

THE STANDARD

Bearer

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME XXVIII

NOVEMBER 15, 1951 — GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

NUMBER 4

MEDITATION

Lichten In De Duisternis

“Doet alle dingen zonder murmureeren en tegenspreken, opdat gij moogt onberispelijk en oprecht zijn, kinderen Gods zijnde, onstraffelijk in 't midden van een krom en verdraaid geslacht, onder welke gij schijnt als lichten in de wereld: voorhoudende het woord des levens.”—Filipp. 2:14-16a

In het verband van onze tekstworden merken we op, dat in het vijfde vers de Filippenzen vermaand worden aangaande het gevoelen, dat in Christus Jezus was. Wat was dat gevoelen, vraagt ge? Het was dit: onuitsprekelijk groote nederigheid. Stelt het U voor: Hij was Gode evengelijk, en nochtans kwam Hij in dienstknecht gestaltenis! En de gemeente te Filippi wordt vermaand om datzelfde gevoelen van groote nederigheid te openbaren. Voorts leert Paulus de gemeente, dat Jezus Christus daarom zoo hoog verhoogd is geworden, zoodat Hij een naam ontving die boven alle andere namen uitblonk, niet alleen in deze wereld, maar ook in de navolgende, de vernieuwde wereld. En dat groote gebeuren in den Heere Jezus Christus zal de gemeente een spoorslag zijn om het woord van den Apostel te gehoorzamen. En zij kunnen gehoorzamen, want God werkt in hen beide het willen en het werken naar Zijn welbehagen. En de inhoud van dat gehoorzamen vindt ge in de woorden van mijn tekst: ze zullen schijnende lichten zijn in een donkere wereld. Daar willen we wat van schrijven. We schrijven dan wat tot U onder het Thema: *Lichten in de Duisternis*; eerst willen we zien, dat ze vermaand worden om *Blijmoedige Lichten* te zijn; dan, dat ze *helder brandende Lichten* moeten zijn; en eindelijk dat ze *Schijnende Lichten* moeten zijn.

Eerst dan, dat ze Blijmoedige Lichten moeten zijn.

Dat wordt ons in den tekst geleerd, als hij zegt, dat Gods volk alle dingen doen moet zonder murmureeren en tegenspreken. Het behoeft ons niet te verwonderen, dat de Apostel dit van de gemeente vraagt, want de wandel eens Christens gaat dwars tegen vleesch en bloed in. De natuurlijke weg van vleesch en bloed is nu een weg der zonde geworden. En van dien weg des vleesches zegt de Schrift dat hij zich der wille Gods niet onderwerpt. Erger nog, de Heilige Schrift zegt in Rom. 8, dat het vleesch vijandschap tegen God is. En dat kan nimmer anders, want hetzelfde gedeelte zegt, dat het ook niet zich aan God *kan* onderwerpen. De natuurlijke mensch is ten eenemale onmachtig om zich te schikken naar God. Hij murmureert en spreekt altijd God tegen. En zoo is een ieder mensch, naar zijn eerste, natuurlijke geboorte. En als ge nu een andere weg ontvangt, een weg des Geestes Gods, dan komt de strijd. Hebt ge dat geestelijke leven niet ontvangen, dan leeft ge rustig door, vervreemd van God en van het burgerschap Gods. Dan kunt ge allerlei goddelooze dingen bedenken en doen en bespreken, en ge hebt in 't geheel geen strijd daarmee. Maar zoodra Gods Geest een ander beginsel zaait in Uw diepste hart, en zoodra dat beginsel tot bewustzijn komt in dat hart, zoo spoedig komt ook de strijd. Dan begeert de Geest tegen het vleesch en het vleesch begeert tegen den Geest. En zoo komt ge er toe om te gaan murmureeren en spreken tegen God. Dan murmureert het natuurlijke leven, dat nog in ons overgebleven is. Ge kunt dat natuurlijke leven ook den ouden mensch noemen, naar de Heilige Schrift. Vergeet het nimmer: ons natuurlijke leven walgt van God en Goddelijke zaken. En het bruischt er tegen in. En dat doet het altijd. Als Uw vleesch godsdienstig wordt, past dan op, want dan zijt ge vlak bij den Farizeër en schijnheilig. Het is eenvoudig een wet in onze natuurlijke leden, dat het hart, het natuurlijke hart murmureert tegen God, en het natuurlijke verstand pruttelt tegen als God spreekt. En daarom

wordt de gemeente hier vermaand om noch het eene, noch het andere te doen.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

En dat niet te doen brengt het kruis. Dan kruisigt men den ouden mensch met zijne werken, en dat doet zeer. Maar het is ook genade, en we beklagen U dan niet, want dat is de weg naar het Vaderhuis daar boven. De murmureering moet gedood en het tegensprekende verstand moet het zwijgen opgelegd. De natuurlijke wil, en begeerten moeten gefnuikt en onder Gods wil gebracht. En dat neemt een steeds voortdurende strijd. Doch die strijd is genadegave van God. En denkt er aan dat deze vermaning verbonden is aan het troostrijke woord van het verband, dat God het willen en het werken in ons werkt. Als we dien strijd hebben is het een teeken dat we op den goeden weg zijn. En elke overwinning over het vleesch sterkt ons geestelijk en brengt ons nader tot God. En met dat doel geeft God ons dien strijd.

Daarom blijmoedig alles gedaan. Let daarop. doet *alle dingen* zonder murmureering en zonder tegenspreken. Wel, alle dingen zijn alle dingen hier. Er wordt niets buitengesloten in deze vermaning. En dat maakt Uw gansche leven tot een betrachten van de theologie. Alles zij godsdienst in ons leven. En alles wat we doen van den morgen tot den avond, en ja, ook wat we doen in den nacht, wordt door God opgeëischt. En dat is recht, want Hij is God. In al die dingen, en in verband met al die dingen die Uw leven uitmaken, moet ge Uws zelfs zaligheid met vrees en beven uitwerken. En dat beteekent, dat ge meer en meer op Christus Jezus moet gaan gelijken. Hij moet meer en meer een gestalte in U ontvangen. En dat moet alles blijmoediglijk gedaan. En ook dat is recht en past voor den Christen. Hij gaat toch immers naar den hemel, dat is, naar God heen? Wie gaat nu al schreiende naar een feest? Wandelen we dan vroolijk achter Jezus Christus aan, zonder te murmureeren en tegen te spreken. Doch integendeel, al zingende en jubelende van innig zielsgenot. Gedenkt hier aan den zoeten zanger Israels zooals hij ons voorgedaan is met zijn lieflijke zangen: Hoe zalig is het volk, dat naar Uw klanken hoort; zij wand'len Heer, in 't licht van 't Godd'lijk aanschijn voort! Ze zullen in Uw naam zich al den dag verblijden; Uw goedheid straalt hen toe, Uw macht schraagt hen in 't lijden; Uw onbezweken trouw zal nooit hun val gedoogen, maar Uw gerechtigheid hen aar Uw Woord verhoogen!

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

In de tweede plaats worden we hier vermaand om helder brandende lichten te zijn voor God en voor Zijn

zaak. Negatief beduidt dit, dat ge onberispelijk zijt en wandelt. En hier komt Gods heiligheid U tegen. Zijt heilig, want Ik ben heilig! Gods Geest en Gods Woord vraagt altijd een volmaakt werk. God is nooit tevreden met half werk. Er zijn zoogenaamde profeten die het den menschen diets maken, dat God tevreden is als we slechts ons best doen. Dat is niet waar. Luistert slechts naar den tekst hier: we moeten onberispelijk zijn. Of we het doen kunnen komt hier niet in rekening. God eischt een onberispelijk leven van ons. Uw licht zal helder schijnen in een donkere wereld. En dat is goed, want het brengt ons geduriglijk onder de tucht van het volmaakte. Voorts zegt de tekst dat we oprecht zullen zijn. Letterlijk beteekent dat onvermengd te zijn. Er zullen geen vreemde bestanddeelen in ons streven zijn. Een oprecht mensch is een mensch die er van binnen uitziet zooals hij van buiten zich aan Uw oog vertoont. Deze vermaning vloekt tegen het valsche, het veinzende, waar men van buiten glimlacht en van binnen vloekt. En daarom grijpt deze vermaning terug naar het diepe beginsel in den Christen. Deze vermaning eischt, dat ge een nieuw hart hebt. En zoo komen we vanzelf tot het hoofdelement van deze vermaning, d.w.z., het hoofdelement in dit tweede deel: helder brandende lichten. Ge moet U openbaren als kinderen Gods. Dat doorloopt een proces. Het is niet zoo, dat ge bij Uw wedergeboorte en bekeering eenvoudig tot kind Gods gemaakt wordt en daarmee uit. O neen. Het is wel waar, dat ge bij de nieuwe geboorte tot een kind Gods gemaakt zijt, doch het is even waar, dat ge meer en meer kind Gods moet worden! Dagelijks moet ge meer en meer het Beeld van den Goddelijken Zoon gelijk worden. Door den weg van de kruisiging des vleesch en de betrachtting van al Gods geboden, in het oprecht wandelen voor Gods aangezicht moet ge meer Gods kind worden. En die weg is de weg der gedurige heiligmaking, zonder dewelke niemand den Heere zien zal. Ernstige vermaning. Let op de beeldspraak. We moeten een helder brandend licht openbaren in deze wereld. En nu stem ik U toe, dat zulk een weg lijden met zich brengt. Doch geen nood. Aan het einde van dat lijden wacht de kroon der overwinning.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

En het doel? Dat zal de tekst U leeren. Omdat de duisternis rondom U is: Satan, de wereld en de machten der zonde en des doods. Elk oogenblik waren ze rondom U; ze haten U; ze bgrijpen U niet, omdat ge licht zijt in den Heere. Ze zijn een krom en verdraaid geslacht. Krom ziet op het afgebogene van de lijn. De natuurlijke mensch is afgebogen van de rechte lijnen waarin en waarlangs hij geschapen is. En zodoende dwaalt het menschedom al meer en meer

van den rechten weg af. Verdraaid te zijn geeft het karakter aan van die afbuiging. Het ziet op het leelijke, het kwade *der zondaren*. Zij grijpen het recht aan, de waarheid en wat er meer geopenbaard wordt van den grooten Schepper van 't heelal, en ze houden het in ongerechtigheid ten onder. Onze vaders spreken ook van deze gruwelijken trek in des menschen hart, als ze spreken van het geheel en al bezoedelen van 't natuurlijk licht. Het is de mensch die in verwaten hoogmoed zich te keer stelt tegen God. Dat zijn de afgebogenen die ook verdraaid zijn. Daar staat ge midden in. En de roeping komt tot U en mij om helder brandende lichten te zijn. Onvermengd schijne Uw licht; zoodat Uw positie onstraffelijk wordt. Nergens op de lijn moogt ge afbuigen. Geen terrein is er waarop ge met dit kromme en verdraaide geslacht mee kunt doen. Alle dingen doet ge anders in Uw wandel.

Dat zal nog duidelijker worden als we op de laatste gedachte wijzen: ge moet een schijnend licht zijn. Er moet invloed van U uitgaan. En dat kan alleen als ge die eerste twee grootheden ontving, namelijk, dat ge blijmoedige lichten zijt, en helder brandende lichten. Dan zult ge ook schijnen in een duistere wereld. En nu komen we tot het hart van de vermaning. Alleen licht kan schijnen.

Wat nu is Licht?

En dan moet ons eerste antwoord zijn: God is een Licht. En ge hebt alreede opgemerkt, dat we hier te doen hebben met figuurlijke taal. In de Heilige Schrift wordt het beeld van licht vaak gebruikt. Denkt vooral aan dien tekst in I Johannes 1:5, waar we lezen: "En dit is de verkondiging die we van Hem gehoord hebben en wij U verkondigen, dat God een licht is en gansch geene duisternis in Hem is." Daar zit eigenlijk het volle Evangelie in. Het is immers de verkondiging van Jezus zelf? Daartoe kwam Hij in de wereld, namelijk, om Zijn Vader te verklaren. En die Vader is Licht.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Dat beteekent, dat God het inbegrip van alle deugd en lieflijkheid is. Er is geen deugd die niet in God en van God is. Als daar zijn: goedheid, liefde, wijsheid, gerechtigheid, heiligheid, macht en kracht, leven en lieven van eeuwigheid tot eeuwigheid. En nu noemden we nog slechts de mededeelbare eigenschappen Gods. Er zijn ook Zijne onmededeelbare eigenschappen die ons doen duizelen, als daar zijn: eenheid, alomtegenwoordigheid, eeuwigheid, oneindigheid, onbegrijpelijkheid, onafhankelijkheid, enz. Al die eigenschappen, wonderen, majesteit en deugden worden in de Heilige Schrift licht geheeten. En daarom schijnt God. Hij schijnt altijd en voor eeuwig. Hij schijnt allereerst in Zijn Eigen lieflijk Wezen van eeuwigheid en tot in der eeuwigheid En, ten tweede, schijnt God in Zijn werk-

en, zooals de schepping van 't heelal. Leest, of liever, zingt ervan in psalm 19:2 en 3. En, ten derde, heeft God Zijn licht geopenbaard in den Zoon Zijner eeuwige liefde. Daarom noemt Jezus Zichzelf: het Licht der wereld! En Hij heeft geschenen en het lieflijke Licht van God geopenbaard gelijk nooit tevoren. En het centrum van dat licht is het kruis van Golgotha. En al dat licht van God in Christus Jezus is ons geschonken in Zijn dierbaar Woord. En zoo komen we tot de vierde plaats. En dat zijn de lichtkinderen van God. Die moeten schijnen, en die schijnen daadwerkelijk. Daarom zeide Jezus, op Zijn discipelen ziende: Gij zijt het licht der wereld!

