



REFORMED

— P A V I L I O N —

VOLUME 2 ISSUE 47

MARCH 1, 2025

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

—Psalm 27:5

CONTENTS

3 MEDITATION
Menstealers

4 EDITORIAL
As Often As Ye Eat This Bread and Drink This Cup (2)

9 HERMAN HOEKSEMA'S *BANNER* ARTICLES
Article 99: The New King and His Kingdom: Melchisedec



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

See reformedpavilion.com for all contact and subscription information.

MEDITATION

And he that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.

—Exodus 21:16

Menstealers

In the judgments that God delivered to Moses upon Mount Sinai, God forbade men-stealing. The manstealer was the Hebrew who overcame his Hebrew neighbor by force in order to sell him as a slave to a foreign nation. Although there was a strictly regulated form of Hebrew slavery and indentured servitude among the Israelites—the point of which was the year of release, a foreshadowing of the liberty that we have through redemption in Christ—God forbade the Israelites from capturing their brethren by force in order to sell them away into foreign bondage. “If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel, and maketh merchandise of him, or selleth him; then that thief shall die; and thou shalt put evil away from among you” (Deut. 24:7).

Manstealing was a monstrous sin. So evil was it that God imposed the highest possible penalty upon the manstealer: “he shall surely be put to death.” By imposing the death penalty upon manstealing, God taught that manstealing was every bit as heinous a sin as murder. For the murderer must surely be put to death, and the manstealer must surely be put to death. In fact, God required that the manstealer be put to death even if he had not yet sold his brother but was only found holding him for sale. “He that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death” (Ex. 21:16).

Why was manstealing so monstrous a sin? Because the manstealer in hatred cast his Hebrew brother out of the covenant. The manstealer would not suffer his Hebrew brother to

live with him among the covenant people of God but sent him out of the congregation to perish among his cruel foes. Oh, the manstealer could not undo God’s election of the enslaved brother or remove God’s covenant love from him. The Lord knoweth them that are his, wherever they may be. But as far as the manstealer was concerned, he was sending his Hebrew brother to die outside of God’s covenant. The Hebrew slave would be cut off from the tabernacle of the assembly, cut off from the communion of his brethren, cut off from the preaching of the gospel in the sacrifices and offerings. The Hebrew slave would be the chattel of the foreign foe, forced to suffer whatever cruelties the haters of Jehovah might inflict upon their helpless victim. How heartless the manstealer was! How monstrous! The manstealer must surely be put to death.

God’s judgment against menstealers would have hit home for the Israelites as they encamped at Mount Sinai. For the fathers of Israel had been menstealers! With ruthless cruelty the eleven sons of Jacob had cast their brother Joseph into a pit and sold him to Ishmaelite slavers. With heartless force the eleven sons of Jacob had cast their brother Joseph out of the covenant to perish among the godless Egyptians. The sons of Jacob would not suffer their Hebrew brother to live with them among the covenant people of God. The nation of Israel had begun as menstealers! And the nation’s manstealing only revealed what was in her heart: hatred of the brother, despising of the brother, violence

against the brother, and cruel separation of the brother. From her very beginning the fathers of Israel were menstealers and were worthy of death!

O church, behold thyself. For the hatred and cruelty in the hearts of the fathers of Israel is the hatred and cruelty of our nature. That hatred and cruelty that cast out our brother was on full display in the crucifixion of Christ. For there our nature cried out regarding the Prince of life,

“Away with him! Crucify him!” The lawful use of the law is to expose and condemn us menstealers (I Tim. 1:9–10).

And now, O church, behold thy savior. For Jesus Christ came not to cast away his people, given to him of the Father. But he came in love to bring us unto God. “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit” (I Pet. 3:18).

