

THE STANDARD

Bearer

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME XXXII

DECEMBER 1, 1955 — GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

NUMBER 5

MEDITATION

A Sweet Savour

"For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved and in them that perish: To the one we are the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things?" II Cor. 2:15, 16

A sweet savour of Christ!

What may that be?

The answer is not difficult, since in the immediate context this figurative speech is explained. Attend to verse 14: "Now thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of His knowledge by us in every place.

The sweet savour is the knowledge of God.

And that, my dear reader, is a lost heritage.

There was a time when we knew the Lord. That is long, long ago, in the first Paradise of God.

They knew God, that is, their progress was toward God, walking hand in hand in the garden of God. They knew His countenance, His will, His wondrous Being. And such knowledge made them rejoice all the day.

They also spread that savour. All the surrounding creatures experienced that they knew God. They were the priests of creation, and the brute creation knew it. They were not afraid of Adam, and they did not run at his approach.

And all such knowledge in Paradise was rooted in the love of God which was spread in the hearts of Adam and Eve.

Ah yes, Paradise was a beautiful picture of harmony and peace.

There walked the prophet, priest and king of God.

And there was happiness in his kingdom.

It was a sweet savour unto God.

But not of Christ. That was destined to appear later on in time.

But through one act of sin, he lost all that sweet savour.

As you all know: savour is taste and smell combined. And the savour of our text is sweet, and so this knowledge of God in Christ is sweet.

But I tell you that ever since Adam fell in Paradise, he does not spread such sweetness anymore.

There is our quarrel with the church of Jesus Christ today. Yes, we have a quarrel with the church of Christ. We have a quarrel with Mother who threw us out of her communion.

And here is the quarrel between her and us: she holds that Adam and Eve retained a small principle of the sweet savour of the knowledge of God, while we affirm that they lost all the sweet savour not only, but that it turned into its very opposite.

And such faith is according to the word of God.

Or do we not read that "a wicked man is loathsome, and cometh to shame"? Like wise, we read of the godless the following in Psalm 14:3, and Psalm 53:4: "they are altogether become filthy." And if you have a reference Bible, you will note that the Hebrew has "stinking" for the word "filthy."

Do you not notice that the Lord uses the very opposite figure to denote the present ethical and moral state of fallen man? In my text we hear the saint in Christ affirm that he is a sweet savour unto God, but in the above texts we read that fallen, wicked, godless man is stinking unto God.

But our dear, erring brethren keep on saying that man has retained a small principle of his original sweetness.

Even the saint of God will judge that apart from Christ he is nothing but wounds and bruises and putrifying sores that have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment. And if you would listen to Job's appraisal of self, especially as we find it in the original Hebrew, there is an anger that your "refined sensibilities" would be outraged, for I assure you that you will hear of terrible things. In truth, brethren, Job likens himself with a running, fetid sore! But the translation of our English fathers says: I abhor myself.

And if you know your Bible, you know that we could multiply these appraisals of self dozenfold. Man has lost his

original sweet savour, and has become a stinking object in God's nostrils, and to His taste.

* * * *

But then came the sweet savour of Christ.

And that savour is a thousand times thousand sweeter than the sweetness of Adam in the first Paradise.

Why?

Because Christ is the manifestation of the Almighty Covenant Jehovah.

In and through Christ there is manifested a knowledge of God which is far and above the knowledge, the natural knowledge of God in the first Paradise. The knowledge of God is now exalted to the heavens.

For Christ is in the bosom of the Father. And it is the determination of the Triune God that in that Christ all the fulness of God's covenant life shall dwell.

There are treasures of knowledge in Jesus that will make you happy for evermore.

Oh, that Christ knows God, and He declares, exegetes that God to us. If you would know God, look strongly on Jesus, His Person, His work, His suffering, His dying, His resurrection, etc.

Now we know this about God: He is so indescribably lovely and good that He will go to everlasting hell for you! Can you even imagine anything sweeter than that?

That is the sweet savour of Christ?

In whom is that savour?

In them that perish, and in them that are saved.

Both are facts.

Men are perishing; and men are being saved.

There are men (and women, and children) that come into contact with men who spread the sweet savour of the knowledge of God in Christ, with the result that they become deadlier than they were before. They were dead when they came into contact with this savour, and when this savour had done its work, they were deadlier.

What does this prove?

This: that God is unbelievable good and virtuous, but that wicked man is horribly wicked and perverse.

The sweeter the thing you give unto the wicked, the more wicked he becomes.

Now read that sentence once more, and you may recognize the most abominable sin ever committed on this sorry earth. What did the angel say to Mary? This: "... therefore also that *holy thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

And what did wicked men do to this HOLY THING? They crucified Him, the Lord of Glory.

There you have my text. Christ with all His Divine and heavenly flavour worked death unto the reprobate.

And so it is today and throughout history.

But in them that are saved He is the sweet savour of life unto life.

They come to church alive in the Lord, regenerated, converted, and hearing the Word of the Lord. And they leave the church more alive in Him. They have tasted that the Lord is gracious.

In them that are perishing; in them that are being saved.

Both terrible and wondrous.

But in both the apostle is a sweet savour.

* * * *

Unto whom?

Unto God.

That is what the text tells us.

Here you have the ever recurring theme of the Bible: all things are for God's sake. So also here. Paul, and his fellow laborers in the vineyard, is unto God a sweet savour of Christ in them that are perishing and in them that are being saved. It is again unto God!

Oh no, you cannot withdraw into a neutral corner when God is coming out to fight His battles. You will have to smell, and you do smell when He emits the sweet savour of His knowledge in Christ.

It is as in the case of Simon when he held the Babe Christ in his arms and addressed Mary and Joseph. That Christ child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign that shall be spoken against. And why? Listen: "that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed!"

And so it is with every sermon that is preached.

You cannot make a detour around the savour of His knowledge in Christ.

You are not and cannot be and remain neutral.

You either increase in life with God, or you perish a little more after every sermon you hear. It all depends whether you live unto God, or whether you are dead before His face.

But both reactions are unto Him.

And the one thing, the one sweet Thing, whether it kills you, or whether it makes you alive and quickens you, is unto God always a sweet savour. As also the men that spread it.

Do you not hear the echo from the Old Testament. What did Isaiah tell Israel? This: the Word of God would never return unto Him void. It shall always (saith God) accomplish that which I please! Either unto hardening or unto making tender. But either way, "it shall prosper in the thing whereunto I sent it." Isaiah 55:11b.

And so everything is unto God.

What a comfort for the poor preacher. He is often abused. But for God's sake. For His sake he is killed all the day long. They hate Christ. And so they hate the preachers for Christ's sake.

And the deepest reason is: they hate God.

For all things are unto God.

He is the Ultimate End of all things, both in heaven and in hell.

And through whom is that flavour, savour, sweetness, knowledge of God?

Strictly speaking, God, of course.

It is of Him, through Him, and unto Him.

We understand that very well.

But in a relative sense God will use mediums. He will send out Jesus the perfect Man first.

And then He will call certain Christians, and tell them: I will permeate you with the sweetness of My flavour, and then you stand into the midst of men, namely, the men unto whom I send My Gospel. And I will do the rest.

And so it goes through the ages.

Men are called, separated unto the Gospel. And they preach the Gospel. And as far as they are concerned, they would like to be a flavour unto life for all their audience. They would like to save all. Not one preacher enjoys being a savour of death unto death unto anyone. Attend to Moses and Paul.

But they bow the head. They bring the Word. They spread the savour of His knowledge.

His is the harvest. Amen.

G.V.

WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

On December 2, 1955, the Lord willing, our dear parents and grandparents,

MR. and MRS. JACOB PIPER

will commemorate their 40th wedding anniversary. We are thankful to our God for having spared them for each other and for us these many years. Our earnest prayer is that He may further bless them in the way that lies ahead.

Their grateful children

Mr. and Mrs. Barney Haak

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Morrow

Mr. and Mrs. Donald Lotterman

and 8 grandchildren.

"Some, more haughty than even Lucifer are not content with barely lifting themselves to an equality with Thee; but are most daringly desirous to govern and control Thee, Who art the King of kings. Such are they, who dread not to affirm, that, even in a common action, their own will walks first as an independent mistress; and that Thy will follows after, like on obsequious handmaid: that they themselves go foremost, like sovereign lords; but Thou walkest behind them, like an hired servant: that they issue their orders as kings; and that Thou, like an implicit subject, actest according to the imperial nod of their determining will."

—Dr. Bradwardine.

"The church of the elect, which is partly militant on earth, and partly triumphant in heaven, resembles a city built on both sides of a river. There is but the stream of death between grace and glory."

—Toplady

THE STANDARD BEARER

Semi-monthly, except monthly during June, July and August

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

Editor — REV. HERMAN HOEKSEMA

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

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

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

Subscription price: \$4.00 per year

Entered as Second Class matter at Grand Rapids, Michigan

C O N T E N T S

MEDITATION —

- A Sweet Savour..... 97
Rev. G. Vos

EDITORIALS —

- The Opinion of Judge Charles A. Flinn.....100
Rev. H. Hoeksema

OUR DOCTRINE —

- The Triple Knowledge (Part III — Of Thankfulness)....103
Rev. H. Hoeksema

THE DAY OF SHADOWS —

- The Prophecy of Haggai.....106
Rev. G. M. Ophoff

FEATURE ARTICLE —

- The Anti-Christian Implications of Russian Communism....109
Rev. E. Emanuel

IN HIS FEAR —

- Speech that Manifests Fear (4).....112
Rev. J. A. Heys

CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH —

- The Church and the Sacraments.....114
Rev. H. Veldman

DECENCY AND ORDER —

- The Office of the Elder.....116
Rev. G. Vanden Berg

ALL AROUND US —

- Love the Lord Thy God.....118
Is the Reformed Church in America an "Open
Communion" Church?.....118
Rev. M. Schipper

CONTRIBUTIONS —

- Hope Welcomes New Pastor.....120
John Lanning

EDITORIALS

The Opinion of Judge Charles A. Flinn

I here publish, without comment, the opinion of the judge in the Edgerton case:

STATE OF MINNESOTA)
COUNTY OF PIPESTONE) ss

IN DISTRICT COURT
THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

The Protestant Reformed Church
of Edgerton, Minnesota, a
corporation under the Laws of
The State of Minnesota,

Plaintiff,

FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND
ORDER FOR JUDGMENT.

vs

John Templeman, Gerard Mesman,
Marinus Mesman, Harold Gunnink,
Defendants.

The above entitled matter came on before the court to be tried without a jury. Mr. Benjamin Vander Kooi, Luverne, Minnesota, appeared as attorney for the plaintiff. Mr. L. M. Himmelman, Pipestone, Minnesota, appeared as attorney for the defendants. Following the trial of said action the matter was submitted to the court on a transcript of the testimony adduced at the trial and written briefs submitted by counsel.

NOW, THEREFORE, having heard the evidence and considered the same, together with the briefs of counsel, the transcript of the testimony, and all the records and files herein, it is found, as,

MATTERS OF FACT

I

That plaintiff is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota.

II

That the defendants are residents of the State of Minnesota and members of the congregation of the plaintiff church.

III

That plaintiff affiliated with the denomination known as the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America. That said church is bound by the usages, orders, and regulations of the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America.

IV

That plaintiff is governed by a consistory, consisting of elders and deacons. That under the discipline, rules and usages of the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America, the consistory is the governing body of the corporation and has charge of the temporalities of said church, including the building and personal property.

V

That said denomination is divided into two classis, namely, East and West. That the Classis East consists of all Protestant Reformed Churches east of the Mississippi River, and Classis West consists of all Protestant Reformed Churches west of the Mississippi River. That each church in said classis sends delegates, a minister and an elder, to said classis which meets at least once in three months or as otherwise provided in Article 41 of Church Order. The general synod of said denomination meets once every two years pursuant to Article 50 of Church Order.

VI

That sometime prior to August 31, 1953, one Hubert DeWolf, a minister in the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan, was suspended and deposed from his ministry by proceedings under the rules and usages of the consistory of said church and the said Classis East of the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America.

VII

That the suspension and deposition of the said Hubert DeWolf as a minister of the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America was based upon a matter of doctrinal interpretation not wholly in accord with the findings of the officers and members of some of the churches of said denomination and that such deposition became a matter of discussion in many of said churches.

VIII

That Classis West of the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America did on September 2, 1953, in Classis West meeting at Oskaloosa, Iowa, decide as follows: "That we cannot recognize the suspension of Rev. Hubert DeWolf and the deposition of the elders supporting him but on the contrary must consider Rev. Hubert DeWolf with his consistory and congregation as the legal and proper continuation of the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan."

