

# THE STANDARD

*Bearer*

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME XXX

MAY 15, 1954 — GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

NUMBER 16

## MEDITATION

### Rend Your Heart, And Not Your Garments

"Therefore also now, saith the Lord, turn ye even to me with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning: And rend your heart, and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God: for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil. Who knoweth if he will return and repent, and leave a blessing behind him; even a meat offering and a drink offering unto the Lord your God?"

Joel 2:12-14

Judgment is impending!

It is "the day of the Lord," the day of darkness and of gloominess, of clouds and thick darkness.

And all of life stands in the sign always of that judgment. The key to the understanding of that day is that it is the day of the vindication of the Lord, the Righteous Judge, as He has revealed Himself in the Son of His right hand, Jesus Christ. On the one hand, therefore the day of the Lord is the day of the destruction of all the wicked of the earth. And on the other hand, that day of darkness is the bright day of the promised salvation for all God's people in Christ.

Therefore . . . .

O, not in the Arminian sense of "before it is too late" must this word of the prophet be understood. The Lord Jehovah does not scare His people into the kingdom: He draws them in His sovereign love. But nevertheless, it is "therefore." Seeing that this is so, seeing that the Word of God concerning that "day of the Lord," — both the typical, Old Testament day of the Lord, and the real day of the Lord, which stretches from the dawn of the new dispensation to the end of history, — seeing that Word is the gospel, the calling of Jehovah to His people is: "Turn ye even to me with all your heart!"

And with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning . . . .

Rend your heart, and not your garments!

Turn unto Jehovah your God!

\* \* \* \*

Say not that this calling cannot be intended for you, O Christian. For then have you never yet understood the gospel, you have not heard the calling, you have not really heard the voice of the God Who calls the things that are not as though they are.

For if you really hear the calling of Jehovah God, the very first thing that you will realize is that there is abundant need of turning. You will realize that His calling presupposes that you have turned away, that you have forsaken Him, the Fountain of living waters, that you have violated His covenant.

Thus it is with all sin: it is a transgression of His covenant. Originally we were so formed that we might be, and also were God's covenant friends. In true righteousness and holiness and knowledge of Him we were created. Called into being by His own almighty creative Word in order that we should know Him and love Him and serve Him, as His covenant friends in the earthly creation. And for a little while it was bliss. But our first father and representative head, and we in him, turned away, and invoked the just wrath of God. To be sure, that fall was no accident. It took place strictly according to the all-wise and sovereign counsel of the Most High. And it took place because our God had in mind some better thing for us, the higher life of His everlasting tabernacle. But that does not change matters ethically. Man is still obligated to love and serve the Most High with all his heart and mind and soul and strength. And it is his bounden duty, therefore, to turn unto Jehovah.

But what is true in general of all sin, is the more severely true of the sin of Israel, of God's people in the old and the new dispensation. For by grace the Lord God took unto Himself a people in Christ Jesus, in order that they should be for the praise of the glory of His grace. He redeemed them. He delivered them out of the fearful bondage in which they were captive. He did that in the old dispensation by promise, in the types and shadows and ceremonies of the law of Moses, when the law was imposed upon the promise, when He brought them out of the land of Egypt and planted His vine in the earthly Canaan, and hedged it about, and bestowed loving care upon it. And in the new dispensation

He realized this promise in His Son Jesus Christ, blotting out the handwriting of sin that was against us, and sending unto us the Spirit of sonship to apply unto us all the blessings of salvation. In the way of sin and grace, He established His covenant with us in Christ Jesus, revealing it peculiarly as a covenant of *grace*. And in that relationship all our sin is in a much stronger sense, much more emphatically, a violation of the covenant relationship, a forsaking of Jehovah. Sometimes the Scriptures refer to it as spiritual adultery. For God's people are His wife, and their Maker is their husband. Married they are to Jehovah by the wonder of His grace. They have a communion of life, and a communion of love. And what a horrible thing, then, when that wife of Jehovah, the bride of Christ, becomes unfaithful, goes awhoring, as she does every time she sins. For all sin is principally a breach of that relationship, for it is contrary to the holy nature of that covenant union.

Need it even be mentioned, then, that this calling to turn, to return unto Jehovah, constantly to turn unto the Lord our God, every day, every hour, every minute of our existence, is extremely necessary? When thus sin is viewed, there is abundant reason for such an admonition, is there not?

\* \* \* \*

Turn, then, to Jehovah your God!

Do so with your whole heart!

Rend your heart, and not your garments!

Highly necessary it is to understand what is really meant by this, what is the true nature of this turning to Jehovah. For we must know whether we are such converted and converting sinners. This is fundamental. In a certain sense, we remain sinners until we die. Our conversion is never complete until the day of our death, when finally and completely the old man of sin is laid aside. But we must know whether the Lord "repents, and leaves a blessing behind." And we can only know that when we turn unto Him. And therefore we must understand this mystery of conversion.

Turn unto Me with your whole heart, saith Jehovah!

That means the mortification of the old man of sin. It implies that we turn *away* from sin, that we forsake our evil ways. It means that we hate our own evil thoughts, desires, inclinations, and actions. It implies also that we fight against them, are sorry for them, long to be delivered from them, and that we actually forsake them. This is first and foremost in the experience of conversion. There is no turning to Jehovah without a turning away from sin. For He is too pure of eyes to behold iniquity!

On the other hand, there is also the equally indispensable element of turning *to* Jehovah. If you do not turn *to* Jehovah, you have not turned *away from sin*. There are only two possible directions to turn. And to turn to Jehovah implies that we love the Lord our God with all our heart and mind and soul and strength. It means that we turn to Him *in Christ* for forgiveness, for grace, for undeserved and unmerited favor. It means that we humble ourselves deeply

before Him, and acknowledge that we are utterly unworthy on account of our sins, and abhor ourselves before His face. And it implies too a hearty striving to live according to all His commandments.

In a word, this turning is a radical change of the whole direction of our life. Such it is in its initial manifestation. And such it is as a constant process which never ends until, having laid down our head upon death's pillow, we finally awake in the glory of the resurrection.

Turn! Turn always! Constantly! Never cease turning . . . .

With fasting, and with weeping and with mourning . . . .

Yes, with fasting, in order that you may soberly contemplate your sins, number them, if you can, in all their multitude, and come to an ever deeper insight into your own sinfulness and sinful nature.

And with weeping and with mourning, because in this present existence the expression of sorrow over sin, the constant weeping of tears of repentance, is the chief characteristic of conversion.

But, mark you, turn with your whole heart; and be very certain that it is your heart, the very center of your being from a spiritual viewpoint, that you rend, and not simply your garments. For conversion does not consist merely in the outward act of turning. It is not that alone. And it is not that first of all. It is a matter of the heart, from whence are all the issues of a man's life. If it is not of the heart, then it is no good; it is not genuine; it is not a radical change. A mere rending of the garments will never do. That may be seen by men, and it may deceive men. But before God it means nothing. If only you rend your heart, then the rest will come; there is no danger, then, that the outward act of conversion will not also take place. But you can very well rend your garments, that which is external, that which may be seen of men; you may very well put on a show of conversion without ever really rending your heart in an agony of sorrow and contrition over its foul contents.

Rend your heart, and not your garments!

And turn with your whole heart! Be very certain that you do not mean to leave it partly unexposed. Rend it, so that it stands completely exposed in all its filth, that you may properly abhor yourself before Him! Do not attempt to turn to Jehovah with a lie in your right hand. Do not say that you are sorry, and at the same time cherish some pet sin. You will never succeed anyway. For He is the Lord! Turn with your whole heart!

\* \* \* \*

Ah, how presumptuous to imagine that such a turning can ever take place while we are still in the kingdom of darkness, that it can be a prerequisite to enter into the kingdom of heaven. How contrary to the true abhorrence and humbling of ourselves.

Nay, it is not merely a question of whether through the mouth of the prophet Joel this calling was *proclaimed*, and must be proclaimed, to all without distinction. It must. But

mark you, Jehovah calls His people, His elect: He is the Lord their God, by His own sovereign election is "the fountain of every saving good." Never can we turn, do we turn, except He turns us. And when He turns us, we surely must and shall and do turn. His calling is efficacious! When He causes us to fast, we fast and learn our sins. When He causes us to be grief-stricken, we mourn and weep. When He tears our hearts, we rend them. All this He does when He regenerates us, and then calls us by His Word and Spirit, operating (O, it is painful, but nevertheless sweet) in our hearts powerfully, and turning our mind and will.

\* \* \* \*

Can there be any doubt then, that when we turn, He will also receive us?

Nay! For that conversion is already the clear token that He is gracious, that is, filled with favor, undeserved, forfeited favor toward us. It is the unmistakable evidence that He is surely merciful, filled with tender affection and pity for us in our misery. He is slow to anger, longsuffering, unchangeably willing our final perfection in Christ through the way of suffering and misery and death. And He is of great kindness, — otherwise He would surely never have turned us, for that required infinite kindness, — according to which He will surely bless.

Do not fear, then. Hesitate not to turn unto Him. For that is the picture of your God!

And He repents of the evil! Nay, He does not change. But it appears to us that He repents, because the eternal and unchangeable God reveals Himself to us in a succession of moments. And then it seems that there is change in Him from judgment to favor, from wrath to blessing.

\* \* \* \*

And in that way, you will experience that He returns from judgment and leaves instead a blessing behind Him. Centrally He did that in Christ. And He reveals it in the outpouring of His Spirit. And the blessing is a meat offering and a drink offering, a sacrifice of thankful praise unto Him for all the wonders of His grace revealed unto us, poor, miserable sinners.

Turn, then, unto Him!

And you shall know that blessedness of the converted!

H.C.H.

#### IN MEMORIAM

The Consistory of the Protestant Reformed Church of Hull, Iowa, hereby expresses heartfelt sympathy with Elder Peter Jansma in the loss of his father-in-law,

#### WILLIAM VANDER KOOL.

May the the God of grace Who performs all things according to His own good pleasure, but also in unchanging love to His people, comfort and sustain him in his sorrow.

Nick Wm. Kooiker, Vice Pres.  
John Hoekstra, Vice Sec'y.

#### 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*

#### C O N T E N T S

##### MEDITATION —

"Rend Your Heart, And Not Your Garments".....361  
Rev. H. C. Hoeksema

##### EDITORIALS —

Domineering, Who?.....364  
Rev. H. Hoeksema

##### AS TO BOOKS —

Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament: Mattheus  
by Dr. F. W. Grosheide.....366  
Rev. H. Hoeksema

##### OUR DOCTRINE —

The Triple Knowledge (Part III - Of Thankfulness).....367  
Rev. H. Hoeksema

##### THE DAY OF SHADOWS —

The Prophecy of Isaiah.....368  
Rev. G. M. Ophoff

##### FROM HOLY WRIT —

Exposition of I Corinthians 16:13, 14.....371  
Rev. G. Lubbers

##### IN HIS FEAR —

Walking in Error (6).....373  
Rev. J. A. Heys

##### CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH —

The Church and the Sacraments.....375  
Rev. H. Veldman

##### THE VOICE OF OUR FATHERS —

The Canons of Dordrecht (Art. 9).....378  
Rev. H. C. Hoeksema

##### DECENCY AND ORDER —

Emeritation of Ministers.....380  
Rev. G. Vanden Berg

##### ALL AROUND US —

Billy Graham Does It Again.....381  
The Way, The Truth and The Life.....382  
Rev. M. Schipper

CONTRIBUTIONS .....383

## EDITORIALS

### Domineering. Who?

In his beautiful and very sober editorial in the last *Standard Bearer*, the Rev. G. M. Ophoff proved to all who are interested in the truth that the Rev. P. De Boer was guilty of publishing a gross untruth when he wrote that I sought and worked in the direction of a split in our churches.

It is, indeed, a sad sign that those that departed from the Protestant Reformed truth constantly seek refuge in lies and slander, particularly addressed to the undersigned.

A glaring example of this is the Cross Bill filed in Superiour Court of Grand Rapids, county of Kent, by the Rev. De Wolf c.s.

For in this cross bill they do not hesitate to testify, under oath, to all sorts of filthy lies and thus are guilty of perjury.

They especially emphasize in that cross bill that I am supposed to be a very domineering character, who can never tolerate any opposition against his own ideas and conclusions.

Thus, e.g., in article 15 of that cross bill, they testify:

Defendants further show that said Herman Hoeksema, commencing early in his life, has been a domineering character whose word is law and who would not tolerate any opposition to his conclusions and pronouncements, and that in organizing the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids he assumed to be the head thereof and to dictate its policies, and would not tolerate any opposition to his own ideas and wishes, became very intolerant, and as time went on created a feeling of dissension (must be dissension, H.H.) in his church."

