

# THE STANDARD

*Bearer*

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME XIX

SEPTEMBER 15, 1943

NUMBER 22

## MEDITATION

### At Horeb

*And he came thither unto a cave, and he lodged there; and, behold, the word of the Lord came to him, and he said unto him, What doest thou here, Elijah? And he said, I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts: for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only am left; and they seek my life to take it away. And he said, Go forth, and stand upon the mount before the Lord. And, behold, the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks before the Lord; but the Lord was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake. And after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire: and after the fire a still small voice. And it was so, when Elijah heard it, he wrapped his face in his mantle.*

*1 Ki. 19:9-13.*

What doest thou here, Elijah?

Here, at Horeb, far from the scene of thy calling, and from the field of battle? . . .

But had not the Lord Himself directed his way thither?

Under the juniper tree, a day's journey in the wilderness, the prophet had poured out his soul in utter despondency, and implored the Lord to take away his life. And there, in the utter exhaustion of his soul, caused by the high tension of Carmel followed by his present dejection, he had fallen asleep.

And the angel of the Lord had aroused him from his profound slumbers, inviting him to arise, and to partake of food and drink that had been prepared for him, "a cake baked on coals, and a cruse of water." And Elijah had followed up the invitation, and (had not the wonder of it registered upon his consciousness?) went back to sleep! But the angel had persisted, and no doubt after the man of God had rested, awoke him once more, this time adding to the invitation to eat and drink the suggestion that a long journey lay ahead of him. And so, the prophet "arose, and did eat and drink, and went in the strength of that meat forty days and forty nights unto Horeb the mount of God."

And now: "What doest thou here, Elijah?"

Is there, in the question, not an evident rebuke that he had forsaken his divinely assigned position, and that his presence there on mount Horeb was the result of an act of disobedience? But how could this be, seeing by divine direction he had come to the mount of God?

It is true, the prophet had not been directly commanded by the word of the Lord to make this long journey. The angel had merely suggested that a long journey lay before him. And there are those who explain that the man of God was at the mount entirely by his own choice and determination. When he left the land of Canaan, and went a day's journey into the wilderness, it was his definite purpose to travel to Horeb, in order that there, at that historic spot where God had established His covenant with Israel, he might inquire after the Lord's will concerning his future work. But this appears very improbable. Was he not minded to resign in the depression of his soul? Did he not, under the juniper tree, complain that his work was all in vain, and that he desired to die?

His way had been directed to the mount of God!

For, though not directly ordered by the angel to make his journey thither, yet it was the word of the angel that had spoken of a journey too long for him, and it was by the nourishment prepared by the angel

that he had been strengthened to make his way through the wilderness. There God would meet him, rebuke him, comfort him, prepare him for further work and final victory. And all the way had evidently been under Jehovah's special direction. Horeb was the silent and mighty witness of the covenant Jehovah had established with His people through Moses, and of that covenant Elijah was a lonely and mighty representative. From Horeb he must start anew. . . . .

Forty days and forty nights had he traveled through the desert. And also this was in God's special dispensation, for the mount was no more than two hundred miles distant from the prophet's starting point.

Had not God's people of old been in the wilderness forty years, because of their disobedience?

And had not God maintained His covenant with His people, and led the remnant according to the election into the land of promise?

And had not Moses, the mediator of the old covenant, suffered with and for God's people in the desert all these forty years, — the limit of human endurance?

And must not all this serve to instruct the prophet in the ways of the Lord, and to prepare him to receive the word of the Lord at Horeb?

O, it was of the Lord, that he was at Horeb!

And yet: "What doest thou here, Elijah?"

For, though by God's goodness over His servant the end of his journey was the mount of God, the beginning of it had been an act of disobedience and weakness of faith.

From his viewpoint, the prophet was far from the field of his labors, purposing to resign.

What doest thou here?

---

Terrible intercession!

For so the Scripture characterizes the answer of the prophet here on mount Horeb.

Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel? . .

Cutting had been the question: what doest thou here?

And always the question very really comes to us, calling us before the bar of the Lord of hosts, the Judge of heaven and earth, and there demanding of us an account, a reason why we are, at that particular moment, in that particular place; and demanding an answer in the light of our calling to be servants of the most High in the position He assigned to us. . . .

And always that question when asked by *Him*, probes deeply into our hearts and minds, laying bare the intents of our inmost being. . . .

It was so for the man of God on Horeb!

And the answer, had it been given directly, would probably have been: I am here to resign! I have become totally discouraged, and wholly dissatisfied with the service of Jehovah. And I willfully forsook my position, and left the scene of my labors, in order that I might tender my resignation to the Lord of hosts!. . . . .

But how could he?. . . . .

How can there ever be, before the face of the Lord, the boldness to refuse the service to which He calls us, Ah, alone under the juniper tree it may seem possible, and we may appear to have sufficient grounds to resign from our calling. But face to face with the living God, all things appear in a totally different light, and the words of resignation we would fain have uttered die upon our lips!

And so, Elijah avoids a direct answer, and in the bitterness of his soul intercedes *against* Israel! "I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts: for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thy altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life, to take it away!"

Terrible, yet true, except for the last part!

Let us not be hard on the man of God, far less exalt ourselves above him. O, it is true, another had stood upon that same mount, hundreds of years before him interceding before the face of God. And the circumstances had been similar. Also then, there had been abundant reason to intercede *against* Israel. For at the very moment when Jehovah of hosts established His covenant with His people, and within sight of that mount that smoked and shook, they had chosen unto themselves gods of their own making, and forsaken the living God, violated His covenant. And yet, the man of God had interceded, not against, but *for* Israel, appealing to the very faithfulness and glory of Jehovah. But there was a difference. Moses must still learn that all is not Israel that is of Israel, and that God is merciful to whom He will be merciful. To him, that people encamped at the foot of mount Horeb were the true people of God, whom the Lord could not destroy. Elijah on Horeb could not see the remnant according to the election of grace, the seven thousand that had not bowed the knee to Baal.

I, even I only, am left. . . . .

And he *had* been jealous of the honor of Jehovah over against the apostasy of the people, and their worship of Baal. He had earnestly endeavored to lead them back to the Lord their God. And they had forsaken God's covenant, and thrown down His altars, and killed the prophets, and revealed themselves as carnal children, children of wrath. And in his jealousy, he had been very zealous for the cause of God's covenant. He had labored and risked his life, and suffered. Nor has his zeal been carnal, as some would have it. For he had acted and labored entirely in

obedience to the Word of the Lord. . . .

And his labors have been fruitless. . . apparently!

They still forsook the covenant of the Lord, the altars were still thrown down, the wicked were still in power!

And the end was worse than the beginning!

I, even I only, am left. . . .

Terrible intercession!

Significant lesson!

For true though the prophet's intercession against Israel was, as far as the carnal seed was concerned, it was nevertheless guilty of two errors, that were the cause of his present state of discouragement and unbelief, and they must be corrected.

The one was, that he lost sight of the remnant according to the election of grace!

I, even I only, am left!

O, the prophet might know better. Had not Obediah, the servant of Ahab, informed him that he had hid one hundred prophets in a cave, and nourished them? But in a state of spiritual despondency we are apt to overlook the work of God.

But God never forsakes His people!

And the prophet must remember that God preserved His seven thousand that had not bowed the knee to Baal! His terrible intercession cannot and may not be against them!

And the second error, closely connected with the first, was that he expected positive results upon his own zeal, while he overlooked the fact that the still and secret operations of the mighty grace of God alone is able to turn the people back to God, and to preserve them in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation. "I have been very zealous, and now, look at the outcome of all my labors!"

There was something in the calling and labors of the prophet that was conducive to this misunderstanding.

He had been a prophet of judgment and of mighty power!

In the wilds of Gilead he had prayed the Lord that He might shut the heavens, and the Lord had heard him: it had not rained for three years and six months. And the land and its inhabitants, the people and the cattle and the beasts of the forest, had suffered under the mighty hand of God. He had prayed for fire from heaven to consume the sacrifice on Carmel, and again the Lord had heard the prayer of His servant, and he had shown His mighty power in the sight of all the people. And once more he had implored Jehovah to open the heavens, and the Lord had sent an abundance of rain!

Mighty signs and judgments!

But these signs and judgments were directed

against the carnal seed, to put them to shame, and against the priests of Baal to confound them, that the glory of the name of the Lord might appear. The conversion of the people was not effected by these judgments as such, but depended upon the mysterious but mighty grace of God!

And so, on Horeb the prophet is corrected.

He must go forth, and stand before the Lord upon the mount.

There the Lord will instruct him by signs.

"And, behold, the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks before the Lord." A sign of the mighty power of the Lord when He comes to judge the world in righteousness, and all the people with equity. A picture, indeed, not of any carnal zeal on the part of the prophet, but of his peculiar calling, and of the very special work unto which the Lord had set him aside.

But the Lord was not in the wind!. . . .

And after the storm the earthquake; and after the earthquake, the fire. Similar signs of judgments, mighty, destructive, shaking the very foundations of the earth, witnessing of consuming wrath.

But the Lord was not in the earthquake!. . . .

And He was not in the fire!

And make no mistake: the storm, and the earthquake, and the fire, were all of the Lord; and He was present in them in His power and holy wrath. But He was not in them, in that power that would save and preserve His people.

The prophet must understand:

The Lord was not in them!

Hark! The still small voice!

A voice of gentle stillness!

Difficult, indeed, it is to imagine just how this still small voice was perceived by the man of God. Was it, perhaps, a gentle zephyr that softly souged through the forest, or whispered over the bare rocks? Or was it the very whisper of the Almighty that was discerned by the prophet?

It matters not: to be sure, it was the very voice of God!

And the prophet understands, for immediately he wraps his face in his mantle, and stands at attention!

Wonderful, mysterious, mighty, still small voice of God! By this is represented the positive work of God, saving His people, and preserving His seven thousand! Not by might, nor by power; not by destructive signs of judgment, storms, earthquakes, fire; but by My Spirit!. . . .

Always operative, mysteriously, softly, but surely!

Blessed zephyr of 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, L. Vermeer, P. Vis, G. Vos, 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

### The Christian Reformed Synod on Labor Unions

It may be interesting to compare the conclusions adopted by the Synod of the Christian Reformed Churches in regard to the union question this year, with those that were adopted a few years ago. The comparison may show in what direction the Synod is moving, or whether it is merely marking time.

We quote these former conclusions, as they appeared in *The Banner* of April 7, 1938:

"Now it is perfectly clear that the Church can accomplish whatever it may be able to do in this sphere, only with the means entrusted to her, that is the faithful preaching of the Word and the judicious exercise of church discipline. But by these means she may accomplish a great deal. She can best promote the organization of Christian labor organizations and of other Christian organizations in the social sphere of life:

"1. By preaching unceasingly and uncompromisingly the biblical principle of the Christian's separation from the world. The Bible clearly teaches that believers constitute a peculiar people, and that as a holy people they are in duty bound to separate themselves from all that is unholy, and should not be unequally yoked with unbelievers, but should avoid all social entanglements that might in any way compromise their Christian character and profession;

"2. By setting forth clearly and unequivocally the antichristian spirit of Marxian Socialism with its glorification of class hatred, class struggle, and class ethics, and its principle that might makes right; and by placing over against this the great fundamental biblical principles of justice as they apply in the industrial world and ought to be maintained by all those who profess to be followers of Jesus Christ;

"3. By calling particular attention to the principle of corporate responsibility, clearly taught in the Word of God (Acts 2:23, 36; 3:13-15; II Cor. 6:14-17; Eph. 5:11; I Tim. 5:22; II John 11; Rev. 18:4), affirmed by an enlightened Christian conscience, and recognized by sociologists; and by giving a discriminating answer to the question whether and in how far one can relieve himself of this responsibility by protesting;

"4. By exercising discipline in the spirit of love, but nevertheless with a firm hand whenever her members become guilty of propagating un-Christian principles in the world of labor, assume an unbrotherly attitude towards their fellow-Christians, take part in

## CONTENTS

### MEDITATION —

AT HOREB.....	497
Rev. H. Hoeksema	

### EDITORIALS —

THE CHRISTIAN REF. SYNOD ON LABOR UNIONS.....	500
Rev. H. Hoeksema	
COMMON GRACE.....	501
Rev. H. Hoeksema	
EXPOSITION OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.....	502
Rev. H. Hoeksema	
THE CHR. SCHOOL AS A SEAT OF TRUE CULTURE.....	506
Rev. G. M. Ophoff	
THE CAPTURE OF JERICHO.....	508
Rev. G. M. Ophoff	
ISRAEL'E THEOCRACY AS A MODEL STATE.....	510
Rev. A. Petter	
THE CHRISTIAN AND SPORTS.....	512
Rev. J. A. Heys	
CHRISTUS' UITVOERING VAN ZIJN PROFETISCH AMBT ONDER HET OUDE VERBOND .....	514
Rev. L. Vermeer	
NIEUWS VAN ONZE KERKEN .....	516
Mr. S. De Vries	
REPLY TO REV. C. HANKO .....	518
Mr. J. Gritter	

acts of violence, trample upon the fundamental principles of justice, or refuse to break with organizations that are avowedly antichristian in character, or reveal throughout an antichristian spirit in their activities.

