

# THE STANDARD *Bearer* A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME XIX

APRIL 15, 1943

NUMBER 14

## MEDITATION

### The Judgment Of The Church

*And as soon as it was day, the elders of the people and the chief priests and the scribes came together, and led him into their council, saying, Art thou the Christ? tell us. And he said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe: And if I also ask you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go. Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God. Then said they all, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am. And they said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard out of his own mouth? Luke 22:66-71.*

What think ye of the Christ?

And if *Jesus* is the Christ, what will ye do with him?

That was then, that is always the question, God's question to the world, that must be answered, and according to which the world is judged.

And also that part of the world that is called "church" must be confronted with this searching question, and must give its answer. In fact, that part of the "world" must appear before the bar of God's justice first of all. It must appear as a leading witness and defendant. It must play a leading role in the answer to this scrutinizing question that is embodied in the cross!

Always judgment must begin at the house of God!

Thus it had been foretold by the prophets of old. Indeed, the Lord would come! And He would come to His temple! But to that temple, that house of God, He would come as Judge! And "who may abide the

day of His coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's sope: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver." Mal. 3:1-3. Hence, it had been said of that day of the Messiah that "it shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." Mal. 4:1. Yet, the house of God would not perish in the fire of that judgment, for unto them that fear the name of Jehovah the Sun of righteousness would rise on that day, with healing in his wings. . . .

The judgment of the Church!

For the Church would be tried, judged, condemned!

And the vials of God's wrath would be poured out upon her in that hour of judgment!

And in and through the separating and refining process of that judgment the sin of the Church would be exposed in all its horror of iniquity, the chaff would be burned, the axe would strike at the root of every fruitless tree, but the wheat would be gathered into the garner. Thus John the Baptist had explained the meaning of His coming. Thus gray-headed Simeon had predicted as he held the child Jesus in his arms: "Behold, this child is set for a fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign that shall be spoken against. . . . that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed." Lu. 2:34, 35. And thus the Lord Himself, had not only definitely declared more than once, but also had plainly signified by driving out of the temple those that had turned it into a den of robbers. . . .

The judgment of the house of God!

The condemnation of the Church, yet her salvation!

For Man's church must be condemned and destroyed; God's Church in Christ must be purified and saved!

The true Church and the false; the Bride and the adulterous woman!

The one is called Jerusalem, the City of the living God, the daughter of Sion; the other is spiritual Sodom and Gomorrah!

And always the one rises from within the bosom of the other!

As one Church they appear in the world. Especially was this true in the old dispensation, when the law was superimposed upon the promise. O, indeed, also in the new dispensation it is true that all is not Israel that is of Israel, and that the carnal seed always springs up and develops and grows in power among the seed of the promise, but now the true Church may separate from the false, and preserve for herself the truth. In the days of the law, however, the Church was confined within the limits of one nation, bound by one law. It worshipped in one temple, was ministered unto by the same priesthood, reigned over by one king. And when the false church corrupted all these institutions, what could the righteous do? . . . .

Now is the judgment of this world! . . . .

For this false church is essentially "world."

Nor is there a more wicked, abominable, hypocritical, self-righteous, self-complacent, outwardly pious and inwardly corrupt, part of the world than this false, apostate church, this wicked, cruel, blood-thirsty adulteress!

It is that church that stones the prophets, and then builds their tombs! It is she that kills the righteous, and then garnishes their sepulchres!

Upon her head is all the blood of the saints! . . . .

And she, too, must answer the question: what will ye do with Jesus that is called Christ?

God's question!

---

Art thou the Christ?

Ah, the false church, as it was chiefly and competently represented at that time by the Jewish council, would rather have avoided the question!

Somewhat they apprehended that if they would be compelled to ask that question, they would by that very fact be summoned before the tribunal of God, to answer *His* question: what will ye do with Jesus, the Christ? . . . .

And so, they had tried to avoid the question!

On Wednesday of the last week of Jesus' earthly life, these leaders of the Jews had held an informal meeting to consult how they might kill Him. For the matter had become urgent, especially since the raising of Lazarus. And two items of their wicked program had then been definitely established: they would try to kill Him by subtlety, and not on the feast day! Thus they would avoid all official procedure and all publicity. And they would not be compelled to answer God's question: what will ye do with the Son of God? . . . .

But God's program differed radically from theirs, and it must be worked out.

Jesus must be officially tried. The Church must face God's question. And the trial and judgment of God must be conducted as publicly as possible, before all the world! The plans of the council were com-

pletely frustrated, especially by Jesus' dismissal of the traitor they had hired for the realization of their wicked schemes. And in that darkest of nights they come against the Lord with a band of soldiers, armed with swords and staves, bind Him, and lead Him away captive to try Him in their council.

What think ye of the Christ?

That is the question.

And well they are qualified to answer it for the whole church of Man of all ages! The Sanhedrin was the highest Jewish tribunal. It consisted of seventy-one members, the high priest always presiding. Even though its power had been considerably curtailed by the Romans, and though they had no longer authority to try cases that involved capital punishment, yet its actual power and influence was still great. And an able representation of the false church it was. The very ablest men of the nation had a seat in that court: elders and scribes, the high priest and the chief priests, men well versed in theological questions, and that knew the law. And they were acquainted with Jesus of Nazareth. Often they had sent delegations to watch Him. They had been witnesses of His teaching in synagogue and temple. Often they had seen His mighty works. . . .

What will ye do with Jesus the Christ? . . . .

That is the question.

And even now they desperately try to avoid it.

Bad enough it is that they must follow the way of judicial procedure. Bad enough that even this procedure already condemns them, and exposes them as instruments of the devil. For such was, indeed, the truth. Even apart from the chief question that must be answered, the entire trial only served to set forth in clearest light the innocence and righteousness of Jesus, and their own wickedness and evil designs! . . .

For their present sessions were illegal.

Four such sessions we may distinguish as having been held that night and in the early hours of the morning. There was a session in the apartments of Annas, the father-in-law of the highpriest, where a preliminary hearing was held, which led to nothing, but served the purpose to gain time for the convocation of the Sanhedrin in the hollow of the night. There was a second session in the apartments of Caiaphas, after the council had convened. It was in this meeting that a desperate but vain attempt was made to concoct an accusation against Jesus, and to find witnesses to sustain it. In the early morning a third meeting was held, in which the Saviour was officially placed under oath, and put before the question whether He were the Christ, the Son of the living God, and where He was condemned to death. And lastly, a fourth meeting was held in the absence of the Lord, to deliberate upon the question whether they should bring Him before the Roman governor for the confirmation of their death sentence.

But how all these meetings were to the condemnation of the judges!

The entire procedure was illegal, a work of darkness!

For, first of all, though they had no authority to try capital offenses, yet they had determined that the Lord should be put to death even before they had tried Him, and they actually pronounced the death sentence! Secondly, their sessions were begun at night, which they were not permitted to do, and which characterizes the whole trial as a work of darkness! Thirdly, they were evidently gathered in the palace of the high priest, while the council chamber was the only legal place for official transactions by the Sanhedrin. Fourthly, and what is much worse, they had no charge! They had captured the Saviour and led Him into their council, but when He stood before them, they knew of no accusation against Him! Fifthly, there were no witnesses, and they endeavor to find witnesses from their own body, not to sustain or corroborate a charge, for there was no accusation, but to invent one! . . . .

O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem! . . . .

Thou that killest the prophets! . . . .

What will ye do with Jesus the Christ?

Already it becomes plain what will be their answer to this most important question!

Gathered in the hollow of the night!

Condemning Jesus to death without authority! Capturing Him without a single charge against Him! Failing even in their most determined attempt to find a consistent testimony against Him!

O, cruel adulteress!

Already it becomes manifest what is in thy adulterous heart!

Yet, say it, openly, definitely:

What about the Son of God?

Art thou the Christ?

O, but the question may not be avoided!

God's question must be answered. In God's courtroom the Sanhedrin, and the whole false church must give an answer to His searching query: what will ye do with Jesus, the Christ, the Son of the living God?

Yes, yes, it is evident that they would rather avoid the issue. For they like to maintain their appearance of righteousness and piety. They are extremely, painstakingly religious, these leaders of the Jews, as the false church always is. They prize highly their reputation. They seek the honor of men. The Christ question must, therefore be avoided. Jesus must be exposed as a malefactor, and as such He must be condemned. Even after they have killed the Son of Man, they must be able to place an extra wreath of honor on the graves of the prophets. . . .

And so, they seek other evidence.

But God will not have it so: what will ye do with Jesus? . . . .

That is the question in God's court!

The high priest becomes irritated at the constant silence of Jesus: why does He not answer the charges brought against Him? And, finally, all their efforts to incriminate the Lord having failed completely, the high priest and the whole council realize that they must face the issue. The Christ question must be put! And by mouth of the president the council places the Anointed of God under oath to tell them before the face of God, whether He be the Christ the Son of the living God! . . . .

And the Lord breaks His silence: I am! And ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of God, and coming with the clouds of heaven!

Now again: what will ye do, if Jesus be the Christ? Kill Him!

The false church stands condemned by its own answer! For, indeed, they still attempt to maintain their pious appearance. They call Jesus' testimony blasphemy. They feign indignation. The high priest rends his high priestly robe. The council maltreat Him, buffet Him, smite Him, spit upon Him, blindfold and mock Him. But what of it? They have spoken the language of Antichrist, for they have denied that Jesus is the Christ! And why should not *Jesus* be the Christ? Did they not know? Had He not revealed the Father? Had He not done many wonderful works? Did not all the prophets testify of Him? Had not John the Baptist pointed Him out? Had He not received the witness of God? Why should not Jesus be the Christ? . . . .

They do not want Him to be!

A Christ after their own heart, one that will walk with them in darkness, and receive the honor of men, one that will not condemn their hypocritical piety, they seek!

But this Jesus they hate!

Crucify Him!

Now is the judgment! . . . .

Hour of wrath and utter desolation: God pours out the vials of His wrath over Sion!

But in that hour God's own Servant, His anointed High Priest, willingly turns to the place of execution, that He might bear away the sin of His beloved Church for ever!

For even though the false church is condemned, and must perish, Sion must be redeemed through justice. The Church of God may never perish! And when men nail the Christ to the accursed tree, and God makes that cross the place of execution, He is there, the High Priest, to change that cross into the altar of His perfect sacrifice. . . .

And in His resurrection the Church emerges from the fire of judgment, justified!

Sion is redeemed through judgment!

Glory to God! H. H.

## *The Standard Bearer*

Semi-Monthly, except Monthly in July and August

Published by

The Reformed Free Publishing Association  
1101 Hazen Street, S. E.

EDITOR — Rev. H. Hoeksema

Contributing editors—Revs. J. Blankespoor, A. Cammenga, P. De Boer, J. D. de Jong, H. De Wolf, L. Doezeema, M. Gritters, C. Hanko, B. Kok, G. Lubbers, G. M. Ophoff, A. Petter, M. Schipper, J. Vanden Breggen, H. Veldman, R. Veldman, W. Verhil, L. Vermeer, P. Vis, G. Vos, and Mr. S. De Vries.

Communications relative to contents should be addressed to REV. H. HOEKSEMA, 1139 Franklin St., S. E., Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Communications relative to subscription should be addressed to MR. R. SCHAAFSMA, 1101 Hazen St., S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich. All Announcements and Obituaries must be sent to the above address and will not be placed unless the regular fee of \$1.00 accompanies the notice.

Subscription \$2.50 per year

Entered as second class mail at Grand Rapids, Michigan

## EDITORIALS

### Reverend Verhil Called Home

That we were deeply shocked when on April 1 the news reached us that our God had suddenly called the Rev. Wm. Verhil away from his earthly field of labor and from the church militant, as well as from his dear ones, is merely to express what many more experienced with us when they heard of his sudden decease.

For sudden it was. According to reports we received the brother suffered a heart attack about eight o'clock in the morning, that caused him to lapse into unconsciousness. He never regained consciousness. And at about ten-thirty that same morning of April he left the earthly house of this tabernacle.

And we are not prepared for sudden news of this nature.

O, we realize in the abstract that such is the reality of our present life, which is nothing but a continual death. We know that every moment may be our last. Frequently we see our fellowmen fall about us as suddenly as standing corn under the scythe of the mower. But, nevertheless, we do not really live in the consciousness that there is but one step between us and death. And thus it happens, that news of the sudden death of one that was dear to us, lived close to us, had a large place in our life, finds us rather unprepared. We are shocked deeply, and it takes some time to realize that it has really happened.

