

*Lubber: "The Law & The Gospel"*

# **PROTESTANT REFORMED THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL**

**NOVEMBER, 1980**

**VOLUME XIV, NO. 1**



**THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL  
OF THE  
PROTESTANT REFORMED CHURCHES  
GRANDVILLE, MICHIGAN**

# **PROTESTANT REFORMED THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL**

---

**NOVEMBER, 1980**

**VOLUME XIV, NO. 1**

---

**This Journal is published and distributed in limited quantities, at no charge, by the Theological School of the Protestant Reformed Churches. Interested persons desiring to have their names on the mailing list should address the Editor, Prof. H. Hanko, at the address of the school:**

**4949 Ivanrest Avenue  
Grandville, Michigan 49418**

**Theological School  
of the  
Protestant Reformed Churches  
Grandville, Michigan**

## CONTENTS:

	Page
<b>The Reformed Doctrine of Infant Baptism (7)</b>	
Prof. Herman Hanko . . . . .	3
<b>Remembering the Lord's Day</b>	
Rev. David J. Engelsma . . . . .	10
<b>The Second Reformation in Scotland</b>	
Rev. Chris Coleborn . . . . .	21
<b>The Law and the Gospel</b>	
Rev. G. Lubbers . . . . .	48

## EDITORIAL NOTES

We have altered somewhat the contents of this issue of the *Journal* by omitting the regular articles written by the professors to make room for other articles which we consider worth publishing and making available to a wider audience. Although both series will be continued in the next issue of the *Journal*, Prof. Decker's series on pastoral care and Prof. Hoeksema's series on the simplicity of God's will and the free offer of the gospel do not appear in this issue. Prof. Hanko has a very brief article which continues his discussion of infant baptism.

We are pleased to present in this issue three different articles which we are sure our readers will enjoy. Rev. Engelsma has appeared in the *Journal* on other occasions, but has submitted a manuscript on the Reformed view of the Sabbath. The material of this essay was originally delivered as a speech. Because Sabbath observance remains an important question in both Reformed and Presbyterian circles, this essay should prove interesting. Rev. Lubbers has submitted a paper on the relation between the law and the gospel. This paper was read a few months ago at a ministers' conference in Classis West. We offer it here for wider publication. Rev. Lubbers is a retired minister in the Protestant Reformed Churches living in Jenison, Michigan. There is growing debate on the place of the Old Testament law in the New Testament economy. We believe this paper will contribute to a clearer understanding of the issues.

Finally, we are happy to have a paper from Rev. Chris Coleborn. He is a minister of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Australia, a denomination in Australia and Tasmania which is maintaining the pure light of the gospel in that land. The paper we are publishing was originally written as an assignment in Rev. Coleborn's work of preparation for the ministry. Because of its length, we are publishing the paper in two sections. Rev. Coleborn writes from a profound knowledge of and a deep love for the Reformation in Scotland. We are grateful that he has consented to the publication of this interesting work.

\* \* \* \* \*

We have finished our re-publication of Turretin's work in Dogmatics and many copies have already been sent out to those who have back-ordered. In fact, although we have not yet had opportunity to advertise our completion of this project, additional orders have already come in. Since the run was small we have already seen our supply of copies reduced by a significant amount. If any of our readers are interested in obtaining a copy, it would be wise to write in as soon as possible. The cost of a copy soft-covered and plastic-bound is \$14.95. The cost of a hard-cover copy is \$24.95. This is our cost — in fact, barely our cost. But the supply is limited, so write soon if you wish to have a copy. This is not a complete translation of Turretin's Dogmatics, but a reproduction of the Geiger manuscript. It numbers in excess of 500 pages.

One last item. We have occasional requests for back issues of the *Journal* — requests which we are sometimes unable to fill. If any of our readers have back issues and are willing to part with them, we would be happy to hear from you. Contact, if you will, any of the professors.

## The Reformed Doctrine of Infant Baptism (7)

Prof. Herman Hanko

We have come near the end of our discussions of David Kingdon's book, "Children of Abraham," and the Reformed doctrine of infant baptism which we developed over against Kingdon's position of believers' baptism. We have shown that, while Kingdon (and other Reformed Baptists with him) disavow any kind of Dispensationalism, they nevertheless fall into this very error as they seek to drive a wedge between the Old Dispensation and the New. We have shown that if one has a proper view of Scripture and a proper conception of the unity of Scripture, the truth of infant baptism is clearly written throughout the Bible.

What remains for us to do is tie up the loose ends, answer a few objections which have been raised against the truth of infant baptism — which objections are more of a peripheral sort, address ourselves to a few texts in Scripture which we have not as yet treated, and in this way bring the discussion to a close.

### TEMPORAL VS. ETERNAL BLESSINGS.

In his defense of believers' baptism, Kingdon makes much of the fact that the blessings which God gave to Israel under the Old Dispensation were temporal blessings which were connected to the temporal and earthly land of Canaan. We have had occasion to point out in other connections that Kingdon misunderstands the whole relation between both Dispensations and fails to recognize that these "temporal and earthly" blessings were but pictures of heavenly and spiritual realities which would be the inheritance of the Church when Christ came. Calvin has an interesting paragraph on this very subject in his commentary on I Corinthians 10:1. He writes:

Here, however, a more difficult question presents itself. For it is certain, that the advantage of those gifts, which Paul makes mention of, was temporal (and earthly). The *cloud* protected them from the heat of the sun, showed them the way: these are outward advantages of the present life. In like manner, their passage through the *sea* was attended with this effect, that they got clear off from Pharaoh's cruelty, and escaped from imminent hazard of death. The advantage of *our* baptism on the other hand, is spiritual. Why then does Paul turn earthly benefits into sacraments, and seek to find some spiritual mystery in them? I answer, that it was not without

good reason that Paul sought in miracles of this nature something more than the mere outward advantage of the flesh. For, though God designed to promote his people's advantage in respect of the present life, what he had mainly in view was, to declare and manifest himself to be their God, and under *that*, eternal salvation is comprehended.

The *cloud*, in various instances, is called the symbol of his presence. As, therefore, he declared by means of it, that he was present with them, as his peculiar and chosen people, there can be no doubt that, in addition to an earthly advantage, they had in it, besides, a token of spiritual life. Thus its use was twofold, as was also that of the passage through the sea, for a way was opened up for them through the midst of the sea, that they might escape from the hand of Pharaoh; but to what was this owing, but to the circumstance, that the Lord, having taken them under his guardianship and protection, determined by every means to defend them? Hence, they concluded for this, that they were the objects of God's care, and that he had their salvation in charge. Hence, too, the Passover, which was instituted to celebrate the remembrance of their deliverance, was nevertheless, at the same time, a sacrament of Christ. How so? Because God had, under a temporal benefit, manifested himself as a Saviour. Any one that will attentively consider these things, will find that there is no absurdity in Paul's words. *Nay more, he will perceive both in the spiritual substance and in the visible sign a most striking correspondence between the baptism of the Jews, and ours.* (Emphasis ours.)

It is clear from this that Calvin has a correct understanding of the Old Testament types and shadows as they prefigured salvation. Calvin goes so far as to say that Israel's baptism in the cloud and in the sea has "striking correspondence," it would extend also to the baptism of children and infants who were with their parents in the passage through the Red Sea. The point here is, however, that no crucial difference can be established between temporal and eternal blessings without separating entirely the Old Dispensation from the New and falling into the error of Dispensationalism.

## PURE VS. IMPURE CHURCH

This question of a pure vs. an impure church is always a vexing question in the debates between Baptists and Reformed. Kingdon also addresses himself to

this question on pp. 57-60 of his book. It is not entirely clear what the line of Kingdon's argument is on these passages, but the point he makes is clear enough and it may be considered representative of the position taken by most Baptists. Kingdon admits that the position which some Reformed take on this question is "not as wide as is so often suggested from the Baptist position." But nevertheless the difference is of sufficient importance to devote several pages to it.

Kingdon frankly admits that both the Reformed and Baptists do not succeed in getting a perfect church here upon earth. Both those who hold to the position of infant baptism and those who maintain believers' baptism have to admit that it is impossible to keep the Church completely free from hypocrites and from unbelievers. However, the Reformed do not take seriously the command of the Scriptures to strive earnestly for such a pure church, while Baptists do take this command seriously. "In respect of the doctrine of the church, the New Testament interpretation of the covenant with Abraham (which Baptists hold to, H.H.) commits us to a view of the church, which, while not perfectionist, takes with the utmost seriousness the New Testament concept of the church as the true Israel of God." To put it a little differently, Kingdon argues that the proponents of infant baptism are *content* with a church in which are many unbelievers and hypocrites, while Baptists are not satisfied with this state of affairs, but constantly strive to keep the church pure.

Baptists point out that it is inevitable that the Reformed should take this position. Kingdon too insists that such a view is really implicit in the whole concept of infant baptism. There are several reasons for this. 1) Those who believe in infant baptism, according to Kingdon, baptize "indiscriminately"; i.e., they baptize infants without regard to repentance and faith. The result is that many are baptized who are not true believers. But, because they are baptized, they are permitted to remain in the Church. 2) Kingdon is really quite persuaded that anyone who believes in infant baptism believes in presupposed regeneration. In fact, it is not at all uncommon among Baptists to think of those who believe in infant baptism as maintaining some form of baptismal regeneration. Because of these views, supposedly implicit in the view of infant baptism, the Reformed are always content with permitting many unbelievers and hypocrites to remain in the Church. No matter what their life may be, the children of believers are considered baptized, members of the church, perhaps (probably) regenerated, and therefore, beyond the reach of discipline. They are in the church by virtue of baptism, and it is no wonder then that Reformed have to be satisfied with a church which is less than pure.

Now all of this argumentation we repudiate. We believe firmly, as Kingdon does, that it is impossible to have a pure church here upon earth which is com-

posed only of the elect. We also agree that there have been times in the past, especially when the Church has entered into periods of dead orthodoxy, when the Church has been content to keep in the Church those who have no part in the inheritance of salvation and who manifest themselves as wicked and as unbelievers. But let our position on this whole question be unmistakably clear.

There is no question about it that not all the children born of believing parents are the elect of God and therefore are saved. We have discussed this before, and need not go into detail on this matter here. But Scripture clearly teaches that there are Esaus in the covenant and that not all those who are of Israel are Israel. The lines of election and reprobation cut right through covenant lines. Of that there is no question. No one who is Reformed and who truly understands the doctrines of the covenant and of baptism will claim that all the children of believers are saved.

In the second place, it has never been Reformed and is not our position that we must “presuppose” the regeneration of the children born of believers. This is not Scriptural and surely we may not presuppose what we know for a fact to be false.

Because these things are true, the Reformed have always recognized the fact that carnal seed come into the Church not only from the outside as those who “creep in unawares”; but carnal seed come into the Church because they are born from believing parents.

It is also the position for those who are truly Reformed that one of the marks of the true Church is Christian discipline. It is true that Christian discipline goes right along with the pure preaching of the Word and the proper administration of the sacraments so that when the Word is not purely preached from the pulpits of a Church and when the sacraments are corrupted, so is Christian discipline corrupted and no longer properly exercised. But this indicates a general decline in the entire spiritual life of the Church. Where the gospel is preached and the sacraments administered according to the command of Christ, there also Christian discipline is exercised. And the result is that those who manifest themselves as wicked and unrepentant are cut off from the Church. Those who will not walk in the ways of God’s covenant manifest themselves as haters of the covenant and enemies of God. They must be and are (if the Church is faithful) cut off.

All this does not mean that it is the calling of the members of the Church (or of the officebearers more particularly) to move through the congregation constantly trying to pick out who are the elect and who are the reprobate. There must be no spirit of suspicion and evil judging in the Church of Christ. It is for that reason too that there must be practiced in the Church (and I am



sure Baptists do the same) what our fathers called *het ordeel der liefde* or, the judgment of love. I.e., we are called to judge those within the Church of Christ as believers until they give evidence of being unbelievers. Without such a judgment, life in the Church is impossible and the love which saints ought to show to each other is sadly lost. So also do parents look upon their children because they know and are convinced that God is pleased to save His Church from their children. When, therefore, they bring forth their children they do so in the confidence that children are indeed an heritage of the Lord and that blessed is he whose quiver is full of them. They can sing, just as well as the Church of the Old Testament

Joyful children, sons and daughters

Shall about thy table meet.

Olive plants in strength and beauty,

Full of hope and promise sweet.

(Psalm 128)

And when they give instruction to their children they do so knowing that that instruction will be blessed because it is sanctified in the hearts of their children by the power of the Spirit.

Indeed, Reformed Baptists have an insurmountable problem here. Because they consider their children to be unregenerated and unconverted, the question can very well be put to them: Why do you teach your children the ways of the Lord? Baptists have given different answers to this question. Some Baptists who are avowedly Arminian, simply say that they teach their children because in this way their children are led to Christ. Such instruction will present them with the demands of the gospel and in this way, it is hoped, the children will be led to accept Christ, profess Him and thus be brought into the Church. Other Baptists, however, claim to be Reformed. That is, they claim to believe in the doctrines of grace — the five points of Calvinism. They cannot answer as the Arminian does. And so if you ask them: Why do you teach your children the ways of the Lord? their answer is that they hope that their children will remember some of the things which they have been taught while young so that, should it please the Lord to save them and bring them to conversion, the things they have been taught will come back to them and profit them after their conversion. But this answer will not really do. The trouble is that it is not an answer which properly takes into account the truth of total depravity. Total depravity, after all, means that one who is totally depraved is not only completely devoid of the grace of God, not only unable to do anything pleasing in God's sight, but such a one is actively opposed to the things of God. It is difficult to understand how instruction in the home to one who is unconverted can really do any good if that child is truly totally depraved.

In the awareness of this difficulty, some Baptists have taken the position that, prior to the work of regeneration there is, in the hearts of God's elect, a certain preparatory work of grace. This preparatory work of grace, apart from regeneration, was sufficient, however, to make the instruction which parents give their "unconverted children" some favorable soil in which to grow. But there is nothing at all in Scripture to support such a view of preparatory grace.

How much better it is then to take the position which Scripture takes. Baptism does not itself bestow regeneration or the life of Christ, but it is a sign and a seal of that work of God whereby He gives to His elect a new heart. That wonder which is signified and sealed in baptism also takes place in the hearts of the elect children of the covenant. In all the instruction which these children receive, parents (and teachers in the schools, and officebearers in the church) may give such instruction in the confident assurance that God will make that Word and that instruction effective.

## THE BAPTISM OF ABRAHAM'S SERVANTS

Kingdon thinks he finds an effective argument against infant baptism in the baptism of Abraham's servants. He writes (p. 44):

We find another instance of the tendency to read the New Testament into the Old in the way in which the account of the institution of circumcision is handled in Genesis 17. Where is there any hint in verses 10 to 14, that any of the males in Abraham's household, be they his retainers or his slaves, or the sons of his concubines, were required to make a personal confession of faith in Abraham's God before being circumcised? Where is there any suggestion that a man born of Abraham's seed might disqualify his children from circumcision if he did not exercise the faith of Abraham? If, on the other hand, it is conceded that not all the males of Abraham's household were asked for a confession of faith in Abraham's God, did Abraham, who was the only person of whose circumcision it is explicitly said that it was the sign and seal of his faith (Rom. 4:11), exercise faith on their behalf as the head of the group and the one with whom the covenant was made? If so, and this would be the most natural interpretation of Genesis 17, it would prove far too much for the Paedobaptists, since it would mean that even now servants could be baptized by virtue of the fact that the head of the household is a believer.

But this position is simply due again to a misunderstanding of the nature

of the Old Testament. It must be remembered that the household of Abraham was the Church of the Old Dispensation. That household included all that were in the house. Abraham was, it must not be forgotten, the prophet, priest, and king in that day. The line of the covenant was continued with him. He was responsible for the entire household over which God had set him. He was responsible also for the spiritual care and spiritual nurture of this household. And when God gave the sign of circumcision as the sign of His covenant, that sign had to be administered in the Church of that time by Abraham. All who belonged to that Church had also to bear that sign, just as was later true in Israel and just as is true in the Church in the New Dispensation when the sign has been changed to that of baptism.

