

CHAPTER 6

THE FALLACY OF CALVINISM OR THE CALLED AND THE CHOSEN

"Augustine, whose method was the vicious one of all dogmatists, which is first to lay down certain propositions, which are little else than our own philosophical conceptions, and then turn to the Bible for verbal proof of these rash overreachings beyond that which is written, is thus an example and a warning. In his Enchiridion he piles up one assumption on another till we stand amazed at what a flimsy support the whole structure of his theology rests on. ...Is it accidental-we think not-that three Carthaginian doctors, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, are responsible for that arbitrary magisterial view of religion which is more Roman than Roman law itself? This is too often the colonial type of mind, to exaggerate the qualities of the mother country. American Puritanism ran to seed the home type of Calvinism, as we know, before the middle of the last century. Predestinarianism in New England reached its last term of Determinism, in which that pure and spiritual conception of election, as the progressive purpose of God to redeem the many through the few, which runs like a river through Holy Writ, is lost in the sands of a dark and hopeless fatalism. This was the point reached by Jonathan Edwards, when the outraged public conscience took the matter in hand, and restored the balance by asserting the suppressed truth. It reasserted all the moral attributes of Deity. It set up a form of Deism which for the time concealed, if it did not deny, these trinitarian truths to which a dominant Calvinism had given a twist." -J. B. Heard.

The amount of Scriptural material available as evidence in proof of our main thesis grows upon me daily; and so fascinating is the study that it is difficult to take time to write. But I trust that enough has been said already to convince the unbiased reader, and especially the God-fearing Bible student, of the far reaching effect of our exegesis on the subject of Biblical Eschatology, and beyond that on the whole question of Biblical Interpretation.

The theme of this chapter is found in Matt. 22:1-14, and particularly in the last verse-the 14th.

These solemn and profoundly significant words were uttered by our Saviour very shortly before His passion; and as a fitting climax to the Parable He added the trenchant words, "For many are called but few are chosen." Exegetes pass over these eight words as if they were a merely accidental appendage of no relative importance. We will see later what a serious mistake this is.

The relation of Matt. 22 to what precedes and follows is well worth noting. The public ministry of Christ has now lasted more than three years and in a few days He will seal the verbal testimony of His sinless life with the still more eloquent testimony of His vicarious death. Never was He more anxious than during these closing days to speak to those of His own nation of the riches of God's grace; and never did His message of mercy and His thrilling call to repentance, as the prime condition of mercy, meet with more malignant opposition and open contempt from the leaders of the people than during these pathetic and tragical days. Such strained relations between Him and the Jewish Hierarchy could not continue much longer without precipitating a bloody crisis. And they knew it quite as well as He. They were convinced that their social and religious prestige must be recovered and vindicated

even though to do so necessitated the judicial murder of the Prophet of Nazareth. They resolved to take no chances.

He knew quite well that the main cause of His failure to get the ear and sympathy of the masses was chiefly owing to the attitude of their religious leaders towards Him. Hence His words of warning concerning the leaven of the Pharisees. Matt. 16:6,12. Indeed, it was with difficulty he was able to rescue the Twelve from its foul contamination. He also foretold the same evil in the present age. Matt. 13:33. But notwithstanding the admonition the deadly leavening process goes on as if never a word of warning had been spoken.

In Matt. 19:1,2, we find the Man of Sorrows heading towards Jerusalem for the last time. On the way He speaks several parables all of which were calculated to exhibit the supreme folly of the Jews in their rejection of Him as their Messiah, and thereby their forfeiture of the Messianic Kingdom. One of the most pathetic events of that day was His meeting with the Rich Young Ruler, and the turning away of the questioner with unutterable sorrow in his heart, unable to realize that his grief was entirely owing to mistaken views of life. So it is today. What a contrast we have in Phil. 3:7-14.

In Matt. 21:1-11 Christ fulfills the prophecy in Zech. 9:9.

"Tell ye the daughter of Zion,
Behold thy King cometh unto thee,
Meek, and riding upon an ass,
And upon a colt the foal of an ass".

Let the reader put the above prophecy side by side with passages like Matt. 2:1,2; John 1:41,49, and then ask himself if these prophecies are substantial facts or mere fictions; and if facts have they been fulfilled, and if not-when will they?

But when the elders, priests and high priests heard the reception given Israel's King as He entered the City and the people shouted, "Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest", their envy and malice knew no bounds. On the other hand what a fearless and fearful indictment of the religious leaders of His day is that contained in Matt. 23. May we not fail to see in these scathing words of inspired denunciation the typical reference to and prophetic forecast of a still more severe declaration of righteous wrath to be pronounced on another generation at His second advent. For "If they do these things in the green tree what shall be done in the dry?"

We will now come to the subject matter of our study. Matt. 22:1-14.

THE MARRIAGE FEAST AND THE WEDDING GARMENT

“And Jesus answering, spake to them again in parables, saying, ‘The Kingdom of the Heavens is likened to a Man—a King—Who made a Marriage-Feast for His Son; and He sent forth His servants to call them who had already been called to the Marriage-Feast, and they were not willing to come. Again He sent forth other servants saying, “Speak to those who have been called, ‘Behold, I have made ready my Dinner, my oxen and the fatlings have been killed, and all things are ready, come ye to the Marriage-Feast.” But they, neglecting it, went away, one indeed to his own farm and another to his merchandise; and the rest having laid hold on His servants, maltreated and slew them. And the King was enraged, when He heard this, and having sent forth His soldiers He destroyed those murderers and set their City on fire. Then said the King to His servants, “The Marriage-Feast, indeed, is ready, but they which had been called were not worthy. Be going, therefore, into the crossways of the roads; and as many soever as ye may find, call into the Marriage-Feast.” And those servants, having gone forth to the ways, did gather all, as many as they found, both bad and good, and the banqueting hall was filled with those reclining. And the King, entering in to inspect the guests, saw there a man who had neglected to put on a weddingrobe; and He says to him, “Friend, how did you come in here not having on a wedding-robe?” And he was speechless. Then said the King to the ministers, “Binding him feet and hands, cast him forth into the outer darkness, there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of the teeth; for many are called but few are chosen.” ‘ “ Matt. 22:1-14.

It is of prime importance to note right here that the parable has a two-fold application: First, to the Jews at our Lord's first advent; and, second, to the Christian Church at His second advent.

It is a common remark among certain students of the word that this or that Scripture is for the Jews, and to assume that thereby the Christian need not pay any attention to its admonition, or rebuke. This is a dangerous business. Let there be no doubt in the reader's mind that owing to the fact of his having greater light the above parable has a more searching application to the Christian than it had to the Jew of our Lord's Day.