—AL

EDITORIAL

As Often As Ye Eat This Bread and Drink This Cup (2)

Reformed churches in general administer the sacrament of the Lord’s supper very infrequently. Although Reformed churches meet more than one hundred times per year for worship, the Reformed tradition is to administer the Lord’s supper only four to six times per year. The Reformed tradition of infrequent administration is surprising in light of the rich Reformed doctrine of the Lord’s supper. The Reformed doctrine of the Lord’s supper is that “as often as ye eat of this bread and drink of this cup, you shall thereby, as by a sure remembrance and pledge, be admonished and assured of this my hearty love and faithfulness towards you” (Form for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper). With such a rich understanding of the Lord’s supper, how did such an infrequent administration come to pass among the Reformed? Let us look at the history of the Lord’s supper to see how our tradition developed.

Jesus’ Institution of the Lord’s Supper

When Jesus instituted the Lord’s supper among his disciples in the upper room, he did not specify its frequency. Jesus taught the elements of the Lord’s supper: broken bread, wine, eating and drinking, and the formula of administration. Jesus taught that the Lord’s supper is a congregational meal for the church and not a private

meal for individuals: “drink ye all.” But Jesus did not specify how often the church should administer the Lord’s supper (see Matt. 26:26–30; Mark 14:22–25; Luke 22:19–20).

Later, Jesus revealed the Lord’s supper to the apostle Paul. In that revelation Jesus did specify that the Lord’s supper was to be administered repeatedly: “oft” and “often.” And Jesus taught the wonderful blessings that he would bestow upon the church each time the supper was administered: “this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me” and “For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord’s death till he come.” Nevertheless, though our Lord taught that the Lord’s supper was to be administered repeatedly, he did not specify *how often* it was to be repeated (see I Cor. 11:23–29).

From Jesus’ institution of the Lord’s supper, we can draw three conclusions regarding its frequency. First conclusion: the Lord’s supper is to be administered to the members of the congregation repeatedly. The sacrament of baptism is only to be administered to a person once: “every man...ought to be but once baptized with this only baptism, without ever repeating the same” (Belgic Confession 34). But the Lord’s supper is to be administered to God’s people again and again: “keeping up among us a holy

remembrance of the death of Christ our Savior with thanksgiving” (Belgic Confession 35).

Second conclusion: the Lord left the exact frequency of administration to the freedom and the judgment of his church. The frequency of administration belongs to those “certain ordinances” that “those who are rulers of the church institute and establish...among themselves for maintaining the body of the church.” These ordinances that the rulers freely establish are “useful and beneficial,” provided that the rulers “studiously...take care that they do not depart from those things which Christ, our only Master, hath instituted” (Belgic Confession 32). Because our Lord did not specify the frequency of the Lord’s supper in his institution, his church is free to establish her own frequency.

The frequency of administration is like those other indifferent matters that the church decides: what kind of bread to use (white? wheat? leavened? unleavened?); what kind of wine to use (white? red? sweet? dry?); how the table is prepared (the minister breaks each piece of bread by hand? a committee cuts the pieces beforehand and the minister only breaks one piece? common cup? individual cups?); where the congregation sits to eat (in their pews? come to the front pews? sit around the table?); how the elements are distributed (handed out by the minister’s own hand to each person? passed in a plate by elders?); and any number of other details pertaining to the sacrament. All these belong to the free decision of the church. The only criterion is what is “useful and beneficial” (Belgic Confession 32) for the congregation.

By leaving the frequency of the Lord’s supper to the judgment of his church, our Lord wonderfully provided for the multitude of circumstances that his church would face through the years. There would be times of peace, when the church could administer the Lord’s supper at every worship service. There would be times of persecution, when the members of the church were on the run and no administration of the Lord’s supper would be possible. There would be times of conversion and growth, when God gathered

his people in a certain place, but a consistory could not yet be formed and a church not yet instituted, so that the sacrament could not yet be administered. There would be times of apostasy and reformation, when the leaders and the people would need extra instruction to reject the corruption that had crept in and to recover the truth of the sacrament. The Lord’s wonderfully simple institution of his supper accommodates all the various circumstances of his church in this world. “As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord’s death till he come” (I Cor. 11:26).

