

# THE STANDARD

*Bearer*

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME XXI

APRIL 15, 1945

NUMBER 14

## MEDITATION

### Reverent Circumspection

(Prayer-Day Meditation)

*Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not  
thine heart be hasty to utter anything before  
God: for God is in heaven, and thou upon  
earth: therefore let thy words be few.*

*Eccl. 5:2.*

When thou enterest the house of God! . . . .

For that occasion, the Word of God in this connection sounds a threefold warning.

The house of God, to which the text refers, was, of course, in the first place, the old dispensational temple, the sanctuary of Israel, where the people of God were wont to worship, to offer their prayers, to bring their sacrifices, to pledge and to pay their vows.

In the new dispensation, this sanctuary is no longer on earth, it is in heaven. For the blood of Christ has sprinkled the way that leads into the inner sanctuary of God, the veil, that is His flesh, was rent, and the way into the presence of God is made manifest. There, in the sanctuary, our eternal and only High Priest appears before God in our behalf, and with our eye of faith fixed on Him, we may walk the blood-sprinkled way, and through the veil boldly enter into the presence of the Most High, confident that we will be received.

Yet, the threefold exhortation offered in this part of the Word of God is still important and to the point.

All three warnings are comprehended in the one: "keep thy foot". Do not blindly rush into God's sanctuary, as if you were entering your neighbor's house, but rather be circumspect, and prepare yourselves properly to meet your God,

Applied to your worship, this signifies first of all, that it is better to hear than to bring the sacrifices of fools. Remember, when you sacrifice, that your offering is presented to the living God. You cannot pretend to do Him a favor. You dare not assume the attitude of the donor. Beware lest you feel that with your gift on the altar you can add to His riches, so that He ought to be pleased with the outward offering. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. All the gold and silver in the world, and the cattle on a thousand hills, are His. Let, therefore, your sacrifice only be a token of humility and deep contrition on your part, an expression that it is your delight to hear His Word and to keep His commandments, if He will but give you grace. For "it is better to hear, than to give the sacrifice of fools." To hear and obey the Word of God is better than sacrifice. . . .

Secondly, this same principle, that you should keep your feet, and not madly rush into the presence of God, implies, too, that you should pay your vows!

Vow, and pay; and defer not to pay; or vow not at all!

For you are making your vow to the living God: and He has no pleasure in fools!

And lastly, when you pray, be not rash with your mouth, so that you speak thoughtlessly, oblivious of the One you are addressing; nor let even your own heart be the criterion of your prayer, and madly make you utter many words.

Rather, when you utter your prayers before the Most High, let the knowledge of Him, and the consciousness of being in His presence, control and determine, both your attitude, and every word you speak.

You are speaking to God!

And God is in heaven, you are on the earth!

Therefore, let your words be few!

Let the fear of the Most High motivate your heart and mind!

Holy circumspection!

God is the Lord!

That, no doubt, is the emphatic and primary significance of the reminder that He is in heaven, and that we are on the earth.

To be sure, He is not confined to heaven, Omnipresent is He. On the earth as well as in heaven His presence fills all things. Nothing excludes Him. Moreover, He is the infinite One, Who transcends all that is called creature, Who cannot be measured by space; the eternal God, Whose beginning or end cannot be discovered, Who transcends all time. The heaven, yea, the heaven of heavens cannot contain Him.

But when the Word of God makes the distinction of His being in heaven, while we are on the earth, it would have us remember that He is the Lord, the absolute Lord, the sole Ruler and Proprietor of all the universe, while we are living on His footstool.

Heaven is His throne!

And when you prepare to enter into His sanctuary, and to appear in the presence of God; when you are about to open your mouth in prayer and to utter your petitions before His face, you must do so in the clear and profound consciousness that you stand face to face with the Potentate of potentates, the only Sovereign of the whole universe, the heavenly Majesty. He is the Creator of the heavens and of the earth. They owe their existence solely to the marvel of His power. They came into being when He called the things that are not as if they were. There was no one with Him. He is the sole Proprietor. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, and He does with all things according to His good pleasure! The heavens and the earth, the clouds and the rain and the sunshine, the rivers and the valleys, the mountains and the hills, the cattle and the beasts of the forest, the soil you plow, and the seed you sow, and the power you employ to do it, the air you breathe, and the water you drink, and the bread you eat, the clothes that cover your nakedness, and the fire that makes you comfortable in the cold of winter, your silver and your gold, and all the means wherewith you toil and labor, yea, you yourselves with body and soul, with mind and will and heart, and with all your power and ingenuity,—all are His!

He is in heaven, you are on the earth!

Beware, when you present your petitions to Him, lest you should speak with the pretention of having any right or claim to even the smallest speck of dust.

Rather remember that you have sinned against His majesty, and that, if He should mark your transgressions, you would be cast into everlasting desolation!

Be not rash with your mouth, and speak not as if He were the caretaker of your property!

Let not your heart be hasty to bring before Him your carnal requests, as if He existed to prosper *your* cause, a "Kind Providence" Whose sole purpose it must be to fill you with prosperity and plenty. . . .

He is the Proprietor, you are His property!

In the heavens is He, while you are on the earth!  
Therefore, let your words be few!  
He is the Lord!

The sole Governor is He!

Alone He is enthroned in the heavens!

All the reins of the government of the entire universe are in His hands. There is no one with Him, no one that gives Him counsel, no one that shares the government with Him, that has the prerogative, the authority, the wisdom, or the power even to be His advisor.

God is in heaven, we are on the earth: He is the Governor, we and all things are the ruled.

And this implies that He moves as by His hand every creature in all the living universe, and directs it according to His will!

Whether you see the sun rise every morning exactly at its appointed time, or whether you watch a lonely white cloud drift, apparently quite arbitrarily, across the blue firmament; whether you marvel at the beauty and exact position of each sparkling and twinkling star in the dark heavens, or whether you see the swift meteor flash across a section of the sky; whether you consider the spring rain or the summer drought, the sprouting grass and herb or the golden grain ready to be harvested; whether you listen to the soft murmur of the brook or to the roar of the mighty ocean in the storm; whether you hear the cry of the raven or the song of the meadow lark,—all you perceive is moved and directed as it were by His hand. Yea, the bullet that seeks its target, the shell that bursts to spread death and destruction, the bomb that is dropped from the plane, the torpedo that makes its treacherous course through the dark waters, as well as the thoughts and plans of mighty man that invents and prepares them for their destructive work,—all are directed as it were by His hand.

When you are healthy and well, it is His hand that makes you so; when sickness enters your home, it is by His hand that it is sent; when you may harvest an abundant crop, it was His gift to you, and when the almost ready harvest is destroyed by hail, His hand alone directed the path of the hail; when there is an abundance of supplies in your cellars, it was He that filled them, but when the bread basket is empty, it was also His hand that emptied it. And when your son gets through this dreadful war without a scratch, but also when he is wounded or killed on the battlefield, it is He that directs it all. The message that is delivered at your door: "we regret to inform you that your son was killed in action," is brought to you as it were by His hand. . . .

Prosperity and adversity, sickness and health, fruitful and barren years, life and death, peace and war,—

they are all His. He determines when and what will be the outcome of this war.

God is in heaven, He alone does, and He alone is able to rule.

He is the Lord!

Be not rash with your tongue when you pray, and be not hasty to utter a thousand requests that may arise from your heart!

When He sends heavy rains at the time of harvest, or drought in the springtime, do not instruct Him to change His government; when sickness enters your family, do not request that He remove it; when war ravages the whole world, and His judgments are in the earth, neither clamor for peace because you do not like it, nor instruct Him as to whose cause is righteous and must have the victory; when hundreds and thousands of young men are killed in battle, do not insist that your son or husband must be kept unharmed. . . .

Rather say: O God, thy will be done! Give us grace to will that will!

He is the Lord!

Besides, that He alone governs all things, implies, too, that He directs all the history and movement of all the universe to His own end!

Things do not move at random!

They are all directed according to an eternal purpose.

The plan of all things is in heaven, in the divine mind, in eternity, in the immutable decree of the Lord of heaven and earth.

And you know, for in His grace He assured you of it, that, as far as those that love Him are concerned, that purpose is everlasting glory and salvation.

Is not that sufficient?

All things work together for good to them that love Him, that are the called according to His purpose.

Would you insist that He change that purpose, because of some individual experience that is not to your liking, some suffering or sorrow that He sends you here on the earth?

Would you not rather commit it all to Him?

God is in heaven, and you are on the earth: therefore let your words be few!

O, let them be as many as you please, pour out your hearts in an abundance of words, if you mean to praise and adore and glorify Him, and acknowledge that He is the Lord! For of His wondrous works there is no end!

But as far as the details of your life and way are concerned, leave them to Him!

Be not rash with your mouth!

God is the Lord!

---

He alone knows!

Yes, also this is implied in the reminder that He is in the heavens, and that we are on the earth.

He knows, He knows all. We do not understand His way or work, except in as far as it pleases Him to make them known unto us!

“Jehovah from His throne on high  
Looks down with clear and searching eye  
On all that dwell below;  
And He that fashioned heart and mind  
Looks ever down on all mankind,  
The works of men to know.”

Yes, and He looks down, not only on the works of men, but on all things, to know them. And, mark you well, He looks *from His throne on high*, and He looks *down*: God is in heaven! His viewpoint is heavenly, that of the Lord of heaven and earth, Who created all things, Who possesses all things, Who does with all things according to His good pleasure, Who directs them according to His sovereign counsel. He knows them, not by studying them and watching their course, but from His own eternal good pleasure and wise decree. He knows them in their relation to one another, and in relation to the final and all-comprehensive purpose they must serve and reach; He knows them all, and He knows them in their minutest detail. He knows exactly what must happen in the affairs of the world, and in your and my individual experience. . . .

Father knows! . . . .

We do not!

We often look at things from the infinitesimally small and narrow viewpoint of our own earthly and carnal wants and desires, in order then to determine, and tell the Lord in heaven what should be done!

For we are creatures of the dust. We are on the earth, we are of time, of yesterday. We are of space, hemmed in on every side. We see but little, almost nothing, except that which it pleased the Lord to reveal to us of His counsel: His general purpose of salvation.

Shall we, then, give Him counsel?

We need give Him no information in our prayers: He knows!

Be not rash with your mouth!

God is in heaven!

---

Soli Deo Gloria!

That is the end! For God is in heaven!

He alone is the purpose of all things. All things are and must be of Him, and through Him, and to Him! Have your delight in that purpose, and approach Him with fear!

With reverent circumspection!

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. Doezema, 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 —

- REVERENT CIRCUMSPECTION .....309  
Rev. H. Hoeksema

#### EDITORIALS —

- THE TEXT OF A COMPLAINT .....312  
NAAR 'T KERKELIJK, NIET NAAR 'T CONFESSIO-  
NEEL GEWETEN .....314  
EXPOSITION OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM .....315  
Rev. H. Hoeksema  
DO THE REPROBATED SIN IN HELL .....318  
Rev. G. M. Ophoff  
EEN GEBED IN OORLOG .....322  
Rev. G. Vos  
THE RADIO AND THE CHRISTIAN HOME .....324  
Rev. S. T. Cammenga  
DEBATE (Affirmative Rebuttal) .....326  
Rev. C. Hanko  
THE UNCONSCIOUS IN THE ORDO SALUTIS .....328  
Rev. A. Petter  
CONTRIBUTION .....329  
Mr. H. A. Van Putten  
NEWS FROM OAK LAWN .....341  
Mr. J. Buiter  
CONTRIBUTION .....342  
Mr. J. Gritter, Sec'y C.L.A.

## EDITORIALS

### The Text of a Complaint

What shall we say about the second part of the "Complaint," that which is concerned with the faculties of the soul?

First of all, I wish to repeat that also this question might be a nice subject for discussion by some philosophical or theological club. How the presbytery of Philadelphia could subject a theological candidate to several hours of grilling on this point is, I confess, beyond my comprehension. And still more difficult it is for me to understand how the complainants could discover in Dr. Clark's views in this respect sufficient ground for a protest against his licensure and ordination. The question involved is, to say the least, debatable.

But more must be said.

For one can only be amazed at the claim made by the complainants that their view on this question, the view, namely, that holds the trichotomous distinction between the powers of the soul, and that assigns to the emotions a leading place among the faculties of the soul rather than to the intellect, is historically and currently Reformed or Calvinistic.

I claim that the very opposite is true.

