

DOCTRINAL PRINCIPLES USED IN THIS COMMENTARY (Optional Reading).

For those familiar with Reformation doctrine, practice, and history, it may be suffice for them to know that this commentary is religiously conservative, Reformed, Protestant, and adheres to the doctrine of the second stage of the Reformation. The second stage of the Reformation started in the sixteenth century with e.g., sacramental reform, and continued till the mid seventeenth century with such reforms as the removal of the Apocrypha from the covers of Holy Writ, and the Federalist understanding of original sin replacing the Augustinian understanding. However, as a general, though not absolute rule, I have kept doctrinal matters in the areas agreed at the first stage of the Reformation, that is, the Lutheran Reformation, only occasionally finding it necessary to go to the second stage of the Reformation. In particular, I find it necessary to go to the second stage of the Reformation in rejecting Lutheran sacramentalism, specifically, the Lutheran idea that there is a “sacrament” of auricular confession, not instituted in Scripture but later instituted by proper “human” authority in the church (*Augsburg Confession* 1:11,13; 2:4) (even though this view remains in the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession*, in practice Lutherans in general came to progress beyond this notion, and moved to the second stage of the Reformation on this matter by using a General Confession in a church service, thus in general rejecting auricular confession *in practice*, although it is found in some Lutheran Churches), together with the Lutheran ideas of consubstantiation in the Lord’s Supper, and baptismal regeneration.

Those familiar with the issues of the Reformation in the 16th and 17th centuries, may wish to proceed directly from here to Part II of this commentary. Alternatively, they may also wish to refresh their memories on matters of great interest to Protestants.

Broad Reformation Protestantism.

On the one hand, the New Testament teaches warns against “heresy” trial abuse (Matt. 13:27-29), and teaches that in the spirit of unity and love (John 13:34,35; 17:21,23) we should tolerate diversity on a number of matters, for example, diverse racial and cultural manifestations of Christianity such as those between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians (Acts 15 & 21), various food rules, or the keeping of various holy days (Rom. 14; I Cor. 8; Col. 2:16). But on the other hand, the New Testament also teaches that we should condemn heresy and not tolerate diversity on core issues of Christianity (Matt. 18:15-17), for example, the Trinity (I Cor. 8:6; 11:19; 12:3), or the gospel of justification by faith (Rom. 1-7; 16:17; Gal. 1:6-9; 3:11,12; 5:20,21). With respect to such characterizations, I think we should safeguard against “heresy” trial abuse (Matt. 13:27-29; Col. 2:16) by *generally* defining heresies (Matt. 18:15-17; II Peter 2:1; II John 10,11) with reference to broad Biblical truths evident in a cross-section of major confessions, catechisms, and practices of Reformation churches. Thus for the purposes of religious separation from apostasy (Rom.16:17), at the level of what the *Apostles’ Creed* calls “the communion of saints,” that is, *the fellowship of believers* in local spiritual contexts, including inter-denominational relations and fellowship between different Protestant groups; the remembrance of Protestant confessors and martyrs; the purposes of excommunication from, or non-participation in the Lord’s Supper (I Cor. 5:11); or for the purposes of prohibiting religiously mixed marriages between “unequally yoked” Protestant Christian believers and “unbelievers” (I Cor. 7:39; II Cor. 6:14), I do not think that diversity between these standards should be a bar to Christian recognition. That is,

I support a broad Reformation Protestant spirit in such matters. However, I simultaneously think individual Protestant churches must remain free, if they so wish, to impose narrower doctrinal standards than these on ministers and other office bearers inside their own church.

First and Second Stages of the Reformation. The Elizabethan Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1559)* had added to it a new liturgical calendar in 1561, drawn up by a Commission, and this was retained in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* which only included six extra days (although Accession Day is also added on various dates, depending when a monarch accedes)¹. From 1578, the Elizabethan prayer book had its own Notes to the Calendar, and these made reference to a number of specifically Protestant saints. These were (modernizing the spellings): Feb. 16, “The learned cleric, Philip Melancthon,” who “upon this day, was born” in “1497.” 2 July, “John Huss” who “was burnt” at the stake “on this day, at the Council held at Constance for professing the gospel of our Lord Jesus” in “1415.” 27 August, “Religion” “on this day, was Reformed, according to God’s express truth, in the most renowned city of Geneva” in “1535” (Calvin). 11 October, “on this day was the first conflict” in “five towns of Helvetia” (Switzerland) “wherein Zwingli was slain” in “1532.” But *four* days are set aside for Martin Luther. 18 February, “Martin Luther, the servant of God, died upon this day” in “1546.” 22 February, the “body” of “Martin Luther” was “upon this day” “translated to Wittenberg, and buried in the Chapel of the Castle there.” 31 October, “This day, in” “1517,” “Martin Luther gave his proposition in” the “University of Wittenberg, against” the “Pope’s” doctrines of “pardon.” 10 November, “upon this day Martin Luther was born” in “1483².”

In harmony with this Reformation Anglican liturgical calendar of 1578, I consider that my great hero, Martin Luther, was like the Old Testament kings of Judah: Jehoash, Amaziah, Azariah, and Jotham, in that like them he “did that which was right in the sight of the Lord”(II Kgs 12:2; 14:3; 15:3,34). But just as these kings left the idolatrous “high places” standing, so “the people” continued to “sacrifice and” offer “burnt incense” at them” (II Kgs 12:3; 14:3; 15:4,35), until the reforming process was completed by Hezekiah who “removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brasen serpent” that “Israel did burn incense to,” and Josiah who “brake down the houses of the sodomites” “where” there were “hangings for the grove” (II Kgs 18:1,5,6; 22:2,7); so likewise Luther left, for instance, idols of sacramentalism standing with his consubstantiation and baptismal regeneration. As the Puritan theologian, John Flavel (*c.* 1630-1691) records, “I see some things, saith Luther, which blessed Austin saw not; and those that come after me, will see that which I see not.”³ (Though we Reformed Anglicans

¹ The three added black letter days are 27 May, 17 June, and 7 Sept. . The three added days with their own collects, communion readings, proper lessons, and offices (services), were Charles I (30 Jan), Charles II (29 May), and Papists’ Conspiracy day (5 Nov., which though referring to the Gunpowder Treason in 1605, had its office modified from 1689 to include thanksgiving for the coming of William of Orange on that same day, 5 November, in 1688). These latter three, together with their offices, were removed from the prayer book in 1859.

² *The Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth 1559*, With an Historical Introduction by Edward Benham, John Grant, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1909, pp. 194-205, The New Calendar of 1578.

³ Flavel’s Sermon 1 (I Cor. 2:21), The Fountain of Life, in *The Works of John Flavel*, 1820, Banner of Truth Trust, UK, 1968,1982, Vol. 1, p. 36.

would not go as far as such Puritans, we still see the reforming process continuing on after the first stage of the Reformation i.e., the Lutheran Reformation.)

But in my criticisms of Romish baptismal regeneration, the reader should understand that while I also reject the Lutheran (or early Reformation Anglican) doctrine of baptismal regeneration (which I find to be inconsistent with the gospel of justification by faith truly found in the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* or Reformation Anglican *39 Articles*), and Berkhof rightly notes “Luther and his followers did not succeed in purging their Church from the leaven of Rome on this point;” nevertheless, the Lutheran (or early Reformation Anglican) teaching is still not the same as Rome. Hence, Berkhof further notes, “On the whole the Lutherans maintain, in opposition to Rome,” that “man” is “entirely passive in regeneration and incapable of contributing anything to it, though adults can resist it for a long time⁴.” That is, even as consubstantiation is *some* improvement on transubstantiation, so Lutheran (or Reformation Anglican) baptismal regeneration is *some* improvement on Romish baptismal regeneration, even though, like later Reformed Anglicans who *generally* came to repudiate early Reformation Anglican baptismal regeneration, I still reject both.

Thus I see the Protestant Reformation as a multi-staged process. The following are some key issues relevant to understanding the diversity in the major historic Protestant Confessions of the 16th and 17th centuries. The reader should also be aware of divergent 17th century Protestant hagiologies relating to events connected with the civil war of the 1640s and 1650s, with Anglicans in the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland* and most Puritan Presbyterians in the *Church of Scotland* (together with their Anglican and Presbyterian derivatives), though not uncritical of Charles I and Charles II⁵, generally supporting their claims to be lawful kings under God’s law (Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:1-10; I Peter 2:17); and Puritans from England and Ireland (together with their Puritan derivatives) generally supporting Oliver Cromwell. Although some relatively small number of Scottish Puritans were pro-Cromwell, there is thus historically an ethnic divide on these matters between Scottish Presbyterians as opposed to English and Irish Presbyterians.

<i>1st stage of Reformation</i>	<i>2nd stage of Reformation 16th & 17th centuries</i>	<i>Further stage(s) of Reformation (?) 16th, 17th & later centuries (?)</i>
* The Lutheran Reformation	* Abolition of Mary “ever-virgin” notion (generally adopted). * Abolition of the title “our Lady” (generally adopted; but for Anglicans, generally, oral abolition of title, but written form remained in 1662 prayer book, and some	* Ministers should not wear a specific form of clerical dress (?) (adopted in some Protestant churches; but the usage of Romish Mass vestments such as the chasuble; and ostentatious clerical dress e.g., the mitre, rejected by all Protestants).

⁴ Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 477.

⁵ E.g., Reformed or Low Church Evangelical Anglicans are anti-Laud, and Charles I should have disciplined him. Both Charles I and Charles II also erred in marrying Roman Catholic wives, which thing was wisely forbidden monarchs from the time of William III.

	<p>oral usage might be made e.g., for “Lady Day” i.e., 25 March.)</p> <p>* Abolition of voluntary private confession (generally adopted, though not necessarily by all Lutherans in all contexts).</p> <p>* Apocrypha removed from between OT & NT (generally adopted by all but Lutherans though some Anglican usage of Apocrypha in services).</p> <p>* Consubstantiation rejected (all but Lutherans).</p> <p>* Baptismal regeneration rejected (all but Lutherans & some Anglicans).</p> <p>* Sunday recognized not simply as a day of Christian assembly, but as the Sabbath (generally adopted by English speaking Protestants, but generally not adopted by European Continental Protestants).</p> <p>* A Federalist view of original sin replaces an Augustinian view (largely adopted by all but Lutherans, some Anglicans, and some other Protestants).</p>	<p>* Abolition of <i>the sign of the cross</i> (?). Some usage of <i>the sign of the cross</i> retained by both Lutherans and Anglicans, but all Puritans strongly disliked its usage at e.g., Anglican baptisms.</p> <p>* Kneeling to take Communion, or having “kneelers” in a church to kneel down and pray before or after a church service (?) Retained by Anglicans, disliked by Puritans.</p> <p>* Keeping of holy days other than Sunday (Rom. 14:5,6). NT allows liberty on (Col. 2:16), although not for Gentile Christians to keep the Jewish days (Gal. 4:10,11) (?) Lutherans & Anglicans kept different holy days, Puritans generally did not (although some kept e.g., the public celebratory form of Bonfire Day).</p> <p>* Abolition of stained-glass windows and crosses. Some Puritans.</p> <p>* Church government (?). Different models e.g., Presbyterian or Congregational (a denominational splitting / creating issue).</p> <p>* Infant baptism rejected in favour of adult / “believers” baptism (?) (a denominational splitting / creating issue; this split Puritans into Baptists as opposed to Presbyterians & Congregationalists).</p> <p>* Universal infant salvation (?) (largely a Baptist view).</p>
--	---	--

		<p>* Exclusive usage of term “ordinance” for “sacrament,” rather than usage of both “ordinance” and “sacrament” (?) (largely a Baptist view).</p>
--	--	---

The first stage of the Protestant Reformation was the Lutheran Reformation. The second stage of the Protestant Reformation consisted of a number of further doctrinal reforms in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Reformed Anglicans (whose views are continued in modern times with traditionalist Low Church Evangelical Anglicans,) proceeded to the second stage of the Reformation; whereas Puritans (Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists,) in varying degrees, sought further “third stage” reforms. Thus whether or not there is then a third stage (or later stages) of the Reformation, is itself an issue of disagreement between orthodox Protestants in an Anglican-Puritan divide (with Lutherans more like Anglicans); and it is also clear that Protestant denominational diversity in sixteenth and seventeenth confessions of faith is related to such issues about the extent of valid reform beyond the Lutheran Reformation. Some Protestants chose to accept second stage reforms in part or in full, but others did not.

Reforms relevant to the first and second stages of the Reformation included: 1) Marian Reform; 2) Abolition of voluntary auricular confession to a Minister; 3) Sacramental Reform; 4) Divorce Reform; 5) Sabbatarian Reform; 6) Federalist Reform; and 7) Apocrypha Reform.

1) *Marian Reform.* The first stage of the Reformation removed the broad teachings of Mariolatry from the holy Protestant Churches. But coming from the darkness of Romanism, there was still a lingering tendency to be over-focused on Mary, which thing Jesus repeatedly rejects in the Gospels (Luke 8:19-21; 11:27,28). Sixteenth and seventeenth century Protestants either believed in, or were tolerant towards belief in, the teaching of an “ever-virgin Mary.” Though the institutionalized Lutheran Church did not progress beyond the first stage of the Reformation in her confessions, *in practice* the notion of an “ever-virgin Mary” which had always been allowed as an option by Lutherans, appears to have disappeared in favour of the other option always allowed Lutherans, namely, that the virgin Mary consummated her marriage with Joseph after Christ’s birth. In the Anglican Church, this issue was complicated by the fact that *some* Anglicans continued to regard the so called 5th and 6th general councils as “ecumenical,” and the so called fifth general council taught the doctrine of an “ever-virgin Mary⁶.” (Although all Reformed Anglicans regarded the Trinitarian clarifications of the 5th and 6th General Councils with favour, per Article 21 of the 39 Articles.) Among some Reformed Churches, this matter was also complicated by the fact that the *Second Helvetic Confession (1566)* also taught the notion of an “ever-virgin Mary” (11:4)⁷. (This confession was used by the Scottish Reformed Churches, and by

⁶ Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 92,305,335. Such Anglicans presumably read down the idea of “inspiration” in the 6th council (680-1) to equate the type of usage of “inspiration” found in the opening Collect of the *Book of Common Prayer’s* Communion Service.

⁷ Schaff, P., *Creeds of Christendom*, Harper, 1877, reprint Baker, Michigan, 1969, p. 255, Latin, “*Maria semper virgine.*”

Continental European Reformed Churches such as those in Hungary, Poland, Czech, Switzerland, France, and Holland.) But in time, Protestants generally came to the second stage of the Reformation on this matter. (Since the notion of an “ever-virgin Mary” is only held by *some* Augustinians, this is further discussed below under the associated issue of the Federalist Reform.)

The Lutheran Reformation had abolished usage of the Marian title, “our Lady,” and all other Protestants except Anglicans immediately accepted this. For example, in the strong anti-Mariolatry Homily 2, Book 2, Article 35, of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* of 1562, Mary is still called “our Lady⁸.” Or in Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs* the Bishop of London and Marian martyr, Hugh Latimer, in the year of his martyrdom, 1555, refers to Mary as “our Lady” (and he is non-committal on whether or not Mary had an immaculate conception from her father “Joachim” in the womb of her mother “Anne” followed by a sinless life, or a normal conception followed by a sinful life; but in either instance, he says “she was delivered from sin by Christ”). He also says that the *Ave Maria* or “Hail” “Mary” (Luke 1:28,30) “was not” a “prayer,” but a “greeting or saluting of our blessed lady” by “Gabriel⁹.” Indeed like Latimer, Anglicans sometimes used “our Lady” in connection with the tradition of calling Annunciation Day (25 March) “Lady Day,” and in the *Lessons Proper for Holy-Days at Mattins (Matins)* and *Evensong* in the *Books of Common Prayer* of 1559 (and also the new calendar of 1561 later attached to this prayer book), or 1662, this feast is called “Annunciation of our Lady.”

Indeed, I well remember how some year ago I attended a Sunday service at St. John’s *Church of England (Continuing)* South Wimbledon in London, in which the preacher, was the Reverend Dr. Edgar Dowse (d. 2009, aged 99). He was a retired Low Church Evangelical *Church of England* clergyman, who like myself, was an old earth creationist (in his instance, unlike myself, Day-Age School). He attracted some notoriety when at the age of 93, he became the oldest person in the world to graduate with a Doctorate of Philosophy (Ph.D.), which he gained from the *London School of Theology* in Northwood, Middlesex (affiliated with Brunel University at Uxbridge in west London)¹⁰. Afterwards, I had lunch with him and two *Church of England (Continuing)* Ministers (Andrew Price and Peter Ratcliffe). One of the matters we spoke about were the words on the 1662 Calendar “Annunciation of our Lady,” and he defended this usage on the basis of the designation, “Lady Day” for Annunciation Day.

In this context, it should also be observed that until the mid 18th century the English generally used an Annunciation Day Calendar in which 25 March was regarded as New Year’s Day. Although increasingly for about 50 years before largely moving to a 1 January Calendar in the mid 18th century, the years were often written for both calendars e.g., 17½ would mean 1711 on an Annunciation Day Calendar, or 1712 on a 1 January Day Calendar; or “St. Valentine’s Day, 17¾” would mean 14 Feb. 1713 on an Annunciation Day Calendar, or 14 Feb. 1714 on a 1 January Day Calendar. But some usage of the Annunciation Day Calendar remains since the mid 18th century. For example, the Decree of Phocas

⁸ Griffiths, J. (Editor), *op. cit.*, pp. 225,234.

⁹ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, p. 447-8.

¹⁰ Courts, K., “Former Vicar becomes world’s oldest Ph.D. graduate,” *The Guardian*, 27 Feb. 2004 (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2004feb/27/highereducation.uk3>); “Ex-vicar, 93, breaks Ph.D. record” BBC News, 27 Feb. 2004 (http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/london/3491394).

establishing the Bishop of Rome as “universal” bishop, has historically been dated by some on an Annunciation Day Calendar to 606, and by others on a 1 January Calendar to 607. Thus e.g., the Reverend Mr. John Brown of Haddington in Scotland, a Presbyterian Minister, in Brown’s *Study Bible* of 1778 (also called *The Self-Interpreting Bible*,) we find the year “606” is always used (e.g., at Rev. 12). And in contemporary times, we find the Strict Baptist, Ian Sadler, refers to how in “606 AD ... the Eastern Emperor in Constantinople,” “Phocas decreed that the Bishop of Rome was the ‘universal Bishop’ ... over the whole Church.” But Sadler is here citing as his source, Hislop, and given Hislop’s virulent anti-Anglicanism, I strongly suspect that both are unaware of the fact that they are basing their date on sources that use an Anglican Annunciation Day Calendar¹¹.

The Reformation Anglican concept of a major Saint’s Day (for which a Collect and Communion readings were provided), was of one who left an *example* to follow in faith and morals, evident in the various Saint’s days collects. For example, in the Collects, reference is made to John the Baptist’s “example” to “constantly speak the truth” (St. John Baptist’s Day, 24 June), or God is asked for “grace to follow thy blessed Saints in all virtuous and godly living” (All Saints’ Day, 1 November). Or in discussing Luke 2:41-44, Homily 1, Book 2, of the *Thirty-Nine Articles* refers to “the example of Joseph, the blessed Virgin Mary,” “and of our Saviour Christ,” “whose examples are worthy for us to follow.” Thus Mary is referred to by Reformation Anglicans as “our Lady” in the sense that she is “our” *example* “Lady,” being virtuous in that she was: a virgin before she was married (Luke 1:27,34,35); submitted to “God” with whom she had “found favour” (Luke 1:30), and of whose will she said, “be it unto me according to thy word” (Luke 1:38), obedient to the lawful authority of government (Luke 2:1-5); a good spouse to Joseph; and generally a good parent to Jesus. Thus from this paradigm’s usage of the Marian title, “our Lady,” Christians should seek to emulate “our” example “Lady,” Mary, in godliness of life. The full form of Latimer’s edited dissertation on Mary the mother of Jesus in Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*, is found in *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*. Here Latimer rejects the idea that “our Lady” is “our friend and patroness,” saying if we think this “then we care not for God.” Rather, he sees Mary as an example, saying, “No doubt our Lady was, through the goodness of God, a good and gracious creature,” “with singular gifts and graces from above, which, through the help of God, she used to God’s pleasure, according to her duty; *so giving us ensample* [an example] *to do likewise*¹².” Or Homily 21, Book 2, Article 35, of the *Thirty-Nine Articles* refers to “the excellent example of the blessed Virgin Mary” who is described as a “most virtuous lady.”

On the one hand, I consider this Reformation Anglican usage of the Marian title “our Lady” is a substantial improvement on the Romish usage of the title (which was adopted by Eastern Orthodoxy). It is to some extent further qualified by the fact that a crowned queen is called in the Book of Common Prayer, “our most gracious sovereign lady” (Matins & Evensong), and so “our Lady” is not an entirely unique title for Mary. Qualified as it is in this Reformed Anglican tradition, I can accept that a man who is inside the boundaries of broad Protestant orthodoxy might still use the title, “our Lady” for Mary, although I have only ever come across one Reformed Anglican Minister, Edgar Dowse, *supra*, so prepared to defend the usage of this title. He connected it with references to the Feast of Annunciation

¹¹ Sadler, I.A., *Mystery, Babylon the Great*, Cromwell Press, Wiltshire, U.K., 1999, p. 102; citing Hislop’s *The Two Babylons*, p. 255.

¹² Pratt, J. (Editor), *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, Vol. 7, A.D. 1555 “Articles,” pp. 467-8 (emphasis mine).

as “Lady Day.” But on the other hand, (like the “Mary ever-virgin” teaching, or Latimer’s non-committal position on whether or not Mary had an immaculate conception,) I think this is a hazardous position to hold to, and it can too easily end up in a situation where one puts *too great a focus* on Mary.

Though Reformed Anglicans may be able to hold in balance the twin Biblical teachings of looking to saintly examples (Philp. 3:17; I Thess. 1:7; II Thess. 3:9), while not putting an over focus on Mary (Matt. 12:46-50); I still think the potential dangers of this title are such, that it is best to allow it to fall into a general oral disuse, even if it remains in print for “Annunciation of our Lady” in the “Lessons Proper for Holy-Days” in the Book of Common Prayer, and receives some minimal oral use in the reading of the Homilies (which if publicly read nowadays, may be altered to “Mary” or “St. Mary”). Reformed Anglicans hastened slowly to the second stage of the Reformation on this matter, but in general, eventually they *wisely* abolished the general oral usage of “our Lady” for Mary. But in a retrograde step, this Marian title was greatly revived by Puseyite Anglicans from the nineteenth century, who then additionally gave it the very different Romish meaning, as they ran backwards through the doors of the second and then the first stages of the Reformation into the darkness of semi-Romanism, slamming these doors of greater Biblical truth and wisdom shut behind them.

2) *Abolition of voluntary auricular confession to a Minister.* In his *Babylonian Captivity* (1520), Luther argued for “three” “sacraments,” namely, baptism, communion, and confession (penance). However he qualified the Romish sacramental teaching with its “three parts: contrition, confession, and satisfaction.” He rejected the Romish teaching that regarded “contrition” as a good work of “merit.” He rejected the Romish claim that the core element “secret confession” to a Minister was ordained by God in Scripture, arguing rather, that though private auricular “confession of sins” in the “sacrament” of “penance” is “not” specifically “commended in Scripture,” that is, it is not of Divine origin but human origin, he “nevertheless” thought it to be “highly useful and necessary,” and so ought to be retained. He further repudiated the Romish “doctrine of satisfaction,” which he said had become “so perverted that people do not realize that satisfaction is simply amendment of life, not” some penance of good works like “pilgrimages, flagellations, mortifications,” and so on. Concerning his designation of confession as a “sacrament,” Luther said that the term “sacraments” might include other things such as “prayer, the Word, and the cross, whereas strictly the term is used of promises with signs annexed and in this sense there are really but two, baptism and the bread.” By contrast, the “sacrament of penance lacks the visible and divinely instituted sign, and” “is only a return to baptism.” Hence he qualified the usage of “sacrament” for his third “sacrament” of confession by saying that when he referred to the “sacrament of penance,” he was using the term “sacrament” differently to when he referred to the “sacraments” of baptism and communion. Thus Luther considered that in the narrow sense of the word “sacrament” there are “two,” baptism and communion, but in the broad sense of the word “sacrament” there are three, with confession being the third “sacrament.”

The Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* (1530) likewise discusses: baptism (Article 1:9), communion (Article 1:10), and confession (Article 1:11) as “sacraments” (Article 1:13). But it rejects Romish notions of righteousness by works for these “sacraments,” declaring that Lutherans “condemn those that teach that the sacraments do justify by the work done” (Latin, “*ex opere operato*” i.e., the Romish view), “and do not teach that faith which believes the remission of sins is requisite in the use of the sacraments” (Article 1:13). They also abolished the need to enumerate all offenses, for “Who can understand his errors?” (Ps.

19:12), and made the usage of private auricular confession to a Minister *voluntary* (Article 1:11). Like Luther, the *Augsburg Confession* does not claim auricular confession is ordained or commanded in Scripture, but says, “Confession is of human right only” (Article 2:4)¹³. In time, the *optional* and *voluntary* elements of Lutheran auricular confession meant that it could be left behind as in general as most Lutherans progressed to the second stage of the Reformation in which auricular confession was generally abolished *in practice*, being replaced with simply the general confession in church services together with an individual’s private confession of sins to God.

Reformed Anglicans went through a three step process in proceeding to the second stage of the Reformation and generally abolishing voluntary auricular confession to a Minister. The first step of this process consisted in Reformation Anglicanism basically adopting Lutheran private voluntary confession (“commonly called” “penance,” Art. 25, 39 *Articles*), but unlike Lutherans, not regarding it as a “sacrament.” This meant ridding it of those Romanist elements connected with a doctrine of justification by works, and making it purely voluntary. The *First Exhortation* in the *Communion Service* from the *Book of Common Prayer, 1662* (though changing location in the Edwardian Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559, and Caroline Prayer Book of 1662,) is found in an earlier form in the 1549 Prayer Book. But the 1549 form states if a man’s “conscience is troubled” then for “the quietness of” his “own conscience” before Communion, if he requires further “comfort or counsel” about God’s forgiveness of his sins, he should “confess and open his sin and grief secretly” to that or another Minister to “receive comfort and absolution” after “auricular and secret confession to the priest.” But the voluntary nature of this is stressed with tolerance urged to both those using “auricular and secret confession to the priest,” and those who are “satisfied with a general confession” in the main Church Service. The fact that this is for “a man” who “cannot quiet his own conscience,” means that like the Lutheran form it is both for specific sins and voluntary. At the *Visitation of the Sick Service* (1549) provision is also made allowing “the sick person” to “make a special confession, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession, the priest shall absolve him after” the “form” provided (which is the Absolution found in the old *Sarum Manuel*), and the rubric also states “the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions,” that is, those referred to in the Exhortation at the Communion Service.

The second step of this Anglican process of abolishing voluntary auricular confession consisted in strictly limiting the use of auricular confession to use with a sick person. In the first instance, this *Exhortation* was changed in the Communion Service in the 1552, 1559, and 1662 Prayer Books. While I think there are evangelistic and pastoral contexts where a Gospel Minister may discuss a person’s sins with him, I do not think that this should ever takes the form of auricular confession and absolution, in which the sins are confessed to the Minister who then “absolves the penitent.” Rather, I consider that at the end of such a context, the individual, if repentant, privately confesses his sins in prayer to God, and seeks pardon from God through the blood of Christ (I John 1:7,9; 2:1,2). This is the type of thing referred to in the revised *Exhortation* found in the Anglican *Books of Common Prayer* (1552, 1559, & 1662) “When the Minister giveth warning for the celebration of the holy Communion” (1662). He addresses the congregation and says, “if there be any of you” who

¹³ Bainton, R.H., *The Age of the Reformation*, D. Van Nostrand, New Jersey, USA, 1956, p. 106,109-111; Schaff, P., *Creeeds of Christendom*, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-15,41; Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 655.

“cannot quiet his own conscience” before he “come to holy Communion,” “but requireth further comfort or counsel,” then “let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God’s Word, and open his grief;” in order “that by the ministry of God’s Word, he may receive comfort and the benefit of absolution” as well as “ghostly counsel, advise, and comfort, as his conscience may be relieved” (1552 & 1559) or “that by the ministry of God’s holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience” (1662) (*The Communion Service, Books of Common Prayer, 1552, 1559, & 1662*). Here “the benefit of absolution” is obtained “by the ministry of God’s Word” (1552 & 1559) or “God’s holy Word” (1662), that is, the Minister goes over Scriptures dealing with God’s forgiveness of repentant sinners in conjunction with other “ghostly” or spiritual “counsel.” The matter is then left to the man to later confess his sin in private prayer to God, and to take comfort in these Scriptures dealing with forgiveness that have been brought to his attention by the Minister in pastoral counselling. That is, the Minister does not actually listen to an auricular confession followed by an absolution (as in the 1549 Prayer Book). This is also highlighted by the fact that at the *Visitation of the Sick Service* (1552 & 1559), there is a complete removal of the 1549 rubric stating “the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions,” since private auricular confessions were strictly limited to the sick from 1552.

Nevertheless, this second step in the Anglican process of abolishing voluntary auricular confession to a Minister, still allowed it in one situation, namely, as the “special confession” of a sick person. The *Visitation of the Sick Service* of 1549 was largely retained in 1552, 1559, and 1662 (though the 1552, 1559, and 1662 Prayer Books abolished the revised and non-sacramental form of voluntary anointing of the sick found in the 1549 Prayer Book). Though strictly limiting its use to a sick person from 1552, Reformation Anglicanism retained the basic Lutheran idea of voluntary auricular confession to a Minister when a “sick person” wanted to “make a special confession,” “if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him” (1552, 1559, & 1662), with the same Absolution found in the 1549 Prayer Book. In the 1552 Prayer Book, the sick person therefore had three options, *Option 1*: not “to make a special confession of his sins.” *Option 2*: “to make a special confession of his sins” in private prayer to God, after which the Minister absolves him, i.e., this is like the silent confession of sins before the “General Confession” followed by the “Absolution” pronounced by the Minister at Morning and Evening Prayer or The Communion Service in the *Book of Common Prayer*. *Option 3*: “to make a special confession” of his sins in voluntary auricular confession to the Minister.

Because the rubric refers to “a special confession of sins” but *does not specify* “to God” or “to the priest,” this allowed, but did not require, movement by the clergy and people to the second stage of the Reformation. Thus if a Minister did not believe in auricular confession, he could even direct the use of *Option 2*, saying to the sick man something like, “Make your confession in silent prayer to God, and then say ‘Amen’ audibly,” at which point he would absolve him; or he could say something like, “Make your confession in silent prayer to God, and then say audibly the General Confession at The Communion Service changing ‘we’ to ‘I,’” at which point he would absolve him. But it was also true that a sick man could here make an auricular confession to the priest after which the priest would absolve him.

Berkhof says the “Church of Rome” “seeks the Scriptural ground for penance in Jas. 5:16,” “Confess your faults” (AV) or “trespasses” (NKJV) “one to another, and pray one for

another, that ye may be healed” (AV). For example, the Anglican Canon Blakeney (1820-1884), a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, quotes the Roman Catholic *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine* (a nineteenth century Irish catechism published in Dublin, that he says was “much used among Romanists” at the time,) which says, “the [Roman] Catholic doctrine and practice of confession” “is prescribed in the New Testament (James 5:16), - ‘Confess therefore your sins, one to another;’ that is, to the priests or elders of the church whom the Apostles ordered to be called for (v. 14).¹⁴” In the first place, I note that the picture in James 5:16 is of people confessing their “sins one to another,” not a picture of people confessing their sins in auricular confession to a Minister. This is doubly significant since contextually such “elders of the church” are present (James 5:14), but they are not availed upon for this purpose. Furthermore, if one is going to claim “Confess” “your sins, one to another” is limited to the Minister, then logically the rest of the verse put in the same words, “and pray one for another” must also be limited to the Minister. But this is so absurd that no-one claims Christians ought not to pray for the sick, but leave such prayer to the Minister. In the second place, I note that we must *rightly divide the Word of God* (II Tim. 2:15), and that one should not expound one place of Scripture in a way that makes it be repugnant to another (Matt. 4:5-7). Since the Scriptures teach elsewhere that we should confess our sins to God (I John 1:7,9,10; 2:1,2), James 5:16 cannot mean auricular confession to a Minister. The Scriptures teach that we should seek reconciliation with Christian brethren if one sins against the other (Matt. 5:23,24), and if a Christian brother asks our forgiveness for some sin he has committed against us, we should, for our part, forgive him (Matt. 18:23-35). Hence we pray in the *Lord’s Prayer*, “forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors” (Matt. 6:12). Therefore this is surely what James 5:16 is referring to. Of course, in conjunction with such reconciliation among brethren, one must then seek God’s forgiveness for the sin in private prayer (Matt. 5:24).

That the Church of Rome would use James 5:13-16 to justify auricular confession is not surprising given her frequent cursory usage of Scripture, and her reading of it through the filter of Romish Tradition. But Reformation Anglicans hastened slowly out of this type of thinking. While the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, and 1559 did not specifically state that James 5:13-16 was being used to justify the option of voluntary auricular confession (1549), or voluntary auricular confession of a sick person (1552 & 1559), the *unqualified* contextualization of voluntary auricular confession in the *Books of Common Prayer’s* Visitation of the Sick Service (1549, 1552, & 1559) *allowed, though did not require*, this view. (The *qualification* made in the third step meant that no alteration was regarded as necessary in the 1662 Prayer Book). This means that unlike Luther who considered auricular confession was “not” specifically “commended in Scripture,” but might “nevertheless” be “highly useful and necessary” and so ought to be retained; in 1549, 1552, and 1559 Reformation Anglicans allowed *either* the view that James 5:16 refers to auricular confession (Roman Church view), or the view that James 5:16 does not refer to auricular confession (Lutheran Church view).

The third step of this Anglican process in proceeding to the second stage of the Reformation and abolishing voluntary auricular confession to a Minister consisted in definitively striking down the view that James 5:16 refers to auricular confession, and removing *Option 3* from the “special confession” in the *Visitation of the Sick Service* (1552 & 1559). This was done in 1562, through the Homilies referred to in Article 35 of the Anglican

¹⁴ Blakeney R.P., Canon of York [1882-4], *Manuel of Romish Controversy*, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK [1883 +/- 1 year], pp. 83-4; Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 620.

Thirty-Nine Articles. In Homily 19, Book 2, “Of Repentance,” the auricular confession view of James 5:16 is rejected, and those who consider James 5:16 refers to “auricular confession” are said to be “the adversaries” who “go about to wrest” or twist this Scripture. For those maintaining this view are said to have “greatly deceived themselves, and” to “shamefully deceive others.” For “What need we” “to tell forth our sins into the ear of the priest,” since “they be already taken away?” And so “Ambrose” (c. 337-397) “in his second sermon upon the hundred and nineteenth psalm” “doth understand that, *both the priesthood and the law being changed* (Heb. 7), we ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliverance from our sins but our Saviour Jesus Christ.” The fact that this Homily then first says, “It is most evident and plain that this auricular confession hath not” the “warrant of God’s Word,” and then gives a clear injunction to “use that kind of confession that God doth command in his Word,” means that auricular confession was abolished and so *Option 3* in the *Visitation of the Sick Service* (1559) was not to be used. But this Homily retained the usage of pastoral counselling, so that a person “troubled in conscience” could “receive at” a Minister’s “hand the comfortable salve of God’s Word” as Bible verses on sin, repentance, and the assurance of God’s forgiveness were read to him, and so the Exhortation of the 1559 Prayer Book was (with minor changes) retained in the later 1662 Prayer Book.

The nineteenth century *Church of England Canon of York* (1882-4), Richard Blakeney, is a good example of Anglicans who, *for some three hundred years*, had completed this three step process and had completely abolished auricular confession to a Minister. (Although for a period in the 17th century, the semi-Romanist Laudians illegally reintroduced some level of voluntary auricular confession on a Lutheran type model.) Canon Blakeney declared, “We are opposed to auricular confession,” “because it is an infringement upon the prerogatives of God,” since “we should confess our sins to God” “Psalm 51:1; 32:5; 130:4; Dan. 9:3-9”. He also opposed “the power which it gives to the priesthood,” and considered “it is immoral in its character and results” as “the priest hears a recital of sins, and asks question of a corrupting character.” Similar statements can be found in the Anglican *Thirty-Five Articles* (1875) of the *Reformed Episcopal Church* in America, which in 1873 had withdrawn as a group of Evangelical Anglicans from the *Protestant Episcopal Church* in America, on the basis of its Puseyism. Article 35 of these says, “Private confession of sins to a priest commonly known as auricular confession, has no foundation in the Word of God, and is a human invention. It makes the professed penitent a slave to mere human authority,” “and opens the way to many immoralities.” Rather, “in any and every case confession is” “to be made to God.” “Priestly absolution is a” “usurpation of the sole prerogative of God¹⁵.” The Protestant confessions of the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists, outrightly adopted the second stage of the Reformation on this matter, at no time ever having auricular confession to a Minister.

Contrary to these advances to the second stage of the Reformation with the abolition of auricular confession by Anglicans in a three step process from 1549 to 1562, auricular confession was revived in the nineteenth century by the inroads of the retrograde Puseyites. This was accomplished by a triple Puseyite deception. In the first place, they ignored the words of Homily 19, Book 2, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, and thus would not give heed to the third step which completely abolished auricular confession in 1562.

¹⁵ Blakeney’s *Manuel of Romish Controversy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 85,87,89; Schaff, P., *op. cit.*, pp. 825-6.

Then they stopped up their ears to the plain meaning of the Exhortation at the Communion Service (1662, basically retained from 1552), as they misread the statement that “the benefit of absolution” is obtained “by the ministry of God’s holy Word,” and perverted it to mean “by the ministry of” *the Minister absolving a penitent after auricular confession*, thus refusing to listen to the second step which limited auricular confession to the sick in 1552. Then they closed their eyes to the fact that from 1552, there is a complete removal of the 1549 rubric in the *Visitation of the Sick Service* stating, “the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions,” since private auricular confessions *were strictly limited to the sick* from 1552. Hence the spiritually ignorant, deaf, and blind Puseyites (so called “Anglo-Catholics” or “High Church”) and semi-Puseyites (so called “Broadchurchmen”), had to decontextualize the Absolution in the *Visitation of the Sick Service* (1662), in order to dishonestly find a form of Absolution to use in such contexts, since the *Books of Common Prayer* (1552, 1559, & 1662) made *no provision* for a general usage of voluntary auricular confession to a Minister. Thus “it happened unto” those in Puseyism and the Broadchurch “according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire” (II Peter 2:22).

3) *The Sacramental Reform.* Both Lutherans and Anglicans rejected the Romish idea of *the sacrifice of the mass*, in which it is said that the mass is a sacrifice by a *priest* on an *altar* to God. Lutherans broke the priest-altar linguistic nexus by calling their clergymen *pastors*, while retaining reference to the Communion Table as an “altar” (on which is brought the *offering* of bread and wine to be later used in communion, and possibly as in the Anglican tradition, the money *offertory* is placed on the Communion Table cf. I Cor. 9:13,14). Anglicans broke the priest-altar linguistic nexus by calling the Communion Table a “table,” while either calling their clergymen *ministers* or retaining reference to them as *priests* (cf. Rom. 15:16)¹⁶. In practice, Reformed Anglicans generally came to limit the usage of “priest” to relatively rare, and mainly written contexts, connected to ordination, and referred to their clergymen as “Ministers” (until the usage of “priest” was greatly increased by Puseyites from the nineteenth century on). Other Protestants broke the priest-altar linguistic nexus by calling the Communion Table a “table,” and calling their clergymen *pastors* or *ministers* or *elders*. However some Protestants continue the usage of “altar” in a *different* context with reference to a *metaphoric* prayer-altar at a *place of prayer*. Hence they make reference to, for example, an “altar call” in an evangelistic campaign, when in some Protestant traditions a person comes to the front and *prays to God* at a metaphoric prayer-altar. Or they refer to getting “married at the altar,” since the couple stand in a church before God and at a metaphoric prayer-altar make their vows before God, whose blessing they pray for. Or they refer to the “family altar,” as the place where families meet for prayer in their homes at a metaphoric prayer-altar (cf. Rev. 8:3,4).

At the time of the Reformation both Lutheranism and Anglicanism considered that in the narrow sense of the word “sacrament,” there are two sacraments, baptism and communion; but in the broad sense of the word “sacrament” there are three. However they disagreed with each other as to what this third “sacrament” was. For Lutherans it was confession, but for Anglicans it was marriage. Other Protestants, and in general later Reformed Anglicans, made no such distinction between a narrow and broad meaning of “sacrament,” and limited the term “sacrament” or “ordinance” to those which both Lutherans

¹⁶ The semi-Romanist Archbishop Laud and his Laudian circle sought to reintroduce this nexus by suing the term “altar” in the Canons of 1640; but lacking the consent of Parliament for such a change, these canons were rightly declared to be illegal.

and Reformation Anglicans considered were designated by the narrow sense of the word “sacrament,” namely, Baptism and Communion. Thus contrary to the claims of the *Council of Trent* that there were “seven sacraments,” and that these were all instituted by Christ in the Gospels, all Protestants agreed with the words of Article 25 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, “There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord,” “for” “they” only “have” a “visible sign” “ordained of God;” that is, bread and wine for Communion, and water for Baptism¹⁷. Early Reformers such as Cranmer and Zwingli understood Baptism and the Lord’s Supper purely as symbols, and over time all Protestants other than the Lutheran Church recognized the need to jettison Luther’s consubstantiation; and likewise baptismal regeneration was generally repudiated by later Anglicans and other Protestants.

4) *Divorce Reform*. If the Romish claim of marital indissolubility, and its natural corollary of refusing to remarry divorcees were correct, then God could never have divorced the Jews (Isa. 50:1) and then made the Christian Church his wife (Eph. 5:31,32). Recognition of marital dissolubility with remarriage of Biblical divorcees is an element of Reformation Protestantism¹⁸. There are three broad divorce schools, found in Protestant Divorce Codes from the time of the first and second stages of the Reformation in the 16th and 17th centuries, the Basilian-Cozensian School, Justinian-Cranmerian School, and Basilian-Bezan School.

All orthodox Protestants historically agree that Christian divorce law is regulated by Matt. 5:32; 19:9. My own views are broadly the same as those of e.g., Thomas Cranmer, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury (i.e., divorce for a series of weighty causes, Cranmer’s *Reformed Laws*). I consider any divorce cause must be for a weighty cause in which marital “hate” (Deut. 24:3) occasions “uncleanness” (Deut. 24:1) in the form of active or passive adultery (Matt. 5:32; 19:9).

The Basilian-Cozensian School is the Anglican view of divorce for adultery (husband’s petition) or adultery with aggravated enormity (wife’s petition), which found a precedent for such thinking in the writings of Basil the Great (Bishop c. 329-379), who allowed divorce for adultery on a husband’s petition, and divorce for adultery with aggravated enormity in the form of adultery coupled with desertion on a wife’s petition¹⁹. Relevant to this school, one finds in the *Duke of Norfolk’s case* (1700), Bishop Cozens’ celebrated argument from Scripture, the Church Fathers, and Protestant theologians, that adultery dissolves a marriage, and justifies remarriage for the innocent party²⁰. In the 1760s, Blackstone refers to “divorces for adultery” “granted by Act of Parliament.” He says that on the basis of “the divine law” found in “Matt. 19:9,” “a man may put away his wife and marry

¹⁷ My views here are the same as those of Broughton Knox (formerly Principal of Moore Theological College,) i.e., Cranmer was a symbolist, though some dispute this.

¹⁸ See my letter, “The Myth of the Anglican Indissolutist View,” *English Churchman*, 29 Nov. & 6 Dec. 2002, p. 2.

¹⁹ Letter 188 (to Amphilochius), *The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1956,1976, Vol. 8, 1968, p. 227.

²⁰ *First Report of the Commissioners into the Law of Divorce*, 1850, London, 1853; Reprint: *British Parliamentary Papers*, Marriage and Divorce, Vol. 1, Irish Univ. Press, Shannon, Republic of Ireland, 1969, pp. 5-6 fn. 4, referring to 13 State Trials, 1332, & c. .

another” for “adultery” (1 Bl. Com. 441²¹). However, to this it must be added that ecclesiastical custom chose to regard simple adultery to be an insufficient cause for divorce on a wife’s petition²², and required adultery with aggravated enormity (wife’s petition).

On this view, “fornication” in Matt. 5:32; 19:9 means an *active* sexual act with man or beast outside of the marriage. It is read subject to the statement on “a writing of divorcement” (Matt. 5:31) in Deut. 24:1-4, to equate “uncleanness” with “hate.” It is considered that for “fornication” to be present in the divorce sense, both elements must be present. It is considered that whenever a woman commits adultery, i.e., “simple adultery,” both elements of “uncleanness” and “hate” are present, and so the man may divorce her. Some consider that both elements are not necessarily present if the husband commits adultery, i.e., “simple adultery,” and such persons look for adultery with aggravated enormity on a wife’s petition. I.e., “hate” being required with something like adultery (“uncleanness”) coupled with desertion (“hate”), or cruelty (“hate”); or a form of adultery intrinsically indicating “hate” such as incest, sodomy, or rape of another woman (criminal conviction usually required as evidence). Others consider a wife can divorce her husband for “simple adultery.”

The Justinian-Cranmerian School is the Anglican view of the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer. This allows divorce for a series of weighty causes, and finds a precedent for such thinking in the sixth century Code of the Byzantine (Eastern Roman Empire) Emperor, Justinian (c. 482-565). In the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, Emperor Justinian the First, abolished divorce “by common consent” altogether²³. Justinian's matrimonial causes code of 542 A.D. recognized divorce for a series of weighty causes.

On this view, the NT allows divorce for sexual “uncleanness” and “hate,” and a wider interpretation is given to a constructive death (Deut. 24:1,2). Thus “fornication” (AV) or “unchastity” TCNT (Matt. 19:9) refers to any weighty cause attacking the sanctity of marriage, and resulting in active or passive adultery. I.e., the words of Jesus in Matt. 5:32, may refer to active or passive adultery e.g., passive adultery exists where there is a persistent and wilful denial of conjugal rights. Thus when a woman deserts her husband, Scripture says she has “played the whore against him” (Judges 19:2) i.e., she is guilty of passive adultery by a denial of conjugal rights. But a constructive desertion may also occur, where a man and wife are still living under the same roof, but there is a persistent and wilful denial of conjugal rights by one of them. Thus both constructive desertion in the form of a persistent and wilful denial of conjugal rights, and actual desertion which thus also constitutes a persistent and wilful denial of conjugal rights, are grounds for divorce and remarriage under NT Christian law (Matt. 5:32; I Cor. 7:2-5,15), just as they were under OT Jewish law (Judges 19:2).

Or in marriage, a man and woman are “one flesh” (Gen. 2:24); and this is a symbol of the union between Christ and the church (Eph. 5:31,32). But “he that is cruel troubleth his

²¹ *Blackstone’s Commentaries* (15th edition by Edward Christian), A. Strahan, London, UK, 1809 (abbreviated “Bl. Com.”) Vol. 1, p. 441.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

²³ Justinian’s *Civil Law*, Vol. 16, Vol. 17, 8th Collection, Title 18; Scott, S.P. (translator), The Central Trust Co., Cincinnati, 1932, 1973, pp. 56-7. This provision allowed what in effect was a separation by common consent, providing both parties then lived in chaste celibacy.

own flesh” (Prov. 11:17). Mal. 2:13-16 teaches that cruelty in which “one covereth violence with his garment,” destroys the marital basis on which a couple are “one.” I.e., it results in the termination of consensual sexual relations between a man and his wife, since sexual intimacy between a man and his wife, and cruelty, are alien to one another, so that they cannot co-exist together for long. Since cruelty instigates the termination of sexual relations i.e., passive adultery since the innocent spouse does not wish to continue conjugal relations with the cruel spouse, the person who is cruel is *guilty of inducing passive adultery* and so held responsible for such “fornication,” and so cruelty is a divorce cause for “putting away” (Mal. 2:16). Of which we have (in allegorical form,) a single instance in the NT, namely, Christ’s “divorcement” of the Jews (Isa. 50:1). For he was taken “by wicked hands,” “crucified and slain” (Acts 2:23), and the Jews declared, “His blood be on us, and our children” (Matt. 27:25). Thus Christ divorced Lady Judaism, and made Lady Christianity his bride (Rev. 12). This shows that the instigation of passive adultery as a result of cruelty, is a ground for divorce and remarriage under NT Christian law, just as it was under OT Jewish law.

Lord Devlin says that historically, adultery, desertion, and cruelty, were the three most common divorce causes²⁴. It is therefore notable, that in Scripture, desertion and cruelty are connected with passive adultery. While a variety of weighty divorce causes can be found in e.g., Justinian’s Code, Cranmer’s *Reformed Laws*, or the 1937 English *Matrimonial Causes Act*; those following such views may disagree among themselves as to what weighty causes can be properly characterized under the same headings as adultery, desertion, and cruelty. Thus while e.g., I support this view, and consider adultery, desertion, and cruelty are valid causes for divorce and remarriage, I may disagree with some so called “weighty divorce causes” which I think wrongly further characterize these type of divorce causes (and constructive death).

The Basilian-Bezan School is compatible with the Presbyterian Lutheran-Calvinist School view of divorce for adultery or desertion. The Luther-Calvin School of Martin Luther and John Calvin, understood Scripture to allow divorce for two principle grounds. Through a narrow propounding of the Matthean divorce provisions, (actual active) adultery, and usually through a broader propounding of the underpinning jurisprudence in the Pauline Privilege, hatred in the form of (actual) desertion. Luther also allowed presumed death due to a long absence²⁵. Beza sought to reconcile the jurisprudence of these Luther-Calvin divorce causes, with a Basilian understanding of divorce for adultery. The Basilian-Bezan School achieved this harmony by very specifically conceptualizing (actual) desertion in terms of (actual passive) adultery in the form of a denial of conjugal rights²⁶. On this view, passive adultery is limited to desertion (Matt. 5:32; I Cor. 7:2-5,15). Luther’s and Calvin’s view of divorce for adultery and desertion are found in the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 24:5,6. The Basilian-Bezan view that conceptualizes desertion as passive adultery (and so requires a writ for the restitution of conjugal rights for desertion,) was historically part of Scottish Law till 1861.

The OT Mosaic law no longer binds Christians of necessity, but NT law does (Eph.

²⁴ Devlin, P., *The Enforcement of Morals*, Oxford University, UK, 1965; Reprint: 1970.

²⁵ See e.g., Phillips, R., *Putting Asunder*, Cambridge Univ. Press., 1988, pp.45-55,78,89.

²⁶ E.g., *Ibid.*, pp. 55,56.

2:15; Col. 2:14; Heb. 7:12; 9:10)²⁷. Where the NT upholds a specific OT Mosaic precept, then it is binding to the extent that the NT upholds it (e.g., Lev. 19:18 & Deut. 6:5 quoted in Matt. 22:36-40; Deut. 25:4 quoted in I Cor. 9:8-10; I Tim. 5:18). Jesus referred to the Mosaic divorce provisions, saying, “It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement” (Matt. 5:31 referring to Deut. 24:1-4). He then interpreted these divorce provisions in Matt. 5:32. Likewise in Matt. 19:7-9, reference is first made to the provisions of “Moses” for “a writing of divorcement,” and then Jesus says that all divorce occurs because of the effects of original sin, that is “the hardness of your hearts” that did not exist “from the beginning” when man was in original righteousness, and then gives the same provisions for divorce in Matt. 19:9 he gave in Matt. 5:32. Therefore, the provisions for a “bill of divorcement” in Deut. 24:1-4, allowing dissolution of the marriage for “uncleanness,” “hate,” or death (“die”) remain binding for Christians, *subject to NT interpretation*. Key NT passages on dissolution of marriage are Matt. 5:32; 19:9; I Cor. 7:15,39.

In Matt. 5:32; 19:19, Jesus allows divorce for “fornication” (AV) or “sexual immorality” (NKJV) (Greek *porneia*). On a narrow definition of “fornication” or “sexual immorality,” adopted by both the Basilian-Cozensian School and Basilian-Bezan School, “fornication” or “sexual immorality” here requires a specific sexual act e.g., adultery (husband’s or wife’s divorce petition), incest (husband’s or wife’s divorce petition), or rape of another woman (wife’s divorce petition). On a wide definition of “fornication” or “sexual immorality,” adopted by both the Justinian-Cranmerian School and *some* adherents of the Lutheran-Calvinist School, “fornication” or “sexual immorality” here, refers to any weighty matrimonial cause which *attacks the sanctity of marriage* and so is *sexually immoral* either because it is an act of active or passive adultery, or because it induces passive adultery. On this basis, e.g., a women deserter could be said to have “played the whore against” her husband (Judg. 19:2). “Whore,” used of such a deserter in Judges 19:2, is Hebrew *zanah*. In Josh. 6:17,25, we read of “Rahab the harlot,” where “harlot” is also Hebrew *zanah*. The same OT terminology, “Rahab the harlot” is rendered in Heb. 11:31; James 2:25, where the Hebrew *zanah* for “harlot” is translated by Greek *porne*. Notably then, “fornication” or “sexual immorality” in Matt. 5:32; 19:9 is Greek *porneia*, from *porneuo*, from *porne*. Thus the wider definition of “fornication” or “sexual immorality” in Matt. 5:32; 19:9, can be linguistically justified through reference to the Hebrew and Greek.

Coming from the time of the first and second stages of the Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Basilian-Cozensian School, Basilian-Bezan School, and Justinian-Cranmerian School, were all manifested in Protestant Divorce Codes found both then and subsequently, in common law jurisdictions.

While the Anglican *Ecclesiastical Canons* of 1597 and 1603 indicate divorce was allowed; Archbishop Whitgift (like Hermes²⁸) sought to reintroduce marital indissolubility in *Foljambe’s case* (1601). By contrast the law rejected the Hermes-Whitgift School

²⁷ See section 5a) *Judaizers and some Puritans who subvert Lev. 18:16*; in *Commentary does not embrace views that some consider are “third” or “later stage” reforms* (below).

²⁸ The Pastor of Hermes (A.D. 160) adhered to the doctrine of marital indissolubility which prohibited all divorce (sometimes called divorce *a vinculo*), but allowed separation (sometimes called divorce *a mensa et thoro*) for adultery, providing that a repentant wife could return (*The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1967, Vol. II, pp. 21-22).

(indissolubility), and followed Bishop Cozens' view (like Basil the Great) that the Matthean divorce provisions (Matt. 19:9) allow divorce only for adultery. In the parliamentary debates over divorce up to the 1857 Divorce Act (before that time each divorce under the law of England required an Act of Parliament), Cozens' view consistently triumphed over Whitgift's view and was incorporated into the 1857 Act. One group within this school understands the NT to mean divorce with remarriage requires both sexual "uncleanness" and "hate" (Deut. 24:1,3). If a woman commits adultery, it is considered both elements are present. If a man commits adultery, it is considered the second element of "hate" may be absent, so on a wife's petition there must be adultery with aggravated enormity e.g., (depending on interpreter) adultery in the form of polygamy (Gen. 4:19; 7:13; Matt. 19:9; Titus 1:6; I Tim. 3:1,2), adultery in the form of incest (Lev. 18:6; I Cor. 5:1), adultery in the form of miscegenation (Gen. 6:2,4; Matt. 24:37-39; Acts 15:20 cf. Tobit 4:12, *Apocrypha*; I Cor. 7:18-20 cf. I Macc. 1:15, *Apocrypha*), sexual immorality in the form of sodomy (Gen. 19:5; Lev. 18:22,23; Rom. 1:26,27; I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10; Jude 7), or adultery coupled with cruelty (Mal. 2:14-16), or adultery coupled with desertion (Judg. 19:2). Another group within this school considers simple adultery should be allowed on either spouse's petition and this became English law in 1923.

Another school, argued by e.g., the Reformer Beza, was historically the law of Scotland (administered by courts) till 1938. This considers the NT allows divorce for sexual "uncleanness" or "hate" (Deut. 23:1,3) in the form of simple adultery (Matt. 19:9) or desertion (I Cor. 7:15). Beza considered desertion a form of passive adultery (Judg. 19:2), and in Scottish law desertion required a writ for the restitution of conjugal rights from 1573 till 1861.

A third view argued by Thomas Cranmer, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, (like Justinian) considers the NT allows divorce for sexual "uncleanness," or "hate," and gives a wider interpretation to a constructive death (Deut. 23:1,2). Thus "fornication" (AV) or "sexual immorality" (NKJV) (Matt. 19:9) refers to any weighty cause attacking the sanctity of marriage in which the "hate" causes active or passive adulterous "uncleanness," e.g., a deserting wife has thus "played the whore" (Judg. 19:2). Thus adultery *manifests* e.g., uncleanness and so hate (Jer. 3:8; Matt. 19:9), and desertion *manifests* hate and so uncleanness (Judg. 19:2; I Cor. 7:15), but other weighty causes constitute divorce causes such as cruelty also *manifest* hate and uncleanness which induces a cessation of conjugal relations, i.e., the innocent party reasonably does not wish to have conjugal relations with the party guilty of cruelty, and so the party guilty of cruelty (hate) is guilty of inducing passive adultery and thus guilty of uncleanness (Mal. 2:14-16). Cranmer's views existed at the beginning of the Reformation in his *Reformed Laws*, but then being replaced by other views, did not re-emerge in English law till 1937 and Scottish law till 1938. But disagreement exists among those of this Divorce School as to the full range of matrimonial causes under this jurisprudence. (This type of jurisprudence is found in Australian law in e.g., the *Matrimonial Causes Act* of 1959, Commonwealth, hereafter called the *Barwick Act*, repealed in 1975).

In addition to these historic Protestant divorce schools found during the first and second stages of the Reformation in opposition to the Roman Catholic teaching of marital indissolubility, some other later views have emerged. An example of such "later stage reforms," is found in the United States of America, where a number of what Larson calls, "evangelical Christian leaders," *prima facie* support divorce for "adultery or desertion." In some ways, this American divorce school's views are a revision of the Luther-Calvin School

allowing divorce for adultery (Matt. 5:32; 19:9) or desertion (I Cor. 7:15). Importantly, the *American Revised Adultery-Desertion School* has qualifications lacking in the Luther-Calvin School. By “adultery,” is meant, a spouse who is “guilty of sexual immorality and is unwilling to repent and live faithfully” (“Matt. 19:9”) i.e., *unrepentant and continued* adultery, not just simple adultery. And by “desertion” is meant, either a religiously mixed marriage in which “an unbeliever” “wilfully and permanently deserts the believing partner” (“I Cor. 7:15”); or where a “marriage and divorce occurred prior to salvation” (“2 Cor. 5:17”) i.e., *as an unbeliever* that person left (and so deserted) a marriage (with either a believer or unbeliever), and so their earlier divorce is valid; i.e., *unbeliever’s* desertion, not just desertion *per se*²⁹. This therefore requires the application of a religious test to determine whether or not the desertion was by an unbeliever and so regarded as a divorce cause.

A specific example of an *American Revised Adultery-Desertion School* proponent, is the contemporary Baptist Minister and Radio and Internet Evangelist³⁰, John MacArthur (b. 1939) of California, USA. He considers “fornication” (AV) or “sexual immorality” (NKJV) in Matt. 5:32; 19:9, is limited to “cases of unrepentant and continued adultery,” rather than adultery *per se*, so that he says that “the Bible permits” “divorce” only, “after all means are exhausted to bring” the adulterer “to repentance.” He further limits desertion in I Cor. 7:15, to “the departure of an unbelieving spouse.” But he then qualifies an *unbeliever’s desertion* in I Cor. 7:15 by Matt. 18:17, so that, “If a person is in chronic sin, and they are disciplined in the church,” then “to be treated as a tax collector and an outcast” “in Matt. 18,” means that if they desert, the innocent Christian “person would be free to remarry³¹.” Since Matt. 18:16 can be used for such things as e.g., marital cruelty, habitual drunkenness, or a crime leading to imprisonment, providing the guilty party does not want to remain married, the Christian party can divorce for a variety of weighty causes once the church excommunicates the guilty party.

MacArthur’s and the *American Revised Adultery-Desertion School’s* claim that a man *lacks an unfettered discretion* to divorce an adulterous wife, and that her adultery must be “unrepentant and continued,” is without Biblical warrant or established historical support among Protestant Divorce Codes. While Protestants have historically *not insisted* that a man divorce an adulterous wife, i.e., he may, in the circumstances, *choose* not to divorce her, all historical Protestant divorce codes grant the innocent husband *an unfettered discretion* to divorce an adulterous wife *if so wishes*. While the desire for marital reconciliation is commendable, and marriage guidance counselling is a proper function of a Minister’s pastoral role in a church, if it is to proceed on Biblically sound grounds, it must not inhibit this innocent husband’s *unfettered discretion* to divorce, which he can only lose by

²⁹ Bob Larson’s *Tough Talk About Tough Issues*, Tyndale House, Wheaton, Illinois, USA, 1989, pp. 26,111.

³⁰ See <http://www.sermonaudio.com> . When I joined Sermon Audio I found that for the first month or so, reference is made to this at the Sermon Audio “Newest Broadcasters” web page. This showed “Gavin McGrath” for sermons after having “Joined: 10/8/2009 [Oct. 8, 2009],” and interestingly the name immediately below mine was that of “John MacArthur” for sermons after having “Joined: 10/5/2009 [Oct. 5, 2009].”

³¹ MacArthur, J., *Different By Design*, Chariot Victor Publishing, Colorado, USA, 1994, p. 64; MacArthur, J., *Divorce & Remarriage*, Grace To You, P.O. Box 4000, Panorama City, California, 91412, USA, 2001, pp. 2-4; “John MacArthur Takes the Hot Seat” (cassette), Grace To You, Kent, England, UK, 2003.

condonation, i.e., if he returns to the marital bed with his wife after learning of this adultery.

MacArthur's and the *American Revised Adultery-Desertion School's* corollary claim that a woman *lacks an unfettered discretion* to divorce an adulterous husband, has *some similarities* with the concepts found in the Anglican's *Basilian-Cozensian School* idea of *adultery with aggravated enormity* for a wife's divorce petition; and finds a partial precedent in *one* of the divorces causes open to a woman under Justinian's sixth century code, which allowed divorce for aggravated enormity on a wife's petition where the husband's adultery occurred *repeatedly outside the matrimonial home*³²; although even here, on this *American Revised Adultery-Desertion School's* rule, a husband who claimed "repentance" from repeated adultery might still be able to block such a divorce. Once again, the desire for marital reconciliation is commendable, but once again, if should proceed on Biblically sound grounds.

At a practical level, if a woman commits adultery, a man will usually want a divorce. If he was hamstrung by MacArthur's type of "unrepentant and continued adultery" *American Revised Adultery-Desertion School* rule, he might leave his adulterous wife, at which point the adulteress could claim "desertion" and seek "church discipline" against him. Thus MacArthur's type of *American Revised Adultery-Desertion School* rule could then add insult to injury to the aggrieved husband, who may then be excommunicated on the basis of being an "unrepentant" deserting husband.

Moreover, at a practical level, unless a woman has been indoctrinated by feminist ideology, in which she has notions of so called "equality" in which she seeks to mimic a male response to adultery, a wife does not generally feel adultery as acutely as a husband, *unless it is adultery with aggravated enormity*. Hence a woman may well be prepared to forgive simple adultery in a husband. Thus, on the one hand, the *American Revised Adultery-Desertion School* view that if the adultery is "unrepentant and continued" a wife can divorce her husband, would allow some wives' petitions for divorce that the *Basilian-Cozensian School's adultery with aggravated enormity* would not, but Justinian's *Civil Law* divorce code *adultery with aggravated enormity* would allow for *repeated adultery outside the matrimonial home*. But on the other hand, the *American Revised Adultery-Desertion School* view would disallow some wives' petitions for divorce that the *Basilian-Cozensian School's adultery with aggravated enormity* would allow, since in cases of adultery with aggravated enormity such as incest or sodomy, a wife could immediately seek dissolution of the marriage on the basis of *adultery with aggravated enormity* under the *Basilian-Cozensian School*. By contrast, under the *American Revised Adultery-Desertion School* rule, a man who e.g., incestuously raped his daughter, could say, "It's the first time I've done it. I repent, I won't do it again;" or "It's only the second time I've done it. I repent, I won't do it again;" or "It's only the third time I've done it *in five whole years*. I repent, I won't do it again;" and if there was no criminal prosecutions resulting in a separation due to the husband's imprisonment, the wife would be meant to repeatedly take the husband back. MacArthur's type of "repeated" adultery concept clearly opens the door to wide abuse by a wicked spouse, who be aided and abetted in their marital abuses by activating the "repeated" clause provisions that MacArthur somewhat naively fails to appreciate.

But as further discussed below at 8) *Was there a "third stage" or later stage(s) of the Reformation? - Anglicans & Puritans differ* (in this general section *First and Second Stages*

³² Justinian's *Civil Law*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 17, 8th Collection, Title 18, ch. 9, No. 5, p. 56.

of the Reformation), and *Commentary does not embrace views that some consider are “third” or “later stage” reforms*; for the purposes of this commentary, I reject any so called “third” or “later stage” reforms. While this includes matters of historic internal Protestant diversity between Anglicans (as continued since the 19th century by traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglicans i.e., Reformed Anglicans) and Puritans (Presbyterians, Congregationalists, & Baptists) my primary concern in this commentary is with regard to those “third” or “later stage” reforms which are contrary to the first and second stages of the Reformation, of which one obvious example is the *American Revised Adultery-Desertion School’s* “unrepentant and continued adultery” view of divorce. The *general historic points of doctrinal agreement among Protestant divorce codes* agreed upon during the first and second stages of the Reformation, are that on the one hand, the Bible prohibits libertine *at pleasure* divorce; but on the other hand, the Bible allows marital dissolubility with remarriage, for adultery by the wife (husband’s divorce petition), and adultery with aggravated enormity by the husband (wife’s divorce petition). While I personally support the Justinian-Cranmerian School, (and note that those adherents of the Lutheran-Calvinist School who consider desertion refers not just to *actual* desertion, but also *constructive* desertion of the marriage, in broad terms arrive at the same type of divorce causes as adherents of the Justinian-Cranmerian School such as myself,) for the broad Protestant purposes of this commentary, I do not go beyond this area of agreement i.e., the divorce causes found in the Basilian-Cozensian School, when dealing with examples of a Biblical divorce. Specifically, in dealing with the fact that one element of the Roman Church’s teaching of “forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:3), is their refusal to recognize the clear Biblical principle of marital dissolubility for adultery, *and associated remarriage of such Biblical divorcees*, I only use examples of adultery (husband’s divorce petition) or adultery with aggravated enormity (wife’s divorce petition), to illustrate the basic point.

5) *Sabbatarian Reform*³³. Neither Luther nor Calvin were Sabbatarians, both regarding the Lord’s Day as simply a day of assembly in public worship, when the Word is preached and the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper may be administered (*Luther’s Catechism*, 1529, *Calvin’s Catechism*, 1545). The Marian martyrs who died at the hands of the Popish Queen, Bloody Mary, because of their faithfulness to the tenets of the Reformation, included both the non-sabbatarian, Archbishop Cranmer, and also the sabbatarians, Bishops Hooper and Latimer. I think the Sabbatarians Hooper and Latimer were greater lights than the non-Sabbatarians Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer, on this issue. For matured reflection on, e.g., the contextual double meaning in the Greek “*mia ton sabbaton*” in Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, where “the first [day] of the week” simultaneously means “the first of the sabbaths,” led others to realize the fourth precept (Exod. 20:8-11; Deut. 5:12-15) continues with the first day of the week, Sunday, as the Sabbath. For instance the Marian martyr, Bishop Hooper, said for the Christian we are “by express words commanded, that we should observe this day (the Sunday) for our Sabbath, as the words of Saint Paul declareth (I Corinthians 16), commanding every man to appoint his alms for the poor in the Sunday.” In “Luke 24 and John 20,” “of the women that came to the sepulchre to anoint the dead body of Christ;” “Luke saith, ‘In one of the Sabbaths early they came to the sepulchre;’ and so saith John by the same words, the which was the Sunday, as no man doubteth. For it is our faith that Christ rose the third day.”³⁴

³³ Cf. McGrath, G.B. (myself), *British Church Newspaper*, No. 181, 26 March 2010, p. 11.

³⁴ Carr, S. (Editor), *Early Writings of John Hooper, D.D.*, Lord Bishop of Gloucester

On the one hand, the Lutheran Reformation with the *Augsburg Confession* was anti-sabbatarian, and so the Lutheran Church did not proceed to the second stage of the Reformation and recognize Sunday as the Sabbath. For example, it quotes Col. 2:16, and says, “The Scripture which teacheth that all the Mosaical ceremonies can be omitted after the Gospel is revealed, has abrogated the Sabbath. And yet, therefore it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when they ought to come together,” namely, “the Lord’s day.” However, even “the observation” of this “Lord’s day” or Sunday, is not kept “of necessity” (Part II, Article 6). Similar views are expressed by John Calvin in his *Sermons on Deuteronomy* where with regard to the 4th commandment of Deut. 5:12-15, he says it is “abolished by the coming of our Lord;” though he considers “the substance” (Col. 2:17) of “the day was shifted” to Sunday, which is a day when “people assemble to have the sacraments ministered, and to make common prayer unto God,” and also a day to privately “read the holy Scriptures or to pray” in one’s “own house.” But with regard to the Sabbatarian element, he thinks “the Sabbath day was given to the Jews,” and was “a figure of the spiritual rest which the faithful ought to observe to serve God on” (Heb. 4)³⁵. Thus like Luther, Calvin was not a Sabbatarian. But on the other hand, the Anglican, Presbyterian (*Westminster Confession* 21:7), Congregational (*Savoy Declaration* 22:7), and Baptist (*Baptist Confession* 22:7) Churches did proceed to the second stage of the Reformation on this matter.

On the Sunday Sabbatarian view, in the Old Testament the term “the seventh day” (Exod. 20:8,9) is used as a relative, not unalterable, time designation (Exod. 12:15,16; 13:6; 24:16; Lev. 13:5,6,27, 32,34,51; Num. 6:9; 7:48; 19:12,19; 29:32; 31:19,24; Josh. 6:4,15; II Sam. 12:18). For example, a leper was to shave and wash “on the seventh day” after he was cleansed (Lev. 14:9,39); Samson’s wife wept for “seven days,” and “on the seventh day” he told her the riddle (Judg. 14:17); or Ahab’s forces camped “seven days,” and then on “the seventh day the battle” occurred (I Kgs 20:29,30). In Exod. 23:10-12 the sabbatical years and days are placed in Hebraic parallelism, and since the starting point of the sabbatical years was altered by Divine decree due to the forty years in the wilderness (Lev. 25:2-5; Deut. 2:7; Ps. 95:7-11), it follows that “the seventh day” of the fourth commandment can likewise, by Divine decree, alter its starting point relative to a working week. Hence in our society Saturday and Sunday are called “the weekend,” because even though Sunday is the first day of the calendar week, it is the seventh day of our working week - and hence the seventh day of the fourth commandment (and on this same principle the sabbath is calculated on a midnight to midnight day, rather than the Jewish sunset to sunset day.)

All Protestant Sabbath-keepers agreed that acts of necessity could be performed on the sabbath (Matt. 12:1-13). But diversity of view emerged between stricter Sabbatarians and more liberal Sabbatarians as to what constituted necessity, together with a range of intermediate positions. From 1562 the Anglican Church came to the second stage of the

and Worcester, Martyr, 1555, The Parker Society, Cambridge Univ., 1843, pp. 338,342 (cf. Exod. 31:15; Ezek 46:4); quoted in Leggerton, H.J.W., *The Church of Rome and the Lord’s Day, Tradition or Bible: Which?*, Lord’s Day Observance Society, London, UK, [c. 1960], p. 24.

³⁵ John Calvin’s *Sermons on Deuteronomy*, 1583, First published 1583, Facsimile reprint 1987, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, & Pennsylvania, USA, 1987, pp. 200,202,205, & 206.

Reformation on this issue. Homily 8, Book 2, Article 35, of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* refers to e.g., Gen. 2:2; Exod. 20:8; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10, and says, “we keep now the first day, which is our Sunday, and make that our Sabbath, that is, our day of rest,” in honour of our Saviour Christ, who “upon that day rose from death.” Thus “upon the Sabbath day, which is now our Sunday,” one “should cease from all weekly and workday labour.” “So that God doth not only command the observation of this holy day, but also by his own example doth stir and provoke us to [be] diligent [in] keeping of the same. So, if we will be the children of our heavenly Father, we must be careful to keep the Christian Sabbath day, which is the Sunday.”

In the representative sample of Byzantine Greek manuscripts used in the sixteenth century to determine the representative Byzantine Greek text as the starting point of textual analysis, I Cor. 16:2, reads “*kata* (every) *mian* (one) *sabbaton* (of the ‘sabbaths’ / ‘week,’ neuter plural genitive noun, from *sabbaton*),” i.e., a plural form of *sabbaton*. But the Latin reading found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (4th / 5th centuries), together with a number of old Latin Versions, and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine of Hippo (354-430)³⁶, is “*per* (‘During’ = ‘On’ / ‘In’) *unum* (‘one’ = ‘the first’) *sabbati* (‘of the week’ or ‘of the Sabbath,’ neuter singular genitive noun, from *sabbatum*).” In the Greek, this singular Latin form would be, “*sabbatou* (of the ‘sabbath’ / ‘week,’ neuter singular genitive noun, from *sabbaton*).” Thus the singular form of the Greek was reconstructed from the Latin for the reading in the Anglican Homily, *infra*.

This shows that as a consequence of textual analysis, in the Homilies, sixteenth century Anglicans regarded *sabbatou* or “sabbath” as the preferred reading in I Cor. 16:2, and their usage of this reading in this Anglican Homily means that at least some of the AV translators would have surely supported it. On the one hand, it makes no difference to the AV’s English translation, “Upon the first [day] of the week” (I Cor. 16:2) which of the two Greek readings is adopted, and so the issue of textual diversity did not matter for the purposes of translating the AV. But on the other hand, if one considers there is a double meaning in the Greek, the meaning, “on the first of the sabbaths” makes no sense in the context of I Cor. 16:2. Notably, this Homily 8, Book 2, adopted the singular reading “sabbath,” regarding this as part of a double-meaning. The Homily says, “the first of the week,” “of the which day mention is made by St. Paul on this wise: ‘In the first day of the sabbath let every man lay up what he thinketh good’ (I Cor. 16), meaning for the poor. By ‘the first day [which is the day] of the sabbath’ is meant our Sunday, which is the first day after the Jews’ seventh day.” The fact that I Cor. 16:2 is considered to have a double meaning, in which “the first [day] of the week” also means “the first [day which is the day] of the sabbath,” is significant for showing that these Anglican Homilies look to Biblical authority for Sunday Sabbatarianism. This Homily further says, “rebels do not only leave the Sabbath day of the Lord unsanctified, the temple of the Lord unresorted unto, but also do by their works of wickedness most horribly profane and pollute the Sabbath day.” This is clearly a Sabbatarian view of Sunday in the Homilies of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*.

However, the Church of England’s *Advertisements* of 1566 under Elizabeth I, state, “that on Sundays there be no shops open, no artificers commonly going about their affairs

³⁶ Wordsworth, J., & White, H.J., *Nouum Testamentum Latine*, Secundum Editorium Santi Hieronymi (Jerome), Oxonii (Oxford), UK, 1911; Augustine’s *De Opere Monachorum* 31, quoting I Cor. 16:1-4, in Saint-Martin, J., *Oeuvres de Saint Augustin* (Latin & French), *L’Ascetisme Chretien*, 3, De Sclee de Brouwer, Paris, France, 1949, p. 396.

worldly,” and “no showing of any wares before the [Church] service be done.” I.e., Sunday markets were allowed after Divine Service. In my opinion, such buying and selling of wares *after* Divine Service violated the Sabbath day (Neh. 13:15-22); so that this enactment might be better described as semi-Sabbatarianism. But English law later reverted to a stricter Sabbatarian view enacted before this, under the Statute of Elizabeth’s father, Henry VIII, in 27 Henry VIII, chapter 5. This stated that no fair or market was to be held on the principal church festivals, Good Friday, or any Sunday, except the four Sundays in harvest. Thus only the four harvest Sundays were regarded as a necessity.

For reasons of “necessity,” at different times the laws of England also allowed the sale of meat in public houses and milk at certain hours, “Bakers were permitted to dress dinners on a Sunday as a work of necessity,” and “fish carriages” were “allowed to travel on Sundays, either laden or returning empty.” Perhaps the best known example of this Sunday-trading in English law, was introduced in the reign of William of Orange. By statute of 10 & 11 William III, chapter 24, it was legislated that, “Mackarel [Mackerel] also may be sold on Sundays before and after Divine Service³⁷,” and because mackerel could be bought and sold on the weekly *holy day*, it became known by a common tradition as the *holy mackerel*. Certainly for stricter Sabbatarians, some or all of these acts of “necessity” under Anglican Sabbatarianism would be deemed “sabbath-breaking.” Questions about *what constitutes necessity* are reflected in Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* (c. 1602 A.D.), when Marcellus asks about “implements of war.” “Why such impress of shipwrights, whose sore task does not divide the Sunday from the week; what might be toward, that this sweaty haste doth make the night joint-labourer with the day: Who is’t that can inform me?” (Act 1, Scene 1, lines 74-79).

Disagreement on Sabbath keeping emerged inside the Anglican Church between stricter and less strict Sabbatarianism; and denominationally between Anglicans (generally less strict Sabbatarians) and Puritans (stricter Sabbatarians). The issue of Sunday public transport highlights this difference. From the sixteenth century on, Anglicans under English Law considered Sunday public transport was a necessity in London. The watermen of the Thames River, were the equivalent of either taxi-drivers or the ferry masters of very small ferries. They operated both up and down, and across, the Thames. Under Queen Elizabeth I, a Sunday trading law of 1584 required that, subject to some limited exceptions, the waterman not work till after Divine Service. Similar bye-laws regulating the limited taxi or ferry service by London waterman on the Sabbath, were made under Charles I in 1626 and Charles II in 1663. Then in 1700, under the great Protestant King, William of Orange, the Statute 11 & 12 William III, chapter 21, stated that forty watermen could ply the Thames on the Sabbath between Vauxhall and Limehouse. This provided a Sunday ferry service from Vauxhall (Central London), past Lambeth Palace (residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury), Westminster Parliament, Charing Cross, Blackfriars, Cannon Street, London Bridge, and Wapping, to Limehouse (East London), in the vicinity of St. Dunstan’s Stepney (“the bells of Stepney” in the rhyme, “Oranges and Lemons.”) This Williamite enactment was still in operation more than a century later³⁸.

The nineteenth century then saw an explosion of public transport forms, in London

³⁷ Bainton, R.H., *op. cit.*, p. 148; 4 Bl. Com. (*Blackstone’s Commentaries*) 64-5. In this work, all references to Bl. Com. are to Edward Christian’s 15th edition of 1809.

³⁸ O’Riordan, C., *The Thames Watermen in the Century of Revolution*, chapter 1 (“The Waterman,” www.parishregister.com/chris_orio_book.paf.); 4 Bl. Com. 64 (later footnote by E. Christian in 1809).

and elsewhere. This led to what I consider to have been an over-reaction by some stricter Sabbatarians who opposed all public transport on Sunday. E.g., in 1856, the Reverend John Bryce, *Clerical Secretary of the Society for Promoting the Due Observance of the Lord's Day*, opposed all Sunday public transport. He not only lambasted the “watermen” now numbering “350,” who had played the Thames on Sundays under Protestant “necessity” laws since the sixteenth century; but additionally lashed out at “Drivers ... 1,907,” “Conductors ... 2,137,” “Supernumeraries ... 2,000,” and “Horse-keepers ... 3,000,” in all “9,394” Sunday public transport workers. Others joining in opposition to all public transport on Sundays, included the Evangelical Anglican, Bishop J.C. Ryle (from 1880, the first Bishop of Liverpool), whose views on this issue were closer to those of stricter Puritans than they were to traditional Evangelical Anglicans (although Evangelical Anglicans exhibit diversity on such matters).

The difference between the traditional Anglican view, that under Protestant laws allowed public transport with the Thames waterman operating on Sunday since the sixteenth century; and the views of Bishop Ryle who opposed this in the nineteenth century; is thus a good example of how Sabbatarians can disagree on what constitutes a Sunday “necessity.” But notwithstanding some diversity on the meaning of “necessity,” even among those who fully came to second stage of the Reformation in embracing the Sabbath reform, there was general agreement among Sabbatarians that the Sabbath should, in broad terms, be kept as a day of weekly rest from worldly work, and a day for church attendance, by as many people as was reasonably possible.

While I generally favour a stricter form of Sabbath-keeping, I do not support the overly strict Sabbatarianism of Bishop Ryle, still e.g., found today among some Presbyterians i.e., my position is intermediate between the two extremes. An example of this stricter Puritan form of Sabbatarianism that I do not support, is found in the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*. This Church has a number of positive orthodox Protestant elements to it, and a number of good people in it. However they have, in my opinion, gone overboard both in the importance they place on the Sabbath, and in the strictness with which they keep it. In this church's centennial publication, *One Hundred Years of Witness* (1893-1993), we read, “if the Ten Commandments were to be likened to ten stones built up, in proper order, to form an arch, the Fourth Commandment would be the key-stone and experience demonstrates that if the key-stone of an arch is loosened and removed the whole edifice quickly falls thereafter.³⁹” On the one hand, as a Sabbatarian I have some sympathy with this statement since the Fourth Commandment is certainly neglected by many professing Christians, and keeping the Sabbath is spiritually enriching. But on the other hand, I find this view to be an out of proportion focus of the Fourth Commandment, since it is true of any one of the Ten Commandments that they are a “key-stone,” so that a person in wilful and habitual violation of it, finds “the whole edifice” “falls.” “For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty” (James 2:11,12).

³⁹ Garwood, J., *The Million Peopled City*, 1853, chapter 4, “The London Omnibus” (“Victorian London Publications,” www.vicotrianlondon.org/publications4/peopled-04htm); Ryle, J.C., “Sabbath A Day to Keep (Exod. 20:8),” (www.fpcr.org/blue_banner_artciles/ryle_sabbath.htm); MacSween, D.R., *op. cit.*, p. 127. Cf. “the Fourth Commandment is the keystone, the removal of which wrecks the whole structure,” McPherson, A. (Editor), *op. cit.*, p. 377.

Moreover, the NT puts more of an emphasis on the other nine commandments than it does the fourth commandment (e.g., Matt 19:18,19, 5th to 9th commandments; Rom. 1:20-23, 1st & 2nd commandment; Rom. 2:24, 3rd commandment; Rom. 7:7; 13:9, 6th to 10th commandments); and when dealing with issues of the fourth commandment, the NT puts more of an emphasis on the elements of meeting together in fellowship and worship, preaching of the word, and not being overly strict on sabbatical rules, than it does on the element of sabbatical rest. On the one hand, these factors do not invalidate the fourth commandment, since “I had not known sin, but by the law” (Rom. 7:7), for I had not known Sabbath-breaking, except the law had said, “Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy” (Exod. 20:8). But on the other hand, these factors do give the Christian important guidance in how to order priorities in resolving moral dilemmas connected with sabbath observance; and I do not think that these factors have been sufficiently taken into account by the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*.

Specifically, the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* (FPCS) Synod has prohibited church members from using public transport on Sundays, such as “trains” or “trams,” even “when no other means is available and where distance precludes walking.” It maintains that “the alternative of staying at home” in such circumstances should be followed, and this church “excludes from Church privileges” such as taking the Communion, “those who thus use public conveyances on the Lord’s Day.” In theory they do “not hold” to “close communion” for non-FPCS members, saying “none are to be admitted to the privilege” of “Communion” “but such as are known as God-fearing persons by a majority of those who are responsible for admission.” But this is then qualified by the fact that the FPCS also says, “All” “who travel by trains or cars run in systematic disregard of the Lord’s Day” “are denied” “Communion.”⁴⁰ In practice, these views would deny the Communion Table not only to anti-sabbatarians like Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer; but also to more moderate orthodox Protestant Sabbath-keepers, such as Queen Elizabeth I, King William III (William of Orange), and many others. While I think it is one thing for the FPCS to insist on their strict Sabbatarian views for church members (much as I think this would still be the wrong view), I also think that by extending this rule to any visiting Christian seeking Communion at a FPCS Church, means that this puts the FPCS in a position where they are “not discerning the Lord’s body” (I Cor. 11:29) i.e., the church of Christ (I Cor. 12:12-27). No view that would exclude e.g., Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, and William of Orange from the Lord’s Table, can possibly be correct.

On general principles, I consider this FPCS view contrary to the emphasis of the NT, which puts the emphasis the other way around i.e., “Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another” to attend the assembly, “and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching” (Heb. 10:25). So likewise, on general principles, it is clear that, “The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath” (Mark 2:26), so that the Christian should not be unduly burdened by these type of unnecessary Judaizing sabbatical rules. My view of “necessity” is thus broader than that of the FPCS. But I would agree that *like the other precepts of the Decalogue*, the fourth commandment should be kept. I would also agree that one should not abuse the concept of “necessity” by an anti-sabbatarian spirit. However in fairness to those in the *Free*

⁴⁰ McPherson, A. (Editor), *op. cit.*, Appendix II, “Synod’s Statement in Reference to Church-Going by Public Conveyances on the Sabbath,” pp. 359-64; “Close” / “Open Communion” 374,379; cf. pp. 139-40,278.

*Presbyterian Church of Scotland*⁴¹, it must be admitted that in this libertine, licentious, and religiously apostate age, the more common criticism that may be fairly made, is not that of an overly strict view of the Sabbath, but that of an overly loose view of the Sabbath. Alas, for many professedly Protestant Churches that professedly went to the second stage of the Reformation, Sunday is no Sabbath.

Some of those Protestants accepting the Sabbatarian reform in the second stage of the Reformation, contextualized Sunday in a Christian liturgical year with Christmas and Easter, whereas others accepting the Sabbatarian reform, rejected any notion of a Christian liturgical year and any idea of keeping Christmas and Easter. The Sunday in Acts 20:6,7 is carefully dated as the First Sunday after Easter, and so the presence of this same double meaning at Acts 20:7 indicates to me the presence of a simple liturgical year in which Sabbaths were counted from the First Sunday after Easter up to Easter Sunday each year. Thus “the first of the Sabbaths” each year was the first Sunday after Easter, the second of the Sabbaths was the second Sunday after Easter, the seventh of the Sabbaths was the seventh Sunday after Easter, that is, “Pentecost” Sunday (Acts 20:16; cf. Acts 2:1; Lev. 23:15,16) and so on.

The keeping of holy days other than Sunday (Anglicans and Lutherans) was historically a point of Protestant disagreement (Puritans), although Puritans sometimes kept nominated Fast Days. However, the issue today is broader than it was since a number of Protestants of Puritan derivation are now happy to keep Christmas and Easter, and e.g., in England, might also support public celebrations on St. George’s Day (23 April, National Motif Saint of England) and Bonfire Day (5 Nov., Guy Fawkes Gunpowder Plot in 1605 & coming of William of Orange in 1688).