"By working along such lines as these with fidelity, the Church will naturally train the conscience of the laboring-men in her midst, and will make them feel more keenly than they do at present the need of distinctly Christian organizations in the industrial world. If the need is keenly felt and the necessity clearly seen, the laborers themselves will find ways and means for the establishment of such organizations. And when they do show that they feel within them the urge to organize on a strictly Christian basis, that they are willing to take up the struggle in separate organizations for the sake of their king, and that they are ready for the sacrifice which it may entail,—then the Church will undoubtedly find many ways in which it can encourage them in their laudable efforts."

Comparing these earlier conclusions with those we published in our paper two weeks ago, we note that there are certain points of similarity between the two.

Both recognize the principle of corporate responsibility, the principle that one is held accountable for the principles and acts of a body of which one is a member.

Both carefully avoid saying anything at all about existing unions, i.e. whether or not they are antichristian in character, and whether it is proper for a Christian to belong to them. The earlier report condemns Marxian Socialism and its principles, but fails to state whether the existing unions are socialistic in principle. The later report at first blush appears to state something about the CIO and AFL, but the careful reader will soon discover that actually it is left an open question whether these unions are based on principles opposed to the Christian faith. In fact, the possibility is granted that it is quite compatible with the Christian faith to be member of them.

Both speak of Christian discipline in this connection; but both also carefully avoid stating that membership in a worldly union makes one worthy of censure.

But there are also points of difference. And a comparison of the two reports will show that the Christian Reformed Churches are moving in the wrong direction, i.e. in the direction of approving of union membership for their members.

The earlier report, though failing to apply the enunciated principles to concretely existing unions, is nevertheless rather emphatic in setting forth the principle of the antithetical position of the Christian in the world. The later report does not even mention

this principle, still less proceeds from it, but is rather based on the utility principle that a Christian may to a certain extent compromise with the world.

The earlier report, though making no definite statement to this effect, nevertheless leaves the impression throughout that the worldly union is antichristian in character, and the membership in the union is incompatible with the Christian's faith and calling. The later report concedes the possibility that Church membership and union membership are compatible. In fact, though the statement is qualified by an "if," it definitely states that they are compatible.

Although neither of the two sets of conclusions definitely states that membership of a worldly union renders one censurable, the earlier report is much more positive in this respect than the later. The latter is extremely vague and ambiguous in this respect.

Some of these points deserve a more detailed consideration.

H. H.

---

## Common Grace

### X.

Naturally, after reading Van Til's criticism of my position over against Prof. Heyns, as set forth in my "The Gospel," I once more turned to that booklet to discover whether I really wrote anything that might suggest such a fatalistic conception of man as a moral agent as Van Til attributes to me. And I must confess that I not only failed to find anything that might reasonably explain Van Til's criticism, but that it seems to me that what I actually wrote should have been sufficient to convince him that my views are the very opposite from what he presented them to be. How the brother could possibly inform the public that I teach that "when a man obeys the will of God he in no sense really obeys; it is God that obeys in him," I am at a loss to explain. He certainly cannot quote one item of my writings in support of that statement. I must kindly ask him to correct this rather serious error.

In the meantime, I can do no better than quote from the above mentioned booklet what I actually wrote on this matter. The booklet is written in the Holland language, and I translate:

"Apart from his imaginary Scriptural proof, Prof. Heyns also has some objections of a practical nature against those who reject the doctrine of a general, well-meant offer of grace and salvation. According to



his conviction, the heresy of denying this doctrine of an offer is very serious, so serious that it ought to be opposed and rejected by us with all our might, no less serious than the error of Remonstrantism. We must, therefore, also consider for a moment these practical objections, on which this conviction of the professor is based, in order then to conclude by mentioning some practical objections of our own against the proposition of a general offer.

"The first objection mentioned by Prof. Heyns, is that, strictly speaking, on the standpoint of those who deny a general, well-meant offer of grace and salvation, one is compelled to deny that God's commandments are well-meant, and have binding force. In order to make very clear in what wrong direction such a denial must necessarily lead us, the professor calls the attention of his readers to the illustration of a murderer. Someone committed murder. He committed this murder in accord with the counsel of God. Hence, God willed that the man should commit murder. Now, if you proceed from the logical proposition that God cannot *will* and *not will* the same thing at the same time, you will simply maintain the one fact of the unchangeable counsel of God, and say: God willed that the man should commit a murder; hence, it is impossible that He did not will it: the sixth commandment, 'thou shalt not kill,' was not valid for this murderer and is not valid for any murderer, is applicable only to those that never murder. And thus, logical consistency compels those who deny that there are two wills in God to deny also the general validity of the commandments of God. If there are not two wills in God, there is no general offer: this Heyns understands very well. But, he concludes, if there are not two wills in God, then there cannot be a law of God with general binding force.

"When I read this, I had to admit that the professor's argument was rather ingenious: such a horrible presentation of our conception is, indeed, calculated to frighten the 'inexperienced.' Imagine, people will say, that Rev. Hoeksema of Grand Rapids teaches that God wills that men shall murder! A clear proof, indeed, that the denial of common grace is a dangerous heresy! Well may one abhor such an error like the pestilence! However, one can also put it on too thick. And although there, perhaps, are those that are sufficiently naive to swallow this, anyone that does a little thinking for himself will draw the conclusion that the professor must be guilty of a little exaggeration. In fact, the professor himself is so kind as to admit that *we* do not draw such conclusions as he presents. But, if we only would be consistent, we would necessarily arrive at such a monstrous conception as the professor here attributes to us!

"The reader understands, of course, that we not only do not draw such conclusions, but also that the Professor's logic is not ours. The Professor asserted

somewhere that through sin our rational faculty was so corrupted that we cannot trust our logic anymore. In view of the above reasoning of the Professor's, I am almost inclined to believe it. But the truth is that we cannot permit the Professor to draw conclusions from our fundamental principles. He so distorts our reasoning that it actually appears as if his 'consequenzmacherei' is our way of reasoning. But he that looks below the surface soon discovers sophistry here. Heyns' reasoning is somewhat similar to the well-known syllogism: 1. Is that your dog? Yes. 2. Is that dog a mother? Yes. 3. Then that dog is your mother! Or, as the enemies of the grace of God distorted the teaching of the Apostle: 1. We are justified freely without works. 2. Hence, the more we sin, the greater becomes grace. 3. Let us therefore sin, that grace may abound!"

We will continue this quotation next time, the Lord willing.

H. H.

---



---

## The Triple Knowledge

---



---

### An Exposition Of The Heidelberg Catechism

PART TWO  
OF MAN'S REDEMPTION

Lord's Day VIII.

Chapter II  
Of The Holy Trinity.

Very sober and brief is the Heidelberg Catechism on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Strictly speaking, it expresses all it has to say on this important subject in one question and answer, the twenty fifth: "Since there is but one only divine essence, why speakest thou of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? Because God has so revealed himself in his word, that these three distinct persons are the one only true and eternal God." But although very brief, the answer may be considered quite complete. It reminds us that we can speak of the trinity only "because God has so revealed himself in his word." It teaches that God is *one*: there is only one divine essence, hypostatically distinct but essentially one, for they are "three distinct persons," but they are "the one only true and eternal God." But although all the essential elements of the doctrine of the trinity are present in this answer

of our Catechism, these several elements need further explanation and development, if we are to understand what the Church means by her confession that God is one in essence and three in persons. And this we must understand. Even though it is true that the triune God far transcends our understanding, the *doctrine* of the Church concerning the mystery is, of course, not *contrary* to our reason, and is capable of being expounded and understood.

Thus, at least, the early Church conceived of the matter, as is evident from what her greatest minds have written on the subject. The truth that God, one in essence, subsists in threeness of persons, was one of the first dogma's established by the Church. And as is usually the case, the final formulation and adoption of this doctrine was attained only in the way of a struggle with opposing and heretical views. The controversy centered around the question as to the proper *deity* and *distinct personality* of the Son. Even before the Church was disturbed by the Arian controversies, there were those who denied any hypostatical distinction in the Godhead. The so-called *Patropassians* held that God is one, the Father. This one God is Father in His invisible essence, but He is Son in His revelation. In the incarnation this Father-God animated a human body, and in that body He suffered and died on the cross. Hence, their name *Patropassians*, which denotes their peculiar view that the Father suffered. Others are known as *Nominal Trinitarians*. They, too, denied the personal subsistence of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. From one God, the Father, emanate two powers or effluences: the illuminating power, Wisdom or the Logos, and the quickening or enlivening power, called the Spirit. Both these heretical conceptions, however, still ascribed a certain *divinity* to Christ, though they denied His proper *deity*. Arius, however, denied both. According to him, Christ is a mere man, not divine in any sense, although He is the first and highest of all creatures. It was especially the Arian controversies that finally led, first, to the convocation of the Council of Alexandria in 321, where the Arian heresies were condemned, and soon after, to the Council of Nicea (325), where the positive doctrine concerning the trinity was established, and officially adopted in a creed, the Symbol of Nicea.

From this Nicene Creed, it is very evident that theological thinking of that time was concentrated on the person of Christ, and His relation to the Godhead. And it was from that viewpoint that the doctrine of the trinity was discussed and established. On the one hand, it must be maintained that the Son was not a mere emanation or impersonal effluence from the Godhead, but a distinct hypostasis or person. And the same truth must be held with respect to the Holy Ghost. On the other hand, equal emphasis had to be placed upon the truth, that the Son (and also the

Holy Spirit) was *not created*, but so begotten of the Father that He is very God, of the same essence as the Father, having His personal subsistence within the divine Being through *eternal generation*. Hence, the Nicene Creed declares: "We believe. . . in Jesus Christ, born of the Father, the only begotten, that is of the essence of the Father (*genethenta ek tou patros monogenee, toutestin ek tees ousias tou patros*), God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of the same essence (*homoousion*) with the Father." And after this symbol has spoken very briefly of the Holy Ghost, it returns once more to the subject of the essential divinity or *deity* of Christ, and the eternal generation of the Son, when it condemns those "who say: There was a time when he was not; and: He was not before he was made; and: He was made out of nothing, or: He is of another substance, or essence, or: The Son of God is created, or: changeable, or: alterable."

It is, perhaps, partly due to this strong concentration upon the question of the deity of Christ, and His personal relation to the Godhead, that the Nicene Creed is remarkably silent on the deity and personality of the Holy Ghost, and His relation to the Father and to the Son. It simply declares: "And we believe in the Holy Ghost." But of course, the Arians were just as heretical in their views on the Holy Spirit as they were in their teachings respecting the Son. And soon after the Council of Nicea, some of the Semi-Arians, who were willing to concede a certain divinity (not *deity*) to Christ, (*homoiousion*, not *homoousion*), openly denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit. After their leader, a certain bishop Macedonius, these Semi-Arians were called *Macedonians*. According to them the Holy Spirit is not co-equal with the Father and the Son, but rather a minister or servant. They argued that, if the Holy Spirit were *begotten*, He must be begotten either of the Father or of the Son. If the former, there are two Sons in the Godhead, and they are brothers; if the latter, the Holy Spirit is a grandson of the Father. Superficial and profane though this form of reasoning was, it was evident that the brief declaration concerning the Holy Spirit made by the Council of Nicea was not sufficient. Also the deity and personal subsistence of the third person of the trinity must be established. And it was this that was accomplished by the Council of Constantinople in 381. It enlarged upon the article concerning the Holy Ghost as follows: "And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life; Who proceedeth from the Father; Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; Who spake by the prophets." We may notice, that although in this elaboration upon this doctrine of the Holy Ghost the essential deity and personal relation of the third person to the Father are clearly established, it is silent with respect to His relation to the Son. It does neither

affirm nor deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. This gave rise to the controversy concerning the "filioque" (and from the Son), the question concerning the double procession of the Spirit. And it was the Western Church, perhaps under the powerful influence of Augustine, that inserted this phrase in the creed adopted at Constantinople, thus separating itself principally from the Eastern Church, that refused to confess the double procession of the third person of the trinity.

