

REFORMATION TODAY'80



NEWS *Front inside cover*

- 1 EDITORIAL
- 3 SEALING AND THE UNITY OF THE PURITANS
- 5 HALLELUJAH! *Herbert Carson*
- 9 THE SACRIFICES OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH *James Cox*
- 15 MY YEARS WITH GEORGE WHITEFIELD *Arnold Dallimore*
- 18 PRINCIPLES OF BIBLE TRANSLATORS *Bob Sheehan*
- 23 VARIOUS VIEWS OF NON BAPTISTS *Erroll Hulse*
- 31 FROM BAXTER TO BARTH
- MID-SUSSEX EVANGELISM AND NEWS *Back inside cover*

NEWS

Israel

FROM ISRAEL, BARUCH MAOZ REPORTS THAT THE WAY IS OPENING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT of a fully constituted church. Opposition from a fanatical orthodox body Yad Le'Achim is severe. These opponents have threatened to shed blood rather than see this church established. There are three main reasons which block the conversion of Hebrew people. Firstly the Scriptures declare that there is peculiar or special spiritual blindness upon them, which requires a special act of sovereign power and grace to remove. Secondly, the Jewish people have been the subjects of more contempt and abuse than any other. The extermination camps of the last war illustrate that vividly. (The article on Paul Schneider in RT 54 shows that Bible believing Christians were put to death for their opposition to Nazism.) Thirdly in their hatred of Christ, some Jews are capable of opposition which borders on madness. Witness the tumult made for the crucifixion of Christ and their cry, 'his blood be upon us and our children!' Who but crazed madmen would call on God for self-destruction? Witness too Paul's blind fury before his conversion on the Damascus Road? Such fanaticism places a further stumbling block before those who might listen if there was a peaceful opportunity to do so, but who are frightened away by violence.

Australia

Don McMurray, one of the elders of the Newcastle 'Baptist Reformed' Church (the Australians have transposed the words) writes to say Peter Law and Ray Meredith are working well together in the establishment of a church at Albany Creek, Queensland. There are positive moves of men of like mind to work together in support of a missionary work in Papua New Guinea, where Neville Bourne, Bernie Crozier and Cliff Heller are labouring.

A new Baptist Reformed church has been planted in the Blue Mountain area, west of Sydney. The church is called the Nepean Baptist Reformed Church, the pastor is David Jackson. A Reformed Baptist church has been formed in Adelaide, South Australia and a pastor is being sought.

New Zealand

The Reformed Baptist Church Auckland, New Zealand (Owen Griffiths, Michael Drake), has called Norman Porter as Pastor. At one time an M.P. for Northern Ireland, Norman Porter has been ministering in a Baptist Church in Adelaide.

Pakistan and the Afghans

From Paul and Zarina Simpson we hear of opportunities on the Afghan border to minister to the Afghan refugees. They regret that preoccupation with their low physical state and the invasion by the Russians, not to mention their entrenched Muslim outlook, makes it extremely difficult to present the Gospel. Nevertheless the availability of Paul and Zarina at such a time is surely significant and worthy of our prayerful support.

South Africa

The annual Reformed Conference at Skoegheim, Natal, is scheduled for 11th-15th July this year. Al Martin and Iain Murray are the main speakers. South African brethren be sure to contact Clive Tyler of the Bible Institute, Main Road, Kalk Bay 7975, as soon as possible for details.

□□□

Editorial

WITH A TWENTY PERCENT INFLATION rate, Britain is plunging deeper into recession and severe unemployment. The government has taken stern measures to combat the downward spiral including severe spending cuts. Magazines have been hard hit and some have already gone out of business with others threatening to do so. Will this magazine survive? We have used up all our reserves. The Cuckfield Church can do nothing to help financially because of heavy commitments on a number of fronts. Among other ventures the church has born the brunt of the Carey Conference expenses from their inception. What are we going to do? Firstly it must be made plain that the cause we represent—our Biblical beliefs, history, church principles—and all that is involved is as precious as life itself, and while there is life there can, and must be no capitulation, no reversion to a spineless, lukewarm evangelicalism which says that these things do not matter.

We enjoy spiritual bonds with a virile and growing Reformed Baptist family round the world. The churches which appreciate this magazine are mostly battling pioneer churches led by men who have found it impossible to continue in compromised denominations. We have no rich patrons. However we do enjoy the help of some powerful churches whose invaluable assistance comes by way of bulk orders. This helps keep the magazine in business.

The following measures are being taken:

1. Concerted fervent prayer.
2. The next issue No. 56 will be 'a Mrs. Thatcher issue'. The policy of the present government has been to make us all face reality and high time too! We will only print the number of pages which corresponds to the value of a British subscription. Get ready for a shock! Will it be only sixteen pages? Perhaps!
3. We will aim to provide more news such as is presented on the front inside cover. We want to keep closely together until the depression passes.
4. We will have to reduce the amount of biographical and historical material. Whitefield, for whom Puritanism offered

the best in reading material said, 'Biography... is the best history,' but even though it is the best we have to cut back at this time of stringency.

5. Articles on specialised subjects will have to appear in abridged form. As an example we point to Austin Walker's work on homosexuals which appeared in outline in RT 52. We now have the full text and a very valuable work it is. If you would like a copy please write to us. When we have assessed the demand we will know how many to duplicate. If and when prosperity returns we will not have to resort to such means.
6. We will attempt to step up our promotional efforts which in the past have been negligible. Especially do we need to press the point that *Reformation Today* is designed for church members. Always to be remembered is the fact that we aim to provide a product upon which a Reformed Baptist pastor can rely totally. We do not shun controversy but the supreme aim always is to grow in grace, knowledge and godliness. We have always shunned controversy for controversy's sake. Out of the subjects we have wrestled with in these pages, instructive and comprehensive works have emerged such as the book *The Believer's Experience* an edition of which has just been published by Zondervans in America at \$4.95.
7. We must concentrate on selling existing stocks such as bound volumes 3 and 4 at £5 each including issues 25-36 and 37-48 respectively. Also we have an index for the first 50 issues (1970-79) at 50 pence and back copies at 35 pence each. Available are numbers 11, 15, 17, 19-21, 24-42, 44-55.

A review of the road we have taken so far is seen in a letter just received from pastor Earl Blackburn of 386 North 1000 West, Provo, Utah 84601, U.S.A.

Dear Bro. Hulse,

Greetings in our great Saviour's name! I am writing you a long overdue letter of appreciation and encouragement. While I was in a Bible college of the 'fundamentalist' camp the LORD revealed to me from his infallible Word the precious doctrines of grace. Not knowing where to turn I continued and finished my schooling there. Without any godly Calvinistic instructors or pastors and without any good sovereign grace literature, I soon went into hyper-Calvinism. This was more or less forced upon me because of my having to defend these Biblical truths in

Front Cover: Photo of young people taken at houseparty organised by the Caterham Baptist Church and held at 'The Gaines' Whitbourne during April.

Bible College. One day in a bookstore in Atlanta, Georgia I came across your booklet, *Common Grace and the Free Offer* (now out of print). As I was looking at it the manager suggested I buy the booklet and assured me it would be a great benefit and blessing. To make a long story short, the LORD used your booklet to deliver me from the deadness, coldness and dangers of hyper-Calvinism. Since then my Christian life and ministry has been changed! What a joy to know that the LORD shall save his people from their sins, and none but his elect people shall be saved, and he has ordained his servants to go and preach everywhere, bidding *all* men to 'repent and believe the Gospel'.

Since that time I have profited from your other books such as *An Introduction to the Baptists*, *The Believer's Experience and Baptism and Church Membership*. Also the Carey Publications *The Way Ahead* and *Local Church Practice* have been very helpful and instructive not to mention, a tremendous blessing. And last but not least, I appreciate *Reformation Today*. I know at this time it may not be possible, but I would like to see it come out monthly instead of bi-monthly.

It has been several years since I read *Common Grace and the Free Offer* and today I am a Baptist missionary in the heart of the satanic cult of Mormonism, Provo, Utah. Provo is 92% Mormon and of the other 8%, five percent of them is Roman Catholic. Two years ago the LORD directed us here and we, by his grace, established Immanuel Baptist Church. It is a small, struggling mission church, but our God has given us the privilege of presenting the Gospel to a countless number of people! There are a number of opportunities here among them. Brigham Young University boasting over 26,000 students and the Mormon Mission Training Center, which sends out approximately 1,000 Mormon missionaries every month. We are trusting the LORD to give us a harvest of souls each which will have been arrested by the free and sovereign grace of Christ! Also we have adopted *The Faith To Confess*, put out by Carey, and the *New Hampshire* confessions of faith.

Yours etc.,

EARL BLACKBURN.

A statement by Bob Campen our accountant

It has not been our policy to take up magazine space with accounts. Losses in the last two or three years jeopardise the future of the magazine, and our readers should be informed. Nevertheless, we have every hope of continuing, as the Lord is still Jehovah Jireh.

Cuckfield Baptist Chapel publishes the magazine with a view to spreading the truth world wide, but the elders understandably feel that it would be wrong to allow the magazine to run out of funds so that money given for the local witness had to be diverted to pay its liabilities.

Some donors have given sacrificially, and we are very grateful. Any friends able to help in this way should send gifts to the agent for their country, ensuring that it is clearly stated to be a donation.

If you would like a copy of the detailed accounts of the magazine for 1979, please send a large (9 in. x 4½ in.) envelope addressed to yourself to the Haywards Heath address, marked 'Accounts' in the top left corner. (U.K. residents please affix a stamp.)

Abridged Income and Expenditure Account—year ended 31st December 1979.

	£
Sales and subscriptions	5,084
Cost of sales	4,817
	<hr/> 267
Distribution and administration expenses	2,734
	<hr/>
Deficit before including other income	(2,467)
General donations	1,566
Bank interest	19
	<hr/>
Excess of expenditure over income for year	(882)
Accumulated deficit at 1 January 1979	(1,291)
	<hr/>
Accumulated deficit at 31 December 1979	£(2,173)

More useful long-term than giving donations is to give a friend the magazine at your expense for one year. If everyone did this, our circulation could double and our financial problems would halve. Our hard-working volunteer helpers would be glad to tackle the administrative problems thus created.

BOB CAMPEN.

Unity, the Covenant and Baptism

The first article in this series was on unity and appeared in abridged form in RT 53. All the articles that follow should be read in the context of our desire to maintain unity.

Great and deep are the truths of Scripture. We should not wonder at some diversity of interpretation. The subject of the sealing of the Spirit is one which has been debated in these pages. That we can both debate and differ without our unity being affected in the slightest degree is as it should be.