Easter is a “holyday” and Christmas is a “holyday” (Col. 2:16) that some orthodox Protestants use their Christian liberty to keep, and other orthodox Protestants use their Christian liberty not to keep. “Let no man therefore judge you” “in respect of an holyday” (Col. 2:16). A form of “Esther” appears to survive in the name of “Easter⁴².” Though

⁴¹ 2015 update: see *A Catechism of the History & Principles of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, Published by the Religion & Morals Committee of the FPCS, Printed by Imprint Academic, Exeter, England, UK, 2013 Revised edition of 1942-3; and my work, *Creation, Not Macroevolution – Mind the Gap* (2014), Vol. 1, Part 1, Chapter 7, section c, subsection iii, subdivision D, heading, “Is it possible to get Hugh Ross’s Day-Age School out of its hot-bed of heresy?,” subheading: Point 1 Illustration. From “Indeed, up until the events of 2012 and 2013, this is broadly how I did understand FPCS” to “FPCS has recently released a new ‘Catechism’ (2013) that among other things glorifies the *Solemn League & Covenant* in Appendix 3, which it says calls for ‘the extirpation of ... Prelacy’ i.e., Anglicanism, describes as ‘fiendish’ the fact ‘King Charles II’ ‘in 1661’ did ‘cause’ this document ‘to be burnt by the hand of the’ ‘hangman’ (Rom. 13:4), and criticizes ‘the infamous Recissory Act’ ‘of King Charles’ II ‘by which’ things the Puritan ‘Church had done’ ‘in the interval between 1638 and the Restoration, had been stigmatised as treasonable and rebellious.’ If this glorification of the *Solemn League & Covenant* calling for ‘the extirpation’ of Anglicanism is not an example of ‘heresies’ that are ‘divisions’ or schisms (I Cor. 11:18,19), then what I ask is?” (citing McGrath, G. {myself}, “Heresies,” *English Churchman* 23 & 30 Aug. 2013 {EC 7878}, p. 2). Thus I have now learnt that the FPCS is in schismatic heresy, a fact leading me to a reassessment of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* which is more critical of them as promoting “damnable heresies” (II Peter 2:1).

⁴² To the objection of some Puritans that the term “Easter” is derived from “Ishtar,” it

centred around Christ's death and resurrection, and not the same as the keeping of the Jewish Feasts of Passover and Purim, the Christian Easter draws on some elements of the Feasts of Passover (Exod. 12:1-20) and Purim (Esther 9:23,26-28). In particular, the fact that Purim or the *Feast of Esther* falls in the twelfth Jewish month less than a month before Passover in the first Jewish month, means that in the same way that Christians have linked St. Nicholas' Day (6 December) with Christmas (25 December), the Christian feast of *Easter* takes its name from the nearby Jewish feast of *Esther*. For were not God's dealings with Israel sometimes a type pointing forward to Christ and/or the Church (e.g., Hosea 11:1 // Matt. 2:15; I Cor. 10:1-4)? And did not "the Jews" "fast" "for" "three days" (Esther 4:15), and "on the third day" (Esther 5:1), did not Esther obtain the king's favour (Esther 5:1-8), that led to the Jews deliverance from Haman (Esther 7:1-10) and his evil designs that the *Feast of Esther* celebrates (Esther 8 & 9)? So too, did not Christ spend *three days* in hell, and *on the third day* did he not thereby show that he had obtained the favour of God the King (on Good Friday), that led to man's deliverance from sin and death? So do not both Passover and Purim find their ultimate fulfilment in Christ? For "are" they not "a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ"? (Col. 2:17). How better to represent this than to keep the annual feast celebrating Christ's death and resurrection at the same time as the Feast of Passover, and name it after the Feast of Esther?

6) *Federalist Reform*. On the one hand, St. Augustine is rightly held in favour by orthodox Protestants for his general defence of the teaching of original sin against the Pelagians. But on the other hand, Augustinianism has some elements in it that were later replaced by Federalism. In his *Confessions*, Augustine (Austin) does not say plainly, "sex is sinful." But this is a necessary implication and conclusion from his teachings. Detailed consideration of Austin's *Confessions* are beyond the scope of this work, but of relevance to our immediate purposes, I note that in this work he reflects on the conflict of sin within him (cf. Rom. 7:21-23), and recognizes man's fallen state due to Adam (chapters 8-10). He also personifies Continence. In e.g., Book 8:11:27, this ancient church Latin writer sees⁴³:

Latin Text of Austin (in interlinear form):	English Text of Austin:
" <i>graves</i> (serious) <i>viduae</i> (widows) <i>et</i> (and) <i>virgines</i> (virgins) <i>anus</i> (old women), <i>et</i> (and) <i>in</i> (in) <i>omnibus</i> (these things) <i>ipsa</i> (themselves) <i>continentia</i> (Continence) <i>nequadam</i> ([was] by no means) <i>sterilis</i> ('sterile' or 'fruitless'), <i>sed</i> (but) <i>fecunda</i>	"serious woman and old virgins, and in all these things Continence was by no means sterile, but the fertile mother of children And she was smiling at me with a cheering challenge, as though she might say, 'Canst thou not attain that which they have? ... The

might be said that in the Christian context it also derived from "Esther." But even if a derivation is from the pagan goddess, "Ishtar," this does not invalidate the usage of such names, since e.g., the Book of Esther revolves around "Esther" - a name derived from "Ishtar," and "Mordecai" - a name derived from "Marduk." One also sees this in other Biblical passages, e.g., the name of "Beltshazzar" (Dan. 1:7) derives from the pagan god, "Bel" or "Baal." If it was wrong to use such names, then the Bible would not refer to "Athens" (Acts 17:5), a name derived from a pagan goddess; and nor would we be able to refer to the days of the week such as "Monday" (Moon), Wednesday (Woden), etc. . But how silly is that?

⁴³ Latin text from: James O'Donnell's *Augustine Confessions*, Part I, Introduction & Text, Clarendon Press, Oxford, UK, 1992, p. 100.

<p>(fertile) <i>mater</i> (the mother) <i>filiorum</i> ('of sons' or 'of children') <i>Et</i> (And) <i>inridebat</i> (she was smiling) <i>me</i> ([at] me) <i>inrisione</i> ([with a] cheering) <i>hortatoria</i> (challenge), <i>quasi</i> (as though) <i>diceret</i> (she might say), '<i>Tu</i> (Thou) <i>non</i> (not) <i>poteris</i> (thou canst attain) <i>quod</i> (what) <i>isti</i> (that [which they have])? ... <i>Dominus</i> (The Lord) <i>Deus</i> (God) <i>eorum</i> (of them) <i>me</i> (me) <i>dedit</i> (he gave) <i>eis</i> (unto them). ... <i>Obsurdesce</i> (Become deaf) <i>adversus</i> (against) <i>immunda</i> (dirty) <i>illa</i> (those) <i>membra</i> (members) <i>tua</i> (of thine) <i>super</i> ([that are] upon) <i>terram</i> (the earth), <i>ut</i> (in order that) <i>mortificentur</i> (they may be mortified) ..."</p>	<p>Lord their God gave me unto them. ... Become deaf against those dirty members of thine that are upon the earth, in order that they may be mortified."</p>
--	--

This type of thing clearly goes well beyond the teaching of I Corinthians 7 that God calls some Christians to marriage and others to life-long celibacy. In the New Testament teaching, the one in marriage "doeth well," and the one in celibacy "doeth better" (I Cor. 7:38). Both states are honourable and pure, indeed, conjugal relations inside of marriage are the antidote to those who have not the gift of continency (I Cor. 7:2,5). A Christian with the gift of continency is not asexual, or a non-sexual being (or like so many Popish priests a man with a homosexual orientation who cloaks his wickedness behind the "celibate status" of being a priest⁴⁴). Such a Christian has a capacity to enter a marriage with normal conjugal relations if he so wishes (I Cor. 9:5), but chooses under God to exercise this gift of continency. Hence "if thou marry, thou hast not sinned" (I Cor. 7:28); for "marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge" (Heb. 13:4).

By contrast, Augustine here regards sexual organs as "those dirty members of thine" that need to "be mortified." And the personified "Continence" gives "a cheering challenge" that one might "attain" to that which these "serious woman and old virgins" i.e., celibate for life. This is not the recognition of a gift of continency (I Cor. 7:7), but *a recruiting challenge to get people to become celibate for life!* With all due respect to Austin who in general was a most learned and godly man, *he has here strayed from the Biblical teaching.* Sadly, this type of recruitment challenge for celibacy came to grip large sections of the church, underpinning notions of "vows of celibacy" for various religious orders. *In short, such Augustinianism came to underpin erroneous notions that "sex is sinful," and confusingly connected such ideas with the more generally correct doctrine of original sin.*

But where then did Augustine get these "sex is sinful" ideas from?

⁴⁴ God may give someone "up to" the "uncleanness" of homosexuality, i.e., giving them a homosexual orientation as a Divine judgement because of their antecedent sin of idolatry (Rom. 1:24-26; cf. I Kgs 14:23,24); although he does not always do this with idolaters. Thus it should not surprise us that so many Popish priests, and so many Puseyite priests (under which designation I also include semi-Puseyite priests), have been given over by God to a homosexual orientation, and thus this vice of sodomy.

Different Christian people have different religious stories to tell. Some come to Christ from an evangelistic meeting where they accept a gospel invitation to repentance and faith in Christ (Acts 2). Some come as escapees from a system of false religion, such as Roman Catholicism. Such were Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Thomas Cranmer, coming out of Popery (Rev. 18:2,4). Some come from a very dramatic experience, possibly having committed extremely serious sins, such as murder (Acts 9:1-31). Some come in a quieter way (II Tim. 1:5). Some are known by God even from their mother's womb (Jer. 1:5).

In his *Confessions*, Augustine tells of how he had been ensnared by the Manicheans (the "ch" is pronounced "k," i.e., "Manikeans") of Carthage in north Africa (Book 3, chapters 6-10). Austin was a young man, honourably attracted to the Manicheans (also spelt, Manichaeans) quest for "truth" (3:6:60). Beyond Carthage, more generally the Manicheans had a dualism of an evil material world in which one was meant to seek a gnostic "inner illumination," by secretive knowledge in which a person comes to "find the real you," in which it is said that one's soul shares in the nature of God from the spiritual world. In this dualism, the type of "fleshly" things condemned as intrinsically evil include fornication, procreation, material possessions, the eating of meat and drinking of wine, giving rise to a strict Manichean asceticism. But this was then overlaid with the religious teachings of prayers, fasting, and almsgiving. They were a distinctive non-Christian religion.

But the more specific Manicheans of Carthage that Augustine was ensnared by were a syncretism between the Christian religion and the wider non-Christian Manichean religion. As such, they constituted a specific Christian heresy. They professedly taught a "new" form of Christianity that rejected the Old Testament and was professedly Christ-centered (3:7-10,62ff). The Carthage Manicheans said Christ was the principle of Wisdom, and they were virulently hostile to orthodox Christians. They regarded flesh as evil, and so were vegetarians, and *regarded all sex as sinful* so that even marriage was forbidden. Hence they even denied that Christ had a body (5.9.102). I consider that the teachings of these type of gnostics prophetically type the Antichrist (I Timothy 4:3; I John 2:18; 4:2,3).

Augustine did not belong to the very strictest group of these Carthage Manicheans, but he was nevertheless held captive by the Carthage group of Manicheans for some nine years, before, by the grace of God, escaping from their evil clutches. Both his initial attraction to these Manicheans as a young man in his quest for "truth," and his ultimate escape from them, bespeak of very positive qualities in Augustine as he sought to understand God and Christianity. None of us are perfect. We all "live and learn."

Nevertheless, it needs to be stated plainly, that just as when Luther escaped from Romanism he still bore the marks of his former life in Romanism in elements of his sacramentalism (consubstantiation, baptismal regeneration, and what he saw as a church ordained "sacrament" of voluntary auricular confession); so likewise, it seems that Augustine unintentionally brought over with him some of this Manichean thinking, specifically, with respect to the idea that *sex is sinful*. However, in the same way that Luther modified transubstantiation to consubstantiation, or improved upon the works' righteousness and obligatory elements of Romish auricular confession to a voluntary auricular confession which lacked works' righteous "acts of penance" given out by the priest i.e., he improved upon Romish sacramentalism though sadly still remained semi-Romanist on these matters; so likewise, Austin improved upon this basic Manichean idea that *sex is sinful*, though sadly still remained semi-Manichean on this matter.

Thus in his *Confessions*, Augustine allows that marriage is valid, and indeed, goes so far as to cast some of the blame for his fall into unchastity on the fact that his family had not arranged a marriage for him (2:2:44); suggesting that his mother, Monica, had done so because she thought it might hinder Austin's career (2:3:46). Given the clear command in Genesis 1:28 that unfallen and so sinless man was to "be fruitful and multiply," the Manichean notion that procreation was sinful was thus purged from Austin's mind. But in order to then reconcile these types of conflicting views in Augustine's *Confessions*, the idea was thus developed that *unlike the Manicheans teaching sex is permissible for procreation in marriage, but like the Manicheans teaching otherwise is sinful* i.e. this is semi-Manichean. Some individuals (I do not say with any positive church sanction, though not with any negative church censure either,) have even gone so far as to claim the story of Adam and Eve eating the apple is "an allegory" referring to the fact that they had sex which was not intended for the purposes of procreation. But whether with or without this view of how man fell into sin; this basic type of semi-Manichean thinking found in Augustine's *Confessions* is also relevant to understanding why the Church of Rome regards contraceptives for married couples to be sinful.

It might also be remarked, that to the extent that Roman Catholic concepts of celibate clergy draws heavily on Augustinian notions, the fact that they engage in "forbidding to marry" of clergy (I Tim. 4:3), can thus be seen to have a connected theological pathway back to the gnostic Manicheans of Carthage that held Augustine captive for nine years.

Among other things, this semi-Manichean element of Augustinianism also developed a craving for an appropriate "ever-virgin" figure which was met in the false notion of "Mary ever-virgin." As they came out of the darkness of mediaeval Romanism, this matter was regarded by the Reformers as a secondary issue, and it did not become more of a focal issue in Protestantism until the latter part of the 16th and 17th centuries. Thus e.g., the *Second Helvetic Confession* of 1566 (also known as the *Second Confession of Basel*, and composed in 1536), refers in chapter 11 to, "the ever virgin Mary," and this Confession of Faith was adopted by the Reformed Church of Switzerland in 1566. It was also recognized by Protestants in parts of Germany (in the Palatinate), Scotland (1566), Hungary (1567), France (1571), and Poland (1578).

However, the late 16th and 17th centuries saw the Reformed come to better understand covenant theology, and thus a better theological model on which to understand original sin and original guilt than the Augustinian model. This was after the Anglican 39 Articles were written, and so whether or not a Reformed Anglican (i.e., since the 19th century what is often called a Low Church Evangelical Anglican,) comes to the second stage of the Reformation on this matter, and if so, whether he follows the traditional Presbyterian or Baptist views, are historically matters of private judgment for Evangelical Anglicans.

Throughout the OT and NT, there has only been *one covenant of grace* by which men have been saved. One can have a covenant within a covenant. E.g., for the Jews "the sabbath" was made a "covenant" (Exod. 31:16) inside Sinai's Decalogue covenant (Exod. 34:28). The *covenant of grace*, or "the everlasting covenant" (Heb. 13:20), has operated as a covenant *inside* both OT and NT covenants. In Gal. 3, St. Paul refers to "the covenant" of grace "that was confirmed before of God" inside the Abrahamic covenant, and says the later Sinai covenant "of law" "cannot disannul" it (Gal. 3:6,8,11,17,18).

Some orthodox Protestants e.g., Presbyterians, consider that the covenant of grace was inside the Sinai covenant, but was abused and misunderstood by NT Jews (Matt. 15:3-6; II Cor. 3:14), who wrongly turned it into a *covenant of works* (Gal. 3:12). Other orthodox Protestants e.g., Reformed Baptists (or Anglicans like myself), consider the Sinai covenant was a *covenant of works*, given as a theoretical alternative way of salvation, but one which due to original sin no man could ever keep so as to merit salvation, so that his *necessary* failure was meant to drive him to cry out for mercy under the *covenant of grace* (Matt. 19:16,18,19; Luke 18:13; John 1:17; Gal. 3:12,21-25; 4:21-31). Whichever view one takes, Gal 3:17,18 teaches that “the covenant” of grace was not disannulled by the Sinai covenant, and that Abraham had this covenant “confirmed” to him i.e., it predates Abraham.

We read of this “covenant” of “grace” (Gen. 6:8,18) in antediluvian times, for “Noah, ... became heir of the righteousness which is by faith” (Heb. 11:7). Since this *covenant of grace* was being preserved through Noah’s building of the ark, it must predate these times.

Indeed, Scripture teaches that it was first made with, and dates from the time of Adam, just after The Fall. In Gen. 3, after they ate the apple, Adam and Eve “knew” that had done wrong, and “sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons” as “they were naked” (Gen. 3:7). When Adam and Eve “knew ... they were naked,” this also included the element of spiritual “nakedness” (Rev. 3:18); otherwise, why would they have “hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden” (Gen. 3:8)?

Thus in dealing with the solution need to their sin problem, when God came into the Garden of Eden, he clearly told them of the coming Messiah. He said to “the women,” that the would be “enmity between” “her seed” and the Devil’s (Gen. 3:15). Thus to talk about the “seed” of “the woman,” requires that the coming Messiah would be “made of a woman” alone (Gal. 4:4) i.e., a virgin birth.

Furthermore, we read, “the Lord God” “did” “make coats of skins, and clothed them” (Gen. 3:21). In the first place, this means that God regarded the “aprons” of “fig leaves” (Gen. 3:7) made by Adam and Eve as inadequate. In the second place, this means that knowing about the coming virgin born Messiah of the world who would “bruise” the Devil (Gen. 3:15), they both knew of the bloody slaying of an animal, from which their animal skin clothes came (Gen. 2:21).

In the third place, this means that the clear statement of God, “in the day that thou eatest” “of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil” “thou shalt surely die” (Gen. 2:17), had in some way been set aside, so as to militate against its immediate severity. For while Adam and Eve would surely die, it was clearly not going to be on that very “day” (Gen. 2:17). How can this be, other than if the animals slain to clothe Adam and Eve were not sacrifices used to type the then coming Messiah? Since Adam and Eve were sent out of the Garden *clothed by God*, rather than executed on the spot, it follows that God’s clothing of them was *a symbol* of his grace. Therefore they must have had explained to them the fact that their clothing skins were symbols of Christ’s righteousness, and that only if they were clothed in his righteousness could they escape the just judgment of God.

Moreover, in the wider context of the knowledge of a coming Messiah (Gen. 3:15); it is clear that there were present in this action three clear elements of atonement: the death of an innocent victim; the shedding of blood; an action by God – who here clothed them.

And that this is the correct conclusion also appears evident from the fact that their children were meant to know that they had to offer up a symbolic sacrifice in Gen. 4:1-5, even though no other God ordained institution of animal killing is stated in Scripture before this other than in Gen. 3:21. Thus we are inexorably compelled to the conclusion that “the everlasting covenant” (Heb. 13:20) was first made with Adam, just after the Fall, in the Garden of Eden; for if it had not been so, he would have physically died then and there, on that very “day” (Gen. 2:17). For in no other way could God be “just” (Rom. 3:26), and not only not execute Adam and Eve on the spot, but positively assist them to escape his immediate judgment “in the day” they sinned (Gen. 2:17), by clothing them (Gen. 4:22), and then driving them out of the Garden of Eden, into the wider region of Eden beyond the Garden (Gen. 3:24), that he had created in six days (Gen. 1:2-2:3).

It might also be remarked, that this means that the earliest symbols of the covenant of grace were connected with the blood of an animal sacrifice, *typing the sacrifice and blood of Christ* (Matt. 20:28; 26:27; John 1:29), and animal skin clothes, i.e., clothes of righteousness *typing the righteousness of Christ* (Matt. 22:11-13; Philp. 3:9; Rev. 3:18).

Oh, the covenant of grace!
It saves those of Adam’s race;
Oh, the covenant of grace!

Moreover, since Adam was federal head of the Edenic covenant of works (Gen. 2:16,17; Hosea 6:7, NASB; Rom. 5), by he must have known of the later covenant of grace in connections with the Messiah (Gen. 3:15). This is also a required conclusion from the fact that God’s “salvation” was “spake by the mouth of his holy prophets” “since the world began” (Luke 1:70).

An element of the covenant of grace is federalism. Federalism as opposed to Augustinianism in the transmission of original sin and guilt, came to be recognized (with Anglicans allowing diversity between Federalists and Augustinians). Benjamin Warfield (1851-1921) observed, “in the hands of the great Protestant leaders of the sixteenth century, and of their successors ... of the seventeenth century, the threefold doctrine of imputation - of Adam’s sin to his posterity, of the sins of His people to the Redeemer, and of the righteousness of Christ to His people - at last came to its rights, as the core of the three constitutive doctrines of Christianity - the sinfulness of the human race, the satisfaction of Jesus Christ, and justification by faith. The importance of the doctrine of imputation, is that it is the hinge on which these three great doctrines turn, and the guardian of their purity⁴⁵.”

Of relevance to this issue, I consider Scripture clearly teaches that Mary consummated her marriage with Joseph after Jesus was born, for St. Matthew says the virgin Mary was with child of the Holy Ghost “before” Joseph and Mary “came together” in sexual union (Matt. 1:18), dates this delay saying Joseph sexually “knew her not till she had brought forth Christ;” and St. Matthew and St. Luke say Christ was Mary’s “firstborn son” (Matt. 1:25; Luke 2:7) and thus followed by at least a second-born, (and possibly third-born, fourth-born etc.,) subsequent offspring, which he later refers to (Luke 8:19-21). If this is not so, it means Mary made an egregious breach of one of the reasons for which marriage is ordained by God, and to the extent she would then have been prepared to “defraud” Joseph of his

⁴⁵ Warfield’s *Biblical & Theological Studies*, Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, 1968, p. 266.

conjugal rights (I Cor. 7:2-5), would have wilfully and unrepentantly committed a form of passive adultery in the form of a wilful and persistent denial of conjugal rights that would constitute a divorce cause (Matt. 5:32; 19:9). Furthermore, the NT recognizes that the Messianic words of Ps. 69:9, are fulfilled in Christ, “For the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up; and the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me” (John 2:17; Rom. 15:3; cf. Ps. 69:21 and Matt. 27:34). Significantly, then, the immediately preceding words are contextually also Messianic, “I am become a stranger unto my brethren, and an alien unto my mother’s children,” for St. John who twice quotes this Messianic psalm of Christ (Ps. 69:4 // John 15:25; Ps. 69:9 // John 2:17) also records, “neither did his brethren believe in him” (John 7:5) (although we know that later “James the Lord’s brother” did believe, Gal. 1:19). Since in Hebrew poetical parallelism Christ’s “brethren” are called his “mother’s children” (Ps. 69:8), this means that they must have been the children of Mary, and so Mary did not remain a virgin after she bore Christ. Hence I reject as erroneous the claims of the *Second Council of Constantinople* in 553 A.D. of an “ever-virgin Mary.”

Sadly, these views prevailed also among early sixteenth century Protestants still struggling under an Augustinian notion of original sin, which considers sex within marriage other than for the purposes of procreation is wrong, and thus they would agree with the Romish notion that contraceptive methods for married couples is wrong. (These type of views continued to also be held by some Protestants, usually, though not always, Augustinians, such as *some* Anglicans. Certainly Scripture teaches that marriage is a heterosexual institution, in part, because one of its functions is procreation, Gen. 1:27,28; 9:1, and so it would be wrong for a couple to always use contraceptives simply to avoid procreating. But e.g., how can one in marriage not “defraud” a spouse of their conjugal rights, and simultaneously “provide” “for” “his own house” without using contraceptive methods to keep the number of children in that “house” at a reasonable level? I Cor. 7:5; I Tim. 5:8. *Coitus interruptus* was known in Biblical times and not prohibited, Gen. 38:9 n.b. Onan here misused this method as he was meant to fulfil the Levirate marriage rule; Lev. 15:16-18 n.b. “seed of copulation” going on a “garment” or “skin” includes *coitus interruptus* and to “bathe themselves in water” facilitates *douche*.) Those desiring to find an “example” in Scripture of someone not having sex within marriage, tried to extend the time Mary could be called “the Virgin Mary” from the time “till she had brought forth” “Jesus” (Matt. 1:18-25), till her death. While this notion of an “ever-virgin Mary” was rightly swept away in the second stage of the Reformation, largely, though not entirely, in connection with the *Federalist Reform*; it was found among earlier reformers. For example, both Luther and Calvin regarded it as a matter of private conscience whether one believed Mary was or was not a perpetual virgin. Thus one can still believe in the broad fundamentals of apostolic Christianity recovered at the time of the first stage of the Reformation, while holding this erroneous teaching of an “ever-virgin Mary.” Hence while I criticize the *Second Council of Constantinople* (553) for its erroneous teaching of an “ever-virgin Mary,” I go further and condemn them only for pronouncing *anathemas* against those not endorsing its view of an “ever-virgin Mary.”

7) *Apocrypha Reform*. While I sometimes use the AV Apocrypha (1611, Cambridge University Press), or RV Apocrypha (1894,1895,1898, Cambridge University Press), I do so from publications of these works which are not attached to copies of Holy Writ. While I also sometime used Brenton’s Apocrypha, this is in an appendix attached to Brenton’s translation of the Septuagint, and so does not constitute a text of Scripture, both because the OT Hebrew and Aramaic Received Text is quite different to the Septuagint in many places (although the Greek Septuagint is in a closed class of OT sources that may be

used to construct the OT Received Text if there is a clear and obvious textual problem with the Masoretic Text), and also because no NT is attached to Brenton's translation of the Septuagint. Though I quote Brenton's Apocrypha, on some occasions he has simply replicated the AV's Apocrypha in the English translation he provides. All Protestant Reformers rejected the canonicity of the Apocrypha, but after the Lutheran Reformation continued to have it printed in Bibles (usually between the Old and New Testaments, occasionally after the New Testament). But among English speaking Protestants this practice was jettisoned as from the early seventeenth century on, Bibles became common which contained just canonical Scripture. The Apocrypha has now gone from the Protestant Bible, and for those of us who accept the second stage of the Reformation, *it has gone for good!*

8) *Was there a "third stage" or later stage(s) of the Reformation? - Anglicans & Puritans differ.* On the one hand, the *Church of England (Continuing)* which left the apostate Anglican Communion in 1994, does not seek to introduce doctrinal change. Thus the *Church of England (Continuing)* is like most Reformed Anglicans who historically do not in general look to "third" or later stage reforms. But on the other hand, the *Free Church of England* which was formed by Reformed Anglicans in 1844, is semi-Puritan in that it introduced some Puritan-type third or later stage reforms, e.g., removal of saying to the Bishop in the Ordinal, "Reverend Father in God"⁴⁶, as well as the abolition of the Homilies from the *Thirty-Nine Articles*; and these type of reforms have been preserved in the *Free Church of England (Evangelical Connexion)* established in 2004. More commonly, "third" or later stage reforms are associated with Non-Conformists or non-Anglicans. Following the *Act of Toleration* (1689), the Puritans (who also existed outside of Britain in the North American colonies of England,) basically became the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists, sometimes known generically as Non-Conformists (a term whose orbit later came to include others). Whether or not one thinks there were any later stage(s) of the Reformation, essentially revolves around what one thinks of the subsequent history of the various Protestant denominations; and views of this are not monolithic among orthodox Protestants.

⁴⁶ An Anglican Bishop is occasionally addressed as, "Reverend Father in God" (The Ordinal, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). But this is not a general title of address, such as "Bishop N," and is qualified, as a "Father *in God*." Likewise a similar type of qualification is found for the requirement that at an Anglican baptism there is a "Godfather" and "Godmother" (Infant Baptism Service, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). While it must be admitted that the spiritual standard of such persons vary; if they are godly, such terminology is compatible with Scripture (I Cor. 4:15; I Thess. 2:11; I Tim. 1:2,18; II Tim. 1:2; 2:1; Titus 1:4; I John 5:21.) This Anglican distinction is not always accepted by Puritan derived Protestants, some of whom may object to this usage in the Ordinal of "Reverend Father in God" for a Bishop, or "Godfather" and "Godmother" in the Baptism Service, or similar references to "the Church Fathers." Thus the *Free Church of England* removed references in their prayer book to the Bishop as "Reverend Father in God." In my opinion, such persons have not accomplished a viable synthesis of all relevant Scriptures, in which they understand Matt. 23:9 in the light of I Cor. 4:15 *et al*; and so, while they are strong on the citation of Matt. 23:9, they are weak on, and make it contradict, I Cor. 4:15 *et al, supra*. Nevertheless, all we Protestants are agreed that Matt. 23:9 forbids the common Roman Catholic (and Puseyite) practice of calling a clergyman, "Father" or "Father N" as a general title of address; or the Romish tradition giving the Bishop of Rome the common title, "Pope" (meaning, "Father").

For instance, issues dealing with church government (which I think the NT allows diversity of opinion on once the apostolate died out), were a key issue for Puritans, who wanted to “purify” the (Anglican) *Church of England*, from what they believed was an episcopal structure that still reflected elements of an earlier unBiblical Roman Catholic form of episcopacy or prelacy.

In overview, by the 17th century, Reformed Anglicans accepted the second stages of the Reformation in varying degrees. Some Reformed Anglicans accepted all of the seven itemized second stages of the Reformation referred to above, others accepted only some of them e.g., some rejected Federalism to remain Augustinians. By contrast, all Reformed Puritans accepted all of the above seven itemized second stages of the Reformation, and all were desirous to further “purify” Anglicanism from what they claimed were unwarranted Romish influences e.g., they all wanted to be rid of a prayer-book service and saints days. The Puritan movement was generally Reformed, though included an Arminian group that formed the General Baptists, as opposed to the Reformed group that formed the Particular Baptists. But during the seventeenth century, the Reformed Puritans split into three rival “third” stages of the Reformation. That which is common to the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* (adopted by the *Church of Scotland* 1649 & 1690), *Congregational Savoy Declaration* (1658), and *Baptist London (or Baptist) Confession* (1689), is the essence of seventeenth century Reformed Puritanism; and that which is different in these three confession (the latter two of which owe much to the Westminster Divines,) is the diversity of the three rival Puritan “third stages” of the Reformation. After these rival “third” stages of the Reformation had produced their confessions, the term Puritan came to be largely replaced with the denominational names of Presbyterian, Congregationalist, and Baptist.

The matter was further complicated by a division between the seventeenth century Baptists, both of whom claimed some connection to Puritanism. The Reformed group were known as *Particular Baptists* and they produced the *Baptist (or London) Confession* (1689). The Arminian group were known as *General Baptists*, and considered Arminianism was part of the program to “purify” the Reformed teaching of the Anglican Church, evident in the Church of England’s *Thirty-Nine Articles*. Then in the eighteenth century, a late claimant to be a “third stage” of the Reformation leaving Anglicanism, arose with the Wesleyan Methodists. Wesley’s Arminian preaching impacted his fellow Arminians among the *General Baptists*, who in 1770 reconstituted themselves under the name of the *New Connection General Baptists*, as a Wesleyan Arminian group of Baptists. Wesley’s preaching in America was also a key factor that meant the largely Reformed group of American Baptists, (who had adopted the *London Confession of 1689* as *The Philadelphia Confession of 1742*.) became more fragmented, giving rise to a stronger Wesleyan Arminian Baptist tradition in the USA. In 1784 John Wesley signed a Deed of Declaration appointing 100 men to govern the Society of Methodists after his death, and he ordained a minister for Methodists in America contrary to the Anglican Bishop of London’s wishes. Four years after his death, in 1795 the Methodists split from the Anglican Church.

On the one hand, I can accept that Wesleyan Arminianism is an improvement on the Arminianism Proper of the Dutch seminarian, Jacob Arminius (1560-1609), who was rightly condemned by the Dutch Reformed *Synod of Dort* (1618). But on the other hand, any form of Arminianism, including therefore Wesleyan Arminianism, is either Pelagian or Semi-Pelagian⁴⁷, and at such variance with the Biblical doctrines of original sin and God’s grace in

⁴⁷ Cf. Part 1, Article 2 of the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* (1530), “They condemn

salvation, recovered and found at both the first and second stages of the Reformation *in opposition to the Arminianism of Roman Catholicism*, that neither I nor any fellow Christian of the holy Reformed faith, could ever accept that either the seventeenth century or eighteenth century Arminians were a “third” or later stage of the Reformation. Rather, this Arminianism was a regression that took them backwards into a semi-Romanist view of salvation. It is at variance with the apostolic teachings of grace, as taught by such apostles as St. Peter (I Peter 1:2) and St. Paul (Rom. 8:29,30; 9-11; Eph. 1:3-12). For contrary to the claims of Arminians, a man is not simply *sick in sin*, but rather *dead in sin*, so that unless he is first “quickened” or made alive, he cannot truly desire or receive salvation (Eph. 2:5,8,9). And so St. Luke records that “as many as were ordained to eternal life believed” (Acts 13:48).

It is only by studying in detail the history of these broad denominations, that one can trace so called “third” or later stages of the Reformation, with each group seeing themselves as the “true” claimant or “natural outgrowth” of the earlier stages of the Reformation. A detailed study of this is beyond the scope of this work, but some examples may prove helpful in order to clarify what is something outside the first and second stages of the Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For example, some Presbyterians, represented in contemporary times by many Free Presbyterians (but not the Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster), took the view that Anglican worship had to be “purified” by only allowing the singing of the psalms, and no other songs e.g., the “Veni, Creator Spiritus” (“Come Creator Spirit”) used in the Ordinal, or the *Gloria in excelsis* (“Glory on high” or “Glory in the highest”) used at the Communion Service, in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*. These are rejected on the basis that they are “uninspired” songs, as opposed to the God inspired songs of the Psalter. This view says that the *Westminster Confession* as a third-stage reform, refers only to “singing of psalms” at 21:5, with Scriptural reference to Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; Jas. 5:13. Such Presbyterians claim that “psalms and hymns and spiritual songs” in Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 are synonyms, and so these passages say the same thing as Jas. 5:13 which only refers to “psalms.” Thus e.g., Act 5, 1932, of the “Formula of Subscription” signed by Ministers of the *Free Church of Scotland* defines “purity of worship” as including, the “practice of the Free Church to avoid the use in public worship of uninspired materials of praise as also of instrumental music.”

The Free Presbyterians look to the usage of these three terms in the psalms

Pelagians,” “who” because they do not understand the proper nature “of original sin,” “argue that man can be justified in God’s sight by his own strength of reason, so as to lessen the glory of the merit and the benefits of Christ.” We fallen men cannot do anything pleasing to God without his grace, we have an *inability* to even repent and turn to him except by his grace. An unregenerate man is “dead in trespasses and sins” (not as the Arminians think, simply *very sick* in sin), until he is “quickened” (AV) or “made” “alive” (NKJV), and given the gift of *faith alone* by which he accepts God’s gift of salvation given by *grace alone* (Eph. 2:1,5,8; cf. Gen. 2:16,17; 3:6; Ezek. 16:4-6; 37:1-14; John 6:44,65; 1 Cor. 2:14). For “when” “the Lord” “passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thine own blood,” he “said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live” (Ezek. 16:3,6); and through the covenant of grace saves us (Ezek. 36:24-31). (The eternal covenant of grace was operated in Ezekiel’s day as a covenant inside an OT covenant, but now is a covenant inside the NT’s new covenant, Gal. 3; Heb. 13:20). But because Arminians undermine original sin, they think a man had an *ability* of his own power, so that saving faith becomes a good work that he is capable of exercising.

themselves, with some reference to the Septuagint. A number of Psalms use such synonyms, e.g., Ps. 30, “A psalm and song.” Or the Hebrew caption for Ps. 76, “To the chief musician on Neginoth, A Psalm or Song of Asaph,” becomes in the Septuagint, “For the end, among the Hymns (*humnois*), a Psalm (*psalmos*) for Asaph, a Song (*ode*) for the Assyrian,” and thus (with different declensions) contains the same Greek words as Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16, “psalms” (*psalmois*), “hymns” (*humnois*), and “spiritual songs” (*odais*). Ps. 22:22 in the Septuagint reads, “in the midst of the church will I sing praise (*humneso* from *humnein*) to thee;” and proponents of this view generally equate the Greek NT “hymns” in Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 with the Hebrew “praise,” noting that in the Hebrew the Book of Psalms is called the Book of Praises. The plural forms in Hebrew, *mizmorim* (psalms), *tehillim* (praises), and *shirim* (songs), are thus said to equate the NT’s “psalms and hymns and spiritual songs” (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16). Reference is also made to Matt. 26:30; Mark 14:26, where at the Last Supper, Jesus and his apostles “sung an hymn.” It is conjectured that this was either Psalms 113-118, or some portion thereof, on the basis that this is traditionally sung at Passover. In the Septuagint, Ps. 118:14 reads, “The Lord is my strength and my song (*humnesis*). On this argument, Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 means sing, “psalms and psalms and psalms.” In harmony with the wider Puritan “regulatory principle,” the Free Presbyterian tradition, looks to specific commands to do things in worship. Hence this view of Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 also brings with it the further claim, that even though musical instruments were used in OT Jewish worship, the NT nowhere specifically states that musical instruments are to be used in worship, and so such psalms are to be sung without any musical accompaniment⁴⁸.

By contrast, the Reformation Anglican view (which I share), maintains that if something has been found to be useful and good in the church, providing that it is not contrary to the Word of God, it may be used (“nothing be ordained against God’s Word,” Article 34, 39 Articles). Therefore, even if the Free Presbyterian interpretation of Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 referring only to the Psalter were correct, it would not change my view that hymns or songs not in the Psalter may be sung, providing they are inside the bounds of religiously conservative broad Protestant Christian orthodoxy. But more than this, the Reformation Anglican view (which I share), as found in e.g., the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, considers “psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs” Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 refers to psalms *and other types of religious songs*. Thus the prayer book contains e.g., a form of “the psalms” to be read or sung. Then at Matins, there is an option, either to say or sing “the Hymn called Te Deum” (Latin, “Thee God”) or “Te Deum Laudamus” (Latin, “Thee God we praise”), or a “Canticle,” from the section of the Apocrypha known in Article 6 of the Thirty-Nine Articles as “The Song of the Three Children,” and called the *Benedicite, omnia opera* (Latin, “Bless ye, all works”), or simply as the *Benedicite* (Latin, “Bless ye”). Thus “Hymn” and “Song” are used in the Reformation Anglican tradition for non-inspired religious songs outside the Psalter. Since we are not told what “hymn” was “sung” in Matt. 26:30; Mark 14:26, it is not possible to exclude from the possible orbit of speculation anything known to the Jews at the time which is theologically sound. Thus the “hymn” “sung” may e.g., have been the Song of Moses (Exod. 15:1-19), or the uninspired, though theologically sound, *Benedicite* from the Apocrypha.

I consider that these three terms “psalms and hymns and spiritual songs” (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16), are *near* synonyms, and *in some instances* may be synonyms. That is, the only

⁴⁸ Watts, M.H., *God’s Hymnbook for the Christian Church*, James Begg Society, Aberdeen, Scotland, UK, 2003 (ISBN 0-9539241-8-1). *English Churchman* 29 April & 5 May, 2005, p. 2; 13 & 20 May, 2005, p. 2; 27 May & 3 June 2005, p.2.

real difference between the three is what the original author, or later tradition, chooses to call them. Thus one could reasonably call the OT Book of Psalms either a “psalter,” “hymnal,” or “song book;” and likewise one could reasonably call a Hymnal comprised mainly, or entirely of non-inspired songs, a “psalter,” “hymnal,” or “song book.” But in order to avoid confusion, by convention, as a general rule, “psalm” has been reserved for the OT Psalter. Thus if a religious song is called a psalm, then it is a psalm; if it is called a hymn, or says something like, “hymn God praise,” it can be called a “hymn;” or if it uses neither the terms nor name of psalm or hymn, but either is called a “song” or says something like “sing God praise,” it can be called a song. This means that there can be overlap, in that a particular psalm might be called “a psalm or song” in e.g., the title, or a religious song might use both the terms “hymn” and “song” and so constitute either or both.

The Greek word *humneo* which is derived from *humnos* is translated “praise” in Heb. 2:12 (quoting Ps. 22:22), “in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee” (AV) or “I will hymn thee.” *Humneo* can also be translated as either “sing praise” (Heb. 2:12) or “sung an hymn” (Matt. 26:30; Mark 14:26), as either “sang praises” (AV) or “singing hymns” (NKJV) (Acts 16:25). Thus the OT Psalter could be reasonably called a “Hymnal,” and “hymns” in Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 could in theory thus refer to this Psalter. But it should also be noted that the NT consistently uses the Greek Septuagint’s names for the OT Books, and if by “Psalms and Hymns” were meant the names of the Book of Psalms first in Greek, that is, “Psalms,” and then in Hebrew, “Hymns,” equating the Hebrew “Praises,” this would be without precedent elsewhere in the NT. While this argument is not conclusive, it creates a presupposition and *probability against this possibility* which could only be rebutted by a clear and unequivocal warrant. Here this would require the words, “from the Book of Psalms” (Luke 20:42; Acts 1:20), after “psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.” This is lacking in Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16, and thus the presupposition against this possibility cannot be rebutted; and so the *more natural and probable* meaning is that “psalms” here does *not necessarily* mean the same thing as “hymns.” A comparison between Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16, on the one hand, and Jas. 5:13; far from showing that these passages are saying the same thing, with the consequence that the trilogy of Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; means “psalms and psalms and psalms,” I think shows that Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 is teaching that there are songs *in addition to* the “psalms” mentioned in both Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 and Jas 5:13, that Christians should sing. Furthermore, to then use only the NT Greek terminology for “spiritual songs,” rather than the Greek and Hebrew, creates a further unlikely stylistic tension. Moreover, the addition of the word “spiritual” in front of “songs” in Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; does not conform to the stylistic usage in the Psalter, where we read before some, “A psalm or song” (Ps. 92), and so “spiritual songs” more naturally appears to mean something different again.

The NT Christians were certainly aware of both inspired and non-inspired songs outside of the Psalter, that used some or all of these terms. E.g., the uninspired *Song of Tobit* (Tobit 13, Apocrypha), which is “a prayer of rejoicing” (Brenton’s Apocrypha), includes “praise” (*ainesin*) to God (Tobit 13:18, Brenton’s Apocrypha). The uninspired psalm in Judith 16:1-17 (Apocrypha) is called “praise” (*ainesin*), “psalm” (*psalmon*) and “hymn” (*humnon*) (Judith 16:1,2,13, Apocrypha). Thus it might be called *A Psalm or Praise or Hymn of Judith*. This hymn is said to have been sung with “timbrels” and “cymbals” (Judith 16:2, Brenton’s Apocrypha). While I would not be happy to sing all parts of this uninspired *Psalm of Judith*, I would be happy to sing some portions of it. E.g., an acceptable portion of the uninspired *Psalm or Hymn of Judith* from Judith 16:13-15 (Apocrypha) is sometimes used as an Anglican song; as is a portion of the uninspired *Song of Tobit* from Tobit 13:1-4,6,

Apocrypha; as is the inspired *Song of Isaiah* in Isa. 12:2-6⁴⁹. Given the clear absence from Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 of the qualification, from “the Book of Psalms” (Luke 20:42; Acts 1:20), are we to believe that St. Paul forbade the singing of e.g., the Song of Moses (Exod. 15:1-19), or the Song of Solomon? To my mind this is an inconceivable possibility. St. John uses the imagery of S. of Sol. 6:10 in Rev. 12:1 for God’s bride, and if Christians wanted to sing e.g., S. of Sol. 6 understood as a love song between Solomon and his bride that types and finds its greater fulfilment in Christ and the Church (Eph. 5:31), then it would be absurd to suggest that Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 prohibits this.

Some of the songs in Scripture were composed in OT times before the Psalter, e.g., the Song of Moses in Exod. 15:1-21 (cf. also Num. 21:17,18; I Sam. 21:11; II Sam. 22; I Kgs 4:32; Judg. 5). In inter-testamental times, we read, “Moses in his song (Greek *odes*), which witnessed to their faces, declared, saying, And he shall be comforted in his servants” (II Macc. 7:6, Brenton’s Apocrypha, referring to Deut. 31:21,26,30; 32:36). But showing that songs could still be composed after the Psalter was written, some new songs were composed in OT times after the Psalms (Isa. 26; Hab. 3). New songs also appear in NT times (Rev. 5:9,10; 14:3; 15:3,4). If only the OT Psalter is meant to be used, then the saints in glory must have erred; for rather than using just the old songs from the Psalter, we read “they sung a new song,” to Christ, “saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign in earth” (Rev. 5:9,10).

In the Apocrypha, we also find, “The Song of the Three Children” (or “The Song of the Three Holy Children”), in which God is “praised” (*ainetos*) (2), this word also be found in e.g., the Septuagint’s Ps. 48:1, “Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised” (*ainetos*). Here the three holy children are said to have “praised” (Brenton’s Apocrypha) or literally “hymn” (*humoun*) their song to “God” (27); and the three are exhorted to “praise” (Brenton’s Apocrypha) or literally “hymn” (*humneite*) “the Lord” (65). Indeed, they exhort “all ye that worship the Lord” to “praise” (Brenton’s Apocrypha) or literally “hymn” (*humneite*) “him” (67). This Greek word *humneo* is derived from *humnos* (hymns); and *humneo* can also be translated as either “sang praises” (AV) or “singing hymns” (NKJV) (Acts 16:25). In fact, in the part of this song found at Matins in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) *alone*, namely, Song of the Three Children, 34-67 (Apocrypha), known as the *Benedicite*, the Greek word *humneo* (in different declensions), occurs some thirty-two times (or if the two disputed verses numbered either 45,46, or 46,47, omitted by Brenton’s Apocrypha are excluded, thirty times) (in fact additional usage of *humneo* is also found in the longer form of this song of the Apocrypha). It is translated as “praise” in the Authorized Version’s Apocrypha (1611), Book of Common Prayer’s version (1662), and Lancelot Brenton’s Greek-English edition of the Septuagint (1851). If thirty-two (or thirty) statements to “praise” or “hymn” “the Lord” in

⁴⁹ *An Australian Prayer Book* (AAPB) for use together with the Book of Common Prayer, 1662, Standing Committee of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia, Sydney, 1978, p. 52 Daily Service (Judith 16:13-15, Apocrypha, is said or sung with the Gloria Patri), p. 66 Daily Service (Tobit 13:1-4,6, Apocrypha, is said or sung with an Amen), p. 74 Daily Service (Isa. 12:2-6 is said or sung with the Gloria Patri). Though I do not generally support the AAPB, preferring the 1662 prayer book, there is a very small amount in it I find of value. Though I do not use these AAPB daily services, I would have no objection to e.g., a choir singing these portions of the Apocrypha (put into old English first), at e.g., “the Anthem” section of a 1662 prayer book service of Matins or Evensong.

the *Benedicite* does not qualify as a clear example of a well-known song from NT times covered by the NT injunction to sing “hymns and spiritual songs” (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16), then what, I ask, reasonably does?

Likewise, in Sirach (or Ecclesiasticus) chapter 39 in the Apocrypha, we read, “Magnify” the “name” of “the Lord,” “and shew forth his praise (*ainesei*)” (Sirach 39:15, Brenton’s Apocrypha) i.e., *ainesei* is the same Greek word used in the Septuagint’s caption for Ps. 145 referring to “David’s praise” (*ainesis*); then “with the songs” (*odais*) (Sirach 39:15, Brenton’s Apocrypha) i.e., *odais* is the same Greek word used for the Septuagint’s caption for Pss. 133,134 and various other psalms referring to a “song” (*ode*); then “and with harps, and in praising him ye shall say after this manner” (Sirach 39:15, Brenton’s Apocrypha). After this introduction, appears the following “praise” or “song” found nowhere in the psalter or OT Scripture: “All the works of the Lord are exceeding good, and whatsoever he commandeth shall be accomplished in due season” (Sirach 39:16, Brenton’s Apocrypha). Therefore if one was to accept the Free Presbyterian view that the OT’s “psalms” “praises” and “songs” are threefold synonyms in the Book of Psalms, and further are synonyms that equate the NT’s “psalm and hymns and spiritual songs,” one could, through reference to the Apocrypha, show that one cannot then limit the term “psalm” (Judith 16:2, Apocrypha), “praise” (Judith 16:1, Apocrypha; Sirach 39:14, Apocrypha; Song of the Three Children, 3, Apocrypha) or “hymn” (Judith 1:13, Apocrypha; Song of the Three Children, 35-68, Apocrypha), and “song” (Judith 16:1,13, Apocrypha, Sirach 39:14, Apocrypha) purely to the Psalter, or other songs from Holy Writ. That is because one can find other songs also called “psalm,” “praise,” “hymn,” and “song,” clearly known in NT times, and clearly outside both the Psalter, and canon of Holy Scripture, and so uninspired. With the Apocrypha freely circulating in NT times as part of the Septuagint, a specific qualification of “psalms and hymns and spiritual songs *in the Book of Psalms*” would be needed to ensure no Christian ever sang such Biblically sound, but uninspired songs, as *The Praise or Song of Sirach* (Sirach 39:16, Apocrypha); or *The Song of the Three Children* (Song of the Three Children 28-68, Apocrypha), a tradition I find echoed in the much later use of the *Benedicite*, taken from the Song of the Three Children 35-66 (Apocrypha), and used at Matins in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662).

On general principles, the idea that uninspired songs cannot be used, if taken to its logical conclusion, would mean that sermons could not be preached, or prayers offered in a church, but only the Scriptures read. The Apostle Paul says, “I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also” (I Cor. 14:15). If “spiritual gifts” (I Cor. 14:12) extend to prayer which is composed and offered freely, e.g., the prayer of the Anglican 1662 prayer book were mainly composed by Thomas Cranmer, or Ministers might offer certain free prayers before the “Prayer of Saint Chrysostom” at Anglican Evensong, or at the start and / or finish of a sermon; and suchlike is subject only to general theological orthodoxy as determined by Scripture; then on the basis of this clear parallel instruction in I Cor. 14:15, hymns and spiritual songs may be composed and offered freely, subject only to general theological orthodoxy as determined by Scripture. This parallel is further reinforced when it is remembered that while the Psalter mentions only one shiggaion, Ps. 7; Hab. 3 refers to another shiggaion, “A prayer of Habakkuk the prophet upon Shigionoth,” “To the chief singer on my stringed instruments” (Hab. 3:1,19). This shows that a prayer may be sung, e.g., Keith Green’s “O Lord, You’re Beautiful⁵⁰.” Likewise, the tunes used by Free

⁵⁰ See Keith Green’s “The Ministry Years,” Vol. 1, 1977-1979, and Vol. 2, 1980-

Presbyterians in their psalm singing are uninspired and must also be rejected if this view was consistently followed. If we allow that sermons and prayers can be composed and offered, and that their theological orthodoxy judged by Scripture, why not allow this same process for hymns and spiritual songs? While on the one hand, it must be admitted that some hymns and songs are to be rejected; on the other hand, who could question the orthodoxy of such great Christian hymns as Martin Luther's "A Mighty Fortress is our God," William Cowper's "There is a Fountain filled with blood," or John Newton's "Amazing Grace"?

The Free Presbyterian tradition further claims that the absence of a specific NT directive to use musical accompaniment means psalms should be sung without instrumental accompaniment. Such an argument makes more sense against the Celtic cultural backdrop of Gaelic singing. In Brittany, France, as well as Ireland, Wales, and Scotland in the British Isles, there is the Celtic tradition of singing without instrumental accompaniment known as *sean-nos* (*sean nos*) (old style) singing. E.g., this is well known in the Connemara region of County Galway in southern Ireland; or at Scotland's National Gaelic Mod⁵¹. While individual *sean-no* singers make their own variations, in broad-brush terms, *sean-nos* singing is always without instrumental musical accompaniment, and is sung with an emphasis on the clear vowel sounds of words, together with holding onto the endings of each line or verse. Against this Gaelic-Celtic cultural backdrop, the Free Presbyterian church, whose historical roots are in Celtic Scotland, makes cultural sense; and indeed the Free Presbyterian musical tradition can be properly assessed in its own right, as a very beautiful musical tradition of psalm singing, manifesting elements of traditional Gaelic-Celtic culture. Were the Free Presbyterians to purely justify their practice of singing without musical accompaniment on such localized cultural factors, that only applied to worship services derived from a Gaelic-Celtic cultural context such as their own, it would present no insurmountable theological problems. Unfortunately, to the chagrin of e.g., their organ playing, culturally Anglo-Saxon brethren to the south, our kilted, clannish, brethren from Scotland, *go too far*. They have sought to make a universal Christian law of their Gaelic customs of not using musical accompaniment with singing in church, justifying this on the claim that there is no specific NT command to sing with musical accompaniment.

With respect to the usage of musical instruments, I note that the psalms themselves frequently refer to such accompaniment. E.g., "It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto thy name, O most High." "Upon an instrument of ten strings, and upon the psaltery; upon the harp with a solemn sound" (Ps. 92:1,3). Or Ps. 150 mentions various musical instruments, "Praise him with the sound of the trumpet: praise him with the psaltery and harp. Praise him with the timbrel," "praise him with stringed instruments and organs. Praise him upon the loud cymbals: praise him upon the high

1982, Sparrow Records, 1999 (on 4 CDs), Brentwood, Tennessee, USA (www.sparrowrecords.com). Most of the songs on these four Computer Discs are good. But Keith Green's theology contains some errors. E.g., in his song, "Jesus Commands us to Go!" he fails to recognize that in the body of Christ there are many members (I Cor. 12:28-30), and that "he gave" "some, evangelists" (Eph. 4:11). I.e., not all Christians are called by God to be evangelists under The Great Commission (Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15,16), although "some" are (Eph. 4:11), and as appropriate, all are certainly called to give a Christian witness in their lives and words (Acts 8:4).

⁵¹ The Royal National Mod is Scotland's main festival of Celtic-Gaelic culture, held annually in October since 1892 at differing Scotch locations.

sounding cymbals” (Ps. 150:3-5). How then can we agree that the NT says we should sing “psalms” (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; Jas 5:13), and then disagree over the usage of musical accompaniment? If we are agreed that the NT teaches we are meant to sing psalms, I cannot see why this does not include within it the psalms repeated instruction to use musical accompaniment. “Praise the Lord with the harp: sing unto him with the psaltery and an instrument of ten strings. Sing unto him a new song; play skilfully with a loud noise” (Ps. 33:2,3).

Moreover, I note that the word used for “melody” in Eph. 5:19, is Greek *psallo* from *psao*, and means “to pull,” or “twitch,” that is, *on a stringed instrument* understood. This same Greek word is found with this connotation in Rom. 15:9; I Cor. 14:15; James 5:13. Thus when e.g., St. Paul says, “the Gentiles” shall “sing” (Greek *psallo*) (Rom. 15:9; quoting Ps. 18:49), this contextually includes musical accompaniment either by one or more stringed instruments, or a stringed instrument together with other instruments; as does St. James teaching, to “sing (Greek *psallo*) psalms” (Jas 5:13). A similar concept is found in e.g., Isa. 38:20, “we will sing” “songs to the stringed instrument.” Examples of stringed instruments include the harp and guitar. If only the psalms of the Psalter without musical accompaniment are meant to be sung, then someone must have forgotten to tell the saints “that have gotten the victory over the” Antichrist “beast” about it; for they, “having the harps of God” (Rev. 15:2) i.e., musical accompaniment, “sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb.” The song, “Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty,” found at Rev. 15:3,4 is not found in the Psalter.

Therefore I do not regard the movement from the Reformation Anglican type of understanding of Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; Jas 5:13, (which historically is shared by most other Protestant Christians,) to the Free Presbyterian type of understanding of these passages, to be a later stage reform that “purifies” the public worship of God. However, I can accept that it was a more Celtic-Gaelic way, and therefore a more Scottish way of singing, than the English Anglo-Saxon derived or Anglican way. Thus sean-nos singing created a cultural context in which it seemed appropriate and normal for Free Presbyterians to ask “the obvious question,” “Why should we break with our cultural traditions and use musical accompaniment?” When this is combined with the Puritan and so Presbyterian idea that one needs a specific NT direction to include something in worship, the origins of this tradition become intelligible. Though it was possibly not the consciously thought out intended effect of Free Presbyterians, who simply looked at the world through Celtic-Gaelic culture in a non-conscious way; nevertheless, the effect of this was to create a Presbyterian tradition that *acted as a vehicle to manifest Scottish national sentiments in contrast with English national sentiments*. Of course, this Free Presbyterian tradition has now been exported beyond the confines of the lily-white Celtic-Gaelic Caucasians of Scotland, being found e.g., in black Negroid mission fields such as the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland’s* churches in Zimbabwe⁵². In view of the way they reach their conclusion that Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 means “psalms and psalms” from the Psalter, I do not think that their interpretation puts them outside the boundaries of broad Protestant orthodoxy. Indeed I have found a number of Free Presbyterians to be a good and godly group of Reformed Christians, with whom I have enjoyed sweet fellowship, and have much in common. I certainly do not consider our differences to be a bar to Christian fellowship between us.

I would also note, that some of those who are quick to criticize the Free Presbyterians

⁵² McPherson, A. (Editor), *op. cit.*, p. 318.

on the basis that they sing “psalms,” but not “hymns and spiritual songs;” are slow to comparably criticize other churches that sing “hymns and spiritual songs,” but not “psalms.” Some churches fail to sing psalms due to neglect of God’s Word, rather than conscious intent. Others claim the Psalter is not appropriate in “the Christian era,” on the basis that they were written before Christ fulfilled such images as the “burnt offering” (Ps. 51:16). Personally, I could not sing e.g., Psalms 2 or 110, without seeing Christ very much in the Psalm. I am quite happy to sing such verses against idolatry as, “their drink offerings of blood will I not offer” (Ps. 16:4), precisely because Christ is known by the Christian to be the fulfillment of the pure OT imagery in e.g., the “sacrifice” of Ps. 50:5; all of which thus still conveys important spiritual truths. The French Huguenot’s great Battle Hymn of the Church Militant Here on Earth was Psalm 68, for “the God of Israel” (Ps. 68:35) is the God of the Christian Church, as since NT times the Church has been God’s Israel (Gal. 3:26-29).

I rejoice in such verses as, “Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand,” “to execute upon them the judgement written: this honour have all his saints” (Ps. 149:6,9). For I see beyond the prophetic type of OT Jewish Israel, to the fact that all Christians have “a two-edged sword in their hand” (Ps. 149:6) in the Holy Bible (Eph. 6:17), and with this, they e.g., “execute judgment upon the heathen” (Ps. 149:7) by declaring through their witness the gospel of Jesus Christ; and “this honour have all his saints. Praise ye the Lord” (Ps. 149:9). “O daughter of Babylon,” “Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones” (Ps. 137:8,9). The Church of Christ suffered what Luther rightly called in 1520, “The Babylonian Captivity” of Romanism⁵³ (Rev. 14:8; 17:5). “O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed” (Ps. 137:8; Rev. 18), “happy shall he be, that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us” (Ps. 137:8). For Babylon “served us” by claiming in “ecumenical councils” that godly saints such as e.g., Wycliffe and the Lollards of England were “heretics” (*Council of Constance* 1415)⁵⁴. Yet the saints of God such as Luther, “rewardeth thee” “O daughter of Babylon,” “as thou hast served us,” by also declaring “thee” to be heretical, but in the saints’ instance, rightly declaring and showing “thee” to be in heresy, as e.g., Luther did at the *Diet of Worms* (1521). “Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones” (Ps. 137:8,9); as e.g., Luther did, when with the Word of God he “dasheth” the Romanist heretics “against the” teaching of the apostolic “stones” (Rev. 21:14), such as “James, Cephas, and John, who” were NT “pillars” (Gal. 2:9). “For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved,” such as Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, and Zwingli, “may be made manifest among you” (I Cor. 11:19). “O daughter of Babylon,” “happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones” (Ps. 137:8,9).

Perhaps then, on the one hand, Free Presbyterians singing *only* psalms from the Psalter; and on the other hand, those singing *only* hymns and never psalms from the Psalter, have more in common than they might first realize. That is because *in practice*, both seem to regard “psalms and hymns and spiritual songs” as synonyms. If my option was between a church that sang only psalms from the Psalter, and a church that sang only hymns, I would prefer the church that sang only psalms, since these are inspired by God himself, and superior to anything that even the most godly uninspired hymn writer can produce. But I thank God that the NT allows me to sing *both* psalms and hymns.

No specific distinction between “hymns” and “spiritual songs” is stated in the NT, and

⁵³ Bainton, R.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 106-111.

⁵⁴ Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 173-82.

I maintain that “psalms and hymns and spiritual songs” are *near* synonyms, and *in some instances* may be synonyms. That is, the only real difference between the three is what the original author, or later tradition, chooses to call them. Therefore, while a modern rather an ancient distinction, I have no objection to the practice in contemporary times of distinguishing between “hymns” in metrical stanzas, as opposed to “songs” such as Keith Green’s, “There is a Redeemer.”⁵⁵ While I am not opposed to such *relatively modern* distinctions of language, it should be clearly understood that there is no evidence to indicate that this was the distinction meant during NT times in Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16. If following the Biblical injunction, I consider a church should therefore use both a Psalter, and also a Hymnal or Song Book. I consider the historic Reformed Anglican tradition maintains this balance well. However, a number of churches make use of only one of these possibilities. I would also agree that some churches have allowed in unBiblical songs that no Christian should sing. But to the extent that Free Presbyterians e.g., the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*, the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, or the *Free Church of Scotland (Continuing)*⁵⁶, all sing only psalms from the Psalter in church, and that without musical accompaniment; and all maintain that they are thereby upholding *Westminster Confession* 21:5; it is clear that those maintaining third (or later) stage reforms, tend to be focused on their own denominations as the fulfilments of those reforms, rather than on a religiously conservative broad-Protestant perspective.

Those arguing for third (or later) stage reforms, as a tendency are thus focused more narrowly on the broad sectarian history of their particular Protestant denomination, or streams of like denominations. For example, among Presbyterian Protestants, in addition to the general Protestant period of anti-Popery in the sixteenth century (first and some of the second

⁵⁵ The story of Keith Green (1953-1982) reminds me of that of King Henry VIII, as it is the story of a man who progressively came closer to Christ, making some mistakes on the way. After justification, Keith experienced sanctification; but like all the saints of God, Keith did not arrive at the final degree of glory in this life (II Cor. 3:18). E.g., he had long hair, though nature itself teaches us that it is shameful for a man to have long hair (I Cor. 11:15). That is because men are physically and psychologically adapted to be military combatants, whereas women are not, and in the most effective military forces it has always been required that men have shorter hair, relative to women. Thus while the variation of warfare has meant male hair length has varied, for those who heed the voice of nature, male hair has always been shorter than female hair as a sign of manliness. E.g., in our culture, since the early 20th century, short hair by men in the military, above the ears, with only a moustache above the lip (air force or army), or close beard (navy), has been appropriate, and so nature teaches that this is *the manly look* that Christian males should follow (and conversely females should have longer hair than this). For similar reasons, males should not e.g., wear earrings (whereas females may). King David “wept” over the premature death of his beloved “son Absalom,” whose sin of long-hair had caught him out (II Sam. 14:25,26; 18:9,10,33). So too, I admit sadness at the loss of such a gifted Christian song writer as Keith Green, over 90 per cent of whose songs are good, and who was tragically killed in a plane crash in 1982. (Green, M., & Hazard, D., *No Compromise*, The Life Story of Keith Green, Word Publishing, Sparrow Press, 1989.

⁵⁶ The *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* was constituted in 1846, and is affiliated with the *Free Church of Scotland*, which broke from the *Church of Scotland* in 1843. The *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* broke from the *Free Church of Scotland* in 1893. The *Free Church of Scotland (Continuing)* broke from the *Free Church of Scotland* in 2000.

stages of the Reformation), there followed a period of anti-Anglican prelacy in the 17th century, till religious toleration was allowed in 1689. But issues between Presbyterians relating to matters of the relationship between church and state, patronage, and the usage of the psalms, continued. Hence the issue of anti-patronage resulted in the formation of the *Free Church of Scotland* under its first Moderator, Thomas Chalmers in 1843, and ultimately affected the wider *Church of Scotland* as an Act of Parliament abolished the law of patronage in 1875. Thus a Presbyterian Protestant may see the *Westminster Confession* and associated anti-prelacy in the seventeenth century as components in a third stage of reform, and anti-patronage in the nineteenth century as a fourth stage reform.

Some Presbyterians, for example, the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, would then see this fourth stage as a final stage reform, and seek to preserve that which they thus attained. But particular Presbyterian denominations, may develop this with further reforms that other Presbyterians may disagree with, or start with a different fourth stage, and develop this with further reforms. For example, the *Bible Presbyterian Church* (BPC) was formed in New Jersey, USA in 1938, as a group that had left the *Orthodox Presbyterian Church of America* (OPC) over millennialist views. The OPC had formed in 1936, after leaving the *Presbyterian Church in the USA* (PCUSA). Dating from 1789, all three of these American Presbyterian churches hold to eighteenth century fourth stage American reforms, which do not in any sense recognize the Establishment Principle (Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:22,23), dealing with changes on civil magistrates relevant to *Westminster Confession* 20:4; 22:3; 23:3; 31:1; 31:2. As Benjamin Warfield notes, “American Presbyterians,” with PCUSA in 1789, (and also the Associate Reformed Church in 1799, and the United Presbyterian Church since its formation in 1858,) “were the first to prepare modifications of the Westminster Confession which turned on” “the fundamental right of unrestricted religious liberty.⁵⁷” Further twentieth century changes to the *Westminster Confession* occurred in all three denominations. For example, the BPC enacted a later twentieth century reform (1938), further amending *Westminster Confession* 32:3; 33:1, so that it is clearly pre-millennial, thus reading, “The bodies of the unjust shall, after Christ has reigned on earth a thousand years, be raised by the power of God to dishonour” (Revised 32:3); and “God hath appointed a day, wherein he will judge the world in righteousness ...” (33:1), is revised to, “God has appointed a day (which word in Scripture in reference to the last things may represent a period of time including the thousand years following the visible, personal and pre-millennial return of Christ), ...” (Revised 33:1).

I entirely agree with these pre-millennialist statements. I think there will be a “resurrection of the just” (Luke 14:14) or “resurrection of life” for “they that have done good,” but also, a “resurrection of damnation” for “they that have done evil” (John 5:29), in which “the dead in Christ shall rise first” (I Thess. 4:16). Scripture repeatedly refers to a specific “day” of Christ’s return on which God will judge both just and unjust alike (e.g., Joel 2:31; Luke 10:12; John 6:39; II Thess. 2:2,3; II Peter 3:10,12). I consider the question of how long this “day of judgment” (e.g., Matt. 10:15) will be, is specifically addressed in Rev. 20, where we learn that the Biblical “last day” (John 12:48), or “day of judgment” (II Peter 2:9), is about 1,000 years long (bearing in mind that the judgment of the wicked at the end of the millennium will take some time after this 1,000 years). For “one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day” (II Peter 3:8). Thus I think the millennium is the interlude between the resurrection of the just (Rev. 20:4,6), which “is the

⁵⁷ Warfield, B.B., *The Westminster Assembly & Its Work*, Oxford University Press, New York, USA, 1931, p. 373.

first resurrection” (Rev. 20:5), and the resurrection of the unjust, which “is the second death” (Rev. 20:6,14; 21:8). *It seems to me that there is no qualitative differences between the saints reigning as kings, judges, and priests during, and after, the millennium.* That is, the saints simply experience their first 1,000 years before the second resurrection, and ponder anew the reality that God is “from everlasting to everlasting,” “for a thousand years in” his “sight are but as yesterday” (Ps. 90:2,4). There is thus a great deal of similarity between my premillennial views and those of amillennialists.

But another Presbyterian denomination, which believes in reforms after their nineteenth century fourth stage reform, may see a quite different subsequent history. For example, having left the *Presbyterian Church of Australia* (PCA), the *Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia* (PRC) formed in Sydney, Australia in 1967, due to a combination of reasons, embracing both a desire to religiously separate from religious liberalism and apostasy, as well as a commitment to enact some fifth stage reforms. For example, historic Presbyterianism has recognized the validity of Anglican baptisms which includes usage of *the sign of the cross*. But the *Westminster Confession* 28:2, is amended with a fifth stage twentieth century reform by the PRC’s revised Westminster Confession, so as to invalidate any baptism that uses the sign of the cross, stating (in part) “whosoever presumes in baptism to use” “crossing, accuses the perfect institution of Christ Jesus of imperfection and causes it to be no sacrament” (28:2)⁵⁸. By contrast I maintain the view of Art. 20 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, that practices such as using *the sign of the cross* are not contrary to Scripture and so valid, if a church finds them good and useful. I consider this PRC amendment is also contrary to the historic Presbyterian position, which says in *Westminster Confession* 28:7, “The sacrament of baptism is but once to be administered unto any person;” since the PRC position requires that a person baptized with *the sign of the cross* (such as myself⁵⁹.) be rebaptized.

Yet another Presbyterian denomination, which looks to further reform after their nineteenth century fourth stage reform, may follow quite a different subsequent history. For example, the *Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster* (FPCU) was formed from a Biblical witness to Gospel mission at Crossgar, County Down, Northern Ireland, on St. Patrick’s Day, 1951. The evangelist on the day was the Reverend Ian Paisley (subsequently the church’s Moderator till 2008), and stemming from a desire to make a Biblical witness and separate from growing religious compromise and apostasy, the FPCU was then formed in Northern Ireland, UK. (It now also has denominational churches in England, Scotland, Wales, the Republic of Ireland, Germany, the United States, Canada, Australia, and elsewhere around the globe). While the *Westminster Confession* and associated *Catechism* form the Subordinate Standards of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster*; under a fifth stage twentieth century reform, the FPCU modifies *Westminster Confession* Chapter 27 on “Baptism,” with a “Note” on “the Articles of the FPC” of Ulster at the end of the chapter, allowing individual local churches to either believe in infant baptism, that is, the historic Presbyterian position, or not practice infant baptism, that is, the historic Baptist position. The relevant section says, “The Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster, under Christ the Great

⁵⁸ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, With Amendments by the Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia, second PRC edition 1999, Covenanter Press, Lithgow, N.S.W., Australia.

⁵⁹ When exactly eleven months old, I was baptized by Chaplain Bryan Hall according to the service in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, which uses the *sign of the cross*, at St. Martin’s Anglican Chapel, Balcombe Army School, Melbourne.

King and Head of the Church, realizing that bitter controversy raging around the mode and proper subjects of the ordinance of Christian baptism has divided the Body of Christ when that Body should have been united in Christian love and Holy Ghost power to stem the onslaughts and hell-inspired assaults of modernism, hereby affirms that each member of the Free Presbyterian Church shall have liberty to decide for himself which course to adopt on these controverted issues, each member giving due honour in love to the views held by differing brethren, but none espousing the error of baptismal regeneration.”

On the one hand, I maintain that the sacrament of holy baptism is properly administered to infants (e.g., Matt. 19:14; 28:19; I Cor. 1:11,16; 10:1,2; Col. 2:12,13), as well as older converts or adult converts from evangelistic work, “for the promise is unto” both such converts “and to” their “children” (Acts 2:39). I repudiate baptismal regeneration, and regard water baptism as purely a symbol, and so administrable by e.g., sprinkling (Heb. 9:10), and consider that what really matters is that a person has God spiritually “baptize” him “with the Holy Ghost” (Matt. 3:11), that is, salvation and regeneration (Ezek. 36:25; John 3:1-21; I Cor. 6:11; Eph. 5:26; Titus 3:5). But on the other hand, I can accept that there is a level of ambiguity in the NT texts, that means my holy Reformed brethren in a Baptist tradition have formed their opinions inside the parameters of orthodox Protestantism.

It is surely a striking fact that one Presbyterian church in the *Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia*, would regard a fifth stage 20th century reform as more narrowly defining the sacrament of baptism than does the *Westminster Confession*; while at the same time another Presbyterian church in the *Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster*, would regard a fifth stage 20th century reform as more widely defining the sacrament of baptism than does the *Westminster Confession*. In the first place, it shows the degree to which later stage “reforms” can move churches away from their historical denominational positions, and thus away from other Presbyterians maintaining the historic position of their denomination, and not being prepared to modify the *Westminster Confession of Faith*. It further shows the degree to which such later stage “reforms” can further distance different Presbyterians who seek mutually exclusive later stage “reforms,” since this comparison on baptism shows different Presbyterians in the PRC and FPCU wanting reform to go in *opposite directions* away from the *Westminster Confession*.

But what, e.g., a Baptist may see as third or later stage reforms, may be very different to these Presbyterian views of third or later stage reforms. Unlike Presbyterian history, which centres around the commonality of the *Westminster Confession* or modifications to it; “Baptist” history is difficult to generalize on, both due to theological diversity between Baptist Churches, and the proliferation of rival Baptist Church histories. That which distinguished Baptist or Baptist churches is their rejection of infant baptism, or the baptism of pre-pubescent children, together with a belief in adult baptism or what they call “believer’s baptism.” One starting point is a distinction between those more closely derived from the sixteenth century Anabaptists, such as the Mennonites (Swiss Brethren), Hutterian Brethren, or Brethren (New Baptists); as opposed to those more closely derived from the seventeenth century British Baptists. Another starting point is the development within Puritanism of a Baptist Reformed group and a Baptist Arminian group; manifested in the seventeenth century division of British Baptists into Reformed Baptists, known as Particular Baptists, and Arminian Baptists, known as General Baptists. Another starting point is the preaching and teaching of Wesley with his Wesleyan Arminianism, since this both led to modification of pre-existing Arminian Baptist teaching in British General Baptist Churches and their derivatives, so as to doctrinally change from Arminianism Proper to Wesleyan Arminianism;

as well as producing a new group of *Wesleyan Arminian* Baptist Churches in North America and their derivatives. However, there are numerous rival Baptist traditions, and analysis or even mention of all the different “Baptist” or “Baptistic” Churches is beyond the scope of this work, though I shall refer to some. The term “Baptist” or “Baptistic,” embraces both orthodox Protestant brethren such as the Reformed Baptists who adhere to the *Baptist (or London) Confession of 1689* (adopted in America as *The Philadelphia Confession of 1742*), and unorthodox groups e.g., the Seventh Day Baptists.

Baptists of an Anabaptist origin, may trace their “stages” of development from their rebellion against Zwingli in Switzerland, and associated rejection of Zwingli’s subservience to magistrates, under such Anabaptist leaders as Conrad Grebel, and from there through to Mennonites and Hutterites. The New Baptists or Schwarzenar Baptists (whose name was selected to distinguish them from the Mennonites, who originated from the “Swiss Brethren” of 1525,) were formed in 1708 under Alexander Mack at Schwarzenar, Hesse, in Germany, although they later became known as the “Brethren.” (The term “Brethren” also has a varied history, and so these “Brethren” are not to be confused with e.g., the Plymouth Brethren, a different group formed in 1831 by John Darby, which split after 1845 into Exclusive Brethren and Open Brethren; or the *Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren*, formed in 1918 from the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in Bohemia and Moravia, i.e., the present Czech Republic).

Taking a perverse view of the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” contrary to the NT teaching of manliness (I Cor. 11:14) and decency in the military (Luke 3:14, NKJV), and the express law of God against “the fearful” (AV) or “the cowardly” (NKJV) (Rev. 21:8), Anabaptists were generally pacifists. However, in 1525 the Anabaptist leader, Thomas Munster, led a peasant revolt at Thuringian in Germany, contrary to the express law of God, “Be subject unto the higher powers” (Rom. 13:1), and was then executed for his crime, “for he beareth not the sword in vain” (Rom. 13:4). His disciple, Hans Hut, then became the chief Anabaptist leader in southern Germany, until he died in prison two years later. Taking a perverse view of the Third Commandment, “Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain,” Anabaptists devalued all oaths by blasphemously claiming any oath involved taking God’s “name in vain” Taking a perverse view of the Seventh Commandment, “Thou shalt not commit adultery,” contrary to the NT teaching that polygamy is “adultery” (Matt. 19:9), Anabaptist followers of Melchior Hofmann, Jan Mathis, and Jan Beuckelson (John of Leiden), established a community at Munster, Westphalia in 1534, where they engaged in polygamy. But the following year, the military forces of German princes took the city by storm, and executed the sexually immoral and adultery (Matt. 19:9) promoting Anabaptist leaders.

The Seventh Day Baptists were formed at Newport, Rhode Island, America, in 1671. Taking a perverse view of the fourth commandment (Exod. 20:8-11; Deut. 5:12-15), these Judaizers teach Gentiles to keep the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday). This is contrary to the NT teaching of Sunday sacredness (John 20:1,19,26; Acts 2:1; 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10), and the express law of God forbidding Gentile Christians to keep Jewish sabbath “days” in Gal. 4:10,11 (cf. weekly *days*, lunar *months*, annual *times* or *seasons*, and jubilee *years* in Lev. 23:25; Num. 28:29), or forbidding that any man “judge you” with regard to the Jewish “sabbath days” in Col. 2:16,17 (cf. weekly *sabbaths*, monthly *new moons*, and annual *holy days* or *festivals* in II Kgs 4:23; I Chron. 23:31; II Chron. 2:4; 8:13; 31:3; Neh. 10:33; Isa. 1:13; Ezek. 45:17; Hosea 2:11). In Acts 4:10,11, we read that “Christ” crucified” fulfils Ps. 118:22, as “the stone which was set at nought,” and “God raised him from the dead” shows he is “the head of the corner” in fulfilment of Ps. 118:22. Then with our minds focused on

resurrection Sunday in Ps. 118:22, we read in the next two verses, “This is the Lord’s doing: it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made: we will rejoice and be glad in it” (Ps. 118:23,24). Since *after the resurrection* Sunday was in fulfilment of this prophecy, “the day which the Lord hath made,” it is thus called, “the Lord’s day” (Rev. 1:10). This sanctifying of Sunday as *the Lord’s day* was anticipated a week before on Palm Sunday⁶⁰. The people then proclaimed the words following the statement, “This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it” (Ps. 118:24), quoting Ps. 118:25, “Save now” or “Hosanna,” followed by Ps. 118:26, and saying, “Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord” (Mark 11:9). Sunday is thus the Lord’s day prophesied in Ps. 118: 24, both because of Palm Sunday and Christ’s resurrection on Easter Sunday. The name, “Lord’s day” (Rev. 1:10), thus reminds us of the Christian Sunday in Messianic Prophecy of these two Sundays.

In the first stage of the Reformation, the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* (2:6) recognized that Col. 2:16,17 meant that the Jewish Sabbath no longer bound Christians. Likewise Calvin’s *Catechism* (or Calvin’s *Geneva Catechism*) of 1545 considered that Col. 2:16,17 taught the Jewish sabbath was “abolished,” and that Sundays were merely days of “sacred assemblies,” when “the people meet” “to hear the word of God,” “to hear the doctrine of Christ, to engage in public prayer,” “to celebrate the sacraments,” “and make profession of their faith.” Then during the second stage of the Reformation, came the clear recognition of the double-meaning in the Greek NT, that Jesus rose “on the first of the week” meaning “the first of the Sabbaths” (e.g., Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1), so that by his resurrection Christ made Sunday the Sabbath. I.e., “the first of the week (*sabbaton*)” is a contextual double entendre also meaning “the first of the sabbaths (*sabbaton*).” Connected with this, it was recognized that the morality of working six days and then resting on the sabbath day, is rooted in the six day creation (Exod. 20:8-11; cf. Gen. 2:1-3), and so transcends the Jewish laws given to Moses. Thus while the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday) no longer binds Christians (Col. 2:16), as part of the Ten Commandments (Rom. 7:7; 13:9), the fundamental sabbath morality of the fourth commandment remains binding, and is manifested in keeping the Sunday Sabbath. E.g., from 1562 the Anglican Church recognized Sunday as the Sabbath in its Homily 8, Book 2, Article 35, of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*. All three Reformed Puritan rival “third” stages of the Reformation, recognized this second stage Reformation truth in their “third” stage confessions, Presbyterian (*Westminster Confession* 21:7), Congregational (*Savoy Declaration* 22:7), and Baptist (*Baptist Confession* 22:7).

The Reformers recognized that Rome’s gospel of justification by faith and works, had similar elements in it to the Judaizer’s false gospel the Apostle Paul condemned in the Book of Galatians (Gal. 2:16; 3:11; cf. Sirach 3:3,30; 35:3, Apocrypha; II Macc. 12:40-45, Apocrypha). This means that the apostolic Gospel recovered at the Reformation includes an anti-Judaizing element to it, in harmony with Scripture. The Church of Rome’s Judaizing did not include an attempt to impose the Jewish sabbath, and so on one level it can be distinguished from the Seventh Day Baptist’s Judaizing. But to the extent that Seventh Day Baptist teaching which commands Gentiles to “observe” sabbath “days” (Gal. 4:10) is one form of Judaizing, their teachings are a regression back into the Judaizing that Protestants,

⁶⁰ St. John covers the feast of unleavened bread under the generic title of “passover.” Jewish days went from sunset to sunset, and were counted on inclusive reckoning. Thus “six days before Passover” (John 12:1) means, Thursday = Day 1; Wed= Day 2; Tues = Day 3; Mon = Day 4; Sun = Day 5; Sat = Day 6; making “the next day” (John 12:12-15) Palm Sunday.

liberated by the gospel of justification by faith, escaped from out of Rome. “How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe [Jewish sabbath] days, and [new moon] months, and [annual] times, and [jubilee] years. I am afraid,” “lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain” (Gal. 4:9-11). On the one hand, some orthodox brethren have not gone beyond the first stage of the Reformation on this issue, i.e., the recognition that the Jewish Sabbath is no longer binding, and that Sunday is a day of Christian assembly in public worship. But on the other hand, it is clear that the Seventh Day Baptist view that the “Jews’ Preparation Day” (John 19:42) is binding, and that in the Christian era one should still “judge” a “man” “in respect of” Jewish “sabbath days” (Col. 2:16), is so at such variance with the first and second stages of the Reformation, that no orthodox Protestant Christian could accept that the reintroduction of the Jewish Sabbath was some kind of later stage reform.

A group of Arminian Baptists in the USA, who establish independent churches (and should not be confused with independent Reformed Baptist Churches in the USA), and have been active in proselytizing work around the globe, reject any suggestion that they are “Protestant.” Organized on a local level only, such Baptists have no overriding denominational church structures, other than the personal interconnectedness of the Ministers of the different independent Arminian Baptist churches in a general area, who sometimes choose to voluntarily meet together in a semi-informal confederal manner, organized by one or more of these Ministers. (This lack of superstructure means locating them can be difficult. They are generally only grouped together on paper in some regional map guides, e.g., Sydney’s “Gregory’s Guide” places them under “Independent Baptists” in the section locating churches.) An independent Arminian Baptist Church from one area, or a group of them from a variety of areas, will sometimes provide finances for a “missionary” to establish a new church, but may stipulate a period of time, after which the new church must become financially independent or close. This type of financing is organized by the prospective “missionary” going to different independent Arminian Baptist Churches, and asking them individually if they will provide such financial support. Though they generally lack any sound understanding of church history, e.g., they talk of multiple “reformations,” in most instances meaning “revivals,” in which no qualitative difference is made between the Protestant Reformation and a “reformation” or revival e.g., a nineteenth century “revival” under the heretic Charles Finney. Their Dispensationalist views do not recognize that the eternal covenant, the covenant of grace, has been the only way men have ever been saved. Their rejection of the three creeds includes their denial of the “one catholic (universal) church” of the *Nicene Creed*, and is a blatant heresy, which means that the imagery of Eph. 5:32 only works if Christ were polygamously pictured as married to many churches. Their rejection of the Biblical teaching of original sin, for which they substitute the trick terminology of, “*the* original sin,” is a device that no orthodox believer could accept. Their fondness for Pelagians like the nineteenth century Arminian preacher, Charles Finney (1792-1875), a former President of Oberlin College, Ohio, USA (1851-1866), is also disturbing⁶¹.

⁶¹ Finney was a Semi-Pelagian who subverted justification by faith by first undermining Original Sin. E.g., Martin Luther spent long hours in the confessional trying to recall all his sins until he realized salvation is a GIFT (Rom. 5:15-17). But Finney tried to re-introduce the bondage of *justification by confession* i.e. if a believer has any unconfessed sin he is no longer justified. Finney referred to the Protestant gospel in which “faith receives an *imputed* righteousness and a *judicial justification*,” so that “Christ’s righteousness is the ground, and that his own” “obedience is not even a condition of his justification;” then said of it, “this is certainly *another gospel* from the one I am inculcating.” Finney’s *New School*

While their historical origins derive from a Protestant past, they have now so thoroughly rejected key Protestant teachings on e.g., original sin and the mystical universal church of all believers, that I think their strident claim that they are “not Protestants” should be accepted.

Baptist churches may form on racial and/or religious lines. E.g., Black African Baptists (of varying orthodoxy,) form an important segment of American Baptist Churches. More Negroid Americans belong to Black Baptist Churches than any other church. In harmony with NT practice which had segregated Jewish Christian congregations, evident in e.g., the Epistles to the Hebrews and James, the Black Baptist Churches of the USA are established for blacks of African descent through Noah’s son, Ham, and grandson, Cush (Gen. 10:6,7). There are also orthodox independent Reformed Baptist Churches which are established only for white Caucasians, descended through Noah’s son, Japheth (Gen. 10:2-5). E.g., Dr. Ed Ulrich, (appointed in 1962 as a Member of the Board of Trustees at Bob Jones University, South Carolina, USA, and former Principal at Goldsboro Christian School, North Carolina, USA), pastored such a church at Lake Waccamaw, North Carolina, USA. (Dr. Ulrich died in 2009⁶².)

Reformed Baptists of, or derived from, the UK, hold the *Baptist (or London) Confession* (1689) as the third stage of the Reformation. Some Reformed Baptists of the *Particular Baptist* tradition have then sought to faithfully preserve this heritage as a third and final stage of the Reformation in independent Reformed Baptist churches. By contrast, other Baptists who in varying degrees have forsaken their Protestant heritage, formed the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland in 1891, a body that incorporated both the Arminian *General Baptists* (who had regrouped in 1770 as Wesleyan Arminian Baptists under the name of *New Connection General Baptists*), and *some* from a Reformed *Particular Baptist* tradition. The apostate Baptist Union was rightly opposed by men like Charles Spurgeon

denied that, “The heart is deceitful” (Jer. 17:9) and so fallen man’s *very nature* is sinful (Ps. 51:5; Rom. 7:14-23). Men before Moses died solely due to our progenitor’s sin (Rom. 5:12-14). Unlike the Roman Church (*Council of Trent* 5:5), the Reformers distinguished between being *declared righteousness* by faith (justification) and *righteousness* from moral growth in holiness (sanctification). In this life we are *imputed* with Christ’s *righteousness* before God *only by faith* in a *legal sense* and due to original sin sanctification never leads to sinless perfection, but is attained at glorification when the effects of original sin are gone (Rom. 1:17;5,7,8). By contrast, Finney devalued original sin and claimed regeneration was “an instantaneous change from entire sinfulness to entire holiness” (Finney’s *Lectures on Systematic Theology*, 1847, Reprint, Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1951, pp. 391,393,407,455-7).

⁶² The “Anchorage Camp” page says, “JUNE 3, 1921 - DECEMBER 29, 2009. Dr. Ed Ulrich, founder and longtime director of The Anchorage Camp, passed away peacefully Tuesday morning, Dec. 29 after a lengthy illness. He was a faithful servant of Christ and his Gospel.” Following this is my comment, under “Gavin McGrath April 3rd, 2010.” “From Sydney, Australia, I knew Brother Ed in Lake Waccamaw, USA, over some years, through both written correspondence to each other and numerous phone calls. I remember him as [a] man strongly committed to the authority of the Bible. I have missed not being able to hold a conversation with Brother Ed for about 10 years now; and his passing is a matter of sorrow. I look forward to meeting him in heaven, for he was a man washed clean by the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. Gavin McGrath. April 2010.” (<http://blog.anchoragecamp.org/2010/01/dr-ed-ulrich/>).

(1834-1892), the Minister of *Metropolitan Tabernacle* in London, an independent Reformed Baptist Church.