Somewhat dialectic in form and, perhaps, on that very account beautiful, is the *Symbolum Quicumque* (The Symbol "Whosoever" so called after its first word), often, though no doubt erroneously, ascribed to Athanasius. We quote it here: "1. Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he holds the Catholic Faith: 2. Which Faith except everyone do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. 3. And the Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; 4. Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance (Essence). 5. For there is one Person of the Father: another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost. 6. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty coeternal. 7. Such as the Father is: such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost. 8. The Father uncreate (uncreated): the Son uncreate (uncreated): the Holy Ghost uncreate (uncreated). 9. The Father incomprehensible (unlimited): the Son incomprehensible (unlimited): the Holy Ghost incomprehensible (unlimited, or infinite). (The Latin here has: *Immensus* Pater, etc). 10. The Father eternal: and the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal. 11. And yet they are not three eternals: but one eternal. 12. And also there are not three uncreated: nor three incomprehensibles (infinities), but one uncreated: and one incomprehensible (infinite). 13. So likewise is the Father Almighty: the Son Almighty: and the Holy Ghost Almighty. 14. And yet there are not three Almighties: but one Almighty. 15. So the Father is God: the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God. 16. And yet they are not three Gods: but one God. 17. So likewise the Father is Lord: the Son is Lord: and the Holy Ghost is Lord. 18. And yet not three Lords: but one Lord. 19. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord: 20. So are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion: to say, There be (are) three Gods, or three Lords. 21. The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten. 22. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created: but begotten. 23. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten: but proceeding. 24. So there is one Father, not three Fathers: one Son, not three Sons: one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts. 25.

And in this Trinity none is afore, or after another: none is greater, or less than another (there is nothing before, or after: nothing greater or less). 26. But the whole three Persons are co-eternal and co-equal. 27. So that in all things, as aforesaid: the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshipped. 28. He therefore that will be saved, must (let him) thus think of the Trinity."

Essentially nothing has been changed in or added to the doctrine of the trinity as adopted by the early Church. The Nicene Creed is still the expression of the faith of the entire Church of Christ in the world. There were controversies and restatements of doctrine with respect to other parts of the truth, but the dogma of the trinity remained the same since its adoption by the Council of Nicea. The Church of the Middle Ages adopted this truth, and the great minds of Scholasticism did not alter it either in form or in content. It is true that there were always individual thinkers that departed from the line of this fundamental doctrine. Old heresies were revived and appeared sometimes in a new form. Some presented views that reminded of *Nominal Trinitarianism*, like Scotus Eriugena and Abelard; others separated the Persons of the Godhead, and were inclined to tritheism, or even to tetratheism. But all such deviations were regarded by the Church as heretical, and never was she seriously disturbed by any of them. And the same is true of the period of the Reformation. The Reformers taught the same doctrine on this score as did Athanasius, Hilary, and Augustine before them. Calvin writes extensively on this subject in his *Institutes*, I, 13. He insists that the Word of God teaches us that there are in God three substances, subsistences, hypostases, a concept which is properly expressed by the Latin Church in the word *personae*, persons. "We certainly conclude from the words of the apostle (in Heb. 1:3) that the Father has a subsistence of His own (*proprium esse in Patre hypostasin*), which is reflected in the Son. Whence again may easily be deduced the subsistence of the Son, which distinguishes him from the Father. The same is true in respect to the Holy Spirit: because we shall at once prove that he is God, and nevertheless it is necessary to consider him another distinct from the Father. Moreover, this distinction is not one of the Essence, which may not be made manifold. If therefore the testimony of the apostle demands belief, it follows that there are in God three subsistencies (*sequitur tres in Deo esse hypostases*). And since the Latins expressed this by the word Person, it is a proof of too much haughtiness and obstinacy to squabble about so clear a matter. Verbally translated one would render it subsistence. Nor, in truth, was the use of the word Person peculiar to the Latins alone, but also the Greeks, probably to



express their agreement, taught that there are three *prosopa* in God. But whoever, whether Greeks or Latins, differ among one another as to the term, they certainly agree in the main thing." Inst. I, 13, par. 2.

It draws the attention that Calvin here appears to use the words Person, Proposa, Hypostasis, Subsistence promiscuously, as referring to the same thing. He is aware of the fact that, especially by the use of the term *subsistence* or *substance*, he exposes himself to the indictment of teaching tritheism. But he refuses to strive about mere words, if only it is established that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are the one true God, yet so that they are distinguished in respect to their personal properties. The Latins, he writes, translated the term *homoousios* by *consubstantialis*, and therefore used the word *substance* to denote *being*. And Jerome considered it blasphemy to say that there are three substances or subsistences in God. And yet one will find that Hilary, for instance, declares more than a hundred times that there are three substances in God! But even though the terms employed may not be above reproach, Calvin reminds us that it is necessary to employ these terms, because the truth of the trinity must be maintained over against such heretics as Arius and Sabellius. As for himself, however, by *Person* he understands "a subsistence in the divine essence, which, related to the others, is distinguished from them by an incommunicable property. By the term subsistence we wish to be understood something different from essence. For if the Word would simply be God, and would not have a peculiar property, John would have spoken rashly when he said that he was always with God. When immediately after, he adds that the Word also is Himself God, he reminds us of the unity of the Essence. But because he could not be with God without being in the Father, there arises hence that subsistence, which, although connected with the essence by an unbreakable bond, nor can be separated from it, has nevertheless a special mark, by which it is distinguished from it. Now I say that each of these three subsistences stands related to the others by a distinct property. The word *relation* is here expressly used, because when mention is made simply and without further definition of God, the reference is no less to the Son and to the Spirit than to the Father. But whenever the Father is compared with the Son, his own property distinguishes each from the other. Thirdly, I assert, that whatever is the peculiar property of each, is incommunicable, because whatever is attributed to the Father as a mark of distinction, cannot be applied or transferred to the Son. And

truly, the definition of Tertullian does not displease me, provided it be rightly understood: that there is in God a certain disposition or economy which changes nothing in the unity of the Essence."

This doctrine of the trinity has found a place in all the main creeds of the Protestant Churches, nor dared the Roman Catholic Church differ from them in this respect, although the declarations of the Council of Trent take issue with the Protestant faith on many other points. As has been pointed out, the Heidelberger is very sober and brief on this point. But the *Confessio Belgica* teaches that "According to this truth and this Word of God, we believe in one only God, who is the one single essence, in which are three persons, really, truly, and eternally distinct, according to their incommunicable properties; namely, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Father is the cause, origin and beginning of all things visible and invisible; the Son is the word, wisdom, and image of the Father; the Holy Ghost is the eternal power and might, proceeding from the Father and the Son. Nevertheless God is not by this distinction divided into three, since the Holy Scriptures teach us, that the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, have each his personality distinguished by their properties; but in such wise that these three persons are but one only God. Hence then, it is evident, that the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Father, and likewise the Holy Ghost is neither the Father nor the Son. Nevertheless these persons thus distinguished are not divided, nor intermixed: for the Father hath not assumed flesh, nor hath the Holy Ghost, but the Son only. The Father hath never been without the Son, or without his Holy Ghost. For they are all three coeternal and coessential. There is neither first nor last: for they are all three one, in truth, in power, in goodness, and in mercy."

The overwhelming testimony of the Church, therefore, brands the Unitarians as heretics, outside of the Christian Church. Servetus launched a violent and blasphemous attack upon this most fundamental of Christian truths, and it cost him his life. But the fathers of modern Unitarianism, and of modern Rationalism, are the two brothers Laelius and Faustus Socinus. They agreed in denying the trinity, and they succeeded where Servetus failed, in founding a sect of their own. They found an asylum in one of the Polish Palatines, produced a number of theologians, and formulated a creed of their own. From there it made inroads into other parts of the world, especially in England and America, while on the continent it found a powerful ally in rationalistic philosophy. But in its Anti-trinitarian position it stands

condemned by the entire Church of all ages, for the Spirit that leads into all the truth constantly taught her, through the Holy Scriptures, to confess that God is one in essence, distinct in three persons, and that these three persons are the one, only, eternal God, Whom to know is eternal life!

H. H.

## The Christian School as a Seat of True Culture

First the question: What, in general, is culture. The term *culture* comes from a word that means to till, cultivate, promote the growth of an organism. In explaining the idea of culture, we may begin with plant-culture. Here culture is the labor, the care, that the farmer bestows on the plants that he grows in his fields. He prepares the soil, sows the seed. He thereupon cultivates the plants. He keeps the soil loose, destroys the weeds that spring up around the plants. He feeds the plants through enriching the soil. This is done largely before the sowing of the seed. The plant, properly cultivated, bears fruit. And its fruit is its culture. The apple is the culture of the apple-tree; the pear is the culture of the pear-tree, and so on. Thus the word *culture* signifies first the cultural action—the care bestowed upon the plant—and, second, the result of this action, the fruit which the cultivated plant bears.

Now humans, too, are plants. Christ compares men with trees when he says that the good tree bears good fruit and the bad tree, bad fruit. Here He refers to humans, to God's moral-rational creatures. Being plants, humans can be cultivated, trained, nourished mentally and spiritually. Cultivated humans bear fruit, and this fruit is their culture. Thus the culture of a man is his works, his entire conversation in word, deed, and thought, either good or bad.

What now is *true* culture? It is the good fruit which Christ's branches bear. "I" says He, "am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. . . ye are the branches. He that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit." (John 20). In speaking of fruit, Christ refers to the entire good works of His people. So, then, true culture is the entire conversation of God is believing people in word deed and thought in so far as it proceeds from the new life in Christ and is untainted by the sins of the flesh. True culture, it is plain, is true religion. It is therefore wrong to speak of *religion* and *culture*. To do so is to indicate that we are void of true under-

standing; that we do not have the right conception of things. To be correct, we should speak of *religion* namely *culture*.

In the light of these observations, it is plain that there is no *true* culture in the world that lies in darkness. For the men of this world are bad trees. And bad trees bring forth bad fruit.

But doesn't the world know, let us say, mathematics? True it does. But mathematics, to limit ourselves to this science, is not of the world but of God. Properly, therefore, it does not belong to the culture of the world. Mathematics belongs to nobody's culture. It is the capital, given man by God, wherewith man works. The culture of the world is the wisdom of the world that is foolishness with God. The culture of the world is the temple of an idol and the idol in that temple. The culture of the world is all that which proceeds from the principle of sin that operates in the world. The culture of the world is the lie, is sin and corruption to which the world gives expression in its philosophy, poetry and art and in all its works. This is the culture of the world. We must not, therefore, go to the world for culture. We must go to Jerusalem for culture i. e. religion.

It follows then that man may be ever so educated, if he is not one of Christ's, he does not have true culture. The blood in a man may be true blue, as they say, he may be ever so refined, well-mannered and polished or generous and kind, if he is not one of Christ's, he does not have true culture. A woman may be ever so lovely, gracious, and tender, if she is not one of Christ's, she does not have true culture. It is the nobility of the soul that proceeds from the new life in Christ that is true culture.

This agrees wholly with what Paul teaches in 1st. Corinthians (chap. 13). Says he there, "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels (speaking with the tongues of angels—this certainly is culture), and have not charity, (*love* in the original; the life of regeneration) I am sounding brass and a tinkling symbol (I do not have true culture). And though I have prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge (i. e., though I be the best educated man in the world, the wisest and the most profound); and though I have faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing (I have no *true* culture). And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor (this is generosity for you, philanthropy), and though I give my body to be burned (What self-denial!) and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." (I have no true culture).

Then the apostle goes on to describe *true* culture. "Charity suffereth long and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself and is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth, beareth all

things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."

Let no one imagine that I am casting aspersions upon education. It may be an excellent thing for a man to be educated. As reformed people we believe in a trained ministry. We insist that the men who occupy our pulpits have knowledge of languages, know words, are able to construct sentences; be trained in the art of self-expression, know history, philosophy and theology. Moses was a highly educated man. Likewise Paul. Likewise the great reformers of the 16th century. Let a man learn, if he can, all there is to be known about everything above and under the sun. It is well. But let him remember that education is good only if it goes hand in hand with *true* culture. Let him remember that education without true culture is a dangerous thing. It is a curse. Better, much better, a minister of the gospel with no education to speak of but with true culture, than a highly educated minister but with no true culture.

