

THE STANDARD

Bearer

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME XXXIII

AUGUST 1, 1957 — GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

NUMBER 19

MEDITATION

THE GREAT REFUSAL

"By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompense of reward." Hebrews 11:24-26.

"Man proposes but God disposes!"

That is a proverb of man. But it is a truth which is thoroughly Scriptural. Proverbs 16:1 could be the basis for this truth. "The preparations of the heart in man and the answer of the tongue is of the Lord."

The plainest historical example is the Cross of Calvary. There not only man, but also the devil proposed to do something. And it was God who wonderfully disposed of those things, and then in such a way that the very opposite resulted from what man and Satan proposed to do. They "thought evil against the Holy Child Jesus, but God meant it unto good, to save much people alive"!

So it is also with the patriarch Moses.

Pharaoh and his daughter did not mean to raise up a deliverer of the slave-people Israel, although they had a hand in it. While Pharaoh proceeded to root out Israel by drow- ing all the male children, this very decree moved the mother of Moses to place him in a little basket and floated him down the river where he was found by the daughter of Pharaoh who owned him as her son. And he was placed in school in Egypt where it was said of him after absorbing all the wis- dom of Egypt that he was "mighty in words and deeds."

Again, the proposing of Pharaoh's daughter and the dis- posing of God.

Of this Moses I would like to talk a little.

* * * *

Yes, he was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. And that was a great wisdom. They were at the very

pinnacle of their time. Even the Greek scholars borrowed from them in their principles of politics, geometry, astron- omy and medicine. Moses received a very thorough formal education at the court of the great Pharaoh.

And at the end of forty years of this education when he was ready to take up his rightful place in Egyptian culture and religion, government and politics (as Pharaoh and Egypt thought) he refused all this.

We read in the Word of God that he went to look upon the burdens of his people. He had come to a certain decision. And that decision was to take preliminary steps to become the deliverer of Israel. Stephen, in his last speech to the Pharisees and Scribes, before being stoned to death, said of Moses: "For he supposed his brethren would have under- stood how that God by his hand would deliver them: but they understood not." Acts 7:25.

That statement by Stephen is illuminating. It shows very much about the subjective growth of the heart and soul of Moses. It shows that he knew the tradition of the fathers. He knew God and the people of God. He knew salvation and the promises which were given to the fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. And he believed. But there is much more. He knew that God would use him as the deliver of Israel out of their cruel bondage. So the Lord must have revealed Himself unto Moses. As yet there was no Bible. Indeed, later, much later, Moses would write the first five books of the Bible under Divine inspiration. And so, God must have revealed Himself to Moses, even though we do not know how and when. But the sure knowledge that God would use him as the deliverer of Israel prompted Moses to go and look upon the burdens of Israel, and take the part of the Israelit- ish man when he was oppressed by an Egyptian taskmaster. And he killed him, hiding his body in the sand. So Moses struck the first blow in this deliverance of Israel. But the following day God put a stop to his hasty work. When he reproved the Israelite for hurting his brother he receives a sneer instead of thanks and obedience. And Moses forsook Egypt and went to Midian where he became a shepherd of Jethro's flock.

He had struck too early. God was not through with Moses as far as his education was concerned. He had to have a forty years' course in theology.

But this much is certain: Moses had cast his lot with Israel and refused to remain in Egypt. He forsook Egypt. And it was to his eternal credit. Because the inspired writer of the Hebrews' epistle tells us that this action was an action prompted by faith.

Moses revealed what lived in his heart when he chose between the pleasures of sin and the affliction of God's people.

It was the choice of faith.

See how he identifies the treasures of Egypt with sin, and the suffering of God's people with the reproach of Christ.

If this was not the result of faith it would have been utter foolishness. He had the world at his feet, and he rejected it all. Instead of basking himself at the rich and powerful court of Pharaoh he cast his lot with a slave people.

What are the things between which he chose?

First there are the riches and the treasures of Egypt. They were first position, then riches, then wisdom and then the resultant power. And to have these four entities constitutes pleasure to the nth degree.

But — they are the pleasures of the flesh and divorced from God! And they are gained in the vanity of life. And the holy record qualifies them to be "but only for a season!"

How true!

First, they are short as such. Suppose he lived eighty more years, as he actually did. What is that? It is a mist and we fly away!

Then, pleasure even abridges our life.

And, finally, what is 80 years, or a thousand, compared with eternity?

And so Moses chooses suffering.

Not as such. No one does except he be sick in his mind and heart.

But he chooses to suffer with the people of God. There lies all the difference. Because he esteems the suffering of Israel to be the reproach of Christ.

The reproach of Christ! That is a strange qualification! We are in the Old Testament. What did Moses know of Christ? Our answer is that he knew Christ even though in the Old Testament degree. But he knew Him.

There are many scriptures that plainly teach that Christ was already in the Old Testament. Read for instance I Cor. 10. There time and time again we read of Christ. The rock that followed Israel in the desert was Christ. And Israel tempted Christ repeatedly.

Christ is the Office Bearer. He is God's King, Prophet and Priest. He was in the World, in the sacrifices, in the shadows, and in the types. And Moses knew much about that. More than any of the other prophets.

He also knew that wherever Christ appeared in His threefold office of righteousness, holiness and knowledge of God, there He was reproached by the heathen. Man by nature hates and despises all goodness. Moses knew that by experience.

And this scripture also teaches that somehow Egypt reproached Israel for Christ's sake. As is often said in history: all wars are essentially religious wars. So also here, and especially here, for Israel bore Christ in their midst. And Moses knew this. He esteemed the reproach of Christ to be the riches of God Himself as He had revealed Himself throughout the ages before Moses to the fathers. Oh, Moses knew much of dogmengeschichte.

* * * *

The inspired writer to the Hebrews tells us the secret of Moses' evaluation of things. He says that he chose and esteemed *by faith*.

And, my dear reader, that makes all the difference.

Faith is a spiritual power.

Faith is an assured knowledge and a hearty confidence. Faith is the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things not seen.

There is a land that is fairer than day.

It is heaven, where God dwells in all His glory.

But it is more than that. When Hebrews 1:1 speaks of things hoped for and things not seen, it is not speaking of the present heaven, angels and heavenly glory at all. It is speaking of the things of the second world that is coming, that is promised, that is longed for by all the people of God.

The present heaven, though wonderful and glorious, is not the end. It is only anticipatory. It is not the real thing. God has something better in store for all of us.

When Abraham beheld a heavenly country and therefore was satisfied to be a stranger on the earth, he did not have the present heaven in view, but the last heaven and earth where righteousness shall dwell.