En hoe kunnen wij lichten zijn die daadwerkelijk schijnen in deze duistere wereld? En dan vindt ge in mijn tekst het antwoord: voorhoudende het woord des levens. Dat zit zoo: we worden door Gods Geest opgezocht en in ons diepste hart wederomgeboren. En die Heilige Geest leidt ons tot het Woord van God waar we het lieflijke Licht van den DrieEenigen God ons geopenbaard vinden. En dan klinkt de vermaning tot de levenden door alle eeuwen heen: Tot het Woord en tot de Profeten! En dan eischt God van ons, dat we ons sieren met dat Woord. Dat Woord zal in ons hart zijn; zal ons verstand beheerschen en alle onze gedachten. Dat Woord moet onze daden motiveeren. Dat Woord moet als een zoutend zout al onze sprake smakelijk maken, smakelijk voor God in den hemel. En zoo ziet ge, mijne vrienden, wat het beteekent om het Woord des levens voor te houden. De wereld rondom slaat de Christenen gade, en nu moeten de Christenen er voor zorgen, dat waar ze ook het volk Gods zien, zij niets dan de lieflijkheid van dat Woord zien in onzen wandel. En daardoor wordt God verheerlijkt.

Wandelt naar het Woord van God en ge zult schijnende lichten zijn, en dan zal er van U gezegd worden, dat ge wandelende Evangeliën Gods zijt. En zoo kunnen anderen tot Christus gebracht worden door onzen godzaligen wandel. Geve de Heere het door Zijne genade!

G. Vos.

□ □ □ □ □

ANNIVERSARY

On November 18th our beloved parents,

Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius Lamse,

hope to commemorate their 25th anniversary. We extend to them our most hearty congratulations.

We thank God that He has spared them for each other and for us and pray that we may have many more years together.

Joyce

James

Mary

THE STANDARD BEARER

Semi-monthly, except monthly in July and August

Published by the Reformed Free Publishing Association
Box 124, Station C., Grand Rapids 6, Michigan

EDITOR — Rev. Herman Hoeksema

Communications relative to contents should be addressed to Rev. H. Hoeksema, 1139 Franklin St., S. E., Grand Rapids 7, Michigan.

All matter relative to subscription should be addressed to Mr. J. Bouwman, 1350 Giddings Ave., S. E., Grand Rapids 7, Michigan. Announcements and Obituaries must be mailed to the above address and will be published at a fee of \$1.00 for each notice.

Renewals:— Unless a definite request for discontinuance is received, it is assumed that the subscriber wishes the subscription to continue without the formality of a renewal order.

Subscription Price: \$3.00 per year

Entered as Second Class mail at Grand Rapids, Michigan

EDITORIALS**Twee Anekdoten**

1.

Dr. Schilder geeft in *De Reformatie* het volgende staaltje door:

“In de Theologische Hoogeschool onderhoudende Artikel 31 te Kampen hangt een schilderij, waar de ark van Noach op geschilderd is. In die ark zitten de Gereformeerden van Artikel 31, aan de ark hangen de Hervormden en de gewone Gereformeerden verdrinken allemaal”.

Dr. Schilder noemt dit een van “de staaltjes van venijnige fantasietjes” over de kerken onderhoudende Art. 31.

En hij voegt er aan toe: “natuurlijk is het ganse verhaaltje nonsens.



2.

Dr. Schilder geeft, nog wel in een schoolspeech over “Zelus en Zeloten”, op eigen gezag het volgende staaltje door:

“We denken hier aan de uitroep van een predikant in Amerkia, die eigen dogmatische beschouwing bindend wil gaan opleggen aan de Kerk des Heeren, en die zijn tegenstander hierin nu openlijk vraagt: ‘why don’t you go?’, waarom ga je niet liever weg, naar een andere kerk, waar je het beter naar je zin hebt?”

Dit, amice Schilder, is een ander staaltje van venijnige fantasie.

En ofschoon Dr. Schilder blijkbaar heel in de verte een klokje heeft hooren luiden, niet wetende waar de klepel hangt, voeg ik er aan toe:

“Natuurlijk is het ganse verhaaltje nonsens.”

H. H.

**Eén Waar Verhaaltje**

Eerst in Hamilton, en nu in Chattam, heeft wat zich noemde de Protestantsche Gereformeerde Kerk haar leeraar aan den dijk gezet.

Dit is, in beide gevallen, geschied zonder eenigen vorm van procedure, zonder dat die kerken, respectievelijk die van Hamilton en Chattam, zich stoorden aan eenig artikel der Kerkenorde, hetzij artikel 31 of eenig ander artikel.

Eenig besef van verantwoordelijkheid voor hun leeraar hebben deze kerken zeker niet.

C O N T E N T S**MEDITATION—**

- Lichten in de Duisternis..... 73
Rev. G. Vos

EDITORIALS—

- Twee Anekdoten..... 76
Een Waar Verhaaltje..... 76
Rev. H. Hoeksema
An Open Letter..... 77
Revs. H. Hoeksema and H. Veldman
A Question 81
Rev. H. Hoeksema

THE TRIPLE KNOWLEDGE—

- An Exposition of the Heidelberg Catechism..... 81
Rev. H. Hoeksema
Ingezonden..... 84
Mr. Wm. Pelskamp

OUR DOCTRINE—

- The Hexaemeron or Creation-Week (9)..... 84
Rev. H. Veldman

THROUGH THE AGES—

- The Arminian or Remonstrant Struggle..... 88
Rev. G. M. Ophoff

IN HIS FEAR—

- Back to School (conclusion)..... 91
Rev. H. C. Hoeksema

FROM HOLY WRIT—

- Exposition of Luke 19:1-10..... 93
Rev. G. C. Lubbers

PERISCOPE—

- The Synod of 1951..... 95
Rev. J. Howerzyl

Van de Kerkenorde, i.e. van recht en gerechtigheid, moeten ze niets hebben.

Wel beseffende, dat ze in een krommen weg wandelen, zijn ze voor den weg, dien de Kerkenorde aanwijst, bang.

Onze kerkmensen hier krijgen door dit goddeloos gedoe zoo langzamerhand den indruk, dat "vrijmaking" zoo ongeveer hetzelfde beteekent als revolutionair.

Zie, amice Schilder, daarom zou ik het veel verstandiger achten, ook voor het goed gerucht van de vrijmaking in Nederland, dat ge, in plaats van allerlei uien op te disschen van zekeren "Amerikaanschen domine", de dingen eens goed onderzocht, i.e. onderzocht in den kerkrechtelijken weg.

De Canadeesche "vrijgemaakten" maken de zaak der vrijmaking in Nederland stinkende.

Ds. D. van Dijk schreef onlangs in de Groninger Kerkbode, dat wij hier in Amerika nog synodaler zijn (in de leer) dan de synodalen. 't Zou me niets verwonderen.

Maar als het aankomt op de vraag, hoe men het gemakkelijkst van een predikant af kan komen, is er heelemaal geen vergelijking te treffen tusschen hetgeen de Gereformeerde Synode in Nederland deed en hetgeen de "vrijgemaakten" (i.e. libertijnen, revolutionairen) in Canada bestonden te doen.

H. H.

AN OPEN LETTER

Below is an open letter addressed to me.

Because the men from Hamilton write as if their former contribution was directed to and against me, which, of course, it was not at all, and because the Rev. H. Veldman is far more intimately acquainted with what took place in Hamilton, I asked him to reply to this open letter.

In the meantime, I want the authors of the open letter to know that I have not changed my mind about their "evil piece of work". I cannot accept an apology as sincere from those, who, while refusing to walk in the way of righteousness (the Church Order), prefer the way of backbiting and slander.

I admonish them to repent and to return from their evil way.

Here follows the letter and the comment by the Rev. Veldman.

H. H.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PROF. HOEKSEMA, EDITOR OF THE STANDARD BEARER

Esteemed Professor:

Your postscript to our consistory's decision which was taken up in the Standard Bearer compels us to answer, and we hope that you will give it a place in the immediately following Standard Bearer. For this our thanks.

First, relative the heading or rather the lack of it above the letters which we sent. This is surely an impoliteness which we perhaps could explain but cannot excuse, and for this we offer our apology to whoever it may concern.

We are glad that you placed our writing in its entirety whereby it can be plain to anyone who can read well that that which you conclude does not follow logically from our writing but is merely a result of your way of reading. It seems to us that you can hardly tolerate one who comes to stand over against you.

What, for example, gives you the right to conclude from one's acts (which you think to be sinful) that such an one is unregenerated?

This at least appears to us to be a theological slip or evasion (theologisch slippertje) and not very Scriptural.

For the rest we will follow your writing as far as it is necessary and possible, but would first of all examine closely the following statement, namely: "Under the cloak of an apparently very humble confession, they launch one more slanderous attack upon their former pastor, the Rev H. Veldman, etc."

This insinuation we must cast far from us. To be sure, if this were true, then the heading, "An Evil Piece of Work", would be altogether too mild. But, although it is very difficult to do so to one who doubts good intentions, we do wish to declare that our apology was entirely upright. We are not at all conscious of having begun, as you write, a *new* attack upon Rev. Veldman, but we have done nothing else than to add the grievance, although perhaps never so plainly formulated and in language understood by each and every one, to make very plain that we in that respect have nothing to confess because we still think the same way, and therefore cannot express our regret that we therein have sinned against Rev. Veldman.

Now our comments. The first we can now pass over without comment. The second that you will not recognize us as the legal church of Hamilton we can understand, but that we have not the right to bear the name Prot. Ref. Church because we no longer live in the church-connection is a riddle to us. Do the churches derive their right from the connection in

which they live, or are the local churches autonomous, and do they not all have the right to break with the church-connection if they are of the opinion that that church-connection hinders them in their service of Christ?

You write further: "The only possible procedure would have been as follows." Did you really think that this procedure were possible? Even if we requested that, it seems to us that it would be impossible for Rev. Veldman and Elder Reitsma to give themselves to a communion which declares itself to be able to do nothing else than finally to depose them from office. Did you think into this situation, professor? We do not believe it and it therefore never occurred to us to ask this of Rev. Veldman and brother Reitsma.

You speak of the minutes of our consistory and we would lay before you some excerpts out of these minutes.

Minutes of Dec. 5, 1950. Art. 3: "Moved and decided to request the classis to make Rev. Veldman loose of the congregation of Hamilton, because, inasmuch as it is impossible for him to help enforce the decisions of the consistory in re acceptance of members, confession of faith, baptism, his official labour has been practically paralyzed." (this decision was adopted upon the request of Rev. Veldman himself, but was rejected by the classis).

Minutes of Jan. 12, 1951. Art. 2 and 3. It is moved and decided as follows: "The consistory, considering the declaration of classis relative the making loose of Rev. Veldman and having taken cognizance of the rejection of that request on the ground that the guilt lies entirely with the consistory, and also that it (the classis) maintains the report of the classical committee, comes to the following conclusion that, as long as Rev. Veldman refuses to perform his official labours upon the basis as willed by the consistory, it is impossible that Rev. Veldman continues to lead in the Service of the Word. As long as there is no change in this situation it must deny him the pulpit." It is moved and decided as follows: "The consistory decided to discuss the consequences of this, namely suspension, at a meeting with the neighboring church of Chatham to be held as quickly as possible."

Thus far the minutes. From this it appears plainly that we touched upon nothing new in our writing, but merely that the grievances which at that time (Jan. 12, 1951) compelled us to begin with the suspension of Rev. Veldman still exist, and that there is no reason to presuppose that Rev. Veldman has changed in this respect. The lie and slander which are alleged to exist here are completely dark to us.