EXPOSITION

The value or utility of exposition is found in its application. The exposition of a given portion of Scripture may exhibit scholarship of a high order, and a mind trained in the subtleties of abstract thought; and yet, if the exegesis proceed on the assumption that the author had in his mind an object and a purpose entirely different, and even opposite to the real one, the exposition will be practically useless. We have already had an example of this in our study of the Rich Ruler. Our present study will afford us another example of the same kind. And it will be found that the vitiating presuppo-

sition is the same in both cases; that is, that the application is to the sinner while in reality it is to the children of God. That which was a fundamental weakness in the typical Jew while reading his Bible, is equally apparent in the history of biblical interpretation during the present Church Age; that is, the disposition, the desire, to pass over and get rid of all portions of God's word of truth and righteousness which speak of judgment on God's people. It is doubtful if there is a single writer of repute from the fourth century onwards in whom this innate tendency is not more or less visible. I do not mean to say that it was intentionally so in all cases. Habits of thought may become cruel masters.

The substance of the parable seems to me to be as follows: The King Who makes the Marriage-Feast is God the Father. The Son for Whom it is made is God the Son, even the Son of Man. The guests who are called to the Marriage-Feast are primarily the Jews, and they alone among the nations of the world.

The Banqueting Hall is the Messianic Kingdom with the Christ as the Son of David reigning on David's Throne 1 Chr. 29:23; Luke 1:31-33. The Joy of the Marriage Feast is the inconceivable felicity of the Messianic Kingdom when such portions of Scripture as Psalms 8, 16, 45, 72, and 89 will be literally realized. See also Rev.: 21:9 to 22:14.

Two calls are clearly set forth in the parable:

First, when God through Moses and Aaron called the people of Israel out of Egypt, and took them to be, His people, saying, to Pharaoh, "Let My people go. The permanence of the call is assumed by all the prophets.

Second, when the Christ came to the Jews, presenting Himself as their long promised Messiah, and for the purpose of fulfilling the Davidic and Abrahamic Covenants in the actual establishment of the Messianic Kingdom according to the teaching of the Fathers of Israel and their Prophets. Amos 9:11-15; Acts 15:13-18. This, of course, would involve the raising of the faithful dead up to that time. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob would then come into the inheritance. Gen. 15:8.

The preaching of Christ and His Apostles was they second call. This was not a call out of Egypt and it was, not a call to salvation in the first degree, for from the Exodus onward the nation was regarded as saved in that sense. Even when in a state of sin and growing ' , apostasy they are still addressed by the prophets as the people of God. Isa. 1:3; 3:12-15; 5:1-13. Neither was ; the second call to be interpreted as a transference from one condition in the flesh to another in the same. It was rather a call to come out of an earthly state and into a heavenly state, where the raised would live in immortal bodies and enjoy perfect communion with God.

How absurd then to apply the parable to the sinnerthe unsaved. It has nothing to do with such. The Holy Spirit says, "He came unto His own (possessions-*idia*), and His own (people-*idioti*) received Him not." The Messiah began His preaching with the words, "Repent, for the Kingdom of the Heaven is at hand." This too was the message of the Baptist. The establishment of the Kingdom and thereby the accomplishment of the -promises made to Abraham and David was impossible except on the basis of repentance and a mighty turning to God. But when Israel's Messiah pointed out the sins of the nation, especially of the leaders, which must be abandoned or the Kingdom postponed, their latent wickedness came into open expression. Men in Israel, as in the Church, had no appreciation of spiritual values, with the result that when the call to victory and glory :came "they would not come." It was too Utopian to be true, they thought. They loved the visible, the tangible, the sensible; and so, "One went to his own farm." He could speak of his earthly possessions as "his own", something get-at-able; but the verities of Messiah's Kingdom did not appeal to him. He could say, "my farm", but he could not say, "my God". The Patriarchs could and did. Gen. 17:3-23; 28:13-22; Psalm 7:1-11.

The Theocratic Kingdom from Moses to the last king on David's Throne, previous to the Babylonian ,Captivity, was a type, or was intended to be a type of Messiah's Kingdom; and it was so to a very considerable .extent during the reigns of David and Soloman-but only a type. How unwise, and indeed wicked, to deny the literality of the Anti-type.

As we have already remarked, the first call was given by Moses and Aaron; and it was an effectual call. The aim of the prophets in Israel was to keep alive the Mes-sianic Hope, but it was a difficult task owing to the materialistic and polytheistic tendencies of the people. Listen to Isaiah:

"And in this mountain (Jerusalem) shall Jehovah of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And He will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all peoples, and the wail that is spread overall nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and Jehovah God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of His people (Israel) shall He take away from off the earth for Jehovah hath spoken it." Isa. 25:6-8.

The second call, if accepted, would have accomplished all this for the Jews. Alas! how blind the people were and hence the lament of the prophet:

"Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for Jehovah hath spoken, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against Me. The ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, My people doth not consider."

But the servants of the King who gave the second call to the Marriage-Feast, as no longer now a thing of hope and prophecy, but as at hand, were the Twelve Apostles and the Seventy along with a few others, Yea, and even the Master Himself, for He took the place of a servant. Isa. 52:13. What supreme delight, what infinite felicity lay bound up in that call; and what centuries of unutterable sorrow the nation of the Jews might have been spared had they accepted it! Who could foresee it all but He who uttered the parable; but He did. Who shall ever fathom the depth of pathos contained in the words:

"Oh, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate."

Alas! how desolate the City, the Land, the People, for these nineteen hundred years. But the third call is just at hand, and it will not be given to the dispersed of Israel by servants (douloi), but by Messiah Himself:

"And His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east", "and I will pour upon the House of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and of supplications; and they shall look upon Me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him as one that is in bitterness for his first-born." Zech. 14:4; 12:10.

Till then the vail will remain on God's ancient People, and till then the covering will remain on the eyes of the Gentile nations. 2 Cor. 3:14; Isa. 25:7. There is absolutely no deliverance for the latter except through converted and restored Israel, and no conversion of Israel till they literally look upon Him whom they pierced.

There is a marked difference in the recorded treatment of the servants of the King. It is not necessarily implied that all of those who refused the second call did so with any conscious enmity in their hearts. Comparing what they had in possession with what the Messiah offered, they preferred to have things remain as they were. We find the same truth in the Parable of the Great Supper. Luke 14:15-24:

"When one of them that sat at meat with Him heard these things he said unto Him, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the Kingdom of God (Messiah's Kingdom). Then said He unto him. A certain man made a Great Supper, and called many; and He sent forth His servant at the hour of the supper to say to those who had been invited, Come, because all things are now ready. And they all with one consent began to make excuse. The first said to Him, I bought a field, and I must go out to see it; I pray you, have me excused. And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I am going to prove them, I pray you, have me excused. And another said, I have

married a wife, and therefore I cannot come".

