

THE STANDARD

Bearer

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME XXIX

SEPTEMBER 15, 1953 — GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

NUMBER 21

MEDITATION

Supplication

"Unto thee will I cry, O Lord my rock: be not silent to mee: lest, if thou be silent to me, I become like them that go down into the pit. Hear the voice of my supplications, when I cry unto thee, when I lift up my hands toward thy holy oracle." etc.

—Psalm 28

There is a difference between prayer and supplication.

Prayer is that activity of faith whereby you turn your soul to God as the Fountain of all things, thirsting for Him and very desirous to be filled by Him with all the good things you need for time and eternity.

Supplication is all that, but it is prayer coloured by your distresses, woes, miseries. Also herein that you turn yourself tempestuously toward Him. If I was writing in the Holland language I would say: supplication is that "ge Hem aanloopt als een waterstroom"!

Well, the latter you find in this psalm.

David is in trouble.

As such, it is also a prophecy of the Christ of God, Who poured out His supplication unto God. A fit commentary on that truth you will find in Hebrews 5:7. His prayers and supplications were characterized by "strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death".

Surely, supplication is tempestuous prayer.

And exactly that you will find in this psalm.

Attend unto the opening: To Thee, O Jehovah, do I cry! It is no serene, calm restful prayer that flows from David's lips at this occasion. The matter is urgent.

It is evident in the opening strophes of this song that Jehovah had been silent. There was no help;

the wicked that were around David seemed to have the ascendancy over him.

And David is horribly afraid of a silent God. Such a God is the God of wrath over the wicked. Of them the Lord says: I am silent; and the wicked go down to the pit under the roaring of the Almighty when His silence is explained.

O Jehovah, when I cry unto Thee, do not treat me as Thou dost treat the wicked. In all the crying of the wicked in their distresses there is no answer from the heavens, because Thou art far from them.

But do not treat me thus when I raise the voice of my supplication unto Thy inner sanctuary.

David has his face turned to the place where the Lord dwelled: the holy of holies. Such is the meaning of verse 2.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

David is horribly afraid of being treated like the wicked. It seems as though there was a conspiracy against the anointed of the Lord. There were wicked people that spoke peace to David while evil was in their heart. And David was under condemnation; he seems to have been the victim of a vile plot so that he groaned under the accusation of being "ungodly and a worker of iniquity". Vs. 3.

Now if only Jehovah would have shown that He understood, that He knew that David was innocent: he could have borne it. But Jehovah was silent. Therefore we hear that vanquished cry, "Carry me not away with the ungodly and with the workers of iniquity." For that is exactly the way which God holds with the wicked. For a long time it seems as if there is no God in the heavens: they multiply evil and are pregnant with unrighteousness. And the heavens are silent. Until the Lord comes and takes them away; then they are carried along as with a

flood; a swift recompence is their portion at the time of God's righteous anger.

David dreads this. Therefore his supplications are heard, with a strong crying and tears.

Certainly, it would be Divine equity when the evil-doers were destroyed from the face of the earth. They had deserved it. Their behaviour testified of their hellish origin. Notice: they spoke peace with their neighbors while evil was in their hearts. That action characterized them. That is exactly the behaviour of the devils: deception, foul playing and dissimulation: their deeds were wicked.

Accordingly, David calls for a swift punishment on such evil men. And notice that David asks the Lord for punishment according to strictest justice. He will delight in righteous recompence. Therefore he pleads that God give them according to their evil deeds.

And the deepest reason is that these wicked men do not regard God. They have no eye for all the wonderful work of Jehovah.

Such is also the greatest sin of all. It shows how much they despise God. They act and speak and walk as though there is no God at all, while all things are a loud testimony of Him. The heavens and the earth and all the host of them is like a veritable chorus of voices. They all sing of His wonderful virtues. Even the bodies and souls of the wicked join in with this concert of God's praises. They have occasion to view the work of God's hands in their very being and yet they act as though He is not. It shows the devilish pride of these enemies of David.

And if the voice of created things is glorious so that not even the blindest heathen is without excuse, how shall it fare with them if they have not regarded the works of His hands in salvation? Remember that it is David, the anointed of the Lord, who cries out against these evildoers in this psalm. Note that in verse 8 David is exulting in the fact that God has been the defense of him, the anointed of the Lord. It shows that these evil people have attacked the work of salvation in Israel.

That work of salvation is above all things glorious. These evil men, whoever they may have been, knew about salvation. The beloved of God, for that is the meaning of the name David, was their king. Against him they plotted and meant his hurt. And doing so they had no regard for the work of the Covenant God, Jehovah.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

That, my brethren, is a grievous sin.

And that sin is full-borne when Jesus pours out

His supplications unto the God of His salvation. This psalm fits the complaints of Jesus entirely. He has relived this psalm so many centuries later.

Jesus, our Lord, was in the midst of just such people who would not regard the works of Jehovah's hands. They acted as if God did not exist, although He surely did not leave Himself without witness. Christ, the beloved, could work miracles, do good, bless and save—but they acted as though Jesus was a malefactor. They spoke peace to Him, but evil was in their heart. Think here of that devilish kiss of Judas, the foul mouth of the Sanhedrin.

Yes, we can understand how David calls down God's righteous judgments upon them. Give them, O God, according to their work! And we see also that David was experiencing before the strong supplications of Jesus, standing in the midst of those that hated Him and His Father who sent Him.

And because they will not regard God who works all this beauteous salvation, David knows that God will pull them down and not build them up.

He will pull them down: it shows their lofty pride and arrogance. But God will pull them down and will not build them up. He will build up all those that pour out their supplications before Him.

This last truth as confessed by David in verse 5 seems to bring him to the wonderful outburst of faith and trust in the last verses of the psalm. It is the transition of strong crying to the jubiliant song of praise and adoration.

Note how different is the tenor of his song from verse 6 onward to the end.

Even while David is writing down his strong crying to God, he begins to experience the answer from the God of his salvation.

Blessed be Jehovah, because He hath heard the voice of my supplication. That is the experience of every soul that pours out his heart to God. The faithful Covenant God never slumbers nor sleeps. How could it be otherwise? He has given the Spirit of prayer and supplication to David. And that Spirit always prays according to the will of God.

Now the tenor of the song goes upward and onward.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Jehovah is my defence and my shield. Yes, the wicked will shoot their poisonous arrows to the pure in heart, but God is their defence. He is always as a strong tower round about those that fear Him. He defends them because it is His own cause for which they are suffering. Listen to the song of the church

of all the ages: For Thy sake are we killed all the day long! We are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Therefore God will defend them. And that defence is first of all experienced in the heart. David felt this defense even before he looked up from his document. As he poured out his soul unto God on the written page, God came to him and caused him to sing: In Him my heart trusted and I was helped—therefore my heart greatly rejoiceth! And with my song will I praise Him!

Incidentally, that is also the reason why the Lord seemed first to be a silent spectator. The Lord will send all these trials and temptations to His children so that they may be helped by Him and return to Him in praise and adoration. The Triune Covenant God wants to be all in all. Through the deep way of sin and grace He brings His church to the inner sanctuary of His heart so that they will everlastingly remember it and confess it: Salvation belongeth to the Lord! And that is heaven. It is supreme happiness for the church to stand around the throne and cast their crowns before Him and tell Him that all majesty, strength, power, dominion, glory and honor belong to Him.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

And finally, David's heart is enlarged; he beholds the whole church in the midst of their misery and struggle with the wicked. And seeing the trials of the body of Christ, he prays for them: surely, David is the anointed of the Lord. He is concerned about the people of God and acts as their representative: O help Thy people and bless Thy heritage. And feed them, and bear them up forever!

This final prayer of David again directs us to the fulfillment of David, Jesus Christ our Lord!

Such prayers are uttered by our great High Priest.

Such prayers are uttered by Him when hanging on the accursed tree. It seems as though we hear it again: Help Thy poor people, O Father! Forgive Thine heritage: they know not what they do!

Such prayers are uttered even now, my brother! He ever lives, this better David, this beloved of the Father, to pray for us.

At the right hand of God, Jesus prays. And is always heard. When the night is so dark that you cannot pray any more, He sends His Spirit to pray within you with groanings that cannot be uttered.

So that you may be helped, lifted up upon the Rock, of God's salvation and everlastingly may be to the praises of God!

—G. Vos

THE STANDARD BEARER

Semi-monthly, except monthly during 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 matters relative to subscriptions should be addressed to Mr. J. Bouwman, 1350 Giddings Ave., S.E., Grand Rapids 6, 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: \$4.00 per year

Entered as Second Class matter at Grand Rapids, Michigan

CONTENTS

MEDITATION—

- Supplication 481
Rev. G. Vos

EDITORIALS—

- How the Guardian Defends Heresy 484
Hofman Learns a New Word 486
Rev. H. Hoeksema

OUR DOCTRINE—

- The Triple Knowledge 490
Rev. H. Hoeksema

FROM HOLY WRIT—

- Exposition of I Peter 1:14-16 491
Rev. G. Lubbers

IN HIS FEAR—

- Afraid of the Gospel 493
Rev. J. A. Heys

- The Breach is Widened 495
Rev. H. C. Hoeksema

- Contribution 500
Mr. H. A. Van Putten

- Index to Volume 29 501
Rev. J. Howerzyl

EDITORIALS

How the Guardian Defends Heresy (Continued)

Is the promise given to Solomon according to I Ki. 9 a different promise from that given to Abraham, or, in fact, different from the promise as it is always mentioned in Holy Writ?

Let us consult the text.

In vs. 3 we read: "And the Lord said unto him, I have heard thy prayer and thy supplication, that thou hast made before me: I have hallowed this house, which thou hast built, to put my name there for ever; and mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually."

Principally this is the promise of God's everlasting house, of His eternal tabernacle with men.

In vs. 5 we read this promise: "Then I will establish the throne of thy kingdom upon Israel for ever, as I promised to David thy father, saying, There shall not fail thee a man upon the throne of Israel."

Here we have the promise of the eternal kingdom of God in the line of the seed of David.

Now the repeated reference in the text to David refers to II Sam. 7. This chapter speaks of the intention of David to build the Lord a house. He reveals his intention to Nathan, the prophet; and the prophet answers the king: "Go, and do all that is in thine heart; for the Lord is with thee." But the Lord countermanded the expressed intention of the king as well as the consent given by the prophet. The latter must return to David and bring him the word of the Lord that not he but his Son shall build the house of the Lord. And it is in this connection that the promise is given to David: "And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever."

That this is the same promise as the one given to Solomon according to I Ki. 9 is clear. Solomon is, in the first place, the son that was promised to David that would build a house to the Lord. He is also the

Son in whom the throne of David would be perpetuated and would be established for ever. There is here no separate promise, apart from the promise to which the Word of God always refers, as Petter would have it.

Repeatedly this same promise to David is, either directly or indirectly, mentioned in Scripture.

One of the most direct and beautiful passages in this respect is that which speaks of "the sure mercies of David." I refer to Ps. 89: 19-37:

"Then thou spakest in vision to thy holy one, and saidst, I have laid help on one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people. I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him: With whom my hand shall be established: mine arm also shall strengthen him. The enemy shall not exact upon him; nor the son of wickedness afflict him. And I will beat down his foes before his face, and plague them that hate him. But my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him: and in my name shall his horn be exalted. I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. And I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake my law and walk not in my judgments; If they break my statutes and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven."

The first question that must be answered in this connection is: who is the seed of David, of which these various passages make mention? With whom shall God's covenant stand for ever, and whose throne shall be established for evermore? From whom shall God's mercy and lovingkindness never depart?

The answer is, without any doubt: It is the seed of David, the line of David's generations as it culminates in Christ.