Finally we would call your attention to a pair of serious errors in the statement of facts at the end of your writing. We could also write of lie and slander

but would rather believe that these are due to ignorance.

We will do so in order. *a* is correct. *b* is in so far correct that the consistory rescinded its former decision, but not in that sense, however, that now the door is open to all that desire to become member, but to all who promise to maintain the three forms as basis of ecclesiastical fellowship and who find expressed in them the perfect doctrine of salvation, given unto us in the Holy Gospel. *c* is correct, also *d*, but *e* is completely incorrect upon a very essential point, namely, that this was no illegal meeting but a completely legal meeting under the presidency of Rev. Veldman held Jan. 12, 1951, and from the minutes of which meeting we quoted above. *f* is correct and the reasons for this action are expressed in the writing addressed to all consistories Jan. 16, 1951.

We hope that all this is sufficient to move you to retract your accusation of lie and slander and acknowledge that it is possible to disagree with you without evil intentions which you repeat in your last sentence. We desire just as you do the unity of the Church but are convinced that you, as also Rev. Veldman, stands in the way of that unity, as long as you and he immediately lay the odium of unreformed and remonstrant upon all who subscribe to the 3 forms from the heart even as you do but teach something else with respect to certain points.

Hoping that this writing may be instrumental toward enabling us to address you again, fully and really, as brother in Christ, we remain,

Respectfully yours,

The consistory of the Prot. Ref. Church
of Hamilton.

L. Van Huizen
L. Klapwijk
J. Ton

COMMENT

The Rev. Hoeksema has asked the undersigned to answer parts of this letter because of my personal acquaintance with the case. I ask the readers of the Standard Bearer to bear with me. I have little desire to enter into this discussion for obvious reasons. However, this is laid upon us. This letter was sent to the Standard Bearer with the request that it be published at the earliest possible opportunity. This explains its appearance in our paper and our subsequent answer.

First, I must declare that I cannot accept the apology of these men. I, too, received a copy of the letter which appeared in the Standard Bearer last Oct. 1. My letter, too, was without salutation or greeting. And, in the case of the undersigned this is worse. Imagine receiving a letter of apology without a salutation or greeting! Neither am I satisfied with this apology in the Standard Bearer. I think that it is

plain Christian ethics and courtesy to send such an apology to me personally.

Secondly, I wish to make a few remarks in connection with that consistory meeting which Rev. Hoeksema called illegal in his article and which, according to the "consistory of the Hamilton Prot. Ref. Church," is or was perfectly legal. They are correct and the statement as it appears in the article of the editor is an error. However, may I call their attention and also the attention of our readers to the following. It is true that the undersigned was suspended at a legal consistory meeting. But it is equally true that the two meetings held the following week were illegal. Mind you, the only sin they confess in the above quoted letter is that they did not in the spirit of love treat us as sinners even unto the end. Not one word is said about the illegal meetings held Jan. 16 and 19, the first being a consistory meeting and the latter the congregational meeting. When the consistory meeting was held Jan. 16, Reitsma, vice-president of the consistory and member of the consistory in good standing, knew nothing of the meeting. Neither did the undersigned. At this meeting Reitsma and I were deposed, my suspension first being lifted. At this consistory meeting it was also decided to hold a congregational meeting Jan. 19. All decisions taken at an illegal consistory meeting are per se illegal. The brethren knew this. I called their attention to this between Jan. 16 and 19, called their attention to a decision of a synod of Middelburg which has bearing exactly on a situation of this nature. These men now have the boldness to call Rev. Hoeksema's attention to his error, namely, that he called the consistory meeting of Jan. 12 illegal, declare, in fact, that his statement is *completely* incorrect, but say not one word about the two illegal meetings which were held the following week. It reminds me of Matt. 7:3: "And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

Thirdly, I wish to make a few remarks about the statement of the editor, namely, and I quote: "That at a later meeting of the Consistory of Hamilton, this body rescinded its former decision and decided to throw open the doors to all that desired to join the church, meaning, of course, especially the Liberated immigrants." The brethren, Van Huizen and Klapwijk and Ton also object to this statement. Of course, the editor can very well take care of himself. The only remarks I wish to make are because of my personal acquaintance with the case. The undersigned fully endorses the statement that the doors were thrown open to all that desired to join the church, *meaning, of course, the Liberated immigrants*. I will not enter now into details. However, permit me to say

that I am ready at any time to support this statement. It simply amazes me that these brethren have the boldness to object to this statement.

Fourthly, I must comment briefly on the following statement in the letter of these brethren, and I quote: "Minutes of Dec. 5, 1950. Art. 3. It is moved and decided to request the classis to make Rev. Veldman loose of the congregation of Hamilton, because, inasmuch as it is impossible for him to help enforce the decisions of the consistory in re acceptance of members, confession of faith, baptism, his official labour has been practically paralyzed. This decision was adopted upon the request of Rev. Veldman himself, but was rejected by the classis." Now I do not wish to deny that I may have requested this, a decision of this nature. But the following must be borne in mind, and these brethren are fully acquainted with this. How often did it not happen at our consistory meetings that the brethren simply would sit there without anyone saying anything (except Reitsma)? Do the brethren recall the consistory held at the home of Reitsma shortly after the Oct., 1950, classis, when I suggested to them that they appeal against the decision of the Oct., 1950, classis at the following synod, that everything would in the meantime remain status quo, and that I would continue to serve them as their pastor during all that time? Do they recall that they refused this? Do they recall that they did not know what to do, and this because I refused to submit to their basis inasmuch as I was a Prot. Ref. minister and they a Prot. Ref. consistory? Do they recall that I suggested to them that they lay the matter before the Jan., 1951, classis, and that I was ready to submit to the advice of that classis? And do they also remember that, before the January, 1951, classis convened, I had determined to fight also this decision of the consistory and had resolved to remain as their minister and let all action proceed from them? Would not honesty demand that these facts be mentioned also?

Finally, I must comment on the slander to which Rev. Hoeksema refers in his article and against which these brethren so vehemently object. The editor of the Standard Bearer speaks of another slanderous attack upon the undersigned. These brethren are amazed because of this particular statement. Permit me, therefore, to call their attention to the following. First, in their letter of Jan. 17, 1951, which was sent to all the consistories, they write and I quote: "The consistory of the First Prot. Ref. Church of Hamilton, in its meeting of Jan. 16, 1951, is compelled to rescind its decision of Friday, Jan. 12, last, and instead of the suspension of Rev. Veldman to make itself loose from the church-connection, upon the ground that it is conscious of the fact that it cannot continue to fulfill its office laid upon it by Christ; *inasmuch as the attitude*

of Rev. Veldman and of Elder Reitsma last Sunday, etc." I have already commented on this in the early part of this year. I merely wish to ask: Is this a personal attack upon the undersigned, and sent to all the churches? Secondly, I would refer to the article which appeared in the "Gereformeerd Gezinsblad" by three former members of the Hamilton Prot. Ref. Church and which I answered in a series of four articles in the Standard Bearer. Van Huizen comments also on these articles in his article in Concordia of Aug. 30. Will these brethren please declare themselves on this malicious attack upon and caricature of the truth of our Prot. Ref. Churches? Thirdly, I would refer to this article by Van Huizen in Concordia of Aug. 30, 1951, and I quote: "Not Protestant Reformed? (the brother refers to the undersigned—H. V.) Indeed, but he was super Protestant Reformed. Rev. Veldman claimed that he was the only one who still preached the pure Protestant Reformed truth . . . Because they did not want to understand us (this surely also refers to the undersigned—H. V.) . . . For the scientific faith is usually loveless. And uncharitableness is very bold. This love was lost in Hamilton, and blocked from both sides . . . But if you manifest a tendency as revealed by Rev. Veldman here in Hamilton, and see a ghost which makes it impossible to gather and build the church of God . . ." I have also commented on these statements in a Standard Bearer not long ago. But, is this a slanderous attack? O, I know that this article was not signed by the consistory. But, it was written by Van Huizen, and I believe that he is the chairman of the consistory there today. Finally, I must call attention to Hamilton's treatment of and its so-called grievance or objection against me while I was their minister. Those brethren must understand that they did not merely sever themselves from our churches, but that they deposed me, and that they are the cause why the undersigned is today without a flock. They must understand that they deposed me without quoting a single article from the Church Order and this in spite of the fact that I asked them on what church-political ground they were suspending and deposing me. They must understand that they deposed a minister who, according to their own testimony, never said one word which in their opinion was not in harmony with Scripture or (and) the Confessions. And, in their letter they speak of my sin and also that, if I did not turn from my sin, they would be compelled to go to the very end with me. In connection with this I would remark, on the one hand, that I never received a visit from anyone who would bring or lodge an objection against me. They write in their "letter of apology" that they regret the fact that they did not walk with me in the spirit of love. However, it is simply a fact that the undersigned was never visited by any-

one of the consistory or the congregation and this in spite of the fact that I refused to be a shepherd. Besides, I call it wicked and malicious slander when these brethren write in this letter, and I quote: "All this does not alter the fact that the Consistory still maintains completely the objections they had against the mode of action of the Rev. Veldman, in which it clearly appeared that he wanted to be instructor (leeraar) but not a shepherd of the flock. The Consistory is of the opinion that this public action (op-treden) must be rejected, because it appeared that he wanted to introduce and to maintain his own interpretation of the Confession, which is not binding in the Churches, whereby he destroyed the congregation and stood in the way of the God-willed unity, according to John 17."—end of quote. I now say to these men: Brethren, shame on you for such a malicious distortion of what you know to be a fact. What is this fact? This, that I over and over and over again maintained that I could not do differently because I was a Prot. Ref. minister who had vowed before God and our churches that he must preach and teach and defend the "doctrine as taught in this Christian Church." Brethren, how often did I not say to you: "Even if you were to convince me of the error of our churches and that you are correct, I would even then not be permitted to preach and teach that way, for the simple reason that I would be compelled to bring a gravamen." They write that I did "not want to be a shepherd of the flock." Again I say to them: "Shame on you. How wicked of you!" I did not wish to be shepherd? With this they evidently mean that I destroyed the church, scattered the sheep, did not wish to gather them. Have these brethren forgotten my trips and wearying discussions (are these almost endless theological discussions not wearying?) day after day after day? And I would maintain my own personal interpretation of the Confessions? Should this consistory not have talked with me *on this point* and have gone to our churches with the purpose of ascertaining whether I was Prot. Ref.? This they never did. Never was a grievance ever lodged against me. In fact, the consistory of a Prot. Ref. Church, instead of simply severing connection with our churches, actually had the impudent boldness to *depose* a minister of whom they had constantly said that they admired him for his honesty and forthrightness, for the fact that he was unmistakably and outspokenly Protestant Reformed.

I believe that I have written enough. More I need not write, although that would not be too difficult. But this should be sufficient. H. V.

POSTSCRIPT:

The undersigned has overlooked one thing in the

letter of the three brethren of Hamilton which should be answered. The reader must understand that this was not a wilful omission. I refer to the duty of the consistory of Hamilton to reinstate Brother Reitsma and the undersigned in their respective offices and the answer of the three brethren to this their duty as expressed in the Standard Bearer by the Rev. Hoeksema and also in the answer which they received from Classis East. In their answer the three brethren of Hamilton say that this reinstatement never occurred to them because it would be useless to do so. I wish to answer to this, and say to these brethren that it is simply their calling and obligation to reinstate us. They have left the communion of our Protestant Reformed Churches and it is up to them to seek reaffiliation with us. Whatever one may say of the possibility or advisability of our returning to Hamilton and again working there as the minister of the Protestant Reformed Church of Hamilton (this question can and must be answered if and when we are confronted by it), this has nothing to do with the duty which rests upon the consistory and congregation of Hamilton. They made the breach, deposed us, and left our churches, and it is their calling to repair the damage which they have done.

H. Veldman



A QUESTION

Dear Editor:

In October 1 issue of the Standard Bearer in your comment on the letter of the "Consistory of the Prot. Ref. Church of Hamilton" you write, concerning the letter, that it is a "piece of work that certainly cannot have been conceived in the mind and heart of a regenerated child of God." About this statement much comment is made in our circle but there is also a difference of interpretation. Will you therefore kindly tell us what you meant with these words?

Thanking you in advance, I remain

Yours fraternally,

J. Blankespoor

REPLY

The different interpretation is, undoubtedly, the correct one. I did not say, and do not say now, that the writers of the contribution from Hamilton are not regenerated men. This I do not and cannot judge. But I did say, and still maintain that backbiting and slander, which are, in the Heidelberg Catechism, called the very works of the devil, certainly are not conceived in the regenerated heart of the child of God. Perhaps, I could have added: "but in his carnal nature."

