

The Standard Bearer

A Reformed Semi-Monthly Magazine • March 1, 2011

CONTENTS

<i>Meditation</i>	Keeping the Heart REV. JOHN MARCUS	242
<i>Editorial</i>	Controversy and Confusion over the Covenant: Is it not time to settle it? PROF. RUSSELL DYKSTRA	244
<i>In His Fear</i>	The Fruit of the Spirit (II) REV. RICHARD SMIT	247
<i>When Thou Sittest in Thine House</i>	Every Day Has Evil Enough of Its Own ABRAHAM KUYPER	250
<i>A Word Fitly Spoken</i>	Glory REV. BILL LANGERAK	253
<i>Bring the Books...</i>	Bonhoeffer: Pastor, Martyr, Prophet, Spy PROF. DAVID ENGELSMA	254
<i>All Around Us</i>	Update: Federal Vision on Trial in the PCA REV. CLAY SPRONK	257
<i>Biographies of Missionaries</i>	William Cameron Townsend REV. ALLEN BRUMMEL	259
<i>News From Our Churches</i>	Activities MR. BENJAMIN WIGGER	262

Keeping the Heart

Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life.

Proverbs 4:23

Physical fitness is important. But far more important than physical exercise and physical fitness is the spiritual aspect of our lives. And at the center of our spiritual fitness is the condition of our hearts.

Some have defined the heart as “the totality of man’s inner or immaterial nature.” Others have called the heart “the whole soul, or inner man” or “the center of all the issues of our life from a spiritual ethical point of view.” The heart sits at the very core of our being and makes us who we are.

When God created Adam and Eve, their hearts were right with God, and the result was that they glorified God and enjoyed communion with Him. Of course, Adam’s fall into sin changed all that: his clean heart became wicked, obdurate, rebellious, and impure.

Rev. Marcus is pastor of the First Protestant Reformed Church in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

From that corrupt stock comes a corrupt offspring. Jeremiah describes that corruption when he says, “the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?” (Jer. 17:9). With such a heart of stone, all we could do is rebel against God.

Thankfully, God has not left us in our fallen condition. By His grace, in Christ Jesus, God gives us new hearts, and He sprinkles clean water upon us in order to purify us from our spiritual uncleanness. He takes away our hearts of stone and gives us hearts of flesh. He puts His Spirit within us and causes us to walk in His statutes (cf. Ezek. 36:25-27).

But as long as we remain in this world our sanctification will not be complete, because our hearts, though renewed, are not completely renewed. Our old nature continues with us, thus involving us in a constant battle against sin. Therefore, God would have us, children redeemed by grace, to keep our hearts with all diligence.

Keeping our hearts involves guarding, watching, and preserving.

Imagine a military installation located in enemy territory. Such an installation would not last long if it were unguarded. An inattentive watchman amounts to an invitation for the enemy to attack. Such is the case with

The Standard Bearer (ISSN 0362-4692) is a semi-monthly periodical, except monthly during June, July, and August, published by the Reformed Free Publishing Association, Inc.: 1894 Georgetown Center Dr., Jenison, MI 49428-7137.

Postmaster: Send address changes to the *Standard Bearer*, 1894 Georgetown Center Dr., Jenison, MI 49428-7137.

Reprint Policy

Permission is hereby granted for the reprinting of articles in our magazine by other publications, provided a) that such reprinted articles are reproduced in full; b) that proper acknowledgment is made; c) that a copy of the periodical in which such reprint appears is sent to our editorial office.

Editorial Policy

Every editor is solely responsible for the contents of his own articles. Contributions of general interest from our readers and questions for the Reader Asks department are welcome. Contributions will be limited to approximately 300 words and must be signed. All communications relative to the contents should be sent to the editorial office.

Editorial Office

Prof. Russell J. Dykstra
4949 Ivanrest Ave. SW
Wyoming, MI 49418
dykstra@prca.org

Business Office

Standard Bearer
Mr. Timothy Pipe
1894 Georgetown Center Dr.
Jenison, MI 49428-7137
PH: 616-457-5970
FAX: 616-457-5980
tim@rfpa.org

Church News Editor

Mr. Ben Wigger
6597 40th Ave
Hudsonville, MI 49426
benjwig@juno.com

New Zealand Office

Standard Bearer
c/o Mr. B. VanHerck
66 Fraser St
Wainuiomata, New Zealand

United Kingdom Office

c/o Mrs. Alison Graham
27 Woodside Road
Ballymena, BT42 4HX
Northern Ireland
alisongraham2006@
hotmail.co.uk

Rep. of Ireland Office

c/o Mr. Samuel Watterson
11, The Laurels
Briarfield, Castletroy
Co. Limerick, Ireland

Subscription Price

\$21.00 per year in the US, \$25.00 elsewhere

Advertising Policy

The *Standard Bearer* does not accept commercial advertising of any kind. Announcements of church and school events, anniversaries, obituaries, and sympathy resolutions will be placed for a \$10.00 fee. Announcements should be sent, with the \$10.00 fee, to: SB Announcements, 4949 Ivanrest Ave. SW, Grandville, MI 49418 (e-mail: doezema@prca.org). Deadline for announcements is one month prior to publication date.

Website for RFP: www.rfpa.org

Website for PRC: www.prca.org

our hearts. We find ourselves in enemy territory, in which the devil constantly bombards us with lies about the “joys” and “rewards” of sin, while the world lures us to partake of its pleasures. To make matters worse, we have our old sinful flesh, the enemy within the gates.

Keeping our hearts is therefore of utmost importance.

Just as keeping a fortress involves constant and thorough examination of the surroundings in order to prevent enemy incursions, so does guarding the heart. If we truly want to keep the heart pure, we will seek to keep the enemy well out of striking distance. Practically, that means we will consider likely sources of temptations as well as specific ways to avoid them. If particular companions, reading material, television, or Internet pose a danger to our hearts, we will take specific steps to safeguard ourselves.

In our pride, we sometimes imagine ourselves to be so strong that we would never fall into this or that sin. Keeping our hearts, we will assume the very opposite: given the right circumstances, and apart from God’s preserving grace, we are capable of committing any sin.

Keeping the heart involves not only examination of potential dangers but also eradication of present sin. The very presence of the enemy brings danger, even if that enemy happens to be a child spying out the camp. If we are serious about keeping the heart, we will take care not to allow even the smallest sin to remain in us. We will repent of every known sin, knowing that even the smallest sin endangers our spiritual well-being.

Keeping the heart, then, means giving deliberate attention to it in order to avoid all occasions of sin.



Keep thy heart with all diligence.

Literally, we could translate, “above all things that are to be watched, guard the heart.” More than anything else, guard the heart. Such is the seriousness of the spiritual battle we face.

We spend our time and money watching out for our homes, our cars, our retirement plans, our diet, and a host

of other things. But none of these is more important than guarding the heart.

There never is a time when our hearts are free from danger. We must never imagine we have reached the point where guarding our hearts is unnecessary. The time we think that we are not subject to temptations is the moment the devil has already put his foot in the door.

Especially, we need to guard our hearts in seasons when we are likely to be tempted.

When we find ourselves in great prosperity, our temptation is to forget that we need God’s care and provision. Guarding our heart, we will remind ourselves that all our possessions come from God, who has entrusted them to us as stewards to use them for His glory.

When we are in adversity, the temptation is to forget that God’s loving-kindness will never depart from us. Guarding our heart, we will remember God’s care in the past and consider His promise to turn all things for our advantage.

Furthermore, we will consider that our present sufferings are nothing compared with the glory to come.

When we are called to a particular duty toward God, it is easy to forget the importance of the work God has assigned to us. Guarding the heart means we will put our duties into proper perspective and strengthen ourselves in the Lord to seek first the Kingdom.

When Satan assails us with the promises of pleasure, we are liable to believe him. Guarding our hearts, we will reject the devil’s lies.

Guarding our heart means we will constantly go back to the truth of God’s Word. Psalm 119:11: “Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee.” There we learn the vanity of earthly things, and the value of the heavenly. In God’s Word we discover God’s faithfulness and the devil’s deceptions. Hebrews 4:12: “For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” If, therefore, we desire to keep our hearts with

*If we truly want
to keep the heart pure,
we will seek to keep
the enemy well out of
striking distance.*

all diligence, we will seek to become more familiar with the Scriptures, meditating upon them day and night.

Keeping the heart is not easy, by any stretch of the imagination; it is an exceedingly hard work. Indeed, it is an impossible work to perform in our own strength.

For that reason, guarding the heart includes our earnest prayers to God for grace. A military installation serving the king will not last long unless the king sends a constant supply of provisions and ammunition. Our hearts cannot be kept pure unless God gives us a constant supply of grace to preserve us from sin and to guide us in His ways. The fact that David prays, "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me" (Ps. 51:10), shows his reliance upon God for grace.



The reason God would have us guard our hearts is that "out of it are the issues of life."


Everything we experience in life is connected in some way to our hearts. "A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things" (Matt. 12:35). Guarding our hearts from idols, we will seek our happiness in God alone. Guarding our hearts from hatred and envy, we will also pursue the way of love and goodwill with our neighbor. Guarding our hearts from covetous-

ness, we will instead seek the good of the Kingdom. Out of our hearts proceed the issues of life.

The two great issues of life, of course, are these: to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever. If we do not guard our hearts, we will not glorify God, nor will we enjoy fellowship with Him.

Of course, it is not the case that guarding our hearts earns the privilege of covenant fellowship with God. Rather, the idea is that God is pleased to give us the enjoyment of fellowship with Himself in the way of our keeping our hearts. When God desires to bless us with the enjoyment of Himself, He does so by first working in us so that we guard our hearts. Jesus Himself indicates this blessedness in His Sermon on the Mount, saying, "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God" (Matt. 5:8). We will experience the beginning of this blessedness in this life; but, especially, we shall enjoy covenant fellowship with God when we are taken to heaven.

