward to his death, as the Jews did, When he began his specific ministry in which he brought these truths out, then he was baptised. And his baptism looked backward, and looked forward. It looked backward to the Old Covenant, in which all those who had been ministering for the Lord, at the age of 30, received a ceremonial cleansing, as they entered into their ministerial work. And he entered on his ministerial work, at the age of thirty, and into the entrance of it, he received the ceremonial cleansing, and the Holy Spirit, ascended from heaven, upon him visibly for service. And that is the primary reason for his baptism.

But there is a secondary meaning too. That in looking forward to his ministry, he takes upon himself, that form which those who enter into the _____, will _____ (2). And which symbolizes the coming of the Holy Spirit, not simply for service, but for regeneration.)

2½ (Question. Whatever meaning it has ~~in~~ in relation to Christ, is an analogy to human beings. As the God-man he would use the form which would be of course for those of us in the light of which ~~he~~ entered, and partook of our nature. There would

be no necessity, but it is a symbol. Well, now that's another subject, which is certainly important enough at this point to take in.

But this, number six, the early Christians expected this, it was the natural understanding, otherwise we would need more of a specific command in the New Testament than we do. The two were understood, they were assumed. We have very little of specific command. "Go ye into all the world baptising, ~~them~~ making them disciples, and baptising them." Where he could have said, Now, I'm instituting a new ceremony, this is what you are to do. This is my command upon you, this is the primary thing. Where does he say to the people, now if you are going to become members of the family of Christ, this is the thing you must do. It is in a great deal assumed. It is assumed because it just simply does. It is a new form of the old ~~thing~~ which was there. Now under these circumstances, well, one more point under six here.

Small a. While the relation of baptism to circumcision would have been obvious, to the early Christians, and is clearly demonstrated by the close similarity, in the meaning of the two, there is one scripture passage, preceded by the relation of baptism to circumcision, it would have been obvious to the early Christians, which clearly states the purpose. I think the evidence would be quite clear, without this one passage. But the one passage does very plainly state it. And that is Colossians 2: 11-12. "In whom also ye are circumcised" He is talking to the Colossian Christians. He is talking to men who had not been circumcised, with the physical circumcision, which the Jewish believers had already received. He often speaks of the circumcised, and the uncircumcised, as the physical difference between the Jewish believers, and the Gentile believers. But though the Gentile believers are not physically circumcised, Paul says they are circumcised. He says, "In whom you are also circumcised." He says you are circumcised, not that you had a physical circumcision performed upon you, You are circumcised by the "circumcision made without hands." You are circumcised by having had that done to you, which circumcision indicates. You have the spirit in you. You have the thing that circumcision represents. "The circumcision made without hands." "In putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." That is, the circumcision ~~which~~ which Christ produces. The circumcision which puts off

of
 the body ~~and~~ the sins of the flesh, the circumcision which cleanses you, not simply
 that
 the physical circumcision ~~and~~ the Jewish believer had, but the circumcision that Christ
 produces. How have you had this circumcision that Christ produces? He says, In whom
 ye are circumcised. Who are ye that are thus circumcised? The ye has not (8)
 it, the with which verse 12 begins. "Ye, buried with him in baptism," are
 circumcised, with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the
 sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ. You have had this circumcision.

We've never been circumcised. We're not Jews. No, but you've been baptised.
 You who have been buried with him in baptism, have had the circumcision. Well, now
 the baptism doesn't put off the body, the sins of the flesh. Does baptism cleanse you?
 Yes. Holy Ghost baptism cleanses you. The spiritual circumcision made without hands
 cleanses you, and the two are identical. You've had the physical sign, and you've
 been buried with him in baptism. And also, you are risen with him, through the faith,
 and the operation of God. And this thing of your being buried and risen with him in
 baptism, symbolizes the circumcision which you have had, that in him you are circumcised
 with the circumcision made without hands. Abraham had circumcision which was a sign
 and a seal of the faith that he had, yet being uncircumcised. You have the baptism,
 which is the sign and the seal of the faith which you had, yet being unbaptised. The
 baptism doesn't make you, save you. The baptism doesn't change you in the spiritual
 realm, but the baptism indicates, symbolizes the ~~minim~~ change in the spiritual realm,
 it symbolizes the fact that you ~~can~~ ^{can} ~~have~~ been united with Christ, and saved through
 him. The circumcision never saves anybody. But the circumcision indicates that you
 can be cleansed from the sins of the flesh, that you can be united with the people of
 God, by something that is done to you. And here he ties the two together.

How have you been circumcised? Why, that you've been baptised. You have been
 circumcised in heaven, you have the circumcision without hands, you have been baptised
 by the Holy Spirit, you have the spiritual baptism. And it is symbolized now, by the
 physical baptism, that which was formerly symbolized by the physical circumcision. And
 so I think the evidence for the equivalent of the two would be quite complete, apart
 from this verse, but this verse seems to make it absolutely water tight. That is the

equivalent. Now, I'm not saying that the equivalent means necessarily that you have to baptise infants. I'm not saying that. But I am saying that the equivalent, the circumcision and baptism, as the initiary rite to the people of God, is complete. Now, that's what I'm saying. Now as to whether it should be done to infants, that is a further question. But that the Christian, who comes, the pagan who becomes a Christian, and is baptised, is receiving the sign looking back to Christ's death, as the pagan who became a Jew, and was circumcised, receives the sign looking forward to Christ. There can be no doubt of that. And the baptism is the sign and seal of our faith, just as circumcision was the sign and seal of Abraham's faith. There can be no question about that. Now as to whether the equivalent has to be carried out in every detail, that does not necessarily follow, because naturally not all that are saved can follow. There is here an inference, as to whether it does extend, but of the equivalent ~~and~~, I don't see how there can be valid question of the equivalent, unless of course, one would take what you must characterize as an extreme dispensational view point.

I don't like the term dispensational, because it is used in so many, many difference senses, that I don't think it conveys anything. But the term, extreme dispensationalist, the idea that nobody was ever saved before Christ, Now, I don't think that there are Christians who believe that. I think that every Christians when you press him that he doubtlessly will agree, that there never has been any other name under heaven, whereby man could be saved, except the Lord Jesus Christ. And that nobody was ever saved by the keeping of the law, and that all are saved through Christ, that ever had been ~~an~~ ever will be. But if one were to assume that people in Old Testament times were saved by the ~~maintaining~~ ^{keeping} of the law, and there was no other way, and Jesus has instituted an entirely new thing, well then, naturally, it would be natural to expect, that that in the New Testament would be entirely unrelated, to that in the Old.

But if you have these people saved through the ~~death~~ ^{olive tree} of Christ, at all times, and as Paul says, there is an ~~analogy~~ that represents the testimony of God, which was predominantly composed of Jews, and then God has broken out some of the natural branches, and grafted in some branches from a wild olive tree, and the natural branches

are going to be grafted in again, then you have a continuity of the people of God. And in this continuity of the people of God, if the Jews in the passover, looked forward to the coming of Christ, and the salvation through him, and we look back to the Lord's supper, to him, for that upon which we daily feed, and the Jews entered the people of God through being circumcised, and circumcision is a sign and a seal of the faith which Abraham had, yet being uncircumcised, it would be very strange if something which is so similar to it, is the initiary rite into the Christian Church, that which we have when we enter, as circumcision was to the people in the Old Testament, and it indicates the cleansing, and it indicates ~~now~~ becoming the children of God, and we are there told that we ~~and~~ are circumcised through the circumcision of Christ, and buried with him in baptism. If this was unrelated to (14) it would be very, very strange, unless the old system and the new one are unrelated. and some come out of a paganism, and some come out of Judaism, and we are an entirely new religion.

But, I believe that it is clearly taught in scripture, we are not coming into a new relation, the New covenant is simply carrying out the old.

~~(Questions)~~

S-65.

(Question: I wouldn't say that for a minute. Weren't you buried with him in baptism when you were saved? Didn't you receive the Holy Spirit baptism when you were saved? That's when you receive the real baptism. And that's when you receive the real circumcision. But you had the symbol indicated, but the actual reception into the body of Christ, could be described as Holy Spirit baptism, or it could be described as the circumcision of the flesh. But you didn't need to have both symbols. You just had one symbol, but it indicates both. It seems to me, that's what Paul is saying here. That Paul is saying that the circumcision of Christ is the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Why do any of us think we have the circumcision of Christ? We've not been circumcised. What does circumcision mean to us? Well, Paul says, you've got the circumcision. How have you got it? He said, you being buried with him in baptism, are circumcised. That is, the connection isn't that two things are mentioned

in two verses, but it is in one sentence, which says we have the circumcision, and it explains how we have it, in that we are baptised. And as you say, you say that you didn't have the symbol, so far as you lived, and if you had the symbol ten years later, or if you never had the symbol, you would have equally been a member of the body of Christ. The symbol was a public declaration to the world. And the circumcision would be a public declaration to the world. But the thing that you have, is the spiritual circumcision, the circumcision of Christ, which is identical with the spiritual baptism.)

3 (Question: I don't think that is good exegetical interpretation. Answer. What is the subject of that - buried with him in baptism? Yes, the subject is, You are circumcised. You buried with him in baptism, were circumcised. I don't see grounds for difference on this particular point. Now whether that means we should apply it to infant baptism is another question. But that a person who comes and believes on Christ, and is baptised, is doing the same thing which before we knew the full details of the death of Christ, as a heathen did, when he became a Jewish proselyte, and was circumcised. I don't see how there can be any question about that.

5 (Question: Now, there is a difficult ~~question~~ problem to .
Equivalent - if by equivalent we mean identical - no. ~~Baptism~~ ^{Passover} is not identical with the Lord's supper. They are not identical. But there is a similarity. And the similarity gives an equivalent - not identical. They equal, they represent, they take the same place. They occupy the same position. But they are not identical. There is a difference. There is a difference in that circumcision is applied only to males. And that baptism is applied to all. There is a difference. Now this difference came. Now are there other differences? Somebody says yes. There is a difference in that circumcision is only given to males, baptism to everyone. There's another difference. Baptism is given only to adults, and circumcision is given to the children of the covenant. They have the perfect right to make that suggestion. God could have easily denied that suggestion, by simply inserting a clear statement, You should baptise your infants, as you circumcised them. He did not do that. God could have made the contrary perfectly clear, by simply saying that although

circumcision was given to infants, baptism is to be linked to those who are old. He did not do that. And consequently, we are left with a possibility of a difference of opinion. When God has not clearly stated, one way or the other about the baptism of infants, it seems to me that it should not be made, a cause of chism in the Christian Church.

I say that I think an infant should be baptised. I find a strong reason why I think it is wise. Somebody else says, I think it is better to wait till later. Well, I say, you take the gospel, I'll take the gospel, we can work together, we are fellow members of the body of Christ. We differ on this point. Now I could say, circumcision was applied to infants, Moses almost lost his life because he did not circumcise, God strongly rebuked him for this neglect. I could say it is sinful. It is wicked to leave the little children unbaptised. I could say that. I do not say that, because I feel that there are some differences. And to say that equivalent is identical, I would not say that. There are some differences. There is ground open for difference of opinion. More than that, I say, that the Old Testament rites and ceremonies are more set, more rigid, In the New Testament we have more knowledge of the fact, and so it is not so important, that we have the rite in exactly the form, or in exactly the time. There is more opportunity of freedom on it, among us, and I do not say that the wrath of God rests upon you, as it did upon Moses, for neglecting the rite that God had prescribed. I will not say that.

But what I do say is, that even as I do not say that, it is wrong for someone else to say that I am sinful in, or that I am doing a thing that is wicked, in carrying out which seems to be to be the correct interpretation of Scripture, in considering that the equivalent holds to the point of including the time when it is to be given. As I see it, circumcision indicated ~~mm~~ two things. It indicated in the case of adults, that they had come from the outside world, they had received the testimony of God, they had been made members of the people of God. It indicated that clearly. Now, when we have people from a pagan background, who come in, we baptise them, we indicate exactly the thing the Church

(9). But circumcision in addition represented another great truth. A truth taught in the scripture. That the children

of believers, are not simply born as little pagans, that you hope will be saved. That they are born into the family of a believer. That they are members of the visible church. They are under its care. Its direction. The normal thing is, for the parent to claim the blessing of God upon those children, and for those children in God's time, for him to regenerate them, for him to bring them to saving faith, for them to clearly testify their faith, and that God commanded Abraham and those people to show their confidence, in God, and their membership in the covenant, by doing this.

Now, this is a second truth. It is a vital truth. I think the other truth is more vital. I think that the stressing of the necessity of belief in Christ, for salvation, is the most vital of all, and if someone thinks they can stress that better, by omitting it to inference, I don't see a cause for schism in the body of Christ, over it. But I don't think that, as circumcision indicated in the past, the natural inference is that baptism will indicate it now. And I don't think it is a tenth as important,

10.

right to indicate it, as that we

recognize the covenant relationship. And that we do treat our children as our Lord wants us to treat them, as those who are deserving of the blessing of the visible church, and for whom we can do our part, and know that he will do his part.

S-66. 4/18/57.

To me, perhaps more vital than anything else is, our attitude. What our attitude is. There are certain blessings, that we should have. And it is very vital that we have those. And as to what the sign is to those blessings, I don't think that it ought to separate Christians. I think that it is unfortunate that we do. But neither do I believe that we have to be in one church. If one group of people wants to carry out a certain form of ceremony, the Lord bless them. Let me carry out the form, that I think I find in scripture. So long as we have the same spiritual blessing. That is the vital thing. But I do think that it is important that we have a tolerance to one another, and a recognition of the basis on which we consider things.

SECTION HOUR OF MR. ROSS. DR. MacRAE IN CHARGE.

We'll look at number six.

2 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: There is a point there which I think it is very important that we have a clear understanding of. We in our discussion of circumcision, that turns us back I think, to the discussion we had on the Old Testament ceremony, where we said that circumcision, (that was 2. Old Testament usage, and under that d, was circumcision. We noticed one, unlike passovers, circumcision was not to be performed repeatedly, but only once for each person. 2. It's meaning. a. It was spiritual. b. It was a sign and seal of faith. 3. It was given to Abraham that he might be the father of all them who believe. and d, it showed that one was united with the people of God. And e, it was given to children, by natural birth, as God commands for circumcision. And then 3, I would add that neglect of circumcision led to God's wrath. And 4, that circumcision came to have an additional meaning - membership in the Jewish nation, and came to be connected with a false view of salvation, a meaning not originally involved in it at all. That is, circumcision as originally given, expressed exactly what baptism expresses now. But circumcision, it was specifically commanded that it be given to the children. They were members of the people of God. As time went on, in the old dispensation, the people of God were the Jewish nation. And so to people's ideas, circumcision came to indicate Jewish nation. Now of course, it did not indicate, the Jewish nation originally at all. And all, right up to the end, received circumcision. Proselytes received circumcision, and when they received it they became members of the Jewish nation. And the Jews got the idea, Nobody could be a member of God's family unless he was a Jew. And in a sense that is true.

We are the Israel of God. In the sense that we are the Israel who are saved. But when there came this physical thing of the Jewish nation, and indicated the entrance into the Jewish nation, and so when Christ was circumcised, and then he was baptised. And that's true of all the early Christians. They were circumcised. And they were united with the people of God. But then when we had this newer understanding, of what the people of God were, of how a person before looked forward, but now he can look back, and know more about it, then those who see it clearly, they become separated

from those who were the people of God. But we had baptism added to it. And so when Peter ~~Ramb~~ went to Cornelius, and he gave him the baptism, these people naturally thought, they all should be circumcised. But it was revealed to them that they didn't need circumcision now, but they had the baptism. And the circumcision, has come to some people's minds to mean, something it never meant in the original. The obligation to perform all the details of the Old Testament ceremonial law. It never meant that. But it came to have that in people's minds. And so Paul says in one place, "I would that they (5:25). They want you to be circumcised." He was against their being circumcised, and yet he says in Philippians, 3: 3, "We are the circumcision." He speaks of circumcision in its spiritual significance. He speaks of circumcision in the may come to be attacked to it.

And we have it brought out particularly in Acts 15, where the question is, "Shall they be circumcised?" And James clearly indicates that when Christ comes back, they'll be two classes of people. There will be the Jews, who believe, and there will be the Gentiles who believe. And therefore, he says, they don't need circumcision, which unites them with the Jew. Now, they already have the baptism which unites them with the people of God, and which circumcision originally meant. They don't need this additional thing, in connection with the Jewish nation. It's a mystery that God has even said, "We don't even have to come through the Jewish nation to be the people of God." But he says, now we can have the people of God without that

7(Question: I don't think that baptism indicates that a person is or circumcision either. Both baptism and (that really connects up with the sense that I gave as f. Nm, under 5. That baptism illustrates entrance into the body of Christ. It indicates entrance into the visible church. And I think that circumcision does the same thing. That is to say, when you baptise a man, you say, nobody can be saved except the Holy Spirit come upon him. No body can be saved, except he die to sin, and be born to Christ. No body can be saved, except something be done to him, by another. Something from outside. It illustrates, how one can enter the body of Christ. We've got many people in the United States, who are baptised, who are not members of the body of Christ. The fact that a man is baptised, doesn't prove that

he is a member of the body of Christ. It illustrates. It shows that this is the way that we can be saved, the way that we can enter. This is the only way we can be saved. It doesn't indicate that a man is a member of the body of Christ. It illustrates what is necessary to enter. It indicates that you become a member of the visible church. You become a member of those with whom we work together as the people of God.

9 (Question: The secondary meaning of circumcision was that this child here - well, there are various elements involved in it. It means in the first place. It illustrates entrance into the body of Christ. It illustrates, that this child here, was born of the family of Abraham, that is not enough. He cannot be a member of the family of God. He cannot be a member of the true people of God, unless something is done to him, that he can not do to himself. Unless the Holy Spirit comes upon him, cleanses him from sin, and unites him with the people of God. It indicates what he must do to be saved. It indicates in the case of the child of Abraham, that this child here is not simply somebody who is born into the pagan world. It indicates that this is a child which is agios. Which has certain blessings which were promised to Abraham. It is a child that is entitled to be under the care of the visible church.

To have the teaching of the visible church. To be given instruction from the visible church. It is a child which we can say, the normal thing is to expect this child in God's own time will receive saving faith, and will be saved, a member of the invisible church, and taking his part as a full member in the visible church.

It is one of whom we can say, that if the parents do their part, they can claim God's promise, "Thou shalt be saved and thy house." That's what the circumcision indicates. Well, now, that is what the baptism indicates. But I don't care if a person doesn't want to use baptism for that purpose, but I think that it is tremendously important, that they recognize the privilege of the child, and they put the child in the category where it belongs. Now baptism doesn't put that child in that category. He's in it already. Any more then it puts us in the visible church. But it puts the child - it indicates that it is a member of the visible church.

Now you take many churches that do not baptise infants. Now they substitute a ceremony and that is dedication. Now if by the substitution of dedication, they are

symbolizing this thing which we indicated, by baptising the child, the thing that circumcision indicated in the Old Testament. If it symbolises the fact that the parents believe that this child has to come to Christ, to be saved, but they believe that they have a part to perform. And they promise to perform their part. And they believe that if they do their part, God will do his. If it can symbolize all that circumcision symbolizes in the Old Testament, it can symbolise what we symbolize by infant baptism, and it is an excellent thing for that reason, because we are symbolizing the scriptural teaching. It is an unfortunate thing though, because it has no scriptural warrant though. There is no scriptural command. There is strong scriptural evidence for what the infant is dedicated for. But there is no scriptural evidence for ~~dedication~~ dedication. If dedication is infant baptism, but simply letting the water out, indicates the same thing. But I think personally that it is better to have it, then not to have something that drives the truth home to you. And I wouldn't quarrel with somebody whether they use water or not. I would just say that there is no scriptural warrant for dedication, as I think there is for ~~infant~~ baptism.

Now I can say, here is circumcision. We're going to represent it by two things. We're going to have water baptism at one time. We're going to have dedication at another, as a means of carrying it out. I think that it is an awful lot better, then neglecting one aspect.

13½ (Question: I see in it, that the little children were not simply pagans outside. But that they had special places. Well, now that was point number six.)

S-67.

(Question: It has been the usual interpretation, of the Reformed churches, that baptism recognizes the infants of the believing parents as holy, as being members of the visible church, entitled to the instruction of the church, and entitled to the). Then it is the expectation that normally, if all the parents do their part, that the time will come, when these children are so convinced, that they have had in their life, that experience, which their baptism has indicated the necessity of. That they have been received into the invisible church.

They have personal saving faith, in Christ. And consequently, they become, not merely members of the visible church, in the sense they are under the care of the visible church, but members of the visible church in the sense that they should go on and take part in all of its

. What you are speaking of, is actually receiving into the church, a man who has been previously baptised, I think that the

that they are now recognizing the obligation. That is the theory of it.

2(Question: The promise is conditional in this way, I say to you, you build a good road, from here, down to the city, and you build a good road, and you will receive so much money for it. And then you build a road, and pretty soon, the bridge on the road breaks down, we say you didn't do it right. And so, as you do it, you're constantly in fear, am I do this right? I must watch every detail. If I don't do it right, the

. That is, it is God who does it, not we. The parent has their part to play, but the part of the parent is a sincere earnest effort, to instruct the child, to train the child, to pray for the child, knowing that God has promised to do his part, if we faithfully do ours. Not, if we are lucky enough, to have a child that is responsive, and if we are lucky enough to hit the right things to bless that child's heart, and we're lucky enough to find the right influences, and we go all through life, wondering, will this child be saved or not.)

Dr. Laird's brother. Dr. Laird's father was a very Godly minister. And his brother grew up, and left the family, and disappeared. And the father kept praying for him that God would bring him back. That he would bring him back to the fold, that he would be saved, and then the father realized that he had recognized that child as a child of the covenant, that he had done his best to claim that child, in the admonition of the Lord, that he had prayed for that child, There was nothing now he could do. He claimed the promise of God, that that child would be saved. A little after that, they had a prayer meeting, and somebody said, Why is it that you didn't pray for the salvation of your boy who disappeared. He said, that promise has already been claimed from the Lord. He said, I know that he is one who is to be saved. And I think that it was in two or three years, that he and his wife showed up, and he told how he had a marvelous experience, and he was saved, and he came back. The father had the confidence. He had

claimed the promise of the Lord. That is, his confidence wasn't based on whether he did his part. If you do your best the child will be saved, if you don't he'll be lost. No. If you look to the Lord for your child sincerely, and ask him to help you to do your part. You can know that he will fulfill his promise. It is he, not you.

It's a tragic thing to bring children into the world, and not know if they have eternal life or not. There's many a man who would almost rather be lost himself, then to have the children lost, forever. It's not necessary to have the children lost, forever. We can claim his promise.

5(Question: I think that one part of it is to pray for him. I think that we know that he will answer the prayer about them, but he wants us to pray for him. It is true that everyone who are saved, were saved before the foundation of the world. He was foreordained of the Lord to salvation. Jesus is the lamb, slain before the foundation of the world. There is a sense in which everyone was saved, before he was born. But there is another sense, in which no one can be saved, until he personally accepts the Lord Jesus. I think that we should avoid a statement like that which can be misleading. But, as we noticed in regeneration, we don't know when we are regenerated. There are some who do, but most don't. Most don't know when they were regenerated. We can all know that we have been regenerated. We can know that. But as to when God, the Holy Spirit, regenerates us, when he gives us this baptism through the Holy Spirit, united with Christ, in most cases of children of Christian parents, you just can't (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) So, if you're going to say, when this child comes to believe, then we baptise him in the great many cases, you can't

. And especially if the child is in a Christian back ground, where it is expected that everybody will be ~~married~~ say these words, you won't find an awful lot that say these words, and they don't 6 $\frac{1}{2}$. You'll find in the average church, they postpone baptism under the age of 7, or 9, or 12, or whatever it is. You'll find an awful lot of people, that no matter how hard you try to screen them, that are baptised at that time, and that later on drift into the world, and then they may come back. And you ask them, well, were you be saved before. Are you saved now? Some of them simply say, they were ~~hasp~~ saved before, and they back slid, and some

will think that they've now been saved. With children of Christian parents, it is generally, very, very hard to tell, when the Lord regenerated them.

But in baptism, I don't think we indicate that this person is that which is regenerated now. We indicate this person cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, unless he has done something about it. This is the only way, to reach heaven, and we indicate that we've received them into our visible church. And in the case of children, no matter how you work it, you are going to be in a great 7½
in a great many cases. But I don't think that we need to be in doubt about the fact of their regeneration. But we may be in doubt as to the time of the regeneration. But if we do our part, the Lord will do his part.

8 (Question: He is not in any obligation to us. But God has entered into a covenant, with Abraham, which covenant, Paul says, as a law, 430 years, later, couldn't have
. God had entered into a covenant, that he will be a God of Abraham, and for Abraham's children. And he says, that he knows that Abraham will instruct the children. And he has commanded Abraham, to give his children the sign of the covenant. And when Paul went to the Philippian jailor, and he said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house," he gave the jailor the ground on which to receive two things. To receive personal salvation from the Lord, and to receive the guarantee that if he does his part, all the members of his house will be saved. Thou shalt be saved and thy house.

9½ (Question: The responsibility for the damnation of any of us is upon ourselves. There is nobody lost, God cursed the Levites. He cursed them, He said, he would scatter them abroad. But when the Levites turned to God, he turned the cursing to a blessing. And there is no man who can blame his being lost - Here the Lord calls a man to go as a missionary to China. And this man rejects God's call. And he devotes himself to making money in this country. And he never goes there. And there are three thousand Chinese who might have heard the gospel, who never heard it and go to hell for it. Now is it that man's thought they went to hell. No, it isn't. Nobody is condemned for ~~anybody~~ any other cause then for his own sin. But God promises us a way, whereby he has intended as part of his plan to save, and in the case of the preacher that

is part of the plan, and I think the Christian should recognize that. And when a Christian falls down on it, there is a definite failure.

11(Question: "This little book here, this little chapter here, in this sermon on Household Salvation by Evangelist _____, has got some very interesting illustrations, on that, of people who have claimed God's promise for their children, He says, I preached this sermon, in the 1st Baptist Church in New York, shortly after noble Doctor _____ had gone in to see the king. At the close of the service, a lady told me that three years before in a public meeting in that church, a man rose in the gallery, and gave a ringing testimony for Christ. He closed by saying, "Five years ago, a dying mother called her daughter to her bed side, and told her how glad she was, that all her children would be with her in heaven. The daughter said, "Why mother. What about John?" The ~~man~~ dying mother then quoted the verse, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house." The man said, I am that son, picked up from the gutter. 12

There is a real problem there, the problem of our responsibility to the salvation of others. It is true of the Christian work, too. A chaplain tells how he went into Christian work. He tells how, was it he, or Alexander, one or the two, they went into a bar, no, it wouldn't be a bar, probably a lunch room, they went in there, and he saw a man, and the man ~~was~~ looked very, very upset. Mr. _____ said to one of them. You know, that man looks so sad. He said, I just felt like going over and giving him a _____, but you know, I was in a hurry, and you know, I just didn't do it. And I went half a block down the street, and I heard the sound of a shot. There was a commotion, and I went back to see what it was. And this man had shot himself. And I said, Now, suppose I had _____ (14) He's gone out into eternity, and maybe I could have testified to him. And he said,

Well, somebody would say, is that chaplain reponsible for that man. Is that man's soul going to be on that chaplain's mind for all the rest of his life. That that man is lost, because he didn't speak to him, about the Lord. Well, I don't think it should be. All of us make mistakes, and we all make serious mistakes. But the Lord is sanctifying us and improving us all the time, and my personal opinion is that the

Lord used that to give an illustration, which would impress upon people, the emergency of, the urgency of the things of God. But as far as that particular man was concerned, that man was not one who was elected unto salvation.

S-68.

I don't think that we need to say that about our children. I think that we can claim our children for God. He says, they are holy. He says, "Believe and thou shalt be saved and thy house." But the fact that some of us fall down,

, but there is no need of it.

(Question: The Westminster Confession has a very good statement. It says, "Elect infants who die in infancy are saved. All who God has elected are to - I think are saved through the regeneration of the Holy Spirit. I don't believe anybody has ever been saved, except as the Holy Spirit regenerates. Well, then, if a child dies in infancy, and that child is elect, the Holy Spirit regenerates him, before he dies. Thus, we have no reason in the world, to hope that they will be saved. I believe that we can safely say that a child of a believer's parent, who dies in infancy, the Lord regenerates and he is saved. The ~~mh~~ Lord has regenerated him before he dies. Now I don't think that that means, if they were baptised. I think that the believing parent's child, if he dies in infancy is saved regardless of whether he was baptised or not.

Well, now, what about the child of unbelieving parents? I just don't know. Somebody said, that all children who die in infancy are saved. Well, isn't that wonderful. One-fourth of the human race is saved. How much better it would be, let's just pray that all the children will die in infancy, because so many who grow up are lost. But it isn't that way. We don't know, about the children who die in infancy. But I think we do know about the children of believing parents. I think that they are saved. I think that the promise, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house is a proof", that we can claim the promise, that if our children grow up, they will come to a saving faith in Christ, and will be regenerated through the Spirit, and will be saved, and I think that we can have trust in him, that these children, even

if they die in infancy, will be regenerated before they die, and consequently they are saved. But the child of the unbeliever, I won't say they're lost, there are no scriptural statements that they are lost. On the other hand, I won't say they're saved, because I see no scriptural statement that they will be. We just have no grounds to know. And there are people who let their heart form their logic, in some way or the other, and we do not have scriptural proof.

3 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: We aren't saved on the ground of our faith, we are saved on the ground of what Jesus did on the cross. Our faith is the instrument, which connects us, but we are saved on the ground of what Jesus did. And how or whether regeneration comes at the time we get faith, or earlier or later, in the case of any one of us, I don't think we know. We certainly have no reason to say that he would save any infant, he didn't regenerate. We have no reason to say that. I don't think he saves them on the ground of their faith, or that he saves an adult on the ground of their faith, but he saves us on the ground of the finished work of Christ, and the Holy Spirit applies that to us.

Now, Jeremiah, the Lord said to Jeremiah, that while you were in your mother's womb, I chose you and I prepared you for the work that you are to do. When did God regenerate him? I don't know when he regenerated him. I don't know when I was regenerated. I've had many times in my life, where I've looked at the Lord, and was certain I was trusting in him, and I can think back as far as I can remember, and I have other times when I have fallen away from a close walk with the Lord, and when I had truly repented for it. When did the Lord regenerate me? I've never had one outstanding instance that was so great that it overshadowed all previous cases, that I could say, this is when I came to the saving faith of him. But I don't think that the average Christian parent does.

~~I was in the Bible Institute of Los Angeles~~

5 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: After the definite statement was made to him, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house," then he seemed to have brought in the other members of the house hold, and Paul could have talked to those members. But the promise was given before

Acts 16: 31. Paul said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house," and he brought in the members of his house hold, and gave them all the word of the Lord, and he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and he was baptised, and those members of his house, who had accepted Christ were baptised. That's not what it says. It says, that he was baptised, he and all his. Not those who believed, but all his, and the same thing is present with Cornelius. Cornelius was told of the ^{Spirit} ~~experience~~, that you will hear words, whereby you and your house shall be saved. And Peter baptised all of them. In other words, his faith meant that he was saved. And the rightful giver to all of them, showing that none of them could be saved, unless they received the Baptism of the Holy Spirit. But that they all immediately were convinced by his word, it would be a very strange situation in deed. Ordinarily when we go to a family, I know families where the father has been saved, the mother was saved later, their claims for the little children, later on the little children were saved. But that they all heard the word, and that all of them immediately accepted, - It could have happened, but if it did why didn't it say it. Why didn't scripture say it?

8 (Question: It doesn't say that all of them accepted, that all of them believed. It said, "Thou shalt be saved and all thy house." And then he baptised them all. And the little children there, they doubtless came to saving faith. But that they all came immediately, it is not told. He could have told them. If the Lord wanted us to say, we will baptise only those who are saved, only those we know are saved, he could have said very clearly, and those who were baptised, those who believed, were baptised. He doesn't say that. On the other hand, If the Lord wanted us to take the statements of Moses, of the wrath of God, on those who do not circumcise the infants, and apply it to the baptism, he could have said, explicitly, "And he baptised them, and all of his little children." He doesn't say that, so he leaves that with the possibility of difference of opinion on that. He would have made it perfectly clear with a few words.

(3 $\frac{1}{2}$). We said under 6 that the early Christians with Jewish background, naturally expected the Lord's Supper, and baptism to be closely parallel, to the passover and circumcision. And under that we particularly mentioned a. While the relation of baptism specifically would have been obvious to the early Christians, and clearly demonstrated by the close similarity in the meaning of the two, there is one scriptural passage which plainly teaches the equivalent. Colossians 2: 11-12. "Ye, buried with him in baptism are circumcised, with the circumcision made without hands." The reason we know we are circumcised, is because we've been buried with him in baptism. We are not (4 $\frac{1}{2}$) because the _____ has water baptism, but the water baptism represents the Holy Ghost baptism, which is the vital thing, which is the equivalent, of having received the circumcision without hands. I do not say, that circumcision, and baptism are identical. They are of course not identical. One looks forward, one looks back. One has a much greater knowledge of certain things. We see through it clearly, rather than seeing through a glass darkly. There is a difference. And there is a difference in certain detail of it. They are not identical. But they are equivalent. They are not merely slightly similar, they are extremely similar. One does what the other did. The two overlap very, very largely, but they are of course not identical. They are different. And the question of their equivalence is one so plainly taught in scripture, I don't see how there can be any difference of opinion on it. But there can be difference of opinion, as to how close the identity is, because it is not a precise identity. It would be ridiculous to say it is a precise identity. Now just where are the minor differences? There is plenty of room for difference of opinion.

6 (Question: I would say that in the outstanding points, one does what the other did. I would say that there are certain things which it was necessary to do when you were looking forward to Christ, that aren't anymore necessary when you look back. And certain things are necessary, when you look back, that are not necessary when you look forward. But in the main, they do what each does, what the other did. They represent a spiritual reality, which spiritual reality, I would say, was identical. I would say the circumcision made without hands, and the Holy Ghost baptism, are pretty close to an

identical sense. They are figures of the wonderful act of the Holy Spirit which he does for those who are saved. And they are figures. We cannot express them identically. But they are both figures which describe the same work of the Holy Spirit, but they make and stress different aspects of that work. And our present figure which represents these, has naturally, a difference. But in the main, it is identical. It is equivalent.

7(Question: I would say that it acquired the natural aspect. . I would say that circumcision as originally given, was given 400 years before there was a nation of Israel. It was given to express a Spiritual relationship. It had no national aspect. But as the nation was developing, the national aspect came to be applied to circumcision, and it is the application of the national aspect to it. And it is the misunderstanding which has developed from that, about it, which results in it being highly desirable to substitute an entirely different form for it.

Well, now, a then. I think we finished. Philippians 3: 3 we should perhaps note. in connection with that, which takes the same idea, where Paul who is against any obligation of the Christian to be circumcised, because of its national aspect, because of it becoming falsely tied up with the teaching of the law, Paul says, We are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh. We are the circumcision. That is to say, There is a false idea of circumcision, which is a national thing, tied up with the wrong idea of salvation. We repudiate that. We do not circumcise, but we have what circumcision really means, what circumcision was really intended to do, what in a correct understanding it always did, we have that. We are the circumcision. But now that we look back to Christ, instead of forward, we substitute ^{Baptism as} ~~that form~~ another form which stresses certain aspects, which were not previously stressed, and does not express perhaps some aspects which were previously stressed, but it points to the same thing, which is equivalent, but not identical.

Small b. Since circumcision is so very similar to baptism, it would reasonably be expected, to be identical itself, except where there is clear, scriptural evidence to the contrary. You note the word I used. When I say expected, I do not say, it is necessary, identical except where there is clear, scriptural evidence. I'm not saying that at all.

There may be differences which are not clearly brought out, but what I'm saying is that the early Christians, that the natural reasons, the one entering upon it, the ones who were the leaders in the Early Christian Church, would naturally assume, the teachings were very similar. That they were identical in various points, and if the Lord wanted them not to have seemed that, it would be the normal thing to be expected, that he would have made it clear. It would naturally be expected, reasonably be expected, to be identical. I don't mean prove to be identical, I don't mean that we must say that prove to be identical, what I mean is, that this is the , which the early Christians would naturally say, that they are identical, except where there is clear evidence to the contrary.

12 (Question: There is very little, that specifically mentions it, in that specific sense. There is the matter under the discussion, but the discussion deals with something from which the circumcision . So it is the discussion of the matter, of whether it is necessary to be circumcised. It points out that there will be people who are Jews, who will think that you ought to be. And we do not mean that it has assumed to itself, a definite national relationship. We don't mean that. scriptural evidence that there will be those who That is the argument.

But it is very interesting that Paul, who was against the idea of circumcision, of their having to be circumcision, says, We are the circumcision. But here he is dealing with a spiritual thing, rather than a physical matter.

S-70.

Number c. Small c. The Lord definitely commanded, the ~~abraham~~ circumcision, which was the sign and seal of Abraham's faith, which also should be given to infants. The Lord definitely commanded that. There are a number of instances of it, but Genesis 17: 12-14. "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. Verse 14. And the uncircumcised man child, who - is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath of

hath broken my covenant." There is a very, very strong command here, given, for applying circumcision, to the sign and seal of Abraham's faith to infants. There's a very, very strong command given, that circumcision be applied to infants, and there is in Exodus, we find that striking passage, where Moses was in danger of death, because of neglecting this sign. Now that circumcision is dropped, and baptism fulfills the same function, it would have been very easy for the Lord, simply to have said, now baptism is to be applied only to those who have reached the age of accountability.

Baptism is not to be applied to the children. Circumcision

(2½)

there was a parallel [?] if it was not so. But baptism, is definitely different.

I'm not saying that there would have to be such a statement. But it would be rather natural to think there might.

Number six. Small d. If the Lord had ^{desired} ~~mentioned~~ that baptism, which is ~~similar~~ so striking similar to circumcision, in so many ways, should be altogether different in this regard, he could easily have ~~mentioned~~ given a command which would make the change clear. There is no evidence of any such command. Now, just two words here, to caution you on, first, I'm not intending this to be a conclusive argument by any means. This is one in a (5½). Second. Paul in his argument in ~~argumen~~ Galatians, could have mentioned that baptism already takes the place of it, and I would say that it would be a good, excellent argument, to ask. The fact that he doesn't use it, I don't think, proves, that it wasn't a good argument. He gives many good arguments. This would be one more. But this is not an analogous argument. In this case, we have a clear command of God given, about circumcision, which people had been expected to follow, and have always followed. Now we have something substituted for it, If the Lord wishes it to be strikingly different, something that they are definitely to do, and they have been accustomed to following a certain plan, it would just make the thing absolutely clear, if he so desired, if he considered the matter. He doesn't give a command to the contrary either. It is not a conclusive argument.

8½ (Question: Where John baptised infants, I don't think we have enough evidence one way or the other. The people came to John. They said, we want to be baptised. Do we know whether they brought infants. We do not know.

Small d. What I'm saying in d here is, if the Lord had given us a specific statement, that baptism was not to be given to children, as circumcision was, we would definitely have no question on it. The early Christians are left to think about it, should it be or should it not. We have no definite statement. And we do have the (10 $\frac{1}{4}$) of an equivalent to circumcision. So there would be at least a thought in the minds of the matter. Should this not be given to infants? There would at least be that thought.

Small e. Now that thought was in their minds. Circumcision was given to infants. Baptism replaces circumcision. Being buried in baptism, we are circumcised with the circumcision of Christ, therefore since circumcision was given to infants, baptism would be, too. Now that thought is in people's minds. Now the apostle could easily remove that thought. They can remove it from their minds, by an explicit command, which we don't have. Or they can remove it, from their minds, by making it very clear that they don't baptise infants at all. All they have to ~~make~~ do is make that clear, that that does not.

Small e. The practice of the apostles on this point, is no where explicitly stated, as would be reasonable to expect, if it differed completely from the previous practice regarding circumcision. Now I'm not giving the proof, not at all. But I'm pointing out here, that since it would be the natural expectation of seeing baptism substituted for circumcision, that it would be given to infants as ~~much as~~ circumcision, since it would be, it would just be nice if the apostles changed it, if they

(12 $\frac{1}{2}$). There is no explicit statement, as to what the apostles did on that, anywhere. Therefore, we are put in the situation of thinking of the supervision regarding the writing of the books. There's the old Testament, there's one religion, there's the New Testament, there's another religion, but that religion had as much to do with this religion. Or, as Paul says in Romans 11, here is the olive tree, from which some natural branches are ~~grafted~~ ^{grafted} out, some other branches grafted in, it is a continuous witness to God, circumcision and passover look forward to Christ, baptism and the Lord's Supper look back to Christ, the Lord's supper is given at stated intervals, the passover is given at stated intervals, circumcision is given once, baptism

is given once, it is - if there is going to be a marked change, it would be natural to expect a statement of command or, a definite statement on it. We don't have the statement. And so those who want to , they may be absolutely right, but the burden of proof is on them rather than on .

S-71.

I'm glad to back up and receive any evidence that any body has to present that there is a command that baptism is to be restricted explicitly to those who believe. It is very easy for us to have an idea, a feeling. Most of you, I think have heard of my experience in New Brunswick last year, when in my debate with the dean of the New Brunswick Seminary, he said, "Well, of course, everybody knows, that the science of Genesis is utterly different from the science of the Bible, because we now know that we have a round earth, but he said, in Genesis, it teaches a flat earth. And I said, "Where?" And he said, why the whole book teaches it. And I said, "Where?" Well, he said, that's what Genesis presents. And I said, "Where?" And the only thing that he could think of, was to say, "Well, it describes a ~~mm~~ great flood, in which the waters pile up this high." That doesn't make a round earth. That doesn't make a flat earth. Well, I don't think the man had time to think about it. He could have thought of a stronger statement than that. I don't think that he could have proved his point. I think it would be very difficult to find evidence in the Bible, and you certainly couldn't find any in Genesis. But he simply had on his mind, because he had gone to Union Seminary, and everybody said, well, of course, the science of Genesis teaches a flat earth. And we all, on many points, hear many things said, and agree. And as I look back, every course that I give, as I begin studying into it, I come to certain point. You know, I've got a feeling, I've had it for thirty years about a certain doctrine. And then I say, now let's get the precise evidence. And I go to scripture and see if it there. And I find that there's a feeling which you have, but I made this statement advisedly, there is no such command. Now it's possible that I overlooked something. And I would be very glad if you called it to my attention, that I have. But I believe that I'm safe in saying, there is no such command.

We are thoroughly agreed, that there are examples of believers being baptised. In fact, I'll go beyond that, and I will say, that I do not think, that any adult should ever ~~be baptised~~ ^{be baptised}, of whom we do not have strong evidence that he is a believer. I will agree 1000 percent with that. There are many examples of believers, and if you take a new movement, and start out, and present it, and you bring it to new people, coming from a Jewish or a pagan background, either one, it would be ridiculous to baptise any adult who, you do not believe has believed. And so we could pile up thousands of cases of people who weren't believers. But does that mean, that it was laid down as a command, that the sign of the covenant is not to be given to the children? It does not follow, To say, if it said that only believers are to be baptised. If it says somewhere, never baptise anyone unless you have specific evidence that that particular individual is a believer, that proves it. But do we have any such command?

?

5¹/₂ (Question: There is a big difference in all cases, between the Old and the New Testament, in the precise detail of administration set down. The Old Testament ceremony was more specific, it would be on a precise date, but the New Testament ceremony, looking back to Christ, we do not have the details set down so clearly. And consequently, in the highlands in Scotland, I think it is once every six months, that they observe the communion. And I think there is a great deal to be said for it, because the way they do it there, they set aside three days for it. All the stores in the town close down. It is the whole city. It gives itself over to the communion, and they say it is a wonderful spiritual experience. That in three days, contemplating the death of Christ, and you may get more spiritual value out of that, than some people do that observe it every single Sunday. There is a lot to be said for that. And on the other hand, John tells us that it ought to be every week. And there's a lot to be said for that. And there are different ways, that I think could be applied to different places. And the same thing is true of the baptism. The infant was supposed to be circumcised on the eighth day. Now no body today, says baptism should be on the eighth day. We understand that our ceremony is not precise with the same historical precision as circumcision. But the general fact, that it was applied to

believers, and to the children of believers, that in a sense, is what a great number of the Christians believe is the proper procedure to follow.