H. H.

THE TRIPLE KNOWLEDGE

An Exposition Of The Heidelberg Catechism

PART TWO

Of Man's Redemption

LORD'S DAY XXXI

2.

The Promise of the Gospel (cont.)

From all the above, that is, both from Scripture and the Confessions, it must be very evident what is the contents of the promise of God. In one word it is, according to Scripture, Christ and all His riches of salvation and blessing. It is the promise that God will raise up a Savior out of the seed of David; that this seed of David shall bear the sins of His people; that God shall raise Him from the dead and give Him glory, exalt Him on the throne of His father David, and give Him the ends of the earth for His possession. Christ is the promised Seed. The promise, therefore, according to Scripture, implies the assurance of righteousness and peace, of forgiveness and sonship, of deliverance and sanctification, of eternal life and glory, of the incorruptible and undefilable inheritance that fadeth not away. It implies for Christ and all that are in Him that they shall be heirs of the world, inherit the new and heavenly kingdom, and dwell in God's eternal tabernacle forever. And therefore, the promise also implies the gift of the Holy Spirit. That Spirit is given first of all to Christ, and then also to them that are of Him. It is through this Spirit that all the blessings of Christ are realized upon the church. It is important that we emphasize this. It is a mistake to present the matter as if God merely promised the objective blessings of salvation to the seed of Abraham, or even to men in general, so that it depends upon their consent whether or not the promise shall be realized unto them. Very definitely the gift of the Holy Spirit is included in the promise. It is God's promise that He will pour out His Spirit upon all flesh. And through this Spirit He effectually works the salvation of Christ in the heart of all His people in the way of regeneration, calling, faith, justification, sanctification, perseverance, and glorification. Through that Spirit they are translated from darkness into light and are kept in the power of God unto the salvation that is to be revealed in the last time. All this is included in the promise, that is, in the positive declaration on the part of God that He will surely bestow

these blessings and benefits of salvation upon all His people.

From all this, and especially also from the fact that the gift of the Holy Spirit is implied in the promise, it must be very evident that the promise of God is unconditional. It is not, and cannot be conditioned by anything on the part of man. This we must clearly understand. A promise is by no means the same as an offer. Also in the latter the person that makes the offer declares his willingness to do something for or bestow something upon the person to whom the offer is made. But for its realization the offer is dependent upon the willingness of the second party, upon his consent to the offer. In this sense we may say that man can really never promise anything, for he is never certain that he can realize what he promises: He is dependent upon many circumstances; and he is even dependent upon the willingness of him to whom the promise is made to receive what is promised. I can offer a man a thousand dollars. But if he refuses, the offer is vain. But a promise is different from a mere offer. A promise is a declaration, written or verbal, which binds the person that makes it to do or to forbear to do the very thing promised. It is an engagement, regardless of any corresponding duty or obligation on the part of the person to whom the thing is promised. A promise, therefore, implies the declaration of a certain good, together with the positive assurance that this good shall be bestowed upon or performed in behalf of the person to whom the promise is made. This certainty of the promise is, as regards the promise of Scripture, emphasized by the fact that it is God Who makes the promise. God conceived of the promise in His eternal decree. He it is that realizes the thing promised in Christ Jesus our Lord. And He declares the promise. This implies that the promise cannot possibly be dependent on anything outside of God. For God is God. He is sovereign. And His work certainly cannot be contingent upon the will of the creature. And secondly, this signifies that the promise is as faithful and true as God is unchangeable. He will surely realize the promise. When He binds Himself to do or to bestow anything, He is bound by Himself and by all His divine attributes to realize the promise unto them to whom it is made. For He cannot deny Himself. And this idea of the promise necessarily implies that it is made to a definite party. An offer, that is contingent upon the acceptance and consent of the second party, may be general. A promise, that binds the promising party and that is certain of realization, requires a definite second party. And thus it is in Scripture. For the promise is centrally made to Christ, and through Him to the seed of Abraham, to the children of the promise, to those that are called heirs and co-

heirs of the promise. And that this certainly is the idea of the promise is clearly expressed in Scripture. For we read in Heb. 6:13, 14, 17: "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee . . . Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of the promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath." To the heirs of the promise it is certain, because it is rooted in the immutable counsel of the Most High.

3

The Preaching of the Promise

When, however, we speak of the Word of God as a key-power, to open and shut the kingdom of heaven, we do not refer to the promise of God as such, but to the preaching of the promise, or the preaching of the gospel. This is evident from Qu. 83 of the Heidelberg Catechism, where we read: "What are the keys of the kingdom of heaven? The preaching of the holy gospel, and christian discipline, or excommunication out of the christian church; by these two, the kingdom of heaven is opened to believers, and shut against unbelievers." And this is also evident from the answer of the Catechism which we are at present considering. The question is asked, "How is the kingdom of heaven opened and shut by the preaching of the holy gospel? Thus: when according to the command of Christ, it is declared and publicly testified to all and every believer, that, whenever they receive the promise of the gospel by a true faith, all their sins are really forgiven them of God, for the sake of Christ's merits; and on the contrary, when it is declared and testified to all unbelievers, and such as do not sincerely repent, that they stand exposed to the wrath of God, and eternal condemnation, so long as they are unconverted: according to which testimony of the gospel, God will judge them, both in this, and in the life to come."

Now the idea of the gospel is that it is glad news about the promise of God. Glad news of glad tidings is the meaning of the word *evangel*. It is glad news for two reasons: in the first place, because the heirs of the promise, that is, the elect of God, are in the midst of the world, and therefore in the midst of misery and death. In the world they are subject to sin and corruption, to all kinds of suffering and tribulation. The present experience of the heirs of the promise is one of sorrow and grief, of affliction and torment, of misery and groaning. And the promise holds before them the deliverance from their present state of misery and destitution. And secondly, the gospel is glad news because of the unspeakably great

riches of the inheritance that is promised. For the promise holds before the heirs not such a deliverance from sin and death as will restore them to a former state and condition of bliss, but fills their hearts with a hope of glory such as never was conceived in the heart of man. It stands to reason that this glad news concerning the promise could only be imparted by Him that conceived of the promise, that is, God. God proclaims the promise. He preaches the gospel through Jesus Christ our Lord. The gospel that speaks of things which eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and which have never been conceived in the heart of man, can only come through revelation. But this revelation of God, this divine proclamation of the gospel, always took place through the agency of men. Hence, he is a preacher of the gospel who can with authority declare in the name of God glad news about the promise, about its certainty of fulfillment, about its riches of blessings, about its progress and the realization of it in history. All through the history of the world there are in the world heirs of the promise. And they know the promise. They are anxious about it, long for its realization. They inquire about its contents and the nearness of its fulfillment. And he that can answer this anxious inquiry, and bring some glad news about the promise was, and still is, a preacher of the gospel.

It is this preaching of the gospel, according to the Heidelberg Catechism, which is one of the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

What is preaching? For a complete answer to this question I may refer you to the Triple Knowledge, Vol. V, pp. 29, ff. Here it is sufficient if I only recapitulate briefly what I wrote in that connection. First of all, preaching, as has been explained above, is the proclamation of the gospel. And the gospel is the sure promise of God concerning salvation to the heirs of the promise. The contents of the preaching, therefore, may be nothing else than the gospel of Jesus Christ, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures. Secondly, preaching is *authoritative* proclamation of that gospel. For the preacher is an ambassador, one that is sent to proclaim glad tidings of good things, the things that are promised in the gospel of Jesus Christ. Thirdly, for that very reason, it is the church that preaches the gospel. For she only can speak with authority as the one that is sent. And that church proclaims the gospel through its official ministry. And finally, preaching is such official proclamation of the gospel of Jesus Christ in the service of the living Word of God through Christ. Especially the last element of our definition of preaching is important here. For it is only through the powerful and living Word of Christ Himself that preaching can possibly be or become a key to open or shut the kingdom of heaven. As we

have said before, it is not in the power of any man either to open or to shut that kingdom. Only Christ has the keys. But it pleases Him to exercise that power of the keys through men, through the apostles, and through the church which is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets. And therefore, through the preaching Christ speaks His own efficacious and living Word. And it is only because it pleases Christ to speak His own Word, that the preaching becomes effective as a key-power.

From all this it will be evident that if the preaching of the gospel is to be a power to open and to shut the kingdom of heaven, it can never be a well-meaning offer of salvation. The promise must be preached. It must never be offered. Thus it is also constantly presented in Scripture. Jesus *preaches* the gospel of the kingdom. Matt. 4:23; 9:35; 24:14. Paul *preached* the gospel among the Gentiles. Gal. 2:2. He preached the gospel of God among the Thessalonians. I Thess. 2:8-9. Or, he spake unto them the gospel of God with much contention. I Thess. 2:2. Or again, he testified of the gospel of the grace of God. Acts. 20:24. And frequently also the word *evangelize*, or to declare glad tidings, is used to denote the preaching of the gospel of God in Christ. I Cor. 15:1; II Cor. 11:7; Gal. 1:11; Rev. 14:6. But never do we find in all the Word of God that the gospel is offered, or that it presents the promise of God as a well-meaning offer of salvation to all that hear the preaching of the gospel. If the promise of God were for all men, there would be no distinctive preaching of the gospel possible. There would be an opening of the kingdom of heaven, but no shutting of that kingdom. Nor is preaching of the gospel as a key of the kingdom of heaven possible when it is conceived as an offer, as a well-meaning offer on the part of God to all that hear. For in that case the preaching presents the door of the kingdom of heaven as always standing wide open. In that case the preaching does not open the gate, but man simply enters the kingdom of heaven by his own free will. And again, in that case the preaching does not shut the gate of the kingdom of heaven, but it is closed by man, that rejects the offer and refuses to enter in. For an offer is a conditional proposition: it depends and is contingent on its consent by man. And, let me emphasize that if the gospel were such a well-meaning offer on the part of God, dependent on the will of man, no man would ever enter into the kingdom of heaven. If the promise were the preaching of a conditional offer, there is nothing in the condition which man can possibly fulfill. He cannot of himself believe the promise. He cannot even will of himself to believe in Christ. He cannot repent and turn, unless God first realizes the promise unto him. And therefore, the promise of God in the preaching of the gospel is either

unconditional, or it is impossible of realization. But the preaching is never an offer of salvation to all men. The promise is not given to all, according to Scripture, but to the seed of Abraham, to those that are of Christ, to them that are in sovereign grace elected unto salvation from before the foundation of the world.

H. H.



INGEZONDEN

Sioux Center, Iowa

Geachte Ds. Hoeksema:

Daar U vraag I niet goed verstaat of er liever geen antwoord op wilt geven, zal ik hem toelichten en er het antwoord op geven.

Inderdaad! Hoe onderscheiden zich genade en zonde? De zonde verscheurt en verdeelt, genade verbindt en vereenigt. De zonde brengt Babel voort, de genade brengt Pinkster.

De zonde doet Kain zeggen: ben ik mijns broeders hoeder? maar genade brengt, als in Ezechiëls gezicht, de verstrooide beenderen bijeen. De geloovigen treden, ook in het zichtbare, als kerk op, omdat de Kerk vrucht is van genade, en als zoodanig saambindt en een levend protest is tegen de zonde, die verscheurt, verbijt en verzet. Daarom is scheuring maken in het lichaam van Christus ook zoo'n groot kwaad!

Aangaande vraag 2: De Kerkenordening zegt in Artikel 41: De Classicale vergaderingen zullen bestaan uit genabuurde Kerken, dewelke elk een Dienaar en een Ouderling ter plaatse en tijd bij hen in 't scheiden van elke vergadering goedgevonden daarhenen met behoorlijke Credentie afvaardigen zullen. Dus dat is een Dienaar die in een gemeente is, en niet een emeritus leeraar of een Professor heeft daartoe het recht. Dat is hier zoo in de Chr. Ger. Kerken, en ook zoo in de Geref. Kerken in Nederland, en ik denk ook zoo in de Geref. Kerken in Nederland, onderhoudende Artikel 31.

CORRECTIE

Dan hebt U een onjuistheid in The Standard Bearer: The Legality of the Declaration. Dat de Synode van Utrecht in 1905 five conclusions had aangenomen. Ik heb hier voor mij het rapport van de praeadviseerende commissie op de Utrechtsche Synode ingediend. Dat eene Generale Synode over deze geschillen geen beslissende uitspraak *doen kan of mag*. Het verschil van inzicht toch, dat aan deze leergeschillen ten grondslag ligt, vindt zijn oorzaak in de beperktheid van ons menschelijk kenvermogen.

