

4. In our World does it look like evil or righteousness shall prevail - see vs. 4?
5. What is the purpose of the third seal - vs. 5?
6. Discuss the inter-relationship of war and scarcity as it is a present reality in our world.
7. How meaningful is our Christian Faith in times of crisis - vs. 8?
8. What were the reasons given for the saints being slain - vs. 9?
9. Discuss the problem of evil with respect to God's justice, righteousness, and power - vs. 10.
10. Why were the saints told to rest - vs. 11?
11. Discuss the inter-relationship of Matthew 24:1ff, and this section of The Revelation - vs. 12/
12. Who does "their wrath" refer to in vs. 17?

Special Study

The Gospel, The Gulf of Guilt, and
Resurgent Universalism!

Scripture: Luke 13:22-30

22. And he went on his way through cities and villages, teaching, and journeying on unto Jerusalem. 23. And one said unto him, Lord, are they few that are saved?

Text: Romans 3:26

I say of his righteousness at this present season that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.

On April 11, 1961, another trial began in the city of Jerusalem, Palestine, which, like another trial in that city 1,929 years ago, was concerned with Justice, Righteousness, Guilt, and Forgiveness. The Jewish Court today, as during the trial of Jesus, sought only justice. What *is* Justice?

Adolf Eichmann, chief of the Gestapo of Jewish Affairs, was responsible for the liquidation of six million Jews! There is no punishment fit for the crime; a crime primarily committed on a little farm in Eastern Poland - Auschwitz! He was set out for all to see, as was Jesus. The world waited for the day when

Eichmann would take the stand - what would he say? What could he say? When the bench gave him permission to take the stand, his first words were - *Ich bin unschuldig!* (I am *not* guilty). Eichmann's reply raised the fundamental problem of the gulf guilt, and how this gulf is to be bridged - if at all. Nothing less than the Christian Gospel is at stake!

The Church of Jesus Christ is on trial again! It has been summoned by mankind to justify its existence. How can the cause of Christ face up to the phenomenon of a dynamic, resurgent universalism? In fact universalism is advancing at such alarming rate that the Evangelical fortnightly, *Christianity Today* is sponsoring a call and challenge to Bible believing preachers all over the world to reply to the cancerous heresy by a higher level proclamation of the Word. Yes, indeed the Church is on trial as never before in her history; so also is the Christian view of the need of fallen men, and his inability to meet his own need. This Twentieth Century trial, as did a first century Jerusalem trial, exemplifies three crucial matters, from a biblical perspective. Something is radically wrong with man; (1) The Offense is Sin; (2) The Offender is Man; and (3) The Offended is God! How can reconciliation be brought about? How can the injured grant peace of forgiveness to the injurer? What makes forgiveness possible?

There is an insidious disease which has reached epidemic proportions and is paralyzing the spiritual and evangelistic life of the Church; its name is universalism. This strange forboding term and its implications for biblically oriented Christians must be diagnosed, and prognosis given - immediately - if a revitalized and commission-bearing church is to speak prophetically, and live redemptively before our generation - on behalf of God in Christ.

We can plan our spiritual counter-attack better after we have a more intelligent understanding of the high strategy of hell. The demoniac strategists of the realm of darkness are heralding to contemporary man - that all men are already saved. A most consoling message! The sole purpose for the community of the committed to fulfill is to announce that fact - far and wide. Universalism is that doctrine that declares a complete restoration of *all men* to a *redeemed* relationship with the living God (the theological term is *apokatastosis panton*). There are so many adherents of this doctrine today that as intelligent, concerned Christians we must be brought to the

realization that this position cuts the spiritual nerve center of the Christian faith, and the possibility of Evangelizing the world in fulfillment of Christ's final commission "Go into all the World."

Possibly, we can have a clearer vision of this position which is held by both theological giants, and many pew padders alike; the doctrine of universalism asserts that the gulf is bridged solely because the nature of God is love and holy love cannot indict sinful man with eternal condemnation. This position implies that God's wrath and judgment are solely corrective and restorative. This deceptive error is that punishment is curative or deterrent, and not as deserved!

Contemporary Universalism asserts three things; (1) The omnipotence of God necessitates the universal salvation of man; (2) The sovereign Lordship of God in Christ is meaningful only if this Lordship necessarily entails the redemption of all men; (3) The irresistibility of the Word of God necessarily means the redemption of all non-Christians, Satan, and his angels of darkness.