There is even evidence of the fact that among these servants of Abraham there were true believers. This is clear from the history of the servant of Abraham who was sent to Haran to fetch a wife for Isaac. But discipline was also exercised in Abraham's home. When Ishmael mocked Isaac, Abraham was obligated to send Ishmael away. This is confirmed by Paul in Galatians 4: "But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman" (vss. 29, 30).

There are a few more points which we must treat, but this will have to wait for a future issue.

## Remembering the Lord's Day

Rev. David J. Engelsma

The Dutch have called Sunday, "God's dike." In the Netherlands, the dike keeps back the threatening seas and, thus, preserves the Hollanders from watery destruction. So, the Lord's Day holds back the raging waves of materialism, earthlimindedness, and pleasure-madness that threaten to engulf the Church and the Christian.

There are leaks in the dike. There are leaks in the dike among Reformed Christians, where once the Lord's Day was honored and the Sabbath remembered. It is necessary that we stop up these leaks; we certainly must not allow these leaks to be enlarged, much less co-operate in tearing the dike down.

The matter of remembering the Lord's Day is one of urgency, as the figure of a dike and the angry waves indicates. First, remembering the Sabbath is one of the Ten Commandments, indeed, a commandment that belongs to the first table of the Law — not a minor matter, therefore.

Secondly, the day in question is the "Lord's day" according to Revelation 1:10, i.e., the day that belongs to the risen, glorious Lord Jesus Christ. In remembering, or forgetting it, we have to do with Jesus Christ Himself.

Thirdly, our remembering the Lord's Day results, by the Lord's grace, in the greatest benefit for us: rest — the pricelessly precious benefit of rest. The Sabbath was made for man (Mark 2:27). The good of man that God had in mind is rest. Is there anything that we need more? Everywhere, there is unrest. There is unrest in the church; there is unrest in the family; there is unrest in the soul of the believer. Apart from every other consideration, it is sheer folly to forfeit rest by forgetting, and even abandoning, the Lord's Day.

The importance of the Church's remembering the Lord's Day was clearly seen, and stated, by one of the fiercest enemies that the Christian religion ever had, the Frenchman, Voltaire: "If you want to kill Christianity," he said, "you must abolish Sunday" — advice that the French Revolution carried out.

### A Special Day

There is one, simple truth that is fundamental to Sabbath-observance — the very foundation of the dike that is the Lord's Day. If this truth is confessed by the Church and if it lives in the hearts of the people of God, all will be well as regards remembering the Lord's Day. But if this truth is questioned or denied,

we have not merely punched a hole in the dike, but we have demolished the dike. The basic question is this: Does Jehovah God, in the Fourth Commandment of His Law, still today set apart one day of the week as a special day; and does He still today, in the Fourth Commandment, require His people to remember this day by ceasing from their ordinary work and play, in order to devote themselves to the worship of, fellowship with, and special service of the Father of Jesus Christ?

The answer to this question is an emphatic, unequivocal "Yes." God still sets aside one day in seven as a special day for us and requires us to observe this day in a special way. In this sense, the day is holy, i.e., it is set apart from the other days by God for the special service of Himself. In this sense, we hallow the day, or keep it holy, i.e., we use it in the special way God wants us to use it, thus consecrating it to God.

God sets the day apart and requires us to remember it *in the Fourth Commandment*. Remembering the Lord's Day is not a matter of Christian liberty, i.e., something neither commanded nor forbidden by God. Rather, it is law, the law of God, just as are the matters of having no other gods, honoring our parents, and not stealing. It is the commandment of the Redeemer to His saved people. It is a commandment that at once teaches us to know our sinful nature more and more, so that we fly to Christ for righteousness, and directs us in the way of pleasing our Deliverer and of living a happy life. It is a commandment that the thankful believer gladly obeys, as a child willingly obeys the father whom he loves.

This is fundamental! Deny this, and you pull the dike down; for if the dike of the Lord's Day is not grounded in the good, solid, divine will of God, it cannot possibly withstand the pressures of worldliness and earthlimindedness exerted against it.

Another view, steadily gaining ground in Reformed churches, is that the Fourth Commandment was wholly ceremonial — "Jewish" — and was, therefore, so fulfilled by Christ that it no longer holds for the New Testament saint. The observance of the first day of the week is merely a custom of the New Testament Church (albeit a good custom, it is usually admitted), based upon a decision of the Church herself. Use of the first day of the week for public worship is not due to any binding law of God, but to the free choice of the Church; she could have chosen some other day of the week. The keeping of the first day is strictly a matter of Christian liberty.

### Confessional Proof

What proof is there, for the Reformed saint, that remembering the Lord's Day is the will of God?

First, there is the decision of an important church assembly, the Synod of Dordt. Unfortunately, it is not well known that among the other actions of this great synod was the adoption of a doctrinal statement on the Sabbath. In his *Tractaat van den Sabbath (Treatise on the Sabbath)*, Abraham Kuyper informs us that the formulation and adoption of this statement took place in about three hours on May 17, 1619. Dordt's position on the Sabbath was expressed in six points:

1. In the Fourth Commandment of God's Law there is a ceremonial and a moral element.
2. The rest on the seventh day after the creation, and the strict observance of this day with which the Jewish people were charged particularly, was ceremonial.
3. That a definite and appointed day has been set aside to the service of God, and that for this purpose as much rest is required as is necessary for the service of God and for hallowed contemplation; this element is moral.
4. The Sabbath of the Jew having been set aside, Christians are in duty bound to hallow the Day of the Lord solemnly.
5. This day has always been kept in the early Church since the time of the Apostles.
6. This day must be so consecrated unto the service of God that upon it men rest from all servile labors, except those required by charity and present necessities, and likewise from all such recreations as prevent the service of God.

Secondly, there is the teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism in Lord's Day 38, Q. 103: "What doth God require in the Fourth Commandment? First, that the ministry of the gospel and the schools be maintained; and that I, especially on the sabbath, that is, on the day of rest, diligently frequent the church of God, to hear his word, to use the sacraments, publicly to call upon the Lord, and contribute to the relief of the poor, as becomes a christian. Secondly, that all the days of my life I cease from my evil works, and yield myself to the Lord, to work by his Holy Spirit in me: and thus begin in this life the eternal sabbath."

The Catechism has a unique, beautiful slant on the Fourth Commandment. It deliberately safeguards the Reformed believer against the error of a legalistic observance of the Sabbath. Legalism identifies obedience to the Fourth Commandment with mere external behavior, especially the behavior of doing nothing on the Sabbath. It stresses the scrupulous keeping of petty, man-made regulations,

especially negative regulations. The Pharisees of Christ's day, for example, forbade the picking of grain while travelling on the Sabbath, even though it was for the satisfying of hunger (cf. Mark 2:23-28). Others thought it unlawful to eat an egg that the hen had laid on the Sabbath. The purpose of legalism, in this observance of the Sabbath, is to earn righteousness. This was the error into which the Jews of Jesus' day had fallen and against which our Lord contended. This was the error that was prevalent in the Roman Church at the time of the Reformation and against which the Reformers, Luther and Calvin, reacted strongly in some of their writings on a proper keeping of the Sabbath.

We must appreciate and maintain the viewpoint of the Catechism. But we misunderstand and misrepresent the Catechism if we explain it to mean that in the Reformed tradition the day is disregarded; all mention of observing a day must be banned; and, therefore, our practice of Sunday-keeping is merely the liberty of the New Testament Church.

On the contrary, this creed teaches that there is a day of the week set apart from the other days; there is a special day. According to the Catechism, there is a "day of rest," a "sabbath," distinguished from "all the days of my life." The reference, of course, is to Sunday. On this day, special behavior is required of the child of God, namely, that he rests, which behavior consists primarily of diligently frequenting the church of God. It is God Who sets this day apart, and He does so in the Fourth Commandment — it is the Fourth Commandment, after all, which the Catechism is here explaining.

We may sum up the teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism thus: the Fourth Commandment still holds in the New Testament; it still sets one day apart as a day in which believers are to rest in their God, under the Word of the gospel. Because of this act of God, all days are not the same for Christians, even though we cease from our evil works all the days of our life. Because of this act of God, the Christian remembers and hallows a day. Our Lord's Day — Sunday — corresponds to the seventh day of the Old Testament; indeed, it is the New Testament Sabbath Day.

### **Biblical Proof**

This teaching of the creed is Biblical. For it is the doctrine of the Fourth Commandment itself. The Fourth Commandment is part of the moral law of God, and the moral law of God is perpetually valid. No more is this commandment done away with than is the commandment against taking God's Name in vain. Like the other nine, it was engraved in granite by the finger of God. If it were the case that the Fourth Commandment was entirely ceremonial, we would now have only nine commandments, not ten, and should speak of the

“Enneologue,” not of the Decalogue. The Fourth Commandment, perpetually valid, requires that we remember a day to keep it holy and, in connection with this, that we cease from our work.

The New Testament Scripture does not abolish the Fourth Commandment. Jesus did not abolish this commandment; nor did He have a lax view of Sabbath-keeping, in comparison with the Pharisees. This is the notion that is sometimes found in the Church, so that those who are careless about remembering the Lord’s Day are regarded as good Christians, whereas those who are careful about observing the Sabbath are suspected of Pharisaism. It is true that the Pharisees charged our Lord with laxity regarding the Sabbath. They accused Him of breaking the Sabbath (John 5:18). They said, “he keepeth not the sabbath day” (John 9:16). But this charge was false.

What was Jesus’ teaching? What was the teaching of His behavior, first of all? Where did the Sabbath Day find Him, and what did it find Him doing? Was He in the field harvesting the crops? Was He taking scenic tours of the Mediterranean? Was He in the stadium watching the Nazareth Bobcats play the Capernaum Bears at some game of ball? Not at all, but He was always in the synagogue preaching the Word; and He was always doing good to distressed saints, healing them and destroying the power of the Devil.

What was the teaching of Jesus’ words concerning the Sabbath? Did He ever admit that the Pharisee’s charge was true? Did He ever say, “I am come, and, therefore, the Sabbath is no more”? Not at all, but He taught that remembering the Sabbath does not consist of idleness; it rather consists of working. He taught that this work must be the worship of God and the help of the needy brother. He taught that the Sabbath was made for man, for man’s great good. And He taught that He is the Lord of the Sabbath. Note well, Jesus does not call Himself, “Destroyer of the Sabbath,” but “Lord of the Sabbath.”

As the Lord of the Sabbath, Jesus fulfills the Sabbath, creating the perfect rest by His atoning death and resurrection. That the Sabbath is now fulfilled Jesus shows by changing the Sabbath Day from the seventh day of the week to the first day of the week. Not the Church, but the Lord Jesus set the first day of the week apart as the day of rest for the New Testament people of God. The Church has no authority to change the Sabbath Day or to require believers to observe the first day of the week. The Church does not make laws; she only proclaims the will of her sovereign Lord, as that will is revealed in Holy Scripture. The Lord of the Sabbath Himself ordained the first day of the week as the day of rest for the Church come of age. He did this by rising from the dead on the first day (Luke 24:1); by meeting with His disciples on the first day, prior to the Ascension (John 20:19; John 20:26); by coming back to the Church



in the Holy Spirit on the first day (Pentecost was a Sunday); and by directing the apostles and the apostolic Church to gather for worship on the first day (Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:1, 2).

Therefore, the Spirit of Jesus Christ calls the first day of the week, "the Lord's Day," in Revelation 1:10: "I (John) was in the Spirit on the Lord's day. . ." This one, brief text is a mighty, a conclusive Word of God for the whole Sabbath-question. All by itself, it utterly refutes the position of Seventh Day Adventism regarding the day of rest and worship for the New Testament Church. What is of greater importance to us is that it clearly teaches that one day of the week, the day on which Jesus arose in glory, is a special day and must be specially observed by those who love the risen Lord. Even though it is certainly true that all the days of the week belong to Christ; nevertheless, it is also certainly true that one of them is "the Lord's Day" in a unique sense.

The Church after the apostles saw this from the very beginning. Ignatius, the most ancient church father, wrote: "Let every one that loveth Christ keep holy the first day of the week, the Lord's Day."

### How We Remember the Lord's Day

Description of the day of rest as the Lord's Day indicates how we are to remember the day. We remember it by devoting it to the Lord Jesus. We remember it by worshipping, knowing, fellowshiping with, and enjoying the crucified and risen Christ. We remember it as John did: by being in the Spirit; hearing Jesus' great Voice (the preaching of the gospel); and seeing Him (by faith) walking amidst the candlesticks (in the Church).

Specifically, we are to observe the Sabbath by diligently attending the worship services of Jesus' Church. This, according to the Heidelberg Catechism, is the first requirement of the Fourth Commandment. Remembering the Lord's Day is diligently attending church; wilful absence from church, or attendance without diligence, is the grossest violation of the Fourth Commandment. The Catechism is Biblical, here. On the first day of the week, the apostolic church gathered for worship: to hear the Word; to break bread; to pray; and to lay aside their gifts for the poor.

It should be evident that diligent church-attendance very really is obedience to the Fourth Commandment of the Law of God. As part of the first table of the Law, the Fourth Commandment demands love for God by His redeemed people — diligent church-attendance is worship, the praise of God in Jesus Christ by a thankful people. The Fourth Commandment calls the saints to rest — at church we rest by enjoying God's wonderful work in Christ by means of the Word and the Sacraments. The Fourth Commandment ends in

Christ Jesus — in attending the church of God we seek fellowship with Christ (Who is present there by His Spirit and Word), and we strive to honor Him.

Attending church is a genuine remembering of the Lord's Day, if it is diligent. First, it must be an act of faith; no unbeliever can possibly remember the Lord's Day, regardless of whether he comes to church. Secondly, it must be faithful; believers are to gather every Sunday, as often as services are held. Thirdly, it must be whole-hearted; our attendance is to be eager, joyful, lively. Good church-attendance is characterized by the attitude expressed in the *Psalter* based on Psalm 122:

With joy I heard my friends exclaim,  
Come, let us in God's temple meet;  
Within thy gates, O Zion blest,  
Shall ever stand our willing feet.

This aspect of obedience to the Fourth Commandment is threatened today. There are leaks in the dike. There are those who attend only infrequently, missing entire Sundays or consistently missing one of the services every Sunday ("oncercs"). There is the growing practice of missing the worship services, now and then, because they interfere with our pleasures, e.g., our vacation plans. The Lord's Day is completely forgotten. It is used for travelling or for sight-seeing, just as though it did not belong to the risen Christ, but to ourselves. The strange notion is found in the Church that the Fourth Commandment may be broken occasionally. Men suppose that, if they remember the Lord's Day 51 weeks of the year, they are warranted in forgetting it one week. What would these same people say if others would adopt this thinking in regard to the commandment against stealing, or the commandment against murder?

"But the Lord's Day gets in the way of my pleasure," says the man determined to enjoy his weekend vacation. Yes, the Law of God has a way of doing this. Throughout the Old Testament, the Sabbath-Commandment "interfered" with Israel's pleasures; and for this reason they broke it (cf. Isaiah 58:13 and Amos 8:5). May we bend and twist the Law to suit our pleasure? Or are we to plan our lives according to the Law and to find our pleasure in doing what it says?

Our would-be vacationer persists, "But I work hard during the year, and I need some rest." To be sure, we need rest; and this needed rest is the rest of the Lord's house and the Lord's Word.

Another threat to diligent church attendance is formalism in worship. The minister preaches dutifully, droning on; and the people listen dutifully, wondering all the while, "When will he ever be done." *How* do we come to church? The early Christians greeted each other with the words, "The Lord is risen!" We might say, "Lousy weather, isn't it."