Now I've never been greatly concerned about the procedure to follow. As far as I'm concerned, you can ~~immerse~~ immerse forward, or backward, upside down, three times, or one time. You can sprinkle, you can pour. Personally, I don't think the Lord, cares much about it. I think that the Lord cares whether your heart is related to him, and whether you believe on his son, and I think that that is the important thing. And I've never been one to get excited about these matters. As far as I'm concerned, while it seems to me, to be a reasonable way in which to carry on the practice of the apostles, and the teaching as it relates to the Old Testament. If somebody prefers to do it another way, I personally feel that there is no reason to get greatly excited about it. But I do feel like getting excited if they call me a sinner, for doing what I feel is definitely taught in the scripture. I feel that we can forget these things, and go on, and win souls to the Lord, and get them to grow in grace. And if you want to use one kind of ceremony, and I want to use another, why, as long as we don't have a command against that, why worry about it. But on this point, I think the argument should be presented in such a way that we each have a real (8½) and let's go on in the phases of each. And I don't say that this is the strong statement here, but I do say that the lack of the command is a pretty definite point. And there is a general feeling that it is wicked to baptise a person who does not believe. And I say it is wicked to baptise an adult who doesn't believe. But it was wicked to circumcise an adult who did not believe. Circumcision is a sign and seal of faith. And God commanded that it be given to children. And so it certainly seems to me to be natural, for one, to expect, that the same thing is brought out, and if the apostles wanted us to understand it differently, why then, they could have given us a clear word, and that would have solved it. And then in their practice, they could have given a clear word.

On the practice of the apostles, I am not saying that it is the apostle's practice to baptise infants. There is nothing to suggest it. But I am saying there is no evidence, that the apostles changed the practice.

~~Winnipeg~~

Question: The scriptural evidence is the vital thing. But then after, the scripture, the situation is such that people dogmatically, and categorically build on a few very questionable evidence, to say there was no infant baptism in the early ages, as to say that it was. Our evidence is very obscure and very slight. The reason for that of course, is we haven't much evidence. After the end of the writing of the Old Testament, we have only the Apostolic Fathers, for a period of nearly a century, and their evidence is very interesting on certain points, Josephus didn't know much about this. He knew a great deal about Paul, and there is the one passage which he speaks of Christ, Our evidence on early Christianity is very obscure. I think the Lord wanted it that way. But when we get on to later centuries we find that that was used. It was either that they baptised all infants, and everybody understood, or they baptised no infants, and so there was no argument about it.

S-72. (Announcement made here on Chaplaincy, and also question about coming test.)

Now I do want to ~~make~~ ^{mention} this point about the practice. There is no command to change the matter of baptising infants. Now, point e was, the practice of the apostles on this point, is no where explicitly stated, as would be reasonable to expect, if it differed completely from the previous practice, regarding circumcision, and f is -

Small f. There is much reason to believe, that children were baptised by the apostles, and no evidence whatsoever, that they were not. Now there is no proof that they were baptised by the apostles. There is no proof that they weren't. But there is reason to believe ~~that~~ there were, there is no evidence whatsoever that there was not. Now it would have been very easy to have given us such evidence. The household of Stephenus were called together and Paul gave them a sermon, and then he said, I will baptise those of you who believe. That would be very simple to say. It would be very simple to say that he spoke to the household of Cornelius and such as were of age, to show testimony, believed, and were baptised. The Philippian jailor, 3/4 of the family, ~~immediately~~ immediately accepted the Lord, one/fourth still had questions and doubts remaining, and so it was deferred until the next week, until they

would be able to take care of these matters. It would be very, very easy to make it explicitly. But there is no evidence that the apostles did not baptise infants. And there is, reason to believe, and the evidence is based on the statement that he was baptised with all that was his. He and his household were baptised. Now this word household doesn't mean much to us in America. Here, a few years ago, we had a man named (6), who was quite a common fellow. He had a nice church in Delaware, and there were two of our students, from the Orient here, and he had them down there, and they spoke in his church. And I asked him for a testimony one day, and you know, he said, So, and so was down at my church, and you know the first thing he did, he came in and he said, What's the basement? ~~Where~~ Where's the basement, and I said to him, American . But the thing was that anywhere in the world, except the United States today, you will find that the families are two to three to four times as big as they are here. You take America in the days of the early Pilgrim fathers, and I studied the genealogies of those days, and practically every family had 15 children. It was the normal, natural course of events, in families, to have big families, and lots of children. This is no longer so. But almost anywhere else in the world, you could go to five house holds, and if four of them didn't have infants in arms, it would be very unusual, almost anywhere else in the world today.

And in the time of the Roman empire, there is certainly no question, that the average household, would almost always have several children. The families were much larger then they are today. Now we have five instances in the New Testament, where the statement is made, that one of the apostles baptised a household. "Thou shalt believe and thy house." And they brought them in, and they opened to them the word of life, and they baptised him and all that was his. They baptised him and his house. Now, it is entirely possible, that these five households, contained no infants, under the age, where you would be justified, in thinking that from that one presentation, you could have some evidence, that that one gave accredible evidence of salvation. It is entirely possible. And it is entirely possible, that the apostles excluded the infants . But what I say, is that it is stragge to me, if that is the case, that no mention is made about it. It is entirely possible in anyone of these, that there was no infants.

But to say that there were not any infants at all is pure conjecture. The practice of the apostles, there is considerable reason to believe they baptised children. There is no evidence they didn't.

Small g. The Lord could have settled the matter conclusively in one direction or the other, by a few words, but he did not choose to do so. Therefore, it behooves us to show Christian charity. Where the scripture is silent, we should show Christian charity.

S-73. 4/30/57.

Repetition of previous outline.

D. 2) The circumcision was applied to males only. In this dispensation, we apply baptism to both females and the male. What warrant do we have for the difference? Well, we have explicit warrant, that it says that Paul baptised the household of Lydia. Now someone may say that the children in Lydia's household were all boys. There were no girls in it, so there is no proof that we should baptise females. But the fact is, that Lydia herself, was female, so there can be no question whatever, that we have explicit warrant here, for the application of baptism to females, even though circumcision would only apply to males. We have an imperfect warrant in it, in the other households that were baptised. Because while Cornelius' household does not mention that there were women present, it would be very, very strange, if there were not women present, and it says that the whole household of Cornelius' was baptised. The same thing was said about the household of the Philippian jailor, and there are not many instances, in the New Testament, where it is made explicit, that women were among those who were baptised, but it would be very, very strange, if they were not, and the whole Church ever since, has applied this symbol of baptism to women as well as to men, though even ~~an~~ circumcision, was applied only to men in a former dispensation.

4) We have already in d, the expectation that it was given to male infants, as circumcision was, but then we have in relation to circumcision, the definite command which we noticed, and we noticed how Moses was in danger of losing his life for not following the command. I have known people who have felt, that since this was done with Moses, since that under the Old Dispensation, he was unfit for service, if he did not

circumcise his children, that therefore it is extremely vital that children should be baptised in this age. I think that that is not so, for the reason that there is a vital difference, ~~an~~ that we should notice between this age and the previous one, that then we looked forward, through a glass darkly. And under those circumstances, it was extremely vital, that before the Lord came, it should be carried out precisely as prescribed, because we could not know enough about the details of Christ's coming, to fully understand, what the meaning of the sign was, and therefore it was vital that we carry out the details of the sign precisely as given. Under the new dispensation, all matters are left rather vague, because now we see face to face, and we know what the actual thing represents, and therefore the sign does not have nearly the importance that it used to, and so for that reason, I would say that if a person is absolutely convinced that the infant should be baptised, they are certainly wrong in neglecting it now. But I do not think that it is the same as one who neglected circumcision in the Old Testament. I believe that people should be baptised, as the initiatory rite to the Christian Church. But if a person lives in a community in which the only sound work was a Salvation Army, or a Quaker work, and they had no sacraments, and under those circumstances, I would say that it doesn't have anything in this age, like it had under the Old Testament. But the vital thing is not that we are baptised, but ~~an~~ that we know Christ. That was the vital thing in the old dispensation, too. But the signs had a greater importance, and it is for that reason, that they had a greater stress.

d. 7 (Question: Here we have the situation. It was done this way before, the natural expectation is that it be done this way now. Now, if the Lord wanted it different, three words would have made it absolutely clear. But now, supposing it was extremely important that we do it the same way, and we are coming into sharp defiance of God's will if we don't. It seems to me that if it were important enough, the Lord could have settled it either way. He could have said that all the household of Cornelius was baptised, except little Timothy. Or he could have said, all the household of Cornelius was baptised, including little Mary, who was only two months old. He could have done it either way. And if he didn't, it would seem to me that, it is a further proof of the fact, that the vital thing is that we have the spiritual

significance which it represents, and that the physical sign, we should do what we find in the Scripture, and give others the right to do what they find in the Scripture.

On e. 11(I've heard someone state it this way. It is arguing from silence. Suppose that somebody tells me that when Churchill made his last trip to America, - no, let's take someone else. Suppose somebody says to me, when Eisenhower, and McMillian had their public meeting in the Bahamas there, Eisenhower was wearing a long beard, that he had grown for the particular occasion. Well, I would say, where's your proof. Well, he would say, you have no proof he ~~did~~, You have no proof he didn't? Well, I would say, I have a picture of Eisenhower when he was inaugurated and he had no beard then. I have a picture of him now, and he has no beard ~~now~~. Yes, he would say, but he grew a long beard for the occasion. Well, I would say, I don't believe it. He would say, Can you prove the contrary. I had never heard it stated that he would grow a long beard for the occasion. Suppose I haven't seen the picture of him. Somebody can say, yes, but you can't prove that he didn't. Well, if I have ^{no} a picture, I can't. But all the accounts don't mention it. Well, the argument from silence to me is vital. If there had been a sweeping change, it would have been very, very change, that it wasn't mentioned. Well, somebody would say, Yes, but I read thousands of words of accounts of their meeting, and I didn't see a single statement, where he didn't have a beard. Not a single statement. There is no statement ~~he~~ has not grown a beard ~~for~~ the occasion. There was no statement at all about it.

Somebody said, when Churchill gave his address, when he ~~made~~ spoke in Missouri, he made his first mention of Iron Curtain. He only wore his shorts when he gave that address. Well, you say, I've never seen a picture of him giving it there. I heard it on the radio. I don't believe it. Well, I've never heard it yet. But they say, well, that's an argument from silence. Well, if something had such an effective change, it would seem strange that it wasn't mentioned. Now somebody else comes along and he says, Now when Churchill gave this address, he wore a green necktie. What is my answer. Well, I say, I haven't the slightest idea whether he did or did not. I say it is up to you to prove that he wore a green necktie. They say, you haven't any proof that he didn't. It's arguing from silence. Yes, I say, but I haven't any proof

wore any tie

that he ~~did~~, but the presumption that he would do only that which was common.

The presumption is not that he wore a particular kind of tie, it might have been long, it might have been a bow tie, it might have been green, red, yellow, or pink. But, a sharp change it would seem would be mentioned, as we mentioned a few minutes ago. The circumcision has been definitely changed, in that baptism is applied to females as well as males, but we have explicit statements that the households were baptised, and that ~~persons~~ includes all members, so we have explicit evidence for that.

S-74.

The burden of proof is on those who would say that a definite change was made. Of course, if Christianity is a brand new thing, then everything starts from scratch. But Romans 11, very clearly teaches that it is a continuation. The great importance of the Lord's Supper, and baptism in many regards, shows that Christ is the fulfillment of the Old Testament traditions, the fact that the story of Jesus about the Rich Man and Lazarus, showed him with Abraham in Paradise. There are many many verses that show a continuation. We have a clear understanding on that.

2 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: Here's a person now. He has been baptised in England. He has been a believer for many, many years. He has no question, but that he is a part of Christ's body. Now he gets a call to a church. And this church says, we don't believe that baptism is valid, unless it is performed by immersion. This man says, I have been baptised. But he says, I believe that what matters is not baptism, what matters is a new creature in Christ. Here is an opportunity to preach Christ. Here is an opportunity to reach people. I don't ~~mean~~ ^{mean} I'm under any false pretenses. I tell the people, perfectly, clearly, that I believe in the mode does not matter. They say, the mode we use is immersion. We would want you for our pastor, but we would want you to be immersed. He would do it for the sake of getting along with people.

But it is wrong to do what is wrong to please the people. There is nothing wrong with going through a particular form. You take a particular, a Protestant marries a Roman Catholic. I don't think they should do it. But if they do, certainly there is nothing wrong, in their having two ~~ceremonies~~ ceremonies. And some have three ceremonies.

Actually, of course, in God's sight, it's the vow that matters, and not the form they go through. And the thing that matters is our relation to Christ. The sign merely tells the world about it.

And so Paul, when he was dealing with Timothy, whose mother, Eunice, and grandmother, Lois, had been such ardent believers, and had brought him up in the full knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures, on which Paul said, "They can make you wise unto salvation." Paul took Timothy, and he circumcised him. But then when Paul found people who say, "You can't be saved, except you be circumcised", then Paul said, he came out most vehemently against circumcision.

6½ (f. It is a fact that we have five instances in the Scriptures, where it is said that the household, was baptised. It does not say all that believed in the household were baptised. It says the household was baptised. Now, the idea that in all five of these households, there was no one in the five households, which were baptised, who was not old enough, that he had personally, explicitly shown a saving faith at the time he was baptised. It is not impossible that such was the case. But when you get five instances together, or even one alone, it is extremely unlikely. As we noticed last time, the ~~panhama~~ families were different, much larger than they are in America. And so we have the five groups, and in no one of the five cases, is there a statement, "I baptised all that believed, ~~except infants~~ in this sense." I think that if Paul wanted to make us be careful, that we must not baptise any who do not believe, he should have given us that statement. There is no specific statement. And of course the fact is, that I will defy anybody, who baptises a thousand people, in the course of many years, to give me an absolute guarantee that ~~a~~ everyone of them believed. We cannot do that. We baptise as the initiatory rite to the Christian Church. ~~But~~ And we should not baptise adults, who we have no reason to believe are saved.

A baptism does not say this man is saved, but what a baptism says is, This man is received into the visible church, and that this man cannot be saved except the Lord saves him, except the Lord unites him with Christ, that the man lets the Holy Spirit come into his heart. We think that this is what happened, but we are not sure. And my guess would be that out of the people of the United States today, who have been

baptised, after they've reached over ten years of age, my guess would be that 2/3rds of them have no saving faith. We cannot tell by baptism that a person is saved or not. But we do say, when we baptise, that you cannot be saved, except the Holy Spirit regenerates you.

13 $\frac{1}{2}$ (There is much reason to believe here, that ~~Anna was~~ ^{children were} baptised by the apostle. There is much reason to believe it, because we have five households mentioned, of which we are told that they were baptised, and it does not say that in any one of those instances, those that believed, were baptised. It simply said, the household was baptised. One of the outstanding instances of course is the Philippian jailor. The Philippian jailor said, What must I do to be saved? They said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house.

S-75.

And washed their stripes, and was baptised, he and all his straightway. Now, supposing that you were to come to a man, You were to find a man, who was deep in sin. And you were to talk to this man, and this man were come to be convinced. And he would say, I would like to be saved through Christ. Supposing you were to go into his house, and he would call out his wife, and all his children. And here comes the man's wife, and here come all the family. It says, all his house. Well, now we don't know how big his house was. It might have been just a wife. On the other hand, he might have had ten children. We don't know. I think that a fair guess is to take a guess, and say he had five children. So here come the wife and the five children. And so Paul talks to them. How long did he talk to them? He doesn't say. But they were baptised the same hour. He didn't give them a course of two or three months of instruction. He talked to them an hour. Well, here's the wife. Women didn't have much education in those days. This woman was married to this man, he was a rough sort of man, perhaps a retired soldier. Here's this rough fellow, and he's been kind of mean to her at times, and at other times he was very, very time.

Now he says, Wife, I've found something wonderful. Here's a man who told me how, I can be saved. And he told her all about it. Well, what would she do?

It's wonderful that the man is changing his life and his attitude. She's rejoicing in it. She's glad to be going with him. But how much evidence do you have that this woman had saving faith? How much evidence do you have, that she knew she was converted. Well, maybe she was, we don't know. It doesn't say here, that he made a special investigation to see whether she truly believed or not. It simply says that in that same hour, they were baptised - the whole household. Now, look at the children. Let's say, here is a boy, who is 16. And this boy had been in all kinds of things around Philippi there. Now he sees his father, and his father's got a wonderful thing, and his father is very much interested in it. And they say, now I want to tell you about it. Now we're going to baptise the whole family. Here is the boy of ten, here is the boy of six. How many guesses do you have that when that boy of six hears Paul speak for half an hour, he says, Yes, I believe. He'll say ~~mmh~~ yes to almost anything you ask him. You don't know whether the child is saved or not. The vital thing is what is in his heart. And you don't know.

Paul doubtless realized that under the conditions there, the jailor was the dominant influence in that family. They were under his control. They would say yes to practically anything he would tell them to say yes, too. But the man believed thoroughly and he would be teaching them, and instructing them, and there would be the best opportunity in the world for those children to come to the knowledge of the Lord. It's not a lone case. There are five different cases. In the case of Cornelius, we find that all of those, not who expressed a personal belief in Christ, but all of those of the household of Cornelius were baptised. He was told that he would receive a message, by which he and all his house would be saved. Then Peter went up there to him, and we find that, Cornelius had called together his kinsman, and near friends. We find that in verse 24, in chapter ten of Acts. Then we find that Peter came in and Peter talked to them, and we find in verse 44, "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." It doesn't say all of them which declared their belief, but all of them which heard. And they had called in all of the kinsman, and their friends. And it's possible for ~~Cornelius~~ ^{them} to say ~~mmh~~, they said, let's get some baby sitters, and leave all these home. It's possible,

but it doesn't say so.

7 (Question: But here, the practice was, to circumcise the whole house. They always circumcised infants. Now they substitute baptism for circumcision, and it says, he baptised all of the house. I'm not ready to certify that in Cornelius' household there were any children. There may not have been. I'm merely saying that we have five instances of households, of which it is stated that the household was baptised, and not one of them says, that all that believed were baptised. Now in this case there was a question as to whether they should baptise them at all, And Peter says, "Can any man forbid water that these should be baptised, which have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" So therefore, it is ^{7 (8½)} for the reason for baptising them at all. Now that reason is given. Now to infer from that, that he went on and said, We are going to limit the baptism to those particular ones, who have given evidence as to having received the spirit, I don't say that

. But I'm ~~not~~ just saying there is no evidence, as far as what it says here, it says all. And it says in the next chapter in verse 14, "Who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." and in any one of these cases there may have been no infants at all. But to say that there were none at all, But that all five were without children, it's not impossible at all, but there is just no evidence of that.

He gave them words by which he and all his house could be saved, he commanded them to be baptised, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word. Well, what he says is, on all them that heard the word. Someone may say here are these children of seven, and six, and five, they heard the word, but they didn't know what he was saying. They heard the word but they didn't understand him, so the Holy Spirit didn't fall on them. Maybe so. But that's not what he said. He said, on all them that believed.

10½ (Question: The five households that were baptised. The household of Cornelius, Acts 10, the household of Lydia, Acts 16: 15. There we read that Lydia, she was baptised and her household. And I think that is our strongest evidence, that we are entitled to baptise females as well as males. It tells here how she came and she believed. It doesn't say anything about the husband. If the household includes

small children, we don't know. But it would be an unusual household if it doesn't. The Philippian jailor, where he says, "Thou shalt be saved and thy house," in Acts 16: 31. Verse 33, he was baptised, he and all his. The fourth case is where Paul says in Acts 18: 8. "And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house." "And many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptised." Now that there doesn't say all the house was baptised, it says, all the house believed. I Corinthians 1: 16, is the other mention of a household, where Paul says, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas., besides, I know not whether I baptized any other."

13(Question: Supposing I was to make the statement that there is nothing wrong with - supposing someone were to say, Faith Seminary students never carry fifty cent pieces in their pockets. Well, I would say, Look at this class here, now. I will be very much surprised, that there are not some here who don't have ~~50~~ fifty cent pieces in their pockets. Well, you say, Mr. Elvig here, he doesn't have a fifty cent piece in his pocket, ~~in~~ Mr. Passhouse doesn't, Mr. Wong doesn't, Mr. Osbourne doesn't. All right, no student has a fifty cent piece in his pocket. ~~the~~ Any individual may not have it. The whole class may not have it. But it would be extremely strange. If you took as many as ten Americans, the chances that there wouldn't be at least three or four of them wouldn't have a fifty cent piece in their pocket would be very rare. Now, I say, you take any one household in those days, and I may guess would be that the chances would be four out of five, there would be infants about in the household. Now, in any one there ~~may~~ ^{may} not have been. In any two there ~~may~~ not have been. It would be very, very slight. If ~~chance~~ the chances are one to five for one, the chances would be one to twenty five that there would be one in two. Now if there are three of them, then the chances may be that ~~chance~~ it would be one to 125. So suppose it would be fifty-fifty chance. The chances that there would be no children in one, would be one out of two, and if there would be one out of two, there would be at least one out of four. I would say that it is possible, that ~~perhaps~~ the apostles did not baptise infants. But the evidence is very substantial that they did because they must have -

baptize household. But I would think that if they do, they would recognize that it was of the apostle. But they didn't. There is nothing wrong with it except - but there is much reason, in fact I would say there is very much reason, because that is very strong.

$\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: The domestic help in those days was not like it is today. The domestic help in those days were mostly slaves. They were people who were there, they were subject to the jurisdiction of the master, they could not leave except he himself get rid of them somehow, and what it would seem to imply was, that the man with his household was received into the invisible church, and the expectation was that this man will bring those people to services, that he will give them teaching, that he will put them under the instruction of the gospel, they are members of the visible church, it is hoped that the Holy Spirit will enter into their hearts, and will bring each one of them to the knowledge of the truth. But the baptism indicates to the world, that he cannot be saved, except the Holy Spirit regenerates him. I think that indicates it. And as the teaching became more widespread, I think they were more particular about who was baptised.

2 (Question: You can't say it's just as for this reason. There are two or three cases where it speaks in a general way like all his, or it speaks of the household. But there are the specific cases, where he says, Thou shalt be saved and all thy house. But he says it in such a way to tie it more to that which really belongs to it. I don't think that the baptism to Paul indicated that everyone of these were saved. But it did indicate that they were brought into the invisible church, under the teaching of the Word, with the aspect teaching. We can't be sure that they were all saved.

g. and then 7. Circumcision stressed two vital aspects of truth.

Small a. In the case of adults, it indicated the belief of the one circumcising, that the one circumcised, had given evidence of possessing true faith, and therefore was worthy to be joined with the people of God.

Small b. Now of course, that adult should be heads of house of households. It certainly indicated this in the case of heads of households. Whether it indicated ~~it~~ it

in every case of every member of the household, we aren't sure.

Small b. In the case of infants, it showed in visible form, that they could not be saved, by natural birth, but that a spiritual cleansing was necessary, and indicated that as children of believers, they were under the covenant of Abraham, and hence under the care of the people of God, and could normally be expected, ~~and~~ be regenerated by the Spirit of God, and be given saving faith, by the Spirit of God, ~~at~~ his own time.

5/1/57.

Small a repeated. As we have in Abraham, it was a sign and a seal of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised. We might think in having such a tremendously important meaning, in the case of Abraham, that it would be wise to restrict it to that meaning, and not to use it in the case of any other meaning. But we find, in b. (See above).

Small c. The truth of the necessity of individual saving faith is so vital, that it can not possibly be overemphasised. This is so vital, that we would be inclined to think that running the risk of losing this, it would be better to drop just about everything. Our reason would lead us to say, time after time, of this having any other meaning, if you can assure the people of this, by restricting the sign to it, There is nothing ~~as~~ so important as this. Without this, you have nothing at all. This is the vital assent. The Lord stressed it with Abraham, in the sign of circumcision, and it is stressed with adults by the sign of baptism. But the Lord did connect ~~it~~ to circumcision an other meaning, He gave it a meaning, and stressed that other meaning in connection with the Old Testament.

Small d. The other truth is also vital, and it is good for us to give it its proper place. In Abraham's time, they looked through a glass darkly. And so it was necessary to present ~~things~~ truths through symbols, and ordinances. We still do that. But this is to a much less extent, ~~as~~ then in the Old Testament times. But it does seem to me that far more important, from any view point, is the truths they represent. The primary proof of the necessity of saving faith, is so vital that anything we can do to instruct them and make sure that they have it, and make sure that they do not

forget it, is very much worth while.

S-77.

Paul says, Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy, the children of believers. They are set apart. They are those who belong to God. They are those who, if you do your part, will be saved. If you ~~bring~~ bring them before the Lord, if you pray for them, if you do your best to teach them the word, you can rely upon his promise, and know that they will be saved. They are members of the visible church. And it is good to stress, this proof. To my mind it seems to be reasonable that the divinely ordained sign for the New Testament sign is that which takes the place of circumcision, but whether one takes it that way or not, I think it is important, that we do have an understanding, of the truth, that the children are holy. And the children, we have a right to claim their salvation from the Lord, and we have a duty to bring them up as members of the visible church. Not just as little children, that perhaps some of them will be saved, and some of them will be lost,

I'm always amused at the fact that a group of people who in the 16th century, got the idea that they should not baptise infants., and consequently became to be called Anabaptists, and then, when they got all kinds of ideas, among them, and divided up into a thousand groups, and were on the point of extermination, a very godly man, gathered to gether a considerable group and welded them into a group, with steadfast earnest love for Christ. This man was called Menno Simons, and after him they called their successors, Mennonites. And this group, which ~~originally~~ originally made its separate existence from others, perfectly on this point of anabaptism, this point on insisting on confining baptism to those with whom we already have evidence of evangelical, saving faith, this group, adherence, and example, as great as any group that I know of this second truth, that they themselves did not illustrate in their sermons. But the Mennonites have been persecuted, have been attacked, they have never had any government, supporting them, that I know of in history, but that little group, had gone on for 300 years, and gone from parent to child, parent to child, generation after generation, with the maintenance of the truth ~~of~~ of faith in Christ, and salvation

through him, and I believe that it's had a very considerable increase in the last forty years, since Modernism has swept so many of our large denominations, and they have reached out, but I think that they have reached out very little, as far as I know, , since the time of the Reformation, when they had had a continuing testimony from generation to generation of loyalty to the Word of God. And they have stressed the first truth, but they have also illustrated the second truth, the second aspect of it, which of course, is tied up with circumcision. Now the vital thing, is that we have both these groups, not how we indicate them.

Small e. It has been believed by the overwhelming majority of Christians through the ages, that baptism is a sign of the covenant to be applied to their children.

I don't say of the professing Christian, I mean of the real ~~me~~ Christian. That is still the case. We have two or three denominations, that are standing for the Word of the Lord, and who have taken a different position on this, but the great majority down through the year have believed this. Now that doesn't prove it. That's just an interesting point. I don't think the majority decides on any thing. It's what the Word of God says. If you have the truth, and you're the only one in the world, stick to it.

6 (Question: ~~It~~ The interesting thing is that ~~me~~ ~~has~~ while we have much controversy over other points, we seem to have no controversy whatever over this point, in the early church. There is just no evidence of it. And the first time that we find references, specific references to infant baptism, the writer is using the practice of infant baptism from another point. He is presenting as evidence, in relation to another point, he is discussing, well if that's so, well, how about infant baptism. And the discussion is, when we have it first explicitly referred to, it is recognized throughout the country, that it is well nigh universal. That is the impression. Now, before that there is absolutely no evidence of any controversy. It would seem that either in the first two centuries, or the first century and a half, of the Christian church, either in Christian families, as in the household of Cornelius, and of the Philippian jailor, and these others, that either all were baptised, or that no infants were baptised. I mean, that it was either the universal practice one way or the other,

But we do not have explicit statements on it. People are just assuming it and going forward. They are assuming one way or they are assuming the other. And we can't say, because we just haven't any evidence.

We have it widely established, by the end of the second century, because then we have considerable reference to it, as evidence from the scripture. But we don't have any argument on either side. But through the ages, this is certainly a fact, that twenty years ago a man said, to me, he was a Quaker, an evangelical Quaker, The Quakers have no sacraments. They used to be a very evangelical group. One hundred years ago, even I think 50 years ago, there were thousands of Quakers in the United States, that were just as loyal to the Word of God as any group that there are anywhere, that there could possibly be. And I have met a good many individuals in the last forty years, who were brought up in groups of Quakers, were thoroughly evangelical, but who have had to leave these groups, as they had turned Modernist. One of them told me about how forty years ago, Dr. Cadbury, was teaching in (8½)
College, here, and he was teaching a Bible class, in the Friends meeting in Germantown. And the older folks began to raise criticism. And they said, he is denying the New Testament. He's bringing in the Synoptic Criticism and this sort of thing. But another said, Yes, but he is teaching our young folks in the college, and it is good for us to know what is being taught there. We shouldn't do away with having him as the ~~main~~ teacher of the Bible class. We want to know what our young people are getting. and so modernism had made a big entrance, but there was probably the majority, of Quakers, meeting there, was still thoroughly sound. But they didn't get rid of the modernistic teaching. Now Dr. Cadbury is a professor at Harvard. But the teaching that he gave, and others gave, have turned them, so the individuals that I know are still very lovely Christians, I've been at their homes for dinner, and they are strict in using the word thee, as they did in the good old Quaker custom.

But the Quakers used to be a very, very sound group, and the Quakers now, except for a group in Indiana, having pretty largely shot through with Modernism. But these two Quakers whom I was talking to, 20 years ago, who still attended some of the meetings, and had an opportunity to give a witness to the truth, were pretty ~~discussed~~

disgusted with most of the people around here, they told me. They man said, You know, I went to Bible conferences. I took the two youngsters, and they went to about six Bible conferences in six different parts of the United States. One after another gave wonderful Bible teaching. They called them inter-denominational Bible Conferences, and he said, Everyone around me was Presbyterian. They were all Presbyterian, but they called them inter-denominational Bible Conferences. Now that was that man's experience. Some body elses experience might be very different. But the thing that impressed me was that a great number of people, 20 years ago, 30 years ago, before Modernism ~~was~~ had gotten such a great hold on many of our Presbyterian Bible Conferences, the great number of people who were very, very sincere true Christians, with Presbyterian backgrounds, who were looking to the Bible Conferences for their teachings, that they were no longer getting in their own churches. And if you'll go back another 20 or 30 years, you'll find about the same thing in the Methodist churches. The thousands and thousands of earnest Methodists, true Christians and the earnest Presbyterians that we had, and the earnest Episcopalians, too, and most of our big denominations, and 3/4ths of our denominations, through the ages have observed this fact.

Small a. The fact that the doctrine has sometimes been misunderstood, or perverted, is no reason to give it up. The fact that the importance of faith for salvation, has been forgotten, misunderstood, and perverted through the ages, is a tremendously vital phase in all groups of Christians. Faith comes in, and takes control, and leads us away, and it happens over and over, and anything that we can do to prevent this is vital, but to say that you have hundreds of great large Baptist churches in the United States, in which there is one thing that they still hold to, what Baptists held to fifty years ago, and that is Baptism by immersion, because I know that many of them do not believe anything whatever in the Word of God. They are completely turned away from it. Anything that we can do that will keep the evangelical truth prominent, that we must personally believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, or we cannot be saved is vital, in any religion. But that doctrine has been forgotten, given up in many places, and infant baptism has often been understood. Whether that in itself is evidence to the loss of vital emphasis of salvation through faith, I don't know.

But as I say, the fact that it has sometimes been misunderstood, or perverted, is no reason to give it up, else we'll be giving up everything.

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit. What is more perverted than that? I went into the Arch Street Church in Washington, and heard a wonderful evangelical talk. And a man looked over to me and said, I've been searching for teaching like this for a long time. I live over across the river here. We go to a Methodist Church. I used to hear my grandmother speak about the Holy Spirit. And I've always wished I could hear more about it. Well, the Holy Spirit, was something he heard his grandmother tell about. He hadn't heard it. But through the ages the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, had been so perverted and twisted, and is even today perverted and twisted, that many people don't even want to mention the Holy Spirit, because it suggests all kinds of hallucinations and wild theories, and attitudes. But the teaching about the Holy Spirit, is one of the great blessings of the Scripture. And while rejecting that which is false, we must cling to and we must stress that which is true. The same thing is true about the Second Coming of Christ. The way people talk about the second coming of Christ, is the way some people go out in white sheets up on the hills to wait for the Lord's coming. The way they make up all kinds of things in their lives, and the way they stress things that all the saints have to have, makes many people revolt against such doctrines, and makes them want to have nothing to do with them.

S-78.

A man said to me, when we were students, he said, Oh, we don't want anybody to think we are Fundamentalists. He said, fundamentalist is someone who picks up rattlesnakes to show that they can hurt us. That's fundamentalism. Well, he was a good earnest worker among students. I think that's awful. I think the word fundamentalist is a word that gives a wonderful stress of standing on fundamentals. And some people can pervert it. Any thing can be perverted. But anything that has been used so vitally, and has been understood so definitely, as this has, I think that if it is misunderstood, or perverted, it is very important that we must see it, and if the thing is doing great harm, we might perhaps have to not use it for a time. But if the thing is taught in

the Scriptures, the fact that a thing has been perverted or misunderstood, is no reason to give it up.

Small b. These promises for our children are a precious heritage and we are very foolish if we neglect them. I think it is fine to have the signs of the promises, but I refer here to the promises. But many people have the signs, and don't have the reality. ~~from~~ Many people have the reality, but don't have the sign. Some people who do not have the signs, baptism of infants which I believe is the Scriptural teaching, substitute for it, the dedication of infants, for which there is no scriptural warrant. Well, they have the doctrine. They are trying to stress it. They are substituting something else for it. Praise the Lord! They are trying to stress the doctrine, even if they do with a ^{method} unscriptural ~~message~~, the important thing is not the method, but it is the doctrine. The vital thing is that we have the doctrine, and observe it.

We are very foolish if we neglect these promises, and there are many a missionary and many an evangelist, that have neglected this truth, in a very ungodly way, even though they may be doing a wonderful work.

6½ (Question: I don't know how far back confirmation can be traced. I mean, I've never belonged to a church that had it, and I don't know much about it, but I've just never come across much reference to it in history. But as far as I know it is the confirmation like dedication. It is a human invention, but it is an invention, which properly observed, can serve a good purpose. And there certainly is no harm, in such things, in using our brains to think of ways of improving the effectiveness of the Church work. But what I mean is - if we use our brains to think of the meaning, and stressed the scriptural doctrine by it. If some of us think there is another meaning in Scripture, well, those of us who ~~do~~ think that way, might use the way we think is given in scripture, but I won't (7¼) to somebody else, because they just don't interpret the scripture on this. I'll rejoice if they think of a new manner, which they are using.

But as far as Hannah, speaking of an example, for this particular doctrine, I don't think it is any example of this doctrine at all, because as far as Hannah is concerned, that is an isolated instance, It is not a regular practice. It is not a thing

evidently intended for all to do, for the thing done in one case. It is not bringing a child as being under the promises to Abraham, and therefore we are looking to God to save him. It is presenting a child for service, and was presenting the child, not as an evidence of the parent's promise by which the child will be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, but she completely abdicated her responsibility to bring the child up, and turn him over to the priest, and say you bring him up. So I don't see how it could be an example of dedication. It is a dedication for service, rather than bringing up the child, with the assurance that this child belonging to God, and to receive proper instruction, and to look to the Holy Spirit to save him, and the parents promise to do their part.

9 (Question: I think it is perfectly all right to adopt things in the church, to take doctrines and stress them. I think that if some people use the means they think the scripture teaches, to stress this particular doctrine, and other people invent in them, to present this particular doctrine, the vital thing is we agree on the doctrine. And we should pray the Lord to bless the other in the understanding of the doctrine. I don't mean to criticize the practice of dedication at all. But merely to say that it is an evidence of the recognition of the doctrine, and we praise them for it. And I feel the Lord has given us a way to prevent it, but I don't feel like making the least bit of a line, between me and the person who prefers a different way, since the Lord did not explicitly say in so many words, this should be done, to infants. He could have so easily said, solved the thing one way or the other, with three words, which he did not do. I do not feel that it is as important ~~as~~ as how we observe rites and ceremonies or when we observe them in this age, as it was in the previous age.

Small c. The vital thing is that we have the doctrine, and observe it.

Some of us prefer to do it in a different form than others do, but I don't think that we should call others sinful, for baptising infants. That is definitely wrong, because if we call others wrong for baptising infants, then we are calling the apostles sinful, because they did in a number of cases, I'm sure.

Small d. Details of ceremonial ~~baptism~~ matters are not so clearly set forth in the New Testament, as in the Old, for reasons already stated.

4. F. 9. The Mode of Baptism.

S-79.

a. The mode is not vital.

It is no where in the New Testament, stated what the mode should be. And the important thing in ceremonies is what they mean anyway. If the mode were vital, the Lord could have stated it clearly and easily. He could have done that. But the truth which is represented is tremendously vital. Most of our churches, have taken the tolerant position, as far as the mode is concerned. The position that it doesn't matter. The main thing is that you have a cleansing with water. If there is absolutely no water available you could even use sand. It is important that we do something, that represents this person ~~who~~ is cleansed, or that if they aren't saved, that they can be saved. Usually water is vital, but what we do with the water, a tolerant position has been assumed, by its close observance through the ages, and certainly is the position I would take, that if anyone prefers immersion, why, I certainly would not raise the slightest objection to their using it. It is quite immaterial what mode you use.

Small b. On the mode of baptism, The Meaning of the Word.

There are two words used in scripture, baptō, and baptisō. Baptisō is the word, normally used for baptism. Baptō is the related word. It would seem that in classical Greek, Baptō meant to plunge into something, and withdraw. Baptisō meant to plunge into and not to withdraw. It is used in classical Greek, of sailors who drowned. They said they were baptisō in the water. It is to plunge in, not into water necessarily, it means to plunge into water, into oil, even of putting something into the midst of another solid. The thing is immaterial in the word. It is simply the plunging in. The fact that they had lost this meaning by the time of the translation of the Septuagint, (the translation of the Greek of the Old Testament) 200 B.C., and there and in the Biblical usage, they had lost their classical meaning. They had taken on a new sense by that time, that water was involved, and they seemed to be used only in connection with water. But they seemed to have been changed, from a plunging in, baptisō, or a plunging in and a coming ~~in~~ out of it, baptō, to simply the application

of water for cleansing purpose. And we find that in that the word bapto is used in the Septuagint, where Nebuchadnezzar went out, and lived like the animals, and his head was wet with the dew of heaven. And this says he was bapto, not baptised, there is no is on it. But it is the other of the two closely related word. He was in the dew of heaven. It indicates a sprinkling or a pouring, depending on how heavy you want it. It had come to be used in that way, by the time we find it used in the New Testament, we find baptiso used, if I recall correctly, where it speaks of the baptising of couches and of tables, and we find that the Pharisees were objecting because the man did not baptise before he ate. And certainly it meant, in those particular cases, cleansing with water. It did not have any thought of ~~immersing~~ plunging into water, for that would hardly be applicable in those particular cases.

and so the word in classical Greek, meant to plunge in, and it is easy to see that Calvin and Luther might from their study of classical Greek, not nearly as much was known about the koine in those days, in fact, the fact of the difference between the koine and the classical Greek, wasn't even recognized, until Professor Deissman, who from the use of the papyri in recent years, 50 years ago, professor Deissman, from the University of Berlin, brought the essence from the study of the papyri, that the Greek of the New Testament is not a borrowed, Hebraised Greek, as had been held by most Historians, a hundred years ago, but that it is the normal Greek, of the period, which the classical Greek, a few centuries before, had developed into, just as the King James english has developed into our English, and it is quite different in many ways. If I were to tell you, that this morning I presenting the dawning of the morning with my prayer, you might very well look at me with astonishment, not merely because you don't think I get up that early, but because it would sound like a miracle, that a man of my type would hardly be able to accomplish. But in the days of the King James Version, it was the perfectly normal thing to say, the word then meant, come before. And if I said today, that I will let your entrance into the class, you will think, well, it's all right to come in here. He said he'll let us. In the Old English it would mean I will hinder. I will prevent it. The meaning has exactly changed in the course of 300 years from one, to the exact opposite.

Between classical Greek, and New Testament Greek, changes have taken place, as

between King James English and our English. The two are similar enough that one knowing one can understand the other, but there are many individual cases where the particular changes have taken place, and we have to study the words in the context, of its own language. Calvin and Luther were great students of the classical Greek, and did not realize, as has now been proven, the difference, between the classical and the Koine, that there is a possibility of a change in words in many cases. So when they found baptizo meaning to plunge in, and stay there, it would be easy for them to say, it is nearer the use of the word, to baptise by immersion today. We now know, that what the important thing is what the word means. And consequently, we know that as far as the word is concerned, that is not an argument, for one particular method. It ~~is~~ just as good for all methods equally as well.

Small c. Significance in relation to Mosaic Mode.

What does baptism mean? John the Baptist said, I baptise with water, but one is coming who will baptise with the Holy Spirit. Therefore, am I come baptising with water. John the Baptist says, the reason we baptise with water/^{is}to indicate the baptism which was performed with the Holy Spirit. Baptism indicates the baptism of the Holy Spirit, it is the Holy Spirit baptism that is vital. The Holy Spirit baptism gets us into the body of Christ, the physical baptism gets us into the visible church. The physical represents the Holy Spirit baptism, We aren't plunged into the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit comes upon us. And so far as the Holy Spirit is concerned, the sprinkling or the pouring would seem to be a more significance symbol then for immersion for that aspect. As far as cleansing is concerned, any particular type of use of water, would fit equally. As far as union with Christ is concerned, again the laying of the hands upon the head has usually been the symbol of uniting with someone, with something, but any one of the three might conceivably represent that. The idea that it represents the burial we'll take up under d, specifically. But as to the mode of baptism, supposing that it represents a burial, and a raising again - supposing that it represents that. In ancient times they did not bury by putting down into the ground. They lifted him up and put him into the side of a hill. That was the regular way for burial, and so the use of it to represent a burial, would hardly be appropriate

until at least, many centuries after the coming of Christ. In the catacombs they buried by lifting them up and putting them on a shelf, in the side of the place there, that was cut out to put the body on. The putting down was not at all like Christ's burial, because he was lifted up, and nothing like the burial of anyone of importance in those days at all.

And the regular symbol for ~~burial~~ burial in those days was the dropping of a little sand. and so historically in ancient times, sprinkling would represent baptism rather than immersion. Of course today we bury by dropping down, and so today it is a beautiful picture of that, and the important thing today, is the reality rather than the picture, and I think there is something very beautiful about using this, and comparing it to this thing, that as you were buried with Christ, raised with him, so you've been under the water, you come out. It's a very beautiful picture, and it corresponds to our usage in the present days. But not in ancient times, because they could not stress it as burial, it wasn't burial at all in that sense.

Small d. The burial is not the primary thought in baptism. The primary thought is Holy Spirit baptism. The primary thought here is cleansing. The primary thought is union with Christ. Burial is a derivation from the idea of the union with Christ.

In Romans 6: 4, the apostle brings in an ~~item~~ item. In Romans 6: 3-4, the apostle brings an argument that we should be dead to sin. He says, We are dead to sin, and then he starts to show we should be dead to sin. He says, if we've been united with Christ, we are united with Christ in all his aspects which includes his death. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" Don't you know that if you are united with Christ, the union with him includes his death. It would be a very strange way to say it, if baptism in itself, specifically to their minds represented a burial. In that case, he surely would say, don't you realize that in baptism the primary thing emphasized was the burial with Christ. It's here as if he is saying, you who have been united with Christ, don't you realize that includes his baptism. That includes a burial. Therefore you are buried with him, through the baptism.

Baptism is not the primary thought as taught in the New Testament, and baptism

and burial could never have been in the minds of any who observed John's baptism. As what would it mean? John was baptising, representing the one who would baptise with the Holy Spirit. Did anyone who saw John baptising think that that represented the burial. It would never have entered into their minds. One reason of course is that burial was never done in that way in those days. But for another reason, they never had any teaching in those days to connect the burial with it.

S-80.

Along the dead sea, this sect that left the temple, and had nothing to do with the temple, were against the temple, and went off and lived at the dead sea, from whom the dead sea scrolls were found, those people had a ceremonial washing which they observed ~~mm~~ three kinds. It was not of one point like baptism. It was done, I forget, about every year, at certain stated intervals, at which they observed this ceremonial washing. Now that would be a sect apart from Judaism as a whole, and it would be something genuine to the members at the time. Now of course, there would be a first time. I don't know what the baptism process was. But as far as I know, at least a few years ago, there was no evidence for it whatever. There may have been something to cover them up.

