



REFORMED

— P A V I L I O N —

VOLUME 3 ISSUE 35

DECEMBER 6, 2025

*For in the time of trouble he shall hide me in his pavilion:
in the secret of his tabernacle shall he hide me;
he shall set me up upon a rock.
—Psalm 27:5*

CONTENTS

- 3 MEDITATION
Urim and Thummim
-
- 4 FROM THE RAMPARTS
Theocrashed
-
- 9 HERMAN HOEKSEMA'S *BANNER* ARTICLES
Article 139: The New King and His Kingdom: Under the Law (continued)
-



Editor: Rev. Andrew Lanning
From the Ramparts Editor: Dewey Engelsma

See reformedpavilion.com for all contact and subscription information.

And thou shalt put in the breastplate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim; and they shall be upon Aaron's heart, when he goeth in before the LORD: and Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the LORD continually.

—Exodus 28:30

Urim and Thummim

One of the most mysterious aspects of the high priest's garments was the Urim and Thummim. The Urim and Thummim were not garments themselves but were placed in the breastplate, which was doubled to form a kind of pocket. The word *Urim* means *lights*, and *Thummim* means *perfections*. The word of God does not give any exact description of what the Urim and Thummim looked like. Many have speculated that the Urim and Thummim were two stones used to cast lots, which seems plausible. Others have allowed themselves the fanciful and superstitious speculation that the Urim and Thummim referred to the twelve precious stones on the breastplate, whose letters would glow with God's answers to questions. However, whether plausible or fanciful, all is mere speculation, for scripture is silent on the appearance of the Urim and Thummim. Scripture is even silent on the making of the Urim and Thummim. God did not command Moses to make them, as he commanded him to make all the garments of the high priest, and there is no record of Bezaleel and Aholiab making them. God only told Moses to take the Urim and Thummim and place them in the breastplate.

Though scripture is silent on the appearance of the Urim and Thummim, it is very clear on their purpose. Through the Urim and Thummim, as used by the high priest, God revealed his will to Israel. Their placement in the garments of the high priest emphasized this purpose. They were placed in the breastplate, so that Aaron would "bear the judgment of the children of Israel

upon his heart before the LORD continually" (Ex. 28:30). The "judgment of the children of Israel" was God's judgment—his will—concerning the thing that Israel should do or the way that Israel should go. Therefore, Joshua was to "stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall ask counsel for him after the judgment of Urim before the LORD: at his word shall they go out, and at his word they shall come in, both he, and all the children of Israel with him, even all the congregation" (Num. 27:21). David called Abiathar with the ephod, and thus the breastplate and Urim and Thummim, to inquire of God whether the men of Keilah would deliver David unto Saul (I Sam. 23:6–12). Later, God would not answer Saul by any means, including Urim and Thummim (28:6). Whatever the Urim and Thummim looked like, they belonged to God (Deut. 33:8) as his means of revealing his will to his people.

The meaning of the Urim and Thummim is fulfilled in Jesus Christ, our high priest. Jesus is the Wonderful Counselor, through whom God makes known to us his will (Isa. 9:6). "For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth" (John 5:20). Therefore, in Jesus "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. 2:3). Our high priest does not hoard this knowledge of God to himself but reveals it to his church. "Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you" (John 15:15).

The Urim and Thummim show that our high priest also holds the office of prophet. “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son” (Heb. 1:1–2). And what has God spoken to us by his Son? The words of eternal life (John 6:68)! The prophet comforts God’s people

by revealing to us “the secret counsel and will of God concerning our redemption” (Lord’s Day 12, Q&A 31). And what our prophet–priest reveals concerning our redemption is the sure truth of God, for “of Levi he said, Let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with thy holy one” (Deut. 33:8).

—AL

FROM THE RAMPARTS

Theocrashed

Introduction

In Mark 13 Jesus instructs his disciples concerning the coming destruction of Jerusalem and the signs that will accompany his return. Four times in verses 32–37 he uses the word *watch*, concluding with this charge: “And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch.”