If the "man of God" is to bear fruit (I now have reference to our elect covenant youth), he must be cultivated taught, trained. The cultivator of that "man of God" is God Himself. Says Christ, "My Father is the husbandman." Properly, God through Christ is the sole cultivator, trainer of the "man of God." God may cast him in the crucible of affliction that his faith may flower. He chasteneth him that he may become partaker of Christ's holiness. An essential element in the cultivation of the "man of God" is his being fed. God feeds him with the word of truth, thus with Christ who is the truth, the true bread. He feeds this man by causing the word—His word—to dwell richly in him.

In training the "man of God," God uses agents—the parents of the child, the pastors in the church and the teachers in the school. The school only is the seat of true culture whose teachers are willing and truly qualified to properly train that "man of God." And here again the essential element in the training of the child is being fed the truth.

Here we come upon the reason why the Christian parent cannot send his child to the schools of the world. The pedagogues in these schools feed the child the lie. But arithmetic is true; and this is taught in the schools of the world. Assuredly, the multiplication tables are true, they being of God and not of man. But in teaching arithmetic, the teacher in the schools of the world proceeds from the lying premise that God is not and that the creature is a god to himself; and so he basically corrupts with his lie God's arithmetic. And it is this lie that pervades all his instruction.

The "man of God" must be fed the truth and the truth unadulterated. Speaking of the "man of God," Peter says: "Desire the unadulterated milk, that ye may grow thereby (1 Peter 2). The unadulterated

milk is Christ as we possess Him in the scriptures. That "man of God" cannot thrive on the lie; but neither can he thrive on the adulterated truth, on the truth mixed with the lie. "As new born babes," says the apostle, "desire the unadulterated milk that ye may *grow*—mark you *grow*—thereby; that ye may grow *thereby* — mark you, *thereby*." What mother would think of feeding her infant child with poisoned food.

Here we come upon the reason why we as parents of Protestant Reformed persuasion must have our own schools—schools that are seats of true culture. Certainly, it is the will of God that we as parents place ourselves in a position that enables us to choose the teachers for our own children. We may not allow others in distinction from ourselves to determine who shall instruct our children, especially not if those others are brethren holding the theory of common grace, which is nothing else but incipient modernism.

The matter, certainly, is of vital importance. Consider that this "man of God" (our elect covenant youth) is not our man, but God's. God bought that "man" with the very blood of His only begotten. We hold our children simply as a trust. God says, "Feed that 'man' that he may grow and mature and be meet for my use."

We hear it said, now by this one, then by that one, that we would do wrong in taking our children out of the Christian schools that be; that the thing for us to do is to co-operate with the brethren in improving these schools, in making them what they should be. The fact is, we cannot for the simple reason that we do not hold in our hands the reins of government of these schools. And we never will. In the school-boards we are in the minority and will continue to be. The brethren see to this. Now it is the majority that rules. This would not be bad if the split were not on vital issues. But since it is, we, the minority, are in duty bound to go our way alone. The issue is vital also before the consciousness of the brethren. The proof of this is that, with respect to the schools, they see to it that the reins do no slip from their hands. And their holding the reins means, let it be repeated, that they and not we determine who shall teach our children.

G. M. O.

---

#### NOTICE

Classis East will meet in regular session Wednesday Oct. 6, at Fuller Ave. at 9 A. M.

D. Jonker, S. C.

## The Capture of Jericho

Having narrated the passage through the Jordan, the sacred writer brings before us in succession (a) the effect of the invasion upon the heathen, ver. 1 of ch. 5; (b) the circumcision of the people, ver. 2-9 (c) the enjoyment of the bread of the land and the Passover in connection with the cessation of the manna, ver. 10-19; the appearance of the angel of God to Joshua, ver. 13-15; and finally the capture of Jericho, ch. 6.

We briefly comment on the first four of these events to concentrate in the writing upon the capture of Jericho.

The terror which, according to the words of Rahab, had before seized the Canaanites west of Jordan (ch. 2:9-11) is greatly increased by the marvelous passage of the Jordan. Their heart melts, their courage flees, and a panic has fallen upon them. And this in token that the Lord has given the land to His people.

The circumcision of the people took place upon an express command of Jehovah because (ver. 4-6) it had been omitted in the wilderness. The adult generation, with the exception of Joshua and Caleb, had died in the wilderness. Since, then, the former circumcised men of war were no more, on account of their disobedience, the present race of young men must, before they dare undertake the conquest of Canaan, receive the sign of the Lord's covenant. The reason why the rite was performed is that the reproach that clave to the people all during the period of the wanderings and that consisted in their becoming a people of slaves under Pharaoh. This reproach had not been removed while they were journeying through the wilderness, because God had been angry with His people on account of their disobedience, and they on their part had neglected circumcision. The reproach is rolled away by the Lord through circumcision. It was only as a sanctified people, holy to the Lord, that they might and could war the warfare of God, successfully strive to enter into the promised land. The name of the place of the performance of the rite was called Gilgal "unto this day," for, said the Lord to Joshua, "this day have I rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you."

At this place the Passover, connected with the first enjoyment of the land, and the cessation of the Manna, was also eaten. The designation of the time—on the fourteenth day of the month—recalls Exodus 12:6. The Manna ceased on the morrow after the Passover, because the people had now arrived in Canaan and no longer needed the bread of the wilderness.

As the people received the consecration to the holy war through circumcision and the Passover, so Joshua their leader receives his in a way agreeable to his position. The Lord, Himself, appears to him. He bears a drawn sword in His hand. Joshua, thus proving that the Lord had strengthened him and made him firm, goes near the apparition and asks the man—a man he at first took the Lord to be—, "Art thou for us or for our adversaries?" The one addressed answers that he is the "Captain of the host of the Lord and is now come." Joshua falls on his face to the earth and does worship, and with deepest reverence asks: "what speaks my Lord to His servant?" The gesture indicates that he recognizes his visitor as JEHOVAH Himself. The Lord instructs Joshua to remove his shoes from off his feet in that the place where he stands is holy. Joshua does so and now the Lord communicates to him His will with respect to the capture of Jericho, ch. 6:2-5.

At the approach of the Israelites, Jericho, so it is next stated, had closed its doors: none went out and none came in. Instead of surrendering and casting itself upon the mercy of God, the city resisted to the end and was thus without excuse. Jehovah now commands Joshua to march around the city with the ark preceded by the priests giving blasts on alarm trumpets, one each day for six days in succession, but on the seventh day seven times, and promises that then her walls shall fall down. This command Joshua imparts to the priests with the people for immediate execution, which then also follows. On the seventh day the Israelites begin their march very early, with the dawn, because they have to make the circuit seven times. At Joshua's command, the people who have before marched in silence around the city, raise a battle shout. The trumpets clang and the walls of Jericho fall flat. Over the prostrate walls the Israelites enter the city, and "each one straight forward," so that their order was preserved as far as possible. This order was, (1) the armed men; (2) the seven priests with their seven trumpets; (3) the priests with the ark of the covenant; (4) the remaining warriors as a rear-guard. The shouting was done on the seventh day only, at the express command of Joshua. Silently and without voice, for six long days, under the prolonged blasts of the trumpets, the people marched around and around the City of Palms.

The city was devoted under the express command of God. It was doomed, laid under the ban, that is, devoted to Jehovah without the possibility of being redeemed. It was thus put away and destroyed utterly to the honor of God, a propitiation, as it were, to the divine justice and holiness, that God might be glorified. The city was burnt with fire, and all that was therein with the exception of the silver, and the gold, and the vessels of brass and of iron. These

were put into the treasury of the house of the Lord.

The fall of the walls of Jericho occurred through the direct efficiency of God. It is certainly soulless to think of an undermining of the walls. Also, nothing is said in the text of an earthquake. Yet certainly the resort to an earthquake is no indication of infidelity if only it be affirmed that it is God who by His almighty presence makes the earth to quake. Whether the Lord assailed these walls directly or made them fall flat through shaking the earth underneath them, makes little difference. In either case the fall of these walls was a miracle.

A devoted city, according to Deut. 14:17, might not be rebuilt. Joshua, therefore, pronounces an imprecation on the foundation and the soil of Jericho. The curse upon this city—the key city of Canaan—was the curse upon everything of an idolatrous nature, upon the Cananite race with all its abominations. Such a curse the New Testament Scriptures utters against all false teachings and corruptors of men and mockers of God.

The fall of Jericho is the type and image of the fall and destruction of the world, not of God's but of man's world. There are, certainly, two such worlds of which account must be taken and between which a sharp distinction must be made. "I pray not for the world. . . ." I am quoting Christ here at John 17:4. "Now is the judgment of the world" (John 12:31). Then there is the admonition of John, "Love not the world" (1 John 2:15). On the other hand, there is also a world that God loved and to which He gave His only begotten, a world that God reconciled to Himself and to which He does not impute its iniquity, John 3:16; I Cor. 5:18, 19.

Now it stands to reason that the world that God loved and so loved that He gave His only Begotten, reconciled to Himself in CHRIST and to which He imputes not their transgressions,—it stands to reason that this world is not, cannot be, that world for which Christ does not pray, God's PEOPLE may not love, is judged and will therefore be destroyed. There are, then, very actually two worlds: God's world and man's world. God's world is Christ, the elect, the church, the body of Christ, that temple—the temple of God, of which Christ is the chief corner stone, the creature—the inanimate and irrational creature that groaneth and awaiteth the manifestation of the sons of God, the new heavens and the new earth on which will dwell righteousness and where God will everlastingly tabernacle with His people. Jericho, certainly, is not the type of this world but of man's world; the world that lies in darkness, whose name is blasphemy, and whose prince is Satan; thus the world that made war with the LAMB and sheds the blood of saints and prophets; the doomed world, with its wars and famine, sufferings, tears, and despair, grave and hell, rich and poor, economic inequalities, oppressions, and

exploitations, vain strivings and expectations, selfishness and greed; the world that possesses the earth and commands the fruits of genius and is seated in the throne of men's kingdoms; yet the world where stalks the curse of God. It is this world of which Jericho was the type, the world of reprobated men, the world whose people imagine a vain thing, and whose kings set themselves and take council together against the Lord and His anointed, Ps. 2. The world of which Jericho was the type is the worldly state as it stands concretely before us in the godless of the earth. It is the church in so far as it takes on flesh and blood in the carnal seed. And to this world belongs also the sinful flesh of the believers.

It is plain that this world—the world of which Jericho was the type—cannot be limited to the axis powers. For it—this world—is as wide and comprehensive as the world. It is world-wide. Wherever the devil is, there is this world. Wherever sin is, there is also this world. Wherever the curse of God stalks there is this world. Wherever selfishness and greed is, there is this world. Wherever death is and the grave and hell, there is this world—the world of which Jericho was the type. This world, therefore is here, in every state of our union, in every city, village and hamlet. This world is in my heart and your heart. It is the height of folly and hypocrisy, certainly, to identify this world with the axis powers.

Man's world, as was Jericho, is, will be, overcome, this world—man's world—with all that it includes and stands for: the devil and his henchmen; the wicked that corrupt the earth; greed sin and oppression and the exploitation of the weaker nations by the stronger; persecution of the saints, their tribulations. They are, will be overcome, conquered. Sin, hell, and the grave is overcome, in a word, all that Jericho stands for.

They who conquer are God's people, and their victory is complete, decisive and absolute. The world is at their feet. It works for good to them. It is their slave, and they its master, not, to be sure, in the point of view of worldly political power, but in the point of view of the nobility of their heavenly sonship. In the point of view of worldly political power, the world is their master. It is the world that occupies the thrones of the world's kingdom. The world possesses the earth.

Yet, God's people conquer. They very actually conquer the world. But it is their faith that conquers—conquers the world. Mark you, faith, not carnal violence, not battleship and fighting planes, and bombers, not armies well trained and equipped with guns and swords, but solely faith, true living faith, the faith that proceeds from the life of regeneration, that the faith according to which God's people walk as children of the light, the faith under the constraint of which, they flee from sin and turn to the living



God, receive God's Word, confess Christ's name and witness for the truth, prophesy of Christ's coming, desire and pray that only God's will be done and His counsel be realized. This is the faith that conquers the world—this, namely, our true contrition of heart, our godly conversation, our confessing and witnessing, our seeking His kingdom, our reaching out in prayer for the heavenly and for the heavenly only. By this faith the walls of Jericho fell. This is the faith that conquers the world. For this faith, this holy, holy striving, God rewards (the reward is of grace). So this faith, this praying according to His will, this seeking in prayer the heavenly, God responds by making the world work for good to us every moment, every second. Thus the world is our slave indeed. So through his living faith, the man of faith brings the world—man's world at his feet, yet not he but God in response to his faith and in answer to his prayers (true prayers—prayers in which the believers seek exclusively the heavenly God, His will and counsel and thus not themselves). Through his living faith the man of faith brings at his feet all that the world stands for: sin, greed, oppression, persecution, tribulations, death, grave, hell, the sinful flesh of the believer himself. The encompassing of the walls of Jericho was the expression of a living faith—the faith of the true Israelites. It was by their living faith that they made their enemies their footstool, yet not they but Jehovah in response to their faith.