Now it ought to be apparent on the very surface that the Great Supper cannot be salvation as now enjoyed on earth even by the most spiritual of God's people. It is that conception of salvation which will be realized when Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the overcomers of all dispensations are raised from the dead, and when Messiah's Kingdom is established over the whole earth and Satan and his demon spirits are bound in the Abyss. This and nothing less was what the Rich Young Ruler had in his mind when he asked the Master what he must do in order to qualify himself for the Great Supper.

But while some of the called treated the invitation with mere indifference and preferred the life (psuke) of the fallen Adam to the life (zoe) of the incarnate Christ, it was not so in every case. Besides the farmers and the merchants there were others whose souls were inspired by Satanic passion, and they laid hold on the servants, maltreated them and finally slew them. They were the leaders of the people and especially the priests and high priests; the very ones who ought to have been the first to hail the advent of David's Greater Son. Hence the righteous indignation of Matt. 23. See also what immediately precedes and follows our parable of the Marriage for the King's Son. Compare Matt. 20:1-16.

A few words from Alford on Matthew's Gospel may be helpful:

"The whole narrative proceeds more upon a Jewish view of matters, and is concerned more to establish that point, which to a Jewish convert would be most important, -that Jesus was the Messiah prophesied in the Old Testament. Hence the commencement of the genealogy from Abraham and David; hence the frequent notice of this or that happening because it was foretold; hence the constant opposition of our Lord's spiritually ethical teaching to the carnal formalistic ethics of the Scribes and Pharisees."

Nothing could be clearer than that the main purpose of Matthew was to establish the claims of Jesus of Nazareth to be the promised Messiah and therefore the LITERAL King of the Jews and the Fulfiller of the Davidic and Abrahamic Covenants.

But since God had set the Jewish Nation aside and the Christian Church had taken the place of testimony for God in the earth, what end was to be served by calling the attention of Jewish converts to the Messianic claims of the Christ? Why, manifestly to show to the seed of Abraham that as a Nation they were not cast off forever, but only for the present parenthetical Church Age, at the end of which the Church would be removed and Israel (the whole twelve tribes) be restored to the honorable place of testimony, and that in the abiding fullness of Pentecostal power, and in which they, if faithful, would reign with the Christ, the Messiah, on His Millennial Throne. In other words, if the postponement of the Messianic Kingdom was rendered necessary by the unbelief of the Jews as a corporate body, that fact, though much to be regretted because of the suffering of the Nation while in a state of judicial blindness

and contempt among the Gentile nations, in no way invalidated the specific contents of the two above mentioned Covenants, but simply postponed their fulfillment and the consequent blessing to the whole world. To Patriarchs and Prophets and to the Jews of our Lord's Day, including the Apostles, the Messiah was to be a literal, anointed King, reigning on or through, the Throne of David. The spiritualized conception which began to come into vogue in the second century, and was almost universally prevalent in the fourth, never entered the mind of any honest Jew previous to the crucifixion of Christ. The Old Testament Scriptures know absolutely nothing of such a wicked departure from the truth, and the Covenants as revealed to the Fathers. It remained for the woman, the Church, to mix the leaven of falsehood in the three measures of meal which God had given to Israel for her comfort and inspiration. But the time is near when every whit of the leaven will be purged out never to enter again.

Why is it that up to Matt. 12 not a single parable appears, and after that they are continually in evidence? Because up till that point the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom in the earth was still regarded as a possibility. But when the Jews charged the Messiah with the accomplishment of His mighty works through demon power (12:22-45), the Nation was temporarily cast off and the Kingdom postponed. Therefore that which was postponed is of necessity now absent, and also that which in its time must be restored. In the meantime the Gentile Nations continue their wicked course under the sovereign rule of Satan, the Prince of the power of the Air. It is not surprising that the said Nations should dislike this portentous truth; but it is surely a preposterous anachronism that the Christian Church, while professing to be Christ's witness in the earth, should hate this sublime truth even more than the Gentile Nations. If one wishes to see an example of the intensity of man's dislike of real Kingdom Truth he must turn up the pages, not of the expert in civil jurisprudence, but of the theologian. It is not necessary to give examples, at least in the present connection.

We have already remarked that the parable has a double application: First, to the Jews as a corporate body at the first Advent of Christ; Second, to the Christian at the second Advent. And the Scriptures clearly foretell the parallel in the history of the two Heavenappointed Witnesses for God in the earth-Israel and the Church. The professing Church at the close of the present age of Grace is going to be in an even worse position to meet the facts of the second advent and its awful issues than were the Jews for the first advent at the end of that age of Law. The universal tendency among preachers and expositors, when interpreting these Kingdom Parables, is to look back and find all their significance, so far as they contain words of admonition and warning, in their application to the willful and stubborn Jews of our Lord's Day on earth. This is supreme folly. Heb. 2:1-3; Rom. 2:1-11; 1 Cor. 10:1-10; 2 Cor. 5:10; Gal. 5:19-21; Col. 3:25.

Turn up almost any commentary that comes to hand and the author will tell you that the Feast is now on, and that believers every where are sitting at the King's Table and partaking of the oxen and fattlings which He in His goodness has provided. But what are the facts? Was the first century after Pentecost a time of feasting for the Apostolic Church? Did the Apostles sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel? and did they then reign as kings according to the carnal conception of the Corinthians? Was Peter feasting or fasting when he lay in prison guarded by four quaternions of soldiers to be executed by Herod the following day in order to please the Jews? And where did Paul find time for feasting during these three arduous and perilous missionary journeys? Was it when he said:

"Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one; thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep?"

Truly, there came a time in the History of the Church when she began to feast. But it was not at the table of King of kings, but of Pagan Rome, when she "become an organized society incorporated with the political systems of the world". But for this kind of adulterous feasting she has paid a fearful price and will pay a still greater price when she faces the issues of the Bema Judgment-not any longer as a corporate body but in her individual units who have shared the profits and emoluments of that adulterous union. Ezek. 16, Matt. 13 and Rev. 17 should be studied side by side as type and antitype. Compare also Rev. 2, 3.

In the eschatological outlook of Matt. 24 and 25 we have some very interesting data when considered in connection with the portentous signs of the times in irrepressible evidence during the years 1914-1916 A. D.

At 24:15 the Master comes to the actual time of the end and only a little beyond 1916 (how far no one knows). Then 24:21-31 records the Great Tribulation, the Second Advent and the gathering of sanctified believers from all parts of the world and their implied rapture to glory. In 24:37-51 He returns to the times immediately prior to the Great Tribulation, including 1914-1916 A. D. It is to this latter period that the THEN of Matt. 25:1 refers. "

"THEN shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins which took their lamps and went forth to meet the Bridegroom; and five of them were wise and five were foolish-And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet Him. Then all those virgins arose and trimmed their lamps. And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are going out. But the wise answered, saying, Not so, lest there be not enough for us and you; but go ye rather to them that sell and buy for yourselves. And while they went to buy the Bridegroom came, and they that were READY went in with HIM to the Marriage (Feast); and the door was shut. Afterwards came also the other virgins, saying, Lord,

Lord, open unto us. But He answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not. Watch therefore (this is specially applicable to 1916), for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh."