On the one hand, a Reformed Baptist Protestant (in the *Particular Baptist* tradition) sees the *Baptist Confession* of 1689 as constituting a third and final stage of the Reformation. But on the other hand, a Strict Baptist (also known as a *Strict and Particular Baptist*) may see the *Baptist Confession* of 1689 as a seventeenth century third stage reform, and the formulation of Strict Baptist doctrine in the nineteenth century which rejects “the free offer of the gospel” as a fourth stage reform. This Strict Baptist view is referred to by some as “hyper-Calvinism,” and in their historic *Articles of Faith* maintains, e.g., “that the invitations of the gospel” “are intended only for those who have been made by the blessed Spirit to feel their state of sinners and their need of Christ as their Saviour” (Article 24); “We reject the doctrine that men in a state of nature should be exhorted to believe in or turn to God” (Article 26); “For ministers to address unconverted persons” “indiscriminately, calling upon them to savingly repent, believe and receive Christ,” “is” “to deny the doctrine of special redemption” (Article 33); or “We believe that any” “expressions” “to the hearers” “that they” “receive Christ, while in an unregenerate state,” “must therefore be rejected” (Article 34).

In John 7:2,37-44, on “the last day” of “the Jews’ feast of tabernacles,” “Jesus” gave a free offer of the gospel. He said, “If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.” Some responded favourably, “Of a truth this is the Prophet. Others said, This is the Christ. But some” evidently remained unregenerate men, and “said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee?” “So there was a division among the people because of him. And some of them would have taken him; but no man laid hands on him.” In order to circumvent such Scriptures (cf. Luke 14:15-24), the Strict Baptists seek to make an unwarranted distinction between Jews and Gentiles. Thus Article 34 of their *Articles of Faith* additionally says, “And we further believe that we have no Scripture warrant to take the exhortations in the Old Testament, intended for the Jews in national covenant with God, and apply them in a spiritual and saving sense to unregenerated men.” While John 7:37-44 is in the New Testament, on this type of Strict Baptist logic, it might be claimed to refer only to Jews. But if so, I would reject this claim, since the Gospel of John was written, “that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name” (John 20:31). It is thus clear that while John 7:37-44 may have been originally said to Jews, its message is ultimately for the “other” Gentile “sheep,” “which are not of this” Jewish “fold”, for “they” too “shall hear” Christ’s “voice” (John 10:16). If such a free offer of the gospel is made to Jews, some of whom are unregenerate and reject it, then such a free offer can also be made to Gentiles.

I consider this Strict Baptist view denies the Biblical teaching that “many are called, but few are chosen” (Matt. 22:14). This is seen in the preaching of the Apostle Paul who “disputed” “with the Jews” and Gentile “devout persons,” and after he preached to them to “repent,” “some mocked” (Acts 17:14,30,32). Or when “almost the whole city” “came” “together to hear the word of God;” this included those who were told, “ye put” “the word of God” “from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life.” These unregenerate persons then “stirred up” people “of the city” resulting in “persecution against Paul and Barnabas;” whereas the elect vessels of God who had heard the same preaching from among some “Gentiles,” “were glad,” for “as many as were ordained to eternal life believed” (Acts 13:44-52). “For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness: but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.” “But we preach,” says the Apostle Paul, a free offer

of the gospel, “Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God” (I Cor. 1:18,23,24). In the UK, the replacement of the Strict Baptist Assembly with the Grace Baptist Assembly in 1976 (and associated name change in 1986 from Strict Baptists to Grace Baptists,) was followed by the repeal of such Strict Baptist Articles opposed to the free offer of the gospel. But there are other Strict Baptists who continue to hold this view as a fourth stage reform.

All Protestants have historically rejected the usage of Romish Mass vestments such as the chasuble, and also the usage of the mitre worn by the Pope and Roman Bishops (though from the nineteenth century on, apostate Anglican Puseyite (“Anglo-Catholic”) and some semi-Puseyite (“Broadchurch”) priests have worn the chasuble, and their Bishops have worn the bishop’s mitre as part of their semi-Romanism). However some consider the non-use of clerical dress by a Minister is a third (or later) stage reform. I consider it is appropriate for a Protestant Minister *either* not to wear special clerical dress, and be well dressed in normal clothing, that is, in a Western context, a coat and tie; or to wear the more moderate type of clerical dress traditionally found in Protestant churches, e.g., (as per the traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglican tradition,) the *Church of England (Continuing)* Ministers wear a clerical collar, black cassock, white surplice, and black preaching scarf; or some Presbyterian Ministers wear a clerical collar with a black Geneva gown.

Or some argue for alcohol prohibition (Num. 6:2-4; Judg. 13:4,5; Amos 2:12; Luke 1:15), whereas I support the moderate consumption of alcohol (Deut. 14:26; Ps. 104:15; Luke 7:33,34; I Cor. 11:20,34; Col. 2:16,21,22; Heb. 9:10), as opposed to drunkenness (I Cor. 6:10; 11:21; Gal. 5:21)⁶³. But in harmony with apostolic teaching, I am tolerant of diversity among the orthodox on whether or not they drink alcohol (Rom. 14:1,21a). For “John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine,” whereas the “Son of man” came “eating and drinking” (Luke 1:15; 7:33,34).

Or some would say the Second Commandment (Exod. 20:4-6) prohibits, for example, any crosses in a church; whereas like Martin Luther, responding to similar claims by Andrew Carlstadt, I think this precept only prohibits adoration or worship of such objects⁶⁴. For example, there were graven images of angels upon the Ark of the Covenant (Exod. 25:18-20,26:31), seen by the high priest annually in the solemn Day of Atonement service (Lev 16), or used as a point of assembly for worship by “Joshua” “and the elders of Israel” (Josh 7:6), and at other times seen by all the people of Israel (Josh. 3 & 4; 8:33), and seen in vision by St. John the Divine (Rev. 11:19) as a symbol of judgment (Rev. 18-20) against, among other things, idolatry (Rev. 13; 21:8; 22:15). Or the Israelites were commanded to make a graven image of a brazen serpent which was a type of symbolic crucifix (John 3:14,15), and this only became an idol when instead of simply looking at it, they started to “burn incense to it” (II

⁶³ Traditional alcoholic glasses are regulated by a size that gives them about the same amount of alcohol. Hence a port glass (fortified red wine) is much smaller than a red wine glass (table red wine). By “moderate” I mean for a man, up to two or three glasses; or for a woman up to two glasses; of any such alcohol, consumed slowly over a period of at least two hours, though possibly longer.

⁶⁴ Bainton, R.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 114-7 (Carlstadt: *On the removal of Images*, 1522), p. 117 (Luther: *With regard to images and sacraments*, 1525).

Kgs 18:1,3,4)⁶⁵.

Or my much beloved Reform Baptist brethren would claim “believers” or adult baptism as a further “reform” (whereas I believe in infant baptism; Matt. 19:14; 28:19; I Cor. 1:16; 10:1,2; Col. 2:11-13). During the first stage of the Reformation, Lutherans retained *baptismal regeneration* (*Augsburg Confession* 1:9). So too, Reformation Anglicans taught *baptismal regeneration*, saying, for example, “infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God’s favour, and made his children and inheritors of his kingdom of heaven” (Homily 3, Book 1, “The Salvation of Mankind,” Art. 35, *39 Articles*). However, Anglicans in general then advanced to the second stage of the Reformation on this issue. This can be done by reading the words of Article 35, “necessary for these times” (Art. 35), as meaning, “these times” of the earlier time of the Reformation in England, but not later times as the Anglican Church more fully progressed to the second stage of the Reformation⁶⁶; and also reading relevant sections in the *Baptism Service* of the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), by distinguishing between two types of regeneration, that is, one refers simply to a change in a person’s relation to the Church and the means of grace (water baptism); the other, to the fundamental change of human nature brought about by saving regeneration (spiritual baptism). On this view, the former is accomplished at baptism, but includes no element of spiritual regeneration, and simply makes a person God’s child in the same sense that Jewish children were by circumcision. That is, both Jews circumcised under the Old Covenant, and Christians baptized under the New Covenant, still must experience the quite separate and distinctive regeneration of the Holy Ghost under the covenant of grace, in order to be saved.

By means of such thinking, Reformed Anglicans in general moved away from baptismal regeneration until it was revived by the Puseyites in a retrograde step from the

⁶⁵ While Reformed Anglicans use the symbol of the cross, e.g., the sign of the cross on the forehead at baptism is part of the Baptism Service in the 1662 prayer book (this symbolism is consonant with Rom. 6:3,6), most Reformed Anglicans do not like using a cross over the Communion Table, although crosses are used on e.g., lectern book-marks. Reformed or Low Church Evangelical Anglican tradition is opposed to crucifixes and images of saints, not because we believe they are prohibited by the 2nd commandment (as the Puritans historically do), but because it has been the experience of the Church that substantial numbers of weaker brethren are thereby led into idolatry by this means (cf. Rom. 14 & I Cor. 8), a fact evident even in the history of the OT brazen serpent. Hence we must “walk in love” (Eph. 5:2) and ban these things as crucifixes (II Kgs 18:4) and images of saints from our churches (Rom. 15:1-4). By contrast, this has not been the church’s experience with e.g., eagle lecterns or stained glass windows, all of which may be historically found in Reformed Anglican Churches. See Article 35 of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, Book 2, Homily 2, “Against peril of idolatry” (Part 2).

⁶⁶ Bishop Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Sarum (“Sarum” is Latin for “Salisbury”), said of Article 35, that it “doth *contain* a godly and wholesome doctrine,” does not mean one must agree with them totally. But to give his “assent” to them “a man must be persuaded of the main of the doctrine that is taught in them,” that in general it is “good and wholesome.” E.g., “since there are so many Homilies that charge the Church of Rome with *idolatry*,” “no man who thinks that Church is not guilty of *idolatry*, can with good conscience subscribe this Article” (*An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, R. Gilbert, London, 1826, pp. 381-3.)

nineteenth century on⁶⁷. Presbyterians and Congregationalists moved to this second stage of the Reformation at a confessional level, saying, for example, “Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ,” but “others, not elected” “cannot be saved” (*Westminster Confession* 10:3,4; *Savoy Declaration* 10:3,4). But what I believe to be the truth attained in the second stage of the Reformation by Anglicans in general, and Presbyterians and Congregationalists at a confessional level, was jettisoned by Baptists purportedly going to the “third stage” of the Reformation with the notion of *universal infant salvation*. In the *Baptist Confession* (1689), the word “elect” is omitted from the *Westminster Confession* form, with the claim, “infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ” (10:3). With respect to a proper understanding of original sin, I consider this Baptist position to be even worse than the Lutheran or Reformation Anglican position on baptismal regeneration.

Historically, the *Synod of Carthage* (412) and *Council of Carthage* (417) addressed the errors of Coelestius, the disciple of Pelagius (and Pelagianism was also condemned by the *Council of Ephesus* in 431). This included the Pelagian teaching documented at the *Synod of Carthage*, “That infants, even if unbaptized, have eternal life” (*universal infant salvation*). The *Council of Carthage*, (advocating *baptismal regeneration*,) rejected the proposition, “that new-born children need not to be baptized, or that they are baptized for the remission of sins, but that no original sin is derived from Adam to be washed away in the laver of regeneration⁶⁸.” Baptismal regeneration is semi-universalist salvation for infants, since it claims all *baptized* infants are saved; whereas the Baptist position is outright universalist salvation for dead infants. I consider that neither *baptismal regeneration* nor *universal infant salvation* properly understands the issues of original sin, God’s sovereignty, and election with respect to infants. “For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth,” “it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated” (Rom. 9:11,13). On the one hand, *baptismal regeneration* has been held by Lutherans and Reformation Anglicans with its semi-universalist salvation of infants teaching, and *universal infant salvation* for dead infants has been held by Baptists; but on the other hand, I consider such persons hold such views *inconsistently* with their *generally* accurate understanding of original sin, God’s sovereignty, and election, as rightly taught in the holy Reformed faith. Since they hold *baptismal regeneration* or *universal infant salvation* for dead infants in a manner *inconsistent* with their Reformed faith, rather than as reasons used to reject the holy Reformed Christian faith, I still embrace such Reformed Protestants as my Christian brethren.

Furthermore, one finds the dual usage of the terms “sacrament” and “ordinance” in e.g., the confessions of Reformation Anglicanism (Art. 30, *39 Articles*), Presbyterianism (*Westminster Confession* 29:2,3), and Congregationalism (*Savoy Declaration* 30:2,3), all of which uphold the Reformation teaching that there are “two sacraments ordained” or instituted by “Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord” (or “Lord’s Supper”) (Art. 25, *39 Articles*; *Westminster Confession* 27:4; *Savoy Declaration* 28:4). By contrast, one finds the replacement of the term “sacrament” for Baptism and Communion with the sole usage of “ordinance” in e.g., the *Baptist Confession* of 1689 (e.g., 30:2,3). Of those Protestants using the term “sacrament,” one group claims “The word ‘sacrament’ is not found in Scripture” but is nevertheless an appropriate term⁶⁹. The other

⁶⁷ Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 477.

⁶⁸ Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 53-4,58-9.

⁶⁹ Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 617.

group claims that “sacrament” is a Biblical term derived from the NT word “mystery.”

Reformation Anglicanism held to three sacraments, considering that in addition to the two Gospel Sacraments, there is a third sacrament of Christian marriage which is a non-gospel sacrament, and not obligatory (I Cor. 7:7-9). That is, marriage was not instituted of Christ in the Gospel, but by God in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 2:21-24), with *Christian* marriage, but *not* non-Christian marriage, being made a sacrament not by Christ in the Gospel, but later by the Apostolate (Eph. 5:32). Thus Thomas Cranmer refers to “the sacrament of matrimony” (Homily 7, Book 1, Art. 35, Anglican *39 Articles*); and in his “Solemnization of Matrimony” Service preserved in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, Cranmer says “matrimony” is an institution “signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church.” This language is clearly an allusion to Eph. 5:31,32, in which Cranmer’s use of “mystical” comes from the Apostle Paul’s use of “mystery” (Greek *musterion* and Latin *sacramentum*), and so Cranmer considered the outward and visible sign of the institution of Christian marriage itself, sacramentally or symbolically represents the union between Christ and his bride, the Church. However the *Two Books of Homilies* referred to in Article 35 of the *39 Articles* qualified this by saying that the term “sacrament might be attributed to anything whereby” a “holy thing is signified,” such as various religious “ceremonies;” whereas “if” “the number of them” “be considered according to the exact signification of a sacrament, namely, for visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sins and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there be but two, namely, baptism, and the Supper of the Lord” (Homily 9, Book 2, Art. 35, Anglican *39 Articles*). Therefore the Homilies qualified the usage of “sacrament” for their third “sacrament” of marriage, by saying that when they referred to the “sacrament of matrimony” they were using the term “sacrament” in a different way to when they referred to the “sacraments” of baptism and communion. Thus Reformation Anglicanism considered that in the narrow sense of the word “sacrament” there are “two,” baptism and communion, but in the broad sense of the word “sacrament” there are three, with marriage being the third “sacrament.”

On the one hand, it is clear from Cranmer’s *Marriage Service* basically found in the later *Books of Common Prayer* up to, and including, 1662, that the marriage theology is Protestant. This is also seen in the fact that about half of Homily 18, Book 2, entitled, “Of the state of Matrimony,” in Article 35 of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, is an address given by the Lutheran preacher of Nuremburg in Germany, Veit Dietrich (Theodor). But on the other hand, this Reformation Anglican view considers that in Eph. 5:32 marriage is called a “mystery” meaning a “sacrament.” However later Reformed Anglicans have tended to disregard this teaching of three sacraments, and since Article 25 of the *39 Articles* says the Homilies contain “doctrine” “necessary for these times,” it is possible to argue that while belief in “the sacrament of matrimony” was “necessary” for the Anglicanism of the sixteenth century coming out of Romanism, it ceased to be “necessary” as Anglicans, or at least, Anglicans *in general*, moved away from this idea of calling marriage a “sacrament.” Indeed, the *Free Church of England* (which broke from the Established *Church of England* in 1844 when the Puseyite Bishop of Exeter withdrew the licence of Reverend James Shore, an Evangelical Anglican Curate in Bridgetown,) removed all reference to the Homilies of Article 25 in their revised *Articles of Religion*, as part of what they regard as a later stage of nineteenth century reform involving both revision of the *Book of Common Prayer 1662* and *The 39 Articles*. In 1927 the *Free Church of England* united with the *Reformed Episcopal Church of America* which likewise makes no reference to the Homilies of Article 25 in their revised *Articles of Religion*. This view has also been continued by the *Free Church of*

England (Evangelical Connexion) (which broke with the *Free Church of England* in 2004 on the basis it had subsequently lost its Evangelical connexion and become apostate⁷⁰).

Other Protestants who retain the term “sacrament” but reject this Reformation Anglican usage of Eph. 5:32, argue that the two sacraments are referred to as “mysteries” in I Cor. 4:1, “Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God” (Presbyterian *Westminster Confession*)⁷¹; and this is a usage of I Cor. 4:1 that Reformed Anglicans are happy with. Whether using Eph. 5:32, or I Cor. 4:1, or both of these verses, the Greek word for “mystery” (Eph. 5:32) or “mysteries” (I Cor. 4:1) is *mysterion* and the Latin form of this word is *sacramentum*, and so such Protestants considers the term “sacrament” has a Biblical origin, albeit one that is derived from the Greek through the Latin (like the term “bishop”). The usage of “ordinance” for the Gospel Sacraments can be justified on the basis of *analogous* language since the Jewish Passover is called an “ordinance” (Exod. 12:43), and Heb. 9:1 refers to OT “ordinances of divine service.” To those who only refer to the “ordinances,” and refuse to use the term “sacrament” on the basis it is “unBiblical,” asking, “Where in the New Testament is a clear, incontestable use of the term ‘mystery’ for the ordinances?” I reply, “Where in the New Testament is a clear, incontestable use of the term ‘ordinance’ for the ordinances?” Certainly neither the usage of “sacrament” nor “ordinance” is *contrary* to the Scriptures (Art. 20, Anglican *39 Articles*). While embracing my orthodox brethren who use only the term “ordinance,” I think both the terms “sacrament” and “ordinance” can be reasonably used, though I generally follow the readily understood convention of using the term “sacrament.”

Thus on these and other issues some diversity of opinion has come to exist among orthodox Protestants as to just what should or should not be included in the full list of reforms in latter stage(s) of the Reformation. Nevertheless, I thank God for the matters I have specified and recognize as belonging to this second stage of the Reformation, in which like Hezekiah (II Kgs 18:1,3,4), later Protestant Reformers “removed the high places” of consubstantiation sacramentalism and baptismal regeneration sacramentalism, “brake down the images” of private auricular confession to a Minister, “cut down the groves” of anti-sabbatarianism by recognizing Sunday as the Sabbath, and “brake in pieces” the notion that the Apocrypha should be printed within the pages of Holy Writ, (usually) between the Old and New Testaments (II Kgs 18:4). I praise God that like Josiah (II Kgs 22:2; 23:7), through a Federalist understanding of original sin, these Protestant Reformers “brake down the houses of the” Augustinians, whose sexually perverse asceticism considering sex was only for the purposes of procreation (with their associated opposition to contraceptive measures by married couples,) denied marital couples their conjugal rights (I Cor. 7:2-5), and with their associated purported “example” of “Mary ever-virgin” had Marian “hangings for the grove” (II Kgs 23:7). For the “light” of God’s “Word” (Ps. 119:105) shone brightly, and I believe “the path of” those in this second stage of the Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was “as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day” (Prov. 4:18).

Reformers going forward out of Rome, apostates going backward into Rome.

⁷⁰ “Free Church of England (Evangelical Connexion) Established,” *English Churchman*, 26 Nov & 3 Dec 2004, p. 3; commented on by *Free C. of E.* Bishop McLean in “Free Church of England,” *English Churchman*, 7 & 14 Jan 2005, p. 2.

⁷¹ *Westminster Confession* 27:4, footnote I Cor. 4:1.

While on the one hand, I accept Luther as a great reformer and mighty man of God, in harmony with the Biblical teaching evident in II Kgs 12:2,3; 14:3; 15:3,4,34,35; on the other hand, I consider the Puseyite (“Anglo-Catholic”) Anglicans and the semi-Puseyite (“Broadchurch”) spin-offs of the nineteenth century, who sought to go backwards and reintroduce among Anglicans notions such as consubstantiation, baptismal regeneration, voluntary private auricular confession to a Minister, and usage of Bibles with the Apocrypha printed between the Old and New Testaments, as like the apostate king Ahaz who “did not that which was right in the sight of the Lord” (II Kgs 16:2). That is because the Anglican Church had gone to the second stage of the Reformation on the issues of consubstantiation, voluntary auricular confession to a Minister, and removing the Apocrypha from the covers of Holy Writ, and *generally* had jettisoned baptismal regeneration.

Specifically, the statement in the *Communion Service* of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, that it is “against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one,” clearly rejects both transubstantiation and consubstantiation; and as a matter of *practice*, by the nineteenth century Anglicans had long stopped using editions of the Bible that contained the Apocrypha between the Old and New Testaments. Consubstantiation for Lutherans, the modified form of baptismal regeneration for Lutherans and Reformation Anglicans, and the modified form of auricular confession for Reformation Lutherans – which in general though not absolute terms came to be jettisoned by Lutherans (and between 1549 and 1562 forms of which were used by Reformation Anglicans), are *exit roads pointing away from Rome*, built so “people” may “come out of” Rome (Rev. 18:4). Therefore they are part of an anti-Romanist and pro-Protestant sentiment, and thus e.g., Lutheran consubstantiation is used to end the idolatrous Romish practice of adoration of the consecrated Communion elements.

By contrast, consubstantiation, baptismal regeneration, and auricular confession for Puseyite and semi-Puseyite Anglicans, are *entry roads pointing towards Rome*, built so people may *go into* the Roman whore’s vortex (Rev. 17:1,2). Therefore they are part of a semi-Romanist and anti-Protestant sentiment, and thus Puseyite Anglican consubstantiation is used to reintroduce the idolatrous Romish practice of adoration of the consecrated Communion elements. Thus the Puseyites and semi-Puseyites were spurning the further light that Anglicans had walked in with the second stage of the Reformation. Like Lot’s wife, they “looked back” and were destroyed (Gen. 19:26), for the later development of Puseyite and semi-Puseyite Anglicanism, shows that they were deviously starting an anti-Reformation and semi-Romanist movement, which eventually cut its anchor ropes with the Christian Reformation and the Bible, and went adrift on the high seas of uncertainty into all kinds of heresies and other evils.

This type of thing is clear in the ARCIC (*Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission*) document, *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ* (2004)⁷². This document recommends “a re-reception” of “Marian” “devotion within” the Anglican Communion, saying that “such re-reception would have to take place within the context of a mutual re-reception of an effective teaching authority in the Church, such as that set out in *The Gift of Authority*” (*Mary*, 63). In *The Gift of Authority* (1998), ARCIC recommended, “that Anglicans be open to and desire a recovery and re-reception” “of the exercise of universal primacy by the Bishop of Rome” (62). On the one hand the document says, “Belief in the virginal conception is an early Christian tradition adopted and developed independently by

⁷² Published by Morehouse, London, UK, and Harrisburg, Pa, USA, 2005.

Matthew and Luke” (*Mary*, 18). But on the other hand, no reference is made to the fact that Matthew then rules out any notion of an “ever-virgin” Mary, by saying Joseph “knew her not till she had brought forth” “Jesus” (Matt. 1:25); and likewise Luke rules out any possibility of an “ever-virgin” Mary by saying Jesus was “her firstborn son” (Luke 2:7), and then referring to other “brethren” (Luke 8:20). Indeed, the notion of an ever-virgin Mary in ARCIC’s *Mary*, is given sympathetic treatment, as a valid, though not necessary, Christian view. It is supported by quotes from “Augustine,” who “wrote, ‘she conceived him as a virgin, she gave birth as a virgin, she remained a virgin’ (*Sermo* 51.18; cf. *Sermo* 196.1)” (*Mary*, 37); as well as fifteenth and early sixteenth century Anglicans, namely, “the English Reformers such as Latimer (*Works*, 2:105), Cranmer (*Works*, 2:60; 2:88), and Jewel (*Works* 3:440-441)” (*Mary*, 45). Reference is also made to one of the King James Version translators, “Lancelot Andrewes” (whose wooden sarcophagus I have inspected inside Southward Cathedral, near London Bridge,) “in his *Preces Privatae*,” who likewise refers to an “ever-virgin” Mary (*Mary*, 46).

But the claim of ARCIC that this type of thinking then “can be traced” “into the Oxford” or Puseyite “Movement of the nineteenth century” (*Mary*, 46, emphasis mine) from this earlier time is quite false. That is because these fifteenth and early sixteenth century Anglicans were still labouring under an Augustinian understanding of original sin, in which sex was regarded as intrinsically sinful and only allowed for procreation. In short, they had not yet been liberated by the later sixteenth century Federalist understanding of original sin, attained to as part of the second stage of the Reformation. Thus they were still trying to find an example of an idealistic “ever-virgin” figure, whom they either wrongly found themselves in Mary, or at the very least regarded it as valid for Protestants who so wished to, to find this in Mary. Thus for such fifteenth and sixteenth century Anglicans, the idea of an “ever-virgin Mary” was held as part of their onward march *out* of Rome, and so finally jettisoned from about the mid sixteenth century; whereas for the Puseyite Anglicans of the nineteenth century, the idea of an “ever-virgin Mary” has been held as part of their regression *back into* Rome, that “hold of every foul spirit, and” “cage of every unclean and hateful bird” (Rev. 18:2).

Commentary mainly at first stage of Reformation, but sometimes necessary to go to second stage of Reformation.

As a general rule, I have kept discussion in this commentary to matters found in the first stage of the Protestant Reformation, that is, the Lutheran Reformation, in order to keep the general thrust of this work *generally* within broad Reformation Protestant tenets. In doing so, I do not thereby wish to deny that the types of matters raised in the second stage (or what some see as a later stage) of the Reformation are *important*, rather, I wish to affirm that the matters which unite Protestants from the first stage of the Reformation are *more important*.

Furthermore, I think this methodology is also justified on the basis that the Biblical Antichrist passages examined are of two kinds. The more common type are broad-brush in their description of Antichrist’s doctrine, e.g., “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3), “who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4), involved in “the mystery of iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7), who like others “transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ” (II John 9), and shows “signs and wonders” designed to “deceive” (Matt. 24:24). Hence I think the broad context requires that these general descriptions be

interpreted with general Biblical truths, harmonious with those recovered at the time of the Reformation. This correlates with the fact that the Scriptures clearly condemn in strong language, the types of things thrown out of the church at the first stage of the Reformation. The Romish Church was engaged in idolatry with, for example, the Romish Mass or veneration and invocation of “Saints.” Can any doubt that idolatry is strongly condemned in Holy Writ (Deut. 5:8-11; I Cor. 10:14; I John 5:21)? For Moses says, “Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image” (Deut. 27:15). Or the Apostle Paul says, “idolaters” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (I Cor. 6:9), and forbids Christians “to eat” with “any man that is called a brother” who is “an idolater” (I Cor. 5:11), an injunction clearly including fellowship in the Lord’s Supper with such a person. And concerning the invocation of saints, can any deny that Scripture prohibits communication with the dead (e.g., Deut. 18:9-12; Isa. 8:19,20)?

The Romish Church denies justification by faith (Gal. 3:11). Can any doubt that this is strongly condemned in Holy Writ? For the Apostle Paul says, “though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you,” “let him be accursed” (Gal. 1:8); and those who engage in such “heresies,” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:20,21). The Romish Church denies Biblical authority, seeking to set up in its place Papal or “ecumenical” council authority. Can any doubt that so subverting God’s Divine authority is strongly condemned in Holy Writ? For Christ says suchlike “do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God” (Matt. 22:29). Or the Apostle Peter warns against “unlearned and unstable” men who “wrest” (AV) or “twist” (NKJV) the “epistles” of “Paul,” “as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction,” and refers to such persons as in “the error of the wicked” (II Peter 3:15-17); warning also that “false teachers” “shall bring in” such “damnable heresies” (II Peter 2:1). The Romish Church claims the Pope can give a dispensation to allow incest, thus establishing Papal authority in antithesis to Biblical authority. This was the issue that England, Wales, and Ireland broke with Rome over under the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, and the King of England and Lord of Ireland, Henry VIII (Lev. 18:16; 20:21). Can any doubt that fornication is strongly condemned in Holy Writ, for the Apostle Paul says, “fornicators” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (I Cor. 6:9), and forbids Christians “to eat” with “any man that is called a brother” who is “a fornicator” (I Cor. 5:11), an injunction clearly including any fellowship meal, for example, the Lord’s Supper? Did not John the Baptist die a martyr’s death because he said, “It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife” (Mark 6:18)? Hence on broad Biblical principles it is certainly reasonable to condemn such Papal sanctioned incest as an example of the type of “iniquity” “already” at “work” in New Testament times (II Thess. 2:7). Thus this historicist methodology accords with the principle of Biblical interpretation that *one explains the unclear passage through the clear passage.*

The Sabbath is good example of how this methodology acts to keep any historicist interpretation firmly within broad and clearly defensible Biblical parameters. In discussing the meaning of “the lawless one,” or what the AV calls, “that man of sin,” in II Thessalonians 2, the Presbyterian Minister, John Cumming says, “the Pope” “omits in the Commandments the second” (Exod. 20:4-6), and “he mutilates the fourth” (Exod. 20:8-11). Likewise, James Wylie laments that “Sunday” is “no Sabbath” in “the dark” “Popish world,” and documents how “Sunday” “has disappeared” as “the Sabbath” under “the Papacy⁷³.” I agree with

⁷³ Cumming, J., *Apocalyptic Sketches*, Second Series, Arthur Hall, Virtue & Co., London, 1852, pp. 478-9; Wylie, J.A., *The Papacy*, Its History, Dogmas, Genius, and Prospects: Being awarded the Evangelical Alliance’s First Prize for Essays on Popery in

writers like Cumming or Wylie that Roman Catholics have an anti-Sabbatarian view of the Lord's Day, and by thus failing to keep Sunday as the Sabbath they violate the Fourth Commandment. I consider that the anti-sabbatarianism of the first stage of the Reformation held by Luther (*Luther's Catechism*, 1529), Lutherans (*Augsburg Confession*, 1530), Calvin (*Calvin's Catechism*, 1545), and Cranmer, is a hangover from Popish ideas about Sunday, properly jettisoned by Sabbatarians at the second stage of the Reformation (e.g., Bishops Hooper and Latimer).

But I do not specifically refer to Sabbath-breaking when discussing "that man of sin" (II Thess. 2:3) in my commentary; and I do not consider the Sunday Sabbatarian interpretation of the NT is a fundamental of the faith. That is because, on the one hand Col. 2:16,17 clearly abolishes the binding nature of the Jewish Sabbath for Christians of both Jewish race and Gentile race; Gal. 4:10,11 (with terminology paralleling Lev. 23 & 25; Num. 28 & 29) clearly prohibits Gentile Christians from keeping Jewish Sabbath "days" and other Jewish feasts (Sunday sacredness was established among these Galatian Gentile Christians, I Cor. 16:1,2), although other NT passages show that Jewish Christians remain free to *voluntarily* choose to keep Jewish liturgical days as part of their cultural heritage (Acts 16:13; 20:6,16); and John 20:19,26; Acts 2:1,2; 20:7 clearly shows a pattern of Sunday Services involving both Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians which establishes Sunday sacredness with respect to a weekly time of Christian assembly. But on the other hand, there is a need for interpretation beyond this of such passages as, e.g., John 20:1; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; as to whether Sunday is the Sabbath (Sabbatarian view), or simply a day of common assembly (non-Sabbatarian view). Further interpretation is also required as to exactly how this view relates to e.g., Exod. 20:8-11; Gal. 4:10,11; Col. 2:16,17 (which together with other Scriptures I understand to allow Jewish Christians to either keep the Jewish Sabbath and a Christianized form of the Jewish liturgical year, or to not keep such Jewish days; but which I think always prohibits Gentile Christians from keeping the Jewish Sabbath or other Jewish days).

On the one hand, when speaking with orthodox brethren who have progressed to the second stage of the Reformation and received the benefit of a religious background in Sabbath-keeping, I will condemn sabbath-breaking as "unholy and profane" (I Tim. 1:9), and a serious violation of the solemn words of the Holy Decalogue (Exod. 20:8-11). But on the other hand, when speaking with orthodox brethren who have not so progressed to the second stage of the Reformation, I challenge them to consider God's appointment of one day in seven, as a sabbath to be kept holy to him (Gen. 2:1-3); and to ponder afresh the double meaning in the words of the Gospels, that Jesus rose on "the first of the week" or "the first of the Sabbaths" (e.g., Mark 16:2). That is, from its very outset, Sunday sacredness (Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10), was understood in the context of a sabbatarian origin, with the Resurrection Sunday as "the first of the Sabbaths" (Luke 24:1; John 20:1), replacing the old Jewish sabbath (Luke 23:56) and associated "Jews' preparation day" (John 19:42). Thus I think we can still use relevant Old Testament passages, e.g., "If thou" "call the sabbath a delight," "then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord" (Isa. 58:13,14). But in either instance, given the need for interpretation of such New Testament passages as Rom. 14:5,6⁷⁴; Gal.

1851, 1852, Hamilton, Adams, & Co, London, 4th edition, 1867, pp. 465-73.

⁷⁴ Though my thinking has changed on the meaning of this passage of Scripture over the years, on my present thinking the meaning of Rom. 14:5,6 is that the NT gives a liberty for Christians to either keep, or not keep, various holy days, "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike" (Rom. 14:5), or fast days, "He that eateth,

4:10,11; Col. 2:16,17; and the historic diversity of views between orthodox Protestants as to whether the Christian Sunday is simply a day of assembly, or additionally a sabbath, I think it would be unwise to use such open-ended and non-specific terminology as “sin” (II Thess. 2:3), “iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7), or “keep his commandments” (I John 2:3), as the basis of a historicist prophetic interpretation that condemned non-Sabbatarians. The Sabbatarian view (which I think is the right one), must stand or fall on the basis of its general Biblical merits.

The other less common type of Antichrist passages are detailed and specific, such as I Tim. 3:16; 4:3 or the heresies of the antichrists and false teachers who typed the then coming Antichrist in I & II John; although much in these passages may also generally be dealt with through reference to the broad tenets of Reformation Protestantism. But *occasionally* I find the Biblically less common detailed and specific passages, create a context that demands I am more narrowly defined than these broad Reformation Protestant principles. For instance, in discussing the “mystery of godliness” (AV) truth that Christ was also “vindicated in the Spirit” (I Tim. 3:16, NASB), I find it necessary to specifically endorse the view of the “Lutherans,” who Berkhof says “regard the descent into hades as the first stage of the exaltation of Christ. Christ went into the underworld to reveal and consummate his victory over Satan and the powers of darkness, and to pronounce their sentence of condemnation.” In doing so, I follow those “Lutherans” who “place this triumphal march between the death of Christ and his resurrection⁷⁵.” This view has also had some historical support among Reformed Anglicans. In a classic Protestant work on the *Apostles’ Creed*, *Pearson’s Exposition of the Creed* (1659), the Lord Bishop of Chester, John Pearson (1612-1686), says this “opinion” that “our Saviour ‘descended into hell’” “to triumph over Satan and all the powers below within their own dominion,” hath obtained” support, “especially in our” Anglican “church” (“Eph. 4:8,9;” “Col. 2:12-15”)⁷⁶. In adopting the view that Christ’s

eateth to the Lord ...; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not”(Rom. 14:6). Thus e.g., orthodox Protestants are free to keep holy days such as Christmas and Good Friday at Easter if they wish; but orthodox Protestants are free to not keep them if they so wish. But this passage does not refer to the fundamentally obligatory nature of the fourth commandment (Exod. 20:8-11) in the Decalogue (Rom. 7:7; 13:9), and so cannot be used to set aside the Christian Sunday of Gentile Christians (John 20:1,19,26; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10).

⁷⁵ Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 342.

⁷⁶ Pearson, J., *An Exposition of the Creed*, 1659,1683, Ward, Lock, & Co., London, UK, 1854 reprint, pp. 358-9. Pearson does not agree with this view of a triumphal march, and he misunderstands elements of it. He claims that on this view, the “words, ‘spoiling principalities and powers,’ are not referred to the cross, but to Christ’s resurrection.” In fact, I would say, Christians are “dead” in their “sins” till “quickened” by Christ, and then die to the world and are “buried with” Christ “in” spiritual “baptism.” But precisely because Christ had already “spoiled principalities and powers” by his atonement on Good Friday, and so was bodily “raised from the dead” on Easter Sunday, we too “are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God.” Therefore I maintain that the description of Christ “triumphing over them” occurred as a triumphal march when he was “dead” and “buried” (Col 2:12-15), i.e., in “the lower parts of the earth” (Eph. 4:9) called “hell” (Acts 2:27,31), *evidencing* the completion of his work on the cross, and so like the resurrection, being “buried with him” brings with it an assurance to the believer of Christ’s triumphal power over “sins,” the “principalities and powers,” and both spiritual and physical death (Col 2:12-15).

descent into hell was a triumphal march in hell, and thus a *triumph in the spirit* between Good Friday and Easter Sunday that preceded his *triumph in the body* on Easter Sunday, I am not suggesting that orthodox Protestants do not have differing views on what is meant by Christ's *descent into hell*. While orthodox Protestant Christians have historically recognized that Christ "descended into hell" (*Apostles' Creed & Athanasian Creed*), they have disagreed on exactly what this means, although all the orthodox have rejected any interpretation of I Peter 3:18-20 referring to any form of "purgatory"⁷⁷. Importantly, those orthodox Protestant who disagree with my understanding of Christ's triumphal march through hell, can still agree on much of what I understand with regard to Christ being "vindicated in the Spirit" (I Tim. 3:16, NASB).

Occasionally I find the Biblically less common detailed and specific passages, create a context that demands I am more narrowly defined than the broad Reformation Protestant principles of the Reformation's first stage, the Lutheran Reformation. In particular, though regarding Luther's sacramental teachings on communion, baptism, and confession to be important improvements on the Romish teachings, nevertheless I find it necessary to go to the second stage of the Reformation and repudiate Luther's sacramentalism. As discussed above, I do not support Lutheran (or between 1549 and 1562 Reformation Anglican) voluntary auricular confession to a Minister, much less regard it, like Luther and Lutherans as a "sacrament," and finding it contrary to I John 1:7,9; 2:1,2, I must totally reject it in my wider treatment of the first two Johannian Epistles. The same is true of Luther's baptismal regeneration, which also contains elements of Rome's baptismal generation that I find contrary to I John 3:1,9; 5:1,4,18. I also think consubstantiation contains elements of the Roman Antichrist's transubstantiation teaching condemned in I John 4:2,3; II John 7. Martin Luther remains my greatest hero outside of Bible characters, but I must reject his sacramentalism since I am captive to the Word of God. "I see some things, saith Luther, which blessed Austin [/ Augustine] saw not; and those that come after me, will see that which I see not."⁷⁸

On Luther's sacramentalism, I broadly agree with, for example, the Reformed theologian, Louis Berkhof (1873-1957) (a member of the Reformed Church of America derived from the Dutch Reformed Church), when he says in his *Systematic Theology*, "on some" "points of doctrine, Luther did not entirely escape the leaven of Roman Catholicism." "The Lutheran Reformation did not entirely rid itself of the Roman Catholic conception of the sacraments." "Luther did not entirely escape the confusion of regeneration with justification;" with the consequence that "Luther and his followers did not succeed in purging their Church from the leaven of Rome on this point" of "baptismal regeneration." And Luther's notion of Christ being "in, with, and under" the sacramental bread and wine, in his "doctrine of consubstantiation" "is no great improvement on the Roman Catholic conception;"⁷⁹ although Berkhof fails to add that *it was a great improvement in some areas* since Luther did away with the Romish notion of the so called "sacrifice of the mass," and struck down the idolatrous practice of adoring the sacramental bread and wine.

In summary, broad-brush non-detailed descriptions of Antichrist are explained

⁷⁷ For different interpretations of Christ's descent into hell (Ps. 16:10; Jonah 2:2; Matt. 12:40; 16:4; Acts 2:27,31; Eph. 4:9; I Peter 3:18-20), see *Ibid.*, pp. 333-68, and Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, pp. 341-3.

⁷⁸ Flavel, J., *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 36.

⁷⁹ Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, pp. 308,309,433,466,477,627,646,653.

through reference to perfectly clear Biblical issues connected with the Lutheran or first stage of the Reformation. Fine-brush detailed descriptions of Antichrist only require movement to the second stage of the Reformation on the issue of rejecting Lutheran sacramentalism of consubstantiation, baptismal regeneration, and the so called “sacrament” of confession. Fine-brush detailed descriptions of Antichrist mean I specifically endorse the view historically held by some Lutherans and some Anglicans, that Christ’s descent into hell was a triumphal march⁸⁰; but this is clearly understood as *not the only view held by orthodox Protestants*⁸¹, and those orthodox Protestant who disagree with my understanding of Christ’s triumphal march through hell, can still agree on much of what I understand with regard to Christ being “vindicated in the Spirit” (I Tim. 3:16, NASB). Therefore, I consider that my methodology properly makes the *Historical School of Prophetic Interpretation* subject to the constraints of Scripture itself. That is, the historical school is thus used to highlight and reinforce clear Scriptural truths upheld by Protestants in opposition to Popery, rather than injected into a host of inter-denominational Protestant debates to create new sectarian arguments on disputed issues, that orthodox Protestants historically have disagreed about the meaning of Scripture on. I only depart from this broader general interpretation of these Antichrist prophecies if I consider there is a very clear contextual factor *requiring that I do this*. This occasionally occurs e.g., I find the need to repudiate Lutheran consubstantiation in the wider context of I John 4:2,3; or I find the need to uphold the issue of *Biblical authority against Papal authority* in Henry VIII’s break with Rome over incest with a deceased brother’s wife, in the wider context of such incest being an example of “the mystery of iniquity” “already” at “work” in NT times (II Thess. 2:7), since St. John the Baptist died a martyr’s death for his proclamation, “It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife” (Mark 6:18; cf. Lev. 20:21).

Commentary does not embrace views that some consider are “third” or “later stage” reforms.

1) *Introduction: Defending Lev. 18:16; 20:21 against Judaizers, liberals, some Puritans, and Papists.* 2) *Incest allowed by Pope forbidden in ancient pre-Reformation times.* 3) *Incest historically forbidden in the British Isles from Reformation times.* 4) *Incest historically forbidden by Protestants on the (European) Continent.* a) *Luther adopts the Biblical*

⁸⁰ The Lutheran *Formulae of Concord*, Article 9, “Of the descent of Christ into hell,” says, “It has been disputed whether this article is to be referred to the passion” of Christ “before” “his death,” “or to the glorious victory and triumph of Christ” in hell “after his death.” “Now” “we have” “agreed that this matter should not be disputed about” i.e., both views were tolerated as within Lutheran orthodoxy. Cf. Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 342; Pearson’s *Exposition of the Creed*, “He descended into hell,” View 6.

⁸¹ E.g., my orthodox brethren of the Presbyterian faith, take the view found in the *Larger Westminster Catechism* 50, and in an appendix to the *Shorter Westminster Catechism* containing “The Creed,” that the words of the *Apostles’ Creed*, “He descended into hell,” mean that he “continued in the state of the dead, and under the power of death till the third day.” Or my orthodox brethren of the Dutch Reformed faith, take the view of the *Heidelberg Catechism* 44, that Christ descended into hell when he hung on “the cross and before,” and so his “soul” experienced “hell” *before his death* i.e., “He descended into hell” (*Apostles’ Creed*) means “Christ, my Lord, by his inexpressible anguish, pains, and terrors, which he suffered in his soul on the cross and before, has redeemed me from the anguish and torment of hell.”

teaching on incest. b) Other Protestants on the Continent. 5) Judaizers, some Puritans, and liberals who subvert Lev. 18:16 a) Judaizers and some Puritans who subvert Lev. 18:16; b) Liberals who subvert Lev. 18:16. 6) Lev. 20:21: A “sin unto death.” 7) Lev. 20:21: God is Judge a) God’s general warnings of future judgment; b) God’s specific judgements: God as primary and/or secondary cause. 8) Summary.

1) Introduction: Defending Lev. 18:16; 20:21 against Judaizers, liberals, some Puritans, and Papists.

In marriage, a man and woman become “one flesh.” While this has a number of elements to it, one element is that “one flesh” means that the spouse’s kindred are the same relationship as one’s own *in-laws* e.g., a sister-in-law is one’s sister (Mark 6:18; 10:8). This is clear from e.g., Lev. 18:17 which reads, “Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her daughter.” A man may be free to marry either a woman who is a widow or divorced on Biblical grounds, or her unmarried daughter. But if he chooses one, he cannot then marry the other. Why? Because if he marries the woman, her daughter becomes his daughter *by affinity*; or if he marries the daughter, her mother becomes his mother *by affinity*. Thus Lev. 18 clearly teaches that incest refers to both consanguinity (blood relationships) and affinity (marriage relationships).

Though Lev. 18 provides an additional reason against incest with a wife’s sister relevant to OT times when polygamy was permitted (Lev. 18:18; Deut. 21:15), but repealed under NT monogamy (Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2); the reason for disallowing marriage with a deceased wife’s sister in Christian monogamous times, is that it is the same degree of affinity as a deceased brother’s wife (Lev. 18:16); and also “the nakedness of thy sister, the daughter of thy father” by consanguinity, and hence thy sister-in-law, the daughter of thy father-in-law by affinity, “thou shalt not uncover” (Lev. 18:9). This fact highlights another important principle in Lev. 18 & 20, stated by the Anglican Bishop of Salisbury (from 1560), Bishop John Jewel (Jewell) (1522-71). “Yet” some “will say,” “there are no express words in the Levitical law whereby I am forbidden to marry my wife’s sister;” and therefore, “by the Levitical law such marriage is to be accounted lawful. For” in “the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus,” “you must remember that certain degrees are left untouched, within which, nevertheless, it” is “never” “lawful for a man to marry. For example, there is nothing provided there by express word, but that a man may marry” “the wife of his uncle by the mother’s side.” “Yet will no may say, that any of these degrees may join together in lawful marriage; wherefore we must needs think that God in that chapter has especially and namely forbidden certain degrees, not as leaving all marriage lawful which he had not therefore expressly forbidden; but that thereby, as by infallible precepts, we might be able to rule [on] the rest; as” e.g., “when God commands that no man shall marry the wife of his uncle by his father’s side, we doubt not but that in the same is included the wife of the uncle by the mother’s side.”⁸²

Thus e.g., the fact that we read of a grandfather, “The nakedness of thy son’s daughter, or of thy daughter’s daughter, even their nakedness thou shalt not uncover” (Lev. 18:10), prohibits all incest between grandparents and grandchildren, i.e., including a

⁸² Paton, C.I., *Marriage with a Deceased Brother’s Wife, Condemned by the Laws of Nature, Scripture, and the Testimony of Churches and Nations*, James Nisbet & Co., London, UK, 1869, p. 52.

grandmother's son's son or daughter's son; and also any spouses of them e.g., a father's son's wife (daughter-in-law). Or the fact that for a man "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister", or the "wife" of "thy father's brother," "she is thine aunt" (Lev. 18:13,14); teaches us that all aunt-nephew, or uncle-niece unions, whether by consanguinity or affinity, are incestuous and forbidden. So likewise, the fact that we are told, "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife: it is thy brother's nakedness" (Lev. 18:16), means that all relationships in the same degree are forbidden i.e., both sisters (consanguinity) and sisters-in-law (affinity) may not be lawfully married. Hence a man can no more marry his deceased wife's sister, than he can marry his deceased brother's wife.

For the purposes of incest laws, the Biblical teaching of "one flesh" (Gen. 2:24) creates an equality between relationships of consanguinity and relationships of affinity. In an age where the wider culture of Western countries promotes the nuclear family i.e., parents and children living in one household, as opposed to the extended family; this type of thinking tends to be ignored. For many in the nuclear family, so called "in-laws" are people one has little to no contact with; and Western countries have repealed a number of historic Biblical prohibitions against marrying relatives by affinity. But from the Biblical perspective, by marriage one enters a larger family. This teaching is succinctly and accurately stated in the Presbyterian's *Westminster Confession* 24:4, which says, "Marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the Word." "The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own."

In broad terms, issues dealing with what some consider are "third" or "later stage" reforms, are not dealt with in the commentary on the Biblical texts. However, *a qualified exception to this occurs where what a person or denomination regards as a later stage reform, is the repudiation of a fundamental Biblical teaching that clearly formed part of the broad Biblical Protestant teaching of the first two stages of the Reformation.* This is thus relevant to incest laws, since what some Puritans, Judaizers, or liberals claim as a "later stage reform" allowing certain forms of incest, in fact strikes down, and renders ineffectual, a *fundamental* feature of the earlier Reformation, because the maintenance of these very incest laws against the contrary claims of Papists, was the specific Biblical issue that Henry VIII broke with Rome over as manifesting *Biblical authority as opposed to Papal authority.*

I note three factors in favour of maintaining the Biblical incest laws of Lev. 18 against Judaizers, liberals, some Puritans, and Papists who seek to subvert them. Firstly, it is the clear teaching of Scripture as recognized by Protestants of the British Isles and (European) Continent in the first and second stages of the Reformation. Secondly, incest between close relatives, as well as the incest discussed with respect to Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, "is a sin unto death" (I John 5:16), involving the death of such misbegotten children; and so directly relevant to the types of the Antichrist used in the Apostle John's First Epistle. Finally, this issue of incest involves matters dealing with *God acting as a primary cause in judgement* (the misbegotten children of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon all died); or *God acting as a secondary cause in judgement* (the misbegotten children of close biological relatives being deformed and dying⁸³). Especially from the nineteenth century, the idea of

⁸³ An argument, based purely on *natural law*, is sometimes made for extending the prohibited degrees of Lev. 18 & 20, by prohibiting first cousins from marrying for eugenic reasons; so that e.g., in 1939 Jacobs refers to a "majority of states" in the USA which "forbid the inter-marriage of first cousins" (Jacobs, A.C., "Marriage Laws," *Journal of Marriage and*

God as judge has been attacked by religious liberals and religious skeptics, and it would be wrong to modify Biblical truth to pander to these ungodly persons. Let us now consider these three matters.

2) *Incest allowed by Pope forbidden in ancient pre-Reformation times.*

This issue of incest, with later Papal “dispensations” allowing incest, once again shows how the Church of Rome has moved away from the earlier Christian teaching of the Bible. For example, the *Council of Elvira* (near Granada, Spain), said in 306 A.D., “If anyone after his wife’s death has married her sister, and she herself be a believer, it was resolved that they should be debarred from Communion for five years, unless it may be that urgent sickness have required a more speedy reconciliation.”

Or Basil the Great (Bishop of Caesarea, Cappadocia, modern Turkey, 370-379) condemned such unions (Basil’s *Epist. Canonica III, Epist. 217, can. 78*). E.g., in his letter to Diodorus (*Epist. 160*), written c. 373 A.D., he condemns incestuous unions between either an uncle and a niece, or a man and his wife’s sister. He says, “For ‘they are no longer two, but one flesh’ [Mark 10:8]. So through the wife her sister passes to nearness of kin to the husband for he cannot take his wife’s mother or daughter, so he cannot take his wife’s sister, because he cannot take his own sister.” The Canons of Basil the Great (375 A.D.), impose a seven year penalty of excommunication on offenders, before they can be readmitted to the Lord’s Table, “if they have repented in tears.” Of course, this includes the requirement, as Basil stated plainly in his Epistle to Diodorus (*Epist. 160, section 2*), that they have separated from their incestuous union before any such admission.

So too, in the eleventh canonical *Answers to Timothy* by the Archbishop of Alexandria (Archbishop of Alexandria, north Africa, Egypt, 381-5), the question was asked, “If a clerk is called to celebrate a marriage, and he hear that it is an unlawful one, as with an aunt, or a deceased wife’s sister, must he go ...?” To this, “Timothy replied that if it be an unlawful marriage he is called to perform, no clerk must be a partaker of other men’s sins”

the Family (Living), Vol. 1, 1939, pp. 4-7, at p. 6). In answer to the obvious question of why then, Scripture does not prohibit the marriage of first cousins, it is possible for a Protestant to postulate that the process of genetic decay evident in the Book of Genesis from when men lived many hundreds of years, down to when they came to live only 70 or 80 years on average; provides a precedent to assert some similar change since Moses’ day which now makes the marriage of first cousins eugenically undesirable and so contrary to godly reason. But it is also possible for a Protestant to reject the eugenics argument, and argue that man has not genetically decayed since Moses’ day. Thus while all who accept Biblical authority agree that first cousins were allowed to marry in Bible times; the matter of whether or not first cousins should now marry has historically led to disagreement. My own view is that such unions are permissible, though *usually* unwise. An exceptional case in which I think the union was, *all things considered*, not unwise, is that of William III and Mary II, being first cousins descended from their common grandfather of Charles I. On the one hand, God most desirably used this union to bring over William of Orange as co-ruler of the British Isles in 1688, a matter of great rejoicing for all true Protestants. But on the other hand, the genetic closeness of the union may help to explain why Mary II was unable to bear children. Though this genetic factor would normally make such a union unwise; as a package deal, I consider that in this rare and unusual instance, this was still a wise union.

(Beveridge's *Synodican*, 2, p. 168)⁸⁴.

Such unions were still regarded as immoral in the seventh century. This is seen in the story of the missionary, Kilien of Ireland. Kilien (Kilian) was an Irish missionary who went to Germany, and worked in the pagan area of Wurtzburg (Warzburg) in Franconia. (This area is in northeastern Bavaria, in Thuringia whose capital is Erfut, where Luther later went to university). The pagan governor of this area, Gozbert, ultimately helped Kilien in his missionary work to these German heathens. But Gozbert had married his deceased brother's wife. After his conversion, Kilien entreated him to terminate this sinful union. Reluctantly, Gozbert agreed. However the woman whom he had incestuously married, Geilana, then sought revenge. She sent assassins to the place where Kilien and his companions were, and had them killed in 689 A.D. . When Gozbert learnt what had happened, he decided to revert back to paganism. But the God who had said, "If a man shall take his brother's wife, it is an unclean thing, he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness; they shall be childless" (Lev. 20:21), was not mocked. After confessing what he had done, Kilien's murderer went mad, tore at his own flesh with his teeth, and died in a sad state. Geilana also died shortly later in despair. Gozbert also died a violent death, and within a few years his race was exterminated⁸⁵.

Thus Kilien died for the moral principle of doing what is right according to God's law against incest. On the one hand, when the Pope of Rome grants a dispensation for this type of incest, such as he did for the marriage of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, he dishonours both the law of God and also the moral stand of men like Kilien, and in effect dances on the grave of Kilien of Ireland. But on the other hand, when he who was the King of England from 1508 to 1547, the Lord of Ireland from 1508 to 1541, and the King of Ireland from 1541 to 1547, namely, King Henry VIII, withdrew from the incestuous union he had entered into with his deceased brother's wife, Catherine of Aragon, he honoured both the law of God and also the moral stand of men like Kilien of Ireland.

3) *Incest historically forbidden in the British Isles from Reformation times.*

The clear teaching of Scripture that a man may not marry his brother's wife (Lev. 18:16; 20:21; Matt. 14:3,4; Mark 6:18; Luke 3:19), formed the basis for the initial break from Rome under King Henry VIII. In the *Church of England* this Biblical morality was expressed in *Parker's Table (1563)*. *Parker's Table* ("A Table of Kindred and Affinity, wherein whosoever are related are forbidden in Scripture and our Laws to marry together"), states that for relationships created by either consanguinity (blood) or affinity (marriage), "A man may not marry" e.g., "his" "wife's father's sister," "wife's mother's sister," "wife's sister," "brother's wife," "brother's son's wife," "wife's brother's daughter," or "wife's sister's daughter;" and "A woman may not marry" e.g., "her" "husband's father's brother," "husband's mother's brother," "husband's brother," "sister's husband," "brother's daughter's husband," "husband's brother's son," or "husband's sister's son." Moreover, e.g., Canon 99 of the *Constitutions and Ecclesiastical Canons* agreed upon during "the reign of" "James, by

⁸⁴ *Council of Elvira*, Bishop of Caesarea, and Archbishop of Alexandria, quoted by Bishop John Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury, England, in his work, *The Law of the Church as to the Marriage of a Man with his Deceased Wife's Sister*, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, UK, 1908, pp. 12,13,15-16.

⁸⁵ Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, pp. 54-6.

the grace of God, King of England,” “Ireland,” “and” “Scotland,” in the *Synod of London (1603)* said, “No person shall marry within the degrees prohibited by the laws of God, and expressed in” Parker’s “Table set forth by authority in the year of our Lord God 1563. And all marriages so made and contracted shall be adjudged incestuous and unlawful, and” “void from the beginning.” “And the aforesaid Table shall be in every Church publicly set up and fixed at the charge of the parish.” In the *Church of Scotland* this Biblical morality was expressed in the *Westminster Confession*, “Marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the Word; nor can such incestuous marriages ever be made lawful by any man or consent of parties, so as those persons may live together as man and wife. The man may not marry any of his wife’s kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband’s kindred nearer in blood than of her own” (24:4).

4) *Incest historically forbidden by Protestants on the (European) Continent.*
 a) *Luther adopts the Biblical teaching on incest.*

A rift initially existed between the Lutheran Reformation in Germany and the Anglican Reformation in England, Ireland, and Wales. The fact that on the one hand, Henry VIII came gradually to Protestantism, only fully accepting it near the time of his death; and the fact that on the other hand, Martin Luther is every good Protestant’s favourite Reformer; has tended to put the blame for this on Henry VIII. But careful scrutiny of the facts will not justify this sentiment, since it is clear that both men were at fault, but by the grace of God, both men finally arrived at the same fundamental truths. While Luther remains my favourite Reformer too, it must be remembered that he was only a mere man, that the age of the prophet existed only in Bible times, and Luther was not himself a prophet whose writings are imbued with the infallibility of the Scriptures. Rather, Luther came to truth as he studied Scripture under the Spirit’s guidance, in the same way that any man in post NT times does. This is how, by the grace of God, Luther came to recover the doctrine of justification by faith. This is also how, by the grace of God, he came to recover the Biblical doctrine of incest, that prohibits the union between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. But just like Henry VIII took some time to arrive at this truth, so too, Luther took some time to arrive at this truth.

Luther did not initially regard marriage by a man with a deceased brother’s wife or a deceased wife’s sister (or a woman with a deceased sister’s husband or a deceased husband’s brother), such as that between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, as incestuous. His great and godly mind being more fixed on the issues to do with the Lutheran Reformation in Germany, he took only a superficial look at the incest laws of Lev. 18 & 20, and wrongly concluded that no incest existed between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. Thus at the same time that the Spirit of God was moving to convict men of the truth of Luther’s stand on justification by faith as manifesting *Biblical authority verses Papal authority*; and also convicting men of Archbishop Cranmer and Henry VIII’s stand on incest being prohibited as manifesting *Biblical authority verses Papal authority*; a most unfortunate rift came into being between the Lutheran and Anglican Reformations, as Luther did not consider that Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon were in an incestuous union.

To understand this, is to recognize that the great man Luther had made a serious mistake, and so the earlier aversion of Henry VIII to Protestants is also more intelligible, since he had obvious difficulties in accepting that Luther really did believe in Biblical authority if he was prepared, as he had been, to condone incest in the form of marriage with a deceased brother’s wife. In 1534 the Westminster Parliament passed the *First Act of Succession*. This Act was concerned with “man’s sinister appetite and affection, by reason

whereof the Bishop of Rome,” had acted “contrary to the great and inviolable grants of jurisdictions given by God.” It declared that “we” “do most abhor and detest; the marriage heretofore solemnized between Your Highness [Henry VIII] and the Lady Katherine, being lawful wife to Prince Arthur, your elder brother.” Thus “in a lawful process,” “made before Thomas” Cranmer, “Archbishop of Canterbury and Metropolitan [Bishop] and Primate of all this realm,” this union was “definitely, clearly, and absolutely declared, deemed, and adjudged to be against the laws of Almighty God, and also” “taken of no value nor effect, but utterly void and annulled.⁸⁶” While Protestants rightly make much of the prayer of William Tyndale at the time of his martyrdom in 1535 in Holland, “Lord, open the eyes of the King of England” to Protestantism⁸⁷; it should also be remembered that the godly Protestants of the Anglican Reformation would have also prayed, “Lord, open the eyes of Martin Luther on incest between a man and his deceased brother’s wife.” In the very year of Tyndale’s martyrdom, God opened the eyes of Martin Luther on the issue of incest.

In a letter to the Lutheran Pastor Leonard, Luther forsook his earlier sexually permissive views on this form of incest, and joined Philip Melancthon and others in recognizing that marriage between a man and his deceased brother’s wife was incestuous. Luther recognized from 1535, that the “one flesh” (Gen. 2:24; Matt. 19:5; Mark 10:8) relationship between a man and his wife, meant that his brother’s wife was his sister-in-law, and so truly his sister, with whom incest is forbidden in Lev. 18 & 20. Thus by God’s laws, a man may not lawfully marry his deceased brother’s wife⁸⁸. With this important development, the rift between the German Lutheran and English, Irish, and Welsh Anglican Reformations began to be providentially healed. The Spirit of God started to knit together these two reforming movements more closely, and as both Lutherans and Anglicans united in their now common stance on *Biblical authority verses Papal authority* manifested in opposition to incest between a man marrying his deceased brother’s wife, they also moved ever closer together on other matters; so that in time Henry VIII embraced the truth of Protestantism just before his death, and the Anglican Reformation became part of the wider Christian Reformation of Protestantism.

Praise be to God, who opened the eyes of both Martin Luther and Henry VIII! “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!” (Ps. 133:1).

4) *Incest historically forbidden by Protestants on the (European) Continent.*
 b) *Other Protestants on the Continent.*

In replying to an enquiry made by King Henry VIII of England and Ireland, the Lutheran theologians of Germany held, “It is manifest, and cannot be denied, that the law of Lev. 18 prohibits a marriage with a sister-in-law. This is to be considered as a Divine, a

⁸⁶ Henry VIII’s *First Act of Succession*, 1534, in Bainton, R.H., *op. cit.*, p. 142.

⁸⁷ Bramely-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, p. 283.

⁸⁸ *Luther’s Works*, Vol. 45, p. 8, fn. 6, referring to Luther’s Letter to Leonard of 18 Jan 1535 in *D. Martin Luther’s Werke*, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Weimer, (Deutschland / Germany), 1883, Br. 7, pp. 152-3; and *D. Martin Luther’s Sammtliche Schriften*, edited by Joham Georg Walch, edited and published in modern German, St. Louis, USA, 1880-1910, 23 volumes in 25 volumes, Vol. 10, pp. 704-5.

Natural, and a Moral Law, against which no other law may be enacted or established. Agreeably to this, the whole Church has always retained this law, and judged such marriages incestuous. Agreeably to this, also, the decrees of synods, and celebrated opinions of the most holy fathers, and even civil laws, prohibit such marriages, and pronounce them incestuous. Wherefore we also judge that this law is to be preserved in all the churches as a Divine, a Natural, and a Moral Law; nor will we dispense with, nor permit in our [Lutheran] churches, that such marriages shall be contracted; and this doctrine we can, and as God shall enable us, we will resolutely defend.⁸⁹”

The “decrees of synods, and celebrated opinions of the most holy fathers,” stretching back to pre-Reformation times and here referred to by these Lutheran Protestants, might include, e.g., the *Council of Elvira* (306), Basil the Great, or *Answers to Timothy* by the Archbishop of Alexandria (381-5), mentioned above.

The French Reformed Church’s Canon 9 in the 13th chapter of their Book of Discipline, adopted in 1559 (and subsequently revised), said, “It is not lawful for any man to marry the sister of his deceased wife; for such marriages are prohibited ... by the Word of God. And although by the law of Moses it was ordained that, when the brother died without children, his brother should raise up seed unto him, yet that law, enacted for the children of Israel, was temporary, relating only to the preservation of the tribes of that people.⁹⁰”

John Calvin met with representatives sent to him at Geneva in Switzerland from the French Reformed Church’s *Synod of Poitiers* (1562) and *Synod of Lyons* (1563) in France, and he was involved with both synods. Then at the French Reformed Church’s *Synod of Vertueil* (1567), we read in Chapter 10, under the heading, “Orders and Decrees concerning Marriage, ... drawn up at the desire of the fathers in this Synod by ... Calvin, Minister of God’s Holy Word, Pastor and Professor in the Church and University of Geneva.” Under these canons “drawn up” “by” “Calvin” himself, we find in the ninth decree, the following Question, “What are those cases of affinity which hinder marriage?” And in Answer 5, “Let no man marry his brother’s widow, nor any woman him who was her sister’s husband.⁹¹” Thus like Luther from 1535, Calvin opposed this form of incest.

The first General Synod of the *Dutch Reformed Church* took place in Holland in 1571 and it adopted Presbyterian church government, the Belgic Confession (1561)⁹², and Heidelberg Catechism (1563)⁹³. In 1580, its decrees against incest included the statement,

⁸⁹ Paton, C.I., *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 48-9.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

⁹² The Belgic Confession was revised by the Synod of Antwerp, Holland, in 1566, and accepted by Synods at Wesel (1568), Emden (1571), Dort (1574), and Middleberg (1581), before being revised and accepted in its final form by the great Synod of Dort (1618-19).

⁹³ Written in 1562, the Heidelberg Catechism was adopted by the Palatinate Church in 1563 (the Palatinate are German lands whose capital was Heidelberg until the 18th century).

“No man may marry the widow of his deceased brother, nor may any woman marry the husband of her deceased husband.” This was reinforced by the much celebrated *Synod of Dort* (or *Dortrecht*) of 1618-1619. The marginal notes of the translators, appointed by this Synod, state on “Lev. 18:16,” “From this law it necessarily follows, that a woman who has been married with one brother, may not, after his death, marry with another brother; and upon the same principle, a man who has been married to one sister, may not, after her death, marry the other sister” (The *Dutch Reformed Church* reaffirmed its historic opposition to unions between a woman and her deceased brother’s husband, in its General Synods of 1797 and 1815.)⁹⁴

5) *Judaizers, some Puritans, and liberals who subvert Lev. 18:16.*

5a) *Judaizers and some Puritans who subvert Lev. 18:16.*

The open-ended and ambiguous Puritan confessions of the Congregationalists’ *Savoy Declaration* 25:4 and Baptist’s *London Confession* 25:4, retain the first part of the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 24:4 which says, “Marriage ought not to be within the degree of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the Word; nor can such incestuous marriages ever be made lawful by any law of man or consent of parties, so as those persons may live together as man and wife.” But they both excise the words of *Westminster Confession* 24:4 which then explains the meaning of this in a most succinct formulae of words: “The man may not marry any of his wife’s kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband’s kindred nearer in blood than of her own.”

The practical affect of this, is that unlike Presbyterian Puritans, Congregationalist and Baptist Puritans following these Confessions of Faith, have historically allowed moral ambiguity on the issue of certain forms of incest, such as marriage with a deceased brother’s wife. If they wish, they may agree with Presbyterians *et al* that such unions are wrong, but if they wish, they may condone or engage in such unions with no censure from their church. Thus historically there have been some Puritans who subvert Lev. 18:16; and so in the name of a “third stage” reform, undermine the first stage of the English Reformation.

The OT levirate marriage rule exception (Deut. 25:5-10; Matt. 22:23-33), is repealed under Christian laws ending old Jewish laws (Eph. 2:15) and requiring monogamy (Matt. 19:9). Therefore Lev. 18 & 20 is written in such a way that once polygamy is prohibited, this lone exception being no longer applicable, all such unions with one’s “brother’s wife” become unlawful. There is thus a Judaizing element in attempts to use the levirate marriage rule to justify such unions in the Christian era, comparable to the 19th century Judaizing Mormon attempts to reintroduce polygamy.

Rousas Rushdoony is a minister of the *Orthodox Presbyterian Church of America* (OPC), which left the *Presbyterian Church in the USA* (PCUSA) in 1936. In doing so, it retained a 1903 PCUSA amendment to *Westminster Confession* 24:4, removing the words, “The man may not marry any of his wife’s kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband’s kindred nearer in blood than of her own.”⁹⁵ Rushdoony is

⁹⁴ Paton, C.I., *op. cit.*, pp. 50-1.

⁹⁵ The OPC also retained the 1903 PCUSA amendment to *Westminster Confession* 25:6 (removing reference to the Pope of Rome as the Antichrist), and Rushdoony is not a

the leader of group called “Christian Reconstructionists,⁹⁶” which seeks to “reconstruct” a society on such models as Calvin’s sixteenth century Geneva (Switzerland), John Cotton’s seventeenth century New England (Massachusetts, USA), or the Puritan’s seventeenth century New Haven (Connecticut, USA)⁹⁷. But in doing so, he and his followers do what neither Calvin nor the Puritans ever did, and claim that Jewish civil laws are *binding of necessity* in the Christian era. For example, Rushdoony says that, “Because sexual union makes, according to Scripture, the two ‘one flesh,’ marriage by a widow or a widower to in-laws is barred as incest, with a single exception,” namely, “the law of the levirate (Deut. 25:5-10).” He laments “It’s general disuse today,” and claims that, “When the family is again restored to its Biblical place, the levirate will quietly take its place in that framework of law.⁹⁸” Neither his purported role model of Calvin, nor his purported American Puritan role models, ever supported such a law or practice. Thus what he calls “Christian reconstruction,” is in fact the semi-reconstruction of the Jewish state that ceased to exist about 2,000 years ago, with a heavily Judaized “Christian” overlay. It has never existed, and so cannot truly be called “Christian reconstruction.”

Though he does not go so far as to claim Jewish “ceremonies and rites” such as circumcision “bind Christian men,” Rushdoony, is nevertheless a semi-Judaizer (Acts 15:5; Gal. 5:3), who denies the Biblical truth that “nor” the Mosaic “civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth” (Article 7, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*). This distinction between the “Old Testament “commandments which are called moral” which “no Christian man whatsoever is free from,” and the “law” of “Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites” which does “not bind Christian men,” and “the civil precepts thereof” which “ought” not “of necessity to be received in any commonwealth” (Art 7, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*), is also expressed in the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* (WC), chapter 19, entitled, “Of the Law of God,” which as a Presbyterian minister in the OPC Rushdoony is meant to believe in, since the OPC has not changed chapter 19. This says that “to the people of Israel,” “as a body politic,” “God” “gave sundry judicial laws, which expired together with the State of that people; not obliging any other now, further than the general equity thereof may require” (e.g., “Exod. 21; 22:1-29;” “Dan. 9:27;” “Col. 2:14,16,17;” “Eph. 2:15,16”) (WC19:3,4). This chapter recognizes that Christians are bound by the “ten commandments” (“James 1:25;” cf. 2:10-12 “Rom. 13:8”), which can be stylistically distinguished in the Pentateuch, because unlike the rest of the Mosaic law written only on the Scrolls of Moses, the Decalogue was also “written in two tables” of stone (“Exod. 34:1;” “Deut. 10:4”) (WC 19:2), (“James 2:10,11”) (WC 19:5), (“Rom. 7:7;” “Rom. 7:12,22,25”) (WC 19:6). Thus the Book of Ephesians recognizes a distinction between “ceremonial laws” which “are now abrogated” (“Eph. 2:15,16”) (WC 19:3), and the “moral law” which “doth for ever bind” (“Eph. 6:2”) (WC 19:3,5). So too, the Book of Hebrews recognizes this distinction between “ceremonial laws” “now abrogated” (“Heb. 9; 10:1” n.b., 9:1,10 cf. 7:12,18,19; 8:4) (WC 19:3), and what “the will of God” “revealed in the law,

historicist (Rushdoony, R.J., *Thy Kingdom Come*, Thoburn Press, Virginia, USA, 1978).

⁹⁶ Together with Otto Scott, he was one of the *Editors* of *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction* in 1984.

⁹⁷ Rushdoony, R.J., *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, USA, 1973, Vol. 1, pp. 1-2,9-10,790-1.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 377,381.

requireth to be done” (“Heb. 8:10;” “Jer. 31:33” cf., Exod. 34:28; Deut. 10:1-5; Jer. 3:16) (WC19:7).

Rushdoony rejects any form of *natural law* and is deaf to *the voice of nature*⁹⁹. But God judged the heathen Canaanites by the laws of Lev. 18, because they are discoverable by godly reason based in natural law (Lev. 18:24,25). These laws (subject to Christian monogamy), remain binding, and so e.g., “Marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the Word” (“Lev. 18”) (WC 24:4). Through reference to the hymen of a virgin, natural law also teaches that a woman should be a virgin upon her marriage bed (see the old Jewish civil law, based upon this natural law fact, but adding Mosaical legal procedures and penalties that no longer bind Christians, Deut. 22:13-21). Moreover, where a Mosaical law simply expresses such morality, it can be characterized under the moral law and binding. For example, the moral law prohibits false gods, idolatry, profaning the name of Nature’s God, and murder (Exod. 20:2-7,13; Lev. 18:21; Deut. 5:6-11,17), and so the Mosaical law of Deut. 18:10-12 clearly remains binding, and indeed God judged the heathen Canaanites for committing these violations of natural law (Deut. 18:12-14).

The NT usage of OT laws is also important, e.g., the general equity of having two or three witnesses (Deut. 19:15; Matt. 18:16; II Cor. 13:1), manifests principles of, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” (Lev. 19:18; Gal. 5:14). Or the general equity of not yoking together two incompatible creatures whose step and pull is very different (Deut. 22:10), gives rise to the terminology of believers “not” being “unequally yoked” in marriage with unbelievers (II Cor. 6:14) in a religiously mixed marriage (I Cor. 7:39) (other than where two unbelievers are married, and one converts but the other does not, or after marriage, one apostatizes, I Cor. 7:12-16). Orthodox believers may sometimes disagree on the value for us today of an OT Mosaic law that both agree no longer binds.

If, *occasionally*, orthodox believers disagree as to whether some OT Mosaic law has any greater binding force today, it is because *they disagree on how a New Testament passage of Scripture relates to that Old Testament Scripture*. For example, long before the Mosaical law, Melchizedek received tithes from Abraham (Gen. 14:20). This shows the superiority of his priesthood, since Levi, who under the Levitical law received tithes (Heb. 7:5,6; Num. 18:21,26-28), therefore can be said to have paid them to Melchizedek, since he was racially “yet in the loins of his father,” “Abraham” (Heb. 7:9,10). Since Melchizedek received tithes, as of right, from Abraham (Gen. 14:20), and Christ is a priest in the order of Melchizedek (Heb. 7:21), I consider that Christ receives tithes from Christians, as of right (Heb. 7:8). The NT refers to the OT priests “which minister about holy things,” and who “live of the things of the temple,” that is, the Mosaical tithes (Num 18:21) and offerings (Lev. 6:16), and says, “even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel” (I Cor. 9:13,14). Thus on the basis of I Cor. 9:13,14; Heb. 7; I consider that Christians should give tithes and offerings for gospel ministry, and that an OT passage such as Mal. 3:8-10 can be fairly quoted for these purposes, even though it was written when the old Levitical law of tithes was operating.

Hence the historic tradition (no longer operative) of paying tithes to sustain the *Church of England* clergy, and e.g., having tithe-barns throughout the English countryside,

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 10,651-2,685.

was in my opinion a valid usage of, “Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse” (Mal. 3:10). For example, on my fifth trip to London (Sept. 08-March 09), in December 2008 I saw “The Tythe Barn” next to Launton *Church of England* in Oxfordshire; and I also inspected the Great Coxwell Tithe Barn in Berkshire, which was built in the 14th century to look like a Cathedral on the outside, although inside it looks very much like a barn, which when I was there near Christmas had a Nativity scene set up with the three wise men. But other orthodox Protestants disagree with me, and consider that the NT does not require the giving of tithes, which they say were completely abolished with the Mosaic ceremonial law. Of those who say this, one group then does not tithe; but another group does tithe, not because they regard it as obligatory, but because they think it is a good idea¹⁰⁰.

Likewise, the Apostle John says, “love not the world,” such as “the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life” (I John 2:15,16); and the Apostle Paul says to deny “worldly lusts” (Titus 2:12). The OT Mosaic law, “Ye shall not ... print any marks upon you” (AV), also known as “tattoo ... marks” (NKJV) (Lev. 19:28), manifested *worldly lusts* in an OT context; for why would a person either in OT times or NT times get a tattoo on their skin, other than because they were involved in *worldly lusts*? Godly reason also is against such tattoos, since the marks are permanent, and cannot be removed. Thus on the basis of both godly reason (natural law), and NT injunctions against “worldly lust” (divine law), I maintain that this Mosaic civil law manifestation of *worldly lusts* under OT morality, is instructive to help us itemize such *worldly lusts* under NT morality. Therefore I would say, that the command holds good for Christians, “Ye shall not ... print any marks upon you” (AV), that is, any “tattoo ... marks” (NKJV) (Lev. 19:28). Importantly then, *my belief in e.g., tithing, or prohibiting tattoos, is based on NT passages*, in which I see the OT Mosaic law as *manifesting* this same morality, and so usable in this qualified way. By contrast, a Judaizer like Rushdoony, simply quotes OT Mosaic passages such as “Lev. 27:30-33; Numbers 18:21-26; Deuteronomy 14:22-27; 26:12,15”(tithing), or “Lev. 19:28” (tattooing), as “the law” for Christians¹⁰¹, because contrary to the orthodox Protestant teaching found in Article 7 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, he considers the OT Mosaic “civil precepts” “ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth.”

The NT sometimes characterizes certain matters under one of the Decalogue’s

¹⁰⁰ E.g., Blackstone says that, “the tenth part of the annual profit” “was” “claimed by” “Papal usurpations,” “under no better pretence than a strange misapplication of that precept of the Levitical law, which directs,” in “Num. 18:26,” “that the Levites ‘should offer the tenth part of their tithes as heave-offering to the Lord, and give it to Aaron the high priest.’ But this claim of the Pope met with a vigorous resistance from the English parliament,” and “when” “Papal power was abolished, and the king was declared the head of the Church of England,” “this revenue” then went “to the Crown” “by statute 26 Hen. VIII. c. 3” (1 Bl. Com. 284). Writing in the 1760s, Blackstone said, “I will not put the title of the clergy to tithes upon any divine right; though such a right certainly commenced, and I believe as certainly ceased, with the Jewish theocracy, Yet an honourable and competent maintenance for the ministers of the gospel is, undoubtedly, *jure divino*” (divine law). “For, besides the positive precepts of the New Testament, natural reason” (natural law) “will tell us, that” there should be a “means of providing” for “them. Accordingly,” “a liberal and decent maintenance for” *Church of England* “clergy” is “established” “of tithes,” “in imitation of the Jewish law” (2 Bl. Com. 25).

¹⁰¹ Rushdoony’s *Institutes of Biblical Law*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 52,84,223.

precepts, thus showing it is morally binding for Christians. E.g., the divorce provisions of Matt. 5:31,32, are contextually part of Christ’s wider discourse in Matt. 5:17-48, in which Jesus says he came “not” “to destroy,” “but to fulfill” “the Law” i.e., the Pentateuch, and “the Prophets” i.e., the rest of the OT (Matt. 5:17); and in this broad context dealing with the Old Testament, he then says, “the law” i.e., the Ten Commandments, remain binding (Matt. 5:18-20). He then itemizes and discusses elements of the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” (Matt. 5:21-26), which included usage of a Jewish ceremonial law on a “gift before the altar” (Matt. 5:23,24; Deut. 16:16,17), manifesting a wider Decalogue principle with respect to forgiveness and reconciliation (Matt. 5:21-26), that continues to operate after this Jewish ceremonial law’s repeal (Col. 2:14,16,17; Heb. 7:12); as well as the right of a government to have law enforcement officers and courts enforce legal actions with respect to the Moral Law, or what is not contrary to it (Matt. 5:25,26). Or the seventh commandment, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” (Matt. 5:27-32). Or the frivolous or rash usage of swearing oaths, which are protected by the third commandment, “Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain,” and ninth commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness” (Matt. 5:33-37). Or the right of a government to have law enforcement officers and courts enforce legal actions with respect to the Moral Law, and so execute for heinous crimes such as murder, prohibited by the sixth commandment, and not to have such powers usurped by individuals in revenge or vigilante killings (Matt. 5:38,39; Gen. 9:6). Or the Decalogue’s Neighbour Principle (Matt. 5:40-48; Rom. 13:9). This means that in Matt. 5:31,32, Jesus characterizes the Mosaical Divorce Code of Deut. 24:1-4 under the seventh commandment, and so it forms part of the continuing morality of Christians. Thus dissolution of marriage due to “uncleanness,” “hate,” or death (Deut. 24:1-4) is part of Christian morality, *as it is interpreted* in Matt. 5:31,32 and other relevant NT Scriptures (Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:15,39).

The precedent of I Tim. 1:8-10 is also important for such characterizations under the Decalogue. Going through the Decalogue (Exod. 20:1-17; Deut. 5:6-21), the Apostle Paul says “the law” is designed to bring conviction of sin to “the lawless and disobedient.” This is seen in the following stylistic analysis.

The Holy Decalogue of Exod. 20 & Deut. 5.	St. Paul in I Tim. 1:8-10
<p>I: “I am the Lord thy God, Thou shalt have <u>none other gods.</u>” II: “Thou shalt not make,” “<u>bow down unto, nor serve</u>” “<u>any graven image</u>” (Exod. 20:2-5; Deut. 5:6-9), since, “Thou shalt <u>worship</u> the Lord thy God,” and him only ‘shalt thou serve” (Matt. 4:10; Deut. 6:13).</p>	<p>The “law” is made to convict “the <u>ungodly</u>” (<i>1st & 2nd commandments</i>) (I Tim. 1:9).</p>
<p>II: “Thou shalt not make,” “bow down unto, nor serve” “any graven image,” “for I thy Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting <u>the iniquities</u> of the fathers upon the children;” & III. “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for the Lord will <u>not hold him guiltless</u> that taketh his name in vain” (Exod. 20: 4-7; Deut. 5:8-11).</p>	<p>The “law” is made to convict “<u>sinners</u>” <i>2nd & 3rd commandments</i>) (I Tim. 1:9).</p>
<p>III: “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God <u>in vain</u>” (Exod. 20:7; Deut.</p>	<p>The “law” is made to convict “<u>unholy and profane</u>” (<i>3rd & 4th commandments</i>) (I Tim.</p>

<p>5:11) since to do so is to “<u>profane</u>” God’s “<u>holy</u> name” (Lev. 20:3; 22:2,32; Ezek. 36:40); &</p> <p>IV: “Remember the sabbath day, to <u>keep it holy</u>” or “<u>sanctify</u> it.” The “seventh day is the sabbath,” “in it thou shalt <u>not do any work</u>” (Exod. 20:8,9; Deut. 5:12-14) since to do so is to “<u>profane</u>” the sabbath (Neh. 13:17,18; Matt. 12:5; cf. “Thou hast despised mine <u>holy</u> things, and hast <u>profaned</u> my sabbaths,” Ezek. 22:8).</p> <p>V: “Honour thy <u>father</u> and <u>mother</u>” (Exod. 20:12; Deut. 5:16); &</p> <p>VI. “Thou shalt <u>not kill</u>” (Exod. 20:13; Deut. 5:17).</p> <p>VI. “Thou shalt <u>not kill</u>” (Exod. 20:13; Deut. 5:17).</p> <p>VII. “Thou shalt <u>not commit adultery</u>” (Exod. 20:14; Deut. 5:18); &</p> <p>X: “Thou shalt <u>not covet thy neighbour’s wife</u>” i.e., sexual lust (Exod. 20:17; Deut. 5:21).</p> <p>VIII: “Thou shalt <u>not steal</u>” (Exod. 20:15; Deut. 5:19).</p> <p>IX: “Thou shalt <u>not bear false witness</u>” (Exod. 20:16; Deut. 5:20).</p> <p>III: “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God <u>in vain</u>” (Exod. 20:7; Deut. 5:11); &</p> <p>IX: “Thou shalt <u>not bear false witness</u>” (Exod. 20:16; Deut. 5:20).</p> <p>X: “Thou shalt not covet” “<u>anything</u> that is thy neighbour’s” (Exod. 20:17; Deut. 5:21).</p>	<p>1:9). In the double entendre of the Greek, Christ rose on “the first of the week (<i>sabbaton</i>)” meaning “the first of the sabbaths (<i>sabbaton</i>)” (John 20:1), thus instituting the Sunday Sabbath (John 20:1,19,26; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10).</p> <p>The “law” is made to convict “<u>murders of fathers</u> and <u>murderers of mothers</u>” (<i>5th & 6th commandments</i>) (I Tim. 1:9).</p> <p>The “law” is made to convict “<u>manslayers</u>” (<i>6th commandment</i>) (I Tim. 1:9).</p> <p>The “law” is made to convict “<u>whoremongers</u>” and “<u>them that defile themselves with mankind</u>” (<i>7th & 10th commandments</i>) (I Tim. 1:10; cf. Lev. 18:22,24,25,27,28).</p> <p>The “law” is made to convict “<u>menstealers</u>” (<i>8th commandment</i>) (I Tim. 1:10).</p> <p>The “law” is made to convict “<u>liars</u>” (<i>9th commandment</i>) (I Tim. 1:10).</p> <p>The “law” is made to convict “<u>perjured persons</u>” (<i>3rd & 9th commandments</i>) (I Tim. 1:10).</p> <p>The “law” is made to convict “<u>any other thing</u>” “contrary to sound doctrine” (e.g., <i>10th commandment</i>) (I Tim. 1:10; cf. Rom. 7:7).</p>
---	--

The word translated “whoremongers” (AV) or “fornicators” (NKJV) or sexually “immoral” (NASB) in I Tim. 1:10 is Greek *pornos* (from which we get the word “pornography”). Its male gendering (*pornois*, masculine plural dative noun, from *pornos*), means the AV’s rendering of “whoremongers” allows for ready application to “a whoremonger (male) and his whore (female).” The broad meaning of *pornos* here to

unchastity is a stylistic device, in which e.g., the 7th & 10 commandment's, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" and "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife," are used as a broad heading against being sexually "immoral" (NASB) or *unchaste*, is found in e.g., the Anglican *Catechism* in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), which includes under the 7th commandment a general requirement to "chastity," and under the 10 commandment an equally general requirement, "To keep my body in" "chastity." Or the Presbyterian *Shorter Westminster Catechism*, says, "The seventh commandment forbiddeth all unchaste thoughts, words, and actions." Likewise the Dutch Reform *Heidelberg Catechism* (1563), says "the seventh commandment" teaches "that all unchastity is accursed of God; and that we should therefore loathe it from the heart and live chastely and modestly," for "in this commandment," "God" "forbids all unchaste actions, gestures, words, thoughts, desires, and whatever may entice thereto" (108,109). It might also be remarked that a girl / woman who engages in fornication and so loses her hymen, preemptively commits adultery against any man she subsequently marries (Deut. 22:13-21; Matt. 1:18-20).

But as in I Tim. 1:10 where a specific expansion is made, so under the 7th and 10th commandments the Apostle Paul refers first to "whoremongers" (AV) in general, "and" then specifically to "them that defile themselves with mankind" (AV), or "sodomites" (NKJV) or "homosexuals" (NASB); so likewise the Presbyterian *Larger Westminster Catechism* expands on the meaning of unchastity, and lists under the 7th commandment such sexual "sins" as e.g., "adultery, fornication, rape, incest, sodomy, and all unnatural lusts." (Lam. 5:11 refers to the seriousness and horror of rape. In addition to being a sexual sin under the 7th commandment, rape is also an assault, and as a sexual assault is also a sin of prohibited violence under the wider orbit of the 6th commandment. E.g., we see both the elements of sinful violent *force* and sexual sin in *lying with* a sister, in Amnon's incestuous rape of Tamar, where we read that he "being stronger than she, *forced* her, and *lay with* her," II Sam. 13:14¹⁰²). So too, in the same way Matt. 5:31,32 characterizes the Mosaic Divorce Code

¹⁰² Cf. the Jewish civil law of Deut. 22:25-27, which likewise says, "If a man find a betrothed damsel in the field and the man *force* her, and *lie with* her: then the man only that lay with her shall die: but unto the damsel thou shalt do nothing; there is in the damsel no sin worthy of death: for *as when a man riseth against his neighbour, and slayeth him, even so is this matter*: for he found her in the field, and the betrothed damsel cried, and there was none to save her." During the anarchy in the "days" of the judges, when "there was no king in Israel," and "every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judg. 21:25), we read of an instance of when "certain sons of Belial" (AV) pack "raped" (NASB) a woman (Judg. 19:22,25). Under NT Christian law rapists are guilty of "hatred" (AV) meaning *hostilities* or "enmities" (Gal. 5:20, ASV & NASB), due to the *force* they use in sexual assault, and also "fornication" (Gal. 5:19), as they *lie with* a person in a prohibited union. Thus unrepentant rapists are twice condemned to hell in Gal. 5:21, which says, "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." In Luke 3:14 Jesus told the soldiers, "Do violence to no man" (AV), or "Do not intimidate anyone" (NKJV). The Greek word, *diaseio* means to *shake violently*, and hence to *intimidate* or *do violence to*. While one can think of a variety of different scenarios where soldiers might abuse their power and so "intimidate" (NKJV) or "do violence to" (AV) someone, *one such* example is soldiers rapping women in time of war (Isa. 13:16). For though God may sometimes allow sinful men to engage in e.g., war rape under his *permissive will* (Zech. 14:2), under his *directive will* he will ultimately punish unrepentant rapists in hell for their wickedness (Gal. 5:19-21). And even when under God's judgment war rape against women occurs in connection with their society's sin (Lam.