Besides, brother Verhil was one of our small group of ministers, and the first one of them to be called home. What is more, he belongs to that group of our pioneers that was with us from the beginning and that went with us through the entire history that gave birth to our Protestant Reformed Churches, and always took a leading part in it according to his ability and position. And as to myself, brother Verhil was one of those men with whom I had more personal contact and fellowship, especially in the days of our struggle as churches, than with many others. And therefore, the reader must bear with me, if in this brief *in memoriam* a personal note of friendship creeps in and comes to the surface.

Not as if on this occasion I intend to extol the praise of man. I know that the deceased brother would be the very last to desire that his praises be sung in public. And I would like to write these few notes in his memory in such a way, that they might have his own approval if he could read them. And yet, they are not a matter of cold statistics to me, but the expression of my personal appreciation and friendship.

Long before the history of 1924 I became acquaint-

### CONTENTS

	Page
MEDITATION —	
THE JUDGMENT OF THE CROSS .....	313
Rev. H. Hoeksema.	
EDITORIALS —	
REV. VERHIL CALLED HOME .....	316
Rev. H. Hoeksema.	
EXPOSITION OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM .....	318
Rev. H. Hoeksema	
REJOICING IN THE LORD .....	322
Rev. H. Hoeksema.	
THE GAINSAVERS .....	323
THE ANTICIPATED INHERITANCE .....	327
Rev. G. M. Ophoff.	
WHAT IS THE POSITION OF THE C. L. A. ....	328
Joseph Gritter—Sec'y of the C. L. A.	
NIEUWS VAN ONZE KERKEN .....	331
S. De Vries	
UNWARRANTED CONCLUSIONS .....	333
Ben Veldkamp	
THE TIME OF CHRIST'S CRUCIFIXION .....	334
Rev. B. Kok	

ed with brother Verhil, in fact, before I became pastor of the Eastern Ave. Christian Reformed Church, when I was still in Holland, and he was a member of the Franklin St. Christian Reformed Church here in Grand Rapids. I learned to know him as a young man that had his religious education and doctrinal instruction in the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands, who was well founded in Reformed truth, loved it with his whole heart, and for that very reason, already at that time, assumed a rather critical attitude over against a good deal of the preaching and instruction of the Christian Reformed Church.

When I became pastor of Eastern Ave. he was one of my members, and I had the opportunity to become more intimately acquainted with him. And the more I learned to know him and understand his principles and his ways, the more I loved him as a friend. First of all, he was a real *man*. By this I mean that he was very "human" in every sense of the word. He loved life, and could enjoy it. And he was characterized by the very "human" weaknesses which I always find in myself, and for which I loved him all the more. He was a man of definite convictions and strong expression. He was of an upright character, a true friend. And above all, he was truly humble, deeply conscious of his sin, so much so that in the early days of our friendship he was inclined to doubt his part with Christ sometimes, and always ready to confess his sins before God and man.

When the controversy about the error of common grace started, there was never any doubt where the now departed brother stood. He did not halt between two opinions. Nor was there ever any doubt in my heart what he would do, if ever the Christian Reformed Church would condemn us and cast us out. And in this confidence he never disappointed us, for he always revealed himself as a staunch Protestant Reformed man, who was heart and soul devoted to the cause the Lord had called us to represent.

Long before he became minister, or studied for the ministry at our seminary, he always took an active part in everything that concerned the church and the kingdom of God. When the R.F.P.A. was organized, and *The Standard Bearer* was published, he was one of the leaders. A deep interest he showed in the entire controversy and ecclesiastical procedure that led to our deposition and our separate organization as Protestant Reformed Churches. No meeting of classis or synod where the matter was discussed, he would miss, if he could possibly attend. To me he was often a support and a source of comfort in those days.

I first talked to him about the possibility of his becoming minister in our churches, when we returned from Hull, Iowa, in the spring of 1925. I had been sent to speak and preach in Hull and Sioux County, and was authorized to organize congregations if possible. Hull, or rather, some people that belonged to

the Hull Christian Reformed Church had asked us to come and labor there. Our deceased brother accompanied me on that trip as a representative of the R.F.P.A. and in the interest of *The Standard Bearer*. Good days they were, even though they were days of strife and trouble. Often I spoke in the Town Hall of Hull on week days, both in the afternoon and in the evening. And always the auditorium was filled. And a congregation was organized there, after three weeks of strenuous work, numbering thirty seven families. Even though later much of the work was evilly destroyed, at that time the Lord comforted us, and encouraged us in our labors. And Verhil made propaganda for *The Standard Bearer*, and got subscribers. It was on the return trip home, in the Illinois Central we took in those days from Sheldon, that I broached the subject of his studying for the ministry. I thought I perceived many qualifications in the brother that would eminently fit him for that work, especially in our pioneer stage. And we had need of faithful men, that were willing to work and sacrifice themselves for the cause. At first, he differed strongly with me as to his calling and qualifications for the ministry, and I did not press the matter. But the Lord pressed the matter on his heart, and soon after he entered the seminary. He was a faithful worker, and willing to bear hardships for the cause, even then. Witness the cold winter he spent with his family in a miserable shanty of a home in Doon.

The rest of my story is soon told. He entered the ministry as pastor of Hull in 1927 as an emergency matter, and on condition that later he would complete his course at our seminary. We had need of ministers, yet the students were not yet ready to graduate. Hence, the emergency measure. When he had finished his course, according to agreement, he became minister of our church in Kalamazoo, from there he went to Oskaloosa, where he remained until the newly organized congregation of Edgerton called him.

Just a couple of weeks ago, he declined the call for home missionary that had been extended to him. One of the reasons he stated was that he did not feel free to leave his present charge, especially, too, with a view to the movement for a Protestant Reformed School that had been started in Edgerton. But the Lord thought differently, and extended a call which he could not decline, and which, I am sure, he would not have declined if he could.

Our readers know, how faithfully he sent in his contributions to *The Standard Bearer*, even though he never was in favor of the change introduced in our paper.

I consider the departure of the Rev. Wm. Verhil a decided loss for our churches.

True, he was not a man of great learning, or of profound theological thought. His education came too late, and was too limited for this. But he was a man



of staunch Reformed convictions, who was personally acquainted with the history of our churches, and who loved the Protestant Reformed truth. He was Reformed at heart. Moreover, the brother had his own peculiar talents, which none other had, or, at least, no one else possessed in that degree. He was able to apply the truth spiritually and concretely, and knew the spiritual needs of his flock. He had great practical ability, and could handle difficult situations very ably. And he knew how to give "push" to a right cause in the proper direction.

Personally, and as the editor of *The Standard Bearer* I wish to express my heartfelt sympathy with the bereaved, all of them, but especially with Mrs. Verhil and her daughter. May they abundantly experience that God's grace is near, and that it is always sufficient to comfort us and to strengthen us for the way we must go! All things work together for good to them that love God! Only a few weeks ago, the departed brother wrote me in connection with a certain adversity the Lord had sent to one of his elders: "But the Lord *always* does all things well!" That is true for us now!

It is true, too, for the congregation of Edgerton, to whom we also express our condolation. They lost a beloved pastor, a faithful worker in the Lord. May our God sustain them, and give them grace to continue the work!

And, finally, I extend my sympathy to all of our churches and people, and particularly to all those who, like myself, lost in the Rev. Verhil a true friend and faithful brother!

And, in the meantime, let us heed the call that comes to us even through the sudden death of our beloved brother: Work while it is day, ere the night cometh in which no man can work!

H. H.

#### IN MEMORIAM

The Consistory of the Protestant Reformed Church of Kalamazoo, gratefully acknowledging Rev. W. Verhil's labors in Kalamazoo from 1932 into 1935, wishes to extend to the bereaved family and to the congregation of Edgerton, Minnesota, their heartiest sympathy in the loss of

REV. WILLIAM VERHIL

whom the Lord took unto Himself so suddenly and abruptly the morning of April 1, 1943.

May our covenant God comfort the bereaved and bestow upon them the peace that transcends all human understanding.

The Consistory of the Protestant Reformed Church of Kalamazoo.

H. Veldman — Pres.

L. De Koekkoek — Clerk.

## The Triple Knowledge

### An Exposition Of The Heidelberg Catechism

#### PART TWO OF MAN'S REDEMPTION

##### LORD'S DAY VII

Q. 20. Are all men then, as they perished in Adam, saved by Christ?

A. No; only those who are ingrafted into him, and receive all his benefits by a true faith.

Q. 21. What is true faith?

A. True faith is not only a certain knowledge, whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in his word, but also an assured confidence, which the Holy Ghost works by the gospel, in my heart; that not only to others, but to me also, remission of sin, everlasting righteousness and salvation, are freely given by God, merely of grace, only for the sake of Christ's merits.

Q. 22. What is then necessary for a christian to believe?

A. All things promised us in the gospel, which the articles of our catholic undoubted christian faith briefly teach us.

Q. 23. What are these articles?

A. I. I believe in God the Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth:

II. And in Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, our Lord:

III. Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary:

IV. Suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead, and buried: He descended into hell:

V. The third day he rose again from the dead:

VI. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty:

VII. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead:

VIII. I believe in the Holy Ghost:

IX. I believe an holy Catholic church; the communion of saints:

X. The forgiveness of sins:

XI. The resurrection of the body.

XII. And the life everlasting. AMEN.

#### Chapter I.

#### Salvation For Believers Only.

In the chapters that now follow, through Lord's Day 24, the Heidelberg Catechism discusses the es-

sence and nature, the contents and significance of saving faith. And it approaches and introduces this discussion with the question: "Are all men then, as they perished in Adam, saved by Christ?" And we realize immediately that this peculiar approach of the subject is due to the subjective and experimental method followed throughout by our instructor. In a dogmatic exposition of the truth, the order and arrangement of the different parts of the truth discussed would be quite different. Such a discussion would begin with the knowledge of God, to answer the question what He is, Who He is, and what He does. It would continue with a treatise on creation, man, and the fall. It would then expound the truth concerning Christ, His person and nature, His offices and work of salvation, His power and glory. And having finished this part of the truth, it would call attention to the Holy Spirit and His work in applying Christ and all His benefits to the elect. And as part of the work of the Holy Spirit it would discuss the important subject of saving faith. But how different is the order in the Heidelberg Catechism! In the preceding Lord's Day mention was made of the Mediator, "Our Lord Jesus Christ: who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption." And the source of the knowledge of this Mediator was pointed out as "the holy gospel." And now, instead of developing the doctrine of this Mediator, our instructor turns to the question of faith. The result of this is that in the following chapters all the main doctrines of the Church, such as the trinity, creation and providence, the incarnation, the atonement, the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, the return of the Lord and judgment, the Holy Spirit and the Church, forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the dead, and everlasting life,—all these are considered and explained from the viewpoint of their being the object of the Christian's faith. And since the Catechism views the whole truth from the standpoint of the Christian comfort, and, therefore, of salvation, it introduces all this with the question: "Are all men then, as they perished in Adam, saved by Christ?"

This question is a very important one, and should be taken very seriously. We would do well, perhaps, to look closely at the question, and to assure ourselves that we understand it in all its implications before we attempt to answer it. Are all men saved? Even this part of the question, taken by itself, is of tremendous import. It is hardly to be treated as if it were a mathematical problem, the solution of which is interesting, indeed, but which, for the rest, does not cause us any grave concern. One cannot really do justice to a question of this kind by making it the subject of a round table discussion in a philosophical club. It is of very grave importance. It concerns men. It is interested in the reality of life and death, of everlasting bliss and desolation. Yes, but that is not

the most important element in the question. For it really concerns God. The question, what may become of all men, is, indeed, sufficiently serious, and becomes more serious according as one considers men in their concrete existence and relations in this world. But a far more important question is, nevertheless, that which concerns God and His dealings with the children of men. And it is, evidently, from this aspect that the Catechism considers the matter of the salvation of all men. Are all men saved? is an inquiry that concerns God as the Subject, man as the object of salvation. The question is not, whether somehow it happens that, fortunately, all men are saved, as it might be reported of the crew and passengers of a shipwrecked ocean steamer, some of which save their lives in lifeboats, others with life-preservers or on rafts, and all of which are ultimately picked up and rescued. Nor does the question: "Are all men saved?" mean to inquire into the success of a determined attempt to save all men. Nor does it mean: are all men willing to be saved? or: do all men have a chance of salvation? or: is salvation offered to all men? On the contrary, the question wholly concerns God. For salvation is of the Lord. And, therefore, as the Catechism puts the question, it must certainly mean: does God save all men?