More importantly, guarding our hearts is a means by which God brings glory to Himself. We ourselves will glorify God for the works He has worked in us. But others will also see good works flowing from a pure heart and give glory to God (cf. Matt. 5:16).

"Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." 

EDITORIAL

PROF. RUSSELL DYKSTRA

Controversy and Confusion over the Covenant: Is it not time to settle it?

Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ (I Cor. 1:12). Thus the inspired apostle Paul pointedly describes the party spirit in the church of Jesus Christ in Corinth. A church divided it was, contrary to the command

of the apostle and of the Lord Jesus Himself. Paul severely rebuked the Corinthians for this division in their midst and instructed them to seek unity in the truth of Christ crucified.

Sad to say, the church on this earth has needed this biblical instruction—being rent many times by doctrinal disputes. A notable example of this is

the difference on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper that created a gulf between the great Reformer Martin Luther and the Swiss Reformers such as Ulrich Zwingli and Martin Bucer. What a shame, we say, that they could not bridge the gulf. It gave the church of Rome occasion to taunt the Reformers for their

failure to be united on something so crucial as the sacraments. Indeed it caused bitter strife between these two branches of the Reformation.

Today, *the* doctrine that separates the churches of the Reformation is the doctrine of God's covenant of grace. If people today would name the theologians they follow, as the Corinthians did in Paul's day, it might sound something like this: I am of (Abraham) Kuyper, I am of (Herman) Bavinck, I of (G. Henry) Kersten, I of (Herman) Hoeksema, and I am of (William) Heyns. Still others would cry: I am of (Meredith) Kline, I of (Klass) Schilder, I of (Norman) Shepherd, and I of (N. T.) Wright. This indicates something of the current controversy and confusion over the doctrine of God's covenant of grace. This division over this central doctrine is, I maintain, a blot on the Reformation, a shame far worse than the conflict that divided Luther and the Swiss Reformers. Nearly 500 years have passed, and the churches of the Reformation cannot yet agree on the doctrine of God's covenant.¹

Consider *some* of the debated aspects of the covenant. First, Reformed churches cannot agree on a

¹ Note that I will use the terms Reformed and Reformed churches in the broad sense of those churches that hark back to the sixteenth century Reformation, both those originating on the European continent that go by the name Reformed, and those of Great Britain that go by the name Presbyterian. I recognize that the doctrine of the covenant developed somewhat differently in the two traditions, but both groups have a covenantal tradition, and both are struggling with the doctrine today.

covenant with Adam prior to the fall. Some insist that no covenant existed between Adam and God prior to the fall. If churches can agree that such a covenant existed, they cannot agree on whether or not Adam was *created* in a covenant relationship. Many maintain that God came to Adam after his creation proposing a covenant. Then too, disagreement arises over whether Adam could *merit* with God or not. And still unresolved is the *relationship* between the covenant with Adam before the fall and the covenant of grace established after the fall.

Concerning the doctrine of God's covenant of grace, so many more issues need resolving. First, what is the covenant? Is it an agreement? Is it a promise, or perhaps a promise and demand? Is it a relationship of friendship? Is it a suzerainty treaty (between the sovereign King and His vassal)?

Then there is the all-important question: *With whom* does God establish the covenant? Some seem to teach—with all men. Most would limit it to believers and their seed, following God's word to Abraham. But who exactly are "the seed"? All baptized children? Does God establish His covenant only with the Jacobs born to believing parents, or also with the Esaus? Is God's covenant with Christ (the Seed)? And thus perhaps with the elect alone? But then why are all children of believers given the sign of the covenant, baptism?

Unresolved also are questions about the "time" of the covenant: Is the covenant eternal, that is, from eternity? Or does it begin in time?

Does the covenant start *and* end in time? Or does it continue into eternity, into glory?

Theologians continue to debate whether the covenant is one-sided, or two. Perhaps one-sided in establishment, but two-sided in its maintenance? Is the covenant conditional or unconditional?

And, finally, is the covenant the means to accomplish a goal? Or is God's covenant the goal itself?

This gives an idea of the conflict and confusion that currently swirl about the doctrine of the covenant. One well-known professor of a Reformed seminary, after setting forth two conflicting views of the covenant, introduced his view of the covenant with the comment that he was in "the muddled middle." It was, I believe, intended to inject a bit of humor into his speech. Nonetheless, I fear that the comment is close to reality. The doctrine of the covenant is "muddled" in the writings of theologians, in the decisions of churches, and in the minds of Reformed believers generally. Although the term is frequently used, and the doctrine discussed, it is most often left undefined and rather vague.

What makes this so tragic is that the theologians and churches with these unresolved conflicts have bound themselves to observing the Reformed confessions—the Heidelberg Catechism (preached in their pulpits), the Confession of Faith (taught to their children), and the Canons of Dort. Others are bound by the Westminster standards, which contain some explicit teaching on the covenant. Yet, in

spite of their common confessional foundations, they cannot agree on these basic questions on the covenant!

And now, making things infinitely worse, cloaked by the covenant confusion, heresy is being surreptitiously introduced into some of these very churches. The heresy is not some minor, insignificant doctrine. Rather, it destroys the very heart of the Reformation, namely, the doctrine of justification by faith alone—the hinge on which, according to both Luther and Calvin, the whole Reformation turned. In this very issue of the *Standard Bearer*, Rev. Spronk (“All Around Us”) reports on the battle with the heresy of Federal Vision that is, it appears, worming its way into one of these churches. In earlier articles, both Rev. Spronk and Rev. N. Langerak have demonstrated that the heresy of the Federal Vision is founded on a particular view of the *covenant*.

The confusion and conflict over the doctrine of God’s covenant is therefore not only a shame on the Reformed churches, it is also threatening the very life of these churches.

It is also robbing God of His glory. God’s covenant of grace, His relationship with His people—a central part of the glorious saving work of God in Christ—and the church cannot set forth this beautiful truth except in a muddled, disputed form. This is intolerable. It should be intolerable for every Reformed preacher and every Reformed believer. We may not simply shrug it off as unavoidable, and each of us continue on his own

path with a particular view of the covenant.

To be sure, there will always be controversy over and attacks on the doctrine of God’s covenant. Our adversary, the devil, is relentless in his attacks on all the doctrines of God, from creation, to the atonement, to the second coming of Christ. Unto the end of time, false teachers will seek to slip their damnable heresies into the church (II Pet. 2:1). But the churches that subscribe to the Reformed confessions ought to come

The confusion and conflict over the doctrine of God’s covenant is not only a shame on the Reformed churches, it is also threatening the very life of these churches.

to a settled doctrine of the covenant that is in harmony with and within the bounds of their confessions.

The doctrine of the covenant must be within the bounds of the confessions, and in harmony with those confessions, because the Reformed churches are confessional, and all their teachings must be so. The development of the doctrines of Scripture by the church can be compared to the work of building, as Paul does in I Corinthians 3. After using the agricultural figure of planting, watering,

and growth to describe Apollos’ and his respective labors in Corinth, he makes use of the carpenter trade. He writes:

For we are labourers together with God: ye are God’s husbandry, ye are God’s building.

According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. *But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.* (My emphasis, RJD.)

Then Paul reminds the ministers:

Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man’s work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is.

If any man’s work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.

If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire (I Cor. 3:9-15).

Surely this is not only appropriate for each minister as he labors in the church of Christ; it is also true of the church itself as it sets forth the truths of Scripture. In this sense the church of Jesus Christ on earth is actively building, always building. Yet the church must be building upon the right foundation, not on sand. Essentially the foundation

is Christ, the chief cornerstone, together with the apostles, that is, the truth they set forth under the inspiration of the Spirit of Christ. The Reformed churches have adopted confessions, and every officebearer in them vows that “all the articles and points of doctrine” contained in the confessions “do fully agree with the Word of God” (Form of Subscription adopted by the Synod of Dordrecht, 1618-1619). That all by itself indicates that the foundation on which the doctrine of the covenant must be established is the Reformed confessions.

But that is not all. The fact is that the doctrine of the covenant is treated in the Reformed confessions. The Three Forms of Unity repeatedly call Christ the Mediator, which is a reference not only to His work of intercession, but also to His official position as Mediator of God’s covenant. Eleven times the Three Forms explicitly refer to the covenant, not counting the several times that

the Canons reject the Remonstrants’ misrepresentation of the covenant. The liturgical forms drawn up by the Reformed churches in the Netherlands likewise give instruction on the covenant of grace, with at least eleven explicit references to the covenant (primarily in the forms for Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, but also in the form for the Confirmation of Marriage and the form for the Ordination of Missionaries). The Westminster standards have numerous references to the doctrine of the covenant, and an entire chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith is devoted to the doctrine “Of God’s Covenant with Man” (Chapter 7), followed by the related chapter “Of Christ the Mediator.”

The point is, the doctrine of God’s covenant of grace must be set forth so that it is in harmony with the existing Reformed confessions. The Reformed churches who seek to clarify this significant doctrine must consciously do so.

The burden of this and subsequent editorials is a call, a plea really, that the Reformed churches strive to settle the controversy, clear up the confusion surrounding this crucial Reformed doctrine. The main point of the editorials is not to make a case for one particular form of the covenant, though the informed reader knows my conviction and commitment to the doctrine of the covenant as taught in the Protestant Reformed Churches. But it is not my purpose to make a case for my view or the teaching of the Protestant Reformed Churches. Rather it is simply to make the case that the Reformed churches must not allow this confusion on the covenant to continue.