As early as Origen the doctrine of restorationism was being spread abroad. He hoped that all men would be redeemed; he also thought that Satan and fallen angels would be stored. Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen, and Theodore of Mopsusta also held that the purpose of punishment is to reform and not condemn. Augustine's repudiation of this doctrine sowed the process of its dissemination. During the 18th and 19th centuries revival brought this wretched heresy into sharper focus than before. This theological aberration gave birth to the philosophical mutation - transcendentalism. The pantheistic tendencies of the period spawned a new breed of preachers. These went far and wide repudiating future punishment or hell. Their words were soothing - as even the unpenitent, belligerent sceptic was informed that the holy God would not be thwarted even by their overt animosity to all things holy.

Those who maintain universalism today, do so but at the expense of the Bible as the Word of God. The new prophets of universalism have been called by a god who is not the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the father of Jesus Christ; and have been commissioned to proclaim a message not authorized by the holy Scripture. Every major contemporary theologian has been schooled in the doctrine of universalism, and has learned well his lessons.

Reinhold Niebuhr would have us believe that man is only in an existential predicament. Sin can be painlessly extracted from this predicament and then the patient can go back on the shores of eternal bliss. God is love; His nature precludes that the separation be eternal. Complete restoration is inevitable!

Another creative Athenian, Dr. Paul Tillich, provides fallen man with sanctified certainty that his redemption has been gained. This voice in the wilderness has compelled many to go out to hear him and have stayed to be anesthetized into spiritual insensibility by his new healing balm - universalism. His disciples have returned to the pew with a new zealous defiance toward any call to a closer walk with the master of men. Dr. Tillich's redeemer is a *tertium quid*, neither man nor God! I humbly suggest that Dr. Tillich's pointer symbol (Jesus is the symbol of Christ pointing men to God) will be powerless to grant forgiveness to the sinner and provide security to the day of the wrath of God. If the universal redemption of all men is to be accomplished, I doubt that this prophetic voice is spokesman for a saviour adequate for the task.

Another architect of contemporary theological thought is Dr. Karl Barth. He is a specialist in anesthetizing his theologically inclined auditors. His doctrine of grace which reveals its irresistible power in the triumph of election in Christ. All men are elected to eternal life in Christ, whether they are aware of it or not!

The great and the small among the fraternity of theologians maintain, with a concerted voice, that God's love necessarily results in the redemption of all men. This assertion must be challenged, if the church is to be rallied from her deadly sleep. The great physician must be beseeched immediately to empower His body again, if the impotence caused by this spiritual sleeping sickness is to be overcome. The spokesmen for the complete restoration of men are growing more numerous. There are many, both high and low, on the ecclesiastical ladder who maintain this fallacious doctrine. Dr. Nels F. S. Ferre declares in favor of universalism in these words as he defines *agape* (one of the N.T. words translated Love) "as indiscriminate kindness to all" (p. 57 - *Christ and The Christian* - Harper, 1958). He categorically asserts that salvation is universal in actual extent. (Ibid. pp. 246-247). He calls the doctrine of the second coming of Christ "the darkest of all umbrellas," because it makes sense of hell and eternal punishment and thus

repudiates his doctrine of God as *agape*. (See p. 33, *The Sun and The Umbrella*). Can the gulf of guilt be bridged in this manner? It will not do merely to assert that God has so bridged the gulf of guilt. Is it actually bridged in this manner? We turn now to consider the position of those who maintain the universal restorations of all men on the basis of the new unbiblical views of the nature of revelation, and the nature of God as *agape* (in the special sense of their new definition), and in our final point we will consider some of the biblical doctrines which are not in harmony with the complete restoration doctrine.

I. Contemporary Universalism in Grounded in a Non-biblical View of the Nature of Revelation

How does God reveal himself? Most contemporary theologians deny that revelation is propositional. By propositional revelation we mean that the words and sentences in the Bible are very revelation. Those who maintain the doctrine of universalism, at least in its modern dress, deny that the Bible is the Word of God. They set forth an anti-biblical view of revelation as they speak ambiguously about events as being the revelation, but since there are no infallible records (according to them), the information from the first century Christians (The New Testament) is of no greater value than the theological systems of Doctors Barth, Bultmann, Tillich, Niebuhr, or Ferré; in fact, they are of less - to many. If this thesis is true, then let us trace the steps historically which led to this new view of revelation and makes universalism so feasible within the framework of its theological presuppositions.