And if you have faith you have part and parcel of that second, last world in your heart, mind and soul. Attend to Paul: our life is hid with Christ in God. That is true in the present heaven too. Our faith is not satisfied with the present earth, but neither is it satisfied with the present heaven. We all wait for the glorious appearance of Christ in His day. And then God will say: Behold, I make all things new. The old earth and the old heaven shall be rolled away like a scroll and out of the conflagration of the old world a new heaven and a new earth shall appear which shall be heavenly, spiritually, eternal and glorious.

That's what Moses knew and trusted in.

And therefore he refused Egypt, its treasures, its riches, its power and its sin. And he clung to the promises of a land

that is fairer than day, and by faith he saw it from afar.
That was the power of the great refusal.

* * * *

For he had respect unto the recompense of the reward.
That is founded on the concept of God's righteousness.
God is just, honest, righteous.

He always rewards the good and punishes the evil. You can depend on that.

And if you would desire proof, it is sufficient unto all eternity to simply look at the Cross of Jesus. There He hangs with the sins and the guilt of His people on Him and in Him. In the form of guilt, of course.

And even when He cries pitiously to God: O My God, why forsakest Thou Me? even then God continues to strike Him. For God is honest, upright, just.

He always punishes the evil and rewards the just.

And when Jesus accomplishes all that the Father gave Him to do in coming, dying, paying the infinite debt and establishing an eternal righteousness, He receives a just reward.

Lo, I come and My reward is with Me to give unto everyone according as his work shall be!

Moses revealed that he worked the work of God through the grace of God. You may also say the same thing this way: Christ wrought in him.

And therefore Moses also received his reward: the reward of grace.

The voice of Moses in his singing, as this very moment, is sweet in the symphony of heaven!

G.V.

New Treasurer and Stated Clerk

Synodical Treasurer: Mr. C. Pastoor
929 Watkins Street, S. E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Synodical Stated Clerk: Rev. G. Vanden Berg
9402 S. 53rd Court
Oak Lawn, Illinois

NOTICE!

Those who vacation in the Holland area are requested to note that the First Protestant Reformed Church of Holland, Michigan has moved its temporary meeting place to its present location, 208 West 14 Street, where divine worship services are held. The Rev. James Mc Collam is the pastor.

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 —

The Great Refusal.....433
Rev. G. Vos

EDITORIALS —

The Letter436
Rev. H. Hoeksema

AS TO BOOKS —

Augustinus438
Filosofie van de Onbekende God.....438
Waar het Om Ging.....438
Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible.....439
Biblical Criticism439
Christ and the Church in the Old Testament.....439
Israel, Key to Prophecy.....440
Rev. H. Hoeksema

THE CALLING OF THE MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL.....441
Rev. G. M. Ophoff

FROM HOLY WRIT —

Exposition of I Corinthians 12-14.....444
Rev. G. Lubbers

IN HIS FEAR —

Living As the Lord Wills.....446
Rev. J. A. Heys

CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH —

The Church and the Sacraments.....448
Rev. H. Veldman

FEATURE ARTICLE —

The Significance of the Candlestick.....450
Rev. H. Hanko

DECENCY AND ORDER —

Major and Minor Assemblies.....453
Rev. G. Vanden Berg

ALL AROUND US —

The Reformed Faith and Arminianism.....455
Rev. M. Schipper

EDITORIALS

THE LETTER

Here follows the letter which those that caused a schism in our churches sent to the synod of the Christian Reformed Church. I am not sure that it is, in all respects, the same as the letter that was actually sent for in a caption above the letter I now have it is stated that it is the letter "as drafted by the committee."

I understand that the synod acted favorably upon this letter. This we can readily understand, for the letter abundantly suggests that the schismatics probably misunderstood and misinterpreted "The Three Points" and that they are willing to listen when the right interpretation is offered them. I also understand that the same synod acted unfavorably on the letter that our churches sent them and refused to enter into a discussion with us. This we can also well understand however unreasonable it is even to refuse a discussion, for there is no doubt in our mind that, not only "The Three Points" are unreformed, but also the action of the classes East and West of Grand Rapids in 1924-25 whereby they cast out faithful and Reformed ministers was thoroughly corrupt.

Here, then, follows the letter:

"To the Synod of the
Christian Reformed Church, etc.

Dear Brethren:

Realizing anew, as churches, that Christ is one and that the calling of believers is always to seek the unity of the Spirit in the Gospel of Peace, we address this missive to you.

We realize that God's Church finds herself in the midst of the ages, under oath of God's covenant to preach the true gospel at home and abroad; and that she is committed to the great task of teaching, preaching and warning all men until the Lord return. Moreover, the Church finds herself vehemently attacked by the powers of Antichrist. By means of seduction, persecution, apostacy and false doctrine he seeks the overthrow of the Church. Against his murderous ambitions we have one supreme weapon and that is the sword of the Spirit, the Witness of Faith, the Word of God.

In view of this calling to unity and witness, the question must arise whether the cause of the Lord is best promoted and defended by you and us going our separate ways or whether it is possible better to promote and defend this cause by a mutual drawing closer together in submission to God's Word. We believe that

unity does not demand that all agree and think alike on all matters of doctrine and life. For us the basis of unity is the Scripture and the Three Forms of Unity, which we cherish. Within the boundaries of Scripture and the Three Forms of Unity, however, there must be room for freedom and for healthy differences of opinion. Therefore nuances, current opinions, personalities and traditions may not be reasons before God for living and laboring separately, especially not in these end-times.

We have led a separate existence since 1924 and are willing and ready to continue to do so if witnessing to the Reformed faith so requires. You and we both believe, do we not, that the welfare and unity of the church is promoted only by being true to the witness of the Holy Scriptures? The issue is whether our witness, that is, yours and ours, is similar.

Our separation took place in 1924 when your Church established the Three Points and maintained them in subsequent ecclesiastical assemblies. Ever since that time we have maintained positions that differed and have found ourselves drifting farther and farther apart. We are grateful for that which the Lord has given us as Protestant Reformed Churches and this is at the same time a challenge to seek the unity of the Church of Jesus Christ, to span separations and seek contacts.

This separation was a process following from the fact that we were interpreting and applying the Three Points. We admit this interpretation may have been one-sided since you have little or no interpretation or application. You, brethren, can understand that we would interpret these Points, we could scarcely do otherwise. To our mind they have been elevated to Church Dogma. They became, as it were, the boundary line between Church and Sect inasmuch as officebearers were tested and are still being tested for their orthodoxy by the things drawn from them. The action against officebearers who refused to sign the Three Points as well as subsequent utterances of your Synods regarding the necessity of subscription to 1924 by those entering the ministry from outside your churches, certainly bears this out. And so the process went on. In this process of interpreting, criticising and in general evaluating these points the possibility exists that we have mis-interpreted your position. If this is pointed out to us we assure you that we will correct it. Moreover, the recent schism in our churches has alerted us to the danger of interpreting statements without consideration of their context, or of giving them interpretation they do not necessarily and contextually need.