Sealing and the Unity of the Puritans

A correspondent from Scotland wrote to say that he doubted the wisdom of publishing Donald MacLeod's article on the sealing of the Spirit in which he evaluated Dr. Martyn Lloyd Jones' expositions on that subject. (RT 48 and reply by Pastor Eaton of Nairobi in RT 51.) Why import that into the general scene? The answer is surely that English literature is read worldwide today and reactions in Scotland may well be the same as those on the other side of the world. For instance missionary Ken Morey was asked by Japanese pastors to expound on this subject because they were perplexed by the doctor's views. Ken Morey writes as follows:

Being on the mission field and in a relatively isolated situation means that I do not have the library facilities I would have liked to pursue this subject further; but I have read such as I have at hand, which includes Hodge, Smeaton, Sibbes, Flavel, Goodwin, Winslow, Vaughan, Buchanan and others.

I completely concur with Professor MacLeod's opinion that Dr. Lloyd Jones has not proved his case from the Scriptures. Pastor Eaton writes on the matter of the various terms used in the scriptures 'a whole string of terms are used interchangeably with reference to the same experience, viewing it from different angles . . .'. I can agree that in some cases this is true, but the Bible is not a workbook for logical or algebraic equations. Each concept or analogy must be carefully examined. The analogy of 'sealing' is not the same as that of 'anointing'. In twentieth century phraseology, when you sign a contract (sealing) you don't usually pour a bottle of ink over it (anointing).

From the analogy of 'sealing', it must be simultaneous with, or immediately subsequent to regeneration. It is God objectively stating 'This is mine.' An unsigned contract is not valid; an unsealed tomb is not secure; an unbranded object does not indicate ownership. In exactly the same way an unsealed believer is a non-descript entity. Is he God's or isn't he? Does God have any children he doesn't claim?

This does not mean that there is nothing subjective in the experience. Far from it. The outworking, effects and recognition of the 'seal' are subjective as the one so sealed and others looking at him recognise the image of God impressed upon the soul. Using Paul's illustration of the son and the heir may help here. He is a son, declared to be so by God at his birth, but does not fully understand all that entails until some later stage in his growth. This deepening experience and growing understanding is the outworking of the foretaste given at birth, and can be seen as the continuous filling of the Holy Spirit.

Is not the lack of assurance, joy, worship, praise and prayer, said to exist in Reformed circles, due not because believers have not been sealed by the Spirit, but rather than by our individual and corporate sins we have grieved that same Holy Spirit by whom we were sealed (Eph. 4:30) to such an extent that we do not enjoy as a daily conscious experience that filling of the Spirit commanded in Ephesians 6:18?

Smeaton writes 'From the three passages where the term SEAL is expressly used, we gather that believers are God's inviolable property, and known to be so by the Spirit dwelling in them. The sealing implies that the image graven on the seal is impressed on the thing, or on the person sealed. In this case it is the

image of God impressed on the heart by the enlightening, regenerating and sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit. By that seal believers are declared to be the inviolable property of God (2 Tim. 2:19); and they are sealed to the day of redemption as something which is to be inviolably secure (Eph. 4:30). Not only so: there is a subjective assurance which they acquire as to their gracious state and final glory . . .' (Smeaton on the Holy Spirit, p. 79).

Not believing in the infallibility of the Puritans, though greatly respecting them and benefiting from their vast knowledge of the scriptures, I would beg to differ with those who claim this 'sealing' can be repeated, making a deeper impression on the soul. I do so on a purely practical standpoint of the analogy. As I mentioned earlier, in this country we daily use seals rather than signatures. It is all but impossible to re-impress the same seal on a faint impression. In fact, where the seal is not recognisable, it is stamped afresh, next to the original. What has been claimed as a deeper impression of the seal, ought rather to be seen as a clearer understanding of what the 'seal' means, or a deeper infilling of the Holy Spirit and not as a second, third, fourth and so on stamping of God's seal on the soul. Maybe the reader would like to try signing his name in pencil and then re-signing it in ink, to ascertain that it is far from easy to make a deeper more permanent impression on exactly the same spot.

There is much more that could be said, but in conclusion I would re-iterate that the 'sealing' is objective in God stating the soul is his, and subjective, in its outworking, as that soul and others recognise the Divine ownership revealed in that 'seal'.

The Puritans and Unity

Ken Morey of Japan in the above comments mentions the Puritans and his respect for them as expositors. Not only can we derive great profit from their expositions but we can also benefit much from their example which, in respect of unity, was better than the Reformers. Luther who was half gold and half clay, can be excused for his volcanic temperament which was one of the factors used to liberate the church from a long age of night and superstition. His stubbornness at Marburg, his views on some parts of Scriptures such as Jonah and James, his shocking harshness toward the Jews, Anabaptists and peasants are issues we interpret in the context of those times. The Puritans had the advantage of the Reformation and were able to develop many aspects of truth in more detail but they kept together in unity. Their grasp of the great central issues such as faith, justification, the place of the moral law and assurance was immeasurably superior to that of the average minister today. The number of men of unusual stature is particularly noticeable in the seventeenth century because of the wealth of literature now available from that time. But the Puritans of the Elizabethan period (1558-1603) also formed a race of men of unusual stature in the faith. However in respect of theologians in the Elizabethan period M. M. Knappen shows that only William Perkins and Dudley Fenner produced systematic formulative theological works. Fenner's work was in Latin and therefore its influence was very limited. I am persuaded that Perkins' influence is over-estimated. Knappen says he was not a great thinker, but rather a great preacher and a clever populariser.

Looking at the Puritan period as a whole one does not have to be a specialist to see that these ministers were not only men of tremendous ability but also of discernment and maturity. They felt strongly about truth but in doing so bore their differences with love and magnanimity. Thomas Goodwin like Richard Sibbes before him and Dr. Lloyd-Jones today held views about the sealing of the Spirit which differed from the others. Baxter held views on the extent of the atonement which was different. Yet we find all these men in church council together. They were men of noble stature and Job-like maturity. They

Continued on page 22

Hallelujah is the title of one of the chapters of an expository book by Herbert Carson in which he leads his readers into the whole domain of Christian worship. The volume is with the printers and is due to be published by Evangelical Press later this year.

Hallelujah!

A CERTAIN MEASURE OF INCONSISTENCY IN THE MAIN ENGLISH VERSIONS OF the Bible obscures the fact that the word 'Hallelujah' occurs much more frequently in the Psalms than might appear in a public reading. The translators adopted a different policy when translating the Psalms from that employed in their rendering of the Book of Revelation. In the former case they actually translated the word Hallelujah as 'Praise the Lord', while indicating in the margin the original Hebrew word.

In the case of the four occurrences of the word in Revelation 19 they simply transposed the Greek word into English letters to give the word Hallelujah. In the latter case they followed the line taken by the translators of the Old Testament Septuagint Greek version, who transliterated the Hebrew word into a Greek form 'Allelouia'—the word which in turn was used by the Apostle John in the song of praise in Revelation 19.

While it was quite correct to translate the word in the Psalms, it did obscure the difference between 'Hallelujah' and the phrase usually translated in the same way. The difference is that in the case of the word 'Hallelujah' it is the shorter version of the divine name which is used—rendered by the A.V. (Ps. 68:4) as Jah. In the other occurrences it is the full name of the Lord which is employed. In both cases the common feature is the verb Hallal which means to praise. The distinction suggests that the term Hallelujah was in fact a special cry or ejaculation of praise used in worship.

The word appears twenty-four times in the Psalms as a summons to praise. Sometimes it comes at the end of a Psalm (104, 105, 115, 116, 117), sometimes at the beginning (111, 112) and sometimes both at the beginning and the end (106, 113, 135, 146-150). In one place only it appears within the Psalm (135:3) but in this case it may be seen as a resumption, after a short introduction, of the initial Hallelujah in the same Psalm.

This variation in usage suggests that the word was used as an introductory summons to praise, and also as a climax of the praise already offered. This note of climax is particularly evident in Psalm 106:48 where it is linked with 'Amen' to provide a two fold response of praise following the recital of God's gracious and powerful deeds on behalf of his people. This conjunction of 'Amen' and 'Hallelujah' is reflected in Nehemiah 5:13 where 'the whole assembly said "Amen" and praised the Lord'.

The same two fold response is seen in Revelation 19:4 where the final 'Hallelujah' is preceded by 'Amen'.

Whether it is heard as a call to a congregation to praise God, or as the joyful response of those who are exulting in God's grace and mercy, the word focuses mind and heart and voice on God himself. He is not only the object of our praise but is also the reason for it. We not only praise God, but we do so because he is the Lord who is worthy to be praised. It is because he is the kind of God Scripture has declared him to be, and because the people of God down the years have proved him to be all that Scripture reveals, that we join with our fellow members of the Church of God in our Hallelujah chorus.

The divine name which, as we have seen, is a constituent element in the word, reminds us that God is the Lord who has revealed himself. This name by which he made himself known was revealed in order to declare his character and his purposes to his people. For that reason the name of the Lord is quite distinct from the names which paganism or the great ethnic religions have produced to designate their deities. Such names represent human attempts to convey the idea that the worshipper has in mind as he approaches his god. The divine name in the Old Testament however is of a totally different character. It is not the product of men's religious reflections but is rather the name by which God himself designated his uniqueness and revealed his nature to men. The name of the Lord is not an echo of men's thoughts but is in fact a statement made by God himself.

Implied in this name is the underlying idea of eternity. God is the great 'I am' who is without beginning or end. He did not come into existence at some point of time in the remote past. His origin cannot be fixed as a historical fact like the origin of the created order. He is from everlasting to everlasting. He is the eternal God. He knows neither change nor decay. He is not trapped in the constant ebb and flow of time. He is bound neither by the clock nor by the calendar. He has not emerged from the past with a personal record of growth and development; nor is he moving tentatively towards an uncertain future. He is, rather, the ever present one for whom the unfolding pattern of history is always 'Now'. Every time then that the Spirit of God elicits from us the cry 'Hallelujah' he is reminding us that we worship the eternal God. Our praise is not a song which will be snuffed out in the chill silence of death but will resound with perennial freshness for ever and ever.

The eternal God is the creator of all things. This is the basic truth with which the Bible begins. It is the truth which again and again so thrills the writers of the Psalms that they burst out into praise. To contemplate the glory of the heavens, the wonder of the seasons, the flocks and herds with their young, the fields with their maturing harvest, the vineyards with their abounding fruit—to contemplate these and

innumerable other manifestations of the marvels of nature is to feel one's heart lifted to the God who made it all. It is no wonder that the Psalms end in a final call to every living creature 'Let every thing that has breath praise the Lord. Hallelujah' (150:6).

The Lord of creation in the Old Testament is also the Lord of hosts. He is the God of the nations. He is not like the localised deities of the pagan world with their limited domain and their petty interests. He is the Lord of all the nations. He is the God of history who by his sovereign providence directs and controls all events to achieve his ultimate purpose of glorifying his own name. It is this sense of history with its accompanying awareness of the sovereignty of God Almighty, which makes our Hallelujah, not the muted refrain of a rather uncertain minority movement, but the joyful acclaim of those who are supremely confident of the final triumph of the Lord.