Met hoogachting verblijf ik

Uw d.w. dienaar en broeder

Wm. Pelskamp

P. S. Mag ik U verzoeken om dit ook in The Standard Bearer te plaatsen?

OUR DOCTRINE

The Hexaemeron or Creation-Week

(9)

THE CREATION OF MAN (2)

We were busy at the conclusion of our preceding article with the question: Why did Jehovah form Eve as He did? Why did the Lord not form her out of the dust of the ground and breathe into her nostrils the breath of life? And we made the observation that Scripture's answer to this question is two-fold. First, Holy Writ would emphasize the truth that the woman is of the man and therefore subservient to him. And we promised to give the second part of this answer in this article.

In the second place, that the woman has been taken out of the man is also to emphasize another Scriptural truth which is expressed, as one might expect, in the New Testament. We now refer to that beautiful passage of Ephesians 5:22-33 which we have already quoted. It is not our intention to dwell at length upon this beautiful portion of Holy Writ. All we wish to do at this time is call attention to the fact that even as the woman is out of the man so also the Church is out of Christ Jesus, and that is undoubtedly the reason why the Lord created Eve as He did. Eve's creation proclaims to us a beautifully striking symbolism. The apostle himself directs us to this thought in Eph. 5, especially in the verses 30-33 which we again quote: "For we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church. Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband." Even as Eve owes her existence to Adam, through the almighty power of the living God, so also the Church owes her existence, through the same Divine omnipotence, to the Lord Jesus Christ, Who loved us and died for us and rose for us, and out of Whom we are what we are, even now and forever. All things were created as a mighty symbol of the spiritual and heavenly reality of all things. To this we have called attention repeatedly in the past, also in this series of articles. This also applies to the creation of Eve. And this is also the reason why people of the living God should never indulge in such silly practices as Leap Year practices, when the girl "goes after" the man. The Church never seeks the Christ; it is always the Christ Who seeks His Church. A man and his wife should always try

to be a pattern of the beautiful relationship which exists between Christ and His Church. This relationship must never be reversed, be it in the natural or in the spiritual sense of the word. The line of salvation is always vertical and it always runs from the top to the bottom.

HIS HIGH NOBILITY

Dichotomy or Trichotomy?

What is meant by this distinction as such? The dichotomist maintains that man consists of two, and only two, distinct parts, namely, body and soul. Trichotomy, on the other hand, contends that man consists of three distinct parts: body, soul, and spirit. The dichotomist, of course, is aware of the fact that Scripture uses the term, "spirit," in addition to "body" and "soul," but declares that the "spirit" must not be regarded as a distinct part of man's human nature or being.

It may be of interest to observe that we can also speak of a dichotomy or trichotomy of the soul. Dichotomy with respect to the soul contends that the soul must be viewed as consisting of merely two parts: mind and will. And the trichotomist maintains that the soul must be regarded as consisting of three parts: mind, will, and feeling or emotion. Hence, the trichotomist advocates that man's feeling or emotion must be viewed as a distinct faculty of the soul. He ascribes equal (if not greater) significance to this aspect of man's life. It is surely not difficult to show that this conception can be and is extremely dangerous. To be sure, we do not deny the existence of feeling or emotion in man. But we do deny that man's emotion is a third and separate faculty of the soul. Emotion is a tremendous thing. The dictionary informs us that this word is derived from a word which means: to move out, stir up, agitate. We repeat: the emotion of man is and can be a tremendous factor. This applies to the life of an individual and also to the life of a nation. It is for this reason that the press plays such a vital role in times of war. The people must become war-conscious! The emotions of the people must be set on fire! The populace must be aroused! We are told that this constitutes one of the basic elements in the training of a soldier. An aroused soldier will rise to greater heights. However, herein lies also the danger of emotionalism. The ascription of a separate faculty to the emotion of man is the fundamental error of all false mysticism. The important question, according to this conception, is: how do we feel? They lay all the emphasis upon an experiential knowledge of Christ and salvation. To be sure, we do not wish to deny this experiential knowledge. We must certainly know whether we are the children of the living God. And

who among us would dare to deny that the greatness of salvation should not fill our hearts and minds with a tremendous emotion? It is hardly possible that the tremendous reality of salvation through faith in Christ Jesus and out of sovereign grace can leave a Christian cold and "emotionless!" The salvation of God in Christ Jesus must surely "fill" us, must it not? But, it is an extremely dangerous thing to ascribe to the emotion a separate faculty, to separate it from the mind and the will. This, we have said, is the fundamental error of the false mystic. He lays all emphasis upon the feeling. He divorces this feeling from the mind. He relies upon the "inner voice," and, divorcing this inner experience from the mind, he also minimizes and ignores the Scriptures as the sole source of all our knowledge of salvation. He does not merely ascribe equal significance to the emotion or feeling of man, but elevates it above the will and the mind. He regards the Scriptures as a dead letter, does not regard the speech of the Lord as it comes to us through His Word. He does not understand that all living and experiential knowledge of salvation is ours only through the Scriptures. And the inevitable result in those circles is exactly that there is much uncertainty and doubt with respect to the blessed and conscious knowledge of salvation. This must be. False mysticism denies the element of Divine revelation. God has revealed Himself as the God of our salvation only in the Holy Scriptures. To deny this must have for its result that we deprive ourselves of the only medium through which we can attain unto the blessed conscious knowledge of the living God. Man's emotion must not be divorced from the mind and the will but must be controlled by them. We do not believe, therefore, in a trichotomy of the soul.

However, we also speak of dichotomy or trichotomy with respect to man's human nature or being. In our appraisal of this question we may remark the following. First, the Reformed conception favors Dichotomy as the teaching of Holy Writ with respect to this matter. Trichotomy, we are told, originated in Greek philosophy and generally found no favour among those of Reformed thinking. Secondly, that the Scriptures distinguish between soul and body can hardly be denied. We certainly read that man's body can die, whereas his "soul" or "spirit" continues to lead a conscious existence, either in life or in death. The Preacher emphasizes, does he not, that when the body returns to the dust the spirit returns unto God Who gave it? And the Lord speaks of those who are able to kill the body but cannot destroy the soul. Besides, the Lord Jesus commends His spirit into the hands of His Father when He is about to die and His body is about to be laid in the grave. And do we not read in the Book of Revelation of the "souls of them that were

beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God . . . and that they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years?" Rev. 20:4. One can therefore hardly deny that the Scriptures make distinction between the body and the soul.

However, in connection with this question of Dichotomy or Trichotomy we also wish to remark the following. First, the word "soul" does not always have the same connotation in Holy Writ. It is used in Scripture, e.g., to denote the entire man, as in Gen. 46:26: "All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, all the souls were threescore and six." Secondly, the word "soul" is used in Holy Writ as including the life of the body. This is evident from passages such as John 10:11, 17, 18; Matt. 16:25-26; John 12:25, and we quote: "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. Therefore doth My Father love Me, because I lay down My life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of My Father . . . For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? . . . He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." In all these passages the original word, also when translated "life", is the word "soul", and it is evident that the life of the body is included here. It must be obvious that when a man tries to save his life he is also trying to save the life of his body. Thirdly, even when we distinguish between soul and body, we must bear in mind that the Scriptures constantly speak of man as a unity. Man is not a soul within a body, so that we must conceive of these parts of man's being as existing independently of or parallel to each other. Man, according to the Word of God does not merely have a soul; he is a living soul. This is evident, first of all, from Gen. 2:7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." This text does not mean that God first created the body out of the dust of the earth and then created his soul by breathing into his nostrils the breath of life. We do not read: And then man became a living soul, but: And man became a living soul. He became a living soul by this two-fold act of the Lord which also includes his being formed out of the dust of the earth. And, secondly, according to the Scriptures every act of man is seen as an act of the whole man. It is not merely the soul of man that sins, but it is man that sins; it is not the body that dies but

it is man that dies. And neither is it merely the body that is redeemed by and in Christ, but it is man that is thus redeemed, body and soul. And therefore we may conclude that Holy Writ constantly emphasizes the truth that man is a unity, is one, body and soul. It is also for this reason that mere outward acts of men are impossible (as the "Common Grace" theorists would describe the good that sinners do); man sins and serves the living God with all that is in him.

Finally, man's soul and body are wonderfully adapted to each other. Of this we will have more to say when we speak of the image of God in man. But even now we may say the following. Hearing and seeing and tasting and smelling, e.g., are not physical but psychical (of the soul) activities. The ear does not hear, the eye does not see, the tongue does not taste, and the nose does not smell. Nevertheless, although the eye, ear, nose, and tongue do not see, hear, smell, and taste, yet as long as I am in this earthly house of my tabernacle I cannot see, hear, smell and taste without them. The body and soul are marvelously adapted to each other. Man was truly wonderfully made.

The origin of the soul.

We may as well say a few words about this problem now. It is true that this question is often treated in connection with the problem of sin and the organic development of the human race. However, we can also discuss this question now.

We are probably all more or less acquainted with the fact that there are three well-known views in regard to the origin of the soul: Pre-Existentialism, Traducianism, and Creationism. The first theory is known as Pre-Existentialism. This theory contends that the souls of men existed in a previous state. We need not say very much about this theory. The Scriptures surely do not support this conception of a pre-existence of the souls of men, so that all the souls were actually in Adam and that they therefore all sinned in Adam in that literal sense of the word. The text which has been quoted in support of this conception is Rom. 5:12: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." The quotation of this particular passage of Holy Writ was based upon an erroneous interpretation of the last part of the text: "for that all have sinned." This expression was regarded as the ground of that which immediately precedes in the text, that sin and death passed on to all men. This happened because all had sinned in Adam, and this was understood then in the literal sense of the word. However, it is beyond all dispute that this expression must not read: for that all have sinned, but: because of which all sinned. Hence, this expres-

sion does not constitute the ground for that which precedes in the text, but it is the fruit of it. Because sin and death have passed on to all men, therefore it is true that all sin.

The second theory of the origin of the soul is known as Traducianism. According to this theory the souls of men are propagated along with the bodies by generation, and are therefore transmitted to the children by the parents. Hence, the entire man comes therefore from the parents. From the days of Luther Traducianism has been the prevailing view of the Lutheran Church. In support of this theory of Traducianism can be quoted the argument which revolves about mental peculiarities and family traits. Children are so often like unto their parents, resemble them also as far as psychial (of the soul) characteristics are concerned. In addition to this argument one may also argue in support of Traducianism that it offers the best explanation for the inheritance of moral and spiritual depravity and corruption, which is after all a matter of the soul rather than of the body. Traducianism, therefore, seems to explain the corruption of the entire human race as out of the one man. Does it not teach that the souls of men are propagated along with the bodies by generation and are therefore transmitted to the children by the parents? However, Traducianism has not escaped unscathed. Several objections have been lodged against this conception. It has been said that Traducianism is contrary to the doctrine of the simplicity of the soul. The soul, then, is a purely spiritual substance and does not admit of division. But, the propagation of the soul would seem to imply that the soul of the child separates itself from the soul of the parents. And, if the soul is propagated by generation and therefore transmitted to the children from the parents, would this not necessarily imply that the soul does admit of division inasmuch as it is separated from the parents? Besides, then the difficult question also presents itself: Does the soul originate from the soul of the father or that of the mother, or of both? This philosophical argument which concerns the propagation of the human soul is something which we are not able to discuss. This we do not hesitate to admit. An argument, however, which can be lodged against Traducianism is that which revolves about the Christ. If, as Traducianism teaches, the entire man comes from his parents, what must we say about Jesus? He assumed an impersonal human nature, was not *personally* human. Hence, not being a human person, He therefore did not become a full and complete man. Traducianism claims that the whole man, person and nature, body and soul, is conceived and born from the parents. Christ, however, was not a human person. Hence, He must have assumed an incomplete human nature.

The third theory of the origin of the soul is known as Creationism. This conception maintains that each individual soul is to be regarded as an immediate creation of the living God, that it owes its origin to a direct creative act, although it cannot be determined when this act occurs, whether at birth or at conception or between birth and conception. The soul is supposed to be created pure but united with a depraved body. Men of Reformed thinking and persuasion preferred Creationism almost without exception. However, serious objections can also be lodged against this conception of the origin of the soul. First, Creationism does not explain the organic development of sin. If it be true that the soul is separately created and then united with a depraved human body, how does it become corrupt? Does it become corrupt through contact with a corrupt body? But, is corruption, then, physical, material, inasmuch as a corrupt body corrupts a pure soul? Besides, is it Scriptural that my soul becomes corrupt through contact with my body, or is it corrupt because of Adam, my first parent? Besides, Creationism does not explain the phenomenon that children resemble their parents, also psychically. Characteristics of the soul, traits of character, etc., are often transmitted from the parents to the children. But how is this possible if we do not receive our souls from our parents, as the theory of Creationism would have us believe. Our own Reverend Hoeksema offers us another solution of this problem in his book: *In the Midst of Death*. However, this quotation must wait until our following article.