What does it mean to watch? It means to be awake, to be sober, and to pay attention to what is happening so that we may recognize the signs that herald the return of our Lord. And those signs are seen most clearly within the church, within the sphere of ecclesiastical life.

One sign of Jesus’ return is the preaching of the gospel to all nations (Mark 13:10). Another is what men do with the truth: before Christ’s return there will be a great falling away; many will refuse to love the truth, and “for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie” (II Thess. 2:10–11). Scripture also teaches that the antichrist will arise from within the visible church (v. 4). Christ’s return is seen, as well, in the rise of false prophets—men not from pagan temples but from within the church—who, as Jesus warns, “shall rise, and shall deceive many” (Matt. 24:11). Iniquity shall abound, we are told in Matthew 24:12, and the love of many—for one another and for the truth—will grow cold. It is for these signs that we must watch.

Jesus’ command to watch includes more than this, but it certainly does not include less:

we must observe what men do with the truth and pay attention to events as they unfold in the church world.

What does that have to do with this rubric? Well, according to the Cambridge Dictionary, a rampart is a large wall built around a town or castle for its protection. This rubric bears the title *From the Ramparts*. That means the duty of this rubric–teer is to look out from the wall; to take note of what is happening in the broader church world; and, as God gives strength, to apply these matters for the spiritual edification and protection of God’s children.

We are called to *watch*. Thus, by God’s grace, I will endeavor to report on ecclesiastical developments for the good of the reader and, if the Lord wills, for their spiritual care. So we will take a break this week from considering the life of Arminius and will consider the events surrounding the breakup of the founders of *Theocast*.

Theocast

On Tuesday, November 4, 2025, at 1:13 p.m., a bombshell detonated in the ecclesiastical blogosphere. Justin Perdue, pastor of Covenant Baptist Church in Asheville, North Carolina, resigned from *Theocast*, a popular Christian podcast. The fallout has been intense. Anyone with a computer, an internet connection, and even the slightest grasp of the facts has weighed in—with very strong words.

Theocast was a podcast with two Baptist ministers as co-hosts: the above-named Justin Perdue and Jon Moffitt, the pastor of Grace Reformed Church in Spring Hill, Tennessee. I became aware of *Theocast* a few years ago, while I was a member of the Protestant Reformed Churches (PRC). Other men in the PRC introduced me to *Theocast*; and what struck us was that, although we had heard the word *gospel* before, we had rarely heard it presented as these men presented it. These men focused on salvation by faith *alone* in Christ *alone*. They also spoke of a law/gospel distinction, which was novel for many of us. We listened with rapt attention, as did many others in the church world. *Theocast*'s audience grew quickly and quite large.

Those of us who grew up in the PRC in the '80s, '90s, and 2000s came of age at a time when the denomination was preoccupied with "developing" the truth, which, in practice, meant leaving behind the simple gospel and the finished work of Christ and focusing instead on man's responsibility.

Although there remained a voice or two in the denomination that continued to preach what God had done (in ages past, men referred to this with the obscure terminology "the sovereignty of God"), that was not the PRC's main emphasis. What replaced *sovereignty* was the all-important phrase *in the way of*. Though the denomination by its own admission had displaced Christ and compromised justification by faith alone from 2015–2018, its actual labor in the following years was directed toward ensuring that no one in the denomination would ever forget the vital significance of the phrase *in the way of*.

