

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

VOLUME XXI

FEBRUARY 1, 1945

NUMBER 9

## MEDITATION

### Holy Impatience

*How many are the days of thy servant?  
when wilt thou execute judgment on them  
that persecute me?*

*Ps. 119:84.*

How long, O Lord?

This question appears to be the basic note of this particular section of Psalm one hundred nineteen.

Strong expressions of grief and sorrow, of anguish of soul and body, but also of hope and yearning for the salvation of the Lord, characterize the entire passage.

The Psalmist's soul fainteth for the salvation of Jehovah, his eyes fail for the Word of God as he anxiously asks the question: when wilt thou comfort me? He is become like a bottle in the smoke, parched and dry, wrinkled and miserable, a thing of reproach and contempt. The enemies have digged pits for him, persecuted him wrongfully, and he is almost consumed by their furious anger. And he prays for God's quickening grace, that he may continue in the way of Jehovah's testimonies. And so, the suffering and longing of his soul are centrally expressed in these questions of impatience: "How many are the days of thy servant? when wilt thou execute judgment on them that persecute me?"

How long, O Lord?

It is the question that is pressed repeatedly from the hearts of the people of God in this world, as they are "killed all the day long," and look for the final realization of Jehovah's promise.

Persecuted by the enemy, apparently delivered over to destruction by the anger of Jehovah, the Church cries out: "O God, why hast thou cast us off for ever?

... How long shall the adversary reproach? shall the enemy blaspheme thy name for ever? ... Arise, O God, plead thine own cause." Ps. 74:1, 10, 22. "How long, O Lord? wilt thou be angry for ever? shall thy jealousy burn like fire. ... Help us, O God of our salvation, for the glory of thy name." Ps. 79:5, 9. "How long, Lord? wilt thou hide thyself for ever? shall thy wrath burn like fire? Remember how short my time is: wherefore hast thou made all men in vain? ... Lord, where are thy former lovingkindnesses, which thou swarest unto David in thy truth? Remember, Lord, the reproach of thy servants. ... wherewith thine enemies have reproached, O Lord; wherewith they have reproached the footsteps of thine anointed." Ps. 89:46-51.

How long, O Lord? ...

We are waiting, hoping, longing! "As the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress; so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God, until that he have mercy upon us. Have mercy upon us, O Lord, have mercy upon us: for we are exceedingly filled with contempt. Our soul is exceedingly filled with the scorning of those that are at ease and with the contempt of the proud." Ps. 123:2-4.

How long, O Lord? ...

"How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" Rev. 6:10.

It is but one way in which the Spirit and the Bride express their intense longing for the coming of the Bridegroom:

Come, Lord Jesus!

Holy impatience!

How many are the days of thy servant?

It is a question of longing, not of vain curiosity. Other answer than that the extent of the days of our years are three score years and ten, or at the most

fourscore years, the poet expects not.

Nor is the question a complaint that the days of our life are all too brief, and that we fly away too fast. This is our attitude in as far as we are earthy, and live close to the things that are earthy. O, we do not want to be "unclothed." And the longing to be "clothed upon" with our heavenly house is not always strong. Perhaps, we prosper to an extent, and our soul cleaves to the dust, to things that are of this world. We are rather satisfied with the present, and we seek not the kingdom of God. Our treasure is upon the earth, and where our treasure is, there is our heart also. And we reluctantly think of the end, and anxiously notice how fast the time flits by. . . .

How many are my days? O, how few! . . . .

But this is not the attitude of the poet, nor the intent of his question. The entire context proves the contrary, as also the last part of this same verse: when wilt thou execute judgment? . . . .

The question expresses a holy impatience, a longing for the end of his days!

Do not misinterpret this intense and eager longing.

It is not the longing of the suicide that is expressed here. The poet is not so overcome with the sorrows of this present time, he is not so oppressed with the burdens of his present existence, that he prefers death to life. He is not morbidly yearning for the end as such, that is, for death. No Christian does. The dissolution of the earthly house of this tabernacle is never in itself an end to be desired. Death is and remains the last enemy. The believer does not want to be unclothed but clothed upon. . . .

But the poet's longing is a yearning and hoping for the final realization of the promise of God, for the perfection of salvation, for the glory of the inheritance incorruptible, and undefilable, and that fadeth not away, for freedom from sin and death and the suffering of this present time, for the glory of God's eternal tabernacle, for the final, public, and perfect adoption unto children, which shall be realized through the redemption of the body. For this salvation his soul faints, his eyes fail in longing. And, as the last part of this verse shows plainly, he longs for this day of salvation, and, from this viewpoint, for the end of his present days, especially because it will be the day of his perfect and public justification. He is being persecuted, killed all the day long. As an evil-doer he is filled with contempt and reproach. He must be justified. And the day of the final revelation of the righteous judgment of God he expects with a great longing.

How many are the days of thy servant?

How long, O Lord?

When wilt thou come to deliver me, and to avenge my blood, and the blood of all the saints, Thy servants, that has been shed upon the earth?

The days seem long.

It appears sometimes as if the Lord were slack concerning His promise.

Day after day passes, and there is no deliverance.

The enemy scorns and derides, and mockingly asks the soul-piercing question: "Where is now thy God?"

"Where is the promise of His coming?"

Come, then, O Lord! Show me Thy salvation! Execute judgment upon them that persecute me!

How many are my days? These days in the body of this death? These days of sin and imperfection, of knowing in part, of looking in a glass darkly, of things that are seen, of the triumph of the enemy, of battle and suffering, of reproach and shame. . . .

Come quickly, O God of my salvation!

Holy impatience!

---

Mighty impatience of the saints!

Mighty, for, paradoxical though it may seem, it is this holy impatience that makes them truly patient!

Impatient with a view to the glory that shall be revealed in them, and with respect to the final justification for which they long and wait in hope, they are truly patient in regard to the sufferings of this present time.

Impatient in their longing for the hope they see not, they do with patience wait for it!

For, mark you well, the poet's anxious query is not motivated by the dissatisfaction of unbelief.

O, unbelief is also impatient, but it is impatient only with respect to the sufferings of this present time. It is not satisfied with God's way. It murmurs and grumbles because of God's dealings with men. It is rebellious. It is mutinous. It refuses to fight the battles of Jehovah. It has no strength to continue in the way of God. It is faint and weak and miserable, and bitterly complains that the way of the Lord is not equal.

Carnal Israel in the desert revealed this attitude of unbelieving impatience repeatedly. They never embraced God's promise. Always their heart was in Egypt. O, it is true, the oppression in Egypt had been intolerable, and freedom from that oppression had appealed to them also. Besides, even to their carnal imagination a land flowing with milk and honey had its appeal. But they cared not for the service of Jehovah. The glory of His name was of no concern to them. Their confidence was not in the Lord the God of Jacob. And when the way of the land of promise was long and difficult, led through the terrible wilderness, they soon manifested their unbelief. In retrospect, the land of Egypt, with its fleshpots, its onions and garlick, after all appealed to them. They became impatient, they murmured against Jehovah, they grew

faint in the way, and they could not enter in because of their unbelief. . . .

They were impatient. . . .but for Egypt!

Their impatience made them look back with longing to the land whence they had been delivered with a mighty hand!

O, and even the carnal nature of the children of God can sometimes so assert itself that they become a prey to this same rebellious impatience.

Asaph, before he went into sanctuary, and considered "their end", uttered such a complaint of carnal impatience with the way of the Lord. Did he not see how the righteous suffered, how his own chastisement awaited him every morning; and how the wicked prospered, had more than heart could wish, and how they proudly boasted in their prosperity? O, his feet well nigh slipped, and it was in his heart for a moment to complain that there is no knowledge in the Most High! . . .

Unholy impatience!

It is characterized, not at all by a longing for the revelation of the glory that shall be revealed in us, but by dissatisfaction with our present way, the way of the Lord. It is motivated, not by the longing for the things that are heavenly, but by the lust for the things that are earthly. It is not a patient enduring unto the end, but an impatient refusal to bear the cross. It has no strength to rejoice even in tribulations, but is so weak that it complains and murmurs at the slightest sign of suffering for Christ's sake. It does not fight the battle, but lays down the arms. . . .

It can never enter into the kingdom of God!

How different is the impatience of the psalmist!

His is the impatience of true patience!

It is an impatience that lends strength of endurance to his patience!

Is he not even now conscious of his being the *servant* of the Lord? And, to be sure, this means that he is "saved," that he is regenerated, called, justified, and partakes of all the blessings of salvation. But it also means much more. To be *servant* of the Lord implies that one's whole life in this world is an appointment by the Most High which one must fulfill, a sacred charge which one must accomplish, a holy obligation which one dare not shirk. It means that by the grace of God His precepts are our delight, and we have a strong desire to walk, not only according to some, but according to all His commandments. It means that we are of the party of the living God, and are set in this world to the glory of His grace in the beloved. . . .

How many are the days of *thy servant*? . . .

The psalmist is conscious of his being the servant of the Lord. He calls himself thus with a free conscience!

It means that he has not forsaken his post. He stands where the Lord his God has stationed him. The

enemies attack, persecute, fill him with reproach and shame. In the position appointed him by his God, he suffers. He does not flee for fear of the enemy. They almost consumed him, but he did not forsake the precepts of his God. And remaining steadfast at his post, he still prays: "Quicken me after thy loving kindness; so shall I keep the testimonies of thy mouth." vs. 88.

But while he is thus patient, he is impatient.

Patient in tribulation, strong to endure, he longs with a mighty longing for the salvation of the Lord!

His soul faints for it!

How long are the days of thy servant, O Lord?

Come, yea, come quickly!

*Holy* impatience!

For even this mighty longing for the revelation of the final glory of the children of God is concentrated in, and consecrated to the glory of Jehovah's name!

This was true of the impatience of the psalmist.

And it is true of all the cries of longing of the servants of Jehovah, of the saints in Christ, throughout the ages.

They long for the theodicy, for the revelation of the righteous judgment of God, they cry to Him day and night, in order that their God and His cause, the cause of the Son of God, the cause of His covenant, which by His grace is their cause, may be justified!

When wilt thou execute judgment upon them that persecute me?

How long dost thou not avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?

The cause of the Son of God they represent in the world. By grace they are righteous. Out of darkness they have been called into God's marvelous light, and as children of light they walk. To the glory of God's grace in the Beloved they are set in the world. Therefore the world hates them, as they have hated God's Christ. And they are persecuted. And they must suffer. And the cause of the Son of God is evil spoken of. It is condemned by the mighty of this world. It apparently suffers defeat. They that represent that cause are killed all the day long. . . .

And so, the righteousness of God does not appear!

The wicked prosper, the righteous suffer. And God is longsuffering. His very name and glory are at stake. Yet, He appears to be slack concerning His promise!

How long, O Lord? For thy name's sake, how long? . . . .

Execute judgment upon them that persecute Thy saints, and let the glory of Thy holy name appear!

And Thy righteousness shine as the noonday sun! For ever and ever!

H. H.

## *The Standard Bearer*

Semi-Monthly, except Monthly in July and August

Published by

The Reformed Free Publishing Association  
946 Sigsbee 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, W. Hofman, J. Heys, 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. GERRIT PIPE, 946 Sigsbee Street, 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

### CONTENTS

#### MEDITATION—

HOLY IMPATIENCE .....	193
Rev. H. Hoeksema	

#### EDITORIALS:—

THE EVANGELICAL & REFORMED CHURCH .....	196
WE HEARTILY AGREE .....	198
EXPOSITION OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM .....	198
Rev. H. Hoeksema	

THE CATACOMBS .....	202
SAMSON'S SEEKING OCCASION .....	203
Rev. G. M. Ophoff	

ALS EEN WATERSTROOM .....	205
Rev. G. Vos	

THE PRINCIPLE OF CHR. SCHOOL DISCIPLINE .....	208
Rev. W. Hofman	

CALVIN AND THE REFORMATION .....	210
Rev. H. Veldman	

CONTRIBUTION .....	213
Mr. J. Gritter, Sec'y C. L. A.	

THE APOLLINARIAN CONCEPTION OF THE NATURES OF CHRIST .....	214
Rev. M. Schipper	

## EDITORIALS

### The Evangelical and The Reformed Church

Before I proceed with the discussion of the "merger," let me state here that through the kindness of one of the brethren of the "Reformed Church in the United States," a brother that took an important part in opposing the merger, I received a good deal of literature that gave me new information about the history the brethren, especially of the "Synod of the Northwest," made and the struggle they went through.