The first reference of the term is, no doubt, to Solomon. This is evident from II Sam. 7:12: "When thy days are fulfilled and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, that shall proceed out of thy bowels." The meaning evidently

is that the throne of David shall, after David's death not be given to another house as had been done in the case of Saul, but should continue in the line of David's generations. Moreover, the text very definitely implies that the throne of David shall be established over Israel immediately after the death of the man after God's heart, i.e. in his son. This, then, was the promise given to Solomon according to I Ki. 9. Moreover, according to the promise to David in II Sam. 7, this son of David was to build the Lord a house. Also this was realized in Solomon. And in the promise of I Ki. 9 the Lord promises that He will dwell in that house and have his name there perpetually. All this makes it abundantly clear that we have no promise in I Ki. 9 different from that in II Sam. 7 and Ps. 89. Petter is utterly in error when he claims this.

Secondly, however, it is also plain from the text that this promise is not ultimately fulfilled in Solomon, but that it has a wider meaning. This is evident from the fact that the term "for ever" and "for evermore" is employed constantly in the text. The kingdom of this seed of David shall be established for ever, his throne shall be established for evermore, God shall never let His mercy and lovingkindness depart from this seed of David, and he shall never break His covenant with him. It would be folly to maintain that this promise was limited to Solomon. We may conclude, therefore, that this seed of David has a wider meaning, and that it refers, in the second place, to an entire line of kings that would come out of the loins of David. And also in this respect the promise was realized in history. The seed of David reigned over Israel perpetually even though, apparently, after the captivity the kingdom was taken away from them and it seemed as if God's mercy to them had failed.

And failed the promise would have, indeed, if it were not for the fact that the text itself forces us to take one more step. Even in this line of kings the promise cannot have been exhausted, for the simple reason that, while the carnal line of the generations of David came to an end, the promise speaks of an eternal and unbreakable covenant and an everlasting throne and kingdom. And, therefore, the promise refers in its final analysis to Christ, the End, the everlasting End of the seed of David. He is *the* Seed of David. He is both: the promised Seed and the one to Whom all the promises are centrally made.

This Petter does not understand when he presents the promise to Solomon as a separate promise that stands apart from the promise to Abraham.

He does not understand this because he does not understand Scripture.

And he does not understand Scripture because he does not properly exegete. In fact, he does not exegete at all, but merely quotes a few texts.

Thus he becomes a false teacher and leads the church astray by his superficial attempt to explain to the people the Word of God.

For do not forget that this superficial and thoroughly unbiblical teaching is designed to inculcate into the churches the false doctrine that "God promises to every one of you that, if you believe, you shall be saved."

This is the reason why he deliberately makes the false distinction between the Promise and promises, consulting Webster's dictionary rather than the Bible for his definitions.

To be sure, Scripture speaks of promises, in the plural, as well of the promise, in the singular. It is the promise of the Seed, the promise of the Spirit, the promise of this life and of the life to come, the promise of eternal life, the promise of His coming, the promise of entering into His rest, the promise to become heir of the world. Hence, the Word of God speaks of the Spirit of promise, of children of the promise, and of heirs of the promise. But always, in Scripture, the promises and the promise are one and the same. As the seven colors of the rainbow are all refractions of the one white beam of light, so the promises are all individual aspects of the one promise.

All the promises of God are yea and amen in Christ.

The promise of the protevangel in paradise, the promise to Noah, the promises to Abraham, the promise to David and Solomon, the "sure mercies of David" in Ps. 89, the promise in all the prophets,—they are all one and the same.

Always they are an oath of God!

For, although in Hebrews 6 it is especially mentioned that God swore the promise to Abraham with an oath, this does not mean that the promise and promises of God are ever less than a divine oath to the elect, the heirs of the promise. Repeatedly God swears to His elect that the promise is sure to them.

And, centrally, the promise is always Christ.

And all the promises of God are made to Him, and in Him to the elect.

This is so clear and emphatic in Scripture that the apostle Paul in Galatians 3 does not hesitate to note the distinction between the singular and the plural of the word "seed" to prove that Christ is the promise and that all the promises are made to Him. Writes he:

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."

Christ is the Promise; the promises are made to Him; and by His Spirit He dispenses the promises to all the elect.

This Petter does not understand. Otherwise he could never have defended the heresy of De Wolf by an appeal to the distinction between the Promise and promises.

But it is not simply a matter of misunderstanding.

He and the Guardian no longer want our Protestant Reformed truth. Of this I am now thoroughly convinced. Deliberately, men like Petter, A. Cammenga, De Wolf, De Jong and others in our churches distort the truth as has always been confessed by us.

For the last several years they were foes within our gates.

It is high time we go through a purifying process.

— : — : —

I must still write about the so-called "conditions" unto the promise to Solomon and to the promise in general.

But this must wait till the next issue, D.V.

H.H.

Hofman Learns A New Word

So he tells us as he assumes the responsibility of a new position, the editorship of *Concordia*.

In itself this is not such an amazing fact, I mean that Hofman learns a new word.

For the word he learned was supposed to be Dutch.

And I imagine that Hofman can learn quite a few Dutch words before he can say of himself or we will say of him that it is rather surprising that he still learned a new one. Even a master of the Dutch language may not consider it beyond the bounds of possibility that, occasionally, he may increase his Dutch vocabulary. And Hofman can hardly be called a master of Dutch.

It is not amazing, therefore, that the new editor of *Concordia* tells us that he learned a new Dutch word.

The Standard Bearer sincerely congratulates him with the increase in his family of Dutch, and wishes him many happy returns of the day on which he learned the new word.

Of this, I am sure, he is surely in need.

Only, I would advise him, if he is really desirous to increase his family of Dutch words to seek cohabitation with some good dictionary or, better still with

good Dutch literature. Otherwise it may easily happen that he finds some Yankee-Dutch in his family as will so easily happen with the Dutch in this country.

I am not sure but this may be the case with the new acquisition of the editor of *Concordia*. And this would be just too bad. *Concordia*, especially editorially, should be an instructor of the people in every respect. If it teaches the people new words, whether Dutch or English, whether newly acquired by the editor or known to him for a long time, they should be pure Dutch or pure English: it should not inculcate Yankee-Dutch. If it would instruct the people in doctrine, it should be pure doctrine, i.e. Protestant Reformed truth, not Yankee-Dutch liberated doctrine. If it would give the people a lesson in ethics or morality, it must be careful that itself furnishes an example of pure ethics and sound morality: it should not become dirty, slanderous, lying, corrupt.

I am afraid that the new editor was, to put it mildly, a little careless in this respect.

I mean, of course, in offering his new Dutch word to the public. He is, of course, quite new to the job of editorship, does not have much experience in writing for the public. He may be excused, to a certain extent. This editorial was his first attempt. Nevertheless, even a new editor is responsible for what he writes. Of course, teaching the public a new Dutch word is not so bad, even if the word is not correct. But it is much worse when the editor writes false doctrine or gives a glaring example of corrupt morals. Then I would advise him to apologize in the very next issue of the paper in which he writes.

The word which Hofman learned is *inkruiperij*.

I am no master of the Dutch language myself, but I hardly think that this is good Dutch.

There is, of course, the Dutch verb *inkruipen*, and the form *inkruipend*. But the noun *kruiperij* means something entirely different from what Hofman means to express by *inkruiperij*. Moreover, the word *inkruiperij* does, I think, not exist.

So, I am quite sure, *inkruiperij* is a Yankee-Dutch child in Hofman's family.

Where did Hofman get the word?

He informs us as follows:

"This word was spoken while a group of us were discussing various things in connection with our present Church difficulties . . ."

Wait a minute! No! You don't mean that, Hofman! A group of you? What group? May we know the names? That would be interesting! A group discussing the present church difficulties? Was it a group of ministers? May I guess? Let me guess by the process of elimination. It was not the undersigned,

nor the Rev. Ophoff, nor the Rev. Vos, nor the Rev. Lubbers, nor the Revs. R. and H. Veldman, nor the Rev. J. Heys, nor the Rev. H. H. Kuiper, nor the Rev. G. Vanden Berg, nor the Rev. M. Schipper. With these men you would never freely and openly discuss what you want to say. They like to shout from the rooftops what they have to say. Even what they have to say in private about the church difficulties every one may know. They have nothing to hide. That is the reason, I am sure, why you would never discuss the church difficulties with them.

That leaves the Rev. Blankespoor and the Rev. Knott, who however, were not in the West, apart from the question whether you would discuss the church difficulties with them. You might, of course, discuss these difficulties with the Rev. Kok, who likes to whisper that undersigned "is an old man, broken in mind and body" (I think the wish is father to the thought, don't you?), but I don't remember that he was in the West in the very recent past.

So that leaves a group of ministers in the Middle West.

But wait a minute!

I must also exclude the Rev. H. C. Hoeksema. For in the first place, you surely would never discuss the church difficulties with him, would you? You boycotted him almost from the beginning of his ministry in Doon, you know. And in the second place, he was the subject of your whisperings, part of which is revealed in your editorial, Hofman. No, he was not present.

Well, that narrows down the number of your private group considerably. My guess is rather safe. I don't have to mention names.

But wait!

I must not forget the Rev. A. Cammenga. I know that he was in the West, and without him a private group for such a discussion of the church difficulties would hardly be complete. And, as an appendix, I might also mention the Rev. De Wolf, whom Cammenga took along to the middle West.

For the rest, I ask you, Mr. Editor of *Concordia*, to tell me how far my guess is correct.

Well, then, in that private group originated the incorrect term *inkruiperij*. For the editor informs us:

"In fact it was used to describe the activity of the origin of a new organization that has made its appearance here in the middle west."

From here on the editorial by Hofman becomes such a string of evil insinuations, false accusations, and downright lies that I am amazed and grieved to the depth of my heart to read how any minister, one that calls himself a Protestant Reformed minister,

that any Christian dares, before the face of God, before Whom he is responsible for every evil word, to write such dirty stuff.

And if the editorial is a reflection of the whisperings of that group of ministers in which the term "inkruiperij" originated, as is evidently the case, Hofman in his editorial simply lifted a tip of the veil that hides much secret evil speaking, slandering, and wicked plotting that was suspected for some time by many.

If *Concordia* does not publicly apologize in the next one or two issues for editing such dirt, I refuse to receive the sheet in my home, and will advise all our good Protestant Reformed people to do the same thing.

Concordia—Discordia!

Let me first of all say a word about that "Committee for Protestant Reformed Action" which, by that group of whisperers was characterized by the erroneous term "inkruiperij."

By the way, it is evident that the group of whisperers meant, by that term to express the idea of secret and sly infiltration, subversive action, such as the Communists in our country follow to gain influence for their party and principles.

In fact, Hofman explains the term, with the application to the above named committee, himself in the following words:

"This new organization calls itself: The Committee for Protestant Reformed Action. Although rather expressive, this term seems to be a very unhappy choice of a name. It sounds altogether too much like those of subversive organizations that are always being investigated by Congress for un-American activities. It is to be hoped that this particular group does not mean to be the instigator of subversive agitation of another nature in our midst, but its beginnings bring sad forebodings nevertheless. And while these beginnings were being related, I learned this new Dutch word: that's the connection."

This is the first lying insinuation.

In the first place, there was nothing secret about the beginning of this organization. Hofman seems to think that an organization of this kind must have the approval of the consistories, or at least the O.K. of the ministers. He evidently is of the opinion that it must knock at the door of the minister before such an organization gain membership for its first meeting from the congregation of which that particular minister is pastor. It really must have the consent of the consistory for such a move!

How utterly absurd!