That phrase became the article by which a man could determine the standing or falling of his church, measured, of course, by how many times the minister used it in one sermon. Although it was never published, I am convinced there existed a secret code, an interpretive key, quietly handed to elders to help them determine their minister's faithfulness. I imagine it looked something like this, so that it was easy to print, cut out, and put in your suitcoat pocket for easy reference:

✂

Number of Times the Phrase In the Way of Was Used: A Guide to Ensuring the Flock is Fed the Pure Gospel of Man's Working:

0 — Your minister is an antinomian. No need to look that word up; just depose him. Don't worry, you can just bring in the church visitors, and they will do all the work for you. And we mean *all* the work. All you have to do is rubber-stamp the decision. There will be no fallout for this; in fact, you will see your star rise in the denomination. ✂

1–5 — He is trying, but he needs help if he is ever to teach the people how vitally important their work is in aiding God in the salvation of his people. Consider having him audit classes at the Protestant Reformed seminary. If he cannot, he should at least become a pen pal with Prof. Brian Huizinga and carefully read Huizinga's extensive treatment of *in the way of* in the April 2023 *Protestant Reformed Theological Journal*. If there is one thing to be learned from the recent controversy, it is a deeper understanding of the glorious and man-pleasing nature of the phrase *in the way of*. ✂

6–10 — You have a gem. Your minister has fully imbibed man and now finally moved beyond the simple gospel. He can now plumb the depths of scripture to identify all the responsibilities man has in salvation. Be thankful for him: he will lead the people right past Christ and directly to the real decision-maker—man.

11+ — Enjoy him while he lasts. He is seminary-bound. ✂

What Does All of This Have to Do with Theocast?

For this audience, everything.

So impoverished were we in the PRC without the simple gospel that many latched on to *Theocast*. It is a reflection of the times, a sign of just how windswept and barren the Reformed landscape has become, that Reformed men found themselves turning to Baptist ministers for instruction on the gospel. Yet such were the times.

We could not quite articulate what *Theocast* gave us that the PRC did not, but we sensed it was something seismic. They said shocking things and then did not walk them back, as we were accustomed to in the PRC. They said things like:

- “The gospel is not repentance.”
- “The good news is the thing that saves sinners from their sin and reconciles us to a holy God. Repentance is not that thing. Repentance itself does not save people.”
- “Is there anything that we need to do in order to come to Christ? The answer to that question is no.”
- “We don’t ask dead people to do anything. So repentance is a fruit of God’s work via the Holy Spirit by the preaching of the gospel in the life of a believer. I know that might be shocking for some people to hear, but repentance is a fruit.”
- “Not only is repentance not the gospel, but faith is not the gospel...We are saved by the object of our faith, who is Jesus Christ.”
- “To say that the gospel is faith, that you just believe—that’s actually not good news. The good news has to be about someone to believe in, which is Jesus Christ.”
- “Many people will say to surrender all to Jesus is the good news...If to surrender all to Christ is the gospel, then we are all damned. Because none of us have ever done it.”

- “We’re here to say that there’s one person who has ever done the gospel, and his name is Jesus; and we trust and rest in him. There’s nothing left to do. We receive what’s been done. Christ is our righteousness; he is our hope and stay and the ground of our assurance and peace before God today and forever.”
- “The law never saves; the gospel always saves.”
- “The gospel must always be ‘I am saved by the righteousness of Christ through faith alone, by grace alone, period.’ *Sola fide*. If you add in performance, you are no longer set free.”

We heard statements like these and waited for the catch. We expected them to conclude, Protestant Reformed-style, “And you may enjoy all these things *in the way of* your obeying and repenting. So get busy. Amen.” But they never did. Many of us shared their posts and podcasts as if we had discovered some newly unearthed treasure, though it was simply the *actual* gospel.

But now the team has fractured. The celebrity co-hosts are now Splitsville. Time will tell what will happen to *Theocast*, but the outlook is not promising, not with the steady stream of hard words appearing on every blog with a comments section.