The quotations the complainants offer in their protest to prove their contention are very unconvincing. In fact, they frankly admit that "From the viewpoint of abstract psychology, it is perfectly true that Reformed theologians have not been in complete agreement as to the number and names of the faculties of the human soul. In speaking specifically of the faculties of the human soul Calvin mentions by name only the intellect and will (Institutes, Bk. I, Chap. XV, Sect. 6). Augustine refers to the perception, understanding and will." (The Text Of A Complaint, p. 8). And again, they admit: "Calvin, who so clearly gives intellect a control over will, though not by virtue of that a primacy over will," etc. (*idem*, p. 9). But they insist that "the more recent theologians, however, seem to agree in large measure on the threefold distinction of intellect, emotion, and will." (*idem*, p. 8).

We may note here that the complainants express themselves very carefully: "the more recent theologians *seem* to agree in large measure". But even so the complainants are in error. It is far nearer to the truth to state that Reformed theologians have, generally speaking, been strongly opposed to the threefold distinction of intellect, will, and emotion, and have often expressed

their fear of the danger of this distinction. The danger of this distinction, to which they usually pointed, is that the emotions in that case gradually assume a dominating and controlling position in the soul of man, and that, according to this trichotomous psychology, such experiences as love and hatred, sorrow and joy, repentance and remorse, in fact, all religion and mortality are relegated to the emotions or feeling. And that would exactly be the deathblow to all true religion. Reformed theologians were, therefore, usually in favor of the dichotomous distinction of intellect and will, and ascribed the emotions partly to the intellect, and partly to the will. And again, it may be stated without fear of possible contradiction that Reformed theology usually favored the "primacy of the intellect."

I thought, and still think, that this was so well known, that I could only be amazed when I discovered that some theologians of Philadelphia took the opposite stand.

Let me offer a quotation or two.

The first is from Bavinck, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, II, p. 596-97:

"Secondly, to this image of God belong the powers (vermogens) of man. While the spirit is the principle and the soul the subject of life in man, the heart is, according to Scripture, the organ for his life. It is, first, center of his physical life, but next also, metaphorically, the ground and source of all psychical life, of emotions and passions, of desire and will, even of thinking and knowing. Out of the heart are all the THOTSEOTH CHAJIM, issues of life. Prov. 4:23. This life, that has its source in the heart, divides itself into *two currents*. (I underscore, H.H.). On the one hand, one may distinguish that life which comprises all impressions, notions, sensations, perceptions, considerations, thoughts, knowledge, wisdom, that finds, especially in its higher form, its organ in the *nous* (mind), and embodies itself in the word, in speech. And on the other hand, in the heart have their origin the affections, emotions, passions, inclinations, impulses, desires and determinations of the will, which must be guided by the *nous* (mind) and express themselves in the act . . . Augustine even recognized in the heart, intellect and will (*memoria, intellectus, voluntas*) an analogy of the trinitarian life of God. Even as the Father gives life to the Son and to the Spirit, and the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, thus also with man it is the heart, the deep, mysterious life of the soul, that gives existence to intellect and will, and that, more specifically causes the will to follow the intellect . . . but the theology of the West avoided all these errors (of Rationalism, Pelagianism, Mysticism, H.H.); it understood that the doctrine of God and of man are closely related; in the trinity it, therefore, maintained the oneness in being, the distinction of the three persons, and the *filioque*, (the procession of the

Spirit also from the Son, H.H.), and accordingly, with respect to psychology it taught that the deep and hidden life of the soul becomes manifest only through the intellectual and volitional faculty, and that, as to these two, the latter is led and governed by the former."

This is clear language. Its meaning is not at all ambiguous. Bavinck teaches that there are only two faculties of the soul, intellect and will; and he maintains the primacy of the intellect. What is more, he here states that Western theology, since the days of Augustine, held the same views.

I have no time to look up the exact pages in the *Psychologische Beginselen* by the same author, but if the complainants will take the trouble, they will find a rather interesting discussion of this subject in that work, and a strong condemnation of the trichotomous distinction. Years ago, I delivered a paper on this same subject before a ministers' conference, and I recollect Bavinck's discussion just now referred to distinctly.

The complainants refer, in proof of their contention, to Dr. Kuyper's *Dictaten Dogmatiek*, Vol. II, *Locus de Homine*, pp. 68-88. But they are mistaken. Dr. Kuyper would be the last one to assign to the emotions the position of a separate faculty. It is true that he speaks of three faculties, but they are the perceptive, the intellectual, and the volitional faculty. Virtually, this means the same as the dichotomous distinction between intellect and will, for the perceptive faculty belongs to the intellect in the broader sense.

And that Kuyper was strongly in favor of the "primacy of the intellect" is well known. Even in the very passage to which the complainants refer, he writes:

"Does the will stand under the command of the intellect, or does it operate out of itself?"

"There has been a controversy about this problem as long as men thought about the responsibility of man. The Mystics say: the will operates out of itself. The pure theologians (*zuivere theologen*) teach: the will stands under the command of the intellect."

On this point of the "Complaint" I must, therefore, maintain: 1. That the complainants have no cause for protest against the licensure of Dr. Clark; and, 2. That their own position is in conflict with the general stand of Reformed theologians.

Personally, I believe that there is room for debate, and for further development of the solution of this problem.

H. H.

The trouble with modern Calvinism in our land is that, while it claims to be a world-view, it has no program of its own. Hence, it supports almost any program the world offers as a cure for its ills.

H. H.



## Naar 't Kerkelijk, Niet Naar 't Confessioneel Geweten

Door het kerkelijk geweten, lezer, bedoel ik in dit verband aan te duiden een geweten, dat oordeelt naar de officieele uitspraak der Kerk, waartoe iemand behoort; door een confessioneel geweten versta ik een geweten, dat oordeelt naar de belijdenis dier Kerk.

Ik dacht aan dit onderscheid, toen ik een antwoord las van de hand van Prof. D. H. Kromminga, in *De Wachter* van 27 Maart, l.l., op de vraag: "Kan iemand ambtsdrager zijn in eene Chr. Geref. Kerk, indien hij met het standpunt, ingenomen door de Synode van 1924 inzake de Gemeene Gratie, verschilt of zelfs daartegen ageert?"

't Is een van die vragen, waarop de vrager een ontkenkend antwoord verwacht, en, zooals te verwachten was, ook ontving. Maar de vrager wist van bepaalde gevallen, waarin "op de nominatielijst namen voorkomen van personen, die met het standpunt van de Synode van 1924 inzake de Algemeene Genade verschillen of soms zelfs het standpunt der afgezette predikanten Danhof en Hoeksema voorstaan." En hij vindt: "zulke mannen behooren niet in een kerkeraad." Des vragers doel was dus eenvoudig, om door middel van de publieke *Vragenbus* zulke praktijken even te laten veroordeelen.

Blijkbaar was de vraag reeds bedoeld om vrucht af te werpen voor de verkiezingen van verleden jaar, maar Prof. Kromminga kon haar niet aanstonds beantwoorden. Dat vind hij wel jammer, maar hij hoopt "dat tegen de verkiezingen van 1945 de zaak niet weer vergeten is." Hij beantwoordt verder de vraag als volgt:

"De ouderlingen, die in onze kerkeraden dienen, moeten het Onderteekeningsformulier onderschrijven en daarmede hunne instemming met onze Belijdenisschriften betuigen en beloven, die te handhaven en daarvan niet af te wijken. Nu maakt dat formulier wel geen melding bij name van de drie punten, door de Synode van 1924 inzake de Gemeene Gratie vastgesteld, maar het mag niet voorbijgezien worden, dat volgens die Synode die drie punten geene toevoeging zijn aan onze Gereformeerde leer, maar van oudsher al in de Belijdenis begrepen geweest zijn. Bovendien heeft de volgende Synode duidelijk te kennen gegeven, dat agitatie tegen de drie punten niet toelaatbaar is. Ze deed dat in hare goedkeuring van de afzetting der beide predikanten om reden van zulke agitatie. Hoe in het licht van deze feiten wfe tegen die drie punten is, en vooral, wie daartegen ageert, met een goed geweten ons Onderteekeningsformulier met zijn naamteekening versieren kan, gaat boven mijn begrip. En even zeer gaat het mijn begrip te boven, hoe een kerkeraad een broeder, van wien hij weet, dat hij tegen de drie punten

is, kan laten teekenen of kan nomineeren. Het spreekt ook vanzelf dat ieder lid eener gemeente, waar zulke mannen genomineerd worden, van welke hij weet, dat ze niet met de drie punten instemmen, geroepen is, den kerkeraad daarop opmerkzaam te maken, ingeval die het niet mocht weten of er niet mee rekenen."

Ik ben het natuurlijk volkomen met Prof. Kromminga eens. Alleen maar had hij in antwoord op de gestelde vraag nog een stap verder moeten gaan, en zeggen, dat zulke ambtsdragers, waar ze werkelijk een plaats hebben in eenen Chr. Geref. kerkeraad, moeten worden afgezet. Dan behoefde de zaak immers ook niet te wachten tot 1945, en werd ze ook niet "vergeten," zooals nu waarschijnlijk wel het geval zal worden.

Overigens heeft hetgeen Prof. Kromminga schrijft alleen betrekking op het *kerkelijk* geweten. Ik kan heel goed verstaan, hoe iemand met een goed *confessioneel* geweten tegen de "Drie Punten" kan ageeren, en toch het Onderteekeningsformulier kan onderteeke-

nen. De moeite ontstaat natuurlijk daardoor, dat de Kerk wel heeft uitgesproken, dat de "Drie Punten" in de belijdenisschriften zijn vervat, maar dat de meeste zelfdenkende Gereformeerden wel verstaan, dat dit toch niet het geval is. Zoo komt er conflict tusschen de kerkelijke en de confessioneele conscientie, en dat wel door de schuld der Kerk, want zij aanvaardde de "Drie Punten."

Ik ben vast overtuigd, dat Prof. Kromminga ook wel weet, dat de "Drie Punten" niet in de Confessie der Gereformeerde Kerken staan, of zijn vervat.

Hij weet evengoed als ik, dat de belijdenisschriften nergens spreken van "gemeene genade," behalve op de bekende plaats, waar onze vaders den Remonstranten dien term in den mond leggen. Hij weet evengoed als ik, dat de Confessie nergens gewag maakt van eene andere dan zaligmakende genade, van eene genade over alle schepselen, over de verworpenen, of van een van Godswegen welgemeend aanbod van genade aan alle menschen. Hij weet evengoed als ik, dat noch Art. 13, noch Art. 36 der Nederlandsche Geloofsbelijdenis spreekt van eene werking des Heiligen Geestes of van eene genadewerking Gods, waardoor de zonde gestuit wordt, en waardoor de natuurlijke mensch, buiten de wedergeboorte om in staat gesteld wordt burgerlijk goed te doen. En hij kan ook, evengoed als ik, zien, dat de Dordtsche Leerregels, III, IV, 4 precies het tegenovergestelde leeren.

Ik spreek dit zoo vrijmoediglijk uit, omdat ik weet, dat Prof. Kromminga een normaal verstand heeft, en omdat deze dingen zoo duidelijk zijn, dat een kind ze wel kan verstaan.

Welnu, daardoor komt het, dat, ofschoon de in de vraag bedoelde mannen zeker niet in eene Chr. Geref. Kerk het Onderteekeningsformulier kunnen ondertee-

kenen naar hunne *kerkelijke* conscientie, ze dit naar hunne confessioneele conscientie wel kunnen doen. En waar eene kerkelijke conscientie gewoonlijk lang niet zoo sterk spreekt bij zelfdenkende personen, als de confessioneele conscientie, onderteekenen ze dan.

Maar ze moesten de kerk verlaten, en zich bij ons aansluiten.

En doen ze dat niet, dan moest een kerkeraad ze onder behandeling nemen.

Het is immers niet alleen de vraag, of ze wel in den kerkeraad kunnen dienen: ook als leden zijn ze voor de "Drie Punten" verantwoordelijk. Als ze geen ouderling kunnen zijn, kunnen ze ook geen lid zijn.

Ook dit is naar de uitspraak der Kerk in 1926.

Prof. Kromminga geeft wel een juist antwoord, maar hij zegt lang niet genoeg.

Om het eenigszins paradoxaal te zeggen: ik ben het veel beter met hem eens, dan hij het met zichzelf eens is.

H. H.

## The Triple Knowledge

### An Exposition Of The Heidelberg Catechism

#### Part Two.

#### Of Man's Redemption

#### Lord's Day XV

Q. 37. What dost thou understand by the words, "He suffered?"

A. That he, all the time that he lived on earth, but especially at the end of his life, sustained in body and soul, the wrath of God against the sins of all mankind: that so by his passion, as the only propitiatory sacrifice, he might redeem our body and soul from everlasting damnation, and obtain for us the favor of God, righteousness and eternal life.

