



# REFORMED

— PAVILION —

VOLUME 2 ISSUE 36

DECEMBER 14, 2024

*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  
Eighth Commandment

---

4 FROM THE EDITOR

---

5 PSALMS, HYMNS, AND SPIRITUAL SONGS  
The Five Books of the Psalms (1)

---

8 HERMAN HOEKSEMA'S *BANNER* ARTICLES  
Article 88: The New King and His Kingdom: Objective Revelation or  
Subjective Development? (continued)

---



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

See [reformedpavilion.com](http://reformedpavilion.com) for all contact and subscription information.

Thou shalt not steal.

—Exodus 20:15

## Eighth Commandment

**S**tealing is taking for oneself what belongs to the neighbor. The thief covets his neighbor's treasure, so the thief by force breaks into his neighbor's house or his neighbor's bank and steals the treasure for himself. The thief covets his neighbor's house, so the thief under the appearance of right evicts his neighbor and steals it for himself. The thief covets his neighbor's wife, so the thief insinuates himself into her life and heart and steals her for himself. Whether by force—so that he is punishable under criminal law—or under the appearance of right—so that no one will ever discover or prosecute his theft—the thief steals what belongs to his neighbor for himself.

Thou shalt not steal.

The opposite of stealing is giving. The thief takes for himself what is another's, but the giver bestows what is his own upon another. The giver does not close his eyes to his neighbor's need nor close his heart to his neighbor's lack nor close his hand to his neighbor's want nor close his door to his neighbor's request. The giver fills his neighbor's emptiness out of his own fullness. The giver replenishes his neighbor's poverty out of his own riches. The giver promotes his neighbor's advantage in every instance that he can or may. The giver loves his neighbor by dealing with him as he desires to be dealt with by others. The thief takes away, but the giver gives away; the thief makes empty, but the giver overflows.

Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt give. "For the poor shall never cease out of the land: therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open

thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy, in thy land" (Deut. 15:11).

Ah, yes, an open hand! Ah, yes, a generous giver! And therein lies the glorious truth that stands behind the eighth commandment. For God is the giver who overflows. God is the Lord and giver of life (Nicene Creed). God is the overflowing fountain of all good (Belgic Confession 1). God is the Father of lights, from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift (James 1:17). God maketh his sun to rise and his rain to fall upon men (Matt. 5:45). God gives and that right liberally!

And that is only to mention God's giving to all men. What God gives to his people in Christ is far richer than rain and sunshine, life and strength, and physical gifts. For the world only uses God's gifts against him. Men of the world are thankless. In their prosperity the wicked "set their mouth against the heavens" (Ps. 73:9). By all his good gifts to them, God sets the wicked in slippery places in order to cast them down to destruction (v. 18). The good rain and good sunshine are truly good gifts—but they do not make the rotten fence post to live, nor are they meant to.

But to his people God gives all things in his love in Christ. "The curse of the LORD is in the house of the wicked: but he blesseth the habitation of the just" (Prov. 3:33). In their sin and death, God's people are empty and needy and poor and bare. We are beggars; this is true. But to his poor people God has come with an open hand and has replenished our poverty with his unsearchable riches in Christ (Eph. 3:8). To his needy people God has come and given the

unspeakable gift of Christ (II Cor. 9:15). To his empty people God has come and filled us with his own fullness in Christ. “And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace” (John 1:16).

What good news for us thieves who covet what is our neighbor’s and who abuse and waste God’s gifts. Behold God’s riches in Christ, freely given! Behold our savior’s giving with a generosity and liberality that no other man could ever match: “Then I restored that which I took not

away” (Ps. 69:4). Behold him who was no thief, nailed to the cross with thieves and in place of us malefactors. “And when they were come to the place, which is called Calvary, there they crucified him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand, and the other on the left” (Luke 23:33).

How shall we rich poor give thanks for such abundant salvation? This way: “Thou shalt not steal.”

—AL

## FROM THE EDITOR

Welcome, one and all, to another issue of *Reformed Pavilion*. It arrives just in time for our readers to take a break from scraping the last few chunks of ice and snow off the driveway. Take off your coat, mix a mug of hot chocolate, and sit for a few minutes. The Lord in his mercy has given us another few pages to publish; may he in his grace apply the truths written herein for the profit of his little flock.