5/2/57. Discussion between professor and student. Very difficult to hear.

5(We're looking at number nine, the mode of baptism, a. The mode is not vital, and we noticed that there was no stress, in the New Testament, on the mode. We noticed that whether one wants to immerse, or sprinkle, or pour, there's no reason why we should ~~make~~ make strong divisions among ourselves over such points. B. The meaning of the word, Bapto, and Baptiso. We noticed that in classical Greek, bapto means to put in and pull out again, baptiso is to put in and leave there. That's the meaning in classical Greek, as baptiso is used of sailors being drowned. But that in koine Greek, the meaning has changed. Water was not involved, in the meaning of classical Greek. By the time of koine Greek, they are restricted to water, but it means simply cleansing, particularly of ceremonial cleaning. Not necessarily of ceremonial, because bapto is used of Nebuchadnezzar who baptised in the dew of heaven. And we noticed that they are used,

that the Pharisee objected if he didn't baptize before he ate, and that it speaks of the baptising of pots and pans, and of couches and of tables, and so on. Of course the pots and pans could be any way, but the couches and the tables, it would be rather strange, if they were dipped into the water.

Then in c we noticed the significance in relation to the mode, that the idea of cleansing being connected with this, anything with water would fit the idea of cleansing. That the idea of representing the baptism by the Holy Spirit, the cleansing by the Holy Spirit, the pouring or the sprinkling, seems to represent a little better, though immersion does not completely fail to represent this idea. We noticed that the idea of it representing a burial in ancient times, would never have been done by dipping one in something, down below him. That would not represent any burial, and the ancient symbol for burial, was sprinkling a little dirt, rather than pushing one down under something.

Then we went on to d, the burial is not the primary thought anyway, it is union with Christ. And Paul points out something which they might have forgotten, they had been baptised with union with Christ. Don't you know your union with Christ includes his death. That is the very important feature of the union with Christ. You were baptised into Christ. You were baptised into his death. And therefore, you actually were buried with him, in baptised. The way Paul presents it, does not seem to be the primary thought of baptism, but something that he wants them to realize is also included in it.

Small e. Evidence that immersion was the universal practice in New Testament times, is non-existent. In fact, much evidence points in a contrary direction.

If we assume that the word baptism means immersion, then we will naturally assume that wherever it speaks of a baptism, it means of an immersion. But if we do not assume such a thing, if we simply look at the situation, and see what we find there, we will find some cases which could fit very well with the idea that perhaps that was the mode used. You will find some cases where it is very difficult from the phraseology used, to think that this was the mode used. Now that is not saying that it could not have been. I'm not saying in this point, that it can be proven, that immersion was

never used. I'm not saying that immersion is something that was always used. I'm not saying that at all. I'm simply saying that proof that it was always used, does not exist. But that there is much that looks in an opposite direction. The principle proof as far as I know, that has been alleged, aside from the use of the word, baptiso, is the appearance of the preposition eis with it. That he came eis the water, for baptism. And of course, if eis always means into, then he came into the water to be baptised. However, we find that the preposition eis is regularly used, to mean to, and not simply into, as when he said John and Peter were running eis the tomb. But that they stopped at the door, and looked in. There very clearly eis does not mean into. And there are a number of other cases, where the word eis is used, where, as in that case, the truth is absolutely clear that the word eis does not mean into.

It seems to be the custom to use the eis ⁽¹¹⁾ eis to mean he came to the tomb, they looked inside, then Peter eis , went into the tomb. And so the word eis in itself, is hardly an emphasis upon which to draw the conclusion that baptism was always by means of going not merely to water, but into water, even if eis were used, in every case of baptism. And the word eis is actually used only in some of the cases of baptism.

14½) I do not mean to say that when he went eis the water to be baptised that it may not be correct in certain cases to read eis as into. If you are sure that that is what it is, that is probably the best way to translate it. But I would say that you couldn't build an argument from it, that you need other evidence, And so, in the case of John, we have no statement as to how, he baptised. We do have the case of their going eis the water.

S-81.

It might mean that they went and were dipped into the water. It is not in itself proof. We do not have evidence as to how John baptised. John baptised in a number of cases, and an argument is ~~given~~ ^{built on} the fact, that in one case, it said he went to a place to baptise, because there was much water there. There is no such mention in other cases. And there is no reason that he baptised by immersion in all the cases, either by the Jordan or another place. Whether he was at this place where there was

much water, or whether he was in the wilderness, there may have been very little water. The fact of there being much water, might have been mentioned, as to there being a great source of water, it might have been to immerse. It may have been possible. And it is just as equally as possible, that the reason he picked this place, at that time, was because the great crowds were coming, and they needed drinking water.

2 (Question: Acts 8: 38-39. Of course, they were in a chariot, they went down from the chariot, and they came up into the chariot again. It said that he came up ek the water. Ek there simply means from. He came up ek the water, is all it says. It says that he went down eis the water. He went down to the water, he came up from the water. If there is evidence that it was, that they went down into the water, it is a perfectly valid translation. But it is equally valid that he went down from the chariot to the water. It doesn't prove anything. It certainly is no proof there against it.

for

I want to quickly run through different instances, ~~where~~ this statement, that evidence that immersion was a universal practice is non-existence. If we assume that the word baptise must mean immersion, then of course, we must try to fit all the cases into the idea of immersion. Some cases you could very easily, and others you could not. But I do not say that it can be proven that in all cases, they did not immerse. I would not even say that in any cases it can be absolutely proven, they did not immerse. But I would say that there is no proof that in all cases they did immerse, and in a number of cases, the phraseology sounds to one who comes to see what is here, instead of trying to prove one way or the other, it sounds very much in a different direction. Now we looked at the baptism of John. The next large instance of baptism is the first instance mentioned of Christian baptism.

That is in the city of Jerusalem when about 3000 souls were baptised, in Acts 2: 41. This was in the middle of the city of Jerusalem, where the message was given. And after he gave the message, ~~in finishing~~ ^{in finishing} his message, Peter said, Repent, and be baptised, everyone of you. And then, they that gladly received his word, were baptised. Now the Spirit could have made it absolutely clear, that then they who received his word, went with the disciples out to the pool of Solom, where they

baptised everyone in the pool. That could be done. But it doesn't. It doesn't say where it is. It just says that they were baptised. Well, now, three thousand men it is not impossible that they took them all to the Pool of Siloam and baptised them. It is not at all impossible. But without a clear statement, the average person would think of it as a quicker method as used in that case. Now, I don't think that this proves much, one way or another, but it certainly doesn't prove immersion.

6 (Question: This does not prove what method it was, but it does to the casual reader, not knowing what mode was used, reading it, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. Now maybe they added them with the baptising over a week or two. It's entirely possible. You can't prove from this statement, I'm merely saying that the immediate impression, that you would get from this statement, would be not necessarily immersion.)

6½ (Question: I don't say that its impossible at all. I'm just saying that in this particular case, particularly in a semi-desert area like Jerusalem, where there was very little facility, and maybe before the Lord was crucified, he made a special arrangement to have a baptistry installed. At this particular place, there was about a dozen different sections to it, where this could be done. We don't know. We just don't have proof that he did. There was no - there is very little facility of water in that area, on this high hill there. Around Jerusalem, water is very, very scarce,

We go on to the case of Cornelius. And we find that when Peter came into the house of Cornelius, there was Cornelius with his kinsman, and they were there in the house, and Peter said, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptised? Now, maybe they went out to a river near, and baptised them there by immersion in the river. Maybe they did. I'm just saying the casual reader, reading it ~~with no~~ with no evidence on the matter would naturally assume from the phrase to mean then, not to forbid us to go into the river, but forbid water, that unless Cornelius had already arranged a baptistry in his house right there in preparation for the situation, that his phrase means to bring the water in. "Forbid water, that these should be baptised." The phraseology does not certainly suggest immersion, but it certainly does include the context.

The Philippian jailor. It was night. There in the jail, we read, that he found Paul and Silas, Acts 16: 30, "And brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in the house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes., and was baptised, he and all his, straightway. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." Now, maybe there, in the middle of the night, the jailor took his whole family, and Paul and Silas, and left the jail, trusting that the Lord who had delivered his life, by causing Paul and Silas not to flee, would guard the rest of the prison while he was gone, and went down to the river, and there they were all baptised, and then went back. It's entirely possible. On the other hand, the verses as you read them, suggest that right there where he washed their stripes, he was baptized right there, and all of his. It does not suggest that the Roman government in preparation for this situation, had a good baptistry installed in the jailor, in order to be ready for the occasion.

10 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: No, I don't think that he lived right at the jail. It was probably adjoining. It might have been like the warden of a prison today, who may have his family in a building right next to the jail, or it may be a portion, that separates the family from the prisoners. I do not know exactly how large the family of the jailors were, but I think that it was extremely unlikely that they were the size of most of us today.

12 (Question: I have been in the public bath in Philippi. I think it is still operating today. It could have said here, they went to the public bath.)

13 (Question: There is definitely no proof one way or the other. But as to evidence, as to whether they always used immersion, the - in many of the cases, the impression you get, is it was something done, in which a little water was brought in, or in which the thing did not have a lot of preparation, and in which the thing was done in a way which immersion was not involved.

In many instances, the impression is quite the contrary to immersion. Because

it does not specifically ever say that they were immersed, nor does it specifically ever state that they were not immersed. And if immersion was always used, it seems very, very strange that in this Philippian jailor's case, I don't see how it could have been, but that that may have been the situation we don't know. It's not impossible. But it impresses me that we do not know. And the same thousand Jews, that there was any arrangement was there, is a subject on which nothing is known. It is not impossible. But it doesn't say so.

S-82.

(Question: Not the way the English has it. Now, we have to look at the original, but certainly the translators certainly understood it to mean it, ~~an~~ because it says, "He took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." It certainly gives one, the impression, that it was done immediately. Well, I skipped over one instance, I remember now.

The case of Paul in chapter nine. Here we read that Paul was blind, and Paul was in Damascus, and Ananias received a vision, and the Lord said to him, Arise, and go into the street which is called straight, and enquire in the house of Judas, for one called Saul, of Tarsus, for, behold, he prayeth, and hath seen in a vision, a man named Ananias coming in, and putting his hand on him, that he might receive his sight." And Ananias said, No, this is a wicked man, it's entirely wrong, but the Lord said, No, God can even take a man like him, and make him a believer. And so Ananias, verse 17, "went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way, as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." "And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales, and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptised, and when he had received food, he was strengthened." Now there is a situation where Paul, blind, was in the house of this man, and there Ananias comes to him, and puts his hands on him, and says he is to receive his sight, immediately he received his sight, and rises is baptised, and then is given something to eat, and is strengthened. Well, now, in the house of Judas there was a baptistry is entirely ~~possible~~ impossible. I've been in it. And it is the ~~house~~

kind of house you would expect. It's a small house. Judas was not a rich man by any means. It's strange that in Damascus that a man like Ananias was quite a place for people to come to. They had things to show them. The house of Ananias. Well, when I got to Damascus, I said, I'm not much interested in the house of Ananias. He was a good man. But all that happened there was that he received a vision and left it. I'd like to see the house of Judas, and I got my guide, and found it, and I read in it, that the house of Judas which was here where Paul was, became a Christian Church, and then when the Moslems took over, they made it a mosque. And they told where the address was, and we went there. And I guess I was one of the few that visited it. And we went to it, and it had all the appearances of a simple house, of a lower middle class person. And you come into it, and the house had been arranged, to make a worship place out of it.

We looked around, and they were very curious to us, but we being rich Americans, of course, they felt that we ought to give them a nice new carpet for the mosque. It was rather hard to get away from there. They were quite insistent, that we give them a nice new carpet for the mosque. We didn't do it. This may not be genuine, but it's a tradition that goes back a long, long ways. And the fact that it is not advertised and stressed as one of the tourist places, ~~uh~~ puts them in favor of tradition, rather than against it. But whether it was the right place or not, it is doubtless similar to where the place was. Judas was ~~probably~~ ^{probably} a lower middle class person. He had his little home there. They brought Paul into the place. He was there. It says that he arose, and was baptised. Did it say that then they took him out to the river, to one of those parts of the beautiful rivers that flows through Damascus. It is much different from Jerusalem, where there are two little tiny streams there. Here are two lovely rivers, less than half a mile ~~up~~ outside the city. Maybe they took him out there, and they immersed him, and they brought him back. But it doesn't give you that impression. He arose, and he was baptised, and then they gave him food, and he was strengthened.

It sounds as if he was quite weak after all the experience of the blindness, and everything. ~~um~~ The impression that you get is hardly that of having been immersed. Now it is possible that he was. They say there is no proof that immersion wasn't a

universal practice. But there is a general impression, that it is quite to the contrary.

5½(Question: In the case of Lydia, they were right by the river. There's no reason in the world, to prove that they were immersed, sprinkled, or poured. Now, if you want to make it quite clear that they were immersed, the verse could quite have easily said it. That Lydia went, and got another change of clothes, and came, and was immersed. Now the fact that it didn't say, doesn't prove it either way.

6¼(Question: It's very rare now a days, that a person goes around in soaked clothes. I would definitely say, that I know of no cases, where there is proof that immersion was not used. I would definitely say that. But there is no proof, that immersion was the mode, in any case. And my conviction is that we should be very tolerant on this matter, and if one group always insists on immersion, forward three times, others immerse backwards, some one time, some three times, others four, others sprinkle. As far as I'm concerned, if we are baptised with the Holy Spirit, that's the thing that matters. And I'd be glad to do it in any form to a person. And I'm not meaning to say that the other modes are better. To me, they represent the significance of it. To me, they carry the idea of baptism, of the Holy Spirit coming upon one, and cleansing one, and uniting one with Christ. Now to some one else, if another mode conveys it better, wonderful. Do it. I don't think it matters. And I'm not saying in this, that one mode is better than another. I'm merely saying that there is no proof, that one particular form was used. And certainly there is no proof that that particular one was immersion.

I just wanted to point out these instances that as stated, can any one forbid water. He arose up, and was baptized straightway there in the house. The Philippian jailor at that hour of the night. The different instances would certainly give a definite impression. But they do approve a different thing. If you are convinced that immersion - baptism means immersed, it is entirely possible that is what it indicates. It just seems strange that in no one case, does it say, that they went out of the city and came back, or that they already fortunately had a particular arrangement made, or something like that. But in no one particular case does it. Now it doesn't prove

that it was.

G. Conclusion regarding the means of Grace.

The means of grace as we've noted are listed as prayer, as the word, the sacraments, There is one means of grace, and that is the Holy Spirit comes into our heart. That is the one real means of grace. Now, the Holy Spirit uses many means as a system. And the sacraments are a dramatic showing to the world, of certain scriptural teaching. We show forth the Lord's death when we take the Lord's supper. And we show forth our belief ~~and~~ ⁱⁿ the necessity of the Holy Spirit, ~~and~~ entering into our hearts, when we are baptised. But the real means of grace seems to me aside from the one, the Holy Spirit baptism, are the word, and prayer. And that is what we are diligently to observe, in the study of the word, and prayer. And it is my personal opinion that we do our people a real service, when having them serve the sacraments to present to the world these great Christian truths. But after all, the visible form doesn't present forth a great deal of Christian truth. It doesn't make a tremendous impression on our part, or on others. It's useful in this way. But the more we can get our people to studying the word, for themselves, and not listening to us, and the more we can get them to using the instruments God has given us - prayer, I think that is the real means of grace.

Now, let's go on to number five. And I'm going to call number five, Individual Eschatology. I'm going to divide Eschatology into two parts, Individual Eschatology, and General Eschatology.

V. INDIVIDUAL ESCHATOLOGY.

A. Introduction to Eschatology.

1. The Importance of the Subject.

Eschatology, literally means, the science of the last things. I think it would be better if we made it the coming things. It is not things that are last, but what's ahead, is eschatology. It is things that are future. Now what is the importance of future things. I read a book, in which, by Douglas, it was a novel, by Douglas, in which he presented his philosophy, and it has a lot of good things, along with some things that I don't like. But he told in it, of a doctor, who was very much against

Christianity. And he told how this doctor was engaged to a very lovely young woman, and she was suddenly taken with appendicitus, and a very poor job done by the doctor, and she died, but it seemed utterly unnecessary, ~~hmm~~ from a medical view. And this man had been very embittered against Christianity, as a result of that. It happened to this young woman. And ~~she~~ then he told how he had gone to this church ~~and~~ and how he had found nothing in it to think that there was any answer to the problem. But this sentence stuck in my mind - something like this. That he realized that here was the vital place of the church. Here was its vital importance. Does it have an answer to this problem, the problem of death. And that to me, just shows the importance of eschatology to us. We are showing people how to live better. We are showing people how to bring their lives into relationship with Christ, and showing these things which we know, are of tremendous importance. But from the viewpoint of the world, here is a fact, that everyone thinks is better, and what does it mean? Where does it lead to? There is the point where the Christian witness has to ~~be~~ come across in his experience with every human being. What is ahead?

And so eschatology, in eschatology, there are facts, there are matters definitely stressed, in eschatology, which are so presented in the Bible, that there are no question about them. Which are of tremendous importance for every human being, and for the work of Christians. And so eschatology, it is not nearly as importance as actually, justification or sanctification. I was a little bit irritated, justification, and sanctification according to the catalog should have finished before this semester. We had to have them this semester. On the other hand, I feel that there is nothing in eschatology ~~anyway~~ any where as important, actually, as justification, and sanctification. And so I was very glad for the opportunity to stress them. They are the vital facts which are of most importance. But from the viewpoint of the ordinary human life, particularly outside this grace, here is the point where it hinges upon. Eschatology what is ahead for him. And though it is a matter of tremendous importance, to take that which is clear, that which is definite, that which is stressed, regarding to eschatology, and to point out to people, and to apply it to their lives. Eschatology in this general sense, is a matter of ~~hmm~~ tremendous importance.

- of people who have died in ancient years, in order to see how much from hydrogen bombs, has come over, and over in that area, where you have so much humidity, and consequently, the effect would be many times as great as it would be in this country. How much of it has gotten into their system, enough to affect their bones, in order to see whether the hydrogen bombs, has an increase in leukemia and bone cancer, so let's say instead of 300,000 people in the world dying of this, in the next 5 years, there might be 301,000 people dying, or just how much affect it is having. Well, he said to me, you know, I'm travelling all over the world on this. He's one of the great scientists in this area. He said, I'm travelling all over the world, I'm spending a great deal of money, that the government makes available for it, and time and effort to try to work these things out, and try to find out about this. And he said, all the time I'm doing this, the thing that impresses me is this, he said, within the next 30 years, I don't think there is a single question in the world, but that the city of New York, and everything within 30 miles of it, is going to be absolutely black from the hydrogen bomb. He said, I don't think there is a question in the world, and he says, yet, people go on in this life, with paying no attention to this, and ~~spending thousands of~~ spending thousands of dollars, to try to cut down by three per cent, the number of people who die by hydrophobia, throughout the world.

If he is right, and he is a scientist in that area, and I am not, but if he is right, it is a terrible to think, well, I'm not going to pay any attention to it. And giving up the thought of examining, and considering how to protect ourselves, from these things, for fear we might increase lung cancer while we are doing it. It's a terrible thought. But, whether that is true or not, we know that death is certain to come. And the Christian knows that the Lord is coming back. And the Lord's coming, whatever your view of eschatology, is going to make tremendous changes in this world. And the scripture says over and over and over again, "In such an hour that ye think not, the Son of Man comes." It is stressed repeatedly that you can not say, that he cannot come until this happens.

He can't come today because, this has not yet happened, for it says, in such an hour that ye think not, the son of man cometh, and say not that this and this must happen. You cannot know. You cannot say when he will come. Now, it should be something that affects our lives. It should be something that affects our preaching. It should be something that affects our relation to him. And so it is not nearly so important as justification. Personally, I think it is tremendously more important than what sort of ceremony we use. But it is of great importance, because what should be the affect upon our life. I believe that eschatology on the whole, is tremendously under emphasized, in our churches, on the whole. I find occasionally a man who preaches on the second coming all the time. And I say, what a ~~shame~~ shame. What a shame not to put more attention on so many other vital points. But I feel ten times worst about a man who never puts any stress on it. It seems to me that it has its proper place, and an important place and should be in that place. It should not be over emphasised, but I would rather see it overemphasised, then forgotten.

2. Dangers to be avoided.

One danger of course is overemphasising it. And I don't think that danger is anything as near to the danger of forgetting it. But it is a definite danger into which some people fall. And it is one which is essential. But I think that c is far more dangerous, and that is dogmatism, where the Bible is not preached. I think that is something that we should avoid at all hazards. I know of an instance of a man who was a - who did not try to go through seminary. He was here one year. He was an older man. He came here, and he studied here one year. He went out, and he took a church in some thousands of miles away from here, and he went into that little church of people who had come out from a church which was connected with the apostasy. They came out from it and took this little church. And he had an opportunity to preach to them the Word of God, and to weld them together into a group, to reach the lost, and to reach others there for the gospel, and to bring people out of the apostasy, into a situation where they could make a real witness for Christ, and before he had been there very long, he began to give them a series of sermons on a rather minor point of eschatology, on which the view that he took was different from the view which was held by practically everybody

in the church. Now on that particular point, I think he was wrong, and they were right. But to prove that he had been right, and to prove that they had been wrong, for him to give a series of a dozen sermons, on that minor point of eschatology, and to get them all stirred up, so that he split the church, and 2/3rds of them walked out, because they found no point in continuing in building a witness in which they were just constantly haranging on this minor point, which some of them may have thought was major. But they hadn't called him, in order to change their view on this. It certainly is not a primary point. There is a danger we must watch. That we get hepped on a point. Let's not think that we have got to make it our life's mission, to continue that sort of thing. Give it its proper place.

Dogmatism where the Bible is not clear, is a great danger in eschatology,

c. The attempt to find more detail than scripture gives.

That is to say, there are those who in eschatology work out this little tiny point, and this, and this, and this, and they become so absorbed in that, that they forget what God has them here for. To spread his word. And these are the three great dangers, in eschatology, and because the people there - maybe we've better make a fourth - Setting dates. And the trouble with setting dates, is that the Lord clearly forbids it. But how many a person has done it. A man said to me once, he said, this great Bible teacher is convinced that, he said, that within the next six weeks, the Lord must come, it was in 1924. The Lord must come for the whole basis of prophecy is fulfilled. And this man had been a great Bible teacher, for 50 years, or more, and that is what he said. Three years before that, the same man, had been preaching at a Bible conference, and he was to speak at four in the afternoon, and Dr. R. A. Torrey at one. And he said to Torrey, you'll get your message in, but he said, the Lord is coming between the time of yours and mine, so there is no use of my preparing mine. He was consistently setting dates, when the Lord explicitly stated that no man knows when he is coming. But these things have brought dispute upon the doctrine. And people think that a person who is interested in eschatology, is knowing a lot of things that the scripture hasn't given, or is spending all his time. There is a book, in which a man figured ten thousand mathematical calculations, from Old and New Testaments.

Pages and pages of figures, in order to try to find out when the Lord is coming. The Lord specifically says, You don't know when he is coming. We should see what detail we can get, but don't spend all our time trying to work little minor details, and above all, don't be dogmatic, on points that are not stressed, in the scripture. These are the dangers in eschatology, but the importance of it is far greater than the dangers.

B. Death

This is the most obvious fact in eschatology. And particularly in individual eschatology. It is often said, Nothing is sure, but death and taxes. Now, to the Christian that is not true, for to the Christian who knows the Bible, he knows that death is not sure, it is absolutely sure, unless the Lord comes. Every single person who ever lived upon this earth, except Elijah, Enoch, and the Lord Jesus Christ. But compared to the millions, there are practically none. They have all passed through this experience of death. But we may not. We may be there if the Lord comes. For those Christians who are living when Christ comes back, death is absolutely certain. It is number one, then, a fact of universal observation. And so then it is a connecting point for Christian witness. A connection point which should be used more than it is. We are always trying to show people how they can be happier., how we can have a better life, How it means they can find an explanation of their problems. How they can get their complexes worked out. We are showing the answer of Christ to all these things, and that is true, and it is a vital part of Christian witness. But people know it, but they try to shove it back of their minds and forget it, that death is certain, apart from the teaching of Christ, it is absolutely certain for everyone, and it is the basic connection, to show its basic importance, and relation. This fact, this inescapable fact of death.

Number two. Its significance is not naturally determined.

A man walking up there in the Canadian Rockies, an elderly couple, walking up there, a man and his wife, looking at the wonderful scenery. I said, isn't it beautiful. They said, Yes, it is. They said, My, isn't it wonderful, that we had a chance to come up here, and see this, and enjoy it. They said, "When you'll living, living forward, when you're dead all over." That was their philosophy, and yet, they

had the thought so strong in their mind, that meeting another stranger, that is the first thing they had to bring up. We've got to enjoy it, because when death comes, there is no more enjoyment of it. When you're dead, you're dead all over. Well, how do you know when you're dead? The significance of death can not be determined, apart from the Scriptures. They've tried. People will give you arguments for immortality. and so (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) has written a great book to prove that there is no such thing as immortality. And when you get down to it all, their arguments either way, aren't worth anything. It is simply, something, from a natural viewpoint, it is a tremendous fact that faces us. A tremendous fact of human life, that everyone must face, but we cannot say, whether death is the end, or whether it is not. He has no absolutely no reason for saying. We have to have a revelation from God.

It is not determinable from the natural viewpoint, it's significance. It's importance. It is tremendously importance. When you get to my age, and you think of the people you've known, who have shown wonderful promise, and have seemed to be headed for great accomplishments, and just like that they are gone. Time after time, case after case. I remember when Wilson ran for President. 4 men, president, and vice president, 2 main tickets. And about five years later, three of them were gone. And it is just unbelievable, the pains that take place in life, from this fact. And we try to shove it out of our heads, we try not to think about it. But you cannot shove it out of your heads. And back in the beginning of the Depression, I remember down here in Philadelphia, man after man, there must have been 50 of them, jumped out of windows of high buildings, because the problems they were facing, were insuperable. They couldn't give an answer, and so they killed themselves. And the human being things, that death will end it up all. And they have absolutely no grounds on which to say that death ends it all. What is beyond? What is its significance? You need the Scriptures for the answer, because human thinking can not give you the answer.

S-85. 5/3/57/

Yesterday, we began the consideration of number five, individual eschatology. And we explained the difference between individual eschatology, and general eschatology. There is quite a bit that is of interest, in connection with individual eschatology,

which would be better to be discussed in general eschatology. And there is also a good deal in general eschatology, which relates very closely to individual. There is quite a bit of overlapping between the two. But I think that we get a clearer idea of it perhaps by separating them, even though they are quite connected. General Eschatology, we are thinking of a person standing back, and thinking what is going to happen in the future. What's going to happen to the world? What's going to happen to different classes of people? and so forth. But when we think of individual eschatology, we are thinking of an individual person. What is ahead for him? And this is certainly, that which is most vital, for the Christian minister, and the believer. What is ahead for you? What is ahead for the person with whom we come in contact. And we noticed that under this, that ~~R~~, that death is ahead for everyone, unless, the Lord comes before we reach that point. You read in the paper, a few years ago, of a man who is active in the senate, and his name is all over the paper. He has many enemies, he has many friends. He is a vital active character. You don't know what he ~~may~~ may accomplish, whether for good or for ill. You look at the headline this morning and he is dead. Dead at 47. It is a fact of life, which it is good for us, to have experiences that bring home to us, its reality. You cannot understand it when you see it of someone else. Of someone you do not know. But when it comes into your own family, there is a tremendous emotional effect, that you cannot express, you cannot understand. It is just beyond anything that you can realize.

I've heard it said, that a person can lie on a bed of agony for 20 years, and that when they go, there is that wrench, there is that tear, there is that emotional experience, that ~~is~~ sometimes seems just as bad as if they were just suddenly killed. It is there. It is a fact of life. People may say, that religion is just a lot of mumblings of a lot of priests. People looking for excuses formake money for themselves. hoodlicking the people with superstition and all that. It's a lot of nonsense, and a lot of them say - Here is a fact, that you cannot explain away. It faces us. It is here. It is real. Every human being has to face it. It is a fact of ^{UNIVERSAL} ~~human~~ observation, and what our attitude is going to be toward it, is something that every human being has to consider.

And I mentioned as number, two, its significance is not naturally determinable.

People say today, Where's the soul? From natural viewpoint we just cannot tell what it is. Many a person says, I'm just going to end it all. What proof do they have for this? How do they know? How can you tell naturally, how can you have the least idea, what death means? You see the body of the dead one there. You lift the hand. It drops down. The eyes stare forward meaninglessly. There is no feeling of personality or anything anymore. It's just lifeless flesh, and you think of how that flesh was moving around, and how it was talking. You think of the reality, of the personality of the person that was there. Now it's gone. What does it mean? There is no way, in which one can tell, from the natural viewpoint. Some people say, in the end, that's all. They can't prove it. They may drop into terrible agony, and pain, and misery.

On the other hand you have the philosophical arguments, and you have the theories, the evidences to prove their immortality, books have been written on, it, and personally, I don't think it is worth anything. Aside from the scripture, aside from God's revelation, anything that human beings can get, as to what death really means, or what comes after it, is worth no more than a human being's guess as to what is on the other side of the moon. We need a revelation from someone who knows. The significance of death simply cannot be determined from the natural viewpoint, except to realize that it is an enemy, it is unnatural, it is, you work, you study, you learn, you advance, it is gone. This night is thy soul required of thee. That is the fact you must face. The end of man's hopes, the ~~man~~ end of his prospects, it kills all that he planned, all that he aimed for, as far as he himself is concerned. The other, upon whom he gave so much love, upon whom he put so much hope, is gone. But what is the real significance? We have to have a revelation. There is just no other way to tell.

3. Mankind has a widespread hope of immortality.

Now, I think there is something in the argument, that man has a widespread feeling that there must be a supernatural force, that there must be reason in the universe. God has implanted in us a - something that calls out for fellowship with himself. I think that is an evidence for the existence of God. But when we get down

to evidences of particular doctrines from a wide spread field, I don't think that it proves anything. And this is a fact, that I wouldn't spend much time on, but we'll merely note it, that mankind, it seems as if, until you get a philosopher who is trying to explain the world data, or use ingenious arguments to try to convince us that we don't have to worry about it. Until you get to that, you find in probably every race, in every group of people, you find stories, ideas, about such cases developing. They ~~manah~~ ^{are based} upon the assumption that the individual goes on. And naturally, what is the individual? Humanly we can't tell. Let's say that it is the hand. We cut off the hand, and we still have the individual. What is the personality. It is not a bit of flesh. It is not a bit of matter, which we off constantly. Someone has said, that our human body changes every seven years, that there is not a bit of matter left in it, that was in it before. What is it? It's something else then a bit of flesh. And there is a universal feeling, until people philosophically convince themselves it isn't so, except in the case where that has been done, there is a widespread feeling of the hope that there must be a continuance, that there is an immortality. I read a great many books, built a great deal upon it. I didn't fully disagree with them. But I still feel that they didn't prove it. But I still think it is an interesting fact to know. (7

4. The Bible clearly teaches that death is not the end.

This is a fact that Christians could well stress and drive home to the people's hearts. And I think that it would be (8) in driving home of this, to get into the consciousness of the unbelieving world that which they already have a natural feeling for believing, but which in many cases they push aside by the philosophical spreading of doubts of immortality. That as far as immortality is concerned, all our arguments, and theories and philosophies prove nothing whatever, but the Bible clearly proves that the teaching of the Bible is that the human soul is immortal. But how you use the word soul we are not worried about the promotion. There is something, the individual, that the person does not come to an end at death. Now that is not emphasized a great deal in the Old Testament. It is emphasized much more in the New Testament. The Old Testament was written by people who came up out

of Egypt. And in Egypt the immortality was tremendously overstressed. In ancient Egypt half of the activity of life was the preparing for the after life. People spent tremendous sums of money in ~~gathering~~ gathering sacrifices to take for their death. Not a sacrifice as such that you give to appease a deity, but a sacrifice which consists of food that the dead might have it to eat. They gave great amounts of food to the dead, then they decided they could fool them with pictures, and they would get just as much good out of it, so they began putting pictures in with them. But they spent a great deal on elaborate pictures, pictures of food, pictures of horses for them to ride, pictures of all sorts of things for them to use, and so much of human effort went into it, that altogether was wrong, and there seemed to be a playing down of it in the Old Testament. But there is a definite assumption throughout and an assumption that beyond ^{this} life, there is a continuance.

There are frequent warnings against consulting ~~minim~~ the dead. Consulting those who claimed to be able to summon the spirits of the dead. And reference to the dead, often consisted of a statement of going down to Sheol. Or in some way the word Sheol is used, which is the Old Testament term, to indicate the (I don't know whether you can say Sheol is the place) but I think it is certainly wrong to say that Sheol is the grave. No one ever speaks of digging a Sheol. It is not a grave. It is the grave, if you want, in a (11) sense, of the place where the soul goes, it is not where the body goes. Sheol as the grave, is not a direct sense, as David's death, that you will bring down my grey hairs to Sheol. He's not saying these grey hairs are to be put in a grave, because there is no (11½) in prayer, in taking physical Sheol as the grave. And there are many references, to the soul being in Sheol, of people going to Sheol.

Sheol is a state of existence beyond the grave. For us with a clear New Testament teaching about the separation between the saved and the lost, there is a problem in that the word Sheol is used for the righteous dead, and it is used for the wicked dead, as the place to which they go. And so some have suggested that Sheol was that all of the dead were together, and then they are separated afterwards. Well, there is no evidence for that statement. I think that the trouble is that Sheol, is

probably like our word ~~abroad~~ ⁽¹²⁾. It is the matter that the Lord has not given us much yet, but he has given us a few clear indications, but he has given them less. But what he has given us, is far more clear, that there is continuous life after death, but the term Sheol I believe, to go to Sheol is like going ~~mm~~ abroad. Abroad means to go out of this country. You go abroad if you go to China, you go abroad if you go to Europe. Abroad is China, abroad is Europe, abroad is somewhere away from here. I don't think so much that Sheol is a specific place, so much as it is all places together where the dead may be. It combines together in one common term. I was very much troubled when I was a little boy, about tomorrow. They all said, what are you going to do tomorrow? No body ever said it is now tomorrow. They tell me that one time as a little boy, I woke up in the middle of the night, and I said, Is this ~~tomorrow~~? When is this morrow? Well morrow as you know is the concept that refers to a relationship as does abroad. Abroad is that which is on the other side of the ocean. Well now, Sheol is that which is beyond death.

But Sheol is used quite a large number of times in the Old Testament, and the reference to it in the Old Testament makes it very definite, that it was not greatly stressed, that there is continued life after death. In the Psalms, we have references to the believer, acceptation of communion with God after death. When you get to the New Testament, the evidence of immortality is much more stressed. There's no change from the Old Testament, ^{but} there is a greater specification, and there is more stress on it. The New Testament very frequently refers to the survival of the soul.

S-86.

The New Testament has many references to the coming resurrection. That there will be the life of the righteous and of the wicked.

$\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: I believe that it is differentiated here in this way that it is not something which can be $(\frac{3}{4})$ by anyone who is lost. But I don't think that it is a specific name for a place for the designation of the condition of being among the saved. I don't think that it is a term that is used a great deal, but it is a figurative term, which means to go with those who are sharing in the gospel age.

(Question: Yes. But we will discuss that more further on. Right at the present, I'm simply interested in the definite point that death is not the end. And ~~Hann~~ Gehannah is used of the reference to individuals beyond death.

2 (Question: The word immortal is used in several senses. The term immortal is used in a sense of having a quality of indestructibility. And I think that we can definitely say that that is not something that we naturally have. We do not have immortal in that sense. God is immortal in the sense that he has no beginning, he has no ending, that he could not possibly be destroyed. Adam was immortal in the sense that there was no need of his dying. There was no necessary reason why Adam should die. In that sense he was immortal. It is quite different from the way God is immortal. Then Adam lost that and became mortal, because sin came in, and put him in a state where death was inevitable. We receive eternal life, and then we receive the resurrected body, a body that does not have the seed of (3). A body which there is no reason why it should not continue forever. It is immortal in a different sense than God is immortal. That is all it means of course, but it is used in a different sense.

3½ (Question: Yes, in connection with Lazarus there. But I don't recall any other case. I don't recall any other place. The Sheol is the common word used. In the New Testament, Hades would seem to correspond with Sheol. But in the New Testament we don't need to be quite as interested in the use of the term Hades, as we are in the term Sheol in the Old Testament, for the simple reason that we have much more evidence, in the New Testament. We have in the New Testament so many references to the souls as continuing after death. We have so many references to the resurrection - the resurrection of the just, the resurrection of the unjust. We have so many references to the blessed life of believers in communion with God. I don't think I'll give you the references to these now, because we will look at them individually, when looking at details later. But simply to say that the evidence is very clear in the Scripture that life continues after death. Death is not the end. And I would think that simply as a matter of general propaganda, that it would be very helpful to bring to the consciousness of the unbelieving one, the scriptural

evidence of the fact that life does continue after death. People as a whole, are not nearly so conscious of this fact as they need to be, and this is the basis used for taking an interest in religion.

Paul says, "If in this life alone we have hope in Christ, we are all men most miserable." It is very, very hard for me to feel that Paul is right in that statement. Very hard for me to feel it. When you compare the life of the one who has the joys in Christ, in this world, with the life of the one who is living in sin, when you see the misery and the frustration, that comes to most of those who are living, when you see the amount of time and effort they put seeking joys that don't ~~genuinely~~ satisfy, and how the pleasure of struggling for something and accomplishing it, and then in most cases, the frustrated feeling of finding simply that it does not satisfy at all. And when you compare it in this life with the joy of a real Christian, the life of the real Christian is certainly under normal circumstances, far superior in this life to that of a non-Christian. Now, Paul may have been simply referring to the time of the persecution, when the Christian was standing in the face of persecution, and misery, and so much opposition, that they thought, why should we go through all this? if in this life alone we have faith in Christ. Or he may have been using it in a comparative sense. If in this life alone we have faith in Christ, well, that is not (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) of what this
if
 can mean. But what he said is in this life alone we have hope in Christ, then we are all men most miserable. He said, if there is no resurrection, let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die. I don't quite think that Paul would go to that point, I think that he was giving it a comparative (6:75) to
 stress ?
~~express~~ the importance of the duty in the resurrection.

But this truth that the value that we get for Christianity from this life, naturally applies for 10, 20, 50 years, but the value that we get from it for eternal life, may perhaps applies to million and billion of years. So comparatively it is a far greater sense. And certainly with the unbeliever, if he thinks that he will have a lot more pleasure in his type of worldly living, then to live like the Christian does. If he thinks he will, I don't think that he does, if he

(7 $\frac{1}{4}$), but if he thinks that way, to realize that his life is a tiny fraction of eternity, and that he has millions of years to go through afterward, in one condition or another. This is enough to make him seriously consider what the facts are

The arguments of the philosopher here, do not prove anything in this, but the Bible clearly teaches and revelation does prove, that death is not the end, and we don't go into a lot of evidences on it because almost every thing we give we'll look at it later anyway.

5. Death is un-natural and shows that something is wrong.

With our Christian teaching with our victory over death, and with our attempt to conquer, the Christian. It is easy for us to push this thought into the background. But this is the scripturally taught fact about death. It is that which naturally occurs to us, as a body, when we don't try to explain it away first, and it is a vital fact, and something which we should retain in our dealings with others. The realization that death is unnatural, and shows that something is wrong. Death is not simply the natural consummation of life. It is not simply the result of man's failure to rise to the height of immortality by the fact of obedience. It is not that. It is something which is wrong, something which is unnatural, something which should not be. It is something in life, that ought not to be here. ~~(man)~~. It is formed and consummated in man's life.

90
Psalms 78: 7 - 11, describes it as an expression of divine anger. "We are consumed by thy anger, and by thy wrath are we troubled. Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance. For all our days are passed away in thy wrath: we spend our years as a tale that is told. The days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labour and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away." Death is presented in the 90th Psalm as an expression of divine anger.

Romans 1: 32 describes it as a judgment. "Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death." Not just that death is going to come to everybody, but that it is a judgment. They that commit such things are

worthy of death.

Romans 5: 16. It is a condemnation. "The judgment was by one unto condemnation." "If through the offense of one many be dead". It is a condemnation. It is a judgment. It is described as a curse, in Galatians 3: 13. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. We are apt in comforting Christians to represent death as a turn in the road. Just a turn in the side of a hill. We can't see ahead, and it looks as if it is a sudden drop. But we just go around, and continue. There is a very real sense in which that is true to the believer, that death loses a good part of its sting, but it does not lose all of it. And for the unbeliever it is an unalloyed (12 $\frac{1}{2}$). It is something that is unnatural, It shows that something is wrong in life.

6. Death is the result of sin.

Most of the verses at which we have looked, and a great many more would simply stress this fact that death is the result of sin. And sin is in the universe, and death is universal. Death came into the world through sin. Death is the result of sin. And death is a punishment for sin. That is the matter which one meets if one must manage to live nowadays, that sin is about us, and we recognize it in others, but that sin has its fruit in death. Death is universal.

7. For the Christian, the sting has been removed from death.

"O death, where is thy sting, O grave where is thy victory." There is still a sting, there is still a victory. But it has been tremendously palliated, it has been tremendously cut down. Paul says, "for me to live is

S-87.

The sting has been removed, palliated, but it still is unnatural. It still is something that requires the grace of God, for us to pass through it as we should, and for us to recognize in others, that they are better and happier (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) and yet - I remember when my father died, for, I think it was three months afterwards, why, that there is a tiny thing appeared with it, so near I could hardly hold them

back, but the tiniest little thing that would happen,

(1). And yet the emotion me so, that much as I loved my mother, she was pushed out of my consciousness. I felt the desire to do everything I could to comfort her. The desire to do everything I could to help her, in this situation, but it was an intellectual desire, which felt that it was the duty, and I wanted my best to do it, but the emotion was so filled with the filling that when I received that telegram from 3000 miles away, that he had gone like that, that I could not understand. My lack toward any strong feeling toward my mother (1½). The only way that I could explain it, was that ? whole my overcapacity for emotion, was occupied with the lack of . I felt exactly the same way , exactly the same way. But it is there. It is real. God wants to show that this unnatural thing is terrible in between the sin that God can be palliated for the sins, and ~~that~~ we can come to see that it is a thing that we must pass through, but he is with us, when we pass through, it, and he takes us into something better, than what we pass through. But yet the ~~sting~~ sting is there. And for the normal Christian it is unavoidable.

2½ (Question: Yes. I just wondered how long we should take with that. That is a very definite matter. The texts which are alleged to prove annihilation by something, but I don't think that most have that as a problem. # And so I think it is a good idea that we can have some special reading on that. All those apparent things, can be explained by the observation, that they are in the discussion of

(3), They are not the presentation of Ecclesiastes where it is giving the thought of man under the sun. Or that they terminologies examined carefully does not necessarily point in that direction. And more than that, they can be completely off-set by a far greater matter that further things continue constantly of

.(3½), And that we in dealing with it, and to go into detail, I don't think that we have the time.

But I think that it is very important for us to realize that though there are human beings who on philosophical ground try to prove annihilation, at death, that the scripture clearly teaches ~~that~~ (4) and that

the alleged scripture passages are an annihilation, is in most cases quite easily explained in one of the

8. Ultimately, death will be removed altogether.

We are told that the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. We are given the hope, we are given the assurance that death as a normal constant feature of human life, will not continue. This is in I Corinthians 15: 26. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

Capital C. The Intermediate State.

It is interesting to note that the term, the Intermediate State, is thought that what comes right after death is not a final state. And it is very interesting that some theologies would say very little about the final death, or about the final resurrection, or about great eschatological events, but they still stress this term quite a bit, the Intermediate State. The state that has become well established. The term has become well established. The Intermediate State. For the moment we are not concerning ourselves with the fact of it being intermediate. We are thinking of it for the moment, as the state which comes when death occurs.

Number 1. We have no way of learning anything about the Intermediate state, apart from Scripture. We stressed that about death, but it is worth stressing with every point, because there is so much use of human reason to reason out matters on which we don't have the data on which to reason. And particularly in spheres like this. There are good men who discuss what happen after death. There is no way to know, except to see what God reveals, because none of us has ever been there. But though we had no way of knowing anything about it, apart from scripture, there are quite a sizable group of people today who think that aside from human reasoning, they have a way of knowing things about it, and that is through spirits, through communication with the dead. And we will come into contact with them, and it is well that we have some idea about it.