Q. 38. Why did he suffer under Pontius Pilate, as judge?

A. That he, being innocent, and yet condemned by a temporal judge, might thereby free us from the severe judgment of God to which we were exposed.

Q. 39. Is there anything more in his being crucified, than if he had died some other death?

A. Yes there is; for thereby I am assured that he took on him the curse which lay upon me; for the death of the cross was accursed of God.

#### 1.

#### Atoning Suffering.

As to the text of this fifteenth Lord's Day, we may

note the following: 1. The original of "propitiatory sacrifice" can be more correctly rendered by "atoning sacrifice," or "sacrifice of reconciliation." The German text has Sühnopfer. 2. "Mankind" can be more fully translated by "the whole human race." The original has: ganzen menschlichen Geschlechts. 3. The original translated by "favor" is: Gnade, and there is no reason why this should not be rendered by "grace." All these remarks concern the answer to the thirty-seventh question. The text of the other questions and answers is quite correct.

Modernism, emphasizing the goodness of the Man of Galilee, and glorying in Jesus as an example for us to follow, cannot but be disappointed and very much dissatisfied with the account of Jesus' life and ministry as presented by the Apostolic Confession: born, suffered, crucified, dead, and buried! From the viewpoint an attempt to write a biography of Jesus, or even to furnish the necessary material for a description of Jesus' character, the *Apostolicum*, it must be admitted, made a rather poor selection of facts. Or what human being ever lived of whom this same review might not be written: born, suffered, died, buried? There would seem to be nothing special or distinctive in all this.

And yet, it is exactly in these words that one must find the revelation of Jesus Christ as far as His earthly life and ministry are concerned. It is true, many other works may be attributed to Him, and could be mentioned here, so many, in fact, that if all were written the whole world could not contain the books. He taught and revealed the Father; He performed many wonderful works; and He stands out in the midst of all men as the One Whom no one could ever convict of sin. But all this would have no significance for us, if He had not suffered and died. And if the revelation of Jesus Christ is to be expressed in a brief confession, the words of the *Apostolicum* must surely have the preference to any "*Leben Jesu*," or character description of the Man of Galilee.

Of course, these words of the Confession dare not be divorced from the preceding declarations concerning Jesus Christ, nor from what is stated subsequently, for it is only in their connection that their special significance is discerned. Taken by themselves, they describe only what is common to all men. All men are born, suffer, and die. And although all men are not crucified, there is nothing unique even in this. Thousands of men were crucified about the time of Jesus' life, and untold thousands more have suffered even greater agonies, were tortured, sawn asunder, torn apart limb by limb on the cruel rack, burnt alive, or left to rot slowly in dark dungeons. And that was the end of them, as far as human history is concerned. But the special significance of the words "suffered, was crucified, dead and buried," must be found in the Subject of this suffering. It was *He* that was born,

that suffered, was crucified, and buried. And He is Jesus Christ, our Lord, the only begotten Son of God, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary. God Himself came in the flesh, and was born. God Himself suffered in the flesh! God Himself was crucified in the flesh, died in the flesh, and was buried in the flesh! Therein, and therein alone, lies the altogether unique and tremendous power and significance of the words of the Confession.

Only because it is the Subject of the only begotten Son of God in the flesh that suffered, can the explanation of this suffering offered by the Catechism in its answer to the thirty-seventh question be maintained. For only the Son of God could truly bear the wrath of God in His suffering, and taste the awful reality of that wrath in all His passion; only the Son of God in the flesh could *sustain* that wrath of God to the end, without being crushed under it, and becoming utterly lost in everlasting desolation; only the Son of God in the flesh could make of that suffering *an act*, and that, too, an act of perfect obedience, so that His passion and death became the perfect *Yes* over against the *No* of sin, the only atoning sacrifice. And so, only by the suffering of the Son of God in the flesh could our redemption from everlasting damnation be accomplished, and could there be obtained for us the grace of God, righteousness, and eternal life.

Moreover, only when we first confess that it is Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, our Lord, that was born, suffered, was crucified and died, is it possible to continue this confession concerning the revelation of Jesus Christ. With mere man this is impossible. You can, indeed, write the real biography of every man, no matter how illustrious a name he may have made for himself among men, in these words: born, suffered, died. For such is the reality of human existence that in these words the most important facts concerning it are related. All is vanity. Death is in all man's life and activity. And there is no way out. You cannot continue the description. Man's existence ends in death, and that, too, in everlasting death. But the revelation of Jesus Christ is not finished with death and burial. Exactly because it is the only begotten Son of God that suffered and died, the confession of the Church continues: "on the third day he was raised again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father, Almighty. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead!"

That, and not the modern good Man of Galilee, is emphatically the revelation of Jesus Christ.

No wonder that Modernism, which begins by denying the true and essential divinity of Christ, is loath to speak of Christ's atoning suffering and death, and rather extols Him as the great teacher, and the perfect example, from whom we can all learn to be good, and whom we may all follow to establish the brotherhood

of man, and to realize the kingdom of God on earth. When a man babbles much about the goodness of Christ, and about the lovely Jesus, and avoids to emphasize His suffering and death, you must inquire of him at once whether he believes the confession of the Church that Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God, co-eternal with the Father and the Holy Ghost.

If the cross is not the cross of the Son of God, is is foolishness!

---

Turning now to the explanation of the Catechism in its answer to the thirty-seventh question, we cannot but notice that it elaborates upon the words of the Confession, and ascribes to them a wider meaning than they can literally have. The *Apostolicum*, evidently, refers only to the suffering of Christ at the end of His earthly sojourn and ministry, when it declares: "suffered under Pontius Pilate." The phrase "under Pontius Pilate" must probably be understood as a temporal modifier, an indication as to the time when Jesus suffered. At all events, the entire expression is one, and is, according to the intent of the Apostolic Confession, not to be split up. It refers, therefore, definitely to the final suffering of our Lord. The Heidelberg, however, divides the phrase of the Confession, and in its answer to the thirty-seventh question treats the words "He suffered" separately, thus making it possible to speak of the passion of the Saviour as extending over "all the time he lived on earth."

Further, it is to be noted that the Catechism mentions the following elements in explanation of the suffering of our Lord: 1. The real essence of this suffering consists in the fact that He bore the wrath of God. 2. This wrath of God He not merely suffered, but He *sustained* it; in German: Er hat den Zorn Gottes wider die Sünde des ganzen menschlichen Geschlechts *getragen*. 3. That He bore and sustained this wrath of God during His whole life, but especially at the end. 4. That He sustained the wrath of God *against the sin of all mankind, of the whole human race*. 5. That thus His suffering constitutes the atoning sacrifice whereby we are redeemed from damnation, and obtain the grace of God, righteousness, and eternal life. These various truths now demand our attention.

First of all, then, the suffering of Christ was essentially a sustaining of the wrath of God against sin, the sin of the whole human race, and thereby it becomes the sacrifice of reconciliation.

For a proper understanding of this mystery of salvation, it may be well, first of all, to recall the distinction that is frequently, and very properly, made in theology between *state* and *condition*. For this distinction is important with a view to the question as to how Christ could bear and sustain the wrath of God. In popular speech the two words are often used pro-



miscuously, but in theology they should be carefully distinguished. By *state* is meant one's legal position as determined by the sentence of the judge or magistrate, while *condition* denotes mode of being, the sum total of the accidental properties of any being at a given time. When someone enters this country as an immigrant, his *state* is that of a foreigner, under the American law he has no rights of citizenship. When, a few years later, he receives his naturalization papers, his *state* is changed. His *condition*, however, remains practically unchanged: he still has foreign blood in his veins, and his outward appearance reveals that he is foreign born. Such modes of existence, however, as sickness and health, soberness and drunkenness, integrity and depravity, are *conditions*.

No man is a sinner both as to his *state* and as to his *condition*. As to his *state*, i.e. his legal position according to the judgment of God, he is guilty; as to his *condition*, he is totally depraved. In his *state* of guilt he is worthy of death, object of the just wrath of God; as to his *condition*, he is incapable of doing any good, and inclined to all evil.

Applied to Christ, this means that He entered into the *state* of sinners, but not into their ethical, corrupt *condition*. In God's eternal decree, He was ordained to be the head of His sinful people, so that He represented them before the law of God, and before the bar of the Judge of heaven and earth, He assumed their guilt. And in the fulness of time He willingly entered into that *state* of guilt decreed for Him in God's eternal good pleasure. For "when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law." Gal. 4:4. He, Who is in Himself the eternal Lord, became a servant, entered into the *state* of a servant, so that He was obliged to fulfill the law. He, Who was above the law, placed Himself under the law. Moreover, seeing that He placed Himself under the law, and that, too, according to God's decree, as the representative Head of His sinful and guilty people, He entered the *state* of guilt, and in that *state* He was obliged to bear the wrath of God to the end, to fulfill all the demands of the justice of God against the sin of His own.

It must be remembered that in and through all this His *personal state* remained that of perfect righteousness before God. He was born without guilt, for He was the Person of the Son of God; and while under the law, and even while under the wrath of God, He remained perfectly righteous: He was the obedient servant of Jehovah. And, as to His ethical *condition*, He was and remained holy and blameless. While He entered into the *state* of sinners, He remained separate from sinners as to His *condition*, except in so far as He must bear the wrath of God, and, therefore, be subjected to suffering and death. The Son of God, Who is Lord and above the law, came under the law, and entered

into the *state* of a servant. The holy Child Jesus, Who was personally righteous both as to His *state* and *condition*, entered into the *state* of sinners, and, therefore, into their *condition* as far as their suffering and death are concerned. This is the meaning of that rich and profound passage in Philippians 2:6; "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

If we bear this in mind, we will be able to understand a little of the profound mystery of redemption and reconciliation.

Christ, so the Catechism teaches us, bore the wrath of God against the sin of the whole human race.

What does that mean?

Let us put the question this way: does it mean that God was ever angry with Christ personally? But how could this possibly be? In His person, our Lord is the only begotten Son of God, Who is in the bosom of the Father eternally. Certainly, it would be blasphemy to assert that the Father is ever angry with the Son. But was He, perhaps, angry with the Man Jesus? Was His anger directed against Christ as the Servant of Jehovah personally? Again, we say that this is equally impossible, and, besides, it is contrary to all we ever read of the Saviour as Man in relation to God. If He suffered the wrath of God all His life, this certainly cannot mean that God was angry with His holy Child Jesus during His entire lifetime, and that our Saviour was conscious of this anger of God against Him. All His life is one testimony of the fact that He lived in perfect fellowship with the Father, and was conscious of His approval and favor. What was announced from heaven at His baptism, and again at His transfiguration on the mount, covers His relationship to the Father during His whole life: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased!" Was He not the obedient Servant? And was not God always well pleased with Him, even as Man? Yea, was there ever a moment in which He was so perfectly obedient, so deeply in harmony with the will of God, as that very moment in which He cried out: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

What does it mean, then, that our Saviour bore the wrath of God?

It implies, first of all, that He suffered the *expression*, the concrete *effect* of the wrath of God against sin, against the sin of others, of the human race. God's wrath is the reaction of His holiness against the workers of iniquity. God is the Holy One. For He is the only Good. He is the implication of all infinite perfections. Hence, He is consecrated to Himself. He seeks Himself, knows Himself, loves Himself, glorifies

Himself. He seeks His glory also in the creature. For man this means that it is his everlasting obligation to be consecrated to God only. He must love God, seek Him, and glorify Him, with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his mind, and with all his strength. If he does this, God embraces him in His blessed lovingkindness and favor, and he is unspeakably happy. But if he fails to do just that, if he turns against the Holy One, rejects Him, rebels against Him, ignores Him, tramples His glory under foot, He reacts against that rebellious sinner in His anger, pursues Him constantly with fear and terror, makes him inexpressibly miserable, casts him down into everlasting darknesses of desolation. This is His attitude toward the sin of all mankind. And the expression of this wrath, i.e. the pain and agony, the suffering and misery, the sorrow and anguish of soul, the desolation and darkness, the fear and terror, the death and hell, that becomes the experience of him against whom God directs His wrath, Christ experienced!

That is the explanation, but at the same time the paradox of the cross!

At the moment of His deepest and most perfect obedience, He endures the agonies of the damned!

At the moment when God is most highly pleased with Him, He experiences all the terror of being forsaken of God!

But this is exactly why hell is still a question, an outcry to God for an answer! And that is the reason, too, why, even from the darkness of hell, and in the condition of utter desolation, the obedient Servant can still cry out: "*My God, My God!*"

He, that knew no sin, is made sin!