Must any free society in the churches have the approval of the consistory or consistories before they can even organize or after they are organized? That, indeed, is hierarchy in its worst form.

Must such action have the consent of the domine's? That is (and now I coin a word which is neither Dutch nor English) *dominocratie*.

Must a Labor Association have such approval? Do you think that such was the origin of the R.F.P.A. that publishes the *Standard Bearer*? Was such the origin of *Concordia*? Or any society or league of societies? Why then, I pray, the Committee For Protestant Action?

Was there anything secret about the action of this committee, as Hofman alleges? That is another lie. It was open and above board from the very beginning, as is evident from the "sheet" which Hofman mentions in his editorial, which was sent, I believe, to all members of our churches in the West, the domines included, in which they openly state the purpose of their organization.

No, that it is not the reason why Hofman and his whispering group are opposed to this committee for Protestant Reformed Action. The reason is, I am sure, that they are afraid that the people might learn to know the truth, and that the corruption of the West might be exposed.

One of the purposes of that Committee for Protestant Reformed Action is to induce the people of the West again to read the *Standard Bearer*, which many people there did no longer read, also under the influence of that whispering group. From the *Standard Bearer* the common church members might learn to know the truth. Their eyes might be opened. For it is still the only paper that represents the Protestant Reformed cause. And thus must, by all means, be avoided.

This is, I am sure, the reason why Hofman and his group of slanderous whisperers are so bitterly opposed to the organization of the Committee for Protestant Reformed Action.

Not because there was any "inkruiperij" about it. (They meant, of course, "onderkruiperij" which is the correct Dutch word.)

Hofman writes: "From a propaganda sheet which they have issued we learn that the ostensible purpose is to bring 'before our Protestant Reformed people the facts and the truth in the present church situation. However, this almost appears as a mere 'front' for their early activity has been marked by insinuation and the sowing of seeds and distrust and suspicion."

That is another downright lie, and Hofman knows it.

The "front" of the Committee for Protestant Reformed Action states exactly what they purpose to accomplish, i.e. to let the people know the facts and the truth. They did not insinuate anything, nor did

they sow seeds of distrust and suspicion, unless it were true that to teach the people no longer to accept the lie is to sow such seeds.

Hofman writes: "That is evident from the methods employed in gaining the first adherents for organizational purposes. Through various and devious means 'certain and particular friends of the cause' were contacted in the various congregations here in Sioux County and Minnesota, to attend this private organizational meeting. And although the organization supposedly represents the Protestant Reformed cause none of our Protestant Reformed ministers, except the young Rev. Hoeksema, were informed, invited or asked, to suggest or appoint members of their congregations who might be willing to serve on such a committee."

About this I remark:

1. That this is a slanderous lie. The committee did not use devious means but went straight to some friends of the Protestant Reformed cause to invite them to join.

2. No, other ministers were not invited. Sad, but true. Who, in the West, could they invite? Would, in 1923, when the R.F.P.A. was organized, that organization have invited Van Baalen, or G. Hoeksema, or C. Bouma, or Berkhof? Well, no more would the Committee for Protestant Reformed Action invite Hofman and his whispering group. They only wanted friends of the Protestant Reformed truth and cause, and not men who sell that cause down the river, as De Jong did in the Netherlands.

3. Hofman speaks of "the young Rev. Hoeksema." His name is H. C. Hoeksema. The editor, evidently, hates the very name Hoeksema. Otherwise he could not avoid mentioning his name and he could not write as if he were old enough to be his grandfather. May I know why you hate that name so, and not only you but also your group of slanderous whisperers? No, you don't have to tell me. I will tell you. It is because the name is connected with the open and public exposition and defense of the Protestant Reformed truth, and the public exposure of all corruption in the churches.

4. Hofman complains that he and his group of whisperers were not invited to "to suggest or appoint members" of the Committee for Protestant Reformed Action." The Lord would say: "Thou hypocrite!" Suppose you would have been so invited, would you not immediately have taken steps to warn the people against joining that Committee? I know you would. And the committee knew it too, of course.

Hofman writes further:

"Neither were these Protestant Reformed consistories asked to help or invited to join the formation.

Instead, slyly, secretly, a small 'select' group was gathered out of these congregations apart from, and without even the courtesy of notifying the consistories or the ministers."

I remark:

1. In the next paragraph Hofman speaks of all this as "scurrilous infiltration." While it is well-known that Hofman does not know his Dutch, he now arouses doubt whether he knows his English. For the adjective "scurrilous" can by no stretch of the imagination be used with the noun infiltration. It means something coarse and vile and abusive, and is especially used in connection with coarse jokes or jocular-ity. And I assure Hofman the Committee for Protestant Reformed Action did not mean "to crack a coarse joke." But Hofman, evidently, means something like sly or secret.

2. And then, again, I say the editorial of Hofman is pure slander. It is nothing but a downright lie. There was absolutely nothing sly or secret about the method of gaining members for the Committee.

3. This would have been true if the committee had been obliged to contact the consistories or the ministers first, before they might contact members of any congregation for membership. But in this Hofman is mistaken. This is never done in case of any general, inter-congregational society. That would be as I have already remarked, hierarchy and "domino-cratie", the lording of the dominé.

And an instance of this scurrilous infiltration Hofman mentions in the next paragraph:

"In one congregation, for example, the Rev. H. Hoeksema (the young Rev. Hoeksema) felt it necessary that he himself make a few personal calls upon certain sheep of that flock. He did not inform or contact the lawful shepherd, nor did he enter by way of the legal consistory of that congregation. In fact, his first call there was made rather hastily on a Sunday evening when the local minister would be busy with his young people's society."

In as far as this paragraph is written, as it is, to prove the "scurrilous infiltration" the whole paragraph is a terrible and slanderous lie.

I do not know to what congregation Hofman refers, but I know that this whole paragraph is written with a purpose to make the impression that "the young Rev. Hoeksema" is a crook. It is a downright lie, except for the bare fact that the Rev. H. C. Hoeksema undoubtedly visited some members of a certain congregation, perhaps also on a Sunday evening, to gain members for the Committee for Protestant Reformed Action. That was his good right. For the rest, the whole thing is a lie. He did not have to inform "the lawful shepherd." He did not have to inform the consistory. He did not "enter the congrega-

tion" at all to steal the sheep. He did not "brazenly take it upon himself to do as he pleased in another congregation." He did not "hastily" act. He did not purposely visit those members at a time when the local minister was busy with his Young People's Society in order to avoid the minister.

All this is nothing else than so much dirt to befoul the good name of Hoeksema.

And so, Hofman, your entire first attempt to write editorials for *Concordia* has only succeeded to make that paper a dirty sheet, and, at the same time, to reveal what dirty slander is going on in some whispering groups in our churches.

I would ask you to publish this entire article in *Concordia*.

Again I say: If no apology is forthcoming I refuse to befoul my home any longer with your dirty sheet, and advise all our good Protestant Reformed people no longer to support this slanderous cause by subscriptions.

—H.H.

— : — : —

ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the RFPA will be held Thursday, Sept. 24th at the Creston Prot. Ref Church, at 8:00 P.M. Rev. H. Veldman will be the speaker. Annual reports will be given by the secretary, treasurer and business manager. Four board members are to be chosen from the following: T. Van Eenenaam (First); J. King, P. Vanden Engel, N. Kunz (Creston); G. Pipe (Fourth); H. Brands, J. Kalsbeek (Second) and A. Langerak (Hope). Please reserve this date and plan to attend.

THE BOARD—R.F.P.A.

— : —

ANNOUNCEMENT

Classis East will reconvene on Tuesday, October 6, 1953 at 9 o'clock A. M. in the Fourth Protestant Reformed Church. This is the same classis as that of April, 1953, and will meet to finish the agenda. Will the delegates of April Classis please take note.

Rev. Geo. C. Lubbers
Stated Clerk

OUR DOCTRINE

THE TRIPLE KNOWLEDGE

AN EXPOSITION OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM

PART III — OF THANKFULNESS

LORD'S DAY 37

1.

The Place of The Oath in the Kingdom

There is, of course, truth in this interpretation. The Lord certainly condemns in this passage the rash and camouflaged swearing of the hypocrites. Nevertheless, I do not believe that this is the whole truth. This is evident when we compare the introduction to this passage in vs. 33 with the conclusion in vs. 37. In verse 33 we read: "Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths." It was therefore not simply a question of rash swearing or of swearing a camouflaged and hypocritical oath, but it was the question of the contrast between perjury and keeping the oath that is once sworn. It was a question of the antithesis between the truth and the lie, between light and darkness. And it is in this connection that the Lord admonishes His people in the kingdom of heaven emphatically in the words of verse 34: "But I say unto you, Swear not at all." And this is emphasized once more in the conclusion of vs. 37: "But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." These words teach very clearly not indeed that the oath as such is sinful, nor that in the world, or even in the imperfect church in the world, the oath may not be necessary but in the kingdom of heaven the simple affirmation of the truth or the simple denial of the lie is always sufficient. That a particular oath is necessary cometh of evil.

The Sermon on the Mount has sometimes been called the constitution of the kingdom of heaven. And we must remember that this constitution is not like the constitution of the United States. The law of the kingdom of heaven is spiritual. It is a law that is written in the hearts of the subjects. It is the perfect law of liberty. It need not be enforced; it is freely observed. But this is not the case with the application of the same law of God in the world. The magistrates bear the sword. They must maintain the law by mere force. They are not interested in the

question whether or not the subjects obey the law from the heart, but only in its external observance. There is, therefore, a fundamental difference between the kingdom of heaven and the kingdoms of the world. That the kingdom of heaven is fundamentally different from the kingdoms of the world is evident not only from the admonition of the Lord concerning the oath, but is still more clear from what follows. In vs. 38 the Lord addresses the subjects of His kingdom in the following words: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." Now no one will deny that these words express strictest justice, and that this justice must be maintained by the powers that be and that bear the sword not in vain. For according to the apostle Paul, in Rom. 13, even the believers in this world must subject themselves to this power: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power, do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Yet the Lord continues to admonish His church, the subjects of the kingdom of heaven, in the words: "But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." It is evident that this is an entirely different law, the law of perfect liberty, the law of love, which certainly is not applicable to the kingdom of the world, and which the powers that be cannot and may not apply, but refers only to the kingdom of heaven and to the relation of the subjects of that kingdom to one another. This the Anabaptist did not understand. They confused the two kingdoms. Hence, they maintained that it was sinful to hold office or to execute justice by the sword or to wage war. Hence, they attempted to establish a separate kingdom of heaven in Munster, where John of Leiden for a while was seated on the throne of Zion with the title, "King of the New Jerusalem and of Righteousness over the Whole Earth."

If we understand this distinction, we will also be able to apprehend the meaning of the words of the Saviour concerning the oath. Surely the Lord never meant to convey the thought that the oath as such is sinful, but He certainly intends to emphasize that

in the kingdom of heaven a special oath should never be necessary, for the simple reason that the subjects of that kingdom should live a continuous oath. What makes the special oath necessary? It is necessary only because we do not live before the face of God constantly, and therefore because we do not always speak as standing in the presence of our covenant God in Christ Jesus. It is necessary because we do not trust one another as always speaking before the face of God. If we always lived consciously in the presence of God, if we always lived from the consciousness of standing in the covenant of friendship, a special oath would not be necessary, because our lives would be a continuous oath. If the believers in Christ Jesus in relation to one another always lived in the perfect confidence that they speak the truth in love, they could never demand of one another to swear an oath. In heaven, in the state of perfection, our life will be one continuous oath. It will be one continuous life in the consciousness that we seek God's face and stand and live before Him and in His presence. And although this state of perfection is never realized in the present world, Scripture nevertheless holds before the people of God in the world the ideal of the kingdom of heaven. And therefore it admonishes them that their relationship to one another should be such that their yea is always yea, and their nay is always nay, and that therefore the oath, the special oath, is absolutely unnecessary, both as to the speaker and as to the hearer. From the principle of regeneration believers in Christ must always speak the truth in love, and fight the good fight also in this respect, that they strive to live one continuous oath before the face of God, as His friends, and to His glory.

