



REFORMED

— P A V I L I O N —

VOLUME 3 ISSUE 46

FEBRUARY 21, 2026

*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
Peace with God

4 THE SCRIVENER
Marriage Is Honorable in All: Question and Answer Session

HERMAN HOEKSEMA'S BANNER ARTICLES
6 Article 150: The New King and His Kingdom: Prophecy and Israel's
Restoration (continued)



REFORMED
— PAVILION —

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

See reformedpavilion.com for all contact and subscription information.

And thou shalt take the other ram; and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the ram. Then shalt thou kill the ram, and take of his blood, and put it upon the tip of the right ear of Aaron, and upon the tip of the right ear of his sons, and upon the thumb of their right hand, and upon the great toe of their right foot, and sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about. And thou shalt take of the blood that is upon the altar, and of the anointing oil, and sprinkle it upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon the garments of his sons with him: and he shall be hallowed, and his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him. Also thou shalt take of the ram the fat and the rump, and the fat that covereth the inwards, and the caul above the liver, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, and the right shoulder; for it is a ram of consecration: and one loaf of bread, and one cake of oiled bread, and one wafer out of the basket of the unleavened bread that is before the LORD: and thou shalt put all in the hands of Aaron, and in the hands of his sons; and shalt wave them for a wave offering before the LORD. And thou shalt receive them of their hands, and burn them upon the altar for a burnt offering, for a sweet savour before the LORD: it is an offering made by fire unto the LORD. And thou shalt take the breast of the ram of Aaron's consecration, and wave it for a wave offering before the LORD: and it shall be thy part. And thou shalt sanctify the breast of the wave offering, and the shoulder of the heave offering, which is waved, and which is heaved up, of the ram of the consecration, even of that which is for Aaron, and of that which is for his sons: and it shall be Aaron's and his sons' by a statute for ever from the children of Israel: for it is an heave offering: and it shall be an heave offering from the children of Israel of the sacrifice of their peace offerings, even their heave offering unto the LORD.

—Exodus 29:19–28

Peace with God

The sixth ceremony that God appointed for the consecration of the priests was the peace offering. By the peace offering God declared to his people the blessed gospel that they have peace with him through the blood of the ram. It was the same gospel in typical form that God declares to us today in its fulfillment. “Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom. 5:1). Let us observe the peace offering and marvel at the grace of God in Christ for his sinful people.

The peace offering was the most elaborate of the consecration ceremonies. Moses would take the second unblemished ram to the door of the tabernacle, where Aaron and his sons would place their hands upon its head. Moses would then slay the ram and smear its blood upon the tips of the

right ears of Aaron and his sons, upon their right thumbs, and upon their right big toes. The rest of the blood would be sprinkled all over the altar of burnt offering. The blood would then be taken from the altar and sprinkled with the anointing oil upon Aaron and his sons and their garments. Various parts of the ram, along with some bread, would then be shaken to and fro as a wave offering and burned upon the altar. The remaining meat of the shoulder and breast would then be held aloft in a heave offering to the Lord and would be the portion for Aaron and his sons to eat. All of this was “the sacrifice of their peace offerings” (Ex. 29:28).

Everything about the peace offering testified that the people's righteousness was not by their works. The people were sinful, but the ram was without blemish. The people must lay their sinful

hands upon the unblemished head of the ram as a symbol that their evil works were transferred to another. Blood must be smeared upon ears that hear and hands that work and feet that walk to cover all the iniquity of the people's hearing and working and walking. The body of the slain ram must be waved and heaved in an unmistakable display to assure the people that God did not overlook but surely saw the atoning body and blood that covered their sins. Parts of the ram must be laid on the altar and burned as a testimony that God himself had provided the sacrifice to die and to burn in the place of God's sinful people.

The peace offering was the gospel that our righteousness is not by our works but is the gift of God through the sacrifice. That is, the peace

offering was the gospel that justification is by faith alone in Christ alone. And being justified by faith alone, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ! That is, because God has provided his own righteousness for us sinners in Jesus Christ, we know assuredly that God is not at war with us but is at peace with us. He is not our foe but our heavenly Father and our covenant Friend. He does not come to destroy us but to deliver and defend us.