They know, and I can prove that they know that this is a lie under oath.

Again, they testify under oath:

"Defendants further show that in the First Protestant Reformed Church the governing body is the consistory so-called and that from time to time persons are elected to serve on said consistory who are called elders. That a large majority of said church was not in harmony with the conduct of said Herman Hoeksema who was the person known as the head or first pastor of said church, and that as new members of the Consistory were elected the congregation was electing persons who were more or less in opposition to the said Herman Hoeksema. 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 or split in said church with the purpose in view of securing the property thereof as set forth in plaintiff's bill of complaint."

What a foul lie! I can only pray that they may repent in dust and ashes before God and men of this filthy piece of slander!

In article 36 of said cross bill they testify as follows:

"Defendants further show that for the purpose of carrying out the conspiracy to get control of the properties of the various church congregations and to dictate the policies of these churches, the said Herman Hoeksema has recently made visits to locations where the churches of classis West are located and there has attempted to create and in some instances has created schism in said churches, has attempted to split the congregations and organize a new congregation over which he could have control, although these defendants allege that the congregations in Classis West have disagreed with the said Herman Hoeksema and have disagreed with the position taken by these cross defendants in attempting to depose the Rev. De Wolf and the other defendants herein, and that the said Herman Hoeksema has in fact lost control of the congregations of Classis West although he has succeeded in causing a split in some of the congregations of Classis West."

Do not the signers of this cross bill know what perjury is? It is defined as follows: "At common law, a willfully false statement in a fact material to the issue, made by a witness under oath in a competent judicial proceeding." In the above testimony under oath there is not an item of truth.

Further, in Article 41 they testify under oath as follows:

"These defendants further show that the history of Herman Hoeksema shows a disposition of intolerance and that of absolute boss and a person whose mentality is such that he is incapable of tolerating any person or persons who might disagree with his own ideas; that he is always right and the person who disagrees with him is always wrong, and that he intends to rule or to ruin, and he and his followers are following a course of conduct which is intended to and does wreck this denomination, causing dissension (must be dissension, H.H.) in its churches, and that no court should place its stamp of approval upon the actions of these cross defendants."

Filthy? There are no words for it! And, mark you well, that none of the signers of this cross bill have ever even as much admonished me for my evil conduct, either personally or in consistory. I ask: is this Christian conduct and language? May God give them repentance of this vile slander before they appear with me in judgment!

The above are only some of the items of this filthiest of all cross bills.

But it was not my purpose to call attention merely to the vile slander of this cross bill. My chief purpose was to show that the signers of this cross bill strongly emphasize that I am supposed to be a very domineering and intolerant character.

This I deny.

What is the meaning of "to domineer?"

It is "to rule with insolence or arbitrary sway; to play the master; to be overbearing; to tyrannize; to bluster; to swell with conscious superiority or haughtiness."

Such an attitude I have never assumed either with regard

to individuals, congregations, consistories, classes, or synods,

I am deeply conscious of the fact that I am a sinful man. But by the grace of God I may say, calling on many witnesses that know me, that I have never attempted to lord it over the churches, over any of my fellow ministers or fellow church members.

What I always did attempt to do is:

1. Maintain and defend the Reformed truth without any form of compromise, whatever might be the result for me or for the churches I have served.

2. Support my position with sound argument from Scripture, the Confessions, and the Church Order.

3. Give well motivated advice to my consistory, often, too, to other consistories that sought my advice, and to the churches in general.

4. Abide by the decisions of my consistory and of the major assemblies, wherever I could submit in harmony with the truth, whether or not I personally agreed.

I challenge anyone to prove that I did not always follow this course of action.

Never have I even attempted to influence the decisions of my consistory or of classis or synod by some form of conspiracy, by talking in private to other ministers or elders about matters that would come up in these assemblies.

On the other hand, I have learned to know the Rev. De Wolf, in the ten years that he was co-pastor with me in the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, as a man that is jealous of power, that had a strong tendency to dominate, and that finally showed that he would never abide by the decisions of ecclesiastical assemblies.

A curious instance of this, though in itself a minor matter, was the case of his arbitrarily using the last name of the child in baptism.

When the Rev. De Wolf first entered upon his ministry in the First Protestant Reformed Church and administered the sacrament of Holy Baptism, he pronounced the family name together with the individual name of the child. This had never been done before in our congregation, nor, as far as I knew in any Reformed church. It was, therefore, an innovation, although, I believe, Kok had introduced before him. He did this entirely on his own authority, without consulting me or my consistory at the time. I doubt, too, whether he had reason or ground for this innovation.

But I kept silent, in the meantime, of course, following myself the ageold custom of using only the individual name or names of the child. I did not protest nor call the attention of the consistory to the matter.

But someone else did call attention to it.

In the minutes of the consistory meeting of Aug. 27, 1945, we read the following:

"Elder Cammenga brought up that in administering the sacrament of baptism to the children of the congregation one of our pastors pronounces the full name of the child and the other only the first name. He thought that there should be more unity on the matter. A motion was made to announce

the full name when baptizing. This was now defeated. Motion was made to ask Rev. De Wolf to use only the first name in baptizing.

A substitute motion is made to table until Rev. De Wolf is present. Substitute motion is carried."

Then, in the minutes of Sept. 10, 1945, art. 8, we read:

"A motion that was tabled at our last meeting to use only the first name in baptizing was now taken up and voted upon. Motion carried."

It is evident that the Rev. De Wolf could not produce reasonable grounds for his innovation to convince the consistory.

Was this the end? And did De Wolf submit to the decision of the consistory?

Two and a half years later the matter was brought up again. In the minutes of March 9, 1948, Article 23 we read:

"It was moved to announce the last name, in addition to the given name, in the baptism of infants. A substitute motion to wait until after Rev. Hanko arrives in deciding this question was defeated and the original motion carried."

You see, that is my idea of domineering, for that is, evidently playing politics. And politics in the church I always hate. Why I am convinced that this was a political move? For the following reasons:

1. First of all, because the decision by the consistory of Sept. 10, 1945 was, evidently, never rescinded. This should have been done, and that, too, by a two third majority.

2. Secondly, judging by the date, March 8, this was, evidently a general consistory meeting, at which the deacons were present and also voted. And this was none of their business.

3. Thirdly, I, who certainly was vitally interested in the matter, because the consistory was well aware that I was opposed to the innovation, was still recuperating in California, and they passed this decision shortly before I was coming home.

4. Fourthly, they hurried the motion through before the Rev. Hanko would arrive, who probably had to conduct a catechism class and would before long have been present at the consistory meeting. Remember that, in 1945, when the same matter was before the consistory, they decided to table the motion to baptize only with the given name until the Rev. De Wolf could be present.

All this I call politics, and politics, in the current sense of that term, is bossism and domineering.

Do not imagine that, with all this, I have in mind my present consistory, for in 1948 the consistory was so constituted that what is now the bad element was in the majority. Seven of those elders that were in the consistory at that time now signed the filthy cross bill. So, of course, did the Rev. De Wolf who was the originator of this innovation to have infants baptized with their last name, and who was the only minister present at that meeting. Besides, a deacon at the time who now is elder is another signer of the cross bill. All in all, eleven of the twenty one elders are now with De

Wolf, while the latter, of course, presided. Of the deacons, if they, too, were present, seven are now on the other side, i.e. seven of the ten. Hence, it must not be blamed to my present consistory that, at the time, they played politics and were guilty of domineering and bossism.

Then, soon after I returned from California, and the Lord had caused me to recover to a remarkable extent so that I could preach again (something for which, I am now convinced, the opposition was very sorry), I had to baptize babies. Imagine my amazement, when in the consistory room, a few moments before the service, the clerk, now one of the signers of the filthy cross bill, came up to me and whispered in my ear: "you must baptize with the last name."

More domineering politics!

There had been plenty of time to acquaint me with the decision of the consistory beforehand. Plenty of time even to lodge a protest with the consistory if I so desired. But it had to be told me at a moment when all opportunity for protest was cut off!

What should I do?

I submitted to the consistory, but before the service I announced from the pulpit that I did not agree with the decision of the consistory and that I protested against it. And when I baptized the children, I so pronounced the first name that it became very plain that the last name did not belong in the ceremony.

First, I considered the possibility to lodge a formal protest with the consistory and, if necessary to take it to classis.

But I refrained from it, and simply let the other two pastors baptize the children.

You ask, perhaps, whether I have weighty objections against the use of the last name in baptism, or whether it is merely because of the dirty politics of the way in which the innovation was introduced, that I was and am opposed to it.

I have asked myself that question also. And my conclusion is that the former is the case. The following are my objections:

1. It is an age old custom in the church to baptize children, an even adults only with the given name, not with the family name. These customs usually are founded upon good grounds. It was up to the innovators to furnish good reasons why we should depart from that custom. This they never did.

2. These grounds for the ancient custom to baptize only with the given name can easily be surmised. We baptize individuals, not the father or mother of the child. Hence, the name of the father, or of the mother does not belong in the administration of baptism. When a girl marries, she loses her family name but not her baptismal name. When such a girl is baptized after she is married, as is sometimes the case, not the name of her parents, nor of her husband, but only her own given first name should be pronounced. When

a child is born out of wedlock, and the mother remains unmarried, while the father is either known or not known, it should not be baptized with the name of the mother but with its own given name only. When a father cannot present his child for baptism because, either he is no member or is excommunicated, the child should not be baptized with the name of such a father, nor with the name of the mother, but only with its own given name. These are some of the reasons why it was the ancient custom in the church to baptize only with the first or given name.

3. Article 60 of the Church Order presupposes that only the first or given name shall be used in the administration of baptism. It reads as follows: "The names of those baptized, together with the names of the parents, and likewise the date of birth and baptism, shall be recorded."

4. The administration of baptism is, to me, too sacred a transaction to be used as an occasion to satisfy the curiosity and even vanity of some. And this is the only conceivable motive for the innovation.

These are my reasons why we should never have departed from the ancient, venerable and well grounded custom of the church to baptize only with the given name.

But talk about domineering and politics?

Who is guilty? Certainly not the undersigned.

H.H.

## AS TO BOOKS

*Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament: Mattheus*, by Dr. F. W. Grosheide. Published by J. H. Kok, Kampen, the Netherlands. Price f 18.75.

As a commentator Dr. Grosheide is rather well known among those of us who still are interested in Dutch literature of this kind. He is characterized by thoroughness and sobriety of interpretation. This is also true of this commentary on Matthew. In an introduction, in which Dr. Grosheide compares the four gospel narratives and especially the three synoptic gospels, he says that, while they all aim to set forth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, the gospel according to Matthew is directed especially to the Jews and presents Him emphatically as the prophet. The commentary proper is, on the whole, a sound interpretation of the original text and written in a very clear style.

The brief synopsis which the author gives at the end of his interpretation of various sections is often helpful.

We gladly recommend this commentary to our Dutch readers and particularly to our students and ministers.

H.H.



## OUR DOCTRINE

### THE TRIPLE KNOWLEDGE

AN EXPOSITION OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM  
PART III — OF THANKFULNESS

LORD'S DAY 41

Chapter 2

Divorce and Remarriage (cont.)

But the grace which might perfect that natural love, and confirm that indissoluble union, and sanctify the married, Christ Himself, the instituter and perfecter of the venerable sacraments (according to the Roman Catholics, marriage is a sacrament, something with which I cannot possibly agree, H.H.), merited for us by his passion; as the apostle Paul intimates, saying, *Husbands love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it; adding shortly after, This is a great sacrament* (the original has "mystery," H.H.), *but I speak in Christ and in the church.*"

And in Canon 7, attached to this chapter, the Council decreed as follows: "If anyone saith, that the church has erred, in that she has taught, and doth teach, in accordance with the evangelical and apostolical doctrine, that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the married parties; and that both, or even the innocent one who gave not occasion to the adultery, cannot contract another marriage during the lifetime of the other; and, that he is guilty of adultery, who, having put away the adulteress, shall take another wife, as also she, who, having put away the adulterer, shall take another husband: let him be anathema."

Except for the view that marriage is a sacrament, properly so called, I must agree with the Roman Catholic conception of marriage, especially in regard to the truth that the marriage bond is absolutely indissoluble.