I discovered, too, that several classes expressed their disapproval of the Plan of Union, and of the merger (among which classis Eureka), while others gave their consent on condition that they could retain the Heidelberg Catechism as their Confession.

However, I still failed to find a formal protest against the action of the General Synod of 1932, by which they adopted the Plan of Union.

Secondly, I noticed (this from the articles in *The Witness* which I reprinted in the previous issue of our paper) that classis Eureka recently incorporated as the Reformed Church in the United States. I understand that this means that the classis is a legal body before the law. I even found a notice from classis Eureka to the Synod of the Northwest (Acts and Proceedings, 1938) stating that the classis already at that time claimed to have a legal right before law to all the property of the Reformed Church in the United States. For us this is something new and strange, i.e. it is foreign to our conception of Reformed Church polity that a classis or Synod can incorporate as a legal body. I am sure that the brethren would do us a favor if they would throw some light upon this matter. I also would like to know whether the action of classis Eureka was a purely local affair, and whether it precludes further conferences with other brethren that are concerned about the condition of the merged church. Does classis Eureka claim the exclusive right at present to the name "Reformed Church in the United States," and would other congregations that would desire to take a similar step have to become a part of the corporation established by classis Eureka in order to share the right to that name?

I confess that I am somewhat confused on the matter. A little more light is very desirable.

But let me now return to the discussion of the "merger."

I would like to make a few remarks about the "Constitution and By-Laws of the Evangelical and Reformed Church," a copy of which is now in my possession through the kindness of the Rev. U. Zogg of Scotland, S. D.

It is not my purpose to enter into a detailed discussion of this Constitution. Our readers will agree with me that we are mostly interested in the doctrinal basis of the Union Church that was adopted finally.

It is very brief, but also very significant. Here it is in full:

"The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are recognized as the Word of God and the ultimate rule of Christian faith and practice.

"The doctrinal standards of the constituent Churches are accepted as interpretative statements of the essential truth of evangelical Christianity as taught in the Holy Scriptures. In these statements of faith, ministers and members are allowed liberty of conscience whose final norm is the Word of God.

"In its relation to other Christian communions the Evangelical and Reformed Church shall constantly endeavor to promote the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." pp. 1, 2.

That is all.

In a footnote we are reminded that "according to the Plan of Union, Article II, the historical confessions of the two Churches are acknowledged as the doctrinal basis of union. The Evangelical Synod of North America in its constitution accepts the Augsburg Confession, Luther's Catechism and the Heidelberg Catechism, in so far as they agree. On all points of difference it adheres to the passages of the Holy Scriptures bearing on the subject, and avails itself of the liberty of conscience prevailing in the evangelical church. The Reformed Church in the United States in its constitution accepts the Heidelberg Catechism as an authoritative expression of the truths of the Holy Scriptures and acknowledges it as its standard of doctrine."

From all this it should be perfectly evident, and we say it without reservation, that the Evangelical and Reformed Church is a church without a confession. It is a creedless church. The truth of this ought to be evident from the following.

1. The statement that "the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are recognized as the Word of God and the ultimate rule of Christian faith and practice," cannot be accepted as a creed, for a creed is exactly the officially accepted statement of what a church or group of churches believes to be the *true doctrine* contained in the Scriptures.

2. Although the statement that "the doctrinal standards of the constituent churches are accepted as

interpretative statements of the essential truth of evangelical Christianity as taught in the Holy Scriptures," might leave the impression that by it these doctrinal standards (the Augsburg Confession, Luther's Catechism, the Heidelberg Catechism) are accepted as the official confessions of the E. and R., this impression is deceptive. The statement declares nothing concerning a doctrinal basis, it does not say that these standards are authoritative, it does not even state that they are *correct* interpretations of the truth of the Holy Writ. Anyone could make this statement without committing himself to being doctrinally or confessionally bound. Of course, those confessions are interpretative statements! What else could they be? And who would deny it? But a creed is concerned with the questions whether you accept them as true statements, whether you agree to be bound by them, whether you will teach and defend them, and reject whatever is in conflict therewith. No confession is adopted by the above statement.

3. Even if it were the intention of the above statement to adopt the standards referred to as a basis of union, this would be completely neutralized by the rest of that paragraph: "In these statements of faith, ministers and members are allowed liberty of conscience whose final norm is the Word of God." I like to call attention to the fact that the term "liberty of conscience" is a beautiful expression that is here used to cover the evil of "doctrinal indifference." No one can be denied liberty of conscience. True liberty of conscience is beyond the authority and power of any man or body of men. And any honest minister or member in any church, though it would have the strictest and most minutely circumscribed creed, has liberty of conscience. He is never compelled to speak against his conscience. Is he not voluntarily subscribing to the confession of the church of which he is a member or minister? And can he not sever his connection with that church whenever he no longer agrees with its doctrinal statements? But the above statement from the Constitution of the E. and R. does not mean freedom of conscience. It means doctrinal indifference. Any member or minister can believe and teach what he wants!

Hence, the Evangelical and Reformed Church is strictly without a creed.

The doctrinal basis adopted in the Constitution is worse than that announced in the Plan of Union.

The latter at least accepted the historical confessions of the two churches as a *doctrinal basis of union*. The Constitution adopts no doctrinal basis at all!

The Constitution of the original Evangelical Synod permitted limited "liberty of conscience," or freedom of doctrine, viz., only in as far as the Augsburg Confession, Luther's Catechism, and the Heidelberg Catechism differed from one another. The Constitution of

the merged church allows unlimited freedom of doctrine. One can explain Scripture precisely as he wants in the united church!

A few illustrations of what this means with respect to what is actually being taught in that church I hope to furnish next time, D.V.

But even now enough has been said to warrant the statement that no true Reformed man or minister can remain in such a fellowship.

H. H.

---

## We Heartily Agree

We wholeheartedly endorse the following paragraph from the pen of Prof. Henry Schultze, clipped from *The Banner* of Jan. 5, 1945:

"There is no aspect of the Christian school program that needs to be watched more closely. The Christian Reformed constituency have founded, maintained, and developed these schools for the purpose of training their children in their own faith. The most important item in such a program will be the teachers. There is a group of people cooperating with us in the Christian school movement who do not see eye to eye with us on some important aspects of doctrine. There is a persistent rumor that they, or many of them, would prefer to have their own schools. We may regret this because, in order to bring and keep these schools to their highest degree of efficiency we need to pull together, but it is a perfectly understandable position. They want their specific form of faith propagated. And that is what our own constituency wants or ought to want. This conception of broad Christianity is a precarious one. In the name of Christianity dances have been sponsored, theatre parties have been organized, the sovereignty of God has been ignored, and the Sabbath has been desecrated. Far be it from me to accuse any teacher in the Christian schools of such a liberal conception of Christianity. But the fact remains that you may have such a liberal conception and still carry the name of Christian. The parents who support the Christian schools do not want any doctrine taught their children that is opposed to theirs. Any honest Lutheran cannot possibly be Reformed. There is not a good Methodist that can be Reformed. These people have their deepest convictions and no one has a right to ask them to be untrue to them. The Dispensationalists are enthusiastic about their position. They cannot be anything else in their teaching but Dispensationalists. If there is any one phase of the teacher's qualification that the board should be very much concerned about it is the teacher's conception of Christian doctrine and life."

These are words which every Protestant Reformed man should take to heart.

The general principle from which they proceed is that, if our Christian Schools are to serve their intended purpose, they must be based on a platform of specific principles.

For the Christian Reformed parents this must mean that they want their "specific form of faith propagated," also in the schools that instruct their children.

The same is true for Protestant Reformed parents.

We certainly cannot agree with the Christian Reformed parents on a basis of specific principles for the education of our children.

If we love our Protestant Reformed truth we will certainly strive to inculcate it into our children "to the utmost of our power."

And this means that we will seek to establish our own schools wherever this is possible.

That must be our ideal.

Let us work together, brethren, with all our might unto the attainment of this end.

H. H.

---



---

## The Triple Knowledge

---



---

### An Exposition Of The Heidelberg Catechism

Part Two.

Of Man's Redemption

Lord's Day XIII.

2.

Christ's Sonship And Ours.

To avoid repetition, we must clearly distinguish just what subject the Heidelberg Catechism is discussing in the thirteenth Lord's Day.

We must not, in this connection, speak of the mystery of the incarnation as such, the doctrine that the Son of God assumed our flesh and blood from the virgin Mary. For this is treated in the following Lord's Day.

Nor is it the purpose of this part of the Catechism to discuss the mystery of the sonship of the second Person in the Holy Trinity, for this was treated in the eighth and ninth Lord's Day of our Instructor.

But the Catechism is here explaining the words of the Apostolic Confession: "And in Jesus Christ, *the only begotten Son of God.*" That Jesus Christ is the eternal and essential Son of God, that the Man Jesus,



Who was born in Bethlehem, and Who left His life on the bloody tree of Golgotha, is very God Himself, — that is the definite point of discussion in this thirteenth Lord's Day. It is true, of course, that, to bring out this specific truth in bold relief, it cannot be avoided to say something about the *eternal Sonship* of this Jesus. But this is necessary only in so far as it is required to distinguish this man Jesus from all other men, to maintain and exhibit the infinite chasm there exists between His Sonship and that of all other children of God, especially that of His brethren.

Let us clearly understand the importance and the necessity of this distinction.

The importance lies in the fact that the Church confesses: "*I believe in Jesus Christ.*" Now, if in this confession she does not also clearly and definitely maintain that this Jesus Christ is *very God*, her faith is nothing but hero-worship, faith in Man, in Self. Then Jesus is not the revelation of the Father, the God of our salvation reaching out to us from the mysterious depths of eternity and infinity, but merely the noblest product of the human race, the revelation of the wonderful possibilities that lie hid in the human nature. Then the confession: "*I believe in Jesus Christ,*" means: "*I believe in the man of Galilee, in his goodness, nobility, teaching, example, and that I have all the requirements necessary to follow him, and to make myself like him.*" Then Jesus is not the revelation of the righteousness, and wisdom, and sanctification, and redemption of God, but of the righteousness, and wisdom, and holiness, and redemption of man.

Such is the Christ of modern philosophy.

It is this Christ upon whom the proud but hopeless structure of modernism is built. The keystone of this structure, that which makes it so hopelessly weak, is a mere denial: the denial that this Jesus is very God.

But the faith and hope of the Church cannot rest in man. When the Church says: "*I believe,*" the object of that faith is always GOD, the only God, the One that dwells in the light no man can approach unto, the Eternal, the Infinite, Who is not comprehended by time or space, but Who Himself spanned the chasm that separates Him from us by His revelation. He is the One Whom no one knows save the Son, and those to whom the Son will reveal Him.

Therein lies the importance of the distinction the Catechism here makes.

Deny that this Jesus is very God, and the article of our faith by which we confess that we believe in Jesus Christ means: "*I believe in Man.*"

Confess, however, with the Church of all ages, that Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God in an altogether unique sense of the word, and your faith and hope are still in the only true God.

And necessary this distinction is, necessary it is always again to insist on, to emphasize this distinction,

and to set it in bold relief, because in the revelation of Jesus Christ God approached us so closely, He came so dangerously near unto us, that He, as it were, challenged sinful men to deny that He is very God.

In creation He reveals His eternal power and God-head, and sinful men refuse to glorify Him, and to give Him thanks. The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiwork. In the theophany of the first Paradise, when Adam apprehended the approach of God in the cool of day, there was a clear revelation of His majesty, before which Adam hid himself. Even when He revealed Himself through the speech of angels, there always was some manifestation of divine glory that made men fear and tremble. Sinai is hid in smoke and darkness, it quakes and trembles at the approach of the Most High, and from its summit roars the voice of the Almighty as the voice of thunder, striking terror into the hearts of men. But in Jesus the chasm between the infinite Majesty and mere men, even sinful men, between the Creator and the creature, the Eternal and time, the infinite God and finite dust, the only Lord and His servants, appears to be completely abridged, eliminated. In the revelation of Jesus Christ GOD seems hid! In the manger He is a babe, helpless and dependent. In Nazareth He grows up as any other child: He increases in wisdom and stature. He dwells among us, eats and drinks, speaks and works, is tired and sleeps, is troubled and weeps. Men can see Him, hear Him, understand Him, touch Him; even contradict Him, oppose Him, mock Him, take a hold of Him and bind Him, judge Him and condemn Him, kill Him and bury Him!

GOD in the flesh yea, in the likeness of sinful flesh!