When the Lord revealed his name to Moses it was in the context of his commission to go and lead Israel out of Egypt. The Lord is the redeemer who sets his people free. That national deliverance was prophetic. It pointed to the greater deliverance accomplished by Christ whose victory at Calvary has redeemed his people from the dominion of sin. The theme of redemption continues throughout the Scripture and the response is constantly one of praise and thanksgiving. Redemption implies the grace and mercy of God who does not deal in judgment with men as their rebellion fully warrants, but freely forgives them and emancipates them from their spiritual slavery. It is no surprise therefore to hear those who are described as 'the redeemed of the Lord' responding in praise. That praise reaches its climax in the Apocalypse of John where redemption is still the dominant note—'To him who loves us and has freed us from our sins by his blood, and has made us to be a kingdom and priests to serve his God and Father—to him be glory and power for ever and ever! Amen' (Rev. 1:5-6).

Our creator and redeemer has also revealed himself as the God of the covenant. His name declares his gracious establishment of a personal relationship with men and women whom he has freely pardoned and whom he has brought into fellowship with himself. He says to these former rebels 'You are my people'. With gratitude they reply 'You are our God'. It is this deep sense of indebtedness to God's mercy, this overwhelming awareness of his gracious pardon, this humbling realisation of the privilege of being the people of God—it is all these which move us to a burst of praise for which the word Hallelujah provides the most succinct, and at the same time the most complete response.

The various aspects of God's nature and of his merciful dealings with his people are summarised in the song of praise in Revelation 19. It is because 'salvation and glory and power belong to our God' (19:1) that the great throng of worshippers bursts into song. He is the God who

saves sinners with an everlasting salvation. He is the God whose truth has blazed out in a world of darkness to display his glory in his mighty works of creation, providence and redemption. He is the God of power whose might is seen in the record of creation, in his judgment of the nations, in the great miracles of the incarnation and the resurrection of Christ, and which will be seen finally in the coming again of the Saviour. Such salvation, glory, and power, can only elicit an exultant response and so again and again the multitude cry our 'Hallelujah'.

The praise of the Psalms and the songs of the Apocalypse both build up towards a climax. The Psalter ends with a crescendo of instrumental music and song which reach their triumphant finale in the last psalm. Every instrument is summoned to contribute to the great symphony. Every mortal tongue is commanded to yield its measure of praise. So, with the clash of the cymbals and the swelling notes of the trumpets, the climactic burst of praise from all creation, rises to the final glorious Hallelujah.

In Revelation 19 there is the same pattern. John heard 'what sounded like the roar of a great multitude in heaven'. They shout their triumphant 'Hallelujah'. They are borne forward by the exaltation of spirit which springs from a realisation that the final judgments of the Almighty have come. 'Again they shout: "Hallelujah".' The twenty-four elders and the four beasts—a symbol perhaps of the complete people of God from the twelve tribes and from the apostolic church, and also of the whole created order—these also join in the victorious acclaim as they fall down and worship before the throne and cry 'Amen, Hallelujah'.

Then comes the final shout of victory. It sounds to John in his lonely exile in a Roman penal colony 'like a great multitude' shouting praise to their God. 'Like the roar of rising water' the praise floods on in a torrent of music and song. There is no ebb in the surging waves of praise, no lull in the swelling notes of joy. Then it reaches new heights as 'like loud peals of thunder' the song of innumerable saints moves towards a climax. It is the consummation of the songs of the suffering church in every generation, the hymns of the pilgrim church in every century of advance or decline, the thanksgiving of a great host of forgiven sinners drawn from every tribe and nation and tongue. Every joyful note blends with the triumph song of heaven. It is the climax of the everlasting purposes of God. The eternal day has dawned and night will never come again. Sin is forever banished and with it all the discordant ugliness of sickness, sorrow and death. Now is the final authentication of the gospel, and now also the supreme vindication of Christ Jesus the Lord. Heaven is alive with song as the music moves to a crescendo of praise. The worship of the triumphant church rises to a glorious finale: 'Hallelujah, for our Lord God Almighty reigns'.

□□□

James C. Cox is an elder of the Macquarie Reformed Baptist Church, Sydney, Australia. This is the first of two consecutive expositions which explain the meaning and significance of the offerings and sacrifices of the Old Testament era. A subject of this nature could easily become heavy and technical but this welcome contribution is very well balanced by way of explanation, suggestion and contemplation. The Bible references are from the New American Standard Bible.

The Sacrifices of the Ancient Church

part 1

IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER THE OFFERINGS ARE TEN IN ALL, THE FIRST FIVE OF which we consider in this article.

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Burnt | 6. Heave |
| 2. Drink | 7. Peace |
| 3. Freewill | 8. Sin |
| 4. Grain | 9. Thank |
| 5. Guilt | 10. Wave |

Some introductory remarks will prepare the way and also it will help to make reference to those offerings which could never qualify.

All animals selected for sacrifice were to be unblemished males of not less than one year old, whether cattle, sheep or goats (Exod. 12:5). The blind, the fractured, the maimed or castrated were not to be offered (Lev. 22: 22-24). So (Lev. 1:4) ‘... that it may be accepted for him to make atonement on his behalf.’

The spiritual significance of an acceptable offering is taken up in the New Testament. Isaiah, the evangelical prophet, anticipated the day when foreigners, the Gentiles, like you and me would joyfully offer acceptable sacrifices and offerings in the house of prayer for all people (Isa. 55:6-8). Paul in Romans 15:16, plainly alludes to the liturgical sacrifices when he describes himself as, ‘... ministering as a priest of the gospel of God.’ The apostle compares himself in his preaching of the gospel to the Aaronic priest performing his sacred function in preparing sacrifices to be offered on the altar. The Gentiles, converted through Paul’s ministry and dedicated to God’s service, are his offering. These Gentiles are made acceptable through the ministry of the indwelling Holy Spirit and are rendered a pleasing offering to the Lord from among all nations. The words of Isaiah 66:20 may have suggested this comparison to the apostle’s mind.

On occasions the New Testament writers extend the typical teaching concerning Christ to believers. Thus Paul in Romans 12:1-2 spans the Testaments, from an unblemished slain beast consecrated for sacrifice, to an appeal '... to give our bodies an acceptable sacrifice to God.' The Apostle Peter uses the concept of offerings to affirm that we are: 'Living stones,' 'A Spiritual house,' 'A holy priesthood,' to offer up spiritual sacrifices through the Lord Jesus Christ (1 Pet. 2:5).

The writer to the Hebrews, whose deeply spiritual teaching about the Lord Christ is extracted from the ceremonial Law, exhorts us: 'let us continually offer up a sacrifice of praise to God, that is the fruit of lips that give thanks to His Name' (Heb. 13:15).

The Unacceptable Offering

All the Old Testament prophets from Moses to Malachi vehemently reproved the covenant people's perversion of the sacrifice which were intended to vividly portray the Messiah's perfect oblation. These perversions led to spiritual adultery—which is unfaithfulness to God, Israel's husband (Isa. 54:5). For example, Isaiah practically opens and closes his prophecy voicing God's hatred of Israel's sacrifices, festivals and multiplied prayers. Their departure from the Mosaic pattern and their choice of what they knew Yahweh despised made them unacceptable (Isa. 1:10-15 and 66:3-4).

Jeremiah declares (6:20) that God cannot accept the offerings of his people as they have no sweet fragrance about them. Later (14:12), the weeping prophet bluntly tells his hearers that God no longer regards their fasts, prayers or offerings, for he is going to make an end of them because of their persistent unfaithfulness. Both Hosea and Amos announce similar messages. Israel and Judah, until their separate demise as autonomous kingdoms, remained very religious people but were divorced from the inner spiritual meaning of the Covenant.

Even Judah's exile with all its pathos (see Ps. 137) did not cure the intrinsic unfaithfulness of the Covenant people. Malachi, the last Old Testament prophet, charges the post-exilic community with offering the blind, lame and sick animals for sacrifice, contrary to the Mosaic Law (Mal. 1:3). Such people who practise these perversions have no fear of God or reverence for his name. It is therefore, understandable that, 400 years later, the then rulers filled up the cup of the nation's iniquity by crucifying the great antitype of all the offerings—the only acceptable sacrifice—the Lord Jesus Christ!

Such teaching is a warning to our generation where a resurgence of true baptistic and reformed life is evident; we could become both orthodox and moribund!

1. *The Burnt Offering*

This offering, as described in Exodus 29:18 and Leviticus 6:9-18, is the most significant of all the offerings and the basis of the other nine. The sacrifice was wholly consumed upon the brazen altar (which stood in the outer Court in front of the Tabernacle or Tent of Meeting): its aroma ascended or 'went up' to God as a fragrant offering.

This sacrifice symbolised our Lord's voluntary death as a fragrant offering to his Father on behalf of all his people, for through it we were perfectly justified. Therefore, with John on the book of Revelation, we exclaim: 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and might and honour and glory and blessing' (Rev. 5:12).

The continual, or daily burnt offering should be contrasted with Hebrews 9:26-28 '... Christ ... having been offered once to bear the sins of many. ...' This sacrifice appears to be the first offered every morning and the last at evening (Num. 28:3-11). In addition to this, a further offering was presented on the Sabbath day, on the first day of each month, and at the new moon and festive seasons.

In Judah, this sacrifice continued until the nation's banishment to Babylon. Upon the return from exile, seventy years later, it was the priest's primary task to reinstitute the morning and evening burnt offerings on behalf of the restored remnant (Ezra 3:3-4).

This sacrifice was also important in the ordination of priests for their ministry (Exod. 29:15-18, Lev. 8:18-24). We should notice how the beautiful and detailed ritual portrays the intimate consecration of the Lord Jesus for the holy office as mediator between God and man (cf. Ps. 40: 6-10).

Two rams were sacrificed in this service. Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the first victim's head (Lev. 8:18) which was immediately killed and its blood sprinkled around on the altar thus consecrating it for service. In the case of the second ram (Exod. 29:19-20) Aaron and his sons likewise identified themselves with the sacrifice, but its blood was personally applied to each priest, firstly to his right ear, secondly to his right thumb and thirdly to his right big toe.

A well known verse of a children's hymn serves to signify the spiritual significance of the blood applied to the ear.

*O give me Samuel's ear, the open ear, O Lord!
Alive and quick to hear each whisper of Thy word. . . .*

(Samuel was both a priest and a prophet.) The blood applied to the right thumb surely taught them, as it should teach us: '... to present your members as instruments of righteousness ...' (Rom. 6:13). The application of the blood to the right big toe must have reminded them that they

trod on consecrated ground in pursuance of their holy occupation. We too are told ' . . . to walk in a manner worthy of the Lord, . . . ' (Col. 1:10).

Immediately following that threefold rite Moses scrutinised and selected portions of the sacrifice. He then filled the priest's hands with the 'grain offering' consisting of unleavened cakes supporting the chosen sacrificial portions. These they presented before the Lord by literally waving them to and fro as a 'wave offering'. Then Moses took the cakes from their hands and offered them up in smoke on the altar. It was an ordination offering: a fragrant burnt-offering to the Lord (Lev. 8:26-29, Exod. 29:22-26).