Sinner, by faith behold the peace offering, Jesus Christ, and his righteousness. Believe in him, who is our peace. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1).

—AL

THE SCRIVENER

Marriage Is Honorable in All: Question and Answer Session

This is an edited transcript of the question and answer session following the speech "Marriage Is Honorable in All," which was printed in last week's *Reformed Pavilion*.¹

*The Westminster Confession of Faith in chapter 24, article 5 says this: "In the case of adultery after marriage, it is lawful for the innocent party to sue out a divorce: and, after the divorce, to marry another, as if the offending a party were dead."*²

The Westminster Confession permits divorce and remarriage for the innocent party. There are a couple of things to note about that. First of all, the Westminster implicitly acknowledges that only death actually breaks the bond of marriage: it says that the innocent party may consider the offending party to be dead—"as if the offending party were dead"—and on that basis may marry another. By this statement Westminster acknowledges that God alone can break the bond of marriage through

death. But acknowledging this, Westminster immediately goes on to permit man to break the bond of marriage. This is an example of what was said in the speech, that the church twists the clear word of God. The Westminster twists what God taught about remarriage after death and says that that may be applied when someone is still alive. You may treat the offending party, who is still very much alive, as if he were dead. So I take Westminster 24, article 5 as an instance of the ingenuity of man in finding ways around the law of God. Man is always trying to find ways to go around God.

And note well that it is not the world that is twisting God's word here but the church. Conservative Presbyterian churches are purported to be among the churches that are most faithful to the scriptures. But even at her best and most conservative, the church is willing to twist the word of God in order to accommodate her own will.

¹ Andrew Lanning, "Marriage Is Honorable in All," speech given on June 7, 2025, in Singapore. The speech can be found at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zXMA6QBVIY>. See also *Reformed Pavilion* 3, no. 45 (February 14, 2026): 4–15. The question and answer session can be found at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R2OBzwcGaR0>.

² See Westminster Confession of Faith, <https://wts.edu/wcf#chapter-24>.

This is something for us to learn, then, too. First of all, we reject the Westminster's view of divorce and remarriage. But also, we must realize that we are no better than the Westminster divines. We too are susceptible to twisting the word of God this way and that way. Our only hope is that God give us his word, that he give us his Spirit to see that word clearly, and that he keep us from error.

Second with regard to those churches that try to follow Westminster and that probably are sincere in their attempt to follow it, they often find it impossible to maintain their own confession. Their confession is that the innocent party may remarry, treating the offending party as dead; but the guilty party may not remarry, treating the innocent party as alive. But in actual practice the churches also often allow the remarriage of the guilty party. And in order to justify their practice, which is clearly contrary to their confession, they must multiply decisions to be appended to their confession. By all their appendices, they permit those who live in ongoing disobedience to Christ and to their own confession to continue in that disobedience—with the church's blessing.

John Calvin's position was that the innocent party may divorce and remarry.

Correct, and that was the position of virtually all of the reformers. It was the position of Martin Luther. It was the position of Calvin and Beza. It was the majority opinion at the time of the Reformation. However, their position must be understood in its context. The context reveals that although the reformers erred badly, their position was an attempt to correct a great evil in the Roman Catholic Church. Today's children of the Reformation can reject the reformers' error, while appreciating what they were fighting against.

The Roman Catholic Church had taken marriage and made it a sacrament of the church, alongside the Lord's supper, baptism, and several others. Marriage was considered a sacrament, which meant that marriage was a means of grace to people who entered into marriage and that the church had sole authority over marriage. So the

Roman Catholic Church tried to elbow the state out of having any authority over marriage. The church tried to elbow out family from having any say in marriage. Conditions in the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation were appalling with regard to marriage because of the church's corruption of the doctrine of marriage.

One of the other things that Rome had done in its corruption of the doctrine of marriage was forbid the priests to marry. Rome required its priests to live in single life, even when those men burned with lust. And so there were scandals in churches where priests, who were supposedly unmarried, had their mistresses and their children all sitting in the church there. So Rome was very cruel in its doctrine, along with being unbiblical.