And because this inquiry concerns God, we should be very careful that *we* do not answer, that we do not offer *our* answer to this question. Probably we would feel inclined to answer the question in the affirmative, either if we solve this problem rationally, or if we let our emotions determine the answer. As to the latter, we must remember that the question concerns, not abstract conceptions of men, but men in their concrete existence and relationships. The question concerns the child that is your flesh and blood, the wife of your love, the brother that grew up in the same home with you, the friend of your bosom, with whom you take sweet counsel, your fellowman that lives and struggles and dies in the same world with you, your own flesh and blood. If, then, you let your own flesh and blood determine the answer to this question, you will probably seek an affirmative reply. Did not Paul's flesh and blood declare once that he could wish to be accursed from Christ for his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh? By all means, then, take this question seriously, and if you must answer negatively, let it be "with great heaviness and continual sorrow" as long as you, too, are still in the flesh! But also a logical or rational solution of this problem would seem to point in the same direction: the salvation of all men. Especially is this true if we consider the entire question as proposed by the Catechism: "Are all men then, *as they perished in Adam*, saved by Christ?" All men perished *in Adam*! Is it not quite rational, then, to suppose that God will also save them all? Does not the fact that all men

perished in Adam imply that they are all one, one in a legal sense, and one in an organic sense? And, granted that all men also bear individual responsibility for their sin, does not the fact remain that the first beginning of their sin and death lies beyond their individual existence, and that they are born in guilt and damnation? If *we*, then, must give an answer to this question, would it not be most rational to conclude that God will certainly save the entire corporation and organism, and every individual of the human race?

And *men* have given and still do often give their own answer to this tremendous question. But even so they did not and do not agree. Very few are they who have the courage to give an affirmative answer without qualification to the question of the Catechism. Yet, from the earliest period of the history of the church there were those who taught that in the end all will be saved. Already such early church fathers as Clemens of Alexandria and Origin favored the universalistic view. And in our day all shades of universalists defend the same theory. They usually argue, not directly from Scripture, but from the fact that salvation is through Christ, and that there are a large number of men who, in this life never had an opportunity to come into contact with Him. The majority of men die without ever having heard of the Saviour. And so, there must be another opportunity to accept Christ, after death, or even after the final day of judgment. And in this way, according to some, all men will gradually obey the gospel and be saved; or, according to others, the majority will repent, while the stubbornly impenitent will be annihilated.

However, like all teachers of false doctrines, these universalists also appeal to Scripture, and have their texts to support their doctrine. They point to such passages as Matt. 10:15: "Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city." Matt. 11:20-24: "Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." Lu. 12:47,48, where the Lord makes a distinction between the servant that shall be beaten with many, and he that shall be beaten with few stripes. But it is evident that no universal salvation is taught in these

passages. They merely make a distinction of degree in the measure of punishment that is to be inflicted upon the wicked.

Besides, they appeal to John 15:22-24: "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin, but now they have no cloke for their sin. He that hateth me hateth my Father also. If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin, but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father." From these words the general conclusion is drawn, that one has no sin and, therefore, cannot be condemned unless he had come into contact with Christ first. But it is evident that this is not the meaning of the Saviour's words. For if such were the meaning, it had been better if the Saviour had never come into the world. And the Word of God teaches everywhere that sin and death have come upon all men through the first man Adam. The Saviour, therefore, means, not that the Jews would have had no sin at all, that they would have been righteous, if Christ had not come and spoken and showed His mighty works unto them, but that the special sin of hating Him and His Father would not have become manifest in them. For it is this manifestation of sin that renders them wholly worthy of rejection.

More difficult to explain, perhaps, is a passage like that in I Pet. 3:18-20: "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: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." The universalists use this text to prove that there is another opportunity after death to hear the gospel. Roman Catholics and Lutherans find proof here for a personal descension of Christ into hell, although they differ with respect to the purpose of this descension. Reformed interpreters usually explain that Jesus did not preach to the spirits in prison after His death, but at the time of Noah and through the Spirit of prophecy. It was then that God's Spirit strove with men, and that through the prophets the gospel was preached to the predeluvian ungodly. However, it seems to us: 1. That the text speaks of a preaching to the spirits in prison, not at the time before the flood, but after the resurrection of Christ. Jesus was put to death in the flesh, quickened by the Spirit, and then, in that Spirit He went and preached. 2. That He preached, not to men in the flesh, not to the disobedient when they were on earth, but to disembodied spirits, to the predeluvian wicked after they had gone into "prison." This is plainly stated: he "preached to the spirits in prison." And to this is added that they were "sometime dis-



obedient." This, of course, refers to the time when "the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah." But the point is that this refers to a period before the preaching took place of which the text speaks. 3. That the text does not speak of a personal descension of Christ into hell in order to preach to these spirits in prison. He went in the Spirit. 4. That the text gives no ground for the contention that the Lord preached *the gospel* to them. The word that is used here in the Greek is the mere formal term for preaching, without informing us as to the contents of the preaching. It means "to herald", loudly to proclaim. Hence, the text expresses no more than that Christ in the Spirit after His resurrection, proclaimed something to the spirits of predeluvian ungodly in prison. Now, if we consider that this predeluvian race of ungodly men had been extremely wicked, had, in fact, filled the measure of iniquity for that time, so that God executed final judgment in the destruction of the first world; and if we recall that the saints of that period had proclaimed to that wicked world that the Lord would come to execute judgment, and that, although they witnessed the judgment of God upon them in the flood, yet did not see the justification of the saints they had persecuted and killed; we can at least conjecture why the Lord should preach to these particular spirits of the predeluvian world, and what must have been His message. He, through whose death and resurrection the world was judged and the prince of this world had been cast out, through the Spirit convicted the spirits of the ungodly in prison of their own utter condemnation and defeat, and of the justification and victory of Himself and His people. For let us not forget that before Him, Whom God exalted at His right hand, "every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." And this is the result of this preaching of the exalted Lord through the Spirit, even in them that are in hell.

One more text to which universalists often appeal to sustain their view that there will be another opportunity to come to Christ and be saved after death, must be briefly considered here. I refer to I Pet. 4:6: "For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." Now, it may be said at once that this text, whatever may be the correct explanation of it, certainly does not speak of a preaching of the gospel after death, for the simple reason that the preaching here spoken of is presented as antecedent to the death of those to whom it was preached: the gospel *was* preached to them that *are* dead, or simply to the "dead" (nekrois). For this same reason, I cannot agree with the interpretation that explains the "dead" as referring to spiritual death. Rather do I think that the

apostle has in mind a special class of dead: those of the church that had died in martyrdom. This seems clearly expressed in the text, for they were those that had been "judged according to men in the flesh," but they had been justified, for they lived "according to God in the spirit." And this also is suggested by the context. To those martyrs the gospel had been preached exactly in order that they might suffer according to men, be condemned and killed by them; "*for this cause*," i.e. in order that the wicked world may be condemned in the day when they shall "give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead." vs. 5.

But it is not only those that are known as universalists, who answer the question: "Are all men saved?" affirmatively, at least with certain qualifications, and as far as God is concerned in the work of salvation. The Pelagians held that there are several degrees of salvation, and, accordingly, different ways to be saved. Man can be saved from condemnation if he obeys the "law of nature." The Israelite could be saved by keeping the law of Moses. And the believer is saved thru obedience to the faith, the "law of Christ." And the Arminian proposes that, as far as God is concerned, all men are saved. For in God's intention, Christ died for all men. It is true that some men are not saved, but this is not due to any limitation God places upon salvation, but to the will of man that rejects the well meaning offer of salvation in Christ Jesus. It is evident that it follows from this, not only that salvation as a work of God is universal, and that it is man that limits this universal work of God; but also that salvation must be extended to all those that never come into contact with the preaching of the gospel, such as all the little children that die before they come to years of discretion, and all the heathen to whom the gospel was never proclaimed. Surely, if it be true that God wills all men to be saved, it must follow that there be other ways of salvation than the one that is prepared through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord. It is evident that, underlying all these universalistic errors, are two main errors. The one is, that one can be damned only for the sin of rejecting Christ and the proffered salvation: original as well as actual sin in itself is not a sufficient ground for damnation. And the other is, that salvation depends for its realization upon the will of man, who can either accept or reject the salvation which, as far as God is concerned, is universal.

H. H.

---

E'er into being I was brought,  
My life in a' its perfect plan  
The eye did see, and in Thy thought  
Was ordered e'er my days began.

## Rejoicing In The Lord

(Conclusion)

But there is more. There is in the joy in the Lord of which the prophet speaks an element of perfect trust and childlike confidence. He that rejoices in the God of his salvation knows that He is good, and that His mercies endure forever. He is always good to us, and always gives unto us that which tends to our eternal salvation. Plainly this confidence that the Lord does all things, and that He does them well, is the basis of the confession of Habakkuk. God is God, and He is the Lord of all. He is the sole Governor of the entire universe, and the reins of government never slip out of His hand. I know that the Lord is almighty, and that He doeth whatsoever is His good pleasure. All power is His, even the power of the creature, yea, even the power of evil men, and of Satan and his hosts. There is in all the universe no power that is not His: the power in nature, of sun and moon and stars, of rain and sunshine, of cold and heat, of health and sickness, of life and death; the power of all the rational creation, of men and angels, good and evil; the power of mighty dictators and warring nations, — it is all His, and He directs it all to His own purpose. I will not, therefore, divide things dualistically into those that are sent to me by my heavenly Father, and those that come to me from some other source, but I know that all things, even also those things that are apparently evil, are sent to me by the Lord in whom I rejoice. I am confident, therefore, that He accomplishes all His good purpose. And I know, too, that all His work is characterized by perfect wisdom. He never fails. He never makes a mistake. I may be able to see only a very small part of the perfect work of God; and as I consider what God does from the viewpoint of my personal interest, things may often appear to go wrong; but I know, nevertheless that His work is perfect, and that in the end the glorious perfection of His work shall surely become manifest. But if I rejoice in the God of my salvation I know, too, that in and through all things the Lord almighty seeks and accomplishes my good, my eternal salvation. How shall He, that loved me, and that revealed His unfathomable love to me in the death of His Son, not freely give me all things with Him? And so, I am confident, that all things work together for good unto me. My joy is in the Lord! And whatever may be my way and my lot, my rejoicing shall still be in Him, and I shall give thanks unto His holy Name!

Yes, then we are able to give thanks in all circumstances of life. Joy in the Lord is an abiding joy. It is ever victorious. It transcends all things and is independent of them. Very evident this is in the words of the prophet. Notice, that in describing the circumstances under which he will rejoice in the Lord, he

speaks of two groups of apparently evil events. The first of these take place in nature and constitute complete crop failure. The fig tree does not blossom, there is no fruit in the vine, the olive labors in vain, and the fields yield no meat. Everything fails. There is utter want and destitution. And the second of these two groups of circumstances concerns the enemy, devastation caused by hostile men. For the flock is cut off from the fold, and there is no herd in the stalls. The enemy made an invasion and plundered the country, so that there is nothing left. Does this calamity affect the prophet's joy? Not at all. He knows that in last analysis it is the God of his salvation that doeth all these things. In Him, therefore, he shall still rejoice, even though all things fail!

And do not mistake the meaning of the prophet. He is not an abnormal person, a sort of a morbid soul, that hates prosperity and rejoices in calamities as such, and for their own sake. Nor do we. No Christian does. We do not rejoice in famine and want, in sickness and pain, in death and destruction such as are rampant in the war-mad world of the present time. We are not coldly indifferent, when our sons are called away from our homes to fight in the bloody battles of the world. On the contrary, these things fill us with fear and trouble, and they cause our hearts to bleed. It was so with the poet. We must remember that at the time when the prophet made this glorious declaration of his joy in the Lord, the calamities he mentions had not yet become real, but it had been revealed to him that they were impending. In a vision he saw the Lord come from Teman, the Holy One from mount Paran. He saw Him in the brightness of His glory as He came to send His judgments upon the land. And as he visualizes the reality of this impending judgment, and of the approaching catastrophe, what is his natural reaction? Does he rejoice in them? On the contrary, listen to his own words: "When I heard, my belly trembled; my lips quivered at the voice: rottenness entered in'o my bones, and I trembled in myself, that I might rest in the day of trouble." He was afraid. He was amazed and perplexed. So that it is evident, that when in the closing words of his song he expresses his joy in the Lord, and his faith that he will rejoice in the God of his salvation, even when the expected calamities shall come, it is not the morbid joy of one that delights in suffering as such which he expresses. Who of God's people would not far prefer prosperity to adversity, plenty to want, peace to war, if it so could be the will of the Lord?