Our prayer is that the head of the Church may be pleased to fill the hands of every preacher ordained by that nail pierced hand with a fruitful and God honouring ministry.

Finally, a portion of that same sacrifice was eaten by the priests at the door of the Tabernacle. This fellowship meal would deeply impress upon the minds of the priests their ordination as priests of the most high God.

From this service of consecration we learn that God claimed each faculty exclusively for his glory and service; from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot! This solemn ritual was a dedication of the whole man to the Lord. It should deepen our understanding of the passage in 1 Corinthians 6:20 ' . . . you have been bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body.'

2. *The Drink Offering*

Perhaps the best known example of a drink offering took place centuries before it was incorporated into the ceremonial law. At Paddan-Aram, Jacob erected a stone pillar and renamed it 'Bethel' (Gen. 35:13-14). From this incident Doddridge gained inspiration for his immortal hymn:

*O God of Bethel! by whose hand Thy people still are fed;
Who through this weary pilgrimage hast all our father's led.*

Every major offering, whether prepared in fulfilment of a vow or spontaneously (by either a native born Israelite or a sojourner who lived among the Israelites on a feast day was offered with a 'grain offering' mixed with oil and a 'drink offering' of wine. Usually, about half a litre of each was used, but the actual quantity was regulated by the kind of animal sacrificed—Numbers 15:4-10.

These associated offerings bring to mind that the Lord Jesus Christ poured out his life for us through the eternal Spirit (Heb. 9:14). And further we know that God has in his resurrection triumph anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows (Ps. 45:7).

The Apostle Paul must have recalled this offering when he wrote, 'I am

ready to be poured forth as a 'drink offering' upon the sacrifice and service of your faith' (Phil. 2:17). 'For I am already being poured out as a "drink offering" and the time of my departure is at hand' (2 Tim. 4:6). It follows then that the spiritual teaching to be drawn from this offering is that your life and mine is to be poured out in sacrificial service, as was the Apostle's, to the glory of God.

3. *The Free Will Offering*

Instructions for this offering are to be found in Deuteronomy 16:10-11. When the congregation celebrated the feast of weeks—Pentecost—they were to bring to the Lord an offering proportionate in size to his blessing upon them as judged by the amount of their harvest. Whilst they were to rejoice in the goodness of God they were also to remember that their forbears had been slaves in Egypt. Therefore, they were to invite the less fortunate to celebrate the blessing of God upon their lives. The freewill offering made possible the restoration of the Temple in Hezekiah's reign and the rebuilding of the Temple after the Exile (2 Chron. 31:4ff., Ezra 1:4).

We have been abundantly blessed in Christ and it is incumbent upon us to share freely what we have with others. Our Lord said: 'Give and it will be given to you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, they will pour into your lap. For whatever measure you deal out to others, it will be dealt to you in return' (Luke 6:38).

Did Paul have this offering in mind when he wrote in 1 Corinthians 16:2 'On the first day of every week let each one of you put aside and save, as he may prosper.' If all the redeemed in every assembly gave one tenth of their net earnings through their local congregation to the Lord's work then Spirit directed ministries would never be starved of funds. The spiritually needy would be confronted with the power of the gospel. 'Accept the freewill offerings of my mouth, O Lord and teach me Thine ordinances,' prayed the Psalmist in Psalm 119:108.

4. *The Grain Offering*

Regulations relating to this secondary offering are set out in Leviticus 6:14ff. Leviticus chapter two lists the various ways grain could be offered: uncooked (v. 2), baked in an oven (v. 4), or cooked in a lidded pan (v. 7). In each instance the offering had to be seasoned with salt (v. 13) as a reminder of God's Covenant and offered at the front of the altar. This offering represented the Lord Jesus as the Bread of God who gives life to the world (John 6:33).

The 'showbread' which was displayed before the Lord in the Holy Place in the Tabernacle and renewed every Sabbath morning, then eaten by the priests, was really a 'grain offering' (Lev. 24:5-9). As part of this offering was allotted to the ministering priest and his family (Lev. 6:16), it would

typify the Lord Jesus in his present ministry as the source of fellowship (1 John 1:7), as well as the sustainer of all the New Testament royal priesthood—John 6:51—‘... the Living Bread which if a man eat he shall live forever.’

As the priests were to derive strength and nourishment from that which is sacred, may I be bold enough to ask if you wait upon the Lord to gain new spiritual strength? (Isa. 40:30-31).

5. *The Guilt Offering*

From 1 Samuel 6:3-4, we learn that this sacrifice was also practised among Israel's heathen neighbours. When the Philistines returned the Ark of the Covenant which they had triumphantly captured as a prize of war, it was with a ‘guilt offering’ that they finally extricated themselves from this plague-bearing centre-piece of Israel's worship.

The Laws governing these offerings are found in Leviticus 5—6:5. The guilt offering was offered for specific sins (v. 7), and unlike any other offering it was to be made according to the offerer's circumstances and therefore was within the means of the poorest Israelite (Lev. 5:11). By contrast we moderns are not merely poor but spiritually bankrupt through the Fall and can offer no oblation acceptable to God (Micah 6:6-7). But Christ, the final, once for all guilt offering, through faith, is available to all whom the Lord God shall call, without money and without price (Isa. 55:1-2). The ‘guilt offering’ was for sins committed in ignorance (Lev. 5:15-17), for unfaithfulness to the Lord, deception, lies and false witness (Lev. 6:2-4), and for theft, where restitution was to be made to the owner (vv. 4-5). Then the sin would be forgiven and the guilty restored to the Lord His God.

In addition to other offerings; a ‘guilt offering’ declared the leper cleansed from his disease. ‘So he shall be cleansed.’ It would appear that this ritual was both a recognition of man's original sin and was intended to emphasise the offensiveness of sin (Lev. 14:12).

Isaiah 53:10 points to the messiah and redeemer as a ‘guilt offering’ cf. 1 Peter 2:24. ‘He Himself bore our sins on the tree.’ The guilt offering was a restoration or compensation made to God represented in the person of the priest; a payment for a wrong done. The servant of Yahweh, the Lord Christ, by submitting to a violent death (the sacrifice of his very life) paid by his own blood the debt we owe to God. The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son cleanses from all sin (1 John 1:7).

Next time we go on to consider the heave, peace, sin, thank and wave offerings.

□□□

My years with George Whitefield

by Arnold Dallimore

IN 1949, WHEN I UNDERTOOK THE founding of a new church in the village of Cottam, I thought to increase my meagre income by doing some writing.

I had known Richard Ellsworth Day who wrote a life of Spurgeon (*The Shadow of the Broad Brim*) and similar works on Moody, Finney and Brainerd, and in view of the financial success these undertakings attained, I determined to produce a life of Whitefield in the hope that it would bring me some monetary reward. This was to be my 'tent-making'.

I read whatever I could lay my hands on concerning Whitefield (which was not much) and by 1951 had a manuscript completed which would have made a paper-back volume of some 200 pages. But I realised the effort was very inadequate and therefore put it aside and made plans to look into my subject much more fully. How glad I am that manuscript was never put into print!

Accordingly I obtained the addresses of several used book dealers in England and began buying any and every volume that dealt with Whitefield, his contemporaries or his times. By 1956, after much reading, I had produced another manuscript, and this contained fuller information on many aspects of my subject and would have made a printed volume of some 300 pages. I had contact with two of the largest Christian publishers in America, but I feared to submit the manuscript, realising that, like most previous biographers of Whitefield, I had failed to grasp much of the true significance of his accomplishments and much of the greatness of his person. Thus I put this manuscript aside also, and

rejoice now that it never saw the light of day!

During the latter 1950's I had correspondence with Mr. Williams, Founder of the Evangelical Library in London, and through him I learned of Howell Harris, a Welshman, who had been a close associate of Whitefield and the Wesleys. Harris left some 3000 letters and 300 diaries and it was evident I must familiarise myself with this literature.

With this in mind I went to England in 1959 and spent nearly three months there. Through Mr. Williams I met Iain Murray and Erroll Hulse of the Banner of Truth Trust—a publishing house which was then but two years old—and they expressed a desire to publish my biography of Whitefield, but stressed that they wanted a very thorough and extensive work. I also met Dr. Lloyd-Jones—visited with him in a gentlemen's Club on Pall Mall—a Club of which he is a member by virtue of his position as a medical doctor. He expressed deep interest in seeing a thorough work done on Whitefield and strongly encouraged my undertaking.

I found much information in the vast library of the British Museum and also made use of several unpublished letters and other documents in the archives of the Methodist Church. I spent a week in the National Library of Wales at Aberystwyth, which houses the Howell Harris literature. I discovered, however, that Harris's handwriting is very difficult to read, but providentially, two or three Welshmen have devoted some years to making out his words, and have published much of this body of literature in *The*

Journal of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Historical Society. Several unpublished sections I found in typescript. The Harris material is highly informative on Whitefield, the Wesleys and their associates and no one is able to form valid opinions on the 18th Century Revival and its leaders without having thoroughly consulted it.

Upon returning home I visited some of the large libraries of the eastern seaboard in America. They house numerous documents relating to Whitefield's ministry in the Colonies. Moreover, during the early 1960's the process of photo copying began to be available and this made it possible to obtain copies of documents in both America and Britain, merely by ascertaining their existence and writing for them. This greatly facilitated the whole matter of research, and I secured copies of numerous letters that I could not otherwise have obtained. I have now at least three hundred letters from the 18th Century, in either photostat or micro-film form, most of which have never been published.

With this fuller range of information in hand I began my writing all over again, planning now to produce a two-volume work. But I met many problems.

I found I had tackled one of the most difficult forms of writing. In a university thesis one has merely to present the facts and document them without regard to style of presentation, but I had to present facts and document them and also to do so in a manner that would make attractive reading. I had to tell a story, had to provide historical proof for every statement I made, yet was obliged to keep the narrative alive and, indeed, in such a story as that of Whitefield's life, to endeavour to make it gripping.

Moreover, it proved impossible—by reason of many overlapping events—

to present matters in a strictly chronological order—and thus I grouped the facts of the various areas of my story, presenting a distinct and unified portion of the subject in each chapter. Of course there were numerous decisions as to what to put in and what to leave out. Likewise, I was alone in my task and longed for someone with whom I could discuss the subject and the problems of understanding and presenting it.

My greatest difficulty, however, arose from the widely prevailing and yet false concept of John Wesley.

Few men ever created in their followers so militant a loyalty as did he. And following his death this attitude became still stronger and in keeping with his Perfection doctrine his early biographers portrayed him as virtually faultless and as a magnificent example of the Perfection he taught.

But although Wesley possessed many exemplary qualities he also had others of a very different kind. He was determined to acquire prestige and power, and could be utterly ruthless and lastingly unforgiving toward anyone who stood in his way. He was not without such characteristics as malice and envy and jealousy, and was never known to admit himself to be in the wrong in any way. Indeed, like his father before him he was very much a dual personality.