In this issue we return to a rubric that has not appeared for a while: *Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs*. It is time to investigate the intriguing fact that the book of psalms is actually five books compiled into one. There is much to learn about God’s purpose in this arrangement. The article today makes a small beginning toward this investigation.

Be especially sure to read the reprint of Herman Hoeksema’s *Banner* article this week. I dare say that the reader will be astounded. What is so astounding about the article, you ask? Well, in it Hoeksema began to openly criticize Dr. Ralph Janssen for Janssen’s low view of scripture. Even though Hoeksema’s public criticism was quite cautious at first, this article landed like a bombshell in the Christian Reformed Church (CRC) of the day. At the time Dr. Janssen held the highly respected chair of Hebrew and exegesis at Calvin Seminary and was probably the most thoroughly educated man in the entire Christian Reformed

denomination. Janssen held advanced degrees from universities in many major European cities—Wittenberg, Germany; Heidelberg, Germany; Strasbourg, France; Leipzig, Germany; Glasgow, Scotland; and Amsterdam, the Netherlands. At the time that Hoeksema’s article appeared, Dr. Janssen was fresh from a resounding victory at the Christian Reformed synod of 1920 over his fellow professors at Calvin Seminary. Add to this the fact that Hoeksema had fairly recently been a student of Dr. Janssen during Hoeksema’s seminary days. And that is not even to mention the fact that Ralph Janssen and Herman Hoeksema were fellow members of the same Christian Reformed denomination, so that the widely-known Christian Reformed minister Hoeksema was publicly criticizing the widely-respected Christian Reformed professor Janssen in the widely-read Christian Reformed church paper *The Banner*.

The issue that Hoeksema addressed in the article reprinted today was the matter of Janssen’s higher-critical views of scripture. The term *higher criticism* refers to the practice of setting oneself “higher” than scripture in order to “criticize” scripture. The higher critic blasphemously sets himself above God’s word in order to determine—by man’s knowledge and criteria—what in scripture is true and what in scripture is mere myth or legend or exaggeration. Such a view of scripture necessarily denies

divine revelation and divine inspiration. In the *Banner* articles republished in recent weeks, Hoeksema has been explaining and condemning the practice of higher criticism. At this point in his articles, Hoeksema began to address the higher criticism of his professor and his colleague, Dr. Ralph Janssen.

The Janssen case would become a major controversy in the CRC and one in which Hoeksema would play a leading role. The immediate result of the Janssen controversy would be Dr. Janssen's condemnation by the Christian Reformed synod of 1922. But the longer-term result of the Janssen controversy would be Reverend Hoeksema's

deposition from the CRC in 1924. For at the root of the Janssen case was the doctrine of common grace. In Hoeksema's *Banner* articles of 1920, we can already see brewing the controversy for which Hoeksema would be called by his Lord to give his ecclesiastical life. In Hoeksema's *Banner* articles one can see the controversy unfolding in "real time." And with the benefit of hindsight, one can see how God was directing all things for the preservation of his true church through the reformation of 1924. How deep and how blessed are the ways of our God!

—AL

## PSALMS, HYMNS, AND SPIRITUAL SONGS

### The Five Books of the Psalms (1)

There is an interesting feature of the book of psalms that is easy to overlook: the book of psalms is actually five smaller books compiled into the one larger book of 150 psalms. Book One of the psalms consists of Psalms 1–41, Book Two of Psalms 42–72, Book Three of Psalms 73–89, Book Four of Psalms 90–106, and Book Five of Psalms 107–150. All five of these smaller books together make up the one grand volume of the 150 psalms.

This week let us begin an investigation of this feature so that, Lord willing, we can investigate its significance in weeks to come.

Most readers (and the editor) of *Reformed Pavilion* would be unfamiliar with the division of the psalms into five books because many printings of our Bibles make no mention of these five books. On the shelf next to my desk I have several copies of the King James Version from various publishers. A quick scan of them shows

that two copies print *Book One*, *Book Two*, etc. in the appropriate places, while three copies make no mention whatsoever of these books. The omission of the book titles should probably be considered an error on the part of the publishers. The authoritative Hebrew text<sup>1</sup> includes *Book One*, *Book Two*, etc. As far as I can tell, the original King James Version of 1611 also included the psalms' book titles. Why some KJV publishers today have stopped printing the psalms' book titles, the undersigned has not been able to discover.<sup>2</sup>

But how did the 150 psalms come to be compiled into five books in the first place? The answer to that question leads us to contemplate God's wonderful, mysterious, gracious work of inspiring the book of psalms.

