

THE STANDARD

Bearer

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME XXX

MAY 1, 1954—GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

NUMBER 15

MEDITATION

"We Will Wait Upon Thee"

"Are there any among the vanities of the Gentiles that can cause rain? or can the heavens give showers? art not thou he, O Lord our God? therefore we will wait upon thee: for thou hast made all these things."
Jeremiah 14:22

Thou art He, O Jehovah our God!

Not upon the vanities of the heathen, but upon Thee will we wait!

The idol gods cannot give rain. Neither do the heavens merely drop showers. But Thou art He. The matter of rain, and therefore also the matter of the withholding of rain, is strictly in Thine hand! For Thou hast made all these things. Thou art the sovereign Creator!

And Thou, O Jehovah, art *our* God!

How foolish, utterly vain, then, to wait upon the vanities of the Gentiles! What sheer folly to expect ought from the heavens!

Therefore . . . we will wait upon Thee!

And here in this vail of tears, when often it appears that thou hast utterly rejected us, and that thy soul loatheth Zion; when there is no healing for us; when we look for peace, and there is no good; when we look for the time of healing, and behold trouble;—here, O Jehovah, acknowledging our wickedness, because we have sinned against Thee, we will also humbly tell Thee in our prayers that Thou art He, begging of Thee for Thy name's sake that Thou wilt not abhor us, that Thou wilt not disgrace the throne of thy glory, that Thou wilt not break Thy covenant with us.

* * * *

The Israel of God you hear in these words, praying for Jehovah to remember them with rain in the time of famine. Judah mourns; its gates languish; they are black to the ground; the cry of Jerusalem is gone up. Ashamed and confounded they return from the pits with empty water vessels. The ground is chapt; the plowmen are ashamed. Even the beasts of forest and field despair. The hind calved

in the field, and, contrary to all animal instinct, forsook its young, because there was no grass. The wild asses are filled with panic, and snuff up the wind like dragons. Their eyes fail for lack of grass.

Once already, with humble confession of sin and backsliding, the prophet Jeremiah had prayed. And the Lord had said, "Pray not for this people for their good." But though most of Israel was apostate, and though the wicked were in high places and held sway in the land, yet there was that remnant, the remnant according to the election of grace.

And can God utterly reject Judah, then?

So the prophet prays again, appealing to the honor of God's own name, and concluding with the vow to wait upon Him.

And rain was important, yea, indispensable as long as Canaan was to be the promised land, and as long as the earthly Canaan was to be a type of the heavenly. For then there must be prosperity and plenty. Then the land must flow with milk and honey. Eventually, of course, the type must make room for the reality, and then rain is no more indispensable for Canaan. And when the prophet prays, that time is not far off any more. His prayer will be answered, not by rain and by the end of famine, but by further judgment upon wicked Israel, while to the remnant God promises redemption. And so while the righteous must suffer with wicked Israel, God is longsuffering over them, and He at length reveals His mercy. And the prayer of the righteous, as always availeth much. They are not put to shame who wait upon Him!

And while we do not live in the *promised land*, as Israel did; and while rain, even though we like it in proper measure, is not *really, absolutely* necessary as a token of God's favor, as it was in the land of Canaan; while in the land of shadows, if there was famine, God's people could ask the question as to whether God had utterly forsaken Judah; and while we are *not any more* in Canaan, and *not yet* in Canaan;—yet we are citizens of Canaan, and as such are pilgrims in the earth. And as long as we are in the earth, we are taught during our earthly pilgrimage to pray for our daily bread. Besides, until the end, as long as suns continue, as long as God's church must be born and gathered from

out of the whole human race, there must be bread to sustain their earthly existence. And the matter of rain or famine is closely connected with that daily bread: no rain, then no bread. And it is God's own promise, made for the sake of His own name, and in His particular grace over His own people: "While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease."

Dreadful it would be, then, not to find water, and to return with empty vessels from the pits. Horrible it is when the ground is chapt, and when the plowmen must be ashamed because it is folly to plow the chapt ground. God's promise, His eternal purpose of the salvation of His church, and therefore, His own name, are at stake.

We must have rain! Rain for the sake of God's covenant! Until the end of all things arrives . . .

* * * *

Upon whom, then, shall we wait?

To wait upon someone for anything means that you have your expectation from him upon whom you wait. It implies the authority to do something and the power to accomplish it on the part of him upon whom you wait. You do not expect a ditch digger to repair a watch. You do not wait upon an idiot to speak words of wisdom. You do not wait upon a buck private to command the army. They have not the power and authority. In the second place, that you *wait upon* someone implies acknowledgement of that power and authority. It implies, therefore, humility, meekness, lowliness, an attitude of silence and expectation before that authority and power. And therefore, to wait upon someone involves especially three virtues. It requires the virtue of contentment, according to which your inner state of heart and mind is in harmony with the will of him who has that authority and power, also as that will and that authority and power touches your life. It involves the virtue of confidence, trust, which has as its basis the knowledge that the power and authority is *for* you, in your favor, loves you, so that you need not be filled with anxiety and worry, but may be assured that this power and authority is used in the right way. And it involves the virtue of obedience, the willingness to do the will of him upon whom you wait. Thus a child waits upon its parents, a subject waits upon his king, and a servant waits upon his master.

And thus God's people wait upon Him!

Upon who else shall we wait, if the question of the authority and power to give rain is the criterion?

Upon the vanities of the heathen? Or upon the heavens?

Sometimes a question to which the answer is obvious states a truth more emphatically than a simple sentence. Thus it is with all three questions in our text.

Are there any among the vanities of the heathen that can give rain? That is a pertinent question. For if there are, then let us wait upon them. And if there are not, is it not rank folly to wait upon them? Your waiting will be

as vain as the vanities upon whom you wait! You have a concrete reference here, of course, to the idols of the Gentile nations round about the people of Israel, vain idols which Judah had introduced into the land of God, so many in number that Judah put the Gentile nations to shame in point of idol-worship.

And the answer is: No, emphatically no! Notice that the prophet speaks of "vanities," not merely of idols. They are no gods at all. They cannot see, they cannot speak, their ears are deaf, their hands are weak. They are but the product of man's sinful imagination, totally empty, devoid of any power and authority whatsoever. Helpless they are, like Baal in Elijah's time, to send either rain or fire. They have no control over flood or drought, over bountiful harvest or famine. Would you wait, then, upon vanities?

Besides, they are the vanities of the *heathen*, of those who have not been regenerated by the Spirit of Christ. And you, the Israel of God, His peculiar people, called out of darkness into His marvelous light, are regenerated, have the new life in you. Upon whom will ye wait?

O yes, and as surely as there are heathen, even civilized heathen, so surely are there heathen vanities upon whom the heathen wait. An idol, a heathen vanity, is anyone or anything beside the one true God, revealed in the Scriptures, which men may contrive and in which they put their trust. And they are as vain today as they were in Jeremiah's time, no matter how civilized they may be. As incapable of giving rain today, and a crop, and prosperity, or even a crumb of daily bread, they are, as they were in the time of Baal and Moloch and Ashtaroth.

Upon them, O God, we will not wait! We, Thy people, the sheep of Thy pasture, the children of Thy covenant, will have no expectation of them!

Nor upon the heavens will we wait. For though we often speak of the heavens as giving showers, and though we often talk as though we acknowledge no god at all, and though we often imagine that nature or fate must take its course, we know, O God, that the heavens cannot drop showers. They have no power in themselves. We know that when the dark clouds gather and rise from the western horizon, and when the gentle showers fall to quench the thirst of plant and beast and man, we know, O Jehovah, that the gathering of the clouds and the dropping of each droplet of water is not of the heavens. They have no power. They have no authority. "It" does not rain. And how, then, shall we make another idol of the heavens, the product of Thy creative power, and say that there is no God? How shall we wait upon the creature instead of the Creator?

Nay, but upon Thee shall we wait! For Thou art Jehovah our God!

Thou art not one among many. Thou art not the national idol of Israel, just as Baal is the god of the Zidonians, and Dagon the deity of the Philistines.

Thou art Jehovah! Our God is Jehovah! The I Am

art Thou, Who art Self-sufficient, and hast no need of any beside Thee. The Independent One, sovereign over all. Not the chief among the gods art Thou, as was Zeus among the gods on Mt. Olympus. Not very high, nor merely the highest, but absolute Sovereign Thou art. The Unchangeable One, Who always is, never becomes. The Almighty, the All-wise. Jehovah, our God!

Thou art He!

Thine is all the authority to send rain, not only, but to bless and to curse! Thou art Jehovah our God, the unchangeable, the ever-faithful God of Thy covenant. How canst Thou possibly forsake Zion?

Thine is all the power to do anything at all. Apart from Thee there is no power, — certainly no power to give showers.

Thine is all the wisdom, so that Thou knowest perfectly when and how and why and in what measure to send rain. And no one has any wisdom and knowledge apart from Thee.

And Thine is the sovereign determination of every last drop of rain.

We shall certainly wait upon Thee! Not as a favor to Thee shall we wait. For who can possibly do Thee a favor? And besides, Thou wilt certainly do all Thy good pleasure whether we wait upon Thee or not; Thou art the I Am, not dependent upon us. But we shall acknowledge Thy absolutely sovereign power and authority. We shall humbly be silent before Thee, whether Thou dost send rain or drought, plenty or scarcity. We shall be content, and not grumble; we shall be satisfied, and confess, "Thou doest all things well;" living by the day, we shall not be anxious and worried, but confident. And thus we shall make our prayers for bread and for rain.

Upon Thee shall we wait, and upon Thee exclusively. None else shall we acknowledge. Upon no arm of flesh shall we wait. Thou art He!

Thou art God! Thou hast made all these things. The heavens, the rain, all the things of nature, yea, the wood and the stone, the gold and the silver out of which the vanities of the heathen are formed. Thou hast made all by the Word of Thy power! And as the Creator, Who callest the things that were not as though they were, Thou art also the Upholder and Governor over all things. Thou, and Thou alone, canst cause rain!

Yea, more: Thou art *our* God. We are Thy people, by sovereign election, by gracious redemption, by irresistible calling! The objects of Thy love! In Christ Jesus! And in Him Thou hast caused us to know Thee!

Lord, give us grace to wait upon Thee. Amen.

H.C.H.

LADIES LEAGUE MEETING

The Eastern Ladies League Meeting will be held May 4, at 8 o'clock at Fourth Protestant Reformed Church. Rev. M. Schipper will be guest speaker. Let us all be sure to attend.
Mrs. G. Pipe, Vice Secretary.

THE STANDARD BEARER

Semi-monthly, except monthly during July and August

Published by the REFORMED FREE PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
P. O. Box 881, Madison Square Station, Grand Rapids 7, Mich.

Editor — REV. HERMAN HOEKSEMA

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

All matters relative to subscriptions should be addressed to Mr. G. Pipe, 1463 Ardmore St., S. E., Grand Rapids 7, Michigan. Announcements and Obituaries must be mailed to the above address and will be published at a fee of \$1.00 for each notice.

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

Subscription price: \$4.00 per year

Entered as Second Class matter at Grand Rapids, Michigan

CONTENTS

MEDITATION —	
"We Will Wait Upon Thee".....	337
Rev. H. C. Hoeksema	
EDITORIALS —	
Of Love and Hatred.....	340
Rev. H. Hoeksema	
Another Assault.....	341
Rev. G. M. Ophoff	
OUR DOCTRINE —	
The Triple Knowledge (Part III - Of Thankfulness).....	345
Rev. H. Hoeksema	
THE DAY OF SHADOWS —	
The Prophecy of Isaiah.....	347
Rev. G. M. Ophoff	
FROM HOLY WRIT —	
Exposition of I Peter 1-10.....	348
Rev. G. Lubbers	
IN HIS FEAR —	
Walking in Error (5).....	350
Rev. J. A. Heys	
CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH —	
The Church and the Sacraments.....	352
Rev. H. Veldman	
THE VOICE OF OUR FATHERS —	
The Canons of Dordrecht (Art. 8).....	354
Rev. H. C. Hoeksema	
DECENCY AND ORDER —	
Engaged in Secular Labor.....	356
Rev. G. Vanden Berg	
ALL AROUND US —	
Dr. James Daane vs. Prot. Ref. Theology and Ethics.....	357
Rev. M. Schipper	

EDITORIALS

Of Love and Hatred

In "Torch and Trumpet" the Rev. L. Verduin criticizes an article by the Rev. R. Leestma entitled "'Chaff' in the Bible." The latter article occurred in the issue of the above magazine of Dec. 1953-Jan. 1954. The criticism by Verduin appeared in the issue of April-May 1954.

It is not my intention to analyze the criticism of Verduin. Besides, a reply to his criticism by the Rev. Leestma is found in the same issue of "Torch and Trumpet" in which the criticism appears.

But what struck me forcibly in Verduin's article is that, while he, evidently, must have nothing of the spirit and attitude of the psalmist of Ps. 139:21, 22 expressed in the words: "Do I not hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? And am I not grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred; they are become mine enemies;" and while he alleges to love all men and does not want to hate any of them, not even the enemies of the Lord; yet, a spirit of hatred against me breathes through a large part of his article.