Again, we must not explain the meaning of the prophet's words, as if he merely contrasts his joy in the Lord with the impending calamities, as if his joy in the God of his salvation is something apart from the approaching sufferings. He surely does not mean to say: when these calamities come, I shall still rejoice

in the Lord, because I know that He shall remove them, or that I shall escape them. No, but he is convinced that these very calamities are from the Lord, that they are sent by the God of his salvation. When the fig tree does not blossom, is it not the hand of the Lord that prevents it from blossoming? When there is no fruit in the vine, who causes the vine to be barren? When the enemy invades the land and cuts off the flock from the fold, who sends the enemy? Is it not the same Lord that is the God of our salvation? And thus it is with all things, not only with the products of the soil, but also with all the affairs of men, social and economical, national and international. It is so with the present war. Back of all the confusion and madness of the present time, back of all the apparent power of mighty dictators and their battling hosts, back of all the destruction and devastation caused by the powers of this world; yea, working through it all and infallibly controlling it unto His purpose, is the Lord, the God of our salvation, Who doeth all things well. His invisible hand is at the controls. We cannot see the wisdom of His work. His ways are past finding out. His judgments are unsearchable. How all these things fit into perfection of His work, we cannot now discern. But we know it. We understand it by faith. He assures us of it in His Word. And, therefore, we may even now, though it be with bleeding hearts, and with trembling lips, rejoice in the God of our salvation, and with all God's people, over the whole earth and in whatever circumstances they may be at present, raise our voice in praise and thanksgiving, knowing that the Lord is good, and His mercy endureth forever!

Let us, then, also this year of our Lord 1942 give thanks unto the Lord, though it be with fear and trembling. Let us beware, lest, when He accomplishes His good pleasure, and causes His kingdom to come, we murmur and rebel against Him, because we must participate in the sufferings of this present time. If we pray as we should, "Hallowed be thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," let us beware lest we grumble in dissatisfaction, when He glorifies Himself, and reveals His power, and causes His kingdom to come, and executes His holy will, in the way of judgments. The prophet beheld the judgments of the Lord in the calamities of which he speaks. The Lord came from Teman and from Paran to judge. And always He comes from Paran to judge the world. And when He judges, war and famine, earthquake and pestilence, calamities of every kind accompany Him. The hand of the Lord is heavy upon the world today. But we know that all these things must come to pass, and that in the way of these judgments He will finally usher in the everlasting kingdom of righteousness and peace, in Christ Jesus our Lord. Does the present world conflict presage that it is the very eve of His coming? I know not.

No one knows. The signs of the times are not given for us to be able to calculate the day and the hour. But one thing is certain, according to His Word He is coming in exactly such ways as those in which He is now leading the whole world. If then, the Lord is coming from Paran, and if in the present distress and confusion we may see the brightness of the glory of His coming for judgment, shall we, as silly children, grumble because we cannot have our usual abundance and sweetmeats, and go to the throne of grace to ask Him to change His ways, and give us peace and prosperity again? God forbid! Rather shall the Church proclaim to the world that the Lord reigneth, and that He doeth all these things. And rather shall we take the confession of the prophet Habakkuk on our own lips, and say: "Though peace and prosperity never return, though all the world go mad, and everything should completely fail, yet will I rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation. I will give thanks in the remembrance of His holiness!"

H. H.

---

## The Gainsayers

(Conclusion)

As was said, it is important to consider that the literary contest of the church fathers with unbelief was carried on with: 1) the non-Christian Gentile world; 2) the non-Christian Jews; and 3) the heretics in the church. In this article attention is directed to the contest of the church with heresy. It was especially in this conflict that the substance of Christian truth was developed and its logical apprehension unfolded. For the assaults of heresy upon the truth, compelled the church to ponder its own articles of faith and oppose them, as fortified by the Scriptures, to the vain imaginings of the heretics. During the progress of this conflict, the church was led into the truth by Christ's Spirit and empowered to exhibit the truth, clearly, logically, and with precision, in its symbols—the great creeds of Christendom.

Nearly all the fathers assailed the heresies of their day, the chief of which was gnosticism in its many forms. The weapons employed were the Scriptures and logic. The stand was that any system of thought, inwardly incoherent and anti-rational, must needs be a lie. The stand is correct. It always has been the stand of the church. The leading aim of the fathers was, of course, to establish the Christian truth on the firm basis of the Scriptures and to develop the truth.

One of the most revealing and precious remains of this type of early Christian literature is the work of Irenaeus *Against Heresies*. Little has come down

to us of the personal history of this father. He was probably born in Syria, and removed, when still a lad, to Smyrna, or some neighboring city in Asia Minor. He himself tells us that in boyhood he was acquainted with Polycarp, the great and noble bishop of that city. He was thus born somewhere between A.D. 120 and A.D. 140. Certain it is that he was bishop of Lyons, in France, during the latter quarter of the second century. Though zealous for the truth, his zeal was tempered with the proper moderation. Victor, bishop of Rome, was enforcing uniformity throughout the church as to the observance of the pascal solemnities. Irenaeus warned him, in a letter, that, if he persisted in his harsh measures, the Catholic Church would be rent in pieces. The bishop allowed himself to be advised; and the controversy was waged less heatedly, until finally settled by the council of Nicea.

In his work *Against Heresies* Irenaeus, on the one hand, disproves and overthrows those multiform Gnostic heresies of the latter half of the second century; and, on the other hand, expounds and defends the Christian, i.e., Catholic faith. The work is divided into five books. The first of these sets forth and minutely describes the tenets of the numerous heretical sects. The description is interspersed with brief comments on their absurdity. In his second book, the author returns to those heresies and demolishes them through lengthy arguments, grounded principally on reason. The three remaining books exhibit the true doctrines of the Scriptures, as being utterly antagonistic to the views of the gnostic teachers. Following the author in that portion of his work, which is devoted to the exposition of Gnostic speculations, one stands amazed at the absurd theories of these heretics. It is doubtful whether anything more nonsensical than these could be imagined by rational beings. But the reader is also impressed by the deep piety, abhorrence of the lie, and love of the truth of our author.

He commences his treatise in this language: "Inasmuch as certain men have set the truth aside, and bring in lying words and vain genealogies, which, as the apostle says, 'minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith,' and by means of their craftily-constructed plausibilities draw away the minds of the inexperienced and take them captive, I have felt constrained, my dear friend, to compose the following treatise in order to expose and counteract their machinations. These men falsify the oracles of God, and prove themselves evil interpreters of the good word of revelation. They also overthrow the faith of many, by drawing them away, under a pretense of superior knowledge, from Him who founded and adorned the universe; as if, forsooth, they had something more excellent and sublime to reveal to them, than that God, Who created heaven and earth, and all things that are therein.

"Error, indeed, is never set forth in its naked deformity, lest, being thus exposed, it should at once be detected. But it is certainly decked out in an attractive dress, so as, by its outward form, to make it appear to the inexperienced (ridiculous as the expression may seem more true than the truth itself.

"I have deemed it my duty (after reading some of the *commentaries*, as they call them, of the disciples of Valentinus, and after making myself acquainted with their tenets through personal intercourse with some of them) to unfold to thee, my friend, these portentous and profound mysteries. . . . I do this, in order that thou mayest in turn explain them to all those with whom thou art connected, and exhort them to avoid such an abyss of madness and of blasphemy against Christ."

That Gnosticism with its blasphemous irrationalities should have attracted so many adherents and proved itself a religious system to be exposed and not ignored shows to what depth of foolishness and moral corruption the human mind under heathenism had sunken, even when it professed knowledge and wisdom. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:22). The task to which Irenaeus (and with him the fathers in general) addressed himself was twofold: (1) to show that the contrast of Gnosticism and Christianity was that of darkness and light, Christ and Belial, the temple of an idol and the temple of God, so that no one would henceforth confound the two; and (2) to so discredit the system that it could not survive. Irenaeus also achieved this objective. By the light of Heaven that flowed from him, and the other polemical writers, the fogs of gnosticism, that had risen from the abyss to obscure the truth, were dispelled and banished.

Irenaeus was a product of the Eastern church; but his field of labor was the West. He is the most sound representative of Christian doctrine of these first three centuries. As his polemic was directed against Gnosticism, he expounds and vindicates the doctrines of the oneness of God, the creation of the world, the incarnation of the Son of God, His true humanity and true divinity. Against the antinomianism of heresy, he proves the oneness of the Old and New Testaments. He closes his work with treatises on the resurrection of the body, the antichrist, the end of the world, the intermediate state, and the millennium.

Another church father who came out against the contemporary heresies is Tertullian, whose full name was Quintus Septimius Florans Tertullianus. He is rated as the greatest of the ancient church writers of the West with the exception of Augustine, as a man of great originality and genius, characterized by deep pathos, the liveliest fancy, and the most penetrating keenness.

Born a heathen, he became a Christian in mature manhood, although this is not certain. He was a

native of the province of Africa (the present Tunisia) and the city of Carthage. He was the son of a pro-consular centurian. His birth is assigned to A.D. 145 and he is said to have reached a very advanced age. He was a presbyter in the church and married. In his second epistle to his wife, he pays a glowing tribute to the Christian marriage state. "What kind of yoke," he wrote, "is that of two believers, partakers of one hope, one desire? Both are brethren, both fellow servants, no difference of spirit or of flesh; nay, they are truly "two in one flesh." Where the flesh is one, one is the spirit too. Together they pray, together prostrate themselves, together perform their fasts; mutually teaching, mutually exhorting, mutually sustaining. Equally are they both found in the church of God; equally at the banquet of God; equally in straits, in persecution, in refreshments. Neither hides ought from the other; neither shuns the other; neither is troublesome to the other. The sick is visited, the indigent relieved, with freedom. Alms are given without danger of ensuing torments; sacrifice attended without scupple; daily diligence discharged without impediment: . . . Between the two echo psalms and hymns; and they mutually challenge each other which shall better chant to the Lord. Such things when Christ sees and hears, He joys. To these He sends His own peace. Where two are, there is He Himself. Where He is, there the evil one is not."

Tertullian received an excellent education in Latin and in Greek and was able to speak and write both. He was familiar with the old historians, had at his command the writings of the Greek philosophers, was accurately acquainted with Roman law, which he also practiced at Rome before his conversion. As a jurist he enjoyed the reputation of being one of the most eminent. After his conversion he gave himself with all his colossal energy to the study of the Scriptures and of Christian literature, whose content he mastered. For what he did, he did with his whole being. Once a Christian, he was so with his whole soul. He was a foe of all half measures and compromises with the world. For the culture of the world he had only contempt. He scorned the Grecian philosophers as the fathers of all heresies. "These are", wrote he, "the doctrines of men and of demons (to wit, the heresies), produced for itching ears of the spirit of this world's wisdom: this the Lord called *foolishness* and chose the foolish things of the world to confound even philosophy itself. For philosophy it is which is the material of the world's wisdom, the rash interpreter of the nature and the dispensation of God. Indeed heresies themselves are instigated by philosophy" (*On Prescription Against Heresies*).

Tertullian was a man of strong passion and vehement temper. With his opponents, whoever they were, heathen, Jews, heretics, Catholics, he had little patience. In this respect he was like Luther. In the

language of one historian: "With the adroitness of a special pleader he entangled them in self-contradictions, pursued them into every nook and corner, overwhelmed them with arguments and sarcasms, drove them before him with unmerciful lashings, and almost always made them ridiculous and contemptible." It is a wonder that he was not killed by the heathen. In attacking the formidable heretic Marcion, he literally exhausted his vocabulary of abuse. He sets out with describing Pontus, the native province of Marcion, as a land unfit for human habitation on account of its physical and climatic abnormalities, and the people who dwelt there as an inhuman race of men, and then goes on to say: "Nothing in Pontus is so barbarous and sad as the fact that Marcion was born there, fouler than any scythian, more roving than the Samatian, more inhuman than the Massagate, more audacious than an Amazon, darker than the cloud of the Euxine, colder than its winter, more brittle than its ice, more deceitful than the Ister, more craggy than the Caucasus. Nay, more, the Almighty God is mingled by Marcion's blasphemies. Marcion is more savage than even the beasts of that barbarous region. For what Beaver was ever a greater emasculator than he who has abolished the nuptial bond? What Pontias mouse had such gnawing powers as he who has gnawed the gospel to pieces."