(Deut. 24:1-4) under the seventh commandment (Matt. 5:27-32), the Presbyterian *Larger Westminster Catechism* includes under the “sins forbidden in the seventh commandment,” “unjust divorce” (“Matt. 5:32”).

It is one thing, to place under the headings of the Decalogue’s precepts the Old Testament’s moral law, *as understood through the New Testament* e.g., one could include *polygamy* as a sin under the seventh commandment under NT morals (Matt. 19:9), but not under OT morals (Exod. 21:9,10; Lev. 18:18; Deut. 21:15-17). But it is quite another thing, to do what the Judaizer Rushdoony does, and place under the Decalogue’s precepts OT Jewish *civil precepts*, on the basis that they *ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth*¹⁰³. Jewish ceremonial and civil laws no longer bind Christian men (Eph. 2:15,16; Col. 2:14,16,17; Heb. 7:12; 9:10), and so this Judaizer’s desire to impose Jewish *civil precepts of necessity* in a “Christian reconstructed” *commonwealth*, exposes him as a heretic. Though a minister of the OPC, his views are contrary to Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* chapter 19, “Of the Law of God,” and indeed he specifically rejects sections of *Westminster Confession* 19, claiming “the Confession” here has “errors,” and “is guilty of nonsense.¹⁰⁴” Though some who use Deut. 25:5-10 to try and justify marriage to a deceased brother’s wife in the Christian era are inconsistent, and unlike Rushdoony, do not consider the levirate marriage rule is still binding in the Christian era, they are nevertheless still guilty of Judaizing. Whether or not they realize it, such semi-Judaizers are in fact “a debtor to do the whole” Jewish “law” (Gal. 5:3).

The old Jewish levirate marriage rule is intertwined with OT polygamy rules, so that a man could take on a second or more wives because of it. The Mosaic law regulated, but did not prohibit, bigamy (Exod. 21:9,10; Lev. 18:18; Deut. 21:15-17). In the OT, such polygamy was not prohibited under the command, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” (Exod. 20:14; Deut. 5:18); but in the NT, such polygamy is prohibited under the command, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” (Matt. 19:18; Rom. 13:9). The NT reintroduced the earlier antediluvian ban on polygamy (Gen. 2:24; 4:19; 7:13; Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2; Titus 1:6), and so polygamy is immoral in the Christian era. E.g., Jesus did not say that a man who “shall marry another” after an unBiblical divorce “engages in polygamy,” but rather, “committeth adultery” (Matt. 19:9). Thus when these two fact are recognized, namely the NT repeals OT laws allowing polygamy and only allows monogamy (Matt. 19:9), and the NT repeals the Jewish “law of commandments, contained in ordinances” (Eph. 2:15), then it follows that under Lev. 18:16, “Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother’s wife,” all unions with one’s “brother’s wife” are now unlawful. Thus all Judaizers’ attempts to claim as a “later stage reform,” departure from the Christian understanding of the Lev. 18 incest laws as found in the Anglican *Parker’s Table* or Presbyterian *Westminster Confession*, are to be rejected as false teaching; whether this is done in the form of Judaizing attempts to reintroduce the old Jewish Levirate marriage rule outright (Deut. 25:5-10); or making reference to the old Jewish Levirate marriage rule, in semi-Judaizing attempts to try and provide a general moral justification for allowing a man to marry his deceased brother’s wife

5:7,11), so that there is a sense in which God makes “the wrath of man” to “praise” him and his purposes (Ps. 76:10), its execution is still by “vessels of wrath fitted to destruction” (Rom. 9:22), for no godly Christian man would ever war rape a woman.

¹⁰³ Rushdoony’s *Institutes of Biblical Law*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, *passim*.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 550-1.

in the Christian era.

5b) *Liberals who subvert Lev. 18:16.* In 1843, the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church in America, in what they would regard as a later reform, departed from what had been the uniform practice of Dutch Reformed Churches. The Synod said, “that all resolutions which may have been passed by the General Synod, forbidding a man to marry his deceased wife’s sister, be and hereby are rescinded.¹⁰⁵” (The Dutch derived Reformed Church of the USA, though once a good church, has now gone deeply into religious apostasy.)

Likewise, in what the *Presbyterian Church in the USA* (PCUSA) would regard as fifth stage twentieth century reforms in 1903, they amended *Westminster Confession* 25:6 to remove reference to the Pope as the Antichrist, and *Westminster Confession* 24:4 to remove the final sentence “The man may not marry any of his wife’s kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband’s kindred nearer in blood than of her own” (Lev. 20:19-21). On the one hand, these amendments meant a member of PCUSA could still believe the Pope was the Antichrist; or the type of incest Henry VIII broke with Rome over was wrong, by holding that the omitted words were redundant and covered by these earlier words, “Marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the Word” (Lev. 18; Amos 2:7; Mark 6:18; I Cor. 5:1), so that the omission of the *Westminster Confession*’s last sentence of 24:4 simply reflected literary style considerations. But on the other hand, these amendments also meant that a member of PCUSA could deny that the Pope was the Antichrist; or claim that the words omitted from *Westminster Confession* 24:4 were erroneous, and in the Christian era Lev. 18 & 20 does not prohibit a man from, for example, marrying his dead brother’s wife. This is the same type of moral ambiguity on this form of incest is historically found among Congregationalists (*Savoy Declaration* 25:4) and Reformed Baptists (*London Confession* 25:4). Liberals holding this view sometimes claim that Lev. 18:16 refers to a man not marrying a woman that his brother has not been lawfully divorced or widowed from. If so, it is a completely superfluous statement, since it is covered by Lev. 18:20, “Moreover, thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbour’s wife.” If those holding this view were correct, then there would therefore surely be no need for Lev. 18:16; a view which also fails to understand the natural ramifications that flow from wider concepts of in-laws becoming part of a person’s extended family upon marriage. This attempt to unite both conservatives and liberals in the one church, by e.g., allowing individual congregations to decide whether or not to allow certain forms of incest¹⁰⁶,

¹⁰⁵ Paton, C.I., *op. cit.*, p. 50.

¹⁰⁶ The idea that individual congregations should decide whether or not to allow incest, finds a sequel in e.g., the *Uniting Church of Australia* (UCA) which passed a resolution in its National Assembly on 17 July 2003, allowing their church’s presbyteries (regional councils) to decide between one of two views, either allowing the ordination of homosexual ministers, or prohibiting the ordination of homosexual ministers. Thus in practice, local UCA churches are free to either condone or condemn sodomy, (although if opposed they can do nothing to prevent others in their denomination from supporting it), in much the same way that Presbyterian denominations repealing the *Westminster Confession*’s last sentence in 24:4, make local churches in their denomination free to either condone or condemn certain forms of incest, although if opposed they can do nothing to prevent others in their denomination from supporting it (cf. Congregationalists *Savoy Declaration* 25:4 and Reformed Baptists *London Confession* 25:4). By contrast, the holy Apostle, Saint Paul, said

clearly became a hallmark of PCUSA. For example, in the 1920s when religious liberals were advocating such heresies as the denial of Biblical inerrancy, or questioning the existence and nature of hell, following a 1925 Commission, PCUSA accepted and embraced these religious liberals.

Religious liberals saying, “there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ” (Gal. 3:28), means the abolition of all forms of sexual discrimination and so sexually segregated patriarchal roles; fought against religious conservatives who considered Gal. 3:28 meant equality of access to God and salvation for males and females, but a continuation of sex specific patriarchal roles (e.g., I Tim. 2:11-3:12; Titus 2:4,5), which have a natural law basis in the creation and the fall (Gen. 2 & 3). In the 1950s PCUSA liberals defeated PCUSA conservatives, resulting in the ordination of women from 1956.

The southern PCUSA historically split with, and was divided from, the northern *United Presbyterian Church in the USA* (UPCUSA), since the mid-nineteenth century on racial issues. Racial desegregationists see in man’s common descent from Adam (Gen. 3:20; Luke 3:38; Rom. 5:14; I Cor. 15:22,45; I Tim. 2:13,14; Jude 14), a racial unity in Adam’s race, that is, the human race, supporting their views. Racial segregationists see in man’s racial diversity from Noah (Gen. 10:1; Matt. 24:37,38; Luke 3:36; 17:26,27; Heb. 11:7; I Peter 3:20; II Peter 2:5), a racial diversity in Adam’s race (Deut. 32:8; Acts 17:26, NKJV¹⁰⁷), supporting their views. E.g., Christ appointed one symbolic outer-disciple for each of the nations on the *Table of Nations* in Gen. 10; and the Book of Acts recognizes this threefold racial distinction because “every nation” (Acts 10:35) is divided into Gentile converts from Shem represented by the Samaritans (Acts 8:5-25, though a mixed race group, all were still within the larger Semitic race); from Ham represented by the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:26-40, the Greek word for “Ethiopia” is *Aithiops* meaning to “scorch” the “face” so this is a racial description meaning something like “a black-face”); and from Japheth represented by Cornelius (Acts 10:1-33), with his Caucasian “kinsmen” (Acts 10:24, Greek *suggenes* from *sun* meaning a “union,” “together,” or “with” i.e., an associate; and *genos*, i.e., a racial associate, e.g., Rom. 9:3). The “woman of Canaan” (Matt. 15:22), a descendant of Noah’s son Ham via Canaan (Gen. 10:6,15-19), is described by *genos*, from which we get the word “gene,” in Mark 7:26 as “a Syrophenician by *nation*” (AV) or “of the Syrophenician *race*” (NASB). Likewise, *genos* can be fairly translated in II Cor. 11:26 as meaning St. Paul’s “own” Jewish “*countrymen*” (AV & ASV) or “*race*” (ASV footnote), who are “Hebrews” and “Israelites” from “the seed of Abraham” (II Cor. 11:22); “Hebrews” being Semites from Noah’s son Shem (or Sem) via Eber (or Heber) (Gen. 10:22,24; Luke 3:35,36). This type of thinking is also found in Shakespeare’s *King Henry IV Part 2*, (2:2:128,) when the Prince of Wales (and future King Henry V), says of the family of the king’s cousin, “they will be kin to us, or they will fetch it from Japhet,” that is, if they were not related by close “kin,” as Caucasians, they can “fetch” or get a claim to kinship from the fact that, like the

“not to keep company” and “not to eat” with “any man that is called a brother,” who is “a fornicator” (I Cor. 5:11); and in this epistle he specifically condemned incest (I Cor. 5:1-5), and “abusers [Rom. 1:26,27] of themselves [I Cor. 6:18] with mankind [Lev. 18:22]” (I Cor. 6:9, cf. Eph. 5:12).

¹⁰⁷ The AV’s “of (Greek, *ek*) one blood” (Acts 17:26) is better rendered, “from one blood” (NKJV), since they were originally “one blood.” But the races of man are no longer “one blood,” but have been divided by God into different bloodlines forming variously different types of “kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation” (Rev. 5:9).

King, they are of Japheth's white race (Gen. 10:2-5).

Racial desegregationists say the NT Jew-Gentile distinction teaches desegregation and allows inter-marriage between races, e.g., "wild" "Gentiles" were "grafted *contrary to nature* into" the "good olive tree" of "Israel," who are "of the seed of Abraham" (Rom. 11:1,24,25). Racial segregationists say the NT Jew-Gentile distinction (e.g., Rom. 1:16; 2:9,10) teaches a *basic* level of segregation, and prohibition of inter-marriage between races, e.g., Rom. 11:24,25 is *allegorical* language, and so cannot be used to adduce such moral principles, since in normative moral terms an act between human beings that is "contrary to nature" (Rom. 11:24) is immoral (Rom. 1:26). Moreover, Rom. 9-11 still retains a basic bi-racial Jewish-Gentile races distinction, (comparable to a bi-racial white-coloured races distinction in our culture,) because God will preserve the Jewish race throughout time, manifesting God's will for the preservation of racial types, (Rom. 9:3,5,7,10,13; 16:7,11,21; Rev. 1:7; 5:9; 7:9), and then a large number of Jews will convert just before Christ's return (Rom. 11:25,26).

Liberals saying, "there is neither Jew nor Greek," "for ye are all one in Christ" (Gal. 3:28), means the abolition of all forms of racial discrimination and so abolition of racial segregation or bars on inter-racial marriage; fought against conservatives who considered Gal. 3:28 meant equality of access to God and salvation for Jews and Gentiles, or whites and coloureds, but a continuation of some level of racial segregation (Acts 21:17-30), which has a natural law basis in the race creation from Noah's three sons (Gen. 9-11), following the earlier destruction of Cain's race and Seth's race for such sins as miscegenation and violence (Gen. 6:1-4,9,11,13). Thus e.g., the NT Books of Hebrews and James being addressed to segregated Jewish Christian churches (although ultimately also intended for "the churches of the Gentiles," Rom 16:4), constitutes a precedent for segregated Chinese Churches, black African Churches, white Caucasian Churches in America¹⁰⁸. PCUSA racial desegregationists (who condoned miscegenation), managed to defeat racial segregationists (opposed to racially mixed marriages)¹⁰⁹. This in turn helped pave the way for the southern PCUSA to join with

¹⁰⁸ Gillespie, G.T., *A Christian View on Segregation*, Made before the Synod of Mississippi of the *Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.*, 4 Nov. 1954; Johnson, R.K., *Builder of Bridges*, *op. cit.*, pp. 322-3; e.g., McGrath, G.B. (myself), *Letters To The Editor, English Churchman*, 22/2/02 & 1/3/02, p. 2; 26/12/03 & 2/1/04, p. 2; 18 & 25 June 2010, p. 2; & McGrath, G.B. (myself), *Letters To Editor, British Church Newspaper*, 12 Feb. 2010, p. 9.

¹⁰⁹ Miscegenationists may see Salmon marrying the Canaanite Rahab, or Boaz marrying the Moabite Ruth, as condoning racially mixed marriages in Matt. 1:5. Anti-miscegenationists may *either* see Matt. 1:5 as simply reporting unwarranted unions with a Canaanite (Gen. 24:3,4,37-40; 28:1,2) and a Moabite (Deut. 23:3, thus dating this union to the start of the judges' time, with various bastardy generations omitted from the genealogies), in the same way Matt. 1:3 reports Tamar's prostitution, or Matt. 1:6 reports David's adultery. *Or* consider the OT allowed a *small* amount of permissible Gentile race assimilation into the Jewish race (Matt. 1:5), (sufficiently small so to still be able to refer to a specific Jewish "race" descended from "Abraham," "Isaac," "Jacob," and "the twelve patriarchs," Acts 7:2,8,19, NASB,) but the NT reintroduces the earlier antediluvian *absolute* ban on miscegenation. Thus anti-miscegenationists consider the NT *either* continues, *or* reintroduces, the antediluvian law (Gen. 6:1-4,9). 1) Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39, on the basis that gluttony, drunkenness, and miscegenation are forms of immorality that precede Christ's return. 2) Acts 15:20 on the basis that the only type of "fornication" (AV) or "sexual

the northern UPCUSA. These two Presbyterian churches had previously been in a historical north-south divide on racial issues, starting with an American civil war split between them in 1861 over black African slavery. (Liberals considering, “there is neither bond nor free” “for ye are all one in Christ” in Gal. 3:28 abolishing slavery among Christians; and conservatives considering Gal. 3:28 meant equality of access to God and salvation for bond and free, but a maintenance of slavery in harmony with Gen. 9:22-27; Eph. 6:5-9; Col. 3:22-4:1; Philm. 10-18; although emancipation of slaves may proceed in harmony with I Cor. 7:21-24, NKJV). UPCUSA and PCUSA joined to form the *Presbyterian Church (USA)* or PC(USA) in 1983.

In the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, PC(USA) is presently divided between liberals and conservatives on the issues of salvation, abortion, and homosexual sodomy. Liberals say that salvation exists for people outside of Christ, and that justification by faith based on Christ’s atonement is *one* way, but *not the only way* to be saved. This means e.g., apostate Christians seeking justification by faith and works can be saved, and also persons not even professing to be Christians can be saved, e.g., Jews, Muslims, Hindus, and Buddhists. Conservatives see salvation only through Christ and the Biblical doctrine of justification by faith (John 14:6; Acts 4:12; Gal. 1:8,9; 3:11), so that for those outside of this gospel there is “no hope” (Eph. 2:12). PC(USA) liberals allow the murder of unborn babies

immorality” (NKJV) that can occur when Jewish and Gentile Christians come together for a fellowship meal, but not when they are apart, is inter-racial dating and/or marriage between them. 3) I Cor. 11:7-9 (Gen. 2:18,21-23) on the basis that to be “one flesh” (Gen. 2:24), a woman should first be one “flesh” racially with her husband (Gen. 28:1,2; 29:14). To be “one flesh” has a number of elements, including the making of spouse’s kindred the same relationship as one’s own *in-laws* e.g., sister-in-law (Mark 6:18; 10:8), a oneness dissolvable in divorce only by God’s law (Matt. 19:5,6,9), a union in the sexual act (I Cor. 6:16), and intimacy of love (Eph. 5:28,29); but *one* element of this is the two should first be one “flesh” in the sense of race (Rom. 9:3; 11:14). For the “woman is the glory of the man,” and so to be the reflected “image of God” from “the man,” she requires a racial similarity, “for” “the woman” “is” biologically “of the man” (I Cor. 11:7,8). 4) The Semitic Abraham lacked faith in God, and in a moment of weakness, had inter-racial sex with the Hamitic Hagar. The Apostle Paul calls this miscegenation a work of “the flesh” (Gal. 4:23 cf. 5:19). 5) I Cor. 7:18-20 on the basis that Christians are not “keeping the commandments of God” (I Cor. 7:19; Ezra 10:3), and like Noah being “perfect in” their reproductive racial “generations” (Gen. 6:1-4,9), and do not “abide in the same” culturally “calling” of their race, when, as in I Macc. 1:15 (RV Apocrypha), Jewish males “made themselves uncircumcised,” “and joined themselves” in marriage “to the Gentiles.” (On this view, I Cor. 7:21-24 then prohibits slave-free marriages.) 6) I Peter 3:20,21; 4:1-3, on the basis that the enumerated sins of the antediluvians are miscegenation and violence leading to murder (Gen. 4:23; 6:1-4,9,11,13), and so (like gluttony and drunkenness, Matt. 24:37-39,) these must remain morally binding for the imagery of this passage to have propriety; since Christians who are spiritually baptized, no longer live in such sins. Since the OT Jewish law in Ezra 9 & 10; Neh. 13, *manifests* this same type of NT Christian morality preserving purity of “race” (Ezra 9:2, NASB; I Cor. 7:18-20) and religion (Ezra 9:1; I Cor. 7:39), the morality in these passages remains usable, and the term *mixed marriage* (Neh. 13:3,23,27), used for racially mixed marriages and/or religiously mixed marriages, relates to them. E.g., opposition to *mixed race* children (see “mixed,” Neh. 13:3; “race” Ezra 9:2, NASB), is evident in the fact that those in Neh. 13:23,24, who were “cleansed” from Israel (Neh. 13:30), are probably those referred to in Zech. 9:6, “a mixed race shall settle in Ashdod” (NKJV). Cf. Ezra 10:3,19,44.

in abortion, and thus condone baby-killing; whereas PC(USA) conservatives oppose this extreme example of child abuse (Exod. 20:13; Lev. 18:21; James 2:11)¹¹⁰. PC(USA) liberals want bars on male and female homosexual sodomite clergy removed, and PC(USA) conservatives want them to remain, and be enforced against some known homosexual sodomite clergy.

It is clear that while post American Revolution denials of the Establishment Principle (Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:22,23) were the ultimate starting point for the subsequent decisions to conform into worldly rather than Biblical values; the more immediate starting point of this massive spiritual and moral decline, namely, the 1903 PCUSA revisions which included removing recognition of the Pope as the Antichrist (II Thess. 2) and allowing for incest, are contrary to some of the great Biblical teachings found in the first and second stages of the Reformation. Thus the 1903 permission for PCUSA members to deny that the Pope is the Antichrist, helped set the tone for their later spiritual and ecumenical compromises on matters of faith, such as their present tolerance towards religious liberals who reject justification by faith in Christ as the only means of salvation. Likewise, the 1903 permission for PCUSA members to adopt a sexually permissive attitude towards incest, helped set the tone for their later libertine compromises on matters of morals, such as their failure to restrain the lust of female sex role perverts who wanted to be ordained, or their present tolerance towards religious liberals who consider Biblical laws on murder in Exod. 20:13; Lev. 18:21 can be set aside for abortion baby-killers, or Biblical laws on sodomy in Lev. 18:22, can be set aside in the same way that Biblical laws on incest in Lev. 18:13,14,16,18; 20:19-21, were set aside for relationships of affinity about a hundred years earlier in 1903.

Another such sad story comes from the Anglican Church. In the nineteenth century, the *Church of England* set about to “profane the name of” “God” (Lev. 18:20) by idolatry (Ezek. 36:18-20), either by adoration of the consecrated communion elements, or by tolerance towards such Anglicans (II John 10,11). Walking in worldly lusts, the *Church of England* had been growing increasingly apostate since the rise of the Puseyites (“Anglo-Catholics” or “High Church”), semi- Puseyites (“Broadchurch”), and religious liberals from the mid nineteenth century; with those who remained faithful to the historic tenets of Reformed Anglicanism then becoming since the 19th century the traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglicans. Then in the mid twentieth century, she followed the worldly lusts of English law-makers who from about the same era had been repealing, or seeking to repeal, various incest laws. In 1946, the apostate *Church of England's* Convocations revised Parker’s Table and reduced the numbers of marriages within the prohibited degrees. This *revised list of sins*, claimed that incest which was condemned as “fornication” since the time of the Reformation, (and before that time condemned under Roman Catholic canon law *unless* a Papal dispensation was granted,) would now be allowed for incestuous marriages in the relationships of affinity prohibited in Lev. 18:12-14,16,18; 20:19-21.

¹¹⁰ As in all murder cases, using the least force reasonably necessary in self-defence is a full defence, so that in the rare instance that a woman would die if she did not have an abortion, such killing is justified on general principles applicable to all murder cases. Here the fact that the unborn child is not responsible for putting his mother’s life in jeopardy, is no more relevant than the fact that a crazed, lunatic, gunman who escaped from a mental asylum, may not be responsible for his actions, but still may be lawfully shot to prevent him from murdering.

Specific relationships removed in the Revised Table (1946) are (1) Spouse's sibling i.e., a man may not marry his wife's sister, or a woman may not marry her sister's husband; and a man may not marry his brother's wife, or a woman may not marry her husband's brother. (2) Uncles /Aunts by affinity: a man may not marry his wife's father's sister (aunt) or his wife's mother's sister (aunt); or a woman may not marry her husband's father's brother (uncle) or husband's mother's brother (uncle); and a man may not marry his brother's son's wife (niece) or sister's son's wife (niece), wife's brother's daughter (niece) or wife's sister's daughter (niece); or a woman may not marry her brother's daughter's husband (nephew), or sister's daughter's husband (nephew), or husband's brother's son (nephew), or husband's sister's son (nephew). Thus did the *Church of England* ridicule, "Beheading of St. John the Baptist" Day (*BCP, 1662, Calendar, 29 August*). Thus did the *Church of England* pour contempt upon "Saint John Baptist's Day" (*BCP, 1662, Calendar, 24 June*), with its reading at *Evening Prayer* of Matt. 14:1-12 (*BCP, 1662, Lessons Proper for Holy-Days, St. John Baptist, Evensong, 2nd Lesson*). For in this reading we learn that John the Baptist died a martyr's death when he was beheaded and had his head put on a platter (Matt. 14:8,10-12), because "Herod" had married "Herodias," "his brother Philip's wife," and "John had said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her" (Matt. 14:3,4). And thus did the *Church of England* make mockery of the prayer in Cranmer's *Litany Service* in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, which says, "From fornication, and all other deadly sin [e.g., I Cor. 6:9; Gal. 5:19]; and from all the deceits of the world, the flesh, and the devil [e.g., Eph. 6:11; I John 2:15-17; 3:8], *Good Lord, deliver us*¹¹¹."

Thus when in 1946, the *Church of England* allowed a man to marry his brother's wife (Lev. 18:16), without specifically saying so, it declared the Romish Queen, Bloody Mary legitimate, and therefore the Protestant Queen, Elizabeth I illegitimate, and also repudiated the grounds upon which King Henry VIII had broken with Rome. Likewise, when in 1588 the Popish Spanish Armada set sail in the hope of destroying Protestantism under the Crown of England of Ireland, Cardinal Allen, whom Pope Gregory XIII (Pope 1572-1585) had

¹¹¹ Smethurst, A.F., & Wilson, H.R., (Editors), *Acts of the Convocations of Canterbury & York*, SPCK, London, UK, 1948, pp. 89-90. This sexually immoral Revised Table (1946) was shamefully adopted by the *Anglican Church of Australia's* General Synod, Canon No. 15, 1981; and thereafter adopted by the Diocese of Sydney on the 7th of October, 1982. Three to four years earlier, they had produced *An Australian Prayer Book, 1978*, (AAPB). In its revised Calendar, while the main *St. John the Baptist Day* (24 June) was retained, *Beheading of St. John the Baptist Day* (29 August) was expunged (and many religious apostates, together with a few good Protestants, were added to the Calendar). The AAPB's readings for *St. John the Baptist Day* (*Evening Prayer* 23 June, Ps. 139, Mal. 3:1-16; Philp. 3:7-11; *Morning Prayer* 24 June, Ps. 50; Judg. 13:2-7;24,25; Matt. 11:2-19; *Evening Prayer* 24 June, Ps. 116; Mal. 4; Luke 3:1-20; *Holy Communion* 24 June, Sentence John 1:6,7; Luke 1:16,17; Readings: Isa. 49:1-6; Ps. 139:1-11; Acts 13:16-26; Luke 1:57-66,80; *After Communion* Matt. 11:11), obliterate all reference to the cause of St. John the Baptist's martyrdom, and its connection to his opposition to incest between a man and his brother's wife. (The *Church of England's* Alternative Service Book 1980 has similar changes, and provides no *Litany*.) In its revised *Litany Service*, the AAPB removed the hated, sin convicting word, "fornication," from the relevant petition, as well as the "all" before "the deceits," so that it simply reads, "From all deadly sin, and from the deceits of the world, the flesh, and the devil, *good Lord, deliver us*."

promised to make Lord Chancellor and Archbishop of Canterbury if the invasion succeeded, printed a Popish pamphlet denouncing Elizabeth I as a bastard and usurper of the throne¹¹². Though apostate before this time, these actions of the *Church of England* in 1946 manifested the fact that like Esau, they had “despised” and “sold” their Reformation “birthright” (Gen. 25:33,34), losing it to the Reformation’s spiritual children (John 8:39-47); some of whom are the Reformed Anglicans who since the 19th century became known as Low Church Evangelical Anglicans, and who oppose such apostasy in the Anglican Church. Among its others sins, the apostate *Church of England* subsequently came to condone adultery (Lev. 18:20), by allowing remarriages after unBiblical divorces (Matt. 5:32; 19:9). About half a century after it allowed incest in 1946, under the incumbent Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, they came to condone homosexual sodomy (Lev. 18:22)¹¹³. Thus by their idolatry in allowing or practising adoration of the consecrated Communion elements contrary to the Communion rubric of the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 (Lev. 18:21), incest (e.g., Lev. 18:12-14,16,18), adultery (Lev. 18:20), and sodomy (Lev. 18:22), the *Church of England* in England and Wales now “defile” “the land” (Lev. 18:27,28) of England and Wales, like the heathens whom God judged by the Children of Israel defiled the land of Canaan (Lev. 18:24-30).

A person supporting the 1903 PCUSA type of amendment to the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 24:4, or the 1946 amendments of the *Church of England’s* Table of Kindred and Affinity, and denying that under Christian law the Bible prohibits persons in the relationships of Lev. 20:19-21 who are related by affinity from marrying, *might* in a Presbyterian context be seeking an anti-*Westminster Confession* device; or in a non-conformist context *might* be seeking a gratuitous anti-Anglican device, such as some Congregationalists (*Savoy Declaration* 25:4) or some Reformed Baptists (*London Confession* 25:4) seeking to deny the English Anglican Reformation under Henry VIII in order to “rev up” a pro-Puritan and anti-Anglican sentiment; or in an Anglican context *might* be a Puseyite seeking a gratuitous anti-Reformation device; in order to cast aspersions on the history of the starting point of the Reformation in England. If done as a “later stage reform,” it *might* be an anti-historic or anti-conservative device, from which it is hoped other liberal departures from orthodoxy may be made in time, once this liberal precedent of allowing some forms of incest has been established. It might also be supported by a Judaizer seeking to thereby reintroduce the old Jewish civil law Levirate rule, or elements of this old Jewish rule.

Whether anti-Reformation, anti-Anglican, anti-Presbyterian, or all three; whether supported by liberals, or Judaizers, or both; in such a context, a person holding such views may openly and falsely claim that the Romish Queen, Bloody Mary, was of legitimate birth; and the Protestant Anglican Queen, Elizabeth I, was therefore correspondingly of illegitimate birth (since Catherine of Aragon was still alive when Princess Elizabeth I was born). In an Anglican context, it is also possible that three distinct groups, one pro-Rome, one liberal, and one that is both a qualified pro-Rome (either Puseyite, “ecumenical,” or both) and liberal,

¹¹² Chadwick, O., *The Reformation*, Penguin Books, 1964, revised 1972, p. 288.

¹¹³ Williams admits to ordaining to the Anglican priesthood, a sexually perverted clergyman who was actively engaging in homosexual acts. In addition to supporting sex role perversion in the form of ordaining women to the Anglican priesthood, Williams also wants them made Anglican bishops (Bob Abernathy & Deryl Davis, “Rowan Williams Preview,” *Religion & Ethics Newsweekly*, 21 Feb. 2003, No. 625, www.pbs.org/wnet/religionandethics/week625/news.htm).

might all support such a change for differing reasons. E.g., an “ecumenical” and liberal Anglican, may be seeking both an anti-English Reformation device and a liberal device, with the former hoping to foster closer relations with Rome by agreeing with Papists that Henry VIII had no basis to break with Rome; while with the later, hoping to push through further liberal changes to morals (that the Church of Rome would not agree with). Likewise, a semi-Puritan Anglican in the Evangelical Low Church, who has forsaken the traditional Evangelical Low Church traditions of Reformed Anglicanism, *might* be hoping by it to foster closer ties with Congregationalist and Baptists (which may help explain some sympathies for this wickedness in some parts of the Diocese of Sydney). A liberal Anglican or Non-Conformist may also be seeking to oppose stigmas of bastardy, and thus more generally hope to encourage fornication, with his claimed “example” of “the illegitimate” Elizabeth I. Thus he may be arguing for a permissive attitude that allows for such incestuous sexual immorality in some lurid contemporary context, in order to foster sexual immorality more generally. But whatever his reasons, such a scandalous interpretation would mean that what he regarded as a later stage reform, was in fact a denial of the Biblical truth of the early stages of the Reformation in the British Isles, as recognized by the historic (Anglican) *Church of England* in England and Wales, (Anglican) *Church of Ireland*, and (Presbyterian) *Church of Scotland*.

6) *Lev. 20:21: A “sin unto death.”* A second consideration is also relevant. The Apostle John says, “If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it. All unrighteousness is sin: and there is a sin not unto death” (I John 5:16,17). This seems to apply to two types of sins. Firstly, “a sin unto death” may refer to what the Litany of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) calls, “deadly sins” (not to be confused with the Roman Catholic teaching that uses the same terminology) i.e., the type of sins found in I Cor. 6:9,10; Gal. 5:19-21; Eph. 5:5; Col. 3:5,6; Rev. 21:8,27; 22:15), i.e., where a willfully unrepentant person in such sin is clearly damned to hell. Secondly, “a sin unto death” may refer to sins that may lead to sickness or death, such as taking Communion at an “Open Communion” where one knows there are other Communicants present who are in unrepentant deadly sins (I Cor. 5:11; 11:28-30); or one does himself partake of Communion in such a state of unrepentant sin (I Cor. 11:28-30).

The type of incest that Henry VIII engaged in with Catherine of Aragon, is an example of the second type of such “a sin unto death” (I John 5:16), when the Lord exercises his reserve powers and right to ensure that such a couple “shall be childless” (Lev. 20:21), as he did in this instance. Thus a mighty God exercised a Divine Prerogative, and unleashed his holy power to bring about Henry VIII’s lack of children with Catherine of Aragon (Lev. 20:21), in order to create a clear choice for Henry VIII of either accepting Biblical authority and ending the marriage, or accepting Papal authority and incurring his righteous wrath. As a connected consequence of his decree, “they shall be childless” (Lev. 20:21), his Divine Majesty then completed that which he had begun, when in his holiness he “slew” the remaining misbegotten child of this union, Bloody Mary, who like Er, “was wicked” (Gen. 38:7). Therefore, the condonation by Rome of the incestuous marriage between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon under a so called “Papal dispensation,” contains elements of the evil condemned in I John 5:16,17, which some of the false teachers of the Apostle John’s day were peddling, and who were in turn types of the then future coming Antichrist. On the basis of these two considerations, I therefore, I maintain that even though the it lacks broad-Protestant agreement, under Christian Biblical laws, incest such as allowing a man to marry his dead brother’s wife, can fairly be used with respect to broad-brush passages, for example, the Antichrist’s “iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7), and how, by contrast, the saints “keep” God’s

“commandments” (I John 2:3) prohibiting, among other things, incest.

7) *Lev. 20:21: God is Judge* There is also a third consideration. In considering the Biblical teaching of God’s judgement, it is important to distinguish between *God’s general warnings of future judgment*, and *God’s specific judgements*.

7a) *God’s general warnings of future judgment.* In his Olivet Discourse (Matt. 24; Mark 13), Jesus used the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. as a *specific judgment* that would follow the persecution of the saints (Luke 21:10-20), which was a type of the *specific judgment* that would occur at the Second Advent. But he also taught that all “wars,” all “famines,” all “earthquakes,” and all “pestilences” (AV) or “plagues” (NASB) (Matt. 24:6-8; Mark 13:7,8; Luke 21:9-11), “are the beginning of sorrows” (AV) or “the beginning of” the “birth pangs” (NASB), that will culminate in the judgment at the Second Advent (Matt. 24:8). While on the one hand, all wars, famines, earthquakes, and pestilences (plagues), are thus *a warning and reminder* of God’s future judgment, this does not necessarily mean that God specifically sends them as judgments on the people they kill (Luke 13:1-5). Rather, famines, earthquakes, and plagues are usually part of the natural order of the God created world in which fallen man now lives; and wars occur as a consequence of man’s fall.

As a consequence of the Fall, the human “creature was made subject to vanity,” so that “the whole creation” of mankind “groaneth,” as the human “creature waiteth” till it is “delivered from the bondage of corruption” (Rom. 8:19-22; cf. “creature” in Mark 16:15, AV & NKJV; Col. 1:23, AV & NKJV; and “whole creation” in Mark 16:15, ASV, or “all creation” Col. 1:23, ASV). Man was originally made to live in a very different world of Eden (Gen. 2:8-15); but when he was ejected from there by God (Gen. 3:22-24), he came to live in a world whose natural processes, following God’s secondary laws, includes such things as earthquakes, or droughts resulting in famines (although as discussed at 3b below, God may also sometimes bring such things about as a specific judgement). Thus in graciously allowing fallen man to live in these non-Edenic regions of the earth that unfallen man would never have inhabited, a good God sometimes allows bad things to happen to people, both good and bad alike, as a warning and reminder to both them and others, that pain and suffering is very real, and will be the lot of those cast into hell on the day when God judges every man.

Therefore part of the message we human beings are meant to take from, for example, God permitting mass murders such as the killing of about 750,000-800,000 Serbs, or about six million Jews, by Nazi Germany during 1939-1945, is not that such Serbs or Jews “were sinners above all the” others in Europe at the time (Luke 13:2). And part of the message we are meant to take from, for example, God permitting plagues such as the Black Plague which killed about 25 million people in Europe from Black Death in 1347-50; 1361-63; 1369-71; 1374-5, 1390, and 1400, is not that such Europeans “were sinners above all men that dwelt in” Europe at that time (Luke 13:4). And part of the message we are meant to take from wars such as World War Two (1939-45), in which the total number of people God permitted to be killed is uncertain, but is somewhere between 35 million and 60 million, is not that such persons “were sinners above all” the others who were not killed (Luke 13:2,4). Clearly God does not always overrule such things as mass murders under his *directive will*, but allows such things as mass murders under his *permissive will*. The message God wants us to learn from such disasters, is that “these are the beginnings,” and not the end of men’s “sorrows” (Mark. 13:8), for “except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish” (Luke 13:5).

Thus while spiritually blinded persons, such as the Popish priest and editor of the Romish journal, *Annals Australasia*, Paul Stenhouse clearly missed the point; this type of thing was adroitly recognized by the Anglican Dean of Sydney, Phillip Jensen, when he commented on the Tsunami earthquake and devastation of 2004-2005. This killed over 200,000 people in south-east Asia and India. Dean Jensen said, “all the beautiful things we see in this world are an expression of” God’s “creative goodness to us” (Ps. 19:1; Rom. 1:20), “and all the disasters of this world are part of his warning that judgment is coming” (Matt. 24:6-8; Mark 13:7,8; Luke 21:9-11;13:1-5), “and both these things should focus our mind on the death and resurrection of his Son and how he saved us¹¹⁴” (Acts 17:30,31).

7b) *God’s specific judgements: God as primary and/or secondary cause.* In Lev. 18 & 20, we learn that pagan nations who did not have the written law of God, were judged by God through Israel because they had “defiled” “the land” (Lev. 18:27) by their incest, sex with a menstruating woman, adultery, murder, idolatry, blasphemy of the name of Nature’s God, and sodomy with man and beast (Lev. 18:6-23). This requires that such immediate acts are part of the *natural law* that may be discerned by reason through God’s common grace, which allows all men to acknowledge Nature’s God and lead generally moral lives (Rom. 1 & 2), but this common grace does not save them, and should not be confused with God’s special grace unto salvation, through the gospel of Christ (Rom. 1:17). On the great Day of Judgment (Rom. 2:12-16), God will judge those who do not have the written law of God by such *natural law* moral standards as, “Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother’s wife: it is thy brother’s wife” (Lev. 18:16); in the same way that he judged the heathen Canaanites by the Children of Israel for having “defiled” “the land” by such sins (Lev. 18:27). What an outrage it is then, that those who *additionally* have the written law of God with the *Divine Law* in the Bible, and the benefits of church history such as the break with Rome under Henry VIII, should allow such incest in their midst!

God as primary and/or secondary cause. In the silver jubilee of his reign, King Henry VIII’s ear being attuned to hear Nature’s God, passed two statutes recognizing *the voice of nature*. That is, the study of nature and nature’s God, reveals certain truths about God, such as his Creatorship, and *some* moral principles may be discerned by godly reason (Rom. 1 & 2). King Henry VIII recognized *the voice of nature* in 23 Henry VIII chapter 1, 25 Henry VIII chapter 6, and 25 Henry VIII chapter 28. 23 Hen. VIII c. 1 was the first of several statutes which removed *benefit of clergy* from wilful murderers, thus ensuring that all murderers were executed¹¹⁵. Under 25 Hen. VIII c. 6, sodomy became a capital crime, and under 25 Hen. VIII c. 28 the incest between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon meant that marriage was declared null and void (and the subsequent 28 Hen. VIII. c. 7 and 32 Hen. VIII c. 38 confirmed the usage of the Levitical Law for determining issues of incest.)¹¹⁶ Thus in Shakespeare’s play, *King Henry VIII*, (which is a fictional work very generally based around historical facts), the king says, “respecting” his “marriage with” his “brother’s wife. This

¹¹⁴ “Wrath of God judgment whips up a storm,” *The Australian*, Tues. 4 Jan. 2005; Stenhouse, P., “Tsunamis are not the wrath of God,” *The Australian*, Tues. 4 Jan. 2005 both in *Faith & Freedom*, P.O. Box 88, Para Hills, South Australia, 5096, Jan. 2005, p. 3. The former Editor John Mackenzie has died; and from August 09, *Faith & Freedom* restarted under Errol Stone as Editor, at P.O. Box 1117, Innaloo City, Western Australia, 6918.

¹¹⁵ 4 Bl. Com. (*Blackstone’s Commentaries*) 201 cf. I Edw. VI.

¹¹⁶ 1 Bl. Com. 434-5; 4 Bl. Com. 215-6.

respite shook the bosom of my conscience,” “methought I stood not in the smile of heaven; *who had commanded nature*” concerning “*my lady’s womb*,” as “a judgment on me” (Act 2, Scene 4).

The English Common Law jurist, Edward Coke (pronounced “Cook”) (1552-1634) says “of buggery, or sodomy” that it is both “against the ordinance of the Creator and order of nature¹¹⁷.” Discussing the “crime against nature,” than is, sodomy (Rom. 1:25,26) “with man or beast,” the classic English law jurist, William Blackstone (1723-1780), says that “the voice of nature and of reason, and the express law of God” in “Levit. 20:13,15,” have “determined” it “to be a capital” crime. He maintains that God reserves a Divine prerogative to execute sodomites (Gen. 18:26,32; 19:5), as seen, “long before the Jewish” civil precepts of Moses (Lev. 20:13,15), “by the destruction of two cities by fire from heaven,” that is, Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19; Matt. 11:23,24; Luke 17:29; Jude 7), so that this penalty is covered by a “universal, not merely a provincial” “Jewish” “precept.”

St. Jude describes “Sodom and Gomorrah” as “giving themselves over to fornication” (Jude 7). This must refer to homosexual sodomy because their wickedness (Gen. 18:23-32) involved a clear homosexual habit and preference, since they preferred to sexually “know” “the men” rather than sexually knowing the “daughters” of Lot (Gen. 19:5-9; Lev. 18:22). (In my opinion, God only allowed Lot to offer his daughters to the sodomites because he knew they would refuse them, and so this was done in order that we who have the Scriptures may know that they had a homosexual preference.) But more than this, they were “going after strange flesh” (Jude 7), or “other (Greek *eteros*) flesh,” because “the men” that they wanted to sexually “know” (Gen. 19:5), were in fact “two angels” (Gen. 19:1). Thus this also showed a desire for cross-species sodomy with angels, and so on one level this sexual appetite for “other flesh” tells of God’s displeasure at cross-species sodomy, which the Levitical Law specifically itemizes and prohibits in the form of cross-species bestial sodomy (Lev. 18:23).

Hence while the inhabitants of Sodom were morally corrupt, as seen in their gluttony and drunkenness (“they did eat, they drank,” Luke 17:28), and their crooked business deals (“they bought, they sold,” that which “they planted” and “buidled,” Luke 17:28; Lev. 19:35,36; Jas. 5:1-5; Rev. 13:17; 18:11-23), had their wickedness not gone beyond this level of evil, they would not have been executed by “fire and brimstone from heaven” (Luke 17:29). Rather, the reason for the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah was the fact that they were given over to homosexual sodomy and cross-species sodomy (Gen. 18:23-32; 19:1,5-9; Lev. 20:13,15; Jude 7); and both St. Peter (II Peter 2:6) and St. Jude (Jude 7), state that this destruction was meant as an “ensample” (AV) or “example” (NKJV). Therefore, while the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah were involved in much “wickedness,” *the overriding moral message from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is that those engaging in unnatural acts, that is, sodomy, are worthy of death.* Thus Blackstone reflects the historic common law position that the story of Sodom and Gomorrah’s destruction condemns *unnatural acts*, and so demonstrates that any form of sodomy, whether homosexual,

¹¹⁷ Coke, E., *The Institutes of the Laws of England*, Part 3, London, 1644; reprint: Garland Publishing Inc., NY & London, 1979, pp. 58-59; referring to various Scriptures, including Gen. 18:29; 19:9; Lev. 18:22, 20:13; Deut. 29:23; Jer. 23:14, 49:18; Ezek. 16:49; Luke 17:28,29; Rom. 1:26,27; I Cor. 6:10; I Tim. 1:10; II Pet. 2:6; Jude 7.

heterosexual, or bestial, is both an *unnatural act* and may be made a capital crime¹¹⁸.

Blackstone also says, the “English law” “treats it” “as a crime not fit to be named” (4 Bl. Com. 215). This type of thinking reflects the idea in Eph. 5:11,12, “And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret.” In some contexts, Scripture does itemize such sins, and so this means that in *some contexts* they may be named, but in *some contexts*, “it is a shame even to speak of” such “things.” The AV’s translation of “homosexuals” (NASB) or “sodomites” (NKJV)¹¹⁹ in I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10, as “abusers of themselves with mankind” (I Cor. 6:9), or “them that defile themselves with mankind” (I

¹¹⁸ Compare John Cotton’s laws of New England (1641), “Unnatural filthiness to be punished with death, whether sodomy, which is a carnal fellowship of man with man [male homosexual sodomy], or woman with woman [Lesbian sodomy], or buggery, which is a carnal fellowship of man or woman with beasts or fowls [bestial sodomy]” (7:20), (*Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Symposium on Biblical Law, Vol. 2, no. 2, 1975-6, pp. 117-28; from *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1798, reprinted, 1835).

¹¹⁹ In I Cor. 6:9, the NKJV translates *arsenokoites* as “sodomites,” and *malakos* (AV, “effeminate”) as “homosexuals” with a footnote stating, “That is, catamites.” Greek *malakos* means “soft” (Matt. 11:8; Luke 7:25), but it can have the meaning of passive homosexuality (*Epistles of Aristeeas* 152; *Sibylline Oracles* 3:184ff; 584ff; Balz, H. & Schneider, G., *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1991, Vol. 2, p. 381). If this is the meaning here, then a contrast is made between the active homosexual partner (*arsenokoites*, on this logic, meaning “men-mounters”), and the passive homosexual partner (*malakos*). Alternatively, *arsenokoites* refers to “homosexuals” (NASB), (on this logic, meaning “men who have sex with men”), and *malakos* means any form of a male being “effeminate” (AV) e.g., the passive homosexual partner, or “drag-queens,” or “fairies,” or transvestites (Deut. 22:5), or heterosexual “fearful” (AV) or “cowardly” (NKJV) males (Rev. 21:8) I.e., on this logic *malakos* meaning “soft” or “effeminate,” means something like “sissies” in I Cor. 6:9, and so includes passive homosexuals, but has a wider scope that also includes heterosexuals, such as men who support feminism (Isa. 3:12; I Tim. 2:12) or (the cowardly, Rev. 21:8) “yellow-breasted chickens.” It seems to me that the this broader meaning is the more probable one, and I note this same Apostle uses *arsenokoites* as a simple generic for “homosexuals” (NASB) who are “sodomites” (NKJV) in I Tim. 1:10. Thus e.g., “soft” heterosexual pacifists or “soft” heterosexual men who support feminism, are as much *malakos* as are passive homosexuals, and both these groups of “effeminate” (AV) men “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (I Cor. 6:9). Thus we should not be surprised that tolerance to homosexuality from the 1960s and 1970s, followed increased tolerance to feminism from the 1950s, and tolerance to anti-Vietnam war pacificism from the 1960s. The rise of feminism required a class of “soft” or “effeminate” (I Cor. 6:9) men who were “fearful” (Rev. 21:8) to fight against it. Once formed, they then divided into heterosexual “effeminate” men tolerant to feminism and homosexuality, and “effeminate” homosexuals. Moreover, for women, one route to Lesbian homosexuality is via feminist ideology. I.e., there is some level of *recruitment* of homosexuals which is much higher among female homosexuals than male homosexuals, in addition to the core group of both male and female homosexuals who have a homosexual *orientation* because God gives them over to a homosexual *orientation* as a Divine judgment on them for their antecedent sin of idolatry (Rom. 1:22-27).

Tim. 1:10); is certainly unusual given the AV's general translation principles of word for word literal equivalence. Why did the AV translators not simply translate the one Greek word here, *arsenokoites*, with "sodomites," a word it uses elsewhere (Deut. 23:17; I Kgs 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; II Kgs 23:7)?

The Septuagint translation of Lev. 18:22 says, "And thou shalt not lie (Greek *koite*) with a man (Greek *arsenos*), as with a woman, for it is an abomination" (LXX). The Greek word *koite* is found in the English word *coitus* for sex. Both root words are found in the Greek word *arsenokoites*, and refer to *men who have sex with men*, i.e., *homosexuals*, in I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10. It seems that *to some extent* the AV translators reflected the view that *arsenokoites* in I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10, is alluding to Lev. 18:22 (LXX); and *to some extent*, like the English common law referred to by Blackstone, through reference to Eph. 5:12, the AV translators wished to convey the idea that there are contexts where this type of thing is "not fit to be named" (4 Bl. Com. 215). Furthermore, in I Cor. 6:18 St. Paul says, "he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body," and this is relevant to that component of the AV translators' terminology in I Cor. 6:9 and I Tim. 1:10 referring to "themselves." Therefore the terminology, "abusers of themselves with mankind" (I Cor. 6:9), makes some allusion to the terminology of Rom. 1:26,27, where sexual "abusers" (I Cor. 6:9) compares with being against "the natural use;" "of themselves" (I Cor. 6:9) compares with "sinneth against his own body" in I Cor. 6:18; and "mankind" (I Cor. 6:9) compares with "mankind" in, "Thou shalt not lie with mankind" in Lev. 18:22. Likewise, the terminology of I Tim. 1:10, "them that defile themselves with mankind," compares with the word "defile" or "defiled" in Lev. 18:27,28,30; once again "themselves" (I Tim. 1:10) compares with "sinneth against his own body" in I Cor. 6:18; and once again "mankind" (I Tim. 1:10) compares with "mankind" in, "Thou shalt not lie with mankind" in Lev. 18:22. These terms in I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10, are thus designed to convey the ideas that sodomy is a sin against the person's "own body" (I Cor. 6:18), so that they are "abusers of" or "them that defile" "*themselves*;" in some contexts, this is a sin *not fit to be named* (Eph. 5:12); and that being an allusion to Lev. 18:22 (LXX), it is *against nature*, since it is a form of sexual *abuse* (Rom. 1:26,27; I Cor. 6:9), so gross, that even heathen nations who do not have the written law of God can know that it is wrong, be *defiled* by it (Lev. 18:22,27,28,30; I Tim. 1:10), and corresponding judged by God for it (Lev. 18:22,27-30; Rom. 1:32; 2:8,9).

Thus e.g., if children were present, one might in conversation with another adult, refer to "abusers of themselves with mankind;" and if a child happened to ask, "What does that mean?" one might reply, "People who abuse themselves, Darling. Now go and play with your toys." Or in order to manifest the concept of Eph. 5:12, and impress the seriousness of such sin, one might, *on some occasions*, first refer to "abusers of themselves with mankind" in "I Corinthians 6:9," or "them that defile themselves with mankind" in "I Timothy 1:10." Then in expansion on this (or in answer to a question as to what these terms mean), one might say, "Who are these abusers and defilers of themselves? I dare not now say it. For it can be shameful to even speak of it. It is the sin of Leviticus 18:22." (And then leave people to look up their Bibles, to learn what this sin is.) But *on another occasion*, one might be more plain, and refer to "the vile and abominable sin of Sodom" (Gen. 18 & 19; Jude 7); "sodomites" (II Kgs 23:7, AV; I Tim. 1:10, NKJV), or "homosexuals" (I Cor. 6:9, NASB; I Tim. 1:10, NASB), quote such explicit passages as Lev. 18:22; Rom. 1:26,27; or make reference to Eph. 5:12, and in this broad context go over the meaning of the Authorized Version's terminology of, "abusers [Rom. 1:26,27] of themselves [I Cor. 6:18] with mankind [Lev. 18:22]" (I Cor. 6:9), and "them that defile [Lev. 18:27-30] themselves [I Cor. 6:18] with mankind [Lev. 18:22]" (I Tim 1:10).

On the one hand, it must be admitted that the AV is unusually interpretive in its translation of *arsenokoites* in I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10. This is the type of thing that Protestants who believe in a literal translation of Scripture usually leave to Bible commentaries. Thus the translation of *arsenokoites* in I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10, by the NASB's "homosexuals" or NKJV's "sodomites," is far more in keeping with the type of literal, word for word equivalence, that one usually gets in a literal translation like the AV. But on the other hand, one can find some qualified precedents for this type of thing in some of the Septuagint quotes in the NT; this is meant to manifest other Scriptures such as Lev. 18:22 (LXX), 27-30; Rom. 1:26,27; I Cor. 6:18; Eph. 5:12; and it must be said that the AV is an Anglican translation. *The Preface* for the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, which became law by the *Act of Uniformity (1662)* stated, "portions of holy Scripture ... are now ordered to be read according to the last translation." This Act made the *King James Version* the *Authorized Version*, that is, the *version authorized* to be used in Anglican churches of the *Church of England* in England and Wales¹²⁰. Moreover, the *Act of Uniformity (1662)* states that the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, resulted from the King's declaration of 1660, "and afterwards the Convocations of" "Canterbury and York, being by his Majesty called and assembled," "His Majesty hath been pleased to *authorize*" "the" "Convocations" "to review the" "Book of Common Prayer," and make any "alterations" they think fit. This therefore included *The Preface* which made the KJV the AV. Thus the Authorized (King James) Version was the *version authorized* by King, Parliament, and Convocation. Given that Anglicans believed that *the voice of nature* played an important role in the break by the *Anglican Church of England* in England and Wales, and *Anglican Church of Ireland*, from the Church of Rome under Henry VIII; and the fact that this king recognized the *voice of nature* against murder in 23 Hen. VIII c.1, and two years later, the *voice of nature* against both incest and sodomy in the silver jubilee of his reign with 25 Henry VIII c. 6 & c. 28; it should not entirely surprise us to find some manifestation of this *voice of nature* in the AV's translation of *arsenokoites* in I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10, not as what might, *prima facie*, be the more expected, "sodomites," but rather, as "abusers of themselves with mankind" and "them that defile themselves with mankind"¹²¹.

In this context, there is also an understandable connection in thought between the AV's translation of *arsenokoites* in I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10; and the English common law as stated by Blackstone. That is, Blackstone says sodomy is "against nature" and in some contexts "not fit to be named" (I Bl. Com. 215); and the AV translators recognized that

¹²⁰ The *Act of Uniformity (1662)* states that this prayer book for "the Church of England" is to "be truly and exactly translated into" so as to be in both "the British" and "Welsh tongue," and after being "translated," a copy placed in every "Cathedral, Collegiate," "parish church and chapel" "in Wales, where the Welsh is commonly spoken or used." Before the 1801 formation of the United Kingdom, in the earlier three Kingdoms of England, Ireland, and Scotland before 1707, Wales was a Dominion of England, and hence part of the Established *Church of England* (and so represented on the Union Jack under the Cross of St. George, the national motif Saint of England, as part of the old Kingdom of England). The Welsh part of the *Church of England* was disestablished in 1920 (under an earlier 1914 Act).

¹²¹ See also my comments in my Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), at Matt. 11:8, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The Third Matter" (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at "Commentary on the Received Text").

sodomy is “against nature” (Rom. 1:26), and in some contexts *not fit to be named* (I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10). In this context, it should be understood that *the voice of nature and of reason* does not necessarily refer to punishments. Rather, the *voice of nature* may refer to such things as: what the Creator made sexual organs for, as opposed to the proper use of the mouth, which is sexually abused in oral sodomy; or the anus, which is sexually abused in anal sodomy. Or the fact that the type of relationship which includes sex, that is, a heterosexual relationship in marriage, should, at some point, naturally include procreation; a fact further showing all forms of sodomy are unnatural. (By contrast, if a heterosexual couple are unable to have children, the type of relationship that it is, remains a natural one, since this is the type of relationship that normally will include procreation.) And *reason* refers to such things, as the greatest overall happiness for the greatest number of people, is obtained when they are in life-long marital relationship. (This is not to deny the teaching of I Cor. 7 that while God calls most Christians to marriage, he calls a smaller number to life-long celibacy.) But if they believe that there is any forum outside of marriage where sex is permitted with someone, e.g., homosexual sex, the *effect on them* is to therefore consider other sexual acts outside of marriage in the form of fornication or adultery must also be therefore permissible. Then, engaging in such acts, they bring long-term unhappiness to themselves and others; losing in some instances, even the capacity to form a life-long marital union. Therefore, homosexual sodomy is immoral and should be restrained. *Reason* also includes issues such as the fact that homosexuality breaks down the natural fraternity among males, based on trust. This is particularly acute where males live together in close quarters, e.g., in the military, since the knowledge, or fear, that a homosexual is in their midst, breaks down the trust between males necessary for an efficient fighting force where men are in close contact with one another. Thus *the voice of nature and of reason* declares that sodomy is *against nature*.

Moreover, the “Lord” warned that if the children of Israel committed various sins, one of which was bestial sodomy (Deut. 27:21), he would send “plagues” or “sicknesses” “of long continuance” among them (Deut. 28:58,59,61). Though said to Jews in a national covenant of Israel, the fact that *the voice of nature* (Gen. 19) shows execution for sodomy is not simply a Jewish precept (Lev. 20:13,15), but a universal precept, means that bestial sodomy is a candidate for Nature’s God more widely unleashing such a plague. On the one hand, it is clear from Scripture that “God who is rich in mercy” (Eph. 2:4), *in his boundless goodness and mercy*, does not always exercise this Divine Prerogative, but he gives space and time for repentance (Gen. 18:32), and so the church can have within her repentant former homosexuals (I Cor. 6:9-11). But on the other hand, it is also clear from the *voice of nature* (II Peter 2:6) *and reason, and the express law of God*, that “they which commit such things are worthy of death” (Rom. 1:32). Thus while neither God nor a human government is obligated to do so, either *may* execute sodomites in harmony with the old Jewish civil law of Lev. 20:13,15. (*This is only an option for human governments*, because unlike the moral law understood through the NT e.g., Lev. 18:22; I Tim. 1:10; Jewish ceremonial laws e.g., Lev. 12:3, no longer “bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof” e.g., Lev. 20:13, “ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth,” Article 7, Anglican *Thirty-Nine 39 Articles*. For Christ “abolished” “the law of commandments contained in ordinances,” while retaining the OT’s moral law, Eph. 2:15; 6:2,3; Deut. 5:16¹²².)

¹²² Mosaical civil laws may be enacted if lawmakers find them to be useful and good, but these laws are no longer morally binding. As discussed above, Rushdoony, is a Judaizer. Contrary to the NT, he claims “the death penalty is required by Scripture for a number of offenses,” including e.g., “sodomy or homosexuality (Lev. 20:13)” (Rushdoony, R.J., *The*

Blackstone records that “in times of Popery,” both immediately before Henry VIII and under his Roman Catholic daughter, Mary, sodomy was “only subject to ecclesiastical censures.” But under the Sodomy Act, “25 Hen. VIII c. 6 revived and confirmed by 5 Eliz. c. 17,” sodomy “was made” a “felony,” and “the general punishment of” such “felonies is” (in the 1760s) death by “hanging” (4 Bl. Com. 215-6)¹²³. In considering Lev. 18 & 20, this means that in the silver jubilee of his reign, Henry VIII recognized both the *voice of nature* against incest, as nature’s God spoke in harmony with Lev. 20:21, “they shall be childless” when Henry took “his brother’s wife;” and also the *voice of nature* against sodomy, as nature’s God spoke in harmony with Lev. 20:13,15, with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19).

Starting from two years earlier in the reign of King Henry VIII, several statutes, beginning with 23 Henry VIII chapter 1, removed *benefit of clergy* from wilful murderers, all of whom were then executed. *Benefit of clergy* exempted clergymen from criminal processes who were handed over by the secular court to an ecclesiastical court, hence the name *benefit of clergy*. This privilege was also extended to all laymen who could read, *but only once*, and they were branded on their thumb to show they had received it. King Henry VIII’s removal of benefit of clergy for murders starting with 23 Hen. VIII. c. 1, once again manifests *the voice of nature and of reason*, as well as *the express law of God* (Rev. 13:10).

Different penalties have historically existed in common law for mixed marriages, up to, and including, the death penalty. Homily 11, Book 1, Article 35, of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, entitled, “Against Whoredom and Uncleaness,” refers to “Gen. 6” and says, “God, seeing this their beastly and abominable living, and perceiving that they amended not,” “to shew how greatly he abhorred adultery, whoredom, fornication, and all uncleanness, he” “destroyed the whole world and all mankind, eight persons excepted.¹²⁴” To this must be made the qualification, that while the earth was “corrupt” due to such sexual immorality (Gen. 6:1-3,11), this unchastity was first punished by reduction of age limits to 120, hence the words of the Homily “they amended not,” are significant. Furthermore, when the judgement of the flood came, the reason also related to “violence” (Gen. 6:11,13). Thus the imposition of the death penalty by a government for mixed marriages, though lawful, and in some circumstances I think even desirable, is nevertheless not required by God’s law. Certainly these mixed marriages helped make “the earth” morally “corrupt” (Gen. 6:11).

Institutes of Biblical Law, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 235). It is not “required,” but permitted, for sodomy (cf. I Cor. 6:9-11).

¹²³ That is not to say one cannot find examples of law codes executing sodomites in Roman Catholic jurisdictions. For example, the fourteenth century French *Code of Orleans* penalties were for a male homosexual’s first offence: castration, second offence: dismemberment, and third offence: execution by burning; and for a Lesbian sodomite: dismemberment for the first two offences, and for a third offence: execution by burning. (Rapetis, P., *Li livres de justice et de plet*, Paris, France, 1890, pp. 279-80, 18.24.22, quoted in Boswell, J., *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, Chicago University, US, 1980, pp. 289-90). Boswell’s book is a very bad and liberal pro-homosexual work, and its claims should always be carefully scrutinized as it contains much error; but it also contains some useful information.

¹²⁴ Griffiths’ *The Two Books of Homilies, op. cit.*, pp. 127-8.

Therefore, when one dissects these two elements, being morally “corrupt” as seen by the mixed marriages, and “violence” (Gen. 6:1-3,11-13), it follows that the *voice of nature* from the Flood teaches that “violence” i.e., murder is a capital crime (Gen. 9:6; Rev. 13:10); and that miscegenation *may in some circumstances be* a capital crime. Thus in Gen. 6 we learn that mixed marriages commence a process of forbidden lust and lack of self-control, that if and when full blown, ultimately leads the society that tolerates them to engage in other acts that the *voice of nature* deems capital. Thus I hold that the usage of execution for miscegenation is a valid option, but not the only penalty option, for any lawfully constituted government in dealing with this disgusting offence.

Notably, the old English law book, *Fleta*, a commentary on the laws of England under King Edward I (Regnal Years: 1272-1307), records that the law then stated, “Those who have connexion with Jews and Jewesses or are guilty of bestiality or sodomy shall be buried alive in the ground” (1 *Fleta* chapter 35). *Fleta* does not say specifically whether he conceptualizes the other party in “connexion” with the Jew as of another race, another religion, or both. On the one hand, the fact that he likens it to unnatural acts would indicate a racial component in his thinking¹²⁵; but on the other hand, it seems hard to avoid reference

¹²⁵ Mediterranean Caucasoids (*Head Hair*: wavy and black; *Facial & body hair*: abundant male facial and body hair; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: medium; *Prognathism*: slight; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: light brown; *Stature*: medium). These are most of the Hamites and Semites mentioned on the *Table of Nations*. The Mediterranean tertiary race (within the Caucasoid secondary race, within the human primary race) divides into three quaternary races (Gen. 10:6,21): Hamitic Putites, Hamitic Mizraim, and Semites. The Putite quaternary race of Larger Libya (Libya, Morocco, Algeria,) is white coloured with medium width noses. The Mizraim Hamitic quaternary race of ancient Egypt is golden brown (and still largely survives in the “Pharaonic race” of Coptic Orthodox). The ancient Egyptians had a racial classification system evident in the frescoes on the Royal Tombs of the 18th to 21st Dynasties (1580-945 B.C.). These distinguish four different racial groups: brown Egyptians, black Africans, lighter brown Asiatics, and white Libyans (Erman, A., *Life in Ancient Egypt*, Benjamin Blom, New York, 1894,1969, p. 32). But *subsequent admixture to form the modern Arab race now blurs these Mediterranean Caucasoid quaternary races* (and even in Biblical times miscegenation between Hamitic Canaanites and Semites resulted in Semitic speaking Canaanites, and further miscegenation between Hamitic Canaanites and Japhethites resulted in Aryan speaking Hittites). More recent race mixing under Mohammedanism means the Semitic Arabic tongue is now widely used in the admixed areas of these once very distinctive quaternary races; and through miscegenation both facilitated and encouraged by Mohammedanism, the accursed blood of Ishmael’s “wild” and violent race (Gen. 16:12) which for millennia had been locked up in seclusion on the Arabian Peninsula (Gen. 25:12-18, NASB), was spread around the Middle East as an integral part of the new mixed race of Arabs or Ishmaelites created by the Mohammedan religion. The *Semitic* quaternary race of West Asia is light brown in colour, frequently with hooked noses (and the Semitic languages form a distinctive group within the Hamito-Semitic family). The Sephardic Jews continue to reflect Mediterranean racial features, whereas the Ashkenazi Jews, being Khazar converts of Caucasian Caucasoid stock generally do not (Gen. 10:3); although some Ashkenazi Jews of the Caucasian tertiary race intermarried with Sephardic Jews of the Jewish race, and thereafter stayed in the Ashkenazi community, so that some of these mixed race “white Jews” have e.g., the Jewish racial trait of a hooked nose. Some Sephardic Jews who have

to a religious component, and indeed, Coke later used and interpreted Fleta this way when he referred to an “ancient law” against “Jew” and professedly “Christian” mixed marriages (3 Coke’s Inst. 89). Thus, like Ezra 9 & 10 or Neh. 13 which deal with both religiously and racially mixed marriages, Fleta shows an ancient legal prohibition on either religiously or racially mixed marriages, or fornication between Jews and Gentiles, which considered those guilty of such an offence to be worthy of death.

Beyond general references to the antediluvians being “corrupt” and full of “wickedness” and “evil” (Gen. 6:5,11,12), five specific issues are itemized in Gen. 4, sabbath-breaking, blasphemy, theft, polygamy, and murder; and two specific issues are itemized in Gen. 6, mixed marriages and violence. Gen. 4:3-5 deals with purity of worship. The words, “And in the process of time” (Gen. 4:3) literally read in the Hebrew, “And at the end of days.” When the question is asked, “At the end of” what “days,” the only answer seems to be the week of Gen. 1 & 2, i.e., “at the end of days *of the week.*” Hence in all probability this was a *sabbath* offering by Cain and Abel¹²⁶. Thus Lee says, “Together with Abel, Cain did at least outwardly keep the Sabbath ‘at the end of the days,’ but he certainly did so with a sabbath-desecrating (and an internal) attitude that was deplorably sinful (Gen. 4:3-9)¹²⁷.” Cain’s impure worship was also blasphemous, since he took God’s name in vain, when he made an unacceptable “offering unto the Lord” (Gen. 4:3), and he also robbed God of the true honour due to his holy name (cf. Rom. 2:21-24). Impurity of worship involving blasphemy, sabbath-breaking, and theft, are certainly serious instances of “sin” (Gen. 4:7). Some forms of blasphemy were a capital offence under later Mosaical law (Lev. 24:11,13-16); but this type of blasphemy was where a man “curseth his God” and “blasphemeth the name of the Lord” (Lev. 24:15,16). Some forms of sabbath-breaking were a capital offence under later Mosaical civil law (Exod. 31:14,15; 35:2; Num. 15:32-36). But the capital offence of sabbath-breaking had to do with *working* rather than *resting* on the sabbath; whereas the issue of purity of sabbath worship was more generally left to the individual and God, rather than civil law enactments. Furthermore, the text isolates Cain’s sin of impure worship involving blasphemy, sabbath-breaking, and theft, specifically to Cain, and links this to his character and later moral decline into murder (cf. Heb. 11:4). It is this issue of murder that is then more in focus in Gen. 4:23; 6:11,13; 9:6. Thus murder is the sin that the text indicates was a wider concern among the more generally immoral antediluvians.

Likewise, the polygamist Lamech (Gen. 4:19) is contrasted with the monogamists who entered Noah’s Ark (Gen. 7:13). We are not told that all antediluvians were polygamists, though others may well have been so. However, in the OT polygamy did not attract the death penalty. The two specific issues itemized in Gen. 6 in the time of Noah’s

intermarried with Ashkenazi Jews have thereafter stayed in the Sephardic community, so that Sephardic communities sometimes include persons not of the Jewish race. But in general terms, the Jewish race (Rom. 9-11) has been preserved among Sephardic Jews, and a small number of Semitic Jews who have historically remained in the Middle East.

¹²⁶ Jamieson, R., *Critical and Explanatory Commentary*, Old Testament, Genesis to Esther, William Collins, London, UK, commentary on Gen. 4:3, says, “Heb. ‘At the end of days,’ probably” means “on the Sabbath.”

¹²⁷ Lee, F.N., *About Sunday: Is it the Sabbath?* By Francis Nigel Lee, Minister, Presbyterian Church, Tallahassee, Florida, USA; Published by the Lord’s Day Observance Society, London, UK, 1978, pp. 28,73.

flood are mixed marriages (Gen. 6:1-4) and violence (Gen. 6:11,13), the latter of which is clearly connected to the issue of murder in Gen. 4. The mixed marriages between the Cainites and Sethites (Gen. 4:16 to 5:32), resulted in the divine penalty of reducing life spans of people who were used to living to about 800 to 1,000 years of age (Gen. 5:27,31), so that those involved had a “hundred and twenty years” (Gen. 6:1-4). Since about 100 years after the imposition of this penalty (Gen. 5:32; 7:11), at the time of the flood, Noah was about 600 years old (a rounded number cf. Gen. 5:32; 11:10) (Gen. 7:11), and then lived to 950 (Gen. 9:29), and since Shem was 98 at the time of the flood, and then lived to 600 (Gen. 11:10,11), we know that neither Noah nor Shem entered a mixed marriage.

Japheth and Ham were less than about 100 at the time of the flood (Gen. 5:32; 7:11); and so both were under the upper limit of the 120 years (possibly a rounded number,) for those who had entered mixed marriages. Japheth was clearly a righteous man, and being specifically blessed of God by Noah (Gen. 9:23,27), one can safely say he did not enter a mixed marriage. As for Ham, he was a bisexual, who when his father Noah was in deep sleep from drunkenness, “saw the nakedness of his father” (Gen. 9:22). In Lev. 20:17 to “see her nakedness” or “see his nakedness” means to have sex with, and so Gen. 9:22 indicates that Ham engaged in anal sodomy on his dead-drunk sleeping father (cf. Hab. 2:15), who “knew what his younger son had done unto him” when he “awoke” (Gen. 9:24). This indicates that Noah knew it had to have been Ham, because he was the only one who engaged in homosexual acts (though Gen. 10:6 shows he was a bisexual who also had heterosexual sex); and thus indicates that though he was sexually immoral, he was included in the passengers of the Ark (cf. Ezek. 14:14,20). This sexually immoral character means that it is certainly *possible, though by no means certain*, that the Sethite Ham was also involved in a mixed marriage with a Cainite woman, in which instance he would have been subject to the divine penalty of aging more quickly, and would have died about 20 to 25 years after the flood. If so, this may also help explain why he called his son “Canaan” (Gen. 9:22,25-27). That is, while “Cain” (Heb. *Qayin*) and “Canaan” (Heb. *Kena’an*) are quite different names, they have a phonetic similarity.

That the flood was not immediately caused by the mixed marriages is indicated by the fact that God had already imposed a specific penalty to deal with this, namely, those involved, including the “men” born from such unions (Gen. 6:3, Hebrew, *’adam*¹²⁸), would

¹²⁸ The usage of Hebrew *’adam* to describe the offspring in Gen. 6:4 requires that they were Adamites i.e., members of Adam’s race or the human race, as does the statement, “the Lord said, I will destroy” “both man [Heb. *’adam*] and beast” (Gen. 6:7); and so totally rules out the theory found in the corrupt inter-testamental Jewish teachings of the pseudepigrapha (Enoch 6,7), echoed by the later 1st century A.D. Jewish historian, Josephus, that these were angel-human hybrids. Moreover, Jesus’ comments in Matt. 22:30 can be seen as contextually rejecting this type of known possibility. In Deut. 14:1, the same Moses who in Gen. 6:2,4 described Seth’s elect race as “the sons” (Hebrew *ben*) “of God” (Hebrew *Elohim*), says to the elect race of Israel, “You are the sons (Hebrew *ben*) of the Lord your God (Hebrew *Elohim*)” (NASB). In OT times, election under the covenant of grace *usually* occurred among a lesser group *inside* the elect race, but such racial election should not be confused with election unto salvation, which was always a personal matter under the “covenant” (Gen. 6:18) of “grace” (Gen. 6:8), by which “Noah was” made “a just man” (Gen. 6:9), being an “heir of the righteousness which is by faith” (Heb. 11:7). E.g., “Thus saith the Lord” “unto Pharaoh,” “Israel is my son,” “Let my son go” (Exod. 4:22,23), “But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness” (I Cor. 10:5).

have their life spans reduced (Gen. 6:1-3). Furthermore, we read of a second time, “after that,” in connection with the Tower of Babel (Gen. 11:6, cf. they are “one race,” Gr. *genos*, LXX), when in mixed marriages, “the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them,” (Gen. 6:4), and the punishment God imposed was *forced* deportation and dispersal into segregated areas (Gen. 11:9), in a manner compatible with what was originally envisaged by him (Gen. 10, included a Hamite-Semite mixed races area along the western part of Arabia containing Sheba and Havilah, Gen. 10:7,28,29), *not execution*. (Cf. the movement of the Hamite-Semite admixed Ishmael, and his descendants, also to Arabia, Gen. 16; 25:12-18, NASB).

In a moment of weakness, Abraham, a Semite, exhibited “the works of the flesh” (Gal. 5:19), when he engaged in miscegenation (inter-racial sex) with Hagar, a Hamite (Gen. 16), thus giving way to “the flesh” (Gal. 4:23). But Homily 7, Book 1, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, observes the seriousness with which the repentant Abraham forbade miscegenation, by *requiring an oath against it*. Referring to “Gen. 24,” the Homily notes that “Abraham,” “required an oath of his servant that he should procure a wife for his son Isaac, which should come of his own kindred: and the servant did swear that he would perform his master’s will.” Furthermore, “Isaac called Jacob,” “and said unto him, Thou shalt not take a wife of the daughters of Canaan” (Gen. 28:1).

In Genesis 34 we read that the Hebrew daughter of Jacob, Dinah, was “defiled” by “Shechem, the son of Hamor the Hivite, the prince of the country,” who “took her, and lay with her, and defiled her” (Gen. 34:2). He wanted to make her his “wife” (Gen. 34:4), but “he had wrought folly in Israel in lying with Jacob’s daughter; which thing ought not to be done. And Hamor communed with them,” asking for Jacob’s “daughter” for a “wife” to his sons, and saying, “Make ye marriages with us, and give your daughters unto us, and take our daughters unto you” (Gen. 34:7-9). Therefore, the “sons of Jacob came,” “and they slew Hamor and Shechem his son with the edge of the sword, and took Dinah out of Shechem’s house,” “and spoiled the city, because they had defiled their sister.” “And they said, Should he deal with our sister as with an harlot?” (Gen. 34:26,27,31). Certainly this is an instance of miscegenation for which the penalty was death. But the Hebrew word *‘anah* translated “defiled” by the AV in Gen. 34:2; also means *forced*, and so is translated in the NASB as, “Shechem” “took her and lay with her by force.” Thus this was a miscegenation rape case, and so *the moral of Genesis 34 is that a man who rapes a woman of another race may be executed* (as may a man guilty of incestuous rape, II Sam. 13, or pack-rape of a woman with unusually cruel violence, Judg. 20)¹²⁹. (In his chapter on “Rape,” the jurist, Sir Edward Coke, refers to the Genesis 34 story in 3 Inst. 60. While any rape is a shocking example of both *sexual immorality* and a *physical assault*, thus exhibiting such “works of the flesh” as “fornication” (AV & ASV) and “hatred” (AV¹³⁰) meaning *hostilities* or “enmities” (Gal. 5:20,

Cf. Hosea 13:13,14.

¹²⁹ In his chapter on “Rape,” Sir Edward Coke refers to Tamar’s incestuous rape by Amnon, and says “observe also the end of the offender” (3 Inst. 60; citing II Sam. 13:14,19.) - which was death. Stephen, J.F., *A History of the Criminal Law of England*, Macmillan, London, UK, 1883; Reprint: Burt Franklin, New York, USA, 1973, Vol. 2, pp. 215-216.

¹³⁰ In elucidating on the 6th commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” The “Catechism” of the 1662 Anglican prayer book says its includes, “To hurt nobody by word or deed.” With regard to the AV’s translation here at Gal. 5:20, n.b., that the 6th commandment includes both unjust “hate” (I John 3:15) and unjust anger (Matt. 5:21,22). It is not a case of

ASV), due to the *force* the rapist uses in sexual assault; historically, particularly horrendous forms of rape, e.g., those involving miscegenation, were open to the death penalty in American States, till libertine US Supreme Court judges made a mockery of justice by denying this penalty in 1977 in *Coker v. Georgia*¹³¹.

The story of Num. 25:1-9 bears an interesting similarity to Gen. 6:1-4, in that as it was the “daughters” of Cain’s race who married the “sons” of Seth’s race (Gen. 6:2), “and also after that,” in connection with the Tower of Babel, the “daughters of men” who married “the sons of God” (Gen. 6:4; 11:6); so likewise here, it was “the daughters of Moab” who sexually enticed the sons of Israel, and through this, “they” (Num. 25:2 is *feminine* gender indicating these same women,) then corrupted all of Israel, male and female, enticing them into the idolatrous worship of Baal. We cannot doubt that the penalty for this sin was execution, since “in one day” alone, 23,000 “fell” by plague (I Cor. 10:8), with another 1,000 dying thereafter from the plague previously contracted (Num. 25:9), together with an unspecified number of leaders being publicly hung in broad daylight (Num. 25:4,5). Yet these were certainly *not mixed marriages*, though they were instances of miscegenation. Many of these men were already married, and so committed adultery with aggravated enormity in the form of miscegenation (II Peter 2:14,15). These sons of Israel engaged in acts of idolatrous cultic “whoredom” (Num. 25:1-3), and so the NT uses this story to

“the AV is wrong here” with “hatred” and the “ASV is right here” with “enmities” at Gal. 5:20 or *vice versa*, it is a case of the Greek having different shades of meaning, and depending on what one is looking at, depending on which English translation is more apt *for those purposes*.

¹³¹ I was on friendly terms with Sir Garfield Barwick (1903-1997) till his death. He was a former Commonwealth Attorney-General, and a former Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia. He believed different racial groups had different racial traits e.g., he considered the Chinese ethnic race was “vigorous,” and by contrast, the “Malays” are “not a vigorous people,” manifested in their lack of “business activity” relative to ethnic Chinese in S.E. Asia. As Attorney-General, under him the *White Australia Policy* was in place, and he recalled Malaysia’s “Tunku saying to me that he understood Australia maintaining a European population: ‘Why should you have my insoluble problem? The problem of ethnic diversity is insoluble. I have Malays, Indians and Chinese and it is insoluble’.” Barwick believed in racialism, that is, “the depths and intractability of the mutual disapproval of some ethnic groups, an antipathy which may prove ineradicable and is often attended by violence.” Concerning the break-down of the *White Australia Policy* by ungodly lawmakers from the late 1960s, Barwick commented, “I have witnessed in latter days with regret a considerable dilution of” the “Anglo-Celtic stock.” “At the lowest, the cause of national unity is not aided by this ethnic diversity” (Barwick, G, *A Radical Tory*, Federation Press, Sydney, Australia, 1995, pp. 171,181,300). Though I usually spoke to him in his Sydney Office, on a visit at his home he autographed his autobiography, *A Radical Tory*, writing on the front page, “Gavin, I hope you’ll find my book interesting particularly about mat.[rimonial] causes and racial matters. Garfield Barwick 27/11/95.” In conversation with me, he expressed his grave concerns at the High Court of Australia going the direction of the US Supreme Court and in effect making law. One case we discussed was *Coker v. Georgia* 433 U.S. 584, which Sir Garfield and I agreed in discussion was wrongly decided, since the US Supreme Court had no business overturning State laws as they did in this case. (Barwick did not much like the usage of the death penalty for rape cases, but thought the matter should be determined by lawmakers in legislatures, not judges in supreme courts.)

condemn idolatrous cultic temple prostitution (I Cor. 6:13,15-20; 10:8; Rev. 2:14). There is a clear contrast in the Pentateuch between a son of Israel engaging in sexual acts of idolatrous cultic “whoredom” with one of “the daughters of Moab,” for which he received the death penalty (Num. 25:1-9), and an Israelite entering a mixed marriage with a “Moabite,” for which the children were penalized for ten generations (Deut. 23:3-6). Therefore once again, miscegenation and /or mixed marriages (Deut. 23:2-8) were clearly penalized, but that penalty was *not execution* unless there was an added element of idolatry.

While mixed marriages from war-brides were allowed, they appear to have had the status of concubinage only, since they were not subject to marital divorce provisions (Deut. 24:1-4), but regulated by easy dissolution provisions (Deut. 21:10-14). Moreover, the children of them were always illegitimate, and depending on the race of the bride, subject to between three and ten generations of bastardy (Deut. 23:2,7,8) in which they were segregated from “the congregation of the Lord.” Of Numbers 31:18, the Reverend Dr. Cooke of Ireland (1788-1868) says in Brown’s *Study Bible* (1778, added notes of 19th century), “the assertion that Moses, in this verse, permitted the people to retain the ‘women children’ for concubines is” “monstrous.” Rather, referring to Lev. 25:46, he considers “the direction in the text was merely a *permission* to hold them as *bond-women*.”

In Ezra 9 & 10 or Neh. 13, mixed marriages occurred, and the penalty was declaring the marriages void and the children bastards (Deut. 23:2,3), so that the Israelites were “separated” from them (Ezra 10:16). In Neh. 13:20, we read that Israel was ethnically “cleansed” “from all strangers,” and the “wives of Ashdod” and elsewhere, whose “children spake half in the speech of Ashdod” (Neh. 13:23,24), are probably those referred to in Zech. 9:6, where we read, “a bastard race” (ASV ftn.) as typed and represented by a leader who is a “bastard” (AV & ASV), i.e., a leader and his people who are “a mixed race shall settle in Ashdod” (NKJV). This segregation into one area for Israelites, and deportation into a mixed races area for the others, conforms with the type of divine action penalty found at the Tower of Babel. That is, once again, *forced* deportation and dispersal into segregated areas, *not execution*.

Thus I conclude that the Flood was not the immediate punishment for those in the mixed marriages of Gen. 6:1-4. This is seen by the fact that a specific penalty had already been imposed on them by reducing their life-spans (Gen. 6:1-3); and that there had been the imposition of some level of segregation from these people, as seen by the fact that e.g., Noah and Shem did not enter mixed marriages and have their life spans so reduced. It is also seen by God’s judgment on mixed marriages in subsequent situations (Gen. 6:4;11:1-9; Deut. 23:2-8; Ezra 9 & 10; Neh. 13), where those involved were *not executed*. Although in Dan. 2:43,44 we read of God terminating a widespread practice of miscegenation by his Second Coming, so that the death penalty may be justified on this basis; it is also notable that the judgement of the Flood in Gen. 6:13 is said to be both because “the earth” “was corrupt” (Gen. 6:11), of which the mixed marriages are an example (Gen. 6:1-3), and also because of the “violence” (Gen. 6:11,13). Thus while Scripture allows the imposition of the death penalty for miscegenation, especially where the practice has become widespread and people are so immoral as to resist all lesser punishments against it (Gen. 6:11; Dan. 2:43,44); nevertheless, Scripture does not require it.

In harmony with this Biblical teaching, the common law has not usually imposed the death penalty for religiously and/or racially mixed marriages, but generally a lesser penalty. For example, Blackstone approved of the general adaptation of English Law to the American

Colonies, and so this included their anti-mixed marriages statues as at the 1760s (1 Bl. Com. 106-107,109). Blackstone was clearly conscious of the fact that in “sending colonies to find out new habitations,” relevant differences that Colonists encountered included those of “religion,” “government,” cultural matters of “language” and “customs,” or “colour” (2 Bl. Com. 7). He held that “in America” the “plantations or colonies” were lawfully constituted, and that in these colonies the English Common Law had been properly refined so as to be “applicable to their own situation,” and this specifically included bastardy matters in his reference to “the general rules of inheritance” (1 Bl. Com. 107).

From the time of the second stage of the Reformation, Protestant countries were historically segregationist, seen e.g., in London’s or Amsterdam’s old Jewish Quarters, or the USA’s old Negro Quarters; which combined with a restrictive immigration policy to ensure these countries were historically kept chiefly Japhetic or Caucasian. Thus racial segregation was generally attained through national boundaries. (In the mid seventeenth century, Oliver Cromwell admitted Sephardic Jews, and established London’s Jewish Quarter; which was retained following the Restoration in 1660.) This was harmonious with the Biblical definition of nations as racial families (Gen. 10. See Gr. *genos*, etymologically connected to our word “gene,” meaning both “nation” (AV), or “kindred” (AV), and “race” (NASB), in e.g., Mark 7:26; Acts 7:19. Or “families” in Gen. 12:3, equates “kindreds” in Acts 3:25 and “nations” in Gal. 3:8.) Thus when Blackstone referred to the American colonies, these were segregationist colonies.

In the Book of Acts, the Apostle Paul defines a nation through reference to race, addressing the “children of the stock [Greek *genos*] of Abraham,” as opposed to those Gentiles who “feareth God” (Acts 13:25). He then states the segregationist principle that “God” appointed “the bounds of” “habitation” of “nations” (Acts 17:24,26; cf. Gen. 10:32). Showing there is a time and place for both inter-racial fellowship and also segregation, he first has inter-racial fellowship with the Gentile Christian, Trophimus, and then joins with his fellow Jewish Christian brethren to engage in an act of segregated worship (Acts 21:17-30). (This principle is also evident in e.g., the Jewish Christian congregations the NT Books of Hebrews and James were addressed to.) It was a capital crime for a Gentile to go through the Gate Beautiful, and the Apostle Paul ultimately died a martyr’s death on the false charge he was some kind of civil rights desegregationist who had taken the Gentile Trophimus, over the segregation line¹³².

A basic level of racial segregation, and opposition to racially mixed marriages, are the two side of the one coin. Until the post World War Two major rebellion against morals, racial segregation was generally accomplished through national borders and a restrictive immigration in the Protestant countries of the British Isles and north-west Europe keeping them Japhetic or Caucasian, and so specific laws prohibiting racially mixed marriages were not required. Legislative prohibition of mixed marriages formed part of the morality of the second stage of the Reformation in the seventeenth century (and later), and was manifested in statutes, both where Protestants came into contact with large numbers of Roman Catholics in

¹³² See e.g., Knox, D.B., *Not By Bread Alone*, Banner of Truth Trust, UK, 1989, chapter “Race,” pp. 51-6. And for the archaeological discovery of a stone stating it was a capital offence for a Gentile to enter “within the barricade which surrounds the temple,” see F.F. Bruce’s *The New Testament Documents*, Inter-Varsity Press, Leicester, England, 5th revised edition of 1960, reprint 1992, p. 93.