This is evident from:

1. The way he introduces me without rhyme or reason in his criticism of Leestma;

2. His elaboration of a quotation of Ps. 139:21, 22 I made at the synod of 1922, the synod that condemned the instruction of Dr. Janssen;

3. His dramatic representation of the statement, the circumstances in which it was made, and the effect it produced upon the entire audience. All this for the sake of creating a wrong impression of me;

4. The fact that he deliberately distorts the meaning of my statement, not only by taking it out of its context, but by inventing a context of its own;

5. All this for the evident purpose to create the impression that I, at the time, applied the text of Ps. 139 to the person of Dr. Janssen rather than to the professor that robbed the church of its sure foundation in the infallible Word of God.

This misrepresentation by Verduin is a lie.

Hence, I maintain that the article by Verduin, with all its alleged love to all men, breathes a spirit of hatred against a brother in Christ.

If this must be regarded as an expression of Verduin's love I, for one, like to be excused as an object of it.

Verduin used to be a Janssen man. Perhaps, he still is, for all I know.

But does Verduin know what Dr. Janssen used to say? He said this in my hearing: "I hope that God will take care of my friends, I am able to take care of my enemies."

He, evidently, referred to the friends that were supposed to support him, but who all forsook him when the

Synod of 1922 condemned his instruction, also the Rev. Verduin. Of only one man I know that consistently followed and defended Dr. Janssen. That was the Rev. Quirinus Breen.

And, strange to say, ever after, Dr. Janssen not only regarded Breen but also me as his friend. Often Breen used to visit me when he was, I believe, in Wheaton. On the way to Grand Rapids he visited Dr. Janssen who, at that time, was living in Chicago. And whenever Breen visited me in the parsonage on Franklin St. he never failed to bring me the sincere regards of Dr. Janssen. You know why? Because, although I had to become his opponent for the truth's sake, he knew that I had been honest with him and never did anything behind his back.

Let me briefly relate the history, much of which is not known.

When I left school in 1915 I respected Dr. Janssen with whom I had one year of instruction. When later, in Holland, some students spread rumors that the instruction of Dr. Janssen was modernistic I could not believe it and told the boys that they must not talk about those things in the churches because such gossip would be detrimental to the school. Dr. Janssen visited me, too, and complained about lack of cooperation among the professors in the seminary.

In 1919 I was in the Curatorium. A complaint was lodged against the instruction of Dr. Janssen by the rest of the seminary professors, Ten Hoor, Heyns, Berkhof and Volbeda. The committee of Curatorium appointed for the case advised this body: 1. To condemn the action of the four professors because they had never talked about their complaint with Dr. Janssen; 2. To express full confidence in the teaching of Dr. Janssen. With the first point I was in whole hearted agreement. Concerning the second point, however, I remarked that this was not necessary seeing that the very fact that the professor was allowed to teach in the seminary ought to be sufficient proof that he enjoyed our confidence, and that, if a special vote of confidence were needed, the matter ought first to be investigated. Point 1 was adopted, the second point was dropped.

In recess I approached Dr. Janssen and asked him if he was satisfied with this decision. By his looks I could tell that he was not. He took me into one of the rooms in the basement of the school and there I had a long talk with him. In the course of our conversation he pulled three letters out of his pocket supposed to have been written to him by some of the students that had discredited his instruction in the churches. He read them to me. In those letters the authors confessed two things: 1. That they had slandered Dr. Janssen; 2. That they had been dishonest in their examinations. Finally, Dr. Janssen complained once more about lack of cooperation in the faculty and asked me if I would approach Dr. Volbeda on this matter in order that more harmony and love might be created between the "four professors" and Dr. Janssen. This I promised.

Not long after a rather natural occasion arose to fulfill

my promise. Volbeda preached for me, while I had a classical appointment in Borculo, and he lodged with us. In the evening I heard him preach a strong sermon on Rom. 9:18. After the sermon, I asked him: "Professor, you know what my people will say this week? They will ask: how is it that with such strong professors we get such poor students?" He replied with another question: "Do they think that I am a zero (een nul in 't cijfer)? Do they think I am afraid?" I said that this was exactly what they would think. Thus we entered into a conversation about the school and I mentioned my talk with Dr. Janssen. I blamed him for not having talked with Dr. Janssen before they sent their letter about his instruction to the Curatorium. He asked me who those students were that had written those letters of apology to Dr. Janssen? I refused to mention names.

Shortly after he had left, however, I received a letter from Prof. Ten Hoor asking me to reveal those names for the reason that there was good ground to believe that what Dr. Janssen had read to me were no letters of the students at all, but merely notes which he had himself taken down!

Later this proved, in part, at least, to be correct.

Do you wonder that I became suspicious and decided to investigate what Dr. Janssen taught for myself? I collected a large pile of student notes, and made a thorough study of them. My eyes were opened to the danger of the professor's instruction at our school.

After the Synod of 1920, where the instruction of Dr. Janssen was elaborately discussed and the "four professors" were defeated, had reached a mere negative conclusion, viz. that it had not become evident ("het is niet gebleken") that there was anything unreformed in the instruction of Dr. Janssen, I criticized that negative decision and substantiated my criticism by quotations from the student notes. This I did in two articles in *The Banner*. This set the church on fire.

The case was reopened.

(By the way, at the time, I visited Dr. Janssen at his home, but discovered that he could not be approached as soon as he found that I stood opposed to him).

A committee of Curatorium was appointed to investigate the instruction of the professor. This committee, too, consisting of the Revs. H. J. Kuiper, H. Danhof, Manni, G. Hoeksema, Kromminga, Van Lonkhuyzen, and myself, also sought the cooperation of Dr. Janssen which he refused. For ten days that committee assembled in a room of the Douglas Park Church, Chicago, waded once more through all the notes, found nothing positive in them and much that was to be condemned. In spite of this, the committee finally split and offered to the Curatorium a majority and minority report.

The majority report, 120 pages print, was written by the Rev. Danhof and undersigned. Kuiper wrote the introduction. Manni simply approved of it.

It was chiefly on the basis of the contents of this majority report that Dr. Janssen was condemned and deposed by

the Synod of Orange City in 1922, and that, too, after he was repeatedly invited by synod to defend himself but refused.

Such is the history in brief.

Now, compare this all with the hateful harangue of Verduin in "Torch and Trumpet" in which he makes the deliberate impression that, in my quotation from Ps. 139, I was inspired by personal hatred against Dr. Janssen, and you will admit that, under the cloak of an alleged universal love to all men, he himself, as a former Janssen man, revealed a spirit of bitter hatred against the undersigned, and, incidentally, against the truth for which I stood in 1922 and still stand.

But what else can one expect?

It is my experience, throughout my ministry, that, if you mean to stand foursquarely on the basis of the Reformed truth in the Reformed Church, without compromise, you must expect personal hatred and opposition and finally be cast out.

Such is still my experience.

But, by the grace of God, I hope to be faithful to that truth until the end, that no one take my crown.

H.H.

Another Assault

(Conclusion)

I shall now deal with De Boer's slander to the effect that Rev. Hoeksema wanted a split and that he talked, wrote and preached split until he finally got his way. I stated that it is hard to conceive of a slander that is worse than this. To make this plain I must speak of things that are not generally known. What will also become plain is that none of us who are now with Rev. Hoeksema wanted a split.

I must begin with the private talks I had with Rev. De Wolf regarding that first heretical statement of his that had occurred in a sermon that he had preached on the Sunday of the 5th of April, 1951. These talks were carried on in a friendly way. For I did not want to offend the brother but my only purpose was to be instrumental in causing him to repudiate his error and to return to the right conception of things. I tried hard to get him to admit that the statement (God promises every one of you that, if you believe, you will be saved) is heretical and that it ought to be retracted. I labored with him as many as seven or possibly eight solid hours. But the brother refused to yield. On the contrary, especially during the hour of our last visit together, he defended the statement with determination and vigor. And so our talks together came to an end.

On parting, he asked me if I was going to protest on the consistory. I told him that I wouldn't, but I later changed my mind because I thought that he might give in, if admonished by the consistory. And so I protested on the consistory. I want to emphasize here that Hoeksema had nothing to do with this. Seeing that he had not heard the

sermon, I doubt whether I even told him that I was going to protest.

When my protest was read on the consistory, Rev. Hoeksema was present. But the following week he left for his vacation, it being early summer. And so the consistory treated my protest without him not only but also, as he had not committed himself, without knowing his stand.

Later in the summer of that year the consistory communicated to me its decision regarding my protest. I received from the consistory a notice to the effect that De Wolf had declared that he had not meant to preach a promise for all, that he had every intention of maintaining and defending the teaching of our Protestant Reformed churches and finally that henceforth he would refrain from using the statement, seeing that some had been offended by it, but, so he had said, without reason, since it did not set forth the promise as being for all but limited it to the believers. The notice asserted further that the consistory believed De Wolf on the basis of this his testimony and further that the offending statement had to be regarded in the light of De Wolf's testimony. Finally the notice urged me to accept the testimony of De Wolf and be satisfied with it. This was equivalent to requesting me that I drop my protest.

But let us take notice. Though De Wolf had declared that he was intended to continue to preach and maintain our Protestant Reformed truth, he had at the same time really maintained that statement. And though he had declared that henceforth he would not use the statement, he had not promised that he would discontinue to preach the theology wrapped up in it, so to say.

The consistory should have appraised that statement and pronounced it right or wrong, non-heretical or heretical. In a word, the consistory should have treated my protest. But it didn't. Its communication to me reveals its attitude toward Rev. De Wolf at that time, how it trusted him, and how ready it was to defend and to shield him. What makes this so worthy of note is that at that time the majority of the consistory—and this majority was rather substantial even—were brethren who are now holding with Rev. Hoeksema. None of them wanted De Wolf a heretic as has so often been said also by De Wolf and is still being said. Bent on trusting him, they refused to pin-point that statement of his and make an issue of it. And this was just as true of Hoeksema, as will now become evident.

As for me, when I received that notice from the consistory, I, too, began to debate with myself whether I had not better do as the consistory had urged and drop the case. I talked to Hoeksema about it, who in the meantime had returned from his vacation. I told him what the consistory had done with my protest and what it had advised me to do. And this is what he said (I clearly remember), "But you are going to drop it (the protest) aren't you? Drop it." And that is precisely what I did.

It's becoming as clear as crystal, isn't it, that De Boer's

contention to the effect that Hoeksema wanted a split is the vilest of lies. None of us wanted a split. None of us wanted De Wolf or anybody else in our midst a heretic.

As for me, I was rather relieved that Rev. Hoeksema had reacted as he did. I imagined that I now had an excuse for not going through with the case, which I was loathe to do.

But there was another protestant—the late Rev. D. Jonker—who, and we say this to his lasting credit, refused to do as he had been urged by the consistory—drop his protest (against the same statement of De Wolf). He insisted and continued to insist that the consistory treat his protest. This was in September of the same year. But during all the three or four months that followed the consistory refused, and its advice to Mr. Jonker continued to be that he drop his protest. But finally in the month of February of the following year (1952) it took action; it treated the protest.

In the meantime I had been chosen elder and was thus again in the consistory. I recall that on the Sunday of my installation, I said to Rev. Hoeksema, "I must guard against sitting there in the elders' pew in a critical mood, when De Wolf preaches." And this was his reply: "No you must not do that."

It was around this time, I believe, or it may have been later, that Mr. D. Jonker told Hoeksema that he was going to protest against Rev. Petter and asked Hoeksema's advice. He urged Jonker not to do it, and so he didn't. And yet De Boer could write that Hoeksema wanted a split.

The consistory then, treated the protest. The statement of De Wolf was examined. A study was made of it, and a motion was finally passed to declare that it was not the expression of the truth of the Confessions and the Scriptures. The statement is negative, it will be observed. But it condemns as heretical the statement of De Wolf nevertheless. De Wolf saw this, too. It explains his persistent refusal during those intervening eight months to subscribe the consistory's appraisal of his statement and to retract it. (I say, during those intervening eight months, i.e., from February 1952, when the protest was treated, to September of this same year—September, the month in which we got from De Wolf the sermon in which occurred the second of his two heretical statements). The most that De Wolf would do is to admit that his statement was an unhappy one. But he refused to say that it was heretical. On the contrary, he persisted in defending it with the Scriptures on the meetings of the consistory as often as we would again take up his case. And this was not often. At the close of a meeting he now and then would be asked if he was ready to retract, and his customary reply would be, "You have my answer," or "You know my stand." And then we would adjourn without doing anything about it. So it went. At no time during these eight months did we press the case. The consistory remained reluctant, and De Wolf was allowed to

continue functioning in his office as if there were not a cloud in the sky.

And what now had Rev. Hoeksema to do with all this, i.e., with the consistory's appraisal of De Wolf's statement? Nothing at all. Fact is that the consistory had dealt with the statement and expressed itself regarding it in a meeting on which Rev. Hoeksema was not present. Fact is that the consistory did not even know what he thought of the statement. For he had not committed himself. This is evident from the consistory's formulation of its appraisal of the statement of De Wolf. As was stated, it was negative and rather weak. Not only that, but the original formulation read, "That it (De Wolf's statement) is not a concise — mark you, concise — expression of the truth of the Confessions and the Scriptures."