— H.H.

— : — : —

The book of life, or decree of election, is the marriage register of the saints; in which their everlasting espousal to Christ stands indelibly recorded by the pen of God's free and eternal love.

—Toplady

* * * *

A true believer lives upon free grace, as his necessary food. And, indeed, he who has really tasted the sweetness of grace, can live upon nothing else.

—Toplady

FROM HOLY WRIT

Exposition of I Peter 1:14-16

The Word of God from the pen of Peter in these verses reads as follows:

"As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance; but as He which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation (living); Because it is written: Be ye holy; for I am holy"

Surely it is imperative that we have the loins of our mind girt up, and be spiritually sober according to the clear teaching of this Scripture passage. Of this sobriety Peter spoke in the former verse, and it is a concept that is constantly in the mind of the writer of this Epistle. In Chapter 4:7 we read: "But the end of all things is at hand; therefore be ye sober and watchful to prayer". Sobriety is therefore to have an eye for the realities of all things in the light of the Word of God and the grace of God in Christ Jesus. He, who is sober, sees his own greatness in Christ in faith and wills to live this new life in hope and sanctification. Only they who are not in their proper spiritual senses will not be careful of their walk in the midst of this world. They will flirt with sin and with the Devil and fall a snare to his wiles, and be brought condemned into the court of God by Satan. Wherefore the Apostle Peter writes in I Peter 5:8 "Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour."

This need of spiritual sobriety is brought to our attention in exhortations. Once more I repeat that these exhortations of the Gospel must not be confused with, nor maliciously presented as being commandments of the law, but they must be left for what they are: precepts of the *Gospel*! In these precepts of the Gospel we are not admonished to become what we are not, but we are told to live out in holy fear and trembling what we have been made to be in the regeneration in Christ through the power of His resurrection. We are to *work out*, bring to a finished process our salvation in Christ; for God is the one who worketh (energizes) in us both to will and to do of His good-pleasure. We are to walk worthily of the calling where-with we have been efficaciously called out of darkness into God's marvelous light.

Any other presentation simply makes the admonition such, that one practically makes of the Gospel a new law (neonomism) and makes the "in the way of faith" a condition; it changes the faith as a means of

receiving, of appropriating into a means of *acquiring*. And this latter then becomes a "pre-requisite" which man must fulfill in faith. That is the deep error of Rome, which is at bottom simply Pelagianism. Here penitence and contrition become meriting factors in acquiring the forgiveness of sins. Rome will have nothing of Calvin's "in the way of faith", and that "faith is an instrument". We greatly appreciate the careful remarks of Dr. G. C. Berkhouwer in his "Ge-loof En Rechtvaardigmaking", pages 193-194, where we read: "From this point Calvin, already in 1536, battles against the penance sacrament in a profound discussion in which one matter comes to stand in clear focus: the forgiveness of sins. The believer receives the forgiveness of sins *in the way of penitence*. (We underscore, G. L.) That "in the way of" is always again *the* Reformation answer to every meritorious penance teaching and every erroneous formulation of the correlation. (faith and justification, G.L.) It is doubtful whether dogmatically it can ever be formulated more clearly because here the secret of the correlation is set forth between this penitence and God's grace".

Although Berkhouwer is here speaking of faith and justification, what he says clearly has meaning also for faith and sanctification, for sanctification is simply walking in justifying faith, in putting off of the "old man" and the "putting on" of the new man in Christ Jesus.

Two errors we must avoid. The one is that of antinomism, that does not will to hear of admonitions of the Gospel to a new obedience, and hence errs by putting apart what God has joined together, namely, walk and grace of godliness and exhortations of the Gospel. This is indeed, as the Fathers of Dort say, a "tempting of God". We are indeed exhorted unto this "in the way of faith". The other is to so present this "in the way of faith" that it becomes a way of acquiring salvation. For as soon as we in any way change the *receiving* of salvation into *acquiring* of salvation we have lost the "only grace and through faith" of salvation!

All exhortations unto sanctification in Scripture are really a stirring up in us of the living hope that is ours, in the grace in which we stand. For only in this living in hope do we purify ourselves as he is pure. And even in sanctification we *receive* salvation, but we in no way *acquire* it. Sanctification is out of faith and conversion. The "in the way of faith" ought therefore, to be our constant watch-word as Reformation churches. lest we return as the dog to his vomit, and as the washed sow to her wallowing in the mire! In the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free let us stand, both in doctrine and in life!

It was necessary for us to give account of these careful distinctions in view of more than one consideration.

In the first place, because it has been insinuated and whispered that the undersigned does not reject the propositions condemned by Classis East from conviction, but rather as a matter of expediency or even because he lacks courage to disagree with his former professors; a certain lack of courage and cowardice submission motivates the undersigned. In view of this I have deemed it necessary to give the underlying motivation of the *Standard Bearer* column in the above paragraphs.

Secondly, it can not do any harm, and I cannot believe but what it will do good to all of us to clearly see the point at issue. The "statements" surely ought to be retracted for the truth's sake as it is in Jesus our Lord. This has nothing to do with personalities. When all the personalities are removed from the stage in humble confession, then still the truth of "in the way of faith" stands as the Rock of Gibraltar. No one has since the days of Calvin improved upon this formulation, and before his day this truth was buried beneath the "prerequisite" works of Roman Sacramentalism. This ought to be seen and acknowledged for our very life's sake.

Finally, it was necessary to also see the true nature of "exhortations" generally so that in the particular text before us, we might see clearly the pitfalls that we should avoid in the interpretation of Scripture. No one can really correctly instruct the people who does not carefully distinguish. In this respect we do not judge that we have attained, but we strive and ever press forward so that our progress may be evident to all!

Let us then turn to the Scripture passage under consideration.

It ought to be clear to all of us that Peter places the need of conversion on the foreground here in the verses 14-16.

Yes, the need of conversion.

Let us not forget, that the conversion of the Scriptures is also due to what we have in the faith in Christ as the gift of God. It is sometimes erroneously presented as if contrition and sorrow for sin precede faith and good works. Then the order is: Contrition, faith, good works. And the first of these is conversion, as a certain prerequisite to faith, justification, forgiveness, and walking in sanctification, good works. But this is erroneous, and has never been the position and teaching of the fathers of the Reformed protestantism. Both Calvin in his Institutes and Ursinus in his Schatboek take the position that all conversion is out

of faith, as must be viewed as the good fruit on a good tree.

Such is the conversion unto which Peter admonishes here in our text.

But since the matter is so important for a proper understanding of the truth of Scripture concerning conversion we will give the following quotations from Calvin, Ursinus and also from Dr. H. Bavinck.

Says Bavinck in "Geloof and Bekeering" Vol. IV, Geref. Dogmatiek, page 133 (we translate) "Thus the concept conversion was already limited on one side—it is not before and outside, but within the new life, and flows forth from faith, and is rooted in regeneration in the narrow sense" *Sapienti sat!*

Writes Calvin: "Now it ought not to be doubted that repentance not only immediately follows faith, but is produced by it. For since pardon or remission is offered (set forth seriously G.L.) by the preaching of the Gospel, in order that the sinner liberated from the tyranny of Satan, from the yoke of sin, and the miserable servitude of his vices, may remove into the kingdom of God—no one can embrace the Gospel, but he must depart from the errors of his former life, enter into the right way, and direct all his attention to the exercise of repentance. Those who imagine that repentance rather precedes faith, than is produced by it, as fruit by a tree, have never been acquainted with its power, and are induced to adopt that sentiment by a very insufficient argument." Book III, Chapter III of Institutes.

Ursinus, writing on the matter of the true conversion of the believer, has the following to say: "Both of these parts of conversion come forth out of true faith. The reason is that no one can hate sin and come to God or he must love God. And no one loves God or is gifted with faith, that is, he must certainly believe that God is merciful, and that he receives in grace, who take refuge to God in true faith. Wherefore that in neither part (putting off old man and putting on new men G. L.) mention is made of faith, is not because faith is excluded from conversion, but because faith must be understood to be in the whole teaching of conversion and thankfulness; just as always when we speak of an activity there is a cause." Fol. 97.

And when it is objected that there is a sorrow before faith Ursinus meets this objection as follows: "I agree that there is a certain sorrow before faith, but not such a sorrow that is a part of conversion. For the sorrow of the godless is before and without faith, and is more a turning away from God than a conversion . . . But in the elect this sorrow is a preparation to conversion."

(To be continued)

G. Lubbers

IN HIS FEAR

Afraid of the Gospel

(II)

Were you to assure the man, who was planning to break into an establishment in order to steal, that the nightwatchman of that building made a practice of leaving that structure at a certain hour every evening to spend one half of an hour seeking a bite of lunch and refreshment in some nearby cafe, you would undoubtedly encourage him to go ahead and perpetrate his crime.

Were you to assure the visitor that the policemen in your city were instructed not to place parking violation tickets on those illegally parked automobiles which had out-of-state licenses upon them, you would undoubtedly encourage him to break those parking regulations.

Were you to set a plate of candy on the table before your children, were you to forbid them the right to take one piece and were you to assure them that, if they did, you would in no way and to no degree punish them, you could well expect to find some of that candy gone when you returned.

How, then, can we maintain what we did last time that we need not be afraid of the gospel, need not be afraid to tell our children that all the sins of all God's people are already paid for and that Christ suffered already all the punishment for which these sins call? How can we maintain that this doctrine of a full and free salvation which from beginning to end is the work of God does not make man careless and profane? How can we maintain that nothing must be put between the elect and the cross, no conditions that must yet be fulfilled, no prerequisites that still stand in the way of their coming to the blessedness already merited by the cross? We find no difficulty here and that for very good reasons which we shall now present.

First of all, let us never forget that it is God who tells His Covenant children that glorious message of joy that all their sins are blotted out and that He has done it *all* for them. It is God Who tells His people that "It is finished" on Calvary's brow, and that their salvation is as sure as God is sure. And when He speaks that gospel to His regenerated children, He does so irresistably and efficaciously. Indeed, were *you* to tell your children that there is no punishment for their sins and were that the extent of it, your children would live as careless and profane as they pleased and perhaps be more careless after hearing you say this

than before. But then your children have not heard the *gospel*. Paul makes a beautiful distinction in Romans 10:18 between the "sound" of the gospel which is gone out into all the earth and the gospel itself. If all we can say is that your children heard the sound of that glorious gospel, then what Paul says in this passage to the Romans will follow. Your children will not believe it. And as unbelievers you can expect that they will be careless and profane, for that is characteristic of *all* unbelievers. You can even expect, if they are unregenerated, that by the sound of the gospel they will be hardened into more carelessness and profanity. That is the truth of Scripture, and that the unbelievers are hardened by the Gospel has always been maintained by the Protestant Reformed Churches. According to Isaiah 55 God's word never returns void. It always has an effect. It is either a savour of life unto life or of death unto death.

Every time the gospel, and not merely the sound of the gospel is heard by the child of God, the response is not carelessness and profanity; it is not a jubilant cry of joy that now we can live in sin with impunity; it is not a devilish conclusion that then we ought to sin that grace may abound. But every time the gospel is heard by the regenerated child of God the result is that this child, in the true *fear* of the Lord, stands in awe before Him and says, "O God, how good Thou art! Keep me pure! Keep me here in the light, for this is life and this is joy!" That is the true fear of the Lord. But to cringe in fear before Him lest you have not fulfilled all the conditions He demands of you, to be afraid that you cannot get to the cross because there are prerequisites to its benefits, things which you must do before God will take you there to enjoy all its blessedness, that is not the fear of the Lord.