Ireland, and also where white Protestants came into contact with large numbers of heathens and/or coloureds in the American colonies. E.g., the Royal Commissioner's Report of 1865 observed that, "The solemnization ... of mixed marriages by the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland is not permitted. By the Irish Statute 19 Geo. 2. ch. 13" of 1745, "every marriage celebrated by a Popish priest between two Protestants, or between a Papist and 'any ... Protestant' is declared absolutely null and void ." "These enactments (except as to the punishment ...) are still in force *When these statutes were passed,*" in 1745, "*all mixed marriages in Ireland between Protestants and Roman Catholics ... were prohibited under severe penalties*"¹³³. Furthermore, William of Orange's 1701 *Act of Settlement* (12 & 13 William III, chapter 2), has never been repealed. The Settlement also prohibits marriage of a British monarch to a Papist, which according to the great common law jurist, Sir William Blackstone, *means in law* that the throne can go to "such heirs only of the body of the Princess Sophia, as are Protestant members of the Church of England, and are married to none but Protestants" (1 Bl. Com. 217).

There is a connection between opposition to religiously mixed marriages and opposition to racially mixed marriages. Those who first recognize that religious purity in the church requires opposition to religiously mixed marriages e.g., between Protestants and Papists; are in a better position to then recognize that since a nation is defined by God in racial terms (e.g., Gen. 10), racial purity in the nation requires opposition to racially mixed marriages. Thus the realization that both concepts are present in e.g., Ezra 9 & 10, is noteworthy. While the church of God is no longer a racial nation of Israel as in the OT, it is nevertheless clear in the NT that a nation is still defined racially and culturally, so that in order for Christians to preserve the God ordained national-racial groups that he made in Gen. 10; Acts 17:26, they must oppose racially mixed marriages. Thus it is clear that Christians should continue to use Ezra 9 & 10 in opposing religiously and / or racially mixed marriages.

E.g., in 1638 American Dutch law in New York prohibited mixed marriages between Whites and Heathens (religiously and racially mixed marriages); Blacks (racially mixed marriages); or other persons (any other racially mixed marriages)¹³⁴. In the same year as the

¹³³ *Report of the Royal Commission on the Laws of Marriage*, 1865. Presented to both Houses of Parliament, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1868, pp. xii to xiii. Reprint: *British Parliamentary Papers*, Marriage and Divorce, Vol. 1, Irish Univ. Press, Shannon, Ireland, (emphasis mine). This report further says, "but" as at 1865, "that" mixed marriages "prohibition has long since been removed, except as to marriages celebrated by Roman Catholic priests." As Joske observed when interpreting this statute, *Swift v. Attorney-General for Ireland* [1912] A.C. 276, found that Roman Catholic-Protestant mixed marriages were not legally prohibited by this statute. This Statute had, "its object the removal of Roman Catholic influence by preventing mixed marriages in which a Roman Catholic priest should take part and incidentally by *discouraging all marriages between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic*" (Joske, P.E., *Law of Marriage and Divorce*, with a Forward by the Hon. Sir Garfield Barwick, Q.C., M.P., Attorney-General of the Commonwealth of Australia, 4th edition, Butterworths, Sydney, Australia, 1963; reprint: 1967, pp. 162,278, emphasis mine). Thus the law later came to view this as a matter to be left primarily to church rules of discipline, rather than state laws.

¹³⁴ *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherlands*, 1638-1674, pp. 10-12, cited in Fowler, D.H., *Northern Attitudes Towards Interracial Marriage*, Legislation and Public Opinion in the Middle Atlantic States of the Old Northwest, 1760-1930, Garland, New York, USA,

Act of Uniformity (1662) gave the *Church of England* the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and made the *King James Version* the *Authorized Version*; the English Colony of Virginia in America, prohibited (racially and religiously) mixed marriages between Christian Englishmen and Negresses¹³⁵. In 1691 the Virginia law was revised and prohibited all (racially) mixed marriages between “English or other whites,¹³⁶” and “Negroes” as well as “mulattoes” i.e., mixed race persons of Negroid-Caucasian ancestry with bastardy specified to the third generation; and racially mixed marriages with Red Indians were also prohibited¹³⁷.

1987, p. 402. The primary (or first level of) race is the human race. But within the human race, five secondary (or second level of) races are evident: Caucasoids, Mongoloids, Negroids, Australoids, and Capoids. There are also some admixed racial groups made up a combination of these secondary races. These secondary races further divide into tertiary (or third level of) races. Only some thereafter divide into quaternary (or fourth level of) races. Racial descriptions are made with the normative qualification that they are a *general group average*, and that there is variation within all groups.

¹³⁵ W.W. Hening, *Statutes at Large from 1619*, II, 170 (Hurd, I, 231-232). Cited in: *Id.*, p. 431.

¹³⁶ The Caucasoid secondary race (or “The Caucasian Group”) has two tertiary races: Caucasians and Mediterraneans. Caucasians - *Head Hair*: wavy and of various colours: orange or red, black, light brown, dark brown, blonde; *Facial & body hair*: abundant male facial and body hair; *Head size*: variable (*tendency* for Western Europeans to be dolicephalic i.e., narrow headed, and Eastern Europeans to be brachycephalic i.e., broad headed, a fact making Poland clearly Eastern European; the dolicephalic Western Europeans artistically type both the Caucasian tertiary race and Caucasoid secondary race); *Nose*: narrow; *Prognathism* or jaw protrusion: slight; *Eyes*: variable, usually blue, green, or brown (although mine are multi-coloured green and gold); *Skin*: white; *Stature*: variable, and these Caucasian Caucasoids are the Japhethites on *The Table of Nations* (Gen. 10:2-5). The Caucasians are racially blessed (Gen. 9:27) and have an unmatched high intensity of creative genius, so that where they are non-admixed, over long periods of time they create ever more technologically advanced and innovative societies. But where they have subsequently become admixed, such as in southern Europe, their creative genius is lost.

¹³⁷ Hening, *Statutes at Large*, III, 86-87 (Hurd, I, 236). Cited in *Id.* Within the Mongoloid secondary race, (*Head Hair*: black & straight; *Prognathism*: medium; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: brown,) (see below); the Eskimo tertiary race of N.E. Asia and the North American Arctic: *Male facial & body hair*: slight; *Head size*: often narrow; *Nose*: narrow; *Skin*: light brown; *Eyes*: slanty shaped; *Stature*: below average; *Other*: long fattish face and prominent cheekbones. The Red Indian tertiary race of the Americas: *Male facial & body hair*: variable; *Head size*: variable; *Nose*: medium; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: light to medium red (meaning brown); *Stature*: medium to tall; *Other*: Usually have slight male facial and body hair but they have more male facial hair on NW Coast, N Calif., & S. Chile. Both Eskimos and Red Indians evidently migrated from East Asia, which area of Asia includes other Mongoloid tertiary races. The Mongoloid’s ancestry in Gen. 10 is not as easily resolved as the other four secondary races. Africa is clearly Hamitic, under the patriarch Ham; and Europe is clearly Japhetic, under the patriarch Japheth. But Asiatic territory was given to Ham, under Canaan; to Japheth, with Magog and Madai; and Shem, with numerous descendants. Thus Bible scholars, while agreeing on the Mongoloid’s Asiatic origins, have sometimes disagreed on their descent from Noah’s sons. My own views on this issue have changed over the years, and I am not dogmatic about the matter. But I presently think the

In 1705 the law was again revised to prohibit mixed marriages between English or other free whites, and negroes or mulattoes, bond or free. A mixed race “mulatto” was defined as either “the child of an Indian,” or “the child, grandchild, or great-grandchild of a Negro¹³⁸.” The 1705 law of Virginia penalties were different for masters or mistresses entering mixed marriages, than for Christian white servants who entered a racially and/or religiously mixed marriages with a “negro, mulatto, or [Red] Indian, Jew, Moor, Mahometan, or other infidel¹³⁹.” (Other revisions followed.)

Thus when Blackstone wrote approvingly of the English Common Law in the “American” “colonies,” on issues such as e.g., “the general rules of inheritance” and thus bastardy (1 Bl. Com. 107,109), as at 1765, a number of the American Colonies had an established legal history of legislatively enacting prohibition of mixed marriages statutes. The English Common Law jurisdictions of the American Colonies, which at some point had passed laws prohibiting at least some racially and/or religiously mixed marriages by 1765,

better view is that they a pure Shemitic race, coming from Aram’s son, Mash (Gen. 10:23), a fact preserved in the Hebrew word for “silk” as *meshiy* (Ezek. 16:10,13). For Scripture isolates them in the NT through reference to the great Silk Route stretching from Europe to China (Rev. 18:11,12). Moreover, “Mesha” is depicted as the most easterly Asiatic point of Joktan, “as thou goest unto Sephar a mount of the east” (Gen. 10:30). Thus the name “Mesha” is a logical territorial starting point for “Mash,” whose holdings were therefore so far east in Asia as not to be specifically referred to in the *Table of Nations*. [2015 update: see my work, *Creation, Not Macroevolution – Mind the Gap*, Vol., Part 2, chapter 15; & Vol. 2, Part 5, Chapter 5, on Mash” in Gen. 10:23.] In 220 B.C. the Tsin (or Chin) Dynasty became supreme. “Tsin” is thought to have been changed by the Malays to “Tchina,” and then by the Portuguese who brought the name to Europe as “China.” But the purer form “Sin” is still retained in the Anglicized form “Sino” e.g., the Sino-Japanese war; Sinology, the Sino-Tibetan Linguistic Family, or the Sinitic (Chinese) languages. On this view, in broad terms, Japheth settled Europe, Ham settled Africa, and Shem settled Asia i.e., Shem is the “patriarch of Asia” (and from here the Americas), so that the presence in Gen. 10 of Japhethites and Hamites in parts of west Asia was merely an exception to this general depiction. If they were neither specifically blessed nor cursed in Gen. 9:25-27, (nor later given a racial curse, as nature teaches occurred with the Shemitic Australoids from Elam,) this may explain why the Mongoloids are intermediate between Caucasians and others in having some limited creative genius, of a much lower intensity than Caucasians, while often also showing high IQs.

¹³⁸ Hening, *Statutes at Large*, III, 252, 450, 453-454 (Hurd, I, 238, 240). Cited in *Id.*, p. 432. The Negroid secondary race (or “The Ethiopic Group”) - *Head Hair*: black & tight woolly curls; *Body Hair*: relatively slight male facial and body hair; *Prognathism*: strong; *Nose*: broad; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: black. Ethiopians artistically type both the Negro tertiary race, and Negroid secondary race. “Negro” is the Spanish and Portuguese word for “black.” The Negro tertiary race has narrow heads and tall stature (and subdivides into quaternary races). The Negrillos are a famous Negroid tertiary race (broad heads; very short stature), known as the “Pygmies” (they subdivide into two further quaternary races). The Negroids are the Cushites descended from Ham on *The Table of Nations* (Gen. 10:6).

¹³⁹ Hening *Statutes at Large*, III, 450, 453-454 (Hurd, I, 238, 240). Cited in: Fowler, D.H., *Northern Attitudes Towards Interracial Marriage*, Garland, New York & London, 1987, p. 432.

were: Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia¹⁴⁰. Thus e.g., in North Carolina as at 1765, the law prohibited racially mixed marriages between, “Whites, [Red] Indians, Negroes, mustees, mulattoes, or any person of mixed blood to the third generation, bond or free.” This anti-miscegenation law included the imposition of a fine on any functionary performing an inter-racial marriage¹⁴¹.

After the American War of Independence, the issue of religiously mixed marriages was left to the ecclesiastical censures and discipline of relevant churches. E.g., the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 24:3 and Congregational *Savoy Declaration* 25:3, says “it is the duty of Christians to marry” “in the Lord: and therefore such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, Papists, or other idolaters: neither such as are godly be unequally yoked, by marrying with such as are” “wicked in their life, or maintain damnable heresies.” Or in similar words, the *Philadelphia Confession of 1742* (adopting the *Baptist Confession* of 1689) says, “it is the duty of Christians to marry in the Lord, and therefore those who profess the true religion should not marry with infidels or idolaters. Nor should those who are godly be unequally yoked by marrying with those who are wicked in their life or who maintain heretical teaching condemned to judgment.”

But in addition to social stigmas in some States, racially mixed marriages continued to be prohibited by statutes in many American States. The Professor of Law at Columbia University, Albert Jacobs, reported in 1939 that a majority of USA “states have statutes which forbid” “miscegenation.” “These statutes,” he said, mainly “forbid” “the marriage of whites and blacks” (the two main racial groups in the USA at the time), but also “the intermarriage of persons of other different races, such as Indians, Mongolians¹⁴², etc.” “The idea behind them is racial purity.” “The idea behind these statutes seems to be sound. We are naturally opposed to such marriages. It is submitted that these laws should continue on the statute books.¹⁴³” These statutes frequently used Biblical language and/or concepts, echoing Exod. 20:5; Deut. 5:9 to Deut. 23:2-8, and thus also reflecting the usage of Ezra 9:12

¹⁴⁰ See Statutes cited in *Id.*, pp. 351,358,381-383,387,403-404,415,417,431-432.

¹⁴¹ *State Records*, XXIII, 160, ch. 1, s. 13, of *Laws of 1741* (Hurd, I, 295). Cited in *Id.*, p. 404.

¹⁴² The Mongoloid secondary race has five tertiary races. The high IQs of some Mongoloids, when coupled with the energetic qualities of *some* Mongoloid races e.g., the Chinese (ethnic) race, make for a dynamic ethnic group that has e.g., spread the Chinese business community from its N.E. Asian base down throughout S.E. Asia. Similar properties are evident in e.g., the Japanese (ethnic) race, and these qualities have been manifested in long-term forward planning and other features which have made Japan a great global economic power. They have created such civilizations as ancient China, Japan, and Central America; and burst forth limited inventive creative genius with the Chinese invention of e.g., gunpowder and the compass. But this is of a substantially lower intensity than one finds in the Caucasian Caucasoids. Thus they must ultimately look to the Japhethites for the great advances, and generally gain their advances in a second hand manner by carefully copying these Aryan concepts, at which point their racial qualities well adapt them to rework Aryan ideas to the nth degree and make improvements along these given lines.

¹⁴³ Jacobs, A.C., “Marriage Laws,” *op. cit.*, p. 6.

(Deut. 23:6); 10:8 (Deut. 23:2,3); Neh.13:1,2 (Deut. 23:3,4)¹⁴⁴. Analysis of the points of intersection between three American Protestant anti-miscegenationists, helps to explain the historical usage of Ezra 9 & 10, and thus Deut. 23:2-8. When he wrote (1954), Dr. Guy Gillespie was the President Emeritus of Belhaven College, Jackson, Mississippi. When they wrote, Dr. Ed Ulrich (1981) and Dr. Marshall Neal (1986) were both of Bob Jones University (BJU), Greenville, South Carolina. Ulrich had been a Member of the Board of Trustees at BJU since 1962, and was Principal at Goldsboro Christian School. Neal was from the School of Religion at BJU.

In broad terms, such writers generally agree on four basic propositions. *Proposition I:* In the *Table of Nations*, the Bible teaches that “nations” are racial “families,” sharing a common biological bond distinctive from other nations, and also a common culture evident in their different tongues (Gen. 10:5,20,31,32)¹⁴⁵. E.g., Negroids are descended from Noah via

¹⁴⁴ The NT equates one’s “nation” with one’s “race” (Greek *genos*). Compare “nation” (AV) and “race” (ASV & NASB) in Mark. 7:26; “nation” (AV), “countrymen” (ASV), “race” (ASV ftn) in Gal. 1:14; “countrymen” (AV & ASV), or “race” (ASV ftn) in II Cor. 11:26 thus manifesting the Biblical teaching that “nations” are racial “families,” Gen. 10:32. (Cf. Acts 7:19, AV & NASB; Greek *suggenes* from *sun* and *genos*, means a “racial associate” or “kinsmen.” Rom. 9:3, AV & NKJV; n.b. Rom. 9:5,7,10,13; cf. Rom 16:7,11,21.) The NT teaches “God” appointed “the bounds of” “habitation” of “nations” (Acts 17:24,26); and thus teaches racial segregation within set “bounds” is God’s will. The NT distinction between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, teaches that where diverse nations or races have come in contact, there should be both a level of contact and a level of segregation. E.g., compare the NT Books of Hebrews and James, addressed to segregated Jewish Christian Churches, as opposed to “the churches of the Gentiles” (Rom. 16:4). Cf. segregated worship in Acts 21. Hence it is right to have e.g., Chinese Christian Churches, black African Christian Churches, and white Caucasian Christian Churches. But the Jewish Christians in Acts 21 had previously had inter-racial fellowship with the Gentile Christian, Trophimus; and rules were laid down for fellowship meals between Jewish and Gentile Christians (Acts 15:20,29; 21:25; Gal. 2:11-14). Thus it is right for Christians of diverse race to sometimes meet together in fellowship. The NT recognizes different racial traits ordained by God. (See Gen. 9:25-27, and compare the Japhethite Gentile in Matt. 8:5-12, with the Canaanite Gentile in Matt. 15:21-28). The NT teaches God’s will for the preservation of the racial groups he made, as seen by the fact that he seeks the preservation of the Jewish and Gentile racial groups, as distinctive racial identities till the end of time (Rom. 9-11). Likewise, in Rev. 5:9; 7:9; God clearly seeks the preservation of different *kindreds*, *tongues*, *peoples*, and *nations*, as a racially visible manifestation of his racially universal salvation to all mankind. Because a racially mixed marriage undermines God’s separation of racial families (e.g., Acts 17:26), and his will for their preservation (Rom. 9-11; Rev. 5:9; 7:9), they are immoral. Therefore, in the same way that e.g., under NT morals, idolatry is immoral (I Cor. 6:9), and so OT morality prohibiting suchlike in e.g., Deut. 27:15 continues to bind Christians; so likewise, under NT Christian morals, the OT morality found in e.g., Ezra 9 & 10, prohibiting mixed marriages involving a difference of “race” (Ezra 9:2, NASB) (or religion, Ezra 9:1), continues to bind Christians in prohibiting racially mixed marriages (as well as religiously mixed marriages subject to I Cor. 7:13-16,39; II Cor. 6:14).

¹⁴⁵ Ulrich, E., “Joint Appendix” for Bob Jones University and Goldsboro Christian Schools, Inc., 1981 in *Bob Jones University case*, 76 L. Ed. 2d, (copy in the US Supreme Court Library), pp. 42-3; Gillespie, G.T., *A Christian View on Segregation*, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

Ham's son, Cush (Gen. 10:6,7), and like the leopard's black "spots," their black "skin" is a distinctive racial feature (Jer. 13:23). Hence in the NT, the Greek word for "Ethiopia" (Acts 8:27) is *Aithiops*, meaning *burnt-face*, referring to the Ethiopian's black skin, and possibly also their wide noses and everted lips. *Proposition 2:* God wills the preservation of racial groups. This is seen e.g., in the story of the Tower of Babel (Gen. 11:1-9), the fact that God set different "bounds of" "habitation" for different "nations" (Acts 17:26; cf. Gen. 10:32; Deut. 32:8), or in the preservation of the Jewish race in the OT (Gen. 11:10-29) and NT. The Jewish race is descended from Noah via Shem, Arphaxad, Eber (or Heber, from which comes the term "Hebrew"), Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Gen. 10:22,24,25; Luke 3:33-36; Rom. 9:7,10,13). The NT distinguishes between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians; and in Rom. 9-11, God clearly seeks the preservation of the Jewish and Gentile racial groups, as distinctive racial identities till the end of time. Likewise, in Rev. 5:9; 7:9; God clearly seeks the preservation of different *kindreds, tongues, peoples, and nations*, as a racially visible manifestation of his racially universal salvation to all mankind¹⁴⁶. *Proposition 3:* Because inter-racial marriage undermines God's creation of racial families (Gen. 10), and his will for their preservation (Gen. 11:1-9; Rom. 9-11; Rev. 5:9; 7:9), they are immoral. Therefore, under NT Christian morals, the morality found in Ezra 9 & 10; Neh. 13, prohibiting mixed marriages, continues to bind Christians with respect to racially mixed marriages¹⁴⁷ (as well as remaining relevant to religiously mixed marriages subject to I Cor. 7:13-16,39; II Cor. 6:14). *Proposition 4.* Nature itself also teaches us that miscegenation is wrong. God never meant the races to enter mixed marriages; if he had, he would not have made separate and distinct races¹⁴⁸.

An interesting comparison exists between the 1966 *General Synod of Bloemfontein* (Dutch Reformed) and Guy Gillespie (Presbyterian), on the usage of Ezra 9 & 10 and Acts 17:26, with anti-miscegenation statutes. The *Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa*, held at the *General Synod of Bloemfontein* (1966) that, "A mixed marriage" "between people of different races" "cannot fulfill all the essential requirements laid down for marriage by Holy Scripture, and must be rejected as impermissible." They further held that, "As sovereign in its own right and acting in the interests of the peoples concerned and for the welfare of the whole community, the Christian state under given circumstances would be justified in taking legislative action and prohibiting racial mixing and mixed marriages." This would be justified where "the level of civilisation and the spiritual and moral values and distinctive character of the people were endangered by the weight of numbers of 'strangers,' or if the distinctive existence and the maintenance of a peculiar identity of the people is threatened." Reference was made to such Scriptures as e.g., "Gen. 10:32;" "Gen. 11;" "Ezra 9:1-5; 12-15;" "Neh. 13:25-27;" "Acts 17:26"¹⁴⁹. Likewise Guy Gillespie, of the *Presbyterian Church*

¹⁴⁶ Neal, M., *Race Relations*, Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina, USA, 1986, pp. 2-4,7; Ulrich, *op. cit.*, p. 42; Gillespie, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-10;12-13.

¹⁴⁷ Neal, *op. cit.*, p. 5 ("Neh. 13:1-3"); Ulrich, *op. cit.*, p. 42 ("Ezra 9 and 10; Neh. 13:1-31"); Gillespie, *op. cit.*, p. 10 ("Ezra, chapters 9-10").

¹⁴⁸ Neal, *op. cit.*, p. 8 ("I Cor. 11:14;" "Rom. 2:15"); Ulrich, *op. cit.*, p. 42 ("His will" "revealed in the nature of his creation"); Gillespie, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6. (Cf. Barnett, L.D., "Students' Anticipations of Persons and Arguments Opposing Interracial Dating," *Marriage and Family Living*, 1963, p. 356.)

¹⁴⁹ *Human Relations in South Africa*, Information Bureau of the Dutch Reformed

in the U.S.A., said that “laws prohibiting intermarriage between” e.g., “the white and negro races” in various American “states” (as at 1954), were “a well considered and time-tested American policy,” supported by such Scriptures as e.g., the way “our Lord,” “in dealing with the Syro-Phoenician woman,” “takes particular care to emphasize the different status of the two races, before granting her request” (Gen. 9:25,26; Matt. 15:21-28; Mark 7:24-30); “Acts 17:24-26;” “Gen. 11;” and “Ezra’s condemnation of mixed marriages (Ezra, chapters 9-10)¹⁵⁰.” In both instances, the fact that the mixed marriages of Ezra 9 & 10 included a component of “seed” (AV) or “race” (NASB) (Ezra 9:2), (as well as religion, Ezra 9:1), is thus relevant to Ezra 9:12 (Deut. 23:6) & Ezra 10:8 (Deut. 23:2,3), and therefore the concept of bastardy in Deut. 23:2-8.

For example, as at 1964, Texas and Tennessee forbade the mixed marriages of Whites and Negroes *through to the third generation* i.e., with mulattoes (half-castes), quadroons (quarter-castes), and octoroons (octo-castes); whereas Indiana and Missouri forbade the mixed marriages of Whites and Negroes *through to the fourth generation* (Deut. 5:9; 23:2,8). Deut. 23:2,3 says of a “bastard,” “even to their tenth generation shall they not enter into the congregation of the Lord for ever” (AV). I think the meaning of “for ever” in Deut. 23:3, is that those to whom the ten generations of bastardy apply, shall “for ever” “not enter the

Church, Johannesburg, South Africa, 1966, p. 3, “Mixed Marriages” pp. 6-10. Compare “bastard” (Hebrew *mamzer*) (Deut. 23:2), which in Zech. 9:6 is translated as “a bastard race” (ASV ftn), “mongrel race” (NASB) or “mixed race” (NKJV); with the South African use of “bastard.” The admixture of Whites with Hottentots gave rise to the “Cape Coloureds,” historically known as moral “bastards” in South Africa, irrespective of the legal status of the mixed marriage that they came from. Thus “bastard” or Afrikaans *bastaard* means, “A person of mixed breed” E.g., “1790 E. HELME tr. *Le Vaillant’s Travels into Africa* II. 8:163, I mean to speak of the natural children which have sprung from an intercourse of the Whites and the female Hottentots, or between these same women and the negroes. They are commonly known at the Cape under the appellation of Bastards.” “1900 A.H. KEANE *Boer States* 6:85 Many are in fact ‘Bastaards,’ that is to say, Hottentot-Dutch half breeds.” (*Oxford Dictionary*, Vol. 1, 1989, “bastard” meaning A.1.b., p. 990,991). The Capoid secondary race (named after the *Cape* of Good Hope). *Head Hair*: tight, woolly, & black; *Male facial & body hair*: slight; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: broad; *Prognathism*: slight; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: dark (yellowish-brown); *Stature*: very short. *Other features*: Flat face, prominent forehead, wrinkles, thin lips, and slanty eye. Capoids have two tertiary races: Hottentots and Kalahari Bushmen. The Hottentots have longer and narrower heads than the Kalahari Bushmen; and many Hottentot adult males lack armpit or pubic hair. The female Kalahari Bushmen often show large fat deposits in the buttocks (steatopygia), and a high placement of nipples on both sexes. Ham is clearly the patriarch of Africa, and so on general principles, the Capoid are Hamitic. This is further manifested in the fact that “Ham” means “black;” and Africa is “the land of Ham” since “land of Ham” and “the Red Sea” on the Arabian Peninsula are in poetical parallel in Ps. 106:33, thus making the designation wider than just “Egypt” (Ps. 106:21), which is also put in poetical parallel with the “land of Ham” in Ps. 105:23; and the Capoids are both black and African. The Hottentots and Kalahari Bushmen share a unique linguistic family, and the “the Hottentots of South Africa believe they are descended from Noh” (cf. Greek “Noe” in Matt. 24:37,38; Luke 3:36; 17:26,27) “and Hingnoh while the Nama Hottentots have a deluge story” (Filby, F., *The Flood Reconsidered*, Pickering & Inglis, London, 1970, p. 53).

¹⁵⁰ Gillespie, G.T., *A Christian View on Segregation*, op. cit., pp. 8-13.

congregation of the Lord, i.e., “even to the tenth generation, shall ever enter the assembly of the Lord” (NASB). But others may disagree with this interpretation of Deut. 23:3,4 and take “for ever” (AV) to mean any descendants of a mixed marriage, in which the “tenth generation” is a graded increase i.e., after 3 or 4 generations they are bastards, after 10 generations they are bastards, their descendants are bastards “for ever” (Deut. 23:3 AV). In support of which, referring to this law in Neh. 13:1,3, Nehemiah says, “the Ammonite and Moabite should not come into the congregation of God for ever” (AV), or in my opinion, he says, “no Ammonite or Moabite should ever enter the assembly of God” (NASB). And this was then applied as a manifesting a general law against mixed marriages (Deut. 23:2), because, “when they had heard the law,” “they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude,” i.e., not just Moabites and Ammonites, but Philistines from “Ashdod” (Neh. 13:23). Notably then, e.g., Alabama, Oklahoma, and Virginia, forbade the mixed marriages of Whites and Negroes or any *descendants of Negroes* i.e., “for ever” (Deut. 23:3; Neh. 13:1). Before 1927, Alabama law forbade marriage between Caucasians and Negroes up to octroons (one-eighth negro) i.e., up to a great-grandfather who was a full-blooded negro. But following a change to the Alabama constitution, after 1927 the prohibition extended to anyone with any Negro ancestry. Such persons were jailed for 2-7 years, and also disqualified from voting. Likewise, the law of Georgia stated that whites could not marry “negroes, mulattoes, mestizoes, *and their descendants*, having any ascertainable trace of either Negro or African, West Indian, or Asiatic Indian blood in their veins¹⁵¹.”

Significantly, no American jurisdictions ever imposed the death penalty for mixed marriages. For example, as at 1964, Virginia imposed a penalty of 1-5 years imprisonments on persons entering a legally void mixed marriage between “Whites and Negroes, or any descendants of Negroes,” and a \$200 fine on a functionary conducting such a union. Wyoming imposed a \$100-\$1,000 fine and/or 1-5 years imprisonment on legally void mixed marriages between “Whites and Negroes or mulattoes, Whites and Orientals, Whites and Malaysians¹⁵²,” with possible penalties against a functionary of such a marriage of \$100-\$1,000 and/or 1-5 years imprisonment. Maryland imposed penalties of 1½-10 years imprisonment for legally void mixed marriages between “Whites and Negroes or descendants

¹⁵¹ See Fowler, D.H., *op. cit.*, p. 343 (Alabama Acts, 1927), p. 362 (Georgia Acts, 1927), pp. 412-3 (Oklahoma Laws 1897, 1907-08), p. 435 (Virginia Laws 1924).

¹⁵² The Mongoloid secondary race (or “The Mongolic Group,”) (*Head Hair*: black & straight; *Prognathism*: medium; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: brown) has five tertiary races. 1) Mongolians (north-east Asia): *Male facial & body hair*: slight; *Head size*: broad; *Nose*: medium; *Eyes*: slanty shaped; *Stature*: below average. For instance, Mongolians, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese. The pug nosed Mongolian ethnic race artistically types the Mongolic quaternary race, Mongolic tertiary race, and Mongoloid secondary race. The Mongolic quaternary race e.g., Chinese, has large broad flattish faces, and skin that is a yellowish hue of brown, especially in old age, and so contrasts with the Japanese and Korean ethnic races (which though part of the same Mongolian tertiary race, do not belong to the Mongolic quaternary race, and) who have lighter brown skins. 2) The Malaysians of S.E. Asia and the Malay Archipelago: *Male facial & body hair*: slight; *Head size*: medium to broad; *Nose*: medium width noses that are slightly concave with a depressed root; *Skin*: dark brown; *Stature*: below average. 3) Eskimos (see ftn. 56 above). 4) American Indians or red-skins (see above). 5) The Ainu of North Japan are Mongoloid (*Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: medium; *Prognathism*: medium; *Skin*: light brown; *Stature*: medium) (*Head Hair*: wavy & black; *Male facial & body hair*: abundant; *Eyes*: variable, usually brown but occasionally greenish).

of Negroes through the third generation; Malaysians and Negroes or descendants of Negroes through the third generation,” with a fine for any functionary of the marriage. Mississippi had a fine of \$500 and/or up to 10 year imprisonment for legally void mixed marriages between “Whites and Negroes or descendants of Negroes through the fourth generation; Whites and Orientals or descendants of Orientals through the fourth generation.” Georgia imposed penalties of 1-2 years imprisonment for legally void mixed marriages between “Whites and any person with Negro, West Indian, or Asiatic Indian ancestry.¹⁵³” North Carolina imposed 4 months to 10 years imprisonment for legally void mixed marriages

¹⁵³ The Australoid secondary race has five tertiary races, subdivided into *Dravidic Australoids* and *Negritic Australoids*. Shem’s son Elam is the Australoid progenitor (Gen. 10:22). The Elamite and Dravidian languages came from the same parent language (McAlpin, D.W., “Proto-Elamo-Dravidian: The evidence and its implications,” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 1981, Vol. 71, Pt. 3, pp. 1-155). The Elamite capital of Shushan or Susa was one of the five major cities of the Medo-Persian Empire, and included a “palace” (Neh. 1:1; Esther 1:2; Dan. 8:2). The Elamites in Bible times are easily the most impressive group of Australoids. The *Dravidic Australoids* subdivide into three tertiary races. 1) Dravidians of India and Sri Lanka (*Head Hair*: wavy to woolly & black; *Male facial & body hair*: moderate to medium; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: broad; *Prognathism*: medium; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: dark brown; *Stature*: medium). The picture in Rev. 18:11,13,15 includes the Dravidian “cinnamon” “merchants” of South India and Ceylon / Sri Lanka. Japhethites settled east of the Elamites. Miscegenation with Aryans in and around the north of India created a further ethnic geographical barrier between the Elamite Australoids around southern Mesopotamia and the Dravidian Australoids in the south of India, and produced an Aryan speaking Dravidian-Caucasian admixed population in the region of, and around, north India. 2) Dark Vedda of Farther India into the East Indies (interior Ceylon/ Sri Lanka, Nicobar Islands, some of the Moi of Indo-China, Senoi or Sukai of Malay Peninsula, Toala of Celebes). (*Head Hair*: wavy & black; *Male facial & body hair*: moderate; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: broad; *Prognathism*: medium *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: brown; *Stature*: short. *Other features*: brows knit, eyes deep-set, large mouth, jaws peaked, male facial hair medium, they possibly have some Mongoloid admixture. 3) Australian Aborigines. (*Head Hair*: wavy & black; *Male facial & body hair*: moderate to abundant; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: broad; *Prognathism*: strong; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: dark brown to black; *Stature*: medium. *Other features*: Large toothed, long-legged, heavy eyebrow ridges.) Aborigines generally have better vision than other races, and an excellent visual memory for shapes. Hence they make excellent trackers, and have been profitably used as such by Police. The *Negritic Australoids* subdivide into two tertiary races. Human Genome genetic research has proven them to be Australoid and not, as some thought, Negroid, e.g., their Australoid blood group is unknown among Negroids. Nevertheless, the phenotypic similarities of the Negritic Australoids to Negroids is quite astounding. “Negrito” is Spanish for “little Negro,” and like the African Negroid *Negrillo*, the Australoid *Negrito* is a pygmy. 4) *Negrito* of South-East Asia and Oceania (*Head Hair*: black, woolly, and fuzzy; *Body Hair*: relatively slight male facial and body hair; *Prognathism*: strong; *Head size*: broad; *Nose*: broad; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: black; *Stature*: very short). 5) *Melanesians* of Oceania e.g. Papua New Guinea. “Papua” is a Malay word meaning “frizzled” with reference to the Papuans hair, and “New Guinea” was named after Guinea in Negroid Africa. (*Head Hair*: fuzzy or frizzy hair very similar to, though not identical with, Negroid hair; *Body Hair*: relatively slight male facial and body hair; *Prognathism*: strong; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: broad; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: dark brown, in parts of PNG, black; *Stature*: medium).

between “whites and Negroes or Indians or descendants of Negroes or Indians through the third generation; Cherokee Indians of Robeson County and Negroes or descendants of Negroes through the third generation.” (Such unions were void and the children bastards.) Other American States likewise forbade racially mixed marriages between diverse racial groups with a clear presence in their jurisdiction¹⁵⁴.

But in my opinion, these jurisdictions were unwise to not allow juries to impose the death penalty for miscegenation. In practice, various Deep South American states allowed the lynching of miscegenationists (or at least the coloured party to this moral crime), and there was an understanding that no criminal prosecution for murder would ever come about on the vigilantes doing the lynching. In the event that this understanding were violated by an independent law enforcement officer, it was further understood that a jury, drawn from the state, would always give a so called “perverse verdict,” i.e., always acquit a white man or group of white men from murder, if so charged. Such practices blurred the line between what was *the law* and *what was legal*. It meant that there was a sense in which vigilantes were “legal,” yet simultaneously, a sense in which they did not represent “the law.” The idea of masked white vigilantes, working with law enforcement officers, received support in such popularized images as “the Lone Ranger” who was a readily recognizable symbol of “a USA good guy,” or “Batman,” and these ideas were cross-applicable to a variety of vigilante groups, including, though not limited to, the Ku Klux Klan.

The popular usage of vigilantes to control any “nigger problem” that might arise, was also reflected in a well known nursery rhyme, whose first and last line are sometimes encrypted in sound-alike letters (e.g., Eany, meany, miney, mo). Two white men would grab a “problem nigger.” “‘e [‘e = he i.e., man 1] knee [Man 1 knees the “nigger”], Me Knee [Man 2 knees the “nigger”], My Knee Mo [“Mo” = moustache area, Man 2 grabs the “nigger’s” head, and brings it down on his knee in the mouth area]; Catch a nigger by the toe [grab the “nigger” around the foot and trip him up so he falls on the ground]; if he squeals let him go [if the technique works, he is released]; ‘e knee [Man 1 knees the “nigger” on the ground], Me knee [Man 2 knees the “nigger” on the ground]; My knee Mo [Man 2 knees the “nigger” on the ground in the mouth area].” Of course the question arises, “What if he doesn’t ‘squeal’?” Alas, having made these vigilantes judge and jury over the black man, it was impossible to deny them the right of a judge and jury to execute; and thus the lynch mob may well be the next step.

On the one hand, it must be admitted that the usage of vigilantes was a quick and cheap way to deal with the largely unwanted presence of negroes in a white man’s land. It must also be admitted that the negro, is all too often a very cocky individual, since lacking the higher IQ of the white man, but wanting an equality with the white man that Nature’s God denies him; he may turn to violence and the arrogant claim of equality with the white man. Thus many so called “nigger problems” arise. The least honourable among them, also lust after the forbidden delicacies of the white woman, and their evil should be restrained. But on the other hand, not all white men are good and honourable men, who exercise such vigilante powers over the negro with wisdom and prudence. There are many white men who are base, carnal, and worthless fellows, sometimes called with justification, “white trash.” Moreover, all power corrupts we frail fallen humans, and absolute power corrupts we frail

¹⁵⁴ Barnett, L.D., “Anti-Miscegenation Laws,” *The Family Life Coordinator*, 1964, pp. 95-7.

fallen humans absolutely. The sad truth was that this kind of power, once allowed to be established as the power of the vigilante, all too easily turned on given occasions to uncontrolled and unchecked murder of negroes. Thus in a worse case scenario (and certainly not all cases were like this,) ungodly whites could e.g., target a godly black man, and under the pretext of vigilant powers to control a “nigger problem,” persecute a saint of God, even unto death. Though I am no friend of the racial desegregationist, nor am I friend of such vigilantes. The usage of such vigilantes led to a low value of human life with respect to Negroes, whose conduct could attract the lynch mob at their whim. There were no proper legal safeguards and checks operating when such vigilantes dressed in Ku Klux Klan garbs, became judge and jury by permissive State practice. The rule of law with its court-room safeguards was in my opinion greatly compromised by a legal system that blurred boundaries between vigilantes who were “legal,” and vigilantes who simultaneously were not enacting “the law” as determined by legislatures and judicial common law. I think the failure of the legal system to deal directly with these matters through black-letter statute law and court-room cases, and to correspondingly have law officers enforce the Divine decree, “He that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword” (Rev. 13:10), was a great wickedness.

It seems to me that other solutions needed to be found than these vigilantes. E.g., deputizing a posse by the local sheriff to deal with any serious “nigger problem,” where there was a general outbreak of lawlessness by them, such as occurred in the “civil rights” desegregationist movement, would strike me as just, necessary, and wise. But all such actions should have been carefully documented, proceeded according to law, and checked by an independent, out of town, review officer. Police inspectors with covert assistants, should then have roamed the state, to ensure that abuses such as those of the vigilante lynch mobs did not occur, or if they did, they were punished. But this was not the practice.

With respect to the specific issue of lynching miscegenationists, I think the proper response for Deep South State governments in this situation is to make miscegenation a potential capital crime, i.e., give a jury the option of voting for the death penalty in any miscegenation case, once a guilty verdict has been found. But the penalty should apply equally to the white person and coloured person engaging in consensual miscegenation, so that both parties fate should be determined by the same one jury vote. The fact that this was not done meant that what many people thought was the woefully inadequate penalty of imprisonment, coupled with the known State governmental policy of allowing vigilantes to lynch miscegenationists (and others), led to a break-down in proper standards of law and order.

Therefore in over 330 years of prohibiting mixed marriages in America between the 1630s and 1960s (till the sexually permissive libertine US Supreme Court invalidated such godly laws¹⁵⁵), *the death penalty was never used* in law for those guilty of entering a mixed

¹⁵⁵ The *Dick Loving case* (US Supreme Ct.), 388 U.S. 1 (1967). This was part of a wider racial desegregationist campaign. Prominent leaders of this wicked movement included, “Reverend” Jim Jones (1931-1978). Based in San Francisco, California, USA, he pioneered and was a chief spokesman for anti-racist ideology and practice in church and state. He was released from his position as a Methodist preacher in Indianapolis when he started to target and increase the numbers of coloureds in the congregation. He then proclaimed himself a “socialist” and opened his own church. He pioneered the practice of racially integrated churches in America. He and his wife adopted Negroid and Mongoloid children. In 1977 he moved about 1,000 followers from California to Jonestown, Guyana, (in

marriage. However, in practice, some US State governments allowed vigilantes to execute such miscreants by lynching, though I consider that this was an unwise and undesirable policy, and the State should have allowed a jury to vote for execution in any miscegenation case. Two wrongs do not make a right. It is one thing for the State, through law to execute criminals guilty of such heinous crimes as miscegenation; it is quite another thing for the government to allow vigilantes to take the law into their own hands, and acting as both judge and jury, then kill such admittedly disgusting criminals.

The fact that prohibition of mixed marriages statutes, dealing with inter-religious and/or inter-racial unions, and dating from the time of the second stage of the Reformation in the seventeenth century, *never imposed the death penalty at law*, is particularly significant when it is recognized that many of these statutes used Biblical language and/or concepts, relating Deut. 5:9 to Deut. 23:2-8, and thus also reflecting the usage of Ezra 9 & 10 (Ezra 9:12 & Deut. 23:6; Ezra 10:8 & Deut. 23:2,3); and Neh. 13 (Neh.13:1,2 & Deut. 23:3,4). That is because such prohibition of mixed marriages statutes reflected a view in both law and society, that mixed marriages were prohibited by the Bible, and the Scriptures do not require that this offence is a capital crime. In my opinion, such states should have been modified to allow a jury to vote for execution of miscegenationists, and an allusion made to Gen. 6:11 and Dan. 2:43,44 in the statute i.e., at the relevant section some reference to a jury returning a guilty verdict, to then have to further vote to decide if the death penalty should in this instance apply to those who being morally “*corrupt*,” have “*mixed*” or “*mingled themselves with the seed of men of a diverse race*”¹⁵⁶.

South America,) where signs read e.g., “Black is Beautiful.” One Negro resident of Jonestown said, “Jonestown to me is a community where ... people of all different races can live together in a harmonious way, [and] where there’s no ... sexism” Like many other advocates of such “human rights,” “Reverend” Jim Jones ruthlessly suppressed free speech expressing racist or sexist views at Jonestown. In 1978, some of his followers first murdered a USA Congressman and four of his party who were visiting Jonestown; and then at Jim Jones’ direction, about 1,000 of his followers committed mass suicide at Jonestown (“The Jonestown Massacre,” *Great Crimes & Trials of the Twentieth Century*, ABC TV, Australia, Negus/Martin Productions, 1992.) What saith the Word of God about such self-murderers? The “murderers” “shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8). Another leader was “Reverend” Martin King Jr. (1929-1968). King was a religiously liberal negro who claimed Christ’s virgin birth was “a mythological story” (*National Observer*, 30 Dec., 1963), and who denied the reality of hell, saying in *Ebony* (Jan 1961), “I do not believe in hell as a place of literal burning fire” (Cloud, D.W., *Evangelicals & Rome*, Way of Life Literature, Washington, USA, 1999, p. 80). During his lifetime, the USA’s *Federal Bureau of Intelligence* (FBI), wisely undertook close surveillance of this evil man. They documented in e.g., tape recordings, that in private King told vulgar jokes, used obscene language, and was a serial adulterer (*Someone’s Watching*, Part 1, New York Times Television, for Discovery Times Channel, 2004). What saith the Word of God of such a promiscuous adulterer? “Be not deceived,” “adulterers” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (I Cor. 6:9).

¹⁵⁶ As a general rule, religious separation (I Cor. 7:39) and racial separation (I Cor. 7:18-20) go together, and religious and racial desegregation go together (Gen. 6; Ezra 9 & 10). I.e., those who understand that the church must practice religious purity and religious separation, are in a better position to cross-apply this thinking, and understand that the nation

Thus the antediluvians were morally “corrupt” (Gen. 6:11,12), as seen in impure worship involving blasphemy, sabbath-breaking, and theft (Gen. 4:3-7; cf. Gen. 2:1-3); polygamy (Gen. 4:19), gluttony, drunkenness, and mixed marriages (Gen. 6:1-4; Matt. 24:38 cf. Matt. 11:19; 24:49). While such “wickedness” was an important background factor to the flood, it would seem that its immediate cause was both a “corrupt” society which continued to engage in miscegenation notwithstanding the imposition of age reduction penalties (Gen. 6:1-3;10); and the presence of “violence” (Gen. 6:11,13). The reason for Noah’s Flood is thus clearly connected with the fact that the antediluvian world “was filled with violence” (Gen. 6:11-13); which is the second matter itemized in Gen. 6, although it interlocks with the third matter dealt itemized in Gen. 4, namely, murder, which is portrayed as happening more widely than just one man, with Cain murdering Abel (Gen. 4:8-15), and Lamech also murdering “a man” (Gen. 4:23).

Indeed, “God” specifically “said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the

must practice racial purity and racial separation. The post World War II ecumenical compromise, (and the later inter-faith compromise with religions that do not even profess to be Christian,) that broke down religious separation, was paralleled in society by a breakdown of race based Caucasian nationalism in countries like the UK and Australia, and a break down in white supremacist racial segregation in the USA. This was then developed in law and society with e.g., the belief that if discrimination on the basis of race was wrong (racism), so was discrimination on the basis of sex (sexism). If discrimination to protect a racial family by racial segregation was wrong, and such a racial family could be lawfully killed by desegregation and miscegenation; and if any discrimination against a woman was wrong; then discrimination to protect a human family by patriarchal oversight, caused based divorce for weighty causes, or prohibitions on abortion, were also wrong. If racial discrimination against half-castes, quarter-castes, and other mixed breeds was wrong, so was discrimination against any bastard, and so discrimination against fornication and adultery was wrong. If discrimination against coloureds, women, miscegenation, fornication, and adultery was wrong, so was discrimination against homosexuality, etc. . Not without reason then, do the anti-discrimination statutes list discrimination on the basis of race as their first major plank for libertinism. And not without reason then, do the neo-evangelicals list the ecumenical movement (religious desegregation) and anti-racism as major planks in their program (e.g., racial desegregation, racially mixed marriages, and in some instances opposition to original sin since it is a racial curse on the human race because of what man’s progenitor, Adam did). E.g., the neo-evangelical Bernard Ramm (1916-1992), showed the start of this process by marring what was generally an excellent work, *Protestant Christian Evidences* (1953), through promoting Billy Graham, the ecumenical compromise, and the religiously liberal *Revised Standard Version* (Moody, Chicago, reprint 1978, e.g. pp. 20,30,35-6,73,166,227,229,240). He then rejected Biblical racial teachings in Gen. 9 & 10 (*The Christian View of Science & Scripture*, Paternoster, London, 1955, pp. 233-234). Having denied the racial curses and blessings in Gen. 9:25-27; he then forsook his originally orthodox position that “The sinnerhood of man is traced to a *historical fall*” (*Protestant Christian Evidences, op. cit.*, p. 245), and first doubted (*Handbook of Contemporary Theology*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1966, at “Adam” and “Fall”), and then denied, the racial curse of original sin from Adam on his descendants, i.e., the human race (*Offense To Reason*, Harper & Row, San Francisco, 1985 e.g., pp. 27-28,51,76).

earth” (Gen. 6:13). The terminology of a place being “filled with violence,” is also found in e.g., Ezek. 7:23; 8:17; 28:16; and we cannot doubt that this is focused on serious assaults and murders (e.g., Ezek. 9:9; 16:36,38; 18:10-13; 22:3-27; 23:37,45; 24:6-9). For example, referring to such bloodshed, Ezekiel says, “the land is full of bloody crimes, and the city is full of violence” (Ezek. 7:23). In the antediluvian world, the patriarch of Cain’s race was a murderer (Gen. 4:8; I John 3:12), and at the time of the flood, the last significant Cainite who is mentioned in the genealogies is the murderer Lamech (Gen. 4:23,24). Therefore, while the antediluvians were involved in much “wickedness” (Gen. 6:5), *one element of the moral message from Noah’s Flood is that murderers should be executed. Thus the voice of nature in Noah’s Flood, declared that murder is a capital crime. Hence after the flood, Noah received a universal precept that the governments of all nations (Gen. 10) were meant to enact, namely, “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man” (Gen. 9:6).*

God judged the heathen nations of Canaan, who though not having the written divine law, were guilty of murder (Lev. 18:21). For by godly *reason* one can both discern that murder is immoral, and also deduce that justice requires the penalty of “life for life” (Deut. 19:21), so that those who engage in “murder” “are worthy of death” (Rom. 1:29,32). Moreover, *the express law of God* delivered to the patriarchs of all nations after the Flood, declares that murder is a capital crime. That Gen 9:6 is a universal precept, is further seen in the fact that it was not only enacted under the Mosaical civil law which no longer binds Christians (Exod. 21:12; Lev. 20:2; 24:17; Num. 35:31; Deut. 19:11-13); but it also forms part of NT law (Matt. 26:52), as St. John the Divine says, “he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword” (Rev. 13:10). This terminology means a murderer must be executed.

But why use the terminology of a “sword” in Matt. 26:52; Rev. 13:10? Certainly it is not because all murders are committed by swords (though some are, Amos 1:11; Acts 12:2), or that all executions are by a sword (though some are, Exod. 32:27,28); e.g., Scripture also refers to executions by stoning (Lev. 20:2), burning (Lev. 20:14), and hanging on a tree (Deut. 21:22,23), for instance, crucifixion (John 19:18,31-37; Gal. 3:13). But “the sword” is sometimes used in Scripture as the symbol of lawful State authority, and hence we read “the higher powers” in government are “of God,” and a state “minister” “beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil” (Rom. 13:1,4). Thus “he that killeth with sword” is a literary stylistic device, to provide a poetical parallel with “must be killed with the sword.” It contrasts the powers of a citizen who has no right to *kill with the sword* (unless so authorized by the government as a member of the police force or armed forces), with those of the state, so that “must be killed with the sword” (Rev. 13:10) is used to make the point that *only the government* may lawfully execute such murderers (Rom. 13:4), i.e., this is *not* to be done as a *personal revenge killing* by aggrieved relatives, friends, or community vigilantes (Matt. 5:38-42).

Therefore, *the voice of nature and of reason*, as well as *the express law of God*, declares that wilful murderers (as opposed to those who commit manslaughter), are to be executed. And while commutation of the death penalty in some circumstances is allowed (e.g., King David killing Uriah), as a general rule, the death penalty should be upheld. Thus God will hold to account at their judgement, all lawmakers, judges, jurists, juries, and other relevant persons, who in any way oppose, hinder, or block capital punishment for murder (Ps. 2:10-12). Such persons, will find on the Day of Judgement, that they have been fighting against God himself, and that they are without excuse before Nature’s God, whose law of *life*

for life is discoverable to all men through godly *reason*. Though a personal revenge killing is wrong, and indeed constitutes another murder, community *retribution* via the lawful authorities is right.

The classic English law jurist, William Blackstone, said, “Upon these two foundation, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, no human laws should be suffered to contradict these.” “To instance in the case of murder: this is expressly forbidden by the divine” “law,” “and demonstrably by the natural law; and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime.” Hence, “if any human law should allow or enjoin us to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine” “law.”¹⁵⁷ In discussing “deliberate and wilful murder,” Blackstone refers to “the general precept to Noah” in “Gen. 9:6,” “that ‘whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed’.” He notes that “over and above the general precept to Noah,” “the Mosaical law” in “Numb. 35:31” was “very emphatical in prohibiting the pardon of murderers.” Certainly Blackstone does not think that the Mosaical law still binds us. E.g., in discussing the English common law’s historical practice of having an “atrocious” “murderer” “hung upon a gibbet,” “the like,” he says in the 1760s, “is still sometimes practised in the case of notorious thieves,” and in the case of murderers, “the judge may direct his” dead “body to be afterwards hung in chains.” (As occurred after the Restoration with the body of Oliver Cromwell, who was a party to the murder of King Charles I in 1649, and the attempted murder of King Charles II in 1651. Cromwell’s head was hung up at London’s Westminster Hall, and the rest of his body hung in chains at Tyburn in London’s Hyde Park.) Blackstone observes, “This, being quite contrary to the express command of the Mosaical law,” “‘The body of a malefactor shall not remain all night upon the tree; but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day; that the land be not defiled.’ Deut. 21:23,” “seems to have been borrowed from the civil law: which, besides the terror of the example, gives also another reason for this practice,” namely, “that it is a comfortable sight to the relations and friends of the deceased.” But finding in “Gen. 9:6” a “general precept to Noah,” he says, “therefore our law has provided one course of prosecution, (that by appeal, of which hereafter,) wherein the king himself is excluded the power of pardoning murder.” In this context, the ear of King Henry VIII to *the voice of nature and of reason* as well as *the express law of God*, is once again important, since Blackstone records that “by several statutes,” starting with “23 Hen. VIII. c. 1,” “the benefit of clergy is taken away from murderers,” and thus murderers could no longer hope to evade the death penalty by having their case transferred to an ecclesiastical court.¹⁵⁸

In understanding the *voice of nature* with respect to punishments, it is important to distinguish between God’s punishment as *a primary cause* and God’s punishment as *a secondary cause*. For example, with respect to murder, God acting supernaturally to destroy the antediluvian world with Noah’s Flood (Gen. 4:23; 6:13; 9:6); or with respect to incest, God acting supernaturally to ensure that the union of Henry VIII and his sister-in-law,

¹⁵⁷ I Bl. Com. 42-3.

¹⁵⁸ 4 Bl. Com. 193-4,201-2. In contrast to Blackstone’s usage of Deut. 21:23, the Judaizer Rushdoony, says “the very land itself” “can be defiled even by leaving a hanged man up overnight (Deut. 21:22,23)” (Rushdoony’s *Institutes of Biblical Law, op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 88). This is not “reconstruction” of the historic Protestant Christian State of e.g., England, that Rushdoony is advocating, but a Judaizer’s reconstruction of the OT Jewish State under the false name of “Christian”!

Catherine of Aragon, “shall be childless” (Lev. 20:21); or with respect to sodomy, God acting supernaturally to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19:5; Jude 7); are examples of God’s punishment as a *primary cause* of God’s actions. By contrast, with respect to incest, God acting through laws of genetics that he created and established, to ensure that a union between a man and his blood-related sister shall be childless, as the children of such a union naturally die; or with respect to sodomy, the transmission of AIDS from monkeys to men by bestial sodomy or jabbing with monkey-blood infected sharp implements, thereafter spreading through *forbidden lust’n’blood*; are both examples of God’s punishment as a *secondary cause* flowing from God’s laws. This recognition is not militated against by the fact that some form of cure for the AIDS virus has been found in more recent times, any more than it militates against the fact that various venereal diseases flow from such secondary causes, even if medical cures for them can be found.

Thus this *voice of nature* recognition is found today with respect to *primary causes* in the belief of godly persons in favour of capital punishment for murder; or with respect to *secondary causes* in the belief that incest between closely related persons results in genetic abnormalities or death as a mark of God’s displeasure. Or with respect to *secondary causes* in the belief that the AIDS plague is God’s wrath against *forbidden lust’n’blood*, such as occurs with sexual transmission associated with cuts in the mouth, or bleeding of the anus, in oral or anal homosexual sodomy¹⁵⁹. (In Africa, AIDS is most commonly contracted from the *forbidden lust’n’blood* of promiscuous heterosexual sex, with associated bleeding as a consequence of concomitant venereal disease open sores on the male penis and/or female vagina; although a less common way may be the *forbidden lust’n’blood* of heterosexual anal sodomy¹⁶⁰. In Western countries, AIDS is most commonly contracted either from infected needles by those involved in the *forbidden lust’n’blood* of drug abuse using an infected drug’s needle; or from the *forbidden lust’n’blood* associated with homosexual oral sodomy or anal sodomy¹⁶¹.)

The *Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome* (AIDS) originated in Central or West Africa and arose from cross-species transmission. One AIDS strain came from either a chimpanzee or red-capped mangabey monkey, and a second AIDS strain came from a sooty mangabey monkey. In the 1970s Afro-Caribbean Haitians trekking back and forth to Zaire in Central Africa, contracted AIDS either from sexual promiscuity with infected Africans, or directly from infected monkeys. They then brought the AIDS virus back with them to Haiti. Some of these Haitians then sexually transmitted AIDS to homosexual sodomites in Haiti.

¹⁵⁹ Adams, M., *AIDS: You Just Think You’re Safe*, Dalton Moody Publishers, Los Angeles, USA, 1986; Boys, D., *AIDS: Silent Killer*, Freedom Publications, Florida, USA, 1991.

¹⁶⁰ Court, J.H., & Muir, J.G. (Editors), *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, The indoctrination of a people, Lochinvar-Huntington, Louisiana, USA, 1990, p. 99.

¹⁶¹ The destruction of Sodom was not halted on the basis of there being no righteous persons in it, but on the basis that there were only a statistically very small number of righteous persons in it (Gen. 18:32; 19:15). Likewise, the AIDS plague may affect a statistically small number of innocent persons, such as those given blood-transfusions in an emergency situation where there is no time to screen the blood, and some irresponsible AIDS’ carrier has given the blood. Sadly, the innocent sometimes suffer, because of the guilty.

Homosexuals visiting from the United States of America contracted AIDS from Haitian sodomites, and then spread AIDS through homosexual sodomy into the USA¹⁶².

There are two probable ways AIDS went from monkeys to humans in the black heart of the dark continent. It may have been transmitted by bestial sodomy with a monkey, associated with heathen Haitian voodoo rituals¹⁶³. It may have been transmitted by heathen African sexual cult rituals, in which black Africans take the blood of monkeys and barbarically jab it into the pubic, back, and thigh sections of both males and females as part of a Devilish ritual, in which they believe they will thereby increase sexual sensation during sexual intercourse. Since they thus break their protective skin barrier, the virus may have been transmitted in this manner in a similar way to which it is transmitted by infected needles to intravenous drug abusers¹⁶⁴. Since there are two strains of AIDS, one strain may have originated with a heathen Haitian voodoo ritual of bestial sodomy with a monkey, and the other with pagan African sexual rituals involving humans jabbing themselves with sharp implements containing monkey blood. The belief that the AIDS plague is God's wrath against *forbidden lust'n'blood*, is thus a modern example of those who listen to hear *the voice of nature* from *Nature's God* speaking on moral matters.

A contemporary application of those who hear the *voice of nature*, and see God's wrath against *forbidden lust'n'blood* with the AIDS virus, may be found through reference to AIDS being carried by infected drug's needles. Some people, like myself, support the Malaysian law's trafficking in dangerous drugs penalty (Section 39[B], *Dangerous Drugs Act*, 1952, Malaysia). Malaysian law wisely has a mandatory death penalty for possession of illegal drugs (not all of which are taken intravenously by drug's needles), whether such possession is intended for personal use or sale to others. Though Malaysia executes people for other offenses, such as murder (section 302, *Penal Code*, Malaysia), of about 360 executions in the last 30 to 35 years, the majority have been for trafficking in dangerous drugs. For instance, possession of more than 200 grams of cannabis (which is not taken via a needle), has seen the execution of about 150 criminals (a number of them foreigners). I support such laws, and find in the AIDS plague support for this penalty from Nature's God.

¹⁶² Smith, R.A. (Editor), *Encyclopedia of AIDS, A Social, Political, and Scientific Record of the HIV Epidemic*, Fitzroy Dearborn, Chicago, Illinois, 1998, pp. 52,64,66-7,120,122,262,264,383-4.

¹⁶³ Boys, D., *op. cit.*, p. 25; referring to Slaff, James, and Brubaker, *The AIDS Epidemic*, Warner, New York, USA, 1985. Cf. Sheldon, W., *Voodoo and the Art of Haiti*, Morland Lee, Oxley Press, Nottingham, UK, pp. xiv, 18-20; Desmanles L.G., *The faces of the gods*, Voodoo and Roman Catholicism in Haiti, University of North Carolina Press, USA, 1992, pp. 9,10; Huston, Z., *Voodoo gods*, An inquiry into native myths and magic in Jamaica and Haiti, J.M. Dent, London, UK, 1939, pp. 120b,215; Loederer, R.A., *Voodoo Fire in Haiti*, translated by D.I. Vesey, Doubleday, Doran and Co., Garden City, New York, USA, 1935, pp. 3,16,17; Haining, P. (Ed.), *The Evil People*, Being thirteen strange and terrible accounts of Witchcraft, Black Magic, and Voodoo, Leslie Frewin, London, UK, 1968, pp. 209-14.

¹⁶⁴ Gould, P., *The Slow Plague*, A Geography of the AIDS pandemic, Blackwell, Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA, 1993, pp. 17,213; referring to Kashamura, A., *Famille, sexualite et culture: Essai sur les moeurs sexuelles et les cultures des peuples des Grands Lacs Africains*, Payot, Paris, 1973.

It is a sobering thought to consider that in the 16th century, godly lawmakers were so attuned to hear *the voice of nature*, that King Henry VIII broke with Rome over the death of several children from incest. By contrast, in the 20th and 21st centuries, ungodly lawmakers in the Western World are so deaf to *the voice of nature*, that though millions of people become ill or die from AIDS, they refuse to restrain such sins as sodomy. They gave money to develop the three-fold AIDS antidote, and they put an emphasis on using condoms to try and stop the infection from spreading. They support an AIDS Day which does not condemn the sins of *forbidden lust'n'blood* whereby it is spread, rather than a DAY OF REPENTANCE for the spread of AIDS by *forbidden lust'n'blood*. They are like those described by St. John. “And the rest of the men which were not killed by these plagues,” “repented not” “of their murders” such as abortion, euthanasia, and gratuitous violence in videos, “nor of their sorceries,” e.g., reading horoscopes in newspapers, “nor” (AV) “of their sexual immorality” (NKJV) e.g., fornication, adultery (such as unBiblical divorces with remarriage), pornography, prostitution, and sex scenes in videos, “nor of their thefts” (AV) e.g., robbing God the glory due to his holy name in prayer and thanksgiving (Rev. 9:20,21).

Sadly, this type of thinking, in which lawmakers listen for, and hear, *the voice of nature*, evident in King Henry VIII’s *Execution of Murderers Act* (23 Hen. VIII c. 1), *Sodomy Act* (25 Hen. VIII c. 6; 5 Eliz. I c. 17), or *Incest Acts* (25 Hen. VIII c. 6; 28 Hen. VIII c. 7; 32 Hen. VIII c. 38); came under attack around the middle of the nineteenth century *with respect to God’s punishment as a primary (or immediately originating) cause*. In a great debate between Charles Lyell (1797-1875), and later Charles Darwin (1809-1882) on the one hand; and on the other hand, old earth creationists such as William Whewell (1794-1866) of Cambridge University, Adam Sedgwick (1785-1873) of Cambridge University, Roderick Murchison (1792-1871) of Edinburgh University, and Louis Agassiz (1807-1873) of Harvard University, Lyell promoted a view of earth’s history with geological uniformitarianism (*secondary causes* flowing from established laws of God). This was in opposition to Whewell (a Welsh name in which “w” is twice silent, the “e” is pronounced as an “i” and so the name is pronounced “Hill”), Sedgwick, and Murchison, who promoted a *general* uniformitarianism (*secondary causes* flowing from established laws of God), interspersed at times with *catastrophism*, and which found *some* instances of *natural* catastrophism (*secondary causes* flowing from established laws of God), and *some* instances of *supernatural* catastrophism (*God as a primary cause*), that is, evidence of direct Divine acts beyond sustaining his creation and its laws. Whewell, Sedgwick, and Murchison also saw the hand of a mighty God in creating and sustaining certain natural scientific laws operating in the normative periods of general uniformitarianism and natural catastrophism. Like other (old earth) creationists, Whewell, Sedgwick, and Murchison, considered, e.g., that the creation of species points to a Creator, because species appear suddenly and well formed in different geological layers, possessing only a limited variability, that keeps them within their species. Thus they rejected the transmutation theory of the Frenchman Lamarck, which came from around the era of the French Revolution, and which later was rehashed with the added “theory of natural selection” by Darwin. As, for example, Murchison noted, there is clearly a beginning to, for instance, plants and fish in the Silurian Period (438-408 million years ago)¹⁶⁵.

¹⁶⁵ Whewell, W., “Lyell - Principles of Geology,” *British Critic*, Vol. 17 (1831), pp. 180-206; Murchison, R.I. *Siluria*, John Murray, London, UK, fourth edition, 1867, pp. 476-506.

Shortly after Lyell's *Principles of Geology* were first published, Sedgwick rejected Lyell's naturalistic hypothesis of uniformitarianism, and in response to this, Lyell said, "Sedgwick's attack is the severest, and I shall put forth my strength against him in the second volume."¹⁶⁶ Upon request to review his book in 1859, Sedgwick also rejected Darwin's associated theory of macroevolution which grew from these "conclusions," as based on inaccurate circular "assumptions." Significantly, he also said to Darwin, "There is a moral or metaphysical part of nature as well as a physical. A man who denies this is deep in the mire of folly. 'Tis the crown and glory of organic sciences that it *does*, through *final causes*, link material to moral; and yet *does not* allow us to mingle them in our first conception of laws, and our classification of such laws, whether we consider one side of nature or the other. You have ignored this link; and" "you have done your best in one or two pregnant cases to break it. Were it possible (which, thank God, it is not) to break it, humanity, in my mind, would suffer a damage that might brutalize it, and sink the human race into a lower grade of degradation than any into which it has fallen since its written records tell us of its history"¹⁶⁷.

This link between the recognition (Sedgwick *et al*) or non-recognition (Lyell *et al*) of Nature's God performing miracles evident in geological science, which affects issues of contemporary moral values, again surfaced when Sedgwick's natural law found in his *Discourses* came under attack in the same year of 1859 with the reprinting of Mill's attacks on Sedgwick. Clark and Hughes record that the libertine "John Stuart Mill said all that could be said against it in an elaborate article which he afterwards reprinted in his *Dissertations and Discussion* (1859). (William Whewell, also attacked Mill's "System of Logic," arguing "that there are *two* distinct elements in our knowledge, experience, without, and the mind, within. Mr. Mill derives all our knowledge from experience alone." Mill's "experience alone" has some points of conceptual intersection with Lyell's claim that one must find processes in our geological experiences today by which to understand all past geology)¹⁶⁸.

Mill's attack on Sedgwick is quite significant. Mill's nineteenth century libertine views in *On Liberty* (1859) or *The Subjection of Women* (1861), were *largely, though not entirely* nullified at the time. They were *in large measure* successfully opposed in law and philosophy at the time by, for example, Sir James Fitzjames Stephen's *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity* (1873); and by society at the time due to the much higher influence in it of people with Christian morals, most of whom would have known little to nothing about James Fitzjames Stephen. Both Fitzjames Stephen (1829-1894) and Mill (1806-1873) were Benthamites but in rival schools. (Bentham's utilitarianism says that the greatest overall happiness of the community may be used as a measure to restrain acts against this, e.g., a kleptomaniac may have his happiness restrained as tolerance towards theft is contrary to the overall happiness of society.) Fitzjames Stephen's type of utilitarianism was generally

¹⁶⁶ Clark, J.W. & Hughes T.M., *The Life and Letters of the Reverend Adam Sedgwick*, in two volumes, Vol. 1, pp. 368-70; Vol. 2, p. 357.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, pp. 357-9.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 404-5; referring to Mill, J.S., *Dissertations and Discussions*, London, 1859 in 8 volumes, Vol. 1, p. 95. Rev. William Whewell, President of the Society, Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Geological Society of London, 16 Feb 1838, p. 25; Whewell's *Of Induction*, With special reference to Mr. J.S. Mill's "System of Logic," p. 79.

harmonious with Christian morality, whereas Mill's was not. (Mill's type of libertine utilitarianism was successfully revived in the 1950s and 1960s Western world, in part as a *post facto* justification for men's sins, and in part as an ideology which allowed the legal system to change laws that then emboldened men in their transgressions, and so intensified their libertine wickedness. Thus the increasingly ungodly legal systems of the Western world, have increasingly followed the Mill-Hart type of legal theory in the post World War Two era¹⁶⁹; and thus both to some extent reflected the lusts of the evil element in society, and to some extent intensified and expanded the influence of that evil element in the popular morals of worldly people in society, most of whom would know little to nothing about John Stuart Mill.)

Thus Sedgwick's understanding of natural law was opposed at the geological and scientific level by Lyell and Darwin, and Sedgwick's recognition that the physical world of nature points to a metaphysical and moral element was opposed by Mill. Hence the corrosive effects of Lyell's anti-supernaturalist theory of uniformitarianism and Darwin's theory of macroevolution, manifested in Mill's libertine morals, first broke the nexus between science and both the metaphysical and moral elements. Then Darwinism and this type of anti-supernaturalist uniformitarian thinking became well established in university science faculties and schools over about a hundred years. (For while we old earth creationist Gap School men accept a good deal of uniformitarianism in the geological record, we also see e.g., Divine catastrophism with the sudden disappearance of species followed by the sudden appearance of new species. E.g., the dinosaurs extinction about 64 million years ago, and creation of the next world, albeit with God bringing some other survivor species through; thus marking out for us in the geological record the boundaries between just two of the many "worlds" he created in different geological ages, Heb. 1:2; 11:3.) Then, the foundations having been destroyed (Ps. 11:3), when the French Revolution type Rights of Man (or "Human Rights") that Edmund Burke had opposed, and the libertine type values of Mill that Stephens had opposed, were again promoted in the post World War Two law and society, the people, their lawmakers and judges, their entertainers, and others, proved, on average, an all too easy target for the fleshly lusts and worldly amusements of the Devil's bandwagon, as they progressed on the *broad road* to hell. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:22).

In 1873, Darwin said, "The safest conclusion" about the reality of God as e.g., "first cause," "seems to me that the whole subject is beyond the scope of man's intellect." Darwin says he entertained a "doubt" as to the capacity of man's mind to conclude there is a God, since on his transmutation of species' theory, it has "been developed from a mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animals¹⁷⁰" But while Darwin expressed a "doubt" about the capacity of man to work out if there had been a *first cause*, and thus a *primary act* of God, from which one could reasonably look for other *primary acts* in the creation of species; he *inconsistently* failed to "doubt" if this brain he thought had come from "the lowest animals," was in fact capable of working out origins *without reference to God as a primary cause*, that

¹⁶⁹ Stephens, J.F., *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, 1873, 2nd ed. 1874; Reprint: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967; Cf. Devlin, P., *The Enforcement of Morals*, Oxford Univ., 1965; Hart, H.L.A., *Law, Liberty, and Morality*, Oxford Univ., 1963.

¹⁷⁰ Darwin, F. (Ed.), *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, John Murray, London, 1887, Vol. 1, pp 306-307; Barlow, N. (Ed.), *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin*, Collins, London, 1958, pp. 93.

is, by his own theory of species macroevolution by natural selection. Darwin thus doubted selectively¹⁷¹. “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools” (Rom. 1:22).

It perhaps was, and still is, one of the greatest paradoxes of this era, that as men came to reject the idea of God as a *primary cause*, the greatest scientist of the twentieth century, Albert Einstein (1879-1955), moved out of atheism into a belief in God, as a consequence of discovering that *Energy* [E], equals [=] *mass* [m] times the *speed of light* [c] squared. Before this discovery, atheists such as Einstein had pinned their hopes on an eternal universe. But by this equation, Einstein realized that about 15 billion years ago, the universe must have started with what became known as the *Big Bang*. Through general relativity equations, this explosion can be traced back to a single point and time called “the singularity.” Neither any scientific model nor application of the laws of physics, is able to describe anything before this point. In short, the universe, all its elements, chemicals, and matter, were created by an external power *ex nihilo*, that is, out of nothing. Therefore science shows God as *First Cause*, and so a *primary cause*, at the time of the Big Bang. Thus Einstein moved from atheism to belief in a Creator God¹⁷². But men still rejected the notion of God as a *primary cause*, and refused to recognize “the invisible things of him” which “from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.” “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools” (Rom. 1:20,22)¹⁷³.

In the broad context of this debate, Lyell and Darwin’s views were intrinsically opposed to any idea of *God as a primary cause* acting in the world (e.g., Divine revelation), but they did not necessarily oppose notions of *God as a secondary cause*. For example, in his *Origin of Species* (1859), Charles Darwin (whose unstable mind resulted in never ending fluctuations in his religious belief), specifically rejected any form of catastrophism, and any notion of God as a *primary cause* in the creation of species. Darwin claimed, “species are produced and exterminated by slowly acting and still existing causes, and not by miraculous acts of creation [*God as a primary cause*] and by catastrophes [catastrophism either with *God as a primary cause* or *God as a secondary cause*]. Rather, he claimed, that “with what we know of the laws impressed on matter by the Creator,” “the production and extinction of the past and present inhabitants of the world should have been due to secondary causes” e.g., his principle of natural selection. Because he rejected Whewell’s critique of Mill’s and Lyell’s type of “experience alone” thinking, which contained the inaccurate presupposition that one must find in observable processes going on today, anything that happened in the past, Darwin could not accept that there had been any great “catastrophes” either in the past or future, because of his limited “experience.” Darwin confidently said, “we may feel certain that the ordinary succession by generation has never once been broken, and that no catastrophe has desolated the whole world. Hence we may look with some confidence to a secure future of equally appreciable length.” For Darwin, “natural selection” was thus moving the world on

¹⁷¹ Stenhouse, P. (Editor), “Darwin in Doubt,” *Annals Australasia*, Vol. 115, No 6, Aug. 2004, p. 32.

¹⁷² Hugh N. Ross (b. 1945), *The Fingerprint of God*, Recent Scientific Discoveries Reveal the Unmistakable Identity of the Creator, Promise Pub. Co., California, 1989, pp. 53-59.

¹⁷³ See e.g., the arguments on Intelligent Design by: Philip E. Johnson (b. 1940) *Darwin on Trial*, IVP, Illinois, USA, 1991, *et al*; Michael Behe (b. 1952), *Darwin’s Black Box*, Free Press, New York, USA, 1996; and William Dembski (b. 1960).

an endless “progress toward perfection.” Of course, Darwin knew nothing about such geologically recorded events as the destruction of the world of dinosaurs around 64 million years ago, followed by the creation of a quite different world by Nature’s God¹⁷⁴.

In April 2004, I was privileged to visit Brno (formerly Brunn in Austria-Hungary) in Moravia, Czech (formerly the western part of Czechoslovakia). I there saw St. Thomas’s Augustinian monastery where Gregory Mendel (1822-1884), the founding father of genetics, undertook his experiments on peas, first classifying certain genetic traits. I there saw a statue of Mendel in the Monastery garden (now lawn with some trees), where he started his experiments on peas in 1856, reporting them to the *Brunn Society for the Study of Natural Sciences* in 1865. I also went up to Spilberg Castle which is set on the high ground of a nearby mountain, to get a view of the Monastery from above.

Darwin was ignorant of the laws of genetics that were discovered about the same time by Gregory Mendel. The work of Gregory Mendel was simply not within Darwin’s “experience.” Though Mendelism was unknown to Darwin, it became known to Alfred Wallace, the joint founding father of the *Darwin-Wallace Theory of Natural Selection*. Wallace quickly realized its ramifications, namely, in Mendelism, species have a high level of genetic stability, and so the necessary macroevolutionary “mutations” required by Darwinism are simply not possible, as opposed to microevolutionary changes within a taxonomical genus, species, or subspecies of a genetically rich creature created by God. But working on the presupposition that Darwinism was right, and therefore Mendelism was wrong, Wallace lambasted Mendel’s work on genetics, saying that Mendelism was “ludicrously inadequate as substitutes for the Darwinian factors,” because the “persistency of Mendelian characters is the very opposite of what is needed amid the ever-changing conditions of nature¹⁷⁵.” But continued research has shown that Mendel was right, and therefore Darwin and Wallace were wrong in this matter. The ramifications of this are profound, and mean e.g., that a simple cell ameba or other such creature, could not “macroevolve” to something more complex since it *simply doesn’t have the genetic material to do so, and it can’t “mutate” what it doesn’t have*.

But the work of great creationists such as Whewell or Sedgwick, was not continued in universities, as bigoted Darwinists continued to insist, contrary to the evidence, that all scientific phenomena had to be explained by natural causes; so that natural causes, no matter how improbable or unlikely, alone could be used to explain scientific data. The extent to which this anti-supernaturalist and secularist nonsense has extended is seen in the religiously liberal Alan Richardson’s *Dictionary of Christian Theology* (1969). This includes a section entitled “Methodical Atheism,” which claims, “The progress of modern science was achieved by the crucial recognition that God must not be used as a term of explanation in science. Science by its very nature must employ ‘methodical atheism,’ i.e., commit itself to the principle ... ‘as if there were no God’.” He then attacks religious conservatives saying, “The recent discoveries of some of the ... ‘new theologians’ about the ‘God of the gaps’ shows that even today there are theologians who have not yet learnt the meaning of methodical atheism in science. It is a confusion of thought to imagine that, because ... science must employ this method, scientists must therefore be atheists ...¹⁷⁶.” Such “scientists” may not always “be

¹⁷⁴ Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, Chapter 14, *Recapitulation & Conclusion*.

¹⁷⁵ Wallace, A.R., *The World of Life*, Chapman & Hall, London, 1910, 1914, p. 123.

¹⁷⁶ Richardson, A. (Editor), *A Dictionary of Christian Theology*, SCM Press,

atheists,” but they are either deists, or theists who are near deists; and of course in a number of instances, they are indeed atheists.

Richardson’s trite, intellectually shallow, and oft repeated claim that supernaturalists have a “God of the gaps” is a self-defeating argument for these people, since they have “a Darwinian theory of macroevolution of the gaps.” The reality is that both supernaturalist and anti-supernaturalists recognize “gaps,” and the question then is how to most plausibly explain them. E.g., about 55 million years ago one finds a small mammal about the size of a mouse, and whales. The macroevolutionist looking to the mammalian commonality has “a theory of macroevolution of the gaps” that says such small creatures must have “*stretched, and strained, and mutated to become gigantic whales,*” which we creationists regard as *a whale of a joke* because the more natural explanation of this “gap;” and based on the law of genetics, the only plausible explanation; is that God created these massive whales. Likewise, the extinction of the dinosaurs about 65 million years ago is followed over the next 10 million years by some large flightless birds, and then some flying birds; and with “a theory of macroevolution of the gaps,” the macroevolutionists would have us believe that some dinosaurs first “*huffed and puffed, and stained and struggled, to macroevolve into flightless birds; and then spluttered and fluttered and flew.*” Looked at in the cold light of day, through reference to the laws of genetics, this type of transmutation theory of Charles Darwin, really is very silly indeed! But what is Richardson’s type of response to reasonable and rational old earth creationist argumentation based on the known laws of genetics? Simply that of a narrow-minded bigot whose circular argument asserts one must have a “recognition that God must not be used as a term of explanation in science. Science by its very nature must employ ‘methodical atheism,’ i.e., commit itself to the principle ... ‘as if there were no God’.” In the words of St. Paul, “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools” (Rom. 1:20,22). This virulently bigoted anti-supernaturalism, also fitted well with the unregenerate nature of such men, allowing them and others to deny such great Christian doctrines as original sin, and the corresponding need for men’s redemption by the blood of Christ.

In the broader context of law and society, this debate underpinned the growth of religious liberalism with its denial of miracles e.g., denial of the virgin birth, bodily resurrection of Christ, and the Divine inspiration, infallibility, and preservation of Holy Writ. With the rejection of the doctrine of Divine preservation of Holy Writ (Matt. 5:18), the Received Text of the NT upon which the Authorized Version was based came under a hitherto unprecedented strong attack, and the result was the Revised Version (1881-5) and American Standard Version (1901). The RV’s and ASV’s neo-Alexandrian text New Testaments were based on Westcott and Hort’s Text, which is basically (though not entirely) Alexandrian Text derived NT; as opposed to the Authorized Version’s neo-Byzantine Received Text NT, which is basically (though not entirely) Byzantine Text derived¹⁷⁷.

This era also saw an unprecedented growth of religious skepticism, seen in vaguely defined forms of theism or deism (which had also received a great impetus from the French Revolution and its earlier ideas of macroevolution by Lamarck); ultimately, spilling over to

London, 1969, p. 213.

¹⁷⁷ See my Textual Commentaries (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at “Commentary on the Received Text”).

the promotion of agnosticism and atheism as well (Ps. 14:1). This debate also had direct and immediate consequences to the English common law's jurisprudence concerning *the voice of nature* from Nature's God. Specifically, one of the more immediate and limited successes of Lyell's and Darwin's views on law and society, was the removal of certain laws based, or partially based, on a recognition of there being a *voice of nature* that may by supernatural acts, that is, *God as a primary cause*, decree that certain penalties are appropriate. More than twenty years before Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859), Lyell was prepared to reduce miracles to nothing more than God's foreknowledge of events, so that he said, "No doubt some people would not like any reasoning which made miracles more reconcilable with possibilities in the ordinary course of the universe and its laws." "They are shocked at the idea of an eruption of a volcano before foreknown, which was to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah."¹⁷⁸ Flowing from this type of thinking, which *denies God as a primary cause*, acting supernaturally to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19; Jude 7), the death penalty was removed from sodomy, and penal servitude then became the penalty for sodomy, in English law in 1861 (24 & 25 Victoria, chapter 100) and Scottish law in 1889 (54 & 55 Victoria, chapter 69).

In some instances homosexual behavior is learnt i.e., it does not spring from a homosexual orientation. E.g., among males, homosexual activity is known to increase in jails (gaols) where those unable to control their sexual lust engage in acts of sodomy as a learnt behavior¹⁷⁹. Moreover, homosexual child molestation is engaged in by a relatively high percentage of homosexual males, when this is compared and contrasted to a relatively small percentage of heterosexual males who sexually molest children¹⁸⁰. While not all, or even most male homosexuals are child molesters, the presence of this relatively large group of homosexual child-molesters may imply that this is regarded as some kind of "recruiting" technique. If so, it appears to be *relatively* unsuccessful; but it *seems to account* for some number of the recruited homosexuals¹⁸¹. We also should not doubt the recruitment power of

¹⁷⁸ Mrs. Lyell (Editor, C. Lyell's sister-in-law), *Life, Letters and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell*, John Murray, London, 1881, Vol. 2, pp. 9-10 (May 1837). It is not hard to see how this type of thinking goes on to deny the Noachic Flood as a Divine Judgment (II Peter 3:5,6), and since, e.g., under Lyell's uniformitarian principles we cannot today see angels rolling stones, the resurrection story of Christ in which "the angel" "rolled back the stone" of "the sepulchre" (Matt. 28:1,2) would also be dismissed. Furthermore, since Christ used the destruction of Sodom (and Gomorrah) as a miniature of the Final Judgment (Matt. 10:14,15; 11:23,24; Luke 10:11,12; 17:29,30), it must also result in a denial of the Second Coming (II Peter 3:7).

¹⁷⁹ Kinsey used such prison or ex-prison populations as about 25% of his sample, so as to inflate his figures on the actual numbers of homosexual males, Court, J.H., & Muir, J.G. (Editors), *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud, op. cit.*, pp. 185,192-3.

¹⁸⁰ See e.g., *Ibid.*, pp. 200,212-213.

¹⁸¹ Having counseled homosexuals for years, Bob Larson said that he found a number of homosexuals had been so molested as children; and he also said a number of them lacked appropriate father images in the house, or had dysfunctional relationships with fathers who rejected them. "Confidential Commentary, How to Reach Homosexuals," June 1995, (cassette recording), Bob Larson Ministries, Denver Colorado, USA, 1995. Though there is some very useful information in Larson's works, they must be used with caution. See my comments on Bob Larson in my Textual Commentaries Vol. 4 (Matt. 26-28), at "Defence of

images in e.g., the media, which seek to glorify sodomy. E.g., a film which suggested various forms of unchastity, including “homosexual conduct,” was promoted by Joshua Golden of the *University of California at Los Angeles* (UCLA), USA, who said, “This film is an excellent attempt to teach people how to be sexual. The opportunity to see how sexual relationships may be sexually accomplished can be learned in ... one’s own home¹⁸².” This is furthered by promoting homosexual images in the secular Big Beat Popular Music culture of e.g., various “rock’n’roll idols¹⁸³.”

One of the consequences of secularist control of the universities is that we cannot get good research done into this type of thing, since the best brains are generally eliminated from academic positions. But based purely on what I have been able to determine from my own observations and conversations, (which I admit is not a sufficiently rigorous research technique to be confident about my “guesstimate” figures,) I would estimate that this “recruited” group of male homosexuals is less than 20% of male homosexuals, and quite possibly less than 10% of them. I.e., the most of them have a male homosexual orientation.

But with regard to female homosexuals or Lesbians, I would estimate the percentage of this “recruited” group to be considerably higher. One notable point of similarity with male homosexuals is the issue of child molestation. E.g., Larson refers to a case of a woman who was recruited into Lesbianism as a means of coping with the fact that her father child-molested her¹⁸⁴. Another point of similarity with male homosexuals is the usage of popular images of homosexuals on TV¹⁸⁵. Larson also records that at the 1992/3 “Year of the Queer” sodomite parade in San Francisco, California, USA, “half-nude” Lesbian Sodomites were “walking down the streets of San Francisco holding up signs saying, ‘WE RECRUIT’¹⁸⁶.”

Moreover, a Head Teacher of a State New South Wales High School in Sydney who I’ve known for over 10 years, told me of how in recent years Lesbian “recruiters” had been discovered in his school. They came in as sport instructors, encouraging girls into both more traditional male sports (these are sometimes called, “Lesbian sports”), as well as more

Evangelical Protestant truth,” subsection “c) A Case Study on Bob Larson Ministries, USA” (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>).

¹⁸² Bob Larson’s *Tough Talk About Tough Issues*, Tyndale House Publishers, Wheaton, Illinois, USA, 1989, pp. 240-241, section on “Television,” referring to “The Joy of Sex” (MPA Company video, c. 1985), citing St. Petersburg Times, 14 Jan. 1985.

¹⁸³ Bob Larson’s *Book of Rock*, Tyndale House Publishers, Wheaton, Illinois, USA, 1987, e.g., pp. 151 (transvestism) & 152 (homosexuality). Though this work is over 20 year old, this same type of thing on a wide range of issues has continued in the wicked secular music industry.

¹⁸⁴ Bob Larson’s *Tough Talk About Tough Issues*, *op. cit.*, p. 146, citing Lesbian writer Katherine Bray’s biography, *Father’s Days* Dell Publishers, New York, USA, 1979.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 203, referring to Actress Donna Pescow portraying a Lesbian in positive terms in “All My Children” (c. 1989).

¹⁸⁶ Bob Larson’s “The ... Deception,” (Video), Compassion Connection, Denver, Colorado, USA, 1993 (while talking to a caller from Lancaster, Pennsylvania, USA).

traditionally female sports. They were in the first instance extremely warm and friendly to these high school girls, and they participated in playing the sports with them. Then after they had built such a “friendship” over some months, one of them would sit down next to them, e.g., on a bus trip to some sporting venue, and tell them that there was a meeting of some of them on a specific night. She would tell the girl that they were Lesbians and explain some of the sexual things they did. This would end with a voluntary invitation to attend, ‘if you so wish.’ A number of girls would attend, and would be recruited into Lesbianism. If a girl did not attend, these Lesbian recruiters would then “give her the cold shoulder.” This occurred not only in their more general discussions with her, but also on the playing field, by e.g., ensuring that the ball was never passed to the girl while on the field.