What are the major attitudes toward the nature of revelation found in contemporary thought, and in what ways do these effect the problem of universalism? In order to deal with these questions, let us retrace some of the more crucial steps in the development of the contemporary mind.

The New Testament clearly reveals an apostolic insistence on revealed truth. The Apostolic Fathers of the second and third centuries were preoccupied with proving the validity of the Christian religion against Jewish and pagan rejections of Jesus as Christ. The paramount issue revolves about the relation of reason to revelation. The traditional position (from Apostolic Fathers to the modern period) has been that reason and revelation constitute two distinct sources of knowledge or truth.

Contemporary insistences on a single source of knowledge react violently to this claim.

The Jewish Philosopher-Theologian, Martin Buber has provided many Christian theologians with a new view of religious knowledge. His view is clearly set forth in his small, popularly written work - *I-Thou*. He maintains that we come to know people in a different manner than we know things. This means that we never necessarily know God through scripture, or evidence of any kind. Commitment becomes totally an irrational leap. This position completely rejects the uniqueness of the Christian revelation. Salvation then becomes available to anyone open or responsive to the Thou (supposedly God). Salvation is no longer dependent on the work of Christ on the Cross and empty tomb. Revelation is no longer content or revealed information, but rather an encounter of man with God, not mediated through the language of scripture, or anything else.

The contemporary anti-biblical attitude toward revelation leads us to consider a correlary doctrine - the nature of God as *agape* (as defined in the new theology), and if this is His nature, then *no one* can thwart His redemptive love, therefore,

must be saved; therefore, man's acceptance or response to God has nothing to do with man's salvation. Yet, the personification of this redemptive love declared "Marvel not at this; for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment." (John 5:28-29; R.V., 1901). Negative Biblical criticism and the so-called assured scientific results play a role in the rejection of the Bible as the Word of God, but we will by-pass this particular problem and move to specific declarations of major theologians - concerning their repudiation of the Bible as the very Word of God.

Archbishop William Temple was a giant among the theological Philistines. He declares against the unique status of the Bible in these words—"What is offered to man's apprehension in any specific revelation is no truth concerning but the living God Himself." (See *Nature, Man, and God*, p. 322). This is a categorical rejection of the propositions of the Bible as very revelation. Emil Brunner said "the fate of the Bible is the fate of Christianity," but he is very hard on this object - which determines the fate of Christianity. The Bible of Brunner, Barth, Bultmann, and their disciples is a document capable of yielding

the doctrine of universalism; but we must not confuse their Bible with the one on which the church has kindled her evangelistic compassion for centuries. Much of the contemporary Church's zeal for the lost has been dissipated, because it has been served from the source of "the power of God unto salvation." This conclusion leads us to consider a second problem which arises out of the first - the nature of God as Love.

Advocates of "open membership" maintain, implicitly and explicitly, a view of revelation which stands in marked tension with the biblical data. When one maintains that we must not allow even baptism to be a stumbling block to a person seeking to become a member of the Church of Christ, he is maintaining an implicate view of the will of God. How do the advocates of "Open Membership" know that it is more Christian to accept the pious unimmersed as fellow Christians than to deny to them the aforementioned status. Though we cannot here consider the intricacies of the contemporary debate concerning the nature of revelation, theological language, etc., we can assert that those who maintain the view mentioned above, do so by implying a new gnostic source of religious knowledge. Those of us who deny the validity of open membership have a right to demand that they clearly articulate a defensible view of the nature of revelation and religious discourse. This has not been observed, at least by this present author. It follows logically that if universalism is a true doctrine, then a discussion of immersion versus no immersion is ultimately non-sensical.

II. Contemporary Universalism Also Entails a Non-Biblical View of the Nature of God which is Inseparable from the New Views of Revelation (Not Content but the Encounter of Persons)

What is God like? How can we know the nature of God? The contemporary universalists maintain that He is love, but what does this mean? If revelation is not content or information (re: Scriptures), how do they know that God is love in the sense that His love necessarily entails the salvation of every man? No biblically oriented Christian would deny that the love of God is *necessary* for our salvation, but would deny that it is the *sufficient* condition of our salvation. How do they know that all men will be saved? Where do the universalists obtain this information? We must take up the promethian task of challenging