What is spirit? I think that we can safely say that a great part of it is

(7). There is no question about it. But I don't think that we can say

that it always does. Sir Oliver Lodge ⁽⁷⁾ was a great English figure. An outstanding

son. His son was killed in France in the first world war. And Sir Oliver Lodge became convinced that his - the spirit of his son had returned, and had brought messages to him. That he had come into contact with his son. And he wrote books on it, and he went about lecturing on it, ~~travelling~~ about the world lecturing on it. And I heard him lecture in Los Angeles, when he told about his interest in this, and the certainty that his son had communicated with him. But one thing he told was about the psychic society with which he was in contact, and how this society was sending - was gathering together information from all over the world. People who thought they had communication with the dead. And that these mediums who received messages were messages from the dead. And he said that various men in the society would write a message and put it in a sealed envelope, and put it away, and the idea was that they wouldn't tell a soul what it was. And afterwards, they were dead ~~and~~, they would convey the message to some medium and that would prove that it was really they that were talking. Now he said, I've never got into this myself, because I know that if I did, I would forget the message. And he said, I would get it twisted when I would send it back, ~~and~~ he said ^{so} (8 $\frac{1}{2}$). But he said there was the leader of the Psychic Research Society in London, who had done that, and he said that he was out on a vacation one time, and when he got back, the people in the office told him, we've had a message from Australia, a medium there gave a message, and we just can't make any sense out of it. They said, it purports to be a message from the dead, and here's what it says, and we can't see what it relates to. How could anybody ever ^{think to} say a thing like it. And he said the minute he looked at it, why, he said, that's my ^{9.} message. He said, Those are the words that I have written, and put in an envelope, to be proof that I have communicated them. And here it has come to a medium in Australia, according to what Oliver Lodge said. That man who had written it was still living. Well, now, it seems to me that that ^{his} which I heard indicated was a pretty conclusive proof that all of ~~that~~ alleged evidence proved absolutely nothing. I should say, proved absolutely nothing as to the thing that he was trying to prove, that there was communication with the dead.

Here was a marvelous thing. Something written in London secretly, and put in an

envelope, sealed away, nobody knows. A medium in Australia received it. Its a marvelous thing, but it does not prove communication with the dead. He is living. He is not dead. What does it prove? I don't think anybody knows, but I think that it does show that this method of alleged proof is just absolutely worthless. The Witch of Endor was asked by Saul to bring up Samuel, and when she proceeded, (she didn't know he was Saul)- she was afraid of Saul. He had ordered that none of this be done.) But she didn't know it was Saul. He was disguised. And she went through this business, to bring up Samuel, and then we read that Samuel came and when he came, the woman was scared and fainted. Why was she upset and fainted, when the very thing happened which she was trying to do? She said she was going to cause it to be done. I don't think there's any question, that she had no expectation that Samuel would come back.

There is undoubtedly a great part of spiritism which is false. There is human method used, to fool people and to trick people, but I don't think that accounts for all of it by any means. And I do believe that there are evil spirits in all of this, which are tricking people. When my aunt was lying very sick in Los Angeles, she had cancer in her lungs. And she was lying there very sick, and her sister-in-law ~~from~~ ^{from} up in Montana, went to a medium and she said that she was hardly in the room, before this medium began to point to her chest, and began to writhe in agony, o, it hurts, it hurts, the very place where the cancer was. But she had no way of knowing. ^{Now} ~~And~~ there could have been some trick that she found out that she found out something about this person, but I think that at that time it was extremely unlikely. My inclination is to think that it was an evil spirit. But she went on to say, but I don't see death, I don't see any death. Which was completely wrong, because my aunt died in a month thereafter. And I don't think that evil spirits would have any way of knowing. Only God knows the future. But I do think that there are evil spirits which trick people, and that in the case of the Witch of Endor, God caused that Samuel himself would come back, in order to rebuke Saul. The scripture tells us that Samuel talked to Saul, and what he said to Saul was exactly what Samuel would say, not what some mind would say which is a spirit talking. And in the case of

Saul, I believe that God sent the spirit of Samuel back, but I do not think that spiritism proves any such thing as communication with the dead. I don't think that it proves continual existence after life, or anything about it.

But it does seem to me that a certain portion of it, is related to the spirit world, the world of evil spirits, which undoubtedly exists and is a real factor in life. But as far as our knowledge of the intermediate state is concerned, human philosophy, human theories, and ideas are worth nothing, and the alleged evidence from the spirit world is worth absolutely nothing. There is only one place to find out, and that is the word of God. But one thing that the Word of God very clearly teaches is that in the intermediate state, there is a clear, sharp division, between the saved and the lost.

Number two. In the intermediate state, there is a sharp division between the saved and the lost. One place that brings that out most clearly is the passage that has already been referred, to. The story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. There we have the story that Christ tells us as a fact, he does not say it is a parable. Even if you were to take it as a parable, however, a parable which the Lord gives where he talks about the condition of the dead, would hardly be simply an illustration. I can tell you about something that I saw in St. Peters Church in Rome can be an illustration. But I certainly did intend to tell you what is true about it. And if you went to St. Peter's Church and saw things exactly the same way as I described them to you,

S-88.

It is describing the condition of the death. And he says here that Abraham said to the rich man, "Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence." The sharp gulf is presented here as being a sharp division, between the saved and the lost. There is a book by S. C. Lewis called the

"Great Divorce." The title is absolutely misleading to anyone today, because it has nothing in the world to do with divorce between man and woman. It is divorce between heaven and hell. But the book is of course utterly uninspired. It is a human device. It is purely an illustration. It is not like the statement that Christ gives about it. Christ says, its this way. We know that it's this way. Whether he is giving us an illustration, or whether it is a specific event. And when C. S. Lewis gives it, it is his imagination. But in his imagination, he brings out very strikingly the division between the saved and the lost. He illustrates it very, very forcibly. He has a very strong idea that the lost can go and visit the saved, so they come there in a bus from hell to heaven in the afternoon. Or they can go over there when they want. And they can stay there if they want, after they get there. But he shows them as being so utterly incompatible, that there is a sharp gulf fixed, that they are ready to go back, because they are utterly unhappy there in that situation in which they are so utterly unfit. I think that the illustration of the sharp gulf is most beautiful.

The complete division between the saved and the lost. It is given to man once to die and after that the judgment. There is no scriptural evidence of any opportunity to pass over the gulf after death. There is no scriptural evidence of any opportunity for a change. Now one of the early Popes read about Virgil

~~and~~, and he was so interested in Virgil, that he prayed the Lord to change Virgil, move Virgil over from hell to heaven, and he thought he did that. Well, that is purely imagination. There is no scriptural proof.

3 (Question: In the intermediate state. Well, now, I wouldn't quite follow you on what you just said. We are not sure whether this is a parable, or whether it was a statement of fact, which means that we do not know whether he is telling about a particular individual. Or whether he is saying, imagining that individual going, but in either case, it says the person went to Abraham's bosom. You say a sower went forth to sow. And you aren't speaking about any one sower. There might be a hundred who go. But there are some who do it, or it wouldn't be apparent.

There wouldn't be a lack of it. And he would say the sower sows, and some fell on good ground, and some fell on bad ground. You say, Well, now that doesn't happen. It's not true to life. It would destroy the whole parable. [?] ~~mean~~ What I mean is the background of the parable must be true to its effect. So I think that it is a valid evidence for this, whether Lazarus was just an illustrated person, or whether he was one particular person, or not. But I don't know of quite any other, that is as explicitly stated, on the intermediate state, ~~annihil~~ per se, but the statement, it is given unto man once to die, and that after that judgment, seems to say quite clearly, that the death ends the opportunity. That judgment is one or the other. It seems to me that makes it clear.

there
Now ~~that~~ is abundant evidence from the resurrection, of the

(4 $\frac{1}{2}$)

But the intermediate state, is a thing that we don't have a great deal about. So what little we have about it, does seem to fall under two categories. Like in Revelation where you speak of the Soul

We don't have any picture anywhere of souls knit together. We have this clear statement that there is a great gulf fixed, and then we have that statement, it is given unto men once to die and after that the judgment. It seems to imply that there is no possibility of change.

5/4/57.

We are looking at individual eschatology. And under it we took a. The Introduction to Eschatology in General, and then b. death, and we noticed that death is a fact of universal observation, that the significance is not naturally determinable. I think that that is extremely important. 3. That mankind has a widespread hope of immortality, stressed, and put everywhere, but I think very important. Man's ideas prove nothing. It is God's word that proves. But we should know about it. Number 4. The Bible teaches very clearly that death is not the end. There is no teaching in the Bible anywhere that there is annihilation after death. Number five is extremely important. Death is unnatural. It is not representative in the Bible as simply a natural change, something that is just an ordinary course of nature. It is a rend, it is a tear. It is something that is unnatural. No matter how clearly

we believe the Bible, how truly we know we are saved through Christ, it is a rend and a tear, for us when our loved ones go to be with the Lord. Because it is an unnatural thing. Death is. Death is not a normal thing. It is something which sin has brought on us. And death is the result of sin. Now number five and six here, are proved from the scripture, and you can make arguments from observations, the feeling and all that may be of value in talking with people, but it doesn't prove anything. Number 7, for the Christian the sting has been removed from death. So as far as oneself is concerned, ^{one} ~~that~~ can very well say that death is just a turn in the road. A twist around a mountain side. A change of a distance. Something that is natural. It is natural and unnatural. It is the unnatural, the wrong thing that sin has produced, from which Christ has taken away the sting from Christians. Therefore he wants us to know this is removed, and trust in him, and have no fear of death, but as far as others are concerned, he wants us to realize that it is unnatural. That we have to experience some of its painful and miserable features of this unnatural thing, which man by his sin has brought into the world.

and then we noticed that 8, ultimately death will be removed altogether. And then I took up 6. The Intermediate State, and I don't like, I mean, in our outline, the term intermediate state assumes something beyond. Someone asked me at the end of the hour, what is the intermediate state? What do I mean by it? I wish that had been asked at the beginning when I came to the point. Because if I give any title which is not clear, I wish you would ask it immediately. We are short now, because justification, and sanctification, which were supposed to be covered in Systematic 3, we had to cover this term. And so we are short, and we have to rush, and I don't dare take much time with extended discussion upon points from here on in eschatology. But if there is anything that I don't make clear what I mean, or if there are any terms which aren't clear, please ask me immediately. Because it is very clear that we must understand, that everything should be clear of what we mean. And if you have vital differences of opinion upon this thing, I wish we had time to have a long period of discussion on them.

If you have a question of clarity raise it. If you have a point of a difference

of opinion on a matter which you think is comparatively vital, you could write it out, and turn it into me. And in that case, I could see how much time, we dare give to it.

But by the immediate state, we actually mean, that which comes immediately after death. But we cannot (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) because everything that the scripture says about what happens immediately after death, it has about five or six things to say about things later on. The resurrection is the hope of the Christian. Not what follows after. Now that has to a great extent been forgotten in the Christian Church, which is unfortunate. And the general teaching of the Christian Church, (I mean that the General Church, even the comparatively orthodox church,) has been, here is heaven, and here is hell. You die and you go to heaven. Or you die and you go to hell. Well, that's not the scriptural teaching. The scripture teaching is not prepare in this life to go to heaven, and spend the rest of eternity in heaven. That's not it. The scripture is - those who believe in Christ, he will raise from the dead, and he will give them the resurrected body, the resurrection intermediate? is our hope, not the individual state. We go into that under that in resurrection, but I'm only mentioning it here as justification, for a wide spread term, the intermediate state. The intermediate state is that which comes between death and the resurrection. What is our condition that we are in then? And under that I mentioned number one, that we have no way of learning any thing about it, except from scripture. And this was a point that was worth/constantly reiterating. Because people imagine about the future life, and we mentioned spiritism and its alleged method of getting truth, and we said that there is nothing to it, except something should happen as it did in the case of Saul, that God permitted Samuel to come back and talk with him, we have no reason to think that such a thing will ever come in our age. We know it did happen on that particular occasion. So we really have no right in ourselves to say we know anything about the intermediate state, and those who claim to, it can be proven to rest on no solid foundation.

There is one way though, and that is what the Bible says. It just exactly like the Bible, and what the Words of the Bible say, however, when I was in college, we had

a big debate. I was on a debater's team. We talked about the
 or something like ^{that} (13) and we had two

, and we were presenting

. And the

fellow on the other side got up and said, we're not interested in the land of

Where is

Where is it? I don't know. The next time I met a

, I said

how many people

in New Zealand? He said, none. He said

at all.

And I found that this man, had taken that

statement directly verbatim out of a book.

. But I would say that there is no

New Zealand. But there is no way in the world I could tell,

whether there are coconuts or palms in New Zealand, except by going there, or

. And there is no reason in the world, why

I could know anything about the intermediate state, except by going there myself, and talking with someone who had been there, or receiving a revelation from someone who knows. And God has revealed unto us very, very vividly about the intermediate state. But he has revealed a few things, and that is all we know about it.

2. In the intermediate state there is a sharp division between the saved and the lost. We do not have any great amount of proof for this.

S-89.

But this he said, that we do have one passage which it seems to me should be enough to decide the matter, even though it is not very natural. That is Luke 23: 42, 43. But Luke 16 seems to me to be quite conclusive, that Abraham said, to the rich man, there is a great gulf fixed. Now you may say, Yes, but how do we know if this rich man is a real man? How do we know this Lazarus is a real man? How do we know this actually happened? Maybe Jesus was just telling a story. Last Friday afternoon, some of us heard the vice-president of a company, ~~man~~ tell what happened

St. Peter when ~~he~~ was talking to a Protestant in heaven. And you hear all kinds of ~~st~~.stories

of St. Peter in heaven, and some of them are very interesting. But they prove absolutely nothing. They are people's imaginary stories. But if I were to tell you a story about events in a German university, and I were to make up the story. And I were to say, now Mr. Taylor went over to Germany to study, and when he came into (2½) he found so and so and they did such and such, and described some of the peculiar happenings there. You would say, ~~that~~ Dr. MacRae studied for 2½ years in Germany. He knows conditions there. At least what they were when he was a student. Now if he makes up a story, the people and events may be made up to illustrate a point, but the background which he puts into it, he is going to put into line with his knowledge, of the situation. And it would be ridiculous that I should tell a story about something that I am familiar with, and give a background which is not true. Now I might ~~deal~~ deal with events and situations and imagine the background to make the story more interesting, which I do not know whether it might be that way or not. But I certainly would not give anything contrary to the situation I know about. If I told you a story about ~~people's life in~~ ^{people's life in} China, all that I say may not be true, because I've never been there. I know very little about it.

But Jesus Christ knows all about everything. And he certainly knows about the intermediate state. And whether it seems to be most likely, he told an actual fact, ~~the~~ an actual rich man, and a natural beggar, and what happened to them, and Abraham actually said what he was supposed to have said, and the rich man said what he was supposed to be saying, which I think is most likely, for there is nothing in it to indicate that it is a parable, and it is not customarily in Parables to give in it, names like this, or to speak of them in this fashion. And yet that doesn't prove that it isn't a parable. If it is a parable, if he wants to present a point, and so he imagines a man doing this, yet the background of it, he would approve in line with what he had said. And therefore when Jesus represents Abraham as saying, to the rich man, there is a great gulf fixed, and no one can pass over. That either shows that that actually happened, which is very interesting, or it shows that Jesus Christ imagines people talking under situations which are the true situations. And in either of them, it is the authority of Christ, rather than of the authority of the rich man

or Lazarus

, and which indicates

. It is when Jesus Christ causes this to be said here, there is a great gulf fixed and no one can pass over it, that that is the true situation, whether Abraham actually said it to any particular rich man or not. So to my mind, we need no further proof that there is a great gulf fixed. A sharp division between the saved and the lost in the after life, then this story that Jesus told in Luke 16. Now in connection with that, we might also of course bring in the definite statement which is familiar to all of you, that he that believeth on the son hath life, he that believeth not the son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.

These statements are not speaking of the intermediate state, but they are surely teaching that the division between the saved and the lost was clearly established in this life, and from that a considerable (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) that there is a marked difference, between the saved and the lost, as soon as they die. That This life is the time of probation. There is no evidence in the scripture whatever for another time of probation. But someone may raise a question. I do not believe that a question can properly be raised on the story of the matter of the rich man and Lazarus. It seems to me that that makes it clear that there is a great gulf fixed.

Number 3. All the souls are fully conscience in the intermediate state.

Now here is a matter upon which we could spend several hours, in which we could take up the various theories that have been advanced. During the Middle Ages there was a group that maintained that souls slept until the time of the Resurrection. John Calvin wrote his first theological work which he called

(6 $\frac{1}{2}$) against this theory, in order to prove that souls do not sleep, but that there is consciousness, of all souls during the period between death and the resurrection. There are those in modern times, and some of our theology books discuss, who have advanced the idea that when we die we go to sleep. There is simply a cessation, which is almost annihilation but not quite. It is a cessation, a consciousness, it is just a condition, whether it be the lost, or the saved, or that some are saved in the one, and some unsaved in the other. But there is no scriptural

warrant, for any such view. Now you may have to deal with it sometime, because if you deal with various cults, you will find that some of them present views like this today. But there is no scriptural warrant for such. There is rather definite scriptural warrant against it. Just to point out one interesting fact, which again is not extremely precise, and yet I think is quite strong, Isaiah 14, describes the coming of the king of Babylon into Sheol, and describes there what the others are saying to him, as he comes. And they picture him as coming down there and meeting together, which could be thought of perhaps as figurative, but it would hardly sound as a figure should be given.

"They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee," "Thou shalt be brought down to sheol, to the sides of the pit. They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, and consider thee, saying, Is this the man that made the earth to tremble? - Thou art cast out of thy grave like an abominable branch." The Lord of Host had sworn what is going to happen to the king of Babylon. The suggestion might be made that part of it is figurative, and yet I think that the language goes beyond that. It does suggest a conscious continuous state for that. Now of course someone say, this is looking forward to the last judgment days. It does not prove that souls shall live between. So I would not want to build too much from that portion. But it fits in with the idea of a conscious continuous state for the wicked. It's easy to get much more evidence of the continued consciousness on the part of the righteous. Of course, Luke 16 again implies continuous consciousness on part, the wicked and the righteous. But we have, I would say, very clear evidence for the consciousness of the righteous prior to the resurrection though our material on the wicked is quite good.

For the righteous, II Corinthians 5:6-8, certainly sounds as though he expects to be conscious. "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. We walk by faith, not by sight. We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." I might say that I like Europe very much. I've always enjoyed travelling to Europe. Wouldn't it be nice to spend the next six nights in

Europe rather than in America. Well, I think it would be rather silly. As a matter of fact, I've only been to Mexico once in my life, and that time I was on a train, and we went through it while I was fast asleep. So sometimes I question whether I can say that I visited Mexico. My body passed through it, but to speak of it as something that is of interest to you, or pleasant, would hardly be sensible, but when Paul says, we are ready to be present with the Lord, that this would mean a state of suspended consciousness, would hardly seem to fit at all into the nature of the state.

Philippians 1: 23. Paul speaks of the state of death. "For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better." Will he be with Christ in a state of unconsciousness? Surely it means that it is something that involves consciousness, that is far better, and it is spoken of as with Christ. With someone in sleep is hardly a reasonable

11(Question: Now there has been discussion about that. We know that if our earthly house, that if this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens. Is that referring to the resurrection body, or is it referring to the place to which we go at death. There is discussion about that. There are theories advanced. Hodge has a discussion about it. It seems to me that it's not so apt to mean the resurrection body, as to mean the state we're in. Some hold it is the resurrection body. We will be referring back to this very definitely. There is certainly in the context, aspects of the resurrection, no question of that. But he seems to leave that thought when he goes on to verse 6, that we are all responsible, that while knowing we are home in the body, we're absent from the Lord. (12) we might say, to be willing to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord, but he seems to be speaking there of the immediate state, rather than

Revelation 6: 9 - 10. The soul is speaking and longing for changes in which there is a certain consciousness. Hodge has three pages which I think are quite good refutation of it. We will not take more time on it at this time. We could spend more time on it.

Number 4. Consideration of the condition of the saved in the intermediate state.

Small a. They are declared to be in the very presence of Christ.

Let's look for a minute at Psalms 17. The psalmist sees the wickedness of man around him, He sees their wickedness and evil, but he has in verse 15, the practical declaration of this bearing upon himself. He says, As for me, he speaks of the wicked who leave lots of their property to their children, Evidently, he doesn't have any belief. He says in verse 15, "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness. Now we don't have to go into the thorough determination of whether it means, I am going to awake in the likeness of Christ, or whether he'll be transformed into his likeness, or whether I awake, being his likeness. But whichever we take it, it certainly shows the person as being in the presence of Christ, satisfied with his presence, and -

S-90.

It is where Christ said to the penitent thief, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." It is in the presence of - it is in his presence.

2. (Question: There are two verses I think on 1st John, which look directly in the direction of an immediate . (2) Certainly, both of them show an eventual in the righteousness of Christ. There's no question about that. I would not deny that in both cases the argument can be made which can greatly lessen the force of these two verses as an argument for the but there is nothing in the argument against it. They certainly do not show, I will be satisfied one hour later, as I might be after I awake from soul sleep. But it would equally likely be when I awake in heaven, I'll rejoice. So they don't prove soul sleep at all, but I wouldn't build upon these few verses.

II Corinthians 5: 1-8. Again in this connection I think that the thing which we are stressing here, shows that we are willing to be absent from the body and present with the Lord, while the great part of the verses look forward to the resurrection. That would certainly not convey the slightest ^{THOUGH} (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) that Paul said, I'm willing now to end this life, and begin the long period of sleep, which precedes

the time when I will be present with the Lord. The whole implication of the verse is I pass from this into the other.

Philippians 1: 21-23 again, the implication of this is very strong, where he says, "For ^{to} me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." To die is more Christ. To live is Christ. To die is to invest. If I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor. Yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ;" Well, it certainly gives the impression that when he departs, then he immediately is with Christ, which is far better. Having a desire to depart and to start that long journey of sleep, which preceeds the time that I will be with Christ, is far better. It is quite an interruption to the passage. It doesn't fit at all with his argument. If it is to establish the case, it should be at least more specific. But it is true that if the word today was inserted in such a way that was grammatical, there could be question about it, then (5) on this point. But the only evidence for the whole thing is the use of the phrase seed as in relation to that. And that's the greatest evidence figure, that a literal statement is used. There is no actual evidence for it, only God and man.

Well a then, they are declared to be in the very presence of Christ.

Small b. Their condition is represented as one of bliss. I think the passages we've just looked at are sufficient evidence on that. Luke 16, certainly shows the condition of bliss in Abraham's bosom. Paul's desire of which is far better is certainly a condition of bliss.

Small c. It is represented as an incomplete condition, though never as one of probation. It is represented as an incomplete condition. Now our strongest passage perhaps on that, I Corinthians 15, and II Corinthians 5. II Corinthians 5, he says, "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Does that refer to the resurrection body, or simply to God's preparation for us. A house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. Well, he continues, "For in

this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." It suggests an unclothed state, which is not the eventual glory, but the clothed state, if the heavenly house is the resurrection body which is a parallel to this earthly tabernacle, which is certainly the present body, strongly suggests that it very clearly refers to the intermediate state, as imperfect. However, if you take it in the other sense, even so, there is the suggestion (7 1/3). It is not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up with life.

I Corinthians 15 is the great passage about the resurrection, which we are not yet speaking about, but the great stress in it on the resurrection certainly implies that that which precedes the resurrection is imperfect. He put this tremendous emphasis here on the resurrection. He says, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain." And he stresses this very much, the very great importance of the resurrection of Christ, and the resurrection which he describes in here, as coming to us. "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump. - The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. - This corruptible must put on incorruption." So the state of - the intermediate state is an incomplete condition ~~state of probation~~, but I thought as I wrote down that it represented an incomplete condition, that might sound ~~as if~~ to someone that it is a state of probation. And so I added, never a state of probation. This is to guard against the misunderstanding of the state.

On the other hand, the idea that it is a complete state, the idea that there is nothing more, once we die, seems to me to be based purely on one passage which I don't think proves it at all. That is Hebrews 12, where we read, in Hebrews 12: 22, "But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general

assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." Well, the spirits of just men made perfect, here, is sometimes taken as proving that immediately at death, we are made absolutely perfect, but it certainly does not say that it expresses all the blessings we have in Christ Jesus. And it seems to be that we are already

are (10) to the spirits of just men made perfect, that we already have fellowship with those who are justified through Christ, and who are being made perfect through Him, rather than that this is a scriptural death. It is sometimes said, Immediately at death, we are completely sanctified. I think that it is true that immediately at death, we are separated from all temptation, from all incitation to sin in the universe. That is death.

But the state is a condition, and surely we are growing, and we are constantly progressing ~~unshakably~~, even though we are no longer, that is, Christ is in us.

11 (Question: It is due to the fact that the natural state of man is a state which involves us, that man is incomplete .

11 (Question: Well, not simply that, we read in I John, there is more to it of course, then that. That's a very, very important statement, but I John 3: 2. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear, what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him." Not, we know that when we shall go to be with him, we shall be like him, but that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him. It refers to the coming of Christ, the time when we, with our resurrection body like unto his, are made perfect and holy. Now we are free from all incitations in sin, from every thing negatively immediately at death, of course, but during that period there is no (12).

12 (Question: We can not be precise on it. It is equivalent, but not identical. We're not identical with him, we're not the son of God. We are not absolutely young. our power is not unlimited, we are not omnipresent, we do not have the attributes of God. But we will have person, we will have spiritual nourishment

completely free of all tendencies , and we will have in addition the positive strength to be separate and holy, and we will be like him, equivalent in our development, not as though we are identical.

13 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: Let me say this. The intermediate state is imperfect in that we do not have a body. It is incomplete in that we are wait for his completion at the return of Christ, which is the time when he shall appear, and we shall be like him. The time for which we long, through which we (14). We can say that. Now we will say that as to whether immediately at death, there is a complete change of our body, not merely in our soul, not merely the removal of sin, but the complete advance in holiness, the ultimate claims that he will have at his resurrection, are not in the matter on which, as far as I know, the Scripture does not teach, and therefore a man is (14 $\frac{1}{2}$). And death completes the development, and it takes place instantaneously. So far as I know it is based on this one verse.

I know of no categorical statement to the contrary. And therefore I should feel that each one was at liberty to what is in the heart. I would not want to present what I think logical, or what someone else thinks is logical, but what does the scripture say. And the Scripture says, that we are unclothed, and we receive the great blessing of having the resurrection body, and that is the vital thing. Now as to whether we immediately at death, make all the complete progress in the of our development, which will be attained by the resurrection or not. I don't know of any scriptural statement, and therefore, it is my guess that it is not. I certainly would not want to say that whether I -

It says when he shall appear. The appearance of Christ is a common phrase used. Now, the same phrase is used up in verse 28, "And now little children, abide in him; that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming. Now, I know I've heard sermons in which they've said, 'The coming of Christ means death. Or the coming of Christ means the coming of the Holy Spirit. or the coming of the Christ is the pouring out of the Holy Spirit on the earth. Something like that. But I believe that he is coming again, that he is returning to the earth.

1½ (Question: I know of no scriptural proof that there is

. I certainly would categorically say that there is in the intermediate state, no temptation to sin. There is no tendency to do that which pleases us whatever. So in the negative sense I would say categorically, that there is complete sanctification from the negative viewpoint of entrance to the

to
 (2). Positively as whether during the intermediate state, that there is a further growth in prayer, a constructive development of our personality, during that state, or whether there is not, I would say that we have no Scriptural basis. I would say that we do know that we will be perfect in holiness when he comes to this earth again. But as to whether that is immediately, or whether there is further growth, I think it is anybody's guess.

That is - c is representative of incomplete condition. I said, though never as one of probation. Then small d. There are far more references to the resurrection than to the intermediate state. Now rather than to give you a lot of references now, we will take that on faith until we get to the resurrection.

Number 5. The Lost are described as being already in conscious torment.

Now on this, there are evidence on the condition of the saved, in ? and the intermediate state, which are far greater, then our evidence on the condition of the lost. I know of no evidence, no clear evidence, on the condition of the lost during the intermediate state, except the parable in Luke 16. Which seems to me to be very, very strong. And there is one statement in II Peter 2: 9. And in this statement in II Peter 2: 9, we read, that "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temp

deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust in punishment, unto the day of judgment." Our authorized version translates it, "unto the day of judgment to be punished." And as the authorized version renders this, it could leave all punishment until after the day of judgment, but as most interpreters think it should be rendered, it is to reserve the unjust in punishment, unto the day of judgment. And if this interpretation is correct, it shows conscious punishment already. (4 $\frac{1}{2}$)

I would say that that is sufficiently questionable, that I wouldn't even mention it except the various theology books do. . Luke 16: 23 is the only evidence I know of actually that .

Number 6. There is no Scriptural evidence for Purgatory.

Now that is very important. There is no Scriptural evidence for Purgatory. It would not be necessary to mention it of course, except that it is of so wide spread use.

5 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Comment raised by Mr. Thomas Taylor: That has to be interpreted I think to indicate it or prove it to anyone. I remember a Catholic friend of mine, reading in I Corinthians 3 and saying, "I don't know what that sounds like to you, but it certainly sounds like Purgatory to me, where he says, their works shall be tried by fire. So if you interpret this, I think it would be good.)

I Corinthians 3. It shall be tried by fire. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." The fire here is represented as something that (6 $\frac{1}{2}$)

rather than something that purifies. It is pretty hard in this context here, to derive purgatory from it. One may say that it sounds like purgatory, but if you read the passage it is not what he is talking about. He is talking about work men

?

on the foundation of Christ. Work then which will be tried with fire, and that will abide which the fire does not destroy. Well, that is, I don't think that anyone coming to this passage with no notion of the doctrine of purgatory, could possibly derive the doctrine. The use of the word of fire, is not presented as a purification, but as a testing to see what is in the work that is worth keeping, not as a cleansing from sin, or evil, but as a testing to see what ~~needs~~ there is that needs more rewards.

Matthew 5: 25-26. He says, "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou has paid the uttermost farthing." In the context is he talking about punishment for sin, or about cleansing from evil? Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Again, I think, perhaps more easily then I Corinthians 3, this could be fitted into the doctrine of Purgatory that one already has. But I don't think that anyone would ever derive this from this statement. I think they would have less ground to think of Purgatory then on the other one, though perhaps more ground, to consider this for the argument for purgatory.

?

8½ (Question: Actually the doctrine is not taken from any place. The doctrine developed as a logical thought, an inference developed very early, in the first three or four centuries, and ~~just as a possibility~~ Augustine as a possibility. As a possibility, not dogmatically, but as a possibility to which he inclined. That there were those who were not sufficiently sanctified, to be received right into heaven immediately, but who would need a purification, a cleansing first. And the view by the time of Pope Gregory I was pretty thoroughly developed. But it has largely been rested upon the authority of the Church, and there is very little on it, actually on the attempt to prove it from the Scriptures. It is largely upon the authority of the Church. But then, when the Protestants began to deny it, and

say there is no Scriptural warrant, the scriptural passages that ~~were~~^{was} presented for it more than any other was II Maccabees. And that passage in II Maccabees which is advanced for it, - In II Maccabees there is the case where certain Jews were found with heathen emblems on them after the battle. Certain Jews in the battle on the side of the Maccabees were found, their dead bodies, with these heathen emblems on them. And the question was about these people who were worshipping the heathen gods, who were fighting on the Jews side, and had been killed. What was going to happen to them? And the prayer for these, there is nothing said about Purgatory in it, it said that prayer was made for these. Now on this thought of prayer being made for them, is the argument advanced, that therefore it must be that prayer can make a difference in the condition of the Lost, and therefore there must be a purgatory. Actually, it is an argument that does not have as much direct wording as the passage in II Corinthians, but it is not actual evidence for purgatory, because the evidence would be against these being believers, because they had heathen emblems on them. It's not an imperfection, not a failure, not a sin they fall into after believing. The heathen emblem is an actual binding up with paganism, involved in it. And it is not specifically said, what the prayer was for, simply that the prayer was for the dead. But much was made of that argument in the time of the Reformation. And there are those who think that that had a good deal to do with the decision of the Council of Trent, to maintain the doctrine, because the Council of Trent met, at least a third of those present, in strongest consent, said the Apocryphal should not be included in the Bible. And Cardinal (12), the cardinal of the church of Spain, had ten years before this, had explicitly stated that the Apocryphal are not a part of the Old Testament, not an inspired work in a book which is dedicated to Pope Leo X, and which the Pope received.

But when it came to the Council of Trent, there was much disagreement about it, and the decision was that anyone who does not receive these books in their entirety, let him be accursed. We can't prove what their motive in it was. Since that, that was their official position, but before that, it was not a belief of the large number

of those present. There is no mention of Purgatory, there is no mention of being cleansed of sins by fire, there is no mention of a state of

(13)

The Roman Catholic theology says that it is a kind of torment, beyond any anguish or misery that anybody ever experiences in this life. That is explicitly stated in their view about it. The view is that the duration of it may be a few hours or it may be thousands and thousands of year. There is no limit that we can explicitly state to it. Actually though, there is very little specific statement, as to definitely know about it, but it is universally held in the Roman Catholic Church, that there is a Purgatory, and ~~the~~ it rests at the basis of a tremendous

(13½). And it makes a death of one who is considered to be a believer, a time of misery, rather than a time of joy when one has gone to be with the Lord. He is found to enter Purgatory, and he enters into this terrible anguish and suffering, which may completely extend for thousands of years, and which can be shortened by prayer, and by money, according to their theories.

(There is no S-93. S-93 is actually part of the Poets course).

S-94. 5/8/57.

- much time on Purgatory. There are those of you who are going to be dealing with Roman Catholics, will find it of course to be a subject of considerable importance. There are many good things written about it. My statement, some thought was a little strong, there is no Scriptural evidence for a Purgatory. Perhaps it would be safer to say No Purgatory Can Be Proven from Scripture, but there is certainly no specific statements reference specifically that can be said this must be a reference to Purgatory. There is no such statement.

(Nothing on record after this statement.)

5 Eschatology, Individual eschatology, E. The Judgment. E.

Number one. Those who are justified through Christ do not enter into judgment for their sin. He shall not find the $(\frac{1}{2})$. He shall not enter the judgment. He is already passed from death unto life. And before we look at that point, there is one particular passage, which I think is quite important in connection with it, and that is Hebrews 9: 27-28. So if you will turn to that quickly. We read that "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment. So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him, "which I don't take as meaning those who are watching the signs of the time, to see when he is coming, but those who are believing on him. They should be loving His appearance, but whether they are or not, if they are true believers, I think they are those who look for him. "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." It seems to me that this is quite clear. That the normal course of events is that a man dies and goes on to judgment. It doesn't say immediately, but nothing intervening which affects the judgment. That a man dies, but then the next step is the judgment. But in the case of the Christian, Christ has already borne his sin upon the cross, and therefore those who are his, those who are looking for him when he appears the second time, it is not for judgment, but it is without sin. Their sin having already been paid, and he appears for their blessing for the confirmation (consummation?) of their salvation. Now that may not seem obvious

$(2\frac{1}{2})$ but on a close look it seems to me that it is absolutely certain that . And of course, it is nothing new, but it is a further strengthening of that which we have already known, that those who are justified through Christ, do not enter into judgment, for their sin.

Number two. Yet there is a judgment for believers.

Are believers all through with judgment? No! Are believers all through with judgment for their sins? Yes. The one who is saved through Christ, their sins have been carried by him, the judgment is past as far as his sins are

concerned, but yet he does pass into judgment. Yet there is a judgment for believers.

NOTE THE FOLLOWING PASSAGES.

Under this, under small a, we'll quickly look at the passages. And as we look at the passages, I looked through scripture, looking at all passages that I came to, which seems to me to have a bearing on judgment. And from those I picked the ones which seemed to have a bearing upon believers. And we will draw certain conclusions from them, but I don't want to just give you the conclusions, and say this is proved, by this and this and this. I want to look at the verses, and to see what the teaching is, and if you know of a verse that you think is vital in that connection, just mention it, but otherwise, we will look at the teaching of each verse as we see it, and then we'll ~~draw~~ draw it together in a conclusion. But I will move rather rapidly, because we have much ground to cover this chapter. But we will look at a few references which seem to me to be most vital in this connection.

First of them is Ecclesiastes 12: 14. "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Now the Christian's sins have been brought into judgment. They have been judged through Christ on the cross. They do not again have to come into judgment. But the Christian has secret things and works which are good. And they will be brought into judgment. Now we don't want to spend too much time on this one verse in Ecclesiastes, but I think that this definitely proves very much.

Romans 14: 10-12. We read there, "But why dost thou judge thy brother?" Who is he talking to? He is talking to Christians, isn't he? The whole passage is to Christians. Him that is weak in the face, he that regardest not the dead, who are thou that judgest another man's servant. He is talking to Christians. And he concludes the discussion of our judging one another with verse 10. "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we -" this is not talking about the unbeliever. He is talking here about everybody, or the Christian. At least the Christian is included, and in light of the context, I would say, only the Christian. But Paul says, "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." So there is judgment for the Christian. "For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue

shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." The Christian is to be judged. He is not to be judged for sin. He has already been judged for sin. He is in no danger of condemnation, but he is to be judged.

I Corinthians 3: 9 - 15. "For we are labourers together with God: ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building. According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon." He is not talking here about sins, or that which brings to ^{him} ~~me~~ condemnation, but he is talking about how he builds in the work of God. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest". Well, of course, the people who have laid it, built it on Jesus Christ. It is [?] Christians. "For the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." Here there is no question of a man being lost. This is not dealing with unbelievers. This is not dealing with those who are judged for their sins, this is judging them for their work for Christ. For their Christian life. And he says, "If any man's work abide," the testifier, the examination, the certain judgment. If any man's work abide that, he receives reward. If any man's work is burned, he suffers loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire. Now of course it would be ridiculous to suggest that this, "yet so as by fire" that this man is going to go through fire, because it has been talking here about works very clearly. There's nothing about man, there's nothing about sin, It has nothing to do with man being guilty before God. It has to do with what if a man's work are such, as to [?] ~~penalty~~ or reward. This man's faith with all his works is burned in the judgment, he has gone into the examination. It means that he has done nothing to receive a reward. He is saved, so as by fire, but he is saved.

I do not believe that many Roman Catholic theologians would use this as a passage for Purgatory, for it is too easy to show that from the context, it has nothing to do with a man being subject to fire, and the fire here spoken of, is a fire which destroys that with which it (9), not simply a fire which

. It destroys the works which are not effective works, not works which are in line with God's will. And so this has nothing to do with Purgatory, but this is a definite end, that Christians are to be judged for the works, and that they are to be rewarded according to their works.

I Corinthians 4: 10 and 12. There we read, No, maybe it should be I Corinthians 4: 4-5. "For I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified; but he that judgeth me is the Lord. Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man have praise of God." This is a question of works, a judgment for rewards. A ~~manhh~~ judgment which is to result in people having praise of God. And Paul says, Let's not be judging one another, and criticizing each other for works and all that sort of thing. God is the one who judges. He wants us of course, to judge one another's works very, very carefully, when we are in a position where we have to decide, about placing the other person in a position, where he will have opportunity to do things which will make for the good, or for the success or non-success of the Lord's work. There we have a specific duty to judge, for this specific occasion. But what he talks about here, is the way Christians are always criticizing one another, slamming one another, in areas in which they personally don't have any responsibility. That he says, God will reward them, or deny his reward, and he says, we that are , but their persons not closely concerned with the work, can't know, can't understand. And he says, The Lord will judge in those matters.

II Corinthians 5: 10. Here is a very, very definite statement. Paul says, "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." That sounds like the passage from Ecclesiastes, doesn't it?

"For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or evil." Ecclesiastes, the last verse says. Paul says, "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

The non-Christian must appear, before the judgment seat for his sins, and he must receive for the evil that he has done. The Christian has been judged for evil. He must appear to receive for the good that he has done, or to be advised for his none receiving, for that which he has done which wasn't worth receiving for. His sins have already been paid for in Christ. But the important thing here, is that we do have a judgment.

II Timothy 4: 8. "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day:" Now, just before that you notice, verse 7, he tells of the good works he has done. "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." He is going to be rewarded for his works. But his particular attention turns, not to the reward of works, but to the reward for the attitude. "Shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Well, now, let's summarize this.

We called small a, Note the following references, then we'll call small b,
 - Small b. The believer, though not judged for sin, which has already been borne to by Christ, will be judged for his service ~~from~~ his Lord, and must give account for his work.

Small c. There is a difference in rewards, depending on true heart and on service rendered.

S-96.

The Lord sees the heart. The Lord knows whether we think a lot about his appearing, and are so concerned, with our own personal affairs, and desires for progress, and so on, that we would be quite bored to discuss his appearing. Or whether we really love his appearing and believe in him. It isn't what we say. It isn't what we think. There is a crown of righteousness for those that, don't

feel so happy that he's safe. That those simply feel so happy in the light he gives to them, don't simply rejoice through the good things that are accomplished through Christ, but really love him, and love him so much that the thought of his coming back and their being with him for eternity, far

(1 $\frac{1}{2}$). It is the heart attitude which God to the fellow man. So the judgment is on the basis of the true heart attitude, and of the actual service rendered through Christ. That is what the judgment of Christians depends upon and there is a specific difference in rewards . I've known people who tried to explain it away, and say, all Christians in the kingdom of Christ, that they can come up absolutely identically, but I've read you several verses in which Paul very clearly states that some receive rewards, some are saved but as by fire. There is a crown for service. There are rewards. We all are equal in this place - in that we are all in His kingdom saved through Christ alone, owing everything to him, and rejoicing in him, and that is so wonderful, that everything else . (2 $\frac{1}{2}$)

3(Question: Every man must appear before the judgment seat of Christ. and there are those who are going to be tremendously . I heard just recently of a great meeting place for Christians where thousands of Christians come together and hear wonderful teaching, and I heard of a man who sacrificially led and directed the programs and planned it, and then I heard of another man who came alone, and gave a mighty which greatly interested them, and made this other man of the whole business, a tremendous help to it, and one day, suddenly the other man appeared to come when this man was away, called the collectors[?] directors together and spent an hour and a half lambasting this fellow, telling them how they should fire him, and most of them wouldn't give in to him, no matter what he said. One of them got up and (4) to him, the others gradually went with him. In the end the man

. Finally, the man who had been so known as the President of this thing, giving so much to it, and everything, he resigned from it entirely.

Well, now, he may think of himself as a man who was doing tremendous things for the Lord, and he may be. I'm not ~~saying he is~~ going to judge him. But I'm merely saying that if he is, as he appeared to those who were in these meetings who told me about them last year, if he is as he appears to them, he is going to have a tremendous (4:75) when he appears before the judgment seat. He will be saved. He will be rejoicing in deliverance from his sins, but some others that he's never heard of, will rank far ahead of him, in the , though he , they will rank far, far above him. I mean in the Christian world, if the view which these people hold of him is the true view. Now, I don't know. I'm not passing judgment. Now I wouldn't for the world mention his name, even though everybody here probably knows his name. But I haven't the data. I can't judge these people. And those in the meeting may not be able to judge. They may be wrong. But the way it impresses them, if they are correct, his judgment of himself is entirely different from the Lord's judgment of him. But the Lord's judgment (5:75) In such case he will . But he is a true Christian, I have no doubt, He will be saved, it is sin in his part, which Christ bore on the cross, which causes him to put up his own pride to the point where it makes a big splash, and doesn't accomplish anything like what he gives credit for.

But we should not judge him, except if we were a member of that Board of Directors, then it would be our duty to go into the thing very thoroughly, and judge. Not for the judgment of his service, but of the judgment of the situation, and what is well for them. And that we have a responsibility to do, but when we are an outsider, we don't have the opportunity to look into those things, we cannot do this. We should leave the judgment to them, but we should know 6:5, and there will be a time of judgment, and .

But the judgment, for sin, the condemnation of sin, has been borne by Christ, on the cross, and the individual will receive rewards for his work rather than to their true , but be saved by fire, not that fire is a strong expression, I doubt if many Christians will be saved in that way that there is no rewards, but I

doubt also, if there are many who will not have a very considerable cut down in their rewards that they may

Small d. This judgment will take place at the return of Christ.

Number 3. Unbelievers are all to be condemned for their sins.