And that is also the reason, why his question, pressed from His utterly forsaken and agonized soul, has an answer. In the hell of mere sinners there is no question. It is the answer, the final answer, the answer of everlasting wrath. But the suffering Servant of Jehovah, because He is obedient and yet forsaken, has a question: *Why me?* And it receives an answer presently, an answer to which the Servant responds even at the cross: *It is finished!*

Christ, then, bore the wrath of God in that He bore all the agonies of soul and body which are the expression of that wrath.

H. H.

---

Wanted.

For the next Calvinistic conference: *Calvinists*. Need have no special qualifications, except that they must be loyal to the cause of common grace and the "Three Points".

H. H.

## Do The Reprobated Sin In Hell

The question that we face in this paper is: "Do the reprobated sin in hell". Or, "Will God make an end of sin also in the reprobated in hell as well as he makes an end of sin in the redeemed who are saved," or "What possibility, if any, is there to the lost in hell for sinning?" The answers to these questions must, of course, be derived from the Scriptures, and not from our reason. Our reason has worth, in our attempt to know the truth, as we possess it in the Christ and as it has been revealed to us in the Scriptures, only if our reason be sanctified by Christ's grace and be put in the service of our faith. Let us then see what the Scriptures teach on this point.

Now the Scriptures teach over and over that the wicked, the reprobated wicked, are to be destroyed. I need not quote Scripture here to prove this. When we shall have determined from the Scriptures just what it means that the wicked shall be destroyed, we shall have found answers to the above questions. Just what does it mean that the wicked shall be destroyed? That the wicked shall be destroyed does not mean, according to the Scriptures, that the wicked are to be annihilated, be made to cease to exist. I need not quote the Scriptures here to prove this. Nor can the teaching that the wicked shall be destroyed be limited to their physical death. Physical death, though the result of sin, is not certainly the punishment of sin. Scripture forbids such a view. It teaches that eternal death is not to consist in the lost spending an eternity in hell as disembodied spirits. The lost, too, according to the Bible, will come forth out of the grave in a body adapted to a mode of existence in everlasting hell. Yet, to destroy a thing means very actually to make an end of it. That God is to destroy the wicked means that He will make an end of them. But the question is: In what sense will He make an end of the wicked?

In answering this question we must set out with taking notice how the wicked in this life, as dwellers on this earth, react to God, to the revelation of himself in his moral law, in providence, in history and in the face of Christ. The wicked are opposed to God. They are antagonistic to Him. But right here we must distinguish between ethical and metaphysical opposition to God, between opposition to God in the ethical sphere and in the sphere that we, for the want of a name, will denote by the term metaphysical. The former, ethical opposition, is defiance of and antagonism to God's will as revealed in His moral law, in history and in providence, thus also to His counsel in so far as it has been revealed. Metaphysical opposition to God is a frustration of His determinate will as expressed in His counsel. As to ethical opposition, there is certainly opposition to God of this type on the part of the wicked,

And that is their great sin. The sinning of the wicked thus takes place in the sphere of the ethical. Now the humanly ethical bears on the will, on the heart of man.

Let us observe then first that the wicked oppose their corrupt wills to the moral law of God, to all His ordinances. The law of God demands of man that he love God with all his heart and with all his mind and with all his will, strength and heart. The reprobated wicked and all men by nature will to hate God and do hate Him with all their being, with their whole heart, mind and will. There is not an atom of love in the heart of the natural man, not the smallest principle of holiness. This, by the way, is the real issue in the common grace as developed by the late Dr. A. Kuyper. Is there, in the natural man, devoid of the life of regeneration, a principle of true holiness, be it ever so small, whereby sin in them is checked and from which proceed works that are truly good in the sight of God. These questions Kuyper answered in the affirmative. And these affirmative answers were adopted by the Christian Reformed Synod of 1924 and form points two and three of Synod's notorious three points. To affirm that the natural man does no good in the sight of God and that sin is not checked in him is to state the matter correctly yet not with sufficient acrimony. These answers can be circumvented. One can play hocus pocus with them by juggling terms. For the Bible does speak of the good that sinners do. "If you do good unto those who do good unto you," says Christ. So, too, does He speak of the righteousness of the Pharisee. But He teaches that the goodness and the righteousness of the natural man is sin and nothing but sin in the sight of God, when He says that, doing good unto those who do good unto us, we excel not the sinners and that, if our righteousness does not exceed that of the Pharisee, we can in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven. And there is a sense in which God does restrain sin in the wicked as for example when he, through fear of the police, restrains a thug from executing some nefarious plan of his. But the question is whether there is in that fear an atom of holiness. Certainly there is not. The natural man is totally depraved. He is a bad tree only that bears fruit that is as corrupt as the principle in him from which it proceeds—the principle of sin. All the issues of his heart are in the ethical sense opposed to the law of God. All that the natural man produces out of himself—his philosophy, his music and songs, however beautiful as to form—his prayers and praise and thanksgiving, his faithfulness to his marriage vows, the honesty that characterizes him as a man of affairs in the world, his tears and mirth, his love and compassion and goodwill toward his neighbor, all his striving—such as his striving to establish peace on this earth—all is an abomination in the sight of God. All is enmity against

and moral opposition to God's law. This is the implication of the Biblical proposition that the natural man is totally depraved. The theory of common grace is fiction. It is insipient modernism pure and simple. It is the prize lie of the devil. From the point of view of its duplicity, it is the masterpiece of darkness. Such are the plain teachings of God's Word. All that is not of faith is sin; and the natural man is devoid of faith. All that is of the world is not of God, and the world passes away and all that is of the world, that is, has its origin in the principle of sin in the world, is doomed to pass away with the world.

Secondly, the natural man is opposed, actively opposed, that is, antagonistic, not only to God's moral will as revealed in the ten commandments but he is actively opposed also to God's determinate will as revealed in providence. When we speak of providence here we have reference especially to the curse of God that began to stalk the earth and to permeate man's existence—turning his day into night—immediately after the fall. Thus we have reference to the continuous revelation from heaven of the wrath of God over all unrighteousness of man, to God's laying waste this earth, Esau's heritage, the heritage of the reprobated, of the world that lies in darkness, to the laying waste of this earth for the dragons of the wilderness, thus to God's impoverishing Edom continually through the centuries, to his throwing Esau down and making his place desolate. Thus we refer to the resulting sufferings of this present time, which is the portion of the damned and in which God's people for a little while must also share. The wicked are actively opposed antagonistic, to this curse in its operation, actively opposed to the wrath of God in its manifestation, opposed are they to war and pestilence, to sickness and to all the various diseases, mental and physical, afflicting mankind, opposed are they to this impoverishing of Edom, to the laying waste of Edom's heritage, opposed to floods and drought and famine and to Edom's place as desolated, opposed in a word, to all the sufferings of this present time with all that it includes. But, one may ask, can this be held against the wicked? Is not also the believer opposed to sickness and death. Does he not also, when taken ill, call in a doctor? And is this not his duty? Does not also the believer avail himself of the findings of science to counteract the blight that attacks his crops, and to destroy the insects that devour his fields? To be sure he does. And certainly, I repeat, this is duty, the neglect of which is to tempt God. In the wicked, however, this opposition proceeds from the principle of sin that operates in the essence of his being. In the wicked, therefore, this opposition to the sufferings of this present time is conscious antagonism against God, hatred of the Most High, rebellion against and horrible defiance of God. The believer, by the grace of God, humbles him-

self under the mighty hand of God and repents in dust and ashes on account of his sins. And he can glory in tribulation because he spiritually discerns and experiences that tribulations, sanctified, as they are, to His heart, advance his salvation. He understands that the sufferings of this present time are not to be compared with the glory that has been prepared for him. But Edom saith, we are impoverished by the Almighty, but we will show God. And in opposition to and in hatred of God, Edom saith, "but we will return and build the desolate places. But thus saith the Lord of hosts, They shall return and build, but I will throw down and they shall call them, The border of wickedness and, The people against whom the Lord hath indignation forever." And God does throw down Edom's rebuilt places even through the agency of Edom himself. Think of the frightful ruin and destruction of this present war. The Lord turns against Edom his own gods, his idols, his science and industry. Indeed Edom wants peace, not God's peace but man's peace. And Edom holds his peace-conferences, and he thinks peace and urges peace and proclaims peace and strives to establish peace. Edom opposes war and sickness and death, builds a mighty civilization, and thinks to establish by these vain efforts, the kingdom of God—which in truth is the kingdom of man and of the prince of this world—thinks to establish this kingdom on this earth in his fierce antagonism to and defiance of the God of the Scriptures. Thus Edom's opposition to the sufferings of this present time—his peace-conferences and peace treaties and all his efforts to establish peace, his opposition to sickness and disease, all his striving toward the uplift of humanity, all his philanthropy, is sin and nothing but sin. It is active rebellion against and defiance of God. It is Edom's vain attempt to free himself and his heritage—this earth—from the curse of God in a way other than that of true repentance and forsaking of sin and of reconciliation to God through the cross of Christ. But God continues to lay Edom's heritage waste. God's curse continues to stalk the earth. And in the appearing of Christ, Edom's heritage will be utterly destroyed. God's people, too, have a heritage, an inheritance in Christ Jesus, the new earth, where the tabernacle of God will be with men. How differently God deals with the heritage of His people. He preserves it for them in heaven and unto this inheritance he preserves His people. Therein, namely in his laying Edom's heritage waste and in his preserving in heaven for His people their inheritance and in preserving them for this inheritance, he shows that He loves His people and hates Edom.

If Edom is opposed to the providence of God of the present, he is also opposed to the providence of God of the past. This is but another way of saying that Edom is opposed to God in history, opposed to history as the

realization of the council of God, thus as a revelation of God, the God and Father of Christ. Edom delivers up history to chance or to fate or He maintains that the destinies of mankind are determined by man himself and that the course of world events are directed solely by man. For God is not in all Edom's thoughts. Now, in Christian lands, where men are brought into contact with the gospel, all this opposition is against Christ, that is, against God as revealed in the face of Christ. It is in these lands that the opposition to God attains the highest degree of intensity. There is then, on the part of Edom, this ethical opposition, antagonism, to God.

However, Edom does not and cannot frustrate God's counsel. For the counsel of God includes Edom in all his ethical antagonism to God; and it is out of the womb of an almighty and sovereign providence that Edom is brought forth by God Almighty and sovereign, brought forth in all his wanton rebellion, in all his defiance of heaven, in all his vain imagining, in all his plotting against God, His anointed and His people, in all his abominable works, in all his atheisms and idolatry, in all his utterly foolish pride, in all his violence and refined sinning, in all his hypocrisy and and selfrighteousness, which is colossal, in all his cruelty, in all his thievery and robberies, in all his lying and deceits, in all his profanity and in all his adulteries and uncleanness. For Edom, in himself, is nothing. He has his being in God and in God he lives and moves. He is but clay in the hands of a potter, and the potter is God. Thus Edom cannot as much as harden himself except God harden him. Edom, in all his abominations, always does what God has determined and wills that he shall do. It means that Edom, in all his opposition to God, is God's slave and serves God's cause, his kingdom and his people, though, to be sure, he meaneth not so, but it is in his heart actually to bring God under his heel. He stands there, does Edom, the world that lieth in darkness, shaking his vile fist in God's face and in the face of Christ, and his striving is to usurp God's place in the universe. Thus Edom continually lives the lie of the tempter, "Thou shalt be as God. . . ." Edom is become as God, as God saith, "Behold the man is become as one of us. . . ." This is not irony, or sarcasm, a statement that is to be taken in its reverse meaning. For the thought here expressed is substantially repeated by Paul, when he said, "Who," namely, that man of sin to be revealed, "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." The meaning is that man behaves as though he were God and as though God were his slave. What a hideous thing sin is. To say that this word of Paul is irony is to destroy it. And the word of God, "Man is become as one of us", is no more irony than is this word of Paul.