This retort, however violent, is deserved. Marcion's doctrines did truly "gnaw the gospels in pieces," assailing the sacred Scriptures by distortions and corruptions of the text itself, and forming the most daring blasphemies against Him who is proclaimed God by the law and the prophets and against Christ.

Tertullian had a tendency to run into extremes, better said, heretical notions. As he advanced in years, this tendency took on strength and drove him, when he was about fifty years old, into leaving the Catholic church and joining himself to the sect of the Montanists. To what degree this lapse of his was lamentable is a matter for debate. Montanism, in its doctrines, agreed in all the essential points with the Catholic church. It held firmly to the traditional rule of faith. But it was characterized by a fanatical zeal in church discipline, by a belief in the continuance of the charismatic gifts of the apostolic church and the free working of the spirit and by opposition to the fixed order of ecclesiastical organization. It also looked for Christ's speedy return to earth to reign during the millennium. What attracted Tertullian to this sect was its contempt of the world, its asceticism, and moral sternness. Tertullian the Montanist severely criticized the Catholics, whom he called *psychics*. In the ethical writings, which he put forth during the period of his lapse, he decries their growing worldliness and lax discipline. But, as a censure of morals, he was disqualified by the Montanist in him. "I should wonder at the Psychics," so reads the first



few lines of his treatise *on Fasting*, "if they were enthralled to voluptuousness alone, which leads them into repeated marriages, if they were not likewise bursting with gluttony, which leads them to hate fasts." In this treatise he justified the extremes of the Montanist fast, and thereby forged it into a weapon for a cruel attack upon the brethren. In his second epistle to his wife, he pays beautiful tribute to the Christian marriage state, blessed by the church and an object of joy to Christ. But in his treatise *on Monogamy*, written during the period of his lapse, he fanatically would make out that second marriage is but refined adultery.

After having done battle with heathen, Jews, Marcionites, Gnostics, Monarchians and Catholics—his whole life was spent in an atmosphere of strife—he died an old man. In appraising this remarkable man and his works, we must distinguish between Tertullian the Catholic and Tertullian the Montanist. As to the heart of his dispositions, he remained all his life Tertullian the Catholic and as such an ardent advocate and powerful defender of the Catholic faith. And to this faith he rendered invaluable services. From him sprang full grown, Latin Christian literature. He introduced the modes of thought and supplied the terms that made the Latin tongue capable of expressing the mind of the church in the great Trinitarian and Christological controversies of subsequent centuries. He was the first to suppose a distinction in God Himself. In his polemic "Against Praxeas" he anticipates the Nicene doctrine of the blessed Trinity. "As if," says he, "in this way also One were not all and that All are of One, by unity (that is) of substance; while the mystery of the Dispensation is still guarded, which distributes the Unity into a Trinity, placing in their order the three Persons—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: three, however, not in condition, but in degree; not in substance, but in form; not in power, but in aspect (specie); yet of one substance, and of one condition (statu), and of one power, inasmuch as He in One God, from whom these degrees and forms and aspects are reckoned, under the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Tertullian glorified the Scriptures as the sole rule of faith. His quotations are numerous and their uses penetrating. His ethical writings are characterized by a lively conception of sin; he thus opened the way for the doctrine of man, as afterwards developed by Augustine. Finally, in tracking down and defeating the gnostic Marcion, the most dangerous among the heretics, he performed a work of inestimable worth for the Christian faith. But his theology is marred by defectively speculative opinions.

Of not one of the fathers of this period can it be said that they did not mix truth with error. This can be explained. The church had just crossed the

threshold of the New Testament Dispensation. The study of the Scriptures, the mastication and digestion of its contents, had barely begun. Then, too, most of the fathers of the second century were soldiers of Christ, recruited not, as the apostles, from the Old Testament church, and not, as the Reformers, from the Roman Catholic church, but from heathendom. Though filled with courage and enthusiasm for the new faith, they did not wholly succeed in freeing themselves from the influence of paganism, in cleansing their soul from its vain wisdom and habits of thought. (For that matter, theologians in general to this very day haven't succeeded in this.) This is especially true of the Greek fathers of this period, in particular of Origen and the school which he represented. His striving seems to have been to unite in one grand and massive thought-structure the wisdom of man on the one hand, and the wisdom of God, on the other.

The fathers of those first three centuries gave to the church no systematic theology. Yet, in the mass of Christian literature, which they jointly produced in their contact with unbelief, and, in particular, with heresy, is found the embryo of all the later dogmas: God and creation; Man and the fall; Christ, His incarnation, essential divinity, and true humanity; the Holy Trinity; the Holy Spirit, His personality etc.

In their struggle with heresy, the efforts of the fathers were concerned, principally, with establishing the doctrines of the rule of faith, especially the Holy Trinity, the incarnation of God and the true divinity and the true humanity of Christ. In this effort, the church was led unerringly by the Spirit and the word in the way of right thinking, between the threatening cliffs. But the representations of these doctrines are, in this period, characterized by no little obscurity and indefiniteness. Expressions occur which were studiously avoided in aftertimes. Thus Tertullian calls the Father the whole substance and the Son a derivation and portion of the whole. Many clear testimonies can be adduced to prove that he taught the eternity of the Logos. But he also teaches that the Son of God was made and was called the Word at the time He went out from God the Father with the voice, "Let there be light" (From his treatise *Against Praxeas*).

The excellencies of the fathers of the first three centuries varies especially with respect to the stand they took against pagan philosophy. It was wholeheartedly repudiated by the Latin fathers, while the Greek fathers viewed it as to an extent a gift of God and a schoolmaster for Christ, like the law in the sphere of religion.

As was said, the number of Polemical works, treatises against heresies, of these fathers that have come down to us is not large. Besides those already referred to, there are but a few more to be mentioned. Most of them were put out in refutation of the multi-

form gnostic heresies, the primary principles of which have been stated in a previous article; some of them in refutation of antitrinitarian heretics, known as monarchians or Unitarians, and who taught that God is one in person as well as in being. If the controversies with the gnostic heresies occupied the whole second century, the controversy with the Unitarians filled the whole third.

G. M. O.

## The Anticipated Inheritance

### THE COMMAND TO DRIVE OUT THE CANAANITES — Num. 33:50-56

“And the Lord spake unto Moses in the plains of Moab by Jordan near Jericho, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them: when ye are passed over Jordan into the land of Canaan: then ye shall drive out all the inhabitants of the land before you. . . .”

The command is repeated in somewhat different language at Deut. 7: 2: “And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them (the Canaanites) before thee: thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; . . . .”

This, then, was the task awaiting the people of Israel encamped in the plains of Moab: to smite, utterly destroy, drive out the Canaanites. The history of the conquest of the land of Canaan has given great offence to the opponents of Christianity, to primitive heathen and Jews, and to English Deists and German rationalists. The Manichaeans classified it among “the many cruel things which Moses did and commanded,” and which went to prove, according to their view, that the God of the Old Testament could not be the God of the New. Eichhorn, among others, in his *introduction*, p. 403 (in Keil’s *Commentary on Joshua*) uses strong words, exclaiming in moral indignation: “How impious is the narrative of the Book of Joshua! It makes God not only give way to the Israelites, against all right, the land of Canaan, which the Canaanites as the first occupants most justly held, but also sketch out a horrid plan for its conquest, and directly order the most dreadful bloodshed and the total extinction of the Canaanites. Who can reconcile this with even a partially correct view of the God-head?”

Fairbairn cautions against meeting the objections of the infidel by wrong methods of defence, such as attempting to soften down the rugged features of the Scripture narrative, by affirming the execution of judgment upon the Canaanites was only designed to take effect in case of their refusing to surrender, and their obstinate adherence to idolatry; but that in every case peace was to be offered to them on the ground of

their acknowledging the God of Israel, and submitting to the sway of their conquerors.”

This caution certainly should be heeded. To soften down the Word of God is to mutilate the text of the Scriptures. The word of God must be proclaimed but not distorted to render it acceptable to unbelieving man.

To say that Joshua had to come to the Canaanites with overtures of peace and that the ban that rested upon these tribes would have been lifted and their lives spared had they made him answer of peace, is not only to soften the rugged features of the narrative but to set aside God’s Word. Deut. 20:10 seq. reads: “When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be, that all the people that is found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee. And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it: and when the Lord thy God shall deliver it into thy hands, thou shalt smite every man thereof with the edge of the sword. . . .” Thus shalt thou do with all the cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the cities of these nations, but of the cities of these people, which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: But thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee: . . . .”

A distinction is here made between the peoples “which are very far off, those dwelling outside the promised land and the tribes infesting Canaan. Not the former, but the latter only were under the ban of God. To the former the armies of Israel had to *proclaim peace*, which, if rejected, returned to its proclaimers, and the city was destroyed. This points to the instructions given by Christ to the church of the New Dispensation: “And into whatsoever city or town you shall enter, enquire who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go thence. And when ye come into a house, salute it. And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city” (Matt. 10:11 seq.)

But to the Canaanites Joshua might not proclaim peace. They were cursed, reprobated, and therefore doomed to destruction. And therefore also they resisted to the end. So we read at Joshua II:18 seq. “And Joshua made war a long time with all those kings. There was not a city that made peace with the children of Israel, save the Hivites the inhabitants

of Gibeon: all other they took in battle. For it was of the Lord to harden their hearts, that they should come against Israel in battle, that he might destroy them utterly, and that they might have no favor, but that he might destroy them, as the Lord commanded Moses."

But before they could be destroyed, they had to become wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly in order that he might be justified. And this they were. Their abominations were of a kind that might be said emphatically to cry to heaven—such idolatrous rites as tended to defile their very consciences, and the habitual practice of pollutions which were a disgrace to humanity. The land is represented as no longer able to bear the mass of defilements which overspread it, as even vomiting out its inhabitants." And they knew the judgments of God, that "they which commit such things are worthy of death."

Had they truly repented, they would have had favor. The righteous, certainly, are not destroyed. And the penitent are righteous men. True, peace might not be proclaimed to them. For God was not for them but against them. Yet, certainly, the judgment *could not take* effect, had they surrendered, put away their idols and turned to the Lord. The above quotation from Joshua is an indirect statement to this effect. God, assuredly gives favor unto all whom he redeems and saves from their sins. As to the Canaanites, He was determined to destroy them and that they should have no favor. Therefore, instead of moving them to repent, He hardened them, and in agreement herewith commanded Joshua to proclaim them no peace. This is different than saying that they would have been destroyed, though they had turned to the Lord. Certainly had they repented and turned to the Lord they would have been saved. For the penitent are the elect, the righteous. Their god does not destroy. But they were reprobated and therefore received no grace to repent, but instead were hardened in preparation of their final doom. Being reprobated Joshua was forbidden to proclaim peace to them. G. M. O.

---

#### IN MEMORIAM

Whereas it pleased Him Who is the Head of His Church, to take from us our Pastor and Minister of the Word,

REV. WILLIAM VERHIL

we wish hereby to express our gratitude to God for the grace we might receive and enjoy through his ministry. And although we sorrow in our bereavement as a congregation, we may believe that he has entered into the rest to enjoy the reward of the faithful. May God comfort us all in these days of sorrow.

The Consistory of the Prot. Ref. Church  
of Edgerton, Minn.

J. Dokter, Vice Pres.  
Wm. Huiskens, Sec'y.

## What Is The Position Of The C. L. A.

Editor of the Standard Bearer

Dear Mr. Editor,

Through the courtesy of several C. L. A. members I am being kept informed concerning the discussions on the C. L. A. and the strike question carried on in your paper. I have followed it with great interest. Not wishing to make misuse of a privilege granted me once before I have refrained from seeking placement of comment, especially since I noticed that there are others who are well able to defend our position.

However, in the issue of March 15 there appears an article by C. H. that can hardly be left unchallenged. It constitutes an attack upon the organization of which the writer is secretary. Therefore I once more ask that I be extended the privilege of having an article published in your paper.

It will be very difficult to meet the many erroneous presentations of C. H. in one brief article. The brother quotes definitions on the strike which are not those of the C. L. A. One really gets a bit tired of repeating time upon time that the C. L. A. wants no part of the strike such as used by unchristian organizations. It is a bit unfair, it seems to me, to continue to try to charge our organization with activities in which it does not believe, after having repeatedly made that clear. I'll return to that subject later.