With that goal, we look next time to a brief history of the doctrine of the covenant, and even at the very idea that a doctrine has a history of development.

... to be continued. 

IN HIS FEAR

REV. RICHARD SMIT

The Fruit of the Spirit (11)

Meekness

A virtue that the Holy Spirit nurtures in the believer by the doctrines of His sovereign, electing, and irresistible grace is the virtue of meekness. The Canons of Dordt, I, 13 teach that “the sense and certainty of this election afford to the children

of God additional matter for daily humiliation before Him...” In the Canons of Dordt, V, 12, we confess that the doctrine of the preservation and perseverance of the saints does not produce in the believer a “spirit of pride,” but is “a source of humility,” among many other worthy virtues. By these statements, it is implied that humility, or meekness, is vital to the Christian life, and it is a fruit of the Spirit of Christ in us that He nurtures by means of the faithful preaching of God’s sovereign, electing grace in Christ Jesus alone.

Rev. Smit is a missionary of the Protestant Reformed Churches in America, stationed in Manila, the Philippines.

Previous article in this series: January 15, 2011, p. 181.

Meekness was prominent in the lives of God's saints in Scripture. For example, according to Numbers 12:3, "Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." Although he was not sinless in this life, which became evident in his sin at Kadesh-barnea, yet the Lord worked in Moses the virtue of meekness to a very great extent. John the Baptist showed meekness when he confessed that he was not even worthy to unloose the buckles on the shoes of Jesus (John 1:27) and when he confessed to his disciples that he wanted himself to decrease and Jesus to increase (John 3:30). Paul showed the virtue of meekness when in I Timothy 1:15 he confessed that "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief."

From these examples, we learn that this virtue must be present and prominent in our hearts. For example, in I Peter 3:4 wives are admonished to adorn themselves with the beauty of a meek and quiet spirit, and to value that jewel and beautiful adornment as God values it: of great price! Believers must exercise humility when restoring in mercy one in the church who has fallen into sin. This they must do in the spirit of meekness, considering themselves, lest they also be tempted and fall, from pride, into great sin (Gal. 6:1). We learn in Philippians 2:2-4 that meekness, or humility, is necessary for the continued enjoyment of the communion of saints in the church. As Christ was humble, and demonstrated that humility in His work of redemption, so must we be of the same mind, and in that lowliness of mind esteem others better than ourselves.

Opposite to that is selfishness. Thinking of me first and only about me is not humility. The Lord teaches us in Philippians 2:4, "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." Selfishness for one's own name and glory is the enemy of humility, especially in cases where the honor of God's name is at stake. The truly humble will stand up and face the heat of the battle

against the dishonor of God's name or become very vocal for the faith when it is attacked in pernicious ways by the Devil and false teachers. Meek Moses did not stand by idly when the people worshiped the golden calf at Mt. Sinai. On the Lord's side, meek Moses took swift action to put an end to such evil in the camp. However, the selfish will avoid such battles.

The opposite of humility is vainglory. One who falls into the trap of vainglory seeks the praise and honor of men in order to puff up his esteem of himself. He seeks to build his "self-esteem" on himself, his own works, and his own goodness. Vainglory and self-esteem are a deadly trap that draws us away from Christ, whose all-sufficient worth is imputed to us by faith alone.

The enemy of humility is pride. Pride can become a sin in church members when they behave with haughtiness towards others who have not been called and converted, as though they by their own abilities made themselves to differ. Pride was the sin of the Pharisee who prayed in thanksgiving to his god that he was so much better than others, especially the publican in that same parable that

Jesus taught in Luke 18. Pride can also be manifest in a refusal to turn away from any false teaching, from a wicked walk of life, from an offense committed against others, or from a very unwise and potentially harmful direction or decision in life. Pride can become manifest in one who thinks that God has not given him enough gifts to serve in his particular station and calling in life. Such a conclusion is a manifestation of pride against the God of wisdom, who distributes His gifts to His people with perfect precision and then commands them to use those abilities in

humble dependence upon Him in their specific station and calling.

Pride can easily become manifest in feeling sorry for ourselves when calamity in life strikes. When one feels sorry for himself, he has not humbled himself before the

Pride can become a sin in church members when they behave with haughtiness towards others who have not been called and converted, as though they by their own abilities made themselves to differ.

mighty hand of God, who gives us our calamities and afflictions in life, but also provides the grace sufficient each day to endure the trials of life with patience and godly fear (I Pet. 5:6-7). Pride becomes manifest when one becomes like Elijah, and thinks that he is the only one left who cares and stands for the truth of God's Word, while everyone else is unregenerated, unconverted, or on the road to apostasy. Such forget that God does have His 7,000 preserved by His grace. Pride is manifest when we begin to think that we, of ourselves, are better and more worthy than others for whatever reason.

Instead of those evil virtues, the child of God must desire to have and exercise the fruit of meekness. Philipians 2:3 describes meekness clearly: lowliness of mind. Meekness is a matter of how lowly we value ourselves—before God chiefly, but also in comparison with others. In meekness one concludes that before God he is only an undeserving servant, and in comparison with others he is the least of the least of all God's saints. That conclusion is not a putting down of oneself before others with false motives, but a genuine understanding that he is the least of the least of God's saints because he is the chief of the chief of sinners. When we understand how huge and extensive our sin and misery are, we will understand how low we really are. Then we will understand how great God and Christ are, and that we are as nothing before God, and in comparison to others, far below the lowest. Then the Spirit makes us to see that the worth we do have is of, in, by, and because of Christ alone. He is our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption entirely.

As is true of all the other aspects of the fruit of the Spirit, we do not possess true meekness naturally. That fact does not take long to appear in us as we grow up. In early childhood already, one expresses effortlessly and naturally selfishness and pride as he rips away a toy from another child or refuses to obey his parent and "come." True humility before God and in relationship to God is truly a gift of God's grace, worked in us by the Holy Spirit alone. God must crush our rock-hard hearts by His grace and give us new hearts, which are pliable and soft. He must infuse in us the life and mind of Christ, who said, "For I am meek and lowly in heart" (Matt. 11:29). In fact, Christ was so lowly and meek that He came into our flesh in the way of His lowly birth, to walk

a lowly way of humiliation, to the lowliest depths of hell, for the lowliest of all, His own sheep, who also by nature hate, reject, and would crucify Him again.

It is humbling, is it not, that Christ humbled Himself so low for us in order that we, who deserve to be cast down, might inhabit the heights of undeserved glory in His heavenly kingdom? What Christ by His death and resurrection earned for us, a life of His humility, He is pleased to work in us by His Spirit through the preaching of the Word. By the preaching of the gospel of God's sovereign, electing grace in Christ, the Spirit is pleased to call us out of the darkness and death of pride into the light and life of genuine humility.

That virtue we need for a faithful life in our respective churches, homes, and places in daily life. For example, the meek wife will be faithful to her husband in her lifelong marriage, will guide her house with wisdom and discretion, and also, as time and opportunity permit, bear the burdens of others within the household of faith.

With this virtue, the Christian young person can attain the proper estimation of himself before God and in comparison to others. He will see his nothingness apart from Christ and will resist the death-trap of seeking value for himself in his own report card grades, in his diplomas, in his successful school or work projects, and in his friends. He will see that his all is in Christ alone, and, in thanksgiving for that, faithfully go to school, find employment, seek a like-minded life mate, make confession of faith, and mature in the obligations of church membership.

With this virtue, lasting spiritual friendships at various levels in life are maintained. The friendship of Jonathan and David is an example of how the blessing of humility is vital to the happy friendships of fellow believers, even in extremely difficult circumstances.

In such relationships in life, the meek look out for the spiritual welfare of the others. The meek will not behave independently and individualistically. They will not say, "I am not my brother's keeper." They will not even build their home independently from the homes of fellow believers and their seed. They will not say that the children of other believers are not their concern. This does not mean that the meek will fall into the opposite error of being busybodies, intermeddling in the affairs of others in which they have no place, and at the same time leaving


their own calling and duties unfinished. Rather, the meek will be ready to serve others as time and opportunity permit because of a deep spiritual concern and interest for the spiritual health of other believers and their seed.

As the meek fulfill their callings in the church, home, and other areas of life, they put others first. The husband will think of his wife first, and so the wife towards her husband. The meek parents will not put themselves, their vacation, their hobbies, or other earthly desires first, but put the needs and spiritual welfare of their children and their children's children first. Bearing the burdens of fellow saints becomes a priority for the meek. Interceding for others in the church in prayer before God's throne of grace is a daily element of the prayers of the meek. Just as the Father in heaven so esteemed those others in the church that He gave His only begotten Son for them, so surely must we esteem our fellow saints.

This virtue would not be present in us except there also be in us the love of Christ. Like all the other aspects of the fruit of the Spirit, meekness also flows out of the first part of the fruit of the Spirit: love. Love is that bond of perfectness, the bond of covenant communion with God in which we seek Him first only because He has sought us first. When Christ pours into us His love by His Spirit,

we love Him. When there is that love of Christ in us, we will hate the world and the evils of pride, and delight ourselves in His life of meekness. With the love of Christ in our hearts, we will learn to live in humility before God and in relationship with other people. By the love of Christ, we will be longsuffering, kind, good, and faithful towards others.

What is the result of that meekness? In this life there is, according to Psalm 37:11, something wonderful that the meek may enjoy. David wrote that the meek "shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." The result of true humility is the enjoyment of an abundance of peace, which surpasses our understanding, with our fellow saints and, above all, with our God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

According to Psalm 37:11, the meek may also expect to inherit the earth. Jesus repeated that in the Beatitudes: "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth" (Matt. 5:5). The blessed hope and expectation for the meek, though they are persecuted and oppressed in this life, is that they shall one day soon be highly exalted into their place in the everlasting and heavenly kingdom of Christ. 