Now that the wicked will be destroyed must imply in the first place that God will put an end to this terrible reaction of the wicked to him, put an end to all their rebellion, and defiance and pride. For the wicked, certainly, are not destroyed if they everlastingly defy God, if everlastingly they behave as though they were God and as though God were under their heel, in their power. Thus, that the wicked are to be destroyed means in the first place that their ethical opposition to God will cease. That God will put an end to this reaction on the part of the wicked, is the teachings of Scripture. Eph. 2:9-11, "Wherefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus is the Lord, to the glory of the Father." Certainly, the tongues that are to confess that Jesus is the Lord, include also those of the reprobated wicked. The knees that, in the appearing of Christ, are to bow before Him include also the knees of the reprobated wicked. For the text says that every knee shall bow and that every tongue shall confess that Christ is the Lord. And there are no statements occurring in the context indicating that the adjectives *all* and *every* must be limited to the redeemed. Now confessing that Christ is Lord, and bowing before him is certainly indicative of an attitude that is opposed to rebellion. The construction that we here place upon this passage has the firm support of several other passages in the Scriptures. Isa. 2:17, "And the loftiness of men shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men shall be made low: and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. And the idols shall be utterly abolished. And they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of His majesty, when he arises to shake terribly the earth." That this prediction, in the final instance, must be made to apply to the humiliation of the reprobated wicked in the final judgment is indicated by the statement that those of whom the prophet here speaks, shall be driven by fear, inspired by the majestic presence of the Lord, into the caves of the earth. The redeemed certainly are not to be included here. Then there are other Scriptures expressive of identical thought. Hosea 10:8: "The high places also of Aven, the sin of Israel, shall be destroyed: the thorn and the thistle shall come upon their altars; and they shall say to the mountains, cover us; and to the hills, fall upon us." Rev. 6:12-7, "And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and lo, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood; and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken by a mighty wind. And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together: and every mountain

and island were moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the lamb; For the great day of wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand."

Scripture makes it unmistakably clear that Edom shall be humbled, brought low, not merely objectively, so that, as he lies there in the dust before God and Christ, his soul still seethes with rebellion, but also subjectively, in his mind and heart. For, according to these scriptures, his soul is to be seized by utter fear and in that fear he will pay homage to Christ and to God. Rebellion in him will cease; as his will to rebel will be broken. His idolatry will cease, as the text just quoted, declares, all his attacks upon God will cease.

Now such a doctrine is blissfully satisfying to every true child of God. His sanctified reason calls for the subjective humiliation of Edom. The conception of Edom in hell, eternally defiant of God, everlastingly reviling God in his heart and with his tongue crying out his rebellion and with his fists clenched in God's face is certainly shocking to the sanctified sensibilities of all those who love God and love Christ. They abhor the idea. Should Edom continue defiant, it could only be because God had not the power to subdue him and in that case, sin, as it riots in Edom, were as mighty or mightier than God. This ethical dualism, therefore, cannot and shall not continue. (We speak here of ethical dualism. What we mean is antithesis. Dualism there is not, as Edom in all his ethical opposition to God is included in God's sovereign counsel).

Mark you, we speak here of this present opposition to God on the part of Edom as an ethical dualism in distinction from what we shall call, for the want of a name, metaphysical dualism. This metaphysical dualism is not. For as we saw, Edom in all his ethical rebellion, is included in the counsel of God and is brought forth by God out of the womb of divine providence. Edom, too, though he meaneth not so, is God's servant. But there *is* now this ethical dualism. The old Persians had both an ethical and metaphysical dualism, and likewise the exponents of common grace of this day and age.

G. M. O.

(To be continued)

The way some people always boast *about* Calvinism reminds me of the Dutch farmer that was shearing his hogs; asked how he was getting along, he said: "Much squealing, but little wool."

H. H.



## Een Gebed In Oorlog

(Psalm 83)

Dit is een der psalmen waarvan we den historischen achtergrond bijna zeker weten. Alles wijst erop, dat we te doen hebben met de periode van Juda's bestaan ten tijde van koning Josafat; en meer in het bijzonder, het tijdstip toen "de kinderen Moabs en de kinderen Ammons en met hen anderen, benevens de Ammonieten, tegen Josafat ten strijde kwamen." (Leest II Kronieken 20.)

Het zag er hachelijk uit voor Juda en Juda's koning. Er wordt een bondgenootschap genoemd in de verzen 7-9, dat tien volken insluit. Bovendien zien we op de kaart, dat die tien volken Israel omsloten. Edom, Ismael en de Amelekieten bedreigden Israel van het Zuiden; Moab, Ammon en waarschijnlijk de Hagarenen lagen in het Oosten; Assur, de trotsche, tierde van uit het Noorden; en de Filistijnen, Gebal en Tyrus beraadslaagden vanuit het Westen. Juda was omsingeld.

Doch, geen nood, Juda's koning vreesde den Heere. Er staat van hem geschreven, dat toen al die vijanden des Heeren erfdeel bedreigden, hij "zijn aangezicht stelde om den Heere te zoeken." Bovendien, zoo lezen we, "Juda werd vergaderd om van den Heere hulp te zoeken." Ook wist Josafat des Heeren wegen. Hij riep gansch Juda en Jeruzalem te zamen in en voor het Huis Gods. En staande te midden van God's volk hief hij zijne stem op en riep den Heere aan. Zijn gebed, hetwelk ons opgeteekend staat in het eerder genoemde hoofdstuk van 2 Kronieken 20, moet ge lezen vooraleer ge verder gaat: het is lieflijk en krachtig. We worden herinnerd aan den spreuk van Jakobus: "Een krachtig gebed des rechtvaardigen vermag veel." Wel, geliefde lezer, hier hebt ge een voorbeeld van een krachtig gebed des rechtvaardigen Konings.

Voorts lezen we, dat na het gebed van den koning de Geest des Heeren kwam op Jahaziël, den nazaat van Asaf. En door dien Geest profeteerde hij en zeide: Weest maar niet bang, volk Gods, want deze strijd is niet Uwe maar Gods! Hij zegt zelfs, dat zij niet eens behoeften te strijden. De Heere zou voor hen uittrekken en door de almachtige kracht van Zijn voorzienigheid den vijand vermorzelen.

En zulks geschiedde.

We merken op, dat Josafat Juda opriep om met hem ten strijde te trekken. Ze maakten zich op en kwamen in de woestijn van Tekoa.

Doch wat een wondere methode gebruikt Josafat om te strijden tegen den woesten vijand. Stelt U voor: hij stelde den Heere zangers die voor de toegerusten zouden uitloopen, den vijand tegemoet, om de heilige Majesteit te prijzen! Wie voert oorlog op die wijze? Wat mag men verwachten van soldaten die psalmen

zingen? Kan dat iets vermogen tegen staal en zwaard en vuur?

En ze deden het ook. We lezen van dien strijd, dat de zangers vooruit liepen en zongen: "Looft den Heere, want Zijne goedertierenheid is in der eeuwigheid!"

En wat deed God?

Luistert en aanbidt!

Ten tijde, dat de zangers aanhieven "een vreugdegeroep en lofzang" stelde de Heere den vijand achterlagen! Let er toch op, dat dit geschiedde *ten tijde dat zij het lied van lof aanhieven!* Zoo voert God Zijn volk ten oorlog.

Nu schijnt het, dat Jahaziel, de zoon van Asaf, gebeden heeft tot God, vooraleer hij profeteerde van de nederlaag die den vijand zou lijden. En dat gebed, hetwelk gebeden is door den zoon van Asaf, hebben we in den 83sten psalm. Dat er Asaf staat en niet Jahaziel komt van het feit, dat vaker den naam van den vader genoemd wordt voor de kinderen, vooral als de vader een beroemd man geweest was in Israel.

Zoo komen we tot den psalm die we hier onder discussie nemen.

Asaf, dat is Jahaziel, zag al die vreeselijke vijanden en toen is hij in het gebed gegaan. Zijn bidden is smeeken. Het klinkt hartstochtelijk.

"O God!" Hoe geheel anders klinken onze gebeden als de dingen als naar gewoonte geschieden, als er geen wolkje aan de lucht is. Dan bidden we wel, doch hoe kalmpjes gaat het ons dan af. Ik betrap me soms aan het einde van mijn bidden of midden in het gebed en zeg dan tot mijn ziel: Beseft ge wat ge aan 't doen zijt? Hoe geheel anders is ons gebed, als het benauwd wordt.

Welnu, het was benauwd ten tijde van dit gebed. Dat kunt ge merken uit veel en velerlei. O God! Zet er gerust een uitroepsteeken achter. Het was een schreeuwen tot God.

Zwijg niet, Heere; houd U niet als doof; en wees niet stil, o God!

We zouden haast denken, dat Asaf hier Majesteitschennis pleegt. Mag men zoo tot God spreken? Ja, dat mag. Al wat Asaf met dien woorden zeggen wil is, dat het er benauwd bijstaat. Och, hij weet wel, dat God nooit zwijgt, dat Hij nimmer doof is, dat Hij Zich nooit stil houdt. God is de steeds werkende, Hij slaapt of sluimert nimmer en Zijn oor is altijd open tot Zijn volk. Denkt er aan, dat dit gebed ingegeven is door denzelfden God die hier aangeroepen wordt.

Daar komt dit bij, dat Asaf zoo spreekt, omdat het *scheen* alsof de Heere Zich afzijdig hield. Hij had het toch gezien en gehoord, hoe al deze booswichten te zamen geschoold waren om de erve des Heere te benauwen? Waarom stuurde de Heere die machten naar het arme volk van God? Waarom hield God Zich zoo lang stille? Wat doel had Hij er mee?

Och, er zijn veel redenen.

Ik denk, dat de hoofdreden altijd is, om Zijn volk luide toe te roepen: Ik ben er! Denkt ge daar wel om, Mijn volk? Ik ben Uw God! Hebt ge Mij vergeten? Ik stuur den vijand naar U toe om U er aan te herinneren, Mijn volk, dat er een God in den hemel is, Uw Herder en Vader, Uw Verlosser en Beschermmer! Ik stuur die dingen naar U toe, opdat ge Mij weer moogt zoeken.

Want zie, (zegt Asaf) Uwe vijanden maken getier, en Uwe haters steken het hoofd op!

Alsof God het niet wist! Hij had al die haters van Zijn naam opgeroepen. Het was God's hand die ze tot Juda en Jeruzalem zond. Doch de arme stakkerds wisten het zelf niet. God wilde ze naar Jeruzalem brengen en zijzelf wilden dat ook, doch hoe vreeselijk is het verschil tusschen dat willen Gods en het willen van de kinderen Lots: Ammon, Moab en de bondgenooten. Het is er mee, als met al de verschrikkelijke dingen die er gebeuren. Hitler wilde de heele wereld in het vuur jagen. En God wil het ook. Doch God wilde het eerst. Van eeuwigheid had God gezegd: In 1939 gaan de masa's der Duitschers op den marsch! En Hitler zal Mijn knecht zijn! Doch Hitler wilde het ook toen de ure daar was. Maar Hitler wilde het met een goddelooze, vuile wil. En God wilde het met een heilige wil. God wilde een voorwee van Jezus' komst brengen op aarde. God wilde den goddeloozen een voorproef geven van wat het zeggen wil om eeuwig gepijnigd te worden in een zee van vuur. God wilde ook Zijn volk kastijden. Want de kerk valt af. En nu gebruikt Hij menschen, vuile, leelijke menschen, die niet terugschrikken van te verslinden en te vernielen.

Het zijn haters Gods die hier bij Asaf getier gemaakt hebben. Hij zegt het tegen God in dit gebed. Hij noemt het bondgenootschap vijand en hater Gods.

Nu is het onmogelijk voor alle haters Gods om God Zelf aan te randen. Dat kunnen zij natuurlijk niet. God is een Geest. Hij is hoog verheven tegen alles wat schepsel is. Het is onzin in den absoluten zin van het woord om ook maar te denken, dat God werkelijk aangerand kan worden. Dat gaat zelf zoo ver, dat Elihu zegt: Indien gij zondigt, wat doet gij Hem? God kan niet aangerand. Onmogelijk.

En toch zou de mensch dat gaarne killen. En hij bewijst het in al zijn doen. De zonde is eigenlijk Theocide, dooding van God. Dat doet de mensch in zijn hart en verstand. Alle zijne gedachten zijn dat er geen God is. En als God in de gestalte van een arm, zwak mensch voor hem gaat staan, dan neemt de mensch Hem beet en nagelt Hem aan het kruis. Dat is de beteekenis van Golgotha uit dit oogpunt. Vreeselijk!

Voorts bewijst de mensch der zonde, dat hij God haat en Zijn vijand is, door Zijn volk te benauwen.

Dat heeft Asaf goed gezien. Eerst zegt hij: zij zijn Uw vijanden en haters. En om het bewijzen zegt hij voorts: zij maken listiglijk een heimelijken aanslag tegen *Uw volk!* Zij beraadslagen tegen *Uwe verborgen!* Hieruit zien we, dat die vijanden het eigenlijk gezet hebben tegen God.