O, how easy it is to deny that He is God at all! And this is exactly what mere men always did. They denied it when, in the days of His flesh, He walked and tabernacled among us, and they even killed Him because He confessed that He was the Son of the living God. And they denied it from Arius to the present time. They admitted that He was a wonderful man, a good man, a man that was more deeply God-conscious than any other before Him, a man that was entitled to the name Son of God, that was *appointed* to be Son of God, but they denied that He is GOD. And they still deny it.

And, therefore, it is very necessary that the Church jealously guard this truth, this Rock upon which she is built, and insist that when she confesses that she believes in Jesus Christ she means nothing else than what she began to confess in the first article of the *Apostolicum: Credo in Deum*. And because in the revelation of Jesus Christ, God is also man, there is no more effective way to preserve the truth of the unique Sonship of Christ, than by drawing clear and sharp lines of demarcation between the sonship of the only Begotten and that of the mere creature, particularly that of

believers. Such lines the Catechism draws in question and answer 33: "Why is Christ called the only begotten Son of God, since we are also the children of God? Because Christ alone is the eternal and natural Son of God; but we are children adopted of God, by grace, for his sake."

Christ, according to His divine nature, is *begotten* of God. He is the *only* begotten. Another Son that is *begotten* there is not. Other sons of God may be *created*, or they may be children by reason of a gracious act of *adoption*, they may even be *born* of God, but they are not *begotten*. But Christ is *begotten* of God. He is not created, i.e. He is not the Son of God through an act of God's omnipotent will, in virtue of which He calls the things that are not as if they were; nor is He adopted, i.e. the right and privilege of being called Son of God are not bestowed upon Him by grace; nor is He born of God, i.e. He is not made a being outside of God endowed with a creaturely reflection of God's virtues; He is begotten. True, He is also born. He is the firstborn among many brethren, the firstborn of every creature, the firstborn of the dead, but all this is true only of the Son of God in human nature. In His divine nature He is begotten, the only begotten. He does not have His origin in the divine conception, in the divine will, in the eternal counsel. On the contrary, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, He is the Subject of that counsel. He is begotten by an act of the Father in the divine *Essence*.

Hence, Christ is the *eternal* Son of God. And this means, to be sure, that as Son of God He has no beginning and no end. There is no distinction of time between the Father and the only begotten Son, as if the Father were first, and thereupon He gave being to the Son. The Father was never without the Son, the Son was never without the Father, the Father and the Son were never without the Holy Spirit. But it also implies that the divine act within the divine Essence, whereby the Father begets the Son, takes place in eternity, not in time at all. Eternity is not time, even as God is not the creature; and time is not eternity, even as the world is not God. There is a chasm between eternity and time that can never be abridged, even as there is such a chasm between God and the world, between the Creator and the creature, between the divine and the human. Time is change, flux, becoming, succession of moments; eternity is the unchangeable, infinite fulness of being and activity. That Christ is the *eternal* Son of God means that He IS Son in virtue of an unchangeable act of the Father within the divine Essence, in which the Father is active with all the infinite fulness of the Godhead. Incessantly, eternally, with infinite perfection of activity of the whole divine Essence, the Father gives life to the Son. This unfathomable deep mystery the Church tried to express by the term *eternal generation*.

And so, as the Catechism expresses it, Christ is, according to His divine nature, the *natural* Son of God. In virtue of the fact that He is *begotten*, and that, too, by an eternal act of the Father within the divine Essence, the Son is *essentially* God. Having His origin as Son in the divine Essence, He is of the divine Essence, God of God, Light of Light, Eternity of Eternity, Infinity of Infinity. The act of generation being an eternal activity of the whole divine Being proceeding from the Father, the Son is Himself God, possessing in and of Himself all the divine perfections. He is Almighty, Allwise, Omniscient, Omnipresent, Eternal, Independent, Self-existent, Incomprehensible, the implication of all infinite perfections, and the overflowing Fount of all good. He is the *natural* Son of God!

And, mark you well, *Jesus* is that only begotten, that eternal, that natural Son of God. He, the eternal Son, at His incarnation, did not change into man. We must not speak of a pre-existent Christ in the sense that before His incarnation He *was* in the form of God, but now *changed* into the form of man. His incarnation did not mean that He *left* the bosom of the Father, in order to become mere man. No, this Jesus, this Christ, this Babe in the manger, this Child of Nazareth, this Man of Galilee, this Sufferer on the cross, IS very God. More must be said about this in connection with the next Lord's Day. But even now it must be remembered that we are speaking of the historical Jesus, when we confess that He is the only begotten, the eternal, the natural Son of God. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Isa. 9:6.

"I believe in Jesus Christ," means: "I believe in the God of my salvation."

How different, how infinitely different from this eternal Sonship of the Christ, is our sonship as believers!

He is begotten, we are adopted, and born of God.

He is the natural Son of God, we are children of God by grace, for His sake.

He is the essential image of the Father, we are but creaturely reflections of His image.

He is Son within the divine Essence, we are children without the Essence of God.

He is God, we are creatures.

Adam, too, was the son of God. He was such by reason of his creation; by an act of God whereby He called the things that are not as if they were. It pleased Him to create a son. Hence, He made Adam after His own image, so that in his very nature he was adapted to reflect the virtues of God, was endowed with true knowledge of God, righteousness and holiness, and stood in the relation of a son to God, his Creator-



Father. He was known of God, and knew Him; he was loved of God, and loved Him; he had the right to dwell in God's house, and enjoyed His fellowship; and he served the Father in the freedom of a son. But he became disobedient. He rebelled. And he lost his sonship. He forfeited all his rights as a son, and became guilty, damnable, worthy of God's wrath, an exile from God's house with no right to return, worse than a stranger. And He also became in his very nature an enemy of God. The image of God in him was perverted into the very image of his father the devil. He became darkness, unrighteousness, unholiness, a lover of iniquity. Man by nature is no longer the son of God.

But it pleased God, nevertheless, to have many sons, and to lead them to a higher glory of sonship than Adam could ever attain. He adopted us, i.e. He gave us the right to be his sons, and all the privileges of children of God. Us, who by nature are no children of God, but children of the devil, exiles from His house, enemies of God He adopted, gave the right to His love, to His care, to His blessings, and to the blessed fellowship of His tabernacle. Just as a human father may adopt a strange child, that is not of his flesh and blood, that is, give it the legal status of his child and heir, so God adopted us, who were no children, and thereby made us legal heirs of all the blessings of salvation.

This adoption is an act of pure grace.

And we may distinguish various aspect of, or, if you please, stages in this gracious act of adoption.

It has its source in God's eternal counsel. For in that counsel He ordained His only begotten Son to be the firstborn of every creature, the firstborn of the dead, and the firstborn among many brethren, the Head of the Church; and in Him and unto Him He adopted all the elect to become sons of God. For He "predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherewith he hath made us accepted in the beloved." Eph. 1:5, 6. And Christ "is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature. . . and he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." Col. 1:15, 18. "For whom he did fore-know, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren." Rom. 8:29. In sovereign grace, therefore, He adopted us from before the foundation of the world, and that, too, in Christ, the firstborn from the dead.

And this adoption is realized in time, and will be perfected in the day of Christ, through the resurrection, and by the revelation of the righteous judgment of God.

It is realized through the cross, the perfect sacrifice of Christ. For in ourselves, as we come into the world

in Adam, we are children of wrath, with no right to sonship whatsoever, guilty and worthy of eternal desolation. But the only begotten Son assumed the flesh and blood of the children, came in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, took His ordained position at the head of all the elect took the whole burden of their guilt and sin upon His mighty shoulders, and with that burden of sin upon Him took the place of God's judgment and wrath in their stead, and in their behalf, offered the perfect sacrifice for sin, obtained for His own perfect and everlasting righteousness, the right to be restored to God's favor, to become the sons of God, and to dwell in His house forever. God realized our adoption unto children and heirs through the death of His only begotten. And in the resurrection of Christ from the dead, this adoption received His own official seal. For He was raised for our justification. Rom. 4:25. Christ, crucified and raised, is the ground of our adoption. We are children for His sake.

This adoption is bestowed upon us, and realized in us through the Spirit of Christ, and by faith. For the spirit of Christ is the Spirit of adoption, through Whom we cry Abba, Father. And: "because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Gal. 4:6. He makes us partakers of the adoption unto children by the faith He works in our hearts, through the gospel, by which we embrace Christ and all His benefits, are confident that we are justified, and that for the sake of Christ we are the sons of God with all the rights of children. Besides, this Spirit witnesses with our Spirit that we are the sons of God, Rom. 8:16. And the same Spirit also realizes the adoption by causing us to be born of God, by restoring within us the image of God, and making us like the image of the Son as the first born from the dead. For what an earthly father is impotent to do, i.e. to make of his adopted child a son of his own flesh and blood, God performs by the wonder of His grace in Christ. He regenerates us, calls us out of darkness into His marvelous light, makes us partaker of His own life and love, and thus bestows upon us the grace of actual sonship.

All this is true only in principle as long as we are in the body of this death. But this adoption unto sons of God awaits its final perfection in the day of Christ. For we "ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to-wit the redemption of our body." In that day we shall be publicly and before all the world justified and manifested as sons of God, and the image of God shall be raised in us to the highest possible glory of a creaturely likeness, for then we shall be perfectly conformed to the image of God's only begotten Son in the glorified Christ.

But forever Christ remains the only Begotten, the eternal, the natural Son of God, Whom we can never

approach, but Who reached out for us in the flesh; while we are forever children adopted, by grace, for His sake, highly favored, yet always creaturely reflections of the divine image.

H. H.

## The Catacombs

A catacomb is an underground cavern or cave. The word is used to denote the ancient underground cemeteries or resting places for the dead in the neighborhood of Rome and of several other chief cities of the Graeco-Roman world. The early view was that catacombs were originally sand or gravel pits and stone quarries from which the heathen derived their building materials and then used the resulting cavities as burial places for deceased slaves and prisoners. This view has been abandoned on the ground that many of the catacombs were no sand pits and stone quarries. It has been well established that the catacombs were dug by the Christians and are thus of Christian and not of pagan origin. It was once thought that the catacombs were built by the Christians as places of refuge in times of persecution. It was seen that the objection to this view is that the task of excavation was huge and could only be carried out by the Christians if unmolested by the heathen magistrates and police. In the present century the investigation of the catacombs has brought to light that they were dug by the Christians for the purpose of serving as burial places for their dead. That the Christians provided burial places for their dead without being molested by the hostile heathen is easily explained. The dead must be removed for the benefit of the living.

The Roman catacombs are long and narrow halls with recesses for tombs built in the hills outside the city of Rome. They are without daylight so that light had to be provided by lamps. Some of the halls extend to a great length. Their combined length is several miles long and the graves can be counted by tens of thousands. Most of the catacombs were constructed during the first three centuries. After Constantine the Christians began to bury their dead above ground. Some of the catacombs belonged to churches, others to private families. Jerome tells of how as a schoolboy he and his comrades visited every Sunday the graves of the apostle—so he thought—in the catacombs of Rome where, to quote him, “in subterranean depths the visitor passes to and fro between the bodies of the entombed in both walls and where all is dark. Here and there a ray from above, not falling in through a window, but only pressing in through a crevice, softens

the gloom. As you go onward it fades away and you find yourself in the darkness of night.” After Constantine the catacombs ceased to be used as burial places. Then pilgrims resorted to them and the devotional use of the catacombs began. Little churches were built near them for the celebration of the memory of martyrs. Pope Damascus decorated the catacombs and built more staircases for the convenience of the pilgrims. His successors did likewise. Then came the barbarian invasion. Christian barbarians, in search for bones of deceased saints, which they regarded as sacred, entered the catacombs and conveyed loads of dead men’s bones from these tombs to their chapels. The result was that the worship of deceased saints was diverted from the catacombs to the churches. The catacombs ceased to be places of interest and were forgotten for six centuries. In the sixteenth century they were rediscovered and they became objects of research. In the present century the investigation of the catacombs has become a department of Christian archeology.

Numerous pictures have been found in the catacombs,—pictures representing scenes of Bible history and of Christ. Pictures of “The Good Shepherd” predominate. These pictures were painted on the walls of the catacombs. The Christians also painted their favorite symbols on the walls of the catacombs and on the graves of their dead they wrote fitting epitaphs and comforting thoughts. The language is a mixture of Greek and Latin and many of the words are badly misspelled, which shows that, on a whole, the Christians were an uneducated people. Only one name of the deceased is given, sometimes his age and the day of his burial but never the day of his birth. More than five thousand of these inscriptions have been collected and interpreted and can now be found in museums. The catacombs also have a varied furniture, most of which has been removed to churches and museums. Among the articles found are rings, seals, bracelets, necklaces, clay lamps, coins, all sorts of tools and children’s toys. Upon many of these articles are found monograms of Christ. A great number of cups are found beside the graves. The presence of this furniture in the catacombs would indicate that the Christians would retreat in them for worship and would hide themselves in these caverns in times of persecution. Rarely would they be pursued in these silent caves.