In their freedom to decide the frequency of the Lord’s supper, most Reformed churches since the Synod of Dordt (1618–19) have settled on four to six administrations per year. “The Lord’s Supper shall be administered at least every two or three months” (Church Order 63).

Third conclusion: every time the Lord’s supper is administered, our Lord truly and graciously bestows heavenly blessings upon his church. The Lord’s supper is not an empty ceremony but a powerful means of grace. “It is certain and beyond all doubt that Jesus Christ hath not enjoined to us the use of his sacraments in vain” (Belgic Confession 35). But “as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord’s death till he come” (I Cor. 11:26). By the Lord’s supper Jesus himself “nourishes and strengthens the spiritual life of believers” (Belgic Confession 35). By the Lord’s supper we “certainly receive by faith (which is the hand and mouth of our soul) the true body and blood of Christ our only savior in our souls” (Belgic Confession 35). By the Lord’s supper God “feeds and nourishes my soul to everlasting life” (Heidelberg Catechism, Q&A 75). By the Lord’s supper we “obtain the pardon of sin and life eternal” by faith (Heidelberg Catechism, Q&A 76). By “these visible signs and pledges” of the Lord’s supper, Christ assures us “that we are...really partakers of his true body and blood” (Heidelberg Catechism, Q&A 79). “The Lord’s supper testifies to us that we have a full pardon of all sin by the only sacrifice of Jesus

Christ, which he himself has once accomplished on the cross” (Heidelberg Catechism, Q&A 80).

What a wealth of riches for us poor, hungry, thirsty, mourning, lowly, wretched sinners! What a merciful savior is our Lord, who graciously instituted such an abundant spiritual feast for the happiness and refreshment of his poor church!

This feast is a spiritual table, at which Christ communicates himself with all his benefits to us, and gives us there to enjoy both himself and the merits of his sufferings and death, nourishing, strengthening, and comforting our poor comfortless souls by the eating of his flesh, quickening and refreshing them by the drinking of his blood. (Belgic Confession 35)

The Early Church

After our Lord’s death, resurrection, ascension, and bestowal of his Spirit, the church continued to celebrate the Lord’s supper under the leadership of the apostles. The early church apparently administered the Lord’s supper frequently. It is even possible that the regular practice of the early church was to administer the Lord’s supper every time she met for worship.

When investigating the early church’s practice, as it is recorded in the New Testament, one encounters two special meals that the church observed. The first special meal was the Lord’s supper. The church kept this meal according to the institution of Christ as part of her official worship in her public assemblies. Paul refers to this sacramental meal as the “Lord’s supper” (I Cor. 11:20).

The second special meal was a fellowship dinner. This meal was not part of the church’s instituted worship but was part of her organic life as believers united to each other in the bonds of faith and love. Jude refers to these fellowship

dinners as “feasts of charity” (Jude 12), or love feasts. Jesus and his disciples had often eaten meals together, and the early church kept up the practice of breaking bread with one another. There were many poor in the early church, but those who had means would provide the food and drink, and the church would gather together in fellowship to partake of the charitable provisions. In her early days the church celebrated these love feasts daily.

And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved. (Acts 2:46–47)¹

At times in the early church these two special meals would be celebrated back-to-back. Having partaken together of the sacrament of the Lord’s supper in the official assembly of the church, the members would linger together afterward in their love feast. In today’s terms it would be like having a congregational dinner immediately following the morning worship service on a Sunday. How good and how pleasant it is when brethren dwell together in unity!

However, in Corinth, the two special meals became combined without any clear delineation. The church in Corinth called her meal the Lord’s supper, but the members behaved disorderly and selfishly, as if they were at a drunken feast where it was every man for himself. The Corinthians’ loveless love feasts drew Paul’s sharp rebuke, in which he condemned their sacrament as being no sacrament.