Wat een mooie naam heeft Gods volk: *verborgen!* Paulus zou daar later van getuigen, toen hij zeide: Ons leven is met Christus verborgen in God! David had al eerder gezegd, dat God Zijn volk verbergt in het verborgene van Zijn tent. En Gods volk heeft uitgevonden de waarheid van Gods gezegde: Hij liet niemand toe hen te onderdrukken! Door alle eeuwen heen heeft men getoornd en geraasd, gevochten en vermoord tegen Gods volk, doch er is nooit een van hen werkelijk beschadigd. Datgene wat Gods volk Zijn volk doet zijn, namelijk, de nieuwe mensch in Christus Jezus, is nooit geschaad geweest door vuur en zwaard. Integendeel, als dat volk uit de smeltkroes der ellende komt, zegt het: 't Is goed voor mij verdrukt te zijn geweest. Wonderlijk! Dat komt omdat hun leven het leven der verberging is. Het is het verbondsleven van God zelf en kan niet geschaad. Wat zou toch een Romeinsche krijgsknecht hebben kunnen doen met zijn zwaard tegen het verheerlijkt lichaam van Jezus? Evenmin kan men het leven Gods schaden, dat in het diepste hart van Gods volk woont. We hooren veel spreken van "vrijheid van Godsdienst", alsof het ons ooit ontnomen kan worden. Vrijheid van Godsdienst is er zelfs temidden van het vuur des brandstapels. Uwe vaders hebben het bewezen.

Doch de vijand raast, al is het ook, dat die in den hemel zit, lacht. Weer: vreeselijk!

Hier raasde de vijand ook. En zijn razen is moordelust. Want hij zeide: Komt laat ons hen uitroeien, dat zij geen volk meer zijn, dat aan den naam Israels niet meer gedacht worde! Ziet ge wel, dat het, ter laatster instantie, de vijand er om te doen om God te vermoorden? Want ik vraag U: Wie had Israel geplant? En Wie wordt door Zijn volk op aarde vertegenwoordigd? En het antwoord op beide vragen is: God! Men wist wel, dat Israel hen aan God herinnerde. Welnu: de gedachtenis van God en Zijn naam, en daarom Zijn volk, moet van den aardbodem verdelgd.

Ziet gij niet, dat de zaak zoo staat? Leest het volgende vers. Daar legt Asaf het hart van de goddeloozen bloot. Ik zie drieërlei. Eerst, hun goddeloos streven komt voort uit een verkeerd hart. Dat staat er. Zij hebben in het hart tezamen beraadslaagd. Tweedens, de goddeloozen genieten(?) eenheid als het tegen God gaat. Dan worden Pilatus en Herodes vrienden. Hetzelfde woord (verbond) wordt gebruikt hier, als wanneer sprake is van Gods verbond der genade. Ze zijn het roerend eens in de hel als het tegen God en Zijn volk gaat. Derdens, wordt hier bewezen, dat men Gods volk haat, omdat men God haat.

Asaf zegt hier, dat het verbond der goddeloozen tegen God (U) gesmeed is.

En nu volgt een opsomming van de namen der god-vergetenen. Er worden tien volken genoemd, die Israel omringden van rondom. Het was werkelijk benauwd.

En wat een combinatie! Ik zie de halfbroeder van Izak: Ismael. Ik hoor het vloeken van Ezau: Edom. Ik bemerk het vuile leven van twee vreeselijke broeders: Ammon en Moab, de zonen van Lot, die door bloedschande in het leven werden geroepen. Waardige zonen van waardige moeders. Merkt het toch op, dat die bastaarden (nauw verwant aan het bondsvolk) de vuile wereld in den arm namen: Filistijnen, Tyrus en wat dies meer de wereld kan bijbrengen.

Een van Gods kinderen, die allang in den hemel is, heeft over dezen psalm geschreven en ik heb zijn getuigenis onder de kommentaren in mijn boekenkast. Hij zegt iets over de opsomming van namen hier, hetwelk ik even door wil geven. Er zit iets lieflijks in en ook iets vreeselijks. Hij verhaalt van een zeer eenvoudige vrouw die de gewoonte had om, als zij geplaagd, vervolgd en getreiterd werd, te zeggen: Ik ga nu naar huis en ik zal het tegen God zeggen wat gij mij aangedaan hebt! Ja, dat is lieflijk. Doet mij denken aan het woord van Jezus: Ge moet worden gelijk een kindeken!

Maar er zit ook iets vreeselijks in, als Asaf die namen opnoemt. En die vrouw zich neerbuigt voor God om haar vijanden den Heere te geven. Vreeselijk om aangeklaagd te worden bij name: Vader! die en die en die hebben mij zoo vreeselijk benauwd! Zoek het, Heere!

Zal Hij Zijne uitverkorenen recht doen, die dag en nacht tot Hem roepen? Ik zeg U, Hij zal hen haastelijk recht doen.

Als ge plagen en treiteren wilt, zou ik U willen waarschuwen: Blijft af van Gods volk. Die Zijn volk aanraakt, raakt Zijn oogappel aan!

G. V.

#### IN MEMORIAM

The Consistory of the Hudsonville Protestant Reformed Church hereby expresses its sincere sympathy to their fellow officebearer, Mr. D. Dykstra, in the loss of his father,

MR. O. DYKSTRA

We pray that our heavenly father may comfort the bereaved widow and son with His grace.

Rev. Bernard Kok, Pres.  
Mr. T. Miedema, Clerk.

## The Radio and The Christian Home

Today, no doubt, there is hardly a Christian home that is not furnished with a radio. Many of the modern inventions of our age have become practically a necessity rather than a luxury. And why should not the Christian too make use of these inventions? Is it not his calling to use the things of this world to the praise and honor of his God? It surely is.

However, as with everything the Christian does, so, too, the use of the radio may be a means whereby the Christian, who has yet but a small beginning of the new life of Christ within him, involves himself in sin against the Lord his God. Consequently, he must know *how* to use the radio in such way that with it fulfills the calling whereby he has been called, namely, to the glory of God.

Speaking of the radio and the Christian home, we are immediately aware of the fact that the Christian home of which we speak exists in the modern era. Some thirty or thirty-five years ago the radio was not to be found in *any* home, except for a few rare exceptions. In the home of that day, one's means of home-entertainment were very limited. Perhaps the most popular instrument by which one might be entertained was the well-known phonograph. The piano and other musical instruments of course also had their place.

Since that time, things have radically changed! The old-time phonograph is considered a quite useless instrument in the home, and in its place has come the up-to-date radio. And that radio has also made its way into the *Christian* home!

Much need, of course, not be said in respect to what a Christian home is. It is understood, that the term refers to the family life of covenant parents with their covenant children. In that home the parents walk as examples before their children which the Lord has entrusted to their care. There the children are instructed in the principles of the fear of God. There the children, in turn, respect and obey the authority of their parents.

God is honored and revered in that home. Christ is the head of that house.

Now into that Christian home all manner of songs and music and speech can be poured by means of the radio.

Programs of every imaginable type are available.

There are religious programs. Here one meets a variety of religions on the one hand. On the other, generally speaking, one meets chiefly but *one* religion, and that the kind in which the free-will of man stands upon the foreground, and the sovereignty of God is placed completely to the background, if not entirely omitted.

Programs of the educational and informative type

may also be selected, although it must be admitted that this kind of programs usually are not to be obtained in abundance. An exception to this is, of course, the many newscasts which are frequent in this present time of war.

Over the radio one can also listen to dramatics. Closely connected with this kind of program is the well-known "serial story". Much can be said in connection with this type of program. Most of the serial stories heard over the radio today are corrupt to the core. Let it not escape our attention that in them one of the subjects frequently treated is that of marriage: of marriage not as it is a symbol of Christ and His Church, but as the bond of matrimony as it often and usually exists in the world of ungodly men and women. Silly love stories are generally treated in which jealousy and envy play an important role with the ending being climaxed by murder or divorce or unreal "love". Many of the serials are very detrimental especially to children since in them children are described as going their own way and robbing the parent of every bit of authority over his family.

Finally, mention might be made of the type of program which is considered as plain entertainment. In this type the music and song of the world stands on the foreground. I know there is music, written by genius musicians, which is truly wonderful and which the Christian may enjoy listening to and be inspired. But, generally speaking, the music and song coming "over the air" is characterized by the vain hope and longing of this evil world which sees no way out of its present death and tries by means of music and song to choke the voice of the wrath of God out of its life.

With this kind of programs you have often sandwiched between the music and song the silly jokes and suggestive statements made by men whose glory is in their shame and who mind earthly things. Often the weather, marriage, crime, and even this war, among other things, is most foolishly and vainly joked about.

To all these different types of programs, not only the American family, but the population of practically the entire world can listen. And the Christian too is able to hear these things if he so desires. For in his home he has a radio. And his radio, as I said before, may be a means whereby he involves himself in sin. Thus, the radio is a very dangerous instrument to the Christian, if he is not carefully on his guard at all times.

We are happy to admit there are many Christian families where the parents are very careful in selecting the kind of programs they or their children listen to, since they have sensed the dangers involved. But, alas, there is also many a Christian family which has

become very lax in its watchfulness in respect to what enters the home "over the air."

There is, for instance, the family, the "Christian" family, which has the radio turned on from the early morning to late at night. And, strangely enough, the father and mother of that family know how to find all kinds of weighty (?) reasons why they should have their radio going throughout the entire day. The one mentions the fact that it is not quite so quiet and lonesome in the house when the radio is being played. Especially the wife whose husband is gone six days out of every week to his work, or the one whose husband is in the armed forces, makes this claim.

Another gives as his or her reason for having the radio turned on the entire day, that he or she doesn't actually hear what is being played or said anyway, but just likes to have it going for some unknown reason.

Still another claims one must continually keep the radio going to be sure to receive all the news reports from the different theaters of war.

Whatever one's excuse may be, however, one forgets many an important danger resulting from such continual radio entertainment. One forgets that it gives very little opportunity for thought and meditation and speaking with the children of the family when and if the radio is continually blasting with its voice. Do not the children of the family become used to the songs and speech of the world, and become quite enthused about such things as they become older? Doesn't that which they daily hear sink into their very heart? Of course, we know it does.

Does not the housewife, who is perhaps not used to the quietness of her home, make a bad mistake when she permits herself to loose her loneliness by means of the radio? Well might one suggest to such an one that she rather engage in singing some well-known Psalter numbers, or some good hymns, or to herself or to her children speak of spiritual matters at times when loneliness overtakes her. She may even select fitting radio programs, of course. But let her not continually have the radio going.

There is also the "Christian" family, which, besides having the regular family radio, has one or more others besides. Sometimes especially the older children are permitted to own such an extra radio. Then they individually tune in to programs which father and mother do not care about, or even perhaps do not exactly approve of. This, too, is a great evil in the Christian home. A program which is worth hearing at all, should certainly be heard by the entire family, and should also surely stand the approval of father and mother.

We finally come to the question, what then is the

calling of the Christian in respect to the radio and his home?

The answer is certainly *not* that he may *not* have a radio. Of course our Christian homes may be furnished with a radio! But then we must see our positive calling and duty in respect to that particular instrument. For sin is not in the radio. The radio is in itself a good gift of God, invented with the talents God has supplied, and is run by the energies and forces God Himself has placed in the universe. But sin is in the heart! It is in the old nature of the new-born Christian.

The Christian, and especially the Christian parent, with his radio, must live the antithesis! The principle of the fear and love of God must control his hand when he selects programs on the radio. And to the programs which can stand the approval of the Lord God, the Christian must say *yes*, while at that very moment he shouts *no* to the corruptions of the world. Over his radio will be heard programs which are proper for the Christian to hear, through which he can be sure he can glorify his God.

In this all the father, as head of the family, especially must exercise control, but also the mother must do so. Doing this the parents will be examples to their children, and when the children come to years of discretion, they, too, as motivated by the principle of the love of God, through grace will also select proper programs over the radio.

But with this all has not been said. The Christian family must also see to it that at the other end, namely, at the broadcasting stations, programs of good quality, and especially good religious programs, are supported. No, I do not mean we should endeavor to have a Christian Broadcasting System. This is not only impossible, but it is not our calling either. But, this *is* our calling, we must support the programs which are of value for the Christian. And in connection with this especially *our own* broadcasts should enjoy our full support. The Christian must contribute liberal financial gifts to this kind of programs, to be sure. But, let the Christian parent himself *too* listen with interest and zeal to these our programs especially, and see to it his children listen also.

Let it be the motto not only, but also the desire of the Christian to walk in accordance with the determination of a Joshua of old, "But as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord" — also with the radio.