IX

That on August 31, 1953, the consistory of the Protestant Reformed Church of Edgerton, Minnesota, met in session with the following members: John Doctor, J. Van Nieuwenhuyzen, James Ver Hey, John Templeman, Gerard Mesman, Marinus Mesman and Harold Gunnink, and that said consistory was on said date the duly constituted and governing body of said church, properly acting as said con-

sistory. That the defendants are a majority of the consistory of the Protestant Reformed Church of Edgerton, Minnesota.

X

That at a meeting of said consistory on August 31, 1953, a motion was duly made and carried by a majority vote of said consistory to the effect that the Protestant Reformed Church of Edgerton did not recognize the suspension and deposition of Rev. Hubert DeWolf as a pastor of the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

XI

That thereafter John Doctor, J. Van Nieuwenhuyzen and Jim Ver Hey, a minority of the consistory of the Protestant Reformed Church of Edgerton, claiming to act for said consistory, met and declared themselves to be the legal consistory of said Protestant Reformed Church of Edgerton and declared the defendants to be guilty of schism, and notified the defendants that they were suspended and deposed as members of the consistory of said church. That said John Doctor, J. Van Nieuwenhuyzen and Jim Ver Hey, claiming to act as the legal consistory of the plaintiff church and purportedly under the provisions of Art. 79 of the church order met with the Doon, Iowa, consistory and attempted to declare the defendants deposed from office as members of the consistory of the plaintiff church. That such attempted deposition was taken without any of the defendants being present. That such action was taken without the defendants being notified of any action or hearing being contemplated and without knowledge of any of said defendants of said meeting.

XII

That none of the members or officers of the Protestant Reformed Church of Edgerton ever filed any protest or complaint with Classis West, the next highest governing body of the Protestant Reformed Church, nor with any higher ecclesiastical body within said church organisation. That no attempt was made by any of the members of said Protestant Reformed Church of Edgerton to comply with the provisions of Article 31 of the Church Order, governing the Protestant Reformed Church.

XIII

That Classis West met on September 2, 1953 and refused to recognize the action of Classis East suspending the Rev. DeWolf of the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

XIV

That the Rev. Homer C. Hoeksema of Doon, Iowa, objected to such action and indicated his intention to appeal to the synod of the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America. That the consistory of the said Doon, Iowa, church thereafter originated a proposal to "reorganize" Classis West and with the consistories or purported consistories of other churches in Classis West, as in existence in August 1953, attempted to set up a Classis West of the churches not in agreement with the action of said Classis West taken in September 1953.

XV

That the synod of the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America had held its regular synodical meeting in June of 1953 at the Fuller Avenue church in Grand Rapids, Michigan, with duly accredited delegates present from all churches which were members of said synod. That said June 1953 synodical meeting adjourned until March 10, 1954, said adjourned meeting to be held at the Fuller Avenue church in Grand Rapids, Michigan. That on the agenda for said March 1954 adjourned meeting of said synod the only item to be considered was the report of a study group. That said adjourned meeting was called by the Stated Clerk of the Synod as in existence in June 1953. That no action was taken at said March 1954 adjourned meeting of synod deposing the defendants as the consistory of the plaintiff church. That no action was taken at said meeting reversing any of the action of Classis West at its September 1953 meeting.

XVI

That the minority of the consistory of the plaintiff church, together with other officers and members of various churches of Classis West as it existed in August 1953 constituted a faction supporting the deposition of Rev. DeWolf. That the defendants, as a majority of the consistory of the plaintiff church, and other officers and members of other churches West opposed the deposition of said Rev. DeWolf.

XVII

That the group supporting the deposition of Rev. DeWolf in Classis West, together with certain officers and members of some of the churches in Classis East, did not attend the adjourned meeting of synod held in March of 1954. That no proper appeal from the action of Classis West on the Rev. DeWolf deposition was ever presented to the said adjourned meeting of synod.

XVIII

That the group supporting the deposition of Rev. DeWolf held a purported meeting of synod consisting of delegates in accord with their views. That such purported meeting was not a legally constituted meeting of synod in according with the Church Order.

AS CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. That the plaintiff corporation is not entitled to any relief as against the defendants herein.
2. That the defendants herein are the duly constituted and legal consistory of the Protestant Reformed Church of Edgerton, Minnesota, and as such are entitled to the control of the property of said church and the use of the name of Protestant Reformed Church of Edgerton, Minnesota.
3. That the defendants have their costs and disbursements herein.

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.
Dated this 1st day
of November, 1955.

Charles A. Flinn
District Judge.

MEMORANDUM

The court commences in the present lamentable dispute with a recognition of the undoubted rule that the civil courts should not and cannot enter into any dispute relative to doctrinal matters in a church organization. Nor can it interfere with or enter into any dispute relative to church government. The court is, of course, bound by the well recognized rule that where a church congregation is divided, the group which has proceeded in accordance with the rules of the church government must be recognized as the group entitled to control of the physical property of any of the churches belonging to a certain denomination.

Here, counsel and all parties have stipulated that the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America are presbyterial in so far as their form of government is concerned. These churches supposedly are organized so that the consistory of a church is the governing body of the individual church. In case the action of the consistory aggrieves any officer or member of the church that officer or member must then appeal to the Classis of which the church is a member. The plaintiff church being a member of Classis West.

The Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America are divided into two groups. Classis West of which the plaintiff church is a member and Classis East consisting of churches east of the Mississippi River. Delegates from Classis East and West constitute the synod of the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America, and actions of this synod are in effect a court of last resort of the denomination.

The problem then is whether or not in the present split in the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America, the parties concerned followed the rules of the Church Order (plaintiff's exhibit 5) by taking proper appeal from consistory to Classis and from Classis to synod.

After a thorough study of the transcript of the testimony and the exhibits, it appears to the court that the members of the plaintiff church feeling themselves aggrieved by not agreeing with the action of their consistory in failing to recognize the deposition of Rev. DeWolf by Classis East, did not avail themselves of their proper remedy by appeal to the September 1953 meeting of Classis West. To the contrary, Messrs. Doctor, Van Nieuwenhuyzen and Ver Hey, at some date subsequent to the meeting of Classis West, met with the consistory of the Doon, Iowa, church, of which Rev. Homer C. Hoeksema was the minister, and a member of the faction with which they were affiliated, and attempted to depose the defendants as the consistory of the plaintiff church. This is evident by defendant's exhibit 2, dated September 11, 1953, which purports to give the results of some action taken prior to that date, although it is possible that no real action was attempted until September 17th or 18th.

It is only too apparent that the reason why no attempt was made to have an appeal from the action of the defendants as members of the consistory of the plaintiff church con-

sidered at the September meeting of Classis West, was that the group supporting the deposition of Rev. DeWolf was satisfied in advance of the Classis meeting that any action of Classis would be unfavorable to their views. Classis West although it had no real reason to act on the matter of the deposition of Rev. DeWolf by Classis East, did refuse to recognize such deposition.

With Rev. Homer C. Hoeksema as the organizer of the churches favorable to the deposition of Rev. DeWolf, a proper remedy was to appeal the action of Classis West to the next synodical meeting. Instead he purported to organize a new Classis West, calling it "reorganized" Classis West. Obviously, including in such supposed reorganized Classis West the churches favorable to their viewpoint on the DeWolf matter.

The synod of the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America had met in June 1953 apparently in reasonable peace and harmony, and then adjourned their meeting until March 10, 1954. This March 10, 1954 meeting of synod was not an annual meeting but merely an adjourned meeting and actually did not have on its agenda anything relative to the DeWolf matter. In March 1954, the breach on the DeWolf matter having widened, both factions attempted to hold what were called meetings of the synod, and at each of these meetings action was attempted to be taken in connection with the DeWolf matter.

The court feels that the action of the group supporting the deposition of Rev. DeWolf in attempting to organize a new Classis West upon realizing that they were defeated in the Classis West meeting in September 1953 was ill advised and not in accordance with the church rules. That therefore any attempted deposition of the defendants as the legal consistory of the plaintiff church by action at the Doon meeting or by action of the claimed reorganized classis is of no effect.

Neither can the court recognize any attempted action of the synod group supporting the deposition of the Rev. DeWolf as the legal action of the synod of the church. The regular synodical meeting in June of 1953 had met and adjourned until March of 1954 and could then take up only the matters then on its agenda. Only the delegates who had been accredited at the June 1953 meeting being the proper members of synod therefore it is felt that any action attempted by the anti De Wolf faction claiming to meet as the synod of the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America is void and of no effect.

Surely, in this whole dispute the remedy of the group claiming to be aggrieved by the action of consistory, classis or synod, is not an attempt to set up a new group favorable to their own viewpoint but to proceed according to the Church Order. A party aggrieved by the action of any church governing body cannot then proceed to attempt to suspend or depose the group whose action aggrieved them. Of course, here, both the group exposed to Rev. DeWolf and

(Continued on page 120)

OUR DOCTRINE

THE TRIPLE KNOWLEDGE

AN EXPOSITION OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM

PART III — OF THANKFULNESS

LORD'S DAY 50.

Chapter Two

Healing on the Prayer of Faith

Still more, in Mark 16:16-18 we read: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues; They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." Finally, the text that is most frequently quoted by those that believe in the healing of the sick through the prayer of faith is James 5:14, 15: "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." Scripture, therefore, certainly seems to lend support to those that believe in the healing of the sick by the prayer of faith.

We should never forget, in the first place, that the healing of the sick and the curing of the lame and the blind and the deaf by the Lord Jesus and also by His apostles were wonders, that they were by no means always accompanied by the prayer of faith on the part of those that witnessed them and were objects of them. They were wonders accomplished by the Son of God in the flesh, and through the same power of the Son of God in the disciples which He sent forth during His sojourn on earth, and by the power of the exalted Christ through the apostles afterwards. And a wonder is at the same time a sign of *the* wonder of grace, a sign of the coming of the kingdom of heaven, and a sign of the spiritual wonder of grace by which the sinner is turned from darkness into God's marvelous light. When the Lord healed the physically sick, it certainly was meant to be a sign of the recovery from the spiritual sickness of sin and death. When He opened the eyes of the physically blind, it was a sign of that wonder of grace whereby the sinner is empowered to see the spiritual things of the kingdom of heaven, to recognize his own spiritual blindness, his sin and his death, and to behold the wonder of the cross and of the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. When He opened the ears of the deaf, it certainly was a sign of that wonder of grace whereby the spiritual ears of the spiritually deaf are opened to hear the Word of God unto salvation. When He cleansed the lepers, that cleansing was a sign of that

wonder of grace whereby the sinner is delivered and cleansed from the pollution of sin and corruption, and sanctified to walk in a new and holy life. The same is true of all the signs and wonders which the Lord Jesus performed while He was in His earthly sojourn in the midst of the world. And even when He raised the physically dead, it certainly was a sign of that marvelous wonder of grace whereby the dead will be raised into incorruptibility and immortality in the day of the Lord Jesus Christ. The same is true of the signs and wonders that were performed by the disciples that were sent out throughout the land of Canaan during the earthly ministry of the Lord. And again, the same holds for the signs and wonders that were performed by the apostles after the resurrection and ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

It is evident that this has nothing to do with healing by the prayer of faith. In fact, many of the wonders which the Lord performed during His earthly ministry did not even presuppose faith in those that benefited by them. Nine of the ten lepers which the Lord cleansed, while only one returned to give Him thanks, certainly did not have faith when the Lord performed His wonder upon them. The man that was born blind and to whom the Lord gave his eyesight, according to John 9, certainly was not cured on the prayer of faith. The same is true of the feeding of the five thousand and of the four thousand in the desert. They certainly did not pray the Lord that He might give them bread to eat. And how about the raising of the young man of Nain, of the daughter of Jairus, and of Lazarus, whom He called out of the grave. There certainly was no activity of faith in them, and no prayer of faith before the Lord raised them from the dead. And the same is true of the wonders performed by the apostles after the ascension of the Lord and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. A clear illustration of this is the wonder performed on the man who was lame from his mother's womb, whom the people laid at the gate of the temple so that he might ask alms of the passersby. Of this we read in Acts 3:2-8: "And a certain man lame from his mother's womb was carried, whom they laid daily at the gate of the temple which is called Beautiful, to ask alms of them that entered into the temple; Who seeing Peter and John about to go into the temple asked an alms. And Peter, fastening his eyes upon him with John, said, Look on us. And he gave heed unto them, expecting to receive something of them. Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk. And he took him by the right hand, and lifted him up: and immediately his feet and ankle bones received strength. And he leaping up stood, and walked, and entered with them into the temple, walking, and leaping, and praising God." It is evident, therefore, that all these signs and wonders that were performed by Jesus and His apostles give absolutely no Scriptural ground for the pretention of those that claim that they can still heal the sick on the prayer of their faith.