Please note:

- a. The kingdom of heaven here is not the kingdom of heaven in Matt. 19:23. The former belongs to the present age, and the latter to the age to come. The context shows this. It is just as easy for the rich as for the poor to enter the kingdom now.
- b. All ten virgins were saved people-they all had oil (type of the Holy Spirit). The difference was in measure.
- c. The foolish virgins are not to be identified with any of the three classes enumerated in the Parable of the Marriage of the King's Son. There we have not only utter indifference, but bitter antagonism. Not so the foolish virgins. They were really interested in the coming of the Bridegroom. But the truth of the message had not fully gripped their hearts. There is a somewhat close resemblance between them and the man without the wedding garment which typifies holiness of heart and life. Heb. 12:14; Gal.5:19-21.

If therefore the absence of holiness, as the negative mark, and the presence of carnality as exhibited in the works of the flesh, as the positive mark, of all Christians who are to be excluded from the Marriage Feast for the King's Son, what percentage of Christians are likely to find access to the Feast, that is, to the Messianic Kingdom of the thousand years? Whether we look at the Church from the historical standpoint, or from that of personal observation, the answer, if facts are to count in our estimate, must of necessity savour of pessimism, so far as the condition of the Church is concerned. But the Master is careful to tell us the number will be very small. Matt. 7:13,14; Luke 13:24. Where can one go among the big denominations of Christendom today to hear the invitation to the Great Supper, or to the Marriage Feast for the King's Son? Or to state the matter in other words, Where can a hungry, anxious soul go to hear the Good News concerning the glory and blessedness of the Great Messianic Kingdom of the Age to Come which is the immediate goal of prophecy and hope in both Testaments?

The Jews under the O. T. believed in a literal kingdom under Messiah, and they regarded it as future. But they did not think it necessary that they should repent of sin and get right with God in order that it might come with the Advent of Messiah. The result was the rejection of the Nation and their present dispersion and sorrow.

The Church since the third century believes in a kingdom, but it is not literal and it is not future. The Christ on the Throne of the Father is now supposed to be reigning over the earth according to the requirements of both Testaments, thus confounding

the Throne of God with that of David. 2 Sam. 7.

In the interpretation of our parable, therefore, let us note and remember that the Marriage Feast for the King's Son has nothing to do with the Christian's earthly life, except by way of preparation, and also that it does not belong to the present dispensation, or age, but to the age to come; and that no Christian will enter the Banqueting Hall, or share the joy and the glory, except as he has made preparation for it by a holy life. Heb. 3, 4 and 12:14.

The word "dinner" in verse 4 of the parable is misleading.

The original is *ariston*, which means a light meal, similar to our luncheon, only that it was the first meal of the day. The Dinner (deipnon) came later, and usually when the day's work was done. This fact throws light on the use of the plural "Marriage-Feasts." Thayer defines *gamos*, a wedding or marriage-festival, and adds: "Under the figure of a marriage here is represented the intimate and everlasting union of Christ, AT HIS RETURN FROM HEAVEN, with His Church." Referring to Rev. 19:9, he says it is "a symbol of the future blessings of the Messiah's Kingdom," but overlooks the fact, which is the turning point of the whole matter, that the Messianic-Marriage-Festival is not for all the saved, but for the true, the faithful, the overcomers. The Holy Spirit is careful to emphasize this fact in many different ways. Thus, "The Marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself READY". Rev. 19:7. "And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness (righteous deeds) of the saints." Could it be affirmed of the Corinthians, Galatians, or Laodiceans, that they generally were ready, and that, if brought before the judge at the Bema, they would be found clothed in fine linen clean and white? And surely no one can deny that their state spiritually was a very fair sample of the professing Church since that time.

No, the King's oxen and fatlings were not for the morning lunch, but speak of the wonderful provision God has made for the felicity of the faithful during the whole of the Messianic Period. The Eastern marriagefeast usually lasted for at least one week, but this for the King's Son will last for a thousand years, when God's provision for those who have loved Him and served Him in this and previous ages will be found to surpass description, going infinitely beyond the utmost reach of the most fertile imagination of man while still in the place of preparation. 1 Cor. 2:9.

THE FALLACY OF CALVINISM

This brings us to the discussion of the 14th verse. Who are the called? and who are the chosen? and what is their relation one to another? The assumption of the Westminster Standards, and practically all expositors is that the called are sinners who have rejected the message of the free gift of Eternal Life; and that the chosen are those who have listened to the call and have accepted the gift and that they only

are saved.

Please note the following sections from Chap. III of the Confession of Faith:

- III. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.
- IV. These angels and men, thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeable designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished.
- V. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving Him there unto; and all to the praise of His glorious grace.
- VI. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so bath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, fore-ordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted and sanctified.

Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted and saved, but the elect only.

- VII. The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice.

For many years I have had a growing suspicion of the Confession of Faith, and during the last two years that suspicion has become a positive revulsion. Its faith is not that of the Son of God. It had been much more becomingly designated a "Confession of Philosophical Determinism", with a veneer of religious pretension.

The absurdity of this thing does not lie so much in the fact that a number of men two or three centuries back should formulate a body of doctrine, so essentially anti-Christian, as that the Reformed Churches for the intervening time should profess to study the Word of God and to live in an age of progress, and yet continue to carry about their necks such a galling yoke, and not know that they were the victims of a

Mediaeval delusion. The Reformed Churches received it from Calvin; and he got it from Augustine, and Augustine got it in art from heathen philosophy and in part from Roman Jurisprudence.

I give a quotation from "Greek Philosophy and Roman Law in the New Testament", by E. Hicks, D. C.L. p. 149:

"Christianity traveled from the East to the West, and though for the first two centuries it was still under the influence of Greek thought and the Greek tongue, the characteristics of the Roman spirit forbade that it should for a lengthened period be ruled by the influence of Greece. The philosophy which was reflected in the theology of the East, was represented in the West by the legal genius of the Roman Empire; and it is not to be denied that a powerful stamp has been given to modern Christianity by the mould of the Roman law in which so many of its conceptions were cast. Christology is the distinctive theology of the Greekspeaking Church; Soteriology that of the Latin."