S. T. C.

---

Wanted.

A fluent Arminian speaker, preferably a D.D., to deliver the *keynote* address at the next Calvinistic conference.

H. H.

## Debate

RESOLVED—*that the Underground Movement in Occupied Countries is Revolutionary.*

### AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL:—

Allow me to state that it is a pleasure for me to debate this subject with so worthy an opponent as the Rev. H. Hoeksema. I appreciate the fact that he has a marked ability to clearly state the issue in question, which is particularly advantageous in this case where the whole argument is so definitely on the side of the affirmative. I also appreciate that he expresses agreement with my contention that we must be subject to those in authority, regardless of how they come into power, and also that any individual attempt to overthrow the government, or any personal act of rebellion against the higher powers must be condemned as revolutionary. The issue has been simmered down considerably by the fact that we can agree on that score.

There remains but one point of difference. The negative produces the argument that the government of Holland still exists and has the power to issue commands to its subjects. Therefore the negative concludes that the organized underground movement, as far as it is organized under the direction of its legal government, is not revolutionary.

Of course, the reference to Holland in distinction from other occupied countries, might be considered an appeal to public sentiment, since Holland carries a warm spot in the hearts of all of us. In that case the argument would lose much of its weight. But in as far as this reference to Holland can serve to clarify the point at issue I have no objection.

The Rev. Hoeksema states his position in six contentions, which we can follow step by step.

1. He states that "the government of Holland was not destroyed, or did it abdicate . . . but it still exists." Thus he concludes that this "is the only rightful authority to whom the Dutch subjects owe allegiance and subjection as far as possible."

Evidently he ignores my former contention that, "even though a former government surrenders under protest, declares itself in exile and surreptitiously orders its former subjects to acts of sabotage, the fact remains that this former government has by the very act of surrender lost all authority over its subjects." He does not deny that this is true. He merely states that the government still exists as the rightful authority to whom the Dutch subjects owe allegiance and subjection as far as possible.

This the affirmative positively denies. There is at present no legally existing body that has the right to be called the government of Holland outside of the



German government. The fact cannot be ignored that the house of Orange has surrendered to the Nazi invaders, and this surrender has been accepted. The queen and her retinue fled the country, it is true, deserting her subjects in the hour of dire need, but a surrender followed. The people were not merely subdued before the onslaught of the enemy, but the Army and Navy both officially capitulated to the invading forces through the remaining representatives of the former government. They felt that all further resistance was futile, so they surrendered to avoid unnecessary bloodshed. And the invading powers took over the seat of government and the control of the nation. If this surrender means anything at all, it certainly means that the former government of Holland has ceased to exist. The very act of surrender has made "a government in exile" a nonentity.

2. For that reason the second argument of the negative also falls away. A government that does not exist is not "in a position to function to a certain extent." Does this mean that it is the responsibility of the German government to feed and clothe the hungry and destitute, while the House of Orange looks on? Are there supposed to be two existing authorities in Netherlands, the one in control and the other acting out of exile? How is this possible, the more so because these two powers are directly opposing each other, the one having capitulated, and the other having assumed the power? In how far would the Dutch subjects be obligated to submit to the controlling power, and in how far would they have to oppose this controlling power by submitting to the government in exile, that has actually been overthrown. Such a situation is not only inconceivable, but even impossible.

The former Dutch government lost all her authority when she surrendered to the invading forces. Though it be true, that the house of Orange is able to contact the people of Netherlands by means of the radio, it has forfeited all right to issue commands and to direct the people "as to what they ought to do in their peculiar circumstances with a view to the ultimate destruction of the usurper, and their own liberation in the end." This is nothing less than a surreptitious act of rebellion on the part of the house of Orange against the powers that be. The house of Orange, as well as the people in Holland, is obligated to abide by the terms of their surrender. Even though the queen and her retinue fled to England before the surrender, she has no more right to issue orders to the people of Holland than the king of England himself. She may not ignore the existing government which she recognized when they surrendered. She may not ignore that government any more than the people who were forced to stay in the country and face the consequences under German domination. To influence her people

to acts of sabotage by means of the radio is also revolutionary.

3. Therefore, the Dutch subjects have no right to organize an underground movement, even though it is under the direction of their former government. This former government has ceased to exist. It has no right to give instructions to its former subjects, nor have these subjects the right to receive them; especially not when these instructions design to destroy the existing government and bring the former government back into power. Why should an organized movement under a revolutionary party be less revolutionary than individual acts of rebellion and sabotage? The people of Netherlands may recognize but one authority, and that is the Nazi government. To them they must submit for God's sake, whether they like it or not. If any individual attempts of sabotage are wrong, as the negative readily agrees, then also all organized movements under non-existing government must also be wrong.

4. And if it is a matter of conscience, and not of sentiment, then there can be no question but that the entire underground movement, even as organized and directed by the former Dutch government, must be strongly condemned as revolutionary. There can be no doubt but that many of the people of Holland would gladly receive instructions from the house of Orange, aid them in smuggling arms into the country, do everything they can to oppose the existing government, and thus await the moment when they can meet and help the invading forces, in order to hail the house of Orange back into their own country. But the fact remains, that they must be subject, not to the powers that were, but to the existing powers, "the powers that be". My opponent agrees that, "it makes no difference in what way those that are in authority come into power, whether by election, by hereditary succession, or by usurpation; always we must be in subjection." But then it must also be agreed, that the Nazi power is the rightful authority in Netherlands. This is the higher power which the people are now conscience bound to obey, come what may!

5. Nor does the appeal to the example of Absalom's rebellion against David hold in the case before us. David fled from Jerusalem, but he took his army with him, AND HE DID NOT SURRENDER. He did not capitulate to Absalom, but rather withdrew his forces to prepare for battle. It is evident from the whole account in Scripture that David had no intention whatever to surrender to Absalom, but gathered his forces so that he might maintain his throne over-against his son. David was still the king of Israel, and Absalom well knew, even after he took occupation of Jerusalem, that he would still have to fight in order to take the kingdom from his father. Therefore Absalom sought counsel of Ahithophel and could be

misled by the counsel of Hushai. And it was exactly in the battle that ensued that Absalom was killed and the rebellion quelled.

The point at issue is exactly that David "was still in authority, and could rally his forces to quell the rebellion, destroy the usurper, and be restored to the throne." But this is not the case in Holland. We do better to compare Holland to Israel in Babylon, and thus go back to the example of Nebuchadnezzar.

6. Therefore our conclusion must be that not only the individual acts of rebellion and sabotage must be condemned, but also the underground movement as it is organized under a revolutionary party, not in control, must be branded as revolutionary.

C. H.

## The Unconscious in the Ordo Salutis

By the "Ordo Salutis" is understood the series of acts or steps whereby the salvation which Christ has merited for His elect people is applied to them by the Holy Spirit of the exalted Christ. From this work the activity of the sinner himself is not indeed always consciously excluded. So, for example, Dr. Gerk. Vos in his definition uses the expression "subjectief toegeigend wordt", and Dr. Bavinck says "Christ and His benefits are first actually applied and distributed in the internal calling, and from man's side passively accepted in regeneration (en passief van s' menschen zijde aanvaard)." Dogm. Vol. IV, p. 100. Similarly Dr. Bavinck says that the calling, the preaching of the Gospel preceeds all the other benefits, for as a rule the Holy Spirit binds Himself to the Word (Vol. III, 602, IV, 13-14), and this is also reflected in the fact that he proposes the order: calling (with regeneration in the narrow sense, faith and conversion); justification, etc.

If now we would receive the impression from these expressions that these theologians were unsound or a bit Pelagian in their views our impression is soon corrected by a reading of their expositions, and it must only be regarded as a proof of some of the difficulties that lie in this field especially with respect to the first steps, namely, regeneration and faith. And especially in connection with the question of regeneration Dr. A. Kuyper states: It is to be lamented that so many theologians neglected to make the (threefold) distinction in the case of regeneration, and still more lamentable that our Forms of Unity make so little distinct mention which of the three they mean (Dict. Dogm., De Salute, p. 71).

The importance of this for our subject will be evident as we consider the further relation to our next step.

The "Unconscious" is not so much a theological as a psychological conception. It is especially in the last century that the field of the unconscious has been ardently studied. We may perhaps distinguish three different angles from which to approach this field, namely, from the inspired data of the Scriptures, by introspection and by experimentation making use especially of the highly developed laboratory apparatus of our day. At least this last, we immediately see, at once opens the field anew. But it is also especially in this last approach that great care must be taken to keep fully in view that which Scripture has infallibly told us about the essence of man, his soul and its spirituality. For it is precisely the doctrine of the soul as a distinct essence that gives meaning to the word "unconsciousness" in distinction from such theories as identify the soul with its actions, for example as the school of Wm. James which speaks of mind as a stream of thought or of consciousness. Rather we can undoubtedly speak distinctively of the soul's reactions, her faculties, the soul as such, and her substance.

Hence though in the rather strict sense of the word we would mean by the "unconscious" that which is closely related to the conscious, that which lies just beneath the threshold in dormancy, yet for our subject we can also mean all that which pertains to the soul beneath that threshold of consciousness.

Thus the question of the Unconscious in the Ordo Salutis confronts us with several important problems.

The salvation in the phase of which we are speaking is the life of Christ—His life of (active) righteousness, holiness, love, covenant-fellowship. How can these things be a matter of unconsciousness?

He may of course maintain that the conscious cooperation of man in his salvation does not at all impugn the Divine initiative for Scripture plainly teach that, for example God converts and sanctifies man, while he at the same time converts and sanctifies himself. Or again, faith is a gift of God but man does the believing. Work out your salvation. . . . for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do. Thus we can readily and may freely speak of a conscious participation of the saved man in these steps of the Ordo Salutis.

But this surely becomes impossible when we come to the step of regeneration. The very term used by the sacred writers, though somewhat figurative, is exactly effective in emphasizing the fact that man is wholly passive, that he was dead but is made alive, that his inmost heart is changed. And though it might still be maintained that this death is not a

physical but a spiritual death, and hence all activity is not lacking yet even then the term stresses the utter inability of the object to cooperate in any way.

But this question is brought to a sharper statement when we consider it in the case of an infant. This problem has undoubtedly not always been treated as objectively as many other points of doctrine, but leaving aside the questions of universal infant salvation, the salvation of all covenant infants, and baptism upon the presumption of regeneration, we may hold that infants can be saved.

However, when it is maintained further that they are saved by faith, since that is the rule of the Gospel, we again must ask, is this a conscious faith or an unconscious faith? And if the latter what does this mean? What is an unconscious faith? Is it believing? Does it perform any of the things that faith as taught in Scripture does. Does it give the testimony of justification at the bar of the conscience? Does it sanctify by appropriating the fellowship and the spiritual virtues of Christ? Is there a faith that is only potentially faith? It seems to me that what is often called the habitus of faith is exactly what it expresses, namely, the habit of faith, which remains also in our sleep and in our "faithless" moments, but is much more of active faith than a potentiality is. And in the other hand the examples or analogies often borrowed from nature are easily misleading. We might say the potentiality of an oak lies already in the acorn, but we know that the rudiments are already these in the physical seed and that which finally becomes the oak is formed by the immanent power and providence of God through the years of growth.

Even when we would speak of faith as a function given with the creation of man, as is done by Dr. A. Kuyper (Encycl. II, 71-78) and Dooyeweerd (Wijsb. der Wetsidee, II, 227 ff) we still only regard it as a neutral something which must still be given a positive soteriological tendency, but is not at all as such the receiving organ adapted to appropriate the gifts of salvation.

Finally, to apply the Scriptural principle, "faith is counted for righteousness" is not at all appropriate here, for it is exactly the conscious living faith that clings to Christ that receives testimony of God's good pleasure.

Before I end this article I would also mention an ethical aspect that comes into consideration when we speak of the unconscious in our salvation. The Scriptures teach that God shall render to every man according to his works. This consideration is much more important than would appear from an isolated passage for this statement of principle occurs again and again throughout Scripture and is stated in very clear detail, for example, in Rom. 2:1-16, where the Apostle maintains the inexcusableness of man and the right-

eous judgment of God by adducing the works that shall serve as the basis of the judgment that is to be revealed.

It is remarkable that also this consideration weighed very heavily with Dr. Greydanus (and is approved by Dr. Schilder) when he chose for and defended the realistic participation of men in Adam's transgression.

Now we may not, in the light of many federalistic passages in Scripture, consider the realistic interpretation of the one passage, Rom. 5:12 as very convincing, but aside from this it is undoubtedly true that the relation between personal works and punishment or reward is not always sufficiently considered. I believe this can be said without in any way slighting the distinctive doctrines of pure grace, immediate imputation, irresistible (not only inseparable) grace.