But how about the passage in James 5:14, 15? Does not this text speak of the healing of the physically sick? Is not that physically sick man admonished to call to him the elders of the church, in order that they may pray over him and anoint him with oil in the name of the Lord? And is not the positive promise to that man that he shall be healed and be raised up?

My answer to this question is that the sickness mentioned in verse 14 of James 5 does not refer to physical sickness, but to spiritual weakness, discouragement, and the darkness of spiritual doubt and lack of faith.

My reasons for this interpretation are the following:

1) In the passage two different terms occur for what is translated in our English Bible by the word "sick." And these terms, although often denoting physical sickness, by no means always refer to the sickness of the body, but may just as well refer to spiritual weakness and illness of the soul. Thus, the term that is used in verse 15 occurs outside of the text in James only in Hebrews 12:3 and Revelation 2:3. In the former passage we read: "For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds." Here the term that is used for "sick" in James 5:15 is translated by "be wearied," and therefore denotes a certain spiritual weakness, spiritual retrogression in the faith, spiritual weariness, as a result of lack of patience in the midst of the suffering of this present time. And in Rev. 2:3 the Lord testifies of the saints in the church at Ephesus: ". . . And hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast labored, and hast not fainted." Here the term that is translated by "sick" in James 5:15 is rendered by "hast not fainted," which, according to the context, certainly cannot mean physical faintness, but refers to spiritual weariness.

As to the first word, translated by "sick" in the fourteenth verse of the passage in James, also this does not necessarily denote any physical ailment, but signifies simply 'weakness.' A comparison with other passages of Scripture where the word occurs can make this evident for everyone. Thus the word is used in Romans 8:3: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." Here the word is translated by "weak," and that too, in relation to the fulfillment of the law, and therefore cannot possibly refer to physical weakness or physical sickness. In Rom. 4:19 we read: "And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb." The very same word that in James 5:14 is translated by "sick" is rendered by the term "weak" in Romans 4:19, and that too, in reference to the faith of Abraham, and therefore cannot possibly denote physical sickness or weakness. The same rendering the term has in II Cor. 12:10: "Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong." That also in this

passage the term cannot possibly refer to physical weakness ought to be evident. The same is true of II Cor. 13:4: "For though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God. For we also are weak in him, but we shall live with him by the power of God toward you." And once more, in the same chapter, vs. 9: "For we are glad, when we are weak, and ye are strong."

From all these different illustrations from Scripture it ought to be evident that there is a good deal in favor of the view that also in James 5:14, 15 the reference is not to physical sickness, but rather to spiritual weakness and faintness of faith.

2) These considerations are confirmed when we pay attention to the context. In verse 13 mention is certainly made of physical affliction and suffering, *kakopatheî*: "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms." Whether this affliction refers simply to sickness, or to suffering inflicted upon us by men, makes no difference. Fact is that in this verse the reference is undoubtedly to physical suffering. Now it is certainly not probable that in vs. 14 we simply have a repetition of what the apostle had already mentioned in vs. 13: "Is any among you afflicted? . . . Is any sick among you?" This would be a senseless repetition. Added to this is the fact that in vs. 13 to the one that is afflicted the admonition is addressed that he must pray, while to the one that is sick according to vs. 14 the counsel is given that he must call the elders of the church, in order that they may pray for him. The meaning is evidently that in vs. 14 the sickness is of such a nature that there is no spiritual power to pray. Is one spiritually faint, in darkness and in doubt, weak in the faith, in hope, in patience? Is he spiritually so bowed down that his prayer will die on his lips? Well then, in that case let him call the elders of the church, in order that they may pray for him, anointing him with oil, a symbol of the Holy Spirit; for of that Spirit, that quickening Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, the one that is sick in that sense of the word has need. Of course, spiritual weakness and physical sickness may very well go together, even so that the latter is the occasion or cause of the former. Hence, the Scripture here teaches that we ought not to call the elders or the minister of the church for any kind of physical trouble. We must be able to pray ourselves also. But when our condition becomes such, when we become weak in the faith and faint in our spiritual life, so that we cannot pray any more, then we must call the elders of the church, that they may pray for us.

Nor must we overlook the fact that really in the entire context the subject is that of spiritual sickness and spiritual health, rather than of physical ailments. Even in the last clause of vs. 15 we read: "and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him," another proof that the question is not of physical sickness, but rather of spiritual weakness and faintness, so that the "sick" has no hold of the forgiveness of sins, and therefore on the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ. Again, in vs. 16 we read: "Confess your faults

one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." The clause, "that ye may be healed," certainly does not refer, according to the context, at least, to physical, but to spiritual healing. And in the last two verses of the same chapter the author once more refers to spiritual healing when he writes: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins."

3) Finally, there is also the consideration that in vs. 15 we have an absolute and unconditional promise that the prayer of faith shall save the sick. Now, one can possibly make of this unconditional promise all kinds of different applications that seem to fit somewhat the idea of physical healing, but no one will ever be able to succeed in applying this unconditional promise in all its significance to physical sickness and physical healing. It simply is not true that we always recover from our physical sickness. Nor do we have the promise in Scripture of constant physical health, if only we pray for it or call the elders of the church to pray for us. For presently the end must come, and we have to be willing to die and to pass into eternal glory. It is not a sign of a strong faith that when we are sick the prayer for recovery is the first that enters our mind and comes to our lips. At any rate, it ought to be perfectly plain that we have no promise in Scripture that when in physical sickness we pray, or call the elders of the church to pray for us, we surely shall recover from our illness.

On the basis of all these considerations I am persuaded that the text in James 5:14, 15 does not refer to physical, but to spiritual sickness, to weakness of faith and faintness in our entire spiritual life.

Of course, in normal circumstances, when we are sick physically, and the sickness is not necessarily fatal, we may recognize the Lord's hand and ask Him that He may cause us to recover from our illness, if it be His will. For as the Catechism has it, in our prayer for daily bread, we acknowledge God as the fount of all good. Besides, we may use the means which God gives us to recover from our sickness and even to prevent various serious ailments. Nevertheless, above all we must never forget that it is the God of our salvation that also sends us the sickness, and that above all we need grace to be patient and to believe that all things, also our sicknesses, work together for good to them that love God, who are the called according to His purpose.

Chapter Three

The Implications of the Fourth Petition

One of the first and chief implications of the fourth petition is that in it the believer acknowledges the absolute sovereignty of God over all things and His providential care for him in his daily life in the midst of the world.

Mark you well, the believer is taught in this petition to

turn directly to his heavenly Father, and to ask Him for his proper portion of bread for one day. And this certainly means, first of all, that we acknowledge Him as the only sovereign over all things, and, on the other hand, confess our own dependence on Him, and on Him alone. He only is the Lord of hosts, and His kingdom ruleth over all. In whatever way and by whatever means and through whatever channels we may obtain our daily bread, we boast not in self, not in our own ingenuity and wisdom, nor in men and in an arm of flesh, but acknowledge that God alone is sovereign and that He alone can and must give us our daily bread. We must never make the mistake of imagining that this prayer is adapted only for the poor, that must live by the day and that perhaps when the day is over have no idea from what source their bread for the morrow must come. On the contrary, this prayer is meant just as well for the rich. It is not meant only for those that must kneel down by their empty bread baskets every day to ask the Lord of all to fill them; but it is a petition that must be sent to the throne of grace also by those that sit down at their well-supplied tables, loaded with an abundance of food and drink. For that food is not ours: It is our heavenly Father's. We have no right to it in ourselves. It is the Lord God that must give it to us, and that must, besides, give it to us in His grace, if it is to be a blessing unto us. For man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. It is God, and God alone, that prepares our food and drink, our clothing and shelter, even as He provides for all His creatures. It is He that sends the springs into the valleys, to give drink to every beast of the field. It is He that makes a habitation for the fowls of the air, that causes the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man. It is He that prepares the wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil to make his face to shine, and bread which strengthens man's heart. Ps. 104:10-15. It is He that covers the heaven with clouds, and prepares rain for the earth. It is He that giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry. Ps. 147:8, 9. But He also governs all the affairs of men in labor and in industry, so that He supplies to us the means whereby we can procure food and drink and all the necessities of our daily life. Literally we may indeed say that it is He that brings our food to our tables. And this is true no matter what may be our position in the world. It may seem easier for the farmer than for the industrialist, for him that literally is dependent on the rain and the sunshine than for the laborer, to utter this prayer. For it is rather evident that God sends the rain and the sunshine, that He gives the increase and makes the corn ripen in the field. But it may appear more difficult how God also brings the loaf of bread to the table of the shopworker through all the maze of economic and industrial and commercial relationships that exist in our world. Yet, the believer knows that even over all these relationships his Father in heaven rules, and that He governs them absolutely.

H. H.

THE DAY OF SHADOWS

The Prophecy of Haggai

The preservation of the church in the convulsions that will destroy the godless world powers, Chapter ii. 20-23.

20. *And there was a word of Jehovah a second time to Haggai on the twenty fourth (day) of the month, saying,*

21. *Speak to Zerubbabel, Governor of Judah, I will shake the heavens and the earth;*

22. *And I will overturn the throne of the kingdom of the kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the nations, and I will overturn the chariot and the riders thereof; and shall go down the horses and their riders, each by the sword of his brother.*

23. *In that day, saith the Lord of hosts, I will take thee, Zerubbabel, the Son of Shealtiel, my servant, saith Jehovah, and I will set thee as a seal, for thee I have chosen, saith the Lord.*

20. *On the twenty-fourth day of the month*—It was the fourth and last message of Haggai. It was delivered on the same day as the preceding of which it forms the climax.

21. *Speak to Zerubbabel*—Though the promise was for all God's people, it was addressed directly to Zerubbabel, seeing that it concerned him first of all. *And shall shake the heavens and the earth*—an abridged reiteration of the promise of ii. 6 (see there).

22. This verse is an extension of ii. 7, "And I will shake the nations." Wherein this shaking is to consist is now explained. *And I will overturn the throne of the kingdoms—throne*—used collectively—thrones, governments. *Kingdoms*—the nations politically organized under one government. Indicated are the thrones of the kingdoms of the nations of our prophet's age and in the final instance the kingdoms of all the ages that were still to come and culminating in the anti-christian world power of the book of Revelation. Heading the list were the kingdoms and the nations of Haggai's own age particularly the Persian empire founded by Cyrus and under the yoke of which the post-exilic Israel of that time found itself and that consisted of several other nations. The Lord will overthrow them all and extinguish their glory sooner or later after they simultaneously or successively make their appearance. *Strength*—the means by which the rulers of the worldly kingdoms large and small entrench themselves in powers and impose their rule upon others. *Chariots . . . horses . . . riders*—These, their well-equipped armies, are their strength in which they trust. With these overthrown their thrones topple and their kingdoms perish. *Each by the sword of his brother*—Every man's sword will be against his fellow as was the case with the Midianite horde with which Gideon did battle in the times of the Judges. But the statement has a more general application. It points to civil war and must be taken to mean that

in their wars the kingdoms of the world will destroy themselves as well as each other.

25. *In that day*—In the period that this destruction is going on and is finally completed.

The initial fulfilment of our prophecy was the violent political commotions of our prophet's time. There were wars and rumors of wars as there are now in this present time. There was war between Persia and Babylon, Persia and Scythia, Persia and Greece, Syria and Egypt. So was the world of our prophet's time, its kingdoms and nationalities, passing away before his very eyes.

Zerubbabel—an offspring of David and as such the representative of his throne and dynasty (Luke iii.27). *My servant*—Though appointed governor by the king of Persia, he was the Lord's servant as ruler of His people. In a theocratic relation his office and the authority that went with it was the Lord's. Through the king of Persia as His organ, the Lord had appointed him to the office and was qualifying him for its duties also spiritually so that he was also the Lord's friend. *And I will take thee, Zerubbabel . . . my servant . . . and will set thee as a seal*—seal. a) "Any device bearing a design so made that it can impart an impression in relief upon a soft substance, as clay or wax. b.) An impression thus made." Here it is the impression made, so that the thought is that of Isa. 49:16, "Behold, I have engraven thee, Zerubbabel and thy people, upon the palms of my hands." The reason is stated in the succeeding verse, "*For thee have I chosen, saith the Lord*"—It means that Zerubbabel was precious in the Lord's eyes. And, therefore, in that day of toppling thrones and falling kings and kingdoms and perishing nationalities, Zerubbabel and his small and despised theocratic state there in Judea would abide and not pass away as would the other kingdoms. For the Lord would guard and protect him as the apple of His eye.