Verily, the faith of God's people conquereth the world indeed. And wanting the things that God wants and wills and these things exclusively, they are at one with God as to their willing and striving and longings, and thus also their will and word is being done and through Christ all that God worketh according to the counsel of His will are also their achievements. Thus they are having their way. They very actually reign with Christ, the Lord of lords, and the King of kings.

Thus their faith is their victory indeed, not certainly in the sense that faith merits with God, and not in the sense that the victory proceeds from their faith as its source, but in the sense the victory is achieved solely in the way of faith, in the way of faith in Christ.

The victory is solely Christ's achievement through His atonement. He vanquished all our foes. And He gives us the victory as a free gift of grace, and when the world will have served His and our purpose (His purpose is our purpose) again in answer to our prayers and in response to our holy strivings, it will be destroyed. The walls of Jericho, of Babylon, shall fall. There will be new heavens and a new earth on which righteousness will dwell. This will be the victory in its glorious consummation. But the victory is solely of God through Christ. The priest that en-

compassed Jericho was Christ, and the ark was His throne and the throne of His Father.

G. M. O.

---

## Israel's Theocracy as a Model State

The term theocracy is not a biblical word, but it is the expression of a thoroughly biblical idea as found in the passages I Sam. 8:7, "They have rejected Me that I should not reign over them;" so 12:12 "Ye said Nay, but a king shall reign over us: when the Lord your God was your King;" so Deut. 33:5 "He was King in Jeshurun when the heads of the people and the tribes of Israel were gathered together."

In general we may characterize this theocracy as the state where God was Father-King and as such the sole law-giver and also avenger of that law.

Now this may seem to raise the objection that thus we have only the kingly office spoken of whereas in the nation of Israel there were three offices which all had a part in the life of Israel as a people and nation, and the objection continues that two of the offices thus hang on in an unintegrated way. But we have rightly always taught that the offices are a tri-unity of official function in a rational being. However this apparent aloneness of the royal office is harmonized with the well-established unity of the three by the fact that the royal is the pre-eminent and the other two are subordinate.

It is undoubtedly true that in man as God's image-bearer the three offices appear and the pre-eminence is given to the priest-hood (I Pet. 2:9; Rev. 1:6, 5:10) since he is prophet to know and declare the will of God: king to execute that will in God's name; priest to offer the fruits of his dominion as an offering of worship.

However the offices in the theocracy are seen as applied to God, and then in the following order: He is Prophet as revealer of His will and good pleasure; He fulfills the function of priest in that He Himself supplies all that is demanded in that will (Isa. 54:17, Hosea 14:9) and thus, because of this He is King whose dominion is undisputably established in righteousness.

In order now to answer the question whether Israel's Theocracy was a model state, we may undoubtedly begin by saying that the theocracy is a perfect state. Everywhere Scripture teaches us that the perfect state shall have come when God shall manifest His Kingdom of grace (Dan 7:14; I Cor. 15:27; Rev. 21:3, 4) in its complete dominion.

Now of this kingdom, Israel's theocracy until

Christ was a type. In it as a kingdom of salvation, God as Father-King ruled in distinction from His dominion of power in the world. And although it might seem that the desiring of a king in Samuel's day was a destruction of the theocratic type, yet in reality it was not so, for the human king in Israel became precisely the type of the Messianic King, the Incarnate. He was one taken from the midst of the brethren and lived in the most intimate contact with God.

When now we come to the transition from the Old to the New Dispensation we must be on our guard. It is hardly safe to say as is so often done that the difference between Old and New is that in the first the church and state are one, whereas in the New they are separate. The truth is rather that in the old dispensation the kingdom of God was existent in Israel mediated by types and shadows and at the same time forming type and shadow of better things to come. And in the New this theocratic principle is not at all abandoned and dismissed but is appreciably advanced. It is precisely in the Church that that God through Christ rules by His Word and Spirit in His Kingdom. This Scripture testifies repeatedly (Heb. 12:22; Jer. 31:31-36; John 6:45). Indeed both church and state, if we may so express it, is now found in the church, for it is there that God by His Word and Spirit touches and orders the whole and every phase of the life of the citizens.

This becomes still clearer when we remember that in the Old Dispensation the civil state corresponding to that of today was found outside of Israel in heathendom, whereas even the typical aspect of the theocratic state continued into the New. Disp., before it died out. It appeared namely in the infallible guidance which He lent to the Apostolical founding and administration of the New Test. kingdom, and it even appeared in the Divine vindication of His authority in such cases as that of Ananias and Sapphira, and Simon the sorcerer (Acts 8) Elymas (Acts 13:6-12) and in line with this are all the signs and wonders of the Apostolic age.

From this it appears clearly that Israel's theocracy was not meant as a model for the civil state of today; on the contrary it is in principle realized in the N. T. Church.

But we may go farther and say not only that it was not a model, but also that it could not be a model. It was itself a defective picture of the perfect, itself full of impossible and embarrassing situations and growing weaker continually as the dispensation wore on. All the immediate and terrible vindications of the divine righteousness and holiness which were so frequent in the early history, e. g., during the Exodus and under the judges become less and less frequent. In the early history every inadvertant error in the

execution of the formal tabernacle-ritual is threatened with death (Ex. 28:43; Num. 4:15, 20) and Uzza, who touches the ark with devoted hand is smitten as an object lesson unto holiness. But when we come to the later kings and prophets an Ahaz builds a heathen altar in the holy place for his own pleasure and an Antiochus Epiphanes sacrifices a sow in the temple of the Lord and sprinkles the broth about the sacred precincts all with impunity. This theocratic type was waxing old and ready to vanish away.

But there is a second reason why that theocracy could not be a model of the present civil state, and that is that it was a kingdom of grace. Terrible as some of the executions and vengeance of the dispensation may have been we may never forget that essential to that dispensation was the operation and saving power of the grace of God. It is grace that made of Israel a people; grace that they are not consumed in the desert, and at Sinai; grace that David is not destroyed for his sins; grace that Jerusalem is spared from the avenging angel; grace that Israel is restored from captivity. This grace was an essential, integral part of the theocratic administration, and explains the continuation of the theocratic people.

Hence the theocracy cannot be the model for the civil state. For in the civil state as such there is no room for grace. Only in the kingdom of Christ is there a possibility of grace. Only in the kingdom of Christ is there a possibility of grace. In the civil state which arises out of nature and is limited to natural ordinances, any act of grace or pardon or amnesty is not grace or forgiveness but is only a correction of miscarriage in the course of justice. And the citizens of the civil state cannot safely be presumed to be susceptible to the methods of grace, not even the Christian citizen with his small beginning of new obedience.

Now these things undoubtedly become more intelligible and we also more easily reconcile our minds to them when we realize that all that may be desired in a state is to be fulfilled in the church and Kingdom of Christ. Even now that is so, as the apostle Paul says, II Cor. 10. For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds, casting down imaginations and every high thing. . . and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ, and through that same Christ shall one day be reconciled unto God all things whether in earth or in heaven. Col. 1:20.

And then we must also follow out the other consequence and maintain that the state can never be restored unless it is brought completely under the dominion of grace. The state is not itself an evil,

but is a phase of creation which has been brought under the dominion of sin.

To understand this we must look at the purpose of the state. It is undoubtedly wrong to say that the purpose of the state is to make human life possible through the restraint of sin. For the state has not come into existence as an after-thought for the restraint of sin but is given with creation and serves the purpose of organizing and controlling the life of men in natural equity for a harmonious systematic development. And that for better *or for worse*. Let us never forget the latter. The law is good, says the Apostle, but it was precisely by the law that sin came to appear in all its sinfulness for the law entered in that the offence might abound. So it is with the state which in itself is good but which by its organization and ordering of life shows sin in all its sinfulness, "the corruption of the best is the worst." Humanity is an organism and by far its greatest possibilities lie in harmonious organization. Thus sin does not reveal its most damnable character in a total of individuals but in the individuals organized into a smooth organism. And God will have sin to appear in all its sinfulness through the highest organization, just as He will, yea, in order that He may reveal the restoring power of grace in that highest organization of humanity which was corrupt in all its intricate ramifications. Rom. 5:20-21.

Also it is undoubtedly wrong to say that the state has its purpose in the creation of a sphere where the church may live unmolested. For surely such an elaborate apparatus was not necessary to create a peaceful sphere for the church. Does not history of the apostolic church tell us of a great fear that came upon all men so that they left the Christians unmolested? And does not Scripture tell us that it will be precisely that state that shall by its intricate organization persecute the children of God?

Therefore we conclude that Israel's Theocracy is the model or type of the state as it is realized in the kingdom of Christ through the church; and further that the civil state, which as a creation of God is good, nevertheless has not within itself the power to arise out of the bondage of corruption and is destined to be brought concretely farther and farther under that power until it becomes the instrument of the highest possible apostacy. For not only does the natural man work the corruption of that state, but also the old nature of the Christian contributes to its destruction, since in that sphere there is no restoring grace.

A. P.

## The Christian and Sports

Should there appear in one of the editions of the Standard Bearer an article or two concerning the happenings in the world of sport we would be shocked. Should there be a detailed report of the progress and outcome of the World's Series in the baseball realm, we would shake our heads and say, "What is this world coming to?" Should one of our daily newspapers publish upon its sport page, items of news concerning one of our churches we would feel highly insulted. The reason for this is that we all feel keenly that the church has nothing to do with sports and that sports are out of place in the life of the church. What then of the individual church member, the Christian, what must his attitude be in regard to sports? May he indulge in them? May he follow their development and daily happenings? We hope in this essay to pen down a few thoughts on this matter.

We do well to bear in mind that a Christian is not merely a church member. He is a disciple of Christ following Him in all His teachings and walking after the pattern He gave us. He is one who partakes of Christ's anointing. The name Christ means anointed. Hence we receive the name Christian. Christ was anointed to be our Prophet, Priest and King. We as Christians are likewise anointed to be prophets, priests and kings of God. As prophets, we are to serve Him with our mind. As priest, we serve Him with our hearts. Our kingly office we fulfill by serving Him with our strength. In one word we may say that a Christian is one who, through the Spirit of Christ, is entirely dedicated to God so that he thinks, wills, and acts only to God's honor and glory. In the measure we do this we are like Christ. In this measure we are Christians.

If we, now, approach the question bearing this in mind, we will have come quite a distance closer to the right conception of the Christian's relation to sports. The whole matter rests on the answer to this question, "Can we with mind, heart and strength glorify God by indulging in the sports of today?" The sports of today may be divided into the competitive sports such as baseball, football, basketball, racing, skating, golf, tennis and the like and such sports as hunting and fishing, wherein one does not compete with another. Some of the competitive sports, however, also lend themselves to individual indulgence and do not always contain the element of competition. Thus it is plainly with swimming, skating and golf.

You feel at once that many things will fall away

and be denied us when we hold fast to the above description of the Christian. If he is, and he most assuredly is, dedicated to God with body and soul, heart, mind and strength, life becomes very small for him. We must not let this turn our hearts or minds away and seek to excuse behavior which is not Christian according to the standard given above. Let me first prove my contention that this is the right conception of the Christian. Jesus, Himself, says, "Whosoever would come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross and follow me." Coming after Him is being His disciple, and that is what a Christian is. Paul declares, "None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: Whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." Or, if you will read Luke 9:57-62. There we are taught that the Christian, presented here as the citizen of the kingdom of heaven, must indeed be dedicated wholly to God or he is unfit to be a disciple of Christ.

We need not be hasty, now, in drawing our conclusions, but we must be honest. The element of competition in sports does not condemn them, unless this competition tends to prevent our glorifying God with the strength and talents He gives us. That is one of the great dangers in competitive sports. We soon become angry and jealous and say things that are not to God's glory or even resort to physical violence. This need not be the case, but only too often it is.