Not least of the dangers is this, that, at the church we attend, the Word of God is not preached. Attending some church (“the church of your choice”) is not necessarily obedience to the Fourth Commandment; attending some church *very faithfully* is not necessarily obedience to the Fourth Commandment. For one concerned to remember the Lord’s Day, the all-important question is: “*What* church do you diligently attend?” “Is it a church that honors Jesus by proclaiming Him as the Lord; the eternal Son of God in the flesh, the only and sovereign Savior from sin?” “Is it a church that gives the rest of God by preaching justification by faith alone and salvation by grace alone?” “Is it a church consecrated to the glory of God in teaching all of God’s commandments, and upholding them by the exercise of discipline?”

### Devotion of the Entire Day to the Lord

For the sake of this diligent church-attendance, we are to put aside the ordinary work of the other six days of the week, as well as our play. This is the Fourth Commandment: “Thou shalt not do any work” (Ex. 20:10). Already in the Old Testament the purpose of ceasing from work was clearly pointed out: “That thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou” (Deut. 5:14). There is no value in not working in itself; but not working is necessary for resting the rest of the Sabbath. When the Israelite worked on the Sabbath (Numbers 15:32 ff.), the sin was not that he picked up some sticks, but that he despised the spiritual rest of God, i.e., Christ and His salvation. He revealed himself to be a worldly man. This deserved, and still does deserve, the death penalty.

It is the same today. Working on the Lord’s Day is destructive of diligent church-attendance. It is true that there are works of necessity that may be done! Jesus taught that one may pull an ass out of the ditch. But, as someone has said, if I have an ass that falls into the ditch every Sunday, I will either fill up the ditch or sell the ass.

The homework of our children is included in this prohibition. Just as our ordinary work is farming or factory work or some business or housework, the ordinary work of the school children is homework; and God requires this work to be set aside in the interest of other, better things.

If obedience to this prohibition of work means financial loss and economic hardship, we should be perfectly willing to suffer such loss and hardship. Jesus Christ is not much of a lord if His Day, and the worship He claims on His Day, are forgotten on account of bread.

Similarly, spending Sunday afternoon watching the football Bears or the baseball Cubs, apart from all other considerations, is destructive of the

public worship of God that is required by the Fourth Commandment. Pleasure is the great threat in our society. The world corrupts the Lord's Day, so that there is more devilry on Sunday than on all the other days of the week combined. This too is an old story. In his glorious call to proper Sabbath observance in Isaiah 58:13, 14, the prophet *begins* by warning Israel against "doing thy pleasure on my (Jehovah's) holy day." If we are going to use the Lord's Day for our play, we could better work — it is the lesser of the two evils. Augustine said long ago, concerning remembering the Lord's Day, "It is better to plow than to dance."

Ordinary work and play are forbidden *because they are destructive of the diligent church-attendance required by the Fourth Commandment*. What one does during the rest of the Day stands intimately related to the public worship of the Lord's Day. To throw oneself into his everyday work an hour or two after the morning worship service is to cut off the lingering effect of the house of God and to drown the hope of the world to come in the cares of this life. The man who spends all of Sunday afternoon wrapped up in the ballgame cannot bring the evening sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to the house of the Lord. Very likely, he will not attend the second service. The appalling drop in the attendance at the second service is largely due to the use of Sunday for the people's personal pleasure — golf, picnics, visiting, watching television, or relaxing at home with a novel. If he does hurry from the end of the ballgame to church, he does not come with a heart filled with the wonderful works of God in Jesus and with affections set on the things above, where Christ Jesus sits on the right hand of God.

### What Am I to Do?

The entire day is to be given over to worship; the whole day is to be devoted to the Lord Christ. This is the answer to the familiar question, "What are we to do on Sunday?"

God intends that we be active; work is required. Doing nothing is not obedience to the Fourth Commandment, e.g., "sacking out" all day. Jesus showed this in John 5. He healed the lame man on the Sabbath and, when the Pharisees objected, said, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work" (vs. 17). The notion that one kept the Sabbath by doing nothing was part of the legalism of the Pharisees.

The work to be done, however, is spiritual exercises — private, personal worship of God. There is public worship, but there is also private worship. We should pray. We should read, not the Sunday newspaper, but Holy Scripture, as well as books and magazines that explain Scripture. Just as our day witnesses

a sad lack in private prayer-communion with God, so also is there a serious falling off of good, solid theological reading and study on the part of all Christians. Earthlimindedness comes in now on the floodtide. The Lord's Day is God's dike! The Synod of Dordt spoke of "hallowed contemplation" as an appropriate activity on Sunday. "Hallowed contemplation" — even the words are strange to us today. We are so busy; our minds are so full of this world; we are so averse to an hour of quiet and solitude. Sunday is a day for thinking holy thoughts — thoughts of my sin; thoughts of my redemption; thoughts of my privileged position and calling; thoughts of the beauty of the Church; thoughts of Christ; thoughts of the glory of God.

Permissible, requisite work on the Lord's Day includes "works of charity," i.e., good works of love for our neighbor, especially our fellow saints. The Heidelberg Catechism mentions contributing to the relief of the poor, or alms-giving, as an important aspect of church-attendance. There are other ways to help the needy. Jesus healed them. We can call on old folks languishing at home or in institutions. We can visit, or have over, the lonely saints. We can comfort the distressed. The Church is full of needy, if we only open our eyes.

On Sunday evenings, delightful Christian fellowship can be enjoyed — and practised, as a duty. Then, we do not discuss our daily jobs, all the restaurants we have gone to, the pennant race, or the many faults of the other members of the congregation; but we speak together about the Lord Christ. Isaiah 58 expressly warns us against "speaking thine own words."

On the Lord's Day, there should be family worship. There is public worship. There is private worship. There is also family worship. The Fourth Commandment is a family commandment. It is addressed by God to the head of the home, the husband and father: ". . .in it (the Sabbath Day) thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor *thy son, nor thy daughter*. . ." The father is responsible for the obedience of his house. He is to rest, with the family. Historically, the Lord's Day has been a bulwark for the family among Reformed and Presbyterian people.

Let there be family worship, especially in view of the threats to family life today. The family should discuss the sermon. (This is not the same as tearing the sermon to pieces or criticizing the preacher.) The family should read and study the Bible together. Parents should teach the children their catechism. How I love to hear a child say at the catechism class, "My Dad (or Mother) told me the story." The family should sing together.

There is so much to do on Sunday that the day is too short. "How long is the Lord's Day?" some have asked. Give the Lord a full day; it is the Lord's Day, not the Lord's hour. Really, this is an ominous question. It sounds

suspiciously like the question of the Jews in Amos 8:5: "When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?" Nobody talks like this about his vacation: "Oh, when will it be over?" Such questions about the Lord's Day indicate a leak in the dike in my own soul — worldliness is pouring in. The man who remembers the Lord's Day, the man who tastes something of the rest of Christ talks differently: "Oh, when will the eternal Sabbath Day dawn?"

Still, our obedience to the Fourth Commandment is, at best, imperfect. We do not have perfect faith in Christ our Rest; we do not come to church with that zeal for God's glory and with that thankfulness for His work in Jesus that we ought to have; we often hear the Word coldly — yes, and we preachers often preach it so; our use of the Sacraments and our prayers are often habitual; our thoughts are profane; our conversations are worldly; when all is said and done, on a Sunday evening, the most that can be said of our Sabbath observance is that we did nothing. The Fourth Commandment teaches us our misery, so that we fly to Christ for righteousness.

But the Lord Who justifies also sanctifies, so that we do have a beginning of obedience to the Fourth Commandment. This beginning, although small, is a victorious beginning. We do rest in Christ by faith on the Lord's Day. This then becomes the power by which we live and work the other six days of the week, ceasing from our evil works and yielding ourselves to the Lord to work by His Spirit in us. Thus, we begin in this life the eternal Sabbath.

Ours is a joyful Sabbath keeping. The Lord's Day is not a dreary day. It is not true of us what Thomas Babington Macaulay acidly (and unjustly) said of the Puritans and their Sabbath observance: "The Puritans opposed bear-baiting on Sunday, not because it gave pain to the bears, but because it gave pleasure to the people."

Rather, our experience is that expressed by the hymn:

"Day of all the week the best,  
Emblem of eternal rest."

Our experience is that promised by the prophet long ago, in Isaiah 58: 13, 14:

If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the LORD, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, Then shalt thou delight thyself in the LORD; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it.

# The Second Reformation in Scotland

Rev. Chris Coleborn

## INTRODUCTION

The Second Reformation in Scotland was a national movement of reform that reached its zenith during the period 1638-1649. Previously, a national movement of reform in the Church of Scotland had occurred, primarily under the leadership of John Knox. At that time, certain Biblical principles and concepts had been laid down as a guide to the Church.<sup>1</sup> However, even before Knox's death, there had commenced a civil movement to overthrow these principles. The conflict between a civil party and the Reformed Church, and an attempt to solve it Biblically, produced what is termed the Second Reformation. It was a popular national movement not only for further clarification and solidification of principles of faith and practice for the Church, but also for reform of the political and civil sphere. Biblical principles were applied to regulate both the ecclesiastical and civil government of Scotland. An understanding of these further developments is essential to appreciate the distinctive character of British, and, in particular, Scottish Reformed faith and practice.

The Second Reformation, as with the First Reformation in Scotland, was encompassing of the total spectrum of Scotland's social existence, so that Christ Jesus, the Mediator between Almighty God and mankind, was seen to rule over all of life.

If it can be said that the First Reformation was primarily concerned with the Prophetical and Priestly offices, prerogatives of the Mediator Christ Jesus, the Second was primarily concerned with Christ's Mediatorial Kingly office and right to rule, not only in the Church, but over kings and parliaments as well.

The Second Reformation dealt with *authority* in the state and its relationship to the Church and people's authority. *Authority* was not primarily seen as in the Church or in the king, or even in the people, but in Christ Jesus as revealed in His Word.

The Second Reformation was preceded by conflict, suffering, and debate, yet it pleased the Lord of the nations so to endow His Sovereign Spirit upon Scotland at that time, that not only were gifted men provided for the times, but also a heart of spiritual life and regeneration was so put into the majority of Scotland's people, that great and momentous principles and decisions were arrived at, and principles were formulated and courses of action taken which even the Reformed Churches of the Continent and England had not arrived at. In the

realm of Christ's Mediatorial Kingly office, application was made to the civil government and its relationship to Christ, so that the Church of Scotland further developed beyond any of the other Reformed Churches, the practical relationship of the civil government to Christ's authoritative Word.

The climax of the Second Reformation could be said to be the participation in the formulation of, and acceptance by the Church of Scotland, of the Westminster standards. While the Church and Nation of Scotland have never again obtained that Biblical consistency of faith and life obtained and blessed of God in the Second Reformation, nevertheless God in His Providence has allowed the Westminster standards to stand as a testimony to the truths and standards of that most remarkable time.

At the commencement of our essay we believe we must state our pre-suppositions. It is our understanding that the events leading up to and including that period of Scotland's history which we call the Second Reformation, (as with all history) cannot be explained and rationalized away in purely humanistic/naturalistic terms. In this instance (as in many others), we see the supernatural and divine. The history of Scotland at this time remains an *enigma* to those who would try to understand it along purely humanistic/naturalistic lines.

Our conclusion is that, while the human element is certainly seen, because of the place of honour and glory given in the Second (as in the First) Reformation to Almighty God in the Mediator, the spiritual life which flourished at that time, the supreme place given to the Word of God, and the extraordinary talents and developments of the time, we are driven to believe it was no other than the real work of the Spirit of the Living God. Only when we realistically take this into account is the enigma of the history of Scotland at this time solved.

In this essay we shall seek to:

1. Indicate the similarities between the Reformation in Scotland and those in England and the Continent.
2. Show how the political situation in Scotland led to the enunciation of the principle of the independence of the Church from the State, in contrast to the domination of the Church by the State in Europe generally.
3. Show that the Scottish Reformers of the Second Reformation went further in emphasizing that the Lord Jesus Christ was King of kings and Lord of lords, and therefore the nation, in its own sphere, should be subject to Him.
4. Make reference to, and take illustrations from, the Covenants and Scottish history in general.



We shall examine the matter of the Second Reformation in Scotland under the following headings:

- I. Similarities Between the First Scottish Reformation and the English and Continental Reformation.
- II. The Political and Ecclesiastical Background to the Second Reformation in Scotland.
- III. The Advancement of Christ Jesus' Universal Kingship and Authority in the Second Reformation.

## I. SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE FIRST SCOTTISH REFORMATION AND THE ENGLISH AND CONTINENTAL REFORMATION.

There were many similarities between the original Reformed Churches of the Continent and those of England and Scotland. An examination of the writings of the Reformers and their Confessional Standards shows a unity in their teaching on such subjects as the authority of the Word of God, total depravity, justification through the work of Christ Jesus only, the utter necessity of the work of the Holy Spirit to bring sinners to Christ and to work saving faith in their hearts. In short, we could say that the initial work of Reformation in Europe generally concentrated attention upon what we would call the Prophetical and Priestly Mediatorial work of Christ; that is, the work of Christ in revealing to us by His Spirit and Word the whole will of God in all things concerning salvation and edification, and by offering up of Himself a sacrifice to be a reconciliation for the sins of His people, and in making continual intercession for them.<sup>2</sup>

It is quite noticeable that we find the primary emphasis of the early Reformed Confessions to be upon the subject of Christ's Prophetical and Priestly work. The Lutheran's *Augsburg Confession*, for example, with the exception of one article on the duty of obedience we owe to the civil magistrate, and some articles on such subjects as the sacraments, etc., is primarily concerned to teach of these things immediately connected to Christ's Prophetical and Priestly offices and work. Even such a thing as marriage is primarily *viewed* in connection with those offices and work. The same could be said of the remainder of the Lutheran Symbols as well as of the Anglican Symbols (which have much in common with the Lutherans, except that they are more general in the compass of the subjects they touch on).<sup>3</sup>

The earlier writings of the Reformed Churches (Calvinists), also show this tendency to emphasize the doctrines and implications for life which are more immediately connected to the Prophetical and Priestly work of Christ, as an

examination of such Symbols as the *First and Second Helvetic Confession*, the *First Scots Confession*, the *Belgic Confession*, etc., will show.<sup>4</sup>

While we make the point that the earlier Evangelical Lutheran and Reformed Churches emphasized the Mediatorial offices and work of Christ as a Prophet and Priest, this is *not* to say that Christ's Kingly work and the implication of it were unrecognized. For all the Reformers recognized that in the matter of *authority* and *rule*, all of life is subject to Christ Jesus as Lord.<sup>5</sup> It is necessary for us to realize this point to appreciate the thinking and principles the Reformers of the Second Reformation in Scotland built upon.

To illustrate the fact that Christ's authority and office of Kingship was recognized and seen as applicable for all of life, we would note the following. The Reformers saw Christ's Kingly Ordinances and rules laid down in Scripture. Thus the Scriptures were the words of King Jesus, our Sovereign God speaking. His voice and authority were not merely limited to ecclesiastical matters, but to life in its totality.

Wylie, the noted historian, writing of the Reformer Zwingli, and describing how Zurich in its *civil* and ecclesiastical life was reformed, writes:

The point in which Zwingli is greatest and in which he is second to none among the Reformers, is this, even his profound deference to the Word of God. . . . When he came to the Bible, he came to it as a REVELATION FROM GOD, in the full consciousness of all that such an admission implies, *and prepared to follow it out to all its practical consequences*. He accepted the Bible as a First Authority, and infallible rule. . . .<sup>6</sup>

Luther, who was behind the other initial Reformers in the application of the truths of Christ's Kingly Office and Lordship, nevertheless *practically* saw how all of life must be subject to Christ. Christ's Lordship was practically seen, for example, when Luther teaches us that study and the intellect of man in natural things is to be brought under Christ the Mediator. Luther writes:

It is perilous to wish *to investigate and apprehend the naked divinity by human reason without Christ, the Mediator*. . . . There has been given to us the Word incarnate, that is placed in the manger and hung on the wood of the Cross. This Word is the Wisdom and Son of the Father, and He has declared unto us what is the will of the Father toward us. *He that leaves this Son, to follow his own thoughts and speculations, is overwhelmed*. . . .<sup>7</sup>

So it is that we can observe Calvin also maintaining the fact that civil rulers, and not only the Church, should be subject to the Lordship of Christ, that is, the authority of the Word as it is applicable to them. Calvin writes that the laws of a government are absurd which disregard the rights of God, and consult only man's ideas. Calvin lists specific passages of Scripture he sees as relevant to the work of the nation's rulers and laws.<sup>8</sup>

It has been suggested by some that the Reformers were occupied in drawing up only ecclesiastical documents, and that in fact the Symbols of the Reformed Churches are applicable only to the Church.<sup>9</sup> While it may be granted that the earlier documents were primarily written in connection with the Mediatorial work of Christ in His Prophetical and Priestly offices, yet it is a gross simplification to suggest that either the Reformers or the Symbols were and are occupied only with matters of "faith" and not life also. Note, for example, the chapters in almost all symbols dealing with the civil magistrate and marriage. Note also the exposition of the ten commandments in so many catechisms where our duty to the state, home, and in commerce, etc. are clearly and explicitly taught, if not implicitly in principle form. The Reformers only dared to address themselves so absolutely to these areas of life out of the Biblical conviction that the Lord is Sovereign King over all of life in all of its forms and expressions.