This neither condemns nor approves. It really says very little. Later, after some debate, the word "consise" was eliminated. Now I ask, does this look as if the consistory was laboring with respect to De Wolf's statement under the direction and advice of Hoeksema? Certainly not. The consistory was strictly on its own, regarding De Wolf's statement and the treatment thereof, as far as Hoeksema was concerned.

All that I ever heard him say previously is that Mr. Jonker had a right to expect that the consistory treat his protest. And all I ever heard him say thereafter, during those eight intervening months, when at the close of our meeting the case would be brought up, — all I ever heard him say on such occasions, if he happened to be present, is, "I wish that Rev. De Wolf would retract that statement." This is all. But De Wolf would not. But even so, never once during all those eight months did I hear Rev. Hoeksema advise that action be taken against De Wolf. What is more, he continued to give De Wolf the hand and to cooperate with him in the ministry as his colleague. And I challenge any of the elders, who are now supporting De Wolf, and who were then in the consistory, to deny that what I here pen down is the truth.

But in the meantime, i.e., during those eight intervening months, Rev. De Wolf persisted in preaching the theology of that first heretical statement of his. But, of course, he avoided using that statement as to the form of its words. For so he had promised. But why should he not persist in preaching the theology wrapped up in that statement? He was all along maintaining it, wasn't he? We all, including the elders that now support him, heard him say, didn't we, on one of our last meetings together, that he couldn't retract the statement, as it expressed his convictions. It means that, taking him at his word, necessity was being laid upon him. He had no choice but to preach that theology. And so he did. Is De Wolf going to deny this? He can't. What it means is that De Wolf's preaching during those eight intervening months was Arminian as to its character and thrust, and sometimes even worse than Arminian. De Wolf knows

how often I told him so, to his very face after the service while at the same time giving him the hand as elder to avoid exposing him to the congregation, which I was always loathe to do. And De Wolf knows, too, and we all know, including the elders on the other side, that on our last meeting together I told him the same thing in the hearing of all of us, and not only that, but that I told him, too, that we had also heard sermons of him thoroughly modernist as to the tenor of their ethical teaching, and that, if he wanted proof, I would oblige him right then and there on the spot by naming the text and providing him with an outline of the sermon to which I had reference. But we all know that De Wolf did not accept that challenge, but kept silence. I am still willing to do, what I then offered. All that De Wolf needs to do is to say the word.

Every now and then during those eight months I would go to Hoeksema and complain to him about De Wolf's preaching and would emphasize that it was about time that something was done about it. But Hoeksema remained reluctant. It seems that he was not to be moved. His lassitude at this time proves so conclusively that he was speaking the truth, when, on the occasion of the graduation of the five candidates, he made, in the introduction of his address for that evening, the following remark, and I quote, "There is, as is well known to you all, a general rumor in our churches that there is going to be a split. With regard to this I wish to say, first of all, that my personal attitude and my personal feeling toward that rumor, which is very real, is that I think a split certainly must be regarded as very deplorable. I ought to know better than any of you, because I went through a split of the church in 1924. And I assure you that it is not a pleasure, but a very real and profound suffering to go through a split of the church. And I think it would cause me more suffering to experience a split in our Protestant Reformed Churches than the suffering I went through when the Christian Reformed Churches cast me out . . ." (Standard Bearer, Vol. 29, pages 412-413).

Taking action against De Wolf was not a small thing. It was not hard to see, in view of developments, that in all likelihood the outcome would be a split in the churches. And that Hoeksema dreaded with his whole soul. I know whereof I speak. For I speak from my own experiences with him. His whole attitude prior to the month of September (1952), in which we got from De Wolf the sermon in which the second heretical statement of his occurred, proves it.

And yet De Boer could write that Hoeksema wanted a split and therefore, instead of calling for unity, understanding, and calm discussion — something that he did not do, De Boer means to say — he talked, wrote and preached split until he finally got what he wanted — a split. This, I believe, is one of the vilest lies that was ever uttered by human lips. Who cannot see this in the light of what is here being written?

Now De Wolf and his elders knew Hoeksema's attitude as well as I. They knew that a split is what he wanted least of all. Yet they allowed also that lie of De Boer to be printed and distributed among the people. And attend to this statement of theirs contained in their "cross bill." I quote, "That by reason of the fact that said Herman Hoeksema could not control by his domineering methods certain persons who were elected to the consistory of this church, the said Herman Hoeksema seized upon a pretext, without merit, to cause a schism and split in said church with the purpose in view of securing the property thereof as set forth in plaintiff's bill of complaint." End of quote. This, mark you, was stated under oath.

Hoeksema wanted a split? Fact is that he did all within his power to prevent it. How? By a persistent and zealous vindication in our midst of sound doctrine over against heresy and error, in a word, by exactly calling — continually calling — for unity — true unity — thus by doing precisely the very thing that De Boer accuses him of not doing.

The expression "calm discussion" occurs in that sentence of De Boer (see above). It is well known that the earmark of the heretic is that, while trampling the truth, he at the same time is forever calling for "calm discussion," love, forbearance, and the like. Yet of all persons he is the most intolerant and sinfully hateful.

Finally, in September we got from De Wolf the thoroughly modernist sermon in which appeared the second of the two heretical statements of De Wolf on which we concentrated. And then Hoeksema finally did take action against De Wolf. For, having himself heard that sermon, he knew that he had no other choice. He perceived that things had come to such a pass that inaction prolonged beyond that juncture would be treason to the cause of the truth. And the courage and determination that was needed to take action was given him.

But how he labored with De Wolf and his supporting elders on the meetings of the consistory in the hope that he might be instrumental in saving them for the truth of God's Gospel, we all know who at the time were in the consistory. It means that as always he was doing his utmost to prevent a split by calling for *true* unity and understanding. But the split came notwithstanding. It came through his very and persistent vindication of sound doctrine against heresy and error also on our consistory meetings. For so God wanted it. It was His doing. For our churches were already split actually and essentially. Being no longer united in the truth, we had come to the parting of the ways.

One more thing. To cause schism in the church is a great sin. So there is still this question. Whose is that sin and responsibility in the present case? Not Hoeksema's, not ours certainly. It is the sin of those among us who departed from the truth and went over to the lie. These are the people that De Boer must accuse of preaching, talking and writing split until they finally got their way.

G.M.O.

Call to Synod

The March session of the 1953 Synod of our churches designated Hudsonville Prot. Ref. Church as the calling church for the 1954 Synod. Therefore we hereby notify the churches that Synod will convene, D.V., Wednesday morning, at 9:00 o'clock, June 16, in the auditorium of our church in Hudsonville, Mich.

The pre-synodical prayer service will be held in our church, and will begin at 7:45 P. M. of June 15, Tuesday evening; and the Rev. Richard Veldman, president of the 1953 Synod will lead us in this worship.

Requests for lodging will kindly be forwarded to the undersigned:

Consistory of the Hudsonville P. R. Church:

Peter J. Lubbers, Clerk
142 Barnaby Road
Hudsonville, Mich.

Attention, Please.

The Board of the R.F.P.A. asked us, sometime ago, to publish some church news in the Standard Bearer. Since it seems rather difficult as well as expensive to convoke a meeting of the Staff, I corresponded with them all and they approved of the idea.

We, therefore, decided to ask Mr. Gerrit Stadt, 754 Prince St., S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich. to be our news editor, and he accepted it.

Please, send all the news to him, real news, of course, not all kinds of gossip. I would suggest that you send your church bulletins to Mr. Stadt and let him glean from them whatever he deems important.

The Editor

IN MEMORIAM

The Consistory of the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan, hereby wishes to express its heartfelt sympathy with our brother, consistory member, Elder Martin Doezeema, in the death of his mother,

MRS. C. DOEZEMA

May the bereaved experience the comfort of our covenant God in His promise of eternal life.

Rev. C. Hanko, President.
J. M. Faber, Clerk.

OUR DOCTRINE

THE TRIPLE KNOWLEDGE

AN EXPOSITION OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM

PART III — OF THANKFULNESS

LORD'S DAY 41

Chapter 1

The Covenant of Marriage (cont.)

This love is not only physical, the attraction between the sexes in general. Nor is it merely psychological and mental, the specific attraction between one man and one woman. But it is a love that is at the same time spiritual, proceeding from the life of regeneration and sanctified in Christ Jesus our Lord. And because it is such a union, that is based upon the communion of nature, of life, and of love, it stands to reason that it is necessarily an exclusive union. No third party can have a place in the union between man and wife. They are one whole. They complement each other completely. And therefore, the union is necessarily exclusive. For the same reason the marriage bond is absolutely indissoluble. It cannot be broken. No more than the union between Christ and His church can be dissolved, no more can the marriage tie ever be severed. It is a most intimate union of life and for life, which only death can dissolve. And the chief purpose of this union, which is to be a reflection of the relation between Christ and His church, between God and His covenant people, is to bring forth the seed of the church, the multitude which no man can number. This too may well be emphasized, especially in our day. As worldly wisdom and ungodly science enlightens men, they become very wise indeed. Science supplies them with the power to determine whether or not they shall have children, not by proper inhibition of their carnal lusts, but by the means which is known as "birth control." There is no reason as far as the results are concerned why men and women, married or unmarried, should not indulge in the satisfaction of their sexual desires. That such a philosophy, destructive though it be for the human race, can be adopted by an ungodly world need not surprise us. It is, however, more than amazing that it can be seriously considered and discussed by what is called the church. Well may it therefore be emphasized that the end of marriage is the bringing forth of the future generations of the covenant of God, the bride of the Lamb.

Chapter 2

Divorce and Remarriage

In the strict sense of the word, adultery is the violation of the marriage relationship. It is the unfaithfulness of a married person to the marriage bed. It is the introduction of a third party, or even of third parties, into the exclusive union of man and wife. It is sexual intercourse by a married

man with another than his wife, or voluntary sexual intercourse by a married woman with another than her husband. It makes no difference whether the third party that is introduced is married or unmarried. He or she that is thus introduced is always guilty of adultery. This is the reason why unlawful intercourse between two married persons is sometimes called double adultery, while that between a married and an unmarried person is designated as single adultery.

We must remember, of course, that the law is spiritual, and that also the seventh commandment is principally rooted in and based upon the law of the love of God. The sinner, who by nature is apart from Christ, is an adulterer at heart. An adulterer he is in relation to God. For he violated God's covenant, and commits adultery with other gods. Instead of loving the Lord his God, he stands in enmity over against Him. The result is that he no longer loves his neighbor for God's sake. Applied to that most intimate of unions and neighborly relationships which is the marriage bond, this means that man and wife no longer love each other in the love of God. It is no wonder that from the principle of sin the marriage bond is considered a human contract, that can be broken. It is based on sexual attraction and lust. Still worse, sexual desire, no longer sanctified by the love of God, is unbridled. It is like a ship broken from its mooring, tossed to and fro on the waves, helpless in the tempest, and presently dashed to pieces on the rocks.

That this is true in our modern world is certainly not difficult to demonstrate. That the sinner, who stands in enmity against God, is an adulterer is abundantly evident from all the corruptions and violations of the seventh commandment in modern society. Is it not true that with respect to this closest and most intimate of all relationships among men the sinner's enmity against God and the neighbor becomes most horribly manifest? Is not the sin of adultery glorified in the world? The laws of our land have fast retreated before the wild rush of the carnal lust of the nation, until they are no longer a protection of the sacred bond of matrimony. As far as the law is concerned, a man may indeed leave his wife for every cause, and a woman can obtain a divorce for the asking. The result is that the number of divorce decrees that are granted is fast overtaking the number of marriage licenses that is issued. But this is only one of the manifestations of the adulterous nature of the sinner. Married couples, women as well as men, even though for personal and social reasons they do not seek a divorce, frequently commit adultery and seek satisfaction of unbridled sexual lusts apart from each other, and that too, sometimes by mutual consent. They agree to permit each other the privilege of promiscuity without interference. Besides, is not the name of the scarlet woman of Revelation written with flaming letters upon all of modern life? Is it not true that the sexual indulgence of the unmarried, of boys and girls in their teen ages, is a general phenomenon?

Chastity in the army and navy during the war was such a scarce article that it was not only considered unbelievable that a young man never had sexual intercourse before and outside of wedlock, but that it was laughed to scorn. Besides, what do you think would there be left of the thrill of the modern theater and movie if they were expurgated of every suggestion of sexual corruption and excitement of carnal lust? Where would be the attraction of the modern dance if the element of sex and promiscuity were eliminated? How much would there be left on the magazine stands if they were purged strictly according to the standard of chastity? And how radically modern fashions would change, if instead of being inspired by Paris and Hollywood, they would be dominated by the principles of chastity and virtue. And now I am not speaking of those worse than bestial corruptions by which men and women defile their own bodies, and "men with men work that which is unseemly." Rom. 1:26, 27.