To fear the Lord does not mean that we are afraid of Him. Shall we, can we be afraid of Him Who is our heavenly, our Covenant Father? Can we be afraid of Him Who loves us with an unchangeable and everlasting love? Nay, "fearing the Lord" is the Old Testament equivalent of the New Testament, "believing in the Lord." And to be afraid of the Lord is *not* to believe in Him. For He says that nothing—and that also means nothing we can do, no sins, no proud rebellion our old man of sin can yet produce and practice in the future—is able to separate us from His love in Christ. Of course not! For He loves us *in Christ*, and eternally He sees us *in Him*. He never forgets the cross nor His sovereign election in Christ. He sees, without it ever being hidden from His eyes and mind for one brief moment, that all the prerequisites of our justification were fulfilled by His Son. The fear of the Lord believes all that. Those who fear the

Lord believes what the Lord says. The fear of the Lord believes Him when He says that "it is finished" on Calvary's brow and therefore believes Him when He says that He is for us and that therefore nothing—not our sins and short-comings—can be against us. That is the glorious gospel which the fear of the Lord embraces and to which those who fear the Lord do not want to add prerequisites and conditions. Let us put it colloquially, we want a salvation that has "no strings attached." We want the gate of Christ's righteousness without other little gates we first must go through to get to this all important and wide open gate. Christ is THE WAY, THE WHOLE WAY, not the biggest part of it.

For rather than to be afraid of God, he who fears Him LOVES Him. Consider that the gospel is nothing less than God's message to His people that HE LOVES THEM. If your children hear that gospel—and we say again not merely hear the sound of those words but the love of which the sound speaks—they will not be afraid of God. Nor will they *want* to be careless and to sin against Him. What is more, when they hear that gospel, they will love God for it. As John says, "We love Him because He first loved us." And that means that if God had not eternally loved us, it would be impossible for us to love Him, but it also means that He causes us to love Him by causing us to experience His love.

That is the second element we must not overlook when we speak of being afraid to preach a full and free salvation of God's grace and work alone. To say that so glorious a gospel makes men careless and that we need to present to men conditions and prerequisites of our salvation in order to avoid a passive doctrine and in order to maintain that those who receive it are not stocks and blocks is to overlook the fact that God works love towards Himself in the hearts of those regenerated children when He comes with the gospel. By the efficacious preaching of that gospel of His love God works love for Himself in the hearts of His regenerated children.

And so, Covenant Parents, tell your children of that wonderful unconditional love. Do not to any degree fear to tell them of it. Tell them that no sins which still remain in God's people shall keep them from entering the kingdom of heaven for the punishment of those sins has been endured and the guilt of them has been taken away before the sins were committed. And if you say no more than that to God's regenerated youth—or for that matter adult—you will not by that gospel move him to passivity or carelessness. You cannot make him careless by that gospel. You cannot overthrow God's work in that child. And if you speak to him of nothing more than God's love

to His people, even though you tell Him of none of God's demands and laws, you still will not make him careless by that gospel. God uses it to work His love in the hearts of His own, and that love *always* finds delight in serving Him. That love always seeks to do what is pleasing in His sight.

We said, that if you say no more than that glorious gospel of an unchanging and unchangeable love of God to His own, that you would not by it move your children to carelessness. That does not mean that you must not say more. You must! You must instruct them in the precepts of the gospel. You must admonish and rebuke them when through the weakness of their flesh they fall into sin. But all this you do not and must not do because there are conditions to the gospel, prerequisites to our salvation or to any phase of that salvation. We plan to write a few things about prerequisites next time, D.V., and show how untenable the position is that God demands prerequisites of us so that an act of ours must *precede* an act of His. At present we simply want to point out that we do and must hold before our children their covenant obligations and demands because (1) by nature they do not know what pleases Him. They must be taught it. (2) Because when they through the weakness of their *flesh* (not weakness of the Gospel) fall back into acts of hatred and rebellion toward God instead of acts of love toward Him, God will bring them back again only in the way of instructing them, through you, in the knowledge of their misery and need for this unconditionally free and full salvation in Christ. (3) Because although it is true that all the sins of all God's people are forgiven and no punishment remains for them, your children may know that they belong to that people of God only by the fruits which God works in them, the fruits of faith, the desire and activity of walking in good works. Then faith, our act of conversion, obedience, repentance and the like are not conditions that first have to be fulfilled by us by God's grace, but they are God given signs to us that in principle we *are* saved already and that therefore, because God is unchangeable, we shall also by His power and grace attain to the fulness of salvation in the day of Christ. By God's fruit in them, which becomes their fruit as His gift unto them, they know themselves as those chosen from eternity to salvation in Christ.

In the light of all the above let us listen to the word of God Himself through the Apostle John, "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment." I John 4:18. Conditional theology works a fear which is not fear of the Lord.

—J. A. Heys

The Breach Is Widened

I refer to the fact that Classis West in its session of Wednesday, September 2, 1953, took the schismatic action of formally declaring that they recognize the schismatic group of the Rev. H. De Wolf as the legal and proper continuation of the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

This action I do not hesitate to characterize as premature, hasty, illegal, and schismatic.

And I call it a widening of the breach in our churches, because: 1) It immediately caused a breach between the Consistory of Doon and the erstwhile Classis West of the Protestant Reformed Churches. 2) It will undoubtedly cause more of a breach among the congregations residing in Classis West, and who will not be able to recognize the schismatic actions of a schismatic Classis. 3) It certainly brings to the fore the long-recognized split in our churches between East and West.

Nor do I hesitate to say that this is good for our Protestant Reformed cause. Recently our editor wrote: where there is a split, that split must actually take place. Long have I and many others realized that there was a split also here in the West; and now, at long last, that split has been realized by the schismatic action of the Classis. And from this point of view, I call it good. I feel relieved, even though from another viewpoint I mourn the schism.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

But let me, for the sake of the record, relate as much as space will allow of the history of Classis West's schismatic action.

Classis was scheduled to meet in Oskaloosa on Wednesday, Sept. 2. All the consistories had, of course, received the material concerning Rev. De Wolf's suspension from the ministry, sent to them by the legal consistory of First Church under the signatures of the Rev. H. Hoeksema, Rev. C. Hanko, and Clerk G. Stadt. They had also received material from the would-be consistory of the schismatic De Wolf group. Some consistories, among them Pella, Oskaloosa, Bellflower, Orange City, and Edgerton, had by majority vote (not a unanimous vote in every case) recognized De Wolf's schismatic group. One consistory, as far as I know, the Consistory of Doon, had by unanimous vote decided to recognize the suspension of De Wolf as legal, and therefore also the consistory represented by the signatures of H. Hoeksema, C. Hanko, and G. Stadt as the legal consistory of the First Protestant

Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan. Doon's Consistory had also published its decision, together with the related material, to the congregation, and had sent to First Church, Grand Rapids, a notice of its decision. Doon, however, had decided not to send anything on this matter to Classis West, considering that the time was not yet ripe, and, in fact, having nothing to send. Being acquainted, however, with the general attitude of Classis West, the Consistory of Doon had instructed its delegates, the pastor and elder J. Vander Top, that in case the Classis should take a definite stand in favor of the schismatic group of De Wolf, they should leave the classis and announce that they would appeal against them.

Such is the background.

On Wednesday morning classis gathered. The Rev. M. Gritters, of Pella, presided. As he took the chair, he said himself that usually he did not take his turn, since he is also Stated Clerk of Classis. Otherwise, however, it would have been the turn of the Rev. H. C. Hoeksema ("The young Rev. Hoeksema," as *Concordia's* editor would call him). Was the reason for this change, perhaps, this, that they did not want the lone dissenting member in Classis West to preside at this momentous occasion?

Bellflower's consistory was not represented; otherwise all the consistories had at least one delegate present.

After the credentials were accepted, it appeared that there were 3 instructions at classis concerning the Fuller Avenue Case, from Bellflower, from Oskaloosa, and from Pella. Mark you well, although only a year ago a rule had been adopted calling for an agenda to be published to all the consistories in advance of classis' sessions so that the delegates might be acquainted with the proposals coming to classis, this rule had been ignored, so that no one (???) knew that any of these instructions were coming to the table of Classis, and no one had a copy of the 3 instructions concerning this serious matter black on white.

The instructions were read and received for information. There was a lengthy discussion about the method of procedure in treating them. During this discussion two important facts became evident, namely:

1) As one of the delegates, the Rev. L. Vermeer, stated almost literally, there was no question as to the final adoption of these 3 proposals by the Classis; it was only a question of the *form* of Classis' decision. And, the Rev. Vermeer was indeed eager for action!

2) The delegates from Doon made known the decision of their consistory, that in case such a stand was taken by Classis they were required to leave the meetings of Classis.

The result of the morning session was that Classis finally decided at least to provide the delegates with mimeographed copies of the instructions from Bellflower, Oskaloosa, and Pella. Nothing further was accomplished, and Classis recessed until 1 p.m., when the mimeographed copies would be ready. We here quote the 3 instructions from the mimeographed copy:

Material from Oskaloosa, Pella and Bellflower

A. From Oskaloosa

August 31, 1953

Classis West of the Protestant Reformed Churches
In Session, September 2, 1953
Oskaloosa, Iowa

Brethren in the Lord:

The Consistory of Oskaloosa desires to inform you concerning the following stand which we have taken.

From the letters received it is evident that Rev. Hoeksema and those supporting him refused to allow the majority to govern in this instance. Further, that rather than following the orderly way of appeal, they followed the revolutionary way of meeting secretly, and secretly and in minority, deposing the majority of elders and suspending Rev. De Wolf.

From the available evidence, the consistory of Oskaloosa can at this time come to no other conclusion than that the group which supports Rev. Hoeksema is guilty of schismatic action and we cannot therefore recognize the suspension of Rev. De Wolf, nor the deposition of a majority of elders, nor the right of existence as a Protestant Reformed Church of that faction of the Consistory which follows Rev. Hoeksema.

We hereby overture Classis to take this same stand with us.

Consistory of Oskaloosa Protestant Reformed Church

Pres. (w.s.) James Howerzyl
Clerk (w.s.) John W. Van Weelden

Done in Consistory, August 14, 1953.

B. From Pella:

I. We hereby wish to acquaint Classis with our stand, in regard to the Split in the First Protestant Reformed Church in Grand Rapids. Both sides have been notified as to the following answer. We overture Classis to take this stand with us.

Pella, Iowa
July 29, 1953

Rev. H. Hoeksema, Rev. C. Hanko, Mr. G. Stadt,

Dear Brethren:

We have received your letter concerning the suspension of Rev. Hubert De Wolf and the deposition of eleven elders.

We answer that we refuse to accept the notification and hence continue to acknowledge them as the legal consistory.

Our grounds for this action are:

1. You, brethren, have, by your actions broken with the Prot. Ref. Churches, by walking out of our churches as a minority of Consistory.

2. You have not followed the church-political way of referring your matters to Classis before proceeding in the way you now follow;

3. And you have carried on mutiny in the Churches by your separatistic activities.

Brethren, we beseech you, return, that we may be one who belong to be one.

Consistory, Pella Prot. Ref. Church
(w.s.) M. Gritters, Pres.
(w.s.) W. De Vries, Clerk.

II. We instruct Classis that the Mission Committee be requested to reinstate our Missionary, Rev. A. Cammenga to his mission activity.