God inspired the finished and completed book of psalms in two main stages. The first stage was God's miraculous work of breathing

<sup>1</sup> The Masoretic text, printed, for example, in a Hebrew edition like the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.

<sup>2</sup> It seems like it would be a major decision to stop publishing the psalms' book titles, so I expected to find that information readily available and was surprised when I couldn't. Maybe I have the wrong books on my shelf or am entering the wrong keywords for web searches. Perhaps a reader of *Reformed Pavilion* will have better success in tracking this information down? If so, I am sure that I speak for all your fellow readers when I say that we would be eager to hear what you discover.

his psalms into existence through men. All scripture (including the psalms) is given by inspiration of God (II Tim. 3:16). The prophecy (including the psalms) came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost (II Pet. 1:21). The result of this stage of inspiration is that the book of psalms is not in any sense the word of man but is entirely the word of God.

The first stage of the inspiration of the book of psalms took place over many years. In fact, God inspired the psalms during the entire thousand-year period in which he inspired the rest of the Old Testament scriptures. During the days of Moses, when God first inspired the written scriptures—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy—God inspired psalms—Psalm 90, at least. During the days of David, Asaph, Ethan, and Jeduthun, God inspired many, many psalms to be used in worship in the temple. After the Jews' return from Babylon, which were the last Old Testament days of God's speaking to his people by written inspiration—Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi—God inspired psalms—Psalms 137 and 126, at least. When God closed the Old Testament canon of scripture in the days of Malachi, God also closed the canon of the psalms. All the Old Testament scriptures that God would inspire had been given; there were no more Old Testament scriptures to add. And all the 150 psalms that God would inspire had been given; there were no more psalms to add.

This first stage of inspiration is what most readers of *Reformed Pavilion* would usually think of as inspiration. But there was a second stage of God's inspiration of the book of psalms.

The second stage of God's inspiration of the book of psalms was God's miraculous work of selecting, compiling, and arranging the book of psalms into its final order and form. This stage of inspiration is probably less familiar to readers of *Reformed Pavilion* because we are perhaps inclined to imagine the book of psalms as a kind of continuous scroll that God gradually filled up during the Old Testament. In our imagination the earliest song that God inspired would have

been written on one edge of the scroll as Psalm 1. The next song that God inspired would have been written next to it as Psalm 2. As God inspired each subsequent song, we imagine the song being written onto the scroll in the next open space, with the last song at the opposite edge of the scroll from the first. At the conclusion of the inspiration of the psalms, we might imagine a single scroll containing the entire body of songs that God had given to his church.

But that is not how God gave the book of psalms. For one thing, as God gave the psalms to his church over the centuries, he never specified that the psalms should be arranged chronologically. God's purpose with the book of psalms had never been that the final arrangement proceed from the earliest psalm to the latest psalm. If God had determined a chronological arrangement, then the earliest psalm—Psalm 90, perhaps—would have been Psalm 1; the latest psalm—Psalm 126, perhaps—would have been Psalm 150. If God had determined a chronological arrangement, the last psalm David wrote in his life—Psalm 72, perhaps (see v. 20: "The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended")—would not have been followed by Psalm 108—"A Song or Psalm of David." But God never intended a chronological order for the final arrangement of the book of psalms.

For another thing, as God gave the psalms to his church over the centuries, he had not yet necessarily even indicated *which* songs would belong to the final collection of psalms. God gave the church many more than 150 songs in the Old Testament. At the Red Sea Israel had the song of the horse and his rider (Ex. 15). In the wilderness Israel had the song of God's faithfulness (Deut. 32). Israel had entire collections of songs that are not even recorded in scripture but only alluded to—the book of Jasher (Josh. 10:13; II Sam. 1:18), which was apparently an early compilation of songs, and the 1,005 songs that Solomon wrote (I Kings 4:32). Israel even had songs written by David that were not included as specific psalms, such as David's song of the bow (II Sam. 1:18—which should not be understood as

David’s teaching the children of Israel how to shoot a bow and arrow, which they already knew how to do, but which should be understood as David’s teaching the children of Israel how to sing a song by that name; see v. 22.) Even though God had given all these songs to his people, God had never intended that all these songs be included in the permanent book of songs for his church.