WHEN THOU SITTEST IN THINE HOUSE

ABRAHAM KUYPER

Every Day Has Evil Enough of Its Own

Solicitude

The fact, alas, cannot be denied, that for more than one household the new year that is at hand will open a new source of trouble and anxiety.

So often one had hoped that he had reached the point of a turn in his affairs. After the many "lean" years, at length the "fat" would make their appearance. The worst was now past. The spring could not be bent lower. And if now there would come but a certain *small beginning*

Reprinted from When Thou Sittest In Thine House, by Abraham Kuyper, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan. 1929. Used by permission of Eerdmans Publishing Co.

of improvement, it would be for trade and business as the first green in the park at spring-time. A spring, which was prophetic of a summer, and presently after that summer and autumn with *rich harvests*.

Then everyone would be on top again. Past troubles would be forgotten. Songs of praise would rise from the dried-up throat. And already now, while still in the midst of adversity, one was kept standing by the hope that soon it would come to this: a hope on which one could not *live* indeed, but which kept up life's courage.

But who can close the eye to the fact that also the year 1895 has not brought us the first bud of this hope.

Advance there is none at a single point. Not one knot in

the great social problem has been unraveled. All through Europe, even across the seas, things are on a tension. And the difficulty of earning an honest living became ever greater. Competition, with its unholy passion, ever more austere. For a dozen and more years we have known a period of prosperity, but it has come to an end.

And though we know very well that “the kingdom of God and his righteousness” must be sought first, this does not alter the fact that the change of year is not an event in *spiritual*, but in *civil* life. And that the question how to pay one’s debts that are still owing, and improve one’s affairs that are going behind, and at least for one year make ends meet with honor, is a hard question for many, that grips the throat as it were and makes the questioning eye gaze somberly out before it.

And now you may say: “Be not concerned, dear brother, He who provides is the Lord.” But from the gospel it is evident that Christ Himself deals with our human heart in its anxiety and in its need in an entirely different way.

For truly, the Lord also said, “Take no thought.” But with this saying He also made that other string in our heart to vibrate: “Every day has evil enough of its own” (Matt. 6:34, Dutch version).



What affects one so cruelly in this saying: “Be not anxious, dear brother!” from the lips of one who is himself in comfortable circumstances is that one dismisses thereby the troubled of heart with a *word*. Superficially passes over what to him are bands of death. And thereby shows that he has no love, does not enter into his neighbor’s trouble, and at heart is weaned of the sympathy of compassion.

And with Jesus you find this to be so altogether the opposite. Something which you perceive at once at the sound of the surprising words: “Every day has evil enough of its own.”

He who says this, shows that He interprets human life almost yet more somberly than he who takes life at its hardest.

Most people take it, that ordinarily life is bearable, without being inviting, and that only at certain times troubles increase to overwhelm our heart.

But Jesus takes it far more seriously and somberly.

No, says your Savior, your life is no chain of bearable days, broken only now and then by a day of adversity.

All of life is troublous. Every day a cup is to be drained. Seven times a week a sun sets and there are stars that darken. Or briefly, as the evangelist has reported it to us: “Every day has evil enough of its own.”

The very reverse, therefore, of what those other comforters say.

Not: “There is no reason to be thus troubled and concerned.” But rather on the contrary: “You have no idea yet of your real trouble. For if you fully understood the *evil of today*, you would have neither time nor strength so much as even to think of *the evil of tomorrow*.”

That you are already busy now with the evil of *tomorrow* and of the *day after tomorrow* shows that you make light of the evil of today, that you do not estimate it correctly, that you do not fathom its depth.

Therefore do not fill your head and heart with evil that belongs to tomorrow. That comes in order when it is tomorrow. Now you have to look out for the evil of *this day*. And he who is right-minded feels that with this he has his hands already more than full.

You have neither time nor strength to be already now engaged with the evil of tomorrow.

Every day has enough and more of *its own evil*.



Did we say too much, that in this drastic word there is something surprising? Something that at once overturns your deliberations, and makes you face life differently?

You had already accustomed yourself to too much evil. To oh so much that really hurt your heart, you had already become indifferent. You no longer called it evil.

What you continued to be alarmed about were merely those very bad things and painful troubles which threatened you from afar.

And Jesus at once calls you back to your heart, and complains about your indifference. That at retiring at night you can say: “Thank God, everything today has gone well. Nothing has gone wrong,” when, viewed by holier light, *nothing* went well. Neither in your own heart, neither in your family, nor in your associations. Not only your inner life, but also your relation to others, and your condition in life, were so altogether different from what this ought to be *in your Paradise*, while, as God’s child, you should be able to call everything short of Paradise evil.

But you are all over this. You sit in the prison-cell, and have been dulled by it. You carry heavy chains and it does not trouble you when the links of them cut into your flesh.

That is your self-degradation. Born child of a king, the beggar's tatters do not offend you anymore, which at better and deeper insight disgrace you.

And this letting go of your high nobility, this looking away from your claim to higher happiness, is what estranges you from your God, from your origin, from your Father who is in heaven. Thereby anxiety for the future of your God quite overpowers you. And while you have become impervious with respect to the evil of today against which you should battle, you fall down helplessly, and without power of resistance, at alarm for the evil that after weeks or months can come.



And do not say that this word of Jesus makes you more unhappy.

This is *seemingly* so, but it *is* not so.

But one reproachfully replies: "With my cares for the future I am greatly burdened. And now you would burden my heart still more by the thought of all sorts of present evils, to which fortunately I had become accustomed, and which therefore troubled me no more."

But the experience teaches otherwise, and Jesus' word puts the seal to it.

We *must* know that our life is "seventy and eighty years, and that it is mostly labor and sorrow." Every day we must feel the raw antithesis between the happiness that God had prepared for us, and the realities amid which we live. Then alone you will know and recognize that your home above, your native land, is with God, that the hard journey, which here we have to make, is the result of our own folly, that we took the wrong way, and thus must turn back upon it, to come out again with our God.

So everything in you becomes awake. You make highest claims to your inheritance for Jesus' sake above, but for this very reason you make no slightest claim to be well off, already now, here on the pilgrim journey.

Evil is here, it is here every day, every hour, indoors and out of doors, within you and in others. And he who has an eye for this, he lives, he feels, the smarting pain in his soul, but energy stimulates him, and in the midst of his wrongs

he can be so quiet and warmly thankful for every cup of cold water that is handed him on his pilgrim journey.



He who goes through life half blind, and therefore does not see the *evil of each day*, does not know sin, feels no concern about the cause of God, his children do not weigh upon his heart with an eternal interest, the love of Christ and of His Zion does not consume him.

When such a man draws a hundred thousand from the lottery, has no sickness at home, and has many friends, he is rich as Croesus, and would cast all care aside.

Other people's needs, deeper wants, more anxious cares do not move him.


And herein lies the falseness of his condition; for once the hour comes when no money can offer him any more refreshment, and deadly terror of eternal need overtakes the soul as he is summoned to judgment, and all this evil of every day for which he never had an eye shall as a mighty specter suddenly stand before him.

He who, if he but had money, would lay aside all care, in the inmost part of his heart leans yet more upon Mammon than upon God. Sometimes even his prayer is nothing else than a prayer that God will help him gain the favor of Mammon.

And to cut off this evil condition at the root, Jesus unsparingly calls you back from the evil of tomorrow and of the day after tomorrow to the evil of today.

To the evil of *this day*. A day in which you see no evil, because your eyes have been blindfolded. And now Jesus removes the blindfold, and shows all the evil, there is *to-day*. Altogether different evil, much deeper evil. Debts not of money, but debts to God. Debts that make separation between you and your Father who is in heaven, and therefore rob you of the rest and comfort which faith in your Father above regarding the future can impart.

Here shines divine wisdom.

He who enters upon the new year, not to take the care for the future out of the hands of his God, but every day with open eye to see the evil that there is in that day, and do battle that day against it, and that day to overcome it, he comes with every passing day *closer* to his God, and every day he learns a little better the difficult lesson, *to commit to his God*, what that God has anyway already in *His* hand. 

Glory

The primary meaning of glory is derived from the Old Testament word *kabod*, as in Ichabod, the child so named after the glory of God departed with the ark (I Sam. 4:21). Its New Testament equivalent, *doxa* (as in doxology), originally meant opinion or view, but biblically has taken on the same meaning as the Old Testament *kabod*, which refers to a thing of heft or weight, i.e., massive, important, substantial, abundant, or considerable, thus honorable, splendid, magnificent, and awesome to see, experience, or contemplate. The opposite is something slight, trifling, vain, and lacking, thus lowly, dishonorable, contemptible, and shameful (Ps. 4:2; Is. 23:9; Prov. 3:35; I Cor. 15:43).

In Scripture, glory is attributed either to God or to something God makes glorious by His presence or as His handiwork. God is glorious in His being. He is the God of glory, which is the splendid, magnificent, and awesome weight of His substantial, considerable, even infinite and eternal, perfections (Ps. 29:3). He is glorious in power (I Thess. 1:9), greatness (Deut. 5:24), wisdom (Ps. 104:24), righteousness (Is. 62:2), holiness (Is. 63:15), love (John 17:24), and mercy and grace (Ex. 33:18-19). And wherever God dwells, in heaven, His temple, or with His people in the new creation, that glory radiates as holy, shining light (Rev. 21:23; Ex. 40:34; II Chr. 7:1).