The Christian Reformed Churches, supported even by the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands, have gradually moved in the very opposite direction, namely, in the direction of the stand that marriage is not indissoluble. In 1945 there was before the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church an "Overture Regarding Divorce." This overture takes the stand throughout that the marriage bond may be dissolved, and that after its dissolution both parties can be remarried. In this overture there is all kinds of subtle argument which would require a careful analization to refute it, — something which we will not here attempt to do in detail. Only one or two illustrations I will here quote. There is an exegesis in this overture on Matthew 5:32. The exegesis is as follows. A certain woman commits adultery with another man. Her husband divorced her. And still another man marries the divorced woman. This marriage is perfectly legal in the sight of God. For, according to the argument in this over-

ture, the husband that put away his wife because of adultery certainly does not make her an adulteress. And therefore, according to this same argument, the man that married that divorced woman does not commit adultery: for the guilty party is no longer bound to her first husband. It is evident that all this is based on the fundamental proposition that the first marriage was dissolved, and dissolved for both parties, so that both parties have the right to remarry. That, however, this argument is pure sophistry is evident on the very surface. All that the Lord teaches in Matt. 5:32 is emphatically that the marriage tie can never be broken. Not even the cause of fornication or adultery breaks the marriage tie, although the husband may put away his adulterous wife. The same overture argues that it cannot be maintained that after a divorce only the innocent party can remarry, and not the guilty party. Also this is based on the presupposition that marriage can be dissolved. Therefore, according to the overture, "As soon as it is recognized that the adultery of the one party does not of itself free either party, that only the breaking of the tie gives freedom, the whole fallacy: one party is free, but the other is bound, falls to the ground. For if the tie is broken, neither is married to the other, and therefore also can remarry." Such is the sophistry of the argument in the "Overture Regarding Divorce."

The only possible safeguard against all such corruption is, what is to my mind, the Scriptural standpoint that marriage can never be dissolved, and that therefore neither the guilty nor the innocent party can possibly remarry, although, by a legal divorce, they can be separated for life.

The Scriptural basis for this stand I find in Matt. 5:31, 32; Matt. 19:3-9; Mark 10:11-12; and Luke 16:18. Moreover, there is a passage in Rom. 7:1-3 that is worthy of consideration in this respect.

In Matt. 5:31, 32 we read: "It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." The passage in Matt. 19 reads as follows: "The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

H.H.

## THE DAY OF SHADOWS

### The Prophecy of Isaiah

*The positive blessings that will operate in the ethical lives of the Israel according to the election of grace when Christ will have come into His kingdom.*

Chapter XXXII:1-8

Behold, a king shall reign according to righteousness (vs. 1a).

The king is the promised Messiah, Christ Jesus. Righteousness shall be the girdle of His loins and faithfulness the girdle of His reins, Isa. 5:5.

The princes of His spiritual kingdom with which He will surround Himself and fill with His Spirit shall likewise rule according to judgment (vs. 1b).

The allusion is in the first instance to the faithful pastors and teachers that Christ will give to His church for the edifying of His body.

In glaring contrast to the apostate rulers in Israel, who oppress and exploit the flock of God, each of them shall be a protection to the afflicted, like a sheltering place of hiding protects from wind and rain. They shall tender the poor positive refreshments, like rivers of water and the deep shadow of a great rock do to the traveler in the desert (vs. 2).

God's people shall be purged of all their imperfections. The eyes of them that see — are endowed with spiritual sight because born from above — shall not be dim. But they shall see with perfect vision and their ears shall hearken. The heart of the hasty, the rash, shall understand knowledge. The tongue of the stammerers shall be loosened and with fluency of speech they shall speak clearly (vss. 3, 4).

The promise here is plainly that of the advancement of the church to spiritual maturity through the coming of the crucified, risen and glorified Christ in the Spirit when the day of Pentecost was fully come, and, lastly, of the appearing of the church in glory.

The fool shall then not any longer be called noble nor the miser bountiful, however deserving they may be according to human standards. Everyone shall be called by a name that expresses what he is in the sight of Christ. A fool shall be called a fool not because he is mentally deficient — his natural abilities may be transcendent — but because, though knowing that it goes evilly with the wicked in the end, he, being profligate, persists in speaking foolishness, working iniquity with his heart, practicing ungodliness, uttering error against the Lord, and making the soul of the hungry empty and causing the drink of the thirsty to fail, i.e., depriving the needy of their means of support — bread and drink (vss. 5, 6).

The fool arms himself with weapons of evil. He devises counsels that are calculated to bind the poor by deceitful words even while the needy one pleads his cause. But the

truly noble does differently. *He* devises things that are noble; and by such things he shall be established (vss. 7, 8).

*The Lord's judgment upon the proud women.*

Chapter XXXII:9-20.

They are the wives and the daughters of the princes in Jerusalem, — women of rank therefore. They dwell in palatial homes and spend their days in luxurious living. Their daily fare includes the choicest fruits of the ground. A sense of security pervades their mind. They have never known any want and are without a care.

The prophet bids these women that live thus quietly, these secure daughters, to rise up, i.e., to arouse their spirits and attend to his voice, hearken to his speech (vs. 9). For an indefinite length of time — days and a year — they shall tremble. For the wine-harvest shall be destroyed, and the fruit-harvest shall not come (vs. 10). The prophet commands them to tremble. He bids them to disrobe and replace the garments previously worn by sackcloth. For there is going to be beating upon the breast for the desirable fields and fruitful vines surrounding the cities and villages of Judah, implying that these fields are going to be laid waist by invading armies of the enemy in the first instance the Assyrians (vss. 11, 12). In the place of vines, thorns and briars will spring up over the land. Even the joyous houses, the gardens attached to the dwellings of the rich in the joyous city (Jerusalem) will grow wild with such weeds (vs. 13). The palaces shall be forsaken and the multitude, by which perhaps is to be understood the poor among the inhabitants, shall be left behind. The hills and watchtowers of the cities of Judah shall be dens forever, the joy of wild asses and pastures for cattle (vs. 14).

The fulfilment of this announcement of disaster took place by stages. Jerusalem was twice brought into a state of ruin, first by the Chaldeans under Nebuchadnezzar and lastly by the Romans in the year of 66. At this time the city was ploughed over as a field. Of the temple not one stone was left upon the other. The cities and villages of Judah were destroyed. Thirty thousand Jews perished. Ninety thousand more were led into captivity and sold as slaves. Then Jerusalem fell, never again to rise as God's own city. Since that time it has been trodden down by the nations and the Jews are still scattered among them all. That was the final and complete fulfilment of this prophecy.

However a new day was to dawn for God's afflicted people, the Israel according to the election of grace. Their sorrows were to endure only for a season, — until the Spirit be poured out upon them from on high, and the desert be a fruitful plain and the fruitful plain a forest (vs. 15). Then judgment shall dwell in the desert, and righteousness remain in the fruitful plain. And the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the service of righteousness quietness and security forever (vss. 16, 17). The people of the Lord shall dwell then in habitations of peace, and in secure dwellings, and in resting places of quietness (vs. 18), when it shall



hail, coming down on the forest, by which is to be understood the godless world-power, and the city, this same power, shall be abased (vs. 19). Blessed are they that sow beside all waters, i.e., the waters of the whole earth — the earth that, such is the idea, the blessed shall inherit as their everlasting habitation, and into the fertile pastures of which they shall drive their cattle (vs. 20).

The preliminary fulfilment of this prophecy was the turning of Judah's captivity. Then was Jerusalem that the Chaldeans had depopulated again inhabited by the Lord's people. A new temple arose on the ruins of the old. The city was rebuilt and its walls and gates repaired. And the fields of Judah that for seventy long years had rested were again cultivated. And the moving principle of all these undertakings was the Spirit of the Lord. For so it is written, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord" (Zech. 4:6).

However this all was still but type and shadow. It did not begin to measure up to the great good that the above prophecy and all similar prophecies hold forth. This good is the coming of Christ in the Spirit as climaxed by the appearing of the new heavens and the new earth at the end of time. It is the transcendent goodness of the new earth and the blessedness of its redeemed and glorified inhabitants that the prophet in the final instance here again describes under images supplied by the circumstances of this present time. And the blessedness of these inhabitants is the peace, the secure dwelling, the resting place of quietness that is theirs as the fruit of the work of righteousness of Christ. And their secure dwelling is their God in Christ forever. Therefore the hail does not come down on them. They are not harmed by God's plagues. They perish not with the world.

33

*The fifth Woe. Chapter XXXIII.*

This woe, in contradistinction to the four preceding ones that were directed against Israel, concerns the Assyrians, at that time the possessor of the world-power and apparently invincible. In all its wars for world dominion it had thus far not suffered a single defeat. This power was again marching and its destination was now Jerusalem (see vs. 7). But the Lord will now bring to pass the word that He has spoken that He would smite the Assyrians (XXX:18 sqq.; 31 sqq.; XXXI:18 sq.).

To him — the Assyrian — that spoils the nations without himself having been spoiled hitherto, and now deals treacherously with God's people, though they dealt not treacherously with him — woe. When presently he ceases to spoil and makes an end to deal treacherously, because destroyed as a world-power, his former victims, the nations, shall spoil and deal treacherously with him (vs. 1).

33

*The prayer of the faithful. Chapter XXXII:2-6.*

With the enemy at hand, the prophet now pours out his heart to the Lord in prayer, doing so as the organ of all the

faithful in the land the thoughts of whose heart he thus voices.

He prays the Lord to be gracious unto them; they are waiting for Him. Let Him be their arm every morning, their salvation in the time of trouble (vs. 2). The prophet is fully confident that the Lord will send deliverance in the present crisis as He has in every crisis of the past, now by this kind of working then by that. The enemy would flee as terrified by a great noise like that of the onset of an army that the Lord would cause them to hear. Or He would scatter the enemy forces by hail and thunder, I Sam. 7; II Kings 7 (vs. 3). The Lord will now deal similarly with the present enemy. And His people will plunder the camp, collecting the spoil with a swiftness like locust eating clean the field (vs. 4).

So will He come now again to the rescue of His people, but not because of any goodness original with them, but because, dwelling, as He does, on high, He the Lord is exalted and fills Zion with judgment and righteousness so that all their goodness is of Him, the high God, who hath mercy on whom He will have mercy (vs. 5). And treasures of salvations and wisdom and knowledge are the stability of his (Israel's) times. And the fear of the Lord — *she* is his treasure, and not such things as horses and chariots and Egypt's strong men.

*The Lord's readiness to help in great need.*

33

*Chapter XXXIII:7-13*

The prophet beholds in his vision strong ones, might men, crying without, i.e., in public, and ambassadors of peace weeping bitterly (vs. 7). He sees the highways of Judah desolate because the people do not dare to do any traveling. The enemy has broken his agreement. He despises the cities. He has regard for no man (vs. 8).

The land mourns and languishes. Lebanon is ashamed and withered away. Sharon, otherwise a fertile and luxuriant plain, is a desert. Bashan and Carmal shake off their fruits (vs. 9).

Indeed the hour is dark.

But the Lord now speaks.

Now He will rise.

Now will He be exalted.

Now will he lift up Himself (vs. 10).

Now, exactly at this time, when from human standpoint their plight is hopeless.

Now will His people see what He will do to the enemy. He will display His power in them, so that, as a result, it will be evident that in devising their counsels they were conceiving foolishness and bringing forth stubble in executing them (vs. 11a).

In this imagery the chaff is the idea or devise as such; the stubble would then be the execution of the plan, i.e., the evil deed or work.

And their breath or breathing will devour them as fire (vs. 11b).

So this sentence reads in the Hebrew and not, "The fire of their breath shall devour them."

It is stated of Paul that before his conversion he was breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord (Acts IX:1). So the enemy. But their evil breathings shall return to them as divine punishment and so, in this point of view, they shall be devoured by their own breath. Into the pit that they dig for others they themselves fall.

In the fire of the Lord's anger the enemy shall burn as lime burns and as cut thorns burn in fire, meaning that they shall be utterly consumed (vs. 12).

The Lord by the voice of the prophet calls to them that are far off to hear what He had done and to those that are near to acknowledge His might (vs. 13).

"What he has done," perfect tense. So, too, the Hebrew. Is this a *common* or *prophetic* perfect? The prophets often used the *perfect* in the sense of *future* perfect to indicate that an action though future was finished, i.e., as good as finished. The Spirit would so vividly project before them the event or scene that He foretold that it appeared as realized. Yet, and of this the prophet was also aware, it still had to be accomplished *in history*. This is the case here. The action of the Lord, the demonstration of His might indicated by the expression, "I have done," had still to be accomplished in time, and the might demonstrated by the action was still waiting to be acknowledged.

This is always the case with the *perfect* as occurring in prophecy. For prophecy had its origin in vision, revelation, and it still had to be fulfilled at the time of its reception. That is to say, prophecy is never historical narrative.