In a limited space as is allotted for this essay all the phases of sport cannot be treated. A few words can be said, however, concerning some of them. In general let it first be stated that when the child of God resorts to any sport to keep his body fit in order that he thereby may serve God, there is no danger in sports. One does need recreation. Paul makes mention of the race more than once. Were it, as such, sinful he would not borrow the figure of this sport. But let it be understood that it must be recreation and must not be carried to extreme so that we play until exhausted, go without food in order to get to the ball parks in time or play even when tired from a day's work. Such behavior is not to God's glory. We may not indulge in sports for sport's sake. Such sports as football, wherein one endangers his life or runs the risk of serious injury, must certainly be condemned. Likewise, the sport of automobile racing, wherein one in no way prepares himself for service to God, is of the devil.

In regard to the organized sports practiced by the world as baseball, football, basketball and the like,

it is the conviction of the undersigned that the Christian should have nothing to do with them and should have no interest in the activities of these godless men who desecrate God's sabbath and live for self and not for God. Their activity is to no degree at all to God's honor and glory. What is not to His glory should be loathsome to us. Should we care to know who is the world's champion if he or they excel only in that which is not to God's glory? When two men fight like beasts in the boxing ring, it is not the Christian who enjoys this. A mind and heart dedicated to God will shudder to see or hear the wonderful body God gave us undergoing such devilish abuse. The Christian's heart is full of love, but the prize-fighter's is full of hate. No one who loves his neighbour would think of stabbing and punching his body so brutally. No Christian will want to witness it or listen to it over the radio. When dogs fight, we stop them. Yet this human brutality is enjoyed by many. If the child of God listens and enjoys these things, it is his old man of sin and he must fight against it and not give in to that lust of his flesh.

Paul warns us that in the last days men shall be lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God. Beware then lest you find yourself in that category. Are you a Christian? Then live a life dedicated to God.

How often is it not that we find a child who knows all the baseball players in a certain team with their batting averages but cannot tell you the names of the twelve apostles! There are grown ups who are no better. Shame on us. The one sin also leads to another, for on the sabbath we cannot let the world go, but either wonder all day how the game is coming out, or else under the pretense of looking for music on the radio, go past the station where the scores are being given. That is not the activity of a Christian. Do not deceive yourself. If the world has such a hold on us, we should examine ourselves and ask ourselves whether we are really Christians after all. We must not be Christians merely in name.

If I may have a few more lines, I would also like to remark briefly on the sports of hunting and fishing. A Christian may practice them. The disciples were fishermen. Isaac sent Esau to hunt for venison. However, the Christian does not fish for the sport of it, and the Christian hunter does not hunt for the sport of it. We see too much shooting of harmless creatures by boys and men just for the sport of shooting. This is decidedly wrong and sinful. Only God can give life, and having given it to creatures we may not without a good reason take that life away. If the creature does not harm us, let it live. How little we think of life! Likewise is the practice of fishing for the fun of feeling the struggling fish, and then having caught it, release it to have the same experience some other day. If we do not fish

and hunt for food, we have no right to fish and hunt. Hunting and fishing are not sports for the Christian. They are means whereby he seeks the food God has provided for him.

J. A. H.

## Christus' Uitvoering van Zijn Profetisch Ambt Onder het Oude Verbond

Bij de bespreking van dit onderwerp, dienen we allereerst voor de aandacht te brengen, dat Christus de ambtsdrager is bij uitnemendheid. Eigenlijk, dat Christus alleen een ambt bekleed en uitvoert, en dat er dus geen schepsel is dat eenig ambt bekleed dan alleen zooals het afgeleid is van Christus' ambt. Dit wordt ons duidelijk als we letten op wat een ambtsdrager is in het algemeen en daarna op de uitvoering van het profetisch ambt, in het bijzonder.

De mensch immers werd van stonde aan in een ambt geplaatst, en dat ambt bestond in het algemeen daarin, dat hij God recht zoude kennen, Hem verheerlijken, Hem dienen met alle dingen, en alzoo verzorger van Gods aardsche huis. In een woord was de ambts taak van den mensch, om in, en met, en door alle alle dingen God te dienen. Echter dit dienen Gods geschiedde op drievoudige wijze, geheel in overeenstemming met des menschen drievoudig bestaan. Dat drievoudig bestaan den menschen wordt wel eens genoemd HET HOOFD, HET HART, en DE HAND van den mensch. Dat zijn de drie zijden van des menschen natuur, met welke hij is versierd, krachtens Gods scheppend werk in hem. Met zijn hoofd kende den mensch Zijnen God en sprak van Hem als het hoogste goed. Met zijn hart, wijdde zich den mensch God toe, en offerde hij in liefde alles aan God op. Met zijn hand hield de mensch de teugels vast en regeerde hij in Gods naam en tot Gods eer. Alzoo was de mensch naar de zijde van zijn hoofd, de profeet Gods, en naar de zijde van zijn hart, de priester Gods en naar de zijde van zijn hand, de koning Gods op de aarde. Zoodat het ééne ambt, hetwelk bestond in vriend-knecht Gods te zijn, op drievoudige wijze uitstraalde en kwam de onderscheiding in dat ambtelijk werk, die vandaag nog kenbaar is door de bekende uitdrukking: de mensch is profeet, priester en koning Gods.

We moeten echter niet uit het oog verliezen dat de mensch eigenlijk niet meer de profeet, priester en koning Gods is. Dat alles verloor de mensch toen hij in de zonde viel. Ja, wel bleef in zekeren zin de mensch profeet en priester en koning. Dat wil zeggen, wel bleef de mensch behouden hoofd, hart en

hand. Hij bleef mensch. Hij werd nooit redeloos, om een andersoortig schepsel te worden. Maar alle deze gaven, van hoofd, hart en hand sloegen in hun geestelijk-zedelijk tegendeel om, en het drievoudig bestaan van den mensch werd nu instrument des duivels. Zoc openbaarde de mensch zijn geestelijke afkomst, n.l., dat hij de duisternis liever heeft dan het licht Gods. Zoo is het ook gegaan met zijn profetisch ambt. De mensch is niet meer profeet Gods. Hij bedenkt en spreekt enkel ijdelheid. Het heeft den mensch niet goed gedacht om God in erkenenis te houden, en daarom heeft God hen overgegeven in eenen verkeerden zin. Zoodat ook des menschen hoofd-zijde, namelijk, die zijde die te doen had met zijn profeten ambt, nu vervuld is met alle ongerechtigheid, hoererij, boosheid, gierigheid, kwaadheid; vol van nijdigheid, moord, twist, bedrog, kwaadaardigheid, oorblazers, achterklappers, haters Gods, smaders, hoovaardigen, laatlunkenden, vindere van kwade dingen, den ouden ongehoorzaam; onverstandigen, verbondsbrekers, zonder natuurlijke liefde, onverzoenlijken, onbarmhartigen. Zie Rom. 1:28-31. In het licht van deze taal der Schrift zal immers niemand kunnen beweerden dat de mensch meer profeet Gods is.

Wat is wel een profeet Gods? Gewoonlijk meent men dat een profeet Gods is iemand, die de toekomst voorspelt, en dus met een blik in die toekomst, den menschen kan toeroepen wat haastig geschieden zal. Nu is dit wel een der elementen van een profeet. Hij moet ook wel toekomstige dingen openbaren en verkondigen. Maar dit is niet het een en al van een profeet. Ja, is dit nog niet zijn voornaamste taak. Volgens het Hebreeuwsche woord voor profeet, is zulk een profeet, een die overkookt en overvloedt. De profeet Gods is een die letterlijk overvloedt en overkookt van de kennis Gods. Het hart is zoo vol van de kennis Gods, dat de profeten overvloeien en alzoo verkondigen ze wat God hun geopenbaard heeft. De kennis Gods vervult hen zoo dat ze overmeesterd zijn door die kennis Gods, en het gevolg is dat ze spreken en niet ophouden totdat ze den vollen raad Gods hebben verkondigd. Alles wat ooit van God geopenbaard moet worden, wordt als het ware van God overgegoten in dien profeet en alzoo wordt de raad Gods bekend gemaakt aan den mensch. Daarom ook kan er geen geopenbaarde kennis Gods zijn, die verborgen is. Nooit mogen we zeggen dat eenig deel der Schrift verborgen is, of dat zekere gedeelten behooren tot den verborgen raad Gods. Wel kunnen we zeggen: Ik kan dat of dat niet verklaren maar nooit dat eenig gedeelte der Gods openbaring, eene verborghenheid Gods is. Er is geen verborghenheid Gods in de Schrift. Deze twee dingen sluiten elkander uit. Als het in de Schrift opgenomen is dan kan het niet meer verborgen zijn. Of als er verborgen dingen zijn (bij God), dan zijn die eenvoudig niet geopenbaard. Zoodat we mogen zeggen dat de profeet Gods is een



die de gansche raad Gods openbaart. De gansche Schrift is product van het profeten ambt.

Nu kunnen we verstaan dat Christus eigenlijk de profeet is bij uitnemendheid. Geen een der bijzondere schrijvers der Schriftgedeelten kon de volle raad Gods verkondigen. Elk een verkondigt een klein gedeelte er van. De capaciteit, zelfs van een Jesaja, was niet groot genoeg, om den vollen raad alleen op te nemen en die te openbaren, en verkondigen. Christus echter heeft die capaciteit wel. Hij, die in den boezem des Vaders is, die dezelfde is gisteren, heden en morgen, die God volkomenlijk kent en mint en dient, is dan ook de profeet Gods. Daartoe heeft God Hem gezalfd voor de grondlegging der wereld. Daarom wordt Hij genoemd de LOGOS Gods, d.i. het WOORD Gods. Hij is de volle uitdrukking des Vaders en door Hem alleen openbaart God zich aan alle schepselen. Hij is niet alleen de profeet Gods tijdens zijn 33 jarige omwandeling op aarde. Ook is hij niet alleen profeet Gods die laatste drie jaren van zijn aardse leven, na dat de Heilige Geest werd Hij daalde gelijk een duif. Door die Heilige Geest werd Hij wel bekwaam gemaakt om in onze natuur dat profetisch ambt verder uit te voeren. Doch Christus werd van eeuwigheid aangesteld en verordineerd om Gods profeet te zijn in deze wereld en tot in alle eeuwigheid. Van af Abel is Hij het geweest die ons den vollen raad Gods betreffende onze verlossing bekend gemaakt heeft.

Nu mag de vraag gedaan worden: Daar Christus te Bethlehem geboren was, nadat de wereld ongeveer 4000 jaren reeds bestaan had, hoe kan worden gezegd dat Christus het profetisch ambt uitvoer van Abel af aan? Immers Christus was nog niet. Hoe kan één die niet is, toch spreken? En het antwoord geeft Petrus ons als hij verklaard: "Van welke zaligheid ondervraagd en onderzocht hebben de profeten, die geprofeteerd hebben van de genade u geschied. Onderzoekende op welken of hoedanigen tijd de GEEST VAN CHRISTUS DIE IN HEN WAS, beduidde, en tevoren betuigde het lijden, dat op Christus komen zou, en de heerlijkheid daarna volgende. Uit deze woorden is het wel duidelijk, (a) dat het Woord nog wel niet vleesch was geworden en Bethlehem nog niet was gekomen, maar (b) dat de Geest van Christus in de profeten des Ouden Verbonds getuigden, en dat juist door dien Geest van Christus, het eigenlijk Christus was die in en door hen overkookte en overvloedde van de kennis Gods.