Besides this, the Reformers show us their conviction of the authority of the Word and of Christ's Lordship, His Mediatorial dominion over the civil realm, as well as ecclesiastical, from their writings. They wrote upon the magistrate, arts, education, commerce, etc. We will give just a few quotes (out of many), from Luther, Calvin, and Knox to illustrate our point. We have specifically chosen their quotes on the subject of the civil magistrate because the civil power represented (at least in their day) authority, and "secular" life generally. As we have noted already, the Reformers, all as one, saw the Authority of the Word as the basis of their faith (and as expressed in their respective symbols), as addressed not only to matters of "faith" but to the civil magistrates as well.

Luther, commenting on Psalm 82, writes of secular rulers who have forgotten God, and on whom their present existence and governing power depends:

(God) has a word to say in this wickedness: "You know well that you are gods and have power; that you have learned and grasped very quickly. But when will you learn from whom you have it? What becomes of Me? What becomes of My commandments which I have given you? It is not your command, but I, I, I have said that you are gods. It is My commandment and My word that

makes and ordains you gods and keeps you gods, and it is not your word or wisdom or might. You are gods made by My word, as all creatures are made, and you are not self-made gods or born gods, as I am. If I had not commanded it, no one of you would have been a god. Mine are all power, rulership, property, honour, lands, and peoples, and all that belongs to them. I have given them to you; you have not acquired them or won them. But what fine thanks do you give Me for them? You reject Me and My Word, and regard Me as no god at all.<sup>10</sup>

Calvin, commenting on Isaiah 49:23 shows us his conviction that Christ's Kingly power and dominion extended to the area of the civil magistrate and society generally. He writes:

Hence it ought to be observed that something remarkable is here demanded from princes, besides an ordinary profession of faith; for the Lord has bestowed on them authority and power to defend the Church and to promote the glory of God. This is indeed the duty of all; but kings, in proportion as their power is greater, ought to devote themselves to it more earnestly, and to labour in it more diligently. . . . Undoubtedly, while kings bestow careful attention on these things, they at the same time supply the pastors and ministers of the Word with all that is necessary for food and maintenance, provide for the poor and guard for the Church against the disgrace of pauperism; erect schools, and appoint salaries for the teachers and board for the students; build poor-houses and hospitals, and make every other arrangement that belongs to the protection and defence of the Church. . . .<sup>11</sup>

Knox, in a debate with Mary, queen of Scotland for a time, taught how there was an authority higher than kings and queens, and that they and their subjects should be subject to it. Knox is reported as saying in his debate with the queen:

Madam, as right religion took neither original strength nor authority from worldly princes, but from the eternal God alone, so are not subjects bound to frame their religion according to the appetite of their princes.<sup>12</sup>

In these exchanges between Knox and Queen Mary, Knox rejected all absolutism, except that of God's Holy Word, and such subordinate authority as is clearly sanctioned by the Word.<sup>13</sup>

Thus it is that we conclude that the Reformers and the Churches of the Reformation saw in the Word of God, which reveals the Mediator, an *absolute authority* for faith and life. While the earlier symbols of the Reformers and their teaching were not so much occupied with the application of Christ's Mediatorial dominion over all of life, yet it was commonly acknowledged by them. It was on this profound principle that the Second Reformation was built.

Within the churches of the Continent and England that were reforming, there were differences. The Lutherans parted from the Reformed over several matters. Apart from the Reformed taking a different stance from the Lutherans on such things as the Lord's Supper, the Regulative principle, etc., there was this additional important difference. In Scotland and amongst the Reformed Churches of the Continent, particularly Geneva, there was a further clarification of the relationship of the civil ruler to the Church. It could generally be stated that the Lutheran and Anglican episcopal Churches were Erastian, and so more or less governed by the State.<sup>14</sup>

Yet the question also needs to be asked at this stage, where the difference lay between the First Scottish Reformation, the Reformed Churches of the Continent, and the Second Reformation in Scotland?

It is our premise that the difference lay in the further formulation of the relationship of Christ Jesus and His authoritative Word to that of the civil government. The source and role of *authority* was the problem dealt with. It is suggested that the following points especially coloured the further development and formulation of the relationship of Christ Jesus and His authority to that of the civil and ecclesiastical realms.

1. Great attachment to the truth that Almighty God has revealed Himself and His will for faith and life through the Mediator of the Covenant, Christ Jesus. It was not only a dogma, but a personal belief; Christ Jesus was seen as OUR King — the King of kings with whom we are bound in an everlasting Covenant of Grace. Nor was it just a theological and experimental truth, but it was seen to have ramifications for the nation's total civil life too.

2. A strong conviction that the Church had the obligation laid upon her to make known what absolutes God had to say about civil rulers and their authority, limits, and duties, as well as what God had to say to the Church.

3. The belief that the doctrine of God's Word, and the knowledge that His Covenant brought of Christ Jesus with His liberty, justice, true life, and His *supreme authority* to demand these things in all of life, belonged to the common

people to possess and enjoy as much as to the aristocracy or scholars in their various institutions.

We shall return to these points further on in the essay.

## II. THE POLITICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL BACKGROUND TO THE SECOND REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND.

A Reformation is a re-structuring of something. It is a re-forming of something already in existence.

To appreciate what it was that was re-formed or structured in the Second Reformation, it is necessary to consider the existing state of affairs in Scotland. It is necessary to consider the background and the events which led up to those events and principles which we term the Second Reformation in Scotland; to trace the degeneration of the First and the rise of the Second.

The Second Reformation was not so different from the First. It merely was the taking up of the same principles of the First Reformation and *further applying and building upon them*. The First Reformation swept as a miracle across Scotland, and great and profound changes were wrought. However, the First Reformation was challenged and began to be undone, in God's providence, by the death of its leader, Knox, and an unsympathetic regent. After reaching a high-water mark, the ground won in the First Reformation again began to be lost to corruption, despotism, and self-interest. Liberty, righteousness, and those blessings which flow from true faith in, and service to, Christ the Mediator, began to be crowded out.

Under the Reformer Knox, the Church had been brought back to the true preaching of the Word, the right administration of the sacraments, and the Biblical use of discipline. The Church, by God's grace and mercy, had been rescued from gross error and moral darkness. Under the First Reformation the light of the glorious gospel of Christ Jesus had returned, but the task of *securing* the true Church's existence, both within the ecclesiastical realm itself and in the nation as a whole, had not been fully accomplished at the time of John Knox's departure from this world. For example, in a time of autocratic rule, the Church's relationship to the State had not been worked out, nor had the Church been fully able to bring in Scriptural rules for its own administration as she would wish. Because of the shortage of suitable ministers, temporary "super-intendents" over more than one congregation were appointed instead of regular courts of Session and Presbytery.<sup>15</sup> Both these unresolved matters were to cause much trouble for the covenant people of God in Scotland.

The civil government and powers of Scotland, while generally supporting the First Reformation under Knox and for a period at that time sympathetic

to the coming of Christ's authority and Word, yet still remained essentially an *autocratic and feudalistic* state. There had certainly been changes in Scotland during the First Reformation, but they had been essentially ecclesiastical. The people had indeed been taught wherein authority properly lies, and how, without the bowing of the knee to Christ and His authority, there could be no real freedom, love, justice and that life which is fully abundant, not only for time but for eternity.<sup>16</sup> Still, the *State* itself lay enthralled in chains which constantly made it liable to despotism and an instrument for avaricious men.

Because the government of Scotland at the time of the First Reformation claimed that absolute authority was inherent to the state, we find that, after it helped the Church of Scotland to throw off the thraldom of the Roman Church and its despotism and despotic claims over all lands (their civil government as well as their churches), the Scottish civil authority turned upon the Reformed Church of Scotland, and began to gnaw away at its Biblical principles and liberties recently won.<sup>17</sup>

By 1560, the First Reformation was accomplished when the Scottish parliament, under the guidance of Knox, declared the Reformed faith to be the national religion. The publication and civil approval of the *Scot's Confession*, the *First Book of Discipline*, and the first General Assembly of the Reformed Church of Scotland all took place in that year.<sup>18</sup> However, after the abdication of Queen Mary Stuart, and the proclamation of her infant son as King James VI of Scotland in 1567, the land was governed by regents. There were several up until 1572 when the powerful Earl of Morton became regent. It was under his regency that the unjust corrosion of the Church's rights and liberties began in earnest and continued under the reign of James and his son, Charles I. In the year Morton came to the regency, Knox died.<sup>19</sup>

The year 1572 saw some of the more powerful civil leaders, among them Morton, beginning openly to seek to impose their will upon the Reformed Church. We can conclude they had no other motive in mind than to have access to the old un-reformed Church estates and revenues.<sup>20</sup>

It should be remembered that prelatric officers continued to exist in 1572 despite the fact that they were not recognized as part of the National Church. Under the civil arrangements of the First Reformation, it was decreed that the remaining popish prelates be allowed to retain *two-thirds* of the revenues of the larger benefices during their lifetime. When several of the larger and wealthier benefices became vacant, the plea of the Reformed Church that their incomes be given to the support of education and the furtherance of the Church's work, fell on the deaf ears of the regent and powerful nobles. These men, instead, set up others in the prelatric offices so that they could obtain the revenue from the

benefices. They could not by law take them completely over. Instead they made themselves patrons of the prelatie charges and appointed men on condition that they gain the greater part of the revenue.<sup>21</sup>

Moreover, in an effort to make this act of covetousness legal, the regent, the earl of Mar, early in 1572 convened the superintendents and certain ministers at Leth. This convention unlawfully assumed to itself the powers of a General Assembly, and delegated several of its members to meet with the Privy Council to resolve the above developments. Thus six of the Privy Council and six ministers made a decision to allow prelatie officers, with the proviso that they be subject to the General Assembly.<sup>22</sup> Knox, who was soon to part from this world into the hands of a faithful Creator, opposed this development.<sup>23</sup>

These so-called bishops were popularly styled *tulchan* bishops.<sup>24</sup> They were in the end only a convenience for the avaricious nobles to obtain the livings of the old Church revenues, which were quite considerable.<sup>25</sup>

However, not only was this intrusion into and innovation of "bishops" upon the Church an evil in that it fed avarice, it also became a *bane* to the Church in four other ways. It set the stage, firstly, for the claim of the civil sphere over the affairs of the Church.<sup>26</sup> Secondly, it commenced the problem of appointed clergy, of *patronage*.<sup>27</sup> Thirdly, it took away in principle the absolute rights of local congregations to approve the election of their own pastors.<sup>28</sup> In the fourth place, the "bishops," because of their poor moral qualifications, became a source of corruption and trouble in the Church itself.<sup>29</sup>

As we shall have cause to note later, these ramifications of having appointed bishops began to draw the Reformed Church into the same mire of civil control and manipulations as that into which the Reformed Church of England had sunk. Under the Stuart kings, the attempt was made to bludgeon the Church of Scotland under the same control and manipulation and thus cause the Church of Scotland to lose one of the most distinctive differences in comparison to the Church of England.<sup>30</sup>

We see the growth of these despotic principles over the divine and civil rights of the Reformed Church when the regent Morton, frustrated because of opposition from the Church over the introduction of the Tulchan bishops and their constant neglect of proper pastoral responsibilities, declared such opposition to be seditious, and threatened the Church with the loss of her liberty if such opposition continued.<sup>31</sup>

Under the regency of Morton, the Church of Scotland at first seemed unable to counter this violation upon its rights. Knox was dead, and none was able, at first, sufficiently to take his place as a fearless and cohesive leader.<sup>32</sup>



Besides, it was under Morton that a victory was won over the nobles who still supported the queen; and he alone, it seemed, was capable of contending with the party of Queen Mary.<sup>33</sup> Still, while there was a lack of leadership and some compromise on the part of some Presbyterians, opposition to the intrusions continued.<sup>34</sup>

Until the Second Reformation there was a series of struggles between the Court and the Church over the divine liberties and rights of Christ Jesus to be the head and ruler of His Church.<sup>35</sup> It is a period of ebb and flow. At times the flow is strong in its movement towards a purer and more decided Presbyterianism, such as under Melville's leadership. At other times, especially after James VI of Scotland became also James I of England, the ebb away from Scriptural forms of Church government and worship flowed stronger.<sup>36</sup>

We should also note here that this continuing battle was the background for the Scriptural formulation of the civil ruler's sphere and of where authority lay for both Church and State. The formulation of the civil ruler's limits of authority and sphere grew out of the study of Scripture in times of conflict, so that one outcome of the Second Reformation was to delineate both the Church's and the State's rights and spheres, and their relationship to one another.

With the return of the learned Melville in 1574, and the recognition by the General Assembly of his office as a doctor, we find a natural successor to Knox and a leader to unite the Church in its resolve to withstand the encroachment on its liberty.<sup>37</sup>

At the time of Melville's return, the Assembly was concerned with answering three questions Scripturally. The first related to whether bishops were superior to other ministers. The second related to the invasions on the property of the Church. The third related to the encroachments made on her authority. All were traceable to the troubles brought about by the imposition of the Tulchan bishops upon the Church.<sup>38</sup> Especially these questions were discussed at the Assembly in 1575, at which Melville was present.<sup>38</sup>

The Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1576 gave an answer concerning the office of bishop. By seeking to resolve this issue the Church was "clearing" the way for a more definite rebuttal, on Scriptural grounds, of the civil government's needless and unlawful interference.<sup>39</sup> The answer the Assembly gave was, "that the name of bishop is common to all who are appointed to take charge of a particular flock, in preaching the Word, administering the sacraments, and exercising discipline with the consent of their elders; and that this is their chief function according to the Word of God." At this same Assembly a large commission was appointed to draw up a complete and systematic work on the *polity* and *jurisdiction* of the Church, which was to become known as the *Second Book of Discipline*.<sup>40</sup>

The regent Morton sought to overbear the Church, and resorted to the claim of the right of rulers to rule over the Church. The regent at this time, and on one occasion, threatened the lives of some of the Church's pastors. Melville, who was present, replied:

Tush, Sir, threaten your courtiers after that manner. It is the same to me whether I rot in the air or in the ground. The earth is the Lord's. My country is wherever goodness is. . . . I have been ready to give my life where it would not have been half so well expended, at the pleasure of my God. I have lived out of your country two years as well as in it. Let God be glorified; it will not be in your power to hang or exile His truth.<sup>41</sup>

Though Morton may have been indignant at such a remark, he did not dare to put his threat into action, for his power and influence were on the wane. His administration had been so severe, accompanied with so much of an avaricious spirit that at last it had become intolerable to a large portion of the kingdom, including many of the most influential of the nobility. He thus resigned in March, 1578, and the boy King James, age twelve, assumed the reins of government under the strong influence of several court favourites. In April, 1578, the General Assembly met and the *Second Book of Discipline* was finally approved. It meant the bishops were brought completely under the Assembly, and were to be seen as ordinary pastors.<sup>42</sup>

The Church of Scotland had reached one of its high points, but only to enter soon into a period of further heightened conflict which would end with the Second Reformation.