All these corruptions are horrible and dreadful. All the more dreadful they are, because they are manifestations of the fierce wrath of God, revealed from heaven upon all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness. If anywhere it is more than clear that there is no such thing as a restraining influence of "common grace," but that the very opposite is true, so that God's terrible wrath punishes sin with sin, and leads ungodly men to ever deeper corruption, it is in the sphere that is covered by the seventh commandment. The tempest that sweeps over men's unbridled sexual passion is the breath of God's terrible and holy wrath. That is the teaching of the first chapter of Romans. Woe to an adulterous world! It is driven to its own destruction by the fierce wrath of a holy God.

Of course, for the same reason, namely, that the law is spiritual, a man, even a Christian, because of the power of sin that is still in his old nature, can violate the seventh commandment in his heart. And if he does so, he transgresses this commandment before God just as well as if he committed the actual deed. This is the teaching of the Lord Jesus in Matthew 5:27-30: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell."

In this connection we must of course discuss the problem of divorce, and the closely connected problem of remarriage of divorced parties, whether by the innocent party only or by both parties. All this, of course, is closely connected with the question whether you consider the marriage bond as capable of dissolution or as a bond for life, that is absolutely

indissoluble. Technically, according to law, divorce is defined as "a legal dissolution of the marriage contract by a court or other body having competent authority." This is one definition of what is properly called divorce. It is a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*, that is, from the bond of matrimony. Another definition, however, is what is called separate maintenance, the separation of a married woman from the bed and board of her husband, *a mensa et toro*. Biblical divorce I would define as a separation for life of married people, that is, a legal separation for life, on the basis of adultery or fornication. I put it this way intentionally, in distinction from others, who claim that a divorce is the dissolution of the marriage tie, so that after the dissolution the bond does no longer exist and the married people are and are permitted to act as if they were never married. Principally one has to choose between these two definitions. And on the basis of Holy Writ I am compelled to choose for the former. It is my conviction that according to the Word of God, divorce can never mean dissolution of the marriage tie. Even if people are legally divorced, they are in my opinion according to the Word of God still married. Only, they are separate married people. Upon this question hinges the problem of remarriage of divorced parties. If it be true that divorce is the breaking and dissolution of the marriage tie, then it stands to reason that divorced parties can remarry. Then it is not even necessary or possible to make a distinction between the innocent and the guilty party: both parties can then remarry simply because the marriage tie is dissolved, and both parties are permitted to remarry. They are no longer married people. And, if divorced people are no longer married, if the tie is dissolved, it is nonsense to talk about innocent and guilty parties. But according to my conviction, on the basis of Holy Writ, the marriage bond can never be dissolved.

In this respect I must agree with the stand taken by the Roman Catholic Church.

In "The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent" we read the following on the doctrine of holy matrimony: "The first parent of the human race, under the influence of the divine Spirit, pronounced the bond of matrimony perpetual and indissoluble, when he said: *This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. Wherefore a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh.* But, that by this bond two only are united and joined together, the Lord taught more plainly, when rehearsing those last words as having been uttered by God, he said: *Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh;* and straightway confirmed the firmness of that tie, proclaimed so long before Adam, by these words: *What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.*

H.H.

THE DAY OF SHADOWS

The Prophecy of Isaiah

The Fourth Woe. Chapters XXXI-XXXII.

The Destruction of the Helper and the Helped together, Chapter XXXI:1-5.

The prophet proclaims a new woe against them that go down to Egypt for help. He describes the posture of these people. They rely on horses and trust in chariots because of their number and in strong horsemen. Thus making flesh their arm, they do not regard with attention and favor the Holy One of Israel to seek after the Lord (vs. 1). They think that sending to Egypt is a particularly prudent measure, and so they pride themselves on their wisdom. But the Lord is also wise, meaning that He alone is wise and that they are fools and so their wisdom, it is foolishness. The future will disclose it, when the Lord brings all the evil that He threatened. He will not remove His words as if they were a mistake. But He will rise against the house of evildoers — the apostates that trust in Egypt's might — and against the help of them that work iniquity, i.e., the Egyptians whose help was being purchased (vs. 2).

It is unutterably foolish to rely in horse and man of Egypt. The Egyptians are but men, i.e., spirit, creature persons. They are not God. And their horses are flesh and not spirit and thus something less than men. But the Lord shall stretch forth His hand and both the Egypt that is being called to help and the Judah that is being supported by this help shall be destroyed together (vs. 3).

The prophet knows for the Lord has thus spoken unto him. A lion has taken one from the flock and all the shepherds hasten in a body to save it. But the lion is not afraid of the voice of the shepherds. He does not crouch at their noise, but roars his defiance. So shall the Lord come down to fight upon mount Zion and upon the hill thereof. As a mother bird hovers over her young so will the Lord hover over Jerusalem and will deliver her. Passing over He will cause her to escape (vss. 4, 5).

It is not difficult to determine how these similes — the one of the lion and that of the bird — must be explained. The prophet has just declared (vs. 3) that the league between the apostates and the Egyptians for the defence of Judah will fail. The menacing power here is again Assyria in the first instance (see vss. 8, 9). Yet Jerusalem will not fall because there is wanting a helper. The Lord of Hosts himself will come down on Zion to fight for her, — Zion the church of the elect. Doubtless this is the thought conveyed, namely that the help of Israel stands solely in the name of the Lord and not in any alliance such as the apostates were promoting.

But according to others the idea of these verses is that the Lord will not allow the apostates in Judah collaborating

with the Egyptians (shepherds in the simile) to snatch Jerusalem, that He has made the object of His wrath and hence His prey, out of His hand. He will bring against the city all the evil that He has spoken. The flying bird is then taken as a vulture guarding its prey (Jerusalem) that it is about to devour.

But the first exposition agrees much better with the whole context and especially with the verses that follow. When Christ who is the body will have come, Jerusalem will vanish away through its own sins. But until then the Lord will defend the city as a type of the heavenly and doing so in token of His eternal love of His people, the church of the elect, that through all the ages to come He will preserve and clothe finally with a perfection and glory that is heavenly.

It is this that the similes image, namely the Lord's loving care of Zion, Christ's zeal of His house. Necessarily implied is the redemption of the church through Christ's blood.

And so the prophet can continue with commanding a return unto Him — the Lord — from whom the children of Israel have departed and can add that in that day every man shall cast away his idols that his own hands made for himself for idolatrous purposes. Such will be the fruit of the Lord's efficacious speaking of His command in the hearts of the redeemed ones (vss. 6, 7). The repudiation of idolatry will be followed by the fall of the Assyrian with a sword other than that of man (vs. 8a).

The allusion is in the first instance to the sword of the angel of the Lord that devoured of the host of the Assyrians, encamped round about Jerusalem, 185,000 men in that one fearful night.

From that sword the Assyrians that survive the slaughter shall flee. Their choicest men will be for melting, i.e., their heart shall quake with fear. Their rock, the king of Assyria, who because of his courage and fortitude — hence, rock — was the stay of his army, shall go away furtively as in fear. His princes shall be afraid of Israel's banner, i.e., they shall be terrorized by the mere sight of it (vss. 8b, 9a).

"Saith the Lord, whose fire is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem." The allusion is to the fire of the Lord's name as symbolized by the fire of His altars. His wrath shall flame to consume His enemies (vs. 9b).

G.M.O.



In het kruis zal 'k eeuwig roemen
En geen wet zal mij verdoemen —
Christus droeg de vloek voor mij.
Christus is voor mij gestorven,
Heeft gena voor mij verworven,
'k Ben van dood en zonden vrij!

I. DaCosta

FROM HOLY WRIT

Exposition of I Peter 1:1-10

We are still occupied with trying to understand the doctrinal and practical implications of the verses 1-3 of this Second Chapter of First Peter. These verses read as follows: "*Putting away therefore all wickedness, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings, as newborn babes long for the spiritual (belonging to reason, logical) milk, which is without guilt, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation, if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious.*"

Two questions, as we intimated in the former essay on these verses, must still be faced and answered.

The first question is: what is the *logical milk*, which is without guile, and why is this milk called "logical" here by Peter? And the second question is: why must all wickedness be put away, and all guile and hypocrisies and evil-speakings shall we truly long for this *logical milk*?

The reader will bear with us when we bring just a little bit more of the technical terminology into this discussion than what we commonly do. With a little sincere longing for the "logical" milk this will not be too difficult. It should be a pleasant experience.

The term "logikos", reasonable, logical is employed in Scripture but twice. It is employed here by Peter and by Paul it is used in Romans 12:1, 2. In the latter passage we read: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy acceptable to God, which is your spiritual serve (belonging to reason, logical worship)" In both of these passages the term is "logikos," that is, *logical*!

It is very interesting and instructive to notice that the ending of the term logical is "ikos" and not "inos." These endings in the formation of the greek terms are worthy of special notice. A case in point is the greek term for fleshly. In the meaning of this term it makes quite some difference whether we read "sarkikos" or whether we read "sarkinos." The latter term means: that which is *composed* of flesh. The former simply means: that which partakes of the *nature* of flesh. This usage of a noun ending in "inos" is quite well demonstrated in the term in greek translated in english: "earthen." Thus Paul writes in II Cor. 4:7, "but we have this treasure in *earthen* vessels." The term earthen in greek is "ostrakinos," that is, a vessel *made from earth*. Nouns ending in "ikos" are those that partake of the *nature* of the things spoken of, while those ending in "inos" indicate whereof a thing is *made*.

In our text the term is "logikon gala", *logical milk*!

In the light of the observations made concerning the distinction between "sarkikos" and "sarkinos," it should be clear to us that this milk of which Peter is here speaking is not *made of* "words" and of logical thoughts, but it does have the *nature* of logical thought. It is reasonable, that is,

it is adapted to the rational in man; it fits with man's moral rational nature. Also in the Scriptures two times two is four!

This "milk" is not simply *composed* of logic. It is the full counsel of God concerning our redemption in Christ Jesus. Its content is the Mystery of Godliness that is great. And it speaks to us of the godliness that is becoming to us as the saints. These mysteries presented to us in the Gospel in their logical nature can only be apprehended in a living faith and hope. In their logical form they are only revealed with the inward illumination of the Spirit to the believers. For this Word (Logos) in this logical milk is none other than the Word made flesh, revealed in the Logos preached and written.

This logical milk cannot be understood by the natural man. He is natural, earthy, devilish in all his reasonings. He is rational up to a point. He understands enough to make him without excuse, but he keeps down the truth in unrighteousness. But the logical in the natural man is without the mind of Christ. He has no spiritual understanding. He cannot put spiritual things with spiritual and have a delight in them. They bore him, and he hates them. He wrestles exactly against the "logic" of the Word. He cannot see that this "logic" is milk, and that this "logic" of the Word is the vitamins that is needed for growth. He would rather not have this "logical" milk, for then he could be safe and secure in allowing every man room for his own opinions. Then he can serve his "gods" after his own choosing. It is the "logical" milk that irks the unbelievers. For this Word throws down all strongholds of sinful "logic" and subjects every thought to Christ! This milk of the word in its "logical" nature brooks no competition. Upon its logic the unbelief of natural man is dashed to pieces, and the gates of hell cannot prevail against it. Who can stand before the "logic" of Christ when he says: it is written? This "logic" is the sword of the Spirit!

This logical milk is the only food that the mind of the Christian can assimilate. It must pass through the sanctified and obedient mind in its logical consistency. Not just a few fragments of the Word, but the entire revealed counsel of God in its inherent consistency. All the pieces of Scripture fit as so many stones in the one grand logical coherence, that is, in the *revealed* coherence. Such a coherence makes for the consistency not only in doctrine, but also in life so that as living stones we all are built unto a spiritual temple in the Lord. Then too the praises that we sing, which are acceptable to Him, will be there as *evidence* of the complete diet of the logical milk. Where this milk is, there is sound growth and not cancerous deformations, now "proud flesh" in the wounds of the church!

Now there are always those in the Church here on earth, who do not have the mind of Christ. For all have not faith. Such men refuse to walk in the "logical," reasonal service. They are not pure in doctrine. They do not bow before the

logical milk, they do not long for it to grow by means of it. It is for them not a *means of grace*. They may read the Bible and attend the church services, even attend the men's society. Yes, they are very "sincere," and they wish you to believe this of them too, but they are not believing ones. They are unpersuasively stubborn before the *logical* milk of the word. Steadfastness they know not. For they do not have the faith. They do not have the truth abiding in them and they stand not in the truth. How can they be steadfast and unmoveable? They are simply stubborn with unbelieving rebellion. Such men Paul calls "unreasonable and wicked men." II Thes. 3:2. The term employed by Paul is not "unreasonable" in the sense of "illogical," but in the sense of being "out of step." The whole church is wrong and they are right. And they are particularly enemies of the preachers of the Word who insists on preaching the Word of *logical* milk. This means that they must keep step with the saints who walk in brotherhood, and in the fervency of love. But that they refuse. They are wicked men. They are against all that is called holy in the church. And the faithful ministers take refuge to God and cry to Him for deliverance. For a faithful preacher soon finds that these are the dogs that turn about and rend him.