Zerubbabel was in need of this encouragement as builder of God's house. But eventually Israel, as God's city, would also fall and pass away. For it was but shadow, as was also Zerubbabel. He typified Christ. He is the true seal upon God's hands—He the Christ. His kingdom is unshakable. It shall abide forever. And the destruction of the kingdoms of the world pave the way for its appearance in glory. "that day" of our prophecy is, therefore, in the final instance, this present dispensation of the world, the end of which will come when the church has been gathered and God's house built.

* * *

(Having herewith completed my exegesis of this prophecy, I am now prepared to provide it with an introduction.)

The Book of The Prophet

The Content—The book consists of four addresses, words of the Lord, i, I—II; ii, I-9; ii,20-23, that bear on the rebuilding of the temple, and a section that describes the fruit of this first address (i, 12-15).

The first "word" (i, I-II) came to Zerubbabel and Joshua

— the civil and ecclesiastical heads of the Jewish people — on the first day of the sixth month of the second year of Darius, king of Persia (i. I). The prophet reproves the people because of their indifference to the condition of the temple. The house of God lies waste with them dwelling in costly houses (2-4). He urges them to pause and consider their way. Because of their carnality, they suffer shortage of crops owing to the fact that the curse of God is upon their fields and upon men and cattle and all the works of their hands. He exhorts them to build God's house and assures them that He will take pleasure in it (5-II). The preaching bears fruit. The attitude of the people changes and they fear before the Lord (12). To encourage them, He promises that He will be with them (13). Whereupon, on the twenty-fourth day of the sixth month, a commencement is made of the work (14, 15).

The second address (ii, 1-9) was delivered on the twenty-first day of the seventh month. Its purpose was to fortify the people against being dissipated by the gloom and despondency of the "ancient men" in the community who had seen the glory of the first temple and in whose eyes the glory of "this house" was as nothing in comparison with it (i-3). The Lord now proclaims His promises. His servants shall be strong, for He is with them (4). The promise of His covenant — the covenant of Sinai — and His Spirit will abide among them. They shall not fear (5). Once more he shall shake the heavens and the earth and the sea and the dry land, and they shall pass away. And there shall be new heavens and a new earth (6). And He shall shake the nations also, and the elect of the nations shall come to His worship. For the gold and the silver is His. So shall He gather His church, build His house. And "this house" shall be filled with His glory, surpassing by far the glory of Solomon's temple. And it shall be a house of peace (7-19).

The third address (ii, II-19) was spoken on the day on which the temple was founded, three months after the first steps toward its construction had been taken. This address promises relief from their present calamities, seeing that they are again zealous as builders of God's house. But at least a part of the people resented the rebukes of the prophet. They imagined that, sprinkled as they were by the blood of their sacrifices, they were holy in God's sight, they and their fields and all the work of their hands, and that, therefore, there could be no connection between their calamities and their neglectfulness regarding God's house. As armed with instruction derived from the priests, the prophet assures them, that, despite their sacrificing, they are unclean through their transgression. This being so, they pollute everything they touch, so that their sacrificing, too, as a work of their hands, is an abomination. Besides, they should understand that the sacrifice does not transmit its sacredness to their fields (10-14). The prophet once more calls attention to their present calamities, but hastens to add that from "this day upward" they shall be blessed of the Lord, seeing that they have repented. Their harvests will again be abundant (15-19).

The fourth message (ii, 20-23) was delivered on the same day as the preceding and sets forth new promises. The kingdoms of Zerubbabel's world shall fall and pass away. But he and his little theocratic state there in Judea shall abide. The Lord will protect him as the apple of His eye. The house of God, therefore, shall be built and completed.

The promise is Messianic, to be sure. Zerubbabel typified Christ. His kingdom is unshakable and shall abide forever. And the destruction of the kingdoms of the world pave the way for its appearance in glory (20-23).

The Prophet

In the Old Testament Scriptures, the name of our prophet is borne by none other. We cannot be certain regarding its meaning and etymology. It may be rendered *festival* or *Jehovah hath girded*. It could also be taken to mean *feast of Jehovah*.

Haggai prophesied to the remnant of Judah that had returned from the captivity of Babylon. He appeared upon the scene in the second year of Darius Hystaspis (B.C. 520) approximately fifteen years after the arrival of the Jews in Jerusalem. His recorded addresses bore upon the building of the temple. Four in number, they are brief messages to the people encouraging building operations. Jointly they cover but four months. Having uttered his prophecies, Haggai disappears from the scene just as suddenly as he had appeared. During his ministry he enjoyed the cooperation of Zechariah his successor in the prophetic office (Compare chps. i, I; ii, I, 10, 20 of Haggai's prophecy with Ezra v. I; vi. 14). This is all that we know with certainty of the personal history of our prophet. It has been inferred from chap. ii.3. that he belongs to the small company of Jews that beheld the glory of the first temple. But this is doubtful as then he must have been close to 80 years at the time of his public ministry. But that he was well along in years would seem to follow from the brevity of his prophetic activity. It is not unlikely that he was born in Babylon in the beginning of the captivity.

Date.

As was stated, Haggai wrought in the second year of Darius Hystaspis, king of Persia, that is in 520 B.C. During that year he received of the Lord four revelations that he communicated to the people on the day that they were communicated to him, the first on the first day of the sixth month (i, I), the second on the twenty-first day of the seventh month (ii, I), and the third and fourth on the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month (ii, 10, 20). He thus addressed the people on three different days and on four occasions.

Historical Situation.

In considering the historical situation that occasioned the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, it is well that we begin with the first return from exile. Cyrus captured Babylon in

538. B.C. In the second year of his reign he made a proclamation throughout his empire in which he exhorted the Jews to return to Jerusalem and build the house of God. Between forty and fifty thousand Jews responded. At first they manifested a commendable zeal. On their arrival in Jerusalem they went right to work. The altar of burnt offerings was built and set on its base, the legal festivals were reinstituted, workmen were hired and the materials gathered for the construction of the temple. And according to Ezra iii, 8-13 the foundation of the temple was laid in the second year.

But now began their troubles. At this time the Samaritans, the heathen nations that the king of Assyria had planted in the depopulated cities of the ten tribes, offered to build with them on the ground that they sought and worshipped the same God. But the request was indignantly rejected and from that day on the Samaritans were bitterly hostile. They tried to cause the work to cease. Doubtless now, too, as well as later when the walls of the city were being repaired, they mocked the people of Judea — the Jews — and threatened to make war against them (See Neh. iv, 18). The result was that the hands of the builders were weakened (Ezra iv, 5). Yet the work must have continued to progress, however slowly. For now and henceforth for thirteen years the Jews were accused of their adversaries before the kings of Persia by hired counselors. They wrote letters in which Jerusalem was presented to view as a rebellious city, hurtful to kings and provinces. They advised that the Jews be prohibited from building. But these machinations could get them no action from Cyrus nor from his son and successor, Cambyses, who reigned from 529 to 521. Perhaps they were too occupied with extending the boundaries of their empire to take any notice. But it was different with the usurper, Gaumata (the Artaxerxes of Ezra iv, 8). He had the records examined and was told that the charges were true. He now gave written command that the city be not built until further notice was given. A copy was sent and read to the leaders of the opposition in Palestine, who in haste went up to Jerusalem unto the Jews and made them to cease "by force and power" (Ezra iv, 24). Shortly thereafter Gaumata, after a reign of but seven months, was assassinated, and Darius Hystaspis acceded to the throne. It was found that he favored Judas, and the Jews, as aroused by the preaching of Haggai and Zechariah, resumed and completed the work of building God's house.

That the slow progress of the work during those thirteen years — in that interval between the founding of the temple and the beginning of the prophetic activity of Haggai and Zechariah — was not entirely owing to the hostility and opposition of the Samaritans is abundantly manifest from the Scripture passages that bear on this matter. 1) The Samaritans did the Jews no actual physical harm. They only threatened and plotted, but it was sufficient to weaken the hands of the builders. 2) the first ruler in the throne of the Persians to outlaw the building operations was the usurper Gaumata.

In the reliance upon the Lord and with their finger pointing to the proclamation of Cyrus, they should have kept right on building during those previous years. 3) The brevity of the usurper's reign — he ruled but seven months — and the fact that his successor, Darius Hystaspis, favored Judea, should have caused the Jews to resume the work. But it did not. They had to be stirred up by the exhortations and rebukes of Haggai. 4) They were being made to experience the curses of the law. The Lord was smiting them with hail and draught and mildew in token that, in neglecting His house, they were walking in a sinful way. But they refused to be instructed. Their miseries were an unmistakable sign that they should be building God's house, but as hardening their hearts they refused to see God's hand in their calamities. 7) While neglecting God's house as insisting that it was not the time to build, they beautified their own homes with their surplus wealth.

From all this it is clear that the real cause of the slowness of the progress of the work was not the animosity of the heathen but rather the disposition and posture of heart of the builders themselves. They had among them men, "ancient men," who had seen the first temple. In their eyes "this house" was nothing in comparison with the house of God in her first glory. So, when the foundation of "this house" was being laid, they had wept with a loud voice. They were that despondent. Being mostly priests and Levites and chief of the fathers (Ezra 3:12) they were a bad influence. Their despondency was contagious. Then, too, perhaps, there were many among them who were discouraged by the fact that the promise of the pre-exilic prophets of a glorious restoration was not being fulfilled, as they had expected. It may also be assumed that the true believers did not make up the bulk of the little community. This non-believing element could have no real need of the temple. And perhaps even the faithful, with the exception of a few, did not miss it too much, seeing that during the exile they had become accustomed to doing without it. The altar of burnt offerings had again been built and stood on its base. Sin was again being atoned. And so their fellowship was again with God at His altar. So they imagined. But they were mistaken. For in their neglectfulness of God's house, they were unspiritual.

It is plain that their disposition justified Haggai's ministry. It justified the tone and the matter of his addresses to them, and the method of treatment that he adopted toward them in these addresses. It was what they needed in their present spiritual condition. And it was also laid upon their hearts by the Lord, so that it bore fruit. They repented of their sinful indifference and did the work. And now that they were again zealous as builders of God's house, His blessings would again be in their fields and upon all the work of their hands.

To be able to estimate the sinfulness of their disposition

(Continued on page 117)

THE ANTI-CHRISTIAN IMPLICATIONS OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM

It must be understood and readily admitted that it is impossible to set forth all the "anti-Christian implications of Russian Communism. I say, this is impossible because Russian Communism is a *"world and life view."* Therefore, it must of necessity express itself regarding all spheres. In other words, in every relationship of life experienced by man, Russian Communism has something to say.

And what we consider to be the Truth, as revealed in God's Word and set forth in what we term Christianity (in its narrow and limited sense, as over against the Moderns and Liberals), also does the very same thing — expresses itself with regard to every experience and relationship of man. This expression may be direct or indirect, as in the matter of only setting forth a principle of interpretation.

In stating this fact, you can see everything is included such as the spheres of Religion, Science, Medicine, Economics, Social Life, etc. Furthermore, included under these specific spheres, there are any number of departments, or what might better be called "minor fields" which certainly must also be considered and an opinion expressed regarding them.

Therefore, to do justice to the title of this Article, one would have to consider these particular spheres with their sub-divisions and demonstrate how Russian Communism, with its *"world and life view,"* radically differs and opposes the *"world and life view"* of Christianity. However, this would be impossible since it would greatly exceed the length of this Article. Yet, because we firmly believe that all things in all spheres have absolutely no meaning apart from God, who brought them into being and who sustains them we can, in this article, endeavour to set forth that which Russian Communism considers to be of *prime importance*. In other words, for Christianity, the essential principle — the pivotal point — the place around which and in whom all things have any meaning, is the *Absolute, Sovereign and Holy God*. Now, then, this being true with regard to Christianity, we can consider what Russian Communism, in its *"world and life view,"* understands and holds to be comparable to that of the Absolute and Sovereign God, in Christianity. In this way, then, opposing the very fundamental and basic principle of Russian Communism to Christianity, we can arrive at some idea, at least, of the "anti-Christian implications of Russian Communism." Implications, I say, because when the *very basic principle* of any system of thought is presented, one naturally sets forth that which effects and thereby colors the whole *"world and life view"* of that system of thought.

This leads me to say that the title of this Article was not chosen arbitrarily, I am sure. It is assumed, and it is true that Russian Communism *does have* "anti-Christian implications." What some, however, consider to be Christian, is another question. Yet, the title of this Article is true and hence, was not chosen arbitrarily and without thought and

purpose of setting forth the truth of an existing situation.