Therefore, God’s second stage of inspiring the book of psalms was his miraculous work of selecting, compiling, and arranging the 150 songs that he had eternally determined into the final book of psalms. Just as the first stage of inspiration was God’s breathing into human instruments to write the psalms, so the second stage of inspiration was God’s breathing into a human instrument to select and arrange the psalms into their final book. And just as the result of the first stage of inspiration was psalms that were not man’s word but God’s word, so the result of the second stage of inspiration was a psalmbook that was not man’s arrangement but God’s arrangement. God used a human instrument to compile a divine book, with exactly the psalm that he had determined being “the second psalm” (Acts 13:33)—so also for the first psalm and the 90th and the 150th.

So wonderful was God’s inspiration of the psalms that he not only inspired the words of each psalm, but he also sovereignly inspired the compilation of the psalms in the order in which we have them today.

The human instrument that God used in this second stage of inspiration was probably Ezra,

as Ezra made his way from Babylon to Jerusalem. Ezra was “a ready scribe in the law of Moses, which the LORD God of Israel had given” (Ezra 7:6). As a ready scribe, Ezra would have had copies of the Old Testament scriptures, including the psalms. Ezra “had prepared his heart to seek the law of the LORD, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments” (v. 10). Ezra “gathered together out of Israel chief men to go up with” him (v. 28). Ezra and his companions “furthered the people, and the house of God” (8:36). Although we are not told specifically whether Ezra was the one who compiled the psalms, Ezra’s position at the close of the Old Testament canon as a ready scribe who went “to beautify the house of the LORD” (7:27) makes it possible, and perhaps even likely, that God used Ezra for this work.

Ezra is generally regarded, both in Jewish and Christian traditions, as the one who compiled the Hebrew Scriptures into the basic canonical form that we now possess—including the book of Psalms. He is as likely a candidate as any for identifying with the task...although it is not crucial to know whether it was him or another individual or group who did the work.<sup>3</sup>

Part of God’s inspiration of the arrangement of the psalms was compiling five smaller collections of psalms into the one grand volume of 150 psalms. To this we will turn next time, the Lord willing.

—AL



<sup>3</sup> Michael LeFebvre, “The Hymns of Christ: The Old Testament Formation of the New Testament Hymnal,” in Joel R. Beeke and Anthony T. Selvaggio, eds., *Sing a New Song: Recovering Psalm Singing for the Twenty-First Century* (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2010), 101–2. See LeFebvre’s chapter for much interesting history regarding the compilation of the psalms. It was this chapter that first made the undersigned realize that there is significance to the fact that the one book of psalms is composed of five smaller collections of psalms.

## Article LXXXVIII. The New King and His Kingdom: Objective Revelation or Subjective Development? (continued)

The last article purposed to call the attention to some of the concrete points of difference between the view of modern higher criticism and what has always been considered the Reformed conception in regard to Scripture, specifically in respect to the Old Testament. We maintained that the Reformed conception, and, in fact, the orthodox view of Scripture, is that it gives us a supernatural revelation of God. It does not simply offer the history of the subjective development of the conception of God in the minds of men, but the supernatural, objective revelation of God to man. We then made the statement that on the basis of this view of Scripture, all possibility of finding in the Word of God a development from a wrong to a correct, from an immoral to a moral conception is ruled out.

It is this last statement we would explain now.

We have already called the attention to the fact more than once, that according to the view of higher criticism there is such a development in Scripture as we deny. Neither need this surprise us. The higher critics begin by discarding faith in supernatural revelation, just as we start from that faith. They claim that it is very unscientific to approach Scripture with a certain pre-established conviction as to its character, just as we maintain that this is the only truly scientific attitude that can possibly be assumed over against Scripture. But beginning from this so-called neutral, we would say unbelieving, point of view they regard and treat Scripture as they would any other book and investigate its pages as offering interesting records of the past.