Now this is the "wickedness" that must have been put off shall we hunger for the pure milk of the Word. This "unreasonableness" of sin and the longing for the "logical milk" to grow thereby, do not go hand in hand! For this is the obstacle of stubborn unbelief that will not do the will of God. It is not simply a little logical flaw in thinking. It is a desire to delude the milk. And the milk is deluded when we pour our human, sinful logic with the Word. To do this is not simply some "logicism" (whatever this may mean, the term is of recent invention) but it is a sinful attempt to delude the milk; it is trying to break the bands of Christ in *His logical* Word!

But the Lord is good to those who taste this goodness.

And the others the Lord has in derision; they taste not the goodness of the Lord in this *logical* milk. They are of itching ears. They need a different preaching. Out of one side of their mouth they say: we want the same thing you do; and out of the other side they say: we need different preaching. The logical consistency of the *preaching* of the Gospel to all, and the *promise* to the *elect believers* . . . that is then "logicism!!" O, tempores, o, mores! The consistent application of the Canons is then "a closed system!" It is the straight-jacket of confessionalism!

But all this is horrible wickedness that must be put off!

It must be put off for it does not fit with hunger for the logical milk of the newborn babes, who grow by the same. The babes subject their every thought to Christ. O, the wonderful nourishment of the Word that fits the new mind in Christ, which longs for consistency in doctrine and life. Let it not be overlooked: the order is *doctrine* and *life*!

All this wickedness must be put off!

For this is hypocritical wickedness. Peter says: All wickedness, and all *guile* and *hypocrisies* . . .

Hypocritical persons really judge differently on the inside than they reveal themselves outwardly. Thus it was with the enemies of Jesus. We read in Luke 20:20, "And they watched him and sent forth spies, who feigned themselves to be righteous, (upokrinomenous eautos dikaious einai) that they might take hold of his speech, so as to deliver him up to the rule and the authority of the governor." How they can pose as scrupulous persons with a difficult conscience! But they are spies for the purpose of catching hold of the talk of Jesus, if they can get a grip anywhere. They have the trap all set and are ready to spring it. The camouflage: a pretense of a difficult conscience in certain matters.

Such hypocrisy must wholly be put off. Also today. It is wickedness with the intent to hurt. Do they not drag our good name, called upon us, before the judgment seat. Are the writings not combed to acquire sweet (????) revenge? Is not every attempt made to catch at a word, a little term! And let each place his hand in his own bosom. Many of us, who think we are such Israelites in whom there is no guile, will have the rude awakening that we are not such guileless Nathaniels. To be without guile means not to set a trap for your neighbor. For the term for guile in the greek is "dolos," that is, a bait, a lure, a snare; hence, craft, deceit, guile. This must be put off, brethren and sisters! God is not mocked!!

Then there is that green-eyed monster called "envy," the very constant companion of all sinful ambition, that will run over the dead body of the neighbor to advance self. It is the horrible sickness of being ill with the neighbor's health and prosperity. It is rottenness of the bones. And this envy does not desire the *logical milk* to grow thereby in fervant love! This envy can whimper about moral issues but it is itself a moral issue! It does not speak of spiritual issues, about the necessity of putting the evil out of the camp beginning at our hearts! Envy cannot talk about moral issues. It is as fitting in the mouth of an envious persons as wisdom is in the mouth of a fool, and a gold ring in a swine's snout!

And then there is evil-speaking. There is a saying: even a fool when he holds himself silent will be counted wise. O, the evil-speaking in our day. How the Name of God is blasphemed because of it. It is not indicative of spiritual growth. Our words must be seasoned with salt. Only the envious will talk his neighbor down. But the righteous will speak the truth in love. And a word spoken in season how good it is.

These are the sins of us all by nature. These are the sins that the babes in Chirst put off to grow by the logical milk of the Word. And these are the sins which evil men will not confess. They stubbornly walk in them. They are "out-of-step" people. They do not walk as becometh the

(Continued on Page 360)

IN HIS FEAR

Walking in Error

(5)

Twelve men who together constituted no more than half of one consistory in one Classis tried to decide for the whole denomination that the following departures from Reformed Church Polity shall now be approved and be practiced in that denomination:

1. That officebearers under discipline must be given decisive vote in their own case,
 - a. as to whether they are worthy of that discipline;
 - b. as to whether or not they have complied with the demands of those who are disciplining them;
 - c. as to whether further action is to be taken against them and as to what that further action shall be.
2. That officebearers who are under discipline to such a degree that they are demanded to apologize for a sinful action remain legal consistory members with all that this implies, so that they have the undeniable right to be present even at the meeting that will consider what measures are to be taken in view of their unequivocal refusal to apologize; so that the meeting is illegal if they have not been notified of it.
3. That if one half of one consistory, under discipline upon the advice of its Classis, complains that the other half has dealt illegally with it, this half need not walk the way of Article 31 of the Church Order but may, though it likewise has no clear majority, take things in its own hands and declare itself to be absolved of the discipline and to be the legal consistory in that Classis that has advised its being placed under discipline.

Twelve men, who constituted only one half of one consistory, tried to decide these things for the whole Protestant Reformed denomination!

Talk about hierarchy!

Talk about a minority trying to rule the majority!

Even the civil courts screen out carefully from jury duty those who might be prejudiced in the case being treated. Men personally involved are surely prejudiced in their case!

And the Church Order adopted by our churches certainly condemns all these decisions taken by Rev. De Wolf and his deposed elders that week of June 21, 1953.

It is not written anywhere in their minutes that they took such decisions, but their bold act of schism, according to which they, as suspended and deposed office bearers, nevertheless set themselves up as a consistory and still assume such a role today in the Protestant Reformed Churches shows that in their opinion the three points mentioned above are their church order. Besides, all their writings ever since the "split" indicate that they insist (twelve men, mind you)

that the whole Protestant Reformed denomination recognize them with these decisions *and on the basis of these principles* as the legal consistory of the First Protestant Reformed Church. What is more, on the basis of those same principles, which are departures from both articles 31 and 33 of the Church Order, they would have us declare that the Rev. Hoeksema, the Rev. Hanko and their elders are not legal consistory members, even though they *never* initiated any discipline against them!

And yet today there still are people who tell you that they have carefully studied(?) both sides of the case and can come to no other conclusion than that Rev. De Wolf is in the right and that the Rev. Hoeksema and all who followed him are in error.

You can tell that to men, but you cannot say that before God. The facts are all too obviously against Rev. De Wolf and his elders. The finger is pointed all too clearly at Rev. De Wolf and his elders as those guilty of schism.

Let them under oath be cross-examined as to whether Article 31 allows such schismatic action as they perpetrated. Let them under oath be cross-examined as to whether they stand for such departures from Church Polity. Let them maintain these points under oath, and then they plainly deny Articles 31 and 33 and are branded as schismatics who broke their own church order. Let them under oath deny these three principles which are the basis for all their actions ever since June 1953. Let them under oath state that such things should never be practiced in a Protestant Reformed Church with its Reformed Church Order and they brand themselves as schismatics.

These men are to be pitied that they have walked so long in their error that they cannot even see the schism they perpetrated. They are to be pitied that they have walked so long in their error that they in their infamous cross bill try to cast out the mote (or do they rejoice in that they think that they have found a mote?) in the eye of the Rev. H. Hoeksema, while their own eyes are full of beams. They are to be pitied—and that includes Rev. De Boer—that the beams in their eyes have caused them to see the mote of a "domineering character" in the eyes of the Rev. Hoeksema and cannot see their own awful act of schism. Before June of 1953 they did not see that mote, for they never disciplined him for that mote. Was their own eye clean at that time? What caused this awful distortion of their view so that now they do not see anything more in the whole case than the Rev. Hoeksema and what they call his "domineering character." And they cannot see that they—twelve men—have tried to write a new Church Order without even going to Classis or Synod with it? What kind of domineering activity is this that one half of one consistory takes it upon itself to decide all these things about office bearers under discipline? Can they show us any precedence in the history of the Reformed church world that equals this? That half of one consistory decides that it is above the church order of its denomination?

And the former Classis West reached a long hand across the Mississippi to Rev. De Wolf and his deposed elders expressing full agreement and satisfaction with this act of legislating into the church order of the Protestant Reformed Churches those three departures from the Church Order which had been officially adopted by our churches. And on the basis of these same three principle departures from the Church Order of the Protestant Reformed Churches they recognized Rev. De Wolf and his elders as the legal consistory of the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

And what have we here?

Again twelve churches (though Doon refused to go along with such an evil way, making it only eleven churches), but at any rate, one Classis, only half of the denomination (as far as Classis are concerned) tried to decide for the other half, the other twelve churches, what changes shall be made in the Church Order. Synod is by passed, and Classis East is written a letter notifying these twelve churches in Classis East that the Western half has already decided that such procedure as listed in the three points of departure, which we wrote at the beginning of this article, must be adopted and practiced by all our churches.

Do not let anyone tell you that the former Classis West did such an innocent little thing and did not interfere with the work of Classis East!

Let their own document speak for them. They write that they cannot recognize the suspension of Rev. De Wolf and deposition of his elders because, "this action was taken at an illegal consistory meeting, since many of the legal officebearers of that consistory were not notified of this meeting." Plain is it not that they too have the church order of Rev. De Wolf and his elders in which Articles 31 and 33 must be changed to exclude officebearers who are under discipline? They have decided that which only Synod can decide, namely, as to whether these men were at that time "legal consistory members." As we pointed out in a former article, they did not even try to prove this point. How can they? To what will they point? It would have been a wholesome thing and beneficial had the former Classis West taken a decision instead to protest the action of the Rev. Hoeksema and the Rev. Hanko's consistory so that it would have come to Synod. We could have had a beneficial discussion of the matter and gotten an official answer as to what work elders who are demanded to apologize may perform while their case is being treated. But no sister Classis and no half of a consistory may take it upon itself to decide for the whole denomination that officebearers who refuse to apologize as demanded by the consistory and as advised by its Classis are legal consistory members who must be allowed to be present when the consistory discusses what to do in view of their refusal to apologize. Even if these men did have the right to be there and it could be proven that the meeting was illegal — which it certainly was not — then the fact re-

mains that the half of the consistory that thinks so and the sister Classis that thinks so, or let us even say that can prove that it is so, would have to prove that not in its own meeting but on the floor of the Synod which would have to make a decision in the matter for the whole denomination.

Rev. De Wolf and his elders and the former Classis West chose instead to go the way of schism.

* * * *

We have more which we wish to write about these things, but we shall, the Lord willing, do that later. We like to finish this article with a few odds and ends which belong to the general picture and could stand a little thought at this time.

Rev. De Boer writes that the whole case is nothing but a moral issue. (Yet he makes it for himself an immoral issue.) We will not take him to task for that now. He, too, is to be pitied that he has fallen so low. If by now his conscience does not yet bother him and accuse him of an awful piece of slander and of change, then let him look up the writings of the Rev. De Boer who used to be a Protestant Reformed minister. Perhaps he can teach him a few things which he has forgotten.

But, if it is nothing more than a moral issue and the Rev. Hoeksema is the cause of the whole mess, then why did those men from the former Classis West who were delegated to the '53 Synod and who held a meeting this past March write to the delegates from Classis East that they believe that it is their calling to prevent "further separation of God's people" and that the means for seeking this unity is "not to compromise the Word of God and the Church's confession." What does that mean?

Can it mean anything else than that they are convinced that there is a doctrinal difference and that they refuse to give up their conditional theology? If as former Classis West wrote to Classis East, "we do not believe that there is a basic difference of fundamental doctrines," why do they have to warn and assure us that they will not compromise with the Word of God and the confessions?

We are constantly being accused of fighting straw men, imaginary dangers and false doctrines. Let them assure us of this and prove it to us by showing us very clearly that THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEIR CONDITIONAL THEOLOGY AND THE CONDITIONAL THEOLOGY OF THE LIBERATED! We claim there is no difference. Let them prove us to be wrong. We would sincerely like to be proven wrong on that point. But let them show us then that De Wolf's statements are not the same arminian conditional theology.

And if it is their calling to "prevent further separation of God's people" why do various ministers and members of their churches work persistently on *some* of the members of undersigned's congregation and of the congregations of others to work more separation? Where is that "brotherly

(Continued on Page 360)

Contending For The Faith

The Church and the Sacraments

EARLY VIEWS OF THE SACRAMENTS OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

(Continued)

Having instituted the feast of the Passover in the land of Egypt the Lord further instructed Israel through His servant, Moses, that this feast be observed as a memorial, every year, in the land of Canaan. Certain changes marked the observance of this feast in the land of Canaan in distinction from its institution and celebration in the land of Egypt. The lamb was now brought to the temple and slain there. The blood was not struck upon the doorposts. And the element of haste was absent. Essentially, however, the feast remained unchanged. The significance of the Passover as observed in the land of Canaan was two-fold. It was, first of all, a remembrance-feast. This was evident from the manner of its observance which we need not discuss in detail at this time. The celebration of this feast in every Israelitish home was featured, among other things, by the fact that the father of the home would retell the story of Israel's deliverance out of the land of Egypt. Hence, the Passover as observed in the land of Canaan was a remembrance-feast. Israel was continually reminded of its deliverance out of the Egyptian house of bondage. Secondly, the Old Testament Passover, annually reminding the people of the living God of this deliverance, was therefore also prophetic. This is easily understood. Israel's deliverance out of the land of Egypt, was, we understand, a great and glorious Old Testament type. Israel's deliverance out of the Egyptian house of bondage is a type, of course, of our deliverance out of the bondage of sin through the blood of the Lamb of God and of Calvary, without spot or blemish, Christ Jesus. Consequently, Israel, observing the feast of Passover in the land of Canaan and reminded of its deliverance out of the Egyptian house of bondage, looked forward in faith to the day when this mighty Old Testament type would be fulfilled in the suffering and death of the Lamb of Calvary. Hence, the believing Israelite did two things when he observed the feast of the Passover. He looked back and was reminded of Israel's deliverance out of the land of Egypt. And, inasmuch as this deliverance was a type of the deliverance through the blood of the Lamb of Calvary, he also looked ahead, in faith, believing that this deliverance out of the land of Egypt would presently be fulfilled in its anti-type in God's own good time.