The catacombs reflect the Christianity of the first three centuries, its hope, faith, and love, its life in the face of death and eternity. These pictures, symbols and relics of handicraft are so many silent testimonies to the social and domestic conditions of early Christianity. And this testimony is that the early Christians were poor, humble, devotional, that they were a people with trials and sufferings in the midst of which they believed and hoped. The most characteristic pictures

found on the walls of the catacombs are those of the Good Shepherd, the fish and the vine. The three combined express the child-like faith of the early Christians. The Good Shepherd represents Christ who calls Himself such. The fish symbolizes salvation and the baptismal water of regeneration. The vine sets forth the vital union of Christ and his people. The catacombs reveal a living hope. Unlike the expressions of despair found on the coffins of the heathen, they proclaim in symbol and word the conviction of the resurrection of the body and of life everlasting. The large number of graves show that Christianity must have been strong in Rome. The religion inscribed upon the walls of the catacombs agrees fully with the religion of the early Christians as reflected by the writings of the church fathers of that period. Many of these inscriptions are also expressive of natural affection. They read, "My sweetest child, innocent lamb, dearest husband, wife, my well deserving father and mother."

G. M. O.

## Samson's Seeking Occasion

It is not easy to set forth Samson in a right light ethically. Certainly he was a true believer. The Scriptures make this unmistakably clear. But was he, as a believer, a man with strong spiritual impulses and with a flowering faith or must he be classified with carnal believers? Was he, with all his sensuality, a man passionately devoted to the cause of Israel's God? How the liberal interpreters judge about the man is clear from the following excerpt from the pen of one of their number. "Nobody could be less like the ordinary idea of an Old Testament 'saint' than Samson. His gifts from the 'Spirit of the Lord' was simply physical strength, and it was associated with the defects of his qualities. His passions were strong and apparently uncontrolled. He had no moral elevation or religious fervor. He led no army against the Philistines, nor seems to have had any fixed design of resisting them. . . . When he does attack them it is because he is stung by personal injuries; and it is only with his own arm that he strikes. His exploits have a mixture of grim humour and fierce hatred quite unlike anything else in Scripture and more resembling the horse-play of Homeric and Norse heroes than the stern purpose and righteous wrath of a soldier who felt that he was God's instrument." In a similar vein from another writer of this class, "Given a man of strong passions and uninstructed conscience, wild courage and giant energy, with a sense of the mission which he has to accomplish against his country's enemies so that he reckons him-

self justified in doing them injury or killing them in the name of God, and you have, no complete hero, but a real and interesting man. Such a character however does not demand our admiration. . . . When we see Samson leaving the feast by which his marriage has been celebrated and marching down to Ashkelon where in cold blood he puts thirty men to death for their clothing, when we see a country-side ablaze with the standing corn which he has kindled, we are as indignant with him as with the Philistines when they burn his wife and her father with fire. . . . The Danite is moved chiefly by selfish and vain passions, and his sense of official duty is too weak and vague. We see little patriotism and not a trace of religious fervor. Samson is a creature of impulse. . . . perceiving the next thing that is to be done in the light not of religion or duty, but of opportunity and revenge."

Certainly, this appraisal of the man is untrue. It is the result of an unwillingness or inability to read aright all that is reported of him in the Scriptures. If there had been that willingness, statements like, "His gifts from the Spirit of the Lord was simply physical strength," and, "He had no moral elevation and religious fervor," would not have been made. For they are equivalent to the assertion that, as to the heart of his disposition, Samson was a wicked man. Let us see what the Scriptures say about him. The first notice to which attention must be directed is the one which reads, "And the woman bare a son, and called his name Samson: and the child grew, and the Lord blessed him." It is not the teaching of the Scriptures that the wicked are blessed. But God blessed the lad. It means that God assumed toward him an attitude of favor and in His love was preparing him physically, mentally, and spiritually for His life's calling, so that, as blessed, he loved God, His cause, and His people. It means that, as constrained by faith, he assumed the obligations of his Nazariteship and was ready and eager to serve the cause of God in the capacity of deliverer of His people. It is wrong to take the Lord's blessing him as having no other effect than that Samson grew up to be a man with a powerful frame, prodigious strength, and an abundance of natural vigor. If these endowments had not included a sanctifying grace, it would not have been reported of him that he was blessed of God. That Samson, in making war upon the Philistines, was acting from the principle of faith is what we read in the epistle to the Hebrews. "For the time would fail me," says the author, "to tell of Gideon, and of Barak, and of Samson. . . ." Thus the author included also Samson in the cloud of witnesses by which God's people are encompassed. And the writer concludes, "And these all—thus also Samson—having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." Thus Samson, too,

lived by the promise. Despite his sins, and they were grievous, Samson was a man of true faith, of heroic faith even. In that faith he warred God's warfare and delivered his people. We must keep this before our mind always, in judging the man, his deeds, methods and motives. Let us then turn to the man and interpret his deeds, as we know them in the Scriptures, in the light of the above observations.

"And the Spirit of the Lord began to move him at times in the camp of Dan between Zorah and Eshtaol" (Chap. 13:25). This is the next notice that calls for our attention. Zorah was Samson's place of birth and Eshtaol was a neighboring city. Both were inhabited by Danites and men of Judah. The "Camp of Dan" lay between the two cities. The text at ch. 1:34 strongly suggest that it was situated on a mountain top and that warlike recollections were associated with its name. It may even have been a military post. For the text there reads: "And the Amorites forced the children of Dan into the mountains for they would not suffer them to come down into the valley." It was there that the Spirit at times and, doubtless, at short intervals, began to move, impel, prod Samson, and there rises in his soul a mighty passion for exploits against the Philistines. It is the sudden surging of a spiritual force that breaks into action. This is the meaning of the notice, "And the Spirit of Jehovah began to move Samson." The man was aroused. As seized upon by the Spirit, he wanted more than anything to do battle with the adversaries of God and of His people. Now warring the warfare of Jehovah is a good deed as a work of faith. But if the warrior is constrained by wicked impulses, warring God's warfare is an abomination. Jehu did it as moved by personal ambition, and he committed murder. What now was Samson's reason for taking action against the Philistines? What was the character of his passion for that war, of the hatred that sustained him in it, and of the zest with which he fought it? God moved him, true, He did. But God also moved David to go and number Israel. And David did number Israel in his pride and committed a heinous sin. We read of this at II Sam. 24:1. The Chronicler speaks of the interposition of satan, yet the sin was committed because God had efficaciously willed it. I Chron. 21:1. The Egyptians hated the children of Israel. But God had turned their hearts to hate. Ps. 105:25. Then there is the case of Pharaoh. His reaction to the command of Moses that he set Israel free was that he tightened his grip on God's people, because God hardened his heart. The point is that all men, good and evil, are moved of God in all that they do. But on this account they are none the less responsible. It is plain that it cannot be concluded from the mere fact that a man is moved of God that he is a truly good man, a good tree bearing good fruit. Other considerations enter in here. Sam-

son was moved of God. But what *his* reason for wanting to make war on the Philistines? Abstractedly there could be one or more of several vicious reasons. So then what in Samson's case was the principle of action in the man, the heart in him from which his spiritual power, zeal, and zest for that war proceeded? Did God move him in His love or in His wrath and anger? Was the man blessed in his deeds or cursed? These are the related questions. And we know the answers. They have already been given as taken from the very Scriptures. The principle from which the man acted was faith. His passion for that war proceeded from a good heart. It was thus as to its core true love of God and of His people and a holy hatred and God's adversaries. And it is in His love that God moved him, love for the man himself and love for the true Israel. For it is reported that God blessed him. The man therefore was blessed in his deeds. These are God's answers. And He should know.

But this is not saying that in fighting that war for the liberation of God's people Samson's flesh was not also active. It was certainly. The principle of obedience in him was also small. He was a man of such gross sensuality that on the surface it is not apparent that the mainspring of his life was faith. As a aint he leaves the strangest impression. The man had humor. And his humor was grim indeed. He liked to play with riddles and was given to jesting. And he loved strange women. He was not a docile and submissive son in the home of his parents, but stubborn and selfwilled, hard to manage, a problem child, if you will. Certainly he was too much for his father to handle. As moved by the Lord, he went down to Timnah. For he understood His calling. He must begin to deliver Israel. Now Timnah was situated not a great distance to the southwest of Zorah, Samson's native place, as was said. It lay, did Timnah, on the border of the tribe of Judah (Josh. 15:10), was assigned by Joshua to the tribe of Dan (Josh. 19:43), but had fallen into the hands of the Philistines. Thus the citizenry of the place was made up of Philistines with perhaps an admixture of Israelites. The two elements had no trouble in getting along together. For though the Philistines had dominion over Israel, they were not too actively hostile it seems. And the Israelites were not at all intolerant of the idolatrous practices of these foreigners. They even went along with them in the worship of their gods. For this, as ever, was Israel's great sin. It was to Timnah that Samson went down. For he must make war against the Philistines. But he must have an occasion for beginning that conflict. And the sacred writer reports that it was of the Lord that he sought an occasion, sought it from the Philistines. Ch. 14:4. But the narrative does not make it plain whether he hoped to find what he sought through mingling with the Philistines in Timnah or

through marrying into one of the Philistine families who dwelt there. Be this as it may, he did the latter. Arriving in Timnah, he saw there a woman, one of the daughters of the Philistines. A brief courtship followed and Samson's mind was made up. He resolved to marry the girl. Though it is true that in Ex. 34:16 and Deut. VII 3 f. only marriages with Canaanitish women are expressly forbidden, the ground of the prohibition extended equality to marriages with the daughters of the Philistines. For this reason the Philistines also were reckoned with the Canaanites in Josh. 13:3. But this did not deter Samson. He hastened to tell his father and mother of his find and to instruct them as to what he wants them now to do for him. "I have seen a woman in Timnah of the daughters of the Philistines; now therefore get her for me for wife." Thus he immediately came to the point. For he was a man of few words. He loved action. And in this instance he wanted immediate action. For the matter was pressing. "Get her for me to wife" 'now without delay.'" His godfearing parents remonstrated with him. They warned him against such a venture. What godfearing parents wouldn't. They said to him, "Is there never a woman among the daughters of thy brethren, or among all my people, that thou goest to take a wife of the uncircumcised Philistines?" But he won't argue with them. He hated argument. He knew what he wanted in the way of a wife. And that for him settled the matter. So his only reply to them is, "Get her for me, for she pleaseth me well." It is not likely that the scene here enacted was new in the little family circle. Doubtless this was not the first time that Samson had stood up against his parents and that his will had prevailed. Too often, as a lad, he had gotten his way with them. So what could Manoah do but yield if he wished to keep the peace with his son. But now the sacred narrator adds, "But his father and his mother knew not that it was of the Lord, that he sought occasion from the Philistines: for at that time the Philistines had dominion over Israel." Certainly this does not mean that Samson had received a revelation from God to the effect that he should take him a wife from the uncircumcised Philistines. God does not militate against His moral will in commanding His people. Samson's marrying that Philistine woman was a sin. Yet Samson had to marry the woman, marry her according to the determinate will of God. For the Philistines had to give him occasion. Thus that forbidden marriage was just another instance of sin serving God's counsel, another instance of the Lord achieving His ends through the perverseness of men, in this case of a man, who, as to the heart of his disposition, was a true believer. The text asserts, and it is well to observe this, that it was of the Lord that Samson sought occasion from the Philistines but not that he sought it through contracting that marriage. The latter was not

of the Lord in the sense that He had commanded it, or gendered the desire for such a forbidden marriage in his heart. God is not the author of vile affections in men; but He does give men over to these affections so that they do the things that are unseemly. For He is God and none else.

G. M. O.

## Als Een Waterstroom

(Psalm 80)

Hier hebt ge een gebed als een waterstroom. En dan ook nog, een waterstroom die toeneemt in onstuimigheid. Vergelijk de verzen 4, 8 en 20. Eerst is het: "O God! breng ons weder!" Dan: "O God der heirscharen! breng ons weder!" En eindelijk: "O Heere, God der heirscharen! breng ons weder!" Het gebed begint met een roepen tot God, stuwt onstuimiglijk voort in het schreeuwen tot God en eindigt met een hijgen en verlangen naar 's Heeren schoonste Naam: De Heere God der heirscharen!