Het is dan ook zeer duidelijk als de profeten, zoo als Jesaja en Jeremia en andere profeten, spreken in een vorm dat ons doet denken aan de sprekende Christus. Bijvoorbeeld, in Jesaja hooren we de stem van dien profeet Gods, n.l. van Christus, als Hij het volk toeroept: "De Geest des Heeren Heeren is op Mij omdat de Heere Mij gezalfd heeft, om een blijde boodschap te brengen den zachtmoedigen; Hij heeft Mij gezonden om te verbinden de verbrokenen van harte,

om den gevangenen vrijheid uit te roepen, en den gebondenen opening der gevangenis; Om uit te roepen het jaar van het welbehagen des Heeren". Uit deze woorden is het zeer duidelijk dat Jesaja wel de spreker is, maar alleen als orgaan van den Christus, die door Zijnen Geest tevoren betuigt het lijden en de heerlijkheid, op Christus komende. Dit wordt nog versterkt door Lukas 4:16-21, waar de Heiland dit woord van Jesaja op zichzelf toepast. En dit vindt ge telkens en telkens weer, reeds van de vroegste jaren af aan. Abel's bloed sprak van het bloed der verzoening. Henoch, heeft van de Nieuw Testamentische zondaren geprofeteerd, zeggende: Ziet de Heere is gekomen met Zijne vele duizenden heiligen, om gericht te houden tegen allen en te straffen alle goddeloozen onder hen, enz. Noah sprak tegen het goddelooze geslacht van Zijnen tijd, en wees in dit alles op de ondergang der wereld onder Gods toorn. Abraham, Izaak en Jakob kookten over van de kennis Gods en der beloften Gods. Mozes, die Middelaar des Ouden Verbonds, sprak van den Christus in de welbekende woorden uit Deut. 18:15-22: "Eenen profeet uit het midden van u, uit uwe broederen, als mij, zal u de Heere uw God verwekken, naar Hem zult ge hooren. Naar alles wat gij van den Heere, uwen God, aan Horeb, ten dage der verzameling geeischt hebt, zeggende: Ik zal niet voortvaren te hooren de stem des Heeren mijns Gods, en ditzelve groot vuur zal ik niet meer zien, dat ik niet sterve. Toen zeide de Heere tot mij: Het is goed, wat zij gesproken hebben. Eenen profeet zal ik hun verwekken, uit het midden hunner broederen, als u; en ik zal Mijne woorden in Zijnen mond geven, en Hij zal tot hen spreken alles, wat Ik Hem gebieden zal. En het zal geschieden, de man, die niet zal hooren naar Mijne woorden, die Hij in Zijnen naam zal spreken, van dien zal Ik het zoeken. Maar de Profeet, die hoogmoediglijk zal handelen, sprekende een woord in Mijnen naam, hetwelk Ik hem niet geboden heb te spreken of die spreken zal in den naam van andere goden, dezelve profeet zal sterven. Zoo gij dan in uw hart mocht zeggen: Hoe zullen wij het woord kennen, dat de Heere niet gesproken heeft? Wanneer die profeet in den naam des Heeren zal hebben gesproken, en dat woord geschiedt niet, en komt niet; dat is het woord dat de Heere niet gesproken heeft; door trotschheid heeft die profeet dat gesproken; gij zult voor hen niet vreezen". Uit dit woord blijkt ook dat alhoewel het duidelijk is dat heel de lijn der profeten bedoeld is vanaf Mozes tot aan de Christus toe, en dat Israel daarnaar mag hooren en ze zelfs kon kennen in onderscheiding van de valsche profeten, toch slaat in diepsten zin dit woord op de CHRISTUS ALS PROFEET GODS. Hij is immers niet alleen de profeet, waarop heel de profetie des Ouden Verbonds uitloopt, maar Hij is wezenlijk DE PROFEET in al die profeten.

En naar die profeet, als de alleen gewettigde spreker, die optreden kan in den name Gods, moet Gods

volk luisteren. Naar geen ander. Die met eenig ander woord komt, is een valsche profeet. Die een ander Evangelie brengt, dan hetwelk gebracht werd door Christus, de Profeet Gods, en zoo van Christus door een Paulus, is vervloekt. Christus, de Profeet Gods, openbaart ons den vollen raad Gods betreffende onze zaligheid en verlossing. In zooverre het volk Gods dus die woorden van Christus opvangt, en ze wederom als getrouwe getuigen in het midden der wereld, weergeeft, in zooverre is Gods volk profeet Gods, het licht doen schijnende in de duisternis. Om die goede en getrouwe getuigenis moet dat volk lijden, maar dat is het ook uit genade gegeven. Want het is niet ons getuigenis, dat weersproken wordt door de leugenliefhebbers der wereld, maar de getuigenis Gods in Christus, de Profeet. God spreekt door Zijn Gezalfden Christus.

L. V.

## Nieuws Van Onze Kerken

Een kort overzicht van het bestaan onzer Protestantsche Gereformeerde Kerken.

Het waren nu juist niet zulke mooie dagen, tenminste niet voor het vleesch, die voorafgingen aan de tijd, dat we ons reformeerden en als kerken door Gods genade een bestaan mogen hebben.

Moeder de Kerk was nu juist niet zoo malsch in het uitdeelen van beschuldigingen. Ze sprak van een eigenwillige stijfhoofdigheid, we hadden Anabaptische neigingen, en ons evangelie maakte de God der liefde tot een tiran.

In een drie-wekelijksche Classis werden er dan ook heel wat kanonnen afgeschoten op het amechtig hoopje dat nu na ruim achttien jaren nog niet is verteerd, maar nog steeds voortwandelt op den ingeslagen weg die zeker de goeie Schriftuurlijke weg is, en zeker naar boven beweest; en al wat daarvan afvoert is valsch en ongereformeerd; en daarom onschriftuurlijk.

Nadat Dss. Danhof, Hoeksema en Ophoff met hunne kerkeraden wreed waren afgezet, werden er dan ook zeer spoedig maatregelen genomen tot organiseren onder de naam van Protesting Gereformeerde kerken.

De gemeenten Kalamazoo, Hope, Eastern Ave., Hull, South Holland, Oak Lawn, Byron Center, Roosevelt Park traden spoedig toe tot ons kerkverband; later volgden er meer.

Er was hier en daar nog al eens een, die naar het scheen, onze zaak was toegedaan. Er werd nog al eens gepleid voor onze zaak. We waren toch eigen-

lijk wel gereformeerd. Het werd toch ook nog uitgesproken door de kerken die ons uitwierpen, dat dit wel waarlijk het geval was, en geen gereformeerd mensch heeft tot op den huidigen dag de moed dit te ontkennen.

Al spoedig werden er maatregelen genomen en gearbeid tot het verkrijgen van een eigen school, die ten doel had om eigen studenten te kweken; want daar aan was groote behoefte. 't Ging echter niet op school, zooals dit werd verwacht. De booze strooide onkruid. Er kwam nijd en haat. Het gevolg was dat een der professors zich onttrok en dientengevolge niet meer meeleeft met ons als Prot. Geref. Kerken. Hij is dan van daar ook de eenigste Protesteerende leeraar; en deze kerk protesteert niet meer. De vrede in school werd hersteld op de basis van recht en gerechtigheid, en ze is gebleven tot op den huidigen dag.

Van tijd tot tijd mochten dan ook jonge mannen diplomas' ontvangen, die het recht geven om beroepbaar gesteld te worden in onze kerken. Onlangs werden er ook nog drie studenten toegelaten tot de dienst des Woords en der heilige Sacramenten. Er was bij deze gelegenheid echter niet veel belangstelling. Dit kenmerkt meestal onze vergaderingen, en 't is een zondige nalatigheid waarop dunkt me wel eens mag worden gewezen vooral met huisbezoek.

Er wordt ook onder ons nog steeds Zendingswerk verricht buiten onze kerken. Door dezen arbeid kwam er dan ook weer een andere gemeente tot stand. De Standard Bearer roept de jeugdige Randolph een hartelijk welkom in ons midden toe.

Ds. Schippers ontving het beroep om te arbeiden van uit ons midden als Zendings-leeraar. Wanneer ge dit briefje leest in de Standard Bearer heeft de Ds. waarschijnlijk een keuze gedaan. Onze "Church News" blad houdt ons hiervan wel op de hoogte.

Er wordt ook veel persarbeid in onze kleine kerken-groep verzicht. De Standard Bearer, Our Church News en the Beacon Lights reizen geregeld van Oost tot West.

In de korte spanne tijds dat we mochten bestaan, werden er verscheidene boeken en pamphlets uitgegeven in ons midden door Ds. Hoeksema; en me dunkt het mocht onder ons wel een beetje meer op prijs worden gesteld. Aan dezen arbeid is veel werk verbonden. Ook de beide laatste boeken die nu juist van zijn hand verschenen getuigen van diepe studie en een heldere blik in de waarheden der Schrift. "In the Midst of Death" en "In the Sanctuary" moesten dan ook door allen gelezen worden die de Gereformeerde waarheid liefhebben. In een Prot. Geref. huisgezin worden ze natuurlijk niet gemist. Al de Chr. Geref. en Geref. Dss. moesten vooral in "The Midst of Death" aanschaffen. Het is een verklaring van de eerste vier Zondagen van onzen Heidelberger. Er volgen d.v. meer boekdeelen over dit schoone macht-werk. Het is geen droge dogmatische verklaring, maar wel een

levendig, helder betoog der waarheid zooals de christen die noodig heeft op zijn pelgrims-reis door dit leven als den eenigen troost in leven en sterven; en ook de wet Gods als een zegel voor ons leven wordt ons voorgehouden, en wel meer in het bijzonder dat we onze naaste zullen liefhebben als ons zelven. Ge vindt in dit boek een goed uitgewerkt betoog: hoe dat de mensch naar Gods beeld was geschapen, maar Satan de rug toekeert, en in Christus weer gered wordt. Ge ontmoet er de God des haats, maar ook dezelfde Jehovah als de ontfermer voor Zijn volk.

Het boek: "In the Sanctuary" is niet van mindere waarde voor de lezer die het waarlijk is te doen om de waarheid. De auteur legt er vooral nadruk op dat bidden geen allemans werk is; en dat er bij de bidder een ernstig trachten moet zijn om te bidden in overeenstemming met Gods wil, want dan ook alleen wordt zijn gebed verhoord.

Het zijn een elftal "lectures", die Ds. Hoeksema het vorig winter uitsprak over de radio in verband met het allervolmaakste gebed. Er worden ook nu weer maatregelen genomen om in de toekomst de waarheid zooals wij die belijden, over de radio te verkondigen, en er is tevens een plan beraamd om meer menschen te bereiken. Dit kost natuurlijk ook meer geld, en we moesten er allen aan mee doen dit plan te doen gelukken. In dezen hebben ook wij als Prot. Geref. menschen een dure roeping. Het is moeite waard dat deze waarheid zoo ver mogelijk wordt verspreid. Men hoort dikwijls over de radio een melk en water evangelie. Ge ziet lezer, dat we als kerken zeer actief zijn om ook anderen te verkondigen de vrije soevereine genade Gods, waar aan de mensch niet meer werkt.

Sommige menschen, ook van gereformeerde huize, verhemelen tegenwoordig niet weinig de welbekende en zeer vermaarde radio spreker, Mr. Fuller van Californië; het is m.i. een evangelie op een stuivertje, zeer misleidend en ongereformeerd. Onder ons moet zoo'n armzalig gedoe dan ook niet worden gesteund. Het zou zeer ondankbaar zijn wanneer er niet eventjes aan wordt herrinerd dat den 15den Augustus 1940, we als kerkengroep feest vierden. De "Editor" van onze Standard Bearer had het groote voorrecht 25 jaren Gods Woord te bedienen. Zijn Eerwaarde mocht 16 jaar onder ons met blijdschap en veel vrucht werkzaam zijn. Er werden op dien dag banden van trouw en liefde, bij verneuwung gelegd. Zoo blijve het.

Dat we als kerkengroep Christelijk onderwijs voor staan behoeft zeker niet worden gezegd. We verstaan het zeer goed dat de publieke school afleidt van het rechte spoor en dat het onverantwoordelijk en zeer zondig is, wanneer ouders toch hun kinderen toevertrouwen aan zoo'n inrichting. En toch denken we dat alleen Christelijk onderwijs niet voldoende is; en daarom ons doel moet zijn, een eigen school. In het verleden hebben ouders van de eerste gemeente hier in

Grand Rapids middelen in het werk gesteld tot het verkrijgen van een Christelijke hoogeschool. Deze poging is echter mislukt. Er was verdeeldheid. Sommigen wilden een school voor hooger onderwijs, en weer anderen waren van meening dat lager onderwijs van meer beteekenis was. Er worden nu middelen in het werk gesteld om dit doel te zien verwekelijkt; en niemand zal het ons zeker wel kwalijk nemen. Het loopt echter niet vlot. Het zou jammer zijn dat 't mis liep. De verschillende vergaderingen voor dit doel worden gewoonlijk slecht bezocht, en verscheiden leden betalen niet het beloofde intekenings bedrag. Sommigen laten u weten dat ze niet willen meedoen aan het verwoesten van bestaande Chr. scholen. Weer anderen zijn van oordeel dat de bestaande scholen goed genoeg zijn, en dientengevolge het de moeite niet loont. Ook zijn er die zeggen dat de methode van ons werken niet deugt, en er wordt ook beweert dat we financieel te zwak zijn. Deze en nog andere meeningen houden m.i. geen steek, en er moet een andere reden voor worden gezocht.

Ik ben er tamelijk zeker van dat er bij ons is een verflauwing der grenzen, een ik geef er niet om geest. In een woord wereldgelijkvormigheid is onze gelederen binnengesloopen, en daarom moeten we weer met beide voeten gaan staan op het standpunt waarop we in 1924 door Gods genade waardig werden geacht te staan. Wij moeten weer de dingen van dit aardse leven verbinden met schatten van het eeuwige leven. Dan gaat het weer alles om God en Diens eere alleen.