A brief resume of the institution of the Lord's Supper.

We offer this brief resume of the institution of the Lord's Supper to our readers, in connection with the history of doctrine, because of its interesting details. Many of our readers may be acquainted with these historical facts but they are interesting nevertheless.

Going back some two thousand years, we may note that Jerusalem, at the time of the Passover, was the center of national interest. Out of the entire country and also from other lands thousands upon thousands of jubilant pilgrims gathered (these Jews had been scattered out of Jerusalem and the holy land in times of great persecution). They had but one purpose: the celebration of the Old Testament Passover. And they were all in festive mood, for this was the feast of the people of the Lord. It occurred once, to convince Nero of the importance of the event, that a high priest commanded the slain lambs to be counted. This number totalled two hundred and fifty six thousand and five hundred (256,500). If we allow ten persons for each lamb (and this, by the way, was the minimum number, whereas the maximum number that was permitted to partake of a single lamb was twenty), we may safely assume that the number of persons celebrating the Passover totalled at least two million, five hundred and sixty five thousand (2,565,000). These pilgrims found quarters, not only in the city of Jerusalem, but also camped in the country round about.

Now the Lord had sent out early John and Peter to prepare for them the Passover. They bought the lamb, either in the holy city, or in the temple-court. Having brought it to the temple where it was slain for them by the Levites, they now prepared it in the upper-room, according to the institution of the feast. In the evening the Lord descends with His ten disciples (John and Peter having preceded them) from the mount of Olives into the holy city. Before them lies Jerusalem, clothed in festive garb—everywhere one can hear the Hallelujahs of the psalms, 115-118. While one could see everywhere the tents of the pilgrims, as they had been set up on the mountain sides, one could also see the smoke ascending to heaven from the beautiful temple which has been built by Herod. The disciples followed their Lord in deep thought. Jesus had spoken to them of His approaching suffering and death, and they realized that something terrible was imminent. And while the people streamed from the temple, each with a lamb upon his shoulder, Jesus proceeded with His disciples to the upper-room whereof we read in the Holy Scriptures. Also Judas Iscariot is with them—who can fathom the thoughts of this disciple? And the Lord, we read, is eager to keep *this* Passover.

The Lord now celebrates with His disciples the Passover in the upper-room. First, the Saviour takes the first cup with thanksgiving and blessing. Customarily the hands would be washed after this; now, however, the footwashing takes its place. Upon this Jesus and His twelve disciples eat of the unleavened bread and of the bitter herbs. Then the Lord takes the second cup. It is undoubtedly now that Jesus, dipping into the dish, that is, of unleavened bread and bitter herbs, speaks to Judas the word that he, who dips with Him into the dish, would betray Him; hence, we now witness the amazing phenomenon that this traitor, although fully rec-

ognized and known by the Lord, is not exposed but dismissed to perform his foul act — Judas, therefore, did not even partake of the Passover and certainly not of the Lord's Supper as instituted by the Lord. Upon this the eating of the lamb with bitter herbs occurs; this concludes the celebration of the Old Testament Passover.

However, whereas it was the Jewish custom to sit quietly after the eating of a part of the lamb, and to eat of the unleavened bread, as a sort of dessert, it is probably now that the Saviour changes this unleavened bread of the Old Testament Passover into the bread of Communion; then, having again washed their hands, they drank of the third cup of wine, and this cup was changed into the wine of the New Testament Lord's Supper.

What does this mean? This means, in the first place, that the Lord celebrated the Old Testament Passover with His disciples. Jesus certainly kept this feast. Concerning this there is no doubt. Secondly, He caused the Old Testament Passover to pass on into its New Testament fulfilment. Jesus died at the time of the Passover. This is not accidental. It occurs through Divine appointment and according to Divine purpose. *The* Passover had been slain in Egypt. And every year a lamb must be slain, at that very time, in commemoration of the Passover as instituted in that memorable Egyptian night. Jesus is *the* Lamb, is He not, and He must be slain at the same time. Calvary's cross and Israel's deliverance out of Egypt are related as type and anti-type. Inasmuch as Israel's redemption out of Egypt was typical of our deliverance out of the house of the bondage of sin, and Christ upon Calvary is the fulfilment of Israel's redemption out of Egypt, the reality of that type and therefore *the* Passover must be slain at the time of the feast. And this explains why it is upon this occasion that Jesus institutes the Lord's Supper. Secondly, besides celebrating the Old Testament with His disciples, Jesus, the fulfilment of the Old Testament type, institutes the sign and seal of its fulfilment which would presently occur upon the cross of Calvary: the broken bread and the poured out wine. These signs are appropriate. The lamb constituted the vital element of the Old Testament Passover. Bread constitutes a vital element of the New Testament Communion. A lamb would certainly be out of place. The Lamb of God has appeared and been slain. *The* Blood has flowed. Hence, blood must flow no longer. The slaying of lambs is no longer necessary inasmuch as *the* Lamb has been slain. Jesus has become for us the Bread of Life, in His death and resurrection, and the signs which properly and beautifully symbolize to us His glorious significance are the broken bread and the poured out wine.

We must not overlook the significance of this institution of the Lord's Supper. Indeed, Jesus celebrated the Old Testament Passover. This must be. Our Saviour was born of a woman and under the law, was He not? He came, not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it. As such he must be sub-

ject to the law. We repeat: Jesus did not come to break the law but to enforce and fulfil it. This explains why He celebrated the Old Testament Passover with His disciples. However, we must not overlook the fact that this is the last Passover. This is not only the last Passover which Jesus celebrates with His disciples. Neither is this simply the last Passover which His disciples celebrate. This is actually the last Passover. It is true that carnal Israel, rejecting Christ and His fulfilment of the Old Testament shadows, continued to observe the law of Moses in their own carnal way. The temple was not destroyed until some forty years later. However, their rites and ceremonies, as continuing after *the* Passover which was slain upon Calvary, were nothing but empty forms. Their continued observance of the Passover was not real, had no content. Jesus observed the last Passover the night before His crucifixion. In Him the Old Testament type speeds to its end. As long as the Blood of Calvary had not flowed the typical blood must flow. But, when once the Lamb of Calvary had been slain, the typical lamb was no longer necessary. Jesus, therefore, is not only subject to the law but He is also its fulfilment. He is the end of the law, He to Whom the entire law of Moses pointed, and its fulfilment. Even this is not all. Jesus is not merely the fulfilment and end of the Old, but also the realization of the New. In Him the lines of the Old and of the New Dispensation converge and meet. He does not destroy the law, does not merely bring it to an end. Jesus does not simply terminate the shadows and the symbols. He fulfills them, does not simply end them, but replaces them with their blessed fulfilment, Himself, the Revelation of God's secret counsel of our redemption. Hence, observing with His disciples the last Passover, He now proceeds to replace it with its fulfilment, the signs of the broken bread and poured out wine as designating Himself as the Bread of Life in the way of His cross and resurrection.

This is, in brief, a resume of the institution of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In succeeding articles, the Lord willing, we will treat the historical development of this doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper as occurring, first of all, during the early centuries of the New Dispensation.

H.V.



The Earth and the Fulness with which it is Stored

The earth and the fulness with which it is stored,
The world and its dwellers belong to the Lord;
For He on the seas its foundations has laid, . . .
And firm on the waters its pillars has stayed,
And firm on the waters his pillars has stayed.
That man ever blest of Jehovah shall live,
The God of salvation shall righteousness give;
For this is the people, yea, this is the race, . . .
The Israel true that are seeking His face,
The Israel true that are seeking His face.

Psalm 24:1, 3

The Voice of Our Fathers

The Canons of Dordrecht

PART TWO

EXPOSITION OF THE CANONS

FIRST HEAD OF DOCTRINE

OF DIVINE PREDESTINATION

Article 8. There are not various decrees of election, but one and the same decree respecting all those, who shall be saved, both under the Old and New Testament: since the scripture declares the good pleasure, purpose and counsel of the divine will to be one, according to which he hath chosen us from eternity, both to grace and glory, to salvation and the way of salvation, which he hath ordained that we should walk therein.

The above translation is correct, except for the word "ordained" in the last clause. This should be "prepared" or "made ready" if it is to be a proper rendering of the Latin *praeparavit*. And the Dutch renders it correctly in the word "*bereid*."

In general, we may remark, first of all, that there is no essentially new thought presented in this article. Everything mentioned in this paragraph is either expressed or very clearly implied in the previous article, where the Reformed truth concerning election is set forth in unmistakeable language. In the second place, it ought to be very obvious that this eighth article is apologetic in character: it sets forth the truth over against the Arminian error. This is evident from the very first words: "There are not . . . but . . ." In this paragraph, therefore, the fathers simply develop more elaborately that which they have already set forth in principle; and they do so in conscious opposition to the Arminian position. In the third place, we may note that in this article the fathers do not cite Scripture, although we may remark that there is at least a hint that they had in mind the passage in Ephesians 2:10 when they penned the last clause: "which he hath prepared that we should walk therein." Undoubtedly the reason why the Scriptures are not expressly mentioned here must be found in the fact that the underlying truth of this article has been Scripturally proven in Article 7, rather than in supposition that what they here state is difficult to prove. For it is not difficult to prove with many Scriptural passages that which is here maintained. That the fathers were aware of this is plain from the article, for they state: "since the scripture declares . . ." This is probably the reason too why some Dutch versions of the *Canons* furnish the Scriptural references of Eph. 1:4, 5; 2:10 with this article.

The error which this article combats is not further defined than by the general description, "various decrees of election," and the reference to a distinction made by some between election under the Old and under the New Testament. In the negative part of the *Canons*, the Rejection of

Errors, some of these "various decrees of election" are mentioned and rejected. We read in Article II of the Rejection of Errors appended to the First Head of Doctrine that the Synod rejects the errors of those who teach: "That there are various kinds of election of God unto eternal life: the one general and indefinite, the other particular and definite; and that the latter in turn is either incomplete, revocable, non-decisive and conditional, or complete, irrevocable, decisive and absolute. Likewise: that there is one election unto faith, and another unto salvation, so that election can be unto justifying faith, without being a decisive election unto salvation." Here, therefore, you find six distinct ways in which the Arminians might speak of election. And you find here also a very clear example of the necessity of insisting that a man shall say very clearly and succinctly what he means by "election." An example too, this is, of what the Scriptures call "cunning craftiness." It is evident that when you speak with an Arminian about election, you must first make certain which of the various decrees of election he has in mind. It is not our intention here, however, to discuss these "various decrees of election," but merely to mention them, in order that we may have an idea of what the fathers had in mind with the expression.

This error is an old one, and not peculiarly Arminian. The Pelagians, centuries before, were guilty of the same error. And the Jesuit notion of a *scientia media* was developed in order to maintain the error and to attempt to harmonize it with the nature of the divine knowledge. Thus, for example, they spoke of all kinds of contingent counsels of God, and of a counsel for practically every conceivable contingency. There was a counsel of God without sin, and a counsel of God which reckoned with possible sin. There was a counsel of God unto salvation along the way of the law, as under the old dispensation; and a counsel of God unto salvation in Christ without the works of the law. And the Arminians simply took over this notion and probably refined it a bit, as is so often the case with heresies.

Over against this the *Canons* insist, first of all, that there is but one decree of election, and that the one decree concerns "all those who shall be saved." That one decree has been at length described in the previous article. Very briefly we may phrase it as follows: the decree of election is the eternal, sovereign, and unchangeable purpose of God to glorify His name in leading to the final glory of His perfected covenant His people in Christ Jesus along the way of sin and grace. This is the only decree which our fathers, in the light of Scripture, recognize.