De psalm werd door Asaf gedicht. Wie hij geweest is weten we niet. Het kan zijn, dat we hier den opperzangmeester van David's dagen hebben, maar dan spreekt hij profetisch. In dezen psalm wordt geweend over een nationale smart welke vreemd was aan de dagen van David. David had doorgaans de overwinning, doch hier zijn de muren doorgebroken en het wilde zwijn verwoest den wijngaard dien God plantte. Ik ben geneigd om te denken, dat deze Asaf van veel lateren datum is, b.v., ten tijde van de Babylonische wegvoering. Dan past de inhoud beter.

En toch maakt het niet uit welke Asaf het geweest is. We hebben hier meer dan historie. In dezen psalm wordt een toestand beschreven van de kerk Gods aller eeuwen. Ge kunt zelfs Uw eigen individuele leven hier geschetst zien, als God Uw oogen er voor opent.

En boven alles, hebben we hier een beschrijving van Jezus' vernedering. Verzen 16 en 18. Jezus heeft dit lied vervuld toen Hij Zich afzonderde en naar een woeste plaats ging om te bidden, te smeeken, God aan te loopen als een waterstroom.

Wat een diep ingeleid kind Gods spreekt hier! Hoe kende hij zichzelf, het volk Israels en den God des Verbonds. Dat blijkt direkt aan het begin. Luistert, hoe hij God aanspreekt: O Herder Israels! Wat een onuitputtelijke rijkdom van gedachten zit in dien naam Gods! Hij grijpt God aan in Zijn diepste hart. Hij beziet alles vanuit Gods oogpunt. Hij pleit op een eeuwige liefde. De Eeuwige God is de Herder. In dien naam Gods zien wij het Wezen. En Asaf noemt God



de Herder van Jozefs kudde. Die liefde Gods was duidelijk aan het licht getreden toen Jozef de geslachten Israels in het leven behoudde in Egypte. O ja, de weg was hard geweest, doch toen alles voorbij was, zag Jozef het, zoowel als vader Israel en de broederen: hoewel de mensch ten kwade bedacht, God had het ten goede geleid. De Herder Israels.

Tweedens, noemt Asaf God als die tusschen de cherubs zit.

Als ge II Sam. 6:2 naleest, ziet ge, dat Asaf daar het oog heeft op drieërlei. Eerst, duidt hij daardoor aan, dat God de God des Verbonds is. De cherubs stonden met uitgespreide vleugelen op de ark des verbonds in het Heilige der heiligen, en, nog nader aangeduid, op het verzoendeksel. Ten tweede, merken we op, bij het lezen van de bovenaangehaalde Schriftuurplaats, dat men daar den naam des Heeren aanriep volgens de inzetting Gods aan Mozes. Ten derde, spreekt die plaats van bloed onschuldig bloed, hetwelk voor schuldigen geplengd werd.

Daarom, o God, die tusschen de cherubs zit, wij roepen Uw naam aan, den Naam die spreekt van Uw eeuwige liefde des Verbonds, gegrond in het bloed der verzoening, der ontferming, der rommelende ingewanden van barmhartigheid.

Verschijn blinkende!

Daar gaat het om. Het is zóó donker, o Heere! Het gaat alles verkeerd. Daar zal deze psalm van gewagen. Klaar het donker op, door te verschijnen als de God Wiens Aangezicht blinkt van Goddelijk licht: barmhartigheid, genade, almachtige kracht om te verlossen, lieflijke goedheid en goedertierenheid! Verschijn blinkende temidden van Uw armzalige kudde. Ons is zeer bange!

Weer heeft Asaf die Ark des Verbonds voor zijn aangedacht, wanneer hij gewaagt van Efraïm, Benjamin en Manasse. Want die drie stammen moesten bij het optrekken van Israel's vergadering vóóraangaan, vlak na de arke des verbonds. Heeft Asaf ook die namen genoemd, om den Heere er aan te herinneren, dat in die drie namen de groote liefde Jakobs is uitgedrukt die hij had voor de kinderen van Rachel?

Hoe het ook zij, hij noemt die namen als vertegenwoordigers van het gansche volk, zooals zij sterk zagen op de arke. In dat verband vraagt hij om de openbaring van Gods macht ter verlossing van het juk der vreemden.

Nu volgt het refrein, hetwelk wij driemaal zullen hooren, doch met klimmende intensiteit. O God, breng ons weder, en laat Uw aanschijn lichten, zoo zullen wij verlost worden.

Als Gods aanschijn maar lichten mag over ons, dan is het goed. Het aanschijn Gods is Zijn aangezicht tot ons gekeerd in schitterende en blinkende liefde. Daarom is Jezus Christus het Aangezicht Gods. Dan wordt ons pad verlicht, om het donker op te klaren. Alle ban-

den vallen dan van onze handen en voeten; dan komen we in de ruimte.

Nu volgt een beschrijving van Israels donkerheden, benauwdheden, ellenden. O Heere, God der heirscharen! hoe lang zult Gij rooken tegen het gebed Uws volks? Ellendiger kan het niet. Hier bidt Israel en God rookt tegen het gebed. Waarom? Omdat het gebed niet deugt. Rookten tegen een gebed is kwaad worden er tegen, zich vertoonen er tegen, zich van zulk een gebed afwenden. Bidden is het heerlijkste werk voor de kerk van Christus. Daarom is het dan ook het moeilijkste werk van alle werken. Als het er op aan komt, op de keper beschouwd, is er nog nooit een goed gebed door ons opgezonden. Alle bidden is bevuurd met zonde. Wij zijn nog nooit van onze knieën opgestaan met de overtuiging in het hart: dit was een goed gebed. Als we het toch deden, zondigen wij dubbel.

Daarom vindt ge vaak de klacht van Gods volk, dat hun gebed niet door de nevelen van Gods rook heen kan.

En toch is God de "Hoorder der gebeden"?

Dat is Hij alleen in Christus. Als Christus' bloed onze gebeden heiligt, dan alleen is er geen rook tegen ons bidden. Dan neemt God onze gebeden aan. Ziet ge, er moet vuur van het altaar in het wierookvat van onze gebeden. Dan zit er kracht in. Alleen het gebed eens rechtvaardigen vermag veel. En die rechtvaardigheid is Godes, is van Christus.

Verder zal Asaf die rookende God beschrijven.

Gij spist ze met tranenbrood! Wat levendige, sprekende beschrijving van onze smarten. Brood is de staf van ons leven. Voor brood moogt leven, ons leven, schrijven. Juist zooals David zingt in het onvergetelijke lied: "Mijn tranen zijn mij tot spijze *dag en nacht*." Ziet ge het? Dag en nacht zijn de stukken waarin ik mijn leven slijt. Dus is de gedachte hier: Gij, o God! zorgt er voor, dat mijn gansche leven niet is dan tranen, smart, ellende!

Hij zal U ook vertellen hoe groot die smart is. De tranen worden ons uitgegoten van een drieling. Een drieling was een ruimtemaat onder Israel. En die drieling was het derde gedeelte van de grootste ruimtemaat. Daarom heette het een drieling. Evenwel, een drieling was een kom, die viermaal grooter was dan de kom, die men gewoonlijk gebruikte bij het eten. Ziet ge het nu? De smart van Israel was viermaal grooter dan men onder gewoone omstandigheden kon dragen. Hetzelfde hebt ge in psalm 7'. Daar staat, dat Gods volk het water van een vollen beker werd uitgedrukt. De smart was hevig, bovenmate groot. (Denkt aan Nederland op dit oogenblik).

Bovendien is Israel zóó laag omneergedaald, dat men twee dingen met hen deed onder de God-haters. Ter eener zijde, waren zij hunne naburen tot een twist. Wie denkt hier niet aan twee honden die vechten om één been? Men scheurt hen uiteen in het twisten en



strijden. Ter anderer zijde, lachte men om hen. Daar staat Gods volk. Om hen heen waren de vijanden. En aller vingers wijzen naar hen. Men licht en spot en verkneukelt zich om den arme: bijtend, snerpend, hartverscheurend.

Toch is er hier een lichtpunt.

Merkt het toch op, dat Asaf belijdt, dat God hun tranen gegeven had. God was het die hen een smaad en twist gesteld had onder de naburen. Met andere woorden, Israel ontving kastijding. Dat gebeurt met den goddelooze nooit. Die kennen geen kastijding. Het verschil tusschen straf en kastijding is dit. Als er een groot kwaad komt over U, als *ge het aan God verbindt!* En het is straf, als ge sterk op den vijand of op het kwaad als zoodanig staart, zonder er ooit aan te denken, dat God het doet.

Nu, Israel heeft kastijding hier. Want zij belijden door Asaf, dat God hen sloeg en niet de mensch. Dan is het een lichtpunt, want het einde van kastijding is het ontvangen van Gods heiligheid. Hebr. 12:10.

En dan komt weer die waterstroom van bidden en smeeken: O God der heirscharen! breng ons weder, en laat Uw aangezicht lichten, zoo zullen wij verlost worden. Het is nu niet langer een schreeuwen tot God, maar tot den God der heirscharen! Wat bedoelt Asaf met die toevoeging: *der heirscharen?*

Daar zit dit in: Asaf bidt den Heere om Zijn legers van strijdbare helden te gebieden tot de hulp van Israel. Ik zal er U iets van vertellen. Noach werd uit de benauwdheid en de tranen verlost door de heirscharen Gods, en ook Mozes en Elisa. Ik noem er maar drie op: er zijn er veel meer.

De eerste wereld benauwde de kerk Gods zoo erg, dat zij teruggedrongen was tusschen de wanden van ééne familie: Noach. Toen riep de Heere de heirscharen des hemels en der afgronden te hulp. En wat was het resultaat? Zij gehoorzaamden terstond en de vensteren des hemels openden zich en de afgronden werden opgebroken en daar kwamen ze aan! Die heirscharen zijn gelijk aan kloeke helden die Zijn Woord doen. En zij verzwolgen de oude wereld der goddeloozen.

Egypte benauwde de kerk van God voor vele jaren en zij smeekten God om Zijn verlossing. Toen gebood de Heere Zijn heirscharen van vuur en hagel, vorschten en vuil gedierte, zweeren en schurft, met de waterstroom van het Roode Meer. En wat was het resultaat? Ik zie Israel zingende en spelende en dansende aan de andere zijde van de zee. Ik hoor de refreinen van Miriam en de vrouwen: De Heere heeft het ros en zijn rijder in de zee geworpen. O, als God ten strijde strekt aan het hoofd van Zijn heirscharen, dan komt er een glorieus overwinning op het kwaad gebroed!

Dothan werd omsingeld door de trotsche Koning van Syrië. Hij zond daarhenen paarden en wagenen en een zwaar heir, welke des nachts kwamen en omsingel-

den de stad. En de dienaar des mans Gods (en dat was Elisa) stond zeer vroeg op, en ging uit; en zie, een heir omringde de stad met paarden en met wagenen. Toen zeide zijn jongen tot hem: Ach mijn heer, hoe zullen wij doen? (Arme jongen!) En Elisa zeide: Vrees niet; *want die bij ons zijn, zijn meer dan die bij hen zijn!* (Lezer, ziet gij de heirscharen waarom Asaf bidt?) En Elisa bad en zeide: Heere, open toch zijne oogen dat hij zie! En de Heere opende de oogen des jongens dat hij zag: en zie, de berg was vol *vrugte paarden en wagenen rondom Elisa!* (De beteekenis van den naam Elisa is: "Mijn God is Heil!")

Begrijpt ge nu waarom Asaf bidt tot den God der heirscharen? Het beteekent dit: Hij wil hebben, dat God Zijn knechten gebiedt om Israel uit al zijn smarten te redden. Hij heeft kennis aan die heirscharen. En weet, als God slechts één woord spreekt, zoo zullen de heirlegers van God ter hulpe snellen en een volmaakt werk van verlossing werken.

Zoo zingen wij van die heirlegers: Gods wagens boven 't machtig zwerk. . . .

Breng ons weder, o God der heirscharen!

Aan het begin heb ik ook gezegd, dat deze psalm ons individuele leven schetst.

Wij gevoelen soms gelijk die arme jongen van Elisa.

Ik ben vaak bang geweest van mijn vijanden.

Dan kermde ik: "Hoe zullen wij doen?"