As has already been stated more than once, the prophecies of the Old Testament Scriptures were progressively fulfilled, i.e., fulfilled by stages. The first stage in the fulfilment of the prophecies of this Assyrian period was the deliverance of the church through the destruction of the world-power as possessed at the time by Assyria.

The initial fulfilment of the prophecy of the above section (chap. XXXIII:1-13) is the Assyrian menace in its final stages as climaxed by the fearful punishment that the Lord inflicted upon the Assyrian host encamped round about Jerusalem and the resulting deliverance of the city. II Kings XVII; Isaiah XXXVI, XXXII.

The Assyrians invaded the land and took all the fenced cities of Judah. Before long they would be storming the gates of Jerusalem. In his desperation Hezekiah sent messengers to the king of Assyria resting at Lachish that he had made his headquarters. The messengers were to purchase his withdrawal. The tyrant agreed to stop the war and go back to his own place. But the price he set on his retirement was prodigious. He demanded, besides subjugation, the sum of 300 talents in silver and 30 talents in gold. The heavy ransom was paid. But it took all the silver in the temple and in the king's palace. The gold had to come from the pillars and the doors of the temple. But still the king

refused to return as he had agreed. Instead, he now demanded the surrender of the capital for plunder and to lead into captivity its inhabitants (Isa. XXXVI:17). In a word, he broke the covenant (vs. 8 above). The text speaks of ambassadors of peace weeping bitterly (see above vs. 7). Doubtless the prophetic allusion is in the first instance to the messengers that Hezekiah had sent to the Assyrian king. In the vision they came back and reported his terrible treachery and the ruin that he had wrought in the land (vs. 8 above). Soon he was encamped with his army round about Jerusalem. Then the Lord rose. The Angel of the Lord went out in the night and smote of their number 185,000. What was left of the host now slunk away, the king going to Nineveh. Here he was slain by his own sons as he was worshipping in the house of his God. The power of Assyria was now broken. From then on the course of its history led downward.

In the vision the destruction of the Assyrian host is implied rather than shown. By the voice of the prophet the Lord then called to all the inhabitants of the earth, near and far, to hear what He had done. But this all took place first in vision and with the prophet in the Spirit. 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, Michigan.

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.

### IN MEMORIAM

On the morning of the 16th April it pleased God to take unto His eternal home our beloved daughter and sister,

JENNIE,

at the age of 41 years.

We are comforted in the knowledge that our loss was her gain, and that God doeth all things well.

"And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away," Rev. 21:4.

Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Van Harn  
Mrs. Frances Nouse  
Mr. and Mrs. Peter Schippers  
Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Van Harn  
Miss Johanna Van Harn

## FROM HOLY WRIT

### Exposition of I Corinthians 16:13, 14

For reasons connected with my schedule of many activities I shall this time not call your attention to I Peter 2:1-10, but I will call your attention to a very significant admonition to the Church at Corinth.

It should be observed that these words of Paul are a part of the concluding admonitions of Paul at the end of a great letter, full of fatherly advice, kind instruction and firm reproof. All these were very necessary in this church.

The reason?

This Corinthian Church had in it reprehensible weaknesses both as to doctrine and walk. They were definitely not standing firmly in the faith, as this became evident in the denial, by some in their midst, of the resurrection. The very core of the Gospel, its real marrow was being denied by some, and it evilly effected all. For evil communications corrupt good manners. It could not be said of them that they were *standing* in the faith, steadfast and unmoveable! Then too they were reprehensible in their conduct and attitude toward the Lord's table.

But there was also their attitude in morals. A man was living with his father's wife; a sin which was not even heard of among nor condoned by the Gentiles. And what was worse the Consistory was lax in disciplining this man as was the whole congregation. They were not watchful as the watchmen on the walls of Zion!

Nor must it be overlooked that there was a very great dissension in the church of Corinth over the persons of Paul, Apollos, Cephas. There was party strife. This strife had not been caused by anything that Paul or Apollos had done. It was simply that the Corinthians were walking in their evil desires. They were fleshly and not spiritually minded. They did not quit themselves like men and were not strong.

It is a wonderful refreshing wind from heaven to read of the warm and sincere cooperation of these two co-workers under God, Paul and Apollos. They are not at all competitors. Each has his own gift from God; each is used by God in his own place. And both understand the christian meekness in human relations between ministers in God's church. Read these refreshing words carefully and let them sink deep into your soul: "But as touching Apollos, the brother, I besought him much to come unto you with the brethren: and it was not at all his will to come now; but he will come when he shall have opportunity," I Cor. 16:12. Paul wishes Apollos to go to Corinth, that it might be evident to the brethren that he had no objections to Apollos' being in Corinth; and Apollos thought this not wise. Gladly would he have come to Corinth, but in view of the situation he would rather forego this evidently wonderful occasion to accompany the brethren, who are to be the bearers of this Epistle. He will come when he finds it convenient!

What a touching example of approving the things that differ; what spiritual sensitiveness! What an example of practical godliness which has lost none of its power and vitality! What glories of God in ministers. What an exhibition of walking in the requirements of faith and love and of becoming like little children. Father of all mercies, make all Thy servants such that are filled with this meekness of wisdom which is gentle, easy to be entreated, full of good works, without partiality, sowing the fruit of righteousness as those making peace. Amen!

Against this very sensitively spiritual background Paul writes: "*Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong. Let all that ye do be done in love.*"

Words of life and beauty are these. And they teach us faith in its duty in this present conflict as pilgrims here below. And they are words of admonition through which God confers grace to us His church so that we are actuated unto this holy conduct and activity of standing vigilantly in the faith.

Concerning each of these elements in this admonition we wish to make a few expository remarks.

First of all I would notice with you, dear reader, that Paul here admonishes the church at Corinth and us that we are to be watchful. Says he "watch ye." The term means to be one who has been roused from sleep and has come to his senses, one that is thoroughly awake. Such a person clearly sees the finality of the issues in the church and understands thoroughly who the enemies are by whom he is surrounded. For this term is employed in Scripture in connection with the spiritual alertness that must be ours as believers in Christ Jesus.

In general we must know that we have to deal with a cunning foe, who goes about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour. He is an adversary at law against us. He accuses the brethren. Is his name not: Accuser of the brethren?! Also we must be alert to the fact that not all have the faith, and that we live in an evil world, where the Word of God is denied, and where we are ridiculed and hated. Then too we must by all means be alert to the fact, that in our flesh there dwells no good thing at all; that the good that we would do we do not, but that the evil we would not do, that this we do. In view of this we must be very alert.

Jesus, our Lord, Himself warned the disciples as follows: "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing but the flesh is weak," Matthew 26:41. A real watchfulness is one of prayer according to the will of God. Watchfulness is living according to the Word of God. True watchfulness means careful reading and confession of the Scriptures in order to live according to them. Says Jesus in Matthew 24:42 after having taught us in the prophetic word "Watch therefore: for ye know not on what day your Lord cometh. But know this that if the master of the house had known in what watch the thief was coming, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to have

been broken through." And again in I Thessalonians 5:2-8, "For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. When they are saying Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall in no wise escape. But ye brethren are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief: for ye are all sons of the light and sons of the day; we are not of the night nor of darkness, so then let us not sleep as do the rest, but let us be watchful and sober . . ."

Such a watchfulness is living according to the word of God. We then live out in true conversion what we are by virtue of God's efficacious calling out of darkness into God's marvelous light. Unto this walking in true godliness and pure confession Paul had admonished in this entire letter. And now he calls them in conclusion to this necessary watchfulness. True watchfulness does not pray a whole year about a problem in life and then do the very obviously sinful thing and make wrong decisions in doctrine and life. Such wrong and sinful decisions are not watchfulness but simply hypocrisy! Let us not be deceived. God is not mocked. Such is the evidence of being drunken with the stupor of sin.

That the thrust of this watchfulness, as here indicated by Paul, is a watchfulness according to the Word, is evident from the next injunction in the text. It reads: "Stand fast in the faith."

The "faith" in which we must stand fast is clearly the objective truth as this is in Jesus, as contained in all the Gospel, and as it is briefly summed up in the Twelve Articles of Faith. Further, it is the entire content of the Gospel as this is confessed in the Confessions of the Reformation and and the Canons of Dort. This "faith" is, therefore, the faith once delivered to the saints.

True watchfulness knows that it is the Devil's lie that it doesn't matter so much what one believes, as long as he is only sincere in what he believes. It is the lie of Satan in his opposition to the church and operating the gates of hell when men teach that the matters of *doctrine* are not important. However, it is so important that it was necessary for Aquilla and Priscilla to instruct Apollos more in the way. We read: "But when Aquilla and Priscilla heard him, they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the Word of God more accurately," Acts 18:26. Yes, they instructed him "more accurately" than he already knew! What a needed and delicate task it is to instruct gifted young ministers. And how ought not every minister to study the Scriptures and the Confessions that he may very accurately interpret the faith once delivered to the saints. Such was the watchfulness of Aquilla and Priscilla when they took Apollos aside to instruct him. And what a gracious young person he was not to resent this instruction. Here was the love that rejoiced together in the truth. It is true watchfulness!

In this accurate understanding and confession of the faith we are to *stand fast!*

This means that once having been instructed accurately

in the truth we are to persistently persevere in it. Such steadfast abiding in the truth, keeping of the truth in our hearts, is not at all to be confused with stubbornness. The stubborn man cares not about the truth as it is in Jesus. For him it is of no concern whether we stand in the truth and confess it accurately, but he is only interested in self. He does not put on the hope of righteousness and stand in the glorious prospect each day of the blessed resurrection from the dead. But we must be steadfast. Nothing must move us from the hope of the Gospel and from the entire faith once delivered to the saints. Let the congregation be such that they desire accurate preaching. An accurate preacher is a real find. He preaches the *logical* milk that does not deceive.

Thus Paul writes in Philippians 1:27-30, "Only let your manner of life be worthy of the Gospel of Christ: that, whether I come and see you or be absent, I may hear of your state, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving for the faith of the Gospel, and in nothing affrighted by the adversaries, which is for them an evident token of perdition, but of your salvation and that from God; because to you it hath been granted in behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer in his behalf: having the same conflict which ye saw in me and now hear to be in me."

Hence, to stand in the faith also implies the reality in us that we "quit ourselves like men." The term in the greek original means: to make a man of, to make brave, to make manly. Thus to become a man, come to manhood. And thus to show yourself every inch a man.

This means that we are to be strong. The chief characteristic of a young man is his strength. I write you, young men, for ye are strong and have overcome the Evil one. This is not the strength of physical force, nor of proud overbearance. It is the strength of godly men, who know in whom they have believed and who say, when it comes to the "faith": Here we stand, we cannot do ought else, so help us God! Such will then be the power that is wholly set on fire with the true zeal of God's house. Remember: not the strange fire of a zeal without knowledge of the accurate interpretation of faith. The zeal that boasts in what the Lord has done for us, in us and through us is the zeal here spoken of.

The evidence that we are truly standing in the faith is when we stand in that song of love as sung by Paul in I Corinthians 13.

It goes as follows: Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass or a clanging sýmbal. And if I have the gift of prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge; and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love I am nothing. And if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love it profiteth me nothing.

Love is what is done out of faith, living faith in the Gospel. Stand fast in that faith. Be motivated by the love

of God. In that love quit you like men and be strong! Only be courageous knowing that presently when all the weary night is o'er and when the battle has been fought, the crown of eternal joy and strength and gladness is the portion of those who were faithful even in a little.

G.L.

### Report of Western Ladies League

Again we have had the God-given opportunity of gathering together as true Christian Mothers and wives of the Prot. Ref. Churches of the Middle West. We met in the Doon Church auditorium, April 23, for an afternoon session. The meeting started by singing a few Psalter numbers. Our president, Mrs. H. Veldman, read Psalm 89, then opened with prayer, and also extended a word of welcome to a well attended audience. Had a short business meeting after which the president introduced the speaker of the day, Rev. H. Veldman. He spoke very enthusiastically and inspiringly on the theme, "The Child and the Promise." He described very clearly how they are related and why this is significant. He showed us that the infant child occupies a tremendously important position in the promise and also that it is the most characteristic of Reformed doctrine. The child, as an infant, is entirely passive. What is meant by "the promise?" God or man? Man trying to detract from the glory of God or *God Absolutely*? A general and conditional promise or divinely particular and an oath of God and unconditional? We know that the realization of the promise is dependent on God and *God alone*! Not an offer to all men, for Christ did not die for all men, as some would have us believe. God makes no effort to *give* the promise of salvation to all men but it is a divine oath for the elect. Romans 9:6.