We will quote again from Arthur P. Stanley:

"This fundamental contrast naturally widened into other cognate differences. The Western theology is essentially logical in form, and based on law. The Eastern is rhetorical in form and based on philosophy. The Latin divine succeeded to the Roman advocate. The Oriental divine succeeded to the Grecian sophist. Out of the logical and legal elements in the West have grown up all that is most peculiar in the scholastic theology of the Middle Ages, the Calvinistic theology of the Reformation. To one, or both of these causes of difference, may be reduced many of the divergencies which the theological student will trace in regard to dogmatic statements, or to interpretations of Scripture, between Tertullian and Origen, between Prosper and Cassian, between Augustine and Chrysostom, between Thomas Aquinas and John Damascenus." Eastern Church, p.111.

What a shame that neither East nor West has a Theology based on the Bible.

In the first place the framers of the "Confession of Faith" make use of two phrases that are not found in the Bible; and moreover, are thoroughly misleading. They are "effectual calling" and "everlasting life". In the use of the former there is the false assumption that the *called* are not saved unless they are effectually *called*; and therefore the *called* are not saved.

In the latter they assume that the prize of age-enduring life has to do with the eternal state, whereas it has to do with the Messianic Kingdom for the age to come. In connection with the sections quoted above they cite about forty proof texts, and fully ninety percent of them are either misapplied or have no bearing whatever.

The teaching of our parable, as we have already stated, has a double application-to the Jew then, and to the Christian, now. In it the Master speaks of the unfavorable reception and even the open hostility to His message of love for the professed people of God in that day; but at the same time He utters a most solemn prophecy as to a like indifference and hostility in this Church Age to the same message concerning the same but postponed Marriage Feast for the King's Son.

All through the present age, from the Apostles downward, the proclaimers of this real Gospel of the Kingdom have, as a rule, been rejected, evilly treated and often slain. The Master Himself, then Peter, James, John and Paul, all suffered martyrdom for their testimony to Kingdom Truth. Preachers of the true doctrine of the Kingdom have always been teachers of the separated life, of purity and holiness. We have only to think of The Friends of God in the twelfth century, of the Waldenses, of Spener in Germany, Madam Guyon in France; of John Wesley in England, and the Bonars in Scotland.

We must now come to the most critical part of our subject, namely, an inductive study of the two principal words in the last verse of our parable-Many are CALLED but few are CHOSEN.

We will state the case again that we may see clearly the proposition before us:

The Westminster Standards assume that the *called* are not saved; that only the *chosen* are saved, and moreover, that the rest of the human race cannot be saved, but are "foreordained to everlasting death." In opposition to this I affirm that the *called* are all saved, but not necessarily sanctified subjectively; and that the *chosen* are both saved and sanctified, and will therefore have part in the first resurrection, while the former will be excluded. Rev. 20:6,5.

The Rich Young Ruler was called but not chosen, but he almost attained to the second class. I have no doubt the man found in the Banqueting Hall devoid of the wedding-garment was called, but not chosen. This is required by the trend and purpose of the parable. It is not denied, but rather assumed that he was a Jew; that is, a member of the Nation to whom "pertaineth (even now) the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises."

The wedding-garment presupposes sanctification. Compare the case of the man with the one talent. Matt. 25:24-30. See the force of "His own servants." The Man traveling into the far country is Christ Himself. Surely He does not commit the gifts of the Holy Spirit to unsaved sinners. The conclusion following from this fact is that the Kingdom Parables are not for sinners. but for the saved. Grip this fact firmly. It is evident, therefore, that if we can establish the above distinction and relativity of the two words called and chosen, the, very foundations of Calvinism are undermined and the whole structure must tumble to pieces as a cruel and insufferable illusion, a child of darkness and sin. Our task is a simple one. The method of proof is scriptural and the logical conclusion is irresistible.

THE CALLED—*KLETOS*

The word translated *called* is *kletos*, plural *kletoi*. It is the participle of the verb KALEO (long o). Some such noun as *guests* is understood, in the absence of which the participle becomes a noun. Thus we have the verb *kaleo*, the participle *kletos*, and the noun *klesis*, calling or vocation. We will require to examine each of these with care.

"Even us whom He hath *called*, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles." Rom. 9:24. Here the verb is evidently applied, not to the unsaved, but to the saved. There is no need to insert the word "effectually" here. To do so is only to add an element of confusion and discord. So far as the first degree of salvation is concerned the idea of effectuality is already latent in the verb as one of its constituent elements, just as heat is implied in the idea of fire.

"But when it pleased God who separated me from my mother's womb, and *called* me His grace." Gal. 1:15. Was that an effectual call or was it not? What is the use of adding superfluous words to Holy Writ except it be to lend plausibility to an unscriptural theory?

"By faith Abraham, when he was *called* to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed." Heb. 11:8. This call was not a mere expression of desire on Jehovah's part; but a work of power which forever separated the Father of the Faithful from the land of his nativity and made him the true servant of the living God. These three citations ought to be enough. Listen to Thayer:

"Everywhere in the N. T. only those are spoken of as *called* by God who have listened to His voice addressed to them in the Gospel, hence those who have enlisted in the service of Christ." Let that suffice for the verb.

THE PARTICIPLE—*KLETOS*

"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, *called* to be an Apostle" Rom. 1:1. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are *called* according to His purpose." Rom. 8:28.

"For we preach 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. 1:23. So in all other places where the participle occurs. It is never once applied to the unsaved, and it is invariably effectual.

THE NOUN—*KLESIS*

"The gifts and *calling* of God are without repentance." Rom. 11:29. "*Called* (aorist participle) with an holy *calling* (noun)". 2 Tim. 1:9. "That our God would count you worthy of this *calling*". 2 Thess. 1:11. Thus we see that all three words-are used exclusively in reference to believers. There are passages where the participle, followed by a genitive of the person as possessor, carries with it more than is implied in justification and the new birth, and makes *kletos* virtually equivalent to *ekletktos*. As "Among whom are ye also the called of Jesus Christ (*kletoi* Iesou Christou). Rom. 1:6. See Thayer. Compare Gal. 5:24. "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts". This can only be affirmed of Christians in whom the claims of Christ are supreme above those of self and the world. All such have on the wedding garment long before they go in to the Banqueting Hall.

Now if the verb, the participle, and the noun, be all applied exclusively to believers, what becomes of the Mediaeval theory of the Confession of Faith which affirms that all the *called* are eternally lost, and only the elect are saved? This is Calvinism. How simple and conclusive is the exposure of the fallacy, and yet this hideous product of heathen philosophy and Roman Law has, in the name of Christianity, held millions of God's people in the galling fetters of a bondage almost as cruel as that of Roman Catholicism, and perhaps quite as offensive to the Great Head of the Church. And yet it is only a few years since Dr. B. B. Warfield delighted the conservative element of the New York Presbytery with a most eloquent eulogy of this anomalous survival of a semi-barbaric age. Read the quotation from Froude's Essays at the beginning of a previous chapter.

But we are not yet done with this little family of words, each in itself a torch and all three a living flame of holy fire.