Whitefield's career and Wesley's were intertwined from the days they first met at Oxford University, and there is no way in which one can adequately tell the story of the former without correcting to some extent the false notions about the latter. Yet herein lies the great difficulty. How can one state that saintly John Wesley could be utterly untruthful when it suited his purpose, that many statements in his much revered *Journal* are prevarications and that he was motivated

throughout life by a desire to aggrandise himself as much as to win the souls of lost mankind? Yet such information must necessarily be revealed if we are to have a true picture of him in his relationships with Whitefield.

Thus I faced the realisation that the manner in which I handled these matters was highly important. Such a portrayal of Wesley would assuredly be denounced a sheer partisanship—as a cheap attempt to magnify Whitefield by minifying Wesley. Moreover, the analyzing of the doctrinal differences between the two men would undoubtedly be regarded by many readers as nothing more than an endeavour to open old wounds and to revive a controversy that was assumed to have been settled and forgotten long ago.

In view of this situation I spent some two years in writing the section on The Controversy in my *Volume 2*. I wanted to avoid, as far as possible, giving any grounds for the change of partisanship, yet at the same time to leave no doubt as to exactly what took place, and what were the actions and spirit of both Whitefield and Wesley in the strife. I quoted extensively the 18th century documents and endeavoured to let them present the picture as to what took place. At the insistence of the publisher this picture was later curtailed to some extent, yet it is still full enough to provide the reader with a clear understanding of this area of Whitefield's life.

Throughout the years of my writing I continually felt my subject was too big for me. Whitefield's greatness has defied his previous biographers and I realise that I too have failed to measure up to its demands.

Nevertheless, I have dealt with aspects of his career and his personality which other writers have overlooked. For

instance I show that not only was he (speaking in the human sense) the originator of the Revival work but he was also the one who first planned and instituted its form of organisation—the form that Wesley later adopted. Likewise I show that Whitefield, although he could have continued to lead his branch of the work, 'Calvinistic Methodism', he chose, in order to avoid a life-long conflict with Wesley, to relinquish his position and let Wesley have the pre-eminence that he so greatly desired. In answer to his followers who urged him to retain his position and have his name go down in history in the greatness that was really his, he replied repeatedly, 'Let the name of Whitefield perish, but Christ be glorified! Let me be but the servant of all.' These are but two of several areas of his life with which I deal and which have long been neglected.

In response to *Volume 1* I have had letters from men and women in many lands who wrote to state what a blessing the book had been to them. Such testimonies make my long and lonely labour seem worthwhile and I feel sure *Volume 2* will continue this result and will bring to men's minds not only a fresh appreciation of Whitefield's God—the God of sovereign grace, the God of Revival.

□□□

Pastor Arnold Dallimore's ministry at the Carey Conference at Cardiff and in a number of centres in England was much appreciated. The Volume 2 referred to published by the Banner should now be available in the bookshops. Cornerstone are responsible for the American edition. We are not informed about the American publication date. The above article by Dr. Dallimore first appeared in Reformation Canada, editor Rev. William Payne, 628 Kilbirnie Place, Burlington, Ontario, Canada L7L 2M4.

Bob Sheehan is the pastor of Grace Baptist Church, Albion Road, Bexleyheath, Kent. At the Carey Conference for ministers held in January this year at Cardiff he presented a most relevant study on Bible translation which we are reproducing in the magazine in three parts, 1. The Biblical principles affecting translation, 2. Interpretation and translation, 3. Language and conclusions. In the study eight available translations are reviewed and contrasted. Basically three views are held with regard to where we begin with Bible translations. Firstly there are those who prefer what is known as the Received Text. Then, there are those who prefer what is known as the Eclectic Text. Thirdly there is a very small but extremely vocal group who will not tolerate any other than the Received Text and who will even go so far as to sever fellowship over this issue. Arrangements have been made for the Whitefield Fellowship of ministers here in Mid-Sussex to hear Bob Sheehan (of the first school) and Keith Davies (of the second) freely present their views. That is on September 11. Their papers will be followed by questions and debate. The meetings are by invitation and ministers who would like to attend should write to the editor.

Principles of Bible Translators

EVERY BIBLE TRANSLATION FACES US WITH TWO ISSUES: THE MINOR ISSUE OF the text—minor because all Bible translations agree for 98-99% of their underlying texts—and the major issue of the principles controlling the translation—major because these principles affect the whole translation. It is to this major issue that this paper is addressed.

In an age that delights to call itself 'scientific', are the Scriptures to be translated according to the techniques formulated by the linguists, or do the Scriptures require special treatment? Does theology have nothing to say as to how the Scriptures are to be translated as Dr. R. B. Dillard claims,¹ or are there Biblical principles which vitally affect the translation of the Scriptures?

Are there Biblical principles for translators to consider?

When an associate professor of the distinguished Westminster Theological Seminary tells us that no principles are established by theology as to how Scripture is to be translated,² we are required to stop and think before we assert otherwise. Yet I find at least four Scriptural principles which must be taken into account by translators. Let me state and explain them:

1. The very fact that the Infinite God, who defies complete understanding by the mind of finite man, has caused Scripture to come into existence is a declaration on his part that he desires to be understood by men. Dr. H. Bavinck sees the wonder of Scripture in the fact that 'God condescends to our level'.³ The whole Scripture is anthropomorphic. As Bavinck

writes, 'It pleases the Holy Spirit, the Author of Scriptures, because of our feeble comprehension, to stammer after our fashion'.⁴ God intends to be understood. The very existence of Scripture proves it. Translators must reflect the Divine intention if they would be faithful in the execution of their task. That which God intended to be understood should not be made obscure by men.

2. The fact that the Scriptures teach a doctrine of verbal inspiration must also affect the work of the translator. An inspiration that extends to the choice of words can only imply a God who is concerned with more than the general sense. He is a God who desires to be understood exactly.

The very perfection of God requires him to be concerned with details. This is the God who bothered to give the measurements of Noah's ark⁵ and to prescribe detailed regulations for the worship of Israel.⁶ This is the God who will not overlook one sin.⁷ This preciseness in the character of God was, therefore, reflected in his out-breathing of Scripture. Because of this a word, a phrase or a verb tense can be the hinge on which a Biblical argument turns.⁸

In the light of this it will not do for us to see the Scriptures as an expression of the general ideas of God. The Scriptures are an expression of precise truth in selected words. God would be understood exactly.

The translator must, therefore, bear in mind that he is dealing with truth exactly expressed. His job is to express the same truth as exactly as possible in the language of his people. It is at this point that one area of disagreement arises. How does the translator express Scripture accurately in his own language?

There have been those who have contended that verbal inspiration requires a word-for-word translation. As God selected his words with precision then the equivalent word in English must be found and used. Is this correct?

The problems with this view are many. Not least of its difficulties is that it arises out of a misunderstanding of verbal inspiration. This doctrine teaches that God chose the best words and grammatical forms in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek to express precisely his message to man in those languages. Verbal inspiration took place in order to ensure that God was precisely understood. The translators task is not, therefore, to give the dictionary equivalents of the words God chose, and to copy Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek grammatical forms, but to express in the most precise form possible the same message in the vocabulary and grammatical forms of the receiving language. e.g. In the Greek of Matthew 4:18-22 there is a whole string of sentences joined by the words 'καὶ' and 'δέ'. To begin sentence after sentence with 'and' is good Greek (and good Hebrew), but even a child at school knows that it is bad English. Translations which follow the Greek structure (e.g. the Authorised

Version) are not translating properly. The receiving language (English) must control the form of the written language rather than the original language (Greek).

Indeed, those who have sought to translate literally using dictionary equivalents have met all sorts of problems. The word order of Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic and English are quite different. A wooden word-for-word translation robs the original of its emphasis. Where the original language was emphatic the translation is simply wooden.

How are the tenses of Greek and Hebrew to be literally translated when the Greek verbs have a larger number of possible forms and the Hebrew has less possible verbal forms than the English?

A literal word-for-word equivalent fails to do justice to the idiomatic nature of language. It is a good Hebrew idiom for the officers of Israel in Exodus 5:21 to tell Moses that he has made them smell in Pharaoh's eyes, but it is not a good English idiom. For the Englishman the same meaning is conveyed if we use a phrase such as 'you have made us to stink before Pharaoh' or 'offensive in the sight of Pharaoh' (R.S.V.). It is the latter and not the former that honours verbal inspiration by giving the precise meaning to God's words that he intended.

Even the most ardent advocates of dictionary equivalents have to give up sometimes or be completely incomprehensible to their readers. Dr. M. C. Fisher gives a notable example; he gives a literal translation of Genesis 33:14, 'As for me, let me lead my gentleness to the foot of the business which is to my face and to the foot of the children that I shall come to my lord to Seir'.⁹ It is unadulterated gobbledegook when translated, although perfectly intelligible in Hebrew idiom.

One of the main examples of a literal translation was the Roman Catholic Rheims-Douay Bible. Ostensibly out of a desire to say no more than the Holy Spirit had said they created exact equivalents to the original where they did not exist in English. The consequence was a Bible with such incredible words as *parasceve*, *pasche*, *didragmes* and *exinanited*.¹⁰ It was this version that the translators of the Authorized Version attacked for its 'obscurity'¹¹ and for 'darkening the sense of the Bible'.¹² The Authorised Version translators, and many others since, recognised that verbal inspiration requires translators to give the precise meaning of the Holy Spirit in comprehensible English.

Verbal inspiration took place in order to ensure that the exact meaning of the Holy Spirit was conveyed. This is to be the intention of the translator; and dictionary equivalents are his servants to this end and not his masters.

3. In considering the principles which are to guide the translators of Scripture we cannot ignore the manner in which the New Testament writers under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit used the Old Testament.

It is surely significant that there is hardly a quotation made which is word-for-word. It is evident that the New Testament use of Scripture was concerned with faithfulness to the meaning of what God had said rather than finding verbal equivalents for the Old Testament texts.

Dr. E. J. Young summarises the evidence when he writes, 'In making their translation the New Testament writers did not seek to give a slavishly literal rendering, but rather, by the use of suitable Greek words that were at their disposal, to bring out the true sense of the Old Testament passage. In making their quotations the New Testament writers do not necessarily reproduce the Old Testament verbatim. They often prefer merely to give the sense of the Old Testament.'¹³ To the inspired penmen of the New Testament it was the sense of Scripture that mattered and not slavish, literal translation.

The translators of the Authorised Version totally agreed. In their 'preface' they wrote of the Apostles leaving the Septuagint many times, and the Hebrew, 'to deliver the sense thereof according to the truth of the word, as the Spirit gave them utterance'.¹⁴

Translators have, therefore, Biblical precedent to give themselves not to slavish literalism in translation but to precision in rendering the meaning of God in the words he used.