What Caused the Split? Doctrine

When Justin Perdue announced his resignation on X, he stated that it was because his co-host, Jon Moffitt, was promoting doctrines that contradicted and compromised “historical, creedal, and confessional definitions of Christology and the doctrine of God.”¹ He said the promotion of these doctrines was being done on a podcast called *Kingdoms Unveiled*, which later developed into a ministry called *Reformed Fringe*. Justin said he had significant concerns with the content being produced; and, although he characterized them as “tertiary and speculative

¹ Justin Perdue (@justin_perdue), “I have decided to resign from Theocast. See my full statement below,” X, November 4, 2025, https://x.com/justin_perdue/status/1985772512530112893.

in nature,” in his judgment, Jon was elevating them to a place of primary importance. These doctrines were either taught by Moffitt or by Moffitt’s co-host, Doug Van Dorn, with Moffitt’s endorsement.

Fair enough. But what doctrines, exactly?

Well, that is where it gets complicated. You see, the podcast *Reformed Fringe* deals with things that—by the podcasters’ own admission—lie on the fringe of Reformed theology. According to its website, Reformed Fringe is a community of Reformed believers “who love the Confessions and also want to talk about stuff like Nephilim, divine council theology, UFOs, cryptids, and that one really weird passage in Daniel.”²

It appears that over the past year, in Perdue’s judgment, various teachings, whether from Moffitt or originating with Van Dorn and supported by Moffitt, were elevated to a level of importance the subject matter simply did not warrant. For instance, when discussing the “sons of God” in Genesis 6 and “gods” in Psalm 82, Van Dorn and Moffitt asserted that if one did not adopt their position that the “sons of God” were literal divine beings and instead held, for instance, the Sethite view (that they were the descendants of Seth, the chosen line), then that one had “an anti-Jesus perspective.”³

One of the more serious issues raised relates to Van Dorn’s teaching about Christophanies, the appearances of the preincarnate Christ in the

Old Testament. According to one commentator, Jon’s co-host on *Reformed Fringe*, Doug Van Dorn, taught that Jesus, “in the Old Testament, ‘comes in an angelic soma [form]’ and ‘entered into his creation, thereby assuming whatever created properties came along with being an angel.’”⁴ According to that author, this is “the central error. This ‘angelic soma’ serves the exact same logical function as the human nature in the Chalcedonian and Theopaschite formulations. It provides a created, passible ‘place’ for the impassible Son to experience passions.”⁵

Confused? Join the club. The difficulty here is that the truths under discussion involve highly speculative interpretations that are difficult for the believer to understand (the undersigned included). One commenter, speaking for a lot of people, summarized it this way: “This controversy is way above my theological knowledge—can someone dumb it down for me lol.” But very few seem to be laughing.

All sides hasten to insist that they are not calling anyone the dreaded “H-word,” but the language being used could hardly be more serious. You can decline to use the word *heretic*, but when you charge that a man has “compromised historic Christian orthodoxy pertaining to primary doctrines: the doctrines of God and Christ,” it is difficult to use stronger language.⁶

Theocast Was Never the Church

Although *Theocast* was intriguing, it was never a substitute for the true church of Jesus Christ.

² Reformed Fringe. Accessed November 27, 2025. <https://www.reformedfringe.com/>.

³ Reformed Fringe. “Genesis 6 and the Sethite Heresy | Kingdoms Unveiled [28],” posted October 14, 2024, YouTube, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5btF-j6jcQU&t=24.8s>. Cited in the “Grace Reformed Network Pastors’ Statement on Recent Theological Concerns,” PDF, accessed November 28, 2025, <https://www.gracereformednetwork.org/post/grace-reformed-network-pastors-statement-on-recent-theological-concern>, 3–4. This document is helpful to understand the time frame of events that led to the breakup.