all universalists with the query - how do you verify your assertion that the nature of God precludes that anyone can be lost, if you are cut loose from a rational view of revelation? If revelation is rational, i.e., propositions contained in the scripture, then we can assert that we know the nature of God is love, because the revelation provides this information, and at the same time gives us abundant evidence of the nature of the love of God. But is the biblical doctrine of love to be equated with the contemporary view of love as entailing the universal redemption of man? The Scripture speaks of both the love of God and the condemnation of the alien sinner. We would never find out from a critical study of the scripture texts that all men are saved, and that our sole responsibility is merely entailed in our telling them so. Quite the opposite is the case! One said to Jesus—"Lord, are they few that are saved?" Though we believe the Bible is unique revelation, we are not here concerned with the mere proof-texting of biblical animosity toward universalism. We will choose a book which contains an extensive doctrine of the love of God, I John; and we now turn to learn what he has to say about the nature of the love of God. We will examine John's theology of love to see if this section of scripture adheres to the contemporary theological definition of *agape*—that is, that God's love is of such a nature that no man - not even the unrepentant sinner, will be eternally condemned. If we find that the Biblical doctrine love is not in harmony with the redefinition of *agape* by the theologians, then we can only say that their new view of the love of God stems from their new view of revelation, and therefore, stands in the sharpest tension with both the biblical doctrine of revelation, and the love of God revealed therein. John develops the first epistle around three basic tests of life - *fellowship*, *love*, and *belief*. Though the entire epistle repudiates universalism, our immediate attention will be directed to the place of love in the life of redemption. John tells the universal church that - "He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is no occasion of stumbling in him." (I John 2:9 - 1901 R.V.). John declares that only the ones who continue to love (present tense verb) continues to abide (Present tense verb) in the light. This entire work was written to give criterion for distinguishing between the *redeemed* and the *unredeemed*! He again raises his voice against the universalist message as he states, "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not abideth in death."

(3:14, 1901 R.V.). The love of God obligates man to love; therefore, there is at least this condition, which must be fulfilled before the love of God is redemptive. In the great section on the test of love (John 4:7-12) we are confronted with the demands of holy love. God is defined as *agape* or love! This sounds like what the contemporary theologians are saying, but here God's redemptive love is conditioned. This becomes crystal clear in vs. 12—"if we love one another, God abideth in us. . .". The condition which must be met, before God promises to continually dwell in the believer is clearly pointed out in John's use of the conditional "if we love one another." "We love, because he first loved" (vs. 19). This great paragraph on the love of God shows three things—(1) That the love of God is not indiscriminately redemptive; (2) and that therefore the biblical doctrine of the love of God is not the doctrine of the love of God which the universalists teach; (3) the universalist's *agape* theology must be the result of a new view of revelation, because it does not stem from the biblical theology of the love of God. This great sketch of scripture clearly demarcates the relation of the love of God to the problem of Sin, truly a problem fit for God! The two questions which we asked at the beginning of this section—What is God Like? and How Can we Know the Nature of God?—receive mutually exclusive answers in the Bible and in the works of contemporary universalist theologians.

We now turn to a third consideration - some biblical doctrines which cannot be harmonized with the doctrine of the universal salvation.

III. There Are Many Biblical Doctrines Which Flatly Contradict the Doctrine of Universalism:

What do universalists reply to the biblical doctrines of the wrath and judgment of God? Marcian taught in the second century, that the Old Testament reveals solely a God of wrath and the New Testament solely a God of love. This assertion tells us more of the level of Marcian's biblical knowledge - than it does about the biblical teaching concerning the wrath of God. The *locus classicus* of the biblical doctrine of the wrath of God is Romans 1:19-32. Here all of mankind is brought under the wrath of God. We must here assert what is very clear in the text that we are here reading of the "objective" wrath and not a "subjective or emotive" wrath.

The desert herald, John the Baptizer, thundered out these words to unrepented Pharisees and Sadducees—"Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come" the same time no one can take seriously the biblical records, and reduce the wrath and judgment of God to a present reality, emptying these doctrines of any future or eschatological impart. All judgment is not condemnatory in nature, but the biblical authors take special care to distinguish this fact from condemnatory judgment which will befall all who are not found in Christ. Paul provides us with the message of divine mercy - "Therefore, there is no condemnation to those that are in Christ Jesus." (Romans 8:1).

The contemporary *agape* theologians have set aside the biblical doctrines of justice, righteousness, wrath, judgment as though they were not there or as though they are in irreconcilable tension with the biblical doctrine of the love of God. Why and how do they choose only a part of the biblical doctrine of the nature of God to the exclusion of other parts? The New Testament as does the Old, speaks of the justice, righteousness and love of God as though they are inseparable. Exegetically, universalism is untenable! How then can we account for the wide spread adherence to this doctrine by most top ranking theological eschalon? Contemporary theologians, controlled by alien philosophical and/or theological presuppositions, hold that these doctrines are contradictory.