4. Nor in considering this matter can we dismiss the practice of the Gospel writers in reporting the words of Christ. We call to mind certain facts. Our Lord spoke in Aramaic. Our Gospels are written in Greek. Therefore, as Dr. E. J. Young reminds us, the conversations of our Lord are in the nature of the case translations.¹⁵

In giving their translations of the conversations and teaching of our Lord, did the Gospel writers always agree word-for-word? Certainly not! Why was this? Because, says E. J. Young, they were not giving a verbatim repetition on every occasion but sometimes a summary.¹⁶ Does the fact that the Gospel writers give a summary of the Lord's words rather than a word-for-word account make them less accurate? Not at all! As long as they each accurately express what was said in precise terms their witness is valid.

If the translation technique of the Gospel writers was not to report every word of the Lord but to give precise reports of his statements, then Bible translators have the highest precedent for giving us precise renderings of the meaning of the original languages without constant recourse to verbal equivalents.

These four Biblical principles lay it as a duty upon all translators to give a precise account of God's message to us in language that we can understand. Their duty to God requires precision; their duty to man requires comprehensibility.

Those Biblical principles may be applied to the main versions in use amongst our people, i.e. The Authorised Version (A.V.), the Revised

Standard Version (R.S.V.), the New English Bible (N.E.B.), the Good News Bible (G.N.B. or T.E.V.), the New American Standard Version (N.A.S.V.), the New International Version (N.I.V.) and the Living Bible (L.B.).

What is the general attitude of these versions to translation? Is their emphasis on conveying the original words or the meaning of those words? All reject word-for-word translation but it is a matter of the degree to which they give priority to words or meaning. In the A.V. the words are given greater importance than the meaning; in the R.S.V. meaning is a little more important; in the N.E.B. and G.N.B. meaning is all-important; with the N.A.S.V. words are again emphasised but in the N.I.V. meaning has greater priority; in the L.B. meaning is again all important. The next article will deal with the interpretative element present in all these translations.



References

- ¹ Skilton J. H. (1978) Presbyterian & Reformed. *The New Testament Student and Bible Translation*. p. 118. ² Dillard R. B. ³ and ⁴ Bavinck H. (1977) Banner of Truth. *The Doctrine of God*. pp. 92-3. ⁵ Genesis 6:14-16. ⁶ Exodus 35:4—Leviticus 27. ⁷ Exodus 34:7; Nahum 1:3; Matthew 18:34. ⁸ Galatians 3:16; Hebrews 12:27; Matthew 22:32. ⁹ Skilton J. H. *op. cit.* p. 31. ¹⁰ Skilton J. (1967) *Evangelical Theological Society Bulletin* (Spring ed.). p. 102. ¹¹ and ¹² *The Translators to the Reader* (1911). Trinitarian Bible Society. p. 34. ¹³ Young E. J. (1963). *Banner of Truth. Thy Word is Truth*. p. 147. ¹⁴ *The Translators to the Reader. op. cit.* p. 15. ¹⁵ Young E. J. *op. cit.* p. 130. ¹⁶ Young E. J. *op. cit.* p. 129.

continued from page 4

debated issues at a level which would leave most groping today. Their inconsistencies in the realm of legalism have been grossly exaggerated. Their faults are more than a hundred times compensated for by their theological calibre and godliness.

The Westminster Assembly of 1643 represents the high watermark of English Puritanism. Of about 150 members there were at least ten Independents which included well known men such as Thomas Goodwin, William Bridge, Philip Nye and Jeremiah Burroughs. There is much for us to learn from that Assembly alone especially with regard to maintaining Christian unity. B. B. Warfield esteemed the formularies of Westminster as 'the most vital expression that has ever been framed by the hand of man'—that is in the post apostolic age. 'Only,' declares Warfield, 'when our grasp upon evangelical religion becomes weak and our love for it grows cold can we lightly lose or rashly cast from us' the expressions enunciated by that body of men (quoted from an address given in 1897).

In Britain we enjoy a large measure of unity and of accommodation within the Reformed constituency. We should always cherish two fundamentals, firstly the freedom in our forums to expound in detail any topic from Scripture and secondly to bear our differences within the framework of the unity already given by the Holy Spirit as expressed in Ephesians 4:1-6. These sentiments may be idealistic, but they are important. It is a sign of immaturity and superficiality if men cannot bear their differences with love and equanimity.



Various views of non-Baptists considered

IN HIS TREATISE ON INFANT BAPTISM WITH THE TITLE 'BELIEVERS AND THEIR seed' Herman Hoeksema declares that Baptists simply have no eye for the doctrines of the covenant, especially not for the truth of the historico-organic development of God's covenant on earth in the line of generations. In the last article '*What is the Covenant of Grace?*' (RT 54) we considered the nature of Covenant Theology. It was made as clear as the moon or sun that we love covenant theology and never more so than when viewed in its progressive stages through the Old Testament ultimately to find its final and glorious consummation in the New. And we too are fascinated by the generations through which God worked in sovereign grace from Adam to Seth, from Noah to Shem, from Abraham to Judah and Tamar, to David and the royal lineage, terminating with Joseph the guardian of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In the Old Covenant the Jews were taken by God's hand and led out of Egypt to become God's one and only nation upon this earth. That nation was monolithic in as much as every person born into it was included in the Covenant made by God with Moses. Within that body of people was to be found a spiritual body. In Isaiah's day the spiritual body had shrunk to about a tenth and by the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel the number of the spiritual had further declined to a very tiny remnant. It is remarkable to observe how God revived the small nucleus that survived in Babylon after the shattering invasion of 587 B.C. From that time onward the principle of inward renewal or regeneration is especially brought to the fore by the prophets in preparation for the impending New covenant administration which completely displaced the Old.

Some of the differences between the Old and the New can be seen at a glance in the following way.

Old Covenant

Inclusion was by birth or covenant status the sign of which was circumcision which pointed to the necessity of regeneration.

Spiritual nurture was by a sacrificial system and a priesthood to administer it, together with the teaching of prophets.

A variety of sacrifices was made by the priests which pointed to God's provision of an atonement.

New Covenant

Inclusion is by a new heart (regeneration), the evidences of which are repentance and faith.

Spiritual nurture is mainly by the ministry of the Word in preaching and also by fellowship with the Lord's people. All believers are priests and all believers have access at all times to God's throne of grace.

Only one sacrifice is commemorated, namely the perfect sacrifice or Christ once and for all. This Passover is remembered round the Lord's Table.

Membership was registered in families and tribes: Judah, God, Manasseh, Levi, etc.

Discipline was maintained by elders. Grievous sin or apostasy was punishable by death.

Children were included in the body from birth. The sign of circumcision was given to males on the eighth day, a mark in their flesh that they belonged to the nation of Israel. Providing they did nothing outrageous they were always part of the Jewish nation even though they might never show any spirituality whatever. No suggestion is ever made of excluding groups such as the Sadducees who rejected the doctrine of the resurrection.

Membership is of individuals with a local body of believers in which discipline is maintained by elders recognised and set apart according to the Scriptures.

Discipline is maintained by elders. Reproof, exclusion from the Lord's Table, suspension from membership and ultimately excommunication are the means of discipline.

Children of believers are included from the time of birth in the nurture and teaching of the church, enjoying all the benefits of the means of grace. When the central promise of the New Covenant is evidenced in repentance and faith (knowing the Lord), then individual members born into Christian homes are baptised and welcome into formal membership.

Now having observed some differences let us survey some of the viewpoints and conclusions come to by those who practice infant baptism. It would take an extended study just to present the differences of view in Holland let alone survey all the positions held. My purpose at this stage is to illustrate the confusion that exists. Noteworthy is the salient feature that all non-Baptists neglect or avoid the Hebrew 8: 6-13 insistence on a *new* administration. It is a *New* Covenant and 'Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers.' The words **NOT ACCORDING TO THE OLD COVENANT** (Jer. 31: 32) ought to be written in letters of shining gold, and hung over every baptismal font. The great or cardinal difference between the Old and the New is that in the New Covenant a new heart and spirit must be given. Regeneration is the prerequisite. Without regeneration a person cannot know the Lord. To belong or to be included you must know the Lord, as it says, '*for they will all know me from the least of them to the greatest of them*' (Heb. 8: 11).

1. *The Roman Catholic position*

Roman Catholics believe in baptismal regeneration. This automatically secures the forgiveness of all past sins. They believe that the rite is absolutely necessary to salvation and that it is not possible for newly-born infants to be saved unless they are baptised. The Trent Catechism declares, 'Infants unless regenerated unto God through the grace of baptism, whether their parents be Christian or infidel, are born to eternal misery and perdition.' However this idea has been moderated and another realm invented. This is the place called *limbus infantum* a place of non-suffering where unbaptised infants are sent.

If we were to take this teaching seriously we might conclude that 93% of the population of the Republic of Ireland are regenerate since 93% are

R.C. and baptised. Likewise we would expect 93% of the population of Italy to be regenerate and 95% of Poland.

To read the documents of Vatican II shows that the Catholics have moderated their outlook considerably. There are many contradictions in these documents. For instance on page 365 we are led to believe that baptism into the Roman Catholic church is essential to salvation and without it nobody can be saved. However later on page 469 in dealing with the 'decree on ecumenism' it is made plain that Christians of other communities are acceptable and that section there is a further assertion that rebirth is through the rite of baptism even though it is administered in other communities. With the casuistry for which the Catholics are so well known we suppose that they could get round these contradictions by saying that damnation belongs to those who know the church of Rome is correct and yet rebel against it. We suppose furthermore that they would regard those outside Rome as being ignorant and therefore needing to be subject to better instruction.

The Roman Catholic doctrine of regeneration is not consistently maintained because their teaching makes it plain that many grow up not to adhere to the faith and therefore are lost. A proper understanding of the doctrine of regeneration means that once regenerate a person can never be lost.

2. The position of Dr. Abraham Kuyper

Dr. Kuyper was a great theologian and author of a three volume classic on common grace. He left the ministry to enter politics and eventually became the prime minister of the Netherlands. He elaborated a most peculiar teaching about baptism. Dr. Kuyper taught that 'at the very moment when the minister administers the water of Baptism, your Mediator and Saviour performs a work of grace in the soul of the baptised child'.¹ This mark of grace is the grace of regeneration. But the teaching which follows is very subtle because Dr. Kuyper was careful to point out that when the results of this regeneration are not forthcoming we must presuppose that it is really there but hidden away in the subconscious. According to Kuyper this hidden grace of regeneration should appear at some future time, perhaps even seventy or eighty years later. We can imagine troubled parents calling in their pastor to deal with the tantrums of a wicked, disobedient son.

'We thought he was born again when you baptised him,' say they, 'but he blasphemes Christ and will not obey his parents!' 'Never mind,' says the pastor reassuringly, 'you must regard him with patience as a believer and faithful member of the church because in due course that secret regeneration hidden in the sub-consciousness will come to the surface.'

This is the famous presupposed regeneration teaching of Kuyper which writes like Hoeksema expose or erroneous.