I have pointed out the fact that whether the verb, the participle, or the noun be employed the implication is always present that the call is effectual. This cannot be denied.

Let us now note the fact that these three words have a twofold use in the N. T. First, when the sinner is called out of the old creation and into the new. This has been the prominent thought in the passages already cited. This call, being in its nature effectual, issues in the new birth and justification. The man so called is saved in the first degree. They are employed, second, when the Holy Spirit would lead men, already saved in the first degree, on to maturity and thus prepare them for entrance into the Messianic Kingdom, which fact is symbolized and parabolized in the teaching of the Great Supper (Luke 14:12-24); and also in the Marriage-Feast for the King's Son. This distinction is of the most vital importance if we are to have sound exegesis and make logical deductions. Just a few examples:

"The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a certain King which made a Marriage for His Son. And sent forth His servants to call them that had been Called to the wedding; and they would not come." Matt. 22:2,3.

Thus our first illustration is from the very parable we are studying. The Jews were looked upon and treated as a people in covenant with God. As already pointed out they had, as a Nation, been called by Moses and Aaron and accepted by God at Sinai as His people. How plain is the fact that the parable could have no possible application to the people of Greece, or Rome, or any other Gentile nation. They had not been called. But Israel had. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth" Amos 3:2. And just as the parable had no application to sinners in that Jewish Age; neither has it any application to them in the present Christian Age. And to so apply it is to miss entirely the vital point in the Master's teaching. And yet this is just the thing that is everywhere done and the traditions of men substituted for the word of God. I will give some samples of this perversion of God's word as presented in our parable from the writings of men considered thoroughly evangelical.

"God makes every possible effort, with tireless patience, to bring men to the Gospel."

"These preparatory foretastes of the great supper which the Church now enjoys."

"Only when Christ was crucified on Calvary were all things fully ready."

"Their abrupt refusal at the eleventh hour, after all was ready to receive them, partook of the nature both of breach of engagement and disloyalty."

"None of the excuses that men make are of any value. There is not one they will dare to offer in the judgment day".

"It is very strange that any wish to be excused. Excused from what? From God, from heaven, from glory, from happiness, from immortality, from the noblest life possible to man".

In every one of the above quotations, which are truly representative of the best orthodox teaching of the Church for centuries, the writers invariably apply the instruction of the Master to sinners, and characterize their conduct in refusing the offer of salvation as inexcusable folly. But as a matter of fact, deduced by sound exegesis, the sinner is not within the whole horizon of the Saviour of men as He gives forth the momentous truth of the parable. True, indeed, the Jews were sinners, but their sin consisted essentially in their rejection of the Messianic claims of the Son of Man. John 1:11, 12, 41, 49; 5:39-43. And the sin of the Jew is the sin of the Christian. He will not accept Kingdom Truth. The first quotation given above should read thus:

"God makes every possible effort, with tireless patience, to bring BELIEVERS into the Messianic Kingdom, but THEY WILL NOT COME."

Besides, it is not true that when Christ was crucified on Calvary" all things were fully ready." The Jewish Nation had by that time been set aside. Matt. 23:37-39, and a new dispensation, or age, was about to be inaugurated, and God had yet to visit the,' Gentiles to take out of them a people for His Name. Acts 15:14-16. The invitation can be given and accepted now, but the Marriage-Feast cannot take place till the fulness of the Gentiles has come in the consummation of Daniel's Seventieth Week. Luke 21:24. Then according to the parable it is not sinners, but Christians who are asking to be "excused from glory, from happiness, from immortality, and from the noblest life possible to man". The Great Salvation of which Paul speaks in Heb. 2:1-3 is the Messianic Kingdom. The majority of Christians come under the description given in Heb. 6:4-8; and 1 Cor. 10:1-10 We will take another example of this use of the verb *kaleo*.

"For the Kingdom of Heaven is as a Man traveling into a far country, who *called* His own servants, and delivered unto them His goods." Matt. 25:14. This parable of the talents is specially for this Church Age. Those who received the talents were "His own servants" before He, Christ, *called* them into service. This call was based on a previous call whereby they became "His". Two out of the three succeed in the service of the Master, and when "after a long time" He comes they will go into the Marriage; but the third fails in service, and he, though a servant, a saved man, is cast into outer darkness. Herein lies the grip of the parable. 1 Cor. 6:9.

An excellent illustration of this use of the verb is found in Rom. 8:30. There is no reference to sinners here. It is the second call. We find the participle employed in this higher spiritual sense in Rom. 8:28: "We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are *called* according to His purpose." This call is to the Marriage of the King's Son, and it is effectual. Compare 1 Cor. 1:24; and Jude 1. It is not true that all things work together for good to Christians who love the world. Rom. 1:18; 2:1-9; Jas. 4:4.

The use of the noun with reference to the coming Messianic Kingdom may be found in the following passages:

"That ye may know what is the hope of His *calling* (klesis). Eph. 1:18.

Walk worthy of your *vocation* (klesis). Eph. 4:1,4.

"For the prize of the high *calling*". Phil. 3:14.

We have the two calls in verse tree: "He sent forth His servants to *call* them who had (at a certain time previous) been called, to the wedding." Why did the Revisers, both A.V. and R.V., translate the first verb by *call* and in the second by *bidden*? In the former the verb is in the infinitive present, and in the latter it is the perfect participle, thus indicating that the first call had preceded the second by some time. In this

respect the parable is based on the social customs of the Jews. Kitto says, "It is still customary in the East not only to give an invitation some time before hand but to send round servants at the proper time to inform the invited guests that all things are ready".

The whole Jewish Nation had been called through Moses and Aaron; and at Sinai God, Jehovah, formally and openly took the Nation to be His own in a peculiar sense, and from that day till the rejection of the Christ they were so regarded. Yes, and even now they are His, though for a time cast off. The time of their restoration is almost at hand. Jer. 31:1-40.