III. We instruct Classis that Classis request of the Theological School Committee that because of the action of our past professors, who have withdrawn themselves from our churches, the committee provide ways and means to again provide our theological school with new Professors unless they repent.

Consistory of Pella Prot. Ref. Church
(w.s.) M. Gritters, Pres.
(w.s.) Wiebe De Vries, Clerk

Done in Consistory, July 27, 1953

C. From Bellflower:

August 25, 1953

Classis West Protestant Reformed Churches
c/o Rev. Martin Gritters, Stated Clerk
Pella, Iowa

Dear Brethren:

At this writing we are not able to say that there will be a delegation from Bellflower to your meeting in Oskaloosa. So far the elders and pastor have expressed that it is not possible to attend the meeting of Classis.

At our meeting of July 27 we received communications from a minority of the consistory of Fuller Avenue, and the Consistory of the First Protestant Reformed Church, informing us about their case.

On our meetings of August 17 and 21 we made decisions concerning the Fuller Avenue case, and are enclosing them.

It was decided to send these decisions to Classis East, too, and to overture Classis West to express the same in substance, and overture Synod to do the same.

Because of the nature of the case we felt constrained to make these expressions and pray that you may give them your careful attention, and that the Lord may lead you in the way of truth and justice in this matter and in all your deliberations.

Yours in His Service,
Consistory of Bellflower Prot. Ref.
Church
(w.s.) L. Doezeema, Pres.
(w.s.) John Buma, Clerk.

Bellflower Consistory expresses re Fuller Avenue Case:

1. That the suspension and deposition of officebearers by the minority group of the consistory of Fuller Avenue congregation cannot be recognized as legal. A minority is not the consistory and cannot suspend from office, nor can it deprive of a vote.
2. That the majority group is the legal "First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids" until the privilege of appeal is considered and Synod has expressed that the majority group cannot be recognized as such, i.e. as a Protestant Reformed Church.
3. That the minority group of Fuller Ave. Consistory, and Classis East erred in its decisions of the case "Hoeksema, Op-hoff versus De Wolf". The judgment is that two statements

of De Wolf are "literally heretical regardless of what the Rev. De Wolf meant by them, regardless of how he explains them."

a. The first statement made, reads: "God promises every one of you that, if you believe, you shall be saved."

This statement by itself, per se, is not heretical. If the Rev. De Wolf taught that 'God promises salvation to every one of you,' he would have erred.

What he meant to preach outside of the two statements has been unjustly ruled out of consideration by Classis East. Therefore we can only limit ourselves to the statements as such at this time.

This first statement is not heretical because its equivalents are found in Scripture and the Confessions. (Acts 16:15, 16; 16:31; Romans 10:9; John 3:16. Canons II:5; III, IV: 8, Heidelberg Catechism Q. 84.)

It makes no essential difference in this case if we say 'God promises' or if we say that 'God says' or 'God swears'. God's Word is yea and amen always. Although it is correct to distinguish God's Word and the minister's word, it is an error to make a separation of the official preaching of the minister, his official preaching, "I preach," from the "thus saith the Lord." Such an error denies the true ministry of the Word.

b. The second statement reads: "Our act of conversion is a prerequisite to enter into the kingdom of God." That is the reading according to the information received from the minority group of Fuller Avenue. Very strange it is to read in a report of Classis East that the statement reads: "Man's act of conversion is a prerequisite to enter into the kingdom of heaven." It is very strange that there are not exactly the same quotations in these official reports.

This second statement with contextual reference among other things may refer to the requisites of salvation and may give prominence to the idea that these must be in the consciousness of one as fulfilled in Christ before such a one can lay hold of the claim to the riches of Christ and His kingdom. Such a statement may refer also to the progressive entering the kingdom as we are called to a godly walk, and to run the race that is set before us, to turn from self to Christ. (Cf. Psalm 100:4; 118:19, 20; Jeremiah 7:2, 3; Matthew 5:20; 7:13, 14; Luke 13:24; John 3; John 10:9; Acts 14:22; Hebrews 4:3; 12:1; 6:16-18; Heidelberg Catechism questions 88-90; 123; Confession of Faith XXII; Canons 1, 12, 13; III, IV:8. 9.

This statement may also with contextual reference give prominence to the truth that this prerequisite is fulfilled according to the will of God in Christ Jesus through His Spirit. (Cf. Acts 13:48; Col. 1:13; Ephesians 2:1-3).

4. That it is misrepresentation on the part of Classis East and the minority of the consistory, in the light of the above:

a. To say that the one statement teaches "a general promise of God unto salvation to all that externally hear the preaching of the gospel head for head and soul for soul, limited by a condition which man must fulfill," and further to quote Scripture and the Confessions as it condemns the error of the Arminians.

b. To say that the second statement "teaches that our act of conversion is a prerequisite to enter the Kingdom of God, which means that we convert, humble ourselves before we are translated from the power of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son"

c. To give this restatement of the two statements according to the meaning of the judges, after having denied the accused the right to his meaning and statement and teaching.

This same treatment would then have to be applied to every Scripture and speech, and to the Word of God too, if just. It

is obvious that when the Lord says in one instance of the Bible that He repents, we may not deny Him the right to say that per se, or say that He contradicts Himself, since He also says, "He is not a man that He should repent." So too, if Jesus says, "God so loved the world", we may not deny Him the right to say that, alleging that it is per se heretical for the word "world" may mean "reprobate world" according to Jesus own usage.

Consistory of Bellflower,
(w.s.) L. Doezeema
(w.s.) John Buma

August 21, 1953

Such was the material on the table at Classis.

Notice, by the way, that there was no other material of any kind that was legally before the Classis concerning this case. Neither the letter addressed by the Consistory of First Church (signed H. Hoeksema, C. Hanko, G. Stadt) to all the consistories, announcing De Wolf's suspension, nor the letter addressed to all the Consistories by De Wolf's schismatic group was before the Classis. Mind you, this constituted the evidence in the case (this, plus the decisions of Classis East), and this evidence was not even legally before the Classis. It is true, some individual delegates had this material with them; but it was not before the Classis officially. All the Classis had, in other words, was the say-so of Bellflower, Oskaloosa, and Pella. And even a cursory examination of those three documents will reveal that all three documents ignore the facts, ignore the grounds offered by Classis for its decisions, and, in their attempt to produce grounds for their stand in some cases offer mere opinions which themselves require proof. But, mark you well, here there was a case before the Classis, *and none of the evidence in the case was even presented for examination!* Talk about church order! Talk about justice! The type of justice defended, I take it, by that insidious and slanderous little magazine which calls itself the *Reformed Guardian*!

But let us go on.

There came a motion to adopt the first point of Bellflower's instruction (see above). This motion caused much discussion. Oskaloosa really wanted their instruction first. Pella liked their presentation better. But in all the lengthy and confused discussion the delegates were essentially agreed: they wanted to sustain De Wolf *cum sociis*, but they could not agree as to the formulation and the grounds. Not a single voice was raised in opposition to this motion, or any other motion that was presented, on principal grounds. The minds were made up. It is true, a couple of delegates spoke of premature action, and would rather "ask Classis East to reconsider their action"; but even these did not differ principally, and

ultimately voted with the majority too. It reminded one strongly of 1924 when they said: "He must get out; but how do we get him out?"

It was in the light of this very attitude of the Classis that the delegates from Doon simply kept silence during the afternoon and evening meetings of Classis. The die was cast. There was no sense in giving any advice as to how to proceed, etc.; it would simply be aiding the enemy. Nor was there any sense in debating the issue, for one would only be accused of obstructionism or be ignored. Besides, the Classis knew our position; and, moreover, the undersigned had to no avail debated the underlying issues of this whole controversy as long as he resided in Classis West. Hence, we kept silence, that the Classis might work out its own condemnation.

A substitute motion was then presented by the Rev. W. Hofman. Its content was principally the same as the preceding motion. The peculiar thing was that the motion without the grounds was first presented, and the chairman allowed the Classis to "chew the rag" about it for a long time, while the Rev. Hofman worked on a formulation of some grounds.

But Classis could not agree on a formulation! Some did not want to speak of "minority" and "majority" in the case. Others had different objections to the formulation. Some still spoke of reconsideration by Classis East. But on one thing the Classis was certainly agreed: *they must take a stand somehow that clearly supported De Wolf, and, condemned Hoeksema.*

Finally the Classis was so thoroughly ensnared in its own deliberations that in desperation they returned to the original suggestion of the Rev. J. Howerzyl, that a committee be appointed to advise Classis about the 3 overtures and to suggest a formulation that would in substance agree with all three instructions. About midway in the afternoon this was done, and a recess was called until 7 p.m., when the committee would be ready. At 7:45 the evening session began, and the committee presented its report, quoted below:

Report of Committee Re Documents of Pella, Oskaloosa and Bellflower

On the basis of these documents we advise Classis to express:

I. That we cannot recognize the suspension of Rev. De Wolf and the deposition of the elders supporting him but on the contrary must consider Rev. De Wolf with his consistory and congregation as the legal and proper continuation of the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Grounds:

1. This action of suspension and deposition was taken at an illegal consistory meeting since many of the legal office-bearers of that consistory were not notified of this meeting.

2. The Revs. H. Hoeksema and C. Hanko and the elders following them failed to follow the proper church political order of appeal when:

a. The Rev. Hoeksema deserted the legal consistory meeting discussing the case.

b. The Revs. Hoeksema, C. Hanko with the consistory members following them severed themselves from the rest of the congregation and organized separate meetings and activities.

II. Regarding the specific documents we advise Classis to express:

A. Re Oskaloosa—that Classis adopt the advice of our committee as under I rather than support the overture of Oskaloosa since:

1. Our advice concurs with the stand taken by Oskaloosa regarding the suspension of the Rev. De Wolf and the deposition of the elders supporting him.

2. Oskaloosa's grounds are not specific and properly formulated when they simply state, "from the letters received it is evident" and again "from the available evidence."

B. Re Pella—

1. Your committee advises under Instruction I, to adopt our expression rather than that of Pella, since:

a. This stand agrees in general with that of Pella.

b. Some of Pella's language is not too clear.

2. Your committee advises under Instruction II, to express that, unless Pella has received official information Classis cannot express itself on this matter.

3. Your committee advises under Instruction III, that we answer Pella, that the appointment of new professors belongs to Synod; see constitution of the Theological School, Art. 6.

C. From Bellflower:

1. That regarding the Church-political aspect Classis adopt our expression since it in general concurs with that of Bellflower.

2. Regarding the material aspect, your committee is not convinced that we are called upon to enter this material as Classis.

III. Finally we advise Classis:

A. To send these documents and our decisions to all the Consistories of our churches, including the two groups in Fuller Avenue.

B. To send these documents and our decisions to Classis East with a letter pleading with and exhorting Classis East to work for reconciliation and unity among the churches and congregations and not follow the way of separation and division which was furthered when Classis East stipulated the entire course of action which was to be followed in this case, a matter which was not before Classis.

Note: Elder Flikkema wishes to state that he does not support all of point I. His expression of Point I is as follows: "That we cannot recognize the suspension of Rev. De Wolf and the deposition of the elders supporting him. Since this action of suspension and deposition was taken at an illegal consistory meeting, since many of the legal office-bearers of that consistory were not notified of this meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Your committee,

(w.s.) J. De Jong, W. Hofman, J.
W. Van Weelden, M. Flikkema and
G. Mesman.