Brother C. H. presents a rather strange mixture of ideas concerning property rights, of employers, and the rights and duties of employees. Frankly I was rather amazed to read what a student of the Bible has to say about property rights, among which are included, of course, the means of production. Is it really true that the employer enjoys such absolute ownership that he can do with his property whatever he desires, and that he can arbitrarily determine what use he will make of it, or whether to allow it to rot if he so chooses? No old-time capitalist could have put it any stronger than brother C. H. did in his article. It is that idea about property rights of employers and their control of means of production which caused thousands of people to turn their backs to the Church when it, more or less by consent, took that position. And it is that position which led to the charge by Marx and others that religion, by which they understood Christianity, is an opiate administered by Capital to keep workers docile.

That, of course, in itself would mean nothing if the position were the Biblical one. But that we deny. The Scriptures teach something else about possession of property and the use of it. First of all, God owns everything. Whatever people have has been loaned to them, as it were. They are only the stewards of it.

And they may not use it arbitrarily, according to their own desires. God wants all of it to be used in His service. That is a basic principle. The practical implications of it are not always the same, at least not in degree. The man who has very few possessions has less responsibility than the one who has many. The man who has control, who exercises stewardship, over a factory or other means of production, has responsibilities which a mere homeowner hasn't got. The means of production must also be used in the service of God. In fulfillment of the second table of the Law he must give full consideration to the rights and needs of his employees and to his responsibilities toward his neighbors, the public. Much more could be written on that, but it is sufficient to prove that the contentions of brother C. H. are very unbalanced to say the least.

The same is true also in regard to what he has written about the employee. It is not clear to me just what position he wants to take. In one place he states that the worker before he accepts a position has the right to demand just wages and working conditions, and that any contract which he signs must be a free, voluntary and unbiased agreement. I agree. But, isn't it true that the worker, without organization, can hardly secure such an agreement? Isn't he usually at the mercy of the employer? Yes, indeed. Hence organization is a necessity in present-day industry. Brother C. H. undoubtedly sees that also. And in his presentation of the worker bargaining with an employer he regards him as a free agent. The relationship, in which the worker agrees to do certain things, perform labor, for a certain price. Yet, a little further in his article brother C. H. states that only the employer, the owner of the means of production, has the right to determine the wages he intends to pay, and the employee is called a servant. Those things just simply do not jibe. Neither does the simile hold which the brother has drawn between an employee in a factory and a guest in one's home. The difference is so obvious that it needs no explanation on my part at all.

Brother C. H. must hold to the idea that the worker is a free agent, not a servant or slave as in the days of the Apostles. Through the influence of Christianity and God's providential care the position of the worker has been greatly improved. Consciously or not, the world today in the labor relationships has more regard for the value of the human being as an imagebearer of God than it had centuries ago. I trust that brother C. H. appreciates that too.

I fully realize that the brother may answer me by saying that the worker has the right to bargain when he takes a position, but that after that he has no right to make any further demands. I agree, of course, that a contract must be kept. The C. L. A. insists on that too. But, contracts are subject to change. What is a sufficient wage today may be entirely inadequate

six months hence. For that reason most written agreements are for short periods, of not more than a year, and usually contain a clause that will make them subject to revision within the contract period in case of necessity. Individuals who have no written agreement are generally in a bad position. First of all, they have very little opportunity to bargain for an adequate wage, unless there is a real labor shortage. Only too often the worker has to take a job with no more of an agreement than to be paid what he is worth and the employer determines that. Now suppose that the employer does not pay him what he is worth, or that after working for a year at a certain rate living conditions change to the extent that his wages are inadequate? And, let us suppose further—these things are very common—that the employer refuses to pay more altho he can well afford to do it. What must the employee do? Brother C. H. says: he can quit. Just like that. Very simple, isn't it? Yes, but now suppose that there is a real unemployment problem already existent, something with which all of us are well acquainted, and that giving up his job means loss of income, suffering on the part of his family? Brother C. H. has no other answer than to say that he can still quit. Yes, oh, yes, but that doesn't solve the problem! And others may say that he must remain on the job and bear the cross which the Lord places upon him. But is such a condition a cross placed upon him by God? I say NO. Crossbearing comes as a result of witnessing for the Lord. Such crossbearing all Christians are subject to, rich and poor, and woe to him who has no cross to bear! But, such conditions as we are discussing are not placed upon the Christian because of witnessing for his Lord! He shares such a condition with unbelievers. It is simply injustice that is in the world because of sin that he is an object of. Such injustice he may and must oppose.

Let us continue our hypothetical presentation. Suppose that the individuals form an organization, or already have one, and the organization goes to the employer and demands a living, adequate wage. If an individual may demand that surely an organization has the same right! But the employer refuses, obstinately, to listen. Surely brother C. H. will not dare to say that that is the employer's right, and that he only has the right to determine what he is going to pay? Such an employer has definite obligations toward his employees, has no right to withhold from them the wages that are their just due. But he does. What then are the workers going to do? Meditate and arbitrate, yes, but what if that all fails? Quit, says brother C. H. By quitting we would understand that they definitely refuse to continue in employee relationship. They will thereby give up whatever claim they have on their job. They have, definitely. After a man has given his labor and mental ability

in the work he has done, has helped to build the employer's business, has been a faithful employee, he has a moral claim on his job. He can relinquish that, throw away the experience and proficiency he has gained in his work, simply quit with no strings attached, and plunge into unemployment. That according to brother C. H., is his right; that would be the only thing that he may do.

There we do not agree at all. The C. L. A. believes that also a christian may do more than that. We agree that before a christian, individually, or through an organization may ever refuse to continue working under certain conditions everything possible must have been done to secure justice in another way. But, after all that has failed the christian too may finally refuse to continue to work under unjust conditions. Whether he does that individually or in concert with others makes no difference in principle at all. He may, as an individual, or in conjunction with others, all other means having failed, finally go to the employer and state that unless the fair demands that have been made are met he will refuse to continue to work, and will not return until the employer is willing to meet them. He expresses willingness to return when the fair demands are granted. And when the employer persists in his refusal he and his fellow-workers leave the place of employment in a peaceful manner.

Brother C. H. calls that an act of open rebellion. Against what, or against whom? Against the God-given authority of the employer, says brother C. H. But, what authority is that? What authority has God given the employer. It is not the civil authority of government. Is the employer authorized by God to use the power of his economic and financial position to impose injustices upon his employees? Of course not. But brother C. H.'s position very definitely warrants such a conclusion. The trouble is that such absolute sovereignty in his domain as he ascribes to the employer is not Scriptural. I also recognize that the employer has a certain amount of authority, such as determining what he will manufacture, and where he will place his employees to best advantage; but he may never discriminate, or deny them the exercise of their rights, or withhold just wages from them. When he does that he is not exercising authority but making misuse of his power. And when workers refuse to continue to work under such conditions they are not rebelling against authority: they are resisting oppression. Such action cannot be called "conspiracy in open rebellion against the God-given authority of the employer" for God never gave such authority to employers.

If such workers during the time that they are not working commit acts of violence, use force to keep others from entering the shop, or engage in other unlawful practices, they do rebel against au-

thority. Not against that of the employer but against the God-instituted civil authorities which forbid such things. The C. L. A. condemns that just as strongly as brother C. H. How often have we said that already? Why then bring that up again? Let me repeat once more also that the C. L. A. would never justify "extortion" or the use of an opportune time to force unjustifiable concessions from an employer. Absolutely not. Only in a just cause, judged by Christian standards and principles, after every reasonable effort to persuade the employer to grant the just demand had failed, would the C. L. A. finally consent to a cessation of work. We deny that that would be an act of violence. The C. L. A. is definitely opposed to every act of violence. This is what it has stated in Article 4 of its revised Constitution: "The use of violence against persons or property, the unlawful seizure of property, the employment of labor spies, intimidation, discrimination, and the use of any other unchristian methods for either advancing or discouraging organization, must be condemned? That principle applies to all other organization activity as well.

While the C. L. A. does not consider the acceptance of the principle of the right of christians to cease working, individually or in concert with others, as a dead issue, since principles never die, it does regard discussion of the use of the weapon, as brother C. H. and others conceive of it, as beside the point. The C. L. A. is just as strongly opposed to such use of the strike weapon as they are. Please remember that. And, it is true that the C. L. A. does not expect ever to make use of a cessation of work to gain its just demands. There are today many government agencies such as the U. S. Labor Conciliation service, State Labor Mediation Boards, The National Labor Relations Board and the War Labor Board, to which organizations can appeal for mediation and arbitration. The last named body even has power to give very definite orders. That is emergency power, of course, which may be taken away again when the war is over. But, the fact remains that there are now so many agencies to give labor organizations and employers assistance in solving their differences that the use of the strike weapon is really not necessary. Those agencies will remain, and others may be added. For those reasons the C. L. A. believes that it is very unlikely that it would ever have to go to the last resort of a work stoppage to gain justice. But, because it believes that it surely does not have to deny the principle of the right of the worker to refuse to continue working under unjust conditions?

I must end this article. It is already too long. I hope that it may have contributed to clarification of our position. Thank you, Mr. Editor, for granting me this privilege.

Joseph Gritter,  
Secretary C. L. A.



## Nieuws Van Onze Kerken

Een tweetal maanden vlogen weer voorbij sinds er een artikel van mijn pen verscheen in de kolommen van ons Vaandelblad. In dien tijd mochten we ook iets hooren van onze zusterkerken in het Westen; en we mochten vernemen dat het kerkelijke leven nog haar gewone gang gaat. Er was nu niets bijzonders te vermelden, dat nu eigenlijk in het bijzonder de aandacht trok. Nu dat is ook 't mooiste en 't gezondste, ook van onze kerken in het midden der kerken-wereld, waarin we een naam en plaats in Gods Voorzienigheid hebben ontvangen. Wanneer de prediking des Woords zuiver bediend, de sacramenten heilig worden gehouden, en de tucht wordt gehandhaafd; dan zorgt God door Zijn Geest er wel voor, dat er telkens weer worden toegevoegd tot de gemeente, die zalig wordt. De wijn-gaard moet telkens weer worden besnoeid, zal ze vrucht dragen.

De Kerk in het midden der wereld heeft een zware strijd te strijden. Ze moet een zuiver geluid geven, want ze moet niet gelijk zijn aan een luidende schel of een klinkend metaal. Er moet meer dan ooit te voren kracht van haar uitgaan in deze donkere, bange dagen. Het staat er anders niet zoo best bij met de kerk, zooals ze zich zichtbaar vertoont in het midden der wereld; en ook in het Christelijke Amerika zit de mensch nog op de troon, en men kan het klaarblijkelijk buiten God wel doen. Ook hier in Grand Rapids en omstreken is nu juist niet zooveel bijzonders van onze kerken te vermelden. Het blad, ons "Church News" wees er onlangs nog op: Nu de Regeering onze jongelingen van 18 en 19 jaar ook oproept voor 's Lands dienst, er eigenlijk geen gemeente is die hiervan verschoond blijft. Er wordt dan ook telkens op gewezen, dat de jongens, die nog met ons mogen in en uitgaan hunne kerkelijke plichten nu meer dan ooit trouw hebben te vervullen. Er moet bij ons een nauwgezet leven zijn, en niet een hinken op twee gedachten. Als men des Zondags zoo in de kerk rond ziet, dan is het opvallend zichtbaar dat er zooveel ledige plaatsen zijn die anders bezet waren. Dit wordt natuurlijk langzamerhand meer zichtbaar, te meer nog nu ook de Regeering getrouwde mannen oproept in de dienst des lands. De bloem der gemeente, het krachtige, en de toekomst der kerk wordt meer en meer gemist ook in onze kerkelijke bijeenkomsten.

Het is dan ook maar goed dat we mogen gelooven dat deze dingen moeten medewerken ten goede voor degenen die God vreezen. Dit is ook een troost voor de ouders, die hunne kinderen moeten afstaan. God in Zijn wijsheid heeft ook hiermee Zijn wijze bedoe-ling. Dit is ook een hart onder de riem voor meisjes die hunne jongens zagen heen gaan, en voor vrouwen, die hunne mannen moeten afstaan. Het heeft ook deze uitwerking bij een waar Christen; een meer nauwgezet

leven en een dieper en inniger gebedsleven, en een meer los worden van de wereld met hare ijdelheden.

De Fuller Ave. gemeente moest tot zoover 110 jongelingen afstaan en ook uit onze gemeente moeten getrouwde mannen zich gereed maken om te strijden voor 't Vaderland. Wij als oudere personen moeten het dan ook wel verstaan dat we in deze dagen een gansch eenige plaats hebben in te nemen in het midden der gemeente.