Mijn broeder, de meest uitgelezen heirlegers van den God des Verbonds zijn verpersoonlijkt in Jezus Christus die te hulp geroepen is door den God Uwer zaligheid. En toen God Hem riep, zeide Hij: Ik kom, o God!

En toen heeft Hij voor Zijn volk gestreden. Hij is in alle hunne benauwdheden benauwd geweest. Hij is tot in de eeuwige gevangenis van Israel gekomen. Hij heeft alle hunne smarten zóó onderschept, totdat Hij den naam verdiende: Man van Smarten.

Zóó is Jezus al de heilegers van den God der heirscharen.

God heeft er van geprofeteerd door Mozes: "Die op den hemel vaart tot Uwe hulp, en met Zijne hoogte op de bovenste wolken." En dat is Jezus!

G. V.

---

God is our refuge and our strength  
Our ever present aid,  
And, therefore, though the earth remove,  
We will not be afraid;  
Though hills amidst the sea be cast,  
Though foaming waters roar,  
Yea, though the mighty billows shake,  
The mountains on the shore.

## The Principle of Christian School Discipline

Our "modern age" must also have "modern" technique and methods in the field of education. Largely under the influence of the philosophy of John Dewey, new theories have been conceived, stated, and incorporated into the public school systems in a varying degree. The results are called by various names: Progressive Education, New Education, Social Education, Social Experimentalism, etc.

The purpose of this "modern" education is expressed in the names by which it is known. The development of a socially efficient individual is the primary end sought by the new educators. Social education should prepare the pupil for living with his fellows through the formation of skills of social communication and the building up of the etiquette of harmonious and frictionless human relationships. The school, thus, is looked upon as the primary agency for adjusting the individuals to his place in society. All means, methods, and activities should be effective to train young people to live together on the highest plane.

It is but natural that the methods employed will spring from this underlying philosophy of purpose. The method to be used is guidance. Through guidance the pupil must be helped to solve his own problems; to make intelligent choices when alternatives are presented. The pupil must be guided into all knowledge and guided to develop the reasoning powers needed to use the facts discovered wisely, in the solution of social problems. Simply stated, the pupil must be free and uninhibited in thought, word, and deed and gently led and guided to think, speak, and act correctly to the greatest good and benefit of himself and his fellowman. The whole theory rests on the basic assumption and error that the inherent nature of an individual is good, cooperative, and unselfish.

This same social guidance should be substituted for discipline as a method of establishing order and good behaviour in the school and outside of it. The pupil should be taught to see that he can best satisfy his own legitimate desires by refraining from any action that will thwart the legitimate desires of others. Self-control must be established as the principle and basis for action. Recognition of the rights of others is the surest source of good conduct, so it is said. When a pupil refrains from a certain act because he sees that it is inimical to the welfare of the group, he has been started on the road to good behaviour, outside the school as well as in it.

Limiting ourselves to the subject of discipline in this Progressive Educational theory we quote the following principles of change sought and somewhat ac-

complished by modern educational philosophers:

1. From the control of conduct through the authority of the Church or Bible, to the development of self-control based upon a desire for social service.
2. From a social training in classical standards of expression, to the development of free, creative self-expression.
3. From a religiously motivated moral training, to one based on conformity to natural laws or on a desire for social service.
4. From Church and private schools, to state controlled, tax-supported, free, common and non-sectarian schools. (Though not strictly a disciplinary motive yet quite interesting and important to us. W.H.)
5. From a method of formal discipline, to one of motivation, in which the pupils' interests are developed and utilized.
6. From methods of indoctrination and domination, to methods of guidance and direction.
7. From a school discipline based on coercion and conformity, to one based on self-control and social intelligence.\*

A simple reading of these statements should be enough to convince us of the corruption of this modern educational philosophy in respect to disciplinary methods and aims. It is hardly necessary to point out that it is fraught with fallacy from beginning to end. As a theory it rests upon the false basis of Humanism with its emphasis on the inalienable rights and inherent goodness of man. It fails to take cognizance of the great facts of sin, the fall, and the *total* depravity of every individual as he is by nature. In practise its results have been well nigh disastrous. This is recognized even by many who have no special regard for Christian principles. The well known columnist Paul Mallon, for example, has written several articles recently in which he accords much of the guilt for our present day juvenile delinquency to the lack of disciplinary training that has resulted from the practise of the ideas advanced by the promoters of Progressive Education.

Overagainst this popular notion and because we are often influenced by the world round about us, perhaps, to a greater extent than we realize, it is well to return to the fundamentals. The Christian Schools should not only be distinct but also antithetical. In fact, its distinction should lie in its antithesis; also in respect to methods aims and practise of discipline. No one will deny that many of our Christian Schools have already lost, or are last losing much of this distinctiveness as

\*. Quoted from: "The Foundations of Modern Education", pp. 593-599—E. H. Wilds, Ed. D. Farrar & Rinehart, New York.

regards discipline not only, but in every phase of educational policy and current activity. The only possibility of retaining what is left, and regaining what has been lost, is to return to the fundamentals in principle and practise. A simple statement, therefore, of the basic principles of Christian School discipline is certainly in order.

The distinctiveness of the Christian School should be found in the fact that its education and means are God-centered and God directed. Christ should be everywhere; for our only knowledge of God and approach to Him is through Christ. Christ must certainly be in the Christian School. And that not only in name or appearance but so, that the knowledge of God in Christ permeates and fills all that is taught and all methods used to accomplish this teaching. It would follow, therefore, that discipline in the Christian School must also be God-centered and God-directed.

In order to find the means to accomplish this ideal of Christian Education it is necessary to turn to Christ, i.e. to the Word; the Revelation of God in Christ. Here only can we find the guideposts; the Lamp and Light upon our way, as regards education in all its phases and ultimately all knowledge and direction. It must be our only rule of faith and LIFE. In the Word of God only can we find the principles and working out of them upon which a Christian School must be built and conducted. It follows, therefore, that it is also to the Word of God that we must turn to discover the principles of discipline that should govern a distinctive Christian School.

Before setting down the principles of discipline revealed to us in Scripture it might be well to circumscribe a bit more closely what is meant by discipline. In the broad sense of the term, discipline means simply to teach. In this broad sense it connotes the training of the mental, moral, and physical powers by instruction and exercise. Thus, any training or study is a discipline. In the narrower sense, as it is also used in our subject, it means to train to obedience or subjection. It implies the positions of authority and submission to authority. At the same time, if it is to be effective, it must include authority, power, and ability to correct and punish disobedience and insurrection. Discipline itself, rests upon the principle of our having been created as servants and to serve, and thus, to be in subjection and obedience.

The first and basic principle of any discipline is found in the fact of the fall into sin. Through wilful transgression of God's commandment man fell from the state of free, willing and loving obedience into disobedience and enmity; thus he became an object of discipline. The guiding principle of Christian School discipline is to be found in this fall. It is beautifully stated in our Baptism Form as follows: "that we with our children are conceived and born in sin, and there-

fore are children of wrath. . . ."

Simply stated, the first principle is that we by nature are totally depraved. It is the first principle for it instructs us concerning the objects of discipline and the necessity for discipline. It teaches us, further, what to expect from an individual by nature and why to expect it. He who is totally depraved is at enmity with God and consequently at enmity with his neighbor. The expression of this enmity will always be disobedience and insurrection for, as the apostle Paul states: "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

This first principle is already, not only distinct but antithetical. It is in direct contradiction to all that was stated in the principles of the Progressive philosophy. It teaches that discipline must certainly be much more than guidance, development, adjustment, and direction. Just because this basic principle is denied and refused by the world all its discipline must necessarily be a guidance and development into condemnation. At the same time, as long as it is denied, all discipline is impossible, for as it is maintained that man is inherently good by nature, correction is unnecessary. Here also is a fundamental reason for maintaining distinct Christian Schools.

If we were to remain with this first principle alone it would be quite impossible to speak of discipline at all. In his state by nature man is hopeless and helpless and can never find a way out; not even by the strictest practise of correction and obedience. His depravity renders it all quite impossible. We hasten to add, therefore the second basic truth that must underly Christian School discipline. This is found in Biblical concept of the Covenant. In the sphere of the Covenant God moves, not man, and God moves so, that He redeems His people and implants within them a new principle of love and obedience. In that Covenant we see God as the great Disciplinarian, Christ as the object of His discipline, while the Cross is both the expression and end of all discipline.

Once again, this second principle is distinct and antithetically opposed to all that the world holds. Not willing to hear of sin, it knows nothing of true punishment and forgiveness. Again, however, it destroys the very possibility of discipline; only as we believe that God by grace has established a Covenant with His people can we hope for success in disciplining our children. That Covenant of Redemption He has established with us and our seed and upon that promise we can depend in the exercise of discipline in correction and training. Only within the sphere of the Covenant lies the possibility of true Christian discipline. Outside of the Grace of God, man always remains what he is by nature—totally depraved and as such prone to all evil; loving, desiring and willing sin.

Upon these two great principles of sin and grace must rest the discipline in the Christian School. Many lesser principles and practical rules and consequences might be pointed out but they are all implied in them. There are, for example, the principles of love, grace, forgiveness and also of punitive measures to enforce obedience. The practical difficulties in the working out of these principles are, undoubtedly, numerous and would require clarification by an experienced educator. Pupil-teacher relationships, class-room and home environment, parent-teacher relationships, parent-pupil relationships, all enter in here. We do believe, however, that these two basic principles, do, broadly point out the objects, aim, content, and methods of distinct Christian School discipline.

W. H.

---

## Calvin and the Reformation

The movement known as the "Reformation" is characteristically spiritual. It denotes that work of God whereby His people, His Church, was liberated out of the shackles of Roman Catholicism. To be sure, the Reformation also had far-reaching political results. Yet, to many it was merely political. This is due to the fact that the Roman Catholic Church, besides being a spiritual power, was also clothed with political might. Nevertheless, the Reformation, in its origin and according to its fundamental significance, is decidedly spiritual.

We associate especially two names with the Reformation: Martin Luther and John Calvin. In this essay we are mainly interested in the latter. The subject "Calvin and the Reformation" is, of course, a very broad subject and can be treated from many angles. We, however, purpose to treat it from the viewpoint of Calvin's place in the Reformation. John Calvin, in the opinion of the writer of this essay, is one of the men most wonderfully gifted by the grace of God since the days of the apostles. Permit me, then, to develop the subject of this essay from the viewpoint of Calvin's training, his work, and the place which is undeniably his in God's work of the Reformation.

### *Calvin's Training.*

When I speak of Calvin's training I purpose to emphasize that God very clearly trained him with a view to his life's task. John Calvin was born at Noyon, France, some sixty miles northeast of Paris, July 10, 1509, twenty-six years after the birth of Martin Luther at Eisleben, Germany, and eight years before the nailing of the ninety-five theses to the church door at

Wittenberg. Calvin was brought up in all the superstitions of popery, and this scholar of Noyon was blindly submissive to the Church, cheerfully complying with all her observances and persuaded that the heretics had richly deserved their fate. Naturally of a timid and fearful disposition he possessed that uprightness of heart which leads a man to sacrifice everything to his sacred convictions. Strictness of morals was led by God's grace into strictness of doctrine. He was quiet and serious during his lessons, never shared in the amusements or follies of his schoolfellows during the hours of recreation, held himself ever aloof, and, filled with horror at sin, he would often reprimand their disorders with severity and even bitterness. Among them he was the representative of conscience and of duty, so far was he from being as some of his calumniators have depicted him. The pale features and the piercing eyes of this scholar had already at the age of sixteen inspired his comrades with more respect than the black gowns of their masters. He was preeminently a scholar. He consecrated to study the whole force of his genius and of his will. He comprehended everything with inconceivable facility. He ran in his studies while his companions were lazily creeping along. Accordingly, his master was compelled to take him out of the classes and introduce him singly to fresh studies.

Although belonging to the humbler class of his age, John Calvin nevertheless received an aristocratic training. His father, Gerard Calvin, not to be reckoned among the rich, desired that his children should receive the same education as those of the best families. A thorough Catholic, Gerard himself held an important office in the Roman Catholic Church, and lived therefore in familiar intercourse with the clergy and the chief persons in the province. This undoubtedly prompted him to seek the best in the field of education for his children. John was brought up strictly; from his earliest years he was compelled to bend to the inflexible rule of duty which soon became habitual to him. And it was chiefly to study that he devoted his time.