⁴ Tony Arsenal, “The Quest for Illegitimate Religious Gnosis: How ‘Fringe’ Theology Deforms Christology,” *The Heidelbergblog*, November 24, 2025, <https://heidelbergblog.net/2025/11/the-quest-for-illegitimate-religious-gnosis-how-fringe-theology-deforms-christology/>; emphasis is Arsenal’s. If any reader is interested in delving deeper into the debate, I recommend he read this article by Arsenal, as Arsenal does a good job of explaining a rather difficult theological issue. The issue, he says, is this: Does Jesus have two natures (human and divine) or three (human, divine, and angelic)? Although Van Dorn denies adding an angelic nature to Jesus, Arsenal points out that Van Dorn does not offer a viable explanation for how Jesus could assume the properties of an angel without existing as an angel.

⁵ Arsenal, “Quest for Illegitimate Religious Gnosis”; emphasis is Arsenal’s.

⁶ “Grace Reformed Network Pastors’ Statement,” 6. New developments continue to emerge almost daily, including statements from both Moffitt and Van Dorn. For that reason I will reserve additional remarks on the doctrinal issues at stake, and on the conduct of those involved in the controversy, for another article, after more facts have come to light and the full picture is known.

The truth that men learned from *Theocast* could not be used as an excuse for them to stay in those places where the truth was being denied. What happened was that men remained in churches where the gospel was compromised and Christ displaced, while comforting themselves with the thought that, even if their denomination was not sound, they could still hear the true gospel by tuning in to *Theocast*. In doing so they overlooked the seriousness of remaining in a place where their families were not being fed the pure preaching of Christ.

Scripture calls believers to unite themselves to a true church, and it is a difficult but necessary question whether some remained more attached to their earthly circumstances than to following Christ.

I would suggest this: for a man who stays in a church that corrupts the gospel, it would be better for him never again to utter the word *gospel* and never again to listen to a podcast where the gospel is taught. Such a man has a better chance pleading ignorance than claiming knowledge of the truth while stubbornly refusing to leave a church that denies it.

What Now?

I do not know what the future holds for *Theocast*. If I were a betting man, I would wager dimes to donuts that *Theocast* slowly disappears from the landscape or, at the very least, loses much of its audience, as so often happens when a celebrity founder departs.

But the calling of the child of God has little to do with podcasts, including *Theocast*. The calling is found in Belgic Confession 28: it is the duty of all men to “join and unite themselves” with

the true church—identified by the preaching of the pure doctrine of the gospel, the pure administration of the sacraments, and the faithful exercise of discipline (Belgic Confession 29).

Many today are members of churches because, without realizing it, they are simply practicing Pascal’s Wager—figuring it cannot hurt to hedge their bets in case God exists.⁷ Their goal is to save their lives, and finding a building with the word *Church* on the sign that allows them to keep their lives gives them the best of both worlds: their lives and what they assume to be a safe place when Christ returns.

But church membership does not confer the right to eternal life. Many would do better to give up the charade. Instead of playing dress-up and going to church, they might as well sleep in, head to Cracker Barrel for a late breakfast, go home, finish some chores, and settle in for the afternoon Detroit Lions game. Their membership in a place calling itself a church where the truth is compromised will likely make things worse for them someday, not better.

The child of God is commanded to join himself to a true church, but that command is not what draws the child of God. You cannot browbeat a man into joining or remaining in a true church. Tertullian was right: nothing is less a religious business than applying coercion in religion. The reason the child of God joins and remains in a true church is because that is where Christ is found. That child of God knows himself to be a leper, lunatic, blind, lame, and dead. He has only one hope: Jesus Christ. And it *his* voice, not the voice of podcasters, that the sheep will follow.

—DE



⁷ Pascal’s Wager: the argument put forward by Blaise Pascal in his *Pensées*, in which Pascal contends that it is better for a man to believe in God and live accordingly than to live as though there were no God. The reasoning is simple: if you believe in God and are right, you gain eternal reward and avoid eternal judgment; if you believe and are wrong, your loss is limited to certain earthly and finite pleasures. Conversely, if you reject God and are wrong, the loss is infinite.