You are undoubtedly aware of the fears and objections that we, and possibly some of you also, have

concerning the Three Points of Common Grace. These fears and objections have become public, spread out over many writings. But lest we should seem to deal in vague generalities, may we cite briefly those aspects of the truth we fear lost or endangered by the Three Points? They are:

1. In Point I, concerning the favorable attitude of God toward elect and non-elect, we, according to our understanding of Point I, see the doctrine of God's elective decrees and the doctrine of irresistible grace jeopardized.

2. In Points II and III, according to our understanding of these Points, we see the doctrine of the antithesis endangered. We realize that the last word has not been said about the antithesis nor about the relation between the believer and the unbeliever in this world, but by endangering the antithesis we damage its presentation and its manifestation in this world.

We are aware, brethren, that even among yourselves there are different interpretations of Common Grace and different conclusions also. We cannot help but feel, however, that when statements are raised to the level of Church Dogma they should be so clear in purpose and content that they cannot be misunderstood. To us the Three Points are not a clear and definite setting forth of the Reformed Faith.

If our fears and misgivings concerning that which you posited in 1924 are unfounded, how shall these fears be removed except by your kind assistance in interpreting that which you have declared? And if our fears are found to be correct do we not do you a service by calling this to your attention?

We feel that it is essential that we thoroughly understand each other. Let us not say that it is futile to approach one another for that is to deny the calling of our Lord to strive toward the unity of the Church. Rather let us trust that where the Spirit is and where brotherly love in submission to the Scripture is present, there is also the possibility of a united witness in the same Spirit. To approach such understanding of each other, we, on our part, assure you that if any misunderstanding or error becomes evident that we will confess and forsake the same, while we trust that you on your part will do likewise.

So, brethren, may we propose to you to consider prayerfully the following propositions:

1. Will you kindly favor us with an answer to this missive so that we may feel a corresponding desire to seek the welfare and the unity of the Church of Christ?

2. Will you kindly consider the fears we have expressed concerning the Three Points of 1924 and consider the possibility of delivering an interpretive

statement which will allay these fears and show that these Three Points are and are intended to be a clear setting forth of Reformed faith.

3. For this purpose or for broader contact will you kindly consider the appointment of a broad committee whose duty it shall be to meet with a like committee from our churches, both committees empowered to discuss freely the differences and the similarities which are found to exist and to report back to their respective churches?

4. If your Synod should consider some other way of seeking the contact proposed in this letter, will you please inform us of it?

Hoping you will grant our requests and praying the Lord's blessing upon His Church,

Yours in His service,
(etc)."

After the remarks I made on this letter in the last STANDARD BEARER I have very little to add. Just a few remarks.

First of all, you may notice that the letter seems to maintain that only the Protestant Reformed leaders interpreted the "Three Points." This is a mistake. And it is simply amazing that the composers of the letter can write such untruths. They certainly cannot be ignorant of the elaborate interpretation of those points given by the late prof. Berkhof, nor the interpretation by Rev. H. J. Kuiper. No doubt, if they ever gain their objective, which, evidently is to unite with the Christian Reformed Church, it means that they have adopted the "Three Points" as interpreted by these men. But even then we would not be surprised. In the light of recent history, I would expect almost anything from those that departed from us and from the truth. They grant the possibility that they may have misinterpreted the "Three Points" and if this is made clear to them they certainly will correct their error! This they express repeatedly. Their "fears and misgivings" concerning the "Three Points" and their interpretations may be unfounded, but "how shall these fears be removed except by your kind assistance?"

And, secondly, I like to call attention that their representation of the "Three Points" and, especially, of the First Point, is very weak and practically meaningless. According to their understanding of the First Point, they "see the doctrine of God's elective decrees and the doctrine of God's irresistible grace jeopardized." How vague and meaningless! I feel confident that the committee appointed by the synod of the Christian Reformed Church to contact them will soon remove their fears in this respect. They will assure them, no doubt, that they certainly believe in the doctrine of election and reprobation. But they will point out to them that the doctrine of election does not alter the fact that the gospel is a gracious and well-meaning offer to all that hear, although

this may be a mystery which we can never fathom. And this is exactly what the First Point teaches, a doctrine which is supported by Scripture and the Confessions. This will, no doubt, remove their fears, and they will readily accept the First Point of common grace. The same method will be followed with regard to the Second and Third Points of Doctrine adopted by the synod of 1924.

The trouble is, of course, that, after departing from the sound basis of the Protestant Reformed truth, they are lost and have no ground to stand on.

But we will watch.

H.H.

AS TO BOOKS

Augustinus, by prof. Dr. A. Sizoo. Published by J. H. Kok, N.V., Kampen, the Netherlands. Price (in American money) \$4.00, in Dutch money f 13.75.

This book by prof. Sizoo, *Augustine, his life and works*, I heartily recommend to all that are able to read the Holland language, not only to theologians but also to the average reader. Prof. Sizoo writes in a style that makes his book accessible to every one that can read Dutch. Moreover, he writes in such a way that the book is more than a mere review of Augustine's life and works. He makes this greatest of all church-fathers live before our eyes. In an introduction prof. Sizoo writes that, in this book, it has been his purpose to picture Augustine to us as he lived in his own time as a historical figure and not simply to enter into his theological and philosophical conceptions. In this, the writer succeeded admirably, although, of course, by reading this book, the reader also becomes acquainted with the theology and philosophy of Augustine.

As to the contents, the book describes Augustine's youth in chapter I; his time as a student in chapter II, the time when he embraced the heresy of Manicheism; his appearance as professor of rhetoric in Carthage and Rome in chapter III; his time as teacher in Milan where he met Ambrosius and became estranged from his Manicheistic heresies in chapter IV; his conversion, for which his mother Monica had always longed and constantly prayed in chapter V; his last years in Italy in chapter VI; his mother Monica in chapter VII; his stay in Thagaste and his calling to presbyter and bishop in chapter VIII; his daily life as bishop in chapter IX; incidents from Augustine's practice as bishop in chapter X; his correspondence in chapter XI; his appearance and work as preacher in chapter XII; his opposition against Manicheism which he had formerly embraced in chapter XIII; his opposition against the schism of Donatism in chapter XIV; his controversy with Pelagius in chapter XV; his works in

chapter XVI; his "confessiones" and his work "De Civitate Dei" in chapter XVII; his last years and his death in chapter XVIII; and, finally, a chapter on his personality.

A very beautifully written and instructive book.

H.H.

Filosofie van de Onbekende God. (Philosophy of the Unknown God) by the Rev. J. M. Spier. Published by J. H. Kok, N.V., Kampen, the Netherlands.