As noted earlier, the conflict with James and then with Charles, was similar to the ebb and flow of the tide of the sea. At times Presbyterianism, and all its implications for freedom and its recognition of the true seat of authority, seemed to thrive. At other times it ebbed, and the despotism of James and then of Charles, aided and abetted by self-interested men, and the few Erastian inclined episcopalian ministers of Scotland, threatened to overwhelm the Reformed Church of Scotland which the Lord in His Providence had been pleased to call into existence. They were times of intense lobbying and of debate. The Head of the Church, Who gives to it its Pastors,<sup>43</sup> was pleased to raise up most remarkable men of both godliness, talent, and learning, who were able, in Christ's name, and according to His Word, to stand against the onslaught of this despotism.

We have up to this point sought to show the *reasons* behind the battle

and conflict, that is, the claim by the government to be absolute in its authority. This claim was expressed by seeking to impose episcopacy upon the Church of Scotland. The monarchs James and Charles came to the conviction that episcopacy would best serve their doctrine of despotism,<sup>44</sup> and thus sought to suppress Presbyterianism which, being Puritan, demanded all claims concerning authority to be submitted to the authority of Christ Jesus as Prophet, Priest, and King. We should greatly misunderstand the Reformed Church of Scotland and its principles and what the Second Reformation was about if we were to think it was merely a quibble over Church government. No, the matter ultimately came down to the most holy and profound truth, that there is no authority but of Almighty God, and He rules through the Mediator Christ Jesus and His Word.<sup>45</sup> Christ is King over His Church and Christ is King over the nations. This was the heartfelt and vital principle involved.

We briefly treat the rulers and times of James and Charles. We do not dwell at length upon them, for the issues are now clear. All that now need concern us are the *solutions and truths* which were arrived at by the Covenant people of God when faced with the issues. We deal with these solutions and stated principles of the Covenanters in our next chapter.

James was one who had imbibed a despotic spirit. While it is true he had the renowned George Buchanan as his tutor, yet he also had the ill example of his mother, the influence of his French connections, the regent Morton, and especially two advisers at court. These latter two were Esme Stewart, the king's cousin, and a Captain James Stewart. Esme was raised by James to the Dukedom of Lennox, and James was created Earl of Arran.<sup>46</sup>

James was not stable in his attitudes or policies, at least not up until the time of his enthronement as king of England in 1603. We cannot but conclude that James pursued this method of almost feverently supporting at times Presbyterianism, and then of doing all in his power to destroy it, because he desired to retain a despotic rule. He chose in the end episcopacy because it best suited his purposes politically.<sup>47</sup>

The vacillation of James can be seen in the following examples. On one hand, in 1581 the king supported what is variously called *The First National Covenant*, *Craig's Confession* and *the King's Confession*. This Covenant, signed by the king and the greater part of the nobility and gentry throughout the kingdom, sought to guard the nation against the encroachment of the Church of Rome and its teachings.<sup>48</sup> On the other hand, James supported and allowed Lennox to appoint a Tulchan bishop to the so-called see of Glasgow. This was a gross violation of the Church's laws, and the Church remonstrated. A committee was thus appointed under the moderatorship of Melville, to present a

remonstrance to the king over the matter. Arran, who was present at the court, cried out after the remonstrance was submitted, "Who dare subscribe these treasonable articles?" "We dare," replied Melville, and advancing to the table, he took the pen from the clerk and subscribed. Once again, only the fearlessness of the Presbyterians and their love of God and His truth prevented the court from overthrowing their principles.<sup>49</sup>

A second example of James' vacillation is found in the acts of Parliament in what are called *The Black Acts of 1584*. These acts ordained, under James, that it was *treason* to decline the judgment of his majesty or of the privy council, or to impugn or seek the *diminution* of the power and *authority* of the estates of parliament. Besides, all subjects were prohibited from convening any assembly without command of his majesty. Also it was ordained that the king might grant commissions to bishops to put in order all ecclesiastical matters in their sees! It is quite clear that the purpose of the act was a blatant attempt to overthrow Presbytery. Over twenty ministers, including Melville, were forced to flee for their lives.<sup>50</sup>

Yet when James saw that Arran's arrogance and tyranny threatened him; when he saw the failure of the Spanish invasion of England, and the promise of the popish lords of Northern Scotland that if Philip II of Spain would make another attempt at invasion they would lay Scotland at his feet and then help subjugate England, he turned again to Presbyterianism. He could see his kingdom slipping from his grasp otherwise.<sup>51</sup>

Again, on one hand James could appoint a man of Robert Bruce's character as an extraordinary member of the privy council and a member of a provisional government to rule while he was absent in Norway for his marriage to the princess of Denmark. Moreover, on his return in 1590, James could say that "he praised God that he was born in such a time as in the time of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place as to be king in such a Kirk, the sincerest Kirk in the world." He then pledged to the General Assembly his life and crown to maintain this Church.<sup>52</sup>

Yet, on the other hand, on trumped up charges, James exiled from Edinburgh their first and finest pastor, Robert Bruce!<sup>53</sup> Besides, James, incapable it seems of being long of one mind, welcomed back to Scotland the popish lords who only so lately sought all of Scotland's downfall. The Church, on learning this and seeing her danger as well that of the whole country, sent a deputation led by James Melville, a gracious and more naturally mild man than his famous uncle, Andrew Melville, to counsel the king to reconsider his actions. King James, upon seeing them, had barely allowed James Melville to commence speaking when he violently interrupted James Melville and overawed him by

denouncing the deputation and their associates as seditious stirrers up of the people. At this, Andrew Melville stepped forward, and taking king James by the sleeve, uttered those memorable words, which in so many ways express the spirit and truth of the Second Reformation. Melville addressed the king as God's silly vassal (that is, lowly servant), and proceeded to remonstrate with him. We record the full speech as it is handed down to us, because we believe it gives so much the spirit and principles of the Reformed Church of Scotland.

Sir, we will always humbly reverence your majesty in public; but since we have this occasion to be with your majesty in private, and since you are brought in extreme danger both of your life and crown, and along with you the country and Church of God are like to go to wreck, for not telling you the truth and giving you faithful counsel, we must discharge our duty, or else be traitors both to Christ and you. Therefore, Sir, as diverse times before I have told you, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is King James, the head of the commonwealth, and there is Christ Jesus, the Head and King of the Church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. Sir, those whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over His Church, have power and authority to govern His spiritual kingdom both jointly and severally; the which no Christian king or prince should control and discharge, but fortify and assist; otherwise they are not faithful subjects of Christ and members of His Church. We will yield to you your place, and give you all due obedience; but again I say, you are not the head of the Church: you cannot give us that eternal life which we seek for even in this world, and you cannot deprive us of it. Permit us then freely to meet in the name of Christ, and to attend to the interests of that Church of which you are the chief member. Sir, when you were in your swaddling-clothes, Christ Jesus reigned freely in this land in spite of all His enemies: His officers and ministers convened and assembled for the ruling and welfare of His Church, which was ever for your welfare, defence, and reservation, when these same enemies were seeking your destruction and cutting off. Their assemblies since that time continually have been terrible to these enemies, and most steadable to you. And now, when there is more than extreme necessity for the continuance and discharge

of that duty, will you (drawn to your own destruction by a devilish and most pernicious council) begin to hinder and dishearten Christ's servants and your most faithful subjects, quarreling them for their convening and the care they have of their duty to Christ and you, when you should rather commend and countenance them, as the godly kings and emperors did? The wisdom of your counsel, which I call devilish, is this, that ye must be served by all sorts of men, to come to your purpose and grandeur, Jew and Gentile, Papist and Protestant: and because the Protestants and ministers of Scotland are over strong and control the king, they must be weakened and brought low by stirring up a party against them, and, the king being equal and indifferent, both shall be fain to flee to him. But, Sir, if God's wisdom be the only true wisdom, this will prove mere and mad folly; his curse cannot but light upon it. In seeking both ye shall lose both; whereas, in cleaving uprightly to God, His true servants would be your sure friends, and He would compel the rest counterfeitedly and lyingly to give over themselves and serve you.<sup>54</sup>

James, after such a sound and faithful admonition, gave an assurance that he would not compromise, yet scarcely were the ministers gone, when he took steps both to restore the insurgent nobles, and further to undermine the Reformed Church.<sup>55</sup>

In 1603, upon the death of Elizabeth of England, James became also king James I of England. He had now obtained a vast accession of wealth and power, and was surrounded by the dignitaries of the Episcopal Church of England. This greatly increased his resolve to "break" the Reformed Church of Scotland, and to introduce episcopacy. It settled him in his despotism.<sup>56</sup>

Perhaps one of the last acts of James against the Reformed Church of Scotland was to impose by bribery and force the so-called *Five Articles of Perth*. These articles ordained:

1. That the Lord's Supper should be received kneeling.
2. That it might be administered in private.
3. That Baptism also might be administered in private.
4. That children should be confirmed.
5. That Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost should be observed as holidays. Though these articles had little general effect upon the Church in Scotland, *nevertheless* they symbolized James' despotism.<sup>57</sup>

James departed this world in 1625 to answer to his Creator, after having greatly weakened the Reformed Faith in both Scotland and England. Besides the havoc he caused the Covenant people of God in both Scotland and England, he, on top of both these grievous crimes, became the immediate cause of the overthrow of the Reformed Faith in the noble land of Bohemia.<sup>58</sup>

It is said that Charles I, James' son and successor to both the English and Scottish thrones, lacked the cunning duplicity of his father. He was in fact quite open concerning his despotic intentions. Yet, for all that, even more so than his father, Charles was filled with a passion for his absolute authority and right completely to rule over all men and institutions. Charles was even more of a despot than his father, and followed his father's policy, after ascending the throne, of seeking to impose episcopacy and a formal liturgy upon the Church of Scotland. Under Archbishop Laud of Canterbury, an Anglo-Catholic system was sought to be imposed upon, not only Scotland, but England as well.<sup>59</sup>

Charles and Laud were not only concerned to change the polity of the Church of Scotland, as was James' *chief* end in his intermeddling, but to make also radical changes to the liturgy of the Church as well and to impose a formal liturgy in place of *The Directory*, which was committed to the principle of "Biblically Regulated Worship."<sup>60</sup>

Knowing that Charles, because of his despotism, would never consent to their demands for spiritual and personal liberty and a conscience ruled by the Word of God, the Scottish people as a nation now organized their defences. The nation generally was stirred to action. Within a short period of time a large committee was set up, representing the nobility, the gentry, the clergy, and the burgesses. This committee was known as *The Tables*.<sup>61</sup>

Though the people humbly and constantly petitioned Charles against the illegal impositions upon the Church, Charles, under Laud's influence, gave no heed to these earnest representations. Thus the Tables issued a proclamation protesting against the innovations upon the Church which in *principle* violated and denied the right of the people's liberties and laws as well as their faith.

The above developments were the background to the famous *National Covenant* (or The Second National Covenant, or simply the Renewal of the Covenant), which we shall discuss more fully later. It was drawn up by Alexander Henderson and Johnston of Warriston, and revised by the Earls of Rothes and Loudon and Lord Balmerino. On the 28th of February, 1638, after a fast on the 26th, this noble document was signed in Greyfriar's Church yard, Edinburgh. It was signed by multitudes of all ranks and classes with great solemnity and a sacred oath. It was a comparatively short and simple declaration which included the earlier *First National Covenant*, or *King's Confession*, and a summary of Acts of Parliament, drawn up at Warriston, which was to show that the

Covenanters were not treasonable or illegal in their action. The final section, drawn up by Henderson, applied the principles to the present situation. The *Second National Covenant*, or *Second Confession of Faith* of the Church of Scotland, called on its subscribers to resist Popery; it defended the Presbyterians against the charge of rebellion; and held all solemnly bound to be true to the Reformed religion, to their allegiance to the king, and to the liberties and laws of the kingdom.<sup>62</sup>

In this atmosphere one of the most important General Assemblies of the Reformed Church of Scotland met to decide what should be done, though they met against the wishes of the Marquis of Hamilton, the King's Commissioner to Scotland.<sup>63</sup> Alexander Henderson was unanimously chosen as moderator. The Marquis sought, by many maneuvers, to prevent the Assembly from proceeding; but, under the wise and able leadership of Henderson, the Assembly proceeded, even after the Marquis withdrew, revoking his approval of the Assembly meeting. The Assembly itself revoked all previous acts of corrupt Assemblies, and once again settled Presbyterianism as the Biblical and only faith and polity of the Church of Scotland. It was a most courageous and daring act under the circumstances.

Henderson, at the close of the Assembly, uttered the memorable words, "We have now cast down the walls of Jericho. Let him that rebuildeth them beware of the curse of Hiel the Bethelite."<sup>64</sup>

Once again the Church of Scotland had risen under God's Providence to reform the Church and to establish the Reformed Faith. This Assembly, perhaps more so than any other, is to be seen as embodying the Second Reformation, though there are other aspects we shall discuss in the next chapter.

All could see these developments would mean war, for Charles I would in no way relent in his despotic stand in either Scotland or England, and the liberties of even the most renowned nobles and leaders were being passed over. It turned out to be the beginnings of a civil war, the course of which would ultimately cost the Stuarts the thrones of both Scotland and England.

Charles had not sufficient capital for the war. He called the English parliament together, trusting that they would grant him the finances he desired for war. The parliament was hostile to the king over his despotism, however, and refused him the finances. Ultimately money came from the bishops and supporters of the Church of Rome to enable an army to be sent against Scotland. The resolute stand of the Scots (who had the emblem of FOR CHRIST'S CROWN AND COVENANT upon their army standard), as well as a lack of will on the part of the English royal soldiers to "fight for the bishops," resulted in a most humbling defeat for Charles. Among the Scottish army chaplains were Henderson, Gillespie, and Baillie.<sup>65</sup>



Charles, after several other attempts to invade Scotland, in order to buy time agreed to a treaty which in fact granted free Church and Parliament Assemblies. Thus, for twenty years (1640-1660), the nation of Scotland had rest.<sup>66</sup>

England, however, was far from being settled. In 1640 the Parliament (known as the long Parliament) met to discuss the troubles of their land. Reforms were made, and the king appeared to be conciliatory; but such horrors as the *Irish Massacre* in 1641, when Irish Roman Catholics rose up against their Protestant neighbours and slew many, and also the knowledge that the king had commissioned it, produced a civil war and revolution. The Parliament of England and Charles, king of England and Scotland, as well as Ireland, were at war.<sup>67</sup>

Both the king's party and the English Parliament appealed to the Parliament and Assembly of Scotland for assistance. Scotland sided with the Parliament of England and agreed to the conditions of a Covenant alliance, called the Solemn League and Covenant. It was at once a civil and religious bond. This Covenant was signed in Scotland in 1638, and in London in 1643, where the two houses of Parliament of England and the Assembly of Divines also subscribed. We thus find the Westminster Standards and the Assembly which produced them growing out of this noble document. We discuss the Assembly and its standards, as well as the Solemn League and Covenant, in the next chapter.<sup>68</sup>

Before we complete this historical resume, which we have felt necessary to give so we will better understand the *reasons* as well as the *principles* brought out in the Second Reformation, we must note the circumstances surrounding Charles' end.

By 1646, the king's power, after war with the kingdoms of Scotland and England, was almost broken. He threw himself upon the Scottish army. Even at this point Charles would not abandon Episcopal government, and thus his claims to despotism, though his kingdoms verged on collapse. The noble Henderson, at the king's request, consulted with the king in a vain effort, as it proved, to show the king the dangers into which he was leading his country and kingdoms by such beliefs as he had. Henderson was taken to glory soon afterwards, weary of the troubles of this world.<sup>69</sup>

Charles was eventually surrendered by the Scots to the English Parliament, upon receiving assurance by them of his safety and honour.<sup>70</sup>

The English Parliament did not long stay master of itself, for the Army was the real power. While nominally under Lord Fairfax, its actual and real ruler and animating spirit was Cromwell. Cromwell, an Independent and head of a generally sectarian army, put himself at the head of the affairs of England, and took Charles into custody, as well as intimidated Parliament so that it was purged of Presbyterians and others not agreeable to Cromwell's designs. Its final numbers did not exceed fifty or sixty, and these were mostly Independents.