When must we baptize our child, in infancy or only the ones that are elect? Through baptism God administers and seals his promise, therefore we baptize babies, on the basis of this fact. This is significant because it means that God's promise is unconditional, in infancy, when we have nothing to do with the promise of salvation. This we find very comforting as wives and mothers, and we thank God that it is not up to us to change their hearts, but it is the act of God's unconditional election.

Doon then gave a musical number, after which we sang another Psalter number while the offering was taken for the Reformed Witness Hour. The president then introduced Rev. H. C. Hoeksema, who had charge of the "Question Hour." He very capably and explicitly answered a couple of questions from the various societies. Edgerton then presented a musical number. The meeting was closed by singing and prayer by the vice president, Mrs. H. C. Hoeksema. Lunch was served by the Hull society after which we departed for our individual homes with an uplifted spirit and a full and thankful heart to our gracious God for the true and unmistakably pure Protestant Reformed Doctrine.

Mrs. Clarence Klein, Reporter.

### Meeting of Theol. School Committee

All young men desiring to study for the Ministry of the Word, kindly appear at the meeting of the Theological School Committee, May 28, at our Creston Church or write the Secretary, Rev. Geo. C. Lubbers, 1304 Maude Ave., N. E., Grand Rapids, Michigan.

The qualifications to be enrolled are the following.

1. Must be a graduate from High School and preferably College.
2. Must have certificate from local Consistory as to uprightness in walk and purity in doctrine.
3. Must have certificate from a reputable Doctor of being in good health.

G. C. Lubbers

Sec'y of the Theological School Committee

### ON GOD ALONE MY SOUL RELIES

On God alone my soul relies,  
And He will soon relieve;  
The Lord will hear my plaintive cries  
At morning, noon and eve.

He has redeemed my soul in peace,  
From conflict set me free;  
My many foes are made to cease,  
And strive no more with me.

The living God in righteousness  
Will recompense with shame  
The men who, hardened by success,  
Forget to fear His Name.

All treacherous friends who overreach  
And break their plighted troth,  
Who hide their hate with honeyed speech,  
With such the Lord is wroth.

Upon the Lord thy burden cast,  
To Him bring all thy care;  
He will sustain and hold thee fast,  
And give thee strength to bear.

God will not let His saints be moved;  
Protected, they shall see  
Their foes cut off and sin reprov'd;  
O God, I trust in Thee.

Psalm 55

## IN HIS FEAR

### Walking in Error

(6)

June 1.

That is the date!

June 1, 1953 is the date that Rev. De Wolf and his followers like to forget and concerning which they are very silent. They would rather hold before you June 23, 1953. Even June 22 does not give them much comfort. Actually it should give them no comfort.

June 1.

That is the date that the former Classis West does not like to talk about. In their schismatic decision to side with Rev. De Wolf after he left the Protestant Reformed Churches, they, too, are completely silent about June 1, 1953. They had to be in order to write that the meeting of June 23 was "illegal since many of the legal consistory members were not notified of the meeting."

June 1.

That is the date concerning which Rev. Blankespoor, Rev. Knott and Rev. Kok did not want to go to Synod but rather chose to ignore so that they too could leave the Protestant Reformed Churches in loyalty to Rev. De Wolf and his deposed elders.

June 1.

Do you know the actual situation that evening? It is worth knowing, and we wonder how Rev. De Wolf and his elders dare to be cross-examined under oath as to the actual situation that evening.

Perhaps it is best that we notify you of the actual situation there in the consistory of the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan. We have been calling your attention, of late, to the fact that twelve men who constituted *no more than half* of one consistory behaved as though they were themselves a clear cut majority.

But listen! Did you know that on June 1, 1953, the date these men all like to forget, the De Wolf element *was in the minority*? The twelfth member was added very shortly before June 23, the date they like to remember. In fact the twelfth member was installed Sunday, June 21, 1953. That addition, however, in no way effects the discipline *initiated* on June 1, 1953.

Ignoring June 1, 1953 the De Wolf element in that consistory pointed our attention in various writings to June 22 and 23. And then they tried to tell us that the minority of the consistory tried to depose the majority. The facts being such, undeniable facts that Rev. De Wolf with only ten elders was in the minority—and we can quote the names on each side, if you need them—when discipline was initiated, we fail to understand how they intend to make the civil court see, and that through cross-examination, that on

June 1, 1953 the minority of the consistory tried to depose and suspend the majority of the consistory. It simply is not true. Their action of waiting three whole weeks to inform the majority whether they would apologize or not only shows that they realized the weakness of their position. They knew that they needed more votes. The best they could do was to make it a tie by waiting until after June 21 when a twelfth member would be added to their group. But let us remember that! By the unanimous vote of 11 to 0 it was decided on June 1, 1953 that *eleven members*, out of a consistory at that time that consisted of *twenty three members*, should be placed under discipline.

As we wrote above the former Classis West is entirely silent about that matter. It is safe to assume that it did not investigate this point at all. In fact it is our contention that the former Classis West investigated nothing. It had no right to take a stand in the case, but if it desired to protest the action *after* Classis East had taken a stand in it, it would have to investigate all these things. The former Classis West did not investigate at all. It illegally treated matters that were not on its agenda and which according to its own rules it might not treat. It took a document from the party involved without approaching the witnesses, the committee from Classis East, who were at all these meetings. It rushed to take a stand before the Classis that was still busy with the case could even make a judgment between the two factions in the consistory. Not one church in Classis East had taken a stand yet, and the former Classis West as a body told Classis East what it intended to do and where it stood.

It has been stated that the former Classis West had to do something with the case since three overtures were on its table. We already answered that in part. But documentary evidence can be produced to reveal more! There really were no overtures there! The chairman, who is also their stated clerk and who knew very well their previous ruling about procedure, should have called them illegally there. But the trouble was that the chairman himself had one of those illegal overtures presented to that Classis. It was, undoubtedly, hard for him to call the work of his own consistory illegal, after all the work he put into it. And with a neighbouring consistory, and with one from far removed they stuck to their violation of the decisions of their own Classis taken only one year before. *These* are the men who talk about an illegal consistory meeting because some of the "legal consistory members" were not notified of it. Yet they treated three documents which were illegally before the body! *THEIR* work was illegal! What will their representatives do when the court asks for their records which show that the documents were illegal?

But even if for the sake of argument—and for that only—we concede that such matters might be treated because of the situation in the churches, then we still maintain that the only treatment former Classis West could give to these documents would have been to instruct these consistories to come back in March with protests against the action



of the group of the Rev. Hoeksema and the Rev. Hanko IN CASE CLASSIS EAST — which was to deal with the case the very next month — SUSTAINED THE ACTION against the group of Rev. De Wolf. THAT was not even a settled matter yet. And the former Classis West by its hasty and schismatic action did give Classis East a very clear picture of the situation before it met in October to sustain the suspension and deposition of these twelve men. They did our churches a great favour in revealing their hand prematurely. It put the schismatic action of Rev. De Wolf and his elders in the right perspective. It drew the picture clearly for us, clearer than we dared or even wanted to believe it should be drawn. The undersigned, who presided over all those hectic meetings when the De Wolf and Kok cases were treated can testify in all honesty that although he, of necessity, followed the De Wolf case very carefully as chairman of these Classical sessions, he did not realize fully what it was wherewith we were dealing and to what a great danger the Protestant Reformed Churches were exposed till the former Classis West in September prematurely revealed its hand. And the letter his consistory sent to all the ministers of the former Classis West and which appeared on these pages was due to a desperate hope that things were not really that bad. But they plainly were. And our letter remains unanswered.

And, we say again, do not let anyone tell you that former Classis West did not interfere with the work of Classis East! By recognizing the De Wolf faction of that consistory of First Church to be the legal consistory and the Hoeksema, Hanko faction to be schismatic they, in effect, told us that if we would take another stand, all our decisions from then on would be ignored by them. In fact as Rev. Blankespoor, Rev. Knott and Rev. Kok showed us they would not even recognize us anymore as Classis East, but would recognize us as a schismatic Classis, a group outside the Protestant Reformed Churches. Is that not INTERFERING with our work? Was it not making our work impossible, or rather stipulating to us what our work must be in order to be recognized by them?

Can you not see how much they interfered with the work of Classis East? They made it so that we could never entertain a motion made by the Rev. Hanko or one made or supported by elder G. Bylsma or by any other delegates from First Church in future Classical sessions. It means that any motion that passed by one vote, they would call a defeated motion if either Rev. Hanko or elder Bylsma had voted for it. Interfere with our work? These men who speak so freely of hierarchy tried to stipulate the whole course of action of a sister Classis for all the future. They talk about ultimatums. What an ultimatum they gave Classis East in regard to its own case! It was this: You decide like we did OR ELSE!!!! Or else we will never recognize ANYTHING you do!

And that holds true also for Rev. Blankespoor, Rev. Knott and Rev. Kok. By refusing to take the matter to

Synod, they notified us that they would not recognize anything we did because we would recognize the votes of Rev. Hanko and elder Bylsma. Had they been consistent they would have left our meeting, since they could not work with us anymore because of their stand. Instead we had to ask them whether they would recognize our work, and this we had to ask because of an ultimatum Rev. Kok gave us by abusing a document his consistory gave him for the Classis. But more of this latter. We want to return to the matter of the former Classis West.

Are we expected to believe that former Classis West last September had all those quotations from the authorities on Church Order which are being published now as an attempt to defend the illegal stand of the former Classis West, are we expected to believe that all the ministers and especially the elders, who voted in favour of that infamous decision of last September, had these "proofs" from the "authorities" clearly before them? When the documents of the former Classis West contain no proof at all that it was an "illegal consistory meeting," are we to believe that such "proofs" were actually produced and discussed there on the floor of Classis? Are we expected to believe that when former Classis West could rush the whole matter through in one day, that there was investigation as to whether such a meeting was legal or illegal? Is it not a more realistic approach to conclude that NOW a desperate attempt is being made to dig up something that looks like proof? And do those men from the other side of the Mississippi, who intend to come to the court trial, think that under cross-examination they can maintain that these things presented as proof really touch the case at hand? You can satisfy the questions of a few layman, who are soon confused by church political procedure, with a few quotations that talk about the necessity of notifying consistory members, *who are not under discipline*, of a consistory meeting that is to be held. But you cannot come before men who know jurisprudence and throw around a few loose quotations about consistory meetings and double consistory meetings and expect them to fail to see that on June 23 a meeting had to be called because these office bearers who were under discipline refused to have anything to do with the office bearers who were advised by Classis to place them under discipline and because they likewise expressed their refusal to have anything to do with the Classis which had given this advice. Let the former Classis West's defenders dig up a case like that! Let them show us that under such circumstances notification must be given so that such can present their case before the double consistory meeting.

Besides that meeting on June 23 had to be held because these office bearers who had been placed under discipline had clearly, unequivocally and with finality given an answer in their case to both the consistory and the Classis. Their presence was not needed nor proper at the meeting that deliberates on such a final and unequivocal answer. Even

(Continued on page 376)

## Contending For The Faith

### The Church and the Sacraments

#### EARLY VIEWS OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

(Continued)

##### *Introductory remarks.*

Anyone acquainted with the time and setting of the institution of the Lord's Supper is surely aware of the fact that the sacrament of the holy Supper was instituted by Christ under the most solemn circumstances. The Lord instituted this New Testament feast when He was about to sacrifice Himself as the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." Holy Communion is the feast of the thankful remembrance of (in obedience to the injunction of Christ to remember His death until He comes) and the appropriation of His atoning death, and of the living union of believers with Him and their communion among themselves. As the Passover kept the people of God in the Old Dispensation in lively remembrance of the miraculous deliverance from the land of bondage, and at the same time pointed forward to the Lamb of God; thus the holy Supper represents, seals, and applies the now accomplished redemption from sin and death upon the cross of Calvary until the end of this present time. In this sacrament the deepest mystery of Christianity is indeed embodied anew, namely, that the eternal Son of the living God, in the likeness of our sinful flesh, has become for us the living Bread unto life everlasting. Here in this sacrament, as a certain writer expresses himself, the story of the cross is reproduced before us (Christ is not offered anew, of course, as Rome would have us believe), and the miraculous feeding of the five thousand is spiritually perpetrated. Here, in this sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Christ, Who sits at the right hand of God, and is yet truly present in His Church until the end of the world, gives His own body and blood, *once* sacrificed for us, that is, His own and very Self, His life and the virtue of His atoning death, as spiritual food, as true bread from heaven, to those who hunger and thirst after righteousness and for the only living Bread. Concerning this sacrament four different views have developed and are being held at the present day. Before proceeding, however, with our discussion of the history of the development of this sacrament, we would, first of all, give an account of the love-feasts (the agape) which accompanied the celebration of the Lord's Supper during the period of the Church's infancy in the New Dispensation. These love-feasts were gradually severed from the Lord's Supper and gradually disappeared in the second and third centuries.