This came to my fellow school teacher friend’s attention, and thereafter the upper echelons of the school’s attention, when a particular girl who had been through this process became quite distraught. She was young, impressionable, and just the type of girl these Lesbian recruiters wanted. But she had a boyfriend, and she did not want to end her relationship with him and become a Lesbian. The school dispersed the Lesbian recruiter group, not by openly exposing them, but by coming up with all kinds of technical sporting reasons. I asked my friend why the school did not, as I considered they should have openly exposed these Lesbian recruiters for public attention? He said that when this matter was considered, it was clear that if they did so, they would get the pressure of different entrenched power groups against them e.g., homosexual groups and perhaps more importantly, politicians. That is because even the non-homosexual politicians, those in the media, or those in control of the *NSW Department of Education and Training*, are brainwashed into believing “homosexuals are born that way, they don’t recruit¹⁸⁷.” Thus they would believe any rubbish story these Lesbians told them, and those in the school who exposed them could expect their teaching careers to be badly wrecked up. Indeed, even now, in deference to my friend, I would not be prepared to publicly name this Sydney High School¹⁸⁸.

But based purely on what I have been able to determine from my own observations and conversations (which I admit is not a sufficiently rigorous research technique to be confident about my “guesstimate” figures,) I would estimate that this “recruited” group of female homosexuals is *considerably higher* than what it is for the male homosexual group. But it is also clear to me that there are a considerable number of female homosexuals who have a Lesbian or female homosexual orientation.

Thus in the first instance I accept the homosexual claim of a “homosexual

¹⁸⁷ See e.g., the false claims made about the “sexuality of the fetus,” Court, J.H., & Muir, J.G. (Editors), *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud, op. cit.*, p. 82.

¹⁸⁸ Typical of this sentiment found in Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, but reflecting wider degenerate values of the Western world; in San Francisco, California, USA, Bob Larson said that at a Sodomite Parade he witnessed in c. 1995, homosexuals in complete nakedness walked up to Police and were not arrested for indecent exposure; but any time an anti-Sodomite Parade protestor appeared with an anti-sodomy placard, the Police acted to quickly move him away so that he would not upset the sodomites. He further said that USA media coverage of this event omitted all reference to nudity and homosexual acts publicly committed at the Sodomite Parade, so as to make these male and female homosexuals look more respectable. “Confidential Commentary, How to Reach Homosexuals,” June 1995, (cassette recording), Bob Larson Ministries, Denver Colorado, USA, 1995.

orientation,” and in the case of the male homosexual group, this appears to account for the overwhelming number of them i.e., at least 80% + and possibly 90%+ of them; and for a lesser percentage of the female homosexuals. (Some of the Lesbians also seem to be recruited through anti-male, anti-patriarchal, feminist ideological techniques.)

In the second instance, I accept the claim of the more religious ones, that “God made” them “homosexual.” E.g., I remember years ago watching a television programme back in the 1980s on Quentin Crisp (d. 1999, aged 90), an effeminate English homosexual and “drag queen.” He said with reference to Adam and Eve in Genesis 1:27, “‘Male and female created he them,’ male and female created he me.”

But when it comes to the homosexual’s third claim, that they were “born that way,” I must reject their claims. We religiously conservative Protestant Christians sometimes say homosexuality is wrong on the basis that, “God made Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve.” I think we are right to say so. We read in Romans 1:22-27 that “God” “gave” certain idolaters “up to” both male and female homosexuality, and “the lusts of their own hearts.” What St. Paul here calls, “the lusts of their own hearts,” would in modern terminology be “a homosexual orientation.” I.e., in the same way that devil-possession involves antecedent sin so that an exorcist must go on “a fishing expedition” to find out how the devil(s) came to possess a person, and these must first be renounced through the blood of Christ, and so the devil’s access to the person denied to the person, and if this is not done, after the exorcism the devil will simply return again (Matt. 12:43-45); so likewise, when dealing with those of a homosexual orientation, one must go on “a fishing expedition” to find out the antecedent sin(s) of idolatry that the person committed, that led God in a Divine judgment to give them over to a homosexual orientation and associated homosexual acts. In this context, I note that in I Cor. 6:9-11 reference is made not only to repentant persons who were “effeminate” and “abusers of themselves with mankind,” but also to repentant “idolaters.” (Not that I thereby suggest that all of the “idolaters” were “abusers of themselves with mankind;” but I would maintain that all the “abusers of themselves with mankind” were “idolaters.”) So too in Rev. 22:14,15 those “without” “the gates” of heaven include both “dogs” and “idolaters.” “Dogs” is a term used in Scripture for homosexuals, as seen in the Hebraic parallelism of Deut. 23:17,18 between “a sodomite” and “a dog¹⁸⁹.”

One complicating factor is that while God may give a person over to a homosexual orientation as a judgment on idolatry, he does not always do so with an idolater. Indeed, he may only do so in a small minority of cases. Another complicating factor is that if such a person is so given over to a homosexual orientation, if their idolatry was such as to constitute “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost” (Matt. 12:31), then they have committed the unpardonable sin and their case is hopeless¹⁹⁰. In the context of the Christian State these

¹⁸⁹ The reason for this terminology is not specifically stated, though it may be an allusion to the so called, “doggy position” of the passive homosexual bending down on his hands and knees, and (with a nearby open jar of Vaseline,) the active homosexual then mounting him. This gives rise to the following jocular Question, “How do you know the difference between the passive faggot and the active poofter?” And (bearing in mind the smell of a broken sewer pipe, with one pinching one’s nose with one’s left hand, and moving one’s right hand back’n’forth over one’s nose so as to replicate blowing away a bad smell,) the Answer is, “The active one wears a peg over his nose.”

¹⁹⁰ I base this conclusion on the fact that on the one hand, the Bible refers to

sodomites would be executed, but in the context of the secular state a counselor can only “push them out the door,” telling them there is nothing more that can be done for them; and working to remind people that “prevention is better than cure,” and so arguing strongly against idolatry in the wider society, in the hope that others will fear and not, first engage in idolatry and then become sodomites (I Kgs 14:23,24). In this context, it might be noted from the high number of Puseyite Anglican clergymen who have revealed themselves to be homosexual, e.g., Bishop Gene Robinson in the USA, that the idolatrous adoration of the Communion wafer appears to be an example of the type of idolatry that may so anger a holy God as to give someone over to a homosexual orientation. Moreover, in this context, the high number of Roman Catholic clergymen involved in homosexual child-molestation would seem to indicate that in addition to the adoration of the Communion elements, idolatry such as Mariolatry and all such Romish teachings of worshipping, and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and connected invocation of saints, likewise appears to be type of idolatry that may so anger a holy God as to give someone over to a homosexual orientation.

It might also be remarked that at this point *we enter an area that the secular state is simply not able to deal with*. The rise of the secular state with e.g., the American Revolution of 1776, and subsequent dismantling of the Protestant Christian State in the UK in the 19th century, meant that as far as the secular state was concerned, the state did not care “if a man worshipped one God, six gods, or no god.” Therefore, the idea that the Trinitarian Christian God actually gives people over to a homosexual orientation as a judgment on their sin of idolatry is something the secular state cannot deal with or accept. Moreover, it means that they cannot deal with fluctuating numbers of homosexuals as different percentages of the population over time. Thus contrary to the evidence that e.g., in ancient Rome, the percentage of homosexual males was very high; much higher than the present 2% of the male population (made seemingly to look higher because homosexuals tend to congregate in specific cities such as Sydney or San Francisco, in order to form “a homosexual community”¹⁹¹, where they are thus more than 2% of that specific city’s population,) they look for roughly similar percentage figures over time. Thus they discount the evidence for much higher percentage numbers of homosexuals in ancient Rome; or claim that the figure was at least 2-10% over the last 100 or so years with various “homosexuals suppressed;” and disallow that e.g., God might give a much larger percentage over to homosexuality in the future. Indeed, were this to happen, these fools would then presumably interpret this as “a higher number of suppressed homosexuals in the past that we formerly realized.”

instances of genuine repentance from sodomy where the person has been cured of, and saved from, their homosexuality (I Cor. 6:9-11). But on the other hand, after researching the issue for years, in his discussion of homosexuality, David Carson found that the vast majority of homosexuals do not ever show any desire to repent to their behavior. David Carson’s “The Scourge of Sodomy,” Annual Public Meeting of the *United Protestant Council*, London, UK, 2006 (cassette recording, distributed by: John Shearer, Denbigh Spring Gardens, Lechlade, Gloucestershire, GL7 3AY).

¹⁹¹ Court, J.H., & Muir, J.G. (Editors), *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud, op. cit.*, pp. 192 & 194. E.g., in Chuck McIlhenny’s *When the Wicked Seize a City* (Huntington House Publishers, Louisiana, USA, 1993), San Francisco is focused on as a city with such a Sodom and Gomorrah “community.” Here the “homosexual community” organizes such groups as what the sodomites call “Queer Scouts” (a homosexual form of Boy Scouts); and “Queer Nation” – a homosexual group with its own flag; together with specifically sodomite newspapers, restaurants, *et al* (*Ibid.*, pp. 42-43).

When we look back to a time of closer connection to the Christian State when sodomy was a capital crime, it seems no more than a few sodomites at most were executed in a given year, anywhere in the British Empire that this law came to apply in. Thus through a combination of a society in which idolatry was much more strongly condemned, and there was a greater application of God's law in which the State judicial and political officers fear God (Ps. 2:10-12), we find that their obedience to God is not in vain, and this acts to inhibit the outbreak of sodomy. I.e., I consider the evidence indicates that the percentage of male homosexuals about 200 years ago was a lot lower than the present figure of *c.* 2%. It is also notable that with the rise of the secular state, one of the first things it did was to repeal laws based on the proposition that God acts in history e.g., repealing execution for sodomy, or repealing incest laws of the type and kind that Henry VIII broke with Rome over; and as seen by the Roman Catholic Toleration / Emancipation Act of 1829 and rise of Puseyism in the *Church of England*, the secularists also allowed the rise of idolatrous practices in the State.

These type of facts are lost on secularists who take away the Christian teaching of a society with e.g., its opposition to idolatry; and who think themselves "compassionate" or "kind" by opposing penalties for sodomy. Also lost on them, is the development of personal qualities of self-restraint and duty, which are also cross-applied for the benefit of the individual and society, when such laws are enacted. Of course, where as in Sodom and Gomorrah, or modern times various Western cities, the sin of Sodom has already gained a stronghold, and by long practice and habit acts of sodomy are rife; a call to repentance having been first often ignored (though hopefully accepted by some, I Cor. 6:9-11), and after a reasonable period of time there being the reintroduction of the death penalty, this would lead to a substantial number of executions in the first instance, with the benefit coming most to those brought up in such a society. This benefit includes the fact that *the voice of nature* is recognized, people are taught the horrors of idolatry, and people are taught that God himself decrees this crime to be capital, as seen in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Thus God is recognized, his holy law acknowledged, and his aid through common grace called upon, by both the state and individuals in it. It is thus by an act of God's grace that great outbreaks of sodomy are restrained when God's holy ways are acknowledged and followed.

Therefore, the secular state's tolerance of idolatry as seen by Roman Catholic toleration Acts, preparedness to allow the Anglican Church to go to rack'n'ruin with idolatrous Puseyites, and removal of the death penalty from sodomy in 1861, all acted to start a process of creating ever larger communities of homosexuals, whose acts were at first largely covert. Over time, this, together with the fact that in a number of jurisdictions, police only prosecuted the crime where there was a "public element" i.e., the sodomites committed the crime in some public way e.g., loitering in public toilets, helped to produce the situation about a hundred years later, where the number of homosexual sodomites was so great, that they were able to successfully lobby for the complete decriminalization of sodomy. This also fitted in with the secular states' spiritual blindness, secular universities spiritual blindness, and corresponding inability to understand what the relevant issues are.

This evil of the 1960s aside, at least in the 1860s that natural law element which regarded sodomy as *against nature* remained part of the law's legal theory, and sodomy remained a criminal offence, also seen in an 1885 English statute against *gross indecency* not leading to anal sodomy, such as oral sodomy.¹⁹² Furthermore, "fornication" (AV) or "sexual

¹⁹² Norman St. John-Stevas (a Roman Catholic jurist,) itemizes sodomy statutes in

immorality” (NKJV) (Matt. 5:32 & 19:9) involving unnatural acts forced upon a wife, constituted a divorce cause (wife’s petition) under e.g., the Australian *Barwick Act*, i.e., if a husband sexually abused a wife by engaging in acts of heterosexual anal sodomy on his naturally unwilling wife, the horrified sodomized wife could divorce him, and marry another¹⁹³.

A contemporary American Common Law jurisdiction manifesting this “against the” “order of nature” (Coke) or “crime against nature” (Blackstone) jurisprudence, though not imposing the death penalty on offenders, is found in the anti-sodomy statute of Virginia, USA. This states at 18.2-361 in the Code of 1950 (as amended at 1993), under “Crimes against nature,” “If any person carnally knows in any manner any brute animal, or carnally knows any male or female person by the anus or with the mouth, or voluntarily submits to such carnal knowledge, he shall be guilty of a” “felony.” Under this statute, Police charged two heterosexual sodomites with a felony in early 2004. Police Sergeant Franklin, apprehended the bugger and buggeress on 29 January 2004, when he found the 21 year old female sodomite engaging in oral sodomy on the 29 year old male sodomite¹⁹⁴. Such acts of heterosexual sodomy are clearly a learnt behavior in which the natural heterosexual desire is perverted into unnatural sodomite acts. And so in addition to issues of the unhygienic nature of sodomy, this movement from heterosexual to homosexual sodomy may be a recruiting technique for some persons to enter the homosexual community¹⁹⁵ i.e., a recruiter may first

the UK and USA in 1961. Compare e.g., Indiana, USA, (*Indiana Statutes* 1956), “The crime of sodomy includes the offence of copulation by the mouth.” “Sodomy, Whoever commits the abominable and detestable crime against nature with mankind or beast,” “on conviction shall be fined not less that one hundred dollars (\$100) nor more than one thousand dollars (\$1,000), to which may be added imprisonment in the State prison not less than two (2) years nor more than fourteen (14) years.” St. John-Stevas also refers to the conviction of a woman for female homosexual sodomy in that State (St. John-Stevas, N., *Life, Death and the Law*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, UK, 1961, pp. 201,314-5).

¹⁹³ See the divorce cause of sodomy in s. 101(b), *Barwick Act*, which includes sodomizing a wife against her will, *C. v. C.* (1905) 22 T.L.R. 26; *Lawson v. Lawson*. [1955] 1 All E.R. 341.

¹⁹⁴ In 1961, St. John-Stevas found law enforcement practices against sodomy in the USA showed that “nearly all” “cases” of “prosecution” for “sodomy” “involved some public element” (*Ibid.*, p. 201). The practical effect of this was that “there were” “sodomites in the land” (I Kgs 14:24); since e.g., homosexual enclaves were set up, and immoral heterosexuals practised oral sodomy, and no law enforcement occurred unless there was a public element e.g., homosexual oral sodomy in a public toilet. This proved to be the prelude to numerous jurisdictions decriminalizing sodomy from the 1970s on. More than 40 years after St. John-Stevas’s finding, even though *in theory* the sodomy statutes *do not require* the presence of a public element, *in practice* law enforcement officers in those jurisdictions maintaining anti-sodomy statutes, generally still seem to require some public element before they will prosecute offenders. E.g., in the above mentioned 2004 sodomy case, Sergeant Franklin found the sodomites in a car, which was parked *in a public place* outside the Newport Trace Apartments.

¹⁹⁵ Adams, M., *AIDS: You Just Think You’re Safe*, Dalton Moody Publishers, Los Angeles, USA, 1986; Boys, D., *AIDS: Silent Killer*, Freedom Publications, Florida, USA, 1991. N.b., the story of the man who first engaged in heterosexual sodomy with his wife,

get them to engage in heterosexual oral sodomy or anal sodomy, and then seek to move them from this over to homosexual oral sodomy or anal sodomy. In this context the more general tolerance that has grown up to such heterosexual acts of sodomy is thus an alarming factor in accounting for the rise of at least some homosexuality. (As already noted, I consider the numbers of male homosexuals recruited into the homosexual community are a minority of the overall homosexual community, but the evidence is that such persons do exist.)

A number of contemporary American Common Law jurisdictions in the United States of America, also maintain the death penalty for murder (although inconsistencies imposed on this by evil and wicked libertines in the US Supreme Court, means that abortion baby-killers are not prosecuted for their heinous crimes). But to the extent that the death penalty remains for murderers in the USA, *the voice of nature* against murder (Gen. 4:23; 6:12,12; 9:6), is still heard to echo with the divine law injunction, “he that killeth with the sword, must be killed with the sword” (Rev. 13:10), in that American jurisprudence based on the natural law conclusion of godly *reason*, that those who “murder” “are worthy of death” (Rom. 1:29,32). Sadly, there has also been a strong push by ungodly persons, deaf to *the voice of nature*, to repeal the death sentence for murder. For example, capital punishment was abolished in the UK by the *Murder (Abolition of Death Penalty) Act* of 1965. Similar abolition of the death penalty for murder has occurred in most Western countries¹⁹⁶.

There also began in the 1860s almost annual bills before the Westminster Parliament to allow incestuous marriage between a man and his deceased wife’s sister¹⁹⁷. Hence in opposing such incest, Thomas Vincent, whose work had a Preface by the incumbent (Anglican) Bishop of Oxford, wrote in 1882, “I see they are going to bring on that ‘Deceased Wife’s Sister’s Bill’ *again*¹⁹⁸.” While the Levitical law provides an additional reason against such incest (while paradoxically requiring under the Levirate marriage rule such unions that men may learn to abhor them) (Lev. 18:18, relevant in OT times of polygamy repealed under NT monogamy, Matt. 19:9), such a man’s sister-in-law (or a woman’s brother-in-law,) is the same distance in affinity, as a blood sister is in consanguinity (Lev. 18:12,13; 20:17), and the same distance in affinity as a sister-in-law is from a man’s brother’s wife (Lev. 18:16; 20:21). It is thus clearly prohibited in God’s Levitical law, and by *the voice of nature* with *God’s punishment coming as a primary cause* in Henry VIII’s time. The near annual attempt to repeal this in the Westminster Parliament from the 1860s, was known as “the annual blister,” e.g., in Gilbert and Sullivan’s operetta, *Iolanthe* (first performed in 1882), reference is made to one who “will prick that annual blister, marriage to [a] deceased wife’s sister.” Similar debates and laws about incest with a man’s deceased wife’s sister (or a woman’s deceased sister’s husband), had occurred in other jurisdictions, e.g., in Australia, this incest became

and then left to join the homosexual community.

¹⁹⁶ E.g., the *Death Penalty Abolition Act*, 1973 (Commonwealth) abolished the death penalty in all areas of Australian federal law.

¹⁹⁷ Though prohibited in the statutes of Henry VIII and Parker’s Table in Ecclesiastical law, such unions were from the early seventeenth century made only *voidable*, that is, they had to be declared void by the courts (1 Bl. Com. 434-5); but in 1835 they reverted to the earlier law which made them invalid in England, Ireland, and Wales, that is, without any court action required. So too, they were invalid in Scotland under Scottish Law.

¹⁹⁸ Vincent, T., *Deceased Wife’s Sister’s Bill*, With a Preface by the Bishop of Oxford, Parker & Co., London, UK, 1882, p. 3

lawful in South Australia in 1871, Victoria in 1873, Tasmania in 1874, New South Wales in 1875, Queensland in 1877, and Western Australia in 1878, before the English law allowed it in 1907.

The principle that a man could marry his sister-in-law (or a woman her brother-in-law) having been thus established, the specific issue that Henry VIII had broken with Rome on, was now further targeted. Marriage with a man's sister-in-law who was his deceased brother's wife (or a woman's brother-in-law who was her deceased husband's brother) (Lev. 18:16; 20:21), became lawful in England in 1921. It had previously been made lawful under State law in Western Australia in 1915, and subsequently in Tasmania in 1924, New South Wales in 1925, South Australia in 1925, and Queensland in 1931, but the Australian State of Victoria had refused to legalize this incest. However, when Federal Law took this area of law over from the Australian States, this incest was also made lawful in Victoria under the *Barwick Act* of 1959 (Commonwealth).

This means that the type of action taken by PCUSA in 1903, when they amended *Westminster Confession* 24:4 to remove the final sentence, "The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own" (Lev. 20:19-21), was part of this wider Western world societal trend on these moral issues. It should also be noted that e.g., the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* defended this section of the *Westminster Confession*, and rightly opposed the *Deceased Wife's Sister Act (1907)*, with their 1907 Synod protesting against it while it was before the Westminster Parliament. Following this godly witness, a London congregation of this church was established in 1907 and continues their till this day¹⁹⁹.

Before these times, those outside the (Anglican) *Church of England* in England and Wales, (Anglican) *Church of Ireland*, and (Presbyterian) *Church of Scotland*, were to some extent protected from falling headlong into sin by godly Anglican laws against incest in England, Ireland, and Wales, and also godly Presbyterian laws against incest in Scotland. Nevertheless, it needs to also be said that there is a long and sad history, of certain non-conformists not listening to, or at least allowing their members to not so listen to, *the voice of nature*²⁰⁰, and Divine Law revealed, on such incest, that predates these later liberal and anti-supernaturalist nineteenth century and later developments.

While the second stage of the Reformation also included some Reformed Anglicans;

¹⁹⁹ McPherson, A. (Editor), *op. cit.*, pp. 113-4.

²⁰⁰ More broadly, there is a historical divide between Reformed Anglicans (like myself) who, like William Blackstone, recognize a form of *natural law* that runs parallel with the *Divine law* and never contrary to it, and *some* Non-Conformists who recognize no natural law *per se*. This type of godly natural law should not be confused with either Roman Catholic so called "natural law;" nor the American Revolution type "natural law" to some extent a common denominator spin-off of Jesuit (Suarez, Mariana, and Lessius) and Jesuit influenced thinking among Puritans of the civil war era (Rutherford's *Lex Rex*), with ideas of legislators having a revolution against a so called "tyrant;" nor the French Revolution (Thomas Paine in opposition to Edmund Burke) or libertine so called "natural law," which has come to infest universities and Western laws, especially, though not exclusively, in the post World War Two era.

Reformed Puritans in the second stage of the Reformation, divided into rival “third stage” reforms with the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* (adopted by the *Church of Scotland* 1649 & 1690), the Congregational *Savoy Declaration* of 1658, and the *Baptist (or London) Confession* of 1689. These Congregational and Baptist “third stage” reform documents, used as their starting point the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession*, and then modified it. Disturbingly, the Biblical correct *Westminster Confession* 24:4, had the words removed, “The man may not marry any of his wife’s kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband’s kindred nearer in blood than of her own” (Lev. 20:19-21), in the Congregational *Savoy Declaration* 25:4 and *Baptist Confession* 25:4. On the one hand, this allowed some Congregationalists and Baptists to consider that these words were unnecessary *but a correct view* of Lev. 18 & 20; but on the other hand, this allowed some Congregationalists and Baptists to consider that these words were *an incorrect view* of Lev. 18 & 20. This absence of clarity also meant that both those opposed to such incest, and those in favour of such incest, were meant to tolerate each others diverse views.

“Glorying” in such tolerance (also found later among Wesleyan Arminians in UK Methodism,) is contrary to the clear words of Scripture. “It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you,” in the form of incest. “Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven” of incest, “that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened.” For “now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator,” “with such an one no not to eat” i.e., either the Lord’s Supper or any fellowship meal (I Cor. 5:1,6,7,11).

The sad tolerance of such incest among Congregational, Baptist, and Wesleyan Methodists, proved yet again, the truth of this maxim, “a little leaven” of incest “leaveneth the whole lump” (I Cor. 5:6). They stood naked when exposed by the mid-nineteenth century Royal Commissioners on the Laws of Marriage with regard to Marriage with a Deceased Wife’s Sister. A deceased wife’s sister is a sister-in-law, and so raises the same types of issues of affinity as a sister-in-law who is a deceased brother’s wife. Thus to allow incest with a man’s deceased wife’s sister, must inevitably lead to allowing marriage with a deceased brother’s wife, such as occurred between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. Either a sister-in-law is by the union of a man and woman in marriage as “one flesh” (Gen. 2:24; Matt. 19:5) a sister, or she is not.

The Royal Commissioners investigating the “Established [Anglican] Church of England” (which at this time was being white-anted by religious liberals and Puseyites,) found “diversity of opinion prevails among the” Anglican “clergy” of England and Wales as to whether or not these unions should be allowed. However, “In Ireland, the great majority of the clergy of the Established” Anglican *Church of Ireland* “are represented as disapproving of these connexions; which are rare also among the Presbyterians in that country, and are generally disapproved of by their ministers.” “In Scotland, the opinion of the” Presbyterian *Church of Scotland* “clergy is decidedly against these marriages.” But by contrast, “The various bodies of Dissenters in England do not appear to entertain the opinion that these marriages” “are in themselves reprehensible²⁰¹.”

²⁰¹ Hope, A.J.B., *The Report of H.M. Commission on the Laws of Marriage Relative to Marriage with a Deceased Wife’s Sister*, James Ridgway, London, UK, 1849, p. 11. At p. 87, an example is given of an aberrant Presbyterian Minister in Dublin, Ireland. “The Minister in the first instance, objected, but afterward” performed the marriage. “The husband has lately become desirous to be relieved from this marriage, on the ground of its

The Royal Commissioners found pockets of incest were isolated to particular geographical areas or groups of religious Dissenters. E.g., “in the neighbourhood of Wakefield,” “William Campbell Sleigh, a Barrister,” “reported “a village or a hamlet,” “in which the morals of the people were extremely lax indeed, and in which uncles and nieces cohabited.” “There was a case reported to” him “in Wakefield” itself, “by a solicitor there, where a girl married” “an uncle by half blood.²⁰²” So too James Thorburne gave evidence of an uncle marrying his niece, in “the case of a Jew” living in sin “at Bristol.²⁰³” Concerning marriage with a deceased wife’s sister, the Anglican Minister of St. Andrew’s Plymouth, reported that when he had been “Curate of Chatteris, in the Isle of Ely,” “about twenty-three years” earlier, there had been rampant incest of this kind, and “no disgrace was attached” to it there²⁰⁴.

A common finding was that “Dissenting Ministers,” e.g., “Baptist” and “Wesleyan Methodists,” were “generally” “in favour of a relaxation of the law” i.e., to allow marriage with a deceased wife’s sister²⁰⁵. For instance, “F.A. Cox,” “a Baptist Minister” was “in favour of the relaxation” of the law to allow this incest. Or “Thomas Binney,” a “well known Congregationalist Minister,” was “decidedly in favour of” a “relaxation” in the law to allow this incest. Binney also thought that “perhaps bigamy” should be tolerated²⁰⁶. But the scandalous web of incest was found to extend to a number of Dissenter Ministers themselves. E.g., “An Independent Minister who had married the sister of his deceased wife,” “gave rise to much family bickering,” “on account of the present state of the law,” against this union, rather than “any objection” “to the incest itself.²⁰⁷” This type of incest also broke out in pockets of both Suffolk and Norfolk. Thomas Campbell gave “evidence,” of “a Dissenting Minister at a town in Suffolk,” who “married his deceased wife’s sister.” So too, there was “a shoemaker in the same town who cohabits with his deceased brother’s wife;” and “there is another case,” of “a surgeon in the same town, marrying his deceased wife’s sister by the wish of his dying wife” (being misguided like Abraham was misguided by Sarah to marry Hagar in Gen. 16, before he “Cast out the bondwoman and her son,” Gal. 4:30). Then there was “a Wesleyan Minister, who married” “his deceased wife’s sister” in Norfolk. There

being illegal,” and so “the man has” “withdrawn from the communion of the Church. He has a large family by both marriages.”

²⁰² *Ibid.*, pp. 32-3.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. 42.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 67-8.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 149-50.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 78. Binney here claimed that “A bishop” “must be” “the husband of one wife” in I Tim. 3:2, “means that if a person had two wives, he was not required to put one away, or dissolve the marriage, but he was not to be an officer of the church.” By contrast, Christ taught that to marry a second wife constitutes “adultery” (Matt. 19:9), and so he prohibited bigamy (or polygamy) for Christians.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

were other cases also in Norfolk, e.g., a farmer who married his deceased wife's sister²⁰⁸.

The Royal Commissioner's stated the legal history of the provisions prohibiting incest with a deceased wife's sister. They said, "The question, whether marriage within the present degrees of affinity were permitted by the law of God, was the subject of much discussion when King Henry VIII [Regnal Years: 1509-1547] sought to be relieved from his marriage with Queen Katherine. This marriage was pronounced null and void by Archbishop Cranmer. From that period the Ecclesiastical Courts dealt with these" unions "by pronouncing them null and void" i.e., such incestuous unions were automatically invalid. "But in the time of James I [Regnal Years: 1603-1625], the Courts of Common Law interfered, and prohibited the Spiritual [Ecclesiastical] Courts from proceeding to pronounce them null and void after the death of one of the parties. Hence all these marriages came to be" "voidable" "in contradistinction to" "void" i.e., such incestuous unions were not automatically invalid, but had to be specifically declared "void" by the courts before they were legally invalid. "This state of the law continued unaltered in England until" "1835, when the Statute 5 & 6 William IV, c. 54 (commonly called *Lord Lyndhurst's Act*) passed. The effect of the statute was to prohibit the Ecclesiastical Courts from entertaining any suit for the purposes of pronouncing them null and void, within the prohibited degrees of affinity, celebrated before the passing of the Act; and all such marriage celebrated after the passing of the Act, were declared by it to be null and void." I.e., any such incestuous unions contracted before 1835 in England, Ireland, or Wales, were not automatically invalid, but had to be specifically declared "void" by the courts before they were legally invalid; however, as from the time of Henry VIII to the time of James I, such incestuous unions contracted after 1835 in England, Ireland, or Wales, were automatically invalid. "This statute" of 1835 "extended to Ireland. The law of Scotland" "holds void *ab inito*," that is, from the beginning, "all marriages contracted within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity or affinity" i.e., such incestuous unions were automatically invalid in Scotland. "In that country the sister of a deceased wife is declared to be within the prohibited degrees, by the whole authority of the church [of Scotland] and generally by lawyers."²⁰⁹

Therefore, on the one hand, one can find theological precedents for the repeal of *Westminster Confession* 24:4 by liberal Presbyterian churches from the nineteenth century on, in the late seventeenth century Congregational *Savoy Declaration* 25:4 and *Baptist Confession* 25:4. Although to this must be made the important qualification that Congregationalists and Baptists subscribing to these confessions were at liberty to regard the words removed by their confessions from *Westminster Confession* 24:4 as redundant for stylistic reasons, that is, still covered by the earlier parts of this section. Nevertheless, it is clear that the views and practices of e.g., some Dissenter Congregationalists, Baptists, and Wesleyan Methodists, were in favour of such incest. But on the other hand, any actual desire to commit such incest by these Dissenters was restrained by godly laws until 1907 and 1921. Any view which would legally condone such incest had lost out in the British Isles, because godly lawmakers listened and trembled to hear the *voice of nature*, and feared to ignore that voice of Nature's God by sexual permissiveness allowing incest.

But wider secularist changes in society and law, had emanated from Lyell's and Darwin's anti-creationist view of nature, which denied that there was a *voice of nature* from

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 173-4.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

Nature's God with respect to *God acting as a primary cause*, in which one could see cataclysmic supernatural acts of God evident in earth's geology. For example, on this premise macroevolutionists have made the bizarre claim that the world of great birds that came into existence after the dinosaur extinction of about 65 million years ago, indicates that these and other birds transmuted from dinosaurs! By contrast, I maintain as an old earth creationist, that the Darwinist's claims, being contrary to both a proper understanding of the laws of genetics (*secondary causes established by laws God created*), as well as the geological record showing the sudden appearance of this world of giant birds after the sudden disappearance of the world of dinosaurs, indicates a cataclysm followed by a radically dissimilar species of animals (albeit with some plants and animals surviving from the former world,) and so points to a supernatural destruction and creation of different worlds by Nature's God (*God as a primary cause*). For the God who "inhabith eternity" (Isa. 57:15), being "from everlasting to everlasting" (Ps. 90:2), created a plurality of different "worlds" (Heb. 1:2; 11:3) over geological time, described, I consider (like Pye Smith *et al*), by the words of Gen. 1:1, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (ASV).

This means that were I to omit reference to the issues of Henry VIII's incestuous marriage with Catherine of Aragon, on the basis of the type of thing found in PCUSA's 1903 *Westminster Confession* changes, which regards sexual permissiveness to such incest as a *later stage reform*, then I would be allowing such liberalism (or in some instances Judaizing,) to intrude into my work. The type of religiously liberal and anti-supernaturalist claims found under Lyell and Darwin were peddled in NT times by "the Sadducees" who "say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit" (Acts 23:8). For as King Solomon says, "There is no new thing under the sun" (Eccl. 1:9); and as the Apostle Peter prophecies, "scoffers" "shall come," "walking after their own lusts," denying "the promise of" Christ's second "coming," "and saying," "since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (II Peter 3:3,4). Therefore while my first two considerations are in themselves sufficient to warrant the type of incest found in Lev. 20:19-21 being placed under broad-brush descriptions of the Antichrist's "sin" or "iniquity" (II Thess. 2:3,7), I consider that this third consideration, namely, *God is Judge*, brings an important issue of modern history to our minds, and acts to confirm the propriety of my methodology which deals with this type of incest; since to not deal with it, would, in part, constitute what the Apostle John calls "love" for "the world" "and the lust thereof" (I John 2:15,17), and the Apostle Paul calls "worldly lusts" (Titus 2:12).

8) *Summary*. I uphold the first and second stages of the Reformation, and maintain that it is important to defend Lev. 18:16; 20:21 against Judaizers, liberals, some Puritans, and Papists. It is one thing for God, under the polygamous Old Testament laws, to grant a dispensation for a brother to marry his deceased brother's wife, polygamously if need be, in order that a child may "succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel" (Deut. 25:6). It is quite another thing, for a Pope, under the monogamous New Testament laws (Matt. 19:9), which repeal the Mosaical ceremonies, rites, and civil precepts (Deut. 25:5-10; Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14,16,17; Heb. 7:12,22), to claim the power to grant a dispensation for a brother to marry his deceased brother's wife. In doing so, "he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God" (II Thess. 2:4) with a Divine Attribute, by which he claims the power "to change" "the" very "law" of God itself (Dan. 7:25, ASV). It is also quite another thing for a Judaizer, like Rousas Rushdoony, to claim the OT Levirate marriage rule exception still applies, and a man should marry his dead brother's wife; for in doing so, he too sets aside the NT's repeal of Jewish civil (and ceremonial) laws.

It is likewise quite another thing for liberals, together with *some* Congregationalists, Baptists, and others, to reject the clear teaching of the first two stages of the Reformation, codified in the Presbyterian's "third stage" reform of the *Westminster Confession*, and claim as a "later stage reform," the repeal of Lev. 18:16, alleging that it is redundant and covered by Lev. 18:20 on the basis that Lev. 18:16 refers to a man not marrying a woman that his brother has not been divorced or widowed from. Analogies with the comparable relationship of sister-in-law in Lev. 18:18 can be misleading because while Lev. 18:18 says, "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her," "beside the other in her lifetime," this was *an additional* secondary reason given so long as polygamy was allowed. But the primary reason, as given in Lev. 18:6 remains relevant after the introduction of monogamy, that is, the person "is near of kin." The permissive view of incest for relationships of affinity (marriage), allowed e.g., by PCUSA in 1903, makes the Word of God in Lev. 18:16 of no effect, since while such incest *may sometimes* also constitute an act of adultery (Lev. 18:20), it *does not always* so constitute an act of adultery, as seen in the case under discussion of a deceased brother's wife. Were such liberals correct, then there would therefore be no need for Lev. 18:16. This type of liberal thinking is an attack on the family, since it fails to understand the importance of extended family relationships such as brother-in-law, sister-in-law, mother-in-law, or father-in-law, which are formed by the marriage. It fails to recognize one element of the meaning of "one flesh," i.e., that in marriage, the man and woman become "one flesh" (Gen. 2:24; Mark 10:8). It is part of the same anti-family attack that e.g., leads some men to ungodly generic jesting about "mothers-in-law." This type of thing is *the thin edge of the wedge* to a more robust attack on the family and its relationships of kindred.

Thus I maintain that *under Christian morality* operating since the introduction of monogamy (Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2) and repeal of OT Jewish ceremonial and civil precepts (Eph. 2:15,16; Col. 2:14,16,17), marriage by a man with his deceased brother's wife is a form of incest prohibited by Lev. 18:16; Mark 6:18. I think that under Christian laws, once a relationship such as e.g., sister-in-law is established, a man is meant to think of his sister-in-law as a family member, something like he would a blood sister, and rule out any kind of sexual interest in her for life. Thus if her husband dies, he should console her as he would a blood-sister; and in turn, she should seek to console her brother-in-law as she would a blood-brother; so that in no circumstances should this relationship of *brother and sister by affinity* then result in a romantic relationship, any more than a relationship of *brother and sister by consanguinity* should result in a romantic relationship. This understanding of Christian incest laws is integral to the first two stages of the Reformation. It is an irreducible part of the Protestant Reformation in the British Isles, and the justification for Henry VIII breaking with Rome on the basis that *Biblical authority must prevail against Papal authority*. To deny this, is to join with Papists in denying that Bloody Mary was a bastard and Elizabeth I was legitimate. This Biblical view of incest is that which was found historically in the British Isles through reference to the law, and also *Parker's Table* for the (Anglican) *Church of England* in England and Wales, (Anglican) *Church of Ireland*; and also the (Presbyterian) *Church of Scotland* through reference to *Westminster Confession* 24:4.

I further maintain that those persons subscribing to a confession of faith which has excised the final words of *Westminster Confession* 24:4, namely, "The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own" (Lev. 20:19-21); but have nevertheless retained the first part of this section, namely, "Marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the Word; nor can such incestuous marriages ever be

made lawful by any man or consent of parties, so as those persons may live together as man and wife;” *should* continue to hold this view on the basis that under a proper understanding of the said “degrees of” “affinity forbidden in the Word,” the section excised is *simply declaratory* of the substance of this earlier section. Thus I maintain that the break of Henry the VIII with Rome on this issue was clearly an issue of Biblical authority (Lev. 18:16; Mark 6:18) verses Papal authority.

I additionally maintain that Henry VIII’s incest was an example of “a sin unto death” (I John 5:16) because God evidently was killing the offspring per Lev. 20:21, usually in infancy, but also including the premature death of Bloody Mary in adulthood. I further consider that this is a sixteenth century manifestation of *the voice of nature*, with *Nature’s God* acting as a *primary cause* in harmony with his reserve right of Lev. 20:21, to decree that such persons “shall be childless.” In the twenty-third year of his reign, King Henry VIII heard, and responded to the *voice of nature*, in which *Nature’s God* decreed *a life for a life*, as Henry VIII removed the *benefit of clergy* loophole that allowed murderers to escape the death penalty (23 Hen. VIII c. 1). In the twenty-fifth year of his reign, King Henry VIII heard and responded to *the voice of nature* echoing from *Nature’s God*, in Acts of Parliament dealing both with incest (25 Hen. VIII c. 28 and subsequent 28 Hen. VIII. c. 7; 32 Hen. VIII c. 38), as well as sodomy (25 Hen. VIII c. 6). Thus the deafening of lawmakers’ ears to this *voice of nature* as a consequence of anti-supernaturalist and secularist philosophy opposing the Protestant Christian State, and connected with Darwinian macroevolutionary theory, was an important factor in gaining the necessary impetus to repeal laws prohibiting this form of incest in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. I thus maintain on the basis of both Natural Law and Divine Law that this form of incest is against God’s laws.

Hence I conclude on Biblical Protestant Reformation principles, that Papal dispensations allowing such incest are an example of Papal “iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7) and “sin” (II Thess. 2:3); and acting with the advise of the Archbishop of Canterbury, His Grace, Thomas Cranmer, that His Majesty King Henry VIII of England and Ireland, was right to break with the Pope of Rome on this issue of *Biblical authority as opposed to Papal authority*. Therefore, since some claim that sexual permissiveness to such incest is a “later stage reform,” when in fact they are striking down, and rendering ineffectual, a *fundamental* Biblical feature of the earlier Reformation in the British Isles, I find it necessary to make an exception to my general methodology of Biblical exegesis which does not generally use broad-brush passages describing the Antichrist to deal with matters that some regard as “third” or “later stage reforms.” Specifically, I include in broad-brush passages dealing with the Antichrist in such terms as “the mystery of iniquity” (AV) or “mystery of lawlessness” (NKJV) “doth already work” (II Thess. 2:7), this issue of incest, at work even in apostolic times (I Cor. 5:1). In this, I am captive not only to what I hold to be the clear Word of God in Lev. 18:16, for which John the Baptist died a martyr’s death, saying, “unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife” (Mark 6:18); but also what I regard as a necessary consequence of recognizing that the antichrists and false teachers of the Apostle John’s day referred to in I & II John, were types of the then coming Papal Antichrist (I John 2:18), and this included the fact that some “who keepeth not his commandments” (I John 2:4), engaged in “a sin unto death” (I John 5:16 cf. Lev. 20:21).

Why has the Historical School of Prophetic Interpretation declined?

On the one hand, the Historicist interpretation that the Pope is the Antichrist precedes

the Reformation, being found before this time, e.g., among the Waldensians. E.g., in the eleventh century, Peter Bruis published a book giving reasons for the Waldensians separation from Rome, with the title, “Antichrist²¹⁰.” Or in fourteenth century England, the Morning Star of the Reformation, John Wycliffe (d. 1384) who founded the English Lollards, declared, “the excommunication of the Pope or any [Romish] Prelate is not to be feared, because it is the censure of Antichrist;” and “the Roman Church is the synagogue of Satan” (Rev. 3:9)²¹¹. But on the other hand, after the Reformation when the Protestant Historicist School proved to be a most effective tool in the hands of the Protestants for exposing the Pope, the Pope turned to his trusted crafty Jesuits, seeking, if such a thing were possible, to come up with something that might stop the Protestants from exposing the Pope of Rome for who he really was.

Two Jesuits went away and turned their devious minds to think about the matter; applying to it all the tricky arts and crafts of Jesuitry. They both came back to the Pope with elaborate ruses; which they thought could act as decoys to attract people away from Historicism. One of them, Alacazar came up with preterism; and the other of them, Ribera came up with futurism. Understandably, the Devil who has personally devil-possessed every Pope of Rome since the formation of the Roman Papacy in 607 with the first Pope, Boniface III; sitting in the control-panels of the head of the Pope of Rome at the time was very impressed with this “decoy” idea, because he himself uses the Roman Catholic Church as his principle decoy to attract people away from Biblical Christianity.

The Jesuit, Alacazar, put forth the preterist interpretation that the prophecies *are all in the past, so people do not have to worry about what they say NOW*; whereas the Jesuit Ribera put forth the futurist interpretation that the prophecies *are all in the future, so people do not have to worry about what they say NOW*. Thus notwithstanding the incongruity of these two opposing schools of prophetic interpretation, they both shared the commonality of attacking the Protestant’s Historical School of Prophetic Interpretation. Thus the Devil hoped that via the slippery tricks of Jesuitry as put forth by Alcazar’s preterism and Ribera’s futurism, he might encoil people in sufficient error as to have them blinded to the fact that since 607 he has personally devil-possessed every Pope of Rome, and that the establishment of the office of Roman Papacy in 607 was nothing less than the establishment of the office of Antichrist.

In more recent historical times, I note that the decline of the historical school of prophetic interpretation in general, and the recognition of the Roman Pope as the Antichrist of I & II John and II Thessalonians 2 in particular, is connected to a number of factors arising from the dismantling of the Protestant Christian State by the secular state founded in the USA in the late 18th century and in the UK from the nineteenth century on. These included as a consequence of secularism in historically Protestant countries, a growing general tolerance to Roman Catholicism in the wider society e.g., the *Roman Catholic Toleration / Emancipation Act* of 1828.

The rise of anti-supernaturalist thinking, connected to the Deism of the French Revolution and American Revolution which are regarded as the events “marking the start of modern history,” i.e., recognition of a God, but denying Divine Revelation, or any active interest of that God in the world; as well as the anti-supernaturalist geology of Lyell and later Darwin, acted to underpin anti-supernaturalism. In 1859, the Westminster Parliament

²¹⁰ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, p. 56.

²¹¹ Bettenson’s *Documents*, p. 174.

removed the *State Services* from the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) and also from its Calendar in England and Ireland. Since 1662, the Calendar had included *King Charles I's Day* (30 Jan.), King of Great Britain and Ireland (1625-1649), with an associated annual service (or Office) for "King Charles the Martyr" who was executed on 30 Jan. 1649. *Royal Oak Day* or *Oak Apple Day* or *King Charles II Day* (29 May), King of Great Britain and Ireland (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1²¹²; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685), celebrating the 1660 Restoration with associated annual service for the "Restoration of the Royal Family" in the 1662 prayer book (revised Office from 1664-1859). And *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.), with an associated annual "Gunpowder Treason" service thanking God for his deliverance of King James, King of Great Britain and Ireland (Regnal Years: 1603-1625) and Parliament from "Popish treachery" in the Guy Fawkes gunpowder plot to blow up Protestant King and Parliament in 1605, with this service being modified from 1689 to additionally thank God for the coming of William III of Orange, King of Great Britain and Ireland (Regnal Years: 1689-1702), who arrived on this same day, 5 Nov in 1688, to save the British Isles from the "Popish tyranny" of the Roman Catholic King James II, and re-establish "our" Protestant "religion." Though only applicable to Ireland, *Irish Massacre Day* (23 Oct.), remembered e.g., the symbolically significant attack by Papists on the Protestant Cathedral in the Anglican Primatial See for Ireland, St. Patrick's *Church of Ireland* Cathedral, Armagh, Northern Ireland, which they set fire to in 1641²¹³; this day was also removed (*Church of Ireland* prayer book Office 1666-1800 remembering the massacre of Protestants by Papists in Ireland in 1641, continued as a red-letter day in *Church of Ireland* Churches, 1801-1859)²¹⁴.

Protestants have historically divided in their views of Charles I and Charles II, with regard to the issue of the Divine Right of Kings to lawfully rule as found in the Bible's teachings of e.g., Roman 13:1-9, or I Peter 2:17, "Honour the king." And connected with this, the *Royalist Cavalier verses Republican Roundheads* civil war under Charles I of the 1640s and early 1650s; and following King Charles I's execution in 1649, and preceding the royalist Restoration in 1660, the period of republican government under Oliver Cromwell (First Chairman of the republican Council of State, Lord Protector [Republican Head of State] in the "Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland," 1635-1658), and his son, Richard Cromwell (Lord Protector, 1658-9). Though Cromwell and his forces were Puritans, the division is not a simple Anglican verses Non-Conformist one e.g., there was both a large group of Scottish Presbyterian royalists with the Puritan Presbyterian Scottish

²¹² As a consequence of the encroachments into Scotland by Cromwell's invading republican army, Charles II held *de facto* power only in parts of Scotland from the latter half of 1650 through to 1651.

²¹³ Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, p. 599.

²¹⁴ Removed in 1859 by Royal Warrant dated 17 Jan. 1859 revoking the Royal Warrant of 21 June 1837 for the Services of 5 November, 30 January, and 29 May (in what was after 1800 the 1662 prayer book of the *United Church of England & Ireland*); and the later Act of 22 Victoria chapter 2, (UK) (25 March 1859), repealing 30 Jan., 29 May, and 5 Nov. in both England and Ireland; and for Ireland and the Church of Ireland, also 23 Oct. (22 Victoria, chapter 2, 25 March 1859; in *A Collection of the Public General Statutes*, passed in the 22nd year of ... H.M. Queen Victoria ..., Printed by Eyre & Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen, 1859; British Library Social Science Room, BS Ref. 3).

Parliament sided with the King, and a much smaller group of Scottish Presbyterian republicans who fought against the king. In broad terms, there was an ethnic divide among Presbyterians with most Scottish Presbyterians joining with Anglicans in defence of the king; as opposed to English and Irish Presbyterians and other Puritans generally supporting Cromwell's republic. But complicating the matter further, a number of the Puritans came to be involved with the Restoration in 1660. However, generally there has historically been a stronger, though not universal, sympathy for the republican period of 1649-1660 among Puritan Protestants of, or derived from, England and Ireland, than among Anglican Protestants or most Scottish Presbyterians²¹⁵.

Both groups of Protestants are generally agreed that Charles I needed to modify his form of rule and engage in greater power sharing with Parliament. But one group (the royalist supporting Protestants, generally Anglican Protestants and *Church of Scotland* derived Protestants), considers Charles I showed that he was prepared to do this, and did so; whereas the other group (the republican supporting Protestants, generally English and Irish Puritan Churches derived Protestants, though including a smaller number of Scottish Puritan Churches derived Protestants), distrust Charles I, and claim his raising of an army to fight the Irish Papists following the massacre of British Protestants in Ireland in 1641, was a two-edged sword, i.e., once raised, Charles I could have used this army against the Puritan Members of Parliament.

The matter is complicated by the fact that after the Restoration, the Act of Uniformity (1662) required "unfeigned assent and consent" to it by all clergymen and school teachers. Many therefore left the Churches owned by Established *Church of England*, and these Protestant Dissenters were a notable minority group. Since many of these were good and godly Protestants who disagreed with some elements of the prayer book, this meant a large number of orthodox Protestants came to associate the Restoration with negative experiences of ejection under the Act of Uniformity. English Puritan history tends to call this "The Ejection." But in fact this *Lesser Ejection* of 1662 should be contextualized with reference

²¹⁵ See McGrath, G.B. (myself here & elsewhere in this footnote), "How We Should Regard Cromwell and Charles I," *English Churchman* (EC) 7757, 2 & 9 January, 2009, p. 2; "Samuel Rutherford" (pro-Rutherford, by M. Johnson), EC 7759, 30 Jan. & 6 Feb. 2009, p. 2; and EC 7760, 13 & 20 Feb. 2009, p. 2 (anti-Rutherford by G. Ella); McGrath, G.B., EC 7772, 31 July & 7 Aug. 2009, p. 2 & EC 7774, 28 Aug & 4 Sept. 2009, pp. 2-3; McGrath, G.B., "Calvin and Charles I," *British Church Newspaper*, No. 169, 25 Sept. 2009, p. 10. McGrath, G.B., "Charles I, ..." *British Church Newspaper*, 23 October 2009 (Irish Massacre Day), p. 10 (defending what I say on 25 Sept. 2009 in reply to Westfold of 8 Oct. 09, p. 11); replying to Westfold, H., "Charles ...," *British Church Newspaper*, 8 October 2009, p. 11; replying to McGrath, G.B., "Calvin and Charles I," *British Church Newspaper*, 25 Sept., 2009, p. 10; Westfold, H., "Charles, Neither Martyr nor Calvinist!" *British Church Newspaper*, No. 170, 8 Oct., 2009, p. 11 (attacking what I say on 25 Sept. 2009); Westfold, H., "Charles I ..." *British Church Newspaper*, No. 172, 6 Nov., 2009, p. 11 (attacking what I say on 23 Oct. 2009); & McGrath, G.B., "Charles I ...," *British Church Newspaper*, No. 173, 20 Nov., 2009, p. 11 (defending what I say on 23 Oct. 2009). Cf. Evans, H., on "Charles I," & Bartley, A., on "Civil War," *British Church Newspaper*, No. 174, 4 Dec. 09, p. 10 (pro-Cromwell) & McGrath, G.B., "Cavaliers & Roundheads," *British Church Newspaper*, No. 176, 15 Jan. 2010, p. 10 ("a modern-time Cavalier" in "fight" "with the pen and not the sword against modern day Roundheads").

to the *Greater Ejection* from 1643. In the *Lesser Ejection* of 1662, Restoration Anglicans ejected from Anglican Churches, schools, and the public service, between 800 and 2,000 Puritans or semi-Puritans; but this was much less than the Puritan ejection of Anglicans before this time in the *Greater Ejection* from 1643. Between 1642 and 1660, under the *Greater Ejection*, the Puritan republicans ejected between 7,000 and 10,000 Anglican Ministers, school teachers, and public servants; and prohibited usage of the Anglican prayer book²¹⁶.

Personally, I consider that blame existed on both sides i.e., both sides had lost sight of the Biblical teaching of Christian love and tolerance on many of the issues that divided them (Rom. 14:1-15:4; Col. 2:16); and the era of tolerance from 1689 which recognized that the Kingdom of England was basically Anglican Protestant and the Kingdom of Scotland was basically Puritan Presbyterian Protestant, ought to have been reached some 50 years or more earlier than it actually was. *Had both sides been prepared to “walk in” Christian “love” (Eph. 5:2), agreeing to “judge” “no man” “in respect of an holyday” (Col. 2:16), and seeking “not to please ourselves,” but rather to “please his neighbor for his good to edification” (Rom. 15:1,2), then the civil war could, and indeed should have been, avoided.*

Certainly some of the Puritans ejected in 1662 were godly men. E.g., when I was Amsterdam, Holland, in 2002, I went through the Door to Bagijnhof with the statue of St. Ursula above it, into an open square, to the “English Reformed Church.” The sign on the church says the “congregation” was “founded” in “1607,” and is “connected with” both the “Dutch Reformed Church” and “Church of Scotland.” Inside is a plaque “erected” “in memory of Matthew Poole” (1624-1679) “who is buried in this church. He was Rector of St. Michael le Querne London in 1649 and resigned in 1662 on the passing of the Act of Uniformity.” Then in 2003 I visited Kiddeminster in the English Midlands. Here I looked through St. Mary’s *Church of England* where Richard Baxter (1615-1691) had been Minister, before he was ejected in 1662. Behind the Communion rails stood an old wooden chair used by Baxter, which says he was “Chaplain to King Charles II,” and outside is a statue of Baxter. Baxter had also been a Chaplain in the republican army, although he was one of those who helped bring about the Restoration in 1660. He unsuccessfully sought to gain dissenter toleration under Charles II, being ejected in 1662 and imprisoned in 1685 for 18 months. Some months earlier in 2003, I also visited the John Bunyan (1628-1688) sites at Bedford, England, where the Baptist Puritan author of *Pilgrim’s Progress* had been imprisoned. The names and works of Protestant Non-Conformists such as Richard Baxter, Matthew Poole (e.g., his Bible commentary), or John Bunyan, are well respected among orthodox Protestants, and the fact that men like these, and many more, were persecuted under the 1662 Act of Uniformity was deeply regrettable. That men like John Bunyan were imprisoned by the Act of Uniformity, is a tragedy lamented by all good Protestants²¹⁷.

²¹⁶ Ella, G.M., “Ejection & Rejection,” *English Churchman*, (EC 7766), 8 & 15 May 2009, p. 2. Precise figures are difficult to determine. E.g., compare Ella’s figures of 800-2,000 Puritan ejections with those of Wroughton who says in 1660, 695 Puritan Ministers were ejected in order to restore earlier ejected Anglican Ministers into churches the Puritans had intruded into; or in 1662, 900 Puritan or semi-Puritan clergy were ejected for non-compliance with the Act of Uniformity (Wroughton, J., *The Routledge Companion to the Stuart Age 1603-1714*, Routledge, Abingdon, Oxford, England, 2006, pp. 34-35).

²¹⁷ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, pp. 666-671 (Account of John Bunyan).

To this, it must be said that it was the stridently Anglican *House of Commons* that was largely responsible for the push to maintain the Act of Uniformity against Puritan dissenters in England (and Ireland). But as a corporate body, the English (and Irish) Puritans were not “squeaky clean,” because by their continued glorification of Oliver Cromwell (and Samuel Rutherford), suspicion hung over them that they might again engage in sedition against the Crown. The solution from 1689 was to give them Dissenter Tolerance, but under the Test Acts, to keep them out of key government positions and Parliament, relevant because under Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* principles of revolution, only the members of the legislature could depose a “tyrant” monarch. Although it was known that less extreme Puritans were prepared to take Anglican Communion from time to time under the Test Acts, and thus hold various government positions; something Lutheran Protestants had done since the 1660s. But Papists were never prepared to do this, so that by the time of their repeal in the 19th century, the Test Acts were in practice more anti-Papist than anti-Puritan.

Charles II attempted to give a Declaration of Indulgence to dissenters in 1663, but was unsuccessful. While he issued a Declaration of Indulgence in 1672 allowing Protestant Dissenters freedom of worship, this also allowed for the rite of the Roman Mass to be performed in private. But the Parliament stopped it within about a year. A further complicating factor was that because Charles II was seeking to give dissenter toleration to both Protestant Dissenters *and Roman Catholics*, suspicion hung over Charles II motives. And was not Charles II a sexually immoral man? Had he not married a foreign Papist wife?

This was an era in which the Pope was still prepared to command men to fight against Protestant governments, and so religious toleration could not be given to Papists without threatening the security of the realm. And a similar fear still hung over the English (and Irish) Puritans because in general they continued to glorify sedition against the Crown under Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford. The Toleration Act of 1689 was possible for Protestant Dissenters because of the shared values of Protestantism, seen e.g., in the common celebration of the protection of Protestantism against Popery in 1605 (Guy Fawkes Gunpowder Plot) and 1688 (Coming of William III of Orange against the Popish James II); or common remembrance of the events of the Irish Massacre of 1641 (Papist Massacre of Protestants in Ireland).

But Papists were in a different boat. The Pope was a temporal power and a foreign power, being Head of State over the Papal States, and involved in political intrigues in Europe. Papal claims of a superior sovereignty to that of the King of England, Ireland, and Scotland, meant that religious toleration to them would mean the Pope could then command Roman Catholics in the realm to fight seditiously against their government. As the common law jurist Sir William Blackstone observed in the 1760s, one should consider that the “restless machinations of the Jesuits during the reign of Elizabeth, the turbulence and uneasiness of the Papists under the new religious establishment” (e.g., the Spanish Armada of 1588), “and the boldness of their hopes and wishes for the succession of the Queen of Scots, obliged the parliament to counteract so dangerous a spirit by laws of” “severity. The powder-treason” of 1605 “in the succeeding reign, struck a panic into James I.”

Then came the “intrigues of Queen Henrietta in the reign of Charles I, the prospect of a Popish successor in that of Charles II.” That is, Charles II reversed the Protestant *Triple Alliance* of 1668 between Britain, Holland, and Sweden, when in 1670 he entered the secretive *Treaty of Dover* which allied Britain against the Dutch, and under this treaty he further promised to announce his conversion to Popery. However, the seriousness with

which he took this may be reasonably doubted, since he also had made a similar promise to Puritans with regard to “the extirpation of ... prelacy” i.e., Anglican Bishops in the *Solemn League and Covenant* in the early 1650s, in order to gain political support from them. The evidence is that he never took seriously either of these agreements (and the *Solemn League and Covenant* was declared “an unlawful Oath ... of this Kingdom” under the 1662 Act of Uniformity). There are two views as to whether or not, at his death-bed, Charles II converted to Popery, but on the available evidence I would say he probably did not²¹⁸.

Blackstone further refers to “the avowed claim of a Popish pretender to the Crown in” “the reign of King William,” “and subsequent reigns²¹⁹.” That is, after the “Glorious Revolution” of 1688, when the Protestant forces of William of Orange (William III) relieved the Protestants of northern Ireland in the Siege of Londonderry (1689), and then in 1690 routed the Jacobite army of the Popish pretender to the Crown, James II at the Battle of the Boyne in southern Ireland; the Jacobites, made four more attempts to snuff out the Reformation in the British Isles. With an unsuccessful French invasion in 1708. With John Erskine, 6th Earl of Mar, in 1715 the Jacobites were unsuccessfully raised. With Spanish support the West Scottish Jacobites ground to a halt at Glesniel in 1719. The famous *Battle of Culloden* (1746) (also known as the *Battle of Drummossie*), near Inverness, ended the Jacobite rebellion of 1745, when James II’s grandson, the Stuart, Charles (known by the Papists as “Bonny Prince Charlie”), seized and enslaved Scotland for Popery, with the help of rebellious Scottish Highlanders. The Romanist Jacobites, whose Roman Catholic armies had taken Scotland by storm, then lunged their Papist invasion forces deep into the belly of England. At maximum extension, their Papist armies occupied Scotland, and the north of England to about 120 miles (or 200 kilometres) from London. Poised to strike like a dagger into the very heart of London itself, they were then “turned back and brought to confusion” (Ps. 35:4), as by the grace of God, fear was now put into the hearts of the Romanists, so that the Papist army turned, and ran hard. And the British Protestant Red Coats then advanced with great gallantry to destroy the Jacobite rebels at the *Battle of Culloden*, and thus ended the Papists’ evil desires to destroy British Protestantism²²⁰.

Such factors mean that orthodox Protestants who support the Restoration in 1660, are to some extent critical of both King and Parliament in this Caroline era, and recognize the great dangers of allowing religious liberty to Romanists as Charles II had wanted to do in both 1663 and 1672, with a Declaration of Indulgence allowing religious freedom to *both* Protestant Non-Conformists *and Roman Catholics*. If as I think *is not the case*, Charles II did make a death-bed conversion to Roman Catholicism, then the issue of how the Parliament should have dealt with Charles II after his conversion to Popery remains theoretical, since while it would mean that he had *de jure* abdicated the Protestant throne (as James II later

²¹⁸ See my Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section, “(c) i) Charles the First’s Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second’s Day (29 May), & Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov),” subsection, “Charles II’s final years and death” (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at “Commentary on the Received Text”).

²¹⁹ 4 Bl. Com. (*Blackstone’s Commentaries*), pp. 54-7, at p. 57.

²²⁰ “Battlefield Britain - Culloden 1746,” P. & D. Snow, Produced & Directed by P. McGuigan, BBC TV, UK, 2004; *Encyclopedia Britannica CD 99*, Multimedia Edition, International Version, 1999, “Culloden, Battle of;” “Jacobite.”

did), because it is an alleged death-bed conversion, his heir, James II, inherited the Crown immediately. (James II lawfully succeeded because any such *de jure* abdication of the Protestant throne does not become a *de facto* abdication unless so recognized and declared by the Parliament. Thus under constitutional law, the next in line to the throne then succeeds; unless of course, that person is also a Papist, in which instance the Parliament might simultaneously declare the second in line succeeds. Thus the Protestant William II lawfully succeeded the Papist James II with Members of Parliament inviting him over, and the Parliament declaring within a reasonable time of his arrival that he was in fact king.)

Both groups of Protestants agree that neither Charles I, nor his son, Charles II, should have married a Roman Catholic wife. Thus both groups (royalist supporting and republican supporting Protestants), support the later *Bill of Rights* (1689), which recognized that it was “inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant Kingdom,” to allow any “persons” who like Charles II at his death-bed, or his immediate successor, James II, who “shall be, reconciled to, or shall hold communion with, the See or Church of Rome, or shall profess the Popish religion,” “to inherit, possess or enjoy the Crown;” or “to” have “any King or Queen marrying a Papist,” as both Charles I and Charles II had done. Hence as with conversion to Popery, “all and every person” who “shall marry a Papist, shall be excluded, and be ever incapable to inherit, possess or enjoy the Crown,” and “in all and every such case,” of either membership of the Roman Catholic Church or marriage with a Roman Catholic, “the people of these realms shall be and are hereby absolved of their allegiance, and the said Crown and Government shall” “descend to,” “such person or persons, being Protestant, as” if these others “were naturally dead.” This gave black letter statute law effect to some of the same provisions formerly found in the unwritten common law of England with respect to a Papist not being able to hold the legally Protestant throne, although added safety provisions so as to ensure this would be a quicker succession, (it had taken the Parliament three years to declare the voidable office of monarch void under James II,) and also rightly prohibited any mixed marriage between a Papist and the monarch.

The division between the two groups of Protestants with the regard to the qualified Divine Right of Kings to rule goes deep, continues to exist, and historically was at the heart of the British civil wars of the 1640s and 1650s. That professed Protestants would go so far as to kill one another in a civil war, over an issue that included a difference of interpretation of Scriptures such as Rom. 13:1,2, is deeply disturbing and very regrettable, for “the Lord” doth “hate,” “he that soweth discord among brethren” (Prov.6:16,19). But one group of Protestants (the republican Protestants), say that Charles I had broken his contract in the same way that James II later did, was not to be trusted, rejected reasonable offers at an accommodation settlement, and had to be killed. This group considers that Charles I was executed by the republicans in harmony with Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* principles which holds that Biblical passages such as Rom. 13:1-9, or I Peter 2:17, “Honour the king;” can on the basis of the “higher law of nature,” be set aside by members of the legislature against a “tyrant” king. This republican group of Protestants sees the Puritan, Oliver Cromwell, as a forerunner to William of Orange (who paradoxically was the grandson of Charles I), and considers that as James II broke his contractual or “covenantal” relations with the country and was rightly deposed by William III with the consent of Parliament, so Charles I was rightly deposed by the republican army of the Commonwealth period with the consent of Parliament. Charles I is regarded as such a bad persons by this group, that he was lawfully executed by the republicans for “treason” against the parliament, and other “high crimes against the realm.”

The other group of Protestants (the royalist Protestants), consider that modifications and changes ought to have been made, but ought not to have included killing the King. Charles I had not, like James II, repudiated the 39 Articles or Anglican prayer book, and so could not, like James II, be said to have *de jure* abdicated the throne. But even if he had, then the next in line, not some republican “Lord Protector,” should have succeeded him. Thus the Puritan controlled House of Commons could have used this very powerful lever as a bargaining chip to e.g., repeal the reactivated statute that Laud used to fine those not attending Anglican Churches, and indeed to discipline the wayward Archbishop Laud. They could and indeed should have worked for some modifications to the law, and Charles I had already shown he was willing to do so. Charles I had erroneously attempted to impose Anglicanism on Scotland with the *Prayer Book* of 1637, but after the resultant Scottish Covenanter War, and victory by the Scots in the first *Bishops’ War*, a truce was signed at Berwick-upon-Tweed in June 1639. In the *Long Parliament* of 1640, Charles the First gave his royal assent to triennial parliaments, and royal assent to changes meaning parliament was not be prorogued without its consent. In the same year he also agreed to the full establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland. Thus Charles I is regarded as a king who parliament could and should have worked with, and of whom the Puritan controlled Parliament was overly negative.

This group, believes the Divine Right of Kings to rule is subject to qualifications, but that whereas under those qualifications, the later Papist king, James II, broke his contractual obligations with God and the country which legally required a Protestant monarch to e.g., be *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, and so was rightly removed; for all his sins, Charles I did not fail to meet these broad legal requirements, even though some of his actions were unwise e.g., his failure to move to discipline Archbishop Laud. This group may also point out the link of succession to the line of Charles I coming ultimately to William of Orange (who both groups of Protestants like), and considers that when King Charles I went to his death, he was dying for a specifically Christian principle, namely, a qualified Divine Right of Kings to rule, that has Biblical warrant in the words St. Peter, “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17), and the words of St. Paul, “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation” (Rom. 13:1,2). Hence Charles the First is regarded as a “martyr.” This group considers that Oliver Cromwell did not accept that “every soul be subject unto the higher powers” (Rom. 13:1), as this included both God and the King to which he was not sufficiently “subject.” Cromwell is regarded as such a bad persons by this group, that after the Restoration in 1660, his body was exhumed and his head placed on a pike at Westminster Hall, where it remained till the end of Charles II’s reign. In the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), Charles I is given his own “Office” (annual service, 30 Jan.), referred to as “Blessed King Charles the First,” and called a “martyr.” In this *Book of Common Prayer* service for “King Charles the Martyr,” the republicans responsible for executing him, referred to as his “martyrdom,” e.g., Oliver Cromwell, are called “cruel and bloody men,” and “sons of Belial” (Satan), with the republican years described as a “tyranny.”

It is significant that the Commonwealth republican and Caroline royalist Protestant groups, both agree that any Divine Right of Kings to rule is *not absolute*, and subject to qualification. They both agree that Charles the First may be criticized for such actions as seeking to impose the 1637 Anglican Prayer Book on Scotland, and ruling from 1629 to 1640 without parliament meeting, before finally agreeing to triennial parliaments in 1640 which once called, could not then be prorogued without their consent. Both see as undesirable the

lack of religious liberty to Puritan Protestants under the 1662 *Act of Uniformity*. They both agree that the legal contract with the country was broken by the Papist king, James II, so that the Parliament rightly recognized his *de jure* abdication as a *de facto* abdication, and rightly called upon the heir, William of Orange, to become king. Both groups converge to form Protestant royalist sympathies with King William III, commonly called, William of Orange.

Both groups agree that James II was lawfully declared by Parliament to have *de facto* abdicated after he *de jure* abdicated, and support William III in the subsequent wars between James II and William III. Both agree that the contract between the country and king is subject to lawfully made laws, and was lawfully and wisely modified in the *Bill of Rights* (1689) provisions, requiring that any future king be a Protestant, and barred from converting to Popery. Both agree on the 1689 provisions preventing the Protestant King from marrying a Papist, and so both agree that some of the “sins” referred to in the service for King Charles included his mixed marriage. Both agree on the connected Protestant values of the *Act of Settlement* (1701) and associated *Act of Union* (1707). Both therefore agree that the law with regard to the monarch is lawfully modified after 1689 so as to prevent a re-run of the scenario under Charles I and Charles II where the king married a Roman Catholic wife. Both agree on the sentiments found in the inclusion of William or Orange in the “Gunpowder Treason” Service from 1689. Both agree with the Williamite “Glorious Revolution” of 1688²²¹. Both agree with the pro-Protestant and anti-Papist sentiments of the “Gunpowder Treason” Service with regard to 5 Nov 1605 and 5 Nov 1688, to be held annually on “Papists’ Conspiracy Day.”

Notwithstanding diverse views among Protestants on the issue of the qualified Divine Right of Kings to rule with regard to the reigns of Charles I and Charles II, and connected with this, associated disagreement over the period of republican rule in the 1640s and 1650s, the fact remains, that so long as the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) contained the state services for “King Charles the Martyr” (30 Jan.), “Restoration of the Royal Family” (29 May), and “Papists’ Conspiracy” Day (5 Nov.), the Anglican Church *recognized the role of the supernatural*, not just in general terms, but in specific terms with respect to God protecting Great Britain and Ireland, and the Protestant heritage of the British Isles against Popery, since the Restoration of 1660 made possible the kingly succession of William III. The services for Charles I & II were connected to the *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* Service, in part because they were a celebration of Anglican *Protestantism*, and in part because William III and Mary II were both descendants of Charles I, as was Charles II. Moreover, Charles I was the son of James I against whom the Guy Fawkes Gunpowder Plot was directed, and the service thanked God for “the wonderful and mighty deliverance of” both “King James the First” and “the Prince” i.e., the future Charles I, from this “Popish treachery.”

Papists’ Conspiracy Day always upheld Protestantism via reference to the events of

²²¹ While the events of 1688 and 1689 are sometimes called, “The Glorious Revolution,” in such instances, the word “Revolution” should be understood to mean “a drastic change” or “great reversal of conditions” such as in the terminology of “The Industrial Revolution;” and should NOT be taken to mean, “the political overthrow of a government by sedition.” Thus any warfare that occurred between them, such as the *Battle of the Boyne* (1690), was the warfare between a lawful king in William III of Orange and a Jacobite pretender to the throne in James II.

1605, and this Protestant emphasis was further strengthened with the inclusion of William of Orange from 1689. Thus irrespective of one's views on the qualified Divine Right of Kings to rule with regard to the reigns of Charles I & II, and the republican period, which have retained elements of controversy among Protestants; as a package deal, these state prayers upheld Protestantism, and the idea that God had intervened in history to protect the country and preserve its Protestant character. The supernatural was seen both with regard to the protection of Protestantism in the British Isles (Papists' Conspiracy Day); and also the qualified Divine Right of Kings to rule (Charles I's Day and Charles II Day); even if, Charles I & II, had, like King Solomon, married "strange women" (Charles I married a French Roman Catholic, Henrietta; and Charles II married a Portuguese Roman Catholic, Catherine of Braganza), and their "wives" to some degree "turned away" their "heart" from the purity of religion (I Kgs 11:1,4) that came again under William III.

Therefore, when these three state services were removed in 1859, this was an anti-supernaturalist statement by the Westminster Parliament, that wanted to dismantle the Protestant Christian State in favour of a secular state, and which no longer considered that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will," even if he sometimes "setteth up over it the basest of men" (Dan. 4:17), whether as Heads of State (such as James II,) or members of Parliament. It removed two services upholding the supernatural with regard to the qualified Divine Right of Kings to rule in the Charles I's Day Service (30 Jan.), and the Charles II's Day (Royal Oak Day) Service (29 May); as well as one service upholding the supernatural with regard to the protection of the country from Popery and for Protestantism in 1605 and 1688/9 in Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov). It took away powerful reminders and acknowledgments, that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will" (Dan. 4:25,32). Actions in the wider society related to this. The fact that the annual 5 November church commemorations in which sermons thanked God for the defeat of the Papist plot of Guy Fawkes in 1605, on *Papists' Conspiracy Day* ceased after 1859, also meant the associated celebrations in which an effigy of the Pope was burnt, were generally (though not universally) discontinued from this time²²².

Similar criticisms may be made with respect to the simultaneous removal of *Irish Massacre Day* (23 Oct.) from the Calendar of the *Church of Ireland* in 1859. This day recalled the massacre in Ireland of Protestants by Papists in 1641. In the Irish context this was a pro-Protestant day similar in type to *Papists' Conspiracy Day*.

This secularist anti-supernaturalist sentiment was further strengthened by the fact that from the same year of 1859, St. Paul's Cathedral no longer held the annual service asking

²²² These celebrations included gunpowder fireworks, and from about 1673 an effigy of the Pope was sometimes burnt. By the end of the 1700s, this Papal effigy was called "a guy" (Chadwick, O., *op. cit.*, pp. 291-2). But without the church services, "Bonfire Night" or "Guy Fawkes Day" (5 Nov.), continued after this time, remaining part of the popular culture in the UK. "Today, as in for the last 400 years, effigies of the Pope, and now more often Guy Fawkes," "are burned on top of large bonfires. As the bonfires burn fireworks are let off in wonderful and spectacular displays" ("Month by Month Calendar of British Festivals and Special Events," in "Facts About November," www.woodlands-junior.kent.school.uk/customs/year/november.htm). By custom, the effigy of the Pope burnt is that of the incumbent Bishop of Rome at the time of the Gunpowder Treason Plot, Pope Paul V (Pope: May 1605 to 1621).

God to deliver them from another fire like the Great Fire of London in 1666. Charles II declared 10 Oct. 1666 an official day of fasting to commemorate the Great Fire of London. Thereafter annual services were held at St. Paul's Cathedral in London every 2 September, asking God to deliver Londoners from another fire like the Great Fire of London in 1666. Many had formed the view that God had sent this fire as a judgment for the sin of gluttony (Prov. 23:21; Matt. 24:38,39, cf. 24:49; Philp. 3:19). The fire started at Pudding Lane (near London Bridge, where Christopher Wren's "the Monument" to the 1666 Great Fire now stands), and its terminus is remembered by the monument of the "Golden Boy of Pye Corner" statue at Giltspur Street, London²²³, (between the nearby church of Holy Sepulchre, where the Marian martyr John Rogers was minister, and the place where Rogers was martyred in 1555 at Smithfield). This latter monument says, the "boy of Pye Corner" statue, "was erected to commemorate the staying of the great fire which beginning at Pudding Lane, was ascribed to the sin of gluttony when not attributed to the Papists." Services dealing with this event first appeared in the *Book of Common Prayer* under Charles II, "by His Majesty's special command" on 10 October 1666, and are also found in Oxford Prayer Books 1681-3. The service was revised in 1696 under Archbishop Tenison, including a new prayer for preservation of the City of London from fire. Different forms of it appeared in prayer books over time e.g., in 1821. The fact that its use continued at St. Paul's Cathedral in an annual service till 1859, was a statement of belief that God is control; God is interested in the affairs of men and may send Divine Judgements on sins such as gluttony, either directing or by permitting such fires as the Great Fire of London; and God is able to prevent any such future fires. Its discontinuance from 1859 was a Deistic type statement that God is not really in control of such things; God is disinterested in the affairs of men and does not really send judgements on men for sins such as gluttony; and God either could not, or would not, be prepared to stop another such fire, even if petitioned to do so.

I have seen Christopher Wren's *The Monument* to the Great Fire of 1666 on numerous occasions over five trips to London (dating from 2001 to 2009). But in March 2009 I climbed its many stairs after it had been closed for 18 months due to it being cleaned. Reference to the Great Fire of London service started by Charles II are chiseled onto Christopher Wren's *The Monument*, near London Bridge. Under Charles II, these words include (in Latin) the statement, "In the year of Christ, 1666, on the 2nd September, at a distance eastward of this place of 202 feet, which is the height of this column, a fire broke out ..., so as ... to remind us of the final destruction of the world by fire. The ... fatal fire ... died out." To which were then added under Charles II in 1681, "But Popish frenzy, which wrought such horrors, is not yet quenched." But these words added in 1681, were deleted by being chiseled out in 1830, and this State sanctioned vandalism has left a visible scar on *The Monument* (although a plaque underneath it tells of this wicked event). Coming as it did just a year after the *Roman Catholic Toleration / Emancipation Act* of 1829, this 1830 State sanctioned vandalism also bespeaks to us of this wider secularist movement to dismantle the Protestant Christian State by wicked secularists.

Thus at the same time, further anti-supernaturalist actions occurred by the Westminster Parliament, which rejected the idea of *the voice of nature*, evident in God's destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19) for the sin of sodomy (Jude 7); or the killing

²²³ Like so many statues (and paintings) erected in the name of "art," this one is of a nude figure. I accordingly regard it as a *statue of perversity* which I think immoral. Better by far is Wren's "Monument" near London Bridge.

of the children of King Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon for incest (Lev. 20:21). By allowing the *Church of England* to go to rack'n'ruin with idolatrous Puseyites and semi-Puseyites who e.g., idolatrously adored the Communion elements contrary to the Final Rubric of the Communion Service in the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, with e.g., “pauses,” or “noddings,” or genuflecting, at the consecrated Communion elements; or allowing the Puseyites Proper to invoke saints contrary to Article 22 of the *39 Articles*; they disregarded the teaching of I Cor. 5:11 that for such sins as a “man that is called a brother” being “a fornicator” e.g., incest, “or ... idolater,” God may administer Divine Judgments of sickness or death on a congregation (I Cor. 11:27-32); or for idolatry, turn them over to a homosexual orientation and the vice of sodomy (Rom. 1:23-27). As already discussed above, sodomy ceased to be a capital crime in England from 1861 and Scotland from 1889. Almost annual bills to allow the type of incest that Henry VIII broke with Rome over (i.e., the same degree of relationship as a deceased brother’s wife, in bills seeking to allow marriage with a man deceased wife’s sister, Lev. 20:21; Mark 6:18), began in the Westminster Parliament from 1860s (finally succeeding in 1907).

In this general context of anti-supernaturalist actions by Parliament and the *Church of England*, with the creation of a secular state in the place of the Protestant Christian State, Protestantism suffered in various ways. Thus the broad sentiment was anti-supernaturalism, but the chief effect was anti-Protestantism. These deistic beliefs meant the Parliament would not act to protect the British Isles against Popery or other false religions, nor protect the *Church of England* against Puseyites Proper, semi-Puseyites, and religious liberals. The continuation of historic Reformed Anglicanism as one type of religiously conservative Protestant Christianity, was continued by a group who from the 19th century on became known as “the Low Church Evangelical Anglicans;” yet they did so without the former help and assistance they had enjoyed from the government. So gross was the politicians dereliction of duty to the *Church of Ireland* that they went so far as to Disestablish it from 1871; and likewise as a deserting father, further Disestablished the *Church of England* in Wales from 1920. (See Isa. 49:23 & Article 37, Anglican 39 Articles.) These deistic beliefs also soon fuelled agnostic and then atheistic notions. Though it is an ancient truth, that “The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God” (Ps. 14:1), the new breed anti-supernaturalists liked to think of atheism and religious skepticism as a “new” or “modern” idea, brought about by their notions of “science.” This was the era of Lyell’s and Darwin’s anti-supernaturalism, under the so called name of being “naturalists.” Yet once again, the truth was, that it is an ancient folly to use worldly wisdom and “science” against the truth of God (I Cor. 1:23,24; I Tim. 6:20,21).

In this anti-supernaturalist environment, the idea of Biblical prophecy in general came under attack. And no-where was this more pointed than in the attack on historicism, which suffered not only because of anti-supernaturalism, but also because of the related anti-Protestantism, which no longer looked to see the hand of God in history between Bible times and the Second Advent. The British society in its parliament and to a large extent its Established Church, had stopped thanking God for safeguarding the British Isles for the truth of Protestantism, and stopped recognizing his supernatural acts in their history. Indeed, the Second Advent itself was denied, by “scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming?” (II Peter 3:3,4).

The promotion of other schools of prophetic interpretation, especially, preterism and futurism also undermined historicism. The apostasy of Protestant churches by religious liberalism, “ecumenical” compromise, or in the case of the Anglican Church by the Puseyites

(“Anglo-Catholics”) and Semi-Puseyites (“Broadchurchmen”). These last two may interrelate, e.g., a religiously liberal view of the Book of Daniel argues in a circular manner, refusing to believe that anyone in the sixth century B.C. could foretell such accurate information as Daniel does on the Medo-Persian and Grecian Empires, and then saying that this “proves” it was written in the second century B.C., with the consequence that there is a corresponding denial that the fourth empire refers to Rome, and so a religiously liberal and preterist interpretation are then necessarily interconnected. There was also the hijacking of theological seminaries, universities, and book publishers by persons lacking appropriate spiritual insight and understanding; *although the coming of the Internet from the late 20th and early 21st centuries has, for the first time in a long time, opened a window of opportunity against the secularists’ information monopoly.* The general secularization of society has further infected many in the churches who simply fail to spend the time and energy in submission to God’s Spirit studying the Word of God on this, and other matters.

But historicists must also admit that some of the blame also falls on so called “historicists” themselves. For example, the misuse of the Historical School by incompetent persons who failed to properly research history. The misuse of the Historical School by persons denying that “of that day and hour” of Christ’s return “knoweth no man” (Matt. 24:36), and seeking to predict the exact year of Christ’s return. It must be admitted that some of those involved in this error were otherwise orthodox Protestant and generally good historicists e.g., the Reverend John Brown (1722-1787) in *Brown’s Bible (1778)* which had numerous reprints (Gresham, London & Glasgow, Revised Edition by the Rev. Drs. Porter & Cooke, mid to late nineteenth century). Some more slyly, in various ways, sought to *create the impression* that Christ *must* return within about 5 to 10 years, without specifically making this claim. For example, *one* such way was by denying that there are still some future unfulfilled elements of the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation such as Dan. 11:40-45, or “the mark of the beast” in Rev. 13:11-18, with the consequence that people were disappointed when Christ did not appear and the Historical School was unfairly discredited in their eyes.

On the one hand, I defend the right of orthodox Protestant Christian brethren to argue for what they believe to be third or later stages of the Reformation, and to form denominational churches and/or churches which may then predominate in a particular geographical region, around such differences if they so wish. But on the other hand, I think they should not lose sight of the big picture, lose love for the brethren (I John 3:10-15), and come to condemn their brethren who disagree with them in terms such as “heretic” or “apostate.” *In particular, I thoroughly reject any attempt to misuse the historical school by harnessing it to a promotion of claimed “later stage reforms.”* Such persons have brought great discredit upon themselves, their cause, and the historical school of prophetic interpretation. For example, the misuse of the Historical School by *pseudo-historicists* who focused on secondary issues that orthodox Protestants disagree over, such as the mode of baptism, or use of the sign of the cross at baptism by Anglicans, whether one keeps Sunday simply as a day of Christian assembly or whether one keeps Sunday as the Sabbath, or whether or not one keeps Christmas and Easter.

E.g., the absurd and ridiculous claims of Samuel Rutherford (d. 1661) that Anglicans who knelt to take Communion thereby committed semi-Romanist idolatry, and so committed spiritual fornication with Papal Rome (Rev. 17:2,5). Rutherford claimed all Anglicans, were in “communion with great Babel, the mother of fornications. ... Will ye, then, go with them, and set your lips to the whore’s golden cup, and drink of the wine of the wrath of God

Almighty with them? ... Oh cursed pleasure!” (Rev. 14:8-10; 17:4,5)²²⁴. This type of nonsense, also carried on in the 19th century by Alexander Hislop (d. 1865), *infra*, does great damage to the credulity of the Historical School of Prophetic Interpretation, since by means of this pseudo-historicism, the well established historic Protestantism of the British Isles and its derivatives, is attacked along with Popery.

Historically Protestants have divided between those who considered “The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies,” providing it does not thereby “ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word” (Art. 20, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*) (broadly Anglicans & Lutherans); and those who considered the “way of worshipping the true God” is determined by what is specifically “prescribed in the holy Scriptures” (Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 21:1) i.e., “The Regulatory Principle” (broadly Puritan & semi-Puritan derived Churches). Thus, for example, historically both Anglicans and Presbyterians followed the injunctions of St. Paul for the “singing” of “psalms” (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16), or of St. James to “sing psalms” (Jas. 5:13). But the Anglicans, finding the tradition of ending a psalm with the *Gloria Patri* (“Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen”), not contrary to Scripture, and indeed a good and useful tradition giving the psalms a Christian Trinitarian ending, added the *Gloria Patri* at the end of any psalm (or portion of a psalm) used. By contrast, the Presbyterians, finding no specific command in Scripture to add the *Gloria Patri* after a psalm, did not add the *Gloria Patri* at the end of any psalm (or portion of a psalm) used. Or Anglicans in the *Church of England* considered *the sign of the cross* at baptism is not contrary to Scripture, is harmonious with the imagery of Rom. 6:3-6, and a good and useful practice to be continued in the church. By contrast, finding no specific command in Scripture to use *the sign of the cross* at baptism, Presbyterians in the *Church of Scotland* considered this was not a practice that they would follow in the church. So likewise, Anglicans found the keeping of holy days such as Christmas and Easter not contrary to Scripture, harmonious with the principles of Col. 2:16, and considered the liturgical year’s calendar to be a good and useful practice in the church. By contrast, Presbyterians found no command to keep such festivals in Scripture, and so did not follow such a church practice.

Such diversity among orthodox Protestants has sometimes been abused by pseudo-historicists “that soweth discord among” the “brethren” (Prov. 6:19). For example, in a classic pseudo-historicist work, *The Two Babylons* (1858), Alexander Hislop, a Scottish Presbyterian Minister in the East Free Church of Scotland, releases veiled anti-Anglican sentiments in his purported treatment of Romanism both with respect to baptism and holy days. He makes absurd claims against using *the sign of the cross* at baptism, and thereby makes “Christ divided” over baptism in a manner comparable to the Corinthians heretics (I Cor. 1:12-17). Hislop also attempts to spy out Christian freedoms to keep (or not to keep) various holy days with his anti-Christmas and anti-Easter rhetoric, and so replicates the Colossian heretics who would needlessly “judge” men “in respect of an holyday” (Col. 2:16). Hislop’s approach makes “the cross of Christ” “of none effect” (I Cor. 1:17) as he attempts to revive the type of sentiments found in the sad old seventeenth century Scottish Covenanter days of *Anglicans verses Presbyterians* (the Bishops Wars of 1639 & 1640); or civil war days in which Hislop, like Samuel Rutherford, parts company with the sentiment of greater part of Scottish Presbyterians, in order to join up with the type of sentiment found in English and Irish type of Presbyterians who supported Cromwell.

²²⁴ Rutherford’s Letter 174 / 86 of 1637 A.D. .