When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord’s supper. For in eating every one taketh

¹ Many interpret the language of “breaking bread” in Acts 2:42, 46 to be a reference to the Lord’s supper. John Calvin, for example, appealed to Acts 2 in support of administering the Lord’s supper every time the church has a worship service. Although such an interpretation is possible, there are several places in scripture that use the language of “breaking bread” simply to refer to a meal, for example, Jesus’ private meal with the two travelers to Emmaus: “And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them” (Luke 24:30). For a more thorough discussion of “breaking bread” in Acts 2, see P. Aasman, “Celebration of the Lord’s Supper—How Often?,” *Clarion* 46, nos. 4–5 (1997), reprinted at <https://www.spindleworks.com/library/aasman/lshowmany.htm#1>.

before other his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not. (I Cor. 11:20–22)

It is especially in Paul's instruction to Corinth that we can discover something about the frequency of the Lord's supper in the early church. Paul was addressing the official worship of the church: "ye come together" (I Cor. 11:17) and "when ye come together in the church" (v. 18) and "when ye come together...into one place" (v. 20). When the members of Corinth came together in their worship, they administered the sacrament of the Lord's supper: "in eating" (v. 21). Paul takes it as granted that the administration of the Lord's supper was part of every coming together of Corinth in worship.

Now, the Corinthians had behaved disorderly and divisively in their worship, so that their coming together in worship was "not for the better, but for the worse" (I Cor. 11:17). And, yes, the Corinthians had so mangled the Lord's supper by their loveless selfishness that what was administered could not even be called "the Lord's supper" anymore (v. 20). Nevertheless, Paul did not rebuke Corinth for administering the Lord's supper frequently but for being hateful and divisive and disorderly in her eating and drinking.

In his epistle Paul immediately went on to reform the Lord's supper in Corinth. He wrote to the Corinthians what he had already told them in person about Jesus' revelation of the Lord's supper to Paul. "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you" (I Cor. 11:23). Paul reformed the Lord's supper by instructing the Corinthians to partake in the knowledge of faith: "discerning the Lord's body" (v. 29). Paul reformed the Lord's supper in Corinth by instructing the Corinthians to

partake in brotherly love: "Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another" (v. 33). But in his reformation of the Lord's supper, Paul did not restrict its frequency. Paul's doctrine of the Lord's supper for Corinth (and for the entire New Testament church) was that "as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come" (v. 26). For Corinth, "as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup" had been every worship service: "when ye come together in the church" (v. 18). The Corinthian church, now reformed by the word of God through the apostle Paul, could continue administering the Lord's supper every worship service: "when ye come together to eat" (v. 33).

The Church Fathers

After the death of the apostles, the church continued to administer the Lord's supper frequently. From the year AD 100 onward, under the leadership of those men whom history calls the church fathers, the church celebrated the Lord's supper at least once every Lord's day. Several early documents and writings of the church fathers explicitly instruct the church to administer the Lord's supper at least weekly. None of these early writings are inspired, and one can find much error mixed in them. But these documents do record what the church's practice was immediately after the time of the apostles.

From the *Didache*:²

Chapter 14. Christian Assembly on the Lord's Day. But every Lord's day gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. But let no one who is at odds with his fellow come together with you, until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be profaned. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord: "In every place and time offer to me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great King,

² The *Didache* is an early summary of Christian doctrine in the form of practical instruction to new converts. Its author is anonymous, but it is generally accepted that the *Didache* was written in the first or second century AD. The chapter quoted here is found at <https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/didache-roberts.html>.

says the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations.”

Ignatius of Antioch encouraged the members of the church

that you come together man by man in common through grace, individually, in one faith, and in Jesus Christ, who was of the seed of David according to the flesh, being both the Son of man and the Son of God, so that you obey the bishop and the presbytery with an undivided mind, breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality, and the antidote to prevent us from dying, but [which causes] that we should live for ever in Jesus Christ.³

From Justin Martyr:

And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased,

the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons.⁴

From Irenaeus, where “gift at the altar” is Irenaeus’ language for the Lord’s supper:

Thus is it, therefore, also His will that we, too, should offer a gift at the altar, frequently and without intermission.⁵

The overwhelming testimony of the church fathers is that the church after the apostles administered the Lord’s supper at least once every Lord’s day.