All of this advice up to the second point regarding

Bellflower (II, C, 2) was with only a few minor changes adopted by the Classis. The principal decision, Point I, was adopted by all except the two negative votes of Doon. From that time on Doon did not vote at all anymore. And at the end of the evening session when Classis adjourned until the following morning, the delegates from Doon repeated their announcement of the morning session, informing the chairman of their departure and of their intention to appeal against Classis.

The doctrinal part of Bellflower's instruction was not treated by the Classis that evening, but again given into the hands of the committee for advice. What became of that part we do not know, since we left the gathering of what was now a *schismatic classis*.

Such is the history of the case.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Much can be said about these decisions. And, D.V., we shall certainly furnish a complete criticism of them in the near future.

That, however, is not the point now. Our intention is now to sound a warning to every consistory, to Classis East, and to all who wish to remain Protestant Reformed! It is this: *you may not recognize and maintain these decisions. Nor may you recognize any officebearer or consistory or classis that maintains these decisions.* They are not Protestant Reformed, but schismatic!

And the reason is plain. First of all, bear in mind that you do not deal here with mere decisions, which may be the subject of debate and argument. You deal with *concrete actions*, or, as one of the delegates himself expressed it, with *finalities*. From now on it is either...or! For, in the second place, it must be evident to all that any person, be he member or officebearer, and any consistory or classis, which supports and recognizes a schismatic group, such as that of De Wolf and his followers, *is also guilty of schism*. I cannot, and you may not, any more recognize Classis West as a legal Protestant Reformed classis, or, in fact, as a classis at all, as long as they continue in their schism! They are nothing but a schismatic group!

That means too, whether you are in the majority or in the minority, that you may not recognize your consistory if it maintains this stand of Classis West. Size and numbers and majority have nothing to do with this question: you may not for a moment recognize these schismatics.

Classis East may not give them an advisory vote, should they appear there, any more than they may seat De Wolf as a delegate. Our Synod, whether the

continued synod of next March, or the new Synod of next June, may not seat them as delegates. They have departed; and until they return, which may God graciously grant, and confess their error, they may not be acknowledged.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

As to the future of our churches here in the West, I do not know as yet just how things will develop. I do know, however, that Doon does not stand alone among our people. There are still many of our members and officebearers too who are with us, and who must now take action. Many of them have long awaited this moment, for they saw it coming. Others are beginning to see things only recently.

But may God give us grace to be faithful in the face of much opposition and many opponents. When He is for us, who can be against us?

—H. C. Hoeksema

— : — : —

IN MEMORIAM

On August 29, 1953, the Lord called to his eternal home our beloved sister in law and aunt

MRS. PETER PASTOOR

at the age of 82 years.

Mr. & Mrs. Cornelius Pastoor
Mrs. Ben Pastoor
Mrs. Gerrit Pastoor
Mrs. Herman Pastoor
Mrs. John Pastoor
Nephews and nieces

Grand Rapids, Michigan



It is in the church, as it is with nations: war must sometimes be carried on, in order to establish a sound and durable peace at last.

—Toplady

The best watchfulness I know of, is a continued looking to, and dependence on, the grace of God's Holy Spirit, from moment to moment.

—From Toplady

CONTRIBUTIONS

Dear Editor of the *Standard Bearer*:

If space permits, please publish the following in the *Standard Bearer*, so that we as churches may know both sides of the burning question, as this is making history with rapid strides, also here in Holland, Mich. Thus the following:— WHAT NEXT?

The above question is very up to date here in Holland, and it is anyone's guess just what the development of this "Condition in the Reformed Sense Idea" will bring to light next.

Spellbound with the perplexities for all that is taking place in general, the 'Conditional-Promise' concept, here in Holland bursted into further development when on Sunday morning, Aug. 23rd, just prior to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, Rev. Kok (in his sermon) told the congregation that if we didn't believe in a 'Conditional-Promise' that then we didn't have the right to partake of the Lord's Supper—that he had always believed in a 'Conditional-Promise', and that this was Protestant Reformed—and THAT WE MIGHT TELL ANYONE THAT REV. KOK SAID SO. I (H.V.P.) have checked, and double-checked these above statements, as to their validity and find the essence of same undeniably true. Thus, I take the liberty TO TELL ANYONE, of this latest development of the 'Conditional-Promise' *idea doctrine*.

Secondly: On Sunday Aug. 30, we had another surprise, which deeply saddened many of us, when the bulletin revealed that one of our ministers who had preached for Rev. De Wolf (Suspended) and the (elders deposed), congregation, was to preach for us during the evening service here. Thus to him was extended the hand of fellowship, and the greeting of God-speed to officially conduct the preaching of the Word from Holland's pulpit, EVEN OVER THE PROTEST OF ONE OF THE ELDERS (which I have investigated H.V.P.). One might ask "Is this one of those 'reformed conditions' also?" My allotted (?) space is full. Maybe more later.

Yours in Christ;

H. A. Van Putten
Holland, Mich.



The way to heaven lies, not over a toll-bridge, but over a free bridge: even the unmerited grace of God in Christ Jesus.

—Toplady

INDEX TO VOLUME XXIX

INDEX OF TEXTS

Texts	Author	Page	No.
Genesis 25:27-34	G.L.	351	15
Psalms 4:6-8	G.V.	145	7
Psalms 17	G.V.	337	15
Psalms 22	G.V.	409	18
Psalms 24	G.V.	433	19
Psalms 26	G.V.	457	20
Psalms 28	G.V.	481	21
Psalms 34:9	G.V.	38	2
Psalms 118 (Continued from Vol. 28)	G.V.	13	1
Continued	G.V.	92	4
Isaiah 49:14-16	G.V.	313	14
Isaiah 53:8, 9	G.L.	303	13
Micah 7:19	G.V.	73	4
Matthew 5:8	G.V.	97	5
Matthew 5:9	G.V.	63	3
Matthew 7:7-11	G.V.	169	8
Matthew 7:21-23	G.L.	395	17
Matthew 15:25, 26	G.V.	217	10
Matthew 16:7b	G.V.	289	13
Matthew 27:45, 46	G.V.	265	12
Luke 2:15-18, 20	G.V.	121	6
Luke 22:41-44	G.V.	240	11
John 3:16	G.V.	1	1
John 6:51	G.L.	373	16
John 11:43	G.V.	193	9
Acts 2:2-4, 11	G.V.	385	17
Romans 11:6	G.V.	361	16
I Corinthians 15:20	G.L.	324	14
Ephesians 5:1, 2	G.V.	49	3
Colossians 3:3	G.V.	25	2
I Peter 1:1, 2	G.L.	18	1
I Peter 1:3	G.L.	42	2
I Peter 1:4, 5	G.L.	71	3
Continued	G.L.	95	4
Continued	G.L.	119	5
I Peter 1:6, 7	G.L.	140	6
I Peter 1:8, 9	G.L.	236	10
I Peter 1:10-12	G.L.	254	11
Continued	G.L.	279	12
I Peter 1:13	G.L.	445	19
Continued	G.L.	469	20
I Peter 1:14-16	G.L.	491	21
I John 2:15-17	G.L.	164	7
Continued	G.L.	185	8

INDEX OF SUBJECTS TREATED

— A —

Absalom Recalled	G.M.O.	68	3
Absalom Revolt—The	G.M.O.	138	6
Absalom Slain	G.M.O.	274	12
Continued	G.M.O.	297	13
Continued	G.M.O.	321	14
Absalom's Murder of Ammon	G.M.O.	67	3
Absolute Antithesis—The	M.S.	455	19
Afraid of the Gospel	J.A.H.	471	20
Continued	J.A.H.	493	21
Age of the Earth—The	H.H.	238	10
Agonizing Cry in Outer Darkness—The	G.V.	265	12
Agony of Jesus—The	G.V.	240	11
Anguish in Darkness	G.V.	409	18
Another Declaration of Principles	M.S.	384	16
Antithesis and Common Grace—The	M.S.	335	14
Arminian or Remonstrant Struggle	G.M.O.	348	15
As to the Birth of the Church	M.S.	287	12
Ascension Into the Hill of God	G.V.	433	19
And Peter	G.V.	289	13

Subject

Author Page No.

— B —

Behoudenis Des Levens—De	G.V.	217	10
Belofte Van Zekere Bevrediging—De	G.V.	169	8
Book Reviews	M.S.	262	11
Book Reviews:			
Christ in His Suffering, by Dr. K. Schilder	H.H.	225	10
De Zegels Hem Bescharen, by Rev. Dirk Sikkell	H.H.	58	3
Deuteronomium, by Dr. J. Ridderbos	H.H.	150	7
Dogmatic Theology, by Wm. G. T. Shedd	H.H.	321	14
Dossier 333, by B. Nijenhuis	H.H.	150	7
Exodus, by Dr. P. N. Kruyswijk	H.H.	293	13
Het Evangelie Naar Mattheus, by Dr. D. Jacob	H.H.	199	9
Het Hooglied, by Dr. G. Ch. Aalders	H.H.	150	7
Jeremiah I, by Rev. H. A. Wiersenga	H.H.	293	13
Kentering in de Vrijzinnigheid, by Dr. G. Brillenburg-Wurth	H.H.	198	9
Minor Prophets, by Lange	H.H.	58	3
Moeder Zeg Me Eens, by V. D. Burg and Bult	H.H.	58	3
Oud Testamentische Kanoniek, by Dr. G. Ch. Aalders	H.H.	34	2
Outlines In Dogmatics, by Rev. S. G. De Graaf	H.H.	293	13
Paradise, by Jan Overduin	H.H.	344	15
Principles of Personality Building for Christian Parents, by C. B. Eavy	H.H.	226	10
Reformed People—What Now?, by Rev. G. Toornvliet and Dr. H. S. Westerink	H.H.	226	10
Regeneration, by Dr. J. D. De Groot	H.H.	226	10
Spreuken, by Dr. W. H. Gispen	H.H.	106	5
The Art of Praying and Speaking in Public, by Herbert Lockyer	H.H.	58	3
The City of God, by Dr. D. K. Wielenga	H.H.	334	15
The Faith of the Fathers, by Rev. P. Visser	H.H.	439	19
The First Epistle of John, by R. S. Candlish	H.H.	198	9
The Last Things—The End of the Ages, by Dr. K. Dijk	H.H.	225	10
The Lord's Property, by Rev. J. G. Feenstra	H.H.	226	10
The Typology of Holy Scripture, by P. Fairbairn	H.H.	151	7
The Untouchable, by Rev. J. Overduin	H.H.	438	19
The Word of God in Human Script, by Dr. H. J. Westerink	H.H.	344	15
The Word of Christ, by Dr. G. C. Berkhouwer	H.H.	438	19
This Happened in the Hills of Kentucky, by John Vogel	H.H.	106	5
Whyte's Bible Characters, by Alexander Whyte	H.H.	321	14
Zielszorg en Psychiatrie, by B. Chr. Hames	H.H.	106	5
Breach is Widened—The	H.C.H.	495	21

— C —

Canons of Dordrecht	H.C.H.	256	11
Continued	H.C.H.	281	12
Continued	H.C.H.	305	13
Continued	H.C.H.	328	14
Continued	H.C.H.	355	15