3. *The position of Dr. Charles Hodge*

As we would expect this eminent Presbyterian theologian based his teaching on the old covenant. It would be too laborious to follow the process of thought for each writer. The reasoning in each case is similar but the conclusions differ. Hodge taught that in baptising infants we bring them to salvation and write their names in heaven. However he taught that it was possible for these same children afterwards to erase their names from the Lamb's book of Life. Let us view his words well:

Do let the little ones have their names written in the Lamb's book of life even if they afterwards choose to erase them; being thus enrolled may be the means of their salvation.²

Now we must allow for the license of illustration, namely, that he means that infant baptism is a means of grace. Nevertheless even when we have done that we are still amazed! Are we really to believe that parents have the power to put their children's names in the Lamb's book of Life, and later that those children have power to erase them again. Even Arminius would shudder to think that such power could be attributed to man!

4. *The position of Prof. W. Heyns*

Prof. Heyns taught theology at Calvin College in America for a number of years and his teaching on baptism had considerable influence.

Prof. Heyns developed a scheme in which we are to understand that by baptising infants grace is infused into them whereby, to quote the Professor, 'they receive a certain life, a life which is not indeed the life of regeneration, but nevertheless life. Through this life they are put in a position to take possession of and to accept the offered promise, the essence of the covenant, or reject it'.³

Well here is an amazing proposition for by sprinkling the little ones we create a third race, a race of little Arminians who grow up with free-will to accept or reject offered grace! There is the race of Adam into which we are all born. We know too of the race of the second Adam, that is Christ, into which we have to be born by the Holy Spirit. But nowhere in Scripture do we find the existence of a third race of people who are partially liberated and who by water and upbringing possess a special spiritual discernment or freedom to choose or reject the Gospel.

5. *The position of Herman Hoeksema*

Hoeksema is an out and out hyper-Calvinist who categorically rejects the doctrine of common grace and gives no quarter whatever for the free offers of the Gospel.⁴ Nevertheless his uncompromising hold on the doctrine of election preserves him from all the foregoing errors. The sovereign right of God to choose some and reject others irrespective of any other factors is correctly maintained by Hoeksema. He recognises

that the doctrine of election ensures that God is by no means obligated to save the children of believers. He was not so obligated in the Old Testament administration and now he is not so obligated in the New. Salvation is not by blood, nor by the will of the flesh but by the sovereign will and choice of God. This exercise of sovereign grace is absolute. Therefore we are in no position to guarantee the salvation of any individual on the grounds that he or she was born into a Christian household. Hoeksema is correct in his firm assertion of this principle. He expounds what he calls 'the organic idea in Scripture'. Summed up in a sentence this means simply that God does work in families—the Hebrew family of the Old Testament and now in believing families in the New. God who predestinates souls to salvation also predestinates the means to that end. To be born into a Christian household is to be born with the means of salvation. Following this 'organic' idea we see that the Lord worked in the family of Seth (Gen. 4: 25, 26) and the families of Noah and Abraham. Afterwards he worked in the nation of the Jews. We see also how he worked in Timothy's family, in his grandmother Lois and in his mother Eunice (1 Tim. 1: 5). In our day we continue to observe the principle. Grace has run in some of our families for three or four generations.

As with the other positions outlined, Hoeksema rests the practice of infant baptism firmly and squarely on the Old Testament dispensation. But he observes that all born into the Jewish nation were circumcised though not necessarily saved. Now all born into Christian families must on the same principle be baptised but this too in no way guarantees salvation.

Hoeksema represents a large school of Reformed non-Baptists who observe the unity of the Old Covenant administration with the New but fail to observe the clearly enunciated differences of administration between the two (Heb. 8: 6-13). (See RT 54.)

Hoeksema points out how the principle of election is asserted very strongly in Romans chapter nine. Both Jacob and Esau were circumcised yet Jacob was chosen and Esau rejected. The same observation can be made with regard to Isaac and Ishmael. Both were circumcised but Isaac alone was the son of promise. We could go further and presume that all twelve sons of Jacob were circumcised. Yet one after the other they grew up to manifest the evil of their unregenerate hearts. Simeon and Levi were cruel, ruthless murderers. Reuben was guilty of an incestuous relationship and Judah of adultery. All the brothers with the exception of Reuben and Benjamin conspired to destroy Joseph and in the event compromised and sold him as a slave instead. Afterwards they willingly imposed the most appalling heartbreak upon Jacob by maintaining their miserable deception about Joseph's death.

If the situation is the same in both Old and New Covenant dispensations then we must expect that whether baptised or not children born into Christian households are going to grow up in an unregenerate state.

Not all the water of the Pacific or Atlantic oceans can change the fact that flesh is flesh. Nor can we control the Holy Spirit with a ceremony. He blows where he wills and when he wills.

6. *The position of Professor John Murray*

In contrast to Herman Hoeksema who teaches that we must regard the visible church as consisting of a mixture of elect and reprobate, Professor John Murray teaches that we must regard all baptised infants of Christian parents as regenerate, that is until they prove otherwise. Says Professor Murray 'Baptised infants are to be received as the children of God and treated accordingly.'⁵

The professor then quotes the Westminster Assembly's Directory for Public Worship which Directory makes it very plain that this whole idea is based firmly upon the Abrahamic Covenant of the Old Testament. This was the line of thought followed by Calvin and which was formulated in Reformed creeds such as the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism.

We come now to make some concluding observation as follows.

1. *The need for clear understanding of the doctrine of regeneration*

We can see from some of the foregoing views that great theologians like Kuyper and Hodge feel that baptism must really signify regeneration. To them it must mean that and so they make it to mean that. In response we see the need to understand what the new birth really is. Professor Murray in his book *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* reminds us that regeneration is 'nothing less than a new creation by Him who calls the things that be not though they were'. He also reminds us of Ezekiel 36: 26 'A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you.' The new birth takes place in a moment of time and once a man is a new creature in Christ Jesus he can never be anything else but that. C. R. Vaughan declares of the new birth, 'It makes a man a new creature in Christ; renews his nature; it recolours his character; it transforms his will; it remoulds his whole system of thinking, feeling, and acting. It gives him new objects to live for; new rules to live by; new principles to impel to action; and new sensibilities to success or failure in the progress and development of that new life.'⁶

While regeneration is inward and hidden it is a work of omnipotence and the effects of an almighty work are to be seen. Resurrection begins inside and immediately results in life. Lazarus came out of his tomb. Paul quit breathing slaughter and began to pray.

The new birth is the first resurrection (Eph. 2: 1-10, Rev. 20: 6). In short the new birth is a mighty supernatural work of God whereby he makes a bad tree into a good tree.

The power with which this is done is compared to the power which raised

our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead (Eph. 1:17,18). This reminds us that God uses the Scriptures and preaching to bring dead souls to life. It is through his Word that he brings the new birth to pass (Jas. 1:18, 1 Pet. 1:21,22).

In the light of all this it is erroneous to reduce the evidence of regeneration to something so passive that they cannot be recognised. Essentially the New Testament church consists of those who are the recipients of the New Covenant blessing of a new heart and a new spirit, that is regeneration. Every local church worthy of the name operates on this vital principle that it is composed of people who know the Lord because he has put them in Christ Jesus who has become for them wisdom from God—that is their righteousness, holiness and redemption.

A sure way to have a dead, formalistic, nominal, lifeless church is to follow Dr. Kuyper's teaching on presuppositional regeneration which is a dangerous delusion—a world of make-believe. Little wonder that so many Reformed non-Baptists in the Netherlands have rejected that error.

2. The necessity to maintain a proper doctrine of original sin

Our Lord in speaking to a privileged child of the Old Covenant, Nicodemus, not only insisted on the necessity of the new birth, that is for Nicodemus, but also reminded him of the fundamental principle that 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh and that which is born of the spirit is spirit' (John 3:6). Everyone without exception is born out of Adam, is guilty of his first sin and is destitute of that original righteousness in which he was created. Moreover all are born with the corruption of Adam's fallen nature. Without exception all so born are by nature hostile to God and spiritual truths and at the same time wholly determined to serve themselves and this world. There can be no compromise about the enmity which is incipient in every child of Adam. All the sprinklings in the world do not make the slightest difference to this basically unspiritual and evil nature. It is true that children born into Christian households are not pagans in the sense that they do grow up under Gospel teaching. This privilege and knowledge does not however change in the slightest their basic disposition of alienation from the living God. What was true of the religious child of the covenant, Nicodemus, is true of them, 'You must be born again!'

3. The necessity of a right attitude toward our children

Jeremiah who worked within the Old Testament covenant community declared emphatically that, 'the heart is deceitful above all things and beyond cure. Who can understand it?' The effects of a godly upbringing can be the cause of our children being well behaved, polite and affable. These are wholesome and attractive characteristics but until they are born again they will have no disposition and motivation to live for the glory of God and in vital communion with him. They may learn to say prayers,

read the Bible and participate in various Christian activities but all this still falls short of 'knowing the Lord'.

Indeed it is much more difficult to awaken young people who have become persuaded that all is well with them because of their privileges. At any time it is the hardest thing on earth to awaken desperate sinners to their awful condition and plight. But I would say that it is even more difficult than that to awaken sinners who feel no need because they are surrounded by good things and by a false complacency that all is well with them because they observe religious practices and because they are not guilty of any shocking sins. To hide the real condition of a person's soul is to ignore the most important reason why the new birth is indispensable.

Because they accept the awful realities of original sin Baptists concentrate wholly upon the means of grace provided by God. It takes all the spiritual artillery we possess to awaken people out of their self-righteous complacency to be brought to see that they are hell-deserving sinners. This applies to our own off-spring just as much as it does to those outside. As in physical warfare all the forces, army, navy and air force, are to be called up into total all-out commitment and effort. So in our spiritual warfare all the means of grace provided by God must be employed.

The worst possible thing that we can do is to lull our children into the idea that they are already regenerate when there is no valid evidence for this. On the contrary in our prayers, teachings, church services, fellowship, the helpful occasions such as visiting preachers, the proper use of special events such as Christian house-parties, the love, care and concern of fellow members of the church, the encouragement of the officers of the church, the right use of family worship, all backed up with godly living in the home and family discipline, all these means are to be wholeheartedly employed in bringing up our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. We are to look to him and implore him to bring them to faith even as we ourselves have been brought out of spiritual deadness by regeneration to a lively faith and repentance from our sins. □□□

References

¹ *Believers and their Seed* by Herman Hoeksema (henceforth abbreviated as H.H.), p. 36.

² *Systematic Theology* volume 3, p. 588.

³ cf. pp. 70-75 *Essays on the Covenant of Grace* quoted from H.H., p. 19.

⁴ H.H., p. 126ff. ⁵ *Christian Baptism*, p. 59. ⁶ *The gifts of the Holy Spirit*, p. 188.

The Carey family conferences have proved to be times of spiritual refreshment. The speakers this year during the first week 11th-16th August are Pastor Tom Lutz of Indiana, U.S.A., Bob Sheehan, Colin Richards and Erroll Hulse.