This is not a popular book that I can recommend to every reader. The Rev. Spier is deeply interested in philosophy as we have noticed before. In this book he describes the philosophy of extentialism as represented by Karl Jaspers. His purpose is, according to an introduction to show that one cannot find refuge in the unknown god of existentialism and of Karl Jaspers in particular but only in the God of the Scriptures Who has revealed Himself in Him Who said: "Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest."

In a closing chapter, the Rev. Spiers offers a criticism of the philosophy of Jaspers in which he, first of all, offers the opinion of others and then his own judgments. Again, in the latter he, first of all, mentions what we can appreciate in this philosophy in order then to offer his own and final critical conclusion. The god of this philosophy, he finally declares, is a Moloch which consumes his children.

With this we certainly agree.

We, therefore, recommend this book to all theologians who are more or less acquainted with recent philosophy and like to become acquainted more fully with the philosophy of existentialism as presented especially by Karl Jaspers.

H.H.

Waar het om Ging, (What did it Concern) by Dr. C. N. Impeta. Published by J. H. Kok, N.V., Kampen, the Netherlands.

In this booklet of 113 pages the well-known Dr. Impeta reviews and criticizes the recent history of the schism and separation which recently occurred in the Reformed Churches (Gereformeerde Kerken) in the Netherlands, Dr. Impeta, in this booklet, chiefly refers to the official synodical decisions to prove that the Reformed (Gereformeerde) Churches in the Netherlands were right and did not depart from the truth that had always been maintained in those churches and that, for the same reason the churches under art. 31 were and are wrong.

With practically all of the material offered we are, of course, quite thoroughly acquainted. Nevertheless, for those that are interested in the recent history of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands we gladly recommend this booklet which gives what I consider a rather objective and correct view and judgment of what happened at the time of this recent schism.

H.H.

Zonder Toga (Without Toga) by the Rev. M. E. Voila. Published by J. H. Kok, N.V., Kampen, the Netherlands. Price f 4.25 (About \$1.20).

This book I gladly recommend to anyone that can still read Holland. It is very interestingly and beautifully written. It ought to be interesting especially for our ministers, not because it deals with all kinds of theological problems, but because it is concerned with life in the parsonage and with the life of the pastor in relation to his flock. The book is cast in the form of correspondence, letters and answers.

Heartily recommended.

H.H.

Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible, by R. Laird Harris, Ph.D. Published by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Price \$4.50.

This book is an isagogical treatise, an introduction to the books of the Bible. It is thoroughly orthodox and is opposed to higher criticism of Scripture. As such it could very well be used as a textbook in our own theological school. After a preface, the book is divided into three parts. Part I treats of the inspiration of the Bible and in this part the author does not hesitate to present and defend the verbal inspiration of Scripture in the proper sense of the term. This we also believe. Part II discusses the canonicity of the Old Testament, first of all from the viewpoint of its determining principle, and, secondly, from the aspect of the extent of the Old Testament Canon. And Part III treats of the Canon of the New Testament. All this is followed by a conclusion in which the author expresses his view as to the determining principle of the canonicity of Scripture. Of this we quote a few sentences:

"The view as to the determining principle of the canon expressed previously may be summarized by saying that the canonicity of the Bible depends upon its authorship. If the book was in the Old Testament, the people of the day accepted it because it was written by a prophet. If it was a part of the New Testament, it was recognized as inspired if it had been written by an apostle — either by himself or with the help of an understudy or amanuensis." p. 272.

"The books did not become authoritative by Church decision or as a result of the veneration attaching to things of antiquity. They were authoritative when written because given by inspiration of God. They were recognized as authoritative, inspired, and canonical by the generations to which they were addressed because of the position of the authors as acknowledged spokesmen of God." p. 282.

With this we can in the main agree although I would still assign a more important place than does the author to the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

But I certainly most heartily recommend this thorough study on the inspiration and canonicity of the Bible. It can be read, not only by theologians, but also by laymen who are interested in a study about the Bible.

H.H.

Biblical Criticism, by Wick Broomall. Published by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Price \$4.95.

This is another book which I can heartily recommend. It is scholarly and conservative. And although I would recommend it, first of all, to our ministers, yet I see no reason why the average intelligent reader should not be able to read it with profit for himself. It is somewhat similar in contents to the book we reviewed above by R. Laird Harris, yet it is sufficiently different for me to recommend both books. It is quite a thorough critique of so-called higher criticism but at the same time it is not merely negative but positive: it is a defense throughout of the conservative position.

As to its contents, the author, first of all treats of the inspiration of the Bible in two chapters. Next he discusses the subject of revelation. Here he distinguishes between general and special revelation. Further, he sets forth the principles of criticism, refutes the stand of higher criticism, views the canon of the Old Testament in the light of criticism, discusses criticism in the light of recent archaeological discoveries. A special chapter he devotes to the book of Daniel in the light of criticism and he closes with a chapter on criticism and interpretation.

One or two remarks. First of all, it seems to me that, as far as the test of the canonicity of the Bible and its books is concerned, the author seems to differ somewhat from Harris. He emphasizes the necessity of the testimony of the Holy Spirit: "Since the Holy Spirit is the real Author behind all Biblical books (II Tim. 3:16), it is logical for us to believe that He will leave of every book He inspires the impress of its divine nature. That men do not readily or always recognize this divine quality of every God-breathed book is due more to the blindness of man's spiritual perception than to any defect in the book itself . . . But when a man is regenerate, the Holy Spirit bears witness with the human spirit of the regenerate that the books of the Bible were authored by the Spirit." With this we agree. pp. 221, 22.

We also wholeheartedly agree with the author's condemnation of the dispensationalists' interpretation of the Old Testament. Cf. p. 312 ff.

Heartily recommend.

H.H.

Christ and the Church in the Old Testament, by Howard A. Hanke. Published by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Price \$2.50.

This book maintains and defends the unity of the Old and New Testaments of Scripture and, at the same time, the truth that the Church did not come into existence on the day of Pentecost but was in the world from the beginning. As the Heidelberg Catechism has it in Lord's Day 21: "What believest thou concerning the holy catholic church of Christ? That the Son of God, from the beginning to the end of the world, gathers, defends, and preserves to himself, out of the whole human race, a church chosen to everlasting life . . ." This truth the author abundantly substantiates from Scrip-

ture as he makes plain that God, salvation and the church are eternally the same, that the divine names, the divine revelation, the redemptive economy, the true church as well as the false church are eternally the same.

This also is a good book which we may recommend to our readers.

I cannot agree with what the author writes on p. 101: "But this new birth has man's conversion as a presupposition." Regeneration is before conversion and the latter is not presupposed.

Nor do I agree with what he writes on pp. 117, 118 that both Jew and Gentile always have been eligible for the kingdom of God. Especially when we consider the Scriptural basis, Rom. 1:18 ff., for this contentation, I do not only fail to agree with the author, but I consider this a dangerous view.