Subject	Author	Page	No.	Subject	Author	Page	No.
Continued	H.C.H.	375	16	How the Guardian Defends Heresy	H.H.	460	20
Continued	H.C.H.	399	17	Continued	H.H.	484	21
Continued	H.C.H.	425	18	Man's Freedom and Responsibility	H.H.	412	18
Continued	H.C.H.	499	19	Our Candidates	H.H.	412	18
Continued	H.C.H.	473	20	Our Visit to Europe	H.H.	316	14
Censured	H.H.	343	15	Reorganization	H.H.	220	10
Changes His Mind on Unions	M.S.	383	16	Reply to Rev. Kok	H.H.	76	4
Children's Retreat Et Alia	G.L.	212	9	Continued	H.H.	100	5
Choosing the Right Church	H.H.	192	8	The Closing of Concordia	H.H.	76	4
Christian Education (See Under Education etc.)				The Deposition of an Officebearer	H.H.	172	8
Church and the Sacraments—The	H.V.	401	17	The New Bible	H.H.	245	11
Continued	H.V.	427	18	The Promise According to the Confession			
Continued	H.V.	451	19	(Continued from Vol. 28)	H.H.	4	1
Continued	H.V.	475	20	Continued	H.H.	28	2
Church Order	G.V.D.B.	260	11	Continued	H.H.	52	3
Continued	G.V.D.B.	285	12	Continued	H.H.	148	7
Continued (Article 1)	G.V.D.B.	309	13	Continued	H.H.	196	9
Continued	G.V.D.B.	333	14	Continued	H.H.	220	10
Continued	G.V.D.B.	359	15	Continued	H.H.	244	11
Continued (Article 2)	G.V.D.B.	360	15	The Promise and Conditions According to			
Continued	G.V.D.B.	381	16	Scripture	H.H.	268	12
Continued (Article 3)	G.V.D.B.	405	17	Continued	H.H.	292	13
Continued	G.V.D.B.	429	18	The Split	H.H.	436	19
Continued (Article 4)	G.V.D.B.	453	19	Why We Should Read the Standard Bearer ..	H.H.	124	6
Continued	G.V.D.B.	477	20	Education—Looking to the Future (See Under			
Classis West Versus the Declaration	H.H.	341	15	Looking to the Future etc.)			
Continued	H.H.	364	16	Exposition of I Corinthians 15:20	G.L.	324	14
Continued	H.H.	388	17	Exposition of I John 2:15-17	G.L.	164	7
Closing of Concordia—The	H.H.	76	4	Continued	G.L.	185	8
Common Grace	H.H.	142	6	Exposition of I Peter 1 (Verses 1, 2)	G.L.	18	1
Conditions in the Light of Scripture	H.H.	292	13	Continued (Verse 3)	G.L.	42	2
Contributions:				Continued (Verses 4, 5)	G.L.	71	3
Biased and Sidetracked	H. A. Van Putten	46	2	Continued	G.L.	95	4
Doctrinal in the Wrong Sense	J. H. Kortering	47	2	Continued	G.L.	119	5
Continued	J. H. Kortering	72	3	Continued (Verses 6, 7)	G.L.	140	6
Een Noodkreet Uit Redlands	J. R. Vander Wal	384	16	Continued (Verses 8, 9)	G.L.	236	10
What Next?	H. A. Van Putten	500	21	Continued (Verses 10-12)	G.L.	254	11
Cry For Help—A	G.V.	337	15	Continued	G.L.	279	12
				Continued (Verse 13)	G.L.	445	19
— D —				Continued	G.L.	469	20
David's Flight	G.M.O.	187	8	Continued (Verses 14-16)	G.L.	491	21
Continued	G.M.O.	208	9	Exposition of Genesis 25:27-34	G.L.	351	15
David's Grief for Absalom	G.M.O.	370	16	Exposition of the Heidelberg Catechism—An (See Under			
David's Return	G.M.O.	393	17	Triple Knowledge etc.)			
Continued	G.M.O.	443	19	Exposition of Isaiah 53:8, 9	G.L.	303	13
Defeat of Ahithophel's Counsel	G.M.O.	232	10	Exposition of John 6:51	G.L.	373	16
Deposition of an Officebearer—The	H.H.	172	8	Exposition of Matthew 7:21-23	G.L.	395	17
Discipline	H.H.	166	7				
Dr. Daane and Common Grace	M.S.	431	18	— F —			
Doctrinal in the Wrong Sense	J. H. Kortering	47	2	Filled with the Spirit	G.V.	385	17
Continued	J. H. Kortering	72	3	First Protestant Reformed Church Splits	M.S.	479	20
Dutch Sentiments	H.H.	166	7	Followers of God	G.V.	49	3
— E —							
Eating and Drinking Christ	M.S.	455	19	— G —			
Editorials:				Gods Eeuwige Ontferming	G.V.	73	4
Censured	H.H.	343	15	Gods Groote Goedertierenheid (Continued from			
Classis West Versus the Declaration	H.H.	341	15	Vol. 28)	G.V.	13	1
Continued	H.H.	364	16	Continued	G.V.	92	4
Continued	H.H.	388	17	God's Love of Zion	G.M.O.	189	8
Continued	H.H.	484	21	God's Providence (Continued from Vol. 28—			
				No. 20)	H.V.	34	2

Subject	Author	Page No.	Subject	Author	Page No.
Continued	H.V.	59 3	Continued	G.M.O.	273 12
Continued	H.V.	83 4	Man's Freedom and Responsibility	H.H.	412 18
Continued	H.V.	111 5	Meditations:		
Continued	H.V.	131 6	A Cry for Help	G.V.	33 15
Continued	H.V.	159 7	And Peter	G.V.	289 13
Continued	H.V.	179 8	Anguish in Darkness	G.V.	409 18
Continued	H.V.	203 9	Ascension Into the Hill of God	G.V.	433 19
Continued	H.V.	226 10	De Behoudenis Des Levens	G.V.	217 10
Good Order	G.V.D.B.	309 13	De Belofte Van Zekere (Bevrediging)	G.V.	169 8
Good Order and Our Churches	G.V.D.B.	333 14	De Herders	G.V.	121 6
Gospel and the Command—The	G.M.O.	23 1	Filled With the Spirit	G.V.	385 17
Grace or Work	G.V.	361 16	Followers of God	G.V.	49 3
Green Eyes	J.A.H.	397 17	Gods Eeuwige Ontferming	G.V.	73 4
— H —			Grace or Work	G.V.	361 16
Heidelberg Catechism (See under Triple Knowledge etc.)			Het Leven der Hemelburgers	G.V.	25 2
Herders—De	G.V.	121 6	Innocence Attacked	G.V.	457 20
Hoeksema's Foolish Binding	M.S.	311 13	Jehovah's Faithfulness	G.V.	313 14
Hofman Learns a New Word	H.H.	486 21	Light for the Future	G.V.	145 7
How the Guardian Defends Heresy	H.H.	460 20	Supplication	G.V.	481 21
Continued	H.H.	484 21	The Agonizing Cry in Outer Darkness	G.V.	265 12
How the Old Country Knows History	H.H.	94 4	The Agony of Jesus	G.V.	240 11
— I —			The Love of God for the World	G.V.	1 1
Ignorance	H.H.	214 9	The Pure in Heart	G.V.	97 5
Innocence Attacked	G.V.	457 20	The Raising of Lazarus	G.V.	193 9
Introduction to Contending for the Faith	H.V.	258 11	Missions and the Creeds	H.H.	143 6
Continued	H.V.	283 12	Moses Intercession	G.M.O.	20 1
Introduction to Decency and Order	G.V.D.B.	260 11	My Brother's Keeper	J.A.H.	326 14
Continued	G.V.D.B.	285 12	Continued	J.A.H.	353 15
I Will Sing	J.A.H.	252 11	Continued	J.A.H.	377 16
Continued	J.A.H.	277 12	— N —		
— J —			New Bible—The	H.H.	245 11
Jehovah's Faithfulness	G.V.	313 14	— O —		
Journalistic Ethics	H.C.H.	230 10	Off-scouring of All Things—The	H.H.	191 8
— L —			Our Candidates	H.H.	412 18
Later Prophets—The	G.M.O.	467 20	Our Courts on the Spot	M.S.	407 17
Leven der Hemelburgers—Het	G.V.	25 2	Our Visit to Europe	H.H.	316 14
Liberated Slam the Door Shut—The	H.H.	117 5	— P —		
Light for the Future	G.V.	145 7	Prayers for the Liberated	M.S.	312 13
Looking to the Future (Continued from Vol. 28)	H.C.H.	16 1	Promise According to the Confessions—The (Con-		
Continued	H.C.H.	40 2	tinued from Vol. 28)	H.H.	4 1
Continued	H.C.H.	65 3	Continued	H.H.	28 2
Continued	H.C.H.	87 4	Continued	H.H.	52 3
Continued	H.C.H.	114 5	Continued	H.H.	148 7
Continued	H.C.H.	135 6	Continued	H.H.	196 9
Continued	H.C.H.	162 7	Continued	H.H.	220 10
Continued	H.C.H.	183 8	Continued	H.H.	244 11
Continued	H.C.H.	207 9	Promise and Conditions According to Scrip-		
Love of God for the World—The	G.V.	1 1	tures—The	H.H.	268 12
— M —			Promise of the Holy Spirit—The	H.V.	403 17
Mahanaim	G.M.O.	249 11	Providence of God (See under God's Providence etc.)		
— R —			Pure in Heart—The	G.V.	97 5
Raising of Lazarus—The	G.V.	193 9	Purified in His Fear	J.A.H.	423 18



MRS EFFIE MONSMA
726 FRANKLIN ST SE. 2 54
CITY 7

504

THE STANDARD BEARER

Subject	Author	Page No.	Subject	Author	Page No.
Reconciliation—The	G.M.O.	88 4	— W —		
Reformed Guardian	M.S.	480 20	What Does Brotherhood Mean	M.S.	287 12
Reorganization	H.H.	220 10	Why Doctrines Have a History	H.V.	307 13
Reply to Rev. Kok	H.H.	76 4	Continued	H.V.	331 14
Continued	H.H.	100 5	Why We Should Read the Standard Bearer	H.H.	124 6
Rite of Expiatory Sacrifices—The	G.M.O.	107 5	Women Suffrage in the Netherlands	M.S.	312 13
Continued	G.M.O.	137 6	— Z —		
Continued	G.M.O.	155 7	Zalige Ervaring Van Gods Goedheid	G.V.	38 2
— S —			Index by Rev. J. Howerzyl		
Science and the Bible	H.H.	116 5			
Smoking and Cancer	H.H.	143 6			
Split—The	H.H.	436 19			
Study of the History of Doctrine—The	H.V.	357 15			
Continued	H.V.	379 16			
Supplication	G.V.	481 21			
— T —					
Tamar Defiled	G.M.O.	44 2			
That Fifth Sparrow	J.A.H.	301 13			
The New Bible	H.H.	214 9			
Theological Dialecticism Vs. the Three Points	H.H.	167 7			
Triple Knowledge—The (Continued from					
Vol. 28)	H.H.	7 1			
Continued	H.H.	31 2			
Continued	H.H.	55 3			
Continued	H.H.	79 4			
Continued	H.H.	104 5			
Continued	H.H.	127 6			
Continued (L.D. XXXIV)	H.H.	151 7			
Continued	H.H.	175 8			
Continued	H.H.	199 9			
Continued (L.D. XXXV)	H.H.	222 10			
Continued	H.H.	246 11			
Continued	H.H.	270 12			
Continued	H.H.	294 13			
Continued	H.H.	320 14			
Continued	H.H.	344 15			
Continued	H.H.	368 16			
Continued	H.H.	390 17			
Continued (L.D. XXXVI)	H.H.	390 17			
Continued	H.H.	417 18			
Continued	H.H.	439 19			
Continued (L.D. XXXVII)	H.H.	442 19			
Continued	H.H.	464 20			
Continued	H.H.	490 21			
Two Fundamental Principles in Preaching	H.V.	11 1			
— U —					
Unbreakable Scripture—The	M.S.	288 12			
Union Question—The	H.H.	94 4			
— V —					
Vacationing in His Fear	J.A.H.	447 19			
Vreedzamen Zaliggesproken—De	G.V.	63 3			