Now again, by far the commonest method of handling theology is to take a subject and then to say, now there are the following ~~theories~~ theories. This group holds this theory. Let's look at it. Let's see the arguments for it, and let's see the arguments against it. Let's see the philosophical implications. Now this group holds this view. Let's see the arguments for it. Let's see the arguments against it. Let's see the philosophical implications, and so on. I personally do not like that approach, in theology. I think that there are various theologies where it is necessary. There are parts of the study where it is the right approach. But in general, I feel that the approach to a subject, is to say, here is a subject, what are the relevant Scriptural passages? Look at the passages, compare them together, see what all they present. And all through this course of theology, my method has not been to read what other people say, mainly to look at what other people say, for the sake of seeing what Scripture references they have considered. And then to be sure to look at all Scripture passages that are adduced by people regardless of their views on this particular point. But what I believe in, is getting all the Scripture together, and saying, not, does the Scripture teach this or that, but what does the Scripture teach about the subject? So I am going to take a less interesting approach, but I think a more Scriptural approach, by going through verses on this subject. All the verses that impress me as important and relevant, in connection with this statement, that unbelievers are all to be condemned for their sins. Now I haven't read the whole Scriptures looking for these verses. I wish I had time to do that. But I haven't. I looked at important verses that others give in/connection. And I made a list, that may be three times as many, but some I ruled out, which seemed to me that their relevance to the subject was highly questionable. And I'm taking verses where there is no question of their relevance to this subject. If any of you have others in mind, which you think are important, in this connection, mention them.

Now in this connection, I'm mentioning again the verse from Ecclesiastes, which we've already looked at. Because it seems to me that it is very relevant. It is the conclusion to the book of Ecclesiastes. The very last verse in the book. Ecclesiastes 12: 14, "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil. That doesn't tell us much about the judgment of unbelievers, that simply tells us that there is a judgment. Then, Romans 2: 16, we have the statement about the men "which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another. In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." He is speaking in the context about the unbeliever's death, how that the unbelieving Jew, they are to be judged for their works. They are to be judged for whether what they have done deserves faith, or deserves blame, and it is true of the judgment of unbelievers. It does not

. (11 $\frac{1}{2}$).

Romans 14: 11. "For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." Paul gives it, showing that Christians are included. They will stand before the judgment seat of Christ. But the verse of course, includes all. So these verses thus far, seem to show there is a judgment upon everyone.

Hebrews 9: 27, shows the same thing. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment."

Acts 17: 31. "God has appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Paul declares to the unbeliever, there is a day when the world will be judged in righteousness. The Christian has already been judged in righteousness, as Jesus has borne his sins on the cross. The world of unbelievers, the world of all those who are not saved by Christ, will be judged in righteousness, for this, by the one whom God has ordained, of whom he hath given assurance, in that he has raised him from the dead.

Revelation 20: 11-13. Revelation 20 has a picture of a great event. For

the end of his great apocalypse or unveiling, John saw a great white throne, verse 11 and 12. "and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth, and the heaven fled away, and there was found no place for them." A stern ^{judge} ~~judgment~~, from whose face, earth and heaven fled away, is the expression. It doesn't mean that all matter was dissolved. It means there was a stern judge, he was there to judge them. He had come to save, he has come now to judge. "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God." All the dead, all those who were still dead at that time. They all stood before God, for Jesus Christ who was . (14). "And the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their deeds." If somebody never had a chance, nobody ever preached the gospel to them, everybody has sinned.

S-97.

But we apart from Christ's goodness, would all be lost, if judged according to our works. And here is a judgment from which there is no mention of anyone being delivered ^{in this} ~~from~~ judgment. Of anyone who was saved. It is strictly a judgment according to works, and verse 15 says, that all those involved in this judgment, it was shown to them that they were not written in the book of life. They had not been saved and cleansed on the ground that their works deserved condemnation, and they did not have Christ to have borne their sins, and so "whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." But they were judged according to their works. Now, we are not going to give a final statement about judgment ~~actually~~, because f. is going to be the ultimate state of mankind. We are not to that yet. I'm just mentioning that the details and results of the judgment, I'm leaving for another head. I'm just dealing in general with the subject now.

Small a. A Look at these Passages.

Small b. No one is exempt from this judgment, except those who are saved through Christ. Hebrews 9: 28. "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time " not with judgment,

as in verse 27, the judgment for the lost, but to them, he appears, (that is, there is a judgment for them, but he appears) without sin unto salvation. He appears to them, unto salvation. But no one else, except those who have believed on Christ, is exempt from this judgment.

Small c. There is doubtless a gradation in punishment.

(2½) said that they were judged according to their works. There is doubtless a gradation in punishment. There's not much said about it. But we might look at Matthew 5: 22. "I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment, and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." Now we do not know enough to know exactly the meaning of these terms, but we can see that they are different. There is a gradation. I believe that it is further evidence that there is a gradation in punishment, when they are judged according to their works.

Number four. There is one picture of judgment in the Bible which seems different from the others. I've given you so far all the Scriptural evidence that I know of on this point, except this one passage which which I am now going to look at. and the others that we have seen, make quite clear that the Christian is judged for his sin, and that judgment is complete in Christ. The judgment has been made, the penalty has been paid, we can no longer enter into condemnation. That the Christian is judged for rewards at the return of Christ, that there is a Great White Throne judgment, at which all the unbelievers are gathered and judged according to their works, and there is no evidence of anyone being acquitted at that judgment. We've seen the evidence for that, but there is one passage which at first sight does not fit. And so we look at that passage now.

Matthew 25: 31 - 46. And there we read, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall he gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." How does a shepherd divide his sheep from the goats. He says, you're a goat, get over here,

you're a sheep get over here, you're a goat, get over here, you're a sheep, get over here. Does he judge them according to works? Does he go into detail on them? Does he examine them carefully? Does he take a microscope, to decide that this one has so much of sheep in it, so much of goat? They are either sheep or goats. It is not part one and part the other. It is a definite judgment, easily made apart. It is a quick judgment. He sets the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on his left.

"Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I was an hungred and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me. I was sick, and ye visited me. I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?" The true believer, should have a humble attitude, instead of saying, look at all the good things that I've done. What a wonderful person I've been. He should be quite amazed at his death, he that has said he has done anything good.

"And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: For I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me." So if a depression comes, and anybody comes up to ask you for a dime, for a cup of coffee, don't you turn him down, because if you don't do it to one of the least of my brethren, inasmuch as ye did not do it to one of the very least of these my brethren.

You failed to give him a dime for a cup of coffee, you failed to go see him when he was in prison, you have done it unto me. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."

Well, this is a picture, that seems different, from the other pictures that we've seen. It seems very different. And so we will note under this,

small a. How it is unique.

Number one. It presents a general judgment.

We have no where had a statement, which would necessarily mean, that all are judged at the same time, but we had the righteous having their judgment for their works, we have another kind, when the unbelievers are judged on the ground of their good and of their sins, on their works. They had two judgments. They were both for works, but one was for good works, and the other was general works and righteousness. But here we seem to have a general judgment. I was at the funeral of a great and good man, and we stood before his funeral. I had been ~~and he was a Christian~~ close to him, and another man was a little more close to him, than I had been. And this other man gave the address. And he said that when this man would rise up in the general resurrection, and here, he was mistaken. A term which to mind is utterly misleading. I don't think that the Scripture anywhere teaches a general resurrection. But he knew how I felt. And it seemed to be rather a peculiar time, right at the funeral, of this, great, good man, and we both loved him, to bring out his view in regards to the resurrection. I do believe that the General judgment idea is not taught in Scripture, nor is a general resurrection.

But this passage taken alone says nothing about a general resurrection, there's no mention in the passage about any resurrection, about anyone who was raised up, but there is what sounds like a general judgment. He gathers all nations before him, and he separates one from the other, like a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats.

Number 2. There is no reference to individual gradations or to individual examinations of works. It seems to be a hasty, quick division, with the same judgment for both, one enters into the kingdom, and one is cast into everlasting

punishment. There is no, every deed done in the body being made known, all the particular things they've manifest, there's no statement of that which it seems to take a long time to do anything that would be satisfactory later. It seems to be a quick judgment, such as you could do between sheep and goats.

Number three. It seems to have a simple test, whether you can

A simple test, with no reference to believers in Christ. Only works and only one kind of (11 $\frac{1}{4}$), all dressed according to whether they went to the prison, and went to the hospital, and gave dimes to the poor in the street. All seem to be judged by that, a simple test, a simple humanitarian test, a test of works and only one kind of works, no reference to belief in Christ whatever in the passage, one way or the other. That is the - it's unique. There are these three features that impress one who has looked at it, and which seems to contradict what is so clearly taught as to the final state. Now, there are three possible interpretations of it. So a was how it was unique.

Small b is Possibilities of Interpretation.

And if someone wants to know exactly and certainly, and dogmatically what every passage in scripture means, let them not study under me, because I would not be able to tell them. And if they know, when (12 $\frac{1}{2}$), I will be ready to , because I do not think that anybody knows what every passage in Scripture means, and I think there is better in God's people, if we see the good things that are obviously clear, and stand on them, and proclaim them, with the words of ~~manifest~~ accomplishment. Don't proclaim on uncertainty. And if we recognize our relative uncertainty on any matter, and we will go on, praying the Lord to make them clearer to us, and to bring us more and more into that area, where we have something we can stand on with certainty. But there are three possibilities of Interpretation.

Number one. This is a Passage which contradicts the other Passages, and so contradicts other teachings of the Word of God. It is not a view that I think a Christian should hold.

Number two. The hypothesis has been advanced that this judgment here, is not

a picture of a judgment of the people of all ages, but is a judgment of the living nation at the time of Christ's return to this earth. It begins when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, ~~and~~ then he sits on the throne of his glory, and ~~gathers~~ together all nations. The hypothesis that the resurrection - number two. A judgment of living nations.

S-98.

those?

?

both being passed into everlasting life, and to keep the brought into the kingdom, which he emphasised. And the - you might say in a way, it is like another chance. Everyone of us has another chance. You wake up in the morning and if you didn't die in the night, you have another chance. You have another chance tomorrow, if you didn't die tonight. If you die during the night, your chances are in vain. The Christian has another chance to do some effective service for Christ. We don't know anything. We're ¹ . Here comes the Lord back to earth here, and those who have not accepted Christ, those who have sin upon them, they are then, no further chance, but some of them might be . Some of them having shown themselves to be humanitarian during the period the meeting was before, in some particular way, might then be allowed to enter into the place, where they would receive a further . Now we can't go into detail about it. I'm simply giving a view that is held by some, and I must say that anyone who holds this view, must admit there is a great deal about it he doesn't know it, which we must all admit about anything we say about the future, because we have only a few outlines, and a great bit of detail we do not know.

But under this we would mention in favor of the view, number one, we note the word nation, all nations were [?] gathered together. Well, that might just mean everybody, but it could mean that there is a judgment of works in nations, it could be the living nations of the time. Note the word nation.

Number two. Note the time. This is when he comes in his glory, and the Holy Angels with him,. It is something that might

right ~~man~~ then, deals only with those who are living then.

Number three. Note the phrase in verse 34. He says to those on his right hand, Come, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. The kingdom has been prepared, from the foundation of the world, that they are to enter. They are chosen to come in with the election of God which he performs anytime he leads one to accept Christ during this age.

However ~~aga~~inst this view, the only thing I know against this, I think a ~~man~~ is very strong for it, is the fact that everything seems to hang on this one particular test ², and surely there have been very great Godly servants of the Lord, who have been so busy serving him ~~and~~ in very effective ways, they've had very little time for hospital visitation, also giving charity to the poor. It all seems to be based on the one little test, seems to suggest very strongly, that it is a particular situation at the end of the tribulation, as with those who ³ of the least of my brethren who show certain attitudes are given this reward.

^{3 1/2} (Question: I would say that it is quite generally held that the least of these my brethren would be servants which at that time, but it might not. [?] ~~and~~ I mean it is not necessary to believe it. But most follow it. Whatever it means, it is a particular group, perhaps the Jews at that time.

Now, against it, is number 46: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." But you notice how it is worded. It doesn't say, these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but these into life eternal. It says the righteous. And so it points to the ultimate destiny. Those who are now ⁴, their faith is certainly everlasting punishment, but those who go into the kingdom, as that those who into the kingdom, and then accept Christ that they receive life everlasting. Do all who who go into the kingdom receive Christ. The phrase at first sight is a little against this view, but I don't think completely. Now there ~~are~~ are two views that have been presented. Now let me mention a third.

The third possibility is that it is a telescope picture. We had a man who took a master's degree here, in the seminary a few years ago, and he wrote a thesis on this

passage, and his conclusion was that it is a telescope picture. In other words, this is not a picture of one event, at which Christ has all the people before him, and divides them. But that this is sort of like a parable. That is, that there is nothing in it that is false. But that it is a telescope picture, gathering into brief compass something that takes place over a long period. The separation of the sheep from the goats. The sheep being those who accept Christ. The separation of the sheep from the goats, the sheep to go into, being those who have been selected of his father from before the foundation of the world, they, to go into eternal life, those to be cast into everlasting punishment, and that the test ^{from} given is here not the real test, but only an example. That it is only just one example, of showing the path that the righteous don't feel they deserve at all, while the wicked feel very much that they deserve it, that they deserve goodness in the part of God, which most of ^{them} ~~us~~ do, and that actually the view, as we have already looked at it, that we have one great judgment of the lost, and we have the righteous judged in Christ, for that this is the judgment of works for the righteous not brought into the picture at all here. But the rest is a telescope picture, giving us the principles, but not actually showing one ^{specific} ~~particular~~ judgment. Now this is, I must say that the of the three possibilities the first one I utterly reject, because I do not believe the scripture contradicts itself, the third one seems to me not impossible, but to have, but yet I am very hesitant about it, that it looks so much like a specific, actually, to think of it as a telescope general view, although I have had colleagues who were very strong in pressing their views. I personally am very 6½
 I must say that personally I am between a second and a third view, and I am inclining very strongly to the second. But not wishing to be dogmatic on it. The second view, it seems to me, is . There's a good bit of detail that we don't know. It will be perfectly clear when the time comes, but we don't know, whether my brethren are Jews, whether it is a particular group of Jews, whether some other group as servants of Christ, I don't feel that we have evidence enough to be dogmatic. But if we take the second view, there's a lot of detail in it, that we don't know, but the essentials of it, I could ^{think} easily fit into the view, that this is

a judgment of living nations, at the coming of Christ. I don't think at all that it is an impossible view, but there is just enough difficulty for me to hesitate about being at all dogmatic about it, and yet to me the telescope view is more dangerous. While the first that it contradicts the rest of Scripture is utterly impossible.

8(Question: Against the second view, verse 46, at first sight here does, although I think that verse 46 can be so interpreted as a possible view. And then against it, of course, is the fact that we don't have absolute proof to see who these brethren are, and why this test should be so tremendously important, at that time. But there are lots of things that are important at particular times. But we just don't have the evidence, and the reason to understand ~~think~~ why it is that way. Now I've only gone over 60% of what I intend to cover. I guess I didn't talk fast enough.

5/10/57.

5. Large F. Ultimate State of Mankind.

This looks past the death, and the intermediate state, the resurrection and the judgment. Now F, is the ultimate state. And under that, much of that will naturally be covered already in the verses that we had on the other subjects. But for completeness in the outline they should at least be mentioned.

Number one. The fate of the Righteous.

Small a. They have eternal life.

Small b. The condition of bliss and joy.

? Possession

Small c. ~~The~~ ~~state~~ of the resurrected body.

Small d. They are ever to be with the Lord.

Small e. They are to have no more sorrow.

And for that I will read you a passage we have not yet read, I think.

D. was ever to be with the Lord, and we had two places where it said so shall we ever be with the Lord. If it simply said, so shall we go to be with the Lord, that would not prove anything about the ultimate fate, but only about the intermediate state. But when he says, so shall we ever be, I think that doubtlessly it leads on to the intermediate state.

e. No more sorrow. And Revelation 21, 3-7. Verse 3, And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.

S-99.

"And shall shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away."

Number two. The fate of the Wicked.

Small a. No promise of any future probation or second chance. That's a negative statement. I don't need to give a verse for it. I say there is no such statement. No where does it give any promise of any future probation or second chance for the wicked. There have been great thinkers in the history of the Christian Church, who have speculated that there would be some second chance. That there would be some further probation, for the lost. Pope Gregory, I think, wasn't it, prayed, that the Lord should take Virgil out of hell, and move him up into Purgatory. But ordinarily the Popes were unable to do that. As though they ~~were~~ had power to get people out of hell into heaven, there is no power to get anybody out of hell. But there have been a few, a very few cases, where people have speculated, on great cases of ambiguity, was given a second chance. Any such is pure speculation. There is absolutely no statement for it in the Scripture, although it must be mentioned that there is no categorical denial of it in the Scripture. There is no positive statement to that at all. There are people, there are sects today, which makes a great deal of very involved, intricate arguments on to it, from the scripture in order to show that the wicked dead are in some ways given a second chance. There is no scripture for such arguments.

Small b. There are doubtless, degrees of punishment.

Now you notice, they say doubtless, and when you say doubtless, doubt. (you usually means there is some, and if I just said there are degrees of punishment, I would say here, this verse says degrees of punishment.

Well, we don't have a clear statement that there are degrees of punishment, anymore then that we have a clear statement that there is any possibility of any future probation, or second chance, for anyone who is lost.

$\frac{3}{4}$ (Question: Doubtless. It means a conclusion based partly on inference, rather than upon clear evidence. That's what it means. If I say Gunnerback is today in Germany, if I say he is today in Germany, I should not say that unless he is there. I talked with him on the telephone, I read it in the paper, something like that. But if I say doubtless Gunnerback is in Germany, what I mean is, I've heard the man who is substituting for him on the news last night, say, that he had taken a plane for Germany. And so my conclusion is that since he started for Germany, he is doubtless there. I have no doubts he is there. But that doesn't mean he is. The plane may have exploded half way over there. They may have run out of gasoline. They may have been capture by pirates. Various things may have happened. Winds may have been contrary, that they had to make a special stop. When I say doubtless, I mean there is some doubt. And that's the peculiarity of language. But when you say doubtless, you mean, I have no reason to doubt. You don't mean certainty. If it was certainty, I would just say it. But when I say doubtless there are degrees of punishment, what I mean is, that the evidence pointing in the direction of degrees of punishment, is sufficient that I have no doubt of it. But that I have no proof of it. And the only proof that I know of, on which we can base, the idea that there are degrees of punishment, as we noticed yesterday, was that it comes in under the judgment also, was that there the statement that everyone would be judged according to his works. The books are opened and they are judged according to their works, that strongly suggests variations.

And then there is one other verse, at which we looked yesterday, which being the only verse that I know of, on this, I will read again. But it is not very decisive, because it is not particularly clear in its full implication. That is Matthew 5: 22. "But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou

fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." Now just what are the specific differences between the judgment, the council, and the hell fire. I mean, if we knew, we could say positively there are degrees of punishment but it is pretty vague, and it is one of the many, many things on which the Lord has not given us much knowledge. But I say the emblem is sufficient, that I do not hesitate in saying, that I have no doubt, there are degrees of punishment. That doesn't mean that I can prove it absolutely, like I can prove the resurrection of Christ or his return.

6 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: Matthew 11. I do not think that that makes it absolute either, but I do think it adds a little to the lack of doubt. It is definite. I mean that it is clear in this, that it will be better for them than for you. Well, how can it be better, if they are all in the same boat? Of course, that could possibly be evaded by saying that there would be individuals who would be saved, and individuals who would be lost in each of these two cases. And there would be more than

.(?) I'm not saying that that would get away from it, but that is a that could be suggested. I think it is very good to mention it in connection with that.

Do you have the place there? (Answer from Passhaus: Yes, Matthew 11: 21-24, but there is another passage also, in Luke 12: 47 - 48.) These all suggest, they don't prove. But they do suggest strongly, that I think that we are justified in saying doubtless.

Further
Small c. Note the following references.

This is under the main head, 2, the state of the wicked. We've looked at these two points, at which we've already seen evidence. Note the following references. Matthew 5: 29-30. I think we'd better call small c, Further note the following references, because I had given two heads before, which I had given first, because the evidence had already taken place. c. Further note the following references. Matthew 5: 29-30. "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hades. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that

one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hades." This suggests that it is a pretty terrible situation. It would be better to cut off your hand, then to risk this. It suggests that it is very bad. You can't get much more from this reference, but Mark 9: 43-48 goes quite beyond. Mark says, that the Lord said, "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

10 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: Yes, a very good question. At this point here, the Lord is not dealing with the matter of salvation. He is here dealing with the matter of the person facing sin, and showing how terrible sin is. And so, it is, in a way, you might say, hypothetical. He says, if your hand offend you, if your hand is going to lead you into sin, and if you can avoid going into that sin, by getting rid of the hand, then cut the hand off. It is better to have a Godly life. It's better to enter into the kingdom of God. It's better for one, even without

(11 $\frac{1}{4}$), then it would be having a little body, to be cast into hellfire, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. Well, there is nothing said in the passage here, of the fact that it wouldn't do any good to cut your arm off, to pick your eye out, or to cut your hand off, because you've already got

, and that the only way you can be saved is through believing in Christ, and that if you believe in Christ, he does not merely save you from the consequences of sin, but he gives you the wonderful blessing of eternal life, and the promise of the resurrected body, which is a perfect, incorruptible body, will not . It does not go into that danger here. So that from this passage we are not justified in learning about the absolute state of the saved. We learn that in some other passage of

Scripture, but I think we are justified in learning something of the saved or the unsaved, that it would be better to go through all eternity with only one eye, or with no eyes, then to endure the terrible punishment, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. ^{So} ~~But~~ I think it is very good because it is not entirely obvious

that point. Now beyond that point, what do we mean here about the that they are cast into hell fire. Of course, the big point of this passage isn't that hell is a fiery place, but it is to show us the terribleness of this to sinners. And it is a wonderful vivid picture, showing the terrible~~ness~~ danger, so that I just can't help it. My hand, I just don't want it to. It just does it. I can't help it. He says, cut your hand off. It's that bad. It's that important, to get away from it. How many of us have such a strong feeling about sin, that we would pluck that arm off, or cut off our hand, rather than to do that which is wrong. It is a wonderful verse to bring out the terribleness of sin.

But the particular thing that we are looking at here now is the ultimate state of the wicked, and I think that we are justified in saying that the ultimate state of the wicked is one of continuing torment, in a state which does not come to an end. Three times he repeated here, "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Surely, a part of it is a continuation of

.(14) and it is

. Now to say that this is literal fire a person cannot . They can say that this is either a literal fire, or a figure of something that is . Literal fire would burn one up, unless . The fire has to be changed, so it is not a literal fire in any sense, but it is suffering the miseries which . And so if people want to argue that hell is a literal place, with literal fire in it, it isn't literal fire in the normal sense, because that destroys. does not. But this is a phrase of miseries that come to them. Now this statement, which Mark makes, three times here, is quoted from Isaiah 66: 24. So we look back

at the last verse of the book of Isaiah, and there we read, "And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord. And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." And so we have a similar picture given in the book of Isaiah, with which the book of Isaiah ends. And this is repeated, and made more explicit by Christ, in the book of Luke.

S-100-

But those are the references on which the teaching of the - they are the references on which the teaching about the continuous suffering forever, for all eternity, of the wicked, and the final state is based. People also base them upon simply the use of the term forever and ever, but that is not nearly so definite. It is with the same contrast, in relation to the continuous sufferings of the wicked, as used in relation to the final life of the righteous. But that is not nearly so definite, as these are the evidences of it, where Jesus uses strong statements about the worm is not quenched and the - that the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. I think though, we should recognize that the amount of evidence, that the Lord has given us, is very small compared to the amount he has given us on various other matters. And the stress he has given to this one, is practically nothing compared to the stress he has given us to such things as the

(1:75) or the everlasting bliss of the righteous, and other such points. Now there was a statement came out this month, in the prominent Evangelical magazine published in Philadelphia, in which the editor of the magazine stated that there were people who were ~~criticizing~~ criticizing the Billy Graham campaign, in New York, because they said that there were people supporting the campaign, people on the sponsorship, who do not believe in eternal punishment. He says there are two kinds of people, that are supporting the campaign, both of them believe in the deity of Christ, both of them believe in salvation through him, and all that. The only difference is that some of them believe in eternal punishment of the lost, and others do not. That's a new definition applied, which I had not

previously observed. I doubt if you would find, in the sponsorship of this Billy Graham campaign, I doubt if you would find 2 %, would be people who really believed in the deity of Christ, and salvation through him, but who do not believe in eternal punishment. I doubt if you would find 2 % in such a category. My guess is that you would find that all those to whose sponsorship has been objected, are people who do not really in any true salvation through ~~sinners~~ faith in Christ. It is rather exasperating that such utterly erroneous statements, that the editor can't believe, should appear so prominently in his magazine. But I would share myself in the feeling which he expresses in it, if his facts were true, that is to say, if we were to make the great (3 $\frac{1}{2}$), for Christian fellowship, whether a person believes in eternal punishment, or not, I would ~~not~~ think that the (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) which he makes would be justified, ~~but~~ for while I believe it is taught in the Scripture, and I do not see any ground in the Scripture, for questioning it or denying it, yet it is not so stressed or so to be made so clear as so many, many other points. A Person who does not believe that the suffering of the lost is eternal, but he truly believes in salvation through faith in Christ, is my Christian brother, and I will fellowship with him, in the closest of Christian fellowship. There will be certain positions, and certain relationships which I cannot enter into with him, because of the questions which it has on the Scripture as a whole. But I do not think that it is the major point at all, in our faith, because the Scripture doesn't tell us much about it. What a terrible, terrible thing sin is we are told, but there are many many things that the Lord has not revealed, and in many things that he never shall.

5(Question: The whole question that I am speaking of at the moment, is whether it is eternal. Certainly, no body can believe in salvation through faith, without believing that they are saved from sin, but what I say, is that I question whether there are 2% , they can find in that group, who really believe in Salvation by Grace, ~~but~~ ~~and~~ that don't believe in eternal punishment. I think that you'll find that those who don't believe in eternal punishment, in that particular group, probably don't believe really in any eternal life of the righteous of the true sense. They probably

believe in immortality in the sense that our Spirit goes marching on, or some theoretical view like that.

II Thessalonians 1: 8-9. The apostle says, that in verse six, "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you. and to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." It says that when Christ comes back those who are causing misery to God's people, will be punished with everlasting destruction in flaming fire. That he says specifically. That does not say that the judgment comes at that particular point. It is not to say that, but it is to say that at that point there begins for those of them for whom it has not already begun a state which continues. A state itself which continues eternally. And this terminology used here of the everlasting punishment, everlasting destruction from ~~in~~ the presence of the Lord, is the same terminology as the everlasting life of those who are saved.

In Revelation 20 we have already looked at the judgment there described. But I stopped short of giving the results of the judgment. We noticed in our discussion of it, that the judgment applies here, only to those who are lost. There is no reference here to any being saved, outside of this judgment. All who come into this judgment are lost, and what happens to them. Verse 14, he says, "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Well here it is explicitly called the lake of fire, into which they are cast, and verse, 21 verse 8, say, "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." Well, those are all the verses I have come across,

come across, which would ~~markham~~ indicate in addition to the two points we mentioned of course, that it is so like on the state of the wicked we will give a summary ~~mf~~ in small d. The terms used to describe continuance of the suffering of the lost ~~un~~points to endlessness. Now with the ground we would like to cover this term, we don't have much time for questions, so I ask that if you have questions that might take more than a sentence or two, that you could turn them into me, and write them, and I will give one that was given two or three days ago, which fits right at this point, and say a word about it now.

Is there a definite scripture as to the place (area) ~~to~~ which the lost go in the intermediate state? Is this area separate from or does it differ from the place of final judgment? I think that the Scriptures we have looked at already, by this time now, will enable us all to answer these questions. Is there a definite Scripture as to the place or area to which the lost go in the intermediate state? I would definitely say no. There is no Scripture which from a spatial or area view point, tells where they go. The word heaven in the Scripture, means that which is apart from this earth. It covers all the universe, and all the heavens. And it is evidently somewhere apart from this earth, to which we go. But certainly, the righteous will be with Christ, wherever he is, but as to the area of the place, we do not know. The wicked at death, go into torment, but the place, we don't know. The parable or the story of the incidence of Lazarus and the Rich Man shows

(10 $\frac{1}{2}$), whether that is a specific element, or whether that is the view point of carrying out the point of the story I don't feel that we could categorically say as to whether these places are spatially near or distant. Anyway the Spirits are, the question whether Spirits can be spacially located, unless ~~mm~~ they are connected with their bodies, so that I do not think that we can say anything about the place or area ~~at~~ ^{to} which the ~~gmm~~ lost go in the Intermediate State. Now, ~~am~~ is this area separate from or does it differ from the place of final judgment. I can say, Yes, it very definitely differs. It is very, very similar, but it differs, because as Revelation says, they are cast into the lake of fire, certainly that is not where they were before. It ~~was saying~~ ^{would seem} that they

have a body after the judgment, that they did not have before. It would seem that they are definitely in a different place.

Roman ~~Number~~ Numeral VI. GENERAL ESCHATOLOGY.

A. General Remarks.

First. Eschatology, General Eschatology, by which I mean not that which deals with ~~him~~ specifically with the individual souls, but which is dealing with the future fate of the universe, has a great amount of space in the Bible. It really includes all prophecy, because it really should not be the last things of eschatology, but the later. And definitely the first coming of Christ is included in the last days, from the viewpoint of the earlier part of the Old Testament. It is that which is after a time, the later events, and so all prophecy which goes on beyond the immediate situations is actually eschatology. And prophecy is quite a large subject in the Old Testament, and includes a great deal of material in the new. It is therefore a subject of great importance. How do we determine whether something is of importance? How much emphasis does God give to it? I do not believe that a true Bible Christian is merely one who deals with everything he believes on the Bible, but is one who tries to emphasise things in proportion to the Bible's emphasis on the subject. He doesn't take three verses out of the Bible, and build 2/3rds of his life on them. But he tries to make his life one that conforms to the Bible as a whole.

And Eschatology is emphasised in the Bible. Then I think that we should say something about the purpose of Eschatology. I won't go into detail on this, due to the shortness of time, but we'll stress the fact that it is not simply to satisfy curiosity. I know there are many Bible conferences, in which - say, there's attendance to discuss various matters of Christian life, but if you give a series of lecture on prophecy you see the people jam in. And if you think it is important in this reserve [?] for people to jam in, then do it. But whether it is that much more important than other matters of Christian life, that I question. I'm inclined to think that a great part of the jam is due, to

satisfy idle curiosity, about details of the future. And that is not the purpose of God giving to us. It is not to satisfy our curiosity, enabling us to know what is going to happen. It is for our encouragement. It is for the upbuilding of the faith. It is for the affect upon our attitude. And that is of great importance. And it has a great importance, and should be stressed. But I believe there are people today, who take a doctrine that has a great ^{? satisfying} salutary effect upon people's lives, which it is intended to have. And they become convinced that this particular doctrine is not true. And they immediately begin long series of sermons, and series of discussions and series of presentations, and conferences, in order to prove that this particular doctrine isn't true. And what do they have to put in its place? Something that they think satisfies more details regarding the (15) but all it does is satisfy curiosity. It does not affect one's life.

S-101.

That which will cause them to have the motive and the attitude that he wants them to have. And so the purpose of eschatology all through the Old Testament, every time a prophecy is given, it is given in order to show people what attitude they should have before the Lord. That is the vital thing. And then the dangers of it of course, is already touched on in the purpose. The danger in simply trying to satisfy curiosity, the danger of getting wrapped up and working on a lot of little details, instead of getting the big matters of how you can serve the Lord, better today.

Capital B. Old Testament Predictions of a Coming One. I

I wish we had a semester on this part B. But let's try to speed very rapidly on it. Most of you had the course in Prophets last year, and those who had the course in Poets this year, between the two have covered most of the passages I'm mentioning to you. So I'll mention them rather rapidly.

Genesis 3: 15. That there is one who is coming who will bruise the serpent's head. That's the first Eschatological prediction in the Bible. He will bruise the serpent

serpent's head, but the serpent will bruise his heel. So there we learn that Satan is going to greatly injure the one whom God sends. But that the one whom God sends is going to put an end to the wickedness of Satan. And so we have all eschatology in a nutshell, in that verse. We have it briefly presented there.

Then, the next verse I didn't mark the reference down for, but all of you who had the prophets course know it. It is the reference to that prophet[?], What right do you have to baptise, the Pharisees said. Are you that prophet? Are you Elijah? Which are you? Christ whom they thought of as the king, or that prophet, or Elijah? They didn't think it was . (2)

They thought of the prophetic, and of the king who was to come. And this verse in ~~Numbers~~ ~~Exodus~~ Deuteronomy 18 he says, he will send a prophet like unto me, and you shall hear him. There is a great prophet coming like Moses. Then the prophecies given to David, that God will give him an everlasting house, and he shall never lack one to sit on his throne. Prophecies of the coming son of David. These ~~prophe~~ promises are developed in various parts of the Old Testament, and detail worked out on them. We won't have time for it here, but we will mention two outstanding incidences of it. Psalms 2, and 110. And some of you may have had discussion of those two psalms in another class, and have noticed how those psalms stress the power of the coming king. And the fact that he is going to ~~reign~~ reign over all the earth, and break the forces that oppose him, with a rod of iron. His enemies are to be made a footstool. The coming king. And Psalm 110 shows that not only is he to have this great kingly power, but also he is to be a priest after the order of Melchizedek. And so there is a coming prophet, a coming king, and ^{the} a coming king is going to become a priest. And then Psalms 22 described the priestly work. It is hard to fit Psalms 22 and Psalms 110 together. It is certainly very hard to fit 22 and 2 together, unless you know absolutely what happened.

And then there is Isaiah 53 which describes the priestly work of the great coming one. There is Isaiah 9 which describes the coming of the great king. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called - and then Isaiah 11, describes

his character and his ~~monk~~ world wide rule and power. And Daniel 7, describes one who is coming in clouds of heaven like unto a Son of Man. To him was given a kingdom. He came to the Ancient of Days, to give him a kingdom, that he shall reign. His reign begins when he comes on the clouds of heaven. Some say that he is reigning now, (4 $\frac{1}{2}$)

but that sharply ~~he~~ contradicts Daniel. Well, these were the main passages. There are others.

Summarizing them. Number one. The Lord has promised the coming of one, who will bring an end to Satan's rule. Genesis 3: 15. What does the bringing to an end of Satan's rule mean? It means rescuing from Satan those who he has under him. It means delivering him from sin. It means more than that. It means overthrowing Satan, and putting an end to his power. The two elements are surely involved, in Genesis 3: 15.

Number two. This one is to combine the function of prophet, priest, and king. We looked at a number of these passages. He is the one who tells us what to do, the one who gives us a wonderful statement, he is to be the one who is a priest, to offer himself for our salvation, he is the one who is to be the king, who is to rule over righteousness, and to destroy the power of Satan,

Number three. Without understanding these principles it is impossible to correlate the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament.

?

The Jew faced it, and he revelled in the wonderful promises of the coming king, who would conquer all nations and hold them in subjection to him, and his rule would go forth from Zion, and the Lord from Jerusalem, and they would beat their swords into plowshares, and he would reign in righteousness, and they

?

revelled in this. But when they read about his being a priest, and about his death, and his misery and all that, they couldn't understand it. And so they tried to spiritualize that away. Today they say that represents Israel etc.

And there were some rabbis in the Middle Ages who said there are two Messiahs, the Messiah of ben Joseph, who suffered, and the Messiah ben [?] who reigned. There haven't been many who held that view, but the main attitude has

been to take literally the prophecies about the great coming king, and to spiritualize away the prophecy about the coming one to suffer. And among Christians, many Christians have taken the exact opposite view. Those wonderful prophecies about the suffering one which are very hard to understand, until you see how they actually took place with Christ, the attitude that many true Evangelicals say, these are true prophecies, they were literally, precisely fulfilled in Christ, but then they spiritualize away the prophecies of his reigning. And when it tells how he ^{7 $\frac{1}{4}$} his enemies to say that represents the [?], and to say that when it says he will reign ^{reign now} forever, that means he will ~~ammmmmmm~~ in the hearts of his people. And so we have these various attitudes, but if we understand the principles of which we have already noticed, it is not too difficult to correlate these prophecies.

Capital C. Old Testament Predictions of a Coming Glorious Age.

You might say there are two strands of predictions in the Old Testament. There are the predictions of the wonderful coming one, and then there are the predictions of the coming glorious age, which is going to introduce. [?] And the question of course becomes, When will he introduce the glorious age? Will he introduce it after he does his priestly work, or will he return again, to introduce it with his kingdom? The time, but the fact of it is certainly very, very clear about it in the Old Testament. The Old Testament predictions of a coming glorious age. I have summarized a good many of them, and presented some of the basic elements in their teachings, in this little booklet which you are all reading, it won't take you long to read it, but there is quite a bit of material packed into it. So I'll mention some of the main passages.

Psalms 2, Psalm 110, both of which speak of how he will reign ~~and~~ over all the world, speaking of the definite, positive, ^(8 $\frac{1}{2}$) which he has sworn he will bring it to pass. Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 gives a wonderful declaration of the time when the rule goes out from Jerusalem, and the law of the Lord from Zion, over all the world, the righteousness prevails. There is not so much said about the king, but about the kingdom in Micah 4, and Isaiah 2. Isaiah 11 talks something

about the kingdom and then goes on to tell about the nature of the kingdom. And Isaiah 11 says that, ends up the passage with saying that righteousness shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea. And in Jeremiah he speaks once about how the time is coming when no one will say to his neighbor, know the Lord, for all will know the Lord. And I asked a man once, who held the view that this is the kingdom to come. Jesus is now reigning. I asked him, What does that mean? When Jeremiah says that the time will come when no one will say to his neighbor know the Lord, for all will know the Lord. And he said to me, Well, that means every Christian will know the Lord. We Christians know the Lord. So, in other words, he interprets this as meaning the time is coming when no one who knows the Lord will say to his neighbor (if his neighbor is one who knows the Lord), know the Lord. He said everyone knows the Lord, would know the Lord. That's what it amounts to. It just means that all Christians will know the Lord. What I mean to say is every Christian knows the Lord. Why say, no Christian will say to another Christian, know the Lord, for every Christian will say know the Lord. But, when he says that no one will say to his neighbor, know the Lord, for all shall know the Lord, it means that the knowledge of the Lord is universal over the earth. There is no one who needs to tell his neighbor about him. And so these passages stress the universality of the kingdom.

Isaiah 65, I didn't deal with in the list, but I mention it here, in the last half of Isaiah 65, is a wonderful picture of the kingdom age, with righteousness, when the child, the person dying at the age of 100 will thought of as having died as an infant. And then there is Daniel 7 which I didn't mention in the passages, ~~but~~ which I just referred to, where the Son of Man comes on the clouds of heaven, and comes near the ancient of days who gives him a kingdom. Not who receives from him the kingdom, but who gives to him a kingdom. When he comes on the clouds of heaven, it is the beginning of his kingdom. Well then maybe when it describes in Daniel his coming on the clouds of heaven, that is a figure for his resurrection from the dead, and describes the beginning of the present age. Maybe so. But if so, then our Lord was wrong when he said to the disciples, Hereafter ye shall see

the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven. Christ said, it shall be his coming in the clouds of heaven, and most Christians believe that the coming of Christ on the clouds of heaven, is now still future, and yet there are many who take it that the kingdom which Daniel says he will then be given is something which was then, and which we have been having for these last two thousand years. It certainly does not fit with Daniel from any view.

Now then to summarize the teaching of these passages on ~~this point~~ this point. I don't need to go into much, because you have the pamphlet which has it condensed. Number one. The coming of this glorious age is declared to be certain.

Number two. It is to be on earth.

Number three. It is to cover the whole earth.

The second one is to be on earth. I've discussed it in the pamphlet taking several (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) for it, but I do not think it is possible to

. It's not a picture of heaven. It's to cover the whole earth.

Number four. It is to be a sign of external peace and safety.

It is not stressed in these passages as the land. We go about in the midst of the land with no fear and of . Not at all. But it stresses that we won't need to be. ~~But~~ the lion and the lamb shall grow up together, in . Number four is a time when the curse will be removed from the earth.

Number five. It is a time when the curse will be removed from the earth.

This is not in quite the same area of certainty as 1, 2, 3, and 4. 1, 2, 3, and 4 are absolutely clear in scripture. Number 5, the curse removed from the earth, from the passages we have already looked at in the Old Testament, it is not impossible to say, the passage about the animals could be taken as a figure. But if it ~~is~~ is a figure, it's a figure of external peace and safety. It is not a figure of the present gospel age. And so I believe that it teaches that the curse will be removed from the earth. I'm quite certain that it does, and I'm sure that in line with New Testament teaching, there is no question. But as to the Old Testament, it is much less stressed than the other points. And even if it be taken figuratively

on this point, number four is absolutely certain, and does not fit with any
kingdom in age.

Number six. It is a time when the Messianic kingdom will reign over the whole earth with its capital at Jerusalem. I wish we had about three weeks to dwell on these six points, but we did spend two or three days on them, those who had the Prophets course last year, which some of you have had. And others of you may yet have opportunity to have. And we have run across some of these points in the Poets course, and some of them are dealt with in the pamphlet. But we don't want to build our doctrines just on the Old Testament, so let's go on to D.

Large D. New Testament Predictions of the Return of Christ.

We've looked at what the Old Testament had, and

S-102.

Number one. Its importance.

Those of you who were in chapel Wednesday heard a discussion on this point, so we won't have to take time on it.

Number two. Its Nature.

The nature of the return. I' just quoted the verse which tells most about it, on Wednesday. It is as, this same Jesus shall so come in like manner, as you have seen him go into the heavens. This same Jesus shall so come in like manner. What more do you need, that it is not another (1), that it is not a spirit coming into our heart, that it is not something that takes place at death, but that it is a real man, coming in a real body, coming visibly, and at a specific time to this earth from heaven. So its nature, we could take three weeks on, but we won't go into detail on it. We'll go on to number three.

Number. Its Time.

And if there is anything about the return of Christ that is clearly taught in the New Testament, and yet many, many people are trying to explain away today, is the time. Because the New Testament explicitly says that in such an hour as ye think not, the son of man cometh. It is explicitly taught in the New Testament, that

a time of the Lord's return is something which is kept from us, so that we can never say, He is coming now, or he won't come back. We can never make either assertion. That is absolutely clear in the New Testament, and it is stressed perhaps twice as much as the eternal punishment of the lost. Now that is a strong statement. This whole tremendous thing of the eternal ^{punishment} ~~thing~~ of the lost; all that is taught in the New Testament, put together, is not nearly as much as there is on this one small formula, that we do not [?] ~~know~~ ⁽²⁾ when the Lord is coming back, and cannot know and have no right to say it cannot happen, until some particular sign. There is nothing of which we can say, This must happen before he can come back. Now that is absolutely definite. I get disgusted when people spend hours arguing that he'll return in the beginning of the week, or the middle of the week, or at the end of the week. What do you mean by week? The week is an inference from one obscure verse in Daniel. I personally believe the interpretation of that verse in Daniel, which derives from it one week at the end of the age, a week of years is a correct interpretation. But in any rate, it is one verse, one obscure verse, which is the only mention whatever of that. Well, now, to take that as the positive thing, and the vital thing is where in this week does it come, when we have got not just one place, but a dozen places where it is stated, and stressed, and emphasized, that you do not know, when the Lord is coming, you can not tell when he is going to come, there is nothing you can say must happen before he comes. In such an hour that you think not, the son of man cometh. And then people, say, O, but ~~unsubstantiated~~ there are all these passages, there is an eschatological complex, and that means after you see the ^{3 1/2} of Jerusalem, after the Jews have come back, after the Abomination of Desolations, after all these things happen, then in such an hour as you think not, he shall come. Then be ready, be ready after all that happens, because you don't know when he is coming. Well, to me, the absolute conclusion and complete answer to all such arguments is found in Luke 12. Because Luke 12 says, nothing whatever about any eschatological complex, about a week, about any setting up of any abomination, about any building of any temple, about anything of the kind. Luke 12 in the midst of a lot of statements, of what Christian people are to be like,

tells that the Lord said to them, that you are not to know when the Lord is coming, verse 40, "Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not." And Peter said in verse 41, "Lord do you speak this parable to us, or to everybody?" Do you mean that we disciples won't know when he is coming, ~~mmh~~ or do you mean that nobody knows? And Christ went on to say that this is for every Christian. That every Christian is always to so live that he is ready, if the Lord comes, because in such an hour that ye think not, the Lord is coming. And then people say, Well, all this ~~mmh~~ refers to the Eschatological Complex, and means that after the temple is built in Jerusalem, and the Abomination is set up, then he may come when he comes. Why it would be stressed a dozen times in Scripture, if that was the case, is beyond me. But above all, why in this chapter, it has nothing in the world to say about any eschatological complex. He would tell those disciples there, that this is the way I want you to live because you don't know when I'm coming, and such an hour that you think not, I'll come. Why on earth did he do that? If it has no relevance to anybody, and things have to happen that ~~mmmm~~ hadn't happened yet. It is to my mind, utter nonsense. And so all these conferences that are being held over the country, and the distributing of books, and arguing to prove that the Lord cannot come back, until certain things happen, are in mind, in flat contradiction to the absolutely clear teaching of the Word of God.