In the eighth verse of the parable we read concerning the King: "Then saith He to His servants, "The wedding is ready, but they which were *called* were not worthy". In the first call out of Egypt the action of God in their deliverance took no note of personal worth, or lack of it. The reason of this was two fold. In the first place, personal or collective worth was out of the question owing to the fact that the covenant people were in bondage and had no teachers; and in the second place, because the theocratic kingdom as then set up at Sinai was only a type, a shadow of good things to come. But with the appearance of Christ, Israel's true King, the time had arrived for the substance to displace the shadow; and owing to the fuller revelation given to the nation through Moses and the prophets they had abundance of time and opportunity to prepare for the second call when the Messiah should appear on the scene in the fulness of time. But at no time during the Mosaic Age could the invitation to the Marriage Feast for the King's Son have been given to the people of Israel. There were many feasts in that age but they were all typical of the better things to come in the Messianic Age. This is the uniform message of all the Patriarchs and Prophets. And since the King was rejected, the Kingdom postponed and Israel's King withdrawn from earth to heaven, it follows that at no time since then could the people of God either during life or at death go in to the Marriage Supper. The second invitation could be given and accepted, but there can be no actual going in to the Marriage-Feast until the Son comes in the glory of the Father and of the holy angels, having received the Kingdom. Luke 9:26; 19: 11-15. Then all believers will be brought before the Bema (2 Cor. 5:10), and there be divided into two classes -the spiritual and the carnal; the just and the unjust; the holy and the unholy. The first class will receive their glorified bodies and will go in to the Marriage, for they are "ready". Rev. 19:7. But the second class will be found naked (without resurrection bodies), and they will be ashamed away from the presence of the King and His Bride. 1 John 2:28; Matt. 25:1-13, 30; Gal. 5:19-21; Heb. 12:14. But this does not alter the fact that they are in possession of the gift of eternal life. Their loss, however, is inexpressibly great. This is the teaching of our parable in its application to the present age of grace, and to the Lord's people.

When a sinner comes to Christ for salvation (in the first degree, the new birth and justification) there is no more room for personal worth than in the case of the typical Israelite when called out of his bondage and ignorance as a slave of Pharaoh, the embodiment of the world spirit. But as soon as the first call comes there is, as with Israel at Sinai, a second call to "the obedience of faith", a holy walk, a real death to the world, the flesh and the Devil; and all this in order to prepare for a place in the coming Messianic Kingdom to be established at the second advent of Christ. It is here that the secondary use of the verb *kaleo* and its derivatives comes into action. When once the reader gets a firm grip on this great fact it will seem to him almost incredible that the Prince of the power of the air should have blinded the eyes of God's people, and especially of its teachers and leaders, to a truth of such vital and fundamental importance. Yet so far as my studies have gone I can find no trace of it subsequent to the Apostolic Age. But the Bible from Genesis to Revelation is full of it. Once the clue is really found you encounter it everywhere. The psychical mind stands in the way. 1 Cor. 2:14; Rom. 8:7.

It is also a fact well worth noting that secular, philosophical, and even theological education, speaking academically, have no tendency to work in the way of freedom from either the psychical or carnal mind, but rather to deepen and intensify the bondage until the victim becomes hopelessly insensible to the appeals and promptings of the Spirit of Truth and Righteousness, and finally dies in a state of condemnation. The successful seeker after truth must, while not despising educational institutions and methods, find intellectual and spiritual emancipation in the School of Christ or not at all. Luke 14: 25-37; Luke 9:23; Psalm 23.

The above considerations are calculated to prepare us for an examination of the essential significance of the second definitive term in the last verse of our parable the word chosen. As a matter of fact the whole force of the parable is summed up and crystallized in this one verse. Every word contributes its quota to the solemn and almost startling conclusion: The many and the few; the for and the but; the called and the chosen.

CHOSEN—EKLEKTOI

Here again we have another family group of three words: The verb-*eklego*; the participle-*eklektos*; and the noun-*ekloge* (long e). These words are translated into English in both the A.V. and R.V., by *choose*, *chosen*, *elect*, or *election*.

The Confession of Faith and Reformed Theology generally assume and even affirm that only the *elect* are saved and the *called* are all lost. We have already demonstrated that the *called* are all saved. What then is the difference in the two words, for they cannot be synonymous. The adversative "but" indicates not only difference but antithesis. The solution is very simple. We have only to follow the Inductive Method steadfastly and conscientiously to reach the truth. Very slight knowledge of the

original is requisite.

The *called* in its primary and most comprehensive sense is the sum total of the saved. And the *chosen* are a small company called (secondary sense) out of the sum total of the saved, for special service and honor. It is also evident on the very surface of the parable that the second call, which issues in the election of the few, is not the result of any arbitrary decision of the sovereignty of the Divine Will irrespective of the freedom of the will of man, for the second call was given to all who had the first call, but the majority "would not come". Let us proceed:

The verb (*eklego*) occurs in the N. T. only in the passive and middle forms. We will first hear what Thayer has to say. He renders it, *to pick out, to choose; to pick or choose out for one's self*; and cites Luke 10:42; 14:7; "One out of many", (of Jesus choosing His disciples). John 6:70. Then he adds:

"Especially is God said to choose those whom He had judged fit to receive His favors and separated from the rest of mankind to be peculiarly His own and to be attended continually by His gracious oversight: thus of the Israelites, Acts 13:17 (Deut. 14:2;4:37)".

Surely that is conclusive as to the real meaning of the word. But it is one thing to define a word and quite another to abide by that meaning in the construction of thought; and therefore we must scrutinize the following part of the quotation with suspicion. He adds:

"Of Christians, as those whom He has set apart from the irreligious multitude as dear unto Himself, and whom He has rendered, through faith in Christ, citizens in the Messianic Kingdom. Mark 13:20".

This sentence needs interpreting, and in doing so we find that he has utterly abandoned his definition and given a comprehension to the verb which, while upholding tradition, nullifies the Scriptures of truth. The definition limits the act of choosing to a few Christians out of many Christians. But in exposition he makes the few Christians to include all Christians. Here is the "little leaven which leavens the whole lump". According to Scripture usage the verb *eklego* in its application to believers indicates the choice of a few out of the many, or all, of the same class-Christians. This verb always presupposes the one which precedes it in the verse we are dealing with (*kaleo* and its derivatives). Matt. 22:14.

Thayer's error may be illustrated thus: Some men are colored; Americans are men; therefore Americans are colored.

We will now turn to the Scriptures and note how the Holy Spirit employs the verb:

"And when it was day He called unto Him His disciples; and of them He *chose* twelve." Luke 6:13.

"Mary hath *chosen* that good part". Luke 10:42.

"They *chose* out the chief rooms". Luke 14:7.

"They *chose* Stephen, a man full of the Holy Ghost." Acts 6:5.

"It seemed good unto us to send *chosen* men unto you." Acts 15:25.

Thus the verb is invariably used where there is the choice of a few out of many of the same class.

THE PARTICIPLE—*EKLEKTOS*

In his definition and application of the participle, Thayer is even more confused than in his treatment of the verb. He proceeds thus: *picked out, chosen; chosen of God to obtain salvation through Christ*. But here we have a right to ask, What salvation? To this question he has no answer. Is it salvation in the first, or second degree? Is it the salvation implied in *kaleo* or in *eklekto*? He carelessly assumes it to be the former when in reality it is the latter. Then he adds, "hence Christians are called the chosen or elect of God". Again we enquire, What Christians? All, or some? He takes it for granted, contrary to the specific statement of the Master, that it is the former while it is clearly the latter. I quote again:

"Eklektoi, those who have become true partakers of the Christian salvation are contrasted with kletoi, those who have been invited but who have not shown themselves fitted to obtain it."