Onze "Ladies Aid" gaat ook nog moedig voorwaarts op haar ingeslagen pad in betrekking tot de boys. Elk lid wordt verzocht om zoo nu en dan eens een briefje te schrijven. Dit wordt gewaardeerd door de jongens, en 't is ook een goeie leerschool voor de "Aid", en zeer leerzaam voor de vrouwen. Men dient er, dunkt me, ook zorg voor te dragen hoe, en wat men schrijft. Onze jonge mannen hebben meer noodig dan eenige vage lijnen. Het sentimenteele moet niet op de voorgrond, maar vooral het verstandige in het moet goed uitkomen.

Het behoeft zeker niet worden gezegd, dat de boys door de gemeente niet worden vergeten; ook niet in de gemeentelijke bijeenkomsten. Ze worden elken Zondag opgedragen aan Gods genadetroon. Dit is van veel beteekenis, en zal zeker vrucht dragen. Een goed gebed wordt dan ook altijd verhoord.

Het is ook nog altijd een goede gewoonte onder ons dat de gemeente als een geheel een laatst vaarwel hun toeroept; een psalmversje hun biddend toezingt, en een tastbaar bewijs van liefde wordt gegeven in het uitreiken van een mooie Bijbel. Dit wordt door de boys zeer gewaardeerd en op prijs gesteld, zoo we van sommigen hunner mochten vernemen uit hun schrijven.

Er zijn soms ook jongens die, zoo het schijnt tenminste, niet op prijs stellen wat de gemeente voor hen doet en uitsprekt in dit laatste vaarwel-woord. Wanneer dan dien avond aanbreekt, is men maar liever afwezig. Nu mij dunkt, dit is op het zachtst gesproken zeer ondankbaar. Moeder de kerk heeft ze geestelijk gebaard. Ze hebben altijd gedeeld in de voorrechten en bijzondere weldaden en liefdebewijzen van moeder; en wie duidt het haar euvel, dat ze haar kinderen nog eenmaal gedenkt in dezen laatsten afscheidsgroet? 't Zal een blijde herinnering zijn in toekomstige dagen voor moeder en voor haar kroost.

Het is mooi dat ook onze Standard Bearer, voor zoover dit tenminste mogelijk is wordt gezonden aan de boys in het leger en op de vloot; en ik spreek de wensch uit dat velen er gebruik van mogen maken, opdat ook dit blad voor hen mag zijn een baken in de zee en een wegwijzer die leidt tot Gods Woord, hetwelk alleen is een richtsnoer van ons leven.

Zooals we vernamen uit "Beacon Lights", dan wordt ook dit blad verzonden aan de boys. Ze ontvangen het in 28 States en ook in de gedeelten der wereld waar de oorlog woedt. Dit blad wijst er tus-schen beiden eventjes op, dat we niet verwachten of

willen dat onze jongens helden worden naar de maatstaf der wereld, en ze niet worden vervuld met haat in hun ziel tegenover de vijand; want Gods Woord leert ons om onze vijanden lief te hebben, opdat we navolgers mogen zijn van Jezus, die werd gescholden en niet weder scholdt; ook navolgens van God die Zijn zon laat schijnen over boozen en goeden. We moeten echter ook kunnen haten met een haat die zijn oorsprong niet heeft in een zondig menschenhart, maar gespeend is aan haat, en gegrond is in de liefde Gods.

Als kerken moeten we ook staan op dat rots-vast fundament, hetwelk de stormen der eeuwen verduurt. Dan zullen we ook als een Protestansch Gereformeerd volk Gode welgevallig zijn in het midden der wereld; en we doen niet mee aan alles dat afglijdt van 't

rechte spoor en weg voert van God en Zijn getuigenissen. Als dan houden we voet bij stuk ook in ons kerkelijk leven. Ook onze Standard Bearer gaat ons niet voor in de onderwijzing die afvoert van de rechte weg en henen leidt naar zij-en bijwegen, waarop een Christen zich niet mag begeven en waarop hij niet wil gaan. Ge leest dan ook niet de raadgeving zooals ik die onlangs las in een ander blad. Dit blad meende de lezers te onderwijzen en op 't rechte pad te houden, en kwam met de stelling, dat waneer iemand zijn geloof wil beproeven hij eigen stad en gemeente maar moest verlaten, om te gaan wonen in een plaats zonder kerk en 100 procent C. I. O. lidmaatschap. Bij een ander schrijver, in dit zelfde blad, luidt het dat de C. I. O. niet zoo bijzonder goddeloos is. Er is nog wel veel goeds van te zeggen. De loonen werden door middel van deze Union verhoogd; en dit komt de kerk toch ook te hulp. Men kan dan toch ook meer opbrengen voor Gods Koninkrijk. En dan vergelijkt deze man, (en

naam is Ds.) een stad als Chicago die uitsluitend het merkteken draagt van de C. I. O. en A. F. L. met een stad als Grand Rapids alwaar dit niet zoo het geval is. En dan komt de Ds. tot de conclusie dat de menschen hier toch ook niet vromer zijn. Hij denkt dat de kerk-menschen hier in Grand Rapids meer de 'movies' bezoeken, en dat er hier procentsgewijze meer ouders zijn die hun kinderen tegen houden van de Christelijke school. Met dit geredeneer wil men dan zeggen, dat de wereld nog niet zoo slecht is, en dat de kerk niet meevalt; en op de basis van een algemeene genade is dit zeker ook wel te verklaren. De Schrift maakt hier echter geen melding van. Deze komt altijd weer met de vermaning, komt uit van haar mijn volk en heb aan hare werken geen deel.

Het is dan ook m.i. goed dat onze kerken nog altijd het beginsel zijn toegedaan; dat een lid der kerk geen lid van een wereldsche Union kan zijn. Mij dunkt dit geldt ook van sommige Associations en Shop Unions; alhoewel men m.i. ook hier voorzichtig moet zijn. Vergun me om eventjes uit eigen ervaring te spreken. Ik was ook voor een poosje lid van een shop union, of van een onder onsje zooals men dit dan

noemt. De regelen van deze union zijn goed. Men kan de lijnen niet rechter trekken. De union tracht alle misverstand uit de weg te ruimen. "Strikes en sit-down strikes", daarvan gruw men. De C. I. O. en A. F. L. vindt geen verdediger in dit systeem, en er wordt altijd op gewerkt en voor gestemd om ze er buiten te houden. Deze "factorie" mag zich er op beroemen dat er in de laatste 40 jaar geen oneenigheden zijn geweest tusschen werk-gever en werk-nemer. De Union voorkomt dit altijd weer. Ik weet het, het gaat altijd om eigen voordeel, maar wie werkt nu ook niet voor eigen profijt! De fout echter in deze Union is deze: drie of vier maal per jaar geeft de Compagnie het recht om een "hall" te huren en mogen de leden zich gezamenlijk vermaken, en het gaat er meestal beestachtig te keer. Er wordt gedanst en gedronken en veel zonde gepleegd. Ge begrijpt dat een Christen hieraan niet mee mag doen. Hij of zij die zich aansluit bij een Association of Union van welken aard dan ook is aan sprakelijk voor al hetgeen er geschiedt, en laat niemand u verleiden met de schoone woorden: waneer we maar protesteeren dan is alles goed en we kunnen nog een zoutend zout zijn. Wat verrot is kan niet smakelijk worden gemaakt. Een ieder is ook verstandig genoeg om iets te zeggen. Het is dunkt me duidelijk genoeg dat het Gods goedkeuring niet kan weg dragen.

Er gaan soms ook stemmen onder ons op of het niet goed zou zijn om als kerken ook een "Chaplain" te benoemen die dienst kan doen in 't leger of op de vloot. Mij dunkt dit was wel mooi, en kon onder den zegen Gods rijke vruchten afwerpen. Nu niet in de eerste plaats voor eigen jongens, want men bereikt er niet veel. Er zijn echter duizenden anderen die men kan bereiken in prediking en onderlige gesprekken. 't Is natuurlijk een andere vraag of er wel een man in ons midden is die voor dit werk kan worden gevonden.

De Fuller Ave. gemeente probeerde het nu drie maal om een Missionary te beroepen en telkens komt het bericht: Na biddend overdenking ben ik genoodzaakt dit beroep niet aan te nemen. Daarom ben ik van gevoelens, dat er niet een van onze Ds. is die de roeping gevoelt om op leger of vloot werkzaam te zijn. Het is dunkt mij ook wel in te zien, dat nu daar onze roeping juist niet ligt. Deze ligt m.i. dichter bij huis.

Ds. Hoeksema verrichte een goed werk in het uitgeven van een 24 blad. "pamphlet" over "The Mark of the Beast". Het geeft de lezer een blik in de toekomst, hoe op grond van Gods Woord in het laatste der dagen, wanneer de valsche profeet, het Beest, uit de afgrond en de Antichrist valsche teekenen en wonderen zullen doen om Gods volk te verleiden indien mogelijk. Zij die dan niet het teken van het Beest aan de hand of 't voorhoofd hebben kunnen niet kopen of verkoopen. Bange, en toch ook mooie dagen voor de ware Christen.

S. D. V.

## Unwarranted Conclusions

Dear Mr. Editor,

Will you please allow me to answer G. T. E. and others who have lately attacked the C. L. A. in the columns of this paper. So many wrong things have been said, and so many unwarranted conclusions have been drawn that a reply is really very necessary.

I do not at all like the tone of some of these articles, nor the unbrotherly spirit that is shown toward an organization that is doing all it can to solve the problems of our Christian workers and protect them against the ungodly unions while these men themselves are doing nothing except to find fault, criticize, and ridicule. But they will have to answer for that, not I.

Mr. G. T. E. likes to take an expression of another and draw unwarranted conclusions from it, altho I think he knows very well himself that his conclusions are not sound. When a person says that he believes that his position is more Biblical than that of another it is very well possible that there is Biblical ground for both. There are many "middelmattige dingen" as our fathers called them on which difference of opinion is possible among Christians, and for both Biblical proof may be offered. That is so with life insurance, the use of recreational activities, etc. It is true also of the strike question. Texts may be quoted for and against, but neither has the right to say that the other's position is unbiblical. However, when one says that he believes that his position is more Biblical he believes that there is more proof in the Bible for his position than for the other and that therefore his position is the strongest. I hope that that is now clear to G. T. E. I might add that it does not apply, of course, to the field of theology which is not "middelmattig."

In regard to James 5:6-8 I would say this: I am not an exegete and will therefore not try to give an explanation. If I did I am sure that wrong conclusions would again be drawn. But I would ask a few questions. Isn't it true that the social conditions of today are entirely different, and that also the employer-employee relationship is not the same? If there had been a possibility at that time to change wrong conditions through organization, in a Christian manner, do you suppose that James would have condemned that? I don't think so. If G. T. E. wants to apply those words literally to the workers of our day it would mean that we would have to work for anything the bosses give us, that we could not do anything to gain justice. And that, of course, doesn't agree with what Mr. G. T. E. himself suggests toward the end of his article.

I am well acquainted with Ephesians 6:11-18,

where the weapons of our spiritual warfare are enumerated. But, if G. T. E. means to draw the conclusion from that that Christians cannot unitedly use those weapons in an organization, to oppose injustices, to fight for protection of their rights as Christian men, he is all wrong. There are both weapons for defense and for offense. The picture of the warrior drawn by Paul is not at all that of the passive, inactive Christian which so many among us want to be. Paul was a fighter for justice, for his rights, and also his rights as a citizen! We must be too. Only, we must do it in accordance with the Word of God. That is what the C. L. A. is doing.

When G. T. E. puts the word Christian in quotation marks, thereby meaning to ridicule, that is not to his credit. There may be a few men in the C. L. A. whose Christianity is doubtful, but may we therefore condemn the whole organization? Personally I am not acquainted with any. And I know too that the C. L. A. does not seek membership of people who are not confessing Christians. Because of the law of our land it has been forced at times to accept some. But only those were accepted who expressed agreement with the Christian principles expressed in the Constitution. Those few never had any influence in the C. L. A. if they came in under false pretenses. Great care is taken that they do not gain any position of leadership. If such people can be led in the right way, and they agree with the activity of the organization, why is it wrong to take them, if thereby the organization can extend the sphere of its influence? I believe with all my heart that a Christian may not join an unchristian union. I have not heard it said that a Christian may not be a member of an organization; that, although not based on Christian principles, does not conflict with the Word of God in its activities. Also among us that seems to be allowed. Why then should we condemn an organization that seeks the application of Christian principles for accepting those who express agreement with those principles, and who are willing to take the Christian yoke upon them, if thereby the organization can work more effectively to promote Christian interests? Brother G. T. E. is evidently not very well acquainted with the problem. If he was he would not write as if the C. L. A. does not even bear resemblance to the Christian name. Shame on him! I invite him to attend a few C. L. A. meetings to find out more about it, and to experience the Christian fellowship and fine Christian spirit which I have always enjoyed there.