Ik moet u ook nog eventjes vertellen dat er middelen in het werk worden gesteld, hier in het Zuidoostelijk deel van Grand Rapids, tot het organiseren van een nieuwe gemeente. Wanneer we goed Prot. Geref. zijn dan verheugen we ons hier in, niet waar? Natuurlijk de enkelen die ons verlaten omdat de lijn der Antithese wordt doorgetrokken staan hier buiten, en derzulken die onder ons deze zondige weg goed keuren, blijven ook koud. Het gaat de verkeerde weg op broeders en zusters. Ge weet beter, en daarom is het zoo gevaarlijk.

Ik had bijna vergeten even mee te deelen dat er in de Eerste gemeente al 135 "boys" in 'sLands dienst zijn, en dit getal wordt langzamerhand grooter.

Ik ben blij dat ik een oogenblik met u mocht keuvelen. Laat ons te zamen voortwandelen op het in 1924 ingeslagen pad. Het is niet een pad voor t' zondig vleesch, maar me dunk als ge geloovig met mij vooruitziet op het einde van de loopbaan dan is toch de kroon der overwinning in 't zicht.

S. D. V.

---

I am a stranger here,  
Dependent on Thy grace,  
A pilgrim, as my fathers were,  
With no abiding place.

## Reply to Rev. C. Hanko

Editor of the Standard Bearer:

Dear Mr. Editor,

May I reply to the article of Rev. C. Hanko, published in the September 1 issue of your paper? It is not a desire to have the last word that prompts me to ask for this, but concern about being misunderstood. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the stand of the Protestant Reformed Churches that membership in the C.I.O. and A.F. of L. is not compatible with membership in the Church of Christ. Therefore I am very anxious to gain the support of the members of those churches for the C.L.A.

I wish to state at once that it is the position of the C. L. A. that the relationship between employers and employees in our present day is one of mutual contract. They are equals in the sight of God. Both have rights and obligations.

It is not correct to do as Rev. Hanko did: place that relationship over against one of absolute authority, as two opposites, the one exclusive of the other, and then to state that the one is Scriptural while the other is not. That is all wrong.

Also in the relationship in which the employer and employee meet one another as equals, in which they enter upon an agreement, recognizing rights and obligations on both sides, there is room for authority. Proper use of the authority which the owner has is recognized by the C.L.A. and in the labor laws of our land. But never the misuse of authority, to impose injustices! That we do not recognize. To that the Christian worker of our day does not have to submit.

I do not agree at all when Rev. Hanko makes the bold assertion that the relationship between employer and employee is essentially the same as between parent and child, husband and wife, citizen and magistrate. In the first instance the relationship has been established by agreement, either spoken or written, which can be terminated at any time without violation of God's law. In the second the relationship has been established by divine institution, a relationship which cannot be broken at will without violation of divine precepts. The authority in the first is very limited, not the authority of government; in the second it is very definitely that. Surely the difference is so obvious that it needs no further explanation.

To bolster his position Rev. Hanko must again hark back to the conditions that existed in the early Christian churches. What were those conditions? A considerable number of the members of those small churches were slaves. They were often mistreated by masters who were not Christians. It is indicated that they were mistreated even for well-doing. There seems to have been hatred against those servants

because of the expression of Christian virtues. To those mistreated servants the Apostles direct admonitions, to be patient, obedient, not only to the good but also to the froward. Does Rev. Hanko suppose that I would contend that the Apostles were wrong in their admonitions? I trust not. In their position those slaves had to do what the Apostles demanded of them. They had no legal standing, no protection by law. They were under authority recognized by the Roman government. Revolt would have been contrary to the law not only but it would have cast an evil reflection upon the Church. It would have led to persecutions far worse than they had experienced up to that time. Those slaves were admonished to be patient until deliverance was brought by the hand of God. That deliverance from bondage did not come in their day, nor by the return of Christ, which the Apostles thought to be imminent. But deliverance from slavery did come! It took centuries, but it was accomplished! Should we not see in the improvement brought about in the social conditions and the living standards of the workers the general operation of God's Spirit, working through the beneficent influence of Christianity? Or must we simply ignore history? And was perhaps the emancipation of the slaves in our own nation less than a hundred years ago a mistake?

The position of the Christian worker of today is not comparable to that of the slaves of the Pauline era. And it is not so that the Bible demands such a recognition of authority as was in force between the slave and his master. That is why I referred also to Abraham and Boaz. Between them and their servants there was good will and mutual understanding. (I fail to see the difference in the exchange of greetings between Boaz and the reapers which Rev. Hanko puts into it.) But that is not all. In Leviticus 19:13, the employer is told not to hold the wages of the hiring overnight. The hiring had rights too. In Lev. 25:39 and 40 there is reference to the hired servant. Jacob *agreed* with Laban in regard to his wages. Throughout the Old Testament there are many indications that there were many relationships of employers and free workers. Jesus referred to such a relationship in one of his parables when he spoke of an *agreement* reached between the owner of the vineyard and the idlers in the marketplace. All that proves that Rev. Hanko's sweeping statement in regard to the Scriptural relationship between employers and employees does not hold, and that the idea of mutual contracts and of to restore it to him. In principle it is the same as

I, too, believe that Christians must suffer in patience! Yes, indeed! Such suffering will surely come when we testify. And when it comes as a result of that we may not revolt or seek revenge. But, that does not mean that we may not strive for justice, when the injustice has no direct connection with our Christian testimony. In such cases we may use the

laws, that God has providentially caused to be enacted. We may not take the law in our own hands, of course not. The C.L.A. abhors that. But, when an employee has unjustly been forced out of employment he has a moral claim to the job he was forced to give up, and he may use moral persuasion to regain it. That is his right. And it is the employer's duty to restore it to him. In principle it is the same as claiming return of something that was taken from him by unfair means. There may be no legal ground for an action to recover. But, that does not mean that the party who was wronged has not the right to seek recovery by moral persuasion, and the one guilty of the offense is certainly obligated to restore it to him. That's sound Christian ethics, isn't it?

I was a bit amused by Rev. Hanks's statement that Paul never did any more than appeal to Caesar! That was very naively put. What more could he have done? If ever there was a man who believed in making use of his rights under the law it was Paul. He appealed to the highest tribunal in the Roman empire! Rev. Hanks ought to have called Paul very inconsistent. The same man who admonished the slaves to submit in patience to everything they had to endure himself appealed from one court to another!

And yet Paul was not inconsistent. His position was entirely different from that of the slaves. They were bondservants but he was a free man! He had some authority of his own. He could and did demand justice.

The difference between the position of Paul and the bondservants was no greater than between that of those same slaves and the free workers of today. If Paul were writing to Christian workers today he would not write to them as slaves but as free men. I imagine that he would admonish them as follows: to be good workers; to give an honest day's work for a fair wage; to bargain fairly with the employer; to respect his rights; to be lawful in the pursuit of their rights; to use their liberty not as a means to impose injustice but to set examples of Christian virtue; in brief, to be Christian in the true sense of the term, making full use of the wonderful opportunities afforded them through their position as free men! Employers would be admonished in the same spirit. And I believe that he would add a warning against affiliation with unchristian unions. All that would be entirely in harmony with the spirit and character of Paul as revealed in his writings and actions. And Paul was Biblical, surely?

I really meant it when I stated before that I think we could use our time to much better advantage than we are doing in carrying on this debate. I do not look upon our differences as of such fundamental importance. We can agree to disagree on that point and still work together. Why should we divide our strength in anticipation of something that may never become a

reality? If we come face to face with the question in a concrete case we can come to a much clearer decision. Then the facts will be right before us. And, as stated before, with the laws protecting labor's rights which we now have, and all the agencies for settling of disputes in states and nation, it is very improbable that the C.L.A. will ever be faced with the question of whether or not to cease work in protest against injustice. For these reasons I believe that we would do better to cease arguing and to work together for a solution of the problems right at hand, one of which is the closed shop. That, to me, is a much more important one right now.

Thanks, again, Mr. Editor, for the space given me.  
J. Gritter, Sec'y C. L. A.

---

## Contribution

Rev. H. Hokseema

Dear Editor:-

In reading the Schedule for 1943 and 1944: I felt that there would be much valuable reading material for the Standard Bearer reader.

This is especially true when we are to have debates on such vital subjects as mentioned. Others could be added such as: Have Elders the right to serve in office without a general knowledge of the Three Forms of Unity, in accordance with God's Word; as also a fair to good knowledge of the church order.

I am excluding the Ministers here. To me it is self evident that they have this knowledge, since they received this at school.

I sometimes fear that our elders rely altogether too much on the pastor. This to my mind is a grievous error. The office of elder is very particular. It is the office of the Holy Spirit in the Church. And I believe that each and every elder is responsible to God for what he does and says, as he fills that holy office.

But all are not agreed with me on that point. As I heard a brother relate some time ago: "The church order is becoming too much a law of the Persians and the Medes." And there are more that view matters in this same way. Thus a good ground for not knowing the church order.

Thus: Is it essential; or none essential; to know, and strictly maintain the church order; and why?

However, I have a remark which I feel constrained to make. I love a good debate. Especially when the question is vital. But at the end of this schedule you as Editor state: "That the views are not necessarily that of the debaters; and that each side will marshal all the arguments to prove his point."





Now I cannot see debate in this light. For how can anyone marshall material which he himself disbelieves to be the truth? Can he take part of the LIE? How could I honestly debate on the question that the CHR. REF. CHURCH is right; and that we are wrong when I am convinced that the Common Grace Error touches the honor and glory of my God? Would I not become a deceiver, and a liar? May we play with the untruth; to establish the truth? I question this very seriously. In doing so (defending the Chr. Ref. Church) would I not be killing myself, and acting what I am not if I took the negative part of such a debate?

Possibly you can enlighten me how these debates can be carried on differently than I surmise. Awaiting your answer, I remain,

Yours in Christ,  
H. A. Van Putten

### REPLY

In answer to the objection of Mr. Van Putten, the following may suffice:

1. Such debates as the brother likes are not formal debates that are assigned to the debating parties, but actual controversies, in which each of the debating parties is convinced of the truth of his own position. In debates that are assigned the parties may or may not be convinced of the truth of the position they take in the debate. And since the debates announced in the Standard Bearer are assigned to the parties by undersigned, it was but fair to me to state that the views defended by them are *not necessarily* theirs.

2. I believe that such debates are possible if both the affirmative and the negative mean to serve the ultimate purpose to bring out the truth of the matter. One cannot, of course, conscientiously serve the lie, even in a debate. But one can certainly purpose to marshall all the arguments that are and may be brought up in support of a wrong view in order to give the opponent an opportunity to refute them, and thus to edify the readers and sharpen their wits.

3. The brother must remember that the subjects assigned to the debaters must be considered *debateable*. Mr. Van Putten has in mind the questions that are not debateable among us, so that the one party of the debate must take the side of what is absolutely considered to be the LIE, and would have to make an attack upon the honor and glory of God to defend his position. The brother will admit that this is not the case with the subjects I assigned to the different parties. They are debateable among us.

H. H.

### NOTICE

The Annual meeting of the Reformed Free Publishing Society will be held Sept. 16, at 7:45 P. M. in Fuller Church Parlors. Speaker for the evening, Rev B. Kok. Three board members are to be chosen from the following nomination. G. Koster, R. Schaafsma B. Woudenberg, D. Jonker, H. Knot, and Chas. Pas toor. All members are urged to be present, also friends and subscribers are invited. Financial report will be read and opportunity given to pay membership and subscription fees. Agents will be there at 7:15. If possible join the organization, your support is necessary.

### IN MEMORIAM

The Deaconate of Fuller Ave. Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids unite to express their sympathy to a fellow member, Mr. Henry Bouwman, in the loss of his

#### BROTHER

who was killed in action.

May our Father in heaven comfort and sustain him and his family in their sorrow.

H. Bastianse, Pres.  
J. Boelema, Sec.

Let all the earth Jehovah fear,  
Let all that dwell both far and near  
In awe before Him stand;  
For, lo, He spake and it was done,  
And all with sovereign power begun  
Stood fast at His command.

He makes the nations' counsels vain,  
The plans the peoples would maintain  
Are thwarted by His hand;  
Jehovah's counsel stands secure,  
His purposes of heart endure,  
For evermore they stand.

O truly is the nation blest  
Whose God before the world confessed  
Jehovah is alone;  
And blest the people is whom He  
Has made His heritage to be,  
And chosen for His own.