To be continued...

—AL



³ *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians*, chapter 20. Ignatius of Antioch (died ca. AD 108) was a disciple of the apostle John. For his faith Ignatius was thrown to the lions in the Colosseum in Rome, where he died with this confession of heaven on his lips: “May I have joy of the beasts that have been prepared for me.”

⁴ Justin Martyr, *The First Apology*, Chapter 67: Weekly Worship of the Christians. Justin Martyr (ca. AD 100–165) was one of the earliest church fathers. After being converted from paganism, he wrote defenses of the Christian faith against pagan philosophers. He and several fellow Christians were arrested for their faith, and the Roman prefect threatened them with death. “And all the martyrs said: Do as you wish; for we are Christians, and we do not sacrifice to idols. The Prefect Rusticus read the sentence: Those who do not wish to sacrifice to the gods and to obey the emperor will be scourged and beheaded according to the laws. The holy martyrs glorifying God betook themselves to the customary place, where they were beheaded and consummated their martyrdom confessing their Saviour” (“St. Justin Martyr,” in Herbermann, Charles [ed.], *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 7 [New York: Robert Appleton Company], as quoted at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Justin_Martyr).

⁵ Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 4.18.6. Irenaeus (ca. AD 120 – ca. AD 202) was a Greek bishop most noted for his refutation of the Gnostic heresies.

Article XCIX. The New King and His Kingdom: Melchisedec

We cannot trace the development of God's Kingdom and covenant without saying a word about that wonderful appearance in Old Testament history that is pictured to us in the Bible as a type of Christ Jesus, our High Priest, Melchisedec. He is a person that has been much the object of study and discussion in the Church, concerning whose appearance there have been many different interpretations, and that was always more or less mysterious, inexplicable to the people of God in general, especially, no doubt, because of the many mysterious things that are written of him in the epistle to the Hebrews. The question, however, that will concern us most is the one that has reference to his historical appearance. Who was Melchisedec? What do we know of him? And how must his appearance in the midst of an idolatrous country, settled by cursed Hamites, be explained?

Naturally, Melchisedec must be discussed before Abraham. True, he is mentioned only incidentally in Gen. 14 as he meets the patriarch on his return from the pursuit of Chedorlaomer. The call of Abraham is narrated first, and the incident of Melchisedec's meeting with the father of believers follows in the narration upon that call. Yet, there is no doubt that Melchisedec belongs historically to the period before Abraham. In Abraham we have the beginning of a new dispensation of God's covenant and Kingdom. His call ushers in the dispensation in which the holy line shall be limited to one people, and in which that people of God's covenant shall definitely appear as such, as God's Kingdom, as his party in the world, even in their outward

existence. In Melchisedec, however, we see one of the last representatives of the dispensation that commenced with the establishment of the covenant with Noah. And I may for clearness' sake as well state from the outset that we do not think that Melchisedec in his historical appearance can at all be explained from so-called common grace, as is often done. Melchisedec, so it is explained, is priest in the original sense of the world. God created man priest. And that priesthood with which man was originally endowed in paradise was, under the influence of common grace, so preserved, that a last beautiful remnant of it is found in Melchisedec. He is priest of the Most High by the common grace of God. We do not believe this. Our reason for this we shall state later. Only, for clearness' sake I wish to say at the outset that we deem this interpretation utterly impossible, that we look upon Melchisedec as a member of the covenant of grace as it was established with Noah and his seed, and that he was priest of the Most High through what we are wont to call "special grace."

Melchisedec is mentioned in Gen. 14:18–20; in Ps. 110 and in the epistle to Hebrews, especially in Chapter VII.