For the rest I heartily recommend this book.

H.H.

Isarel, Key to Prophecy, by William L. Hull. Published by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Price \$1.50.

This book I cannot approve. The reason is that it represents the premillennial view in its boldest form. In other words, it is not Scriptural. Just let me quote as only one illustration what the author writes about "the rapture":

"A hush seemed to rest upon the earth, a breathless air of expectancy pervaded the atmosphere. Then they were gone! There could be no doubt of it, countless empty places testified to that fact. Not many in the higher positions of authority were missing, not many of the wealthy homes had been disrupted, but among the ordinary homes there were many empty homes. There were homes too that were now divided, husbands grieving for missing wives — wives for husbands. There were many who remained but who were not ignorant of what had transpired, for they had been warned but had not heeded."

For proof the author refers in a note to Matt. 25:6-10; I Thess. 4:16, 17; Lu. 17:34-36. But he does not explain these passages.

But let this be sufficient. I cannot recommend this book.

H.H.

IN MEMORIAM

The Consistory, Men's Society, and Ladies' Aid Society of the Manhattan Protestant Reformed Church herewith expresses its sympathy to Mrs. Peter Flikkema and children and the Menko Flikkema family in the loss of their beloved husband, father, brother, and uncle,

PETER FLIKKEMA

whom the Lord suddenly took to Himself on the evening of May 28. May they be comforted with the assurance that "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord." Rev. 4:13b.

Rev. P. Vis, President
P. Hoekema, Clerk

CALL TO ASPIRANTS TO THE MINISTRY

All young men desiring to study for the ministry of the Word in the Protestant Reformed Churches kindly appear at the next meeting of the Theological School Committee which will be held D.V., on Thursday, August 29th, at 7:30 p. m. in the consistory room of First Church, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

The qualifications requisite to enrollment in our Seminary are the following:

1. You must present a letter from your local consistory certifying that you are upright in walk and pure in doctrine.
2. You must have certificate of health signed by a reputable physician.
3. You must be a graduate from High School and show evidence that you have completed a one year course in High School in History General and Church History; and have also completed the following College courses: Latin — two years, Greek — two years, German — two years, Philosophy — one year, Psychology — one year, Logic — one semester.

All correspondence relative to the above announcement should be sent to the undersigned.

Secretary of the Theol. School Comm.
Rev. M. Schipper
1636 Martindale Ave., S. W.,
Grand Rapids 9, Michigan.

Announcement

The Synod of the Protestant Reformed Churches convened in Grand Rapids, Michigan, on June 5, 1957, has examined brother Alvin Mulder.

The afore mentioned Synod has declared this brother Candidate for the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments in the Protestant Reformed Churches.

This candidacy becomes effective on July 7, 1957, D.V.

G. Vanden Berg, Stated Clerk
of the Protestant Reformed Churches

Notice for Classis West

Classis West of the Protestant Reformed Churches will meet, the Lord willing, in South Holland, Illinois, Wednesday, September 18, 1957. The consistories are reminded of the rule that all matters for the classical agenda must be in the hands of the stated clerk thirty days before the meeting of Classis.

Rev. H. Veldman, Stated Clerk

THE CALLING OF THE MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL*

The minister of the Gospel is called. He is called of God. He is called of God to be a minister of the Gospel.

A long time ago, when I was still a student in the seminary, I happened on a day to be in conversation with a minister of the Gospel. We were talking about this very thing — the calling of the minister. In the course of our conversation he made the statement that he did not believe that a man is actually called of God to be a minister of the Gospel. He said that He for one had never heard the voice of God, calling, mandating, charging him. His being a minister of the Gospel he ascribed to the fact that he had chosen this particular profession, seeing that it had appealed to him, had therefore prepared for it, and had subsequently been called and ordained by the church. If a minister is really speaking the truth about himself in talking that way, he has no moral right being in office. He is a usurper. Surely not to be guilty of having intruded himself, a minister of the Gospel must have heard God's voice calling him to the ministry of the Gospel.

I wish to speak on this idea for a few moments. I have arranged my material under two points, namely 1) the reality of the calling and 2) its significance.

That the minister of the Gospel, worthy of the title, is called of God is the very teaching of the article XXXI of our Belgic Confession. Here the statement occurs and I quote, "Therefore everyone must take heed, not to intrude himself by indecent means, but is bound to wait till it shall please God to call him; that he may have testimony of his calling, and be certain and assured that it is of God." Since the Belgic Confession is one of our official creeds, we here express it as our firm belief that, according to the Scriptures the minister of the Gospel is called of God. Such is our confession. But what does it mean that the minister of the Gospel is called of God? Surely it can mean nothing less than that God speaks to him, makes him to hear His voice, mandating, charging and sending him, laying upon him the necessity of proclaiming Christ's Gospel. We should understand that God speaks to the minister of the Gospel, whom He calls, as truly as He spake to Moses out of the midst of the burning bush. He hears God's voice as truly as Moses heard God's voice, mandating him and arming him with the word that he was to speak to the children of Israel; and as truly as the rest of the prophets heard God's voice and the apostles. Truly God's ministers are called of God now, today, as well as in days of old. And they know themselves as called of God, are aware that He sends them, puts His word in their mouth, and that therefore it is His Gospel that they proclaim. That the prophets of old had this awareness, that they knew themselves as called of God is plain from the superscriptions that appear above their discourses. "Thus saith the Lord," and,

"The word of the Lord came unto me," and, "The burden of the word of the Lord."

We must hold fast the truth and fact the ministers of the Gospel, worthy of the title, are called of God. If He called His prophets of old, why should He not in this new dispensation of the world still be calling His servants. Certainly when the last apostle died, God did not lose His voice.

In the light of these observations we see what it means that the ministers of the Gospel are called of God, perceive what are the elements that enter into the constituency of this calling, namely the following: First, that the minister of the Gospel is chosen of God for the work of the ministry; second, that God forms him for this work, by reason of which he is God's organ through whom God speaks His Gospel; third, that God makes him to hear His voice, mandating, sending and thereby authorizing him to proclaim His Gospel and that God qualifies him for this ministry by His Spirit.

It is obvious that the word "calling" in this context has much the same meaning as the word "anointing." Truly, the minister of the Gospel worthy of the name is the anointed of the Lord, and as such God's own gift unto His people. It is so true what Paul says, namely, "And He (the exalted Christ) gave — mark you, gave — some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ" (Eph. 6:11-12).

Not that the ministers of the Gospel of this day are to be placed on a level with the prophets and the apostles of the Holy Scriptures. By the latter God gave us His word, so that when the last apostle died the canon of the Scriptures was closed. It is only upon this word, Gospel, as upon a foundation, that Christ builds His church. Hence it is that word and that word alone that the ministers of the Gospel, the pastors and teachers in the church, who came after, proclaim as identifying themselves with it. It is as mindful of this difference that we say that the minister of the Gospel is called of God as truly as the prophets of old were called of God. As viewed from this angle there is no difference.