In the beginning of the New Testament Church the Lord's Supper and these community feasts occurred together. These love-feasts were very common in the early days of the Church of God. It is evident from Acts 20:7 that this

occurred upon the first day of the week (this text reads: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.") It is, of course, not difficult to understand why the sacrament of Communion was celebrated daily in the apostolic period with a simple meal of brotherly love, in which the Christians, in communion with their common Redeemer (that He was their Redeemer they all enjoyed in common), forgot all distinctions of rank, wealth, and culture, and felt themselves to be members of one family with the living God. A lovely communism of gifts, not imposed upon the Church of God from the "top," by political heads of state, but as prompted from within, characterized the Church of the Lord during that early period. We may read a description of this wonderful fellowship among those early Christians in the concluding words of Acts 2, verses 41-47. At these gatherings, when the Lord's Supper and these community feasts occurred together, the first of these gatherings consisted of the service of the Word, and it was attended by all. After the service of the Word only the believers remained. First, then, a communion feast was enjoyed of the gifts which had been brought by various members; secondly, prayers and thanksgiving were offered; and finally the Lord's Supper was celebrated. Later, we know, a change occurred within the Church of God. These love-feasts and the Lord's Supper were separated. Man's carnality began to assert itself. Some would be drunken at the time of the Lord's Supper, and others would continue hungry. Paul writes of these things in his epistle to the Corinthians, admonishes the people of God to eat at home, and we quote (1 Cor. 11:17-22, 33-34): "Now in this that I declare unto you I praise you not, that ye come together not for the better, but for the worse. For first of all, when ye come together in the church I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it (what a tactful way of speaking on the part of the apostle; he knows that it is impossible to believe all the things one hears, but he fears that he must "partly" believe these "rumours"). For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you. When ye come together therefore, into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For, in eating every one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not. Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another. And if any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together unto condemnation. And the rest will I set in order when I come." — end of quote. These love-feasts or community feasts and the Lord's Supper were therefore gradually separated from each other. The people ate their meals at home, and Communion and the service of the Word were united. At various times in the history of the Church of

God communion and the Word were observed weekly, even daily, as especially, for example, in times of persecution.

At first, as we have already observed, the holy Supper of our Lord was joined with these love-feasts, and was then celebrated in the evening, in memory of the last supper of Jesus with His disciples. But as early as the beginning of the second century these two exercises were separated, and the communion was celebrated in the morning, the love-feast in the evening, except on certain days of special observance. Tertullian gives a detailed description of the Agape when he refutes the slanderous and shameful accusations of the heathens. But the growth of the churches and the rise of the manifold abuses led to the gradual disuse, and in the fourth century even to the formal prohibition of the Agape (the love-feast), which belonged in fact only to the childhood and first love of the Church of God in the New Dispensation. It was, we are further informed, a family feast, where rich and poor, masters and slaves met on the same footing, partaking of a simple meal, hearing reports from distant congregations, in times of the greatest adversities and afflictions, contributing to the necessities of suffering brethren and encouraging each other in their daily duties and trials. Augustine describes his mother, Monica, as going to these feasts with a basket full of provisions and distributing them. One cannot doubt that the infancy of the Church of God as in the New Dispensation and the character of the times which were surely characterized by the words of Christ: "In the world ye shall have tribulations," contributed heavily to these love-feasts of the early Christians. Their separation from carnal Israel and common afflictions certainly drew them to one another. They were deeply and profoundly conscious of the "tie that binds." And this is surely easily understandable if we bear in mind those peculiar and perilous times. Their enjoyment of the grace of God and spiritual knowledge of the truth was not yet characterized by a deep and profound knowledge of the truth.

Permit me to conclude this description of these love-feasts of the early Christians with a quotation from Tertullian to which we have already referred in our preceding paragraph. He describes these love-feasts as follows: "About the modest supper-room of the Christians alone a great ado is made. Our feast explains itself by its name (Tertullian refers here to the name "Agape" — H.V.). The Greeks call it love. Whatever it costs, our outlay in the name of piety is gain, since with the good things of the feast we benefit the needy, not as it is with you, do parasites aspire to the glory of satisfying their licentious propensities, selling themselves for a belly-feast to all disgraceful — but as it is with God himself, a peculiar respect is shown to the lowly. If the object of our feast be good, in the light of that consider its further regulations. As it is an act of religious service, it permits no vileness or immodesty. The participants, before reclining, taste first of prayer to God. As much is eaten as satisfies the cravings of hunger; as much is drunk as befits the chaste. They say it is enough, as those who know that

the Lord is one of their auditors. After the washing of hands and the bringing in of lights, each is asked to stand forth and sing, as he can, a hymn to God, either one from the holy Scriptures or one of his own composing — a proof of the measure of our drinking. As the feast commenced with prayer, so with prayer it closed. We go from it, not like troops of mischief-doers, nor bands of roamers, nor to break out into licentious acts, but to have as much care of our modesty and chastity as if we had been at a school of virtue rather than a banquet" — end of quote. However, the fact remains that, because of the increasing distances between the various churches and the carnality of the members of the churches, these love-feasts degenerated into orgies of drunkenness and shame. Gradually these "agape" disappeared; in fact, they were formally forbidden in the fourth century.

This concludes our review of the love-feasts in the Church of God during the time of its New Testament infancy. In our following article we will continue our introductory remarks on this important subject of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. We will notice that, although simplicity characterized the conception of the early Christian Church of this sacrament, the seeds were sown during this period for the development of all the various views of the Lord's Supper that were to be developed in a later period. H.V.

### IN HIS FEAR

(Continued from page 374)

the consistory that was called in failed to feel the need of their presence. For (1) it did not insist that these disciplined office bearers still be called in for consultation or else that the meeting be postponed until they could be there and (2) it considered the "apology" offered, together with the refusal to do anything more, as sufficient for them to decide that these office bearers who were under discipline had not done that which Classis advised and which the consistory had demanded. That is the only thing with which they had to deal, and that thing they had before them on the meeting. And the very fact that these office bearers even tried to vote AGAINST the decision of their consistory and AGAINST the advice of their Classis was all the evidence that the neighbouring consistory needed for this case. Had they not given a final answer it would have been different. But by their final answer, it became plain even to the neighbouring consistory that these men would no longer recognize either Classis or Consistory. On June 22 these men initiated an act of insubordination. Does any authority on Church Polity maintain that such must be notified of a meeting that will decide what to do in light of their insubordination?

With words and quotations from other cases that are entirely different from this one, you can still the questions of some and make less doubtful in the minds of a few the illegality of the work of the former Classis West. But you cannot change the facts that way, nor does that make legal the illegal actions of all these who walk in error. J.A.H.

## The Voice of Our Fathers

### The Canons of Dordrecht

#### PART TWO

#### EXPOSITION OF THE CANONS

#### FIRST HEAD OF DOCTRINE

#### OF DIVINE PREDESTINATION

Article 9. This election was not founded upon foreseen faith, and the obedience of faith, holiness, or any other good quality or disposition in man, as the pre-requisite, cause or condition on which it depended; but men are chosen to faith and to the obedience of faith, holiness, etc., therefore election is the fountain of every saying good; from which proceed faith, holiness, and the other gifts of salvation, and finally eternal life itself, as its fruits and effects, according to the testimony of the apostle: "He hath chosen us (not because we were, but) that we should be holy, and without blame, before him in love." Eph. 1:4.

From the point of view of the controversy against the Arminians this article is one of the most crucial in all the Five Heads of Doctrine, for it strikes at what is undoubtedly one of the most fundamental errors of the Arminians in a most fundamental fashion, at the same time setting forth one of the main tenets of the Reformed and Scriptural position. This does not mean, however, that there is anything *essentially* new in this ninth paragraph; there is not. Here again we find a further development and articulation of what has already been set forth in the seventh article on the subject of election. The fathers, as it were, after they have developed the truth of sovereign election in Article 7, want to make certain that everyone, friend and foe alike, understand clearly all the implications of what they there stated. And it must surely be admitted that they succeed in accomplishing this purpose to a remarkable degree in the present article. This statement, as a succinct and unambiguous expression of the Reformed position over against that of the Arminians, could scarcely be improved upon. It unmasks the Arminian error. It in a few words sets forth a very important aspect of the Scriptural truth of election. And it clinches the entire argument by not only quoting Scripture, but stressing with just a few words in parentheses the point of the text which is quoted. This is indeed a masterpiece! It warms the very cockles of a Reformed man's heart to read such an expression of the truth, especially in times like ours, when departure from and denial of this truth is the order of the day.

It is to be regretted that we do not have a very accurate English translation of this article, even though the translation given does not destroy the main sense of the original. At best, our translation is not very close to the literal rendering. In order to bring this out, let me quote the first part of the Latin text: "*Eadem haec electio facta est non*

*ex praevisa fide, fideique obedientia, sanctitate, aut alia aliqua bona qualitate et dispositione, tanquam causa seu conditione in homine eligendo praerequisita, sed ad fidem fideique obedientiam, sanctitatem, etc.*" One may see at a glance especially two errors in our English translation. The first is that the clause, "on which it depended," does not appear in the Latin at all. And the second error is that the terms "cause, condition, and prerequisite," do not stand in a coordinate position in the Latin, as they do in the English rendition. We would therefore offer the following substitute, even though it may be literal to the point of clumsiness: "This same election was not accomplished out of foreseen faith, and the obedience of faith, holiness, or any other good quality or disposition, as the cause or condition required beforehand (*praerequisita*) in the person to be elected, but is unto faith, and the obedience of faith, holiness, etc." For the rest, we propose that "proceed" is hardly an accurate translation of "*profluunt*," and could better be changed to "flow forth," which is more in harmony too with the term "*fons*," or, "fountain."

As we said, the article is directed against the Arminians. They taught, as is evident from the language of this article, not merely one condition of election and salvation, namely, faith, but several. There was not only faith, but also the obedience of faith, holiness, or a walk in sanctification. And there was finally the good quality or disposition of perseverance unto the end. Only he who believed and obeyed, and walked in holiness, and then (for this must be added) persevered unto the end, and thus fulfilled the conditions of election and salvation set forth by God, could count on eternal life. But even then we have not mentioned all the conditions which the Arminians taught. Just as they taught several different kinds of election, so they propounded a veritable multitude of conditions unto election. The Arminians, you know, could, if need be, even speak of an election *unto faith*. And they could insist that we are saved through faith, and that faith is a gift of God. They could do this by playing *hocus pocus* with the truth. For you will readily understand that no Arminian could possibly take one step more on the path of the Reformed truth than this. He would not claim with the Reformed believer that God gives this faith to whom *He* wills, unconditionally, and according to free and sovereign and unconditional election. Not at all. There were more conditions behind which these heretics could take refuge. The election unto faith was after all also conditional: man must use the light of nature aright, and be humble, meek, pious, and thus worthy and fit for eternal life. Always, therefore, the Arminian, in order to shield himself and cover up his corrupt doctrine, seems very cooperative and agreeable. He is willing, seemingly, to retreat from his position. BUT . . . there is always a condition! And still another condition!

The above theory this ninth article blasts in unmistakable language.

And the reason is plain. For according to this heresy, the

decree of election is really not the work of God, but the work of man; and the decision of election is not really in eternity, but in time.

There is always a condition. And the meaning of the term *condition* is very evident here. On the one hand, the term is used coordinately with the term *cause*. And on the other hand, the fathers qualified both terms by the modifier *prærequisita*, "required before hand." Hence, according to the *Canons*, a condition is a prerequisite (something required beforehand) which one must fulfill or comply with in order to receive something or to have something done unto him. Such a condition, according to the Arminians, is faith, the obedience of faith, holiness, perseverance, and also the proper use of natural light, the proper humility, piety, and fitness for eternal life. These prerequisites must be met by man in order to receive from God the blessing of election. Hence, man's faith, man's obedience of faith, man's holiness, etc., — all these are causes or conditions of election. Election is out of faith, out of the obedience of faith, out of holiness, out of the proper use of natural light. Such is literally the formulation of this article when it sets forth the Arminian heresy: "This same election was not accomplished *out of* foreseen faith (*ex prævisa fide*), etc."