Article CXXXIX: The New King and His Kingdom: Under the Law (continued)

“Now I say that the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from the servant, though he be lord of all.” —Gal. 3:1

The question naturally arises: Why was Israel of the old dispensation placed under the law? We found that they possessed an elaborate system of legislation given to them by divine inheritance, which they were in duty bound to keep. This law directed their steps and guided their lives from moment to moment, from step to step, so that there was little left to free and spontaneous action. How and where and through what forms they were to worship God, how, in fact, they were to serve God in their entire life was carefully revealed. They were continually under the law. And the question will surely arise: Why this law for the people of God of the old dispensation?

The answer cannot be that they were saved in a manner different from that in which the church of the new dispensation is led to her inheritance. All of Scripture contradicts this plainly. They were saved in the same manner, in the same Mediator that was still to come, through the same justification which is by faith, and by the same Spirit. And, therefore, every idea as if the Israelites of old were saved through the observance of the law, while the church of the new dispensation is saved by grace, must be rejected as untrue. Neither is it true that Israel of the old dispensation was only a type of the people of God in the future. Also this has been suggested. Israel was not really God's people. Just as Canaan was not really the dominion of God's kingdom, just as Jerusalem was not the real city of God, just as the sacrifices of bulls and goats was not really the sacrifice of vicarious

atonement, just as tabernacle and temple were not really the indwelling of God with man, just as all these things were merely shadows, and the reality was still to come in the future, so Israel itself was not really a people of God, regenerated and living by faith. It was merely a shadow, a type of the people of God that was to be realized and gathered in the future. Also this cannot be the true conception. The fathers of the old dispensation were surely children of God in the real spiritual sense of the word. They were justified even as we were. Their faith was counted to them for righteousness even as ours. They were regenerated and saved through Christ as well as we. And, therefore, never must we allow the view that they were not essentially the people of God. The substance of God's covenant and kingdom was with them as well as with the church of the new dispensation.

And yet, although this view is not correct, there is an element of truth in it. One of the reasons why Israel was under bondage and was in need of this elaborate body of laws directing their entire life at every step and moment was, undoubtedly, that they were called to manifest the life of the kingdom and covenant of God in the world, before this kingdom had been historically realized. Israel as a nation must be God's kingdom in the world and must in all the forms of its life reflect the life of that kingdom. Yet, the kingdom of heaven has not yet come historically. And it is because of this contrast that the people of God are in need of an outward form, imposed upon them by divine revelation, according to which they must direct all their life. And it is also for this same reason that this law is dispensed with, and this outward form may

disappear the moment reality has come. It is, therefore, not the difference between the servant and the child that serves to illustrate the difference between Israel and the church of the new dispensation, but as the apostle points out in the text quoted above, it is rather the difference between the heir as child, as small child, and the same heir as full-grown man. Essentially the relation does not differ. But the dispensation changes. Israel of old could not be left to itself, to its own, free, spontaneous manifestation for the simple reason that the reality of the kingdom as such had not historically come. The people of God of the old dispensation, though they were very really God's people and God's children, received a picture of the reality that was to come in order that they might conform their life to the features of the picture as long as the reality of the kingdom was not there. And that picture is the law in its broadest sense.

Let us get the main line of development before us to make this plain.

God's purpose is to establish his kingdom in the world.

Historically he establishes that kingdom first of all in creation. All the world he makes his kingdom. In that kingdom he places man that he shall have dominion over all. In relation to his God this man is friend-servant. It is the relation of a covenant. Created after the image and likeness of God, man is adapted to God's communion, to the life of God as a friend with his friend. Yet, as friend he is to serve God. His calling is to be God's servant. He must consecrate himself to his God as his prophet, as his priest, and also as his king. With all that he possesses and is, with all the world over which he has received dominion, he must serve his God. For his Friend is also his Sovereign. With relation to God, therefore, man is friend, but as friend also servant. With relation to the world man is king. And thus he stands as the servant-king, as the king-priest; and thus also the world is God's kingdom.