This type of thing, reminiscent of Protestant tensions before the *Toleration Act* of 1689 which granted non-Anglican or dissenter Protestants religious liberty in England, seeks to split Protestants along the same type of lines that Rutherford did. For instance, he seeks to pervert Historicism into Pseudo-Historicism, and use it to split Reformed Anglicans (who use *the sign of the cross* at baptism) and Presbyterians (who do not use the sign of the cross at baptism); and he smashes the pre-eminence of Christ, once again, particularly seeking to split Evangelical Anglicans (who keep Christmas and Easter) and Presbyterians (who historically did not keep Christmas and Easter, a position later maintained mainly in the Free Churches of the Presbyterian tradition)²²⁵, as he sets out to “judge” men “in respect of an holyday” over Christmas and Easter, thus enticing orthodox Protestants away from “holding the Head,” which is “Christ” (Col. 2:8,9,16,19,20). Of this type of thing the Apostle Paul wrote, saying that we should be “avoiding profane and vain babblings,” “which some professing have erred concerning the faith” (I Tim. 6:20,21). Not only is this (and other similar claims by Hislop) bad theology with respect to the gospel, as brother is turned against brother, but it is also bad “historicism.” It is one of the factors that has helped to subvert historicism, and turn it into a tool of pseudo-historicism whereby a group of warped denominationalists use it as a poisoned weapon against orthodox Protestants, in the process, thus helping to discredit the historical school as *the Protestant School of prophetic interpretation*.

Let us consider in more detail this kind of damaging pseudo-historicism found in the ridiculous claim of some pseudo-historicists that the “mark” “of the beast” (Rev. 13:15,16) is found in *the sign of the cross*, either when made *on the forehead* at a Roman Catholic baptism, or made when a Roman Catholic crosses himself. For example, Ian Sadler (a Strict Baptist), says “the mark of the beast” “is” “practised by the Church of Rome, where the sign of the cross on the forehead is made with water in baptism.” Like Hislop, Sadler’s outrageous concerns over the *sign of the cross* are linked to claims that the “+” shape of the cross has its origins in ancient Babylon where it was used as a symbol for the pagan god Tammuz. Hislop’s earlier work (1858) that Sadler’s work (1999) draws on, claims, “That which is now called the Christian cross was originally no Christian emblem at all, but was the mystic Tau of the Chaldeans and Egyptians - the true original form of the letter T - the initial of the name of Tammuz - which,” is “in Hebrew, radically the same as ancient Chaldee” (or Aramaic).

Hislop’s claims that the “+” shape in *the sign of the cross* is the letter “t” standing for “Tammuz,” on the basis of its similarity with the letter “t” in older forms of Hebrew (tau /

²²⁵ Compare similar rhetoric in George Gillespie’s *Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies Obtruded on the Church of Scotland* (1637). Written after the *Five Articles of Perth* (1618) in which an attempt was made by Anglicans to impose feasts such as Easter on mainly unwilling Presbyterians, as was kneeling (rather than sitting) at Communion, and Anglican prelacy with episcopalian confirmation; Gillespie rightly argued that such things are not necessary and Anglicans were spying out their Presbyterian Christian freedoms. But he was wrong to go beyond this, and spy out Anglican Christian freedoms to do such things, absurdly claiming (in words that anticipate Hislop), that thereby the Church’s “shamefaced forehead hath received the mark of the beast,” 666. By contrast, the Presbyterian’s *Directory for the Public Worship of God* (1645) avoided such pseudo-historicist extremity in stating their Presbyterian view that “Festival days” had “no warrant in the Word of God,” and so Christmas etc. “are not to be continued.”

tav) or Chaldean. In the first place, *even if this was the origins of the Roman usage of a cross*, I think it would be quite absurd to suggest that therefore we ought not to use *sign of the cross* for this reason, or worse still, that for this reason the *sign of the cross* constitutes “the mark of the beast.” After all, if this was such a serious concern, God would never have allowed Christ to hang on a cross, since on this ridiculous type of logic, Christ would thereby be somehow making an act of pagan devotion to Tammuz. Indeed, Christ’s crucifixion was foretold in prophecy by King David about a thousand years before the event, and long before the practice of crucifixion was used by the Romans in the words of the Messianic psalm, “they pierced my hands and my feet” (Ps. 22:16). But where is the evidence that the shape of a cross in Roman crucifixion was based on an act of devotion to Tammuz? Hislop further claims, “There is hardly a pagan tribe where the cross has not been found²²⁶.” But even if *some* pagan cultures did have a cross symbol e.g., certain “Egyptian monuments” with the hieroglyphic ankh which is a cross with a ring at the top representing *life* or the *soul*; this is most assuredly *not* where the symbolism of the Christian cross is derived from, nor stands for, and it is folly to claim that this Christian symbol actually represents some kind of “pagan” religious allegiance. Thus in the second place, the origins of the cross as a Christian symbol is not related to paganism. Rather, the cross as a symbol of Christianity was greatly promoted from the time of Constantine the Great. Thus e.g., we find on the Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer Calendar*, *Invention of the Cross Day* (3 May) remembering that the mother of Constantine, Helena, went to Jerusalem in 326, and located what is now the traditional site for Christ’s crucifixion; and *Holy Cross Day* (14 Sept.) marks the starting point for the third usage of 3 ember days (see “Tables and Rules” 1662 BCP), and *Holy Cross Day* remembers the building of a basilica in Jerusalem in 335 on the traditional site of Christ’s sepulchre and Calvary as remembered on *Invention of the Cross Day*.

The *sign of the cross* is not limited to Roman Catholics, and has historically been used by orthodox Protestants in Lutheranism (Luther’s *Short Catechism*, 1529) and Anglicanism (Baptism Service, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). Hence this type of pseudo-historicist thinking leads to such erroneous ideas as, “the mark of the beast” is being presently administered (when in fact it still remains a future element of prophecy). Or that it is has been administered and received not only by Papists, but also by Anglican Protestants such as the Marian martyrs, Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley; and other godly Anglicans whose baptism included receiving *the sign of the cross* on their forehead, or who have administered an Anglican baptism using *the sign of the cross*, for example, the Anglican clergyman John Kensit, who was martyred for his Protestantism on English soil by Papists in 1902.

Likewise, discredit has been brought on historicism by the misuse of the Historical School by *pseudo-historicists* connected with cults that attack orthodox Protestants and claim their cult is the “true” church. Common themes of these *cult pseudo-historicists* include a devaluation or denial of the Trinity, denial of justification by faith, and interpretation of the broad-brush passages dealing with the Antichrist to refer to their heretical and anti-orthodox Protestant teachings. Let us briefly consider five examples of such cults, the four major cults, Seventh-day Adventists, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Mormons, and Christian Scientists, and

²²⁶ Porcelli, B., *The Antichrist*, His portrait and history, Protestant Truth Society, London, UK, Fourth Edition Revised, 1929, pp. 1024; Sadler, I.A., *op. cit.*, pp. 76,283; Windburn, R., (Ed.), Appendix 3 in Turretin at pp. 122-4; Hislop, A., *The Two Babylons*, 1858, 4th edition 1929, reprint 1965, S.W. Partridge, London, Great Britain Section 4, “The sign of the cross,” pp. 197-205 at p. 197.

one of the many minor cults, the Christadelphians.

Some of these cults claim to have a “prophet.” Of course, it should be remembered that the gift of prophecy only existed in Bible times. The Apostle Paul foretold, “if there are gifts of prophecy, they will be done away” (I Cor. 13:8, NASB), and dated this by limiting “apostles and prophets” to the church’s “foundation” era (Eph. 2:20) i.e., NT times. Thus there cannot be either apostles or prophets after NT times, since we are no longer in the “foundation” period (Eph. 2:20). Hence when confronted with anyone who claims to have the gift of prophecy in post NT times, such as Ellen White (Seventh-day Adventist), Joseph Smith (Mormon), or Mary Baker (Christian Science), we automatically know that by definition the person is a false prophet. This recognition forms an integral part of the *sola Scriptura* Reformation catch-cry found in the Reformation Motto, “*sola gratia* (Latin, ‘grace alone’), *sola fide* (Latin, ‘faith alone’), and *sola Scriptura* (Latin, ‘Scripture alone’).” For Scripture is complete and needs no further additions (II Tim. 3:16); and so with this insight, Luther was able to dismiss all Popish claims to any extra-Biblical authority, with *Scripture Alone* thereafter becoming a defining quality of Protestantism.

None of the four major cults believe in the doctrine contained in the Biblically sound *Athanasian Creed*. This creed was named after, not written by, Athanasius (c. 296-373), Bishop of Alexandria in north Africa, who was a great defender of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity against Arian heretics. The *Athanasian Creed* upholds Trinitarian and other Biblical teachings sometimes denied by cults, e.g., that man has a “soul” (Gen. 2:7; Matt. 10:28; I Cor. 15:45), or that Christ “descended into hell” (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27,31). It also expresses the Biblical teaching that those in “heresies” that put them outside e.g., the Trinitarian Christ that died for men’s sins and rose again on the third day (Rom. 5:6; 10:9; I Cor. 8:6; 12:3; II Cor. 13:14), and who shall come again to judge the living and the dead (Matt. 25:31-46), “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:20,21), and those who are “unbelieving” “shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8).

The *Athanasian Creed* was written in the fifth or early sixth century. It is thought to have been originally composed in southern France or Spain, since its early influence appears to have been mainly in southern France and Spain during the sixth and seventh centuries, especially against Arian heretics. The earliest known copy of it is found in the *Homilies* of Caesarius of Arles (died 542). It is also found in the canons of three *Councils of Toledo* in Spain (589, 633, and 638 A.D.). The *Council of Autun* (or *Augustodunum*) in southern France (670), directed that all clerics “shall learn” the Apostles’ and Athanasian Creeds. From about 800 A.D., this creed enjoyed regular usage in the Roman Church of Western Europe. The *Athanasian Creed* was said in Latin in the Roman Catholic *Sarum Breviary*, though this was not a service for the people. Recognizing the privileges and duties of the universal priesthood of all believers, the Protestant Reformers wonderfully facilitated the use of this most excellent creed by the body of believers. It was surely an unwarranted and perverse logic by the Roman Church, that locked this creed up in Latin, and hid it with monks and Popish priests; for the body of believers most assuredly benefit from the Biblically sound teaching of this creed, which by the grace of God, helps to protect them from various heretics and unbelievers.

Concerning its condemnation of heresy and other dogmas, e.g., the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord* says, of the “Apostles’, Nicean, and Athanasian Creeds,” that “we publicly profess that we embrace them and reject all heresies and all dogmas which have ever been brought into the Church of God contrary to their decision” (Epitome 2). Or e.g., the

Anglican theologian, Broughton Knox (1916-1994), who was Principal of two Evangelical Anglican Colleges, Moore Theological College, Sydney, Australia (1959-1985), and George Whitfield College, Cape Town, South Africa (1989-1992), upheld the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*. This included Article 7 of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, which says, “The three creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius’s Creed, and” “the Apostles’ Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.²²⁷” Commenting on the *Athanasian Creed*’s damnatory clauses with special, though not exclusive reference to unbelievers, Knox says, “The classical statement of the doctrine of the Trinity is the Athanasian Creed.” The “strong asseverations of the Athanasian Creed” “remain true.” “Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he holds the catholic faith. Which faith except everyone do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the catholic faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in unity, neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the Substance” (*Athanasian Creed*). “The Athanasian Creed,” says Knox, “is succinct and correct. Its strong words, that it is not possible to be saved without believing in the Trinity or in the reality of the incarnation, only spell out the gospel message that salvation is found in Jesus the Lord. For Jesus cannot be called Lord apart from the doctrine of the Trinity.²²⁸” (Mark 16:15,16; Rom. 1:1-3; 8:9;10:9; I Cor. 8:5,6; 12:3; 13:14; I John 2:23; 4:2). The Apostle Peter warns of “false teachers” “who” “shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord” (II Peter 2:1), and so those who deny Christ as Lord in the doctrine of the Trinity stand condemned by Holy Writ.

The *Athanasian Creed* is upheld by e.g., the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord* (1576 & 1584) (together with the Apostles and Nicene Creeds, as one of the “three approved symbols” of the faith, in Article 12), Anglican *Irish Articles* (1615), *French Confession of Faith* (1559) (compiled by Calvin and De Chandieu), and Dutch Reform *Belgic Confession* (1566). These Protestant Confessions do not generally focus on the errors of heretics such as e.g., those in Eastern Orthodoxy and Oriental Orthodoxy, or the errors of unbelievers such as e.g., those in Judaism or Mohammedanism, or the heathen Red Indians of the Americas, in a way that compares with these confessions length of focus on rejecting the errors of Roman Catholicism in favour of the true gospel of grace recovered by Luther in the Reformation. The point is clear. Before the Protestant Reformation which commenced in 1517, Trinitarian heretics such as the Eastern Orthodox (who deny the double procession of the Holy Ghost²²⁹), and Oriental Orthodox (who deny the humanity of Christ via monophysitism²³⁰), heretics who

²²⁷ Knox, D.B., *Thirty-Nine Articles*, Anglican Information Office (AIO) Publication, Sydney, Australia, pp. 20,88.

²²⁸ Knox, D.B., *The Everlasting God*, 1988, reprint: Lancer Books, Sydney, Australia, 1992, pp. 49-50.

²²⁹ “The Father was made by no-one, and is neither created nor begotten. The Son is from the Father alone, and is neither made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, and is neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeds” (*Athanasian Creed*).

²³⁰ “The correct belief then, is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. God of the substance of the Father, begotten from eternity; and man of the substance of his mother, born in the world. Perfect God and perfect man, subsisting of a rational soul and body. Equal to the Father, concerning his Divinity; and inferior to the Father, concerning his humanity. Although he is God and man, yet he is not

e.g., as religious liberals “say that there is no resurrection” (Matt. 22:23), or outright unbelievers e.g., those in Judaism or Mohammedanism, stood rightly condemned by the *Athanasian Creed’s* damnatory clauses²³¹. *After the Protestant Reformation, there is a continuation of this position.* That is because, “The three creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius’s Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles’ Creed, ought to thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture” (Article 8, *Thirty-Nine Articles*). A heretic who will not “hear the church” on these teachings that may be proven from Holy Writ, is “as an heathen” (Matt. 18:17). Trinitarian heretics such as the Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox, together with other heretics who deny e.g., the Second Coming of Christ, do so because they “are of” their “father the devil” (John 8:44), and together with all unbelievers e.g., atheists (Ps. 14:1) or heathens (Eph. 2:12), are “damned” (Mark 16:16) to hell. The *Athanasian Creed* thus remains an important instrument in the hands of orthodox Protestant Christians, to condemn unbelief as well as many heresies.

Hence e.g., the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* states that, “this confession of our Christian faith, commonly called The Creed of Saint Athanasius,” be used at “Morning Prayer, instead of the Apostles’ Creed” on various holy days. Specifically, on Christmas day (25 Dec.), Epiphany (6 Jan.), St. Matthias’ day (24 Feb.), Easter day, Ascension day (40 days after Easter), Whitsunday (two Sundays after Ascension day), Trinity Sunday (the Sunday after Whitsunday), St. John Baptist’s day (24 June), St. James’ day (25 July), St. Bartholomew’s day (24 Aug.), St. Matthew’s day (21 Sept.), St. Simon’s and St. Jude’s day (28 Oct.), and St. Andrew’s day (30 Nov.). This requires that the *Athanasian Creed* be publicly used about once a month. Thus such people are privileged to recite the *Athanasian Creed’s* great spiritual truths, and are, by the grace of God, kept safe from the teachings of a variety of heretical religions (e.g., in Eastern Orthodoxy, the Greek Orthodox Church; or in Oriental Orthodoxy, the Armenian Orthodox Church), all infidel religions (Judaism and Mohammedanism), and all heathen religions (e.g., the “fortune-telling” Gypsies). Hence e.g., in sixteenth century England or Ireland, both before and after the Reformation, the *Athanasian Creed’s* broad condemnation of unbelievers and Trinitarian heretics, may have sometimes become in practice a simple statement such as, “Beware of witches, Gypsies, Jews, Arabs, Turks, and Greeks.”

ATHANASIAN CREED

two [persons], but one Christ. He is one, not by changing Divinity into humanity, but by taking humanity into [his] Divinity. He is altogether one, not by mingling of [his Divine and human] substance [to form a part-God part-man], but [he is fully God and fully man] by [virtue of the] unity of [his] Person. For in the same way that a rational soul and body is one man, so God and man is one Christ” (*Athanasian Creed*).

²³¹ “Whoever desires to be saved must above all things hold fast to the universal faith. Unless one keeps this faith completely and inviolably, he will undoubtedly perish forever.” “Therefore he who desires to be saved should thus understand the Trinity.” “Furthermore, it is necessary for eternal life that one also faithfully believe in the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. The correct belief then, is” “This is the universal faith [on the matters we have specified]. If one does not faithfully and firmly believe it, he cannot be saved.” These clauses simply manifests the Biblical teaching (e.g., John 8:44; Gal. 5:20,21; Eph. 2:12; Rev. 21:8).

(Named after, not written by, Bishop Athanasius
 a defender of Christ's Divinity in opposition to the Arian heresy,
 present at the Council of Nicea, 325 A.D., and Bishop of Alexandria, 326-73 A.D. .)

<i>Form found in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer of 1662</i>	<i>A modern form sometimes used in this commentary</i>
<p>Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith.</p> <p>Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.</p> <p>And the Catholick Faith is this:</p> <p>That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity, Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance.</p> <p>For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost.</p> <p>But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal.</p> <p>Such as the Father is, such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost.</p> <p>The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate: and the Holy Ghost uncreate.</p> <p>The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible: and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible.</p> <p>The Father eternal, the Son is eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal.</p> <p>And yet there are three eternal, but one eternal.</p> <p>As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated: but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible.</p> <p>So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty: and the Holy Ghost Almighty.</p> <p>And yet they are not three Almighties: but one Almighty.</p> <p>So the Father is God, the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God.</p>	<p>Whoever desires to be saved must above all things hold fast to the universal (catholic) faith.</p> <p>Unless one keeps this faith completely and inviolably, he will undoubtedly perish forever.</p> <p>Now this is the universal faith [on the matters specified].</p> <p>We worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity, Neither confusing the Persons, nor dividing the [one Supreme] Being.</p> <p>For the Father is one Person, the Son is another, and the Holy Spirit is another.</p> <p>But the Divinity of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is exactly the same in equal glory and co-eternal majesty.</p> <p>What the Father is, that the Son is, and that the Holy Spirit is.</p> <p>The Father is not created, the Son is not created, and the Holy Spirit is not created.</p> <p>The Father is infinite, the Son is infinite, and the Holy Spirit is infinite.</p> <p>The Father is eternal, the Son is eternal, and the Holy Spirit is eternal.</p> <p>Yet there are not three [beings who are three] eternal, but [three Persons in] one eternal [Supreme Being].</p> <p>Likewise, there are not three infinites, nor three who are not created, but [three Persons in] one [Supreme Being] who is not created, and [three Persons in] one infinite [Supreme Being].</p> <p>Similarly, the Father is Almighty, the Son is Almighty, and the Holy Spirit is Almighty.</p> <p>Yet there are not three [beings who constitute three] Almighties, but [three Persons in] one Almighty [Supreme Being].</p> <p>Therefore the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God.</p>

<p>And yet they are not three Gods, but one God.</p> <p>So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord. And yet not three Lords: but one Lord.</p> <p>For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord; so are we forbidden by the Catholick Religion to say there be three Gods or three Lords.</p> <p>The Father is made of none: neither created nor begotten.</p> <p>The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created, but begotten.</p> <p>The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.</p> <p>So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.</p> <p>And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other, none is greater, or less than another;</p> <p>But the whole three Persons are co-eternal together: and co-equal.</p> <p>So that in all things, as is aforesaid: the Unity in the Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped.</p> <p>He therefore that will be saved: must thus think of the Trinity.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.</p> <p>For the right faith is that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man;</p> <p>God of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds:</p>	<p>Yet there are not three Gods, but [three Persons in] one [Supreme Being who is] God.</p> <p>So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Spirit is Lord.</p> <p>Yet there are not three Lords, but [three Persons in] one [Supreme Being who is] Lord.</p> <p>For in the same way that we are compelled by Christian truth to recognize each Person by himself to be God and Lord; likewise we are forbidden by the universal religion to say, ‘There are three Gods,’ or ‘three Lords’.”</p> <p>The Father was made by no-one, and is neither created nor begotten.</p> <p>The Son is from the Father alone, and is neither made, nor created, but begotten.</p> <p>The Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, and is neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeds.</p> <p>So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Spirit, not three Holy Spirits.</p> <p>In this Trinity, none [of the Persons] comes before or after the other [in their Divine equality], none [of the Persons] is greater than, or less than another [Person];</p> <p>But all three Persons are co-eternal and co-equal with each other.</p> <p>So that in everything, as previously affirmed, the unity in the Trinity, and the Trinity in unity is to be worshipped.</p> <p>Therefore he who desires to be saved should thus understand the Trinity.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is necessary for eternal life (Latin <i>salus</i> = “life,” “health,” “welfare,” “safety,” or “salvation”) that one also faithfully believe in the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.</p> <p>The correct belief then, is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man.</p> <p>God of the substance (or ‘being’) of the Father, begotten from eternity;</p>
--	---

<p>and Man, of the Substance of his Mother, born in the world.</p> <p>Perfect God and perfect man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting;</p> <p>Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead: and inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood.</p> <p>Who although he be God and Man: yet he is not two, but one Christ.</p> <p>One, not be conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking the Manhood into God.</p> <p>One altogether, not by confusion of Substance:</p> <p>but by unity of Person.</p> <p>For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and Man is one Christ.</p> <p>Who suffered for our salvation: descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead.</p> <p>He ascended into heaven, He sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty: from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.</p> <p>At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies: and shall give account for their own works.</p> <p>And they that have done good shall go into eternal everlasting: and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.</p> <p>This is the Catholick Faith:</p> <p>Which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.</p> <p>Glory be to the Father, and to the Son: and to the Holy Ghost;</p> <p>As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.</p>	<p>and man of the substance of his mother, born in the world.</p> <p>Perfect God and perfect man, subsisting of a rational soul and body.</p> <p>Equal to the Father, concerning his Divinity; and inferior to the Father, concerning his humanity.</p> <p>Although he is God and man, yet he is not two [persons], but one Christ.</p> <p>He is one, not by changing Divinity into humanity, but by taking humanity into [his] Divinity.</p> <p>He is altogether one, not by mingling of [his Divine and human] substance [to form a part-God part-man],</p> <p>but [he is fully God and fully man] by [virtue of the] unity of [his] Person.</p> <p>For in the same way that a rational soul and body is one man, so God and man is one Christ.</p> <p>Who suffered for our salvation. He descended into hell. On the third day he rose again from the dead.</p> <p>He ascended into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from there he will come to judge the living and the dead.</p> <p>At his coming all men will experience the resurrection of the body, and they will give an account of all their deeds.</p> <p>Then those who have done good will enter eternal life, and those who have done evil will enter eternal fire.</p> <p>This is the universal faith [on the matters specified].</p> <p>If one does not faithfully believe it, he cannot be saved.</p> <p>Glory to God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,</p> <p>As it was in the beginning, is now, and will be throughout eternity. Amen.</p>
---	---

Therefore, let us consider the five cults in question, with special, though not always exclusive reference to, the doctrine contained in the *Athanasian Creed*.

The Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) cult is one of the four major cults (along with the Jehovah's Witnesses cult, Mormon cult, and Christian Science cult, and together with the Jehovah's Witnesses and Mormons, is one of the three most major cults)²³². Official SDA documents uphold the Deity of Christ, and doctrine of the Trinity²³³. But to this there is an important qualification. Unlike the other three major cults, and unlike most of the minor cults, which deny the Trinity outright; the Seventh-day Adventist cult devalues the doctrine of the Trinity by building bridges of spiritual tolerance and friendship between those who hold to orthodox Trinitarian teachings and those who deny orthodox Trinitarian teachings. It does this by maintaining that allegiance to the cult and its distinctive teachings is *what really matters, not the Trinity*. This point is evident from analysis of Seventh-day Adventism on three Trinitarian issues. The SDA cult has historically allowed members to be either orthodox on the Trinity and believe the Son was *begotten from eternity*; or be semi-Arian Trinitarian heretics, and embrace the Arian heresy that the Son was created at some point in time. The SDA cult allows members to be either Christologically orthodox and believe that Christ had the same type of *sinless human nature* that Adam had *before* the Fall, and so overcame sin where the first Adam failed; or be Trinitarian heretics and embrace the associated heresy of sinless perfectionists, by claiming that Christ had the *sinful human nature* of Adam *after* the Fall, and so has given us an example of sinless perfection that all can attain to. The SDA cult allows members to adhere to the orthodox Trinitarian view of monotheism, in which there are *three Persons* in *one* supreme *Being*; or be heretics who maintain under the misuse of the name "Trinity," a Tri-theistic view of polytheism, in which there are *three beings* in coalition, who are *one* simply in *unity* of purpose in their sharing of Divine power and authority i.e., a Tri-unity Triumvirate.

The SDA cult was founded in 1863 by the cult's prophetess, Ellen White (who rejected Arianism), her husband, James White (an Arian heretic), and Joseph Bates (an Arian heretic). Ellen White was a sex role pervert, whose lusts for male teaching authority violated the clear NT Christian teachings of Holy Writ, "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (I Tim. 2:11,12). "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. What? Came the word of God out from you? Or came it unto you only? If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord" (I Cor. 14:34-37). Thus the Biblical gift of prophecy, as seen through reference to the NT gift of prophecy in these Scriptures, was qualified to mean that while a prophetess could recount a vision, she could not, like a male prophet, have a teaching role over adult males. Yet it is clear that the cult's prophetess, Ellen White, did exercise a teaching role over adult males. Ellen White, James White, and Joseph Bates, did not "acknowledge that the things that" the

²³² For a penetrating analysis of all four major cults by a distinguished Reformed theologian, see Anthony Hoekema's *The Four Major Cults, op. cit.* . Though one of the four major cults, the Christian Science cult is considerably smaller than the three most major cults.

²³³ Hoekema's *The Four Major Cults, op. cit.*, pp. 108-9, 112-3.

Apostle Paul did “write,” which “are the commandments of the Lord” (I Cor. 14:34-37).

Since the SDA cult was founded by two Arian heretics (James White and Joseph Bates), together with Ellen White (who rejected Arianism); this means that from the outset, the cult’s prophetess, was prepared to give a religious “greeting” (ASV) or “bid” “God speed” (AV) to those who “transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ,” and so was a “partaker of” the “evil deeds” of these Arian heretics (II John 9,10,11). She also showed herself to be one of those “false prophets” who “are gone out into the world” “that confesseth not that” “Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:1-3), since the flesh he came in was one in which there “is no sin” (I John 3:5), yet she fostered tolerance between cult members who did and did not accept the sinless human nature of Christ, and made conflicting statements as to her own view on the matter. Those rejecting orthodox Trinitarian teachings have been permitted to hold the very highest offices in the cult. E.g., one of the three founders of the Seventh-day Adventist cult in 1863, James White (1821-1881) was an Arian heretic who on several occasions served as President of the SDA’s General Conference (the highest SDA church office). Another President of the SDA’s General Conference, William Branson, maintained that Christ had a sinful human nature like Adam *after* the Fall.

The Seventh-day Adventist publication, *Adventist Review* (6 Jan. 1994), says, “Adventist ... pioneers, including James White, J.N. Andrews, [and] Uriah Smith ..., held to an Arian or semi-Arian view - that is, the Son at some point in time ... was generated by the Father.” The “Trinitarian understanding of God, ... was not generally held by the early Adventists. Even today a few do not subscribe to it.²³⁴” Given that SDA Arians like J.N. Andrews or Uriah Smith still recognized that in some diminished sense the Son of God is “Divine,” within the broad parameters of Arianism, they are more precisely semi-Arians as opposed to Arians Proper, and are somewhat like the semi-Arians under Basil of Ancyra (Galatia, modern Ankara, Turkey) (died 362), who claimed the Son was “of like substance” (*homoiousios*) with the Father, in opposition to the orthodox teaching of men like Basil of Caesarea (from 370 A.D. Bishop of Caesarea, Cappadocia, modern Turkey), also known as Basil the Great, who rightly maintained that the Son was the “same substance” (*homoousios*) with the Father.

This reference in the *Adventist Review* (1994) to John Andrews (1829-1883), is also quite noteworthy. J.N. Andrews claimed that the Son of God was created “at some point” in time. In Heb. 7:1-3, we read that Melchizedek (Gen. 14:18-20), an OT “King of Salem,” was “without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but was made like unto the Son of God.” As a normal human being, we cannot doubt that Melchizedek had a “father,” “mother,” “descent,” “beginning of days,” and “end of life.” However, *no reference to these are made in the OT record of him*, which provides no genealogical information about him, and does not refer to either his birth or death. It is clear from Heb. 7:1-3, that *this was a deliberate omission*. I.e., in order to be a *type* that pointed to the Messiah who would be “a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek” (Ps. 110:4; Heb. 5:6; 6:20; 7:17), all such references about Melchizedek are omitted, in order that as a prophetic type he might be “made like unto the Son of God,” who “abideth a priest continually” (Heb. 7:3). This requires the conclusion that the greater fulfilment, who is none other but the “Lord” himself (Ps. 110:1,4), that is, “the Son of God” (Heb. 7:3), must be the

²³⁴ *Adventist Review*, 6 Jan. 1994, pp. 10,11; quoted in www.Smyrna.org/Books/Who_Is_Telling/What_Does_the_Present_Church_Say_.htm.

one who really is “without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life” (Heb. 7:3). The term, “Son of God” requires a relationship with God the Father, and through his incarnation the Son also had a mother. However in Heb. 7:3, “without father” is qualified by “without mother,” and the meaning is clearly biological origins i.e., “without descent,” since he has no “beginning of days.” In other words, in harmony with Ps. 90:2, the Son of God *is from everlasting* (“without beginning of days”), and *to everlasting* (no “end of life”). This same truth is recognized in Heb. 1:8 where Christ is called “God,” “‘Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever’;” since this is a quote from Ps. 45:6,7, and we read elsewhere in the Psalms, that God’s “throne is established of old; thou art from everlasting” (Ps. 93:2).

J.N. Andrews commented on Heb. 7:3 when writing in the Seventh-day Adventist publication *Review and Herald* (7 Sept., 1869). Andrews blasphemously denied that the Son has no beginning, claiming that the words, “having neither beginning of days” (Heb. 7:3), should not be taken literally, since only God the Father was without a beginning. Andrews claimed, “the Son of God,” “had God for his Father, and did, at some point,” “have a beginning of days.”²³⁵ In the words of the Seventh-day Adventist cult prophetess, Ellen White, Andrews is remembered by the cult, as the “first” SDA “missionary” “in Switzerland.” She also says, “We were happy to meet” “Andrews” “from Europe” when he came to “Battle Creek,” Michigan, as an 1878 European delegate to the SDA’s “General Conference.” Ellen White also claimed, “Brother Andrews” is one “of the ablest advocates of truth.”²³⁶ These statements clearly require the conclusion that Ellen White “bid” “God speed” to a semi-Arian heretic, who clearly “abideth not in the doctrine of Christ.” She thus became “partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 9,11). The ongoing glorification given by the cult to Andrews, is evident in the fact that their tertiary institution, Andrews University in Michigan, USA, was named after him in 1959 (at that time combining their Potomac University, with their Emmanuel Missionary College, which before 1901 was known as Battle Creek College, founded in 1874). That the Seventh-day Adventist cult would glory in the name of Andrews University, shows how unBiblically tolerant they are to cult members who embrace this Arian heresy. The Word of God is clear that, “whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father” (I John 2:22); and “he that hath not the Son of God hath not life” (I John 5:12). In the words of the *Athanasian Creed*, “The correct belief then, is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. God of the substance of the Father, begotten from eternity.” “If one does not faithfully believe it, he cannot be saved.”

The reason for the SDA acceptance of an Arian heretic like J.N. Andrews, clearly revolves around the fact that he promoted the cult’s teachings. Indeed this is evident in one of Ellen White’s most important works, *Great Controversy* (1881). Here she quotes Andrews, who says that the Jewish “‘Sabbath ... lies at the very foundation of divine worship’;” quoting from “J.N. Andrews, *History of the Sabbath*, chapter 27.” Ellen White then claims that, “In contrast to those” who so keep the Jewish Sabbath, “the third angel points to another class, against whose errors” “is uttered: ‘If any man worship the beast and

²³⁵ Pfandl, G., “The Doctrine of the Trinity among Adventists,” 1999 (www.macgregorministries.org/seventh_day_adventists/trinity.htm).

²³⁶ White, E.G., *The Upward Look*, Review & Herald, Washington, D.C., USA, 1982, p. 102; *Life Sketches of Ellen G White*, 1915,1943, Pacific Press, California, USA, p. 238; *Testimonies for the Church*, 1948, Pacific Press, California, USA, Vol. 1, pp. 625-6.

his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God' Revelation 14:9,10." She then engages in what she claims is, "A correct interpretation of the symbols employed" in the Book of Revelation, and concludes that these words of Rev. 14:9,10 refer to "Sunday-keeping." Thus she depicts those observing Sunday sacredness as receiving "'the mark of the beast'.²³⁷"

What a stark contrast there is between these claims by Ellen White with the words of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Colossians! On the one hand, St. Paul says to believe that in "Christ" "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" is important (Col. 2:8,9). Since the Trinitarian God is "from everlasting" (Ps. 93:2), if in "Christ," "dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2:8,9), it follows that the Son of God is from everlasting. To deny this, as J.N. Andrews did, is to deny Christ his "preeminence" (Col. 1:18). But on the other hand, St. Paul says the keeping of Jewish "sabbath days" is not important, for "Let no man" "judge you" "in respect" "of the sabbath days" (Col. 2:16). The cult prophetic, Ellen White, therefore says the very opposite of the Apostle Paul, since she says the keeping of Jewish *sabbath days* is so important, that people ought to recognize an Arian heretic like John Andrews as one "of the ablest advocates of truth," even though he denied that "in" "Christ" "dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2:8,9); and further depicts those who reject Andrews view about keeping the Jewish Sabbath as receiving "the mark of the beast" for "Sunday-keeping."

The classic Seventh-day Adventist cult pseudo-historicist work is Uriah Smith's *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*. Uriah Smith (1832-1903) was an Arian heretic who regarded Christ as a semi-Divine created being. In his *Thoughts, Critical and Practical on the Book of Revelation* (Battle Creek, Michigan, USA, 1865) he says Christ was "the first created being," in his revised edition (1881) commenting on "the beginning of the creation of God" (Rev. 3:14) he replaces the word "create" with "begotten" but gives it the unorthodox Arian meaning, saying Christ "*came into existence* in a different manner, as he is called 'the only begotten of the Father'" (emphasis mine). In his final edition of 1897 his views remain the same. He refers to those who consider Rev. 3:14 "does not necessarily imply that he was created," but then says, "*others, however, and more properly we think,*" take the Arian view "that *he himself came into existence* in a different manner," that is, he was not "*created in the ordinary sense* of that term," but "begotten" (emphasis mine). This unorthodox Arian meaning of "begotten" requires that Christ "came into existence" at some point of time in the past, when he was "begotten." Smith's interpretation of Rev. 3:14 is strikingly similar to his commentary on Dan. 7 where he refers to "Arius, parish priest of the ancient and influential church of Alexandria." "Arius maintained 'that the Son was totally and essentially distinct from the Father; that he was *the first* and noblest of those beings whom *the Father had created* out of nothing'" (emphasis mine).

The Biblical orthodox teaching is that since the Second Person has *always* been the First Person's Son, he is "neither made nor created, but" "begotten *from eternity*" (*Athanasian Creed*) (Micah 5:2; John 1:1,14, 3:16-18; 1 John 4:9) (emphasis mine). Or in the words of the *Nicene Creed*, the "only-begotten Son of God" was "eternally begotten of the Father"²³⁸. Responding to Arius's claims in c. 321 A.D. that "before he [Christ] was

²³⁷ White, E.G., *The Great Controversy*, 1888,1911, Pacific Press, California, USA, pp. 437-8,446-9.

²³⁸ The rendering, "eternally begotten of the Father" is found in the 1662 Anglican

begotten or created,” “he did not exist;” the general *Council of Nicea* (325) maintained that the Son is “one substance” or “being” (*homoousion*) “with the Father,” “and those that say ‘there was [a time] when he was not,’ and ‘before he was begotten he was not,’ or those that allege that the Son of God is ‘of another substance’,” or “‘created’” the “church anathematizes.²³⁹”

In his commentary on Dan. 7, Smith is dismissive of the “general council” “called at Nicea” in “A.D. 325” which condemned the Arian heresy, saying, “This opinion” of “Arius” “was condemned by the council, which decreed that Christ was of one and the same substance with the Father.” “The controversy,” “however, was not to be disposed of in this summary manner.” He describes “the Arians” as being part of “the Christian world,” and glorifies a number of Arians, for example, the Arian missionary Ulfilas; Alaric, the conqueror of Rome; Genseric, the conqueror of Africa; and Theodoric, the king of Italy. Just one year after his 1897 edition, and five years before his death, he claimed in *Looking Unto Jesus* (Review & Herald, Washington, D.C., USA, 1898, p. 13), that “with the Son the evolution of Deity, as Deity, ceased. All else” “has come in by the creation of the Father and the Son,” that is, he claimed through a process of “evolution” “the Son” took upon himself “Deity,” but that no further created beings could evolve on up to become God. Uriah Smith was not the only Seventh-day Adventist whose Arian views have been tolerated by the SDA cult, but he is one of the most prominent and influential. The Bible says of people like Uriah Smith, “He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son” (I John 2:22), and “he that biddeth” “an antichrist” “God speed is partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 7,11).

The Seventh-day Adventist cult never formally adopted Arianism, and indeed has issued documents upholding the Deity of Christ²⁴⁰. But the cult has nevertheless historically *tolerated* such semi-Arianism, regarding it as being within the boundaries of permissible doctrinal diversity. Some forty years after Smith’s death, the cult produced a revised and edited edition of this commentary in 1944 (Southern Publishing Association, Tennessee, USA), which removed Smith’s comments endorsing Arianism at Rev. 3:14. In some ways this made Smith even more dangerous since people first were introduced to Uriah Smith as the classic Seventh-day Adventist commentator on Daniel and Revelation *without knowing he was an Arian heretic*, and later would find out about this. The reality is that whether the cult is using his 1897 final edition or the 1944 revised edited edition, Uriah Smith is one who clearly “abideth not in the doctrine of Christ” by being an Arian heretic who embraced semi-Arianism, and since the cult “biddeth him God speed” by the lofty esteem in which they hold him and promote his work as their classic commentary, they are a “partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 9,11).

Notably, this was sanctioned by their prophetess, Ellen White, who in 1899 urged that

Book of Common Prayer form as, “begotten of his Father before all worlds.” For an explanation of this terminology see my Textual Commentaries, Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “Byzantine Text Bonus for Commentary: Two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries!,” section “* B) Sam Angus of Sydney University: the big heretic,” subsection “(2) Some lives hurt by Angus’s heresies: Four case studies,” at “Case Study 4: Alex Neil, a Presbyterian Elder” (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at “Commentary on the Received Text”).

²³⁹ Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 25,39. Cf. Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 93-4.

²⁴⁰ Hoekema’s *The Four Major Cults*, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-3.

“canvassers should be secured” to sell both her works, for example, “Great Controversy,” together with Uriah Smith’s “Daniel and the Revelation,” claiming that such book-sellers “will be accompanied by angels, who will go before them to the dwellings of the people, preparing the way for them” (White’s *Colporteur Ministry*, Pacific Press, USA, p. 58). This requires the conclusion that “angels” “will” be “preparing the way” for people to receive a book that promotes the semi-Arian heresy, and glorifies several Arian heretics. In 1903 White again mentioned these same books, saying “every effort should be made to get them before the people” (White’s *Evangelism Review & Herald*, p. 366). Or in 1902, just four years after Smith had again expounded his semi-Arian doctrine in the *Review and Herald* published book, *Looking Unto Jesus*, and five years after he again did so in his *Daniel and the Revelation (1897 edition)*, White said, “I feel very tender towards Elder Smith. My life interest in the publishing work is bound up with his.” “We hope always to see” the “name” of Uriah “Smith” “in the *Review and Herald* at the head of the list of editors; for thus it should be.” “Thus God would have it” (White’s *Selected Messages*, Review & Herald Vol. 2, p. 225). This requires the conclusion that “God would have” an Arian heretic “at the head” of the SDA editorial staff. Her 1905 comments in this context are also revealing since they require the conclusion that “instruction” came from God to have “widely circulated” a book “needed now as never before” that promotes the Arian heresy. White said, “Instruction has been given,” that is, from God, “that the important books,” written by herself, such as “Great Controversy,” and Smith’s “Daniel and Revelation,” “are needed now as never before. They should be widely circulated.” “Had tact and skill” “been shown in the sale of these books, the Sunday-law movement would not be where it is today” (White’s *Colporteur Ministry*, pp. 123-4). By presenting an Arian Christ in the place of the Biblical Christ, Smith showed himself to be “a deceiver and an antichrist.” Ellen White, thus “biddeth” Uriah Smith and his Arian commentary “God speed,” that is, she gives it religious recognition, and so she necessarily became a “partaker” of this Arian antichrist’s “evil deeds” (II John 7,10,11).

Here we come to the nub of the matter. In his *Epistle to the Colossians*, the Apostle Paul says Jewish “sabbath days” are not important for Christians, but recognizing that “in him,” that is, in “Christ,” “dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily,” is important for Christians (Col. 2:8,9,16). Since the Trinitarian God is “from everlasting” (Ps. 90:2), it follows that all three Divine Persons are *from everlasting*, and thus we read of the Second Divine Person that he is “from everlasting” (Micah 5:2). To deny this, as Uriah Smith did, is to deny Christ his “preeminence” (Col. 1:18), and to deny that “in” “Christ” “dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead” (Col. 2:8,9). Like her followers, White reverses this order, saying that the keeping of Jewish *sabbath days* is a matter of such importance, that people ought to promote the work of the Arian heretic Uriah Smith which denies that in Christ *dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead*, and if this was done, “the Sunday-law movement would not be where it is.”

Observance of the Christian Sunday was sanctioned by Christ and his Apostles (John 20:1,19,26; Acts 2:1; 20:7). But like White in her “Great Controversy” (chapters 25 & 38), in his “Daniel and the Revelation” commentary, Smith depicts Gentile Christians who like the NT Galatian Christians maintain Sunday sacredness (I Cor. 16:1,2), and submit to the Divine injunction that they ought not to keep Jewish sabbath “days” (Gal. 4:10,11 // Lev. 23 & 25; Num. 28 & 29), as receiving “the mark of the beast” for observing the Christian Sunday. E.g., at Rev. 13:11-17 he asserts, “Sunday-keeping must be the mark of the beast.” Thus on the one hand, Seventh-day Adventists from their prophetess Ellen White down, greatly devalue the Trinity by making belief in Christ’s full Divinity and associated rejection

of the Arian heresy *a non-essential fundamental belief*, since they tolerate this view held by two of the cult's three founders, Joseph Bates and James White, the latter of whom was the SDA's General Conference President on several occasions; they have historically promoted Uriah Smith's *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation* as their classic commentary; and they glory in the European missionary work of the Arian heretic John Andrews, after whom they named Andrews University in 1959. But on the other hand, they so elevate their heresy in which they "judge" a "man" "in respect" "of the" Jewish "sabbath days" (Col. 2:16) as *an essential fundamental belief*, that in Uriah Smith's Arian commentary, they depict persons who *refuse to keep the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday) by instead observing the Christian Sunday as receiving "the mark of the beast."* This shows a thoroughly warped and twisted theological perspective. It is clearly repugnant to the apostolic teaching evident in Col. 2:8,9,16.

Following in the footsteps of their propheticess, Ellen White, the Seventh-day Adventist cult has a long history, continuing to the present, of devaluing the importance of the Trinity and tolerating Trinitarian heretics. For example, there are historic Christological divisions within the cult as to whether the human nature of Christ was sinless (like Adam before the Fall) (orthodox view, II Cor. 5:21; Heb. 4:15; 7:26; 9:14; I Peter 1:19; 2:22; I John 3:5)²⁴¹, or sinful (like Adam after the Fall) (unorthodox view). The orthodox view, which was stated at the *Council of Chalcedon* (451), is that the Son is "of one substance with the Father as regards his Godhead, and at the same time of one substance with us as regards his manhood; like us in all respects, apart from sin."²⁴² Being "one substance" is sometimes called being "consubstantial," so that the Son is *consubstantial* (or "one substance") with the Father in Divinity; and *consubstantial* (or "one substance") with us in humanity, *except that he was without sin*²⁴³. This is also stated in the *Athanasian Creed* where Christ's sinlessness means he is "perfect man." This creed says, "we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. God of the substance of the Father, begotten from eternity; and

²⁴¹ The "Son" came "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3). Christ "took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses" (Matt. 8:17; quoting Isa. 53:4). Whereas the sinless Adam before the Fall was not subject to death, by contrast, the sinless second Adam was subject to human death, being *imputed* with our sins (Isa. 53:6,9-12; Rom. 6:23). For he was "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3). As John Calvin observes, "Although the flesh of Christ was unpolluted by any stain, it had the appearance of being sinful, since it sustained the punishment due to our sins, and certainly death exerted every part of its power on the flesh of Christ as though it were subject to it. Because our High Priest had to learn by his own experience what it means to assist the weak, Christ was willing to undergo our infirmities In this respect too there appeared in him a certain resemblance to our sinful nature" (John Calvin's *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans & to the Thessalonians*, translated by R. Mackenzie, Edinburgh, 1961, p. 159; cited in Cranfield, C.E.B., *International Critical Commentary*, Romans, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1975, Vol. 1, p. 380.

²⁴² Bettenson's *Documents*, p. 51.

²⁴³ With respect to Christ's Divinity, being the "same substance" or "one substance" *also* means being the "same being" or "one being" with the Father and Holy Spirit, since there is only one Supreme *Being* (singular); whereas with respect to Christ's humanity, being "one substance" or the "same substance" with mankind does not also mean this, since there are many human *beings* (plural), not just one human *being* (singular).

man of the substance of his mother, born in the world. Perfect God and perfect man, subsisting of a rational soul and body.”

It is important to understand the statement of Christ’s sinless human nature in the *Council of Chalcedon* (451), against the backdrop of the earlier *Council of Ephesus* (431). The *Council of Ephesus* addressed a number of heresies relevant to the Trinity, and condemned Pelagianism. The council justly condemned Coelestius, the disciple of Pelagius. In various ways, Pelagians (or semi-Pelagians) fail to understand the proper nature of original sin (Ps. 51:5; Eccl. 7:29, NKJV; Matt. 19:8; Rom. 3:23; 5:12). Among other Pelagian heresies, Coelestius claimed, “That a man can be without sin, if he choose²⁴⁴” (I Kgs 8:46; Ps. 130:3; Prov. 20:9; Eccl. 7:20; Rom. 7:7-25; Gal. 6:13; I John 1:8). By first condemning this heresy through the *Council of Ephesus*, and then stating at the *Council of Chalcedon* that Christ is “of one substance with us as regards his humanity; like us in all respects, apart from sin,” it follows that Christ had the sinless human nature of Adam before the Fall, and overcame where Adam fell; not the sinful human nature of men after the Fall, who *before glorification* can never “be without sin” in the sense of sinless perfection.

The Reformed theologian, Anthony Hoekema, notes that like all Arminians, Seventh-day Adventists have a Pelagian concept of original sin with respect to salvation²⁴⁵. In its section on “Original sin,” the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* is prepared to “condemn Pelagians and others who say” “that man can be justified in God’s sight by his own strength of reason” (1:2)²⁴⁶. In addition to this Arminian form of Pelagianism, another element of Pelagianism arises in the SDA cult with respect to the issue of sinless perfectionism. The Seventh-day Adventist cult’s debate over whether or not Christ had a sinless human nature, is complicated by the fact that Ellen White herself made contradictory statements, sometimes supporting Christ’s sinless nature and sometimes supporting the claim he had a sinful nature. For example, Hoekema notes that in *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine* (Review & Herald, USA, 1957), Christ is presented as having a sinless human nature; but in *Drama of the Ages* (Southern Publishing Association, USA, 1950), the President of the SDA General-Conference (the highest SDA church office), William Branson presents Christ as having a sinful human nature. Or Paxton notes in 1977 the cult issued worldwide “Adult Sabbath School Lessons,” in which he says the cult claimed “‘Our Model is not merely an example which beckons us on but is never to be reached.’ Jesus ... possessed a sinful nature common to all men. Hence, Jesus is qualified to be our Example, and the gospel (good news) is that He has proved we can overcome sin and live exactly (sinlessly) as He did.” Paxton says this “caused no small stir” between the two rival Seventh-day Adventist factions, that is, the sinless perfectionists who consider Jesus had a sinful human nature and has shown fallen men can reach sinless perfection, and the anti-perfectionists who consider Jesus had a sinless human nature and has shown unfallen man need not have sinned. Paxton’s work thus vindicates Hoekema’s statement: “On the question ... of the sinlessness of Christ’s human nature, we conclude that there is still much ambiguity in Seventh-day Adventist teaching²⁴⁷.”

²⁴⁴ In Augustine’s *De gestis Pelagii*, 23 (Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 53-4).

²⁴⁵ Hoekema’s *The Four Major Cults*, *op. cit.*, pp. 112,125,390.

²⁴⁶ Bettenson’s *Documents*, p. 210.

²⁴⁷ Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 315-20; Hoekema’s *The Four Major Cults*, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-115; Paxton, G.P., *Shaking of Adventism*, Zenith, Delaware, 1977, pp. 133-4.

Following in the footsteps of Uriah Smith who denied the *Council of Nicea* (325) teaching that the Father and the Son are one “substance” or “being,” some SDA cult literature also rejects the orthodox Trinitarian teaching that the Three Divine Persons are one *substance* or one supreme *being* (Greek *homoousios*) as taught by e.g., the *Nicene Creed* or *Athanasian Creed*. For the “universal faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity; neither confusing the Persons: nor dividing the Being” (*Athanasian Creed*). That is, the three Divine Persons form *one Supreme Being* or *one God*. Because God is *one Being* there is *monotheism* (Deut. 5:6,7; 6:4; Gal. 3:20; James 2:19), but because, unlike humans who are one person one being creatures, God is *three Persons* in the *one Being*, there is a Trinity.

The Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) reading at Evensong for Trinity Sunday is Genesis 18 or Gen. 1:1-2:4. Gen. 1 & 2 refers to the Divine Person of “the Spirit of God” (Gen. 1:2), and the plurality of Divine Persons in the Godhead, for “God said, “Let us (plural) make man in our (plural) image, after our (plural) likeness” (Gen. 1:26). Then in Gen. 18 we read that “the Lord” (Jehovah) “appeared unto” Abraham, “and he lift up his eyes and looked, and, lo three men stood by him.” “And said, My Lord” (singular) (Gen. 18:1-3). In Gen. 18 it is clear that in this theophany Abraham is communing with “the Lord” (Jehovah) (Gen. 18:13,14,20,26,33). The usage of “the Lord” (AV) or “Jehovah” (ASV) for God (singular), coupled with the theophany of “three men” (Gen. 18:2), requires the conclusion that this was a Trinitarian theophany of three male Divine Persons in one God, of whom we know from Gen. 1:2,26 that one of the Divine Persons is the Spirit. Thus these Trinity Sunday readings in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* highlight the doctrine of the Trinity in the Old Testament.

Christ also taught that for those with spiritual insight, this doctrine may be found in Old Testament Scriptures. “David,” “the sweet psalmist,” “said, The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue” (II Sam. 23:1,2); thereby teaching both the Divine inspiration of the Psalms, and the Person of the Holy Ghost. Then in Ps. 110:1, David refers to another two Divine Persons, saying, “The Lord said unto my Lord.” In the Gospel, Jesus first states that “David” was “in Spirit” (Matt. 22:43) when he wrote Psalm 110, thus maintaining the truth of II Sam. 23:1,2, and drawing attention to the Divine Person of the Spirit. He then quotes Ps. 110:1, “The Lord said unto my Lord,” and applies the second “Lord” to the Messiah, in asking the question “of the Christ” or Messiah, “whose son is he?” (Matt. 22:42-45). This makes the point that the Second Divine Person who is “Lord,” is the “son” (Matt. 22:42) of the first “Lord” (Matt. 22:44) i.e., the Son of God. And since he is also the “Son of David” (Matt. 22:42), Christ here teaches the incarnation of the Son of God as Christ. But in addition to teaching that the three Divine Persons of the Trinity and incarnation of the Son of God are taught in the Old Testament, Christ also taught that the Old Testament upheld monotheism, saying, “Hear O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord” (Mark 12:29). This then requires the conclusion that in the Gospels, the three Divine Persons of “Father,” “Son, and” “Holy Ghost” (Matt. 28:19) are one Supreme Being or “one Lord” (Mark 12:29). For “the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Spirit is Lord” (Matt. 22:44; II Cor. 3:17). “Yet there are not three Lords, but [three Persons in] one [Supreme Being who is] Lord” (Mark 12:29). “For in the same way that we are compelled by Christian truth to recognize each Person by himself to be God and Lord” (e.g., John 20:28); “likewise we are forbidden by the universal religion to say, ‘There are three Gods,’ or ‘three Lords’” (*Athanasian Creed*).

Christ said, “I and my Father are one” (John 10:30). In this Scripture, the plurality of the Divine Persons (Father and Son), together with the plurality of the verb “are” (Greek *esmen*, literally, “we are”), together with the fact that “one” is in the neuter, acts to rule out any possibility that Christ here means that the two Divine Persons of Father and Son are actually one Divine Person²⁴⁸. Rather, the neuter “one” here, requires the conclusion that these two Divine Persons are *one* Being. As one Supreme “Being” (*ousia*)²⁴⁹, Christ says, “the Father is in me, and I in him” (John 10:38). But being a distinct Person (hypostasis²⁵⁰), the Son says, “I came out from God. I came forth from the Father” (John 16:27,28; cf. I John 5:7,8).

In the Greek, *hupostasis* (“subsistence” or “existence”²⁵¹) has a general and particular sense²⁵². In its *general* sense, it means a shared essence e.g., all men (both males and females), have a common hypostasis of “humanness.” In Ps. 139:14-16, King David refers to a man’s “soul” (verse 14, Hebrew *nephesh*), his bodily “substance” (AV) or “body” (verse 15, Hebrew *ostem*), and the combination of these constituting the human “substance” (verse 16, Hebrew *golem*). In the Greek Septuagint translation, the order of some parts of these verses are rearranged and some word changes are made. Nevertheless, the basic idea is still conveyed. Thus we read of a man’s “soul” (verse 14, LXX, Greek *psuche*), his “bones” (verse 15, LXX, Greek *ostoun*), and the combination of these constituting the human “substance” (Greek *hupostasis / hypostasis*). This is therefore an example of hypostasis (Greek *hupostasis / hypostasis*) being a synonym for “substance” (Greek *ousia*)²⁵³. These verses teach the basic formulae, *soul* (vs. 14) + *body* (vs. 15) = *human substance / being* (vs. 16). Thus e.g., the *Athanasian Creed* rightly says of Christ’s humanity, that he is “man of the substance of his mother, born in the world,” “man, subsisting of a rational soul and body.” Or the *Council of Chalcedon* says Christ is “of one substance (*homoousios*) with us as regards his humanity,” he is “truly man, consisting also of a rational soul and body.” The

²⁴⁸ The heresy of Modalism or Sabellianism, claims that there is only one Divine Person, and he shows himself in different modes or manifestations as either the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit.

²⁴⁹ *Homoousios* meaning “same substance” or “one substance” or “one being,” is from Greek *homos* (one / same) and *ousia* (substance / being). The constituent Greek words are found in a non-Trinitarian context in the Septuagint and NT. E.g., the genitive form *homou* is used in Job 34:29, LXX, “a”/“one” (*homou*) “man”; and *ousia* is found in Tobit 14:13, LXX Apocrypha, “he inherited their substance” (*ousian*). In the NT word *homothumadon* from *homou* (the genitive form of *homos*) and *thumos*, we find the meaning of “one” in e.g., “one accord” (e.g., Acts 1:14; 2:46). The Greek *ousia* (from *ousa*) has the meaning of “substance” in Luke 15:13, where we read that the prodigal son “wasted his substance (Gr. *ousia*)” (in this non-Trinitarian context, meaning his “goods,” Luke 15:12)

²⁵⁰ Hypostasis (singular) and hypostases (plural), are the Anglicized forms of the Greek *hupostasis*.

²⁵¹ Cf. “Behold, thou hast made my days old; and my existence (Greek *upostasis*) is as nothing before thee: nay, every man living is altogether vanity” (Ps. 39:5, LXX).

²⁵² Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 32-3.

²⁵³ Cf., “Remember what my being (Greek *upostasis*) is: for hast thou created all the sons of men in vain?” (Ps. 89:47, LXX).

Son is both fully God and fully man. He is “one substance” with the Father in Divinity; and “one substance” with us in humanity. Referring to his Divine substance, rather than his human substance, in this *general* sense of *hypostasis* being synonymous with *ousia*, the *Council of Nicea* said “the Son of God” was not “of another substance (*ousia*) or essence (*hypostasis*)” with “the Father.”²⁵⁴

However, in its particular sense, the Greek, *hypostasis* means the essence of an individual, by virtue of which he is himself. Depending on context, it is thus either a synonym, or a near synonym, for “person.” In its *particular* sense, John Smith is John Smith because of his *subsistence* (*hypostasis*) i.e., his “John Smithiness.” As Basil of Caesarea noted, “*ousia* has the same relation to *hypostasis* as the common has to the particular. Every one of us [humans] both shares in existence by the common term of essence (*ousia*), and by his own properties in such an one [hypostasis] and such an one [hypostasis].”²⁵⁵ In the Book of Hebrews, *hypostasis* is used in the general sense in Heb. 11:1, where (in a non-Trinitarian context) it means “substance.”²⁵⁶ But in Heb. 1:3, *hypostasis* is used in the particular sense, for we here read that the “Son” (Heb. 1:2) of “God” (Heb. 1:1), is “the express image of his person (*hypostasis* / *hypostasis*)” (Heb. 1:3). The Father is thus said to constitute a specific Divine “person (*hypostasis*).” In this particular sense of the word *hypostasis*, the Cappadocian Trinitarians, under the leadership of Basil of Caesarea (c. 329-379), rightly distinguished between the three Divine Persons each having their own *subsistence* or *hypostasis* (Greek *hypostasis* / *hypostasis*), while being part of the same *one being* (Greek *homoousios*)²⁵⁷.

It subsequently became standard among orthodox Trinitarians to employ this distinction, and so as to avoid any confusion, the *general* sense of *hypostasis* as a synonym for *ousia* with respect to Christ being of the *same substance* (*homoousios*) or *one being* (*homoousios*) with the Father, as rightly used by the *Council of Nicea*, went into disuse²⁵⁸. Hence by long-standing convention, only *homoousios* is now used for this purpose. Thus the

²⁵⁴ Bettenson’s *Documents*, p. 25.

²⁵⁵ Schaff, P., & Wace, H. (Editors), *A Select Library of Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series, 1894, reprint: Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1968, Vol. 8, pp. 253-4, at p. 254, Basil’s *Epistle 214*.

²⁵⁶ “Now faith is the substance (Greek *upostasis*) of things hoped for.” Cf., “all their substance (Greek *upostasin*) that was with them” (Deut. 11:6, LXX); “their substance (Greek *upostasis*) has been utterly destroyed” (Job 22:20, LXX); “He has gathered thy substance (Greek *upostasin*) from without that lodged in choice vessels” (Jer. 10:17, LXX).

²⁵⁷ Schaff, P., & Wace, H. (Eds), *op. cit.*, Vol. 8, pp. 137-41, Basil’s *Epistle 38, Concerning the difference between Ousia & Hypostasis*.

²⁵⁸ *Hypostasis* has retained one other usage relevant to the Trinity. In its *particular* sense, it is used for the *hypostatic union* in Christology. The *Council of Chalcedon* rightly used it with respect to the “union” of Christ’s human and Divine “natures,” saying, “the characteristics of each nature being preserved and coming together to form one person and subsistence (*hypostasis*), not as parted or separated into two persons, but one and the same Son” (Bettenson’s *Documents*, p. 51). Hence the *Athanasian Creed* rightly says, “For in the same way that a rational soul and body is one man, so God and man is one Christ.”

Biblical teaching is expressed by orthodox Trinitarians as the recognition of three Divine Persons each having their own *subsistence* or *hypostasis* (Greek *hupostasis / hypostasis*), yet forming part of the *same substance*, or *one substance*, or *one being* (Greek *homoousios*). E.g., Berkhof records how orthodox Trinitarians “preferred to speak of three hypostases in God, three different modes, not of manifestation, as Sabellius taught, *but of existence or subsistence*.²⁵⁹” The fact that the three Divine Persons (hypostases) are part of *one being* (*homoousios*), means there is monotheism with *one Supreme Being* or *one God*, NOT three Supreme Beings or three gods.

Thus the creed from the *Council of Nicea* says, the “Son” is “begotten not made, of one substance” or “one being” (Greek *homoousion*) “with the Father;” the *Nicene Creed* (named after, and in its final form partly written by, the *Council of Nicea*), says, “the only begotten Son of God,” is “of one being” (Greek *homoousion*) “with the Father;” and likewise, the *Council of Chalcedon* (451) says, the “Son” is “of one substance” (Greek *homoousios*) “with the Father as regards his Godhead.”²⁶⁰ Therefore the *Athanasian Creed* says, “For the Father is one Person, the Son is another, and the Holy Spirit is another. But the Divinity of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is exactly the same in equal glory and co-eternal majesty. What the Father is, that the Son is, and that the Holy Spirit is. The Father is not created, the Son is not created, and the Holy Spirit is not created. The Father is infinite, the Son is infinite, and the Holy Spirit is infinite. The Father is eternal, the Son is eternal, and the Holy Spirit is eternal. Yet there are not three [beings who are three] eternals, but [three Persons in] one eternal [Supreme Being]. Likewise, there are not three infinities, nor three who are not created, but [three Persons in] one [Supreme Being] who is not created, and [three Persons in] one infinite [Supreme Being]. Similarly, the Father is Almighty, the Son is Almighty, and the Holy Spirit is Almighty. Yet there are not three [beings who constitute three] Almighties, but [three Persons in] one Almighty [Supreme Being]. Therefore the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God. Yet there are not three Gods, but [three Persons in] one [Supreme Being who is] God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Spirit is Lord. Yet there are not three Lords, but [three Persons in] one [Supreme Being who is] Lord. For in the same way that we are compelled by Christian truth to recognize each Person by himself to be God and Lord; likewise we are forbidden by the universal religion to say, ‘There are three Gods,’ or ‘three Lords’.” “So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Spirit, not three Holy Spirits. In this Trinity, none [of the Persons] comes before or after the other [in their Divine equality], none [of the Persons] is greater than, or less than another [Person]; but all three Persons are co-eternal and co-equal with each other. So that in everything, as previously affirmed, the unity in the Trinity, and the Trinity in unity is to be worshipped.

²⁵⁹ Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 87.

²⁶⁰ See Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 25,26,51. In the *Nicene Creed* found in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (BCP) (1662), *homoousios* is translated as “substance,” i.e., the “Son of God” is “of one substance with the Father.” In the *Nicene Creed* found in the Anglican Church of Australia’s *An Australian Prayer Book* (AAPB), 1978, *homoousios* is translated as “Being,” i.e., the “Son of God” is “of one Being with the Father.” (While I do not as a package deal endorse the AAPB, considering the 1662 BCP should be used in church services, there is a small amount of material I find of value in the AAPB, which according to its title page is meant “for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662;” even though in practice the 1662 BCP has sadly now been largely or completely phased out of most Anglican Churches in the Diocese of Sydney.)

Therefore he who desires to be saved should thus understand the Trinity.”

By contrast, in 1987, the official Seventh-day Adventist publisher in Australia, Signs Publishing, in Warburton, Victoria, published Frank Breaden’s *Instruction Manuel*, which among other heresies, denies that God is *one Being*. Breaden states that this work has the endorsement of the “South Pacific Division Committee” of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, “whose evangelistic vision, financial backing, and sub-committee assistance,” “made” this work “possible.” This SDA cult publication is thus designed to proselytize people into the SDA Church. Breaden’s *Instruction Manuel* (which comes with overhead projector pictures and/or picture book), is largely focused on achieving its proselytizing goal through SDA *cult pseudo-historicism*. Breaden follows standard Seventh-day Adventist heresies, which (like Jehovah’s Witnesses) deny that a man has a soul; connected with this, further deny that there is any consciousness after death before the Second Advent (see e.g., II Cor. 5:1-10; Philp. 1:21-24; Heb. 12:23; Rev. 6:9-11), or that the fires of hell are now burning (Luke 16:19-31; Heb. 9:27; II Peter 2:9); and as a derivative of these general heresies, specifically deny that Christ had a “soul” that descended into “hell” (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27,31)²⁶¹.

This means that like other Seventh-day Adventists (and Jehovah’s Witnesses)²⁶², Breaden denies that a human “substance” or human “being” consists of a “soul” and “body” (Ps. 139:14-16; Matt. 10:28). He thus denies that Christ is “man of the substance of his mother, born in the world,” “man, subsisting of a rational soul and body” (*Athanasian Creed*); or that Christ is “of one substance (*homoousios*) with us as regards his humanity,” he is “truly man, consisting also of a rational soul and body” (*Council of Chalcedon*); or that “in the same way that a rational soul and body is one man, so God and man is one Christ” (*Athanasian Creed*). Like other Seventh-day Adventists (and Jehovah’s Witnesses), Breaden also further denies that Christ “descended into hell” (*Apostles’ Creed* and *Athanasian Creed*).

Having denied the Biblical teaching of man’s *substance* or *being*, Breaden then further denies the Biblical teaching of God’s *substance* or *Being* i.e., the monotheistic teaching of *one substance* or *Being*. Breaden refers to the “three Divine Persons” as “three personal Divine beings” (plural). He considers these “three” “beings” (plural) are one in a “tri-unity,” which he erroneously uses as a synonym for “Trinity.” Contrary to Breaden’s claims, “Trinity” does not mean his “Tri-unity.” Breaden’s *three persons* who are *three beings* held together by a “tri-unity,” are a polytheistic triumvirate, since this tri-theistic view denies the monotheistic truth that the *three persons* are *one being*. But in this same *Instruction Manuel* designed for the purposes of proselytizing people into the SDA cult, we also find Breaden depicting those who do not keep the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday), but rather “observe Sunday,” as receiving “the mark of the beast.”²⁶³ What a contrast this is to the

²⁶¹ Breaden, F., *Instruction Manuel* for 60 Study Guides, Signs Publishing, Warburton, Victoria, Australia, 1987, pp. ii,12, No. 19, pp. 5,86-7 (denies man has a soul), 87 (denies soul’s consciousness after death and before Second Advent), 89-91 (denies the fires of hell are burning now).

²⁶² Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 110-1,135-6 (Seventh-day Adventists), pp. 265-6,293-5 (Jehovah’s Witnesses).

²⁶³ Breaden, F., *op. cit.*, No. 48, pp. 11,191-4 (claims “mark of the beast” for those who “observe Sunday” rather than Jewish “Sabbath,”); No. 56, pp. 11,219-222 (denies *homoousios* by claiming “three” “beings” in “Tri-unity”).

Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians! Here St. Paul refers to the three Divine Persons (e.g., Gal. 1:1,3; 4:6; 5:16,18), and teaches that monotheism is important, saying, “God is one” (Gal. 3:20); and the Jewish sabbath day is unimportant, saying of Gentile Christians who got Judaized and started to “observe” Jewish sabbath “days,” “I am afraid,” “lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain” (Gal. 4:10,11).

The reason why the Seventh-day Adventist cult, from their prophetess Ellen White down, embraces Arian heretics, like John Andrews or Uriah Smith; or the reason why Ellen White evidently cared so little about making contradictory statements as to whether Christ had a sinless or sinful human nature, and associated with White’s duplicity the reason why the Seventh-day Adventist Church embraces Christological heretics who claim Christ had a sinful nature, like Branson; or the reason why the issue of the three Divine Persons of the Trinity constituting *one* Supreme *Being* (Greek *homoousios*) has been treated as so unimportant in the cult, with the consequence that they embrace tri-theist polytheistic heretics like Bredan; is always the same. It revolves around the fact that they regard themselves as the only true church²⁶⁴; and seek converts who will endorse the unique or near unique teaching of their cult, almost at any cost (cf. Matt. 23:15).

That is because, like the other cults, the SDA Church lacks a primary focus on the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, of which the Trinity is one. Their failure to be focused on “Christ,” in whom “dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily” (AV), or in whom “all the fullness of Deity dwells in bodily form” (NASB) (Col. 2:8,9); results from their obsession with cult practices such as setting out to “judge” people “in food” (NKJV) (by imposing the Jewish dietary laws of Lev. 11 or vegetarianism), “or drink” (by prohibiting tea, coffee, and alcohol), or “in respect of” the “sabbath days” (by imposing the Jewish sabbath); and “intruding into those things which” their cult prophetess, Ellen White, “hath not seen,” because she was “vainly puffed up by” her “fleshly mind” (AV), “and not holding” “the head” which is Christ (Col. 2:16,18,19). They have an ascetic focus, making men “subject to ordinances,” such as “Touch not; taste not; handle not,” with respect to things “which all are to perish with the using,” “after the commandments and doctrines of men” (Col. 2:20,21). In fairness to the Seventh-day Adventist Church, on the one hand, it must be admitted that, “These are matters which have, to be sure, the appearance of wisdom in self-made religion and self-abasement and severe treatment of the body.” “But” on the other hand, they “are of no value against fleshly indulgence” (Col. 2:23, NASB). “If” “then” we “be risen with Christ,” we should instead “seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God” (Col. 3:1).

The distinguished Reformed theologian from America, Anthony Hoekema, and the Reformed or Evangelical Anglican Diocese of Sydney clergyman from Australia, Geoffrey Paxton, have shown that despite their erroneous usage of the term “justification by faith” to describe their teaching of salvation, in fact Seventh-day Adventists do not believe in justification by faith. Rather, through a bizarre pseudo-historicist interpretation of Dan. 8:14, they have reintroduced the Romish ideas of *justification by confession* and denial of Christ’s completed atonement and work of salvation on the cross (in the Romish context the latter being connected to the idea of “the sacrifice of the mass”). Justification by confession is the very thing Luther broke from when after years of long hours in the confessional trying to remember all his sins lest failing to confess one he should not go to heaven, he then

²⁶⁴ Hoekema, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

discovered the Biblical doctrine of justification by faith and the gates of heaven swung open to him. He realized that in receiving the gift of salvation all his sins, past, present, and future, had been forgiven, and so he could not be barred entrance into heaven if he had forgotten to confess a sin (Ps. 103:12; Isa. 44:22; Rom. 5:21; 8:1,32-34; Heb. 10:14)²⁶⁵.

That is, believers confess their sins after salvation not in order to be saved, but because they are saved, so if they should forget to confess some sin this does not affect their salvation. Hence, e.g., the usage in the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* (1530) of Ps. 19:12, “Who can understand his errors?” By contrast, in chapter 28 of “Great Controversy,” White, taught *justification by confession* and *the uncompleted atonement on the cross* through a pseudo-historicist understanding of Dan. 8:14 in which she claimed that since “1844” an “investigative judgment” has been going on in heaven in which occurs the “blotting out of sins” (starting some 1,800 years after Calvary and continuing till the Second Advent, this is at radical variance to Scripture, Lev. 16; Heb. 9:12-14,25,26). This heretical denial of Christ’s completed work on the cross (Heb. 8-10) is connected to the rise of the SDA Church which is meant to be telling people about it. White says, e.g., “When any have sins remaining upon the books of record, unrepented of and unforgiven, their names will be blotted out of the book of life, and the record of their good deeds will be erased.” *This lack of assurance (John 5:24; 20:31; Rom. 10:9; I John 5:13) is the very type of thing Luther and Protestantism has always rejected!* The cult also rejects the Reformation tenet of *Scripture alone*, claiming *new revelations of the Spirit* by their prophetess, Ellen White, and once again giving a pseudo-historicist interpretation of Rev. 12:17; 19:10 to justify this. (Contrary to SDA cult claims, the possession of the “Spirit of prophecy” in Rev. 12:17 means *the Bible*, not *new revelations*.)

The Christadelphian Church is one of the many minor cults. Cult members are pacifists who deny the existence of the Devil, claiming Satan is simply the principle of evil in a man. They deny the Trinity; they deny Christ’s Divinity or any pre-existence of Christ (Micah 5:2; John 1:1-4; 8:58) before his human birth, claiming Christ was *only* a human being; and they further deny the Person of the Holy Spirit, claiming the Spirit is “simply the Power of God.” They teach soul-sleep; and deny a universal “resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust” (Acts 24:15), claiming instead that the wicked “sleep” on forever, with only the just being later resurrected. In 1998 they had about 850 church congregations world-wide²⁶⁶.

Christadelphian cult pseudo-historicists include Boulton and Barker²⁶⁷. They blasphemously allege that the “doctrine of the Trinity” is of “pagan origin.” They likewise reject the “the festivals of Christmas and Easter” as “pagan.” They note in support of their anti-Christmas and anti-Easter views, the foolish comments of the pseudo-historicist “Hislop” in “*The Two Babylons*.” Contrary to e.g., Col. 2:8,9, “in” “Christ” “dwelleth all the fulness

²⁶⁵ Elwell, W.A., (Editor), *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians*, Michigan: Baker, 1993; Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*; Paxton, *op. cit.*; Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 514.

²⁶⁶ “Christadelphians” (www.religiousmovements.lib.virginia.edu/nrms/christadelphians_draft.html); quoting Lippy, C.H., *The Christadelphians*. This website also contain a list of this cults beliefs.

²⁶⁷ Boulton, W.H., and Barker, W.H., *The Apocalypse and History*, first edition 1915, Maranatha Press, London, second edition *circa* 1925.

of the Godhead bodily,” and Col. 2:16, “Let no man” “judge you” “in respect of an holyday,” they claim the “doctrines of the Trinity and the festivals of Christmas and Easter,” “are directly opposed to” “the Scriptures.”²⁶⁸

Scripture clearly teaches the conscious existence of disembodied souls in the after-life, whether in heaven or hell (e.g., Matt. 22:31,32; John 11:23-26; II Cor. 5:6,8-10; Philp. 1:21-24; I Thess. 3:13; Heb. 9:27; 12:23). By contrast, in harmony with the Christadelphian Church’s belief in soul-sleep, when discussing Rev. 6:9 with respect to “the souls” “under the altar,” Boulton and Barker claim that “the cry of these souls was” in “no” sense “real,” on the basis, “The dead know not anything (Eccl. 9:5).” This type of misuse of Eccl. 9:5 is comparable to Jehovah’s Witness and Seventh-day Adventist views²⁶⁹. Their claim that Rev. 6:9 is comparable to Gen. 4:10, where the “blood” of Abel “crieth” out, will not withstand strict scrutiny. Unlike Abel’s blood in Gen. 4:10, in Rev. 6:9 these souls are pictured as having a consciousness that has a sense of justice, and a capacity to speak, they are given “white robes” which they are able to receive, they are addressed as being rational souls when told to “rest yet for a little season,” and it is explained to them that “their brethren” will also “be killed as they were” (Rev. 6:9,10). *Rev. 6:9,10 is clearly not a picture of soul-sleep*, so that Boulton and Barker have to undertake some very strenuous mental gymnastics to try and twist these verses in such a way that they are said to teach soul-sleep. Notably, the Christadelphian cult’s doctrine of soul-sleep means that they deny Christ’s “soul” was “in hell” when his body was dead (Acts 2:27,31). The Greek word St. Luke uses here for “hell” is *hades*, which is also used in St. Luke’s Gospel where Jesus says “Capernaum” “shalt be thrust down to hell” (Luke 10:15), thus showing that hell is below; and in the Parable of Lazarus and Dives, where Dives “in hell,” “lift up his eyes, being in torments, and” “he cried out,” for he was “tormented in this flame” (Luke 16:23,24). This picture of “hell” in Luke-Acts is clearly not one of soul-sleep. This is also consistent with the fact that St. Peter says that when Christ descended into hell, “he went and preached unto the spirits in prison” (I Peter 3:19), i.e., this is not a picture of soul-sleep. Therefore this Christadelphian Church’s notion of soul-sleep is rightly condemned in the words of the *Athanasian Creed*, that state Christ had a “soul,” and that “He descended into hell.”

Boulton and Barker deny the Biblical teaching of what they call the “Reformation” teaching about “the rewards and punishments of good and bad.” In discussing the resurrection, they again decontextualize Scriptures in order to claim that most people die and “sleep a perpetual sleep and shall not wake” (Jer. 51:39), [and] ‘shall be as though they had

²⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 227.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 33. Playing on the ambiguity of Hebrew “spirit,” which can mean either a man’s soul or a creature’s breath, Solomon first asks, “Who knoweth the spirit [i.e., soul] of man, whether it goeth upward, and the spirit [i.e., breath] of the beast, whether it goeth downward to the earth?” (Eccl. 3:20, ASV). This is a Hebraic poetical way of saying, “Who knows whether a man has a soul that goes to God at death; whereas an animal doesn’t?” He contrasts wisdom and folly (e.g., Eccl. 10:2,3). First he gives the answer of the fool, “the dead know not anything” (Eccl. 9:5); and later the answer of the wise man, “the spirit shall return unto God who gave it,” “For God shall bring every work into judgment” (Eccl. 12:7,14). Thus to use Eccl. 9:5 to try and justify soul-sleep, would be like an atheist trying to claim that the Bible supported his view on the basis of Ps. 14:1, “There is no God;” whereas contextually David says, “The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.”

not been' (Obad. 16).²⁷⁰ Thus they deny that there will be a "resurrection of damnation" for "they that have done evil" (John 5:29). Given such heresies as their denial of the incarnation with their claim that Christ was *only* a human being, their denial of the Holy Trinity, denial of the reality of hell, and semi-denial of the Day of Judgement; it is surely understandable that they are anti-Protestant. They claim, "The Reformation" "scarcely touched the principles of the system. Let anyone consider the primary doctrines of the two in regard to God and Christ, human nature, the Devil, the rewards and punishments of good and bad respectively, and it will at once be perceived that the essential principles" of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism "are identical."²⁷¹

The issues of "God and Christ," some elements of "human nature," and some elements of "the rewards and punishments of good and bad," are dealt with in Trinitarian and anti-Pelagian teachings of the four general councils of the Church Fathers' Era (Nicea, 325; Constantinople, 381; Ephesus, 431, and Chalcedon, 451), together with the three "universal" or "catholic" creeds. The Protestant Reformers coming out of Rome were careful to preserve these wonderful truths since they are Biblically sound. They recognized that Roman Catholicism was a cunningly wrought mingling of truth and error, and they did not wish "to throw the baby out with the bathwater." Boulton's and Barker's comments once again show just how valuable an instrument the *Athanasian Creed* is for safeguarding people from these types of cults. In the words of that most beautiful of creeds, the *Athanasian Creed*: "So that in everything, as previously affirmed, the unity in the Trinity, and the Trinity in unity is to be worshipped. Therefore he who desires to be saved should thus understand the Trinity. Furthermore, it is necessary for eternal life that one also faithfully believe in the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. The correct belief then, is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. God of the substance of the Father, begotten from eternity; and man of the substance of his mother, born in the world. Perfect God and perfect man, subsisting of a rational soul and body. Who suffered for our salvation. He descended into hell. On the third day he rose again from the dead. He ascended into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from there he will come to judge the living and the dead. At his coming all men will experience the resurrection of the body, and they will give an account of all their deeds. Then those who have done good will enter eternal life, and those who have done evil will enter eternal fire. This is the universal faith [on the matters specified]. If one does not faithfully believe it, he cannot be saved."

Like many cult pseudo-historicist writers, the Christadelphian cult's Boulton and Barker make a deceptive attempt to link their work to that of earlier orthodox Protestant historicists. E.g., they state, "Dr. Thomas, following Mr. Bicheno, a Baptist minister of

²⁷⁰ Boulton and Barker, *op. cit.*, pp. 229,234. Jer. 51:39 is referring to the fact that when these evil people are "drunken," and "sleep" after their drunkenness, the "sleep" they think will be for a short while, will be "a perpetual sleep" *with respect to their normal existence as human beings on the earth* because they will be killed, "and not wake" *ever again* in this life. This in no way teaches soul-sleep, nor invalidates the doctrine of the resurrection of the just and unjust. Obadiah 16 also refers to the destruction of people *in this life not the next*. In this life, "they shall be as though they had not been," but in the next life their souls will go to God for judgment.

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 118,227,228-9.

Newbury, has suggested ...,” without stating John Thomas is a Christadelphian²⁷². These cult pseudo-historicists claim that their work stands in the tradition of “Elliott’s *Horae Apocalypticæ* [which] was published in 1844-1862, [and] *Eureka* [which] was finished in 1868.” The former work by the Evangelical Anglican clergyman, Edward Bishop Elliott (1793-1875) is clearly historicist, but the latter work by the cult’s founder, John Thomas (1805-1871), was clearly Christadelphian cult pseudo-historicist. Thomas was part of the Millerite movement of William Miller (1782-1849) that predicted Christ’s return in 1843 or 1844, and Thomas founded the Christadelphian Church in 1844. (The Seventh-day Adventist Church also came out of this Millerite movement²⁷³.) Despite such historicist pretensions, theirs and Thomas’s works condemn the Biblical theology of orthodox Protestant historicists such as Elliott. E.g., they absurdly claim that “the sign of the cross which is made at baptism” is “the trade mark of the image” “of the beast.” If so, Elliott whom they site, both received the “mark of the beast” at his own baptism, and as an Anglican clergyman administered the “mark of the beast” every time he baptized someone in harmony with the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662)²⁷⁴.

The Jehovah’s Witnesses cult is one of the four major cults (and together with Seventh-day Adventists and Mormons, one of the three most major cults). In specific terms they are Arian heretics who deny the Divinity of Christ, and Pneumatomachian heretics who deny the Person of the Holy Spirit. In general terms they are Trinitarian heretics, who deny the doctrine of the Holy Trinity *per se*. They also deny the Biblical doctrine of justification by faith (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11), claiming instead that a man is justified by a combination of faith and works²⁷⁵. The denial of Christ’s full Divinity (e.g., John 1:1; 5:18; 10:30,33; Philp. 2:6; Col. 2:9; I Tim. 3:16) by Arian heretics, was rightly condemned by the *Council of Nicea* (325). The Macedonian heretics, named after their leader, Macedonius, denied the full Divinity of the Holy Ghost (e.g., Acts 5:3,4; I Cor. 3:16; II Tim. 3:16; Heb. 9:14). They are also known as the Pneumatomachians, a Latin form of the Greek word meaning, “fighters against the Spirit.” These Trinitarian heretics were opposed by the Cappadocian Trinitarians under the leadership of the Bishop of Caesarea, Basil of Caesarea or Basil the Great (c. 329-379), together with Basil’s brother, Gregory of Nyssa (c. 330-395)²⁷⁶, and Basil’s friend,

²⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 118.

²⁷³ Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 89-92.

²⁷⁴ Boulton and Barker, *op. cit.*, pp. 101-2,176.

²⁷⁵ For a superb analysis of Jehovah’s Witnesses, see Anthony Hoekema’s *The Four Major Cults*, *op. cit.*, pp. 223-344.

²⁷⁶ Gregory of Nyssa’s orthodox work on the Trinity, was that of one who was a lesser luminary standing in the reflected glory of the greater luminary of his brother, Basil. On the one hand, Gregory lacked our benefit of a codified statement such as the *Athanasian Creed*, with its centuries of endorsement by great Christian luminaries such as Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer; but on the other hand, he had the benefit of the completed Word of God, which is sufficient. Gregory of Nyssa lost his focus on God and the authority of Scripture. He became increasingly entangled in a compromised and ungodly mix of semi-Christianity and semi-pagan Greek Platonic ideas, connected with the errors promulgated in the writings of Origen of Alexandria (c. 185- c. 254). Thus Gregory was sadly sucked into the vortex of heresy. Like Origen, Gregory of Nyssa denied that the constitutional nature of man was a dichotomy of soul (or spirit) and body (soul + body = man), and claimed that man was a

Gregory Nazianzus (329-389), whose orthodox Trinitarian teachings on the Holy Spirit of God were endorsed by the *Council of Constantinople* (381). The Trinitarian heresies of the Jehovah's Witnesses include a denial of the Person of the Holy Ghost (e.g., Gen. 1:2,26; John 14:16,17,26; 15:26; 16:7-14; Acts 16:7; Rom. 8:16,26; I Cor. 12:11).

In e.g., the Book of Romans, the Apostle Paul, teaches the importance of Christ's Divinity (Rom. 9:5), and the Person of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:16,26). In this Epistle, he further says, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned: and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord;" "and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple" (Rom. 16:17,18). Reflecting these types of Scriptures, the *Athanasian Creed* states the Biblical position. "Whoever desires to be saved must above all things hold fast to the universal faith. Unless one keeps this faith completely and inviolably, he will undoubtedly perish forever. Now this is the universal faith [on the matters specified]. We worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity; neither confusing the Persons, nor dividing the [one Supreme] Being. For the Father is one Person, the Son is another, and the Holy Spirit is another. But the Divinity of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is exactly the same in equal glory and co-eternal majesty. What the Father is, that the Son is, and that the Holy Spirit is."

Jehovah's Witnesses cult Trinitarian heretics are pseudo-historicists. Jehovah's Witnesses cult pseudo-historicism claims, for example, that the "seven times" or years that passed over King Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 4:23,32) represents 2,520 days and on the day-year principle terminate their 2,520 years with World War One in 1914, further claiming that Christ's return must occur before the last of those born during World War One have died, on the basis that "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled" (Matt. 14:34). This greatly distorts Matt. 24 which is referring to those who actually see "the coming of the Son of man" (Matt. 24:27) which certainly did not occur in 1914, and also further distorts the clear teaching that no-one should attempt to set time parameters on the Second Advent for "of that day and hour knoweth no man" (Matt. 24:36). Moreover, while maintaining that "A prominent part of Babylon the Great is the Roman Catholic Church," Jehovah's Witnesses claim the final world power is identified as the "Anglo-American world power²⁷⁷."

This type of thing has the effect of misfocusing people on political events connected with the UK and USA. By contrast, the proper focus of the Antichrist is on the Roman Papacy (Rev. 13:1-10); and the "ecumenical councils" after the Bishop of Rome gained primacy in 607, (found in a lesser fulfilment with such "ecumenical" councils from the

trichotomy of soul, spirit, and body (soul + spirit + body = man) (Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, p. 191). He also adopted Origen's universalism, and thus denied the Day of Judgment (*Encyclopedia Britannica CD 99, op. cit.*, "Gregory of Nyssa"). Both a denial of man as a dichotomy of soul and body, and a denial of the Day of Judgement, are rightly condemned in the *Athanasian Creed*. Gregory of Nyssa's demise from defender of orthodoxy to heretic, teaches us, "be not high-minded, but fear," for "thou standest by faith" (Rom. 11:20).

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 252-4,297ff.; *Pay Attention to Daniel's Prophecy!*, Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania, New York, U.S.A., 1999, pp. 95-7,301; *Revelation: It's Grand Climax at Hand!*, Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society of New York, New York, USA, 1988, pp. 194-7,199,208,252,259-260.

*Second Council of Constantinople 553*²⁷⁸ on, following the Bishop of Rome's temporary titular primacy from 533 to 565, a concept repudiated by Gregory the Great who exhibited saintly anti-Pope traits,) and in greater fulfilment from the *First Lateran Council* (1123) on (when the Pope came to call and preside over all such councils) (Rev. 13:11-18); as well as that "great whore" (Rev. 17:1) of the Roman Catholic Church (Rev. 17:2-6,9).