Now, not only do the Arminians (who so frequently claim, by the way, to have a very simple gospel) work confusion and make the gospel a very involved thing by their multiplication of the decrees of election and their multiplication of conditions, but they propound a most horrible lie. They put God in the position of the weatherman. He foresees. It may be that God is a very excellent forecaster, so that He never has things figured out incorrectly, and so that, for example, He sees infallibly who will believe, and who not, who will persevere, and who not. This makes no essential difference. God foresees, and on the basis of that foresight He elects or does not elect. He is not the Determiner of all, but He is Himself determined by the fulfillment or non-fulfillment of the conditions of election by the creatures of His hand, men. He is not sovereignly free, but absolutely dependent upon men.

In a day when conditional theology is rampant even in Reformed circles, it is of the utmost importance that we understand this matter clearly. This is the first time that the fathers make mention of any conditions and prerequisites in the *Canons*, but it is not the last. And never do you find this expression employed in any other fashion. Always a condition is a prerequisite which must be met by man before he can receive the blessings of salvation from God. It is something that would indeed bind God. It is something for which indeed God must wait, before He can go further. It is indeed something which we must fulfill in order to merit something. This conclusion, if we would indeed desire to speak confessionally, can never be escaped. It is for that reason, therefore, that the *Canons* never employ the terms *condition* and *prerequisite* in any other way than to place them in the mouths of the Arminians, and to lay them to

their charge. All the more striking this fact becomes, when we consider that both before and after the Synod of Dordrecht there have been Reformed men who attempted to use the term, and who used it freely. In fact, if they had been so minded, it would have been very easy for the fathers to employ the terms as their own at the Synod itself. They had the opportunity, as a study of the written opinions concerning the Arminian theses of the various theologians, offered to the Synod, will show. But they steadfastly avoided it when it came to formulating the *Canons*, even as the authors of our *Catechism* and of the *Confession Belgica* refused to use such language when they penned those creeds.

It may be objected by some to whom a conditional theology is nevertheless dear that in this article, and throughout the *Canons*, the fathers are not opposing a conditional salvation, or a conditional promise, or a conditional gospel, but the heresy of conditional election. Now it may surely be granted that in this present article, at least, the subject is election, and the non-conditional nature of election. But for that very reason it must be granted that this article *per se* condemns any theory of a conditional salvation at the same time. So clear is this, that if there were no other expression on the subject in all our confessions, this one article would be quite sufficient. This is true because of the positive truth which the fathers maintain in the same article, as we shall make plain. The peculiar expression (also employed in the well-known "Declaration of Principles of the Protestant Reformed Churches," and at one time criticized by the late Dr. K. Schilder) that election is the "fountain of every saving good, from which flow forth faith, holiness, and the remaining gifts of salvation, and finally eternal life itself, as its fruits and effects," absolutely precludes any possibility of speaking of a conditional salvation, any more than one can speak of a conditional election.

And this plain consequence of the doctrine of sovereign election as set forth in the *Canons* any Reformed man should not only be willing, but eager to admit.

For the question is always ultimately: is salvation determined by God or by man? The consistently Reformed believer, who surely wants to answer, "By God," should not hesitate to say at the same time: "There are no conditions which man must or can fulfill."

And that is not a minor issue, and a fit subject for academic debate. It is of the very marrow of the Reformed faith!

H.C.H.



#### I LOVE THE LORD, FOR MY REQUEST

I love the Lord, for my request  
And humble plea He makes His care;  
In Him through life my faith shall rest,  
For He both hears and answers prayer.

Psalm 116:1

## DECENCY and ORDER

### Emeritation Of Ministers

The thirteenth article of our church order reads as follows: "Ministers, who by reason of age, sickness, or otherwise, are rendered incapable of performing the duties of their office, shall nevertheless retain the honor and title of a minister, and the church which they have served shall provide honorably for them in their need (likewise for the orphans and widows of ministers) out of the common fund of the churches, according to the general ecclesiastical ordinances in this matter."

#### A. *Reasons For Emeritation*

In recent years the question, "What constitutes a valid emeritation for a minister of the gospel?" has aroused new interest in our circles. Resulting from the sinful secession of our erstwhile Canadian churches, we were left with two ministers without a charge. These men, who had devoted years of service to the churches, needed support which the churches also provided for some time out of the emeritus fund. Always it remained a question, however, whether this was proper and whether it would be necessary to make some other provision in this extraordinary case. It appeared doubtful whether Article 13 of the D.K.O. applied in this instance. The result of this was that the matter was again considered by the Synod of 1953. Whereas the Acts of that Synod have not yet been made available (we understand that they have been confiscated by the former stated clerk and the group that seeks to undermine our Protestant Reformed Churches) we will have to rely upon our memory as to what the Synod did. Synod, as we recall it, put the entire matter of emeritation in the hands of a study committee which is to report at a later date. The findings of this committee will have no bearing upon the case in question because since the time of the 1953 Synod one of these ministers has become schismatic and the other has re-entered into the active ministry. However, a study of the question is in itself worthwhile and a future Synod does well to express itself clearly on this important matter so that henceforth classifying all kinds of cases under emeritation may be avoided.

What constitutes a valid reason for emeritation? The article stipulates "age, sickness, or otherwise," that is, reasons which render the ministers incapable of performing the duties of their office. The problem arises in the interpretation of the words, "or otherwise." Does this mean other reasons beside age and sickness which incapacitate the minister? Or does it mean that although the minister is capable of performing the duties of his office there are other reasons and circumstances over which he has no control which make his functioning in the office impossible, and, therefore, entitle him to emeritation? If the former of these is correct emeritation would not apply in the cases which

we as churches have had before us. If the latter, however, is true it would apply and these ministers would then be entitled to all the rights of an honorable emeritation.

It appears from our practices in the past that we have interpreted this article according to the latter sense. This we believe is an error. This does not mean that we protest supporting ministers who, due to no fault of their own, come into straits such as ours did in Canada. Neither is it our belief that the churches are without obligation to help such servants of Christ who were shamefully maltreated by the churches they served. Our contention is, however, that this does not warrant emeritation and that assistance should be rendered through other channels. This would be both possible and proper. And this support is to be "according to the need" which is to be determined by the consistory of the church where the minister without a fixed charge is a member. Synod does wrong in fixing a flat sum on an annual basis. This may perhaps be an easy way out of a difficult situation but it is not the right way. The churches certainly must help where there is need but this need ought to be investigated and reported by the proper body. This cannot be done by a body that sits in session once a year. The churches are obligated to support the able-bodied only in as far as there is real need when they themselves have realized their duty to provide their own needs. Whether or not this is being done ought to be under the surveillance of the local consistory.

This implicitly follows also from the fifteenth and sixteenth articles of the Constitution of the Emeritus Committee. They read as follows: "Art. 15 — A minister who has been declared emeritus by reason of sickness or weakness, but later has regained his health shall no longer have claim to support but is morally obliged to provide his own needs. Art. 16 — A minister who has regained his health shall declare himself eligible for a call or follow another pursuit of life. The church who has supported him shall then be free from this obligation."

If this is the rule for those who were once incapacitated by reason of sickness and are now restored to health, then it follows that the moral obligation to support ministers without fixed charges also rests firstly upon the minister himself. He may be declared eligible for a call. In the meantime he is duty bound in as much as possible to provide for himself. If then there is still need the churches are obligated help in such need. If after a certain stipulated time no call is forthcoming the able-bodied minister ought to consider this as a Divine directive to turn to some other pursuit of life. Such is the course prescribed for emeritus ministers who are restored to health and receive no call and it is our opinion that these abnormal cases do not warrant greater consideration than the others.

That emeritation does not enter into the cases we cited is further evident from Article 13 of the church order itself. The article simply does not cover these cases. It speaks only of various instances where ministers are incapacitated. They



become personally unable to perform their work due to "old age, sickness or otherwise." In their commentary on the Church Order, Monsma and Van Dellen explain this "otherwise" as follows:

"After mentioning age and sickness, the Church Order adds, 'or otherwise.' This refers to conditions pertaining to the person of the minister, just as age and sickness do. For the expressions are clearly kindred. The word 'otherwise' simply refers to conditions which can be justly classified with old age and sickness. For example: nervous break-downs, permanent bodily injury, etc."

This view substantiates the position that emeritation can be granted only in the case of personal disability. This position we think is correct and in harmony with the idea of emeritation which indicates that one's service has come to a termination.

We have still another case in our churches which is worthy of consideration. The Rev. Ophof, one of the professors in our Seminary, was granted an emeritation (without support) a few years ago. This we believe was neither necessary nor according to the idea of an emeritation. Neither sickness, age, nor disability warrant this action. It has been argued that this was necessary in order that the professor might retain the honor and title of a minister of the Word. This, however, we claim is not true. He has that honor and title by virtue of his being professor in our seminary. We claim, as we wrote in the Standard Bearer of May 15, 1953, that the office of Professor of Theology and that of the Ministry of the Word are inseparable. From this issue we quote the following excerpt and our readers will have to refer to that issue to get the entire argument:

"Our conclusion is, therefore, that there are only three distinct offices in the church of our Lord Jesus Christ. This does not mean that the task of training men for the ministry of the gospel which is the labor of the professors of theology does not belong to the institute of the church. It certainly does. Our contention, based especially upon the passage of II Timothy 2:2, is that this work does not belong to a separate office but is inherent in the office of the ministry of the gospel. And, whereas the work is of such magnitude that it requires the whole effort and time of the office bearer, the minister who functions as professor of theology should be relieved of his congregational duties so that he may devote himself entirely to that labor."

This is our position still and in the light of this it should be evident that an emeritation for the professor is unnecessary. Suppose for a moment that the professor, who is already emeritus-minister, should become ill or because of age finds it necessary to lay down his work in the school. Must he then be made emeritus the second time? Would he then also become emeritus-professor? Article 13 of our church order as we understand it does not allow his being made emeritus at this time. The term "emeritus" (although it does not appear in the article itself) means "retired from active service, one who has served out his time." Certainly

this was not true of the professor a few years ago. He has been and is still actively engaged in the office and, consequently, the term "emeritus" applied here is a misnomer. He is today functioning in a particular work of the office of the ministry of the Word and is, therefore, not an emeritus minister but an active minister. The time for his emeritation is when it becomes necessary for reasons of disability to lay down his work and retire from duty. Now, if it is desired that the professor retain a definite connection with some church it might be conceded that he be given a title such as "Associate Pastor of ..... congregation" but this is not at all necessary. His connection with the congregation is in his membership and his title of minister ensues from the office he holds as professor which is the office of the ministry of the word though not of any particular or individual church.

Next time, D.V., we will discuss other phases of emeritation.

G.v.d.B.

## ALL AROUND US

*Billy Graham Does It Again.*

A friend gave us a copy of „Belijden en Beleven," a Reformed Weekly of March 5, 1954, edited by Prof. F. W. Grosheide of Amsterdam in the Netherlands. The paper contains a rather large picture of Billy Graham, and underneath the picture we read the following: (I translate freely — M.S.)

"American Evangelist Billy Graham conducts crusade throughout England.

"The noted American preacher Billy Graham arrived last week Tuesday with the 'United States' in Southampton, England, where he will reside for three months in order to shake people spiritually awake at the great meetings, mammoth gatherings, and to point them to Jesus Christ.

"Billy Graham is coming to Amsterdam in July. On Saturday and Sunday, July 3 and 4, he is speaking, D.V., in the Apollo Hall. It is presumed that he will also appear in St. Paul's Church at Amstelveen.

"When Graham came to the London Waterloo Station sacred hymns were sung by the masses. A portion of the spectators broke through the line of police to see at close range the big blonde preacher, who called out to them: 'God bless you.' It took twenty minutes before Graham and his wife and assistants could squeeze through the crowds to the waiting auto.

"What is sympathetic is that Billy Graham in spite of all the great gatherings — his audience is about 2½ million a year — remains unassuming. He is himself of the opinion that these mighty gatherings do not mean much. He is only interested in holding the attention of his listeners. Graham is

an orthodox preacher, and wants to evangelize for the Church, and to the Church.

"His coming to the Netherlands is also prayerfully awaited, for which the Netherlands Billy Graham Committee is organizing prayer-meetings, of which the first was already held last week Saturday in the English Church on the Begijnhof in Amsterdam. More of these services will follow on the last Saturdays of March, April, May and June."

Yes, Billy does it again. Wherever he goes the people are gullible it seems. When he goes to the Halls of Congress, the legislators take off their hats and suddenly become religious. When he goes to the masses, they all but ride him on their shoulders. When he goes to the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands, they say: Come on, Billy! we are praying for you!

How the gold has become dim!

Quite a Billy!