5/14/57.

In Eschatology as in most subjects, if you get the main principles, most of the details will fall in line. And when you get particular details which don't seem to fall in line, then you examine these closely, and if you have got your principles correctly, you will find that on examination they will fall, if they don't, if there is just an isolated case, where it doesn't, you might very well say, here is a problem with this particular case. We don't know the answer. We will keep our eyes open, and keep watching, and doubtless eventually we'll find it. When you find two instances that definitely don't fall in line, with the principles established, then it is time to go back to your principles, examine them carefully, and see if there is some point in which you have erred, in your understanding of a principle, or

reasoning your selections of particular principles on which you are proceeding. I have studied this matter of Eschatology, quite carefully for a great many years, and this has affected, ~~in~~ [?] the larger events, the order of events I have presented in periods, and last week we dealt with, even in connection with Individual Eschatology, we covered principles which, to my mind, enter most of the controversial points, in General Eschatology. We covered them incidentally. Then last Friday we began our consideration specifically of General Eschatology, and in dealing with that we went rather rapidly, and one reason for that, was because quite a bit of valuable and important material, would be fine to go again here, have been covered in other classes, or in assigned material, and consequently in view of the lateness of the time in the Semester, it could be assumed that you would gather it from that, rather than take the time to repeat it again.

I want to mention before we go our main heads of last Friday, because of their great importance. B, was The Old Testament ~~Amos~~ Predictions of a Coming One, and we noticed these predictions predict the one who is going to be the king, and the one who is going to be the priest, declare that his priestly work is going to be fulfilled on the cross, declared that his kingly work is to be fulfilled in putting a complete end to evil in this world. Then we looked at C, Old Testament Predictions of the Coming Glorious Age, which are the discussion of his kingly work. And we noticed that the coming of this glorious age, is declared to be certain. It is to be on earth. I didn't go into that, that it is on earth, but in the little pamphlet I assigned to you last week, I went into some pretty definite evidence on that, that it is to cover the whole earth. 4th point is especially vital. That it is to be a time of external peace and safety. Those of you who had the prophets course last year, recall the ~~important~~ careful examination we made of several passages (10) in the , which are also discussed in the pamphlet which I assigned you last week, which deals with this fact, that ~~and~~ even if you of the Old Testament prediction about the coming of the glorious age, as figurative, it still has that of which it is a figure, of being external peace and safety. They are many predictions in the Old and New

Testament of the peace which God gives us in the heart. That in the midst of adversity, in the midst of evil, around us, we can have the peace of God in our heart, but these particular passages at which we have looked, make very clear that it is to be a time of external peace and safety around us, so that there is nothing to fear. And of course there is no point in saying, When we get to heaven there is nothing to fear, there are no gangsters there. There is nothing to fear there. That's obvious. There's no need of these Old Testament passages to prove that. That is perfectly obvious. It is one of the things that we look forward to. But these Old Testament passages, which tells of the king to come to this earth, when Christ comes back, express this feeling of external peace and safety.

Number five, I said categorically it is to be a time when the curse is to be removed from the earth, but I asked you to note definitely, that this is of a different order of certainty, as taught in the Old Testament statements, then number four. These Old Testament statements, may be taken literally, they may be taken figuratively, but they cannot be reasonably observed to mean otherwise than ~~in~~ a time of external peace and safety. But as to whether the curse is to be removed, depends upon (12) . That is to say that the prediction that the lion and the lamb shall grow up together, that all these ~~man~~ picture of human beings . That is possible, it is not going beyond the ground of reasonable, determinable figure in that sense. But if you take them that way, it still is not a picture of the one who used to be a lion, now being a lamb, surrounded by evil, but having the peace of God in their hearts. It is the figure of one who used to be a lion, no longer being ^{12 $\frac{1}{2}$} to the lamb,

. I believe they are to be taken literally, base those passages , but I ~~think~~ that not simply upon ~~the Old Testament~~, but upon the way they fit into in other passages, of , from which I think that this particular teaching is always derived.

Then we mentioned in number six, It is a time when the Messianic kingdom will reign over the whole earth with its capital at Jerusalem. And then we went on

S-102. 5/14/57. (13)

548.

to d. The New Testament Predictions of the Return of Christ, and we briefly mentioned number one, The importance of this that it is

It was an individual that went up to heaven. It was a physical going up to heaven. It was a bodily ascension into heaven. It was a visible ascension to heaven. To whom was it visible? Was Christ's going into heaven, was ~~me~~ that seen of every person on the earth, or of only those who were on the side of the earth from which he ascended into heaven? Did the American Indians over here, see him ascending into heaven? Or was it just the people on that half of the globe, that was facing toward him? What would you say? Which was it? He ~~will~~ shall so come in like manner, as you have seen him go into heaven. His going into heaven was visible. But in order to see it, you had to be looking. Did anybody in Jerusalem see it ~~in~~ except the disciples? We can't say. I believe that anybody in Jerusalem, who was looking in that direction, at that particular instance, they would have seen it. I don't think he was invisible. But we have no evidence, anybody in Jerusalem saw him, except the disciples. They were out on the Mount of Olives. And there they stood talking to him. He was lifted up and he went up into heaven. Last June, I believe it was June, there were two planes flying through the air, and those two planes, right above the Grand Canyon, where there are thousands of tourists, driving along the roads, looking around, watching the scenery, and going into the Indian watch tower, going up, and looking around, in every direction; just about a mile from the Indian watch tower, anybody standing on the Indian watch tower looking at the sky would have seen these two planes coming along, and all of a sudden, seemed to have hit, and both go flopping down. It was out in the middle of the Grand Canyon. The radio stations in Los Angeles, recorded that, a few minutes after this had happened, the time when the planes were supposed to have reported in, 5 miles further on; they were both supposed to report in at 11: 31, that they were at an altitude of 21,000 feet, at that particular same spot. And they are talking now about getting all kinds of new machinery, in order to check them in the air. And all they needed to have was the men in Los Angeles to act on the information they already had, and tell one of them to get to a different altitude. ~~And~~ But they both checked in at the same spot, at the same altitude, at 11: 31. Well, a few minutes before that, they hit, but the ^{man} ~~man~~ in Los Angeles couldn't see it,

and all he knew was that at 11: 31 they didn't report in. And another hour or two went by, and there was word from them, and they went hunting, and finally several hours later, they found the remains down at the bottom of the canyon. And so immediately, the word was sent out. Did anybody see anything happen to ~~them~~ these planes? And they inquired, and they made radio messages, and newspaper accounts, and everything, and they could not find anybody who had seen anything happen. I think it was six or eight months later, that someone came forward, and said that they had seen it happen. They were driving along near the canyon, and saw these two planes up in the air, and suddenly the two planes seem to have come right together, and then they both fell. And one man had seen it, and he reported it six or eight months later. And of all the other thousands of people, no body had seen it happen. Yet it happened in plain sight, above them, in the most populated part of the area, within 500 miles, at that time of the year.

Well, now, Christ was on the Mount of Olives. And it probably took a very brief time, from when he left them, and went up, until he landed in the cloud. And somebody down in Jerusalem might have said, Oh, look, look, mommy, see that man going up into the sky. She said, Ah, that's just another one of these flying saucers here, don't you pay any attention to that. That's just imagination. And if any body saw a man going up into the air, they would have said, my eyes are playing tricks on me, or it is the heat of the day, or something, that just can't be. There's some natural explanation of this, of what I see. At least, as far as we know, nobody saw him. We can't say that nobody did, but if anybody did, they did not particularly pay attention to it.

Was it a secret ascent into heaven? No, it wasn't a secret ascent. It was perfectly plain ~~to~~ to anybody who looked. But as far as we know, nobody ~~was looking,~~ ^{was looking,} except the disciples who were with him at that time. He went into heaven, he is coming back in like manner as you have seen him go. It will be visible. It will be bodily. That we know. But as to how many will see him, or when they will see him, that is something for which we need further evidence. We don't gather it from this particular verse.

Now as to the nature, we won't go into further detail on that here, but we began to mention the time of the coming. And there is much discussion about the time. In a thousand A. D. people made a very reasonable suggestion, that since Christ had been gone a thousand years, the signs that he was gone, was at an end, and at a thousand A. D. there was a great cry, the Lord is coming back, and many people sold everything they had, and went out and got ready to meet him. And in a thousand A. D. he did not appear, and then I think it was in 1833 again, there were a large group who were now ready for his coming. In about 1900, or a little bit later, there was a group that figured out, figuring up the prophecies of the time he was coming. They wanted to be in Jerusalem, so they could be among the first to see him. And so Mr. Spafford ^{and}, went over to Jerusalem in order to find a good place for his family and himself to live. And he got over there, and he ~~announced~~ wrote to his family, and he said, come over and join me. And his wife and his children got on a boat, and started, and the boat was sunk, in the ocean, and never got there. And then he wrote that beautiful hymn, It is well with my soul, describing the way the Lord was with him despite this thing that had happened. But he was there, and he started the American colony in Jerusalem, waiting for the return of the Lord. And thirty ^f or forty years went by, and he didn't come, and they lost their zeal, and became a commercial establishment, to make a lot of money out of selling curios to tourists. But it no longer has its original purpose.

But there have been many, many such instances of people who knew that the Lord was coming at a certain time. But we notice that in the scripture we are told that in such an hour that ye think not, the Lord is coming. And I think there are two things we can say to that. When the person says, the Lord's got to come today, we can say, No, it may be a hundred years from now. And when the Lord - somebody says he won't come for a hundred years, we can say no, it may be today. In such an hour as ye think not, the son of man comes. I mentioned some verses under this. I think that this is a very vital principle. And the reason I think it is a principle, is because it is so stressed in the New Testament. There are so many references to it, that it can not be taken as merely an accidental feature, that we

do not know when it is to be. Well, I mentioned some verses last time, but rather than look at them closely, immediately in detail, I'm going to take up two preliminary considerations.

Small a, under 3. Under time. Small a. Two preliminary considerations, about the time of the Lord's Coming. And the first of these, number one under a is this - Number one, There is no reason to say, that the return of Christ must be regarded as one indivisible event. There is a little booklet that was published about seven years ago, by a Godly Christian man with a heading, Are there two comings of Christ? And I have a book here, called, "The Blessed Hope," in which the statement is made on page 70, "Though ^{The} vocabulary used of our Lord's return, lends no support for the idea of two comings of Christ, or two aspects of his coming, on the contrary it substantiates the view, that the return of Christ, will be a single, indivisible glorious event." Now that is a statement, which you hear a great deal today, from various Christians. And this point, as a preliminary consideration, I want to say that that is a statement which has ~~no~~ absolutely no foundation. It must be a single, indivisible event. When was the first coming of Christ? When he was conceived? Was that the first coming of Christ? Was it when he was born? Was that the first coming of Christ? Was it when he began his ministry? Was that the first coming of Christ? Was it when he was crucified? Was it when he was raised from the dead? Was that the first coming, or the second coming? Which was it? The event of the first coming of Christ, was over a period of over a thirty years. And one Old Testament passage speaks about the coming of Christ, and tells something about his position? condition, and another tells about the coming of Christ, and tells something about his resurrection, another tells about it, and tells about the beginning of his ministry. The first coming of Christ, was an event, ~~which~~ which lasted a period of years, and had many statements, and aspects, and facets, and for anybody to say, the first coming of Christ, must be a single, indivisible event, is simply trying to prove things, by words, instead of by looking forever. That is equally true, of the second coming, of Christ. The Old Testament never speaks of the first coming of Christ, or the second coming of Christ. It speaks of the Lord's coming. And it

Lord was going to do this, and tells something about the first coming. It says the Lord is going to do this, and says something about the second coming. And as we study the Old Testament, you find all these things about the coming of Christ. About when Messiah will come, about what Messiah will do, and you would never dream from reading the Old Testament, that half of these events take place within a period of 30 or 35 years, and that the other half of them are at least 1500 years later, maybe 2500 years later. And there is that big space between ~~these~~ ^{these} events, which are always described in the Old Testament as being done by the Messiah at his coming. Studying the Old Testament, we would find that the events are so different in character, that it would be difficult to see how they would all occur at one time. And when we find what is said of his first coming, and that it is promised that he is coming a second time, we find that about half the events, connected with the coming of Christ, ~~as~~ in the Old Testament, occurred at his first coming, and that about half of them, have not yet occurred. And so the coming of Christ, described in the Old Testament, proves to be something which is in two parts. And his first advent has occurred. So to say that the second advent must be based upon a particular ~~part~~ ^{part} ~~of the Old Testament~~ ~~proves to be something that is in two parts and the first advent has occurred.~~

word, brings out, when did Eisenhower become President of the United States.

If you want to be strictly technical he became president of the United States at midnight.

S-104.

of the United States. Well he was elected, and after he was elected, they immediately gave a Secret Service man to guard him. Why did they do that? He wasn't president of the United States yet. Well, he was elected president. And what he did not, assumed an importance, far greater, than what he did before. He was elected President, though actually, he had no authority yet. Then midnight came of a certain day. Truman is no longer President, Eisenhower is now President. But yet

eight hours later, or maybe ten or twelve, they have the inauguration service. ^{turned his power over}
~~But you~~ and they made him President, and Truman ~~was~~ ~~as~~ ~~President~~, and yet Truman didn't have any power to turn over. But his power ran out at midnight, the night before. And then ~~after~~ a little after Congress convened and he gave his first message to Congress as President of the United States. These were all events connected with his becoming President of the United States. You could draw a technical line at midnight, which is of very little importance, actually all these events were connected with it, and they were all part of the ~~man~~ becoming president of the United States.

(1/2) (Question: The quotation that I was referring to in this book was one of many such statements you will find in books now a days, and I just read it as a sample here. It says here on page 70, in this book, "The vocabulary used of our Lord's return, lends no support for the idea of two comings of Christ, or two aspects of his coming, on the contrary it substantiates the view, that the return of Christ, will be a single, indivisible glorious event." And its this phrase, single indivisible event, will there be one coming of Christ or two? You hear that very often today. How many comings are there? The Bible doesn't say anywhere, how many comings there are. But the events connected with the coming of the Lord, are grouped around a period of from 4 B. C. to 30 A. D. And the other events are grouped around a period yet to come. And we refer that loosely here as the second coming - a phrase which does not occur in the Scripture. He shall so come. We group it around that one phrase.

Well, that's number one ~~man~~, and you notice the quotation I gave you here, started the word used, it says, the vocabulary used, and so as a secondary preliminary consideration here, I want to take The Terms Used for Christ's Return. I just said that the Second Coming is not a Scriptural term, so I will now contradict that. Hebrews 9: 28. "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." He shall appear a second time. Well, that is rather like saying the second coming, but it is not precisely. As far as I know, that is the only

place in the New Testament, where the phrase the second coming is used. Unto them who look for him shall he appear the second time. Does that mean nobody else will see him? Only those who look for him? It doesn't say, whether they will or won't. What this passage says, is, he shall appear unto them without sin unto salvation. To other people he will appear to condemnation. But will it be at the same time or at a different time? This, at any rate, uses the phrase, "appear the second time", and then in Acts 1: 11, we read, he shall come. But as nouns, ~~managing~~ describing the return of Christ, there are three phrases, three words which are used a great deal.

One of them is parousia, which is generally translated appearance, though not always. Sometimes it is simply translated present, at other times. Then there is the word apocalypses, which is unveiling or revelation. And there is the word epiphanea, which means, we have the modern word epiphany from it, it means an outshining, a shining out. A manifestation. These three words are used in the Scripture, a good bit for the return of Christ. Parousia, apocalypses, and epiphania. We will speak a little more about each of them. But before we do so, I just want to say a word on the great question ⁱⁿ ~~of~~ dealing with the Scripture, the vital question about technical terms. It is very easy for us to assume that when a word is used in the New Testament, it is always used precisely the same sense. If you were writing a book of science, you're apt to say, this word means this, with a precise definition. We will try to confine this to this precise usage. That is not normally in the New Testament. The books are written by different men, at different times. The Holy Spirit might have led them to adopt a technical, specific vocabulary in which each word would have a precise technical usage, but that is not the case.

What does the word ^{law} ~~managing~~ mean in the New Testament? Well, there are at least eight different senses of which it was used. We the general idea of law, but the specific meaning we have to gather from context. What does the word think mean in the New Testament? Did it mean specifically, precisely the same idea, Paul and James flatly contradiction one. But the ideas can be gathered

from the word plainly, and when we gather the ideas, there is no contradiction though between Paul and James, ~~But~~ there is a verbal contradiction. Now it is possible for a word to be used as its strictly, technical term, but it is very uncommon. I know a man who had a big argument, that the end always meant so and so. Here is what the end means. When you speak of the end it speaks of this precise point of time. I believe if you will examine the Bible, the end means what it says. It means the end of whatever you are talking about. It doesn't mean one particular point of time. But he said, the end always means, this. Well, somebody pointed out that ^{7¼}. He said the end of this and the end of that and the end of the other. He said, Well, I mean the end used absolutely. When it doesn't say the end of what, it always means this. And then somebody pointed out in word, it clearly didn't mean what he said. He said, Well, there it is used non-technical. And so when you get down to it, his assumption that the end was the technical term, that it always means this, he simply did not stand on it.

We have to look in the Scripture in context to see what words mean, and to see the range of meaning they cover. And their usage of specific technical term is quite uncommon. Now there is a tendency to take this word parousia, and say that means Christ's appearance to his disciples. That is his presence with us, and his unveiling, his apocalypses, his epiphenia, those mean his appearance to the world. That will not stand up. That three words represent three aspects of one thing, of the return of Christ, not three different points, not three different events, but three different ways of looking at it. His parousia, his presence, may mean the beginning of his presence. It more usually does. The time when he appears to - his coming. The apocalypses may be the time when he reveals himself to his disciples and may be the time when he reveals himself to the world. It refers to his second coming. But it does not specify necessarily what moment of the coming, and the same is true of the epiphanea. I've brought the Englishman's Greek Concordance with me this morning, with the intention of taking each of these verses, and giving you a few instances of the statement I've just made. I don't

think I'll do it, because there is much ground that we want to cover. I think that it rather categorically it, I suggest that you put down what I've said about it, and if you find time to look into it, and have any question about it, raise it later, because I don't want you to take it on my say so. It is just for the lack of time, that I'm not going to look at it now, . But I want to lay that down as a principle. And I think this is a very, very vital thing in prophecy. . I don't know of any viewpoint, in prophecy, I don't care what the view point is, I don't know of any viewpoint, that I've had much contact with people who hold, that I have not found, and sometimes brought it into this area. Of assuming without specific evidence that some word is ~~not~~ a technical term, to indicate one specific point, rather than that it may be a general term, and it may perhaps be used to indicate more than one specific term, that you have to learn from context. That is an ~~error~~ error that all fall into it. All views I know.

It is sometimes helpful to present your view. And say, look here, Parousia is here. This is the Parousia. The apocalypses is this. This is the apocalypsis. It only says such things about the Parousia, and then he says such things about the apocalypses. But before you do that look up every use of it in scripture, and be sure you are correct in your statement. Because it is very easy to make it clear to people, to put it up that way. You have, here's the teaching. Here's this and this, clearly taught in Scripture. All right. You find this word used in connection with this, and this in connection with this. And we say here is the technical word for this, and here is the technical term for ~~this~~. And then we start in explaining that. It is easy to make it clear to people by using that method, but then someone else comes along, and shows where this word is used of this, and this word is used of this. And then you are in a big argument over words, that could be avoided, by making sure in advance, whether you are using something as a technical term, where the Scripture uses it as it uses nearly all words, as general terms. The technical aspect of this must be derived from studying the context. But I won't take the time as I had intended to do, to look into each of these words separately. I've mentioned their general meaning, but we will say this, that they are used, more or less ^{not} discriminately in the

New Testament, about the return of Christ. So much then for these preliminary considerations, I would really like to take an hour on it about this particular point about the three words, but I don't dare because there are other things which may be more valuable. But we will call that a. Preliminary considerations.

Small b. No one can know when Christ will return. That's a very important statement. I believe that is made very clear in the New Testament, very definite. No one can know when he will return, and yet there have been so many times ~~that~~ as I've mentioned ~~that~~. So many times when people have said, that ~~that~~ ^{he} is coming at this particular time, at this particular moment. I know of a travelling man who wrote a book which was three times as big as this one, in which it is all figured here, ~~that~~ ^{figure} figuring on an astronomical viewpoint, ~~that~~ ^{figure} on the basis of certain Old Testament statements, that ~~that~~ ^{figure} the exact time when the Lord is coming back. A very Godly man, but how much better that time could be used, If you could figure the exact time when Christ is coming back, it might be very interesting to do so. It seems to me it was A. J. Gordon, who that the ~~that~~ 1360 days, ¹³, that those, that that is the time when AntiChrist will rule, and Anti-Christ is the Papacy, and therefore if we know the exact time when the Papacy began, we shall know ~~the~~ exact time when Christ is coming back. Well fortunately, for that, no body can say exactly when the Papacy began, so from that view point, it doesn't tell us. And there is no viewpoint that tells us because the Lord has said, we are not to know. Matthew 24: 36, makes it very clear, Mark 13, 32-33, 35-37, makes it very clear, Mark 13: 32. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Not even the Son knew the day and the hour when the Lord will come back, and after he says that to his disciples there, he went on to say, "Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is." "For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning: Lest coming

suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch." He says it unto all. Nobody knows when it is. We cannot know when it is. Acts 1: 7, the disciple says, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?" And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.

S-105.

- comes a certain period of seven, years which we will call the week. And it shall be during the last year of that seven, but what the day or the hour in the week, you don't know. No man knows the day or the hour. That's not what it said at all. He said, it is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. You ¹/₂ to witness, not to know the times or the seasons. He says in Mark, you are not to know whether he is going to come right soon, at evening, whether he is going to come at a thousand A. D. at midnight, whether he will come at the Reformation Time, at night time, or whether he is going to come in the morning sometime during the succeeding two thousand years. You are not to know. So noone can know when Christ will return is, I think, a very, very important emphasis of Scripture.

Small c. The return of Christ is to be a Sudden Event, and Christians are always commanded to be ready for it. It is to be a sudden event, and Christians are commanded always to be ready for it. Under that one in parenthesis (one) Note the Following Statements Mentioned. I'd like to read them all, but maybe I'd better give you the references. Matthew 24: 26,-27, 28, 30, 36, 38, 42, 44. Repeating, repeating, repeating, of that day knowest no man. In such an hour that ye think not the Son of Man cometh. Be ye ready for ye know not when he is coming. Watch for you know not when he is coming. And 25: 13 stresses it again. Parallel in Mark, Mark 13: 32, 33, 35, 37. Parallel in Luke 17: 24, and I think of utmost importance, in Luke 12. And Luke 12 is of very particular importance in my opinion, because in Luke 12 where, I'll mention the whole passage, verses 35, through 48. I'll mention the whole passage, because the whole passage, of tremendous importance, for this reasons, that in Luke there is ~~not~~ absolutely nothing in the context, to tie it up to any future time

whatever. Jesus was talking to his disciples said, in verses 33 to 34, Sell ~~what~~ that ye have, and give alms, - for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." And then in verse 35, ~~mayn~~ he says, yes and ~~in~~ after two thousand years, when the times come that you see the signs that you know the return of Christ is approaching, then, "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants, And this know, that if the goodman of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not." Who is the ye he is talking to? Is he telling this to the people two thousand years later, when they begin to see certain signs, and know the times are approaching, now they are to be ready? There's nothing said about any future event in this whole chapter except this.

Is he saying this to the ungodly? ~~Be~~ Some people say because the verse before says, the goodman would not have allowed his house to be broken, therefore it is the ungodly they are talking about. He is talking to the disciples. He says, "Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not." And then Peter asked him a question, Peter said, Is this meant for the people two thousand years later, or does it include us, too. Or does Peter say, is this meant just for the ungodly, or does it include us, too. He ~~phrased~~ phrased his question very differently. Peter said unto him, "Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all?" Peter said, Is this just the disciples. Does this refer to just us here? Or is this for the whole Bible teaching? And the Lord continues then, reiterating the point, that they are not to know when he is coming, but that they are to be ready ~~constantly~~, for his coming, because in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man

cometh. There are two verses in Revelation where he says that he comes as a thief. He comes as something, but you just can't tell when it is going to be. There are two verses in Revelation.

Then there ~~is~~ is I Thessalonians 5: 1-9, which uses the same phrase, that he comes as a thief in the night. That is, he comes, as something, which people cannot tell when it is going to be. Well, we note these statements, number one here. Now I want to lay down the principle, number two about it.

Number two, as far as unbelievers are concerned, the unexpectedness of the return is quite natural. In some of these passages he says, the coming of the Son of Man will be as it was in the days of Noah. People were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, ~~mm~~ until the flood came and took them all away. [?] And Ladd in this book here says, that as far as the days of Noah were concerned, there was nothing unexpected about the flood. He said there were all kinds of signs that the flood was coming, and the greatest sign of all was that Noah was preaching it for a long time. Everybody knew about the flood. There is nothing sudden or unexpected about the flood. But I think that ~~mm~~ is just trying to build an argument, then the man thought that was. As far as the flood is concerned, God told Noah there was going to be a flood, but whether he told Noah the time when the flood was to be, we don't know. But as far as the rest of the people were concerned, they doubtless thought, that crazy old fool Noah, for a hundred years now, he has been preaching that there is going to come a great flood, and nobody ever has seen anything like it yet. As Peter said, people will say, Where is the ~~mm~~ scoffers will say, Where is the promise of his coming, for all things continue as they were from the beginning. The unbeliever, you can predict the thing all you want, it will still be an unexpected thing to him, because he doesn't believe what you say. He pays no attention to it, and so, if we have a hundred signs of the Lord's return, it is not going to make an expected thing as far as the unbeliever is concerned.

The unbeliever, if he accepts the signs, and believes the Lord is coming back, becomes a believer. The unbeliever considers it all as a lot of junk. A

lot of imaginations he ^{probably} pays no attention, and if he does pay any attention, the chances are that most unbelievers - it just means nothing to them, any talk that we make of the return of Christ. And so as far as the unbeliever is concerned, it will inevitably be an unexpected thing, and there is no reason in the world, why over a dozen times in the New Testament, it would be stressed repeatedly, in such an hour as ye think not, the son of man cometh. Be ye ready for ye know not when ~~he is~~ ^{he is} coming, is all that is meant, that to the unbeliever he is going to come as a thief in the night, he is going to come as something that they don't expect, that suddenly catches them and there they are. That would be anyway, regardless of how many signs, how many indications there may be on it. And so that this number two is a rather important one, but as far as unbelievers are concerned, the unexpectedness of the return, is quite natural, and certainly it is no reason for it to be stressed, and emphasised in the New Testament, as it is. Now this book of Ladd's which is called the Blessed Hope, would be much better entitled the "Absurdity of Pre-Tribulation" because that is his theme. His whole book is ~~monomaniacal~~ devoted to the subject, Pre-Tribulationism is a new and absurd view. He says that, he says repeatedly in here, the thing of the blessed hope, is the return of Christ, it is not the Pre-Tribulation rapture. Well, I don't like that phrase, Pre-tribulation rapture. I don't like it, and I can't say that I like the term Pre-millennial return either. Because both of them put the accent in the wrong place. The important thing about the rapture of the saints is not whether it is before the tribulation or not, the important thing is, Is there to be a rapture of the Saints, and if so, how are we to know when it is coming? That's the important thing. And then, the tribulation is another subject. The subject of interest, but not half as important as the rapture per se is to a Christian believer, and the same thing is true of the return. There are two important things. The return of Christ, and the millenium. And we believe in the return of Christ, and we believe in the Millenium, and we are interested in the relationship between the two. I don't like the term which makes one of them an adjective, the subject of the other, and to say, we are looking for a pre-tribulation rapture. One man said,

this is rocking chair theology, a pre-tribulation rapture. You're afraid to go through the tribulation. It's rocking chair theology. Well, that's ridiculous.

The Scripture says, In the world, ye shall have tribulation. And if anybody thinks he is going to ~~may~~ escape tribulation, is simply not following the New Testament. The tribulations that the Christian Church had in the time of Nero, and that the Christians had in the time of the Reformation, was about as bad as any tribulation could possibly be, and it is altogether possible that we may have just as bad tribulations yet. The vital question isn't, Do we believe in a pre-tribulation rapture? The thing is, what does the Scripture teach about the return of Christ? Does it teach that it is preceded by events of which we can say, He will not come until these events have occurred. And I believe that we can categorically say, that the Scripture clearly teaches, that for the believer the return of Christ happens in such an hour that ye think not, and we have no right at any moment, to say, the Lord cannot come now, because the tribulation hasn't occurred, or that the Lord cannot come now, because there has just been a tribulation. We just don't know. It is given in, many passages given and stressed, and emphasise that the return of Christ, is an event the certainty of which we can know, but the time of ~~the~~ which we can not know, until utterly it breaks upon us.

Number three. The Christian is exhorted to Godly living, not only in view
^{his} of His love for ~~the~~ Saviour, but also because of the fact that he ~~cannot~~ not know when
^{can} his Lord will ~~return~~. Ladd takes up each of these cases in the Scripture, and he says, "The Christian is not exhorted to Godly living because he doesn't know when the Lord ~~will~~ is coming; he is exhorted to it because of his love for Christ.

We are exhorted because of our love for Christ, but over and over and over the New Testament stresses, that we are to watch, that is, to be wide awake, to be vigilant, to be active in the service of the Lord, because in such an hour, when we think not, the Son of Man cometh. If we get this principle definitely, and it is strongly emphasized, and clearly taught in the Scripture, it is better then getting a hundred

arguments from comparison of words and phrases ~~in~~ and technical terms, which in the end don't prove a thing one way or the other.

We're looking at 6, d, New Testament Predictions of the return of Christ. And we notice first its importance, second its nature, and third its time. And under that we took up preliminary considerations, first there is no reason to say that it must be regarded as one, indivisible event. I don't know what is one indivisible event, as a matter of fact. I just don't know. People going to war, will long for the end of the war. What does that mean? One, indivisible event. When does the war come to an end? Did it come to an end on D-E day, when the power of Hitler completely collapse? Or was it a day later when Stalin finally agreed, that the Russians might be informed that Hitler had collapsed? Or was it a bit later when the Japanese sent the message that they would be ready to consider un-conditional surrender? Or was it when MacArthur was in Tokyo Harbor, and when the treaty was signed there? Or was it when the troops landed in Japan, or was it quite a bit later when the actual peace treaty was signed? Or when was the end of the war? It's like, all such things are not indivisible. There is not one point of time that is the end. Here was someone in the Philippines and they were longing for the end of the war. Now you say the war is over, Hitler is dead. They wouldn't be extremely happy. As far as they are concerned, the war went on for another six months. Here's somebody over in Germany. They've been oppressed under Hitler. There's a complete surrender. They are happy. The war is over. No, it isn't over. They are still fighting for six months over in the earth. What I mean to say is that it is not one, individual ~~and~~ event. Nothing is hardly in life. Everything makes changes, everything has sections, and one particular phase or section, has particularly close relation to one individual, and another to another individual. And that which interests us particularly is naturally that which has the greatest affect upon us.

3(Question: We are told in the Scripture, that Christ is going to return, suddenly for the believers. We are told in the Scripture, that he is going to return, suddenly, to bring wrath, and misery, and the end of life to the unbelievers. There are those who say his return is one, indivisible event. That all of this must happen at one time. But I think that it need not be at one time.

3 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: Well, I mean more than that. I mean the specific thing of his being reunited physically with the believers, and the specific thing of his being manifested openly to the unbelievers, are part of one complex of events, the return of Christ. But they do not have to take place at one instance, or even necessarily on the same day. I'm not saying they couldn't. But ~~that~~ I am saying that we can't take for granite that they must say it is one indivisible event, and therefore they have to believe it. That's what I am saying. Of course, it is true, there are other events connected with the return of Christ, which it would be perfectly absurd to say that it is just one, indivisible event. The things connected with it, naturally spread over a period of time. But the return in a narrower sense, it is coming to individuals upon this earth. And when you say the return is one indivisible event, what they mean isn't that the coming of Anti-Christ, and the whole judgment, everything all have to happen at one instance, but what they mean is that His ~~his~~ coming to the saved, and His coming to the lost, all happen at one time. And I'm just saying that there is no more reason why it has to be that way, then that when he came the first time, he had to be shown to the shepherds and the wisemen, and to the people in the temple, and to the people to whom he preached the sermon on the Mount, all at the same time. He came to them at different times.

5(Question: from Mr. Sutton. Answer: Yes, I would say that as far as proving to the Jehovah Witnesses, that he has not already come. The way to do it ~~namam~~ would not be to prove that it is one, indivisible event. It would be entirely possible, as far as this particular point is concerned, that they might be right. I think we have to use other evidences to prove that they are wrong. I don't think on this particular point, that it - I do not think that we can say they are wrong because if he has come to them the whole world must have seen him. If they are the only Christians and we are not, he might have very well come to them, and then come to us ungodly people later. But we don't admit they are the only Christians.

6(Question: I was quoting from Dr. Ladd, of Fuller Seminary.)

7 (Question: You read in the Scripture, many, many times, that Christians are commanded to watch in view of the fact that Christ comes in such an hour as you

think not, therefore here is his return to Christians, and you are commanded way back here in the time of Christ, Watch because in such an hour as you think not, he comes. And Peter says, Do you say that to just us or everybody? He says, to everybody. In other words, it starts right here. You are to so live, as if he may come at any time. Then you are told that an Anti-Christ is going to be made manifest, that he is going to do many, many terrible things upon the earth. You are told that a number of very striking things are going to occur, and at the end of all these things, that Christ is going to appear in the clouds of heaven, bringing wrath and destruction to those who oppose God. Well now, we are told that in such an hour as you think not, he is going to come. But we are also told that before he shows himself, in the clouds to the whole world, and bring wrath and destruction, to all that oppose, before that there is quite a series of events which are going to take place. Now the question is, should we say just as soon as this event and this and this and this, takes place, we'll know we are exactly here, and we'll begin to watch. Because we don't know what day or hour he comes. And if so, why are we told back here to watch?

And Ladd says, This is one-indivisible event referred to. But I'm saying, it is not necessary to consider it as one, indivisible event, because I don't know of anything that is really considered as one, indivisible event. As far as we are concerned, we are a dozen times commanded to watch, because we know not the day or the hour when he is coming. Then it would stand to reason, that as far as we are concerned, we are not to say, Well, after ~~this~~ we see, and after we see this, and this, and this, and then we get these things, so that we are sure that we are right there, then we'd better begin watching because he may come. Therefore it would seem that as far as we are concerned, Christ's personal manifestation to us, is a personal event, that we can recognize. That is not to say that there may be many events here that in the providence in God are taking place, but we can't ~~name~~ put our finger on it, and say now is the time when he is coming back again.

I wish we had six months on the matter, because there are a few simple principles which seem to me to solve the whole business. But there is a ~~number~~ tremendous

twenty or thirty years went by, they probably thought there was another ~~20~~ period. But they kept thinking, well, we don't know how soon it is, because he said, you can't tell. Don't ever say it can't be now, for in such an hour as ye think not, it is. Don't be like the servant who said, My Lord delays his coming, and I'm going to have a good time. Suppose somebody said to us, Now 50 years from now, the Lord is going to come back. You say, well now, Let's get a good job where I can make a lot of money. Let's have a good time. Let's really enjoy life for 30 years. Then let's quit all that, we'll take the money we've saved up, and we'll ~~am~~ devote ourselves to ten years of the most devoted Christian service, and when he comes back, 40 years from now, he'll find me in the most devoted Christian service, which I've been engaged in for ten whole years, and which I've been able to devote myself utterly to, because I had saved money before, in order to be absolutely

. And then he'll say, Well done, good and faithful servant. But we don't know if he is coming in 40 years or not. For all we know it may be three years from now. Now suppose we know it is only 3 years from now. We say, What's the use of spending time getting a theological education for? I get the training I need, and then I start in serving the Lord, and here he comes, and all my training is wasted. But the Lord says, No, in such an hour as you think not, he cometh. If you are spending a few years in concentrated training in order to make your life count for the most, he will understand that when he comes. He won't say that you should have been serving me for these last few years instead of training because he didn't know that he was coming.

S-107.

So that is the attitude he wants us to take. Of servants who are looking for ~~the raphman~~ their master, and once their master, when he comes, to find them faithfully serving him. Not people who say, Well, he's going to come at such a time. Now we'll start, we'll clean up the house, we'll get everything in fine shape, and we'll be all ready for him. My wife was reading a book of somebody who had a home somewhere out ~~mf~~ on an island, and they said that they found that

it was necessary to have everything spick and span all the time, because they never knew when folks would drop in. Some people may come at 7 in the morning. So they kept everything spick and span. They didn't figure, now we've got to have everything ready by four in the afternoon. They said, you didn't know when folks were coming. Now in ordinary life, we like people to understand that they shouldn't come, until late in the afternoon. And if they come in the morning, and things are a mess, and they understand they are going to be, because we don't expect visitors in the morning. Well, we expect visitors in the afternoon, and by that time we have everything spick and span. Well, the Lord doesn't want us to say, that's when he's coming. We'll be all spick and span, and cleaned up for him then. He wants us always to be ready, for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh.

1 1/2 (Question: Matthew 24: 6. "All these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet." It means you can't tell when he is coming. You can't say he won't come, and you can't say he will come. You can't say - look here. Look at all these wars. It must be the last days. The Lord is just around the corner. He's right here now. They could have said that in the days of the Roman Empire. It was so evil, time and again, There's nothing to ~~any~~ day that can be paralleled except the return of him. Nothing. Times were so terrible in Germany, that people said the Lord is certainly coming now. He said, in such an hour as ye think not. May be he is coming back. Be ready. But maybe he isn't. He wants you always to be so ready that if he comes he'll find you faithful, at all times.

Well, now he says, you are to be witnesses to me, and this gospel is to be preached to all the world, and then the end will come. And (2 1/2
the Scripture said, this is the gospel which was preached to all nations under heaven. So by the time that Paul was writing his last ~~apostle~~ epistles, the gospel had been so carried, to many nations, it was so great that Paul said, that it has been preached to all nations under the heavens. Now we know that before the Lord comes back, every member of the elect will have been saved. But we don't know how large the elect is. Peter might say, the Elect is 25,000 people, and we've got

24,990 now, that believe in Christ. As soon as we get 10 more, the Lord is coming back. We might say today, the elect consists of 56, 200, 094, and we've got 56, 200, 093, and as soon as the next one comes, the Lord is coming back. But we don't know how big the Elect are. Now we are told to preach the gospel to every creature. Maybe we should do like St. Francis Xavier did. He threw holy water around, and tried to hit everybody with it, because as soon as everybody has heard the name of Christ, the Lord is going to come back. We know that it is better to go to a hundred people, and to give them such an understanding, so that they know what it means. to accept Christ, then it is to go to 10,000, and then just have ^{hear} them, ~~hahaha~~ John 3: 16 just once, and have no chance to have it presented in a way that will mean something to them. That's not what he means. Now there are people who will say, that the gospel has now been preached in every nation, I heard this about 20 years ago, every nation in the world except Nepal and Afghanistan. No missionaries are allowed. Once the missionaries get in there, the Lord is going to return. Well, we can't say that. We have no way of knowing. As far as the requirements of this verse are concerned, it was fulfilled in the time of Paul. As far as what the Lord intends to have, before the Lord comes back, it is not yet fulfilled, or he would have come back. But we are in no position to say, we've got to get to this particular tribe of people in South America, because the Lord can't come until we do, and when we get there he'll come. We can't say that. Because we don't know ~~a~~ just how far this $(4\frac{1}{2})$ is to mean. Our task is as evangelists. We are to be looking throughout all the world, and suppose we give it to every creature in this generation; there is another generation ~~where~~ where no one has heard it. And they are coming on all the time. So we have no way of saying when it is. It is definite in God. But as far as we are concerned, there are a dozen times in the New Testament, when he says, Be you like men who are waiting for their master, and if he comes in the evening, or if he comes at midnight, or if he comes in the morning early, whenever he comes, you all be ready to receive him, ~~and~~ that he finds you faithful as good servants.

Now that could be found once in Scripture, AntiChrist.
 but when it is stressed a dozen times, the Lord does not mean we have to wait for the
 He can not come yet because the Anti-Christ has not yet appeared. There have been
 fifty people, in the course of history, that people have proven were the Anti-Christ.
 And each time it was proven false. And when he destroys the Anti-Christ by the
 breath of his mouth, when he comes, everybody will know that is the Anti-Christ.
 But that we will be looking Anti-Christ, there's no Scriptural warrant
 for it. But we are supposed to be ready in such a time as ye think mt.

6(Question: Yeah, I was wondering, in I Thessalonians, 5: 23 and 24, Well,
 Paul under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit says, he expects our bodies, and
 spirits and souls to be preserved blameless until the coming of the Lord. Faithful
 is he who calleth you, who also will do it. Does that mean that he ~~wasn't~~ wasn't
 wrong about the time of the Lord's return, but he just didn't know when? Answer.
 Paul did not know when he is coming back. Even Christ did not know. Nobody knows
 when. But Paul prayed the Lord to keep ~~him~~ ^{us} from falling into error and temptation
 which will injure our bodies.

This point under that, that I mentioned yesterday, there's no reason to say
 that it must be regarded as one, indivisible event. And I wouldn't even mention
 that if there weren't so many books and pamphlets written based on the assumption
 since it is one indivisible event, therefore his return to the believer, and his
 return to the unbeliever, must be at the same time. I say that we have no right to
 make such an assumption. We have a right to check into the Scripture, and to see
 what the fact is, but not to make an assumption that it is one, indivisible event.
 We have his return to the saved, and his return to the lost. It's one appearance
 to all, or are we mistaken? ~~It~~ That is the question to be considered, but not
 to be assumed.

7 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: Dr. MacRae, would you say that we wouldn't know either?
 Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come
 a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, ."
 answer. Well, there was a falling away. Nero was revealed as a very wicked man,

he killed the Christians and burned them, and certainly was a son of perdition.

(Question: In other words, when the son of perdition, has been revealed, we ourselves will not be sure, that it is that one. Answers. I would say there are two possibilities.

We are now in our outline on point, I was just ready to name point IV, D, 3, (1)

and on point 6, D, 4, d, subpoint 3, I have listed the argument from II Thessalonians II. I'd rather take that in order, rather than jump to it now.

Well, I was just wanting to remind you that I said yesterday, there is no reason to say, it must be regarded as one, indivisible event, and I think we must agree there is no reason to so say. And number two. The terms used for Christ's return refer to the return of the whole. Parousia, apocalypses, epipheneia. And these seem to make a big point, which is this; they say, we are looking for the epipheneia of Christ. Now the epipheneia is this,

(9 $\frac{1}{2}$), is really the same point as number one.

But the term his coming, his manifestation, his disclosure, his appearance, they refer to Christ being manifested and don't say to who. And he may be manifested to the Christian, he may be manifested to the world, it may be one event, or they may be two places. This is the negative argument, which I wanted to mention, in regard to clear away arguments simply based on words but not in fact.

10 $\frac{1}{2}$ (Question: Now here is an argument from analogy. When Christ came, most of the world, most of the ~~man~~ Jews had no idea that he was coming then. That there were wise men who saw the star in the heaven, and knew he was coming. And there were some people in the temple, who were looking for the (11) of Israel. And then, when they came into the temple, the Holy Spirit said, this is the one you are looking for. And they welcomed him then. Whether these people knew, three years before that, that he was come in the next few years, anymore than they would have known, 20 years before that he might be coming back. We have no idea. But now is that analogy something to prove about what will be at the second coming. We have a dozen times in the Scripture, that is the New Testament statements, that in such an hour that ye think not, the Son of Man cometh. Be ye ready because ye know not the day or hour. Be ready. At such a time that ye think not he comes.