God reveals this glory in all His works (Ps. 104:31). One such work is creation. The heavens declare the glory of God (Ps. 19:1). The God of glory thunders, is upon many waters, and above all the earth (Ps. 29:3; 148:13). As creatures of His wisdom and power, He gives glory to the flowers of the field (Matt. 6:29), to forests and fields (Is. 60:13), to bodies terrestrial and celestial (I Cor. 15:40), and to kings and kingdoms of this world (Matt. 4:8). But it remains His, that the whole earth be full of His glory (Is. 6:3). The wickedness of fallen man is that he robs God of His glory. Man, once crowned with glory, but having sinned and come short of the glory of God, shamefully changes that glory into an image of himself and attributes its substantial splendor to the mere chance of evolution (Ps. 8:5; Matt. 6:2; Rom. 1:23; 3:23).

Rev. Langerak is pastor of Southeast Protestant Reformed Church in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

The thievery does not end there. Man robs God of His glory in the redemption of fallen sinners and creation, by attributing some part of it to the will, worth, or work of the man. God will have none of it. His glory is great in salvation (Ps. 21:5). He creates the church, places salvation in Israel, and builds up Zion for His glory (Ps. 102:16; Is. 43:7; 46:13). To the glory of His grace He accepts those who are in Christ and gives to them His inheritance and the fruits of righteousness (Phil. 1:11; Eph. 1:6, 18). To make known the riches of His glory, He afore prepared them as vessels of mercy unto glory (Rom. 9:23). Astoundingly, the glory that man tries to steal, God shares with us (John 17:22). He calls us unto eternal glory; and afterwards receives us unto glory (I Pet. 5:10; Ps. 73:24). We are changed from glory to glory (II Cor. 3:18), will receive a crown of glory (I Pet. 5:4), and appear with Him in glory that is not worthy to be compared with our present sufferings (Col. 3:4; Rom. 8:18).

God most perfectly reveals His glory and glorifies us by His presence in the Spirit of Jesus Christ. As the express image of God, Jesus is the brightness of His glory and was glorified with Him before the world was (Heb. 1:3; John 17:5). Though He entered into our shame, we beheld His glory as of the only begotten of the Father and manifest in mighty miracles (John 1:14; 2:11). Not seeking His own glory, He was raised from death by the glory of the Father and received into heaven, the King of glory, who comes again with great glory (John 8:50; Rom. 6:4; Ps. 24:7-10).

Our calling is to give God the glory due unto His name (Ps. 29:2). We glorify God by worshiping Him reverently with the saints (Ps. 96:8); by declaring among the heathen His marvelous works, including creation (I Chr. 16:24); by attributing to Him alone the strength, wisdom, grace, love, and mercy of His work of salvation, including election (Rom. 9:23); by believing and confessing that Jesus alone is the Lord of glory (I Cor. 2:8; Phil. 2:11); and by patiently rejoicing in hope of the glory to be revealed in the perfected kingdom of Jesus Christ (Rom. 5:2). For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, has shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of His glory in the face of Jesus Christ (II Cor. 4:6). To Him be glory forever.



Bonhoeffer: Pastor, Martyr, Prophet, Spy, by Eric Metaxas. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, 2010. Pp. xvi+591. \$29.99 (cloth). [Reviewed by David J. Engelsma.]

If ever resistance to civil authority could be excused, it was Dietrich Bonhoeffer's. If ever the attempt to assassinate the ruler of a nation could be justified, it was the attempt by Bonhoeffer and his fellow conspirators. Bonhoeffer resisted the monstrously evil Nazi Germany. He and his co-conspirators made an attempt on the life of the presage of the man of sin, the Führer, Adolf Hitler.

On this resistance culminating in the attempt to assassinate Hitler, this splendid biography centers.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer was a German Protestant theologian and churchman who opposed Hitler and his Nazi Germany from the very beginning. Two days after Hitler became the "democratically elected chancellor of Germany" on January 30, 1933, Bonhoeffer gave a radio address in which he declared that the idea of leadership embodied in Hitler's Führer-principle—absolute lordship—is idolatry.

With Pastor Martin Niemöller and others, Bonhoeffer established the "Confessing Church" in Germany in separation from and opposition to the "German Christians"—the bulk of German Protestantism, that cravenly, shamelessly, and ardently played the whore to Hitler's beast.

For Bonhoeffer, discipleship after Christ (the subject of one of Bonhoeffer's famous books) demanded action against the wicked Hitler, who was destroying Germany, corrupting the church, and exterminating Jews. This action took form in 1944 in the attempt to assassinate Hitler by exploding a bomb near the German leader. By decree of Hitler himself, the German authorities executed Bonhoeffer by hanging in April, 1945.

Today, virtually all of Protestantism regards Bonhoeffer as a Christian martyr—one who died, honorably, for his confession of the lordship of Jesus Christ. Such is the

regard for Bonhoeffer of this well-written, gripping biography: *Bonhoeffer: Pastor, Martyr, Prophet, Spy*. The sub-title is *A Righteous Gentile vs. the Third Reich*.

Theologian

Bonhoeffer's life is fascinating to the theologian. Bonhoeffer studied under renowned scholars: the notable liberal, Adolf von Harnack; the able historian of dogma, Reinhold Seeberg; the great Luther-scholar, Karl Holl; and the famous American theologian, Reinhold Niebuhr. The theologian who had the most influence on Bonhoeffer's own theological thinking was Karl Barth. The two were friends. Barth authored the Barmen Declaration, manifesto and official confession of the German Confessional Churches. The Declaration rejected "the false doctrine, as though the State, over and beyond its special commission, should and could become the single and totalitarian order of human life, thus fulfilling the Church's vocation as well." It rejected as well the notion that the church should become "an organ of the State."

Although the book offers no critique of Bonhoeffer's theology, it is apparent that the theology of that disciple of Karl Barth was a neo-orthodoxy that rejected the radical liberalism of von Harnack in Germany and of Emerson Fossdick in America; confessed the resurrection of Jesus from the dead; insisted on a life of costly discipleship after the risen Jesus, in contrast to "cheap grace"; and even preferred the preaching of the fundamentalists in America to that of the liberals, at the time of the fundamentalist/modernist struggle.

Of a sermon by the notorious liberal Harry Emerson Fossdick in the Riverside Church in New York, Bonhoeffer wrote:

Quite unbearable.... The whole thing was a respectable, self-indulgent, self-satisfied religious celebration. This sort of idolatrous religion stirs up the flesh which is accustomed to being kept in check by the Word of God. Such sermons make for libertinism, egotism, indifference. Do people not know that one can get on as well, even better, without "religion"?.... Perhaps the Anglo-Saxons are really more religious than we are, but they are certainly not more Christian, at least, if they still have sermons like that.

Prof. Engelsma is professor emeritus of Dogmatics and Old Testament in the Protestant Reformed Seminary.

Later, that same Sunday, Bonhoeffer attended the services at which the fundamentalist McComb preached. To this sermon, Bonhoeffer responded positively. “Now the day has had a good ending.... The sermon was astonishing (Broadway Presbyterian Church, Dr. McComb) on ‘our likeness with Christ.’ A completely biblical sermon.”

During a stay in the United States in 1930, to study at Union Theological Seminary, Bonhoeffer passed this devastating judgment upon liberal theology and preaching: “In New York they preach about virtually everything; only one thing is not addressed, or is addressed so rarely that I have as yet been unable to hear it, namely, the gospel of Jesus Christ, the cross, sin and forgiveness, death and life.”

Typical of liberalism’s penchant for condoning evil by blaming others (especially the United States) was Fosdick’s defense of Hitler: “Fosdick was one of the most vocal proponents of appeasing Hitler. He championed moral equivalency, which argued that the phenomenon of Hitler and fascism came into being because of the faults of America and its policies.”

Bonhoeffer was a man of courage in a nation and in a church of cowards. Boldly, he rejected Hitler and National Socialism; boldly, he defended the Jews; boldly, he called the church to be the church; boldly, he urged his weak colleagues, not only in the false church of the “German Christians,” but also in the Confessing Church, to take a stand; boldly, he returned to Germany from a safe haven abroad to work for, and suffer with, the Confessing Church; boldly, he allied himself with the conspiracy to kill Hitler; and, bravely, he went to his death early one morning in April, 1945. As his executioners led him away to the gallows, he said to his fellow prisoners, “This is the end, for me the beginning of life.”

And then there is the haunting love of Bonhoeffer for the young woman to whom he was engaged, but whom he would never marry. His love-letters from prison are moving.

Opponent of National Socialism

Bonhoeffer’s strategic place at the center of spiritual, ecclesiastical, and physical opposition to Hitler makes this account of his life valuable, and gripping, also for its insights into Hitler, his henchmen, National Socialism,

and the German nation that deified Hitler. One who has read much in the literature of Hitler, Nazi Germany, and World War II will learn more from this volume.

The chapter on Hitler’s coming to power and the rise of the terrifying reign of the Nazis—the chapter on the “Führer-principle”—is as incisive as any account I have read.

So the German people clamored for order and leadership. But it was as though in the babble of their clamoring, they had summoned the devil himself, for there now rose up from the deep wound in the national psyche something strange and terrible and compelling. The Führer was no mere man or mere politician. He was something terrifying and authoritarian, self-contained and self-justifying, his own father and his own god. He was a symbol who symbolized himself, who had traded his soul for the *zeitgeist*.

The author’s description of Hitler and his philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche is worth quoting at length.

Hitler must be called a Nietzschean, although he likely would have bristled at the term since it implied that he believed in something beyond himself. This clashed with the idea of an invincible Führer figure, above whom none could stand. Still, Hitler visited the Nietzsche museum in Weimar many times, and there are photos of him posed, staring rapturously at a huge bust of the philosopher. He devoutly believed in what Nietzsche said about the “will to power.” Hitler worshiped power, while truth was a phantasm to be ignored; and his sworn enemy was not falsehood but weakness. For Hitler, ruthlessness was a great virtue, and mercy, a great sin. This was Christianity’s chief difficulty, that it advocated meekness. Nietzsche called Christianity “the one great curse, the one enormous and innermost perversion...the one immortal blemish of mankind.”