On the other hand, this topic was *not simply selected* that we, as Protestant Reformed people, might also *"jump on the band-wagon"* as so many have done and are doing, and voice our objections to Communism. This is true of all of the so-called free world. It seems that all are raising their voices and condemning Communism. But why, may we ask? What is the reason? If you should ask the reason of a cross-section of the so-called free world, the answer would undoubtedly be: "Russian Communism is deserving not only of severe criticism, but denouncement and condemnation because it makes it impossible for the people to realize and enjoy the *"Four Freedoms."* And what are these "Four Freedoms?" *Freedom of Speech, Worship, Want, and Fear.*

In a report prepared by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and entitled: "Tensions Within the Soviet Union," we read the following: "*Public enemy No. v of the Kremlin is, however — and has been since the establishment of the Soviet regime in Russia — the nature of man himself, with all his inborn instincts and desires for well-being, personal property, moral freedom, and spiritual independence.*"

In these words, you can see, one of the reasons (one with many ramifications) why our own country, the United States, condemns Russian Communism. Its true, Russia is worthy of being openly and vehemently denounced, but *this reason* is a very shallow and superficial one, yea, a very hollow one. For don't you see, while in substance Russia is condemned for her materialism, in that very condemnation, the *"nature of man"* is upheld and defended. This means that the very materialism which is condemned on the one hand, is defended and exalted on the other hand. For, what is the nature of man? What are the "inborn instincts and desires for well being, etc?" Do not all these things manifest and reveal the sin and the corruption of man's heart? Do they not show what man is, by nature? Did not God see that *"the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually?"* (Ge. 6:5) Did He not declare: *"there is no man that sinneth not?"* (1 Kings 8:46). Is not man, by nature, *"shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin?"* (Psalm 51:5) And what does God behold when He looks upon man? *"Everyone of them is gone back: they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one."* (Ps. 53:3) Does not the Lord declare, through His servant, Isaiah that all men *"are as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away."* (Is. 64:4) And, under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, does not Paul cry out: *"O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"* (Rom. 7:24) Then, too, what is the purpose of God declaring: *"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbors?"* (Ex. 20:17)

Does not this language of the Holy God clearly reveal the

depths of sin in the heart of man? Furthermore, does not this language show us how this sin in the heart of man is manifested? He "longs for" and "pines away" for the earthly — for the "material" that the sinful desire and lust of his wicked heart may be satisfied. How then can we uphold "the nature of man with all his inborn instincts and desires for well-being?" What "good" can possibly come forth from man, as he is, by nature? Common grace may have the answer, but the Word of God knows nothing of such "good."

Very few there are who truly understand the "anti-Christian implications of Russian Communism." Therefore, to arrive at what Communism considers to be the very fundamental principle in its "world and life view" and to oppose this to Christianity, it is only proper that something be said of that which gave rise to this principle. Hence, we must briefly note that behind the "world and life view" of Russian Communism stand certain aspects of the philosophies of Hegel, Feuerbach, and also the contribution of the French sociologist, Proudhon.

Communism has given a very important place to Hegel's "Dialectics." From all that we read, Hegel fostered what is called a "Dialectical Idealism." He is referred to as an "idealist" because his concern was with the nature of ideas — thoughts and concepts. The manner in which these ideas and thoughts and concepts developed — the approach Hegel used to determine the nature of them has been called "dialectical."

This simply means that ideas which are completely opposite and contradictory are created. This is very evident, he held, because everywhere about us and even in our minds, there is an unfolding process, and this process is that of *contradiction or dialectics*. He said, further, that everything is in a state of flux; everything is always moving and changing. A thing changes into its very opposite and its very opposite then changes into something else. There is never any immutable (unchangeable) truth or principle for Hegel. All you have is ideas and thoughts. And these are the result of this dialectical process — process of contradiction. But this process, you see, can only end in despair because it is a vicious circle. As long as there is not any stable and unchanging truth which can serve as a standard and criterion for all times, then there can be no certainty, either. Yet, this is Hegel with his *thesis — antithesis and synthesis*.

For instance, if I am in a gathering and there is a question as to how we shall spend the evening, I might suggest that we go for a walk. Someone else might suggest that we remain at home. Disagreement and conflict arises, and out of this conflict comes forth the *synthesis*. We do not go for a walk, nor do we remain at home, but we go for an automobile ride. Now, strange as this example may sound, it nevertheless serves to illustrate Hegel's dialectical process; *thesis — antithesis, and synthesis*. In the first place, an idea is affirmed. Secondly, it is nullified or negated by another idea; then from this conflict, there comes forth the synthesis

which is nothing other than the reconciliation or union of the opposites.

From all this, Hegel concluded that there was nothing stable — stationary, or fixed; everything could be changed. Because once the synthesis takes place, the whole process begins afresh — the synthesis becomes another thesis. All reality, then, is nothing but a process of change — a going from that which isn't too clear, to that which is a little clearer. And to this thinking process, all the earth is subject because it is a part of it. In other words, the earth develops in the way in which we think. This process continues until such time as an ultimate idea or concept makes its appearance, and in which all opposites or contradictions are resolved.

But now, this Feuerbach was one who believed *only in matter*. Being thoroughly materialistically minded, he held that *only matter was the fundamental reality*. Nothing else was real but matter. Therefore, he added: *a man is what he eats*.

All this was quite appealing to Karl Marx who, at this time was formulating the philosophy of Russian Communism. He saw attractive elements in both Hegel and Feuerbach and hence, he took the dialectic process of Hegel and applied it *not* to thought, ideas and concepts, but to *matter and history*, as well. In this way, he combined the thinking of these two men and called it *dialectical materialism*. This meant, of course, what was true regarding the idea and thought with Hegel in his *thesis, antithesis, and synthesis*, would be true with Marx and Russian Communism regarding *matter or the earthly*. Therefore, Russian Communism says, *you don't need God because everything moves and changes and develops and is becoming*. Why? Because of this *thesis, antithesis and synthesis* in all the universe. This whole process, it says, will continue until such time as the "classless society" comes forth, and in which all opposites are resolved. For Russian Communism this meant the two great classes would disappear; the *Bourgeoisie*, the class known as Capitalists, who hire the wage-labour; and the class known as *proletariat*, those who must sell their labour-power to live.

But this isn't all. Marx also saw the value of Proudhon's contribution in which he emphasized the necessity of giving "economics" its rightful place. After all, said Proudhon, "economics" was very important therefore, the dialectical materialism should be applied to "economics." This, Marx did and the result was that "economics" became *basic and fundamental to all matter — to all reality*. Furthermore, in the system of Communism, it is the "hub" of all history — seeing that it is nothing but reality in "historical form."

Therefore, Russian Communism speaks not only of Dialectical Materialism, but also of an "Economic Determinism" and "Historical Materialism."

As one writer put it: "History is bread" for Russian Communism. *Economics* is now seen to be the *basic principle*. Why? Because "economics" is concerned with man, and man is concerned with the "material." Therefore,

according to Communism, "*man is economics*" — he's nothing but a mechanical being in the huge economic machine.

Well, this can mean only one thing. If you've got "Economic Determinism" and "Historical Materialism," the result of applied "Dialectical Materialism," *then one thing is sure: the Spiritual must certainly go. You can't possibly have any place for God, and Russian Communism hasn't either.* It refuses to recognize any God above it: *materialistic and atheistic it is in its ideals.* Hence, setting itself up as the "*preserver*" and "*saviour*" of man, it demands all of man's loyalty.

The purely *material* and *earthly* is that which receives the emphasis, as is evident from the place given to "*economics*" in Communism. As Karl Marx wrote in his "Poverty and Philosophy" — "*The social history of men is never anything but the history of their individual development, whether they are conscious of it or not. Their material relations are the basis of all their relations. These material relations are only the necessary form in which their material and individual activity is realized.*"

Thus, it becomes imperative to do away with the differences or inequalities among men and bring forth a "*classless society*" according to Marx. *This will be the ultimate synthesis* and "*economics*," being the very fundamental and basic principle of Russian Communism's "*world and life view*" is considered to be the principle that will bring this synthesis. Why? Because "*economics*" concerns the abundance of things and *all this is necessary* to remove the lines of inequality, according to Communism.

But, now, we ask: "*Is not God, God?* And therefore, must not Russian Communism be condemned because, as we have seen, *in its very essence, it is rebellion against God* and in direct conflict to His Truth? Isn't this so? *Of course it is!* But, where do we read of Communism being condemned because of this? Rebellion against God. *Not the god of the Modernist nor even of the Arminian-Fundamentalist, who sows the seed of Modernism.* But where do you read or hear such a condemnation of Communism because it is *a rising-up of the creature against the Creator* — the Sovereign Creator who is no respecter of persons and therefore has declared: "*Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.*"

The Sovereign Creator who made all things and in the midst of all things placed man and called him to serve and glorify His God as a faithful steward, in the way of consecrating all things to Him.

Where do you read of Communism being condemned because God, in His Sovereign and Righteous Justice gave man gifts — *not only creating the spiritually rich and the spiritually destitute, according to His Sovereign Election and Reprobation, bringing forth the "Jacobs" and the "Esaus"* — but where is there such condemnation of Communism because it is *also this same Sovereign God who makes the earthly rich, and the earthly poor* — who even declares: "*For ye have the poor always with you.*"

When we speak of the "anti-Christian implications of

Russian Communism, we do so from the viewpoint that Communism, in its sinful and darkened mind, wilfully rejects the truth that it is the Sovereign God who "*putteth down one, and setteth up another.*" It is the Lord who "*doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel.*"

Therefore, *all men are not equal before God's face.* The difference is there and Russian Communism may *not* and *cannot attempt* to erase and remove that difference with her sinful and wicked philosophy of *atheistic materialism.* *She can never do it!* Because the very essence of her philosophy which is exemplified in the "*material*" — in the things with which she sinfully strives to realize her ends — *the earth and the earthly goods* — these, do not belong to her. For *all things are the Lord's* and hence, she may not act like the thief that she is.

But now, in all sincerity, I ask again: "Where do we read of any such denouncement and condemnation of Communism?" And I answer: "*Only from the lips of those who have been given to taste the Mercy and the Grace of the Sovereign God of their salvation, and whom they desire to exalt in all their life and walk.*"

E. Emanuel

HE HOLDS THE KEY

Is there some problem in your life to solve,
Some passage seeming full of mystery?
God knows, Who brings the hidden things to light.
He holds the key.

Is there some door closed by the Father's hand,
Which widely opened you had hoped to see?
Trust God, and wait; for when He shuts the door,
He holds the key.

Is there some earnest prayer unanswered yet,
Or answered not as you had hoped 't would be?
God will make clear His purpose by and by.
He holds the key.

Have patience with your God, your patient God,
All-wise, all-knowing, not long tarrying, He.
And of the doors of all your future life
He holds the key.

Unfailing comfort, sweet and blessed rest,
To know of every door He holds the key;
That He at last, when just He sees 'tis best,
Will give it thee.

"Whoever hath Christ, cannot be poor; whoever wants Him, cannot be rich."
— DYER

IN HIS FEAR

Speech That Manifests Fear

(4)

No one likes a proud man.

And by nature all men are proud.

It is the very pride of man that he hates a proud man. The hatred of pride in the natural man is not a spiritual virtue. In the natural man hatred of the proud is the reaction of one carnally proud heart and mind to the boastful and haughty deeds and words of another. Because the natural heart is itself proud, it cannot stand to hear some other proud heart boast of being more than itself.

Man may be very shy and retiring. By all that the natural eye sees he may appear to be so very humble. Yet his fear before men which this shyness and inferiority-complex reveal may be rooted in pride. So proud he may be of his name, position, social standing or the like that he retires into the corner lest he suffer shame or ridicule. He is extremely sensitive to ridicule, criticism and shame; and fearing them he stays quietly in his corner because his pride makes him so sensitive.

Fear of men is not necessarily humility.

The fear of the Lord is always humility.

To fear Him and to be proud at the same time is impossible. He seeth the proud afar off but hath respect unto the humble. And Adam and Eve, when they lost their fear of Him, dared to go ahead and disobey His command not to eat of the forbidden fruit.

He hates pride in righteous jealousy, for He is God; and there is no God besides Him. Paul tells us in his epistle to Timothy that the condemnation of the devil is pride, I Tim. 3:6. And all men as they are spiritually his seed and children have that pride in them and have not the fear of the Lord, except it be given them by God as He causes them to be born again.

That is why the shy, retiring, bashful man who cowers before his fellow men and manifests a definite fear before them is often bold to speak haughtily before God! He dares to criticize God whereas he fears to whisper a complaint against his employer, his neighbour or even before a friend.

We do! We all dare to criticize God. That is the pride of our old nature. And we do that in many, many ways. We do when we grumble when He sends us things contrary to our wishes. We do when He prevents our plans from being realized. We dare to call it all wrong.

In His sovereign good pleasure and in His righteousness indignation God sends the storms, the hurricanes and tornadoes—things which were never in the world before the fall of man and the entrance of sin into the world—the hail and the sleet. And the man who dares not raise his voice in protest to the man who employs him and treats him shame-

fully will utter speech which shows disrespect to the Living God rather than fear, reverence and awe before His majesty, His sovereignty and righteousness.