Truly then, God calls the men of His choice to be ministers — ministers of His word. Why should this not be true, considering who God is. He is God to whose power there is no limit. By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the hosts of them by the breath of his mouth. He spake, and it was done. He commanded, and it stood fast (Ps. 33:6, 9). He quickens the dead, and calls those things which be not as though they were (Rom. 6:17). His people He calls out of darkness into His marvellous light — His people, which in time past were not a people (I Pet. 2:9ff). The Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God (Rom. 8:16). If there be these workings of God, why can there not also be even today that working of God whereby He calls the men of His choice to be ministers of His Gospel? It can't be because it is easier to call a sinner out of darkness into the light than to call a man to

*Commencement address delivered on the evening of June 12, in the First Protestant Reformed Church, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

the ministry of the Gospel, so that, though God is capable of the former, He lacks what it takes to do the latter. To deny that God calls to the ministry of the Gospel is a matter of utmost seriousness. It comes close to saying that there is no God.

We must now face the question how God in this day calls His servants to be ministers of His Word. He calls His servants in this day not apart from His church, not as circumventing the church, as He did in days of old in calling His servants, but through the church as His organ, by her voice. Moses was not called through the church, but the Lord spoke to him from out of the burning bush apart from the church. Samuel was not called through the church, but the Lord spoke to him from out of the holiest place of the earthly tabernacle. So it was with all the prophets of the Old dispensation. The Lord spoke to them directly usually in visions or in dreams, but always as circumventing the church. This had much to do with the fact that it was the dispensation of shadows. The church had not yet attained to spiritual majority. For the Spirit was not yet. But when the fulness of time was come, God sent "forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons, and because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father." The church therefore is no longer a child, differing nothing from a servant, but a son, and as such heir of God through Christ (Gal. 4:1ff). This being true, the church has received new rights, including the right to engage in the calling of her officebearers, definitely the ministers of the gospel, which is but saying that, as was just said, God now calls his servants through His church as His organ, through the agency of her voice.

The voice of the church is heard first of all in the election by the consistory in cooperation with the congregation. Second, the voice of the church is heard in the message, "Come over and help us," that the church directs in the call-letter to the one that was chosen. Third, the voice of the church is heard in the charge that the church directs to the one chosen on the occasion of His ordination — the charge, "Take heed, therefore, beloved brother, and fellow servant in Christ, unto thyself and all the flock, over which the holy Ghost hath made thee overseer, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood: love Christ and feed His sheep, taking the oversight of them not by constraint, but willingly: not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind, neither as being lord over God's heritage, but as an example to the flock. Be an example of believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity. Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, meditate upon those things, give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all; take heed to thy doctrine, continue steadfast therein. Bear patiently all suffering, and oppressions, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ, for in so doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear

thee. And when the chief shepherd shall appear, thou shalt receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." (Form for the ordination of ministers of God's Word). Let us observe that the content of this admonition is almost literally taken from the Scriptures. What it means is that it is the very commandments and Gospel of God that the church here speaks to the called one. However, if the called one, in addition to being called of the church, is also called, being called of God, the voice of the church by which he is being made to hear these mandates and this Gospel must become to him the very voice of God. And this it does, if he is being called also of God, by a working of God that consists in His speaking these mandates and this Gospel in the mind and heart of the called one, laying, impressing, binding them on his heart in such a way that the admonition directed to him by the church becomes to him the very voice of God mandating, sending and authorizing him to proclaim God's Gospel. Then he feels in his heart, is convinced in his soul, that he is called of God to the sacred ministry. For He has heard the voice of God and not alone the voice of the church. The trouble with that minister of whom I spake is that, if he was speaking the truth about himself, he had heard the voice of the church only and not also the voice of God.

Our fathers had understanding of these things, as appears from the first of the three questions that is put to the called one on the occasion of his ordination. The question reads, and I quote, "First I ask thee, whether thou feelest in thy heart that thou art lawfully called of God's church, and therefore of God Himself to this holy ministry." This can mean but one thing, namely, dost thou feel in thy heart that God called thee through the church, that is, has the voice of the church become unto thee the very voice of God, so that thou feelest in thy heart that in being called of the church thou art called of God. That this is the meaning is plain from the following statement found in the Call-letter, "Now, dear reverend brother, may the king of His church so *impress this call upon your heart* and give you light, that you may arrive at a decision that is pleasing to Him and if possible for us mutually gratifying." Let us mark the clause, "*impress this call upon your heart.*" If God does so — such is the implied idea — thou wilt feel in thy heart that thou art called also of him, and in this case thou wilt come over and help us.

Certainly, if the voice of the church has not become to a man the voice of God, and if the church nevertheless ordained him, because she does not know the heart, he is nevertheless in office, yet not truly so, seeing that he was called of the church only and not also of God. To the question, "Dost thou feel in thy heart that thou art called of the church and therefore also of God, he replied with an "I do," while he should have replied with an "I do not." And so the church ordained him, for God only knows the heart. This is a matter of utmost seriousness, because, if a man is not

also called of God, he is not going to be qualified for the duties of the office by the Lord God either. Nevertheless the man is going to be held fully responsible for His conduct in office.

That God calls His servants implies that by His Spirit and His word He also qualifies them for the work of the ministry by continually putting in their hearts appropriate mandates and the Gospel. That there is a special qualification for the work of the ministry is clear from the admonition that is directed to the called one on the occasion of his ordination. For example, the mandate, "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation and to doctrine," are words directed not to the flock but to the one called to be the shepherd of the flock. God continues to speak these and similar mandates in the heart of His servants, and thereby qualifies them, continues to call them spiritually. Of this working of God the laying on of hands is expressive. This laying on of hands is not a meaningless ceremony, but an action of the church indicative of how God spiritually qualifies His servants for the work of the ministry, for the duties of the office.

It ought to be clear that the significance of the calling of the minister is immeasurably great. It is that important as to be indispensable. First, that the minister is called means that He is sent, authorized. And authority here is right—the right to proclaim God's Gospel. Everyone has not this right, but only he who is sent. The sent one alone is ambassador of God. He only has the right to implore, officially implore, Be ye reconciled to God. How then, in the words of the apostle, shall they preach, except they be sent? (Rom. 10:15a.). The rest of this verse is a quotation from Isaiah. Let us take notice of it. It reads, "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things." Surely, the feet of such are beautiful indeed. But let us consider that they are preachers, that is, sent ones, ones sent of God through the *church* as His organ. One who preaches though he be not sent intrudes himself upon the office. The feet of such an one are not beautiful in the sight of God. I said, the minister is sent of God through the church as His organ, yes, and through the church and the church only, the church as institute, and not through some individual or organization that owes its existence to the will of man. This is a correct teaching. It is surely the teaching of the Scriptures. It was to the church that the Holy Ghost said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." It was the church that laid hands on them and sent them away (Acts 13:2, 3).