Nicholas Berdyaev, the Russian Orthodox Existentialist, states that, "The justification of hell on the ground of justice. . . is particularly revolting and lacking in spiritual depth" (see p. 267 - *The Destiny of Man.*) Berdyaev is actually claiming that the biblical teaching that "God is love" is precluding justice. The very work which gives this definition of God - I John - militates against Berdyaev's interpretation of the significance of the doctrinal assertion that "God is love." John maintains that the nature of God as love obligates man - if he is to be among the redeemed. John is no universalist, but Dr. Berdyaev is! You will have to choose which one you follow!

This new non-biblical view of the nature of God is clearly revealed in the universalism of C. H. Dodd. The nature and purpose of the atoning work of Christ receives radical alteration at the hands of some master theological surgeons. The new understanding of the nature of Christ's atonement is a genetic aberration. Dr. Dodd was largely responsible for the change in

translation from *propitiation* to *expiation* in the Revised Standard Version, and New English Bible, etc. What is the theological difference between these two terms? *Expiation* involves an atonement for a thing; *propitiation* involves atonement to a person! The contemporary theological foundation for favoring *expiation* is most apparent in the so-called *agape* theology: that God is love, and cannot and does not demand atonement to himself in order that reconciliation of the sinner can be effected. This idea is not only foreign to the New Testament, but rather it stands in diametric opposition to the biblical doctrine of atonement. The use of *expiation* in Romans 3:25, etc., clearly reveals the contemporary attitude toward the nature of God; that God's nature precludes His demand for propitiatory sacrifice. We must never cease from declaring that though God's nature demanded propitiatory sacrifice; and that He was that sacrifice in the person of the Lamb of God! The biblical doctrine of the objective wrath of God, which leads to the condemnation of the person outside of Christ on the day of Judgment, has no place in a concept of atonement based on expiation. The apostolic declaration that new power became available to men in Christ is central for the biblical doctrine of *Kerygma*. What was the origin and extent of *newness* on the earth? What was the relation of *Kerygma*, and the source and power of *newness*? In the fulness of time God made available in Christ a *new power* to become sons of God. God made a *new covenant* with men and this covenant was inseparably related to the death of the testator - the Christ of the Cross and empty tomb. (Heb. 8 and 9). This *new covenant* brought into possible existence a *new life*. This new quality of life transcends mere existence. Paul pictures the new life of one who has died to sin in Romans 6:1-7. We are entombed with Christ by the instrument of baptism - in order that we rise to "walk in newness of life" (vs. 4). This beautiful section of scripture plainly reveals that this "newness of life" is conditioned; therefore, it is not indiscriminately available to all men as universalism asserts.

Newness of Life is made available to man through the preaching of the Cross. The paradox of *The Skandalon* (I Cor. 1:18-25) is that it is the power of God - only to those who are saved; it is a stumbling block to the Jews, who thought that there was some other way to be redeemed; it is foolishness to the Gentiles (nations or Greeks), because it was intellectually absurd that man's only possibility for salvation was made available

through a crucified savior on an ignominious cross. This new life was a separated life. Here the tension with universalism is sharply focused. This is no sacred-secular distinction; because of a re-interpretation of the kingdom and lordship of God based on a complete restoration of man to God. The newness of life is the quality of life available only to the *new man*. The Ephesian Epistle gives us a divine perspective from which to see the new man in Christ. The construction of the Church (chp. 2) was to destroy *unwanted walls* which divide the creation of God. "That he might create in himself of the two one new man. . .and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross" - (Eph. 2:15-16 R.V. 1901). In a burst of glory Paul discloses that the new man is not to walk as the Gentiles, and he admonishes us to "put on the new man, that after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth." (Eph. 4:24). His radical distinction between "the old man" and "the new man" clearly stands in opposition to the indistinguishable line between old and new man in universalism.