H. Veldman



Attention: Consistories

The Board of the RFPA decided at their last board meeting to send THE STANDARD BEARER to all the young men of our demoniation who are in the Armed Forces. Will you please forward their names and addresses to Mr. John Bouwman, 1350 Giddings Ave., S.E., Grand Rapids 6, Mich. Also PLEASE KEEP US INFORMED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESSES.

THE BOARD

THROUGH THE AGES

The Arminian or Remonstrant Struggle

In our previous article we were occupied with the principal section of the "Remonstrations" of Wtenbogaert and his party—the Remonstrants—a section in which they set forth their own beliefs regarding the points of doctrine in dispute.

The close of the "Remonstrations" contains a number of requests.

"That their noble Lords be pleased to give to these things their full attention, according to the authority given them of God in all matters ecclesiastical as High Christian rulers of these lands and churches; and doing so, first to see to it that—considering that their noble Lords are acknowledged by all to be such as to whom is due supreme supervision and highest jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical and worldly under God and according to his Word (which point they well understand to be such as according to God's Word must be taught and explained)—(that) in a lawful gathering of synod, to be held under the authority, presidency, guidance, co-judgment, and moderatorship of the States Lords, the Remonstrants, their reasons having been properly considered, be given a full hearing, and the aforesaid doctrines be more closely examined and investigated; or else that the Remonstrants and the other Reformed ministers from both sides bear and endure each the other in these matters without anyone being suspected, suspicioned, outlawed or in the least troubled on account of the aforesaid doctrines as explained on either side—be that one in the service of the church or in the service of the state or still to be called to either of these services—that he be not troubled no more for the present than in the future; or else, if they do not want to do this, that then they instruct us better from God's Word, further their request and petition is that it please their noble Lords to take them under their protection against all church censure that on account of this their Remonstrations and the stigma thereof might be proclaimed against them jointly or against any of them separately."

Dat Hunne Edel Mogenden gelieven op al deze dingen, volgens de Autoriteit, die hun in kerkelijke zaken als Hooge Christelijke Overheden dezer landen en kerken, door God verleend is, rijpelijk te letten, en dit doende, voor eerst te maken

dat—aangezien immers Hunne Edelmogenden bij een iegelijk erkend worden voor degenen, wien het opperste opzicht en het hoogste gezag over Kerkelijke en wereldlijke zaken, onder God, naar zijn woord toekomt (welk punt zij ook verstaan alzoo naar Gods woord geleerd en gehandhaaft te moeten worden)—(dat) zij, Remonstranten, in een wettige Synodale vergadering—onder de autoriteit, voorzitting, beleid, medeoordeel en moderatie der H. H. Staten te houden—volkomen gehoord worden en, hun redenen behoorlijk overwogen zijnde, de voorschreven leerstukken nader worden ingezien en ondezocht, of ook dat de Remonstranten en de andere Gereformeerde Predikanten malkander van weerszijden hierin dragen en dulden, zonder dat voorts iemand, hij zij in kerk- of scholdienst, zoo min voor het tegenwoordige als het toekomstige, zoo min voor hen, die alreede deze diensten vervullen, als voor hen, die er nog toe geroepen zullen worden, om de voorzeide leerpunten, zooals ze hiervoor ter weerszijden verklaard staan, gesuspiceerd, gewraakt of in 't minste bezwaard zal worden, of, zoo men dat niet doen wil, men ons uit het woord Gods beter onderrichte: met verder verzoek en bede aan Hunne Edel Mogenden, dat hun gelieve, hen te nemen onder H.E.M. tegen alle Kerkelijke censure, die, ter oorzaak van deze hunne Remonstrantie met den aankleve van dien, tegen hen gezamenlijk of tegen iemand hunner in 't bijzonder zou mogen worden uitgesproken."

Rightly considered, this closing section contains the sixth article of faith of the Remonstrants, a faith or conception according to which the civil government is under God the head also over all things in the church. As was explained in another connection, in this conception the christian state and its citizenry is the church and the church is the state, and in this christian commonwealth the sole ruler under God is the civil government. Consistories are allowed but only as so many executive committees of the government. As has also been explained, the conception goes by the name of Erastianism. The request of Wtenbogaert and his party was that the government make the conception its own and act upon it, first by declaring the Confessions to be in error and on this account devoid of power to limit the teaching ministry in its interpretation of the Scriptures, and then second by ordering the clergy of both camps to tolerate each other respecting their doctrinal differences.

Once having become known, this secret "Remonstrations" could be counted on to arouse the ire of the Calvinists such as Gomarus. Fully aware of this and fearing the wrath of their opponents, Wtenbogaert and his party also petition their government to take them under the protection against all church censure.

The concluding part of the "Remonstrations" is a protest.

"In closing the Remonstrants protest before God and His holy congregation and likewise before their noble Lords and even before the whole world that this our doing by no means tends towards any partisanship, strife, separation, or schism, be it in church or state, much less toward any change in the religion, but that their only purpose is to free them-

selves, by this candid, voluntary disclosure and declaration of their sentiments, from all strange suspicions by which they now for some time abroad and here at home have been troubled; (and) to request correction (of the confessions—O) or better instruction (in the same—O) or at any rate forbearance on both sides and peace and love; or in case against all hope and expectation they could obtain neither and as a result could no longer with good conscience and in peace perform their public services, they in that event by order of their government will leave them in order henceforth to serve God and their neighbor according as they in good faith and in full submission to their government will find it proper to do.”

“Remonstranten protesteeren ten slotte voor God en Zijne heilige gemeente misgaders voor uwe Edelmogenden, ja voor de gansche wereld, dat dit ons doen geenszins strekt tot eenige partijschap, tweedracht, afzondering of scheuring, ’t zij in Kerk of Staat, veel minder tot eenige verandering in de Religie; maar dat hun bedoelen anders niet is dan zich van vreemde suspicien, waarmede ze nu geruimen tijd zoo binnen als buiten ’s Lands, bezwaard geweest zijn, met deze ronde, vrijwillige opening en verklaring van hun bedenken, te bevrijden; verbetering of betere onderrichting, of althans duldigheid ter weerszijden, en vrede en liefde te verzoeken; of zoo zij, tegen alle hoop en verwachting geen van beiden kunnen verwerven en diensvolgens hun publieke diensten niet langer met een goed geweten en met vrede zouden kunnen vervullen, zij dan op bevel der Overheid gewillig afstand daarvan zullen doen, om dan voorts God en den naaste te dienen, zooals zij in goeden gemoede, altijd zonder kwetsing van de onderdanigheid, die ze de Overheid schuldig zijn, zullen bevinden te behooren”

Having now before us the “Remonstrations” in its entirety, it may be well to state in their order the several petitions contained in it—let us take notice, petitions directed by its author and signatories to *their government*.

1. A petition to the effect that *their government* authorize a revision of the Confessions, that is, order the Confessions to be changed and this despite the fact that they had been officially adopted by the churches.

2. A petition to the effect that *their government* wait with the calling of a national synod until a synod could be convened willing to do their bidding (change the Confessions).

3. A petition to the effect that *their government* make an end of the Confessions as a limiting instrument in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures and thus allow the teaching ministry to explain the Scriptures as it pleased and this on the ground that the Confessions belong to a species of writings from the nature of matters always in error.

4. A petition to the effect that *their government* make room in the churches for their peculiar doctrinal

tenets (heresies) by outlawing the Confessions in their present form.

5. A petition to the effect that *their government* acknowledge itself to be under God the head also over all things in the church and assert itself accordingly; thus a petition that *their government* pronounce the Reformed Church Order that the churches had officially adopted null and void and replace it by the Erastian.

Every one of these petitions is contained in the “Remonstrations” either as clearly enough expressed or as suggested.

Finally the manifest aim of the “Remonstrations” in its introduction was to make it appear that the God of the Calvinists’ is the fatum of the pagan religion of the Romans, who spins the thread of men’s lives arbitrarily without rhyme, reason and purpose, and that thus the Calvinists’ doctrine of predestination—election and reprobation—is fatalism pure and simple.

Yet despite these their petitions and this their aim, Wtenbogaert and his party in the closing section of their “Remonstrations” could communicate to their government sentiments such as these: “The Remonstrants protest before God and His holy congregation . . . that this our doing by no means tends toward partisanship, strife, separation, schism . . .” and “but their purpose is peace and love . . .” Peace and love indeed but on their terms, of course. They say, too, in this closing section of their “Remonstrations” that their purpose is forbearance. But we shall see of how much forbearance they themselves were capable.

There is now this question. Did the government yield to Wtenbogaert and his party? As we shall see, the government yielded to the Remonstrants on every point. Relentlessly did it strive to put into execution all their petitions.

Wtenbogaert immediately placed the “Remonstrations” in the hands of the States Counsel, Oldenbarnevelt. But the document as to the thrust of its content must have frightened him. For it was not until a half year thereafter that he was able to muster sufficient courage to submit it to his government and then as a piece not meant for publication. Not that he was at variance with the aims of the Remonstrants. These aims had his full sympathy. But he feared the reaction of the Calvinists.

Also Wtenbogaert evidently thought it wise to proceed with caution. When the “Remonstrations” was still locked in the cabinet of Oldenbarnevelt he wrote and published a tract in which he strove to provide the sixth article of his “Remonstrations” with proof from the Scriptures and from history. Doubtless his purpose was to feel out his countrymen before allowing his secret doing to become known. The States of Holland

were highly pleased with his production. To their minds its argument was irrefutable and they commanded the classis and the curators to see to it that no one openly write against it.

The indignation of the Calvinists at being thus mandated by their government was great. And they did not keep silence. Fact is that through the years Wtenbogaert had completely reversed himself. Twenty years previous in a sermon on Joh. X:3 "To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear his voice: and he calleth his own sheep by name and calleth them out" he had championed the principle of the autonomy of the church with reference to the government and accordingly had set forth the government merely as an executive committee of the church and had thus allowed it simply the right to cooperate with the church and to approbate and execute her resolutions. How Wtenbogaert had changed? But so it goes. Nevertheless it raises the question what in the world had come over Wtenbogaert, this court-preacher of the Prince. This sermon was published, needless to say, to the great embarrassment of Wtenbogaert.

There were several assailants of Wtenbogaert's argument. But the reasonings, however well-meant, were not always correct. So one, Van Mehen, set forth the view in which he coordinated under God the high government (for example in this land of ours the president and the congress in contradistinction to, let us say, the state governors) and Christ as the head of His church, and thereby proclaiming the legal parity of the two. As the lower lay rulers (the state governors) are subject to the president and the congress, so the rulers in the church, and they only, are subject to Christ. Such was here the conception. But the Scriptures teach us differently. According to Holy Writ, Christ is not coordinate with the high government but as seated at God's right hand and thus under God its supreme Lord. The Potentate of potentates is He, and as such also the head over all things in the church which He rules by His Spirit and His Word. Not only the rulers in the church but the rulers in the state as well are subject to Christ, He being the Lord of lords and the King of kings as well as the king of His church.

The government by now had adopted measures for protecting the Remonstrants against any action that the churches might want to take against them. It forbade the convocation of synods. It sent the classes the five articles of the Remonstrants and required that they regard them as not being in conflict with the sentiment of the church. In examining the students no one might sound them regarding their attitude toward these articles. The ministers were commanded to remain silent in the preaching respecting "the high mysterious points that at the present time were being

disputed far too much" and to bear one another in love.

In the mean time the secret doing of Wtenbogaert and his party, their addressing to their government a secret "Remonstrations", had become known, definitely to the synodical deputies of North and South Holland. Their informants were the States-members of Amsterdam and Dordrecht.

These deputies met together, Aug. 3, 1610. Together they read and appraised the "Remonstrations" of Wtenbogaert. Jointly they decided to appose to it a writing known to posterity as "The Contra-Remonstrations." On the 10th of November they appeared with their document on the meeting of the States and let it be known by their spokesman Plancius that they were prepared in a lawful synod to prove that the articles of Wtenbogaert's "Remonstrations" were in conflict with the Word of God and with the Confession and the Catechism. Whereas these articles had never been examined in any lawful ecclesiastical gathering, they requested the States not to impose them on the churches, but rather to convoke a synod for the investigation of these articles.