This relation is destroyed through sin. Not, of course, in the sense that man does not remain

man. Not so that man is no more prophet, priest, and king; but he becomes friend of the devil, the enemy of God. He becomes the devil's prophet and speaks for him, the father of the lie. He prophesies from him and for him. He becomes the devil's priest and consecrates himself and all things to the prince of darkness. And thus also he proposes to be the devil's king. Essentially this is the case at the moment of the fall. But in its fulness all this realizes itself organically through the history of the world and of mankind, and will find its culmination in the kingdom of Antichrist, when the fulness of this world's development shall be consecrated to the dragon. Thus the world is very really a kingdom of darkness.

However, all this serves only to realize God's purpose, namely, that all things shall be united not in the first, but in the second Adam, of whom the first Adam was an image. God will wrest his kingdom from the power of darkness and establish a new kingdom. In that new kingdom Christ, Immanuel, the Friend-servant of God **par excellence**, is to be the king. In him the people shall renew their covenant relation to God by faith. They shall be priest-kings with him in the eternal kingdom.

Now, it was Israel's calling to manifest the life of that kingdom of God in the world in the old dispensation before the fulness of time, before the reality of that kingdom had come in Christ Jesus. It was to be a nation of king-priests. Or rather, the nation as such was to reveal itself as king-priest of God in the world. They were to be God's covenant people, holy and righteous unto him and before him. That they were such a holy and righteous people of God, living in covenant communion with him, had to be manifested in their life in the world. They were to be God's party in the world, glorifying his name, standing for his cause over against the power of darkness, fighting his battles. As such a holy people unto the Lord they were to be God's kingdom. God was to be their king, ruling over them; their land was to be God's dominion; they were to be God's people, obeying him as their

sole ruler ultimately. In short, in all its life Israel was to reveal itself as God's holy, priestly, royal covenant people.

But it should never be forgotten that this outward life of Israel, this form of Israel's existence was far in advance of reality. In reality the kingdom of heaven was not yet historically established. Christ had not yet come. The Head and Mediator of the new covenant was still to come in the future. The king of the new kingdom was still to be manifested. The blood of atonement, in which alone the people of God could be justified, had not yet been shed. Surely, all God's people were justified in him that was to come, for God loved them from eternity. But the fact is nevertheless that this atonement was to be realized only in the fulness of time. The king had not yet assumed his reign with power over all things at the right hand of God. The Spirit of Christ had not been poured out to dwell and abide in the church. Never should it be forgotten that the church and the kingdom of the old dispensation, not even excluding the church triumphant in heaven, were awaiting the coming of reality. And Scripture unmistakably teaches that the coming of that reality, having its climax for the beginning of the new dispensation in the exaltation of Christ at the right hand of God, was of tremendous significance not only for the church militant on earth, but also

for the church triumphant in heaven. However this may be, it is plain that Israel was called upon to manifest the life and form of a kingdom, the historical reality of which was still to come in the future.

It is for that reason that Israel was in need of a picture, of a shadow, of a type of that life, in order that it might conform to it. Jerusalem and Mount Zion, tabernacle and temple, altar and sacrifice, prophet, priest and king, Canaan and its products, all these were pictures and shadows. In these the believing Israelite grasped, indeed, the reality that was to come in the future. There can be no question of the fact, for instance, that the sacrifices of the Old Testament, as, for instance, the repeated sin-offering, pointed the believing Israelite to Christ. The law, in other words, was also a pedagogue, a taskmaster to Christ. But the law itself was a shadow, and as such a form in which the life of Israel was to be molded, in order that it might reflect the life of the kingdom of God and of his covenant.

Israel of the old dispensation is the child in need of outward direction. It cannot be left to its own, spontaneous manifestation. The child is still under bondage. When reality has fully come and is fully revealed, the shadow that had served as a guiding picture may be discarded.

—Grand Rapids, Mich.