As was stated, the calling implies spiritual qualification. This is the other reason why the calling is indispensable. Let us consider that the minister must preach. Now preaching

consists in explaining God's Gospel to the flock and in applying it according to the needs of the flock. In preaching, therefore, the minister comes to the flock not with the literal word of God but with his own word. To do the former the minister should have to read the Scriptures and refrain from adding to the portion read one syllable of explanation. But this would not do. This would not be preaching. The task of the minister is to explain and apply the Word of God. But this explanation is his own word. Surely preaching the Gospel is a glorious engagement. But it is just as precarious as it is glorious. For there is always the question whether God's Gospel is truly being preached, whether the word of the minister is substantially the word of God. There will be no danger that it is not, if the minister only be called of God. For the calling implies qualification, and qualification here includes all that is needed in the way of spiritual gifts to preach the Gospel. It includes being led of Christ's spirit into the truth of the Scriptures in order that they may be rightly understood. It thus includes insight into the Scriptures. It includes the will prayerfully to study the Scriptures continually, persistently, day and night. It includes the desire and courage to preach and to vindicate sound doctrine against heresies and error. It includes also prayer to be thus qualified. For the minister cannot pray either. Qualification therefore includes everything in the way of spiritual gifts. For in himself the minister is nothing except an empty vessel and a sinful man. Surely, the calling is indispensable. For only if a man be called will he be qualified.

There is still the question how a minister knows in his heart that He is truly called not of the church alone but also of God. As was explained, God makes the minister to hear His voice, and the result of this working of God is that there forms in the heart of the minister the firm belief that he is called of the church and therefore also of God. And then he also will bear the fruit of being called of God. Then he *will* surely take heed unto himself and to all the flock to feed the church of God. Then he *will* love Christ and feed His sheep. Then he *will* be an example of believers. Then he *will* take heed to his doctrine and continue steadfast therein. Then he will bear patiently all sufferings and oppressions as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. For, being called of God, God speaks these mandates in his heart; God, in a word, qualifies His servant. And in the way of his bearing these fruits, the minister more and more makes sure his calling to the sacred ministry.

Once more then, how shall they preach except they be called . . . sent? Except they be called, they may not preach; for they have not the right. Except they be called, they cannot preach; for they are not qualified.

G.M.O.

FROM HOLY WRIT

Exposition of I Corinthians 12-14

(I Corinthians 13:8-13)

We should ever keep in mind, for the proper understanding of this beautiful song of love in I Corinthians, that Paul is discussing the concept love from the viewpoint of its superior nature to all other spiritual gifts in the church. And, when he does so, he does not merely speak of the concept love in the abstract, but as love concretely reveals itself in the Church on earth by the operation of the Spirit of Christ.

Shall the gifts in the church really serve for the *mutual* benefit of all, for the entire body of Christ and for each member in particular, then these gifts must all stand in the service of love, the love of God, which is out of the Father, through the Son and in the Holy Spirit.

For these "Spiritual Gifts," we repeat for the tenth time, are only *means to an end*, and they are in no sense of the word an end in themselves. All must be so used in the church, that by virtue of the "love," they are the "more excellent way!"

That love is "more excellent" is evident from its manifestation. It is "longsuffering" and it "endures" all things.

But why is love thus?

The deepest reason must be the fact that "God is love!"

And this love of God must be manifested in the entire economy of salvation in the church, both in this age and in the age to come. The exceeding greatness of the love, mercy and infinite goodness of God must be manifested in the church. Wherefore "love" is not a temporary arrangement 'till the time appointed,' but it belongs to the quintessence of salvation itself. Take "love" out of salvation and you deny the very meaning of salvation!

Wherefore it is the wonderful reality, that, when all the gifts in the church have served their purpose, they shall be removed, or belong to the past stages of the church's life on earth. But "love" shall never belong to the past!

This is the point Paul illucidates and teaches in a masterful way, showing us the architectural lines of the work of God's good-pleasure over all things.

The passage we refer to is found in I Corinthians 13:8-13. Since the passage is of such great moment, we will quote it in full. We read: "*Love never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall be done away; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall be done away. For we know in part and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is*

in part shall be done away. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child: now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things. For now we see in a mirror darkly (in a riddle); but then face to face: now I know in part: by then shall I know fully as also I was fully known. But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three: and the greater of these is love."

It should be observed that Paul gives us one complete section. He begins and ends by saying the same thing about love, only he begins with a *negative* statement, whereas he ends with a positive statement concerning love. Writes he in verse 8 "*Love never faileth . . .*" and ends with the positive "*and now remains faith, hope, love, these three . . .*". We believe that these two words, to wit "never faileth" and "remains" constitute the key-words in this passage.

Concerning the term "never faileth," it should be noticed, that the term really looks forwards, anticipating the idea of "always remains" and backward toward the manifestation of this "love" in that it is "long-suffering" and that it "endures" all things. It never fails in its wonderful manifestation, since it is so enduring in nature, greater than even faith and hope. It never fails in its inner manifestation, since it never ceases in its Divine operation.

And positively, it should be noted, that love is "greater" than faith and hope. Such is the comparative degree of the adjective in the text. Writes A. T. Robertson in his "W.P. Of The New Testament." The form of *meizoon* is comparative, but it is used as superlative, for the superlative form *megistos* had become rare in the Koine. (Robertson's Grammar, pp. 667 f.f.) This is entirely possible. However, I really believe that the comparative form indicates that Paul is comparing "love" not with two other gifts, but rather with faith and hope as in one class. And the reason why "love" is greater than either faith or hope is, undoubtedly, the fact that the former is basic for the latter. Faith is *energized* by love, and rooted in love. See Gal. 5:6. And the hope, which is in our hearts, is there only because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts. Were the love taken from our hearts, we would not trust and hope in God. Compare Rom. 5:3.

Concerning this never failing and abiding love, superceding all gifts, faith and hope included, Paul has a few very important matters to tell us, when he compares this "love" with other spiritual gifts (charismata) in the church, particularly: speaking with tongues, prophecies, and knowledge. (See verses 8 and 9). We should notice the following:

1. That on the very surface there is a distinction between the gift of "tongues" on the one hand and the gifts of "prophecy" and "knowledge" on the other hand. It would seem that the difference between these gifts was underestimated by the Corinthians. Lacking a sense of the proper relationship of all the gifts to the church, as rooted in love, they also lacked this sense of proportion of the relationship

of the several gifts mutually. Hence, they gave a greater importance to "tongues" than they did to "prophecy." The obvious reason for this was that tongues afforded the flesh free play for displaying itself; the superficial mind always loses sight of the essential. And, now, Paul suggests very strongly the superiority of "prophecy" over "tongues."