As to his appearance in connection with Abraham, we know the history. The kings of Sodom and Gomorrah, together with the kings of Admah, Zeboim and Belah, had rebelled against Chedorlaomer and proposed to maintain their rebellion in the battle of the vale of Siddim. In that battle, however, they were defeated by Chedorlaomer and his allied kings and definitely subdued. The victors departed from the battlefield with the spoil of Sodom and

Gomorrah, carrying with them many captives, among whom were also the family of Lot. Someone carries the sad news of this battle to Abraham, who lived in Mamre at the time. And immediately that patriarch with three hundred and eighteen trained men pursues the victorious kings. He overtakes them at Dan, surprises them by night, utterly routs their forces and even pursues them as far as Hobah. He returns victoriously, carrying with him the rescued captives and the spoil Chedorlaomer's alliance had taken from Sodom and Gomorrah. Upon his return the king of Sodom fetes the victorious patriarch and gratefully offers him all the spoil he had taken, only asking that the people be set at liberty. But Abraham refuses, explaining that he would not be made rich by the king of Sodom. But also a certain Melchisedec, who is described as king of Salem and priest of God Most High, meets Abram, to supply him with bread and wine for him and his men. He blesses Abraham, saying: "Blessed be Abram of God Most High, possessor of heaven and earth; and blessed be God Most High, who hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand." And lastly we read that Abram gave to Melchisedec a tenth of all, that is, undoubtedly, of the spoil he had taken.

In Ps. 110 we read simply that Christ is to be priest after the order of Melchisedec—"Jehovah hath sworn and will not repent: Thou art priest forever after the order of Melchisedec."

And the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews explains this priesthood of Christ after the order of Melchisedec more fully, especially in Chapter VII: "For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of God Most High, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him, to whom also Abraham divided a tenth part of all (being first by interpretation king of righteousness, and then also, king of Salem, which is king of peace; without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God), abideth a priest continually." Here again Melchisedec is mentioned as king of

Salem, as priest of God Most High. Again we are told that he blessed Abraham, and that the latter gave tithes to the former. Besides, we are told that he was a king of righteousness and a king of peace; that he is without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life; that he is made like unto the Son of God and abideth a priest continually.

Now, the question arises: what do we learn of this wonderful appearance as historical person? We understand that in Heb. 7 he is pictured in his typical significance, as a type of the priesthood of Christ Jesus. That he had no father and mother and was without genealogy must not be so interpreted that Melchisedec was no real human being. He certainly was, as is plain from the history of his meeting Abraham. And as real, historical human being, Melchisedec, of course, also had father and mother. When the author of Hebrews tells us that he had none of these, he refers to his appearance as priest in contradistinction from the Levitical priests. The priesthood of the latter depended exactly upon their genealogy. They had to be able to point to their father and mother, to their genealogy, to their descent from the tribe of Levi in order to prove their right to the priesthood. The right of Levitical priesthood was limited to that tribe. But Melchisedec as priest appears without these. His father and mother are not mentioned. He appears suddenly. His genealogy we know not. He had not need of pointing to these to prove that he had a right to be priest of the Most High God. Yet, he was priest in a very real sense of the word, and that not of some Canaanitish god, but of the true God Most High, the Sovereign of heaven and earth. And, therefore, we learn first of all that this Melchisedec was priest of God in the truest sense, that he served the true God, the same God who revealed him to Abraham and consecrated himself to Him alone. In the second place we learn that he was a righteous king and a king of peace. There is no reason not to accept that Melchisedec as historical person was actually a king that ruled in peace and justice. As priest of the true God Most High

he consecrated his kingdom and all things to the Most High he served. And, therefore, we find in the midst of idolatrous Canaan at the time of Abraham a person that is king-priest, who as such serves the true God, as is plainly acknowledged by Abraham, who receives his blessings and even acknowledges his priesthood by giving him tithes.

The question is: how must this unique appearance be explained? How can we at all account for the existence of such a man in the midst of heathen tribes at so late a period as after the calling of Abraham?

It is worth while to investigate this question.

—Grand Rapids, Mich.



REFORMED
— PAVILION —