Bonhoeffer resolutely opposed this demonic state. In a letter to an ecumenical churchman outside Germany, whom Bonhoeffer was urging publicly to speak out against Hitler and Nazi Germany for the sake of the true church in Germany, Bonhoeffer wrote, “It must be made quite clear—terrifying though it is—that we are immediately faced with the decision: National Socialist or Christian.”

Eric Metaxas is gifted with a scintillating style. The election of the crude, blustering, lecherous Johann Heinrich Ludwig as the Nazi bishop of the church of the “German Christians” was as if “Gomer Pyle had become the archbishop of Canterbury.” That exemplar of appeasement, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, finally declared war on Germany, when Hitler invaded Poland, because “someone lent Chamberlain a vertebra.” Of the death of Reinhold Heydrich, second only to Himmler in the Nazi hierarchy in cold-blooded killing, Metaxas writes: “Heydrich was dead...the albino stoat...the architect of the Final Solution fell into the hands of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.” Hitler’s clever propagandist, Joseph Goebbels, is described as “the vampiric homunculus.”

Martyr?

To the book’s thesis, however, the question must be put: Was Bonhoeffer’s physical resistance to the government of Nazi Germany excusable? Was the attempt to assassinate the Führer justified? Was Dietrich Bonhoeffer a martyr?

The question is not without practical significance. May Christians in similar circumstances today use force to overthrow a godless, persecuting state? May Christians, in the name of Christ, one day attempt the assassination of the Antichrist? Can resistance to civil government, and civil government that has come to power lawfully at that, ever be obedience to Christ—genuine discipleship—on the part of Christian citizens?

Scripture denies it. “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation” (Rom. 13:1, 2). The only account Metaxas takes of this plain prohibition of resistance to the state and, therefore, certainly of assassination of the head of state is a dismissal of the classic text. According to Metaxas, and, evidently, Bonhoeffer, one who applies Romans 13 in such a way as to condemn the resistance in which Bonhoeffer was engaged (the obvious meaning of the text!) is guilty of a “simplistic understanding of Romans 13.” Here, Bonhoeffer’s neo-orthodox denial of the inspiration of Scripture is evident.

Bonhoeffer himself indicated his awareness that the conspiracy to take the life of Hitler was sin. Early on, he asked leaders of the Confessing Church if they “would grant absolution to the murder of a tyrant.” Absolution is necessary only for sin. Discipleship after Christ neither needs nor requests absolution. Similarly, Claus Schenk von Stauffenberg, the Roman Catholic who placed the bomb at Hitler’s feet in the Wolf’s Lair on July 20, 1944, asked his priest, “Can the Church grant absolution to a murderer who has taken the life of a tyrant?”

The illegitimacy of Bonhoeffer’s resistance to Hitler and Nazi Germany is apparent from the secretiveness and duplicity it required. Metaxas notes that Bonhoeffer was deeply involved in “the tangled huggermuggery of secret intelligence missions.” The way of Christ is not “huggermuggery.” The way of Christ is an open, bold confession, and an equally open, bold denunciation. It is the way, not of killing, but of being killed. This was Jesus’ own way before Pilate, Herod, and the godless, persecuting Roman world-power. There was no recourse to force and violence (John 18:33-37). I Peter 2:11-25 binds this way upon all Christians, always and everywhere.

It is not surprising that the resistance by Bonhoeffer and others failed miserably. When the bomb did not kill him, or even harm him seriously, Hitler hardened himself in his conviction that he was the man of Providence—the Messiah—for Germany. The result of the botched assassination was the execution of thousands, including men and women only remotely connected to the plot. Those who resist the powers receive to themselves divine judgment.

It was right that Hitler not perish by assassination. Hitler had to live to see his utter defeat and the complete failure of his thousand-year “Reich.” He must die by his own hand—no hero, treacherously “stabbed in the back” by assassins, but an abject coward, as all bullies are, afraid to face the consequences of his evil deeds.

In his execution by hanging, Dietrich Bonhoeffer was not a martyr. Rather, he suffered “as a murderer...an evil-doer” (I Pet. 4:15).

That is a shame. ☹

Update: Federal Vision on Trial in the PCA

A Case Study in Working Hard not to Exercise Discipline

Will you adopt a study report condemning the Federal Vision? In 2007 the General Assembly of the PCA (Presbyterian Churches in America) said *yes* to this question and adopted a report condemning the heretical movement known as the Federal Vision. But now the more pressing question is, will you discipline the heretics who publicly teach and defend doctrines that are associated with the Federal Vision? The actions of three of the governing bodies of the PCA indicate the answer to this question is, *not if we can avoid it!* The Standing Judicial Commission (SJC—the ecclesiastical court that represents the PCA's General Assembly) and two Presbyteries in the PCA have dealt with Federal Vision cases and so far have failed to deal adequately with the heresy and its proponents. It will take a few articles to examine the actions of these bodies. In this article we will examine the actions of the Siouxlands Presbytery (SLP).

Despite clear evidence that Pastors Greg Lawrence and Joshua Moon subscribe to heretical views associated with the Federal Vision, SLP has failed to discipline these men, and indeed seems to be working hard to avoid exercising discipline.

Little positive can be said about SLP's handling of the Greg Lawrence case. In April of 2009 SLP appointed a committee to investigate Lawrence's views. The committee reported back to SLP in September of 2009. The committee demonstrated that Lawrence is guilty of teaching heretical doctrines and recommended "that the presbytery find that there is a strong presumption of guilt that TE Lawrence is teaching contrary to the Standards in a way that strikes at the fundamentals of the system

and/or the vitals of religion in its doctrine of baptism."¹ Lawrence's view of baptism is that God establishes His covenant with every baptized child and bestows upon every baptized child saving benefits. Recognizing that not every baptized child is eternally saved, Lawrence teaches that some baptized children lose the salvation they received at baptism. Lawrence is guilty of teaching at least three errors that contradict the confessions: 1) Grace is universal (within the covenant), 2) grace is resistible, and 3) saints can lose their salvation.²

SLP did not vote to find a strong presumption of guilt against Lawrence. Instead the SLP adopted a motion made by Joshua Moon (more on him in a moment) "to reject the report of the committee with its motion to find a strong presumption of guilt." At this same meeting (September of 2009) the Presbytery adopted a motion made by Moon basically stating that it found nothing wrong with Lawrence's teachings.³ In October of 2009 SLP decided it acted hastily in exonerating Lawrence and appointed a second committee to study his views. In January 2010 this second committee recommended (the vote was 6-0) SLP find a strong presumption of guilt against Lawrence. The Presbytery decided instead to postpone action and appointed a committee to instruct Lawrence (presumably about his errors). SLP met again

¹ Quote taken from: <http://www.weswhite.net/2010/02/chronological-overview-of-siouxlands/> viewed on January 11, 2011.

² Some of Lawrence's heretical statements concerning baptism can be found at <http://sjc2010-4.blogspot.com/2010/10/panel-decision-in-sjc-2010-4.html> viewed on January 11, 2011. This webpage contains a document entitled "Panel Decision in SJC 2010-4." Lawrence's statements are found under section IV. C. of this document.

³ On the September, 2009 meeting of SLP see http://theaquilareport.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=481:presbytery-of-the-siouxlands-exonerates-member-suspected-of-federal-vision-teaching-complaint-to-sjc-contemplated&catid=50:churches&Itemid=133 viewed on January 11, 2011.

Rev. Spronk is pastor of Peace Protestant Reformed Church in Lansing, Illinois.

in April of 2010 and once again did not vote on the recommendation to find a strong presumption of guilt against Lawrence and received a report from the committee appointed to instruct him. Finally, in September of 2010, SLP voted on the recommendation to find a strong presumption of guilt. Pastor Wes White explains,

The Presbytery did decide to [find a strong presumption of guilt against Lawrence and] go to trial in a somewhat unusual way. TE Joshua Moon offered a substitute motion that would have completely exonerated TE Lawrence . . . The Presbytery agreed to accept this motion as a substitute motion. Then, the question was called. . . . The substitute motion failed 13-20. The result was that the Presbytery will proceed to a trial of TE Greg Lawrence.⁴

That Lawrence is on trial under a strong presumption of guilt (which I have been told means he is not considered “in good standing”) is certainly a positive development. That there are members of the Presbytery who have persevered in pursuing the case despite frustrating and inexplicable delays is also an encouraging sign. Yet there are two facts about this case that indicate SLP has worked to avoid disciplining Lawrence. First, it took the Presbytery six meetings and over a year to find a strong presumption of guilt against Lawrence when it should have done this at its second meeting (in September of 2009). Second, SLP still has not condemned Lawrence’s views as heretical nor called him to repentance, though it has had ample opportunity to do so (this could have been done by the third meeting in October of 2009).

If little positive can be said about the SLP’s handling of the Lawrence case (though it is a positive thing that there are members of the Presbytery who persevere in pressing the case), there is even less to be said about its handling of Joshua Moon’s case. At the September 2009 meeting of SLP Moon defended the heretical views of Lawrence. In a speech he delivered to defend Lawrence, Moon clearly proved himself to be a proponent of the Federal Vision heresy.⁵ Perhaps Moon is becoming best known for his belief in the *temporary* forgiveness of sins.

⁴ Quote taken from <http://www.weswhite.net/2010/09/sioux-lands-presbytery-declares-strong/> viewed on January 11, 2011.

⁵ For the full speech see <http://godshammer.wordpress.com/2010/01/29/more-federal-de-vision/#more-1141> viewed on January 11, 2011.