The C. L. A. secretary has assured me that he will write again about the strike question so I will not touch on that. Just a few words in regard to what is the will of God. There also G. T. E. has been again unfair in his conclusions. When I mentioned the will of God I had in mind of course that all that is sinful is contrary to the will of God. Is that right or not?

Yes. I believe that it is the will of God that His people shall have a sufficient amount of what is necessary for their daily bread. That does not mean that there will not be times when Christians will go hungry. God may allow that, in order that also through such experiences His will shall be worked out. God led Israel to a land filled with milk and honey, a rich land! He wanted them to have that. When they fell away from Him He took it from them. God's will for Israel was that it should have plenty. When he took it from them it was because they went contrary to His will. That is Scriptural, and I accept that. Even in Israel there were always still some who feared God. But when God came with His judgments He allowed the just to suffer with the unjust. Brother G. T. E.'s questions in regard to a Christian never having died of starvation, etc., is therefore only another example of the brother's apparent delight in drawing unwarranted conclusions to try to make another brother look foolish.

What G. T. E. suggests in regard to an organization such as he would favor surprised me. The brother wants to be very conservative otherwise but there he evidently favors State Socialism. That is the only way in which all the problems in social life can be met if the civil government has to act in the manner in which he suggests. I don't agree with that at all. Yes, government must punish the evildoer, but who is going to determine in every little instance whether or not an evil has been perpetrated? We would then have to have laws covering every phase of human activity. Not for me. Before long all our liberty would be gone. The policy that I believe in is this: that the government enact laws that give direction, that protect the exercise of rights, that establish sound policies. (That, of course, aside from its function as the bearer of the sword.) Then let the people exercise their right within the established limits. That's democratic. And that policy is much safer for the Christian church. That is an entirely new subject upon which I cannot very well enter. It would take too much space.

Ben Veldkamp

---

I will extol Thee O my God,  
And praise Thee, O my King;  
Yea, every day and ever more  
Thy praises I will sing.  
Great is the Lord, our mighty God,  
And greatly to be praised;  
His greatness is unsearchable,  
Above all glory raised.

## The Time Of Christ's Crucifixion

The question whether the crucifixion of Christ took place on the day of the Jewish Passover, or on the day before, has, since the second century of the Church, engaged the minds of the attentive readers of Holy Writ. This is due to the fact that there seems to be an irreconcilable conflict between the synoptic gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, and the gospel according to John, in respect to this particular question. All the gospel writers are manifestly agreed as to the *day* on which Jesus was crucified, namely Friday, but they seem to differ as to the *date*. The whole controversy hinges upon the one question, did Christ's crucifixion take place on Friday the 15th Nisan, the date of the Jewish Passover, or on Friday the 14th Nisan, which was the day before the date of the Passover, known as the day of preparation. The Jews celebrated the Paschal supper on the evening of the 14th Nisan, which formed, strictly speaking, part of the 15th, as the Jewish day began at sunset. This 15th Nisan formed the first and great day of the seven days of the feast, and was considered peculiarly solemn, like unto the Sabbath as far as cessation from labor was concerned. Exodus 12:16. Consequently this question whether or not the death of Jesus took place on the day of the Jewish Passover, is necessarily related to the question whether the last supper of Jesus and His disciples took place on the evening between the 14th and 15th Nisan, at the time when all Israel celebrated the Paschal Supper, or did it take place the evening before, between the 13th and 14th Nisan. It is in connection with this question that there seems to be a conflict between the synoptics and John.

It is generally held that, according to the synoptic gospels, Jesus was crucified on Friday, the 15th Nisan, the day of the Jewish Passover, which implies of course, that on the evening before, Jesus had celebrated the Paschal feast with His disciples in conformity with Jewish law and practice. This seems to be the idea expressed in such passages as Luke 22:7, 8. "Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed. And he sent Peter and John saying, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat." Mark 14:12 "And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the Passover, his disciples said unto Him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the passover?" And Matthew 26:17 "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto Him, where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?" All these passages seem to emphasize that the last supper of Jesus and His disciples took place at the time when the Jews celebrated the Paschal supper, and hence that Jesus was crucified on the day of the Passover.

John's gospel, on the other hand, would lead us to the conclusion that the Friday of Jesus' death was the 14th Nisan, the day of the *preparation* of the Paschal supper and the Paschal feast in general. This seems to be the meaning of John 18:28 "Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the Passover." From this passage of John it is very evident that the Jews had not yet eaten the Passover, which they would have, if the Lord's Supper had been instituted at the time that the Paschal supper was regularly held. This passage clearly designates the day of Jesus' condemnation and death as the day prior to the Jewish Passover. So also John 19:14, 31, 42. "And it was the preparation of the Passover, and about the sixth hour; and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King." From this verse also, it is evident that according to John it was not the day of the Passover, but the *preparation* of the Passover, when Jesus is tried before Pilate. In verse 31 we read "The Jews, therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away." Also in this verse it is evident that John places the time of Christ's crucifixion and death not on the Passover, but on the day of the *preparation*, and that he emphasizes the solemnity of the coming Sabbath is due to the fact that that year the weekly Sabbath coincided with the great Sabbatic day of the 15th Nisan, the day of the Passover. Therefore the apostle adds, "(for that sabbath day, was an high day)". See also verse 42 where we read "There laid they Jesus therefore because of the Jews' preparation day; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand." It is also evident from John that the night in which the Lord instituted the Lord's supper, was not the night of the Passover. In Chapter 13:1 we read "Now before the feast of the Passover, when Jesus knew that His hour was come. . . ." Some commentators have sought to explain "that in this verse the *feast of Passover* meant the morning of the 15th, and that the phrase: "*before the feast of Passover,*" must therefore mean the evening of the 14th, and so the hour of the Paschal supper (agreeably to the Synoptics). If John had said: "*before the feast of Unleavened Bread,*" this meaning could have been admissible (Mark 14:1). But how can we for a moment imagine John placing the Paschal supper *before*, and consequently *outside* of, the feast of Passover? How can we hold that, writing for Greek readers, he designated the Paschal feast by saying: "Before the feast, a supper (or even: the supper) being ended," without designating this solemn feast more clearly." F. Godet. That the night of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and consequently the day of the cruci-

fixion, was not that of the Passover is also evident from the 29th verse of John 13 where we read that the apostles, when Judas was dismissed, thought that he was going out to buy some things needed for the feast. "What shop would have been open in Jerusalem on that night, (if it were the night of the Passover) when every family, rich or poor, was gathered round the Paschal table?" Godet. From all these passages of the gospel of John it is evident that Jesus was crucified on the 14th Nisan, the preparation day of the feast Passover. That Jesus did not eat the legal Passover with His disciples; but that He died on the day on which the Jews were preparing to celebrate it.

From the foregoing the seeming conflict between the synoptical narratives, and the gospel of John, must have become apparent. Can these seeming conflicts be harmonized? According to Godet and others the presentation of John, that Christ was crucified on the 14th Nisan, the day before the Passover, is and remains the only possible one. The objections that Jesus died on the day of the feast are numerous. How could the priests and their officers go forth from Jerusalem to lay hands on Jesus in Gethsemane at the very time when the whole people were celebrating the Paschal feast within their dwellings? How could tribunal sittings of the Sanhedrin be held during the time of the Paschal feast and supper? How could Joseph of Arimathea *buy* fine linen, to wrap up the body of Jesus, if the day were a solemn feast day on which nothing was to be bought or sold? Mark 15:46. How could Simon be coming from out of the country on the Sabbatical morning of the 15th Nisan? Mark 15:21. Why did the women put off embalming the body of Jesus that evening in order to rest, because of the sabbath, if the very day on which these things took place was itself a Sabbatic day? Luke 23:56. In harmony with John's gospel we read in Luke 23:54 "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on."

"The only point at which the synoptical account seems really to conflict with that of the Gospel of John, is the date of the disciples' question, *where wilt Thou that we go and prepare that Thou mayest eat the Passover?* Matt. 26:17; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7. But here everything depends on the precise time of the question put by the apostles. If it is supposed that it was put on the *morning* of the 14th Nisan, all possibility of harmony certainly disappears. For the evening which followed that morning, on which the last supper of Jesus took place, could have been no other than that between the 14th and 15th, that of the Paschal feast among the Jews, which inevitably places the death of Jesus on the morrow following that feast, and so on the 15th. But Strauss has remarked, (Das Leben Jesu, 1864, p. 533) that the procuring of the room and the articles necessary for the



Paschal feast could not have been put off till the morning of the day on which the feast took place to secure a room. Also Clement of Alexandria, to designate the previous day, that of the 13th uses the term *pro-preparation, or preparation for the preparation*. The day of the preparation (for the feast) was the 14th, but that on which the arrangements needed for this preparation were made was the 13th. Now, of these measures the most essential was to secure a room. It is therefore probable, to say nothing more, that it was on the afternoon of the 13th that the disciples referred to the Lord the steps to be taken with this view. Are the expressions used by the evangelists opposed to this idea? Luke says: *The day of unleavened bread was come. . . .*" These terms apply to the afternoon of the 13th, to the time of sunset, as well as to the morrow morning, and even better. For it was exactly at this time, on the evening of the 13th, between six and seven, that lamps were lighted to ransack the darkness corners of the houses, and to remove from them the last particles of leaven. Matthew says: On the first day of the feast of Unleavened Bread, the disciples. Mark says: *"The first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the Passover. . . ."* Mark's somewhat more detailed expressions are solely intended to put Gentile readers more completely in possession of the object of the feast. They may as well as those of Matthew, with which they are synonymous, refer to the last hours of the afternoon of the 13th, which, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, began the 14th."

An interesting coincidence, which can hardly be accidental, presents itself here. On the evening between the 13th and 14th Nisan, before the stars appeared in the sky, people went from every house to draw water from the fountain with which on the morrow to knead the unleavened bread. This custom no doubt explains the sign which our Lord gives to His two disciples, Peter and John, when, on sending them to the city, He says: "Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him. . . ." This coincidence fixes at the same time the hour when the disciples were sent; it was evening when the stars were about to appear. The 14th had therefore begun. In reality, it was the beginning of the first day of unleavened bread." F. Godet.

"It will be objected that it was rather late to buy and prepare the lamb. But from the 10th Nisan it must have been put aside and kept in a particular place. It was needed only to take and roast it, which could certainly be done between six and eight o'clock. The other necessary articles belonged to the furniture of the room, or might easily be procured by the host or His disciples." (F. Godet, Commentary on St. John's Gospel.)

Hence we conclude that it is the very clear pre-

sentation of the gospel of John that the time of Christ's crucifixion and death was on Friday afternoon, the 14th Nisan, the day of the preparation for the Passover, and that consequently Jesus' last supper with His disciples was not held at the time the Jewish Passover was eaten, but rather the evening before the feast. This fixes the time of Christ's death at the very hour when the Passover lamb was slain, and thus He became our Passover.

B. K.

---

#### IN MEMORIAM

Classis East of the Prot. Ref. Churches met in session April 7, 1943, in the First Prot. Ref. Church at Grand Rapids, has adopted a resolution to express its heartfelt sympathy to the bereaved family and to the congregation of Edgerton in the sudden passing of our late brother,

REV. WILLIAM VERHIL

We hereby express our great gratitude to God for all He in His grace gave unto us in the brother and for the labors God enabled him to perform in our churches, and pray that the God of all grace may give us submission to His will now that He has called our brother to Himself.

May God comfort us all, and especially the bereaved family and congregation, in this loss which is his gain.

A. Petter — Pres.

B. Kok. — Clerk.

---

#### HE WHO SAID

He who said "Let there be light,"  
Was shut within the darkness of the womb,  
And He who said "Let there be life,"  
Lay still in death within a silent tomb.

He who made the burning sun  
Saw it grow cold and dark on Calvary,  
And He who brought us peace with God  
Cried out, "My God, Thou hast forsaken Me!"

O suffering Christ who hung that day  
On that stark cross between the earth and sky,  
The shuddering sky which veiled its face,  
There, but for Thee, my Lord, hung I, hung I!