A spirit of piety showed itself early in the child's heart. Hence, his father conceived the design of devoting his son to theology, then known as the "queen of sciences". At that time it was customary to bestow ecclesiastical titles and revenues on children. Children at ages of seven to eleven were made cardinals. Accordingly, upon John Calvin, at the age of twelve, was conferred by the bishop to his community the benefice of chaplain. A benefice was an ecclesiastical financial allowance to pursue one's studies in theology. He received the chaplaincy attached to an altar in the cathedral of Noyon. Thus Calvin became a member of the clergy and capable of entering into the holy order. Later the Catholic Church declared bitterly that she fed John

Calvin at her breast and harbored a snake in her bosom. At the age of fourteen, in 1523, John Calvin went to Paris to continue his studies. There he made great progress in Latin literature. Being a member of the holy order because of the benefice bestowed upon him, he came into contact with the godlessness among the clergy, in whose piety he, as a good catholic, had had implicit faith. How he must have been shocked! It was also at this time, while the future reformer was growing to maturity in the college of La Marche in Paris, that Rome and her satellites were uniting every effort to hunt down and tread under foot everything that bore any resemblance to the Reformation. Already six years before the ninety-five these had been nailed to the church door at Wittenberg. And the blood of the Protestants was flowing freely in the country of France, inasmuch as the Reformation in France did not enjoy the political support as in Germany.

In 1528 John Calvin's father ordered him to change his studies to law. Gerard had fallen out of the grace of the ecclesiastical authorities in Noyon. So he left Paris for Orleans. The following year he continued his studies at Bourges. At these schools he came under the influence of a certain Melchior Wolmar, a humanist and favorable to the Reformation. However, in 1531 his father died, and Calvin returned to Paris and to the study of Greek and Hebrew, although from the summer of 1532 to that of 1533 he again was a law student at Orleans. It was during this time at Orleans that his fellow-students honored him, and students will not honor of their own accord dubious or disagreeable characters. It was also meantime in 1533 that "God by a sudden conversion subdued his mind to a teachable frame", according to his own words, having been, to use Calvin's own words again, "too obstinately devoted to the superstitions of popery to be easily extricated from so profound an abyss of mine." Of the circumstances of this conversion nothing is certainly known, but its central experience was that God spoke to him through the Scriptures and the will of God must be obeyed. Now, however, he was immediately inflamed with as intense desire to make progress in the spiritual knowledge of true godliness, so that religion had henceforth the first place in his thoughts. Humanism was replaced by a thirst after the living God and a knowledge of Him out of the Scriptures. With renewed energy he applied himself to the study of the Scriptures and, particularly, to the subjects of Greek and Hebrew.

Among those with whom he discussed Reformed doctrine was his bosom friend, Nicolas Cop, who was elected rector of the university of Paris. In connection with Cop's address as head of the university, it seemed to the two friends a splendid opportunity to commend the Reformation to the cultured and brilliant audience which would attend. This address they planned together. Cop delivered it. He spoke on "Christian

Philosophy." By "Christian Philosophy" he meant the gospel. This speech amazed the audience. In it Cop pleaded for reform, using language borrowed from Luther, but its concluding part was more independent, and in it was struck that note of certainty as to salvation which was to be a feature of Calvinism and Calvinistic doctrine. Because Cop had infuriated the theologians of the Sorbonne (the theological school in Paris), having branded them as sophists, he had to flee Paris. Also Calvin fled because his intimacy with Cop was known. Shortly afterward Calvin returned to Paris, but his sympathy with the Reformation could not be hidden, and hence he no longer felt safe in the city where already so many had been imprisoned for their faith's sake. In January of 1534, at the age of twenty-five, he went forth a wanderer, usually living under an assumed name. Apparently his light was to remain hidden.

#### *Calvin's Work.*

Calvin's life's work centered in Geneva. Except for a brief stay in Strassburg he labored in Geneva until the end of his life. It was in September of 1536 that he, at the age of twenty-seven, accepted the position of teacher in this city of Switzerland. In the year 1535, during his wanderings, while at Basel, he wrote his famous "Institutes of the Christian Religion." To be sure, this work underwent considerable revision and alteration at various times; yet, it is amazing that such a profound work, even as far as its first edition is concerned, should have been completed by a man at the age of twenty-six or twenty-seven. Calvin took up his abode in Geneva upon the urging of Farel, who proclaimed upon him the curse of God if he were to leave Geneva. With Farel Calvin worked in perfect harmony, himself declaring: We were one heart and one soul. Calvin's career in Geneva was a turbulent one. In 1538 he was banished from Geneva and labored in the midst of a congregation for approximately a year in Strassburg. He returned to Geneva because, when a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, during Calvin's absence, attempted to induce the city to return to Catholicism, this city realized that only Calvin was able to refute convincingly the arguments of the Catholic. Of course, we cannot enter into a detailed discussion of Calvin's work in Geneva. There he encountered fierce opposition from many quarters, particularly from those who resented his rule as with an iron hand and his determination to preserve and maintain the purity of the Church of God. With untiring vigor he fought against the evils of the people. Calvin believed in church discipline to the fullest extent. We must remember in this connection, that, although he believed that only the Church was authorized to exercise discipline and determine whether a person should be subjected to censure, nevertheless the civil govern-

ment was called upon to punish all evildoers, including those who committed sins which today are not considered punishable by the state. Calvin believed that also in this manner the state must ever stand ready to defend and aid the church. With respect to the Church the great reformer distinguished between the Church Visible and Invisible. Only, when he spoke of this distinction he did not mean to imply that the former, in distinction from the latter, consisted of good and evil. The Church Invisible was, according to Calvin, the elect body of Christ. The Church Visible was its manifestation, revealing itself in the pure preaching of the Word, the proper administration of the sacraments, and a Christian walk. To maintain the purity of the Church of God he labored in Geneva, and he regarded the state as obliged to assist him therein.

Many were his labors and untiring his efforts in the city of Geneva. His work concerned primarily the proclamation of the Word of the living God. Besides preaching, catechetical instruction was given to the seed of the church. Calvin wrote his own catechism books. Although his catechism did not have the genial and artless simplicity of Luther, it, like everything else which flowed from the pen of the reformer, is remarkable for its theological thoroughness and solidity. In concluding our brief account of Calvin's work we desire to mention one very important matter. In 1558, when Calvin's was forty-nine years old, an academy was founded in Geneva. This institution was primarily designed for the education of theologians. Calvin would gladly have expanded it into a university, but for this the financial resources of the small community of Geneva were inadequate. Theodore Beza was its first rector. In the very first year after its founding nine hundred men, from almost all the nations of Europe, entered their names upon the rolls of the institution. Tremendous was the reformer's influence which he exerted upon foreign countries. His correspondence was immense and extended in all directions. His industry was marvellous. To be condemned to idleness, as he occasionally was when sickness interfered with his labors, was most painful to him. His works are well-known. Besides his "Institutes" he completed a commentary on almost all the books of the Bible, a work which is noted for its general soundness. However, his incessant mental exertions at length consumed his physical strength. These troubles at the last increased to such an extent that he went to the pulpit from his bed and returned to the latter immediately after the close of the service. He was at last obliged to permit himself to be either carried or supported to his lecture-room. Exhausted with labor and borne down by sickness, he longed for repose. On the sixth of February, 1564, he preached his last sermon. On the Second of April he caused

himself to be carried to the church on a litter, listened to the sermon, and received the sacrament from the hand of Beza. He died at eight o'clock in the evening of May 27, retaining his consciousness to his last breath. His burial was very simple, without the slightest ostentation.

#### *Calvin's Place in the Reformation.*

Finally we face the question, "What is Calvin's place in the Reformation?" He was the third of the three reformers: Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. However, he was the third only in the order of time. Much has been written of Luther and Calvin with respect to their personal characteristics. One hears of the immediate attraction to the heart-winning Luther; Calvin, on the other hand, because of his oftentimes startling severity, is often viewed as devoid of all sensibility, as one destitute of love. To this we answer, firstly, that a zeal for the truth of God's Word consumed him, as it were. Secondly, it is known that the French reformer at no time disdained diligently to visit and care for the sick in the city whenever it was possible. The inexhaustibleness of Calvin's loving impulse to help and advise on every side, and to comply with all requisitions upon him, from the weightiest demands upon his Christian charity to the little courtesies of friendship, is most brilliantly evidenced by his extensive correspondence. How many tears were dried up by this apparently austere man! In this respect he is in no wise inferior to Luther, and it may well be that he not infrequently surpassed him in tact and tenderness. The most loving tenderness and care are always exhibited by those who are thoroughly acquainted with the Word of God.

With Luther the Reformation was mainly soteriological. His salvation stood upon the foreground. Luther is characterized throughout by seeking peace for his soul. Overwhelmed by his sense of sinfulness was he even after he became priest and professor in Wittenberg. In fact, it was this seeking for peace which led him from the study of the law to the priesthood. However, his pursuit of peace quickly led him into conflict with the customs and rituals of the Roman Catholic Church. Yea, what is more, the practices and very heart of that Church hindered him in the pursuit of peace, was to his soul a barrier in his seeking for the living God. Luther, finally assured of justification only through faith, assured of this justification as received from God alone without any human intermediaries, began to labor against these false practices within the Church. Doing so, it became apparent that he attacked her very foundations, and was therefore excommunicated.

John Calvin went further. Understood correctly, Luther's struggle was not a superficial one. The question of peace for one's soul is profound. Yet,



Calvin went further. And, make no mistake about Calvin. He also knew by experience the meaning and the power of sin. However, and this was true particularly of Calvin, the matter of salvation was still more profound than mere personal salvation. Man's salvation is not an end but only a means. We are saved only for God's Name's sake. We have been called out of darkness into God's marvellous light in order that we may proclaim the blessed virtues of that God. The glory of God was Calvin's theme throughout. Of that glory of God the Scriptures spoke to him. And with all his amazing learning and almost unbelievable capacity for work and understanding he applied himself, with all the God-given love of his heart for the truth, to the study of the Word of God. That Word he studied; that Word he preached; the honor of that Word he upheld. Scripture was his only guide, his only rule of life. His knee he bowed to nothing else. All his life long the Lord had led him in that way. God had gifted him with a brilliant mind. His childhood and youth had been spent in study. With the writings of the scholastics and early fathers he was thoroughly acquainted. His tireless passion for study gave him tremendous learning. And God had subjected, by His Spirit, that brilliant mind to the knowledge of Himself, revealed in His Word. "A dog", thus he wrote once, "barks when he sees his master attacked; it would be cowardice for me to see the truth of God attacked and keep silence." This man, who could treat his most bitter enemies with the greatest kindness, became an uncontrollable fury when the glory of God was at stake.

Calvin's importance in the Divine work of the Reformation, the return of the people of God out of the shackles and darkness of Roman Catholicism is, as we see it, three-fold. In the first place, he maintained the principle of the authority of Holy Writ as the only authority and basis for the faith and life of the church, in contrast with the usurped authority of the Roman clergy and the exclusive authority of the pope. Maintaining this principle he rocked and caused to crumble the very foundations of that church. Scripture was his only text-book. Scripture was his only rule of life. To the Scriptures he turned, and through his God-given genius he preached, revealed the Scriptures to the people. The Word of God was John Calvin's sword. And how he wielded it! Secondly, in maintaining the Scriptures, he maintained its cardinal truth: the sovereignty of God. It is hardly necessary for me to prove this. People today prate of Calvinism, a calvinism which certainly would sound strangely foreign to the Reformer, whose name it bears. People today prate of a calvinism, whose underlying principle seems to be a control of the whole world, in a universal, general sense, for God, possible by and based on the theory of common grace. I say, it is hardly

necessary for me to refute this. Since when is natural goodness ever to be viewed as the heart of the Reformer's teaching? Calvin's common grace (which he taught—we deny it not) was to the Reformer a secondary issue, something which seems to fit in very awkwardly with his conception. Calvin is known in history as the fearless champion of the sovereignty of our God. This, of course, controlled all his other conceptions. Hence, he proclaimed the truths of unconditional election and reprobation, man's natural hopelessness and corruption, so that his virtues are but brilliant vices, the Christ as the only and all-powerful Saviour and the irresistible efficacy of grace—this is Calvinism. And also this shook the very foundations of the Roman Catholic Church. In the third place, Calvin's importance was universal. To him there was neither Greek nor Scythian, neither Frenchman, German, not Swiss, but only the new creature in Christ Jesus. Calvin's influence, by means of his theological academy and immense correspondence, reached out to the nations of the then known world. Luther provided the spark which set the Church of God on fire; Calvin laid its foundation, as upon the Word of the living God. Calvin died at the age of fifty-five. He passed away because he could live no longer. He died because he was thoroughly exhausted. But his work was finished. He had split wide open the human defenses of the Church which barred the way for God's people unto the living God. To God be ascribed all glory for His work accomplished through this servant of our God.