The reformers saw what Rome had done. They rescued marriage from being a sacrament. They showed that it is a creation ordinance and a civil ordinance; and therefore family has a say in marriage, and the state has a say in marriage. But they also wrongly applied the idea of man's natural appetite for the woman to a man who was divorced. Rome had erred in requiring the priests to be celibate. The reformers reacted to that error with their own error of saying that no one may be required to be celibate, even after a divorce. The reformers ignored or misinterpreted Jesus' teaching in Matthew 19, that this hard saying is made possible by the grace of God, who makes some people eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Jesus wasn't talking there about priests' living celibate lives. He was talking about those who were lawfully divorced and, if they couldn't be reconciled to their first spouses, lived for the rest of their lives unmarried.

The Reformed tradition was correcting the Roman Catholic error regarding the celibacy of priests. But the Reformed tradition erred grievously here, and Protestantism has given to the world a bad heritage when it comes to marriage. Marriage means nothing in the Western world, where many of the Protestant churches are. Marriage means nothing in the Eastern world either. Marriage is not honorable in all anymore. It is easy come, easy go in marriage. That is in

degrees, so that there are some cultures and some places that have very loose laws regarding marriage and others that have more strict laws. But wherever you go, it is not the law of God that is followed in marriage.

Before the reformers, for a thousand years, from the time of Christ until around AD 1000, the church's universal position was exactly what we have described today: marriage is for life; no divorce except for fornication; and even after a lawful divorce, no remarriage. That has been the

position of the church. The reformers did not go back far enough when they tried to reform the church. For us today that means that, though we appreciate Calvin and Luther on many things, we don't follow them on this. We reject this error in the Reformed tradition. We correct it according to the scriptures, and we truly reform by going back before the reformers to the ancient church and especially to Jesus' instruction in the New Testament.

—AL

HERMAN HOEKSEMA'S *BANNER* ARTICLES

The Banner

March 16, 1922

(pp. 166–67)

Our Doctrine by Rev. H. Hoeksema

Article CL: The New King and His Kingdom: Prophecy and Israel's Restoration (continued)

“And so all Israel shall be saved.”—Rom. 11:26a

Strange, to say the least, it may be considered that the Savior, if the purpose of his coming had at all been to establish a Jewish kingdom, never speaks to his people of this purpose, but in word and deed discourages the hope of such a restoration of David's throne in the literal sense of the word. And strange, too, it is that although the Lord refers to the future of his Kingdom repeatedly, he should never mention a literal restoration of the Jewish nation with their laws and institutions, their land and their temple as in former times.

Equally strange it is that the Apostle Paul does not speak of such a future for the Jews. He surely does not teach that in the future there will be a return to the old economy and a literal restoration of the nation of Israel. Yet, if such a future were to be expected we would surmise that the Apostle Paul would not be silent concerning it. He also was an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. His heart's desire and prayer for Israel was fervently that they might be saved. And his sorrow over their unbelieving attitude is so great that he does not hesitate to assert that he could

wish himself to be accursed from Christ for the sake of his brethren, his kinsmen after the flesh. Yet even in those well known chapters, Rom. 9–11, in which the apostle deals with Israel's relation to the salvation there is in Christ Jesus, he does not picture such a future for Israel as a nation as many literal interpreters of Old Testament prophecy claim to be forthcoming. In these chapters he begins by stating that his heart is filled with sorrow and heaviness over his kinsmen according to the flesh, because of their pitiful condition and their apparent rejection. But presently he begins to argue that no one must draw the inference from the rejection of Israel as a nation, that the promises have failed with regard to Israel. For it must be remembered that they are not all Israel that are of Israel. The illustration of Isaac's election as Abraham's seed, and the well-known election of Jacob as the seed of Isaac according to the promise prove this sufficiently. Spiritual Israel, Israel according to election, not national Israel, must be considered the true people of God and objects of the promises. The true spiritual Israel in the old dispensation were confined to Israel as a nation,