It was termed the *Rump Parliament*, so little was left of the legal and so-called *Long Parliament*. It was this *Rump Parliament* which condemned Charles to death as a traitor.<sup>71</sup>

Some number of the Scots under the Duke of Hamilton, seeing these developments, sought by a military expedition to rescue Charles from the Cromwellian forces. It was not supported by the Presbyterians, *not* because they did not oppose Cromwell's intentions, but being earnestly consistent to Christ and His Word, they felt they could not, *seeing* there had been no provision made for the king to secure the liberties of the nation, should the expedition succeed.<sup>72</sup> Still, it was supported by the Parliament of Scotland. The Scots were defeated, and in 1649 Charles was beheaded, much to the horror of the Scots. Amidst these changes until the "killing-times" of Charles II and James VII, the Church of Scotland nevertheless prospered in the wake of the Second Reformation and its blessings.

The Scots' reaction to the death of Charles is almost sufficient in itself to belie the accusation that the Presbyterians merely wanted power and authority themselves.<sup>73</sup> The sentiment of the Presbyterians, both as to their loyalty to their unworthy Monarch as well as to the Mediator Christ Jesus, and to the principles and rights of His Kingship in Scotland, is well summarized in a statement of Baillie about Charles.

Yea, had we been ten times victorious in set battles, it was our conclusion to have laid down our army at his feet, and on our knees presented nought but our first supplications. We had no other end of our wars; we sought no crowns; we aimed at no lands and honours; we desired but to keep our own in the service of our prince, as our ancestors had done; we loved no new masters. Had our throne been void, and our voices been sought for the filling of Fergus' chair, we would have died ere any had sitten down on that fatal marble but Charles alone.<sup>74</sup>

Before leaving this chapter on the political and ecclesiastical background to the Second Reformation, another brief but very important point must be made. It is a point which lies at the very basis and life of the Second Reformation. That is, the Second Reformation, as with all true Reformations from the beginning of the world, was preceded by a holy, divine, and spiritual awakening of the people of Scotland's hearts and minds both to love the Lord their God with all their heart, with all their soul, with all their strength, and with all their mind, and to love their neighbour as themselves. When the Almighty, in

the face of the only Mediator, was their fear, there was nothing more dreadful or above that Spirit-inflamed regard they had for the Lord and His ways, no, not life itself, as the later “killing-times” show.

Unless we take into serious account this basis and movement behind the Second Reformation, and genuinely view the Second Reformation as a spiritual movement of life and conviction in the hearts of the people, rather than a political reaction, we can only conclude the Scots were an enigma. They remain a mere historical idiosyncrasy, when we interpret the Second Reformation as a peculiar psychological and sociological interaction; whereas if we honestly examine the times, and listen to what the people say, we cannot leave it as an “interesting case,” in the realm of anthropology! That generation, by no means an ignorant one, should rise up and condemn us if we were to do this.

Nor should we imagine that such a spiritual motivation was limited merely to one class of the nation’s people. It manifestly was to be found in all classes; the common people especially were led by a true conversion and a conscience informed by Biblical and true knowledge.

We give several quotes to help us appreciate what was going on in the hearts of the people and in the land while the Second Reformation was in progress. Macpherson writes, for example,

many of the best men testify of the spiritual awakening that accompanied and sprang from this conflict for civil and spiritual liberty. Pastors and people felt in a singular manner the presence of the Lord among them and His favour toward them. “Over a great part of the country,” says Kirkton, “you could hardly lodge in a family where there was not family worship. You could ride far without hearing the sound of an oath. I verily believe there were more souls converted to Christ in that short period of time than in any season since the Reformation, though of treble its duration. . . .”<sup>75</sup>

McCrie, commenting upon a revival in the Church at Shotts, where no fewer than five hundred people ascribe their conversion to one preached sermon, writes:

. . . the revival . . . was not characterized by those excesses which have brought discredit on similar scenes in our own country and elsewhere. The Word of God sank deep into the hearts of the hearers, forcing them to retire, like the stricken deer, into solitude, there to weep and mourn till the dart was extracted by the hand that

had launched it, and the balm of consolation was poured into the bleeding wound. . . . And it is worthy of remark, that then, as it has often been, both before and since, the Most High was visibly preparing His Church by a copious effusion of His Holy Spirit, manifest in the general revival of religion, for the struggles which awaited her, on asserting His righteous claims against the powers of this world, and carrying into effect the noble enterprises which were before her . . . .<sup>76</sup>

Macnicol, commenting upon the revival at Shotts, also writes,

To this day of revival at the Kirk of Shotts must be traced the springs of that Covenanting testimony which was given during the generation that followed. Eight years later, when the Covenants were sealed, it was found that the strength of the movement lay in the middle ward of the country of Lanark, wherein stands, embosomed upon the moorland, the Kirk of the parish of Shotts . . . .<sup>77</sup>

Hetherington, in his noted historical work, recounts the times of spiritual renewal connected to times of fasting and humiliation over Scotland's sins. Of one occasion in 1628, he writes,

Much of the searching power of the Holy Spirit seems to have been granted to both ministers and people during their solemn fast; and many felt, that in humbling themselves before God, and making an earnest confession of sin, both national and individual, they obtained a strength not their own, — a spiritual strength, preparing them for greater sufferings, and giving earnest of final deliverance. And let any truly pious person imagine the contrast between the cold, formal, and insincere services of the prelatists, and the deep, earnest, heart-wrung supplications of the Presbyterian sufferers, breathing the very essence of spiritual contrition, and he cannot fail to perceive one mighty cause of the disrespect with which the former were regarded, and the powerful hold which the latter possessed of the nation's heart.<sup>78</sup>

Wylie, writing of the period around 1625, comments on the spiritual awakening in Scotland and how it continued for years in its effect upon the population.

This invisible but mighty agent moved to and fro, appearing now in this district and now in that . . . It turned as it listed, even as do the winds, and was quite as much above man's control, who could neither say to it, "Come," nor bid it depart. Whenever it passed, its track was marked, as is that of the rain-cloud across the burned up wilderness, by a shining line of moral and spiritual verdure. Preachers had found no new Gospel, nor had they become suddenly clothed with a new eloquence; yet their words had a power they had formerly lacked; they went deeper into the hearts of their hearers, who were impressed by them in a way they had never been before. Truths they had heard a hundred times over, of which they had grown weary, acquired a freshness, a novelty, and a power that made them feel as if they heard them for the first time. They felt inexpressible delight in that which aforetime had caused them no joy, and trembled under what till that moment had awakened no fear. Notorious profligates, men who had braved the brand of public opinion or defied the penalties of the law, were under this influence bowed down and melted into penitential tears. Thieves, drunkards, loose livers, and profane swearers suddenly awoke to a sense of the sin and shame of the courses they had been leading, condemned themselves as the chief of transgressors, trembled under the apprehension of a judgment to come, and uttered loud cries for forgiveness. . . thousands who, but for this sudden transformation, would have been lost to themselves and to society, were redeemed to virtue, and lived lives which were not less profitable than beautiful. This influence was as calm as it was strong; . . . it was the judgment, not the passions, that was moved; it was the conscience not the imagination, that was called into action. . . .<sup>79</sup>

Moreover, when we consider the expressed sentiments, as well as the described, of those who entered into the Covenants of Scotland, we can not help but conclude that on the whole, and in the majority of cases, it was a Biblically informed conscience and a spiritually motivated affection, which underlay the whole of the Second Reformation.<sup>80</sup>

### References

1. Found Confessionally in the *Scots Confession* and the *First Book of Discipline*.

2. See Larger Catechism, No. 43 & 44.
3. See Schaff, P., *The Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. III, Baker, Michigan, 1969.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Seen from an examination of the Confessions of the Reformed Churches, where matters of "life" as well as "faith" are subjected to the Word. For example, the magistrate, marriage, the exposition of the ten commandments to commerce, etc.
6. Wylie, J.A., *The History of Protestantism*, (3 vols.), Cassell, Petter, Galpin, London, Vol. III, p. 430.
7. Brown, C. *Philosophy and the Christian Faith*, Tyndale Press, London, 1969, pp. 44 & 45.
8. Calvin, J., *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, IV, xx, 9.
9. As expressed for example in the writings of the A.A.C.S.
10. *Christian and the State in Revolutionary Times*, The Westminster Conference, 1975, p. 7. For further information on Luther's position see p. 5 ff.
11. *Ibid.* pp. 20-21 and also p. 18 ff.
12. Knox, J., *The History of Reformation of Religion in Scotland*, Melrose, London, 1905, pp. 233 ff, 256, and 308 ff. etc.
13. *Ibid.* See also Hetherington, W.M., *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, J. Johnstone, Edinburgh, 1843, p. 98.
14. For further comments on the differences between Calvin and Luther on the Civil Magistrate, see Calvin's formula worked out for Geneva, and also Westminster Conference, 1975, *op. cit.* p. 26.
15. See the *First Book of Discipline*, Chapter VI.
16. Renwick, A.M., *The Story of the Scottish Reformation*, I.V.F. London, 1960, p. 95 ff. Hetherington, W.M. *op. cit.*, p. 97.
17. Hetherington, W.M., *op. cit.*, p. 98; Latourette, K.S. *A History of Christianity*, Harper and Row, New York, 1953, p. 771.
18. For more information on both, see Renwick, *op. cit.*, p. 105 ff.
19. Hetherington, W.M., *History of the Church of Scotland*, J. Johnstone, Edinburgh, 1848, p. 43.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
21. *Ibid.*, Renwick, *op. cit.*, p. 171; McCrie, T., *Life of Andrew Melville*, W. Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1899, pp. 46-50; Collins, G.M., *The Heritage of our Fathers*, Knox Press, Edinburgh, 1974, p. 8; Walker, W.A., *A History of the Christian Church*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1958, p. 410.
22. Hetherington, *History of the Church of Scotland*, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 43; McCrie, T., *Sketches of Scottish Church History*, (2 Vol.), J. Johnstone, London, Vol. I, p. 96.
24. The Scots called a stuffed calf skin a *tulchan*. When milking a cow, the skin would be put by her side. The logic being that the cow would presume she was feeding her calf, and so more easily let her milk flow. It was a deceitful way of obtaining the milk. See also Renwick, A.M., *op. cit.*, p. 171; Macpherson, J., *History of the Church in Scotland*, Gardiner, London, 1901, pp. 130-131.

25. We are told that at the First Reformation, the Church had half the land of Scotland, and that the prelates kept two-thirds of it! Compare Walker, W.A., *op. cit.*, p. 368 and Hetherington, W.M., *History of the Church of Scotland, op. cit.*, p. 41. See also, Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 8; McCrie, *Sketches, op. cit.*, p. 96; Hetherington, W.M., *History of the W/Assembly, op. cit.*, p. 98.
26. Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 517; Hetherington, *History of the Church of Scotland, op. cit.*, pp. 43-44.
27. Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
28. Latourette, *op. cit.*, p. 771.
29. Wylie, *op. cit.*, pp. 516-517; Macpherson, *op. cit.*, p. 131; McCrie, *Melville, op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.
30. Latourette, *op. cit.*, p. 771. (See also footnote 29.)
31. Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 517; Hetherington, *History of the C/Scotland, op. cit.*, p. 44; McCrie, *Melville, op. cit.*, pp. 44-45.
32. McCrie, *Melville, op. cit.*, p. 50.
33. Renwick, *History C/Scotland, op. cit.*, p. 171.
34. Hetherington, *History C/Scotland*, p. 44; McCrie, *Sketches, op. cit.*, pp. 97-100.
35. McCrie, *Sketches op. cit.*, p. 97.
36. *Tercentenary of the National Covenant of Scotland, (1638-1938)*, Convention of Reformed Presbyterian Churches, Blackie and Sons, London, 1939, pp. 103-104.
37. McCrie, *Melville, op. cit.*, p. 43 ff.
38. McCrie, *Melville, op. cit.*, pp. 50-51.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
40. Hetherington, *History of the C/Scotland, op. cit.*, p. 45; McCrie, *Melville, p. 51 ff.*
41. McCrie, *Melville*, p. 51 ff; Hetherington, *History of the C/Scot*, p. 45; Note also the claim of Douglas, J.D., *Light in the North*, Paternoster, Exter, 1964, pp. 20-21, of Melville's "high presbyterianism" and of his being the one to bring it in, is refuted by Hetherington, *History C/Scotland*, p. 44 & also McCrie, *Melville, op. cit.*, pp. 51-53, which show that from the First Reformation, Presbyterianism was the accepted belief of the Church, and Melville was but one of many who advocated and believed in Presbyterian Church Government.
42. Hetherington, *History C/Scotland, op. cit.*, pp. 45-46; Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 519.
43. Ephesians 4:10-11.
44. Hetherington, *History W/Assembly, op. cit.*, pp. 98-99; Latourette, *op. cit.*, p. 773.
45. Douglas, *op. cit.*, p. 59.
46. Hetherington, *History C/Scotland*, p. 46; Wylie, *op. cit.*, pp. 520-521.
47. Hetherington, *History W/Assembly, op. cit.*, pp. 98-99; Douglas, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

48. Smellie, A., *Men of the Covenant*, Banner of Truth, London, 1960, pp. 3-4; Macpherson, *op. cit.*, p. 131; *Encyclopedia of Christianity*, (4 Vols.), N.F.C.E. Marshallton, 1972, Vol. III, p. 114; *Testimony of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, Baird, Belfast, 1875, p. 89 ff; Hetherington, *History C/Scotland*, *op. cit.*, p. 45; McCrie, *Sketches*, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 104 ff; McCrie, *Melville*, *op. cit.*, p. 80 ff.
49. McCrie, *Melville*, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-85; McCrie, *Sketches*, pp. 107-110; Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 9; Macpherson, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-143; Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 522.
50. Hetherington, *History C/Scotland*, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-52; McCrie, *Melville*, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-105; Macpherson, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-143; Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 523.
51. Wylie, *op. cit.*, pp. 523-524; Hetherington, *History C/Scotland*, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
52. Hetherington, *History C/Scotland*, *op. cit.*, p. 53; Douglas, *op. cit.*, p. 18; Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 524; Macnicol, D.C., *Robert Bruce*, Banner of Truth, London, 1961, p. 54 ff.
53. Macnicol, *op. cit.*, p. 110 ff.
54. McCrie, *Melville*, *op. cit.*, pp. 181-182 ff.
55. *Ibid.*; Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 525.
56. Hetherington, *History Church/Scotland*, *op. cit.*, p. 68; Collins, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12; Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 529 ff.
57. Collins, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.
58. Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 530.
59. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 411; Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 14 ff; Hetherington, *History C/Scotland*, *op. cit.*, p. 80; Hetherington, *History W/Assembly*, *op. cit.*, p. 99 ff; Douglas, *op. cit.*, p. 22 ff.
60. *Tercentenary*, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-106.
61. Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 15; Macpherson, *op. cit.*, p. 184.
62. Hetherington, *C/Scotland*, *op. cit.*, p. 89 ff; Macpherson, *op. cit.*, pp. 184-185; *Tercentenary*, *op. cit.*, pp. 106-107; McCrie, T., *Miscellaneous Writings*, J. Johnstone, Edinburgh, 1841, p. 16 ff.; *Testimony*, *op. cit.*, p. 50 ff; McCrie, *Sketches*, *op. cit.*, p. 206 ff; Douglas, *op. cit.*, p. 24 ff; Smellie, *op. cit.*, p. 4 ff; Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 410 ff; Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 540 ff.
63. Hetherington, *C/Scotland*, *op. cit.*, p. 97.
64. Hetherington, *C/Scotland*, *op. cit.*, p. 98 ff; Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 544; McCrie, *Sketches*, *op. cit.*, p. 224; Smellie, *op. cit.*, p. 10 ff; McCrie, *Miscellaneous*, *op. cit.*, p. 30 ff; Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 15 ff; Macpherson, p. 188 ff.
65. Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 545 ff; Hetherington, *W/Assembly*, *op. cit.*, p. 100 ff; Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 412-413 ff; Hetherington, *C/Scotland*, p. 101 ff; Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 21 ff; McCrie, *Sketches*, *op. cit.*, p. 243 ff; Mitchell, A.F., *The Westminster Assembly*, (Baird Lecture), 1882, London, 1883, p. 93 ff; Douglas, *op. cit.*, p. 30 ff.
66. Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 546.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 548.