H. V.

---

## Contribution

Editor of The Standard Bearer

Dear Mr. Editor,

My attention was called to an article which appeared in the December 1, 1944, issue of the Standard Bearer, written by Mr. H. A. Van Putten. That article reflects so unfairly upon the C.L.A., and even upon the so-called neutral unions, that it is not right to leave it unchallenged. I would therefore like to have a little space to reply to it.

The brother first of all condemns collective bargaining. But, it is quite clear that he has a faulty conception of it. First of all it must be understood that when representatives of unions bargain with an employer *they do not bargain for what a worker is going to be paid but for what is going to be paid for the performance of a job.* And if an employee can staisfactorily

perform that job he is entitled to the rate set for it. It is true, of course, that there is a great difference between men. And, the C.L.A. and many other unions as well, take cognizance of that and therefore provide that the rate set on a job is the minimum rate and that the employer may pay more to the more efficient employees. That fact that the employer very seldom does that only proves how little exceptional ability is appreciated.

Collective bargaining has come with mass industries. And it is a blessing for the worker that it did. What chance has an individual in a mass industry, where the employer has no direct contact with the men, to bargain so that he will get justice, when not a man's ability but the labor market determines what wages are going to be paid? (I have normal conditions in mind of course.) Not only that, but if Mr. Van Putten's idea were to be carried out there would have to be 300 different rates in a factory employing 300 men. No two men are exactly equal in ability. What a mess that would be! What a lot of trouble that would cause! Who would determine the exact worth of each man? The answer is of course that they must do that together. Yes, but isn't it much fairer then to bargain for all the employees doing the same kind of work at one time, through a chosen representative who has the ability to do so? What Mr. Van Putten writes about such a man not being able to swear an oath, etc., is quite meaningless. Such an argument is only brought in for effect. I have many times represented men in bargaining. An oath was never required, but if it had been I would not have hesitated to take it.

When the brother touches on responsibility before God he ought to think a bit more about his responsibility toward fellow-workers. The Lord taught us to pray, "Give *us* this day our daily bread", not, "give *me*". Christianity is not everybody for himself, but we are definitely our brothers' keepers too. In our employment that means that we should be as much concerned about our fellow-workers getting a just wage as about ourself. The way to do that is to bargain collectively through a Christian organization.

So much on that topic. But the brother passes on an argument against unions that would be amusing if it wasn't so terribly unfair. His assumption of a decorating contractor taking a job, then demanding more, and because the other party refuses to pay it proceeding to drive that man's family from his home, destroying his property, etc. etc., is supposed to be a fair picture of a union in action! What a shameful misrepresentation even of an unchristian union! It is very true that some unions have made misuse of their power. But the caricature presented by Mr. Van Putten is not a true picture of at least 95 percent of organized labor. I am not making a plea for the neutral unions. There are many reasons why I believe that

Christian workers should not belong to them. But, let's be honest at least. Such a picture as Mr. Van Putten has drawn is grossly unjust.

And then the admonition to C.L.A. members at the end, to think it over! Think over what? Does Mr. Van Putten even mean to imply that the ridiculous comparison he made also applies to the C.L.A.? If so he owes us an apology. Who ever heard of the C.L.A. breaking a contract, beating up people, destroying people, destroying property, etc.? I would like to know about it.

Such writing, Mr. Editor, does more harm than good. Your Church has the union problem to contend with. But, those who are faced with the problem are not going to be kept out of unchristian unions by presenting that kind of arguments. Above everything we must be honest and just! Would it be just to condemn all the people in a church as thieves and adulterers because a few had fallen into such sins? That would be doing exactly as Mr. Van Putten has done.

Yours for justice and truth,  
J. Gritter, Secretary C.L.A.

---

## The Apollinarian Conception of the Natures of Christ

There are some people concerning whom you just cannot become angry. No matter how they may oppose you, there is something about them that makes you want to like them. Perhaps this is due to the logical way they present their opposition; then too, their personal character or sincerity often tempts one to handle them, as they say, "with gloves on". Some opponents there are who are so offensive in their approach that you immediately decide to vanquish them and put them in their proper place. While, on the other hand, there are others, who perhaps are just as vicious and bent on your destruction but who are not quite so boastful and appear to be very sincere in their opposition, against whom you decide to treat them as kindly as possible and sincerely lay before them your argumentation as you have been impressed by them.

The study of the history involved in our subject and particularly as it pertained to the person of Apollinaris himself, has brought me to two inescapable conclusions: first, I was dealing with an intelligent but dangerous heretic; second, I was confronted with a man who left every semblance of sincerity in his attempt to defend his doctrine.

The Apollinaris of whom I speak is the well-known heretic inscribed in Church History with the full name

of Apollinaris of Laodicea, and is to be distinguished from his father also known by the same name. The latter was made a presbyter in Laodicea in Syria and was called Apollinaris the Elder, while his son with whom we are now concerned was known as Apollinaris the Younger. He was born presumably about 310 and like his father was first a teacher of rhetoric. About 346 he became acquainted with Athanasius, and they became warm friends, notwithstanding theological differences. Athanasius calls him a bishop in 362. Epiphanius also speaks of him as one who had always been beloved by himself, Athanasius, and all the orthodox, so that when he first got tidings of the new heresy, he could hardly believe that such a doctrine could emanate from such a man.

Apollinaris had done excellent service as a champion of the Nicæan symbol against the Arians, and had given a still more conclusive proof of his zeal in that cause by suffering exile on account of his opposition to the Arian heresy.

How Apollinaris was moved to invent the theory which forever marked him in the annals of Church History as one of the arch heretics may be accounted for with several reasons, chief of which no doubt would be his determined hostility to the opinions concerning the person of the Saviour, characteristic of the Arian heretics. The Arian doctrine of the person of Christ was, that in the historical person called Christ appeared in human flesh the very exalted, in a sense divine, creature named in Scripture the Logos. The Logos having taken the place of a human soul, and being liable to human infirmity, yea, even to sin, in as much as, however exalted, He was still a creature, therefore finite, and fallible, was capable of turning, in the abuse of freedom, from good to evil. Apollinaris replied to Arius in effect as follows: "Christ is, as you say, the Logos appearing in the flesh and performing the part of a human soul; but the Logos is not a creature, as you maintain; He is truly divine, eternally begotten, not made, and therefore morally infallible". In no other way did it seem to him possible to escape the Arian mutability, for he not only admitted the fallibility of all creatures, however exalted, but he believed that in human beings at least a rational soul, endowed with intelligence and freedom, not only may, but must inevitably fall into sin. Accordingly, Apollinaris denied that Jesus had a human mind and ascribed to Him only an immutable divine mind which, to quote his own words, "should not through defect of knowledge be subject to the flesh, but should without effort bring the flesh into harmony with itself."

The advantage Apollinaris saw in this theory was therefore a sinless Mediator which according to all orthodox thinking was essential to salvation. In other words, if Christ was fallible and capable of sin, He could not be the perfect Saviour.

The second advantage believed to be gained by his theory was the securing of the unity of Christ's person. Apollinaris asserted that if Christ possessed two perfect natures then it must also be maintained that He was two persons and consequently the resultant product is two mediators. "If", said he, "to perfect man be joined perfect God, there are two, not one: one, the Son of God by nature; another, the Son of God by adoption." On the other hand, he held that his theory gave one person, who was at once perfect man and perfect God, the two natures not being concrete separable things, but two aspects of the same person. Christ was true God, for He was the eternal Logos manifest in the flesh. He was also true man, for human nature consists of three component elements, body, animal soul, and spirit of all three are combined, according to the theory, in the person of Christ; while, on the common theory, there were four things combined in Him, whereby He became not a man, but a man-God, a monstium, resembling the fabulous animals of Greek mythology. True, it might be objected that the third element in the person of Christ, the mind (nous), was not human but divine. But Apollinaris was ready with his reply. "The mind in Christ," he said in effect, "is at once divine and human; the Logos is at once the express image of God and the prototype of humanity." This appears to be what he meant when he asserted that the humanity of Christ was eternal,—a part of his system which was much misunderstood by his opponents, who supposed it to have reference to the body of Christ. There is no reason to believe that Apollinaris meant to teach that our Lord's flesh was eternal, and that He brought it with Him from heaven, and therefore was not really born of the Virgin Mary; though some of his adherents may have held such opinions. His idea was, that Christ was the celestial man; celestial, because divine; man, not merely as God incarnate, but because the Divine Spirit is at the same time essentially human. In the combination whereby Christ's person was constituted there was thus nothing incongruous, though there was something unique; the divine being fitted in its own nature, and having, as it were, a yearning to become man.

The third advantage accruing from his theory, that of making God in very deed the subject of a suffering human experience, Apollinaris reckoned of no less value than the other two. It seemed to him of fundamental importance, that the person of Christ should be so conceived of, that everything belonging to His earthly history, both the miracles and the sufferings, should be affirmed directly and exclusively of the divine element in Him. Further, he asserted, a man liable to the common corruption cannot save the world; neither can we be saved, even by God, unless He mix with us. He must become an impeccable man, and die.

and rise again, and so destroy the empire of death over all; He must die as God, for the death of mere man does not destroy death, but only the death of one over whom death cannot prevail. Such thoughts as these appeared to Apollinaris arguments in favor of his theory; for he maintained that in the common theory the divine had really no part in Christ's sufferings. To rectify this defect was the leading aim of the new Christology. Gregory of Nyssa, in his polemical treatise against Apollinaris states that the whole scope of the work in which the latter promulgated his opinions was to make the deity of the only-begotten Son mortal, and to show that not the human in Christ endured suffering, but the impassible and unchangeable nature in Him, converted to participation in suffering.

The defects of the theory of Apollinaris are very glaring. One radical error is the assumption that to get rid of sin we must get rid of a human mind in Christ. Gregory of Nyssa, referring to the apostolic dictum, "Tempted in all points like as we are, without sin," very pertinently remarks, "but mind is not sin." If it be sin, then to be consistent, the theory ought to take away mind not merely from Christ, but from human nature itself. Yet Apollinaris is so far from doing this, that he represents mind (nous) as the leading element in human nature. It is because the mind is the dominating element that its omission is necessary in order to secure the unity of Christ's person. If Christ consists of two perfect, i.e. complete, un-mutilated natures, then, according to Apollinaris, He is not one.

Another manifest defect in the theory is, that it adopts means for excluding the possibility of sin in Christ, which defeat another of its own chief ends, namely, that of making the divine partaker of suffering. Place is found for the Physical fact of death, but no place is found for the mortal suffering connected with temptation. Christ is so carefully guarded from Sin, that He is not even allowed to know what it is to be tempted to sin. Apollinaris was so afraid of the Arian doctrine of fallibility that he solves the problem of Christ's sinlessness by annihilating the very conditions under which the problem had to be worked out. Accordingly, all the temptations and struggles of Christ are reduced to a show and a sham.

In conclusion, let us recapitulate summarizing the tenets and errors of Apollinaris and set forth briefly the true and accepted doctrine that evolved from this controversy.

1. Apollinaris denied that Christ possessed a human mind and therefore necessarily denied a complete human nature.

2. Apollinaris asserted that the humanity of Christ was eternal, the humanity here, having reference not to the flesh but His spirit, was both divine and human, celestial and eternal, again denying the conception and

birth of a complete human nature in time.

3. Apollinaris asserted finally that not the human in Christ endured suffering but the divine, hereby denying the Scriptural truth that "He was tempted in all points like we yet without sin."

No better can the true doctrine accepted and expressed by the Church over against the Arian and Apollinarian heresies be stated than in the creed adopted at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 which is as follows:

"We, then, following the holy Fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood; truly God and truly man, of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, in two natures, inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one person and one subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets from the beginning have declared concerning Him, and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself has taught us, and the creed of the holy Fathers has handed down to us."

M. S.

---

O come, behold what wondrous works,  
 Jehovah's hand has wrought;  
 Come, see what desolation great  
 He on the earth hath brought;  
 To utmost ends of all the earth  
 He causes war to cease;  
 The weapons of the strong destroyed,  
 He makes abiding peace.

Be still and know that I am God,  
 O'er all exalted high;  
 The subject nations of the earth  
 My Name shall magnify;  
 The Lord of hosts is on our side,  
 Our safety to secure;  
 The God of Jacob is for us,  
 A refuge strong and sure.