The Lords of the States were of the opinion that a Provincial Synod could as yet serve no good purpose, but if the aggrieved ministers had need of proving that the V articles militated against God's Word, opportunity would be given them so to do in the meeting of the States; let us take notice, in the meeting not of *synod* but of the *States*. So the Lords of the States (government) insisted. The Calvinists yielded the point, though reluctantly; whereupon the *States* decided that each side—Calvinists and Remonstrants—delegate six persons for the discussion of the "points" in a conference to be held in the presence and hearing of the *States*. But the discussion, so the *States* insisted, had to be friendly; it had to be carried on in a spirit of love (These people—Wtenbogaert and Oldenbarnevelt and their party—always and forever were shouting: love! love! love! But at the same time they were selling the truth down the river. So it goes); moreover the purpose of the conference had to be to see if it were possible for the parties to the dispute to understand and bear each other, and if not, they must clearly state their difference, circumscribe, fix, indicate its limits, in order that *their government* might know what next to do.

On the specified day the twelve debaters were assembled with a delegation of the high government (the States General). The Calvinist Hommius surprised his Remonstrant opponents by producing the previously composed "Contra-Remonstrations", which, upon the insistence of his Calvinist colleagues, he was permitted to read when Wtenbogaert had done reading his "Remonstrations". This "Contra-Remonstrations" is an

arresting bit of composition. As freely translated it reads thus:

"Noble, Noble born, potent, exceptionally wise, Mandating Lords! The undersigned, commissioned by the classes to confer with some co-workers in the Gospel reply to the contention of the Remonstrants as follows: that the Remonstrants are sorely mistaken in thinking that they have not occasioned the rumors that they strive after a change in the doctrine. The only explanation of the present unrest is that some ministers oppose their peculiar opinions to the general sentiment of the church, and that they have never been willing to give a candid and open statement of their opinions, much less to submit themselves to the judgment of the churches. They cause themselves to be suspected not only by their insistence on the revision of the Confession and the Catechism but especially by allowing it to be said that they have something new while refusing to reveal in any classical meeting what it is. We, too, admit that the Confessions as to their authority and worth may not be compared with the Holy Scriptures; he who says differently wrongs us. But considering that all sects abuse God's Word by using it as a covering for their opinions, It is highly necessary for the better preservation of peace and unity that the Church possess some general Forms of Unity setting forth what she believe to be the truth of God's Word and by subscription binding on all the ministers in the Church. It is a cause of concern when such general Confessions of the Church are brought under a cloud and disputed about; this is harmful to the church and leads to suppression of the truth. This fruit is discernable also in these lands, where Revision has been sought though there be no need. As a result the common doctrine of the Reformed Churches is being distrusted! If there is something in Catechism or Confession that is in conflict with the word of God or is not in sufficient agreement with it, no one among us is so unwise that he would not admit that the Word of God is the only standard by which all doctrine must be proved; but the error would first have to be pointed out, and this has not been done to this day, despite the fact that the Remonstrants often have been requested and urged so to do.

(continued in the following article)

G. M. Ophoff

IN HIS FEAR

Back To School

(Conclusion)

In our previous article we laid emphasis upon the fact that the path of Christian isolationism is indeed a dangerous one. This implies of course that when this principle of isolation is applied to the department of our life which we describe by the term education, the result is inevitably a dangerous education.

Salutary it is, that we realize this, for especially two reasons. In the first place, it is well to realize thoroughly what we are doing and what we are supporting and what we are seeking. We do not want a movement for Reformed education that is based on anything less than good sound principles, not only, but we do not want a movement for Reformed education that is launched and maintained by parents who do not know and thoroughly understand the principles upon which they stand, and realize full well the consequences of their actions. We must not act blindly in this matter. We must not imagine that from any earthly point of view the outlook is rosy. On the contrary, the more stringently this principle is applied, the darker the outlook becomes. And we must realize this, lest we be disappointed at the results, lest we become discouraged, and lest we be tempted to give up the battle when our position becomes narrow. In the second place, we may certainly to a degree judge the true condition of any movement for Christian education by the amount of opposition it faces in the world and from the world, by the degree of its dangerousness. If in the course of its existence such a movement "finds the going easy", meets with little opposition, experiences little of the dangers which we enumerated, we may be fairly certain that there is something wrong with the movement. We may be certain, because the difference of principle between God's people and the world is a dividing difference, an irreconcilable difference. And the manifestation of two such irreconcilable principles leads inevitably to a constant warfare. Sometimes that warfare may be cold, sometimes hot. Principally it is always hot. And therefore, we may safely conclude that when one or both parties in this warfare put the sword into its sheath, something radical has happened. And that "something" is without fail this, that the movement for Christian education has deserted its principle of isolation, and exchanged it for that of amalgamation.

But all this leads us to the question:

What Really is Safety?

If by the safety of God's people in the world is

meant the safety of our earthly life and existence, then it is indeed dangerous to be spiritually isolationist. Then all the dangers which we depicted in the previous issue of the STANDARD BEARER come into the picture. And they give the lie to the contention that there is any safety in isolation. For it is not only a fact that this principle of isolation calls for financial sacrifice, but that same principle requires that you condemn the world and express that they are not fit to educate your children. From that principle an act of separation flows spontaneously, a confession. You say: "I go forth from you, because I do not want to come into contact with that which is vile and impure. And I do not want my children to be trained by you. They are holy, sanctified, members of God's covenant. And therefore, when I go forth from you, I take my children along, that neither I nor the children whom the Lord has given me may be contaminated by that which is unholy, but that together we may stand before the face of the Lord our God."

And then indeed, from the viewpoint of the earthly it is not safe; and from the viewpoint of the flesh it is dangerous.

We must learn to understand, therefore, that this question of safety and danger is in no sense of the word a relative matter. It is not a question of *safe*, *safer*, or *safest*. Nor is it a matter of choosing between two alternatives: either to be safe now, in the world, in order then to suffer everlasting agonies in hell, or to be in danger now, here, in this life, in order then to be everlastingly safe in the life to come. But in the most fundamental sense there are only two possibilities, safety or danger. And those two possibilities apply to the one man in his one life: that is, a man is either in danger during all of his earthly existence and walks, and then he is walking always further down a dangerous path, until he is carried over the precipice into everlasting danger; or he is safe in all his walk and earthly sojourn, until he finally reaches the perfect and highest manifestation of that safety in the everlasting arms of the Almighty.

For safety is not a question of earthly goods, of earthly riches, of an earthly name, of earthly position, of worldly honor, or even of our earthly life itself. Such is the philosophy of the world—a deceitful and materialistic philosophy that had its origin under the shadow of the tree of knowledge of good and evil in paradise the first. By that philosophy the world is controlled. According to it the world acts. And by it the world goes to destruction. We cannot even qualify the term, and say that this is *temporal safety*. It is no safety at all! For he who would find safety in *things*, mere things, must understand that he not only finally is cast into destruction, but he is *going* progressively further into destruction. He is walking in slippery

places. Would you say that the fool who goes out into the current of the Niagara River, and is being borne inevitably to destruction by that current, is safe, even though he himself may hilariously gloat that he is having a wonderfully easy and fast boat-ride, and though he makes no effort to resist the force of the current that will surely carry him to his death over the falls? No more is the spiritual fool safe, who enjoys being carried by the current of the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eye and the pride of life, finding in that current all the things of this present world, while he is being swept to sure destruction by the swift tide of the very current which he has no desire to resist and which he makes no effort to resist.

Safety is not in things. Things as such have nothing to do with the safety of any man, be he a child of God or a child of the devil. There is only one kind of safety—the safety of being the object of God's favor. To know Him, in Christ Jesus our Lord, to taste His favor, His blessing, His goodness, His grace, His mercy, His lovingkindness which is better than life—that, and that only, is safety. And to be separated from the God of all grace, and instead to be pursued by His wrath and fierce anger—that is danger.

Of these things we must be constantly reminded. For it is so easy for us to be deceived by the philosophy of this present world and by our own deceitful flesh. Before we are aware of it almost, we fall into the error of relativism in regard to this question of safety and danger. And we must understand that the dangers of this spiritual isolation of God's people are but *apparent* dangers, while really our safety is exactly in this isolation, no matter how dangerous it may appear. If we understand this, we cannot attempt the foolish, halting gait of him who essays to walk with one foot in the world and the other in the kingdom of heaven.

Real Safety in Isolation

Hence, it is not when God's people individually, or the church as a whole, are rich and lack nothing and make themselves worthy of the friendship of the world, that they are safe. Exactly then they are lost. And well may we remember the unqualified truth of the words of the Lord Jesus: "He that would save his life shall lose it!"

But it is just when the people of God keep their identity in the midst of the world, when the church remains *church*, when they manifest clearly and unequivocally that they are God's people, of His party—be it with the loss of everything else—that they are safe. Then let the world and the gates of hell rage. As long as God's people do not go under spiritually, they have the victory. And the latter is possible only

in isolation, never in amalgamation. And remember: this principle applies to all of life, education included!

That is the real lesson of church history, of all of sacred history. Israel did not go down to defeat because of her isolation, but exactly then, when it forsook the living God and united with the world. Never do you find any instance in the history of God's old dispensational people in which they were defeated while they faithfully maintained their isolated position. To be sure, the powers of the world raged against them because they were God's people. It was not the intention of Assyria and Egypt and Babylon to assail the people of Israel because they were so apostate. They raged against the people of God. But nevertheless, it was at those periods when Israel forsook the Lord their God, played the harlot with the nations of the world and their idols, and because apostate, that they invariably went down to defeat.

The history of the new dispensation teaches the same lesson. When the church becomes rich, powerful, and influential at the cost of its spiritual identity, then it has lost the battle and laid down its own life. And it is that church that refuses to be swallowed up by the world, either from within or from without, that remains safe and secure.

What is the ground of that safety? Scripture teaches us that they are safe because God is their refuge and because underneath are the everlasting arms.

They are safe, then, not *because* of their isolation. If that should ever be the relation, their safety would be a very insecure and doubtful matter. For at the very best, the isolation of God's people is but very imperfect and characterized by many failures. But they are safe, then—and safe before their own consciousness too—because then it has been realized in them through the Spirit of Christ, "I will be your God, and ye shall be my sons and daughters." For it is God that chose them. He it is Who called them. He it is Who for and in and through them fights the battle, Who maintains His covenant, Who makes them more than conquerors. And He it is Who shall finally reveal that the cause for which they stand by grace, is indeed the cause of the Son of God, which surely hath the victory.

Dwell alone then, you and your children. Do not hesitate to be a separate people also in the sphere of education. But know that this is no cause of the flesh, but a cause of faith.

Then you shall have to "go it alone", yes—but with your God. And He is a sure refuge. With Him you are forever safe. His arms are everlasting! And in Christ Jesus they are underneath you!

Our safety lies in isolation!

H. C. H.

FROM HOLY WRIT

Exposition of Luke 19:1-10

Since this passage of the Word of God is quite lengthy and whereas we all have our Bible to look up this passage we shall not quote it in full, but will limit our quotation to the verses 9 and 10, where we read *"but Jesus said unto him: today is salvation come (happened) to this house, in as much as he also is a son of Abraham. For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost."*

For the proper and correct understanding of this passage from Luke 19, it is of the greatest importance, that we notice carefully what we read in the former Chapter, verse 35. There we read that Jesus is on His way to Jerusalem; that it is His last journey to this city; for now His hour has come that as the Son of Man He will be lifted up, even as Moses lifted up the Serpent in the wilderness. For Jesus took His disciples aside on the way to definitely instruct them in the meaning and purpose of His going up to Jerusalem. He tells them all this, so that when it does come to pass they may understand and believe!

Oh, it is true "they understood none of these things, and this word was hid from them, and they did not know the things said." Later, when Jesus had risen from the dead, He opened their minds that they might know the meaning of the Scriptures, as all is fulfilled in His death and resurrection. Luke 24:26, 27.

Hence, we ought to give the more earnest heed to this word of Jesus spoken to His disciples by the way, and that, too, when we try to understand the meaning of what Jesus is doing by inviting Himself into the house of Zaccheus!

Let us, therefore, try to understand the meaning of what Luke relates to us in the first ten verses of Chapter 19.

It is quite evident, that Luke wishes to impress upon us the note worthiness of a certain man, Zaccheus by name. He tells us the following about this man.

In the first place, we are told about this man that He was a Chief of the Publicans, or Tax Collectors for the Roman government. From the viewpoint of Jewish patriotism this man was on the lowest possible level of society. He is notorious in this city of palm-trees, Jericho. He is known by all the populace as a man, who is a sinner, a notorious sinner, with a very bad reputation. There was no love lost upon him; hated by all was he and esteemed by none. Such a man was Zaccheus in Jericho. That is a matter that Luke vividly portrays to us.