68. McCrie, *Miscellaneous, op. cit.*, p. 47 ff; Smellie, *op. cit.*, p. 13 ff; Hetherington, *C/Scotland, op. cit.*, p. 106; Macpherson, *op. cit.*, p.196 ff; Latourette, *op. cit.*, p. 773; Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 546 ff; Collins, *op. cit.*, p. 93 ff; *Testimony, op. cit.*, p. 54 ff; McCrie, *Sketches*, p. 266 ff.
69. McCrie, *Miscellaneous, op. cit.*, p. 56 ff.
70. Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 554. Note here also the claim that the Scots sold Charles, as taught by Douglas, *op. cit.*, p. 35, and how it is refuted by McCrie, *Sketches*, II, p. 23 ff.
71. Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 554-555; McCrie, *Sketches*, II, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31.
72. McCrie, *Sketches, op. cit.*, II, p. 29 ff.
73. Such as Douglas, p. 31.
74. McCrie, *Sketches, op. cit.*, I, p. 253.
75. Macpherson, *op. cit.*, pp. 189-190.
76. McCrie, *Sketches, op. cit.*, I, p. 196.
77. Macnicol, *op. cit.*, p. 182; Hetherington, *C/Scotland, op. cit.*, p. 79 ff.
78. Hetherington, *C/Scotland, op. cit.*, pp. 79 & 59.
79. Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 533.
80. For example, see Wylie, *op. cit.*, pp. 543-544.

# The Law and the Gospel

Rev. G. Lubbers

## THE SUBJECT LAW AND GOSPEL

Any one acquainted with the rudimentary teaching of the Bible will immediately agree that the question of the relationship between the law and the gospel-tidings is of the greatest import for faith and life in the midst of this world and in the militant church which triumphs by grace alone. We have but to think of the pivotal importance of this subject in the history of dogma and exegesis prior to the Sixteenth Century in Romish teaching. The philosophic teaching of Romish theology denied the truth of the gospel of justification by faith alone, and placed the terrified conscience of the sinner once more under the heavy burden and hard yoke of the law, tempting God (Acts 15:7-11; Matt. 11:28-30; Matt. 23:4). Jesus warned untiringly against this leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees (Matt. 16:6). And Paul wages his great and mighty polemic against those who would corrupt this truth of the gospel, the real and abiding relationship between the law and the gospel.

This question of the true relationship of law and gospel is a constant question of importance also in post-Reformation theology. Ever and again the question of Antinomianism versus legalistic Neonomism was raised. Neonomism sought the ground of our justification in our faith, thus departing from the clear and lucid teaching of the Reformed fathers in the Heidelberg Catechism (Ques. 61). And Antinomianism denies that the believer is a new creature. It seeks righteousness only in Christ's passive obedience and forgets that Christ came to "fulfill the law" also in us. This was a battle which was waged in the Reformed Church in France, England, and Scotland, and was particularly pin-pointed in the "Marrow Controversy" in Scotland. This controversy was an attempt to guide the reader safely between Antinomianism and Neonomism. (Compare *Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia*, Vol. VII, p. 206. Herman Bavinck's *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, Vol. I, 166, Vol. II, 330, Vol. III, 572-531, 588.) This paper will proceed on the conviction that the true relationship between the law and the gospel is not a happy balance between Antinomianism and Neonomism, but that the truth of the gospel is on higher ground, that is, on the higher ground of the truth that Christ came not to destroy the law or prophets, but that He came to fulfill both! He is the truth which sets the sinner free from the curse of the law and puts this law in our hearts.

It is of the utmost importance for understanding the Scriptures, as well as

for a proper preaching which places men and women of God under the nurture of the Word, that we properly and rightly divide the Word. Also here we must be workmen who are not put to shame (II Tim. 2:15).

## OUR METHOD OF DISCUSSION

We are not interested here in basic methodology. It is our starting point that we must follow the sane and proven rule that Scripture must be interpreted in the light of Scripture. We will try to select such basic and directive passages as are given by God in the Old Testament concerning His law and gospel and by Christ in the New Testament as the One in Whom all God's promises are yea and Amen to the glory of God the Father. We shall also refer to the ecclesiastic pronouncements of the Confessions on the relationship of law and gospel. But the Scriptures are the infallible rule and Canon of faith. Even all the Confessions must be tried by the touchstone of the Holy Scriptures.

In speaking of our *method* we refer to the arrangement of the material. We will follow this order:

1. We will first of all take notice of the meaning and implication of the Biblical terms: law and gospel. It is our purpose to see how these two mysteries relate to each other in the economy of salvation in Jesus Christ.

2. We shall next attempt to see how that the law was given in the Old Testament Dispensation within the framework and context of the promise of the gospel.

3. We shall then try to show how the relation between the law and the gospel is clearly revealed to us in the New Dispensation. At this juncture we shall take notice of the teaching and formulation of this important mystery in the *Three Forms of Unity* of the Reformed Churches.

4. Lastly we shall attempt to learn from Scripture how the law and the gospel will be related in heaven's glory where we shall "know even as we are known" when the tabernacle of God shall be with men.

### I. The Law and the Gospel — as terms in the Scripture.

#### A. The term "law."

1. The most common noun in the Hebrew for the word "law" is "Torah." This term means: "direction, teaching." It is derived from the Hiphil of the root  $\text{יָרָא}$ , which means: "to teach, to instruct." The basic meaning of the verb is "to point out, to show."

2. It is used most often in the Old Testament Scriptures of the Divine Law. "In the singular it is the body of divinely given law. It is for the guidance of God's people in the various matters to which it relates" (see *Inter-*

*national Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, p. 1852, Vol. III). It is no mere *setting forth of external rules*, but it is really instruction in the knowledge of God as He revealed Himself. This we see clearly in such passages as Psalm 19:7-9 and Psalm 119:1-8.

In the 19th Psalm we see that there are various synonyms for the term "law." They are the terms: *testimony* of the LORD (vs. 7); *statutes* of the LORD (vs. 8); *commandment* of the LORD (vs. 8); *fear* of the LORD (vs. 9); *judgments* of the LORD (vs. 9). It is quite evident from what is said of each of these that the "law" here is not viewed as a heavy burden but as the rule of the child of God as he prays that the meditation of his heart as expressed in the words of his mouth may be as the acceptable morning and evening sacrifice upon the altar of incense. It is sweeter than honey and the honeycomb, and it gives great reward to him who keeps these laws, testimonies, etc. By these the "servant" of the LORD is warned and his feet are kept from evil ways that lead to destruction. The law of the Lord is holy, just, and good (Rom. 7:12). It rejoices the heart, it enlightens the eyes, it endures forever; it is true and righteous altogether. And the saints in the Old Testament sang of this law in their chiefest praises: O, how love I thy law!

3. Sometimes the term "law" refers to the first five books of the Bible known as the Pentateuch. Jesus evidently thus used the Scriptures in the evening of the resurrection day in the midst of the apostles in the upper-room. There Luke singles out: Moses, the *Psalms*, and all the *Prophets*. This refers to all the Old Testament Scriptures which contain the text of the law down to the death of the law-giver, Moses (see John 1:17).

4. There is also a sense in which the "law" refers simply to the law of the ten commandments as promulgated by God Himself from the top of Mount Horeb. These are referred to as the "Ten *Covenant Words*" which were written upon two tables of stone. The second set of these, written with the finger of God, was placed in the Ark of the Covenant. These are covenant words under the mercy-seat, where the blood of sprinkling was sprinkled. We shall have opportunity to refer to this sense and use of the "law" further in this paper.

5. Whereas all the law and the prophets depend upon the two tables of the law (Matt. 22:37, see also: Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18), it is not at all strange that the *entire Scriptures* from Genesis to Malachi are called "The Law." Jesus asks: "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?" The passage referred to is *Psalm* 82:6. In Romans 3 the term "law" refers to numerous passages: *Psalm* 14:1, 2, 3; 53:1; 5:9; Jer. 5:15; *Psalm* 140:3; 10:7; Prov. 1:16; *Isaiah* 59:7, 8; *Psalm* 36:1. We could mention many other passages. This will suffice.

6. Again the term "law" refers to the entire dispensation of the types and shadows as to their *legal* and *demanding aspect*: do this and thou shalt live (Rom. 10:5; Gal. 3:12; Ez. 20:11). In the last passage we read: "And I gave them my statutes, and shewed them my judgments, *which if a man do, he shall live by them.*"

In view of all that we have here said about the term law, it is now necessary that we point out in which sense we are using the word "law" in our discussion of the relation between law and gospel. Here we will need to follow the Scriptures themselves.

First of all, then, the "law" in Galatians 3:12 refers to the way of life by human obedience instead of being saved by almighty grace. It means to be under the *principle* of law. The term "under law" as used by Paul does not refer to any given commandment, but refers to a trying to be saved by law-works, by merit. It was the erroneous, Pharisaic conception of the covenant whereby a man stood in a contractual relationship to God. The covenant was viewed as a mere legal contract, with mutual stipulations, and not as a testament which came in effect through the death of the testator. Now this use of the law we will also treat. However, in our subject "Law and Gospel," we are interested in the "law" as it is part and parcel of the *fulfilled* righteousness of Jesus Christ on the Cross. How does the law relate to the Gospel in Psalm 19:7 ff. where we sing: O, how love I Thy law? In this phase of the law we are deeply interested. Here too we must be careful lest, even though we say that law has been fulfilled in Christ's death and thus put meritorious law-works out of the front door, we do not, in practice, drag it in the back door by not seeing how the law has become for us in Christ a "new" commandment, calling for a *new* obedience, walking in newness of life (Rom. 6:4). We must not serve in the oldness of the letter but serve in the newness of spirit. We belong to another husband, legally (Rom. 7:6).

B. The term "gospel."

1. It would be a mistaken notion to treat the concept "gospel" as merely a mystery of God revealed in the New Testament Scriptures. It is true that the term "gospel" ( Εὐαγγέλιον ) is not found in the Old Testament. Yet, in a sense, the entire Old Testament itself is "gospel." Any preacher who does not understand this has no right to be a minister of the gospel. For the *prot-evangel* is found very clearly in Genesis 3:15 which, although directed toward the Serpent himself and announcing his complete destruction, announces also the triumph of the Seed of the Woman over the seed of the Serpent. The Church, under Christ, will triumph over the wicked world, the reprobate world which is under Satan and his dominion of darkness.

a. We must cling to the beautiful line drawn for us in

Question 19 of the Heidelberg Catechism. It has four verbs: *revealed*, *preached*, *portrayed*, and *fulfilled*. Revealed by God Himself in paradise, preached by patriarchs and prophets, portrayed by sacrifices and other ceremonies of the law, and finally fulfilled in God's only begotten Son. It is the red line of blood-theology throughout the Old Testament in a sprinkling of *blood*, which all pointed to the Lamb of God Who taketh away the sin of the world.

b. In His beautiful refutation of the unbelieving and disobedient Jews Jesus says: ye do not really believe in Moses. Had you believed Moses and the Scriptures, ye would believe in *Me*, for Moses wrote concerning me ( ΠΕΡΙ ΕΜΟΥ ). Jesus was the great and only subject of the Pentateuch! No one has ever properly preached on these books who did not preach the gospel in Jesus Christ! To those who fail to do so, these Scriptures are a closed book (Isaiah 29:9-12). The man who preaches only law out of the Old Testament can preach only law in the New Testament. He does not see law and gospel!

2. It is of importance to remember that the Old Testament is the embodiment of the gospel in *promisary* form. This is true of Moses, Psalms, and all the Prophets (Luke 24:27, 44, 45). It is because of this promisory nature of the Old Testament gospel that the Son of Man *must* suffer the agonies of the wrath of God at Calvary, and thus enter into His glory to shed His grace and Spirit abroad in the hearts of all the elect, whether Jew or Greek (John 3:14-16).

3. In the New Testament the term for gospel is ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ, which means: good news. For those who desire to refresh their memory on this concept of the gospel we refer them to the pamphlet written by Rev. Herman Hoeksema, on *The Gospel*. In our study of the term "gospel" we find that the term is found some 76 times in the New Testament Scriptures. The verb is ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΖΩ. In the KJV this is translated, "preach the gospel." We find this verb very frequently in the New Testament. We suggest that you confer Young's *Analytical Concordance to the Bible*, page 430. Of interest is the quotation of the Septuagint as found in Luke 4:18. Here Jesus quotes Isaiah 61:1: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me: because the Lord hath anointed me to *preach good tidings* to the meek, etc." It is the good tidings for the "poor," "the meek," "the broken-hearted," "those that mourn in Zion." Such was the predicted preaching of Jesus when He would come to seek and to save that which was lost. And Jesus applies this prophecy to Himself as He preaches in the synagogue in His hometown of Nazareth. Surely the gospel is good news concerning the fulfilled promise in Christ Jesus (Acts 13:32, 33).

4. The gospel in the New Testament is called:

a. Simply *the* gospel. It is quite evident that when it is so

used it is presupposed that this is the only gospel given under heaven, the well-known and accepted gospel in the church in the world. Thus Paul used the word in Philippians 1:5, 7, 12. Surely such must be the implication of the definite article, not only in the light of the rules of grammar, but especially in the light of the strong language of Paul in Galatians 1:6-9 where Paul pronounces the *divine anathema* upon any and all who preach another gospel concerning the fulfillment of the promise than Paul had preached. This is also the clarion note in the preaching of Peter in Acts 4:12, where we read, "For there is none other name given under heaven among men, whereby we must be saved." There is only one gospel.

b. This gospel is called the *gospel of God*. It is a gospel-tiding which could not and did not come up in the heart and mind of man. God Himself first revealed these glad-tidings in Paradise. He is the Alpha and the Omega. He proclaims the end from the beginning (Is. 45:21; Acts 15:17b). Furthermore, this gospel is called the *gospel of Christ*. Christ is the content of the gospel, Jesus Christ and Him crucified (I Cor. 2:2; Gal. 6:14; see further: Mark 1:1; Rom. 1:16; Phil. 1:27; I Thess. 3:2). In the Gospels it is called the *gospel of the Kingdom*. It preaches the coming of the kingdom of heaven in the death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ. It is preached as being "at hand"; the long-awaited kingdom is come. It is glad-tidings concerning the complete restoration of the kingdom and the restoration of all things (see Matt. 4:23; 9:35; 24:14; Mark 1:14).

We may conclude this discussion of the term "gospel" by stating that it is the glad-tidings, the full-orbed tidings of the fulfillment of God's promised mercies in Jesus Christ, when God made Him Lord and Christ over all things (see the beautiful exposition of Peter in Acts 2:14-36). Christ is our great High Priest now; the curse of the law is taken away and the law will now be written in our hearts.

## II. Law and Gospel in the Old Dispensation.

### A. The law-giving at Sinai is a part of the gospel of Christ.

1. It should be quite clear and obvious to any Bible student that the law-giving is for Israel as she is a royal priesthood in Christ Jesus (Ex. 19:5, 6; I Peter 2:5, 9). Israel was not merely represented by the great King-Priest after the order of Melchizedek, but Israel itself is this peculiar people and possession of the Lord.

a. Surely, not all Israel is what is called Israel here at the foot of the Mount of God as became evident when Moses ascended the mount of God for forty days and nights. God will have mercy on whom He has mercy

(Ex. 32:7, 8; 33:12-23). An entire generation of Israel shall never enter into the rest because of their unbelief (Heb. 3:14-19).

b. Still, Israel is the elect people of God, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, called out of the darkness and slavery of Egypt under the blood of the atonement of the passover lamb and the blood on the doorposts. They were baptized into Moses and in the sea; they drank water from the Rock, Christ Jesus; they ate manna, angels' food, which fell from heaven for forty years (I Peter 2:5, 9).

c. And so the law was given to Israel as a people who were cleansed, who were washed (Ex. 19:14, 15; I Cor. 6:11). Typically and principally Israel is viewed here in the desert at Sinai as the people of the promise, a promise made to Abraham and to his Seed after him. They are viewed as being in Christ Jesus, who died with Him that they might also live with Him. Hence, God pronounced His law from heaven as covenant words at Sinai's heights. "I am the LORD thy God, which hath delivered you from the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." What the Lord commands of Israel He commands from His "redeemed" people as a walk of thankfulness. In all of Israel's life in the land they must never forget that they are a redeemed people, that they had been strangers in the land of Egypt (Ex. 22:21; 23:9). They must be thankful for much since they received much from Jehovah.

d. The law is given to a people with whom the LORD deals as with no other people. For, as Moses says in Deuteronomy 7:6 ff., "Thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The LORD did not set his love upon you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people; but because the LORD loved you, and because he would keep his oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath God brought you with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of the bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt. Know therefore that the Lord thy God, He is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his covenant in thousands of generations."