The *new man* makes up of the people of God. In universalism the whole earth is ushered into the kingdom indiscriminately, but the Scriptures speak of an "elect race, a royal nation, a people for God's own possession" - (I Peter 2:9). The three adjectives *elect*, *royal*, and *holy* cry out against a complete restorationism. Beginning in the ancient records of Israel we take note of the development of a special people of God. The development culminated in the construction of the Church of Jesus Christ - spiritual Israel (Romans, chp. 9-11). Christ himself demarcated two distinct groups of men - "the sheep and the goats." From the beginning to the end the Bible repudiates the doctrine that *all* men are children of God. The old liberal theologians spoke often about the "universal fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man," and so do their successors, the contemporary preachers of universalism. In apostolic preaching the saving power of Christ was extended to all here-ers as conditioned. But all who heard did not hear! The Paradox of seeing when they cannot see was illucidated by Isaiah (chp. 6) by Christ, (Mk. 4:10f), and by Paul (Acts 28:26-28). All three declared that their hearers were conditioned by their "cultural ears"! But we must never forget that only those who hear and believe the same shall be saved.

That the Lordship of God, revealed in Christ, was conditionally set forth is clear from the first occasion of apostolic

preaching. When Peter and the eleven finished holding high the magnificent master - men cried - "Men and brethren, what *must* we do?" (Acts 2:14ff - the word translated *must* is from the Greek *dei* which expresses all kinds of necessity). The reply came - not that the love of God was unconditioned, but rather that the seeking sinner must do something to lay hold on eternal life. Peter said "Repent"! (This is in the imperative, or command mode.) Christ. . .except ye repent! He continued and declared "and be baptized everyone of you." (This part of his reply is also in the imperative mode—"be baptized.") This was not a suggestion or a mere request, but a command! The results of obedience would be—"the remission of sins" and "the gift of the Holy Spirit." After every example of Apostolic preaching - men were challenged to *decide* for Christ. His saving power is available only to those who decided to stand without the gate and suffer with Christ. To decide for Christ means to cut through or away the possible alternative of denying His redemption.

There is no possible way to eliminate *orgē* from the Bible, even by the most radical critical surgery, - "only he who continues to the end - the same shall be saved." The contemporary *agape theologians* manipulate the biblical data to fit into their theological molds which were formed by existentialists and phenomenological views of man, and the human situation, not the biblical doctrine of love, son, man, forgiveness, etc.

The *raison d'être* of the church is to evangelize all men everywhere, and bring them to saving knowledge of Christ. In the March 1st, 1963 edition of *Christianity Today*, Dr. Ferré graciously but vainly attempted to reply to Dr. Kuhn's analysis of Dr. Ferré's view of universalism. Dr. Ferré quoted the Scriptures in his effort to show that universalism is clearly a biblical doctrine. Since this is not a self-evident claim, it would require extended critical discussion. (For a recent study of alleged Pauline universalism see Paul Munch, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. This is an excellent refutation of supposed Pauline Universalism).

Dr. Ferré's universalism is clearly delineated in his statement - "to attribute eternal hell to God is literal blasphemy, the attributing of the worst to the best. From such blasphemy may God deliver everyone." p. 24, *Christianity Today*, March 1, 1963. It must be apparent that what constitutes blasphemy and the nature of God, according to Jr. Ferré, has not been

vouch-safed in the Scripture, but if at all, through some other relevatory medium unknown to most of us. Contemporary universalism is merely voicing again the words of a Dostoevskian archangel who has reappeared in our midst, and bids all men give him ear. "I refuse my mission if the torture of an innocent child by the brute is to be the ransom of the world." Often, neither the thoughts of men nor archangels voice the word and will of God! The time of the tyranny of words is again upon us! The revelation of God declares against the indiscriminate redemption of man; and the voice of the theological oracles echo and re-echo that redemption of all men is a fact - go and declare it. The oracles of our age of naturalistic humanism are declaring that man is the absolute. Man is infatuated with himself and is seriously ill with self love, like Goethe's Werther.

Bertrand Russell said that the only thing that would save western civilization is Christian love; but he too wants Christian love without God's Christ. The gulf of guilt has been bridged, but only for those in Christ! The *Hound of Heaven* is seeking the lost, and it is His love that persists—while human hybris (pride) intensifies. Francis Thompson gives us thrilling insight into the nature of the love of God: a God who loves sinners, and judges the unrepentant, has announced in His Word that the unredeemed will be lost. Let us retrace the steps of *The Hound of Heaven* as we challenge every hearer to receive Christ as Lord of life and death, time and eternity. These steps are strewn with the tears of Christ who came to be our saviour, and who will, if necessary, come again to be our judge. "Not everyone who sayeth unto me Lord, Lord will enter into the Kingdom of God but he that doeth (present tense - keeps on doing) the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophecy by thy name and by thy name cast out demons, and by thy name do many mighty works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Matthew 7:21-23, R.V., 1901).