In the light of these facts we may well reflect upon the question whether the salvation of infants, and even regeneration is unconscious or whether God indeed by a secret operation of His unwritten Word internally reveals Himself in His divine virtues and in His gifts of salvation (which by us are received by conscious knowledge and faith) to those who are the recipients of His life of love and fellowship.

But here we will surely love to exclaim as we reflect upon this hidden and unknown realm "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out.

A. P.

---

## Contribution

Holland, Michigan  
March 23, 1945

Dear Editor:

May I have a bit of space to reply to Mr. Gritter's article which appeared in the Standard Bearer of February 1, in respect to collective bargaining of the C.L.A.? I must admit that I cannot follow his reasoning or logic at all. Irrespective of what procedure is followed in setting wages, the fact yet (and always will remain) that all men are not equal in performing a job. Mr. Gritter admits this when he writes: "It is true, of course, that there is a great difference between men." This great difference can, and does necessarily, affect the employer. If a man, or men, lags in one department this will necessarily affect another department. This will prove detrimental to the welfare of the employer. Has the employer the right to fire

this, or these men, so that his production may continue efficiently? Does the C.L.A. also weed out such poor labourers (I am now only speaking of a matter of fact for an example) who prove detrimental to the employer's cause? Do they bar him from the union, or discipline him when and if he loafes on the job?

Mr. Gritter may see the blessing of collective bargaining, but I still fail to see it in the light of Scripture. I cannot see why, if and when an employer desires to hire and a labourer seeks labor, that these two cannot come to an agreement. *This is no mess.* It has always been done, and can yet be done; with respect for each other's rights.

Mr. Gritters is positive that the union is the only answer to acquiring our daily bread. What is he going to do when we will not be able to buy or sell unless we have the mark of the beast? Will he take the mark also? Is bread the ultimate goal of the Christian's life? And will he do everything and anything to gain that bread? I think not. And when we pray: "Give us this day our daily bread", is a brother therefore selfish. I think just the opposite. A Christian that in love and trust in his Heavenly Father prays this in all sincerity is certainly a lover of his brother. This cannot be otherwise. To help this brother, through joining the C.L.A., to get a better wage is far from proving that he yet loves the brother. The opposite may be (and I feel also is) the expression of love for the brother. That would be to tell him not to join the C.L.A. until such a time that justice and truth can truthfully be maintained, so that the brother may not become guilty of forcing the employer to do things to his hurt e.g. limiting him in his rights which God has given him.

The whole argument centers about the question as to what right the worker has in respect to acquiring the amount of wage that he feels he should receive for a week's work. Scripture says: "As a man thinketh, so he is." If *we think*, therefore, that \$40. is the amount we will bargain to get it. But who has set the union to be sole judge in this matter? What happened to the unions during the last depression? Did we then not pray: Father, give us this day our daily bread? And did not the Heavenly Father give us that daily bread? Have we lacked anything, so that we could not praise Him? Of course not!

Our responsibility to God comes first at all times. If and when we meet this responsibility, as sincere children of God, then it is impossible to conceive that he, who lives thus, does not love his brother, and will also seek his welfare. I refer, of course, to childlike faith in God, not to the shaky type which is confession with the mouth only. The latter, when depression or loss of a few dollars seems probable, will feel that starvation is just around the corner and begin to worry and fret. The result is that such will acquit

themselves as unbelievers. But God will never forsake His own. Do what we will it will not change matters at all. That which we acquire to ourselves is in God's favor or disfavor—a blessing or a curse. Are not all our ways and lives determined by God from all eternity? Will not He supply us with our daily bread as long as He has determined that we need it?

No, we must not sit down and just assume that God will provide. Nor will any child of God ever do that. But his first aim in all things is: God bless us in prosperity and adversity, health and sickness. (See Art. 13. Belgic Confession). God bless the work of my hands so that I may have to help the poor and needy, but if Thy will be different, give me grace to glorify Thee. Save me from greed and cause me to live righteously in all my ways so that Thy name may be glorified in and through me, even in the midst of the world. Yes, then it may be possible that we end up at the Deaconate, but are we then not yet blessed?

Money, wages, etc. are not necessarily a blessing. Only that which is received in God's favor is such. Does a little child fear that his father will not care for and protect him? Ask him and quiz him to find what his answer will be. It will put us to shame for so should we also trust in our loving Heavenly Father. When this is done, then and then only, will peace be ours even though we may receive a considerable cut in our home budget.

Now to come to my last point, the core and basis of the whole question. *Let your yea be yea and your nay be nay!* This is the Christian's pledge of honor. He need not swear an oath. His yea and nay should not be questioned. This is God's Word, and that too for a Christian Labor association. Now when the representative meets the employer, backed by the union, backed by the strike clause in the constitution (I call that strike clause the six-shot automatic revolver loaded with solid lead—22-20-45—calibre, or what have you) the weapon that may do hurt (IF AND WHEN, be careful, mister, WE MEAN BUSINESS) this weapon is the THREAT to do hurt, if and when the union sees fit. On what grounds? Scripture? Confession? Christian principles of love to your neighbor and brother? Does this fit with what the Heidelberg Catechism teaches about the 6th commandment: Thou shalt not kill? Not necessarily outright killing, nor breaking of bones, nor even only destruction of property. But nevertheless, killing by destroying his God-given rights: 1. To hire and fire whom *he will*, if necessary. 2. To pay the wages *he desires* to pay. 3. To *operate* or *close* his factory as conditions demand. 4. To hire competent men and not to hire those whom he does not desire *for reasons of his own*.

Who has placed us as judge over him *or his property*? *God has not done so.* May we then take the

law into our own hands? May we seek his hurt by word or deed? Is not this killing him? Is not this setting him at naught? Suppose that he is unrighteous, may we therefore be unrighteous? Force belongs to the government. When was this changed? If the employer deals unrighteously (?) by cutting wages due to market values has a union a right to force him to pay higher wages to his own hurt? Does not our condemnation of the employer condemn ourselves in doing so? I think so.

Finally, for me to belong to the C.L.A. and to be represented by anyone, with whom I am corporately responsible (for whatever may happen—peace, strike, or force of any kind, of which I am not assured) and then to go home and to pray: Father, give us this day our daily bread, is nothing short of blasphemy.

Again, think it over brethren. Better to receive \$1 per day in grace and favor than \$3 per day in distrust and fear that we have acquired it unrighteously. Our Father in heaven knows our needs. He will surely supply them!

Your brother in Christ,  
H. A. Van Putten.

---

## News From Oak Lawn

When on November of 1944 our minister, Rev. C. Hanko, made known unto us that he felt that he must accept the call to Manhattan, Montana, our hearts were saddened and we felt for the moment that all was against us, for Rev. Hnako had labored in our midst faithfully for almost ten years and in that time ties had been made that were not easy to break, not alone that Rev. Hanko and family were well liked in the congregation, but his work among us had the result that we became as one unit, loving each other in Christ and seemingly that if that tie would be broken all would be lost and all kinds of dark clouds loomed at the horizon. But the Lord did not leave us and made plain to us that it was His way and we received the testimony from Him that He cares for us and so we became reconciled to our state, knowing that neither God nor His Word would leave us. We were reminded of this fact again when on January 1 Rev. Hanko preached his farewell unto us on the last texts of the Bible. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Very fittingly Rev. Hanko pointed out unto us the wealth of this promise and although we were saddened that this was Rev. Hanko's last sermon as our pastor we went home assured that our shepherd Jesus Christ watches over us.

In the meantime Oak Lawn sent out a call to Rev.

A. Cammenga who in due time let us know that he felt not called upon from God to come to Oak Lawn, and again we sent out a call this time to Rev. M. Gritters, who under God's guiding felt that he must come over and help us. And so the Rev. Gritters and family arrived in our midst on March 22 and on Friday, March 23 we came together in the church to meet Rev. Gritters and family.

A short program was given by the congregation with some refreshments and a joyful evening was spent by all. On Sunday morning, March 25, Rev. B. Kok installed Rev. Gritters as our pastor after preaching unto us on Isaiah 21:11, 12, and in the afternoon Rev. Gritters preached unto us out of Eph. 3:8, the last part. The unsearchable riches of Christ and pointed out unto us the riches of God's Word.

And so we are again pastor and flock. May God send His blessings upon us that together we may grow in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. May the loss of Sioux Center be our gain and where the Lord already has supplied Sioux Center with a new pastor we wish them God's blessing.

During our vacancy we were always supplied with a minister, except two Sundays when students Howerzyl and Hoeksema preached for us. We wish to thank all those who administered to our needs.

The Consistory,  
John Buiter, Clerk.

---

## WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

1895 — 1945

On April 19th the Lord willing, our dear parents and grandparents,

HENRY BUISKOOL

and

ANNA BUISKOOL nee Dyksterhouse

hope to celebrate their 50th Wedding Anniversary. We their grateful children are indeed thankful to our Heavenly Father for sparing them for each other and for us.

We extend to them our sincere congratulations and pray that the Lord will continue to bless and keep them in the years to come.

Their grateful children,

Mr. and Mrs. Peter Zuidema

4 grandchildren

2 great-grandchildren

Kalamazoo, Michigan,



## Contribution

Editor of The Standard Bearer,

Dear Editor,

Please allow me to thank Mr. G. T. E. for the fine compliments paid me in his contribution in the Standard Bearer of February 15. I have always taken a certain pardonable pride in the fact that my articles do not lack in clarity and also that I observe the rules of ethical journalism. But, a person can easily make a slip, and it is therefore very gratifying that a man of Mr. G. T. E.'s apparent ability publicly compliments me on the attainments of those objectives.

The rest of the brother's contribution is not so clear to me. I do not quite understand the purpose of it. I do not know brother Van Putten personally, but I gladly and joyfully accept the wonderful testimony given concerning him. I have met many such Christians in both the Protestant and Christian Reformed denominations, and all of them are my friends. Certainly, judged by the standards of the world they are peculiar, and I with them. We are one in our devotion to the service of God!

That being the case it is so strange that brother T. E. presents brother Van Putten as my *adversary*, an *enemy* or *antagonist* according to Webster. Now that is really absurd—I mean of course the presentation, not Mr. T. E. Surely we who agree on the essentials of the Christian faith and life can disagree on some of the practical aspects without considering one another *adversaries* or *enemies*. I certainly do not, and I am very glad that of all the Protestant Reformed brethren whom I have met, and sometimes disagreed with, he is the first one who takes such an extreme position.

One last remark: We believe, do we not?, that even those Christians who have attained such heights of sanctification as brother T. E. ascribes to brother V. P. are still sinners. Our Catechism says that "even our best works in this life are all imperfect and defiled with sin" (Lord's Day 24). We have sin to contend with until death. Hence it is not strange that even the holiest among us can fall into the sins of misrepresentation, or wholesale condemnation, or the casting of an evil reflection upon others or upon a Christian organization. And, if that is done I do not consider such words or writings as worthy of being called "sharper than a two-edged sword", but as expressions of a fallible Christian, and I shall not only not hesitate to raise my pen against such expressions—not against the Christian—but consider it my Christian duty to do so.

J. Gritter,  
Secretary C. L. A.

## IN MEMORIAM

After a long period of illness, the Lord in His infinite wisdom took unto Himself our beloved wife and mother,

MRS. RICHARD ONDERSMA

at the age of 48 years.

Although we mourn our loss, we rejoice in the assurance that her desire has been fulfilled and that she is now in glory, in the rest that remaineth to the people of God.

The family,

Mr. Richard Ondersma  
Mr. and Mrs. S. Ondersma  
Clara  
Pfc. and Mrs. O. L. Hollemans

## IN MEMORIAM

The Men's Society of the Roosevelt Park Protestant Reformed Church herewith expresses sincerest sympathy to two of their fellow-members in the loss of those who were dear to them. To W. Koster in the loss of his son,

DICK

and to A. Langerak in the loss of his brother,

PFC. HARRY LANGERAK

We trust that they may experience that our Father Who bringeth these things to pass dost also grant us grace and comfort in the dark hour of tribulation.

Roosevelt Park Men's Society,

Rev. M. Schipper, Pres.  
Mr. Geo. Ten Elshof, Sec'y.

Let heaven and earth and sounding sea  
To Him glad tribute bring;  
Let field and wood and all therein  
Before Jehovah sing;  
For, lo, He comes to judge the earth,  
And all the world shall see;  
His everlasting faithfulness,  
His truth and equity.