In the second place, we are told that this Zaccheus was rich in this world's goods. He is a man of financial means. He had, no doubt, at times taken money from the people by fraudulent means. He had succumbed many a time to the temptation of the deceit of riches. He probably had a good house and investment, and people cursed him under their breath when they saw his estate. And there was certainly a great deal of reason for their being offended at the wrong deeds of this Zaccheus. And the point that we would have you notice is that this is placed on the very foreground by Luke, the Evangelist.

That this Zaccheus had taken money from the people by black-mail and other illegal means is also confessed by him. Say he to Jesus: "And if I have taken anything from any man by extortion I restore to him fourfold." The conditional sentence that is here employed in the Greek indicates a condition of fact. The fact of extortion is here admitted by Zaccheus. The people certain were not speaking untruth when they said that he was a notorious sinner, (who had robbed nearly everybody in the city with exorbitant taxes).

Now it certainly is a remarkable thing and worthy of special notice, that Jesus, *while on his way to Jerusalem to die on the Cross*, selects this man as the one with whom He will spend the night as guest, is it not? Were there no others? Could he not have tarried under the roof of Bartimaeus, who would, no doubt, gladly have had Him as his guest? And if the aged Timaeus was still living would he not have deemed it a distinct honor to have Jesus of Nazareth at his house, the man who had given sight to his son?

But no, Jesus says: I must abide at your house, Zaccheus!

Pray, what does this mean?

Certainly it cannot imply, that Zaccheus was after all not such a bad man as the people presented him to be, and that Jesus wished to show the people that Zaccheus was not such a bad man after all. Thus, at least, some who reason as those not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God, would present the matter. It is then pointed out that Zaccheus was trying to see Jesus. He made a great attempt to get by a glimpse of Him. Had he not climbed into the fig-mulberry tree by the road-side. Surely this Zaccheus was not wholly bad. Jesus did not enter the house of such an evil man after all. And the people must be taught to have a little more respect for the down-trodden! Such is then the presentation

But *such* is not the meaning of Jesus' action!

What Jesus wished to teach here is the *fundamental purpose of His coming into the world as the Son of man in whom was going to be fulfilled all that was written by the Prophets*.

And when Jesus proceeds to give a very definite

demonstration of this in Jericho, then it is that the thoughts of many hearts are revealed; Christ then becomes the sign that is contradicted, which has been set for a falling and rising of many in Israel, for the glory of Israel and the light of the nations! That Jesus would intentional "go out of His way" to demonstrate this here in Jericho is exactly what the Scriptures abundantly teach us to expect from our Savior in His prophetic-priestly and kingly labors in this humiliation. Does Jesus not, two days hence from this day in which He passed through Jericho, deliberate requisition the ass's colt of one of the citizens of Israel's commonwealth to show the meaning of and to fulfill the prophecy written concerning Himself in Zachariah 9:9 where we read: "Say unto the daughter of Zion, behold thy king cometh unto thee, meek and riding upon an ass's colt, upon the young foal of an ass?" Well, thus it is also in this case. This is a deliberate demonstration of the meaning of His work on the Cross; it speaks of the *very genius of His coming into the flesh to suffer and die*, to reveal the full counsel of God concerning our salvation, and to rule in our hearts by His grace and spirit, so that we should walk in newness of life.

For let us notice the following in the text.

In the first place we repeat that Jesus chooses His demonstration material rather carefully. He chooses the seemingly worst man in town. But such is grace, is it not. Where sin abounds grace does much more abound. Jesus could not have made a better selection. Not that we are judges, but this we simply humbly and thankfully read in the text. He was the Chief of publicans and he was rich! I almost hear Paul say this of himself: for I am the chief of sinners! But these people in Jericho all murmur: He is gone to tarry with a man that is a sinner. Behold, a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners!

In the second place it is evident, that Jesus wishes to reveal Himself as the one in whom grace and truth will become a reality, for when Zaccheus comes to his own defense over against these murmuring fellow-citizens in Jericho with an appeal to fulfilling the *works* of the ceremonial law, then Jesus very firmly brushes this aside as being so much loss and dung compared with the excellency that is in Himself, Zaccheus indeed gave back fourfold to those whom he had defrauded, and he gave half of his goods to the poor. But did he give all that he had as Jesus instructed the rich young ruler as recorded in Luke 18:18-30?

In the third place Jesus Himself tells Zaccheus and all the people and us why He tarries at the house of Zaccheus. It is because the nature of His work as Prophet, Priest and King demands it. He has not come to fill up what was still lacking in the native endeavors of legalists and moralists. He has come into the world

to save that which was perishing under the wrath and curse of almighty God under the burden of the law! He became from a woman and was made under law that He might redeem us perfectly from this curse of the law. That must be manifested here on the way to Jerusalem. Behold the blind receive their sight and the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear and the dead are raised up and the poor and contrite of heart have the gospel preached to them! And blessed is he who is not offended in this Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews who will hang on the tree as the accursed one a week hence, on the place of a Skull!

For in effect Jesus tells Zaccheus, as the great Prophet, that he must not make his defense before the people. Not excuses and self-defense help before God! It is simply the only comfort in life and death that must be the boast of Zaccheus; that he is not his own, but that he belongs to this faithful Savior, Jesus of Nazareth, who will fulfill all the Promise of God to Abraham and to his Seed in His death and resurrection. That must be the humble boast of Zaccheus.

Zaccheus must say: I have defrauded the people. But by the stripes of this Jesus I am healed. God gives me repentance and thus He heals me with the leaves of the Tree of life which are for the healing of the nations. God comes to save His own people. This people is hopelessly lost up to the very moment. Nay not simply some outstanding evil in the past as superficial people and hypocrites judge, but hopelessly lost in sin, being dead through trespasses and sins. That is what Zaccheus must say.

Why did salvation come to the house of Zaccheus? Why did Zaccheus wish to see Jesus? Why must Jesus call Zaccheus out of the fig-mulberry tree? Is it not because this Zaccheus and his entire house also are sons and daughters of Abraham, the father of believers, and of Sarah, the Jerusalem above?

Ah, Zaccheus take now the shoes from off thy feet for the ground upon which thou standest is holy ground. Jehovah hath seen thy plight as He has seen the plight of all the children of election, steeped in sin by nature, hopelessly lost! Does Jesus of Nazareth, the I-shall-be who I-shall-be here not step across the threshold of thy dwelling to save thee and thy entire house simply because He foreknew thee in sovereign love, and because by virtue of this love He has promised to save thee completely?

Presently this Jesus will surely make His "Exodus" at Jerusalem when He will deliver Zaccheus and all the filthy sinners from their Egypt of sin to bring them to the glory of grace and truth. Then will the shackles of self-righteousness fall and all the righteousness of law will be so much loss and dung for the excellency of Christ Jesus in His saving the lost.

And Zaccheus will stand no more than two months

later in the church at Jerusalem with those who gave their all; sold their possessions to give to the poor. Bartimeaus will not need to sit begging by the wayside. Zaccheus will be like the widow, who gave her last mite simply because Jesus so completely saves the lost!

G. Lubbers



PERISCOPE

The Synod of 1951 — September-October Sessions

Synod of 1951 has finished her sessions some time ago. As we have given a factual report of the June sessions of this Synod, so again we will give such a factual report.

Synod opens its second series of sessions Wednesday morning, September 26, meeting this time in the basement of the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan. Both Classis East and West were represented by a full delegation. There were a few changes made during the sessions of Synod. Several times Elder delegates found it impossible to be there and were represented by their alternates. And on the second day of Synod Rev. Vermeer received word from his consistory of an accident resulting in death to one of the members of Redlands and it was necessary for him to return to conduct the funeral.

Called to Synod's attention after the opening exercises were two documents, one from Classis West regarding their action on several documents before Synod, and another from Rev. Veldman regarding the provision made for him. Both of these were received for information and no further action was taken.

Synod then began its treatment of the Declaration proper by reading the Declaration together with the Preamble and the amendments suggested by Classis East, as well as Classis East's ground for adoption.

A motion came to the floor "That the Synod declares that the Declaration of Principles as amended by Classis East is the expression of the Three Forms of Unity, with regard to certain fundamental principles, as these Confessions have always been maintained and interpreted by the Protestant Reformed Churches." A substitute motion was allowed, "That Synod treat the Declaration point by point," and the amendment was added, "To determine whether the Declaration is in harmony with the confessions."

After all pertinent material was placed in the hands of the Preadvisory Committee in this matter, for collation and its report rendered Synod began its deliberations on the above motion.



MRS. EFFIE MONSMA
726 FRANKLIN ST. SE.
CITY 7

2 52

Thursday morning the motion was made and supported "That Synod declare that Point I of the Declaration of Principles, as amended by Classis East, is the expression of the Three Forms of Unity, with regard to certain fundamental principles, as these Confessions have always been maintained and interpreted by the Protestant Reformed Churches."

An amendment comes to strike out the "et alii" and to enumerate as follows: "Form for the Administration of Baptism, Form for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, Form of Excommunication, Form of Readmitting Excommunicated Persons, Form of Ordination of the Ministers of God's Word, Form of Ordination of Elders and Deacons, Form for the Installation of Professors of Theology, Form of Ordination of Missionaries, Form for the Confirmation of Marriage Before the Church, and Formula of Subscription." This amendment is carried, which means that instead of reading, "They accept the Liturgical Forms used in the public worship of our churches, such as the Baptism Form, et alii, as confessions of a minor order," the et alii is omitted and the above list is put there instead.

Next a motion is made to strike out the paraphrase and insert the literal "Three Points" in point I of the declaration. This motion however fails to carry.

Next a motion is made to strike out the word promise and insert the word preaching in I B. (This is in the paraphrase of the Three Points and it was pointed out that historically our struggle was exactly against the contention that the preaching is a gracious offer of salvation to all men). This motion was adopted in the afternoon session.

A motion is next offered to amend I D 2 by inserting "believers, that is" following the words, "infallibly lead all the." This paragraph now reads: "That the promise of the gospel is not a gracious offer of salvation on the part of God to all men, nor a conditional offer to all that are born in the historical dispensation of the covenant, that is, to all that are baptized, but an oath of God that He will infallibly lead all the elect unto salvation and eternal glory through faith." This last phrase would then have been changed to read: "... that He will infallibly lead all the believers, that is the elect unto salvation etc." This fails to carry.

An amendment regarding this same part comes, dealing now with the "oath". It suggests that we insert: "A Word of God bound by an oath" following the word but in this section. It would then read: "That the promise of the gospel is ... a Word of God bound by an oath" instead of "That the promise of the gospel is ... an oath of God etc". This amendment fails to carry. Revs. Doezeema and Van Weelden record their positive votes on the above issue.

At the beginning of the Friday morning session Rev. Hoeksema asks for the floor and speaks until 11:00 on the motion. After this an amendment comes: "That the preaching of the Gospel is not a gracious offer of Salvation on the part of God to all men, but the official declaration of the oath of God, that He will infallibly lead all the elect unto eternal salvation through faith." During the discussion of this motion the morning session is ended and finally in the afternoon session it is defeated.

A substitute for the whole motion as amended is now offered as follows: "That Synod expresses that there is nothing objectionable to the Declaration of Principles, Point I and the amendments as adopted on the floor of Synod." An amendment to this substitute for the whole is immediately offered as follows: "Because it is the truth expressed in our confessions." The amendment passes by a vote of 9-7. The amended substitute passes by a slightly larger majority.

A motion now comes to the floor that Synod declare "That Point II of the Declaration as amended by Classis East is the expression of the Three Forms of Unity, with regard to certain fundamental principles, as these Confessions have always been maintained and interpreted by the Protestant Reformed Churches?" During the discussion of this motion the meeting comes to a close.

At the beginning of the Monday morning session Rev. Doezeema requests Synod to state definitely the reasons why it expresses the previous motion and asks that this request be recorded and that Synod's answer be recorded. (This request refers to the motion in the paragraph above). The chair rules this request out of order. Grounds: The procedure to express that the Declaration is in harmony with the Confession properly belongs to the business of Synod. Synod of 1950 placed this matter before the churches, convened in Synod of 1951.

A motion is now made to table further discussion on the contents until Synod takes up the matter of the necessity of the Declaration. This motion is ruled out of order by the Chair on the basis of Synod's decision to treat the Declaration point by point. The ground is given for the above motion that Synod has gone beyond her decision and that by the motion as discussed she virtually adopts the declaration while supposedly comparing it with the Confessions. The ruling of the President declaring the above motion out of order is challenged. The vote to sustain the President is a tie. The President is not sustained. The motion to table is put to a vote and is a tie. The motion is defeated.

(To be continued).

J. Howerzyl.