The shy, retiring and meek little man who dares not ask his "boss" for a raise, who dares not express an opinion contrary to that given by a fellow mortal is bold to speak up when the Almighty, Sovereign God has wrought a work that displeases him.

How often have we not grumbled, criticized and spoken disrespectfully of God's works that displease us. We ask: "Does it have to rain again?" Or we grumbling and protesting against the Sovereign God say: "Look! It would have to rain just when we got all set for having some fun." Do we not realize that such statements and questions are directed toward God? He sent that rain. He chose the moment for it to pour down. He with His finger guided the clouds and sent the winds to bring them to that particular spot at that definite moment. We criticize Him when we ask whether it has to rain again. We find fault with Him when we grumble that it would just have to rain the day we had set aside for fun and pleasure. Our speech so quickly and plainly reveals that we are not walking in His fear.

And when He sends things our way, when He piles affliction upon affliction upon an individual—and does it sovereignly in His good pleasure—we sometimes dare to say: "That should not have happened to a dog!" It pleased God to have it happen to a man, and we dare to express the thought that God should not even have caused a dog to experience such a thing.

And in that holy sphere of prayer?

We must constantly be on our guard in our prayers lest in them likewise we utter speech of pride and arrogance rather than speech that manifests fear. We are all too quick in prayer to criticize what God sends and to ask Him please to change it for our sakes. How carnal we are. The rain for which the farmer longs and from his viewpoint he needs for the growth of his crop spoils our plans for a holiday. The farmer rejoices and gives thanks to God for the timely shower; while others may even dare to go thru the motions of praying to God and asking Him to withhold it or make it to cease. We say "go thru the motions of praying" to Him because actually that is not prayer. Such a man surely does not stand in his thoughts and desires before Jehovah. He may stand before a god of his own imagination, some goody-goody who exists for the good of man and in a wishy, washy way tries to please all men. But before a sovereign, unchangeable God Who declares to us in His word that He is the "I am that I am" he does not stand.

A request of the Sovereign God may very well reveal a proud heart. The expression of a heart that is not content with the lot God has given it is not one of fear and humility before God but one of pride and haughty criticism of the works of a Sovereign God!

It may sound pious. It may seem to breathe all kinds of spirituality. I once heard a minister pray that God might

"increase the number of the elect." Such a prayer may sound so full of love. It may sound like the words of Stephen: "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." It may seem to breathe the same spirit as Jesus' words on the cross: "Father forgive them for they know not what they do." It may seem to echo the sentiment of Paul when he says that he could wish himself accursed for his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh. But the fact remains that such a petition is rooted in pride and breathes a spirit of criticism of the works, the eternal works of the unchangeable and sovereign God.

It surely does not fit in with the prayer of Jesus: "I thank Thee O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou has hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them to babes", Matthew 11:25. Significantly enough, Jesus adds, "Even, so Father, for so it seems good in Thy sight." That breathes humility before God. That is the speech that recognizes His sovereignty and bows before it. God does not increase the number of the elect in time! From eternity He chose His people, how many and who they are. For, names are written in the Lamb's book of life. And names refer to persons. God chose persons not simply places which will be filled by the persons who are willing to fill them. Heaven and the kingdom of heaven is not ruled by the principle of "First come, first served." There are not so many seats in heaven, so that and as soon as they are filled God will bring this world to an end. God decreed how many and who would be saved; and He upholds the world in its present form until the last one of these is born and born again. Then this world will have served His purpose and He will usher in the new world in which righteousness shall dwell.

Let us be careful in our prayers lest we criticize God's works. Let us be careful lest we evince a spirit of knowing a few things ourselves which we better relate to Him for His instruction. Perish the thought! Yet we do exactly that at times in our prayers. Let us beware lest in pride we come before Him to tell Him what the course of our life in the future ought to be, what ought to happen to us. Let us beware lest we even dare to come before Him to tell Him what is best for His church here below in the way of material and natural things.

We want to build a new school. We have plans for a new church edifice. Our church or our school is in financial difficulties. We are on the board of some institution of mercy that is supported by the churches to which we belong. We plan a drive. We set out to collect for these causes which undoubtedly are worthy causes. But do we first dare to go to God and tell Him that we just have to have this money? The cause may be a worthy one—worthy in the sense that it is in the spirit of what God enjoins of us in the Scriptures. Missionary activity is also a worthy cause. No doubt about that! But it does not always please God to prosper that missionary activity in a financial and material way. Did the Spirit not even forbid Paul to preach the word in Asia?

That occurs countless times in the New Dispensation. The Spirit does not speak audibly to the church to forbid such things. But He does close the door by making it either financially impossible for the church or else thru the ban and law of the ruler of the land where men had purposed to bring the Gospel. Do we then dare to tell God that this is all wrong? Dare we tell Him that His kingdom cannot get along without our sending a missionary here or there? Are we walking in His fear in our prayers when we dare to tell Him that we just got to get that new church building, the addition to the school, to hire a few more nurses and doctors, to purchase more beds and this and that equipment?

Thrice Paul prayed for the removal of the torn in his flesh. And we would surely be inclined to think that with its removal Paul would have been able to serve the church of God to a greater degree than he did with it being present. But God said, "My grace is sufficient for thee." Let that be our comfort also when projects in the church and its sphere which we have planned and strive to realize are plainly not the will and plan of God. But let us by all means watch our speech and thoughts in our prayers lest we assume an attitude of criticism of the ways of God. Let our prayers utter speech that is characterized by praise and not by pride.

Let our speech, then, whether in prayer or conversation among men, whether to man or to God, always be characterized by this that we say "Not my will but Thy will be done." Such speech praises God. For such speech declares that He is a sovereign God. Such speech manifests fear before Him. It reveals that we stand in awe and reverence before Him.

When the weather is contrary to our flesh, let us bow before Him Who sent it to us. Then we will not ask (Him) whether it has to rain again. Then we will not grumble and ask (Him) whether it is ever going to warm up again. Then we will not criticize His works and say that He should not have caused this to happen to a dog. We will say, "Not my will but Thy will be done."

Speech that manifests fear before Him is the speech of humility.

And that speech is possible only as the Spirit of Him Who humbled Himself even unto death is given us. Only as His mind is in us will we speak His language of praise rather than of pride.

Speech that manifests His fear manifests also His mercy.

For in His mercy He humbles us and sanctifies our hearts, minds and tongues.

J.A.H.

"Inward holiness and eternal glory are the crown with which God adorns and dignifies His elect. But they are not the cause of election. A king is not made a king, by the royal robes he wears, and by the crown that encircles his brow; but he therefore wears his robes, and puts on his crown, because he is king." — Toplady

Contending For The Faith

The Church and the Sacraments

VIEWS DURING THE SECOND PERIOD (300-750 A.D.)

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

THE PAPACY (by Philip Schaff).

(Continued)

The North African bishops and councils in the beginning of the fifth century, with all traditional reverence for the apostolic see, repeatedly protested, in the spirit of Cyprian, against encroachments of Rome, and even prohibited all appeal in church controversies from their own to a transmarine or foreign tribunal, upon pain of excommunication. The occasion of this was an appeal to Rome by the presbyter Apiarius, who had been deposed for sundry offences by Bishop Urbanus, of Sicca, a disciple and friend of Augustine, and whose restoration was twice attempted, by Pope Zosimus in 418, and by Pope Coelestine in 424. From this we see that the popes gladly undertook to interfere for a palpably unworthy priest, and thus sacrificed the interests of local discipline, only to make their own superior authority felt. The Africans referred to the genuine Nicene canon (for which Zosimus had substituted the Sardican appendix respecting the appellate jurisdiction of Rome, of which the Nicene council knew nothing), and reminded the pope, that the gift of the Holy Ghost, needful for passing a just judgment, was not lacking to any province, and that he could as well inspire a whole province as a single bishop. The last document in the case of this appeal of Apiarius is a letter of the (twentieth) council of Carthage, in 424, to Pope Coelestine I, to the following purport: "Apiarius asked a new trial, and gross misdeeds of his were thereby brought to light. The papal legate, Faustinus, has, in the face of this, in a very harsh manner demanded the reception of this man into the fellowship of the Africans, because he has appealed to the pope and been received into fellowship by him. But this very thing ought not to have been done. At last has Apiarius himself acknowledged all his crimes, The pope may hereafter no longer so readily give audience to those who come from Africa to Rome, like Apiarius, nor receive the excommunicated into church communion, be they bishops or priests, as the council of Nice (can. 5) has ordained, in whose direction bishops are included. The assumption of appeal to Rome is a trespass on the rights of the African church, and what has been (by Zosimus and his legates) brought forward as a Nicene ordinance for it, is not Nicene, and is not to be found in the genuine copies of the Nicene Acts, which have been received from Constantinople and Alexandria. Let the pope, therefore, in the future send no more judges to

Africa, and since Apiarius has now been excluded for his offences, the pope will surely not expect the African church to submit longer to the annoyances of the legate Faustinus. May God the Lord long preserve the pope, and may the pope pray for the Africans." In the Pelagian controversy the weak Zosimus, who, in opposition to the judgment of his predecessor Innocent, had at first expressed himself favorably to the heretics, was even compelled by the Africans to yield. The North African church maintained this position under the lead of the greatest of the Latin fathers, St. Augustine, who in other respects contributed more than any other theologian or bishop to the erection of the Catholic system. She first made submission to the Roman jurisdiction, in the sense of her weakness, under the shocks of the Vandals. Leo (440-461) was the first pope who could boast of having extended the diocese of Rome beyond Europe into another quarter of the globe. He and Gregory the Great wrote to the African bishops entirely in the tone of paternal authority without provoking reply.

In Spain the popes found from the first a more favorable field. The orthodox bishops there were so pressed in the fifth century by the Arian Vandals, Suevi, Alani, and soon after by the Goths, that they sought counsel and protection with the bishop of Rome, which, for his own sake, he was always glad to give. So early as 385, Siricius, as we have before observed, issued a decretal letter to a Spanish bishop. The epistles of Leo to Bishop Turibius of Asturica, and the bishops of Gaul and Spain, are instances of the same authoritative style. Simplicius (467-483) appointed the bishop Zeno of Sevilla papal vicar, and Gregory the Great, with a paternal letter, conferred the pallium on Leander, bishop of Sevilla.

In Gaul, Leo succeeded in asserting the Roman jurisdiction, though not without opposition, in the affair of the archbishop Hilary of Arles, or Arelate. The affair has been differently represented from the Gallican and the ultramontane points of view. Hilary (born 403, died 449), first a rigid monk, then, against his will, elevated to the bishopric, an eloquent preacher, an energetic prelate, and the first champion of the freedom of the Gallican church against the pretensions of Rome, but himself not free from hierarchical ambition, deposed Celidonius, the bishop of Besancon, at a council in that city, because he had married a widow before his ordination, and had presided as judge at a criminal trial and pronounced sentence, of death; which things, according to the ecclesiastical law, incapacitated him for the episcopal office. This was unquestionably an encroachment on the province of Vienne, to which Besancon belonged. Pope Zosimus had, indeed, in 417, twenty-eight years before, appointed the bishop of Arles, which was a capital of seven provinces, to be papal vicar in Gaul, and had granted him metropolitan rights in the provinces Viennensis, and Narbonensis prima and secunda, though with the reservation of *causae majores*. The metropolitans of Vienne, Narbonne, and Marseilles, however, did not accept this arrangement,

and the succeeding popes found it best to recognize again the old metropolitans. Celidonius appealed to Leo against that act of Hilary. Leo, in 445, assembled a Roman council (*concilium sacerdotum*), and reinstated him, as the accusation of Hilary, who himself journeyed on foot in the winter to Rome, and protested most vehemently against the appeal, could not be proven to the satisfaction of the pope. In fact, he directly or indirectly caused Hilary to be imprisoned, and, when he escaped and fled back to Gaul, cut him off from the communion of the Roman church, and deprived him of all prerogatives in the diocese of Vienne, which had been only temporarily conferred on the bishop of Arles, and were by a better judgment taken away.

He accused him of assaults on the rights of other Galilean metropolitans, and above all of insubordination toward the principality of the most blessed Peter; and he goes so far as to say: "Whoso disputes the primacy of the apostle Peter, can in no way lessen the apostle's dignity, but, puffed up by the spirit of his own pride, he destroys himself in hell." Only out of special grace did he leave Hilary in his bishopric. Not satisfied with this, he applied to the secular arm for help, and procured from the weak Western emperor, Valentinian III, an edict to Aëtius, the *magister militum* of Gaul, in which it is asserted, almost in the words of Leo, that the whole world acknowledges the Roman see as director and governor; that neither Hilary nor any bishop might oppose his commands; that neither Gallican nor other bishops should, contrary to the ancient custom, do anything without the authority of the venerable pope of the eternal city; and that all decrees of the pope have the force of law.