For the second week, 18th-23rd August, Pastor Don McKinney of Lake Charles, Louisiana, U.S.A., Richard Chester, Achille Blaize and Martin Hallett are chiefly responsible for the ministry.

For information write to John Rubens, 23 Brickhill Drive, Bedford MK41 7QA.

FROM BAXTER TO BARTH

A perspective on the literature of baptism

VERY FEW OF THE BOOKS TO WHICH I shall refer are now in print and for that reason I will not attempt to give any details other than that of the titles and sometimes I will refer to authors only.

E. Brooks Holifield in *The Covenant Sealed* outlines the debate on baptism among the Puritans. As early as 1622 the Baptists were seen as a threat. The weakness of the non-Baptist position was soon detected by the contradictory arguments put out. Samuel Ward of Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge adopted a position similar to that held by Prof. Douma that infant baptism does actually save the infants. Most other Puritan divines were embarrassed by Ward's position. Under pressure Ward developed a doctrine to the effect of sustaining a regeneration strong enough to save infants if they died in infancy but inadequate later.

The tension between the non-Baptists seems always to be between those who say that baptism is just a sign and nothing more and those who wish to make it more than that, either by an infusion of some kind of grace or else by a legal right conferred in the constitution of the infants as Christians and members of the church, even if not regenerated.

Another Puritan, Burges, elaborated a principle similar to that taken up by Abraham Kuyper. This was that initial regeneration takes place with the sprinkling. Full regeneration is actualised at a later date.

In 1643 John Tombes attempted to persuade a special committee of the Westminster Assembly of the error of infant baptism. Tombes could not bear the thought of separation and therefore never joined the Baptists formally.

At that time Richard Baxter strongly defended infant baptism. In his early ministry Baxter doubted infant baptism so much that he discontinued the practice. Later in defending infant baptism he proposed very tentatively that sprinkling conferred the power to obey God. That is more or less the position elaborated by Prof. Heyns of Calvin Seminary this century.

John Owen was one of those who took up his pen to defend infant baptism against the exposures of Tombes. His treatise (*Works* vol. 16) takes up the best stance possible for a bad case, namely, that the practice must be based firmly upon the Old Covenant, that it does not infuse grace of any kind but is a sign of the grace the infants may become capable of receiving at a later date. It does not appear that the diversity of covenant administration was pressed at that time, nor was it pressed a couple of centuries later when Abraham Booth wrote a three volume work on baptism. Booth like Tom Watson in our day (*Baptism not for Infants*) concentrated much on exposing the multitude of glaring inconsistencies and contradictions in the infant-baptism position and establishing at the same time a positive case with the bricks and cement of their concessions.

C. C. Berkouwer in his book *The Sacraments* traces out in usual scholarly manner the objections to infant baptism made by Karl Barth. Barth had a brilliant intellect which was quick to detect an inconsistent case. He gave non-Baptists a rough time. Rising up to meet his challenge was Oscar Cullman who laboriously put back the pieces of the Old Covenant which Barth almost succeeded in pulling down. It is only by desperately cleaving to the continuity and unity of

the Covenants that their case can stand. Concentration in detail of the diversity insisted upon by the N.T. was not adequately pressed by Barth.

G. R. Beasley Murray's *Baptism in the New Testament* is a comprehensive work of great scholarship and merit. This author deals with Marcel's *The Biblical Doctrine of Infant Baptism* of which he declares that no work that he read was more unsatisfactory (p. 334). Marcel maintained that the usage and efficacy of the two rites was identical (p. 156). But Beasley Murray quotes Ernst Fuchs, 'baptism differs from circumcision as the new aeon differs from the old; the two rites belong to different worlds!' Nevertheless Beasley Murray does not attempt a detailed exposition of the difference of administration between the Old and the New Testaments.

Prof. John Murray (*Christian Baptism*) is like a defensive chess player intent on defending a position. He proceeds directly to maintain that baptism can mean something other than immersion. That is all he need do to accommodate the 100 per cent practice of the Presbyterians to sprinkle or pour. That approach however fails to deal with the mind of the Lord on this matter. That is what is the

mode Christ intends? With that issue Alexander Carson who was formerly a Presbyterian deals with great thoroughness and scholarship (*Baptism. Its mode and subjects*). Also according to Prof. John Murray, to whom we owe so much on other themes, the church becomes invisible because, 'it is not the prerogative of those who administer church government to determine whether professions are true and sincere or not' (p. 41), to which absurdity we reply simply with an assertion that the business of knowing the Lord and discerning and appreciating others who know the Lord is the business of all God's people. Either we partake of the truths of 1 John chapter one, knowing and fellowshiping with the Father and the Son or we do not. And if not then a person has absolutely no business in the formal membership of Christ's church on earth!

David Kingdon's *Children of Abraham* (which we would like to reprint as soon as funds allow) and Paul K. Jewett's *Infant Baptism and the Covenant of Grace* are full of positive exposition. Both deal with the diversity of the covenant administrations though neither concentrate in detail on Hebrews chapter 8.

□□□

WHITEFIELD FRATERNAL FOR 1980

Thursday, 29th May

- 11.00 a.m. The theology of the Puritans
Erroll Hulse
2.00 p.m. Law and grace in the life and teaching of
William Huntington—a study in 18th
century antinomianism Robert Oliver

Tuesday, 24th June

- 11.00 a.m. Justification by Faith Omri Jenkins
2.00 p.m. Local church evangelism John Blanchard

Thursday, 11th September

Modern translations. The underlying issues examined and debated. Chairman for the day: Bob Horne, editor of *The Evangelical Times*

- 11.00 a.m. Keith Davies (1) Area of agreement,
(2) Comments on the Received text,
(3) Arguments in favour of the Majority text.

- 2.00 p.m. Bob Sheehan (1) Comments on the
Received text, (2) Arguments in favour
of the Eclectic text, (3) Attitudes toward
those who differ.

Thursday, 13th November

- 11.00 a.m. Regeneration John Marshall
2.00 p.m. Russia Today John Marshall
All the sessions are followed by questions and discussion. Chairmen vary according to the nature of the subject.

The gatherings are for evangelical ministers only and are by private invitation. If you have a friend who is in pastoral office who you think would benefit from and enjoy these fraternal please give the details to Dr. Phillips, 156 Buckswood Drive, Crawley RH11 8JF. Phone Crawley 513317 or 511893.

Unless otherwise notified the fraternal for 1980 will take place at no 5 Fairford Close (off Oathall Road) Haywards Heath.

EVANGELISM IN MID-SUSSEX

The Mid-Sussex Bible Convention came into being through a trio of evangelicals; Rupert Studd, Rector of Ardingly, Kingsley Coomber, F.I.E.C. Haywards Heath and Erroll Hulse the pastor of Cuckfield Baptist Church.

On 30th November last year, Rupert Studd was taken from us having suffered from cancer. Rupert was born in Exeter in 1932 coming from a distinguished and long line of gentry. Numbered among his forebears was J.E.K., C.T. and George Studd who played cricket for Eton, Cambridge University and for England. C. T. Studd became a missionary to China, India and Africa, where he founded W.E.C. (Worldwide Evangelistic Crusade).

On the central truths of the faith we enjoyed an excellent unity. Rupert Studd's enterprise and ability is now very sorely missed. He was a driving force for these rallies. His last ten days excepted, when he was in hospital, he used all his remaining strength to serve. Armed with Greek New Testaments, we sought to encourage our brother, but always came away having been ministered to rather than having ministered. His example in bearing the disease which took down his body is unforgettable. His patience was often tried and he confessed to bad temper which he resisted. His courage was outstanding.

There has been delay in paying tribute to our friend for the manner in which he glorified our Redeemer before our eyes—this delay being due to the struggle we have had to get the rallies established again. The arrangements cover an area stretching from Crawley to Brighton and for this year are as follows:

1980

15th May	Clair Hall Haywards Heath	I. Hughes of Sheffield
24th June	Martlets Hall Burgess Hill	O. Jenkins (Director of the E.M.F.)
24th July	Martlets Hall Burgess Hill	Eric Olson of Send
5th August	Three Bridges Free Church Crawley	Tom Lutz, Indiana, U.S.A.
18th September	Lewes Town Hall	John Short of London
16th November	The Tabernacle Brighton	John Beattie of Crosby, Liverpool

The speakers are expected to present the Gospel in a biblical expository manner, suitable at one and the same time for Christians and non-Christians. Trimmings are kept down to a minimum. We invite our friends to come and face up to the claims of Christ.

Readers may wonder about our attitude toward those in denominations where Ecumenism prevails. Our policy is to encourage evangelical ministers wherever they may be to see the significance of The Reformation and the Reformed faith. They alone can judge the subject of secession in the light of their calling to pastor their people. If they become convinced of the need to secede then the timing surely belongs to their conscience not ours.

□□□

NUMBER 55

MAY-JUNE 1980

Reformation Today is a bi-monthly magazine published by Cuckfield Baptist Church, Sussex.

Editor

ERROLL HULSE

*5 Fairford Close, Haywards Heath, Sussex,
RH16 3EF.*

Assistant Editor

IAN RANDALL

27 Ardingly Road, Cuckfield, Sussex, RH17 5HA.

Associate Editors

DAVID KINGDON,

*Carn-y-nant, Cnwc-y-dintir,
Cardigan SA 431 BA, Dyfed, W. Wales*

JOHN DAVISON, Scotland.

12 Keir Street, Perth.

JIM VAN ZYL, South Africa.

*22 Verbenia Street, Lynnwood Ridge,
Pretoria 0002.*

WAYNE MACK, U.S.A.

511 Fisher Lane, Warminster, Pa. 18974

Agents

Agents to whom subscriptions should be sent.

BRITISH ISLES

*P.O. Box 106, Haywards Heath, Sussex,
RH16 1QL.*

AUSTRALIA

*Ray Levick,
P.O. Box Q141, Queen Victoria Bldg., Sydney 2001.*

NEW ZEALAND

*Michael Drake,
P.O. Box 51075, Pakuranga, Auckland*

U.S.A.

*Bill Carey,
2201 Duncan Road, Wilmington, Del 19808,
Puritan Reformed
1319 Newport-Gap Pike
Wilmington, Del. 19804
J. W. Baker,
P.O. Box 1024, Oxford, Miss. 38655
Ron Edmonds,
2817 Dashwood Street, Lakewood, Calif. 90712.
Max Latchford,
1308 Griffith Place, Oakville, Ontario L6H 2V8.
Martin Holdt,
7 Hebbes Street, Cambridge, East London.*

CANADA

SOUTH AFRICA

Subscriptions

BRITISH ISLES	£2.50	2 years £4.50
IRISH REPUBLIC	£3.00	2 years £5.00
AUSTRALIA & N.Z.	\$5.50	2 years \$9.50
SOUTH AFRICA	R4.50	2 years R7.50
U.S.A. & CANADA	\$6.00	2 years \$11.00

Single copies one-sixth the above in each case which includes postage.

Gifts are welcomed and those who wish to support the Magazine should make out their cheques to "Reformation Today".