Anthony Hoekema records that the Jehovah's Witnesses cult teach that "Christmas" is a "pagan" celebration, and they refuse to have blood transfusions. After discussing their "absurd" interpretation of Lev. 17:14 which they say prohibits, "blood transfusions," Hoekema then gives "another example of" their "absurd" interpretations of Scripture in the fact that "Jehovah's Witnesses forbid the use of Christmas trees." In the Jehovah's Witnesses publication, *Revelation: It's Grand Climax at Hand! the mark of the beast* is said to be given out to "Anybody in everyday activities such as buying and selling" who chooses "to do things the way the" "beast does," "for example, in celebrating holidays" (such as Christmas).

This type of Jehovah's Witnesses (or Christadelphian) cult pseudo-historicist opposition to Christmas, may not be entirely unrelated to their denial of the Trinity. The Bible indicates that the birth of Christ was in September / October²⁷⁹. It certainly was not around December in the "winter" (John 10:22), since it would then be too cold for "shepherds" to be out "in the field" with "their flock by night" (Luke 2:8). But the theological significance of Christ's Nativity relates to the Christological Trinitarian teaching of the Incarnation, and hence in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* the *Communion Service* readings for Christmas Day are Heb. 1:1-12 and John 1:1-14.

The Jewish Feast of Dedication falls in December, starting on the 25th day of the ninth Jewish month of Chislev and lasting "eight days" (I Macc. 4:52,59). Christ spoke about his Incarnation (John 10:36) and Divinity (John 10:30,34-38) at the Feast of Dedication (John 10:22-38), and so this makes it an appropriate *symbolic* time of year to have a festival celebrating Christ's incarnation, with the "eight days" of the Feast of Dedication being replaced by the "eight days" (Luke 2:21) between Christ's birth (25 December) and the Feast of the Circumcision of Christ (1 Jan). Other similarities between the Christian Christmas and Jewish Dedication (or Chanukkah, or Hanukkah) include the fact that the Feast of Dedication which is also known as the Feast of Lights, involves the lighting of ceremonial candles (like Christmas candles), gifts are exchanged (like Christmas gifts), and children play holiday games on it (like the Christmas emphasis on children). Thus on the one hand,

²⁷⁸ Like the *Third Council of Constantinople* (680-1) which rightly condemned the monothelite heresy, the *Second Council of Constantinople* (553) mingled truth and error. On the one hand, it rightly condemned the Nestorians and Semi-Nestorians, and succinctly states great orthodox Trinitarian truths; but on the other hand, it wrongly taught the notion of an "ever-virgin Mary," and pronounced an "anathema" on those who rightly rejected this heresy.

²⁷⁹ Zechariah was in the priestly division of Abijah (Luke 1:5). 24 divisions shared the duty over each 12 months (I Chron. 24:1-19). Thus each division served about half a month, and "the eighth" division of "Abijah" (I Chron. 24:10), served about the second half of the fourth month. "And after those days" i.e., in the fifth month, "his wife Elisabeth conceived" (Luke 1:24). When she was in her "sixth month" of pregnancy i.e., the eleventh month of the year, Mary conceived (Luke 1:26). Nine months later Christ was born in the seventh Jewish month of Tishri or Ethanym, which is about late September or October.

Jehovah's Witnesses deny that "in" "Christ" "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead" (Col. 2:8,9), or that one can have Christian "love in the Spirit" (Col. 1:8) by their denial of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; but on the other hand, they so elevate their heresy in which they "judge" a "man" "in respect of an holyday" (Col. 2:16), that in their commentary referred to above, they depict persons who use their Christian liberty to keep Christmas as receiving *the mark of the beast*. Once again, this shows a thoroughly warped and twisted theological perspective. It is clearly repugnant to the apostolic teaching evident in Col. 2:8,9,16.

Another example the Jehovah's Witnesses give in *Revelation: It's Grand Climax at Hand!* of how a person can receive *the mark of the beast* by doing "things the way the" "beast does," is by blood transfusions. This publication says people "who fall sick are often pressured by doctors and nurses to break God's law on the sanctity of blood," that is, to have a blood transfusion. And to help drive home their point of view that receiving a blood transfusion is one of the ways of getting *the mark of the beast*, there is a picture provided of a sick woman lying in a hospital bed, holding up her hand refusing to have a blood transfusion to a doctor. The doctor is standing next to a clear packet of blood that he is pointing to with his pen, indicating that he recommends a blood transfusion. But according to this publication, those who succumb to such a recommendation will receive *the mark of the beast*²⁸⁰.

The Mormon (Latter Days Saints) Church is another one of the four major cults (and together with Seventh-day Adventists and Jehovah's Witnesses, one of the three most major cults). Like the Seventh-day Adventists, Mormons *prima facie* claim to believe the Trinity, but then through Trinitarian heresy go on to deny the orthodox Trinity of the Biblically correct *Athanasian Creed*. E.g., Joseph Smith's *Book of Mormon* says, "And now, behold, this is the doctrine of Christ, and the only and true doctrine of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, which is one God, without end" (II Nephi 31:21)²⁸¹. In fact, the Mormons then go on to deny the doctrine of the Holy Trinity by polytheistically denying monotheism. They claim that the three Divine Persons are three separate Beings i.e., Tri-theism. E.g., Joseph Smith taught what he called, "the plurality of Gods."²⁸²

But as discussed above, because God is *one Being* there is *monotheism* (Deut. 5:6,7; 6:4; Mark 12:29; John 10:30; James 2:19). That is, unlike humans who are one person one being creatures, God is *three Persons* in the *one Being*, and so there is a Trinity. Hence the Apostle Paul teaches monotheism, saying, "that there is none other God but one." He specifically rejects polytheism, "as there be gods many, and lords many." He then immediately refers to two of the Divine Persons in this *one* Godhead, "But to us there is but one God, the Father," "and one Lord Jesus Christ" (I Cor. 8:6-8), and he also refers to the Divine Person of the Spirit in this Epistle (e.g., I Cor. 2:10,11). All three are mentioned together at the end of his Second Epistle to these Corinthians (II Cor. 13:14).

Yet Mormon teaching does not stop at Tritheism, since they further teach that there

²⁸⁰ Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 237,249-50; *Revelation: It's Grand Climax at Hand!*, *op. cit.*, pp. 197-8.

²⁸¹ Quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 34.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 34-5; quoting Joseph Smith's Sermon the "The Christian Godhead - Plurality of Gods" (16 June 1844) from *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, pp. 370,372.

are many gods in addition to their “three Gods” of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and they further claim that these gods were once men, i.e., they teach the deification of men, “Ye shall be as gods” (Gen. 3:5)²⁸³. Connected with this, they devalue Christ’s Divinity, claiming that any man can attain to godhood and thus be like Christ. Since some distinction is still maintained between all these “gods,” they deny the equality of the Father and the Son, in order to keep the Father as a supreme God. Thus Mormons teach, “Jesus is greater than the Holy Spirit, which is subject unto him, but his Father is greater than he.”²⁸⁴ By contrast, Scripture upholds the teaching of monotheism (Deut. 6:4; Mark 12:29); and the equality of the three Divine Persons (John 5:17,18; Philp. 2:1,5,6). In the words of the *Athanasian Creed*, “We worship one God in Trinity,” “the Divinity of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is exactly the same in equal glory and co-eternal majesty.”

The Apostle also says, “For there must be” “heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you” (I Cor. 11:19). The Lutheran *Formulae of Concord*, Article 12, in the section on the *Error of the Anti-Trinitarians*, refers to Tri-unity Tritheism. It says of this “heresy,” there are “such as imagine” “that there is not one sole Divine and eternal essence only of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three distinct Persons, so each Person has a distinct essence” or being. It says of those who adhere to this heresy, “some of these may think that the separate Persons, in their separate essences” or beings, “are of equal power, wisdom, majesty, and glory,” (this is the view of the Seventh-day Adventist evangelist, Frank Breaden, discussed above²⁸⁵). “Others think that these three persons and essences” or beings “are so unequal in respect of essence and attributes, as that God the Father alone is true God” (this is the Mormon view, discussed above). Then the Article says, “All these errors.” “We reject and condemn, as being false and heretical, and as being inconsistent with the Word of God, with the three approved Symbols,” i.e., the Apostles’, Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds. We cannot doubt that the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord* is absolutely correct on this matter. The *Athanasian Creed* states the teaching of Holy Scripture. “Whoever desires to be saved must above all things hold fast to the universal faith. Unless one keeps this faith completely and inviolably, he will undoubtedly perish forever. Now this is the universal faith [on the matters specified]. We worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity; neither confusing the Persons, nor dividing the [one Supreme] Being.”

Like the other three major cults, the Mormon cult denies the Biblical constitutional nature of man as consisting of body and soul / spirit. Mormonism does this by teaching that all men have a pre-existent soul (or spirit). The Mormon’s cult prophet, Joseph Smith, changed his theological views on the soul, from an earlier view that man *is* a soul, but does not *have* a soul, to a later view that man *has* a soul. But throughout these changes, he consistently taught that man has a pre-existent spirit, and so consistently denied the orthodox teaching that the soul / spirit of man originates at conception, and so he consistently denied the *Biblical* constitutional nature of man as body and soul / spirit

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp. 36-41.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 54, quoting Smith, J.F., *Doctrines of Salvation*, 1,18.

²⁸⁵ Breaden, F., *Instruction Manuel*, *op. cit.*, p. 220 says, “all three of these Divine Persons are” “equally God,” and in this “Tri-unity” constitute “three personal Divine beings who are equal in every sense of the term.”

Like the Jehovah's Witness and Seventh-day Adventist cults, Joseph Smith of the Mormon cult originally claimed that man *is* a soul, but does not *have* a soul²⁸⁶. But unlike these other two cults, Smith originally denied this dichotomy (soul + body = man), by a strange misuse of spirit and soul, which like the trichotomists, made a distinction between the soul and spirit. Smith originally taught, pre-existent spirit + body = soul. In Scripture, man is a dichotomy of body and soul *or* spirit, i.e., "soul" and "spirit" are used interchangeably (soul / spirit + body = man)²⁸⁷. Hence sometimes reference is made to the soul (Gen. 35:18; I Kgs 17:21; Ps. 139:14-16; Matt. 10:28; Acts 2:27,31; Rev. 6:9), and sometimes the spirit (Ps. 31:5; Eccl. 12:7,13,14; Luke 23:46; Acts 7:59; I Cor. 7:34; II Cor. 7:1; I Peter 3:19).

For example, the interchangeability of the terms "soul" and "spirit" is necessary for understanding the contrast between "living" and "life-giving" in St. Paul's statement, "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit" (AV), or "The first man Adam became a living soul. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit" (I Cor. 15:45, ASV & NASB). Man can only be called "a living soul" (I Cor. 15:45) because *after* his creation his "soul" became alive or "living." So too, with reference to his humanity, Christ can be called "a living soul" or "a living spirit" (even though he is not, like most of the redeemed in heaven before the Second Advent, a disembodied spirit / soul, but both spirit / soul and body, Luke 24:39,40). In I Cor. 15:45, St. Paul makes a contrast between the first Adam as "a living soul," and the second Adam, not as "a living" but as "a life-giving spirit" (ASV & NASB). This contrast between "living" and "life-giving" rests on the presupposition that "soul" and "spirit" are interchangeable terms.

Trichotomists point to Heb. 4:12; I Thess. 5:23 and claim, soul + spirit + body = man. Protestants have historically taught the *Perspicuity of Scripture* i.e., the Bible is clear, and if verses on an issue are obscure in one part of Scripture, they will be set out clearly in another part of Scripture. For, "the entrance of thy words giveth light: it giveth understanding unto the simple" (Ps. 119:130). Thus it is an important rule of Biblical interpretation, to explain unclear passages like Heb. 4:12; I Thess. 5:23, through reference to those clear passages that teach man is a dichotomy of soul (or spirit) and body.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, "soul" (Heb. 6:19; 10:39) and "spirit" (Heb. 12:23) are used interchangeably²⁸⁸. The Greek word *kai*, can be used as a co-ordinating conjunctive

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 110-1 (Seventh-day Adventists), 265-6 (Jehovah's Witnesses). The Christian Science cult also denies that man has a soul (*Ibid.*, pp. 192,196-7).

²⁸⁷ Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, pp. 192-5.

²⁸⁸ This makes the idea of "both soul and spirit" i.e., a Philonic dichotomy in which "*psuche* (soul)" contains a higher quality than the "*pneuma* (spirit)" in which the "*psuche* (soul)" comprehends the spiritual sphere of the divine, look very incongruous with Heb. 12:23 where it is "the spirits of just men" that are "made perfect" in heaven i.e., the "*pneuma* (spirit)." What is the value of such redemption of the "*pneuma* (spirit)" in Heb. 12:23 if it lacks this higher quality? Why do we not read "*psuche* (soul)" at Heb. 12:23? (Or if, perchance, the converse was argued i.e., a notion that the "spirit" contains this higher quality; then what is the propriety of saying that "the soul" reaches into the Most Holy Place in Heb. 6:19, or that "the soul" is saved in Heb. 10:39?) When this factor is taken into account; together with the fact that "*psuche* (soul)" (Heb. 6:19; 10:39) and "*pneuma* (spirit)" (Heb. 12:23) are elsewhere used interchangeably in the Epistle to the Hebrews, it follows that the "*te*" of the majority Byzantine text poses a serious textual problem in terms of how these two

introducing an alternative, and so be translated as either “or” or “nor.” E.g., in the AV we read that St. John the Baptist “shall drink neither wine nor (*kai*) strong drink” (Luke 1:15). Or St. Paul says, “Give none offense, neither to the Jews, nor (*kai*) to the Gentiles, nor (*kai*) to the church of God” (I Cor. 10:32); and “In the mouth of two or (*kai*) three witnesses shall every word be established” (II Cor. 13:1). E.g., in the NASB, the Greek *kai* is translated as “or” ten times²⁸⁹. I take the Greek *kai* (“and,” AV) of Heb. 4:12 to mean “or” i.e., “dividing asunder of soul or (*kai*) spirit,” in the sense of *opening up* a person’s “soul or spirit” to understand “the thoughts and intents of” his “heart.” Though unlike the ASV & NASB the AV fails to translate it, in Heb. 4:12 the word “both” (ASV & NASB), Greek *te*, occurs before the second *kai* here meaning “and,” i.e., “and *both* of the joints and marrow.” But no such “both” (*te*) occurs before the first *kai*. Thus a contextual distinction is made between the division of “soul or (*kai*) spirit, and (*kai*) of both (*te*) joints and marrow.” This indicates that “soul” and “spirit” are being used interchangeably for the same thing, whereas “joints and marrow” are two different things.

Having established that reference is sometimes made to “spirit or soul” in Heb. 4:12, this same principle can then be applied to I Thess. 5:23, where once again we find the Greek, *kai* is used for stylistic similarity, but with a contextual difference of nuance i.e., “spirit or (*kai*) soul and (*kai*) body.” Thus the meaning is, “your whole spirit or soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Such stylistic parallelism of “soul” and “spirit,” is also found in the *Magnificat*, where Mary says, “My soul doth magnify the Lord, and (*kai*) my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour” (Luke 1:46,47). The orthodox position of the Bible that man is a dichotomy, was stated at the *Council of Chalcedon* (451), which (in a Christological context) refers to “man” “consisting” “of a rational soul and body.”²⁹⁰

By contrast, Smith’s original teaching was, pre-existent spirit + body = soul. Thus the Mormon’s cult prophet, Joseph Smith, claimed, “the spirit and the body are the soul of man” (*Doctrine & Covenants* 88:15). On this unBiblical distinction between soul and spirit, he claimed “the spirits of men who are to be judged, and are found under condemnation” are brought to life before the millennium (*Doctrine & Covenants* 88:100,111). By contrast, “the resurrection from the dead is the redemption of the soul” when after the millennium, “the meek of the earth shall inherit it” (*Doctrine & Covenants* 88:16,17). He thus puts a sharp distinction between “spirit” and “soul.” The “spirits” can be absent from the body after death (*Doctrine & Covenants* 45:17; 129:1,3); but the “soul” only exists when the spirit is joined to the body (*Doctrine & Covenants* 18:15,16; 88:15). Smith also taught that God first “spiritually” “created all things” (*Moses* 3:5, *Pearl of Great Price*), and then added a body, “Man became a living soul,” “nevertheless, all things were before created: but spiritually were they created” (*Moses* 3:7, *Pearl of Great Price*). According to Mormon theology, man’s pre-existence as a spirit included a rebellion, in which some spirits were more obedient

Greek words are used elsewhere in this Epistle. Therefore, I consider the minority Byzantine reading (e.g., H 013; Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius *et al*) also found in the Latin Vulgate and some old Latin Versions must be correct. I.e., the “*te* (both)” does not attach to “soul and spirit” here.

²⁸⁹ Luke 1:15; Acts 5:16; 26:29; I Cor. 10:32 (twice), II Cor. 13:1; Eph. 5:3; Philp. 2:14; Col. 2:16; I Tim. 1:9.

²⁹⁰ See Bettenson’s *Documents*, p. 51.

to God than others²⁹¹. (In this Joseph Smith to some extent resembles some of Origen's heresies on pre-existent souls being fallen angels, some of which are then born into men as their souls, and others of which become the devils of this world.)

As a consequence of this view, in his so called "Inspired Version" or "Joseph Smith's Translation" (JST), Smith changed the AV's "dividing asunder of soul and spirit" in Heb. 4:12, to "dividing asunder of body and spirit." I.e., on his original view, pre-existent spirit + body = soul, then "the dividing asunder of soul and spirit" (AV) would result in a dead body, so by altering this to "dividing asunder of body and spirit" (JST) he itemized what he then regarded to be the two elements of the soul. Smith's original idea that, pre-existent spirit + body = soul, is condemned by the *Athanasian Creed*. The orthodox position that man is a dichotomy of body and soul was stated by Athanasius of Alexandria, who specifically repudiated the trichotomist view²⁹². It is therefore very appropriate, that the creed named after, not written by, this champion of Trinitarian orthodoxy, includes the Biblically sound statement, "that a rational soul and body is one man" (*Athanasian Creed*).

But Smith later jettisoned this distinction of spirit and soul, while retaining the idea of men having pre-existent spirits. The Mormon's *Pearl of Great Price* is divided into five sections, section 1 of which is Smith's *Book of Moses*, and section 2 of which is Smith's *Book of Abraham*²⁹³. Hoekema dates the *Book of Abraham* as "representing a later stage in Smith's theological development." His *Book of Abraham* is polytheistic, and rewrites Genesis with repeated references to "the Gods" creating (Abraham 4:1-31, *Pearl of Great Price*). Smith here claims that like other human beings, Abraham was a pre-existent spirit, and that God stood among all these pre-existent "spirits" when he decided to make the earth for these pre-existent spirits, who were then to be subjected to a period of probation on it (Abraham 3:23-25; 4:1, *Pearl of Great Price*)²⁹⁴. But in Abraham 3:23, *Pearl of Great Price*, Smith describes these pre-existent "spirits" also as pre-existent "souls." This shows a shift away from his earlier unorthodox view that spirit and soul were different, to a later view that regarded spirit and soul as interchangeable terms. Nevertheless, (very much like Origen,) he still retained the unorthodox view that mens' spirits / souls were pre-existent.

From the time of the Reformation, orthodox Protestants have historically divided between soul traducianists and soul creationists. Traducianists, like Luther and most Lutherans, considers the soul is propagated with the human body as part of the natural process of sexual reproduction²⁹⁵. Creationists, like Calvin and most Reformed Christians, considers each soul is created by God and united to the body by a Divine act²⁹⁶. In my opinion, soul creationism is the better opinion, e.g., we read in Heb. 12:9 that God is "the

²⁹¹ Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 46-8.

²⁹² Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, p. 191.

²⁹³ Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, p. 29.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁵ For the traducianist view that e.g., descendants are described as being in their fathers' loins (Gen. 46:26; Heb. 7:9,10), see Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, pp. 197-8.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 196-200.

Father of spirits” or souls. Or in Ecclesiastes 12:7 we learn that at death “the” soul or “spirit shall return unto God *who gave it*” (emphasis mine). And the OT prophet Zechariah says, “the Lord” “formeth the spirit of man within him” (Zech. 12:1). However, the matter is not a fundamental of the faith, and I accept as orthodox my fellow Protestant Christian brethren who take a different view on what I think to be the natural meaning of these Scriptures, and are soul traducianists.

But while the issue of *how* the soul originates, namely, traducianism (e.g., Luther) or creationism (e.g., Calvin), is within the boundaries of Protestant orthodoxy, the issue of *when* the soul originates is not. An interesting example of a soul originating, that both soul traducianists and soul creationists agree on, is the creation of Adam (i.e., like creationists, traducianists also regard this as an example of soul creation on the basis that Adam was the first man). God first “formed man of the dust of the ground,” then “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul” (Gen. 2:7). That is, he acquired a “soul” that was “living” or alive *when he was made*. Since the “first man Adam became a living soul” (I Cor. 15:45, ASV & NASB) because *after* his creation his “soul” became alive or “living;” therefore he did not have a pre-existent soul. In Ps. 139:14-16 reference is made to the “soul” (vs. 14) and “frame” (ASV & NASB) or “body” (translating Hebrew *’otsem*) (vs. 15), coming together to form the human “substance” (vs. 16). This event is dated in time, to “when I was made in secret” (vs. 15). This requires the conclusion that the soul (or spirit) originates at conception i.e., when a person is “made” (vs. 15)²⁹⁷.

Therefore the notion of pre-existent souls (or spirits) that are joined to a human body is clearly unorthodox. This Mormon view of pre-existent souls has a number of similarities (as well as differences) with Origen’s trichotomy (soul + spirit + body = man), since Origen of Alexandria (c. 185- c.284) also believed in the pre-existence of men’s souls. Like the later Mormons, Origen considered man’s present situation with all its inequalities, was a punishment for a previous existence as spirits²⁹⁸. Berkhof rightly observes four further objections to the heresy of men having pre-existent spirits (or souls). Firstly, this unBiblical view reflects a pagan dualism of matter and spirit, in which the soul is being punished for being attached to a body. This kind of thing is comparable to the first century gnostics who denied that Christ had a real human body or was fully human, because they considered human flesh was intrinsically evil. Hence St. John says that these “antichrists” who typed the then future “Antichrist” (I John 2:18), denied “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2,3; II John 7). Furthermore, since man is regarded as first being a pre-existent spirit, to whom a body was later attached as an after-thought, the Biblical distinction is destroyed between angels who were created to be “spirits” (Heb. 1:7), and men who were created to be “body” and “spirit” (I Cor. 7:34 cf. Gen. 2:7; I Cor. 15:45). Thirdly, the unity of the human race in Adam and the Fall is undermined (Rom. 5:12; I Cor. 15:22,49), since it claims individual souls (or spirits) existed long before this. Finally, it finds no support in man’s consciousness, for men have no memory of such a purported event²⁹⁹. Therefore like Origen,

²⁹⁷ While it is possible to give Ps. 139:13-16 a traducianist interpretation, I think the more natural reading of these verses requires a creationist interpretation of soul + body = man. Here David says, God “covered” (vs. 13, AV) or “knit me together” (vs. 13, ASV footnote), i.e., “knit” “together” (vs. 14, ASV footnote) the “soul” (vs. 14), and human “frame” (vs. 15, ASV) or body, to form the human “substance” or being (vs. 16).

²⁹⁸ Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, p. 48.

²⁹⁹ Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 197.

Mormons from their cult prophet, Joseph Smith onwards, are clearly soul heretics, whose notion of men being *pre-existent spirit + body*, is contrary to the Biblical constitutional nature of man as *spirit* (originating at conception) + body.

Because Mormons focus so much on the *Book of Mormon* and other Mormon writings such as *Doctrine and Covenants*³⁰⁰, the Mormon cult engages in far less pseudo-historicism than the other two of the three most major cults, namely, the Seventh-day Adventist cult and Jehovah's Witnesses cult. That is, since they make such relatively little usage of the Bible, *as a derivative consequence*, they do not major on cult pseudo-historicism in the same way that Jehovah's Witnesses and Seventh-day Adventists do. Nevertheless, they do engage in some cult pseudo-historicism. For example, in commenting on the seals of Rev. 6, the Mormons claim the fourth seal of Rev. 6:7,8, extends "from 1,000 B.C. to the coming of our Lord;" or they say of the sixth seal in Rev. 6:12-17, "We are now living during the final years of the sixth seal, that thousand year period which began in 1000 A.D. and will continue though" "until just before" "when Christ shall reign personally on earth."³⁰¹ In commenting on Dan. 2, Mormon President Spencer Kimball claimed, that "the stone cut out of the mountain without hands" (Dan. 2:45), was the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" when it "was restored in 1830 after numerous revelations from the divine source."³⁰² Or, in a blasphemous example of Joseph Smith's deification of man, he takes the description of God the Father in Dan. 7:22, and says, "Daniel in his seventh chapter speaks of the Ancient of Days; he means the oldest man, our Father Adam."³⁰³ Thus Smith claims that Satan's promise came true, "Ye shall be as gods" (Gen. 3:5), when in fact, "the Devil" "is a liar," and "there is no truth in him" (John 8:44).

The Christian Science Church is one of the four major cults, though it is significantly smaller than the three most major cults. It borders between being classified as one of the largest and most enduring of the many minor cults, or as being classified as the very smallest of the four major cults. Exact numbers of cult members are difficult to gain since this cult's *Church Manual* prohibits the publication of membership figures. Estimates vary considerably. One estimate put their numbers as low as about 10,000 adherents in the 1930s reduced to about 8,000 adherents in the 1960s. Another estimate (*Christian Research Journal*, 1992), thinks there were about 270,000 adherents in the 1930s reduced to about 150,000 adherents in the 1990s. Other estimates vary from under 100,000 to as high as about 400,000 adherents³⁰⁴. Notably, both the lower and higher estimates of cult members,

³⁰⁰ Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 24-33,75-87.

³⁰¹ *The Life & Teachings of Jesus and his apostles*, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA, 1978, second edition, revised 1979, p. 459 on Rev. 6:7,8 referring to McConkie, DNTC, 3:481; and p. 460 on Rev. 6:12-17, referring to McConkie, DNTC, 3:485-6.

³⁰² *Old Testament: I Kings-Malachi*, Religion 302 Student Manual, Prepared by the Church Educational System, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA, 1981, second edition, 1982, p. 299 on Dan. 2:31-45; quoting Kimball in *Conference Report*, April 1976, p. 10.

³⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 305 on Dan. 7:9-14; quoting Smith's *Teachings*, p. 157.

³⁰⁴ Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 179-80 (the lower estimates); "Church of Christ, Scientist - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia" (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christian_Science) (the

agree that the Christian Science cult has been declining substantially in membership numbers since the 1930s; whilst at the same time the other three of the four major cults have all been substantially increasing their membership numbers.

The Jehovah's Witnesses cult has been justly criticized for attacking the sanctity of human life contrary to the command, "Thou shalt not kill" (Exod. 20:13; Rom. 13:9), by e.g., allowing the children of Jehovah's Witnesses parents to needlessly die, as a consequence of their parents refusing permission for needed blood-transfusions. This emanates from the Jehovah's Witnesses cult's teaching against blood transfusions. So likewise, the Christian Science cult has been justly criticized for likewise violating the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," by e.g., allowing the children of Christian Science parents needlessly to die, as a consequence of their parents refusing permission for needed medical treatment of curable ailments. This emanates from the Christian Science cult's teachings against receiving medical treatment.

Like the Jehovah's Witnesses cult, the Christian Science cult denies the doctrine of the Holy Trinity *per se*. Their starting point is to conceptualize a duality of spirit and matter, in which spirit is equated with good and matter is equated with evil. The reality of matter, and thus the reality of evil, is then denied³⁰⁵. Such a teaching necessarily denies the incarnation of Christ, since the doctrine of one who is fully God and fully man is antithetical to this duality. For connected reasons of this duality, they also deny the constitutional nature of man as body (matter) and soul (spirit)³⁰⁶. E.g., the cult prophetess Mary Baker denied that men have souls, claiming, "The terms *souls* or *spirits* is" "improper."³⁰⁷

The Christian Science cult further deny that Christ suffered for our salvation, Christ's resurrection, Christ's ascension into heaven, Christ's second coming (by reducing the "second coming" to the spiritual 'return' of an idea, namely, the teachings of the Christian Science cult from 1866 or 1867), the reality of heaven and hell, and the final judgement³⁰⁸. The Apostle Paul twice refers to "God our Saviour" (Titus 1:3, 2:10), and makes it plain that this is Christ, referring to "that blessed hope" of the Second Coming, "and the glorious appearing of the great God our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Titus 2:13). Concerning those who, like the Christian Science cult, deny such great truths, the Apostle says, "A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject" (Titus 3:10).

The Christian Science cult stands condemned by such Biblically sound teachings as, "Whoever desires to be saved must above all things hold fast to the universal faith. Unless one keeps this faith completely and inviolably, he will undoubtedly perish forever. Now this is the universal faith. We worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity; neither confusing the Persons, nor dividing the Being." The "Son of God, is God and man." "He is perfect God and perfect man, subsisting of a rational soul and body." "Who suffered for our

mid-range and higher estimates).

³⁰⁵ Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 186-8.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 196-7.

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 192; quoting Baker's *Miscellaneous Writings*, p. 466.

³⁰⁸ Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 189-91,200-9,216-21.

salvation. He descended into hell. On the third day he rose again from the dead. He ascended into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from there he will come to judge the living and the dead. At his coming all men will experience the resurrection of the body, and they will give an account of all their deeds. Then those who have done good will enter eternal life, and those who have done evil will enter eternal fire. This is the universal faith. If one does not faithfully believe it, he cannot be saved” (*Athanasian Creed*).

Like the Mormon cult, the Christian Science cult engages in far less pseudo-historicism than the Seventh-day Adventist cult and Jehovah’s Witnesses cult. Like the Mormon Church, this is because the Christian Science Church focuses more on religious writings other than the Bible. In the case of the Christian Science Church, these are the writings of their cult prophetess, Mary Baker Eddy³⁰⁹. Nevertheless, the Christian Science cult does engage in some cult pseudo-historicism. For example, a number of orthodox Protestant historicists have applied the 1260 days (Dan. 7:25; Rev. 11:2; 12:14; 13:5) on the day-year principle (Num. 14:34; Ezek. 4:6; Dan. 9:24), from the decree of Phocas, and terminated it in 1866.³¹⁰ But engaging in cult pseudo-historicism, cult prophetesses Mary Eddy tried to date the rise of her cult as the fulfilment of the true church at the end of this time prophesy, linking it to some purported secretive and spiritual second coming of Christ (although by Christ’s purported “second coming” in 1866 or 1867, Mary Eddy means the “return” of a spiritual idea, namely, the teachings of the Christian Science cult³¹¹). Thus contrary to the Biblical teaching, “every eye shall see him” (Rev. 1:7), Mary Eddy claimed, “It is authentically said that one expositor of Daniel’s dates fixed the year 1866 or 1867 for the return of Christ - the return of the spiritual idea to the material earth or antipode to heaven. It is a marked coincidence that those dates were the first two years of my discovery of Christian Science.” Commenting on this, in the classic work on the major cults, namely, Hoekema’s *The Four Major Cults*, Anthony Hoekema notes that, “To affirm,” “that the second appearance of Christ coincided with the rise of Christian Science is to make Mrs. Eddy equivalent in importance to Jesus himself.”³¹²

In summary then, the Protestant Reformers did not waste space in their confessions by itemizing the many errors of heretics like the Nestorian Church, or unbelievers like the witches. Rather, they used the *Athanasian Creed* as a Biblically sound threshing instrument, in order to locate some relevant grains of heresy or unbelief out of the larger husks of these religions’ errors. Since all unbelievers, and the vast majority of all heretical religions are

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 171-86.

³¹⁰ In its greater fulfilment, I consider these 1260 years refer to the rise of the Papacy in 607, on inclusive reckoning terminating in 1866, marked by the Protestant martyrs of Barletta, Italy, in that year. This prophesy largely focuses on Papal political power, evident in the Papal states later gained in 756 and then lost during the period 1860-1870; till the Papal “deadly wound was healed” with the Vatican State in 1929 (Rev. 13:3).

³¹¹ The cult’s work, *Retrospection and Introspection*, p. 70, claims, “The second appearing of Jesus is, unquestionably, the spiritual advent of the advancing idea of God, as in Christian Science,” quoted in Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, p. 219.

³¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 219-20; quoting *The First Church of Christ, Scientist, and Miscellany*, p. 181.

caught by the theological threshing action of the *Athanasian Creed*, this means that it is not necessary to go into the many errors of unbelievers, or the further errors of the vast majority of the heretical religions exposed by this creed. Of course, in some contexts one may choose to consider some further elements of the many false religions exposed by the *Athanasian Creed*, but in other contexts one may choose not to³¹³. While Scripture allows a more thorough analysis of a false religious system, it does not require it.

On the one hand, Christians should show tolerance and love to one another, and not divide or break fellowship with each other over non-fundamental matters (Prov. 6:16,19; Rom. 14:1; I Cor. 8; Gal. 5:14,15). But on the other hand, Christians must defend fundamental doctrines against the perpetrators of error (Acts 20:28, 29; I Cor. 5:5,9-11; II Peter 2:1). The *Athanasian Creed* only isolates major deviations from fundamental teachings of Holy Writ, which are of such a magnitude as to clearly constitute heresy; and so those found to be in heresy under its damnatory clauses, cannot seriously claim that due regard to Christian love and tolerance has not been shown to them. For contextually, the Apostle Paul first says, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another” (Gal. 5:14,15); and then he warns that those in “heresies” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:20,21). Of those who deny broad Biblical doctrines such as those in the *Athanasian Creed*, this same holy Apostle says, “A man that is heretical” (RV) or “A man that is an heretick” (AV), “after the first and second admonition reject” (Titus 3:10, AV).

Thus via the *Athanasian Creed*, e.g., the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord*, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, or Dutch Reform *Belgic Confession*, denounces hell-bound Trinitarian heretics such as the Eastern Orthodox (anti-*Filioque* heretics³¹⁴, who also deny Christ’s decent into hell³¹⁵.) and Oriental Orthodox (monophysitist heretics³¹⁶), together with

³¹³ Article 29 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, says specifically of the Greek Orthodox Church, (a member of the Eastern Orthodox communion of churches,) identified through reference to the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, simply, “the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred.” Specific examples of this are found in e.g., its denial of the double-procession of the Holy Ghost upheld in the *Athanasian Creed* (Article 7, 39 Articles), and in its idolatrous usage of icons (Book 2, Homily 2, Part 2, “Against peril of idolatry,” in Article 35, 39 Articles).

³¹⁴ The Latin, *Filioque*, refers to the words “and the Son,” upholding the double procession of the Holy Ghost. The Eastern Orthodox Churches (e.g., Greek Orthodox Church or Russian Orthodox Church) deny this, claiming a single procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father *alone*. Scripture teaches that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *and the Son* (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7). “The Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, and is neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeds” (*Athanasian Creed*).

³¹⁵ The teaching “he descended into hell” (*Apostles’* and *Athanasian Creeds*), is also stated in e.g., Art. 3, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*. The Eastern Orthodox deny this, instead claiming a transitional heavenly “paradise” (Luke 23:43) was the same as the “hell” into which Christ descended (Acts 2:27,31). They claim that Christ descended into “limbo,” where it is said the souls of the OT just were awaiting Christ’s resurrection. They are joined in this error of a “limbo of the fathers” by Romanists, who adopted this heresy notwithstanding its condemnation in the *Athanasian Creed’s* damnatory clauses.

³¹⁶ E.g., the Armenian Orthodox or Coptic Orthodox Churches.

unbelievers such as e.g., Jews (Rom. 10:1,2; II Cor. 3:14,15), Mohammedans³¹⁷, or heathen Red Indians of the Americas. This meant the Reformers could avoid detailed discussion on the false, repulsive, unnecessary and generally undesirable to know, greater details which may go into “the deep things of Satan” (Rev. 2:24, ASV) evident in e.g., the Devilish details about American Indian heathen religions. Thus the Reformers were, by the grace of God, able through reference to this creed, ultimately able to facilitate a situation where the ennobling and edifying doctrines of the *Athanasian Creed* were focused on. For it is enough to know that heathens reject e.g., the doctrine of the Incarnation and Holy Trinity, to know that they are hell-bound. In using this approach, the Reformers also signalled that there was a *continuation* in Reformation times of their pre-Reformation position, which had always been to condemn those in such heresies and unbelief. This thus reduced the religious field to only a relatively small number of other heretical groups (e.g., in the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, “certain Anabaptists” who “falsely boast” that the “riches and goods of Christians are” “common,” Article 38; or “The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences,” Article 37; or in the “Christian religion” “a man may swear when the magistrate requireth,” Article 39)³¹⁸. This then allowed the Reformers

³¹⁷ Mohammed’s infidel anti-Trinitarianism included his denial, “that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is” “God of the substance of the Father, begotten from eternity” (*Athanasian Creed*). Mohammed blasphemously claimed, “God the eternal! He begetteth not, and he is not begotten” (Sura 112, *Koran*); and that “Jesus is no more than a servant” (Sura 43:57, *Koran*), without Divinity (Sura 3:73, *Koran*). Showing himself to be of his “father, the devil,” who “is a liar” (John 8:44), Mohammed in his *Koran* also falsely depicts Christians as saying, “God is the third of three,” to which he replies, “there is no God but one God: and if they refrain not from what they say, a grievous chastisement shall light on” “them” (Sura 5:77, *Koran*); and in a similar fashion, Mohammed also says, “say not ‘Three’,” “for” “God is only one God!” (Sura 4:169, *Koran*). In fact, the orthodox Trinitarian teaching is that, “the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Spirit is Lord.” “Yet there are not three Lords, but one Lord.” “For in the same way that we are compelled by Christian truth to recognize each Person by himself to be God and Lord; likewise we are forbidden by the universal religion to say, ‘There are three Gods,’ or ‘three Lords’” (*Athanasian Creed*). Mohammed further denied the atonement i.e., that Christ “suffered for our salvation” (*Athanasian Creed*). He also denied that Christ “descended into hell,” or that “on the third day he rose again from the dead” (*Athanasian Creed*). This all formed part of Mohammed’s denial that Christ was even put to death. Commenting on “their saying, ‘Verily we have slain the Messiah, Jesus’;” Mohammed claims, “Yet they slew him not, and they crucified him not.” “And” “they did not really slay him, but God took him up to himself” (Sura 4:156, *Koran*). Contrary to e.g., Matt. 19:9, Mohammed also condoned adultery by teaching polygamy (Sura 4:3, *Koran*). Contrary to e.g., Mark 7:19, where Christ “declared all foods clean” (NASB), he forbade pork, bacon, and ham, and required halal butchery (Suras 2:168; 5:4, *Koran*); and contrary to e.g., Ps. 104:15; Col. 2:16, Islamic Law (Mohammedan Law) further prohibited alcohol (Sura 2:216). (Rodwell, J.M., translator, *The Koran*, 1861, 2nd ed. 1876, With an Introduction by G. Margoliouth, 1909, reprint Dent & Sons, London, UK, 1974.)

³¹⁸ Compare the Lutheran *Formula of Concord*, Article 12, “Of other heresies and sects.” This says “Anabaptist Articles” “cannot be tolerated in daily life” which claim, “That a godly man cannot with safe conscience hold or possess any property, but that whatever means he may possess, he is bound to bestow them all as common good.” Or that

to put the focus where Scripture puts it (e.g., II Thess. 2), namely, in a bi-polar context of the *Church of Antichrist* (Roman Catholicism) versus the *Church of Christ* (Protestantism).

Today, we are faced with religious liberals who e.g., deny the atonement (“Who suffered for our salvation, *Athanasian Creed*), deny the reality of hell (“He descended into hell” *Athanasian Creed*), deny the resurrection of Christ (“On the third day he rose again from the dead,” *Athanasian Creed*), deny the Second Coming of Christ (“he will come to judge the living and the dead. At his coming all men will experience the resurrection of the body, and they will give an account of all their deeds. Then those who have done good will enter eternal life, and those who have done evil will enter eternal fire, “*Athanasian Creed*); or in conjunction with their religious apostasy seen in their support for the ecumenical and inter-faith movements, some deny that those in heresies or unbelief are damned souls³¹⁹. Today, we are also faced with four major cults and numerous minor cults. Sometimes the best way to dispel the darkness is simply to shine the light i.e., rather than go through the many errors of various heretics and unbelievers, simply affirm some broad tenets of Biblical Christianity in order to dispel the darkness of false religions. In this context, the *Athanasian Creed* stands as a time-honoured and time-proven faithful guard of Biblical orthodoxy. In addition to exposing some of the errors of religious liberals, its beautiful theological threshing action, now also allows us to expose some of the false teachings of the four major cults and various minor cults, without having to go into too much, if any, further detail about these cults many other erroneous beliefs. Given the large number of cults, and the shifts in teachings that leaders in a given cult may make over time, this makes the theological threshing action of the *Athanasian Creed* very useful for isolating enough relevant information about various cults to expose them as false religions, that are damning souls to hell. It also means that one does not have to delve into their many false and repulsive teachings, but rather, by addressing the relevant heresies isolated by this creed, one can ultimately put the focus on the beautiful and edifying teachings of the *Athanasian Creed*.

Thus this technique of using the *Athanasian Creed* as a threshing instrument, now takes on a further particular significance because of the ecumenical movement, preterism, and cult pseudo-historicism. Apostate Protestant ecumenists oppose historicism because it is unapologetically Protestant. Preterists have lunged out to attack historicists, and it is notable that the preterist interpretation of prophesy is frequently, though not always, associated with the soul damning teaching of religious liberalism. The rise of cult pseudo-historicism has also been one factor in bringing into disrepute the historicist school of prophetic interpretation. Cult pseudo-historicism must be denounced, and not confused with the historicist school of orthodox Protestants.

Therefore, on the one hand, I do not wish to oversimplify the reasons for the historical school’s decline in Protestant Churches by overstating the negative impact of pseudo-historicism, whether the type peddled by, e.g., anti-Anglican Puritans like the denominationally bigoted Free Presbyterian Hislop, or the type dispensed by various cults.

“Anabaptist Articles” “are intolerable in the Commonwealth” which claim, “That the magistrate, under the New Testament, cannot with a good conscience punish criminals with death;” or which claim, “That a Christian man cannot with a safe conscience take an oath.”

³¹⁹ E.g., Knox records that for some it has become “fashionable” “to denigrate the strong assertions of the Athanasian Creed, and indeed this creed has been dropped by certain” churches because of this (Knox, D.B., *The Everlasting God*, *op. cit.*, p. 49).

Moreover, I consider that in the final analysis it is only by God's good grace that anyone can be convicted of any Biblical truth. But on the other hand, there can be no doubt that the gross theological inaccuracies, abuse and misuse of historicist concepts and categories of thought, and the anti-orthodox Protestant invective of such pseudo-historicists, has been a factor in subverting and undermining the historical school among orthodox Protestants. That is because, *in the hands of a wise and Biblically sound preacher or writer, the historical school generally acts as a point of unity among orthodox Protestants in their celebration of the tenets of apostolic Christianity recovered by the Protestant Reformers, and their associated recognition of the Roman Pope as the Antichrist who is their common enemy in his opposition to the Christian Reformation.*

The Historical School: Where we Protestants came from, where we are, and where we are going to.

The recognition by Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, and all the great Protestant Reformers of both the first and second stages of the Reformation that the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist foretold in Holy Writ, forms an important and integral part of the Reformation. By recognizing that the Papal Antichrist could not be "revealed" till "what withholdeth" it in New Testament times, namely the Roman Empire, disintegrated with the fall of Rome and the Western Roman Empire in 476 A.D., so that "he," that is the Western Roman Emperor was "taken out of the way" (II Thess. 2:6-8), a historical context is given that helps the Protestant understand the Reformation and Protestant Christianity. That is, the gradual corruption of apostolic Christianity in post New Testament times was part of the "falling away" (AV) or "apostasy" (NASB) that had to "first" happen (II Thess. 2:3), in order to prepare the way for the rise of Antichrist following the fall of Rome in 476 A.D. . Then with the rise of the Roman Papacy in the heartlands of the Western Roman Empire as a forerunner typed from 533 to 565 by the titular primacy of the Bishop of Rome under Justinian, and then as a full-blown reality from 607, the Roman Pope and his empire of Roman Catholicism reigned powerfully for a long period of about 900 years from 607. Then this era of Papal darkness "in" a part of "the temple of God" (II Thess. 2:4), was followed by the glorious light of the Reformation, as "those days" of the 1260 day-year (Num. 14:34; Ezek. 4:4-6) prophecy (Dan. 7:25; Rev. 13:5) from 607 to 1866 (on inclusive reckoning) were "shortened" (Matt. 24:22) in those parts of Western Europe liberated by the Reformation from the 16th century; and then further "shortened" by the rise of the secular state from the late 18th and 19th centuries in other parts of Western Europe; although in the Papal States this power continued the whole period (even continuing in reduced measure for several years after 1866 till 1870). Thus the depiction of the Antichrist in the Gospels, Pauline Epistles, and Johannian Epistles reminds the Protestant that God foresaw and told us that this Papal reign would transpire, that it would be accompanied "with all power and signs and lying wonders" by "the working of Satan" (II Thess. 2:9), and indeed will continue in some form till the Second Advent (II Thess. 2:8), for the truth of Protestantism will never be universally accepted this side of eternity since the Pope will continue to operate "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish" till "the Lord" "shall destroy" him "with the brightness of his coming" (II Thess. 2:8,10). Hence for the Protestant, II Thessalonians chapter 2 comforts and explains God's foreknowledge and sovereignty amidst great desecration of the Christian "temple" or church by the Roman Pope (II Thess. 2:4), just like for the Jews in the 160s B.C., Daniel chapter 8 gave comfort and explained God's foreknowledge and sovereignty amidst great desecration of the Jewish temple or "sanctuary" by Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. 8:13,14).

Furthermore, the recognition that just before the Second Advent "the false prophet"

will in some way “make an image to the” Pope (Rev. 13:14), which I understand (on the data presently available to me,) to be *in all likelihood* an animated and great miracle-working image of the *mother-goddess figure* of Mary, helps us to understand why the spiritual forces of darkness have been promoting religious liberalism, “ecumenical” tolerance to Rome by other churches, “inter-faith” tolerance to Rome from religions that do not even claim to be “Christian,” religious universalism, agnosticism, and atheism. These ideologies send people to hell in the next life. But in this life, tolerance towards Romanism, and a disbelief that Romanism is a religion of the Devil, makes people spiritually defenceless against the Antichrist, so that when in the future they behold a Marian miracle working image, saying something like, “The Roman Pontiff is the *Vicarius Jesu Christi*, the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Hear then, and obey, the Vicar of the Son of God,” they will be easy prey. The agnostics and atheists being quickly convinced of the reality of the supernatural will succumb to the Antichrist, and apostate Christians and other religions, having lost their hostility to Romanism, will refuse to believe such supernatural manifestations are of the Devil, and so, accepting them to be of God they will also fall victim to the Antichrist. A mopping up operation against dissidents involving economic sanctions (Rev. 13:16,17) and the killing of those who do not succumb to these devices (Rev. 13:15), will then ensure the wide-scale acceptance of the Pope as the “Vicar of Christ.”

Thus Biblical prophecy in the historical school of prophetic interpretation helps the Protestant to understand where we came from, where we are now, and where we are going. This prophetic key to the past, present, and future, thus unlocks mysteries otherwise unknown. May God open the eyes of his people to see these wonderful Biblical truths in my humble prayer in Jesus’ name.

Bible Translations.

1) *The “AV only” history* 2) *Translations Used.*

1) *The “AV only” history.*

The “AV only” legal history dates from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries as part of Anglican canon law. In 1604 the King of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and Supreme Governor of the Established *Church of England*, King James I (Regnal Years: 1623-1625), summoned a meeting of Churchmen. They recommended that a new translation of Holy Writ be made. The King agreed, and the result was the King James Version of 1611.

The *Act of Uniformity* (1662) introduced the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), and this Act of Parliament states in the Preface, that the “portions of holy Scripture ... are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation.” Since the “last Translation” was the *King James Version* (KJV), this Act thus made the KJV the *Authorized Version* (AV) i.e., it was the *version authorized* to be read in *Church of England* Churches by Act of Westminster Parliament.

Furthermore, the Uniformity Act states that the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) resulted from the King’s declaration of 1660, and the *Church of England* Convocations of Canterbury and York producing the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), which “His Majesty ... fully approved and allowed ..., and recommended to ... [the] Parliament.” Thus it follows from examination of the 1662 Uniformity Act, that through the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), which included the relevant Preface authorizing the KJV, that the

King James Version was the *version authorized* by King, Parliament, and Convocation. It was this triple authorization by King, Parliament, and Convocation found in the Act of Uniformity of 1662, that gave the King James Version its enduring designation as “the Authorized Version.”

Thus the *Church of England* became an “Authorized Version only” church till the nineteenth century. But once again, the term “Authorized Version only” is placed in quotation marks, since the *Church of England* historically authorized a different translation of the Psalms in the *Book of Common Prayer* for usage in public worship. Miles Coverdale was editor of the *Great Bible* (1538-9) (based on Tyndale’s and Coverdale’s earlier versions), with a Preface by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, from 1540. Coverdale’s *Great Bible* psalms were used in the *Book of Common Prayer*, so that while it was an “AV only” church, it allowed some latitude providing the AV remained the principle translation. Furthermore, the Homilies in Article 35 of the 39 Articles, being composed before 1611, do not use the AV, and these may be read in church services in place of a sermon, or parts of them might be quoted from in a sermon. Because of its status in Anglican canon law, the “AV only” status of Anglicanism was safeguarded in law.

The plethora of post World War Two new versions, usually based on the NU Text (“N” from “Nestle” and “U” from “United Bible Societies”), has greatly undermined the historical place of the AV among Protestant Churches, and has been one of the corrosive influences in the great decay of true religion. Fortunately, a number of churches have, by the grace of God, kept alive the importance of the AV. In this process, some have formally returned to, or never moved away from, the “AV only” Protestant position of the mid seventeenth to late nineteenth centuries. For example, among Anglicans the *Church of England (Continuing)* is an “AV only” Church³²⁰; among Presbyterians; the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* is an “AV only” Church; as are a number of independent Baptist Churches. In this great and noble work of promoting the AV, the outstanding efforts and labours of the *Trinitarian Bible Society* have been of clear noteworthiness. The *Trinitarian Bible Society* publishes and distributes Scriptures in many different tongues throughout the world, but for English readers only publishes the Authorized Version. It is thus an “AV only” organization.

The interested reader will find more detail in my Textual Commentaries, Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) in the Preface at “1) Textual Commentary Principles,” sections, “a) The ‘AV only’ history” & “b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus)³²¹.”

2) Translations Used

I do not support the usage of *interpretive* Bible translations e.g., the *Revised Standard Version*, the *New Revised Standard Version*, the *New International Version*, or the *English Standard Version*. Rather, I support the *literal* form of Bible translation which *as a general rule* seeks word for word equivalence, and uses italics for words added by the translators (a

³²⁰ Samuel, D.N., *The Church in Crisis, op. cit.*, pp. 55-85 n.b. pp. 59-9,68.

³²¹ See my Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14) (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at “Commentary on the Received Text”).

practice first used in 1534), e.g., the Authorized (King James) Version (1611), (English) Revised Version (1881-5), American Standard Version (1901), New American Standard Bible (1971,1977,1995), and New King James Version (1982). This form of Bible translation, which seeks to retain as much of the sentence form, grammar, and writing style of the original as is reasonably possible, is sometimes called “formal equivalence.”

As one who supports the Received Texts of the OT and NT, the principle translation used in this commentary is that literary masterpiece of the English language, the Authorized Version. Other versions used, namely, the RV, ASV, NASB, and NKJV, are intended by me to be supplementary to, not a replacement of, the Authorized Version. Since only the AV and NKJV are translations of the Greek NT Received Text, it follows that they are the two most accurate translations of the NT with respect to text type. Broadly speaking, the AV is far more accurate than its closest rival, the NKJV (e.g., some key historicist passages in Dan. 8 & 11 are still better in the AV than any other generally available translation).

The Alexandrian Text was regarded with great favour by the neo-Alexandrian textual critics Westcott and Hort, and used in the RV’s NT (1881) and ASV’s NT (1901). Its two 4th century leading representatives are London Sinaiticus and Rome Vaticanus, though in more recent times the Bodmer Papyri, most notably p 66 and p 75 from the third century, shows the earlier history of this school of editors and copyists. The NASB is based on a late 20th century critical text also in the neo-Alexandrian tradition of textual criticism, Nestle’s 26th edition. Though it must be admitted that the RV, ASV, and NASB NT’s are based on an inferior Greek text type to the AV and NKJV, I nevertheless find them useful with regard to certain passages. However the reader should clearly understand that my usage of the RV, ASV, and NASB does not in any way constitute an endorsement of the inferior Greek text types that their NTs are based on.

The ASV is generally a mild revision of the RV, and both translations are generally the same. Perhaps the most distinctive translation difference between the two is that the ASV always uses “Jehovah” for the OT *YHWH*. Certainly the Anglicized Protestant form “Jehovah” is the correct one for an English translation to use since to leave it as *YHWH* or make it “*Yahweh*” would not be a translation into English. On the one hand, the NT consistently follows the Septuagint and uses “Lord” for OT quotes, rather than a Hellenized form of “Jehovah” (e.g., Mark 1:3; quoting Isa. 40:3). But on the other hand, the abbreviated form of “Jehovah” as “Jah” (Ps. 68:4), is directly used in the NT’s “Alleluia” (AV) or “Hallelujah” (ASV) (“Praise Jah”) (Rev. 19:1,3,4,6), and indirectly used in such names as e.g., Elijah (Rom. 11:2). I think this NT balance is best found in the AV & RV, both of which generally use “LORD” and capitalize it in the OT to show that the underpinning Hebrew is *YHWH*, but which also make some limited usage of “Jehovah” in the OT. I think this NT balance is lost in the ASV which uses “Jehovah” to great excess; and this NT balance is also lost in the NASB and NKJV which never use “Jehovah” in the OT. Rather than quote the same words as “RV & ASV,” I generally cite only the ASV; although the reader should be aware of occasional differences e.g., I prefer the RV reading of I Cor. 14:33,34 over the ASV reading³²², which like the AV and NKJV rightly divides verse 33 and 34. Though I may

³²² The RV reads, “for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace; as in all the churches of the saints” (I Cor. 14:33, RV). Then a new paragraph starts with, “Let the women keep silence in the churches” (I Cor. 14:34, RV). By contrast, the ASV, in my opinion *incorrectly*, reads “for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace” (I Cor. 14:33, ASV). Then a new paragraph starts with, “As in all the churches of the saints, let the women

sometimes quote a passage from the RV, ASV, NASB, or NKJV, generally, when I quote them it is only with respect to a particular verse, or a phrase, or a word in a particular verse. Unless otherwise specified, all Biblical references are from, or to, that prince of English Bible translations, the AV.

Some twentieth and twenty-first century AV critics have claimed that while they think the AV was a good translation in its day, since its publication in 1611 its language has become archaic, and so a modern language translation is justified. On this basis, the RV of 1881-5 and ASV of 1901 are also criticized, since they retain many such English archaisms. E.g., the 1946 *Church of Scotland* General Assembly, sent a memorandum to numerous churches in the British Isles, claiming the Authorized Version (1611) and Revised Version (1881-5) were outdated due to their *archaic language*, and seeking support for a new translation. The Chairman of the translation Committee, C.H. Dodd, further criticized the RV on the basis that it had “never fully established itself in use.” Dodd’s criticism of the RV was misdirected, since it was often used in the same way I use the RV and ASV, i.e., as a *supplement to, not as a replacement of, the AV*.

The *Church of Scotland* General Assembly’s new “translation” later became known as the *New English Bible* (NEB) of 1961-70. Whatever defects the AV might have, they pale into insignificance when compared with the defects of the NEB. The NEB is such a loose, liberal, and non-literal “translation,” that it was wisely banned from the pulpits by Protestants such as e.g., the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*³²³. (Sixty years later, in 2006 the *Church of Scotland* General Assembly voted to permit their Ministers to conduct “blessing ceremonies” for both Lesbian sodomite and male homosexual sodomite unions. For “God” “gave them up to uncleanness,” Rom. 1:24-27)³²⁴.

The fundamental claim by e.g., the *Church of Scotland* General Assembly (1946), that the AV and RV (or by extension the ASV) ought to be replaced because they use archaic English, is a misplaced criticism and shows a lack of understanding of the AV’s, RV’s, and ASV’s original English. When it was published in 1611, e.g., the AV’s “thee,” “thou,” “ye,” “gat,” or “spake” *were already archaic*. In 1611, the common man said, they “got” up (NASB & NKJV), not they “gat” up (Num. 16:27, AV, RV, & ASV). In 1611, the common man said, “you shall eat” the “old” food (NKJV), not “ye shall eat” the “old” food (Lev. 26:10, AV, RV, & ASV). In 1611, the common man said, “God spoke” “these words,” “You shall not steal” (NASB & NKJV), not, “God spake” “these words,” “Thou shalt not steal” (Exod. 20:1,15, AV, RV, & ASV). The AV translators *deliberately* used words *which in 1611 were archaic* in their day, but with which, with relatively little effort, men could learn. The reason for this was manifold.

Firstly, they gave recognition to the work of the Protestant martyr, William Tyndale whose work is evident in between 60% and 80% of the Authorized (King James) Version (and who used what was contemporary English at the time of his 1534 revised translation). Secondly, the usage of moderately archaic English was a deliberate literary device. The

keep silence in the churches” (I Cor. 14:33,34, ASV).

³²³ McPherson, A. (Editor), *op. cit.*, pp. 265-8.

³²⁴ *English Churchman*, 9 & 16 June, 2006, p. 5, “Church of Scotland Seeks to Bless What God has Cursed.”

translators wanted to make the point that the words of God, found in the Bible, *are ancient words*³²⁵, “written aforetime for our learning” (Rom. 15:4). “Thus saith Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein” (Jer. 6:16). This technique was continued by the RV and ASV translators. In their OT Preface, the ASV translators said that their twentieth century task of semi-modernizing the English was made subject to the fact that “we desire to retain” “the antique flavour” of such moderate archaisms as *thee* and *ye*.

The Aramaic sections of the predominantly Hebrew OT in Ezra 7:12-26; Jer. 10:8; Dan. 2:4 to 7:28 are an example of how *some* Bible writers used Aramaic as a literary device for those who spoke the Hebrew tongue. An original hearer of God’s word would listen to a language very similar to his own Hebrew tongue, and with relatively little effort, he could learn the Aramaic differences. *Thus an original hearer of God’s word did not listen to the Word of God in his common Hebrew tongue and idiom, rather, he was required to master a more educated form of language, in the very similar, but not identical, Aramaic tongue.*

Likewise, some of the Aramaic sections of the Greek NT are an example of how *some* Bible writers used Aramaic as a literary device for those of the Greek tongue. Aramaic preserves the poetical qualities in the alliteration on the “m,” “th,” and final “a” in “Anathema Maranatha” (“Accursed when the Lord comes”) (I Cor. 16:22). Likewise, the “a” sounding assonance and “f” sounding assonance on the “ph” “ph,” are preserved in “Eph’pha-tha, that is, Be opened” (Mark 7:34). Furthermore, some level of cultural adaptation is clearly part of valid translation, as seen in some of the OT quotes in the NT. For example, in Acts 7:42-43, Amos 5:25-27 is quoted with Septuagint (LXX) influence, and faithfully conveys *the spiritual meaning* in the Hebrew. But e.g., St. Stephen, recognized that the real spiritual power behind “Damascus” (Amos 5:27) was the Devil. Hence he used *what in his NT culture* was a better known city name that the Devil was also behind, namely, being in “Babylon.” This type of usage of spiritual cities comes from the OT, for Isaiah refers to Jerusalem as “Sodom” and “Gomorrah” (Isa. 1:10); and this technique continued in the NT (Rev. 11:8), with the use of “Babylon” for Rome in the Book of Revelation. St. Stephen here likewise uses the well known OT centre of idolatry, Babylon, to make the point that (like Rome in Revelation), Damascus was spiritually “Babylon,” and thus the spiritual significance of captivity “beyond Damascus” (Amos 5: 27) is the same as “beyond Babylon” (Acts 7:43). While such translation techniques are clearly valid when the Holy Ghost who first had a prophet write Amos 5:27, then interprets it through another prophet who wrote Acts 7:43; we who live in an era where the gift of prophesy no longer exists cannot with the same confidence generally use this technique of translation. But if this is done as a cultural adaptation to moderately archaic English, in what is generally a literal word for word translation, I think such NT precedents are instructive.

Therefore the usage of moderate English archaism by the translators of the AV in 1611, RV in 1881-5, and ASV in 1901, as a culturally appropriate literary device to convey the fact that in the Bible, “God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets that have been from of old” (Acts 3:21, ASV), for “his holy prophets” “have been since the world began” (Luke 1:70, AV & RV), for example, “Moses of old time hath” “them that preach him” (Acts 15:21,

³²⁵ Bragg, M., *The Adventure of English*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, UK, 2003, pp. 105-115; “The Adventure of English” (TV Video Series), An LWT Granada Production, 2002.

AV), is in my opinion harmonious with these types of literary (Ezra 7:12-26; Jer. 10:8; Dan. 2:4-7:28) and translation (Acts 7:42-43, quoting Amos 5:25-27) techniques, evident in the Bible itself. Certainly this AV, RV, & ASV type of literary tradition is *not contrary to* anything stated in Scripture. While the number of such *additional* archaisms in the AV has admittedly increased since 1611, these *additional* archaisms still remain relatively few in number, and they do not adversely affect, indeed one may say they actually enhance, this basic literary style. (Nevertheless, AV, RV, and ASV appendices or booklets showing the modern equivalents of such archaic words, are in my opinion useful and good³²⁶.) Thus I maintain that this style of moderately archaic translation which is understandable with relative ease, which characterized the Authorized Version at the time of its publication in 1611, the Revised Version at the time of its publication 1881-5, and the American Standard Version at the time of its publication in 1901, is not contrary to anything in the Bible, and *is a valid literary form of Bible translation.*

A third consideration of the AV translators, also continued by the RV and ASV translators, is the belief that to produce an accurate word for word translation, requires the ability to distinguish between singular and plural second person pronouns i.e., “you” *singular* is “thee” and “thou,” and “your” *singular* is “thy;” whereas , “you” *plural* is “you” and “ye,” and “your” *plural* is “your.” This also requires associated declensions e.g., thou *art* (singular) and you *are* (plural). This need comes from the fact that such distinctions are found in the Hebrew OT and Greek NT. Without them, it is not always clear as to *who* is being referred to. Numerous examples of this occur (e.g., Matt. 5:26,27,42,43; I Cor. 4:6-8, II Cor. 6:1,2; Rev. 2:10), but let us consider just two, to make the point.

Luke 22:31,32, <i>New King James Version</i>	Luke 22:31,32, <i>Authorized King James Version</i>
“Simon, Simon! Indeed, Satan has asked for you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for you, that your faith should not fail, and when you have returned to me, strengthen your brethren.”	“Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.”

As is made clear in the AV, Jesus says “Satan hath desired to have you” i.e., “you” is plural and so refers to all the apostles, not just St. Peter, “that he may sift you” (plural) i.e., all of them. “But” says Jesus, “I have prayed for thee” (singular) i.e., the Apostle Peter, to whom the rest of the sentence is address as seen in the you singulars “thy faith, “when thou art,” and “thy brethren.” By contrast, using the NKJV, the original “Satan has asked for you, that he may sift you as wheat” (NKJV), could be easily misunderstood to be applying to the Apostle Peter in the singular, or if it was taken to be in the singular, then “I have prayed for you” (NKJV) might mean Jesus has prayed for all the Apostles, with only the very last “when you have returned” referring to the Apostle Peter. In short, the average reader would need a very good commentary to understand what was being said in Luke 22:31,32 (NKJV), whereas the average reader needs no such commentary to understand Luke 22:31,32 (AV).

While overall the neo-Alexandrian NT text based ASV is a much inferior version to

³²⁶ E.g., some Trinitarian Bible Society editions have these at the back, e.g., their “Classic Reference Bible” edition.

the neo-Byzantine NT Received Text based AV, a comparison between the ASV (1901) and its son, the NASB (3rd ed. 1995), shows how the ASV is generally a more accurate translation of a neo-Alexandrian NT text than is the NASB. That is because, like the AV, the ASV quite deliberately retained the usage of “thee,” “thou,” and “thy” for “you” singular, and “you,” “ye,” and “your,” for “you” plural. (While the NASB’s 1st edition of 1960-71 and 2nd edition of 1977 retained “Thee,” “Thou,” and “Thy,” for references to Deity, this was a reflection of the practice of using AV type English in prayer as a compatible reinforcement of the AV, reflected in e.g., the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*. Thus it ultimately made no sense to retain this practice purely for Deity, and nor is their any warrant for this in the underpinning Hebrew OT and Greek NT. Thus as with the RSV’s similar practice, this was merely a transitional device to move people away from the AV.)

<p>I Cor. 6:18-20 <i>New American Standard Bible</i></p>	<p>I Cor. 6:18-20 <i>American Standard Version</i></p>
<p>“Flee immorality. Every other sin that a man commits is outside the body, but the immoral man sins against his own body. Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you, whom you have from God, and that you are not your own? For you have been bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body.”</p>	<p>“Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body. Or know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have from God? And ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body.”</p>

As is clear in the ASV (or RV), the Apostle Paul first refers to a man’s “own body” (singular), and then refers to “your” (plural) “body” i.e., the church (cf. I Cor. 11:29, ASV), which “is a temple of the Holy Spirit,” and as a corporate “body” the church should “glorify God” “in your” (plural) body.” By contrast, using the NASB one could easily think that verses 19 and 20 were referring to the believer’s “body,” and so the passage could be badly misunderstood. St. Paul means the “body” of *the church* is a “temple of the Holy Spirit” (ASV) (cf. II Thess. 2:4), *not* that *the individual Christian* is a “temple of the Holy Spirit,” which is how one could possibly read the NASB. If this were the intended meaning, then the ASV would here read “thy body is a temple of the Holy Spirit,” and “thou art not thy own, for thou wast bought with price,” so “glorify God” “in thy body.” Thus in I Cor. 6:18-20, the average reader needs a very good commentary to understand what is being said in the NASB, whereas the average reader needs no such commentary to understand the ASV. Thus “the more modern English” of the NASB is not here an improvement upon the ASV, but an even worse translation than is the ASV. Of course, either the ASV or NASB match the accuracy of the AV here; with both them omitting the AV’s “and in your spirit, which are God’s” from I Cor. 6:20³²⁷.

³²⁷ Detailed textual analysis of I Cor. 6:20 is beyond the scope of this work. But I note in passing that the longer reading has Byzantine Majority support. The longer reading is supported by the ancient church Greek writer, John Chrysostom (347-407) both in his Homilies of I & II Corinthians, Homily 26, and in his Homilies on I & II Timothy, Homily 14) (Schaff, P., *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, [first series,] *op. cit.*, Vol. 12, p. 149, Vol. 13, p. 421). Its inclusion is typically Pauline in this passage (cf. “both in body and in spirit” at I Cor. 7:34), and results in a stylistically expected and balanced flow from “body” and “spirit”

The NT sometimes uses lone Aramaic or Hebrew words, such as “Abba” (Father) (Mark 14:36; Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6), “Hosanna” (“Oh Save!” or “Save now!” addressed to God) (Matt. 21:9,15; Mark 11:9,10; John 12:13), “Sabaoth” (“armies”) (Rom. 9:29; James 5:4), or “Alleluia” (AV) or “Hallelujah” (ASV) (“Praise Jah,” thus preserving the Hebrew name of God “Jah” e.g., Ps. 68:4, the longer form of which is YHWH which we Anglicize to “Jehovah,” just like St. John Hellenized YH to “ia” in Rev. 19:1,3,4,6, or the NT does elsewhere with “Elias,” AV or “Elijah,” ASV e.g., Matt. 11:14); the Hebrew “Rabbi” (e.g., John 1:49; 3:2), or the Aramaic “Rabboni” (Mark 10:51; John 20:16). The Greek NT sometimes uses Aramaic for one word quotes of Christ (Matt. 5:22, “Raca;” Mark 7:34, “Eph’pha-tha”), as well as for longer Aramaic quotes of Christ (Matt. 27:46; Mark 5:41; 15:34). There is clearly an educational quality to some of these quotes, e.g., St Luke says, “that field is called in their” Aramaic Jewish “tongue, Aceldama, that is to say, The field of blood” (Acts 1:19). Or St. John says, “They said unto” “Jesus,” “Rabbi, (which is to say, being interpreted, Master,) where dwellest thou?” (John 1:38); or “Simon” “saith,” “We have found the Messiah, which is being interpreted, the Christ” (John 1:41). It is clear that in Matt. 27:46, that the Aramaic “Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?” (“My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”), is relevant to the inaccurate statement of “Some of them that stood there, when they heard that,” saying, “This man calleth for Elias (Greek, ‘Elian,’ masculine singular accusative noun, from Elias)” (Matt. 27:47). It also conveys to us that in his agony, Jesus may have cried out more loudly, “ELI, ELI,” then more softly, “lama sabachth,” then more loudly gasped out the, “AN,” and then more softly pronounced the final, “i.”

If the Greek NT is prepared to educate the reader as to the meaning of Aramaic words not in their common Greek tongue when it is appropriate (Mark 5:41; 7:34; John 1:38,41; Acts 1:19); and if in the NT “Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?” is preserved among Greek speakers from the Aramaic because precision is important for understanding the misquotation that Christ “calleth” “Elias” (Matt. 27:46,47; Mark 15:34,35); *then so likewise, the usage among modern English speakers from the old English of “thee,” “thou,” and “thy” for “you” and “your” singular, as opposed to “you,” “ye,” and “your” for “you” and “your” plural, and associated declensions, can also be preserved on the basis that the reader can be educated as to the meaning of these words because precision is important.* Thus I maintain that this style of moderately archaic old English translation which is understandable with a relatively small amount of further education, and which characterized the Authorized Version at the time of its publication in 1611, (or the Revised Version at the time of its publication 1881-5, and the American Standard Version at the time of its publication in 1901,) is harmonious with the usage of Aramaic and Hebrew in the Greek NT, and *is a valid literary form of Bible translation.*

In this context, I also note that churches using the AV have historically put prayer in a similar format, whether formal prayers, such as those of the Anglican *Book of Common*

in I Cor. 6:16,17. By contrast, its omission created a stylistically incongruous and abrupt ending, which acts as a fatal witness of its removal. Its presence in the Received Text gives us a standard whereby we can judge its inclusion in sources outside the closed class of three NT sources used for determining the Received Text (i.e., Byzantine Greek Texts, Latin texts, and both Greek and Latin church writers,) e.g., the longer reading is also found in e.g., Syriac Pesitto Version (1st half 5th century) (“Pesitto” is a German form of the name of this Syriac Version), Syriac Harclean Version (616), and Armenian Version (5th century).

Prayer (1662), or free prayers in which e.g., “thee” and “thou” are used when addressing the Deity. This same thing is also done for hymns, e.g., “How Great Thou Art³²⁸.” This can be justified on the basis of promoting comparability of language with the AV, in some religious contexts, since this form of moderately archaic English is clearly being used in the Bible translation, and so can logically be also used in prayer, or hymns, as a means of helping to keep knowledge of these English archaisms alive. I.e., this acts as a positive reinforcement for using the AV.

The New American Standard Bible’s first edition (1960-1971) was revised with a second edition in 1977, and then a third edition in 1995. Like the New King James Version (1979-82), the NASB’s third edition (1995) removes all old English archaisms and is written in contemporary English. The New Testament is predominantly written in *common* (Greek *koine*) Greek, and this is an example of how *some* Bible writers used the contemporary language of their day for those of the Greek tongue. *Thus an original hearer of God’s word did not generally listen to a classic form of Greek that required him to master a more educated form of the language, but rather, in general he heard the Word of God in his common Greek tongue and idiom.* I note that the NKJV (1979-82) and NASB (1995), are the first more commonly used literal English translations (and the only ones like this which are generally accessible,) for about 400 years to use contemporary English. Thus I maintain that this style of using the contemporary modern English of the day, which characterized Tyndale’s translation at the time of its publication in 1534, the New King James Version at the time of its publication in 1979-82, and the third edition of the New American Standard Bible at the time of its publication in 1995, is not contrary to anything in the Bible, and *is a valid literary form of Bible translation.*

However, I repudiate the neo-Alexandrian NT Text (and also some of the OT Text) on which e.g., the NASB is based. Moreover, I would maintain that the NKJV is much less accurate than the AV because of e.g., its failure to use “thee,” “thou,” and “thy,” for “you” singular. A decision was made by English speaking Protestants in the early 17th century that accuracy is paramount for the Protestant’s Bible, and therefore the type of model that one finds in the OT’s usage of Aramaic would have to be used for English translations in order to more accurately translate the Word of God. That decision was later confirmed by e.g., Anglicans with the language used in the 1662 Caroline prayer book, or by Presbyterians with the language used in their 1650 Caroline Psalter. Therefore I think an inter-denominational Protestant group like the *Trinitarian Bible Society* has maintained the right balance by

³²⁸ Written by Carl Bomberg (1859-1940) of Sweden (1886); English translation and paraphrase (1949) by Stuart Hine (1899-1989) of Britain, as modified by Manna Music, USA (1955). “[1] O Lord my God! When I in awesome wonder, Consider all the worlds thy hands have made. I see the stars, I hear the rolling thunder, Thy power throughout the universe displayed. [Refrain] Then sings my soul, my Saviour God, to Thee; How great thou art, How great thou art!; Then sings my soul my Saviour God, to Thee; How great thou art, How great thou art!” [2] When through the woods and forest glades I wander, And hear the birds sing sweetly in the trees; When I look down from lofty mountain grandeur, And hear the brook and feel the gentle breeze. [Sing Refrain] [3] And when I think that God, his Son not sparing; Sent him to die, I scarce can take it in; That on the cross, my burden gladly bearing, He bled and died to take away my sin. [Sing Refrain] [4] When Christ shall come with shout of acclamation, And take me home, what joy shall fill my heart; Then I shall bow in humble adoration, And there proclaim, ‘My God, how great thou art!’ [Sing Refrain].

translating various renderings of the NT into various common languages from the NT Received Text; but in English, endorsing only the Authorized King James Version of 1611.

Taking into account both the issue of greater AV accuracy with “thee,” “thou,” “and “thy,” etc.; the generally greater spiritual discernment of passages by AV translators over other more modern translators; and the connection of the AV to a *Protestant cultural history* which has increasingly come under attack in recent times, I consider that churches should move to an “AV only” position with regard to sermons and the public reading of Lessons (Bible Readings) in church services. *We must both protect and celebrate our Protestant Christian cultural heritage, and also use the most accurate available English translation; and thus we should clearly endorse the usage of the AV in “AV only” church services* (as defined above). Thus if a reading of the AV needs improvement, then in a sermon I think it best to simply refer directly to the underpinning Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek, in making the correction; or in rare instances, cite an older neo-Byzantine version such as the Geneva Bible. (Occasional citation of an older version like the Geneva Bible is consistent with the usage of Scripture citations in the Anglican Homilies of Article 35 of the 39 Articles.) But I consider that in written works such as this one, some relatively minor, secondary, and qualified usage of some of these newer versions may be of value *on specific passages* where the issue of text type does not matter. This qualification is not one that some of my fellow “AV only” brethren share with me. *Que sera sera*³²⁹.

Thus with regard to the issue of translating what is in their respective texts, I regard the AV (NT neo-Byzantine Received Text), RV (a NT neo-Alexandrian text), and ASV (a NT neo-Alexandrian text) as generally more accurate than the NASB (a NT neo-Alexandrian text) and NKJV (NT neo-Byzantine Received Text; but like these other “modern versions,” the NKJV does not follow the OT Received Text). I conclude this in part, but not just because, with the AV, RV, and ASV one can follow the Hebrew OT and Greek NT, in distinguishing between “you” singular and “you” plural. Thus in terms of quality translation of the text before them, I generally prefer the AV, RV, and ASV, over the NASB and NKJV. However, when one takes into account the issue of NT text type, and the fact that the AV and NKJV are based on a substantially better NT text than are the RV, ASV, or NASB, it follows that *the AV remains by far the best English translation*. The NKJV, though inferior in translation accuracy to the AV, and though suffering from its endorsement of the Majority Text, nevertheless may in some contexts be a useful supplementary (although at times the NKJV changes the translation³³⁰). *Therefore, if a man should say he only wants to use one version, then let that version be the AV!*

On the one hand, I am conscious of the fact that the neo-Alexandrian Westcott-Hort NT text of the RV and ASV, and neo-Alexandrian NU text-type of the NASB, is the product of damaging anti-supernaturalist religiously liberal theology, which denies the supernaturalist preservation of the Scriptures (Isa. 40:8; I Peter 1:25). So too, the NKJV, while based on the NT’s Received Text, contains a textual apparatus very selectively showing variants in both

³²⁹ “What will be, will be.” From the Latin tongues of Spanish and / or French; as derived from the Latin tongue of Italian, *Che sara sara*.

³³⁰ E.g., anti-miscegenationist passages in the Book of Proverbs dealing with the “strange” woman are sometimes changed in the NKJV to refer to adultery. As with other modern versions which also do so, this finds no warrant in the underpinning Hebrew, and reflects the worldly values of their weak and unreliable translators.

the NU Text (neo-Alexandrian) and Majority Text (Burgonite). The NKJV Preface claims that the “Majority Text is similar to the Textus Receptus” or Received Text, “but it corrects those readings” of the Received Text “which have little or no support in the Greek manuscript tradition.” Thus like the RV, ASV, and NASB, the NKJV has a subversive effect on Scriptures such as e.g., Acts 9:5,6; I John 5:7,8. Moreover, all these translations are based on inferior OT Texts since they do not follow the OT *Textus Receptus* (although the OT Hebrew Masoretic Text they use is extremely close to it, and much closer to the OT Received Text, than the representative Byzantine text is to the NT Received Text). Although the OT Texts they use are much closer to the OT TR than their NT text is the NT TR, they are nevertheless defective (e.g., S. of Solomon 8:6, RV, ASV, NASB, & NKJV footnote reading). Taken in isolation, these are powerful arguments against the usage of these translations, and at the very least I think this requires that they only ever be used as supplements to, not as replacements of, the AV. Certainly in a church service, I think that these factors mean the main Bible used from the pulpit and for Scripture readings should always be the AV.

But on the other hand, the literal quality of these translations for the OT (and there is relatively close similarity between the OT Text used by these versions and the OT Received Text), and most of the NT where there is no disagreement on the text, means that I find the RV, ASV, NASB, and NKJV are useful translations on some passages, where the issues of text type are not in question. And where it is, the NKJV’s support for the Majority Text notwithstanding, the NKJV is still a better NT than the neo-Alexandrian’s NT versions because the NKJV uses the Received Text for the main NT translation, and there are less departures from the Received Text by the Burgonites’ Majority NT Text (which it endorses) than there are by the Neo-Alexandrians’ NT Text. Providing that they are understood as supplementary to, not a replacement of, the AV, it seems to me that the Westcott-Hort text supporting RV and ASV, the NU text supporting NASB, and the Majority Text supporting NKJV, can be selectively used, their faulty OT and NT text-types notwithstanding, in the same way that the NT makes selective use of the OT Greek Septuagint, the Septuagint’s faulty OT text type notwithstanding.

I think a distinction also exists between a work such as this, and the general policy that a preacher should apply in the pulpit. Given that usage of the RV, ASV, NASB to a larger extent, or usage of the NKJV to a lesser extent, could trip up a believer, I think it best to keep to the AV in church services. In instances of clarification, I think the preacher might best refer simply to the possible meaning of the Hebrew and Greek where he wishes to bring out a shade of meaning that the AV does not catch, or where necessary simply explain the meaning of an archaic word in modern English. Given that “AV only” churches were never strictly so, on the type of precedent found in the Anglican Homilies, I think one might occasionally cite an older Version like the Geneva Bible, or Tyndale’s 1526 NT, if helpful to do so. In this sense, I support and prefer “the AV only” position in a church; although under sufferance, I sometimes attend churches where the NKJV is used. But as in its historical application in e.g., the Anglican or Presbyterian Churches, where psalms were used not found in the AV, I think some such leniencies should be allowed where reasonable. In my experience, churches using the AV in their services are the best churches, and churches using the NKJV in their services are the second best churches. Very occasionally, I have come across a church where the preacher uses the NASB, and in broad terms the church is generally orthodox, but the preacher has not properly thought through the issue of the preservation of Holy Scripture, and has gotten tripped up by the erroneous NU Text. However, I think in a written work of this nature, where the reader is advised of the issues,

and it is clearly stated that the better OT and NT Texts are those of the AV, then a greater degree of leniency can be had to the selected usage of the RV, ASV, NASB, and NKJV.

In reaching this conclusion, I am further conscious of the fact that for some, the usage of the RV and ASV from the late 19th to mid 20th centuries, became in the longer term, a transitional phase away from the AV, in which the AV was then replaced altogether in the post World War Two era. But unlike myself, those so using supplementary versions as transitional versions, considered that the neo-Alexandrian critical texts of the NT in these supplements were better than the AV's Received Text. Moreover, again unlike myself, they sometimes considered that the usage of moderately archaic English was intrinsically undesirable. Furthermore, unlike myself, they promoted the usage of these new versions in Sunday Church Services.

Certainly, I for one would not want my usage in a written work, of the RV, ASV, NASB, and NKJV to have the effect on anyone, of encouraging them to jettison their AV's as their main translation. If a reader should feel that he cannot in his own mind, dissociate my type of usage of supplementary usage of these versions, from an outright attack on the general usage of the AV, then I think he is wise to never use these as supplementary versions, and stick with just the AV. Indeed, there are some "AV only" brethren who would not agree with my supplementary usage of these versions in this work.

My position is close to, though not quite the same as those who maintain this different "AV only position." I agree with the historic form of the "the AV only" position found in Anglican church services. This is seen in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662. On the one hand, this requires the AV be used for all readings of the Lessons, stating in its "Preface," "portions of holy Scripture, as are inserted into the Liturgy; which, in the Epistles and Gospels especially, and in sundry other places, are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation" i.e., the KJV of 1611 (emphasis mine). But on the other hand, the 1662 prayer book uses a different translation for the Psalms; as it does also with citations read from the Homilies of Article 30 of the 39 Articles; and for instance, at the *Communion Service* John 3:16 is rendered, "So God loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, to the end that that all that believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life;" rather than as, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (AV) (emphasis mine).

Thus some of my beloved brethren in Christ disagree with me on this matter, and think the RV, ASV, and NASB, should never be quoted in any context because of their undeniably inferior OT Text and especially inferior NT NU text; and the NKJV should never be quoted in any context because it endorses an inferior OT Text and the inferior NT Majority Text in its textual apparatus. Thus they think it best to use only the AV in all contexts. I confess I have a certain sympathy with them, and my position is close to, though not the exactly the same as theirs. "To his own master" a man "standeth or falleth." "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind" (Rev. 14:4,5). For my purposes, selected quotes are sometimes taken from the RV, ASV, NASB, and NKJV, in those areas where their underpinning text is not a problem. But if a faithful preacher wishes to develop some part of my work from the pulpit at these points, I think he should simply quote the AV, and then say, e.g., "the Greek here can also mean ...;" possibly citing occasionally some older pre-1611 version that culminated in the AV, but not e.g., quoting from the NASB.

Verbal Inspiration of Scripture: What is a literal interpretation of Scripture?

I maintain that the Divine Inspiration of Scripture (II Tim. 3:16) and the Divine Preservation of Scripture (I Peter 1:25), are the two sides of the one coin. I believe in the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture (II Tim. 3:16; II Peter 1:20,21), so that God chose the very words the Bible writer used, taking them out of their own vocabulary so as to preserve differences of writing style (Isa. 51:16; Jer. 1:7). For even as the breath of a man can blow through different pipe instruments such as the flute, trombone, bagpipes, or harmonica, making different musical sounds which nevertheless play the same tune; so the Spirit of God has blown through different men, and using their vocabularies has made books of the Bible with different writing styles. I consider that one should take a literal reading of Scripture, unless context clearly indicates otherwise, for example, parables, or when a literal reading would lead to a fundamental absurdity. For example, “the mountains skipped like rams, and the little hills like lambs” (Ps. 114:4), if taken literally, would lead to a fundamental absurdity that mountains have four legs like a ram or a lamb, and so this is clearly poetical language. Or our Lord Jesus’ words, “I have given you an example” “to wash one another’s feet” (John 13:14,15). If taken literally this would lead to the fundamental absurdity that the Middle East cultural practice of washing dirty feet in sandals (Gen. 24:32; 43:24; I Tim. 5:10), should be applied to our own day and age when people wear shoes; and so in our culture John 13:14,15 means we Christians should practice hospitality, humility, and service to our brethren in Christ, but not that we should literally wash their feet anymore.

Or St. Paul’s words for Christian brethren to “Greet one another with an holy kiss” (II Cor. 13:12). On the one hand, in our Western culture adult females may sometimes greet one another with a kiss without any connotation of them being Lesbian sodomites; or adults and children may sometimes greet one another with a kiss without any connotation of paedophile sexual perversion. And in some contexts an adult male may kiss an adult female that he knows fairly well, especially one that he is related to, in a non-sexual relationship (usually kissing her on the forehead or cheek,) without any sexual connotation e.g., an adult son would so kiss his mother. But on the other hand, if II Cor. 13:12 were taken literally, this would lead to the fundamental absurdity that the Middle East cultural practice of adult men greeting each other with a kiss (II Sam. 19:39; Prov. 24:26; Luke 7:45; Acts 20:37), should be applied in our Western culture where, whether or not this was the intention, such a kiss between adult males would carry with it a homosexual sodomite connotation contrary to the Biblical teaching of Gen. 19:5 (cf. 18:23-32); Matt. 10:15; Luke 17:29; Rom. 1:27; I Cor. 6:9; II Peter 2:6. Thus in our Western culture, Rom. 16:16; I Cor. 16:20; II Cor. 13:12; I Thess. 5:26; I Peter 5:14 means for adult Christian males that they should greet one another in a friendly, godly, manner *with a handshake*.

Or St. James words, about “anointing” the “sick” “with oil” (Jas. 5:14). If taken literally this would lead to the fundamental absurdity that the ancient medical practice of massaging with oil, or pouring oil into wounds (Isa. 1:6, ASV; Luke 10:34) should be applied to our own times, even though oil is usually no longer the best ointment or medical treatment for various ailments, and when the establishment of a medical profession with sophisticated and complex medical knowledge, means that to “call for the elders of the church” to administer the medical treatment now lacks propriety. Thus in our culture James 5:14,15 means we should use the best available medical treatment of the day, and ask “the elders of the church” (and other Christians) to “pray” with us “in the name of the Lord.” Since we no longer live in apostolic times when the New Testament was still being written, and so when healing was guaranteed for those who possessed this gift as one element of them establishing

their supernatural authority (Acts 3:6), the words “and the prayer of faith shall save the sick” (Jas. 5:15) are no longer guaranteed. Thus any such prayer for the sick must now be made in the clear knowledge that it is subject to the Lord’s will (Matt. 6:10), which is not always to so heal the sick person.

We cannot take literally St. Luke’s words, that “Anna” “departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day” (Luke 2:36,37), since this would lead to such fundamental absurdities as, for example, that she never slept, or never left the temple to eat. Rather, the meaning is that this was *the general tenor* of her life; and so too the meaning of St. Paul’s words, “Pray without ceasing” (I Thess. 5:17), is that prayer should characterize *the general tenor* of the Christian’s life. Or St. John’s apocalyptic description of Rev. 13:2, if taken literally, would lead to the fundamental absurdity that Christians should be on the look out for an animal roaming around which is “like unto a leopard,” with “feet” “as “a bear,” and “the mouth of a lion.” Therefore this apocalyptic language is not describing the literal physical appearance of the Antichrist, but some other features of him.