In them we learn how people conceived of God in olden times. But there is more. They not only approach scripture without faith in supernatural revelation, but they have themselves formed a preconceived notion of history in their minds. Man has ascended from the lower to the higher, also in his conception of God. And if Scripture ascribes to a man like Abraham, or even to any man living before the age of the prophets, a rather high conception of God, morality and religion, immortality, etc., these higher critics claim that this was impossible, and that these men are fictitious characters. One can easily see that from this standpoint it is established before Scripture has ever been investigated that it can never offer us anything more than a record of the development of religious ideas, from the lower to the higher. Hence, what we find in the Bible is such a record of development. In the early parts of Scripture it is plain that people have a very low conception of God and morality and perhaps no view of the future life at all. Gradually the conception of God is exalted and purified. In Israel we find, at least up to the time of the prophets, still the conception that Jehovah is after all only one of many gods. He is Israel's God, but the gods of the nations are gods, too. Till finally the Christian concept is attained as the highest. It is plain, there is no supernatural revelation in this process. It is simply a matter of subjective, natural development.

Now, I want to be understood as maintaining that this sort of development cannot be present in Scripture if it is a supernatural revelation of the Most High.

Mark, this statement does not mean that there was no development in the course of revelation. It does not mean that Adam, immediately after the fall in paradise, possessed the same fulness of knowledge in regard to the God of salvation as Paul in the new dispensation. It does not mean that Noah could have written a treatise on the doctrine of the Trinity. Not at all. There is development. But it is a development in revelation. God revealed Himself as the God of salvation more clearly and more fully as the ages rolled by, till finally He fully manifested Himself in the Word become flesh. The light of revelation was clearer in Abraham's days than in those of Enoch; it shone more brightly in the days of Isaiah than in those of Samuel; it is more glorious in the new than it was in the old dispensation. I think this truth is accepted by all. There is development in the fulness and clearness of revelation through the different dispensations. And, therefore, when we deny that such a development as the higher critics present to us is in harmony with the idea of objective revelation, we must not be understood as denying that there is any development in revelation whatever.

Neither, of course, do we deny that there was much actual polytheism among Israel, that is, that in various periods of its history the nation served other, served many gods. Time and again Israel lapsed into the service of idols. It would be folly to deny this. Think of the period of the Judges, when time and again Israel allied itself with the gods of the nations round about. Think of the time of Elijah, when upon royal authority the worship of Baal was instituted as the religion of Israel. In fact, not only up to the time of the prophets, but all through that period it is plainly Israel's sin that they leave the Fountain of living water and hew themselves broken cisterns, or, to speak in a frequently occurring figure, that they commit adultery and whore after other gods, while they leave their rightful Husband. But it should be borne in mind that this is always presented as apostasy on the part of Israel, as grievous sins. Never to our knowledge, in the time of the Judges no more than in the period of

the prophets, is this fact presented as excusable ignorance on the part of Israel. Israel is warned, chastised, sent into exile because of this apostasy. No more than one could draw a conclusion as to the general Christian conception of the Word of God from what higher critics have to say in regard to Scripture, no more can one draw a conclusion as to the proper religion of Israel, from what is everywhere presented as a case of grievous apostasy.

But we maintain first of all that the idea of supernatural revelation postulates that throughout Scripture the same God, who is One Lord, the only true God of heaven and earth, is revealed. Not in the early part of the Old Testament a sort of polytheistic deity gradually developing into the manifestation of the true, the one God. But all through Holy Writ one God. Scripture is, from beginning to end, monotheistic. We do not care to prove this from scripture itself. All we are concerned about now is to show that this only is to be harmonized with the idea of objective revelation. If God revealed Himself to the patriarchs, He certainly revealed Himself as He is, and, therefore, not as many gods. Neither did He reveal Himself as a sort of immoral god. He could not. He is the Holy One, the perfectly Righteous, who loves justice and equity. And how could He possibly reveal himself different from what He is? And in the second place, we also maintain that this idea of objective revelation rules out the possibility of a polytheistic or unworthy conception of God in those who received it. That Abraham should receive the objective revelation of God, talk to Him as a friend with his friend, have covenant-communion with Him and still have an idea that God was not one but many gods; in short, that he should be a polytheist is to me an inconceivability. The same is true of Moses, Samuel, David, Israel as a people. They possessed the revelation of the one true God. A rather rich and direct revelation of Him. They could not possess it and still be polytheists or semi-polytheists.