were enclosed in Israel's national existence. But in the new dispensation this was changed. What was rejected was the outward shell, not the true seed. The true Israel, the elect of God, are now gathered from both Jew and Gentile. And this is a fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. For Hosea had prophesied: "I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there shall they be called the children of the living God" (Rom. 9:25, 26). And thus also Isaiah had prophesied that Israel as a nation would have been like unto Sodom and Gomorrah had it not been that there was left a seed according to election (Vs. 29). And the conclusion is that the Gentiles, who did not seek after the righteousness of the law, have obtained the righteousness which is by faith, while Israel as a nation, seeking after the righteousness of the law, has been rejected and failed to obtain true righteousness in Christ Jesus.

The apostle then continues in Chapter 10 to show that the righteousness which is by faith is the only true and valid righteousness for the people of God, whether they be Jew or Gentile. "For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed." There is in this respect no difference between Jew and Gentile, and the same Lord is rich unto all that call upon him. But Israel was disobedient to the word of the gospel and went about to establish their own righteousness by the works of the law, not submitting themselves to the righteousness of God. And thus the nation of Israel as such was rejected. This does not mean that there is no salvation for the Jews in the new dispensation, but simply that Israel's national ruin became the occasion for the salvation also of the Gentiles. They are grafted in on the old olive tree, while some of the natural branches of that tree have been cut off. Surely there is, also among the Jews, a remnant according to election that shall be saved. But in the new dispensation they can be saved only by being grafted once more into the same tree together with the Gentiles. It is, as it were, as if hardening in part must come over

Israel to make room for the new branches from the Gentile world in order that so all Israel may be saved. When the fulness of the Gentiles and the remnant according to election from the Jews have been saved, all Israel shall be gathered in.

Thus, in very general outlines, is the presentation of the Word of God in Rom. 9–11. Whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the manner in which this salvation of the remnant from Israel shall be gathered in, certain it is that the apostle does not speak of a literal restoration of the people of Israel, or of a salvation that is all their own. On the contrary, he emphasizes strongly that there is no difference between Jew and Greek. And what is true of this passage is true everywhere of the epistles of Paul. Constantly he militates against the introduction of the former things of the law, of days and months and seasons and ceremonies. And this he does not on the basis that the Church is gathered as a people distinct from the Jews, while these same ceremonies shall be reinstated in the future of Israel as a nation, but simply on the basis that they were shadows and have lost their significance. The body is now one. Baptism is come in the place of circumcision. We are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands. Our passover is sacrificed for us. Old forms have passed away, a new dispensation has been heralded in, and the shadows have lost their meaning for the people of this new dispensation.

It is no different with the Apostle Peter. In fact, the change this apostle manifests on the day of Pentecost in that first remarkable gospel message compared with the last conversation the apostles have with their Master is marvelous. To the very last moment that Jesus was with them in the world, the apostles appear to have entertained the thought that the Lord would soon restore the kingdom of Israel in the literal sense of the word. But wonderful is the sudden insight the apostles have obtained when the Spirit is poured out on Pentecost. It seems as if a new flash of light has suddenly been directed upon the Old Testament prophecies. And we hear Peter preach: "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the

patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself: The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ” (Acts 2:29–36).

Surely, a beautiful illustration from Scripture itself as to the manner in which to interpret Old Testament prophecy. For David, speaking of himself and of his own soul, is here presented as speaking of Christ. And the promise that of the seed of David there should sit on the throne of David forever the apostle evidently interprets as being fulfilled now that Christ has been raised from the dead and is exalted at the right hand of God. Now he sits on David’s throne. Now is the prophecy of the Great Occupant of David’s throne fulfilled. Now he is made both Lord and Christ. But surely, of a restoration of the throne of David in the literal sense as an abiding element in the expectation of Israel as a nation, we read not a word.

To one more passage we must call attention in this connection, namely, to the first half of Rev. 8. But this passage requires a separate discussion.

—Grand Rapids, Mich.



REFORMED
— PAVILION —