The letter of Leo to the Gallican churches, and the edict of the emperor, give us the first example of a defensive and offensive alliance of the central spiritual and temporal powers in the pursuit of an unlimited sovereignty. The edict, however, could of course have power, at most, only in the West, to which the authority of Valentinian was limited. In fact, even Hilary and his successors maintained, in spite of Leo, the prerogatives they had formerly received from Pope Zosimus, and were confirmed in them by later popes. Beyond this the issue of the contest is unknown. Hilary of Arles died in 449, universally esteemed and loved, without, so far as we know, having become formally reconciled with Rome; though, notwithstanding this, he figures in a remarkable manner in the Roman calendar, by the side of his papal antagonist Leo, as a canonical saint. Undoubtedly Leo proceeded in this controversy far too rigorously and intemperately against Hilary; yet it was important that he should hold fast the right of appeal as a guarantee of the freedom of bishops against the encroachment of metropolitans. The papal despotism often proved itself a wholesome check upon the despotism of subordinate prelates.

With Northern Gaul the Roman bishops came into less frequent contact; yet in this region also there occur, in the

fourth and fifth centuries, examples of the successful assertion of their jurisdiction.

The early British church held from the first a very isolated position, and was driven back by the invasion of the pagan Anglo-Saxons, about the middle of the fifth century, into the mountains of Wales, Cornwallis, Cumberland, and the still more secluded islands. Not till the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons under Gregory the Great did a regular connection begin between England and Rome.

Finally, the Roman bishops succeeded also in extending their patriarchal power eastward, over the *praefecture* of East Illyria. Illyria belonged originally to the Western empire, remained true to the Nicene faith through the Arian controversies, and for the vindication of that faith attached itself closely to Rome. When Gratian, in 379, incorporated Illyricum Orientale with the Eastern empire, its bishops nevertheless refused to give up their former ecclesiastical connection. Damascus conferred on the metropolitan Achaïus, of Thessalonica, as papal vicar, patriarchal rights in the new *praefecture*. The patriarch of Constantinople endeavored, indeed, repeatedly, to bring this ground into his diocese, but in vain. Justinian, in 535, formed of it a new diocese, with an independent patriarch at Prima Justiniana (or Achrida, his native city); but this arbitrary innovation had no vitality, and Gregory I received active intercourse with the Illyrian bishops. Not until the eighth century, under the emperor Leo the Isaurian, was East Illyria finally severed from the Roman diocese and incorporated with the patriarchate of Constantinople.

From this description of the rise of the papacy, in this and preceding articles, as narrated by Philip Schaff, it is evident that the rise of the papacy was gradual, and that the contention of the Roman Catholic Church, that the pope at Rome is the successor of the apostle, Peter, is hardly substantiated by history. The rise of the papacy must be explained politically as well as spiritually. The fact that Rome was the leading city in the West, that the bishop of Rome was often consulted in controversial matters and that he often gave sound and orthodox advice and counsel, and that the bishop of Rome was also a tower of strength against the assaults of the barbarians contributed much to the rise of the papacy. Nevertheless, we have also seen that his claim of superiority was often disputed, and that therefore it is obvious that he did not owe his position to the fact that he was the successor of the apostle, Peter. In later articles the Lord willing, we will show that the rise of the papacy was also achieved through two gigantic frauds. These frauds are now acknowledged to have been frauds. Nevertheless people believed in these frauds for centuries; and when finally they were exposed as frauds the papacy had been firmly established. In the following and subsequent articles we will continue with the historical presentation of the papacy by Philip Schaff, and discuss the papacy proper.

H. V.

DECENCY and ORDER

The Office of the Elder

"The office of the elders, in addition to what was said in Article 16 to be their duty in common with the minister of the Word, is to take heed that the ministers, together with their fellow-elders and the deacons, faithfully discharge their office, and both before and after the Lord's Supper, as time and circumstances may demand, for the edification of the churches, to visit the families of the congregation, in order particularly to comfort and instruct the members, and also to exhort others in respect to the christian religion." (Article 24)

I. The Idea Of The Office

Just as soon as we begin to consider the nature and functions of the office of the elder, we will understand why the spiritual requirements, which we have discussed, for this office are so very rigid. It is perhaps because the office itself is not always properly esteemed that the requirements for it are minimized and careless neglect is frequently displayed in selecting qualified men for it. The consequence of this is that those who hold the office of elder are not always given proper respect. This is not as it should be. Our Confession correctly states, "that everyone ought to esteem the elders of the church very highly for their work's sake, and be at peace with them without murmuring, strife or contention, as much as possible." (Art. 30) This can be a conscious reality only when we rightly understand the dignity and importance of the office itself.

To help us arrive at this understanding, let us consider the import of the term "Elder" itself. Our Form for Installation tells us that this term is taken from the Old Testament. It is certainly true that we read a great deal in the Old Testament of the elders. It appears as though the term then signified mainly one of advanced age in distinction from youth or the inexperienced and, perhaps, because at that time those who were chosen the office of leadership were generally taken from the older men. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia informs us, "Among primitive peoples authority seems naturally to be invested in those who by virtue of greater age and, consequently, experience are best fitted to govern. Later the idea became merged in that of dignity. In like manner the word *patres* came to be used among the Romans. So also among the Germans authority was intrusted to those who were older. The same is true among the Arabians to the present day, the sheik being always a man of age as well as of authority."

In the Old Dispensation the elders in Israel functioned in civil as well as in ecclesiastical matters which undoubtedly was due to the union of state and church. They served as local magistrates in bringing murderers to trial (Deut. 19: 12, 21:1ff., Josh. 20:4); in punishing a disobedient son (Deut. 21:19); in inflicting penalty for slander (Deut. 22:

15); for noncompliance with the Levirate marriage law (Deut. 25:7ff.); enforcing the law (Deut. 27:1); in conducting the service in expiation of unwitting violation of the law (Lev. 4:13ff); etc. In general the elders were older men who served as rulers and judges in Israel.

In the New Testament we find two separate words, "Presbuteros," from which our word "Presbyter" is derived, and "Episkopos," from which the English "Episcopate" comes. Thayer, in his "Greek-English Lexicon," says that the former did not differ from the latter as is evident from the fact that the two words are used indiscriminately and that the duties of the one are described by the terms of the other. This is undoubtedly correct but with the added distinction that "Presbuteros" emphasizes the dignity of the office while "Episkopos" tends to stress the functions or duties of it. The former term is by far more generally used and is nearer akin the Old Testament word, being used in Luke 15:25 and I Timothy 5:2 very definitely to express superiority of age. The latter term is only used about a half-dozen times in the New Testament. It has its derivation from a word that means "to inspect, examine, to look after" and thus expresses the idea that the elder is one who is assigned the task of attending to the spiritual interests of the church of Christ. He is one appointed to office in the church wherein he is called to exercise spiritual oversight over the flock. He is an *overseer*, as the term itself is also translated in Acts 20:28. This passage is worthy of special note. It reads thus:

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood." On the basis of this passage we must point out the following:

1) The elder is one who is appointed and qualified by the Holy Ghost. He is divinely called. Elders are not man made. God places him in the office wherein he is called to execute the will of God in all things that pertain to His church. He may not be a man-pleaser. It must be remembered that the sole ruling authority in the church is Christ. The elder is His servant, appointed and commissioned by Him to rule His church by the power of His Word. Both the elder himself and the congregation must always be mindful of this. Then, the elder will watch and pray that he does not sinfully lord it over the church by imposing upon her his own wishes, and, if the congregation is spiritual, she will not murmur and rebel to the good rule of the elder but will humbly submit herself to the authority of Christ manifested through him. Elders may not decide ecclesiastical matters by practical considerations but, having been appointed by the Holy Ghost, they are bound to determine all things according to His will. In his office he has no authority to do otherwise even though his decisions meet with disagreement among many and even arouses the ire of some.

2) The above passage records the words of the apostle, spoken in Ephesus, at the same time that he had warned that

"grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." The elder then is one who is entrusted with the task of watching and guarding the flock against such intrusion. That task is by no means diminished today.

3) The elder is one who is called not only to watch but also to provide. This is clear from the passage quoted also. He is to feed the flock. He is a spiritual shepherd of Christ's sheep. Frequently elders conclude that this part of the office rests exclusively on the minister. This is not true and every elder must be ready always to exhort, instruct, comfort, and guide the sheep.

4) The elder must exercise oversight over the flock not only but also, yes, even firstly, over himself and his fellow elders. As was said in the sixteenth article of our church order, his task, together with the minister of the Word is to exercise church discipline and to see to it that everything is done decently and in good order. That begins with self, then one's own house and extends to the house of God. The elder is called to rule under Christ so that everything may be properly maintained in the church according to His Word.

This important office of the church is beautifully circumscribed in the Form for Installation in three parts. This description of the office should not be brought to the attention of the church just once a year and then in a hastily executed ceremony but every member of the church should be so well acquainted with it that he may at all times know what he may and may not expect of the elders. And these who serve as elders should know it especially well in order that they may diligently and faithfully deport themselves in their office in accordance with this mandate:

"In the first place, the office of elders is, together with the ministers of the Word, to take the oversight of the Church, which is committed to them, and diligently to look whether every one properly deports himself in his confession and conversation; to admonish those who behave themselves disorderly, and to prevent, as much as possible, the sacraments from being profaned; also to act against the impenitent, and to receive the penitent, again into the bosom of the church. . ."

"Secondly, since the apostle enjoineeth, that all things shall be done decently and in order, amongst Christians, and that no other persons ought to serve in the Church of Christ, but those who are lawfully called, according to the christian ordinance, therefore it is also the duty of the elders to pay regard to it, and in all occurrences, which relate to the welfare and good order of the Church, to be assistant with their good counsel and advice to the ministers of the Word, yea, also to serve all christians with advice and consolation."

"Thirdly, it is also the duty particularly to have regard unto the doctrine and conversation of the ministers of the Word, to the end that all things may be directed to the edi-

fication of the church; and that no strange doctrine be taught, according to that which we read, Acts 20, where the apostle exhorteth to watch diligently against the wolves, which might come into the sheepfold of Christ; for the performance of which the elders are in duty bound diligently to search the Word of God, and continually be meditating on the mysteries of faith." (Form of Installation)

How then shall we summarize this?

The office of the elder is that position which God has established in His church and in which He places men, vesting them with authority to teach and to rule so that all things in the church may be brought into subjection to the good Word of God. This is indeed a very great task and an honorable position. No one understands this more than the diligent elder himself. And all elders are fallible men. This, to, the good elder knows and confesses. Because of this he labors with holy fear and godly trembling.

As such you must receive him. Do not murmur against him. Rather labor with him knowing that his task is great. Give him your whole hearted cooperation. Unto that you are called: Remember that the Word of God exhorts you to, "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief for that is unprofitable for you." (Heb. 13:17)

The next time, D. V., we will examine the various elements of the 23rd Article of our Church Order which speaks of the Elder's Task.

G. Vanden Berg

THE DAY OF SHADOWS

(Continued from page 108)

and to be able also to apprehend the Lord's love and mercy in his manner of treatment to sinful people—and I speak now of the Israel according to the election of grace — we should have understanding of the way in which the blessings and curses of the law worked themselves out in the existence of the people of Israel as a nation in that day of shadow. For this see my "observation on the blessings and cursings of the law," attached to my exegesis of ii, 19.

Significance and Purpose of our Prophecy

Significance — all four addresses of our prophet are connected with the rebuilding of the temple. He is insistent that the house of God be reconstructed. And he does not rest until building operations are resumed. And the fruit of his preaching is that the people are stirred up. And the work is done. This is the significance of his prophecy for the church of that day. For as yet the temple was indispensable. For the Word had not yet become flesh. Christ had not yet suffered and died and entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. The saints had not yet come unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem. For this Jerusalem was not yet (Heb. xii, 22). What it meant is that the earthly Canaan was still the

(Continued on page 120)

ALL AROUND US

Love the Lord Thy God.

A friend sent us the latest issue of the *Missionary Monthly* (November, 1955) in which she called my attention to an item of interest which we pass on to our readers.

On page 311 of this issue appears a brief review of one of Rev. H. Hoeksema's books on the Heidelberg Catechism with the above title. The Rev. Gary De Witt writes concerning this volume as follows:

"This is the eighth volume in Rev. H. Hoeksema's series on the Heidelberg Catechism; therefore little need be said about it but to bring it to our reader's attention. In our Reformed Churches where we take the preaching of the doctrines of the faith seriously, this series has been a great blessing. Dr. Hoeksema's thoroughness, his lively presentation, and his strict adherence to the Scripture have helped many a pastor keep his presentation of Scripture truth dynamic and interesting.