A dozen times. Let that time not overtake you as a thief in the night. But be you ready. In other words, you don't know when the thief is coming. You can't possibly know when the thief comes. But if you are fast asleep, and pay no attention, you are in an entirely different situation, then if you are ready; the thief/doesn't overtake you even though you don't know when ~~he~~ he is coming. He says, be not - the day will come as a thief in the night. Now these dozen statements about the second coming, there is nothing like that about the first coming. And therefore, is an analogy with what the situation was regarding these four or five people, (and no more), is this point worth more than a dozen clear statements about the second coming? We have no parallel regarding the second coming. ~~in the night~~

13(Question: In other words, you are to start watching when you see the fig tree budding out. If that's the case, I don't know why a dozen times we are told, to watch and be ready, because in such an hour as ye think not. Well, that is all in the outline. I'd like to move a little faster, because I think that possibly it will be clearer as we get to somewhat more logical passages. We've anticipated a number of things here, but I - ~~in the~~ other hand it might make it more clearer to take up a particular point from (13 $\frac{1}{2}$). But as I have the outline listed, I have a, the preliminary considerations,

S-108.

A man said, Now, my brother was, ten years ago or more, he said, is in the Philippines, or in Japan somewhere, and he said, we understand they are soon going to begin returning the troops to America. And so we know that my brother will get here, sometime within the next couple of years. And so he said, we are expecting him. Now we have an attitude of expectancy. Now he said, of course we know, it will be at least a month or two yet, before he could be started on his way home. And we know it will take him at least a couple of months to get here. But we are expecting him. We have that attitude of expectancy, right now, even though we know it cannot come, for another two or three months. But we can't say that about this, because the Lord

says we are always to be ready. He doesn't say, in three months from now, we'll start getting ready. We are always to be ready. One of the clearest evidences on this is Luke 12, and I don't see how anybody can get away from Luke 12. Because in Luke 12, there is not a single word about signs of the coming. There is not a single word in Luke 12, about Anti-Christ. There's not a single word about the return of the Jews. There's not a single word about these commands being given to people about 2000 years from now. It is given directly to the disciples there at that time. And he tells them what kind of people he wants them to be.

And he begins in verse 35, and he says, "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately." Now suppose a man leaves, and he says, I'm going off and we're going to have a wedding. We're going to have a thousand guests invited, and we're going to have a big affair, and a reception afterwards, and he says, As soon as I get home, you be ready to open up. The minute I get home. Well now, the man here is at home, and he says, I'd like to go, and do some things that will take me a couple of hours. And his wife says, don't do that. He ~~man~~ said, You ~~be ready~~ don't know when he is coming back. You be ready to open up. Well, he said, he just went. He's got to get there. He's got to go through the ceremony. They have the reception. He'll be at least four or five hours. For absolute safety, let's say three hours. Three hours from now, I'll be on the job. From then on, I'll be on the job. It may be hours, I can't say when. When we see these signs, then we are to begin to get ready. But for the present we don't have to worry about it, ~~for~~ but look at what he says to the apostles here. He says, Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately." And writer could have said, But look here, there's a sign. This doesn't come suddenly and unannounced. It says, when he opens and knocks. There's a sign and an event. Isn't that a silly thing? It says that when he comes and knocks, then he'll open to him immediately. Well, we don't have to be

ready, because he is going to knock first. But what it says here, is that when he comes and knocks, then they open to him immediately. We'll going to hear the trump of God, the Lord is going to descend, going to descend with the archangel Michael, and the trump of God, and when we hear the trump, he's here, we are ready to go, there is a preliminary sign. But the sign is just about as much ahead ~~minutes~~ of time, as the knock on the door is, before the arrival of the person. Knock, and they may open to him immediately. But they say, there can't be an ~~anytime~~ any moment rapture. He can't come at any time, because he is going to knock first. What's the use of talking to people ~~to~~ who ~~make~~ up that kind of argument. They may open to him immediately. He said, "Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching." But he doesn't mean by that, come, see down the street how near he is. He means, on their guard, wide awake. "Find watching - verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them." Well now, what Lord is going to come forth and serve the servants. That's nonsense, referring to ordinary life. But it isn't. It is a description of ~~the fact~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Lord~~, ~~when~~ ~~he~~ ~~comes~~, is going to do these wonderful things for us. But he wants us to be faithful on the job, vigilantly serving him, when he comes. And if he should come in the second watch, or come in the third, and find them so, blessed are those servants. Verse 40 he says, Be therefore ready also: for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not. Does he mean after 2000 years when you begin to see some signs. Then you don't know what day or hour he is coming. He says to Peter and the disciples, "Be ye therefore ready, for the son of man cometh an hour when ye think not. he said the same thing, a dozen other times. But here, there is no etimological contrast. There can be no principle in this passage, that it is those disciples there to whom he is talking, and telling them of the attitude that he wishes them to have.

The return of Christ is to be a sudden event, and Christians are commanded to be ready always for it, and under this, D, I have some subheadings. So number one was, Note the following statements, and I think I mentioned them to you yesterday.

One that I mentioned particularly, Luke 12, fits it, because there is no context by which anyone can explain it away. It is given in the characteristics that the disciples are to have, there is nothing in the context, about any signs or about anything of the kind. In fact, the context says, When you see a sign, that looks as if the Lord is nearer, that is a further realization, that you should always be ready for him. But it doesn't say, you can wait for the sign. You don't have to be ready, until you see it. Some people think that the increase in knowledge is a sign that the Lord is coming. Now if we presuppose that the increase in knowledge is a sign that the Lord is coming, when will the increase in knowledge reach such a point, that it becomes an inclusive sign, that he is coming. In the Renaissance we had such a tremendous increase in knowledge, oh so much beyond any thing we had before. You might say, well, surely he is coming now. And then the next century we doubled that, and the next century we doubled that. And ~~the signs~~ in science, the last 20 years have perhaps doubled all that ~~was known~~ we knew before. So we can double it again 50 times and we won't approach the Lord's knowledge. How far, everytime we have an advance, we know that ~~we know~~ ^{he warns us} that the Lord is nearer. But how far is left to go we don't know. He could come at anytime. Because, watch, for in such an hour as ye think not, the Lord cometh. There is no sign given in Scripture, of which he ever says, the Lord cannot come, until this sign. There is no sign of which we can say, that it would not happen if he ~~had~~ had come at the end of the first sign.

One was - note the following statements. Two under c is, As far as unbelievers are concerned, the unexpectedness of the return is quite natural. And so as we noticed that as ~~many~~ no matter how many signs they may have, before he comes, they will not expect him. If they did, and they thought he was coming, they would become Christians. They think it is all nonsense, maybe they don't in their hearts, but they pretend they do. They try to make themselves think it is nonsense. And if they do not admit the deity of Christ, sufficient to accept him, they certainly do not admit that he is going to come at this ~~point~~ ^{time?}, or next year. It can be shown that he may come. It may be an added argument, to lead them to seriously consider the claims.

But the unbelieving world, ~~as~~ it is going to be unexpected whatever happens.

Number three. The Christian is exhorted to godly living, not only in view, to his love for his Saviour, but also because of the fact that he cannot know when his Lord will come. And we have these dozen or so commands to watch, and Ladd makes a great deal of the fact, that it is not the word (9¹/₄) as that those who watch him, as you watch someone, in order to protect something, or to keep something from happening. That is not the word used here. And I think that is a vital thing, which I have frequently mentioned in the past, and it is very important to stress. That the word watch in these contexes is an Old English word. And what it means is ~~him~~ be vigilant, be active. And that one should be able easily to get from context, ~~apart~~ from the Greek word, because in these parables, in these illustrations, he always said, it is the one who is ~~attentively~~ giving the ~~people~~ servants their food, in due season. It is the one who is carrying on the household for the Lord. That's the one who is watching. ~~Running~~ ^{Not} the one who is running to the window all the time, to see if he is appearing around the corner. When Martin Luther was in the Wartburg [?], he wasn't running all the time to see how he could get out. He was translating the New Testament. Advancing the work of Christ. And that's what he means by watching. It's being vigilant. It is being wide awake. It is being on the job, increasing, and improving our Spiritual life, and carrying on our service for him.

There are two Greek words used , and .
 only a couple of times, 8 or ten times in this
 point. [?] And they mean substantially the same thing. They mean to be wide awake, or to be vigilant, be active in his service. Well now, Ladd and others say, we do not need a belief in an (11) coming, in order to keep us serving the Lord. We do not need that if we know the Lord. is a sufficient motive. And of course it is true. ~~▲~~ We do not need any motive except the fact that God is our loving Creator. What more do we need, to live a good Christian life, and to put him first in everything. God who has created all things, has created us and loved us. What more do we need? and yet, we fall into sin, in //y.

error, and we get sloppy and lazy and the Scripture stresses over and over again. The eyes of God through all the earth, watching all people. He is with us. He is present all the time. He is a great motive to Christian service. Not merely that he is our loving creator but that he is everywhere. Now that ought to be enough, but it isn't. And then we have the great motive of ~~gratitude~~ gratitude to our Saviour. We love him because he first loved us. He did so much for us we should be anxious that our lives would glorify him in everyway and that we should serve him. That ought to be sufficient motive. We shouldn't need any other motive. But God knows our weakness, and the (12) of our heart, and he gives us the additional motive, that there is a crown of righteousness laid up for those who love his appearance. That every man is to appear before the judgment seat of Christ and we're to give account of all the deeds that we've done in the body. And that he will reward us according to our works. The rewards for service is an additional motive that he gives us to help us to keep on the path of his will for us. And then even with all that we stray and get lazy and we fail to serve him as we should, and he gives us an additional motive. He gives us this motive of the uncertainty of the time of his coming.

Now these people say he doesn't need to give us that. We've got the evidence. Well, of course he doesn't need to. He didn't need to give us more than one. But he has given us more than one. And he has a dozen times said, Be you as men that wait for ~~his master~~ their master and don't know when he is coming. Watch and when he comes he will find you all in his service, active, because in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh. He gives that as a motive for serving him. He gives it repeatedly. And this verse in Luke 12 is the one that I like the best, because there is no ~~context~~ ^{context} which anybody could use to explain it away.

(Number four). This particular motive is removed if it is possible to say that the coming can not occur until something else has happened first.

This particular motive, which is stressed a dozen times in the New Testament

is removed, if it is possible to say that the coming can not occur until something else has happened first. And yet this motive is repeatedly stressed. The Lord could have given us signs, and said don't worry about me coming back. You just carry on your work and when he is coming back he'll give you an evidence when he comes. But he hasn't said that. He said, Be like people watching for their master, because you don't know when he is coming. In such an hour as you think not he is coming. He stresses it a dozen times in the New Testament.

(Number five). Since this motive is frequently stressed we can be sure that no recognizable event is referred to before the coming of Christ.

S-108 (Other side) (1)

It is a sudden event as far as the Christians are concerned.

Number four. That the New Testament teaches two phases of the actual return of Christ. There are two phases of it. We notice in Hebrews 9, I have read you already, Hebrew 9: 27-28, where he says, "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." He appears to those. That's one phase. II Thessalonians 1: ~~men~~ 6-10 has both phases. "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; And to you who are troubled rest with us." That should be one verse. "Seeing it is a righteous thing"- here it is two phases, to God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you - and to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." That is the first phases. And the second phase, "When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." There are the two phases. "To a wicked ungodly world - in flaming fire taking vengeance on them." To the believer, to you ~~who are troubled, rest with us~~ when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and

who are troubled, rest with us, "when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and and to be admired in all them that believe." There are two statements, two phases obviously. But they don't have to come at the same time, they can come at a different time. But they are mentioned separately, because we stress them utterly so different. So there are two phases of the return of Christ.

Small a. There is a manifestation to the unbelieving world.

Under that, I just read to you II Thessalonians 1: 7b to 9. Please also note down II Thessalonians 2: 8, note also Revelation 1: 7. Note also Matthew 24: verses 29-30, which is for this phases. The other phase is further on. Matthew 29-30 you have the two phases there. Let me read them to you. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heaven shall be shaken: And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." You see the two phases. On the one side, the wicked, they see the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and they mourn. They see him coming in the clouds of heaven. He sent his angels with a great sound of a trumpet ~~and~~, and they gather the elect from the four winds. Those are two distinct phases. Do they happen simultaneously? Or does he first come to the wicked, and then come to the righteous, or does he come to the wicked, and previously come to the righteous. And it is here referred to, though not in chronological order. There are two phases.

If we Christians are told to be ready because we do not know when he is to come, and yet if his coming is after his coming for the unbeliever, then we have plenty of time. There is no reason in the world for anyone of these commands to be given because we know he can't come until after all these things happen, and then he is coming for his people. But if this comes before, if verse 31 comes chronologically before verse 30, we have no way to know how much before 30. He

It might be ten years before,

Revelation 19 also shows the manifestation to the unbelieving world, and then ~~amp~~, small amp b. There is a manifestation to those who are saved which is suggested in some of the above passages, and is plainly described in I Thessalonians 4: 13-18. I Thessalonians 4: 13-18, is the only place where we have detail given about the rapture of the believers. But we do have it given. It is part of the Scripture, and to say, Well, Jesus doesn't mention it, therefore it doesn't matter. Jesus said, I have many things to tell you, but you cannot bear them now. But when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will lead you into all truth. Jesus implies in Matthew 24 that there is an appearance to the unbelieving world, though the details to the believer - though the details he gives are mostly about the unbelieving world, but he allows for the others. He suggests it and then through Paul he gives us the details in I Thessalonians 4: 13-18, the clear, detailed statement about how exactly the rapture of the Church is to take place.

S-109. 5/16/57.

We want to summarize what we've been covering in these last two weeks in Eschatology and we want to touch on the remaining matters that are necessary, and there will be ~~an~~ a number of passages yet to look at. And since the time is short, I'm going to move ahead rapidly, and I would - if there are things I didn't make clear, please ask me, but we will not have time, unfortunately, for extended discussion. In fact, I doubt if we can time for any discussion because we must finish out the heads. We are looking at D. New Testament Predictions of the Return of Christ. Number one, its importance, number two, its nature, number three, its ~~m~~ time. And on number three, a was preliminary considerations, b. No one can know when Christ will return. c. The return of Christ is to be a sudden event, and Christians are commanded always to be ready for it. And we had several headings under that. Under that we had 1, 2, 3, and 4, and 5. And then we took up 4, the New Testament teaches two phases of the actual return of Christ. And I gave Hebrews 9 which stressed one of these phases, and then II Thessalonians 1: 6-10, which brought them both out very clearly, even though the English versification

unfortunately is confusing. But if you divide the verses right you have his revelation to the wicked, his revelation to the righteous. What it does to the wicked, and what it means to the righteous. And that would be very easy to see if there were no verses there. But as they are, they confuse. And a was, There is a manifestation to the unbelieving world. and I gave a few of the many references given under that. And then b, There is a manifestation to those who are saved which is suggested in some of the above passages, and is plainly described in I Thessalonians 4: 13-18. Now I Thessalonians 4: 13-18, is the only passage in the New Testament which gives us a fair amount of details about something which is referred to ~~in~~ very frequently in other passages. But here alone we have detail ~~name~~ given, and we have a very considerable amount, which the Lord gave to Paul. We are told here that we are not to feel bad about those who have died, thinking they're not going to participate in the glory of Christ's coming. Because they also will participate. He says, "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord," He says we which are alive. Which certainly shows that Paul thought there was a possibility that it would come during his life. We which are alive and remain. Yet he's repeated constantly that we don't know when it will be. It might be during his life time. It might be after. If during his life time, then he'd be one of the we which are alive, and remain, and ~~and~~ if after his death, then he'd be one of the them which are asleep. We which are alive shall not precede them that are ~~and~~ asleep. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, and the voice of the archangel, and ~~with~~ the trump of God." Who will hear this shout, this voice of the archangel, this trump of God. When he is revealed to the whole unbelieving world, the whole unbelieving world will see the signs of his coming, and hear the sound. Here he is talking of his revelation to the Christian. They will hear the ~~name of his manifestation~~ shout and the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall arise first, then we which are alive and remain shall ~~not~~ be caught up together with them. That's quite different

from a coming down to the earth. We will be caught up together with them, in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord.

Somebody has said, the fact that it says to meet the Lord, means that the Lord is coming, and we just go and meet him, and come back with him instantly. That's taking a lot out of the word meet.

If you meet somebody the two of you are coming from opposite directions and you meet. What happens after you meet - whether you continue in the direction you were going, or whether you turn and one goes this way, and you turn and both go this way, or both go that way, or turn and go in a third way, or whether you stop there awhile. I've had the latter very often. I was going in a certain direction, I met someone going this way, and we met and we stopped, and sometimes we spent an hour there talking. And then after we spent the hour talking, one of us would turn around and go back with the other in the direction the other was going. Since I hate to stand up still, I'd much rather be walking. I'd always wish we had done it in the first place, instead of standing afoot. But we meet the Lord in the air, it says that he is coming, and we go up to meet him, and it does not say what happens next. That we have to learn from other passages. But we meet the Lord in the air, and it doesn't say, and then we turn to earth with him. We will turn to earth with him but whether it is immediately, or when it is, Paul doesn't deal with it here. He says, so shall we ever be with the Lord. "Wherefore comfort one another with these words." Well, this is a very interesting passage. We could spend two or three hours looking at it, and stressing to our minds and hearts, its implications. But I think its personal meaning is very obvious, and so we'll move on to c. ~~Small c~~

Small c. The manifestation to the unbelieving world takes place at the end of a series of events, but the fact that these events are predicted, will not make ~~the~~ its occurrence any less surprising to those affected by it.

We've already said that. I just wanted to bring it out at this point again, in connection with this phase of the return of Christ. We can know a great deal about ~~the~~ when he is coming to the unbeliever, but as far as they are concerned, they

don't believe it, so it is a complete surprise to them of when it comes.

Jude 14 speaks of his coming - of this coming. Jude 14 says, "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying," he prophesied of these, and the these mentioned just before is the apostates and the enemies of Christ. Enoch "prophesi~~d~~ of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints." We come with him, when he comes to execute judgment upon all ~~that are ungodly~~ and to convince all that are ungodly, etc.

I Thessalonians 3: 13, he refers to his coming also. There are many verses of this, I'm just taking a few outstanding ones. "To the end he may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father," when? "At the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his ~~many~~ saints." The time when he comes with his saints to this earth to put an end to all ungodliness. Now that's c.

Small d. The manifestation to the believers must come before any of the recognizable events, therefore there is an interval between the two phases.

He comes toward this earth with the trump of God, we rise to meet him in the air. He comes on to the earth and brings judgment to the earth. There are various events predicted, but the believer is told that the Lord comes in such an hour that he has no expectation, he has no way of knowing he is then coming. Therefore the events which are predicted to come, before the manifestation to the world, must come after the manifestation to the Christian. Else these dozen or so, strong statements, Be ye ready for ye know not when he is coming, speaking to Peter and those immediately after, watch and be ready. You don't know when he is coming. They are meaningless if ~~we~~ we do know that he cannot come until after certain events take place.

11(Question: I will say this, that it is quite clear in the Scripture that when the Lord comes to the unbelieving world Israel will be there as a nation. That is quite clear in Scripture. Now it is entirely possible that the Lord might rapture the Saints, and that in the interval between when the Saints have gone to heaven, and when they come back with him, Israel will have become a nation, that ^{the Jews} the Jews would settle in Palestine, that the whole thing may have happened then.

And consequently, there is no reason why his coming might not have occurred to the Saints before any Israelites went back to Palestine. But before his coming to the unbelieving world, they are to have a nation. Now then, the result is that when you see someone going back, that is further evidence of the approaching of the ~~s~~ time. And they have gone there, and so, 40 years ago, there was a further evidence. It might be drawing nearer now. Now they have become a nation. That's further evidence. But the nation only possesses ~~now~~ 1/2 or 2/3 of the ground that it is going to have. It may be that the Lord may come today, or tomorrow for his believers. And after that Israel will seize the rest of Palestine, and many things will happen between then and when he comes back. It may even be on the other hand that the Arab nation will rise up and join together, and drive Israel into the sea, if its his desire, and that Israel will come completely to an end, and that a 100 years from now, they'll be a new return to Palestine, and a new establishment of the Israelites. There is no ~~mark~~ sign ~~(sign)~~ in the Scripture of which we could say that when this happens we know the Lord's coming is nearer, and there is no sign of which we can say, until this happens he cannot come, for the saints. But we know that there are things that will happen before he comes to the unbelieving world, and when we see some of them ~~happen~~ happen, that's a further assurance of the truth of the whole thing,

Now under this I have an a and a b. I will give a and b as rapidly as I can, but these are extensive. (Should be 1 and 2 in parenthesis)

(1)
~~Smabime~~. is The reasonableness of expecting such an interval. The Lord comes back to the righteous in order to give them rest. He comes back and he is going to get the judgment of rewards. He comes back and there is the marriage supper of the lamb. There are all of these events that are going to happen in his relation to the righteous after he comes to the (14¹/₂). The Lord comes to the unbelieving world, but before he comes to the unbelieving world, there is the ~~mark~~ pouring out of his ~~wra~~th upon ~~inmm~~ them. There is the rise of Anti-Christ, there are certain things predicted ~~between~~^{of} the relationship between anti-christ and the world. He will destroy anti-Christ with the breath of his coming when he

appears.

We have these events then which will happen in relation to the unbelieving world before he appears. We have these events which will happen in relation to the believer after he appears. But when he appears to the unbelieving world he will come with thousands of his saints to execute judgment upon the earth. And it would seem very reasonable that he has ~~always~~ already established a relationship with his saints, given them their reward, put them in the position to carry on the judgment and establish the kingdom when he comes rather than all the unbelieving world rather than that all of this comes later. (15)

S-110.

In such an interval that that is how we know there is an interval. The way we know there is an interval, is because (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) we are told repeatedly is something that precedes any recognizable sign. We can not say it will not be 4000 years. We can not say it will be today. We have to say we don't know. Because he wants us always to be ready for his coming. In the first generation or the $\frac{1}{2}$ second or the third, or this may happen a hundred years from now. He wants us to be ready.

Small (2). Objections to this view. That is objections to the view of the ~~minimum~~ two phases being separate instead of both occurring at once, at one, indivisible event. Now there are two principle objections that are raised to this view. and these two objections we could take a month discussing, but I just want to rapidly mention them.

Small alpha. The Insistance that Matthew 24 and the parallels show that Anti-Christ must come first. That is one of the two principle objections. There are a great many objections, but most of them are just arguments about words. But there are two major objections presented, and this is the first. The insistance that Matthew 24 and the parallels show that Anti-Christ must come first. Now, in Matthew 24 we have the disciples asking, What are the signs of His coming. (21) When will these things happen? What are the signs of your coming? And Jesus said

when you see wars, and nation against nation, that's not the sign that I'm coming. I come at such a time as ye think not. He said, People will say Christ is here. Go out to him. He says don't pay any attention to them. He comes in such an hour as ye think not. He predicts the destruction of Jerusalem, warns the ~~man~~ Christians to flee from the city, and to be safe from that, but he says that if the people say Christ is coming now, don't pay any attention, because as the lightning comes out of the ~~west~~ east, and shines to the west, so shall the coming of the Son of man be. You can't tell when it is going to be. But he says that before the coming of the Son of Man to the wicked on the earth, he said, there will be great tribulation. The sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give her light, and will appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven, and all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. He is describing the future course of this world, and showing how it comes to an end, with this age, (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) the coming of Christ in great glory to this earth. Then in verse 31, "and he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. And if verse 31 chronologically comes after verse 30, then the Lord Jesus Christ comes back to this earth to the unbelieving world before the resurrection of the just, and he comes back to this earth in power and great glory, and then after he comes back, he (4) the righteous, and has the resurrection of the righteous after.

?

But all of the predictions that we have about the coming destructiveness of the resurrected just ~~that~~ show that it is not preceded by all these recognizable events described here, for many of the Scriptures of his coming to the earth, say he is coming with his Saints, and that clearly moves out the possibility that the righteous are not - he does not come to the righteous, that they are not gathered to himself until after he has come back to the earth. And so it is very plain that while he is speaking here about his revelation to the wicked world, then after speaking about that ~~that~~ through verse 30, he mentions in ~~in~~ verse 31, he mentions his gathering of the elect, not in chronological order, but as a separate subject, without telling

here where it is going to come, in the whole context of events here. But he goes on to speak to the righteous and tell them to be ready for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh. And he repeats that exhortation several times in the preceding verses, and they have absolutely no meaning if he comes at the end of a long period of events.

Now in Mark where he gives this prediction has these two verses in the same order, after verse 20 where he says, then shall they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with power and glory. He says, then shall he send his angels that gather together the elect from the four winds. And the word then which does not occur in Matthew here, but does occur in Mark here, to our English here would say, he comes to the wicked, and then he sends his angels to heaven and earth, and raises up the righteous and brings them to him, after he is come to earth. Well now, if this were then, meant after that, that would clearly contradict all the teachings in Scripture that when he comes to the earth, he comes with his saints, that the gathering of Saints is something that is previous rather than after His coming to the earth. It would ~~be~~ clearly contradicted. But the Greek word used here for then is tote. And the word tote which is used here, is a word which is translated then very frequently in our New Testament, and it is used sometimes of events which follow previous events. But it does not mean following ~~then~~ because if it did, it would speak of events which follow previous ~~then~~ events, and as a matter of fact, in Matthew, there are many illustrations which we could give, but just to give you one very rapidly, in ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 2, we read that the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, and said, Rise, take the young child, and Mary his mother, and flee into Egypt. (Verse 13.) And verse 14, "When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt: and was there until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son. Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth,". Then, tote. Does it mean after this, after the death of Herod when Joseph came back, then Herod, seeing he was mocked of the wise men, sent, and killed the children of Bethlehem. Of course, it means nothing of the kind. It means at that

time. It means then, it means at the time when the wise men had come to Christ, and when he began to realize that they weren't coming back, ~~hacama~~ to tell him where he was. And then Joseph and Mary had started to Egypt, though he didn't know it. Then he saw, it does not mean after Joseph came back, because Herod was dead. That is one illustration, but we could give many, of the fact that tote, then does not mean afterwards, but it means at this general period. In this case it is two or three years before, the previous period. But it is at that general period, that's spoken of.

And so the tote in Mark which is here translated then, means at that general period. It does not mean after the event described in the previous period. Well, we could look at many other instances, but we have many other points we want to mention today. So I will very briefly mention Beta.

Beta is the argument from Revelation 20, and I don't want to take time on this because I never heard of this argument until night before last. And yet, oh, by the way, somebody asked me yesterday, quoted something that I had criticized and said that Gaebelin says so and so, and I was quite shocked because it was the exact opposite of anything that Gaebelin would have ever said. And I couldn't understand how the question came to be raised until after class I realized that I had said this book, the Blessed Hope said, and naturally it would be easy for someone to think that I had said Our Hope, the magazine that Gaebeline founded. I ~~can~~ can easily understand how they could misunderstand it. And so let me simply say that I had ~~u~~ quoted something from ~~a~~ a book called "The Blessed Hope" by Professor George E. Ladd of Fuller Seminary, which is not about the blessed hope, but which is a book against the idea of the rapture of the saints previous to the coming of Christ to the earth. That's the subject of the book. It takes a big (9½)
but it deals with one small phase of that, and there is one page of the book, which regrets that we argue about these details, because why don't we all get together to ~~make~~ make people believe that Christ is coming back. That's one ~~page~~ ^{page} ~~page~~ and then there is 166 other pages, which are arguing over this little point, that it is wrong and wicked to believe in a pre-tribulation rapture, because the blessed hope is not a

pre-tribulation rapture, but is the coming of Christ to this earth. Well, I don't like the phrase, Pre-Tribulation Rapture, frankly I don't, because it sounds as if the hope of the Church was to get out of the tribulation, and it isn't at all. We have tribulation through this age, and we may have terrible tribulation yet. What is meant by the phrase, ~~the~~ Pre-Tribulation Rapture, is that the coming of Christ to the Saints is not to be preceded by a specific tribulation which can be recognized as such. It may be preceded by tribulation, because the thing about it is, we do not know when he is coming. He may be coming in a period of peace, he may be coming in a period of tribulation. In such an hour as ye think not he comes. But I don't like the phrase. Pre-tribulation rapture sounds as if we don't get any tribulation, we believe. It's not that at all. Previous to any tribulation which is predicted as recognizable as preceding the return of Christ. That's all. But that is what I have quoted from, and he says in here, that the Scripture is not clear as to - he thinks - because of inference after inference - he thinks - that Christ comes to the unbelieving world, and to the believers at the same time, and there is no interval between them. There is no evidence for it except one, and the one he gives I never heard of before in my life. And I was much interested. But it is not being used otherwise much. I don't want to ~~me~~ spend much time on it, but I'll mention here very briefly what it is. But if you don't understand, I won't go back and take ~~me~~ time, because alpha and gamma are so much more important, because they are much more used.

But this argument is that in Revelation 20 verse 4, it says, "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." And Ladd says, this statement, they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years, describes the first resurrection, which we all agree with him. He says, this describes the first resurrection, and he says the first part of the verse describes two kinds of people, because it says, I saw thrones and they ~~me~~ sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them. So there are people sitting on thrones.

And then he says, ~~written~~ "And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded during the tribulation, and then it says, they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. So he says, this phrase, they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years shows the false practice of teaching, those who he saw sitting on the throne, and those who were martyred and came up out of the tribulation, he said, they were all raised at the same time. And this proves that the resurrection comes after - the resurrection of believers comes after Jesus Christ comes back to this earth. Well, I never heard of the argument before, but he gives it as the one conclusive argument, which seems to me, that the very fact that he said he saw thrones and they sat on them, implied that these people had already been raised, rather than that after he saw them ~~they~~ and they sat on them, then they had to be raised from the dead, and they reigned with him a thousand years. So it doesn't seem to be to be much of an argument. But I mentioned it here. But then gemma is a difficult argument. I'm going to have to take four minutes on gemma, because it is a very important argument. I should take four weeks on it.

But gemma is the Argument from II Thessalonians 2: 2. And that is a matter which is much more difficult. I Thessalonians, Paul tells the believer that they're not to worry about their death, that they won't participate on Jesus' kingdom on earth, because he says, he'll bring them with him, and you are to come -

S-111.

- you should be ready and watching, so that it won't be a matter of tremendous surprise for you when the Lord will come, because you are ready whenever he comes. That's what he says in I Thessalonians 1. But it would seem that among the Thessalonians there were some who advanced an idea somewhat like what the Millennial Dawnists, or Jehovah Witnesses or whatever they are calling themselves at present, say today, that the Lord has already come to the earth, and only some people don't know it. He's already here. Well, that is what some of them say. Now we know that he won't come that way. He's coming in the clouds, and he'll receive his own

to him in the clouds. And then he comes to the earth, and everyeye sees him. But these people did not have that clearly in mind. And therefore, these people in Thessalonica were beginning to think the Lord's already come. He's come to earth. He's setting up his kingdom. And we have not been told about it. We have not been included. And so in II Thessalonians 2, Paul says, now, we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is (it says) at hand. But this was translated before the discovery of the porpyry, in which this word is regularly used for the present day. It is now present, is a much present translation as all scholars agree. As that the day of Christ is now present. That Jesus Christ is already come, and set up his kingdom on earth, and you have not been informed of it. You don't know, and you are left out. Well, he says, don't be troubled by a letter which somebody says is from Paul, that Christ is already here, or anything like that. Let no man decieve you by any means: for that will not come. You will not have a situation where the Lord is here, except certain things happen first. Except there come a falling away, and the man of sin be revealed. The man of perdition ~~man~~ who will oppose/^{us}and exalt himself above all ~~other~~ that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.

He says, now ye know what ~~man~~ prevents that he should be revealed~~ye~~ yet, because the mystery of iniquity already works, only he that hinders, (the old english word let is hinder of course) he that hinders will hinder, until he be taken out of the way, and then shall that Wicked one be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. And so there are those who say, the Lord cannot come to the believers until after the anti-Christ has been revealed, whom the Lord is going to consume with the breath of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming. But the point here is that the Lord will not come to the unbelieving world - will not come to set up his kingdom on Earth here, until the Anti-Christ has been revealed, and has been

destroyed. Now if this means he won't come to the righteous either until after that, then all the past statements Paul and Jesus made, that in such an hour that ye think not, that ye don't know when he is coming, and that you should be ready immediately, because it might be now. All those statements are contradicted and ~~and~~ are absolutely meaningless, if you take it that way. Well, God is not a God of confusion. He doesn't say one thing a dozen times, and then say something the exact opposite. So we know that this passage, if correctly interpreted will not say that. The opposite of what these others do say. But what does this passage say?

It says Christ's kingdom, set up on earth here, does not come until after he has come to the earth, and has destroyed that Wicked one, the Anti-Christ. Well, now, when will the Anti-Christ be revealed. Verse 8 says, after that which is taken out of the ~~the~~ way that presents him from being revealed. What is the thing that is preventing him from being revealed. What is it? That he who hinders will hinder, until he be taken out of the way. What is the thing that is hindering the Anti-Christ from being revealed, and will hinder until it be taken out of the way. A very easy way to find out, all that you have to do is look at ~~at~~ (4 $\frac{1}{2}$)

little New Testament. And in there he has a footnote, that fully explains. he says ~~in~~ there in his footnote, to II Thessalonians 2, where it says that the one who impeded, until be gotten out of the way, this seems to refer to the Roman Empire, incarnated in the Emperor. See, that's what ~~But~~ that the Anti-Christ shall be revealed. ~~What~~, he continues, who ~~was~~ probably was just referred to as the Man of Sin, whom after all checked the Jews at an earlier period from doing their worship. ? So the Roman empire, the Roman emperor is referred to as a man of sin, but it is he that hinders the revelation of the Holy One who God will reveal at ~~that~~ his second coming. Well, the Roman Emperor has gone a long time ago, so if that's what it means it has no particular relevance to us today. But I don't think that that's what it means.

I think very clearly what it means is, the Holy Spirit acting through the Church. It does not mean the Holy Spirit. It means the Holy Spirit acting through~~f~~ the Church. These arguments, like Ladd's book, say, Now, if the Holy Spirit cannot convert the

world today, with its Christians, if the Holy Spirit can't convert the whole [?] day, how do you expect the whole world to ~~ann~~ be evangelized between the rapture and the return of Christ, when the Holy Spirit is gone. Well, the Holy Spirit will not be gone. The Holy Spirit is everywhere. He is omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, he's God. He's never gone. But that which is gone, is the Holy Spirit acting through the Church. It is the Christians in whose heart the Holy Spirit is, which are the salt, what keeps this world together, and keeps it from disintegrating into wickedness, and he says after the Church, with the Holy Spirit in it, is taken out of this world, then he says, the wicked one, the Anti-Christ will be revealed. And so this passage on careful examination does not teach that all the other statements are wrong, that in such an hour as ^{we} ~~ann~~ think not the Lord comes, but that actually he can't come until after Anti-Christ

(6:75) the earth. It is talking about the establishment of his kingdom, and his coming to the wicked world, which does not come until after the Anti-Christ comes. And the Christian is taken up, before the Anti-Christ is revealed, because that must be that which hinders, ~~hannann~~ will be , until he is taken out of the way. And I personally ~~am~~ believe this is referred to earlier, but I wouldn't be dogmatic about it. He says, that day won't come, except there be a falling away first. Well, there was a great falling away with gnosticism. had taken place. There has been falling away after falling away after falling away. And I don't think that's what he meant as a sign. He won't come until there be some apostasy. There have been hundreds of them. That is not a recognizable sign in any sense, so it would be nothing to tell the Thessalonians here. The word here, translated as falling ~~any~~ away, is the word apostasia, only occurs two or three times in the New Testament, and it is never used as translated falling away else where. And it is a word that is sometimes translated in a secular sense, to mean rebellion, and in other case ^{an} it is translated an interval. [?] It is used for a state. An interval. And it comes from the verb which means to depart. The verb is used maybe 50 times in the New Testament. The angel took Peter out of the prison, and they walked out in the street, and then the angel departed from Peter, and it is this verb. And this is the noun

from the verb, and so my personal opinion is that the verb here, simply means, the noun here simply means the departure, and it is referred to the taking up of the saints prior to the Revelation, but I would not be dogmatic. If it means an apostasia, a falling away, there have been many of them. So the sign is already fulfilled. But since he speaks a little later about the taking away of the Church, it is my impression that -

8½ (Question: Dr. MacRae, if the idea here is in reference to the unbelieving world, then Paul is not dealing with the immediate problem of the Thessalonians. He is writing to the Christian Church. The Christians are expecting the ~~return~~ return of Christ, with reference to himself. Now Paul seems to answer here, and he deals with the coming of the Lord to the unbelievers.

I'm afraid I won't dare take time on that now. I'd like to. There are so many other points we want to get over. (Question: But Paul was still dealing with the impossible). Dealing with their problem, which ^{is} they thought the Lord was already here, to set up his kingdom. And he says that won't matter until first there be a falling away, first that which hinders will not hinder, and then the Anti-Christ will be revealed. I don't dare take time on that now.

This is gemma, the argument from II Thessalonians 2:2, and then there is one statement in the Old Testament which I just mentioned incidentally here, with dealing with the New Testament evidence, which seems to me to show clearly that the resurrection of the - to show clearly the resurrection of the righteous takes place before the tribulation to the wicked, when the Anti-Christ is revealed, and that statement is in Isaiah 26. And Isaiah 26 we looked at in Prophets course last year. I'll barely mention it here, that we have the resurrection from the dead described in verses 10, in verses 19. Isaiah 26: 19 is the resurrection from the dead. The previous verses on the frustration of the Church, not bringing deliverance on ~~the~~ the earth, neither have the inhabitants of the world fallen. The answer of Christ is the resurrection of the believers in verse 19, and then in 20, he says, "Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut they doors about thee:

hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. For, behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity." After the resurrection of believers comes the Lord coming out of his place to pour out the punishment on the unbelievers.

Small e. The vital thing is not the relation of the Lord's coming for his
Saints, to the tribulation or to the week, but the utter uncertainty of the time,
so that we should ^{ALWAYS} all be ready. The thing that is stressed, and stressed, and stressed again, is such an hour as ye think not, the Lord cometh. Well now, some people say I believe he is coming in the beginning of the week, I believe he is coming in the middle of the week, I believe he is coming at the end of the week. What's a week? He said he is coming before the tribulation, there are loads of tribulation before he comes. There is a tribulation after he comes. The tribulation that comes after he comes, doesn't come before he comes. But there are many other tribulations before it. But as far as the week is concerned, the whole matter about the week, rests on one very difficult passage in Daniel. I personally believe that he is going to come after the coming of Christ, and taking his saints to heaven. I believe that that's when it is going to come. But instead of saying he is going to come, at the beginning of a week, I think it is better to say, he is coming at an unexpected time, for his own, and there's an interval between, and we find a reference to this interval in Daniel. To say that it is the beginning, the middle or the end of the week, the whole matter rests on one very difficult verse, and shouldn't be made the foundation, but rather something that should be judged after, and the time be based on these dozen of clear statements in the New Testament, a rather than on one obscure statement in Daniel.

~~His return during the week~~

Number five. Other effects of Christ's return.

~~Small a.~~ Small a. The resurrection of believers.

Small b. The marriage supper of the lamb. Which certainly takes place after we meet him in the clouds. It isn't postponed until after he comes to this earth, and setting up of the kingdom.

Small c. The judgment seat of Christ. (The giving of the rewards to the righteous.) It certainly takes place before the coming back to the earth, and setting up the kingdom.

Small d. The salvation of all Israel. Described in Romans 11, and Jeremiah 31: 31-34. So shall all Israel be saved. It must take place during this period.

Small e. The destruction of Anti-Christ. And we've just looked at the verses about that.

Small f. Christ manifested in glory to all who oppose him.

Small g. The establishment of the kingdom of righteousness and peace.

Small h. Satan bound for a thousand years.

Number six. The great promise of the Return in the New Testament. It is mentioned 318 times, in 250 chapters. I've mentioned in a chapel talk last week, how every verse, and chapter of I Thessalonians ends with it. And how it effected Timothy. In his last epistle to Titus it is stressed. In the first of the last of Paul's epistles.

~~Num~~ Capital E. Relation of Old Testament and New Testament Predictions.

Number one.

S-112.

Number two. The Millenium.

Small a. Description in the Old Testament. We've looked at these. I gave you a pamphlet. I asked you to master this article, in which I've gone into some of the evidence of it. The ~~descriptions~~ descriptions in the Old Testament of the Millenium. We've already looked at connection with the kingdom in the Old Testament, at its phases which are stressed there, and they're in the pamphlet that I gave you. So I've just mentioned the heading here, in Small a.

Small b. In Revelation 20, the New Testament reveals the length of the promised kingdom and the fact that the Resurrection and judgment of the wicked dead comes at its end. This truth which is contained in Revelation 20 is clearly taught already in Isaiah 24. The last part of Isaiah 24, tells of Satan's being bound, and while he is bound, the kingdom of Christ, while he is bound before he is loosed for a little

season. Now a question that is much discussed is when is Satan bound? According to Revelation 20 this age ends with the return of Christ, and after the return of Christ, he sets up his kingdom for a thousand year. The kingdom described in the Old Testament. But Revelation 20 does not describe the details of this kingdom. They are given in the Old Testament, in Isaiah 11, in Isaiah 2, and Micah 4, and these other passages quite fully. Revelation 20 simply speaks of it as a time of 1000 years when they reign with Christ, and says that during this time, Satan is bound. There are many who do not accept Revelation 20 as the prediction of what is going to come after the return of Christ. and all of them have to give some explanation of what it means, that Satan is bound for a thousand years. And so, those who do not believe, that this is a description of the kingdom which comes at the return of Christ, say most of them, that Satan is bound now. A book was published within the last two years, by Kik, who is the associate editor of the new magazine, Christianity Today. And Marcellus Kik, in this book says, its discussion of Revelation 20, he says that Satan is bound now. That it is a discussion of this present age. Well now, if Satan is bound now, why in the New Testament, in Ephesians 4: 27, Ephesians 6: 11, 12, I Peter 5: 8, and so on, why is it that in these passages then, that we are constantly exhorted to be on our watch against Satan who comes as a roaring lion trying to deceive us, and to put on the whole armor of God, to be able to resist the wiles of the Devil. Why are we exhorted ~~repeatedly~~ repeatedly to do this, if Satan is bound now. It just doesn't make sense. Somebody said, If Satan is bound now, he must be tied to a mighty big chain, mighty long. Because certainly, the New Testament is full of exhortations to us, to resist the wiles of the devil today, but Revelation 20 says, he is bound for a thousand years that he should deceive the nations no longer. That is not a description of today. That is a description of what is going to happen, after Christ comes.

So there are two major points of difference today about the return of Christ. One is the question whether there are two phases of his return or one. Let me say that that has nothing to do with Pre-Millennialism. A person could be a Pre-Millennialist or an A-Millennialist, and believe in a Pre-Tribulation rapture, or a Post-Tribulation

rapture. It is an entirely distinct question from Pre-Millennialism. But I believe the Scripture clearly teaches that the believer cannot know when he is coming. Now the other question which is a new question today, is the matter of Pre-Millennialism, A-Millennialism, and Post-millennialism. And there are those three views, the Post-Millennial view, that the world gets better and better, the view that Warfield held, that every woman, man and child on this earth is converted by the preaching of the gospel, and then Christ returns. That is the Post-Millennial ~~premillennialism~~ view that all the wonderful promises of the kingdom in the Old Testament, are fulfilled at the return of Christ. And then the Pre-Millennial view is that these promises are fulfilled after the return of Christ. And the so called A-Millennial view is that these promises, of a universal reign of Christ, are not fulfilled before the view ? till the gospel comes to the whole world, nor is it fulfilled after his return to establish righteousness on the whole earth, but that there is no millenium. Those are the three views.

Since we only have one minute, I'll have to skip over certain points I have here about the glories of the Millenium, and about the Lord's blessing to

(6 $\frac{1}{2}$). I'll skip those points and give point 5. And Point 5, has 6 subheadings. And in this minute, I'm just going to give them to you very rapidly. I'm skipping point 4.

Point 5. Our attitude toward prophecy.

Small a. Prophecy should not be just to satisfy curiosity.