In such a capacity Israel stands before the mount when God speaks the ten covenant words according to which Israel is to walk in relationship to God, to their neighbor, and to all things. This shows that the law-giving at Sinai was part of the gospel of Christ and His atonement and cleansing from sin. The law would never fit with the religion of the heathen and the pagan, but fits with the people of God in the land of Canaan as they are to live about His tabernacle. It fits in the land of Immanuel, the land of Hepzibah and Beulah, the land of



marriage, a land in which God has all His delight, where the marriage of the King's Son is portrayed in the beauty of the perfect Bride. With this the royal law of liberty fits. This was its design as given on Mount Sinai. This mountain proclaimed that another day would come. At Sinai Israel stands in the faith which is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen yet (Is. 62:1-4; Heb. 4:8; 11:1, 2). Hear Israel cry for the better day in Exodus 20:19; Deuteronomy 5:27, 28; 18:15-19!

The law was given to the *redeemed* church!

B. There was the "not yet having arrived" at the heavenly mount in the Old Dispensation.

1. In Mount Sinai we also see the *bondage* of the law: God placed His people "under law." To understand this we must remember that, when we take the law merely as ten "commandments" and sever it from "I am the Lord thy God" and "ye are my people," then it is the letter that kills (II Cor. 3:6b). When the law is merely written upon tables of stone with the finger of God and it is not under the sprinkled blood of the mercy-seat of the Ark of the Covenant, yes, then the law is a mere teacher of sin, terrifying, petrifying, killing. And until Christ came there was no real Mediator to bring us grace and truth, the real blood of sprinkling (John 1:16-18). We could not come to the heavenly mount Zion, the City of the living God, and to the church of the firstborn in heaven, and to the festal array of angels in glory, as long as there was no Mediator Whose blood speaks better things than that of Abel (Heb. 12:22-24). The law was given through Moses, but grace and truth came (ἐγένετο) through Jesus Christ, Who declared to us the Father as the Only Begotten in the bosom of the Father (John 1:17, 18; Gal. 3:19, 20)!

2. This implies that the preaching of the "ten words" was, in the Old Dispensation, connected directly with the presentation of Christ in the promises to the fathers and with the preaching of this promise as this was portrayed in the sacrifices and ceremonies of the law. Any prophet who did not preach the "ten words" in that context was a forerunner of the Pharisees of Jesus' day. Israel in the Old Dispensation had its annual Day of Atonement, the climax of all the feast days (Lev. 16:1-28). Here the priest came, bringing first the sacrifice for his own sins and then for the sins of the people (Heb. 5:1-3); and thus the people were ceremonially clean. Yet, the sins were not taken really away. There was a deliberate remembrance made of sin each year (Heb. 10:3, 4). It all waited for the better sacrifice, better promises fulfilled by Him Who said, "Behold, I come to do Thy will, O God!" (Heb. 10:5-18; Psalm 40:6; Isaiah 1:11).

3. And so all was "not yet" in the Old Testament. All must wait

till the Seed should come. This meant that the preaching of the law was in the Old Testament always within the framework of the promise and the ratified testament to Abraham and to his SEED which is Christ. As the day drew nearer that the Christ should come, the fulfillment of the promises and the preaching of the prophets grow richer concerning the Christ. One has but to peruse casually the chapters 40-66 of Isaiah which were spoken some 700 years before the birth and coming of Christ. In moving beauty we see this Christ portrayed in His suffering, death, resurrection, and glorification in Isaiah 52, 53. Who is not greatly comforted when he reads the words of Jesus' text which He chose in the Synagogue of Nazareth — the words found in Isaiah 61:1-3? Now this was all "not yet" in the days of Isaiah and the prophets. All waited the fulfillment. How the "heart of Jerusalem" was comforted by Isaiah's words and those of Ezekiel! These were days when the gospel could not be heard. Does not Israel cry in Psalm 74:9: "We see not our signs: there is no more any prophet; neither is there among us that knoweth how long"? This cry is pressed from their lips when the temple is destroyed, the feast days are not kept, the sacrifices are not brought, and they do not see the Lamb of God typified before their eyes as crucified. They long to hear the law proclaimed in the light of the promises made to Abraham and to his Seed. They only desire to hear that they are justified not by works of law, by the letter that kills, but that they are justified as was father Abraham, who saw Christ's day and rejoiced (Gen. 15: 4-6; John 8:56-58).

4. Those who deny that there are "gospel-tidings" in the Old Testament Scriptures do not believe the New Testament Scriptures which teach on every page that the Old Testament was a "testament." Also the ten words on Mt. Sinai were really such testamental words which are blood-sprinkled (Ex. 24:4-8). It is clear from Hebrews 9:19 that also the "book" was sprinkled. The Old Testament Scriptures are blood-sprinkled words and are not a mere code of morals and civil conduct.

Law and gospel are so connected in the Old Testament that you cannot have the law without the gospel nor the gospel without the law. Here is the death-blow to all legalistic, nomistic preaching as well as to all antinomistic preaching and living! The ten commandments, rightly considered, are ten precepts of the gospel, which come to us by the mercies of God (Rom. 12:1, 2). Such is our reasonable (logical) worship-service! Yes, such it is in the Old Testament Scriptures as well as in the Old Dispensation of the grace of God. Yes, such it is even when the law is added for the transgressions' sake, and must serve to lead the non-age church to the adulthood of the New Testament (Gal. 4: 1-6).

### III. The Law and the Gospel in the New Dispensation.

A. In a sense we have already touched upon and treated this mystery of the law and gospel in the New Dispensation when we spoke of the law and gospel in the Old Dispensation. This ought to be obvious. What was present in the fundamental lines and fabric of the Old Testament in *promisory form* is now come as a reality.

1. This implies that the use of the Old Testament ceremonies and figures of the law must be abolished among Christians. The truth of these figures as well as their "substance" remain with us in Christ Jesus. This means that Christ by His coming, His suffering and dying, "is commanded and illustrated" in these Old Testament shadows. He is the embodiment and fulfillment of them (*Belgic Confession*, Art. XXV; see also Calvin's *Institutes*, Vol. I, Book II, Chap. VII, paragraph 16. The *Belgic Confession* refers to such Scripture passages as Rom. 10:4; Gal. 5:2-4; 3:1; 4:10, 11; Col. 2:16, 17).

2. This further implies that the basic relationship of the law to the gospel, as directed to the church which is redeemed, is in both the same: in the one in promisory form, in the other as being fulfilled by Christ in every jot and tittle (Matt. 5:17-20). We hold that in Christ the "I am the LORD thy God, who hath delivered you from Egypt, the house of bondage" became a full reality. Grace and truth became to us by Jesus Christ. The law is fulfilled in Christ and in us in Him. That is the truth of the gospel, the glad-tidings of salvation, rich, full, and free. When Jesus speaks of this to His disciples in Matthew 5:17-20, He sets all of His labors as the fulfillment of the law in the proper focus of all the Scriptures. We call attention to the following elements here in this passage in Matthew. We trust the relevancy to our subject will become plain.

?

mt 5:17

a. He speaks here of the reason for his "coming" into the world, the Cosmos. The Aorist tenses here (ἤλθον) refer not simply to Jesus' birth in Bethlehem, but refer to His entire coming, His Messianic labors both in His state of humiliation and in that of His exaltation. Principally it refers to His work of suffering on the Cross (delivered for our offenses) and His resurrection from the dead (raised for our justification, cf. Rom. 4:25; Rom. 10:6-10).

b. Jesus came to fulfill "the law and the prophets." Neither did He come to destroy, to make of none effect. The Old Testament Scriptures in their unity and totality, as they have their "end" in Christ, come into their own in Him. He must not be associated with the Samaritans who only would use the Pentateuch. Christ fulfills Moses, Psalms, and all the prophets. He repeatedly quotes from them all. And all the Scriptures stand united in His Messianic consciousness throughout His suffering and also on the cross.

c. It is noteworthy that Jesus connects this fulfillment of all the Old Testament Scriptures with the spiritual nature of the law of the Decalogue which was promulgated on Sinai. That He came to fulfill all the Scriptures means that He came and fulfilled the *Great Commandment* on which all the law and prophets are briefly summed up. All *depend* on this great commandment as briefly stated in Deuteronomy 6:5 (the Great *Shamah* in Israel) and in Leviticus 19:18. Jesus sets this commandment forth as a righteousness which exceeds the righteousness of the Pharisees and Scribes, who with their kind of legalistic righteousness shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. And He shows very clearly, by showing His interpretation of the second commandment, which is like unto the first, what this righteousness is which is required of us. Thus the gospel of the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness is here set forth. We see the place that the law has in the New Testament in Christ's blood. For this is not merely a law written upon tables of stone, but it is a law written upon the tables of the heart (Matt. 5:17, 18). Every last jot and tittle of the promise of salvation shall then have come to pass; the law shall perfectly be written in our hearts, the law of love to God and to our neighbor in relationship to all things (Jer. 31:33). This is not the covenant made with the fathers but it is God's new covenant. He will remember our sins no more (Heb. 8:8-12)! Yes, He will write His laws in our hearts and minds, and He shall be to us a God and we shall be to Him a people! Thus God's dwelling place shall be with His people; we shall be a temple of God in the Spirit (Eph. 2:22).

This is the great gospel perspective of Matthew 5:17 ff.

Here we see the perfect harmony of law and gospel.

B. The foregoing brings us to the question of the place of the Decalogue in the life of the believing Christian. It is of great importance to observe carefully that the Heidelberg Catechism treats the law as Decalogue in the part of *Thankfulness*, the "third thing" that a believer must know to enjoy the only comfort in life and in death, namely, that we belong to our faithful Savior, Jesus Christ, Who has bought us with His precious blood (Questions 1, 2).

1. We ought not to overlook that the "must" of performing "good works" in the Catechism is the must of true faith by which we have been ingrafted into Christ (Question 64). It is *impossible* that those who are ingrafted into Christ with a true faith should not bring forth fruits of thankfulness (compare John 15:5; Matt. 7:17, 18).

2. That this "must" is the must of true faith is set forth clearly and succinctly in Question 86. This Question is an introductory and anchor question and answer. It is not primarily directed against the error of the Antinomian, but it is equally directed against the error of nomism and all the leaven

of the Pharisees throughout the ages. For this "must" (*sollen* in German) is not the "du solst" merely of the principle of law (being *under* law-principle) but it is a necessity which flows from the fact that we are made a good tree; that a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit. Even though this is often readily assented to, still, in the actual preaching, the "du solst" of the good works of the Christian are often presented as simply a matter of law, and not a gospel-truth in the form of precepts of the gospel, gospel warnings, admonitions and threats.

3. Those who walk in practical works of thankfulness do so *out* of faith, which is *energized* by love (Gal. 5:6). This faith needs a rule. It is the rule of the law which is prefaced with: I am the LORD thy God; I have redeemed you. And so faith does not set aside the law, but it *establishes* the law (Rom. 3:31). And this means that in faith we put off the old man and put on the new man, ingrafted into Christ! And thus by faith God energized us both to will and to do so that we work out our salvation *more and more* in progressive sanctification. But we nevermore are under law; we are ever under grace. Otherwise there is no possibility of giving heed to the perfect law of liberty (Rom. 6:1-23; James 1:25). Those who give heed to this law as the rule for their life of faith which works by love, they stand in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free (Gal. 5:6). Such walk under the easy yoke and light burden of Christ and find rest for their souls in the keeping of God's commandments in thankfulness. These love to hear the law of God read on the Sabbath. The commandments are the ten precepts of the gospel-message of the redemptive walk of faith and sanctification, without which no man shall see God. Law and gospel here are joined in harmony with the blood of the cross. The law for them is the blood-sprinkled book and words of the covenant.

#### IV. The Law and the Gospel in Heaven's Glory.

A. Jesus suggests this eschatological perfection in Matthew 5:17. He speaks of the great catastrophic event of the passing away of heaven and earth. When that event comes to pass then all that was written and foretold in the law and prophets shall have *come to pass*. It will be history. Concerning this Jesus points out the following particulars:

1. There will be a time, a point in God's economy of salvation, when all shall be fulfilled. The Greek term means: to fill up a measure, make it full. The term is used in this sense in Matthew 3:15 and in Ephesians 1:23. It is not the same as to execute the simple carrying out of a command, or what exists in plan and intent. It surely does not mean to teach us how to save ourselves. Nor is it the same as, *to achieve* so as to conquer the difficulties. Rather the term "to fulfill" implies a complete realization of all the possibilities and end

fulfilled =  
fill up

??  
rather  
"confirm"  
"establish"

of the law and the prophets in Christ as the *Head* of the Church. This means that this Church will be the fulness of Christ Who fills all in all with His Spirit and grace. Thus will all the law and the prophets be fulfilled. Christ did not come to take away and abrogate the Scriptures, but truly to fulfill them in all their promisory implications.

2. This means that the law shall be in our hearts perfectly when the great eschatological event of Christ's *Parousia* takes place. This is the teaching of Jesus here and in Hebrews 8:11. When the covenant is fully fulfilled we shall no more have preaching of the gospel nor shall we have the law read to us on the Sabbath. The need of each as a means of grace shall be ended. The law shall then no more come to us in the form of admonitions of the gospel as they are used in all the Epistles of Paul, Peter, and John. All shall then have come to pass. No man shall teach his neighbor, saying "Know the Lord."

3. Paul teaches us that prophecy shall be done away with. We now know in part; we see in a glass darkly; but then shall we see face to face and know God thoroughly even as we are known of God in infinite love and foreknowledge (I Cor. 13:12). Then shall we have the perfection spoken of by Jesus in Matthew 5:48. We shall be perfect even as our Father in heaven is perfect. That is the covenant of God with man, the new covenant which is ours in Christ's blood.

B. Perhaps we may say in the light of Scripture that in the perfection of heaven's glory the law and the gospel will be both fulfilled.

1. The gospel, the glad-tidings concerning the promise, will then not be preached. It is truth. But what was preached concerning the fulfillment of the promise and also the just demands of the law will stand forever. It will be the gospel that has grown and increased by the Spirit in our hearts. All the sunshine and rain needed to bring about the full harvest will then be shown to be of infinite effect. This is according to the prophecy of Isaiah 55:11-55, "So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing wherein I sent it. For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree: and it shall be to the LORD for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off."

2. The law shall then be fulfilled in us. We shall not be under law, but we shall be fully image-bearers of God in true knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. We shall be that true and everlasting chosen generation, that royal priesthood, that holy nation, called out of darkness into God's marvelous light (I Peter 2:9).

and  
eschat  
law  
(?)

As  
fallen  
was "under  
the law."

3. Meanwhile, everyone who has this hope in him of seeing God as He is *purifies* (indicative mood) himself as that One is pure (I John 3:3). The only incentive to walk in godliness is the hope of seeing God. It is the reaching out with uplifted heads for the perfect redemption which is ours now in the firstfruits of the Spirit. We look for the glory which shall be revealed in us.

*The author does not address the civil use of the Law, nor the extent of the O.T. Law that is still in force in the N.T. for both the Church and the state.*