But what is the true salvation? To this he has no answer, nor have the expositors. One may consult any lexicon he can lay his hands on and there is nothing but confusion and exegetical inconsistency wherever you turn. And the confusion arises from the fact that they do not see one of the most transparent truths in the Bible; namely, the dualistic character of salvation as involved in the two verbs *kaleo* and *eklego*. In his definition of *kaleo* he says, "only those are spoken of as *called* by God who have listened to His voice addressed to them in the Gospel", but in the quotation given above he says, "the kletoi are those who have been invited to become partakers of the Christian salvation but who have not shown themselves fitted to obtain it." What could be more utterly foreign to the inductive method, and to good common sense than that kind of reasoning? And there is absolutely no way out of the tangle apart from the line of interpretation presented in the pages of this book. But to do this is to consign post-millennialism and Calvinism to the Abyss whence

they came. Better now than later.

We will now quote a few passages which exhibit the Scriptural use of the participle:

"Many are (effectually) called, but few are *chosen*". Matt. 22:14.

"And they that are with Him are called (in secondary sense), and *chosen* and faithful". -Rev. 17:14.

"To whom coming as unto a living stone-*chosen* of God and precious." 1 Pet. 2:4.

Here again we see that it is a few out of many of the same class.

But it is when we examine the passages where the participle (*eklektos*) is rendered into English by the term "elect" that the fundamental fallacy of Calvinism comes clearly into view. Let the reader keep in mind the basic assumption of Calvinism, that only the elect are saved, and we will proceed with our argument.

"And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the *elect's* sake those days shall be shortened". Matt. 24:22.

"And shall deceive the very *elect*". Matt. 24:24.

"And they (the angels) shall gather together His *elect* from the four winds of heaven". Matt. 24:31.

"Shall not God avenge His own *elect*?" Luke 18:7.

"Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's *elect*?" Rom. 8:33.

"All things are for the *elect's* sakes". 2 Tim. 2:10.

It is surely unnecessary to cite any more passages. The universal assumption of the lexicons, expositors, and theologians, is that the above Scriptures apply to all Christians. But the solemn truth of the matter is that they are predicable of only a very few Christians. The days of the great tribulation will not be shortened for the sake of all Christians then living on the earth; but for the sake of the few, those who have loved the Saviour above all else and have been true to Him in their life and testimony. They are the Christians who have faith in God when the great mass of believers are drifting with the world, and are the victims of its ambition, its lust, and its hopeless delusion. And no sane man can deny that while the relation of the Church to the world, as presented in the Scriptures, is one of contrast and even antagonism, the line of demarkation today is practically obliterated and therefore the professing Church must share with the world the now impending wrath. The appeal

of the Master is now to the individual only. Rev. 3:21. Indeed, the professing Church will be one of the agencies that will by its sins call down the wrath of God upon the world, of which it has become a part. Compare Amos 3:2 and 1 Pet. 4:17,18.

THE NOUN—*EKLOGE*

Thayer defines it thus: *election, choice, the act of picking out, choosing.*

We will note just a few examples to prove the unity of thought and purpose running through this little family of words:

"He is a *chosen* vessel (lit. a vessel of *election*) unto Me". Acts 9:15.

"The purpose of God according to *election*". Rom. 9:11.

"According to the *election* of grace". Rom. 11:5.

"The *election* hath obtained it". Rom. 11:7.

"As touching the *election*". Rom. 11:28.

"Knowing, brethren beloved, your *election* of God". 1 Thess. 1:4.

"Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and *election* sure; for if ye do these things ye shall never fall". 2 Pet. 10.

The one essential point to be carefully observed in all three words (the verb, participle, and noun) is that they speak of a few Christians selected for a purpose out of the great mass of Christians, and that, too, on the ground of personal fidelity to truth and righteousness and God. In other words, the unholy, I might almost say blasphemous, thought, or dogma, of the sovereign election of a few out of the great mass of sinners to eternal life, and that all the rest are cast off and delivered to be eternally damned, is utterly foreign to the Scriptures, and an inexcusable slander on the character of God. The open infidelity of all the Ingersolls, Voltaires and Paines the world has hitherto produced have not done half the damage to Christianity that has been done by this infidel dogma which lies at the very basis of Calvinism. In His Word Studies Dr. Vincent makes the following comment on 1 Thess. 1:4:

"This, and the kindred words, *eklegein, to choose, and eklektos, chosen or elect, are used of God's selection of men or agencies for special missions or attainments; but neither here nor elsewhere in the N. T. is there any warrant for the revolting doctrine that God has predestined a definite number of mankind to eternal life, and the rest to eternal destruction.*"

To this I say, Amen. But in the next two sentences of the same paragraph the good Doctor falls into error and virtually contradicts, in part, the truth of the above quotation.

He says:

"The sense of this passage seems to be defined by the succeeding context. The Thessalonians had been chosen to be members of the Christian Church, and their conduct had justified the choice".

But we have already proven that all the *called* are saved and therefore are members of the Christian Church. It is the same old error, hoary with age, the failure to see the dualism of salvation, first from the guilt of sin and second from its power and the bearing of these on human destiny. The truth of the matter is that the Thessalonians, because of their fidelity to the saving truths of the word, and especially the truth of the Lord's pre-millennial coming to establish the Messianic Kingdom, had proven themselves worthy of a place in the first resurrection and in the consequent glory of that Kingdom, to which, on the ground of their fidelity, God had elected them. But the Corinthians as a body had given themselves up to carnality, and the Galatians had fallen into legalism, and so they are not only not among the *elect* but are exposed to coming judgment. 1 Cor. 3: 1-15; and Gal. 5:19-21; 1 Cor. 6:5-10. It is the privilege of every man who has had the first call out of the world to know that he is saved, regenerated, justified. Being assured of this it is his further privilege to listen to and accept the second call to the Marriage of the King's Son and by faith, by cleansing through the word and growth in grace, to get himself ready for the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. But such preparation is impossible except by the knowledge of dispensational and prophetic truth. The second call was silenced, so far as corporate testimony was concerned, about the end of the third century. Since then the professing Church has been its most deadly enemy. But nearly one hundred years ago the Holy Spirit began to revive that testimony through the instrumentality of certain individual men, and today it is believed by tens of thousands. But it is useless to expect that the Church, in its corporate capacity, will ever again place the seal of its approval on this glorious truth so dear to the hearts of Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles; yea, and above all, to the heart of the Christ of God.

In the meantime let every lover of truth and righteousness give attention to the words of Peter:

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the Day Star arise in your hearts". 2 Pet. 1:19.

He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come suddenly. Amen. Even so, Come Lord Jesus.

The Dualism of Eternal Life: A Revolution in Eschatology
by Pastor S. S. Craig