Small b. What Differences in interpretation of prophecy should not cause us separation and hostility among those who should be working together for the advancement of the ~~message~~ gospel. You don't have to get that down word for word. You get the idea. Details of prophecy we should study, but we shouldn't make them the vital points among Christians.

Small c. Prophecy has a vital purpose in our lives, and we should think what is the purpose. Not just to satisfy curiosity, or to argue about, but the blessings God wants to give us through these great points he wants us to understand.

Small d. It is a sort of encouragement in whatever tribulation falls to our lives.

The blessed hope is not that we escape the tribulation. We may have many tribulations. The blessed hope is that Jesus Christ is coming, and that no matter what tribulations we may have, we know he is coming. His promises are sure. We can be encouraged and look forward with confidence to his coming, and though there will be a great tribulation to the world after he comes for the believers, that's not the hope - escaping the tribulation. The hope is going to be with him.

Small e. It is a motive for Christian living and Christian service. That we should watch, that we should be active, we should be vigilant. We should be serving the Lord. If ~~man~~prophecy accomplishes this, it is a great and blessed thing. If prophecy keeps us from the service of Christ, because we spend a lot of time arguing ^{harmful thing.} details, it's a ~~man~~. But it is not meant to be a harmful thing. It is meant to be a blessed thing, and it encourages us, and its strengthening of us in our determination to serve him faithfully.

Small f. The last prayer in the Bible - even so Come Lord Jesus.

And I want to finish this course with just a word of Prayer.

PRAYER FINISHING THE COURSE.

Oh God our Father, we thank thee for these wonderful promises, in the Scripture. We thank you for the promises in the Old Testament, that our Lord will ^{set} ~~take~~ up a kingdom of happiness and glory and peace. Oh our God we pray that you will ~~stamp~~ quickly bring an end to the wickedness and the harm, and misery of this age, and establish that wonderful kingdom. And oh our God we thank you for the promises of the New Testament. That this kingdom will be established, because the kingdom will [?] be with you, that he whom we love, who died for us, will return to be with us. Oh, our God, we had to hurry in this semester to cover these great themes, regeneration, justification, sanctification, and these wonderful truths of the return of Christ, but oh our God make them real in our hearts, help us each one to be full of the knowledge of God, give us an objective attitude, that we may go to your word, and see what's there, and stand on it, and not to try to read our ideas into it. But oh our God, if our Lord carries, may what we learned this semester be used with each one of us to spread the knowledge of Christ. Even so come Lord Jesus.



**Interdisciplinary Biblical
Research Institute**

**The Allan Alexander MacRae
Memorial Library**

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IV

INDEX

1957

I - N - D - E - X.

Systematic Theology IV, 1957 (Spring).

I. What is Theology?	Page 6.
II. Systematic.	Page 10.
A. It is the Systematic Arrangement of Facts.	Page 12.
B. It is theology as a system.	Page 12.
a. What is Systematic Theology?	Page 17.
b. The means of gaining knowledge in this field.	Page 17.
1. An authoritative human being.	Page 17.
2. The voice of the church	Page 19.
B. How do we secure knowledge in this field? Negatively.	
1. Not through the statements of an authoritative human being.	Page 21.
2. Not through the Decision of a Church body.	Page 27.
3. Not through creeds.	Page 29.
4. Not through examining the history of dogma.	Page 31.
5. Not through studying the History of Philosophy.	Page 32.
6. Not through some Esoteric Process.	Page 33.
Positively.	
1. We secure knowledge of theology in exactly the same way as we secure knowledge in other fields of science.	Page 34.
a. By Induction.	Page 34.
b. Deduction.	Page 34.
c. Revelation. (Communication.	Page 34.
2. Theology differs from other science only as regards the acceptability of the nation.	Page 42.
3. Data otherwise inaccessible can only be secured by revelation	Page 45.
4. We have such a revelation.	Page 46.
5. The Revelation becomes a source of material for inductive study.	Page 47.
6. The Bible under the leading of the Holy Spirit, is the only source for knowledge of Theology.	Page 48.
C. What is the purpose of the course?	Page 48.
1. It is to gain a balanced knowledge of the vitals and essentials of Christianity.	Page 48.
2. It is to gain secure training in dealing with Theological problems.	Page 53.
3. It is to determine the proper attitude toward those who differ with us, on points of Theology.	Page 55.
A. Vital points of today.	Page 55.
a. How important is	
B. Secondary matters.	Page 56.
1. How important is the matter?	Page 57.
<u>I.</u> Justification.	Page 62.
1. The definition which we learned from the catechism.	Page 63.
2. All reformed creeds agree and the Lutheran Confession teaches precisely the same doctrine.	Page 63.
A. Its importance.	page 63.
1. The Great Emphasis in the New Testament.	Page 63.
2. It is the great doctrine of the Protestant Reformation.	Page 64.
3. It is important because it is the key that opens the door to eternal life.	Page 64.
4. Without it, nothing else would be of any help.	Page 66.
5. It is the foundation of Christian life, and the touchstone of Christian freedom.	Page 67.

pages [1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [4](#) [5](#) [6](#) [7](#) [8](#) [9](#) [10](#) [11](#) [12](#) [13](#) [14](#) [15](#) [16](#) [17](#) [18](#) [19](#) [20](#) [21](#) [22](#) [23](#) [24](#) [25](#) [26](#) [27](#)



About IBRI:

The Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute is a group of Christians who see a desperate need for men and women convinced of the complete reliability of the Bible who will:

(1) get training both in Biblical studies and in some other academic discipline, and

(2) use this training to help other Christians deal with the many areas where non-Christian teaching is so dominant today.

We believe that such trained people can be effective in removing many stumbling blocks that keep others from the Gospel.

★ [Our Objectives](#)

★ [Our Programs](#)

★ [Our Beliefs](#)

★ [Membership](#)



You can contact IBRI by e-mail at: webmaster@ibri.org

This Web Site has been selected as a "Links²Go" Key Resource for Theological Studies



[Links²Go](#)
[Theological Studies](#)

I - N - D - E - X.

Systematic Theology IV, 1957 (Spring).

I. What is Theology?	Page 6.
II. Systematic.	Page 10.
A. It is the Systematic Arrangement of Facts.	Page 12.
B. It is theology as a system.	Page 12.
a. What is Systematic Theology?	Page 17.
b. The means of gaining knowledge in this field.	Page 17.
1. An authoritative human being.	Page 17.
2. The voice of the church	Page 19.
B. How do we secure knowledge in this field? Negatively.	
1. Not through the statements of an authoratative human being.	Page 21.
2. Not through the Decision of a Church body.	Page 27.
3. Not through creeds.	Page 29.
4. Not through examining the history of dogma.	Page 31.
5. Not through studying the History of Philosophy.	Page 32.
6. Not through some Esoteric Process.	Page 33.
Positively.	
1. We secure knowledge of theology in exactly the same way as we secure knowledge in other fields of science.	Page 34.
a. By Induction.	Page 34.
b. Deduction.	Page 34.
d. Revelation. (Communication.	Page 34.
2. Theology differs from other science only as regards the acceptibility of the nation.	Page 42.
3. Data otherwise inaccessible can only be secured by revelation	Page 45.
4. We have such a revelation.	Page 46.
5. The Revelation becomes a source of material for inductive study.	Page 47.
6. The Bible under the leading of the Holy Spirit, is the only source for knowledge of Theology.	Page 48.
C. What is the purpose of the course?	Page 48.
1. It is to gain a balanced knowledge of the vitals and essentials of Christianity.	Page 48.
2. It is to gain secure training in dealing with Theological problems.	Page 53.
3. It is to determine the proper attitude toward those who differ with us, on points of Theology.	Page 55.
A. Vital points of today.	Page 55.
a. How important is	
B. Secondary matters.	Page 56.
1. How important is the matter?	Page 57.
<u>I.</u> Justification.	Page 62.
1. The definition which we learned from the catechism.	Page 63.
2. All reformed creeds agree and the Luthern Confession teaches precisely the same doctrine.	Page 63.
A. Its importance.	page 63.
1. The Great Emphasis in the New Testament.	Page 63.
2. It is the great doctrine of the Protestant Reformation.	Page 64.
3. It is important because it is the key that opens the door to eternal life.	Page 64.
4. Without it, nothing else would be of any help.	Page 66.
5. It is the foundation of Christian life, and the touchstone of Christian freedom.	Page 67.

I - N - D - E - X.

Systematic Theology IV, 1957 (Spring).

I. What is Theology?	Page 6.
II. Systematic.	Page 10.
A. It is the Systematic Arrangement of Facts.	Page 12.
B. It is theology as a system.	Page 12.
a. What is Systematic Theology?	Page 17.
b. The means of gaining knowledge in this field.	Page 17.
1. An authoritative human being.	Page 17.
2. The voice of the church	Page 19.
B. How do we secure knowledge in this field? Negatively.	
1. Not through the statements of an authoratative human being.	Page 21.
2. Not through the Decision of a Church body.	Page 27.
3. Not through creeds.	Page 29.
4. Not through examining the history of dogma.	Page 31.
5. Not through studying the History of Philosophy.	Page 32.
6. Not through some Esoteric Process.	Page 33.
Positively.	
1. We secure knowledge of theology in exactly the same way as we secure knowledge in other fields of science.	Page 34.
a. By Induction.	Page 34.
b. Deduction.	Page 34.
d. Revelation. (Communication.	Page 34.
2. Theology differs from other science only as regards the acceptibility of the nation.	Page 42.
3. Data otherwise inaccessible can only be secured by revelation	Page 45.
4. We have such a revelation.	Page 46.
5. The Revelation becomes a source of material for inductive study.	Page 47.
6. The Bible under the leading of the Holy Spirit, is the only source for knowledge of Theology.	Page 48.
C. What is the purpose of the course?	Page 48.
1. It is to gain a balanced knowledge of the vitals and essentials of Christianity.	Page 48.
2. It is to gain secure training in dealing with Theological problems.	Page 53.
3. It is to determine the proper attitude toward those who differ with us, on points of Theology.	Page 55.
A. Vital points of today.	Page 55.
a. How important is	
B. Secondary matters.	Page 56.
1. How important is the matter?	Page 57.
<u>I.</u> Justification.	Page 62.
1. The definition which we learned from the catechism.	Page 63.
2. All reformed creeds agree and the Luthern Confession teaches precisely the same doctrine.	Page 63.
A. Its importance.	page 63.
1. The Great Emphasis in the New Testament.	Page 63.
2. It is the great doctrine of the Protestant Reformation.	Page 64.
3. It is important because it is the key that opens the door to eternal life.	Page 64.
4. Without it, nothing else would be of any help.	Page 66.
5. It is the foundation of Christian life, and the touchstone of Christian freedom.	Page 67.

- B. What justification is. Page 68.
1. Justification is an act. Page 68.
 2. It is an act of grace. Page 71.
 3. It is not an act of power. (Not an efficient act.) Page 73.
 4. It is not simply pardon. Page 74, 80
 5. It is a forensic act. Page 76.
 - a. The terms used. Page 82.
 - b. Justification is described as the opposite of condemnation. Page 84.

to
 - c. The parallel with such judicial terms as/impute. Page 85.
 - d. The fact that justification is so clearly ~~hang~~ and constantly related to the merits of Christ. Page 85.
 - e. The fact that God's justice is represented in Scripture as unchangeable. Page 85.
 - f. The results from it require complete acquittal. Page 86.
- C. How God justifies. (The Condition of Justification) Page 88.
1. The Negative. Page 89.

Justification is not the result of any works that we put forth.

 - a. The Pelagian Error. Page 89.

(Pelagius held that Jesus Christ by his death, brought grace which is helpful to us.) Page 89.
 - b. The error of the Romanists. Page 91.
 - c. Jesus bore the penalty of our sins upon the cross. Page 93.
 - d. The righteousness of Christ is imputed to us. Page 94.
 - e. Faith is the instrument through which we receive justification. Page 96.
 1. Faith is not a work on account of which we are justified. Page 101.
 2. Faith is not the ground of our justification. Page 103.
 3. Faith is the instrument through which we receive justification. Page 103.

Systematic Theology IV, 1957, (Spring.)

4.	The faith that justifies us is not mere knowledge.	Page 104.
5.	The faith that justifies is not mere assent.	Page 105.
6.	The faith that justifies involves trust.	Page 108.
7.	This faith is one that unites the Believer to Christ.	Page 109.
8.	This faith is a living faith.	Page 110.
9.	How is this faith secured?	Page 113.
	(a). Faith is a gift of God.	Page 113.
	(b). Faith comes by hearing God's word.	Page 113.
	(c). Faith is the work of the Holy Spirit.	Page 113.
	(d) Our Faith increases by fixing our eyes on the Promises of God.	Page 113.
10.	Thus we see that faith is not a work for which God rewards us, by saving us.	Page 114.
	f. The Time of Justification.	Page 114.
D.	The Results of Justification.	Page 118.
	1. Remission of Sin.	Page 120.
	2. Full satisfaction of the Law's Demand.	Page 120.
	3.	
	4. Restoration to God's Favor.	Page 125.
	5. Title to eternal life.	Page 126.
	6. Adoption to Sonship.	Page 126.
E.	Objections to the Biblical View of Justification.	Page 128.
E.	The Relation to other doctrines.	Page 131.
F.	The Relation of Justification to Regeneration.	Page 145.
	1. The meaning of the term - Regeneration.	Page 145.
	2. Regeneration is entirely a work of God.	Page 146.
	a. Regeneration is not baptism.	Page 147.
	b. Regeneration is not a natural forward step in man's Development.	Page 147.
	c. Regeneration is a spiritual quickening - a new birth.	Page 147.
	3. Regeneration.	Page 152.
	a. Regeneration is always described as something done to us, never something that we can do ourselves.	Page 152.
	b. Regeneration is always represented as dependent on God's will, and not due to any goodness in us.	Page 152.
	c. Regeneration is a secret act of God.	Page 152.
	d. We know that God has regenerated all those who are justified.	Page 153.
4.	We must carefully distinguish God's part and man's part in Salvation.	Page 154.
	a. Regeneration is entirely of God.	Page 154.
	b. Regeneration is the first step in sanctification.	Page 154.
	c. Justification is by God's grace.	Page 154.
5.	We must carefully distinguish between the believer's judicial standing and the believer's qualitative state.	Page 155.
	a. Regeneration is always represented as a change of condition, it is never represented as a change of position.	Page 156.
	b. We can know our judicial standing; our position as children of God is a direct result of our judicial standing.	Page 156.
	c. We can never know in this life, our precise qualitative state.	Page 157.
	d. We must rejoice in our judicial standing and can go forward to possess our possession.	Page 158.
6.	We must seek constant improvement in our qualitative state, but never let our joy in the Lord be based on the measure of our success in this area, but only on our standing through his grace.	Page 158.

7. Consideration of the time of our justification. Page 159.
- a. We are justified from all eternity. Page 159.
 - b. We are justified by the death of Christ. Page 159.
 - c. We are justified by the resurrection of Christ. Page 159.
 - d. We are justified when faith begins to act. Page 159.
 - e. Justification finds its expression in eternal life. Page 159.
 - f. Many of us can know the exact time when we became conscious that our sins were borne by Christ. Page 160.
8. Consideration of the time of Regeneration. Page 164.
- a. Regeneration is planned in the counsel of God from all eternity. Page 164.
 - b. Our regeneration is secured as a result of the death of Christ. Page 164.
 - c. The resurrection is a proof of our justification. Page 164.
 - d. When God applies it to us. Page 164.
 - e. The full proof of regeneration is when you have complete Sanctification. Page 166.
 - f. We have no way of observing when our regeneration takes place. Page 167.
9. Which comes first - Justification or regeneration? Page 168.
- a. Both are in the plan of God. Page 168.
 - b. Both are secured through the work of Christ. Page 168.
10. There is definite scriptural evidence that seems to point to a temporal order of the two. Page 170.
11. We can state the order of events in salvation as follows. Page 175.
- 1. Election.
 - 2. Atonement.
 - 3. Vocation.
A complex of events including the beginning of most aspects of our salvation: including regeneration and justification.
Regeneration.
Conversion
Justification applied by faith.
 - 4. Sanctification.
 - 5. Glorification.
12. If we believe in Christ we can know that we are justified and can rest on his finished work, if we know that we have been justified, we can then know, that we have been regenerated, and must apply ourself to working out what God has worked within us. ? ? Page 177.
13. We must examine the relation of the orator selucus. Page 181.
- a. If recognition of God's decree would cut the nerve of evangelism, such recognition would equally destroy all human initiative. Page 181.
 - b. As a matter of fact, this is not what happens. Page 185.
 - c. We do not know God's plan as to precise events, but we do know that our free agency is real, and that we are responsible for the results of our action. Page 181.
 - d. Life is full of choices and man is responsible for his choice. Page 192.
 - e. Recognition that it would seem to be taught that regeneration precedes faith, is no more destructive to human responsibility than recognition of God's decrees, for a substitutionary nature of Christ's atonement. Page 194.
 - (1). Moral influence theory of the atonement. Page 195.
 - (2). The governmental theory of the atonement. Page 197.

Systematic Theology IV, 1957, (Spring).

f.	God's Word recognizes man's part in leading others to know Christ.	Page 199.
g.	God has put us here to carry out His Will for us, rather than for the purpose of understanding all the mysteries of the universe.	Page 203.
h.	Our responsibility in life.	Page 203.
	1. To make sure of our own justification.	Page 204.
	2. To make progress in our own sanctification.	Page 204.
	3. To show others how to be justified.	Page 204.
	4. To show others how to be sanctified.	Page 204.
H.	The Objections to the Scriptural View of Justification.	Page 207.
	1. It is said to lead to licentiousness.	Page 207.
	2. It is inconsistent with the grace of the gospel.	Page 211.
	3. God cannot declare the unjust to be just.	Page 211.
	4. Christ's righteousness due for Himself.	Page 212.
	5. Believers continue guilty, and liable to punishment.	Page 214.
	6. It only concerns the outward.	Page 214.
J.	Other Views of Justification.	Page 215.
	1. The Pelagian View.	Page 216.
	2. The Roman Catholic View.	Page 216.
	3. The Arminian View.	Page 217.
II.	Sanctification.	Page 221.
A.	What it is.	Page 221.
	1. Sanctification deals with condition, not with position.	Page 224.
	2. Sanctification is a process, not an act.	Page 225.
	3. Sanctification deals with that which is relative, not with that which is absolute.	Page 225.
	4. There are certain senses in which sanctification could be spoken of as absolute.	Page 225.
	5. Sanctification strictly speaking, refers to character rather than to the good works which are the fruits of character.	Page 228.
B.	Its importance.	
	1. It is much stressed in Scripture.	Page 229.
	2. It is the area in our salvation where most of our efforts would enter.	Page 229.
	3. It is a subject on which misunderstanding can do great harm.	Page 229.
C.	Sanctification is a process which usually involves struggle, and part of ones progress, and which is never complete in this life.	Page 230.
D.	How we secure sanctification.	Page 237.
	1. If we have really been justified and have truly taken Christ by faith to be to us all that he offers himself, we can never be satisfied to continue in our sin.	Page 238.
	2. Sanctification begins as a supernatural work of God's free grace, that is the miracle of regeneration.	Page 239.
	a. The new birth is the introduction of a new principle, not the substitution of a hidden person.	Page 239.
	b. The new birth does not eradicate the old nature.	Page 240.
	c. The justified person is called upon to fight against sin and to root out the deeds of the flesh.	Page 241.
	(1). A process.	

- d. Though man has a duty to strive for sanctification, the process is one which is initiated by the Lord and carried on by the Triune God, and the completion of which is assured by Him to everyone who has been justified through the grace of Christ. Page 250.
- (1). We could make no progress, in sanctification, if God had not first regenerated us. Page 250.
- (2). Sanctification is said to be a work of God of Christ and of the Holy Spirit. Page 250.
- (3). God has decreed that the sanctification of everyone who believes in Jesus Christ will be carried to completion. Page 251.
- 5. Sanctification, like justification, is secured by the death of Christ on the cross. Page 252.
- 6. Sanctification is said to be accomplished through God's Truth. Page 257.
 - a. The word is a mirror which shows us our sinful condition, and enables us to see our faults. Page 258.
 - b. The Word is our only source for knowing what God's righteousness requires. Page 259.
 - (1). God's righteousness requires cleansing from the sin described in the law. Page 259.
 - (2). Improvement, not merely of external acts, but of internal motives. Page 261.
 - (3). Freedom from anxiety and other manifestations of lack of trust in God. Page 262.
 - (4). Active development of the fruits of the Spirit. Page 264.
 - (5). The development of true love to God and man. Page 266.
 - c. Through the Word, we learn how much God was willing to do to free us from our sin, so that our desire to be rid of sin, is increased by our contemplation of the life and death of Christ. Page 268.
 - d. Through the Word, we learn the technique of sanctification, and thus the process can greatly be speeded up. Page 268.
- 7. Sanctification flows from our union with Christ. Page 270.
- 8. Sanctification requires that we learn to rest in the Lord, and to let him live in us, and through us. Page 273.
- E. Erroneous Views of Sanctification. Page 274.
 - 1. Antinomianism. Page 274.
 - 2. Perfectionism. Discussion of the arguments given for it. Page 277.
 - a. The Bible commands believers to be holy. Page 278.
 - b. Holiness and perfection are often ascribed to believers in Scripture. Page 279.
 - c. There are said to be Biblical accounts of Saints who have led perfect lives. Page 280.
 - d. The apostle John declared very explicitly, that those who are born of God, do not sin. Page 280.
 - 3. Objections to the theory of Perfectionism. Page 283.
 - a. The Bible very explicitly says, There is no one on earth who does not sin. Page 283.
 - b. According to Scripture, there is a constant warfare between the flesh and the spirit in the lives of God's children. Page 283.
 - c. Confession of sin, and prayer for forgiveness, are continually required. Page 283.
 - d. Perfectionists themselves deem it necessary to lower the standard of the law, and to externalize the idea of sin. Page 283.
 - e. There is a tendency in most such movements to overemphasize the human part in salvation. Page 287.

- f. There is a danger of a separation of justification and sanctification. Page 297.
4. Conclusions regarding Perfectionism. Page 298.
- a. Its dangers. Page 298.
- b. The truths that it is stressing. Page 298.
- (1). The importance of holiness. Page 298.
- (2). The need of further works of grace. Page 299.
- (3). The need of ceasing from our own works, and resting on Christ. Page 301.
- F. Conclusions Regarding Sanctification. Page 305.
1. It is impossible to overstress the importance of Sanctification. Page 309.
2. If we are not making progress in sanctification, we had better make sure of our justification. Page 309.
3. God wants us to learn to live closer to Christ and constantly to concentrate on His person and His work. Page 310.
4. We should expect great things from God. Page 311.
5. We should rejoice in everything that God sends us. Page 311.
6. Roughly, Christians can be divided into four classes, in regards to their sanctification. Page 314.
- THE LAW. III.** Page 318.
- A. The Purpose of the Law. Page 318.
- 8 1. Negative. Page 318.
2. a. It does not supplant the Abrahamic Covenant. Page 318.
- b. It does not precede God's grace to Israel. Page 318.
- c. It was not the condition of Israel entering the Promised Land. Page 319.
- d. It was not that which was to determine Israel's continuance to be God's people. Page 319.
- e. It is not represented as the means of securing salvation. Page 319.
2. Positive. Page 319.
- a. It gave a comprehensive and detailed statement for the guidance of a nation as God's own people. Page 319.
- b. It showed the path of sanctification's blessing. Page 319.
- c. It represented in typical and symbolic form, great truths of God's nature and of God's plan, so as to impress them upon the minds and the hearts of His people. Page 319.
- d. It provided a step forward in God's revelation to the individual by writing his knowledge of the righteousness God requires. Page 319.
- e. It gave a measuring stick to show man his fear and unworthiness and acceptancé of a Saviour. Page 319.
- B. The Nature of the Law. Page 319.
1. The law is a blessing, not a curse. Page 319.
2. It is a sign of God's love. Page 319.
3. It is not merely external, but spiritual in its intent. Page 319.
4. Few great dangers. Page 320.
- (a).
- (b). Lack of freedom. Page 321.
- C. Types of Law. Page 324.
- D. The Decalogue. Page 340.
- THE MEANS OF GRACE. IV.** Page 342.
- A. General Considerations. Page 342.
- B. The Word of God. Page 344.
- C. Prayer.
- D. The Sacraments. Page 357.
1. The Meaning of the Word. Page 357.
2. Old Testament Usuages. Page 367.
- a. The purpose of the ceremonial law. Page 367.

5. Baptism.

a. The fact of this covenant blessing is clearly taught in Scripture.

(1). Paul describes Abraham as a Father of all who believe.

(2). Abraham had a responsibility for his children.

(3). God promises blessings to the children of his people.

b. The bringing of children into the world is not simply a by-product of man's wickedness, it is a positive command of God.

c. God does not command us to bring children into the world, simply in the hope that perhaps they may be saved.

Page 374.

Page 374.

Page 374.

Page 374.

Page 374.

Page 374.

Page 375.

- d. Page 402.
- d. If we do our part we can trust God to do His. Page 402.
- e. Jesus commands to Peter show the importance of feeding His lambs. Page 403.
- f. Baptism illustrates entrance into the body of Christ. It indicates entrance into the visible church. Page 404.
6. The early Christians with their Jewish background naturally expected the Lord's supper, and the baptism to be closely parallel to the passover, and to circumcision. Page 406.
- a. While the relation of baptism to circumcision would have been obvious to the early Christians and is clearly demonstrated by the close similarity, in the meaning of the two, there is one scripture passage which clearly states the purpose. Page 409.
- b. Since circumcision is so very similar to baptism, it would reasonably be expected to be identical itself, except where there is clear, scriptural evidence to the contrary. Page 428.
- c. The Lord definitely commanded the circumcision, which was the sign and seal of Abraham's faith, which also should be given to infants. Page 429.
- d. If the Lord had desired that baptism, which is so striking similar to circumcision, in so many ways, should be altogether different in this regard, he could easily have given a command which would make the change clear. There is no evidence of any such command. Page 430.
- e. The practice of the apostles on this point, is nowhere explicitly stated, as would be reasonable to expect, if it differed completely from the previous practice regarding circumcision. Page 431.
- f. There is much reason to believe, that children were baptised by the apostles, and no evidence whatsoever, that they were not. Page 435.
- g. The Lord could have settled the matter conclusively in one direction or the other by a few words, but he did not choose to do so. Therefore it behooves us to show Christian charity. Page 437.
7. Circumcision stressed two vital aspects of truth. Page 446.
- a. In the case of adults, it indicated the beliefs on the one circumcising, that the one circumcised, had given evidence of possessing true faith, and therefore was worthy to be joined with the people of God. Page 446.
- b. In the case of infants, it showed in visible form, that they could not be saved by natural birth but that a spiritual cleansing was necessary and indicated that as children of believers, they were under the covenant with Abraham and hence under the care of the people of God, and could normally be expected to be regenerated by the Spirit of God, and be given saving faith, by the Spirit of God, in His own time. Page 447.
- c. The truth of the necessity of individual saving faith is so vital, that it can not possibly be overemphasized. Page 447.
- d. The other truth is also vital, and it is good for us to give it its proper place. Page 447.
- e. It has been believed by the overwhelming majority of Christians through the ages, that baptism is a sign of the covenant to be applied to their children. Page 449.
- 8.
- a. The fact that the doctrine has sometimes been misunderstood, or perverted is no reason to give it up. Page 451.
- b. These promises for our children are a precious heritage and we are very foolish if we neglect them. Page 453.

- c. The vital thing is that we have the doctrine, and observe it. Page 454.
- d. Details of ceremonial matters are not so clearly set forth in the New Testament, as in the Old, for reasons already stated. Page 454.
- 9/ The Mode of Baptism. Page 455.
- a. The mode is not vital. Page 455.
- b. The meaning of the word. Page 455.
- c. Significance in relation to mode. Page 457.
- d. The burial is not the primary thought in baptism. Page 458.
- e. Evidence that immersion was the universal practice in New Testament times is non-existent. In fact, much evidence points in a contrary direction. Page 460.
- G. Conclusions Regarding the Means of Grace. Page 468.
- V. Individual Eschatology. Page 468.
- A. Introduction to Eschatology. Page 468.
1. The importance of the subject. Page 468.
2. Dangers to be avoided. Page 471.
3. The attempt to find more detail than scripture gives. Page 472.
4. Setting dates. Page 472.
- B. Death. Page 473.
1. A fact of universal observation. Page 473.
2. Its significance is not naturally determined. Page 473.
3. Mankind has a widespread hope of immortality. Page 476.
4. The Bible clearly teaches that death is not the end. Page 477.
5. Death is un-natural and shows that something is wrong. Page 482.
6. Death is the result of sin. Page 483.
7. For the Christian, the sting has been removed from death. Page 483.
8. Ultimately, death will be removed altogether. Page 485.
- C. The Intermediate State. Page 485.
1. We have no way of learning anything about the intermediate state apart from Scripture. Page 485.
2. In the intermediate state, there is ~~an~~ a sharp division between the saved and the lost. Page 488.
- 3/ All the souls are fully conscious in the intermediate state. Page 495.
4. Consideration of the condition of the saved in the intermediate state. Page 498.
- a. They are declared to be in the very presence of Christ. Page 497.
- b. Their condition is represented as one of bliss. Page 499.
- c. It is represented as an incomplete condition, though never as one of probation. Page 499.

- d. There are more references to the resurrection than to the intermediate state. Page 503.
5. The Lost are described as being already in torment. Page 504.
6. There is no scriptural evidence for purgatory. Page 509.
- E. The Judgement.**
1. Those who are justified through Christ do not enter into judgment for their sin. Page 509.
2. Yet there is a judgment for believers. Page 509.
- a. Note the following passages. Page 510.
- b. The believer, though not judged for sin, which has already been borne by Christ, will be judged for his service to his Lord, and must give account for his work. Page 513.
- c. There is a difference in rewards, depending on true heart and on service rendered. Page 513.
- d. This judgment will take place at the return of Christ. Page 516.
3. Unbelievers are all to be condemned for their sins. Page 516.
- a. Look at these passages. Page 518.
- b. No one is exempt from this judgment, except those who are saved through Christ. Page 518.
- c. There is doubtless a gradation in punishment. 8 Page 519.
4. There is one picture of judgment in the Bible which seems different from the others. Page 519.
- a. How it is unique. Page 521.
1. It presents a general judgment. Page 521.
2. There is no reference to individual gradations or to individual examinations of works. Page 521.
3. It seems to have a simple test, whether you can Page 522.
- b. Possibilities of interpretation. Page 522.
1. This is a passage which contradicts the other passages, and so contradicts other teachings of the Word of God. Page 522.
2. The hypothesis has been advanced that this judgment here, is not a picture of a judgment of the people of all ages, but is a judgment of the living nation at the time of Christ's return to this earth. Page 523.
- (a). Note the word nation. Page 523.
- (b). Note the time. Page 523.
- (c). Note the phrase in verse 34. Page 524.
3. It is a telescope picture. Page 524.
- F. Ultimate State of Mankind.**
1. The fate of the righteous. Page 526.
- a. They have eternal life. Page 526.
- b. The condition of bliss and joy. Page 526.
- c. Possession of the resurrected body. Page 526.
- d. They are ever to be with the Lord. Page 526.
- e. They are to have no more sorrow. Page 526.
2. The fate of the wicked. Page 527.
- a. No promise of any future probation or second chance. Page 527.
- b. There are doubtless, degrees of punishment.^o Page 527.
- c. Note the following references. Page 529.
- d. The terms used to describe continuance of the suffering of the lost points to endlessness. Page 535.
- VI. GENERAL ESCHATOLOGY.**
- A. General eschatological remarks.** Page 536.
- B. Old Testament predictions of a coming one.** Page 537.
1. The Lord has promised the coming of one, who will bring an end to Satan's rule. Page 539.
2. This one is to combine the function of prophet, priest, and king. Page 539.
3. Without understanding these principles it is impossible to correlate the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament. Page 539.

- C. Old Testament Predictions of a coming glorious age. Page 540.
1. The coming of this glorious age is declared to be certain. Page 542.
 2. It is to be on earth. Page 542.
 3. It is to cover the whole earth. Page 542.
 4. It is to be a sign of external peace and safety. Page 542.
 5. It is a time when the curse will be removed from the earth. Page 542.
 6. It is a time when the Messianic kingdom will reign over the whole earth with its capital at Jerusalem. Page 543.
- D. New Testament Predictions of the Return of Christ. Page 543.
1. Its importance. Page 543.
 2. Its nature. Page 543.
 3. Its time. Page 543.
 - a. Two preliminary considerations about the time of the Lord's coming. Page 552.
 - (1). There is no reason to say that the return of Christ must be regarded as one indivisible event. Page 552.
 - (2). The terms used for Christ's return. Page 554.
 - b. No one can know when Christ will return. Page 558.
 - c. The return of Christ is to be a sudden event, and Christians are always commanded to be ready for it. Page 559.
 - (1). Note the following statements mentioned. Page 559.
 - (2). As far as unbelievers are concerned, the unexpectedness of the return is quite natural. Page 561.
 - (3). The Christian is exhorted to Godly living, not only in view of his love for his Saviour, but also because of the fact that he can not know when his Lord will come. Page 563.
 - (4). That this particular motive is removed if it is possible to say that the coming can not occur until some thing else has happened first. Page 569.
 - (5). Since this motive is frequently stressed we can be sure that no recognizable event is referred to before the coming of Christ. Page 569.
4. The New Testament teaches two phases of the actual return of Christ. Page 569.
- a. There is a manifestation to the unbelieving world. Page 570.
 - b. There is a manifestation to those who are saved which is suggested in some of the above passages, and is plainly described in I Thess. 4: 13-18. Page 571.
 - c. The manifestation to the unbelieving world takes place at the end of a series of events, but the fact that these events are predicted, will not make its occurrence any less surprising to those affected by it. Page 573.
 - d. The manifestation to the believers must come before any of the recognizable events, therefore there is an interval between the two ~~manifestation~~ phases. Page 574.
 - (1). The reasonableness of expecting such an interval. Page 575.
 - (2). a. Objections to this view. Page 576.
 - a. The insistence that Matthew 24 and the parallels show that Anti-Christ must come first. Page 576.
 - b. The argument from Revelation 20. Page 579.
 - c. The argument from II Thess. 2: 2. Page 581.
 - e. The vital thing is not the relation of the Lord's coming for his Saints, to the tribulation or to the week, but the utter uncertainty of the time, so that we should always be ready. Page 586.

5. Other effects of Christ's return. page 586.
- a. The resurrection of believers. Page 586.
 - b. The marriage supper of the lamb. Page 586.
 - c. The judgment seat of Christ. Page 587.
 - d. The salvation of all Israel. Page 587.
 - e. The destruction of Anti-Christ. Page 587.
 - f. Christ manifested in glory to all who oppose Him. Page 587.
 - g. The establishment of the kingdom of righteousness and peace. Page 587.
 - h. Satan bound for a thousand years. Page 587.
6. The great promise of the Return in the New Testament. Page 587.
- E. Relation of Old Testament and New Testament Predictions. Page 587.
- 1.
 - 2. The Millennium. Page 587.
 - a. Description in the Old Testament. Page 587.
 - b. In Revelation 20, the New Testament reveals the length of the promised kingdom and the fact that the Resurrection and judgment of the wicked dead comes at its end. Page 587.
 - 3. The Lord's Blessings.
 - 4.
 - 5. Our attitude toward prophecy. Page 589.
 - a. Prophecy should not be just to satisfy curiosity. Page 589.
 - b. Difference in interpretation of prophecy should not cause us separation and hostility among those who should be working together for the advancement of the Gospel. Page 589.
 - c. Prophecy has a vital purpose in our lives, and we should think what is the purpose. Page 589.
 - d. It is a sort of encouragement in whatever tribulation falls to our lives. Page 589.
 - e. It is a motive for Christian living and Christian service. Page 590.
 - f. The last prayer in the Bible - even so - Come Lord Jesus. Page 590.

Assignments in SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IV.

Assignment for Tuesday, April 23, 1957:

Read the first five letters in Edmund B. Fairfield's booklet, "LETTERS ON BAPTISM", twelve copies of which are on reserve in the library.

Hand in to the office by noon, Thursday, April 25, 1957, a summary of these first five letters.

Assignment for Wednesday, April 24, 1957:

Read letters six through ten, inclusive, in Edmund B. Fairfield's booklet, "LETTERS ON BAPTISM."

Hand in to the office a summary of the contents of these five letters, also by noon, Thursday, April 25, 1957.

Assignment for Thursday, April 25, 1957:

The assignment for this day is to review for ^{Friday's} ~~tomorrow's~~ one-hour examination, to be given at 8:00 a.m.

Assignment for Tuesday, April 30, 1957:

Read letters eleven through fifteen, inclusive, in Edmund B. Fairfield's booklet, "LETTERS ON BAPTISM."

Hand in to the office by 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, April 30, 1957, a summary of the contents of these five letters.

Assignments in SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IV.

Assignment for Tuesday, April 23, 1957:

Read the first five letters in Edmund B. Fairfield's booklet, "LETTERS ON BAPTISM", twelve copies of which are on reserve in the library.

Hand in to the office by noon, Thursday, April 25, 1957, a summary of these first five letters.

Assignment for Wednesday, April 24, 1957:

Read letters six through ten, inclusive, in Edmund B. Fairfield's booklet, "LETTERS ON BAPTISM."

Hand in to the office a summary of the contents of these five letters, also by noon, Thursday, April 25, 1957.

Assignment for Thursday, April 25, 1957:

The assignment for this day is to review for Friday's one-hour examination, to be given at 8:00 a.m.

Assignment for Tuesday, April 30, 1957:

Read letters eleven through fifteen, inclusive, in Edmund B. Fairfield's booklet, "LETTERS ON BAPTISM."

Hand in to the office by 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, April 30, 1957, a summary of the contents of these five letters.

Assignments in Systematic Theology

for Tuesday, March 12th

There is nothing to be handed in in connection with this assignment. It will not be considered late if the work for it is not done before class Tuesday, provided it is completed by 11:00 P. M., Wednesday.

The assignment consists of reading and study in Volume III of Hodge, and should take about one hour. It is as follows:

Master 1 (Pages 259-272) of Chapter 19

Assignment for Wednesday, March 13th

This assignment also does not require anything to be handed in.

It consists of reading and study in Volume IV of Hodge, and should be completed not later than 9:00 P. M. on Thursday.

Get a general idea of the contents of Section 2 (Pages 272-5) of Chapter 19. Master sections 3 and 4 (pages 275-281). Get a general idea of section 5 (Page 281-290) and of pages 305 to 314 of section 7. Get a good idea of section 6 (Pages 290-305).

An assignment for Seniors for Thursday, March 14th and for Monday, Tuesday, March ¹⁹~~18~~th will be posted later. Middlers will have no advance assignment for these two days but will be given the time to use in reviewing the material covered this semester up to that point in preparation for their mid-semester test at 11:30 March 18th.

ASSIGNMENTS IN SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

FOR SENIORS for Thursday, March 14th

Read Hodge, Volume III, Pages 314 through 362. Write out a brief summary of the contents of this material averaging about one sentence to a page. This will not be counted late if turned into the office by noon on Monday, March 18th.

for Tuesday, March 19th and Wednesday, March 20th

Read Hodge, Page 362 to the middle of Page 387, and also Section 12, which runs from Page 421 to the middle of Page 437. This lesson should take about two hours. One hour of this will be counted as the assignment for Tuesday, March 19th. The other hour will be the first half of the assignment for Wednesday, March 20th. For the other hour of the assignment for Wednesday, March 20th and for Thursday, March 21st, there will be no assignment given, leaving this time free for review for the mid-semester test which will be given on Thursday, March 21st at 9 o'clock and will cover everything covered in class or in assignments up to that time. On the assignment for Tuesday and Wednesday, a summary should be written out as was done with the assignment for the previous Thursday. This should be handed into the office not later than 9 A.M. on Thursday, March 21st.

FOR MIDDLEERS for Wednesday, March 20th

Do the same assignment as was given to the Seniors for Thursday, March 14th. This should be turned in not later than noon on Wednesday, March 20th.

for Thursday, March 21st

This assignment, which should take about two hours, is the same as the assignment that was given to the Seniors for Tuesday, March 19th and for the first half of the assignment for Wednesday, March 20th. This should be turned into the office not later than noon of Friday, March 22nd.

Mr. Ross.

Assignment in SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IV for April 17 (Wed.), 1957.

Master the contents of pages 11 through 59 in Rev. Edmund B. Fairfield's booklet, "LETTERS ON BAPTISM."

Turn in to the office a summary of the contents of these pages not later than 5:00 p.m., Thursday, April 18, 1957.

Assignment in THEOLOGY IV for April 18 (Thursday), 1957.

Master the contents of pages 60 through 110 in Rev. Edmund B. Fairfield's booklet, "LETTERS ON BAPTISM."

Turn in to the office a summary of the contents of these pages not later than 5:00 p.m., Friday, April 19, 1957.

There are ten copies of this booklet on reserve in the Library.

MID-SEMESTER TEST IN MIDDLEBURY SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

March 18, 1957 - 2:30 P.M.

Time - 55 minutes. Plan your time so as to finish.

1. a. Give the answers to the following questions:

Larger Catechism question 70 - What is justification?

Shorter Catechism question 36 - What are the benefits which in this life do accompany or flow from justification, adoption, and sanctification?

- b. State in outline form what Hodge presents as the aspects included in the first commandment.
2. Fully discuss the New Birth in its relation to justification and sanctification.
3. Fully state how sanctification is accomplished through God's truth.
4. Discuss the dangers in perfectionism.

MID-SEMESTER TEST IN SENIOR SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

March 21, 1957 - 9:00 A.M.

Time - 55 minutes. Plan your time so as to finish.

1. a. Give the answers to the following questions:

Shorter Catechism question 33 - What is justification?

Larger Catechism question 77 - Wherein do justification and sanctification differ?

- b. What does Hodge say about capital punishment in its relation to the sixth commandment?

2. a. Outline four different views of justification.

b. Briefly discuss the time of regeneration.

3. Fully state how sanctification is accomplished through God's truth.

4. Discuss the dangers in perfectionism.

EXAMINATION IN SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IV

Tuesday, May 21, 1957 - 9:00 A.M.

- VIII. Fully discuss the Sacraments as means of grace, dealing particularly with the Sacraments and ceremonies of the Old Testament.
- IX. Discuss the coming judgments as to the persons and tests involved in each, and the time when they will occur.
- X. How many returns of Christ will there be? Fully discuss this question, dealing at length with each aspect of the Lord's return.
- XI. State the various views held regarding the Millennium, and discuss fully the view presented in the course.

CHAPTER III - PERSON OF CHRIST

	Page
1. Preliminary Remarks	378
2. Scriptural Facts concerning the Person of Christ	380
Proof of the Doctrine	
First Argument, all the Elements of the Doctrine separately taught	381
Christ had a True Body	
Christ had a Rational Soul	
Christ is truly God	382
Christ One Person	

	Page
Second Argument, from the Current Representations of Scripture	383
Third Argument, from Particular Passages of Scripture	384
3. The Hypostatical Union	387
Two Natures in Christ	
The Two Natures are united but not mingled or confounded	389
There is no Transfer of the Attributes of one Nature to the Other	390
The Union is a Personal Union	
4. Consequences of the Hypostatical Union	392
Communion of Attributes	

	Page
The Acts of Christ	394
The Man Christ Jesus the object of Worship	396
Christ can sympathize with his People	
The Incarnate Logos the Source of Life	
The Exaltation of the Human Nature of Christ	397
5. Erroneous and Heretical Doctrines on the Person of Christ	
The Ebionites	398
The Gnostics	399
The Apollinarian Doctrine	400
Nestorianism	401
Eutychianism	402

	Page
6. Doctrine of the Reformed Churches	405
7. Lutheran Doctrine	407
Different Views among the Lutherans	409
Remarks on the Lutheran Doctrine	413
8. Later Forms of the Doctrine	418
Socinianism	
Pre-existence of Christ's Humanity	421
Swedenborg	
Isaac Watts	423
Objections	427

	Page
9. Modern Forms of the Doctrine	428
Pantheistical Christology	429
Theistical Christology	430
Ebrard	434
Gess	435
Remarks	437
Schleiermacher	440
Schleiermacher's Christology	441
Objections to this Theory	442
Founded on Pantheistic Principles	444

	Page
Involves the Rejection of the Doctrine of the Trinity	445
Schleiermacher's Anthropology	447
Schleiermacher's Theory perverts the Plan of Salvation	450