In the second place, the article refuses to admit any essential difference between the old and the new dispensation. For not only does it mention the fact that this one decree of election is valid for "all those who shall be saved;" but lest there should be any misunderstanding as to the meaning of this expression, it adds: "both under the Old and New Testament." This is a noteworthy expression, not only as far as the doctrine of election *per se* is concerned, but for

the whole of the Reformed truth. It teaches the fundamental unity of the old and new dispensations. It underlies the truth that there is but one promise in both the old and new dispensations. And it necessitates our maintaining that there is but one people of God in both the old and new dispensations. Very striking indeed is this expression in the light of the fact that premillennialism as such is of a later date in the history of the church. Reformed people can certainly appeal to this article in order to bar that heresy from the church. Striking is this expression too, because today almost all Arminians are premillennialists, who commit the fundamental error of separating between the Jews and the Gentile children of God, between the "kingdom of God" and the "church of God." For it stands to reason that if there is but one decree of election, there cannot possibly be two peoples of God. And if that one decree of election, setting forth sovereignly, eternally, and unchangeably one people of God, applies, to both the old and the new dispensation, then the essential unity of the two dispensations necessarily follows. For certainly, when we speak of God's elective decree, we are getting down to the essence of things.

And so we may thankfully remark, "How right the fathers were in this matter, more right than they themselves dreamed, perhaps." For while we may distinguish between the dispensations, we must not divide them. There is a distinction in *dispensation*, not in the grace dispensed. In the Old Testament we have the dispensation of shadows. In the New Testament is the dispensation of fulfillment. But there is no essential difference. The salvation, as well as the way of salvation, are fundamentally the same. Always it is Christ, Who is the way and the truth and the life. Shadow and reality, type and antitype, are inseparably connected. The law of the old dispensation was the shadow of the fulfilled gospel of the new dispensation. That law was a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ, and as such it was also gospel. And so, Abel and Enoch and Noah, Shem and Abraham and Isaac, Jacob and the whole remnant according to the election of grace, but also every saint of the new dispensation,—all were included from eternity in the one decree of election, to receive the one salvation in Christ, in the one way of sin and grace.

From this unity of the decree of election follow the truths mentioned in the last part of this article, namely, that we are chosen both to grace and to glory, to salvation and the way of salvation, which God hath prepared that we should walk therein. Here the fathers go to the very heart of the matter. The Arminians made separation at this point. They taught that to be chosen unto grace and to be chosen unto glory were two entirely different matters, that it was perfectly possible to be chosen unto grace and not to be chosen unto glory, that it was entirely within the realm of possibility to be chosen unto the way of salvation and not to be chosen unto salvation. They insisted on putting the decision as to salvation and glory *in time*, rather than in eternity; with man, rather than with God. All depended

on whether one would persevere, and die persevering. It was always possible to lose grace, and to wander permanently from the way of salvation. Hence, there was never any certainty in the Arminian gospel, but always contingency. The result was, necessarily, that with such a gospel there was never any assurance in a man's heart, but always doubt and fear. Always the question remained whether a man would persevere until he breathed his last breath. Over against this the fathers here state the positive truth. And we should understand it clearly. Election includes both the glory of the final inheritance and the grace to attain to that glory. But now we should notice that this does not merely mean that God elects grace as the way to glory; it means that God elects His people unto that grace which is the inevitable way to glory. God elects us unto salvation. He ordains the way to salvation. And He chooses His people unto that way that leads inevitably to salvation.

We said that this follows from the unity of election. In other words, it is possible to make distinctions between the grace which is the power to bring us into glory, and the glory itself; between the way to salvation, and the final salvation. *But it is impossible to make separation.* That grace includes all the blessing of preservation. That way is the way of regeneration, calling, faith, justification, and sanctification. But it is the way also of perseverance. And God chooses His own unto that way, the whole way, that therefore leads without fail to the final salvation.

Although this objection is not treated in the present article, it may well be pointed out that the Arminian cannot validly object that such a doctrine makes for careless and profane men. And the reason for this is not in a supposed "second track," or "other side." The Reformed man will never present the matter thus, that God elects both to the way and the salvation, *BUT* that we must walk in that way. Along such a course you end in doctrinal quicksands from which it is impossible to extricate yourself. On the contrary, the reason why the above objection is not valid lies in the nature of God's grace and in the nature of the way of salvation to which God elects His people. The way to salvation is *per se* a way to be walked in. And the grace unto which we are elected is such a power that causes us to walk in that way. There is no salvation without that way. There is no way unto salvation that is not to be walked in. There is no grace of God which functions, or can function, without bringing a man upon that way and leading him along that path all the way to glory. God has prepared a way that we should walk therein.

What an unspeakable comfort for the child of God! Everything is certain, established unchangeably and sovereignly from before the foundation of the world. The decision is not in time, but in eternity. It is not in our will, but in God's. He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord!

H.C.H.

DECENCY and ORDER

Engaged in Secular Labor

ARTICLE 12 — "Inasmuch as a minister of the Word, once lawfully called as described above, is bound to the service of the church for life, he is not allowed to enter upon a secular vocation except for such weighty reasons as shall receive the approval of the classis."

The principle upon which the above cited rule is based is that a minister of the Word, once lawfully called unto the office, is bound to the service of the church for life. This principle, to which Reformed Churches have always adhered, undoubtedly has the sanction of Holy Writ even though it is not specifically stated in Scripture that the minister's tenure of office is for life. This in itself is not strange as there are many truths which are based upon sound Scriptural inference rather than upon direct revelation. Think, for instance, of the truth of infant baptism. Nowhere is a direct command given and, yet, it can easily be proven that this practice is thoroughly Scriptural.

There are several passages in the Word of God from which the principle of life-service may be deduced. In the Old Testament the priests and Levites were called into the service of the sanctuary for life. In Deuteronomy 18 we are informed that "they shall have no inheritance among their brethren: the Lord is their inheritance For the Lord thy God hath chosen him out of all thy tribes to stand to minister in the name of the Lord, him and his sons forever." In the New Testament we read that it pleased God "to separate Paul from his mother's womb and called him by His grace to reveal His Son in him, that he might preach Him among the heathen." (Gal. 1:15) This was a life calling. Concerning it the apostle himself writes in I Corinthians 9:16 that "necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel." The Lord says in Luke 9:62 that "no man having put his hand to the plough and looking back is fit for the kingdom of God." From these and other passages we may certainly establish this sound rule.

There are also other considerations which bring out the reasonableness of this principle. In "The Church Order Commentary" three of them are cited. We quote them in full:

1. "In full harmony with this principle of life-long service it may be noted that the internal call to the ministry in the heart of the future ministers is always interpreted to be a call for life."

2. "Let it also be remembered that the dignity of the office of the ministry of the Word is advanced by appointment for life."

3. "And it is also true that young men can hardly be expected to go through a course of training extended over many years unless they can look forward to the ministry as a life-long work."

Although, therefore, we maintain this important principle, we also differ from the conception the Roman Catholics have of this matter. The Romish church teaches that the nature of the ecclesiastical office is such that he who once receives the office can never loose it. The office bearer and the office are inseparably united for life. Consequently, when an office-bearer in the Romish church makes himself unworthy of his office, that office is not taken from him, but he is merely prohibited from exercising it. This is not our view. The office and the person are not inseparable. The person of the office-bearer may be dismissed from office (Art. 11) or deposed from office (Art. 79) or "for such weighty reasons as shall receive the approval of the classis" he may enter upon some secular vocation and thereby loose all right to the office. (Art. 12)

This latter is then another form of dismissal. Perhaps the difference between this and Art. 11 may be expressed by saying that under Art. 11 the dismissal action is initiated by the consistory whereas in Art. 12 it is the minister who requests dismissal. To leave the ministry under the provisions of these articles is not necessarily the same as "faithlessly deserting the office" or as "being deposed" from the office although it stands to reason that both the deserter and the one deposed will also resort to some other vocation. The difference is that desertion and deposition imply guilt whereas the dismissal spoken of here is honorable. The twelfth article speaks of cases where, in exception to the rule that the minister's tenure of office is for life, one is honorably given the right by the church, with the approval of the churches in general, to lay down the office of the ministry and pursue some other kind of work. Of course, this is done only when weighty reasons can be advanced.

Laying down the work of the ministry in this manner must also be distinguished from receiving an emeritation which we will discuss in the next article. Emeritus ministers, who for valid reasons, are relieved of their labors in the ministry continue to receive support from the church and also retain the honor and title of a minister of the Word. Those who enter other vocations receive neither support nor the title.

This article neither condones nor forbids the practice of some ministers who engage in part-time secular labors. Some of our ministers in the past have been employed as part-time mail carriers, school teachers, painters, etc. Frequently the twelfth article of the church order is cited as proof for the contention that such practices are always wrong. This cannot be done for if that is the meaning of this article it militates directly against the Scripture and, besides, the article does not speak of this situation but refers to those who desire to exchange the ministry for some other work. We may add, however, that the practice of part-time secular employment by the ministers of the word is usually to be frowned upon. There must be very valid reasons to tolerate it. The work of the ministry is of such a nature that it re-

quires one's full attention and devotion. Only in cases of dire necessity will one, conscious of his high calling, seek to supplement that work with other labors. It might be said, perhaps, that the apostle Paul, as we wrote in a former article, was engaged for a time in the trade of tent-making. This is true and we cited before the reasons he did this. Yet, it ought not be forgotten that in II Cor. 12:13 the apostle, referring to this, writes: "For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? Forgive me this wrong." The churches ought to see to it that such practices are not necessary.

Because of the very nature of the office of the ministry and the life-long calling that goes with it, reasons which form a justifiable ground for dismissing one honorably must be very cogent. They must be weighty not only in the mind of the minister who requests dismissal but they must be proven valid to the consistory and the classis. In 1920 the Reformed Churches of Holland added a provision to this article which makes it necessary also to gain the approval of the Synodical Delegates before one is dismissed to engage in other work. This rule is quite proper and would be in place here as much as it is in Art. 11. Our same reasons for its presence in that article would hold favoring its incorporation here. Certainly ministers ordained to the office only with the approbation of Synodical Delegates ought not to be dismissed without their approval.

What, then, are some of the valid reasons justifying dismissal? Certainly it is not sufficient ground to dismiss a minister because he may be discouraged with the hardships and afflictions of the labor of the gospel or because he has trouble with his consistory. Neither can we agree with those who claim that an appointment to governmental work is valid reason to lay down the ministry. The office of statesman is not higher than the office of the clergy and neither is the work of Caesar more important than that of Christ. Those who seek an exodus from the ministry to engage in politics either have never been truly called to the ministry or they are seeking the praise and honor of men. Therefore, also such reasons which reveal a motive to seek higher wages and more of this world's good are always invalid.

Yet, there are situations which may arise in the providence of God that make it necessary for a minister to leave his work and find other employment. In 1578, for instance, there was a case in which a minister was dismissed because he was without a flock. There was nothing else for him to do but to find other work to support himself and his family. And, whereas, the fault did not lay with him, his dismissal was honorable. We know of another instance where a minister, after several years of ministry, was confronted with an unmanageable situation in his own home. And, whereas Scripture requires that the bishop is "one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all

gravity (for if a man know not how to rule his own house how shall he take care of the church of God?)" (I Tim. 3:4, 5) it was deemed advisable that he be dismissed and pursue some other course of labor. Whereas he committed no gross sin worthy of deposition, his dismissal too was honorable. Another instance might be that of a man who, after some time in the ministry, finds that he lacks the necessary qualifications for that work and upon his own request seeks for the welfare of the church to be dismissed. The consistory could, in such an instance, resort to Article 11 and have him dismissed but perhaps before such action is taken the minister himself acts under Article 12. In such a case an honorable dismissal is quite proper and in the best interest of all concerned because it also makes it impossible that some other congregation is later confronted with serious difficulties as a result of having called the one wholly unqualified. Dismissal under Article 12 severs the bond to the ministry with finality.

G.v.d.B.

ALL AROUND US

Dr. James Daane Versus Prot. Reformed Theology and Ethics.

In two issues of the Reformed Journal, those of January and February, Dr. Daane devotes as many articles to the defense of the Christian Reformed doctrine as stipulated in the First Point of 1924. He chose to do this by writing respectively on the themes: "Can the Gospel Be Preached to Every Man?" and "Christian Ethics and the Doctrine of Election."

He evidently had three things in mind when he wrote these articles. He would therein answer the Rev. B. Kok who criticized Dr. Daane in an earlier issue of the Journal for telling Kok and all those who believe in conditions that they had taken a step back to the Christian Reformed Churches. To this I already called your attention in the February 15th issue of the S. B. Secondly, Daane would, in defense of the First Point, ridicule the doctrine as well as the ethics of the Prot. Reformed Churches. And finally, he evidently intended to set some of the Christian Reformed people straight on the doctrine of the antithesis. In respect to the latter it appears that he has a great fear that some of his people have imbibed the doctrine of the Prot. Reformed Churches, or, as he calls it most of the time, "Hoeksema's theology."

Had I known that the Rev. Hoeksema would write the brief article addressed to Dr. Daane in the March 15th Standard Bearer, I would not have promised to criticize Daane's wrong presentation of Prot. Reformed theology. I gathered from Hoeksema's writing that when he has time he will answer Daane himself. And who is more able to say what is Protestant Reformed theology than Rev. Hoeksema?