-----

It is in this connection that I wish to state my first reason for being concerned and uncertain in regard to the action of last Synod. And I want to state it objectively. In the first place, in justice to Dr. Janssen, whose teachings were called in question before the Synod of last June, it must be stated very strongly that he is no disciple of the Wellhousen school of criticism. Of this he has been frequently accused in private conversation. And lest I leave the impression that this is also my opinion, I want to express myself very positively to the contrary. Proof abundant I would be able to furnish that the professor is always combating on scientific grounds the Frafian theory of the Old Testament. Time and again in the professor's dictations one meets with a presentation of the critical view of a certain matter in order then to be followed by a refutation of this view by Dr. Janssen. Neither, let it be plainly understood, do I underrate the doctor's scholarship. I rather wish to pay my highest regard to his scientific ability and attainment. I do not believe that in regard to knowledge of Semitic languages there is another man in our church that could take Professor Janssen's place. And I would not rejoice, but rather think it a pity if we would have to lose him for our circles.

And yet, in regard to the question I have just discussed, I feel uncertain. To my mind the professor in his teaching yields too much to the critical school, so much that it is difficult to harmonize it with the idea of revelation. And I consider it a pity that Synod did not enter into this matter. Let me quote a few passages from the professor's dictations.

On page 11 of the notes on the history of Abraham, a comparison is drawn between the Canaanitish god and the God of Abraham. We find that Abraham stops at Bethel (House of God). Now, in spite of the fact that Scripture connects the naming of this place with an incident in Jacob's life, the professor thinks it probable that the Canaanites already called the place Bethel (House of El, God) and then the further conclusion is drawn, that also the Canaanitish god is El. The statement is made in the notes: "Hence Canaanitish god and Abraham's God is

the same." But it is said further that this does not mean that the Canaanitish people practiced monotheism, that they believed in one God. Does that mean, if Abraham's God and the god of the Canaanites are the same, that Abraham did not believe in one God either? One cannot help but receive the impression that this is actually the meaning, for immediately the statement follows: "Throughout the centuries to exile even the Israelites clung to semi-monotheism." And again on page 18 of the same notes the statement is made that the idea of Israel until the prophets also was that there are other gods beside the true God. Now, in all seriousness, I cannot harmonize this conception with the idea of an objective, supernatural revelation to Abraham and Israel.

On pp. 12, 13 we find an account of Abraham's half-truth that Sarah was his sister. The history is presented as if Abraham for business purposes and to get connection with the Egyptian court wanted to deliver Sarah to the harem of the king. For the sake of profit he deliberately delivers her to the king's harem. When the morality of this deed is discussed, it is stated that for Abraham the standard of morality and religion was not what it was later. This furnishes an excuse for Abraham, though from a later point of view the deed cannot be justified. Now, this may be true for Abraham as a Babylonian chief. But where does supernatural revelation come in? Are we to suppose that Abraham, who had received revelations from Jehovah, who had received the promise, who worshipped Jehovah, had so little conception of God and his precepts that he did not know that it was wrong, morally a crime, to deliver his wife, who was to be the covenant-mother, to the harem of the Egyptian king? If you rule out supernatural revelation, this is conceivable. Otherwise it seems impossible.

Once more. On p. 13 of the notes on Old Testament Isagogics, in the introduction to the book of Ecclesiastes, I find the following comment:

"Fundamental thought. The author is a contemplative thinker, teaching, pondering and seeking out. The fundamental thought that he has reached by his thinking is that all is vanity.

In spite of all thought of a brighter nature he continually comes back to this thought. He has periods of unbelief and doubt.

“The first thing that he has observed is that all is in perpetual flux. ‘Panta rei.’ Philosophic thought. Furthermore, he has noticed that the wicked prosper and the righteous suffer. The conclusion is: ‘Vanity of vanities, all is vanity.’

“Moreover, he has discovered the finitude of the human mind. Here again, similar to Job. All is vanity.

“Query: How does it come about that he always comes to the same conclusion? It is due to a peculiar kind of doubt. He has periods in which he does not believe in the immortality of

the human soul. He confesses to this doubt in 3:19. Happily, however, the man has other periods in which he is reconciled from his skepticism (cf. 3:13). Faith is finally strongest and he concludes with: ‘Fear God and keep his commandment.’”

Again we ask: where does supernatural revelation come in? What, if this is all that is to be said of the book of Ecclesiastes and its author, as to its fundamental thought, what does distinguish it from any philosophic writing? It is hard to see.

I want to state yet a few things in regard to the idea of historicity. But about this next time.

—Grand Rapids, Mich.



REFORMED  
— PAVILION —