"This volume begins the third section of the Catechism and includes the first table of the law (Lord's Day 32 through 38). Each Lord's Day has from three to four messages. Although each message contains many references to Scripture to this reviewer it would have added a stronger emphasis if each message could have had its appropriate Scripture heading. We preach the truths expressed in the Catechism from the Word of God. Our people must be made very conscious that this is the truth of the Scripture. In conclusion, we recommend this volume to Bible Students."

We were pleased to read this brief but favorable review, and we are thankful to God for the help Rev. Hoeksema's books on the Catechism is evidently giving to others besides our own ministers. Either the Rev. De Witt has not heard of or he isn't affected by the ungodly rumor that the Rev. Hoeksema is "weak both in mind and body." To him the books of Rev. Hoeksema are clear evidence of a sound Reformed mind and faithful adherence to the Holy Scriptures. And he seems to be aware of the fact that many others in the ministry of his churches have been helped by Hoeksema's series on the Catechism.

When I read this kind of appraisal of Hoeksema's works I begin to wonder how it is that several of those ministers who were formerly with us can so disparagingly speak of this man of God whose abundant gifts have been used of God for the help of so many. Perhaps we should say that not he, but they, are "weak in mind."

As to the criticism the Rev. De Witt offers regarding each message with "its appropriate Scripture heading," we remark first of all that Hoeksema's exposition of the Catechism, as we understand it, is not a treatment of a certain text of Scripture though often in his exposition he treats specific texts. Rather he purposes to let the light of the

whole of the Word of God speak in the instruction of the Catechism. Rev. De Witt also admits this when he says "each message contains many references to Scripture." And secondly, Rev. Hoeksema never intended that each message should be a sermon with a text. If the minister wishes to use much of the material Rev. Hoeksema offers in his books, let him provide his own text if he is not lazy. And finally, I cannot see how the preface of a certain Scripture text to each message "would have added a stronger emphasis." Does not the abundance of Scripture evidence in the messages themselves make for stronger emphasis than the superscription of a certain single text? I think it does.

At any rate we are glad this volume eight is recommended. And our readers who read the last *Standard Bearer* will remember that Rev. Vos informs us that the ninth volume is already off the press, and the tenth and last volume is ready for the printer. We are grateful to God that the author was spared to finish this monumental work.

Is the Reformed Church in America an "Open Communion" Church?

The Rev. Jerome De Jong, pastor of the First Reformed Church of Englewood, Chicago, Illinois, writes on this subject in the *Church Herald* of October 28, 1955. Also this minister in the Reformed Church of America takes cognizance of Rev. Hoeksema's series on the Heidelberg Catechism from which he quotes.

The Rev. Mr. De Jong introduces his article with the following:

"It must be admitted that this article will appear to many to be an argument in semantics, a quibble about words. Yet it is an important matter to consider. It has often been stated that this is one of the great differences between this denomination, and a sister denomination of similar theological convictions. This is one of the historic reasons for the division of the churches in 1857. In order to answer this question there must be a definition of the phrase, 'Open Communion.' The Rev. Herman Hoeksema, who cannot be accused of liberal leanings in this matter, defines 'open communion' as follows:

Most churches in our day have 'open communion.' They do not exercise Christian discipline, and the keys of the kingdom of heaven are long covered with rust. Anyone may determine wholly for himself whether or not he shall partake of the Lord's Supper. (*Eating and Drinking Christ*, p. 129)

"In the light of this definition, the Reformed Church, constitutionally, liturgically, and historically, is *not* an 'open communion' church. Not everyone may come to the Lord's Table. The exclusions follow."

Here the Rev. De Jong offers five reasons why all are not invited to partake of the Sacrament in the Reformed Churches of America. Briefly stated they are:

1. All unbelievers are excluded.
2. All children are excluded, i. e., baptized non-communicants.

3. Not every church member is included. All those who lead "offensive lives" or are in "open sin" are excluded.

4. Not every approved member is included. The liturgy makes it clear that members must (1) consider their sins and need of forgiveness (2) have a living faith in the living Saviour who forgives sins, and (3) purpose henceforth to live lives of thankfulness.

5. But what of the communion invitation? Does not the Reformed Church invite anyone present to partake of communion? Certainly not!

Here the invitation to partake of the Sacrament may be given to communicants present who are not members of that particular church. (Liturgy, p. 43).

The Rev. De Jong continues: "The invitation is first of all to *communicants*. A communicant is someone who is a full member of some church. This is more than inviting anyone 'who loves the Lord Jesus.' Perhaps someone is present who loves Him but who has never felt it necessary to join the church. Clearly such a person is excluded! Then too a communicant is obviously someone who is in 'good and regular standing' in his own church. Otherwise such a person would be 'outside of communion.' He is under the discipline of his own consistory, or session, or board of trustees, or board of deacons. We may also add, according to Article 76 of the Constitution, RCA, that this is a member of an evangelical church. This Demarest defines as 'one that holds to the Gospel of the Grace of God in Christ Jesus.' (Demarest's Notes, p. 116). It might be further extended to mean one who held the faith expressed by the Apostle's Creed, one who trusted in Christ alone for salvation. This would exclude Mormons, Christian Scientists, Spiritualists, Russelites, Modernists, and also Roman Catholics. The usual form of the invitation in the Reformed churches is, 'Those who are members in good and regular standing of the other evangelical churches.

"If, in spite of all these exclusions, one still insists that the Reformed Church in America is 'Open Communion' because she issues an invitation to others, then the appellation is truly hers, but she does not invite everyone to the Lord's Table, remembering the words of Paul, 'For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.' (I Corinthians 11: 29)."

We remark first of all that the Rev. De Jong may have proved on the basis of the liturgy of his church that the Reformed Church in America has no "open communion." I am inclined to believe also that he correctly understands the difference between "closed" and "open" communion. But I am not so sure that his church lives up to the liturgical stand of "closed communion." Does not his church allow in her membership members of secret societies, lodges, etc.? Do not these members also partake of communion? Isn't this partly responsible for the separation that took place in the Reformed Churches in 1857 when the Christian Reformed Churches had their historical inception? If lodge members are allowed

to be members of the church in good and regular standing, are not disciplined for their membership in these godless organizations, are not expelled from the Lord's Table, can the church then be said to have "closed communion"? I think not.

It is therefore time that the Rev. De Jong and others of his churches take special notice of the quotation of Rev. Hoeksema's book "They do not exercise Christian discipline, and the keys of the kingdom of heaven are long covered with rust." And, "Anyone may determine wholly for himself whether or not he shall partake of the Lord's Supper."

The question concerning the acceptance of an invitation to "open communion" is one that arises frequently also among members of our own churches. We have received, e. g., letters from those in military service who are often faced with this problem. The service chaplains invite all the boys under their jurisdiction, Pentacostalists, etc., to come and partake in unison of the elements at the Lord's Table. Only recently we received such a request for advice in the matter. And they must have an answer.

Rev. Hoeksema in the Beacon Lights of June, 1943, gave the following advice: "The question is whether I would advise our boys in the service, though not in their own church, to partake of communion when opportunity presents itself, either in some other church, or in the camp. And my answer is, first of all, that under ordinary circumstances it would, of course, not be proper to accept an invitation to 'open communion.' And even under your extraordinary conditions in the service you will have to use discretion. Nevertheless, if communion is served in the proper way, that is, according to the Scriptures, to celebrate the atoning death of our Lord Jesus Christ; and if you feel the need of partaking, and should, perhaps, feel as if you were denying your Lord by abstaining, you certainly may feel that you are in the Lord's way, when you take your place with them that love the Lord and commemorate His death at the table of communion. And so, my advice is: partake, but use your discretion."

Of course, this last clause "but use your discretion" somewhat negates the first part of the advice; namely, "partake." If one uses his discretion he will also consider that in the Lord's providence he is indeed in unordinary circumstances. He may have a chaplain who is a firm believer in general atonement. Or, he may have soldiers sitting next to him who have no doctrinal agreement with him at all, or who show in their walk that they are practical unbelievers. How can a child of God, who loves the Lord Jesus, ever sit down under these circumstances and partake of the Lord's Table, if it be the Lord's Table? We do not allow anyone to partake of our Communion Service who is not in doctrine and life in agreement with us, do we? It seems to me that consistency would demand that the same principles must determine the question of partaking in "Open Communion." Therefore I am inclined to advise that temporarily while in service the Lord deprives His children of this privilege. Just as a man who lies on his bed, ill with cancer, is deprived of partici-

pating in the communion, or another is for some other providential intervention deprived of this privilege, so are those who for a time are required to serve in the military. Let them wait until the Lord brings them back to the church of which they are members, where their discretion tells them that here they can really have communion.

M. Schipper

CONTRIBUTIONS

Hope Welcomes New Pastor

After over 13 years of labor in our midst, Rev. Heys accepted a call to preach the Word in the congregation of Hull, Iowa. Spiritually his ministry was indeed fruitful in our midst as we were instructed from Sabbath to Sabbath in the truth of God's holy Word. And although we were not ready for him to leave, the Lord has called him to labor elsewhere, and our prayers go with him in his new field.

For seven months we were without a minister of our own, but although the elders took care of the pastoral work in the midst of the congregation, we were not without the ministry of the gospel on the Sabbath. For every Sunday Classis East supplied our needs, or if they were unable, our seminary sent us its students. And, although it is always abnormal to be without a minister nevertheless, God cared for us and did not forsake us with His presence.

In August we extended a call to Candidate Herman Hanco after calling the ministers that were eligible for a call. He informed us that he felt that God had called him to labor in our midst, and so it was arranged that he should begin his ministry with us. That reminded us that the ministers we have had in years gone by have always come to us directly from the school.

We arranged for his classical examination and having received permission from the Classis to proceed with his ordination, we did so on the night of August 13. Rev. C. Hanco preached the sermon basing it upon Isaiah 50:4. Rev. Vos, our moderator and advisor, read the form, and Candidate Hanco was ordained to the office of the ministry of the Word in Hope Church. The congregation welcomed him into their midst in a program that was arranged and he with his family, entered the fellowship of the saints in our congregation.

It was a forcible reminder to us and to him that the Lord cares for His church throughout all the ages of history, and will care for it even until the end of time when He will take it with Him to glory.

May God bless him and us, in our mutual relations.

The Consistory of the Hope Prot.
Ref. Church.

Clerk, John Lanning

THE OPINION OF JUDGE CHARLES A. FLINN

(Continued from page 102)

the group supporting him, claim to have acted legally and in accordance with the Church Order.

The court feels that here it must, as it has, find of necessity that the defendants were and are the legal consistory of the plaintiff church and have never been properly deposed by plaintiff or any legal acting body of the Protestant Reformed Churches in the United States of America.

Nothing is more lamentable than a dispute of this nature. Many of the exhibits herein include vehement protestations of a desire for peace and harmony. Nothing has been shown by either group to indicate any disposition to give an inch in any direction to aid in achieving the peace and harmony which all parties claim is so desirable. This court has nothing to do with the doctrinal differences between the pro and anti DeWolf factions. Nor would it be competent to decide which group is correct in their interpretation of the doctrine of the church. Suffice it to say, that not much has been shown in this proceeding, and all matters connected with it, to make the court believe that the two groups desire the peace and harmony which they so vehemently claim they desire. I cannot but believe that the matter could have been decided within the church organization had either group been willing to submit to the action of their own governing bodies as the Church Order requires. The presbyterial form of government, such as the churches of this denomination have, requires, as does any democracy, that the minority submit to the will of the majority.

It is possible that the action of the consistory of the plaintiff church can be reviewed by or possibly reversed by a legal meeting of Classis West or synod, but in the opinion of the court this has not yet been done. Therefore the conclusions of law reached by the court must of necessity be that the defendants are the legal consistory of the Edgerton church and as such entitled to control of the church properties at Edgerton.

Charles A. Flinn, District Judge

THE DAY OF SHADOWS

(Continued from page 117)

heaven of the church, the earthly Jerusalem the capital of God's kingdom, and the earthly temple His house. Here in this earthly temple alone of all places the glories of the triune Jehovah were revealed in the face of Christ as reflected in the typical things of the law — the priest and the sacrifices. Here alone the saints stood before God's face. Here they could hear themselves blessed of Him. Here the saints shouted with joy. The temple was the bond that drew together the faithful far and near, such of them as were scattered among the nations as well as those that dwelt in the community. It was thus at the time the center of unity of the whole church. And it, therefore, had to be built.

G. M. O.