Our readers will recall that Hoeksema casts from him the theology Daane ascribes to him and asserts that he cannot recognize his theology in Daane's presentation of it. He also challenges Dr. Daane to give answer to four or five propositions which, it seems to me, hit at the very heart of the matter Daane has chosen to bring up. I will be very brief, therefore, in my criticism of Dr. Daane and wait for him to answer the Rev. Hoeksema. This time, then, we will give you only a snatch here and there of Daane's articles, and in conclusion a few words of comment.

Under the heading: Can the Gospel Be Preached to Every Man? Daane says among other things the following:

"The first of the Three Points of 1924 teaches that the preaching of the gospel is an offer of salvation to every individual addressed by the gospel. There is therefore, according to the teaching of Point I, a general offer of salvation expressing a common favor of God toward every individual to whom the gospel comes, whether he be elect or reprobate.

"Rev. Herman Hoeksema objected to this teaching. He urged that the grace of the gospel is *particular* grace, i.e., for the elect only. Consequently, the preaching of the gospel is grace only for the elect, and is only a means of condemnation for the reprobate. Therefore, Hoeksema urged the preaching of the gospel is not grace to each individual to whom the gospel is preached."

Under the sub-title: "The Principle of Equal Ultimacy," Daane continues:

"How does Hoeksema arrive at this position? He arrives at this position by defining the gospel of God's grace by an equal reference to election and reprobation. In theory Hoeksema rejects the principle that election and reprobation are equally definitive of God's purpose in Christ. Yet in fact his view of the gospel of grace rests on this principle. Since many hearers of the gospel are lost, the preaching of the gospel cannot have been grace to them. Hoeksema regards the teaching of Point I that the gospel is grace to all who hear as an Arminianistic corruption of the grace of the gospel. The gospel can be grace only to those who are saved. Thus Hoeksema pares down the grace of the gospel to make it fit the fact that the non-elect are lost . . .

"When the gospel is defined equally in terms of election and reprobation, then the gospel is defined so as to fit the results, namely that the elect are saved and the reprobate lost. Everything seems to fit nicely together. Everything seems so logical!

"Yet the position which urges that the gospel is grace only to the elect who are saved is plagued with a large difficulty. The gospel must, as Jesus commanded, be preached to every creature. The difficult task that falls on the shoulders of those who believe that the gospel bespeaks only a particular grace which is for the elect only, is the task of showing what the gospel says to every creature. What does a gospel defined only in terms of particular grace say to the non-elect? What does it say that can rightly be called

gospel? What can it say to every creature, if it has a message of grace for the elect only?

"But the difficulty is even more troublesome. Since the preacher cannot discriminate between the elect and reprobate, what can the preacher of the gospel say to any individual man? Moreover, since he does not know whether the individual hearer is elect or reprobate, he cannot say anything at all. The gospel loses its addressability to the individual man. On Hoeksema's basis the Gospel cannot be preached.

"Hoeksema senses and struggles with this problem which emerges out of his manner of interpreting the gospel. How can a gospel of particular grace and of particular grace only, be preached to all men? How can he deny Point I that the gospel is grace to all who hear, and yet retain a gospel that can be addressed to every creature?"

Dr. Daane then treats under the sub-titles: Hoeksema's Solution of this Problem, and, Has Hoeksema Changed His Position? much of the material we have already quoted both in our article of Feb. 15th and in the two articles we wrote in answer to Concordia which took exception to our writing of Feb. 15th. Briefly, Daane tries to show that Hoeksema senses the problem Daane suggests and therefore has seen fit to purify his doctrine from all traces of conditionality. Also Daane tries to show that Hoeksema's attempt to solve the problem has failed, and that therefore Hoeksema's position remains unchanged. Rev. Kok and others have also seen this problem and have tried to solve it with their conditional doctrine, but they also will fail so long as they do not return to the Christian Reformed Churches. Daane shows, and I think correctly so, that one is inconsistent who holds to the doctrine of conditions and at the same time rejects the doctrine of the Christian Reformed Church. But Hoeksema stands the same as he did in 1924. He still has a "gospel that cannot be preached." Daane concludes:

"In conclusion then it must be asserted that Hoeksema, through his denial that gospel proclamation is grace for all who hear, has divorced the *general* proclamation of the gospel from *particular* men . . . This leaves his problem unsolved, and makes it clear that Hoeksema's conception of the gospel is a gospel deprived of its addressability to the particular man—and every man is a particular man!"

Under the heading: Christian Ethics and the Doctrine of Election, Daane has much to say. We can quote only a small portion of it. Here are some of the things he writes:

"Christian Ethics are grounded in Christian Theology. As a Theology differs, its Ethics will differ. A Christian Reformed Theology which support the Three Points should possess a different Ethics than the Protestant Reformed Theology which denies them. The respective Ethics must differ as widely as the respective Theologies. Yet many would be hard set to show the difference between the Protestant Reformed conception of the Christian's attitude toward the world and our conception of the proper Christian attitude.

"If a Church's Ethics must correspond to her Theology, why would many be hard set and why would some even deny that there is a difference between Christian Reformed and Protestant Reformed Ethics? Because we have in a very high degree adopted Hoeksema's methodology in our Ethics. Hoeksema's theology is what it is because of his conception and employment of the absolute antithesis between election and reprobation. But what we repudiated in the area of Theology in 1924, we have adopted for our Ethics. The Synod of 1924 told Hoeksema that it is wrong to interpret God's attitude toward the world in terms of the absolute distinction between election and reprobation. Yet we frequently do the very same thing in the realm of Ethics. In Ethics we frequently use the absolute antithesis as he uses it in Theology. This accounts for the fact that our conception of the Christian's attitude toward the world is almost indistinguishable from that which stems from the soil of his theology.

"Why has not this cultivation of Protestant Reformed Ethics on the soil of Christian Reformed Theology been recognized for the error it is? Because the distinctive feature of Hoeksema's theology has rarely been clearly seen. The oft heard criticism that Hoeksema's theology emphasizes election too much and is therefore off-balance, betrays that the critic has never seen the distinctive feature of Hoeksema's theology. Such criticism is only remarkable for its superficiality. Such a critic has no safeguard against cultivating Protestant Reformed Ethics on Christian Reformed soil.

"A far better criticism is that Hoeksema's theology is static and timeless. But it has been too little perceived that right at this point we meet Hoeksema's conception of the antithesis. It is Hoeksema's conception of the antithesis that is static and timeless. Therefore he holds that God is only and therefore timelessly for the elect, and only and therefore timelessly against the reprobate. Because he conceives of the antithesis as static and timeless he can maintain that God always and only loves the elect and always and only hates the reprobate. And on the basis of this theological principle the kind of Ethics finds support which claims that Christians are *for Christians only* and *against the reprobate . . .*"

"Does the Bible teach us to divide all mankind into two groups, the elect and the reprobate, the good and evil, the regenerate and unregenerate, brother-in-Christ and not-brother-in-Christ, *for the purpose of determining and dispensing our ethical attitudes and responses on the basis of this division?* Theologies constructed on the principle of the equal ultimacy of election and reprobation, answer this question in the affirmative. In the realm of Theology this means that God has grace for the elect only, and has only wrath for the reprobate. In the realm of Ethics this means soil for the view that Christians must dispense two sets of ethical responses, one set for the regenerate elect and another for the unregenerate reprobate. But the Bible answers the above question in the negative. It denounces an Ethics that cries:

Identification first! It condemns the principle that the Christian's love must be dispensed on the basis of elect and reprobate, regenerate and unregenerate. It teaches that such an Ethics is a distortion both of the nature of grace and of the doctrine of election."

Under the sub-title: Love Your Enemies! Daane tries to prove from Scripture that what he describes as Hoeksema's theology, and therefore his ethics, must land us in Phariseeism. The latter also divided all men into two groups. Daane writes further:

"It is not the refusal to discriminate between men when dispensing our ethical responses which constitutes a denial of the difference between the regenerate and the unregenerate, but the insistence that we must divided men into two camps when dispensing our ethical responses that constitutes such a denial!

"Positing two sets of people and dispensing two sets of ethical responses, is an ethical denial and confusion of the difference between the elect and the reprobate, the regenerate and the unregenerate. *And this ethical denial and confusion is not unrelated to the difficulty that adheres to Hoeksema's conception of preaching.*

When Rev. Hoeksema preaches the gospel of the Promise (which he contends is for the elect only), he must assume that he is speaking to the elect and not to the reprobate. But such an assumption in the realm of preaching is also a practical denial and confusion of the difference between the elect and the reprobate. Both the ethical and the practical-preaching denial and confusion of the difference stem from the same source: the application of Hoeksema's conception of the antithesis to God's attitude of grace (Theology) and to the Christian's attitude toward his neighbor (Ethics)!"

Under the sub-title: Ethics and Election, Daane concludes with the following: "The Divine act of election separates. It results in two kinds of people. It accounts for the class of men who are regenerated in distinction from the class which is not regenerated. But election is not only an exclusively divine act, it is *specifically an act of grace*. The most significant thing that one can say about election is that it is a matter of *grace*. For this reason it is exclusively an act of God.

"For this very reason it is profoundly unethical for the Christian to presume that he too can elect, to presume that he can divide mankind into two groups and dispense his ethical responses accordingly. *When a Christian urges that God loves with an electing kind of love and that therefore he must do likewise, he is denying the very nature of grace . . .*"

"A Theology which so uses the doctrine of election and reprobation that its gospel cannot be preached to every creature, to every particular man and reprobation that it cannot without discrimination dispense its ethical attitudes and responses, is also a distortion of the grace of God . . ."

"A Theology built on the equal ultimacy of election and reprobation nourishes an Ethics that divides between man and man. Such a theology and such an ethics is *essentially divisive*. And a Church which believes in such a Theology and lives by such an Ethics, is a Church that will be rent by a never-ending process of divisions and schisms . . ."

My space is more than used up. Briefly I would conclude that Dr. Daane surely does not understand the Prot. Reformed doctrine of the antithesis, and perhaps has not the correct conception of this doctrine himself. I, too, would be very much interested to hear from him what he actually understands by the "absolute antithesis." Secondly, I fear that Daane has never really made a thorough study of the Scriptural concept "Love" and "Love your neighbor." Surely the warped conception he ascribes to us is preposterous. Thirdly, it is apparent that Daane has never read and digested Hoeksema's explanation of passages such as Matt. 5:44, 45; Luke 6:36; Acts 14:16, 17, etc. It might be good for Dr. Daane if he took the time to read carefully the History of the Protestant Reformed Churches where all of these and many more texts are explained. If he doesn't have a copy, I shall be glad to send him one free of charge. All he has to do is write me. I guarantee him that he will apologize for writing as he did if he is honest and has faithfully read the truth about us. If Daane is honest he will tell his readers that he has heard the Rev. H. Hoeksema preach the glorious Gospel of Salvation as he has heard no other preach it. This he did when he attended Calvin Seminary. How does he dare to present a distorted report of Hoeksema's gospel preaching now? I cannot understand how this is possible!

M.S.

FROM HOLY WRIT

(Continued from Page 349)

children of obedience. They walk as such upon whom the wrath of God cometh.

Awake then thou that sleepest and arise from this doctrinal and practical lethargy. And you will taste in this putting off of these horrible vices that the *logical* milk is full of spiritual vitamins. By this word you shall grow with a spiritual growth in fervent love.

Thus only shall we be a people manifesting that we have been called efficaciously out of darkness into God's marvelous light!

G.L.

IN HIS FEAR

(Continued from Page 351)

love" of which they speak so freely? Why do they love only *some* of the sheep so that they seek to separate them from their awful shepherd and awful consistories? Why not try, by the same *personal* contact to convert the shepherd *and the consistories* also? And that when there is no doctrinal difference and when it is their calling to prevent "further separation of God's people?" What can they be after then? Let them tell us plainly.

J.A.H.

LET ALL EXALT JEHOVAH'S GOODNESS

Let all exalt Jehovah's goodness,
For most compassionate is He;
His mercy, excellent in fulness,
Endureth to eternity.
Let Israel praise Jehovah's goodness,
And say, Exalt His majesty;
His mercy, excellent in fulness,
Endureth to eternity.

The Lord's right hand is high exalted,
Jehovah's strong and mighty hand;
The vaunting enemy He halted,
And made His chosen ones to stand.
I shall not die but live before Him,
And all His mighty works declare
That all may joyfully adore Him,
Who in His lovingkindness share.

The stone the builders had rejected,
And in contempt refused to own,
To their dismay has been selected
To be the foremost cornerstone.
This thing is from the Lord Almighty,
It is a marvel in our eyes;
Man cannot understand it rightly
Nor fathom it in any wise.

Psalm 118:1, 3, 5

NOW WITH JOYFUL EXULTATION

Now with joyful exultation
Let us sing Jehovah's praise,
To the Rock of our salvation
Loud hosannas let us raise;
Thankful tribute gladly bringing,
Let us come before Him now,
And, with psalms His praises singing,
Joyful in His presence bow.

For how great a God, and glorious,
Is Jehovah whom we sing;
Over idolgods victorious,
Great is He, our God and King.
In His hand are earth's deep places,
His the strength of all the hills,
His the sea whose bounds He traces,
His the land His bounty fills.

Psalm 95:1, 2