Moon, like Lawrence, believes that God gives saving benefits to all baptized children, including the forgiveness of sins. Moon admits some of these baptized children are not ultimately saved. Therefore he concludes that the forgiveness of their sins must be only *temporary*. Moon expressed this belief in the following statement: “We are told by the complainants that you cannot attribute forgiveness of sins to the potential reprobate. But that is clearly wrong.” According to Moon it is clearly right to teach that the reprobate do receive the forgiveness of sins.⁶

Now what has SLP done a year and some months after Moon’s speech to deal with his views, which are contrary to the Westminster standards and in harmony with the Federal Vision? In October 2009, when the SLP should have found a strong presumption of guilt against Moon, the SLP did the opposite and declared it found no strong presumption of guilt against Moon. In January of 2010 SLP had a second opportunity to begin the process of discipline with regard to Moon. A minister in the Presbytery brought forward a complaint against the October 2009 decision and asked the Presbytery to begin investigating Moon under a presumption of guilt; the complaint was denied and Moon remained a minister in good standing. In April the SLP had a third opportunity to deal with Moon when another minister sought to lay charges against him, but the Presbytery would not allow him to do so. To date SLP has done nothing to censure Moon and considers him an orthodox minister in good standing in the PCA.

SLP has failed to deal correctly with Moon’s views, nevertheless, the bright spot in the SLP is that there are men who will not give up in this important fight. Three of the Presbytery’s ministers brought a complaint against the Presbytery’s decisions to the General Assembly of the PCA. The General Assembly passed a report condemning Federal Vision in 2007. Surely the Standing Judicial Commission would overturn SLP’s decisions and demand Moon be investigated with a strong presumption of guilt! It didn’t . . . which will be the subject of our next article.



⁶ Moon’s use of the word “potential” to describe a reprobate person, is confusing at best and more than likely indicates that he does not believe in sovereign reprobation as taught in the Westminster Confession of Faith, chapter 3.

William Cameron Townsend— Father of Wycliffe Bible Translators and Summer Institute of Linguistics

As the Christian church spread throughout the known world, the Bible was translated into various languages so that people could read it in their own tongue. By the time of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, the Bible was translated into more than thirty languages. The next three centuries saw an increase in that work to such a degree that another thirty languages were added. The missionaries who were sent to foreign fields recognized immediately the great need for the Scriptures in the native tongue. Those men, including William Carey in India, Adoniram Judson in Burma, and Hudson Taylor in China, dedicated much of their time to translation work. The translation work became necessary even in America, where John Eliot translated the Bible into the language of the Algonquin Indians of Massachusetts.

As interest in missions grew, there was a significant change in the way in which Bible translation proceeded. Instead of the work being done by Bible scholars, monks in libraries and monasteries, and missionaries trained in the original languages, the work was increasingly undertaken by teams of individuals with minimal or no theological training who were sent all over the world. These people were trained in linguistics, were not preachers, did not work to establish churches, but devoted their time and energy to translating portions of the Bible into

the native languages. As soon as they accomplished the goal in one area, they moved to another. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, over 1,500 more translations of the Bible were published. Half of those have been since 1950. One man had much to do with that explosion in translations. His name was William Cameron Townsend, known as Cam, or Uncle Cam, to many.

W. Cameron Townsend was born in 1896 and was brought up in the Presbyterian faith in California. While attending a Presbyterian college in Los Angeles, he joined the Student Volunteer Movement and was inspired by missionary chapel speeches to get involved in missions. An opening came to sell Bibles in Latin America, so Cam applied and was assigned to Guatemala. But this was during World War I, and he decided to enlist in the military and give up his job as Bible salesman. A missionary from Guatemala made contact with him and rebuked him for being a coward by going to war, where a million other men will go, and refusing to go to Guatemala to sell Bibles. This single woman accused him of leaving the women to do the Lord's work alone. Cam felt her rebuke and applied for a discharge from his captain, who remarkably approved the discharge, telling him that he would be able to do a lot more good selling Bibles in Central America than shooting Germans in France.

Soon after arriving in Guatemala in August of 1917 with a college friend, he found out that there were many languages other than Spanish represented in that country. As Townsend lived among and got to know some of

Rev. Brummel is pastor of the Heritage Protestant Reformed Church in Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

the Indian tribes, one man took offense at his attempt to sell him a Spanish Bible and stated, "Why, if your God is so smart, hasn't he learned our language?" This statement moved Townsend to spend the next thirteen years of his life learning the language of the primitive Cakchiquel Indians, reducing it to written form, and translating a Bible into their language. It seemed initially like an impossible task to understand the different sounds that were seemingly indistinguishable, until an American archaeologist advised him to quit trying to press the Indian language into the Latin mold and instead try to find a logical pattern within the language. This advice changed the course of Townsend's language study, and it became the basis of his linguistic training program.

Townsend had an independent spirit. Once he saw the need for translating the Bible, he left his job selling Bibles and joined the Central American Mission (CAM). After he was finished translating the New Testament, the CAM desired to see him stay with the Indian tribe to build them up in the faith. But Townsend wanted to move on to another tribe and translate the Bible into their language instead. This resulted in resignation from CAM, and in 1934 he and another man founded Camp Wycliffe. This was not a mission organization, but was set up to provide linguistic training. The name was changed to Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL). But soon it began to serve a much broader audience of people involved in trade and government work who wanted to learn foreign languages.

In 1943, Wycliffe Bible Translators (WBT) was officially organized, and retired businessman Bill Nyman was appointed its president. This organization received funds for the support of Bible translators who were sent throughout the world. Today, WBT has its international headquarters in Singapore, is working in more than one thousand languages, and is completing translations of either the entire Bible or the New Testament in approximately thirty new languages each year. It takes an average of ten to fifteen years to translate the entire New Testament. It is estimated that there are almost seven thousand different languages spoken throughout the world, with the Bible or New Testament translated into about one third of them.

Townsend was a controversial figure in many ways. To his credit, he tried hard to avoid a one-man rule with

the organizations he started. He appointed boards of directors and others to lead those organizations. Often he was unhappy with and felt hindered by some of their plans, but he was willing to submit. To his fault, he often put a priority on good relationships with foreign governments above spiritual interests. He was often more involved in government social programs than promoting the gospel. He created controversy by authorizing the occasional use of mission planes and pilots for government use. He was willing to cooperate with and hire Pentecostals and Roman Catholics for translation work, an action that created tension within his organization. Although many of the translators did have college degrees and advanced degrees such as Ph.D.s, Townsend resisted all attempts to make college or seminary instruction prerequisite for Bible translation work. He himself was a college dropout, and although he was offered many honorary degrees and doctorates, he declined all but one from a Peruvian University, so that he could maintain affinity with translators without degrees.

Another controversial matter in the mid-1900s was Townsend's willingness to get women involved in the work. Initially he balked at sending women into some of the remote jungle areas, but after a few persisted and claimed that God would protect them as well as men, he relented. Unmarried women were accompanying couples in missions by this time, but they were not being sent out in pairs alone. Doris Cox and Loretta Anderson began their work in 1950 among one of the most feared head-hunting tribes in the Peruvian jungle. They admitted to being scared most of the time for the first five months. But eventually they won the hearts of the people, and even the chief was brought to confess Christ. Later the chief confided in Townsend that if two men would have come to their tribe, they would have killed both of them. If a couple had come, he would have killed the man and taken the woman for himself. But what could a great chief like himself do with two harmless girls who insisted on calling him their brother? This gave Townsend a testimony that he used over against those who continued to challenge his practice.

The one thing that motivated Townsend to press on in his work long after most men would have taken retirement was his view of the Bible. He insisted that the

greatest missionary is the Bible in the mother tongue. He often said that the Bible never needs a furlough and is never considered a foreigner. Townsend was so focused on getting the Bible into as many different languages as possible that he overlooked some significant things.

We are thankful for the high view of the Bible that Townsend exhibited. We are grateful for the strides made in understanding, putting to print, and establishing dictionaries for many languages of the world. While we understand the need for preaching to accompany the written Word, as Romans 10:14 teaches, who can object to the translation of the Bible into the languages of the world? We desire that God's Word be taught and preached to as many people in the world as possible, in their own languages, prior to the return of Jesus Christ.

But is this a positive trend with regard to Bible translation? While WBT seeks to maintain accuracy, clarity, and naturalness in every translation, there are serious pitfalls when one becomes so focused on getting the Bible into as many different languages as possible. Three concerns can be raised.

First, is it really a high view of Scripture to subject the Bible to translation by those who have no knowledge of the original languages and no theological instruction? Regardless of the high standards that WBT seeks to maintain, the end results are going to differ tremendously based on the theological bent and linguistic abilities of the translator, and on the English translation they are using as their starting point.

Second, how accurate is a translation that is put together by a small team of individuals? The task of Bible translation is very difficult because many languages do not have words for the biblical terms required to translate the Scriptures. Many times hard questions come up, for which there are no ready answers. For instance, a translator among the Eskimos finds all references to agriculture

difficult to translate. Bread is not known in many tropical countries. The translator is tempted to substitute other foods for bread. Terms such as justification do not have a proper word. Translators are required to find the closest, natural equivalent to the word, and coin new words and phrases at times. Working out these details is always very difficult. Historically these difficult decisions were faced by large teams of educated scholars who knew the original languages, were well versed in Reformed theology, and were committed to remaining faithful to the original text.

Third, should not those involved in the translating remain on the field to teach and instruct the people regarding the new vocabulary necessary for them to understand the Scriptures?