---

*"The Way, The Truth, and The Life."*

This is the title of a little booklet of which I have received two issues so far. The editor is a certain Jay Green whose latest address is 219 James, S. E., Grand Rapids, Michigan, however, the booklet is post-marked Wilmore, Kentucky. I do not know how I happened to get on the mailing list, but I hope they will continue to send me this monthly periodical. I found it most interesting reading. Though we would perhaps say things a little differently, as, for example, the idea of the so-called "Covenant of Peace," we agree in the main with the general contents of these booklets. There appears from the two issues I read a studied attempt to emphasize the sovereignty of God in predestination, the total depravity of man, the vicarious atonement of Christ, the unconditionality of faith, and other fundamental truths in which the Protestant Reformed man rejoices when he reads them, and especially from one outside of our own circles.

The appearance of these booklets is similar to those issued by the late Arthur W. Pink which he entitled: Scripture Studies. Perhaps the publishers took their cue from Pink since I noticed that they also quote quite freely from him. Other English writers are freely quoted, such as John Owen, Thomas Brooks, Thomas Manton, Isaac Watts and others. Some of these Puritan writers could say profound things.

But allow me to give you a few samples of the subjects these booklets treat of and some of the things said about them. And, by the way, most of the subjects are treated *seriatim*, i.e., the articles treated are not complete in one issue but may be continued in succeeding issues. For example, the subject: Christ, Our Beloved Mediator — has been under treatment for two years, and the editor tells us that he has hardly scratched the surface. In the issue I have before me the editor in treatment of this subject is writing under the theme: The Extent of His Atoning Satisfaction.

Here is a quotation of what he wrote which I thought was nice. "We noted that every man could not have been the recipient of the benefits of the atonement because of the NATURE OF CHRIST'S SATISFACTION: 1st, Christ was the Head and Representative of a certain group of people; 2nd, He was the Substitute and bore the sins and guilt of those people whom He represented; 3rd, He performed a Penal work so that EVERY command of the Law, as well as every punishment demanded by the Law was fulfilled for those same 'many' whom He died to save; 4th, He performed a Priestly work — His sacrifice was accepted by God the Father and so must merit the eternal acceptance of His people, else we are still in our sins. The opponents of election must in fact deny all these things, or else believe things which destroy each other." A little farther down in the article he writes: "The EXTENT of the satisfaction of Christ, is the very same as the INTENT of the Great God who gave Him the work to do, and those for whom He was to perform the work." And still farther, we read this: "The ORDER in which God chose to do these things which are necessary to the salvation of a people for Himself appears to be as follows, according to the Scriptures: FIRST, God chose those whom He would love, some from among men, but not all: 'But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God *hath from the beginning* chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.' He chose the people, then the means of their salvation, *through* sanctification and belief. SECOND He gave those He had chosen to Christ Jesus: 'Behold I and the children which God hath given Me.' 'I have manifested Thy name unto the men which Thou gavest Me out of the world; Thine they were, and Thou gavest them Me.' 'This is His (the Father's) will, that of ALL which He hath given Me I should lose (how many) NONE (not a single solitary one)' (See John 6 and 10). THIRD, then, Christ identified Himself with these people, and He undertook the great work of bringing them to heaven for an eternity to enjoy God forever and ever. In order to bring them, He had to satisfy Justice, and all the work of satisfaction was wrought in order that God might be both just and the Justifier of them that come unto Him via Christ Jesus, their Saviour. How much, and how exclusively Christ identified Himself with this particular group can be seen in the great intercessory prayer of John 17, 'I pray for them: I pray NOT for the world, but for them which Thou hast given Me' and further on, He mentioned me, and others of His elect in this age: 'Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word.' FOURTH, the names of these whom God had chosen were written in a book back yonder before the foundation of the world, see Rev. 13: 8 and 17: 8. FIFTH, God predestinated and ordained those chosen to be sanctified and to believe the truth (Acts 13:48, Rom. 8:29, 30, Eph. 7:4-13). SIXTH, Christ, when the fulness of time had come, died for MANY (not

all) but only for those who had been given Him, and whose names had been written in the Book of Life. 'All the Father giveth Me shall come to Me.' 'Who gave His life a ransom for MANY! It is evident that the many, and the ones given, and the ones written, and the ones elected, are all the same.'

Writing on the general subject of FAITH, and more particularly on the sub-title: Faith Is An Operation of God, A Free Gift, the editor, answering some objections to this doctrine, declares among other things: "It is indeed a hard saying, and impossible for the natural mind to receive, that 'no man CAN come unto me, except it were given unto him' of the Father. Any teacher who affirms this truth may expect some to go away and walk no more with him. If that Paramount Teacher, that Man who spoke as no man ever spoke before or after, I say, if that Man could not teach this doctrine in such a way as to hold all His followers to the truth—then who art thou, O man, who schemeth how you can present the truth and still hold all those who hear you?" And a little farther down, he writes: "This doctrine, that God works faith in man, and that man hath nothing in him which encourages faith to arise, has always been a target of those who deny the everlasting and particular love of God for His own."

And finally, to quote no more, here is an excerpt of what the editor wrote on the subject: THE MERCIFUL LOVE OF GOD TO HIS OWN, and the sub-title being: God's Love to His Vessels of Mercy is from Everlasting: "Our aim is that THE EXCEEDING GREATNESS OF GOD'S LOVE TO USWARD shall become better known to us all. 'The great love wherewith He loved us,' is such that it 'passeth knowledge' (Eph. 3:15-21). Many of today's popular sects, including the modernists who have taken over the old denominations, make a very great effort to show they are worshipping a God of love. The caricature which they worship as a god, however, has very little resemblance to the true God—even in the so-called love which they claim for him. This miserable little god of theirs loves every man with a white-hot love, but he (alas) *cannot* do anything for them except wish and hope that they will find some secret source of power to respond to His love and thus make it possible for Him to enjoy the consummation of His love. The God of the saints is a happy, satisfied God, Who needs nothing and no one to maintain His happiness—and this God that WE worship is a glorious God, an Almighty One who always has been, is, and always will be the Master of His world, or worlds as the case may be; this God is Love, and He loves people, and He is so powerful, so wise, so controlling a God, that He is wise and able to bring them happily into heaven with Him for the rest of eternity. That other god but exists in the imagination of the blind guides, but if he did exist, how miserable would he be, to love all men, but to have his love unreturned, and to see the greater part of those he loved cast into the lake of fire, an inferno He Himself prepared, but which He had hoped would not

be used for men—is that not the most pathetic picture imaginable?"

I say once more, that I enjoyed reading the two booklets sent to me. Though we would perhaps criticize some of their contents, and though we would no doubt say the same truths differently (because the editor is evidently under the influence of the English writers), we nevertheless enjoyed seeing in print a studied attempt to emphasize cardinal doctrines of the Reformed faith. Maybe such a man as Jay Green should be contacted (he is stationed right in Grand Rapids). If he believes what he writes, he is not far away from the Protestant Reformed faith.

M.S.

## CONTRIBUTIONS

March 31, 1954

*Dear editor of the Standard Bearer:*

The Hope School Board requests that you publish the following correction in the April's issue of the Standard Bearer.

Correction: In the Dec. 15 issue of the Standard Bearer under the topic "Doctrine and Life," it was revealed that Rev. Blankespoor received the following announcement for his bulletin in writing: "The Hope School Board must conduct a financial drive which will be done the evening of Dec. 2, \$1,000 or more must be paid on the money we loaned. Also we have expensive bus repairs, which has sadly depleted our school operating fund. We trust you will receive those who call on you Dec. 2 and help for this needy cause."

We wish to inform the readers of the Standard Bearer that Rev. Blankespoor did not receive such a written announcement. Therefore it is not true that Rev. Blankespoor mutilated and apocopated said written announcement, neither was the announcement read to him; the secretary simply informed him of the drive and its necessity by telephone. Consequently, Rev. Blankespoor used his own words on his bulletin.

The Board of the Hope Prot. Ref'd Chr. School  
John Kalsbeek, Sec'y.

P. S. It is not the editor's fault that the announcement was published in this form. It simply was handed to me in the form in which I published it.

Ed.

\* \* \* \*

May 3, 1954

*Dear Editor of the Standard Bearer,*

Although the article of D. Scheele in the "Concordia" hardly merits an answer, it nevertheless has in it some obvious misrepresentations which for the sake of the Protestant Reformed Church in Lynden should be corrected. Two of the brethren of Lynden and the undersigned went to see Scheele thinking that if his errors were pointed out to him

he would be willing to correct them. It has become obvious that we were expecting too much.

Scheele says, "The very same man, who today is broadcasting these things around, at one time, when the Rev. A. Cammenga labored in Lynden, did the opposite. In season and out of season he praised the excellency of Rev. A. Cammenga. Whomever he met he urged to come and hear our missionary. No one ever preached more beautifully and richly, especially on the Heidelberg Catechism, as he claimed at that time . . . And yet today, this slandering. To say the very least, I call this antagonism."

These remarks in this connection.

1) Whether these things are true or not I do not know. It makes no difference.

2) The fact is that according to Scheele's own words these things happened at least one and one half to two years ago. The condition debate was not heard yet in these parts of the country in all its details, and Rev. Cammenga was yet a minister in good standing in the Protestant Reformed Church. When it became known that Cammenga too supported the conditional theology of the Liberated, our people here would have nothing more to do with him.

3) I am convinced now more than ever that Rev. Cammenga did the cause of the Protestant Reformed truth great damage in his labors in this field.

4) It is obvious that our people did no slandering of the name of Rev. Cammenga but only became awake to the fact that he was attempting to take from them the truth of God's sovereign unconditional promise and election.

Scheele goes on and says, ". . . the Rev. Hoeksema reports that the congregation of Lynden again and again wanted Rev. H. Veldman to be put on trio, but that he was called a 'kerk verwoester'. . . Now Rev. Hoeksema knows as well as I that this accusation against Rev. H. Veldman originated . . . in the consistory room of our former Protestant Reformed Church in Chatham . . ."

1) The statement as such may be true, I don't know. But the impression is left that that was not a reason why Rev. Veldman was left off of the trio. However that is not true. The opposition did give that as one of their reasons, although officially, why Rev. Veldman was not placed on the trio whether the term originated in Chatham or not.

2) The Consistory would never give their reasons for putting only "condition men" on trio. Undoubtedly if they did, some of the politics of the Consistory would come to light.

3) If the opposition used the term "kerk verwoester" in the form of a quotation which Scheele alleges, they would have said, "Rev. Veldman was called a 'kerk verwoester' in Chatham, but we can't believe that." But it was evidently said many times that Rev. Veldman certainly was a "kerk verwoester."

Scheele says, "Whenever we had a reading sermon, and we had lots of them, the sermon was criticized as being

'conditional' and such alike. Oftentimes by doing this they, the opposition, were accusing their 'own men' such as Rev. Vos, Rev. Heys, etc."

The statement is untrue in every sense of the word.

It would have been far better if Scheele had never written this article. I say this because in the first place, Scheele makes use of half truths which are meant to deceive, and which are therefore the worst form of lie. And secondly, Scheele has convinced many people that he has thrown overboard the stand he took in Chatham against conditional theology. We ask in his own words, "What are we to think of this change?"

And the people in Lynden have told me that now as far as the personal element of the whole history is concerned the matter is closed with them. A doctrinal debate is always welcome, but if the opposition insists on degenerating the issue to "a moral issue" the matter is closed. H. Hanko

#### MY SONG FOREVER SHALL RECORD

My song forever shall record  
The tender mercies of the Lord;  
Thy faithfulness will I proclaim,  
And every age shall know Thy Name.  
I sing of mercies that endure,  
Forever builded firm and sure,  
Of faithfulness that never dies,  
Established changeless in the skies.  
Behold God's truth and grace displayed,  
For He has faithful covenant made,  
And He has sworn that David's son  
Shall ever sit upon his throne.  
The heavens shall join in glad accord  
To praise Thy wondrous works, O Lord;  
Thy faithfulness shall praise command  
Where holy ones assembled stand.  
Who in the heavenly dwellings fair  
Can with the Lord Himself compare?  
Or who among the mighty shares  
The likeness that Jehovah bears?  
With fear and reverence at His feet  
God's holy ones in council meet;  
Yea, more than all about His throne  
Must he be feared, and He alone.  
O Thou Jehovah, God of hosts,  
What mighty one Thy likeness boasts?  
In all Thy works and vast designs  
Thy faithfulness forever shines.  
The swelling sea obeys Thy will,  
Its angry waves Thy voice can still;  
Thy mighty enemies are slain,  
Thy foes resist Thy power in vain.

Psalms 89:1-8