Townsend and WBT would argue that it is better to have at least a part of the Bible in the hands of the local

people, than nothing at all, and that something, even if it is not as good as it could be, is still better than nothing. But when it comes to Bible translations, there are some that are best not published, because of the damage that they can do to the cause of Christ. The words of Matthew 18:6 are sobering. If a poor translation leads to a person subscribing to false doctrine, then judgment will be met on the translator. "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he

were drowned in the depth of the sea." Jesus' final words at the close of the canon in Revelation 22:18, 19 make the work of translation very sobering: "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out


...is it really a high view of Scripture to subject the Bible to translation by those who have no knowledge of the original languages and no theological instruction?

of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.”

Far better is the practice of *churches* being involved in the translation. Churches need to send missionaries to lands where they will devote their lives to language study, translation, and discipling the locals. A newly-translated Bible that has language foreign to the culture of the people will have little use apart from preaching and study. And who is better equipped to do the preaching and teaching than those who were involved directly in the translating, those who understand the reasons behind the word choices.

Are we as churches willing to make the sacrifices necessary to undertake that kind of commitment to missions?

Do we have men and women willing to give their lives to that kind of work?

Rather than lower the standard, we must keep the standard high as to what is required to equip one to translate God's Word. There is a great need for godly scholars who are well grounded in the original languages, solidly Reformed, and equipped to translate the Scriptures and other Reformed literature accurately into the languages of the world. We are thankful for and can learn much from such mission organizations as WBT and SIM. Our prayer is that God will continue to raise up godly scholars and missionaries in our midst and give them the necessary gifts and graces to be willing to devote their lives to the important work of discipling the nations. 

NEWS FROM OUR CHURCHES

MR. BENJAMIN WIGGER

Congregation Activities

The Council of the Hudsonville, MI PRC has been busy the past year or so working on a proposal to update and renovate Hudsonville's existing church building. Continued growth in Hudsonville has resulted in the congregation outgrowing their space for catechism classes, Bible study, and Sunday school, as well as in their nursery, restrooms, and fellowship hall. Hoping to address those needs, the Council presented the congregation with a proposal to renovate their fellowship hall and the existing rooms around it, including an addition to the north side of their building and an entire parking

Mr. Wigger is a member of the Protestant Reformed Church of Hudsonville, Michigan.

lot reconstruction. The men of Hudsonville met on January 25 and voted to approve this proposal.

In perusing bulletins each week we often notice the different announcements concerning Bible societies and what they are studying. One such announcement caught our eye last week. The Men's Society of the Hope PRC in Walker, MI was considering the topic, "Is a Democracy Compatible with Christianity?" An interesting question, and one that gave us something to think about. I guess we will have to ask a member of that society what answer they came up with.

The Prayer Sister group of the Byron Center, MI PRC held their "reveal" get-together in late January. This group of women, 18 years old and older, provides a simple way for the ladies of Byron Center to get to know each other better, and it offers a way to encourage each other and pray for others specifically. This

group sends cards to their "secret prayer sister" throughout the year and gives a small gift at the party when the year wraps up. They also have the opportunity to send cards to various members of their church throughout the year.

Sister-Church Activities

Rev. A. Stewart, pastor of the Covenant PRC in Ballymena, NI, our sister church, presented a public lecture in the Lurgan Town Hall, in Lurgan, NI, on February 4 on the topic, "Predestination: What the Bible Says." Rev. Stewart hoped to answer various questions regarding predestination, including: What is predestination? Why are so many people scared of it? and How is it denied and opposed in our day?

Evangelism Activities

The Evangelism Committee

of the Providence PRC in Hudsonville, MI gave to the members of their congregation two CDs. One CD was by Rev. W. Bruinisma, entitled, "The Witness of the Reformed Believer," and the second by Rev. R. Kleyn, entitled, "Sounding Out the Word." These are of a lecture and a sermon given last year at the Covenant of Grace PRC in Spokane, WA, and were meant to serve as a help in personal witnessing.

The Evangelism Committee of the Loveland, CO PRC also made these two CDs available to their congregation. But rather than give each family a copy, they made them available through their church library.

Something new has been added to the website of the Immanuel PRC in Lacombe, AB, Canada (www.reformedalberta.ca): "Our Covenant God: An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Covenant from Scripture," by the late Rev. Herman Veldman, with an appendix, "The Expression 'Sanctified in Christ' in our Baptism Form." This is a series of seventeen articles from the *Standard Bearer*, written in 1947-1949, after meetings of representatives of the PRC with Prof. K. Schilder of the Liberated. This material touches on the issues underlying the Federal-Vision heresy.

The Evangelism Committee of the Georgetown PRC in Hudsonville, MI continues their work at the Men's Building of the Holland Rescue Mission in Holland, MI. Georgetown has been leading a Bible Study there each week on the

Ten Commandments. In addition, they distributed cassette albums of a series of sermons preached by their pastor, Rev. C. Haak, to area rest homes.

Highlights from the January meeting of the Evangelism Committee of the Southeast PRC in Grand Rapids, MI included a report that Southeast continues to supply about 300 pamphlets per month to 12 area restaurants. The committee also discussed the program that has been used in the past to supply audio cassettes of the *Standard Bearer* to about 30 blind people.

Young People's Activities

The Young People's Society of the Hull, IA PRC hosted a lock-in at the Dordt College Rec Center on January 21, starting at 10 p.m. In addition to serving pizza, snacks, and drinks throughout the night they organized a 3-on-3 basketball tournament for both boys and girls and a co-ed volleyball tournament to help keep the young people awake and active.

The congregation of the Southeast PRC in Grand Rapids, MI were invited to stay after their evening service on January 9 for a young people's fundraiser. Jared Langerak gave a repeat performance of the organ program he gave earlier at the PRC of Crete, IL. After the service the congregation was able to enjoy a light supper, which was followed by an hour of organ music. A collection was taken for this year's convention expenses.

The Young People's Society of the Doon, IA PRC hosted a skiing/snowboarding/tubing outing

at the Great Bear Resort on January 24.

Minister Activities

In the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Australia, the denomination with which our denomination has a Corresponding Relationship, David Torlach, who was trained in our seminary, was ordained and inducted into the office of the ministry of the Word and Sacraments on February 5 in the Winnaleah, Tasmania congregation. We rejoice with the Torlachs, the Winnaleah congregation, and the denomination at this gift of God. To Him be the praise and glory.

Rev. J. Marcus declined the call extended to him from the Wingham, Ontario PRC.

Rev. C. Spronk declined the call he received to serve as the next pastor of the Hope PRC in Walker, MI.

Rev. W. Langerak received two calls, besides the one from Southeast PRC—one to serve as pastor of the Edgerton, MN PRC, and the other to serve as pastor of the Hope PRC in Walker, MI. ☺

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Wedding Anniversary

■ With gratitude to God, we rejoice with our parents,

VIRG AND GEN WARNER,

in celebrating their 65th wedding anniversary on March 9, 2011.

We thank our heavenly Father for providing us with parents who set a godly example. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee" (Genesis 17:7).

- * Rev. Steve and Ginny Steenstra
- * Paul and Bev Neerhof
- * Jack and Kim Warner
- * Barry and Mary Warner
- 17 grandchildren
- 5 great grandchildren

Zeeland, Michigan

Wedding Anniversary

■ With gratefulness to God, we congratulate our parents,

FRED and ROSE IWEMA,

on the occasion of their 40th wedding anniversary. Throughout these 40 years, they were blessed with three daughters and six grandchildren:

- * Margie and Patrick Alsum
- Allyson, Joseph, Jason
- * Mary and Jared VanOverloop
- Tyler, Logan, Ethan
- * Sarah Lynn Iwema

We are so grateful for the godly example of marriage they have provided us, and we pray that God will bless them with many more happy years together. Psalm 89:1: "I will sing of the mercies of the LORD for ever; with my mouth will I make known thy faithfulness to all generations."

Elk Grove Village, Illinois

Congratulations

■ The Council and congregation of Byron Center PRC express their congratulations to their pastor,

REV. AUDRED SPRIENSMA.

Ordained as minister of the Word of God in 1981, Rev. Spriensma, this January, celebrated 30 years of faithful service.

"How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" (Romans 10:14).

Dale Bartelds, Clerk

Resolution of Sympathy

■ The Adult Fellowship Society of Hope PRC of Redlands wish to express Christian sympathy to Chris Feenstra, Glenn and Beth Feenstra, Marlin and Sarah Feenstra, and Wayne and Michelle Buiter in the death of their father,

DONALD FEENSTRA.

"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" (Revelation 21:4).

Rev. Martin VanderWal, President

Resolution of Sympathy

■ The Ladies' Society of Hudsonville PRC express their sympathy to Mrs. Grace Kamps in the death of her brother,

BEN VEGTER.

May she take comfort in knowing that this too was according to God's plan.

"Fear thou not; for I am with thee: be not dismayed; for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness" (Isaiah 41:10).

The Ladies' Society
Pat Lanning, Secretary

Notice

■ In keeping with vows made at baptism, the Loveland Protestant Reformed Christian School Society plans to begin providing Protestant Reformed high school education for their students in the 2011-2012 academic year. For a small community of supporters, this is a costly endeavor, involving, as it does, expansion of facilities and of teaching staff. 'Outside' support will therefore be much appreciated. Interested parties who would like further information about the project, and about how to contribute to it, are invited to contact Craig Poortinga, at craigtiffanyp@hotmail.com or (970) 593-1658. Heartfelt thanks for your generosity!

Available:

SALTSHAKERS MAGAZINE

A Reformed magazine published by youth in the Covenant

Evangelical Reformed Church in Singapore.

It is worthwhile reading for young people and older people.

Published every other month.

Available free by e-mail.

To subscribe, send an e-mail to: cksaltshakers@gmail.com.

Also available from the CERC website at: www.cerc.org.sg