2. For this reason it is stated of "tongues" that they "shall cease." Notice they simply cease. They just stop. Suddenly they are no more in the church of God. They are of a very short duration. They were designed by God only to serve as a "sign"; they were merely a mode of making the content of prophecy and knowledge known. But this mode of impartation of knowledge and prophecy can and does fall away, without in the least affecting the church's possession of the necessary knowledge of the mysteries of God. Hence, they shall "cease."

3. On the other hand "prophecy" and "knowledge" must be "done away," that is, by an act of God whereby he drastically *changes* the order of things, He annuls, abolishes, puts an end to prophecy and knowledge, changing its very nature. This will be effected by God in the Parousia, when all things shall be perfected in heavenly perfection. This shows that the gifts of knowledge and prophecy are a permanent gift in the Church, while that of speaking with tongues is not permanent. And all attempts on the part of certain sects to revive the speaking with tongues is erroneous. Furthermore, this also shows that the knowledge referred to in the text is that which is the possession of the entire church throughout the N. Testament dispensation, taken as a whole. This refers to all her theology and confession. And this also refers to all her prophesying, and preaching in which she says: Know the Lord! This latter cannot simply cease, but must be superceded by a greater and better form of knowledge and prophecy, and thus the old must be abolished forever, by the bringing in of the better and eternal.

In the Parousia of Christ, when the world shall pass away in fire, all analytical knowledge will also pass away. When all the theological works of all the theologians will be burned nothing will be lost. All these books will be absolutely useless in that "form" of seeing "face to face." They will no longer fit the situation. They will all be abolished by the Lord. That will be the time when no one will say to his neighbor: know the Lord!

The disannulling of the present knowledge and prophesy does not mean that this knowledge is for the present not a *valid* knowledge. It is. It is the gift of the Holy Spirit. We must be busy in theological effort. Such is our calling. It is the very essence of a "knowing *in part* and of a prophesying *in part*." We should observe that this "in part" is not the same as "from part." See Romans 11:25 where we read "because hardening has come upon a *part* of Israel . . ." Here we do not read "apocryphous" but we read "ek merous," that is "out of part." Luther translates this as meaning "piece-meal"

knowledge. (stückweise). Such piecemeal knowledge is valid knowledge. It does not mean knowing "relatively," a knowledge of approximation. It rather refers to a knowledge which is genuine and real, a revelation of the full counsel of God in Christ, which the entire church will grasp together, putting it together in piece-meal. It is analytical knowledge.

This is clear from the history of dogma and of the confessions in the church.

How gradually the church began to grasp the importance of all the great dogma's of Scripture, of the mysteries of God in Christ, is evident from the fact, that each age in the church performed a definite task in the making the truth in Christ their content of prophecy and of knowledge. Surely the church saw this all by faith in essence. But to lay it all down in confessional statement was a slow and a laborious process, occasioned by much error and misconception. And always this was because we know *in part* and prophesy *in part*.

This is indeed sobering.

Such an understanding of the limitation shows that all prophecy and knowledge is limited, partial and also temporal. It shall be annulled and abolished.

We are now as church really to be compared with the little child in relationship to the adult. It is the same child, the same person, in both cases. The one, the child, is the immature person. The adult has put away the things of the child, in speaking, in psychological feelings and affection, and in thought-processes. There is a tremendous change. Such will be the change, only in a far greater degree, in the knowledge of the Church now and in the future age.

Now we see, as it were, through a glass darkened. We see as it were in a "dark-saying." We need to ponder the meaning, think upon it, meditate. Nothing is intuitive in the "knowledge" in the church. All is labor. Now the light falls over our shoulder, as it were, upon the mirror of revelation; we stand, as it were, with our backs to God.

Presently we shall see face to face.

We shall see the glory of God, all the mystery, unfolded before our wondering gaze. We shall see face to face. We shall know with a knowledge which is complete and full. Our knowledge shall fully agree with the knowledge of God to us.

Here we do not argue who is the greatest; we do not vie for superiority and honor. We are like little children. We look in faith and hope wrought by love to hear from the more sure prophetic word, "O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted, behold I will set thy stones in fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy pinnacles of rubies, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy border of precious stones. And all thy children shall be taught of Jehovah, and great shall be the peace of thy people."

G.L.

IN HIS FEAR

Living As the Lord Wills

We certainly do.

We have a calling to learn what the will of the Lord is in every phase of our life and in every circumstance of our life. Our calling is to do nothing that is contrary to the will of God. Never may our prayers breathe any other spirit than the one in Jesus' prayer, "Not my will but Thy will be done."

Yet it may also be stated that we always do live as He wills.

We may speak of the will of the Lord in a twofold sense. We may speak of it in the sense of His ethical will, or we may speak of it in the sense of His determinative will, His will of decree. By His ethical will we mean that wherein He delights, the behaviour He demands of us, that which is expressed by God Himself in the Ten Commandments. His ethical will is that we love Him and our neighbours as ourselves. His ethical will is that we walk in the way of those commandments, conforming all our life to them, living for His praise and glory, dedicated unto Him with all our being and possessions. By His will of decree, His determinative will we mean that which He has determined in His sovereign and eternal counsel shall take place in this midst of this great and wide creation which He has made. In that counsel or will of decree is determined every step of our lives: when we are to be born, to whom we are born, where we will be born, what we will do every moment of our earthly lives, the moment of our death, the way in which we will be overtaken by death, whether we are elect children of His and will immediately enter in the glory of His kingdom or whether one is chosen to everlasting destruction and at death will be cast into the lake of torment. All these things in the life of the individual, all things in the lives of all men, all that happens in creation whether in heaven, on earth, or in hell occurs according to His determinative will. Therefore we said, We certainly do live as the Lord wills.

Whether our life shall be one wherein things go in such a manner that the flesh has little whereof to complain, or whether it is a way that is constantly lined with hardships, sorrows and disappointments for the flesh, we live as the Lord wills.

Not infrequently you will hear one extolling the providence of God when that individual by a few minutes missed getting on the plane that crashed with no survivors an hour after departure. Of course that was the providence of God. Such an individual, who was detained and kept from boarding that plane that took all its passengers to death, certainly lives because the Lord so willed it. We always live as the Lord wills. But it is just as true that all those passengers and crew that perished did so in the providence of God. That

plane crash was in His providence as well as the events that caused some of those who intended to board that plane to be left behind. We live as the Lord wills, but we also die as the Lord wills. It is well that we go to Him and thank Him for His providence when He wills to save us from what seemed to be certain death for us. But we do not do Him justice when we rule out His providence, His almighty hand and sovereign will in those things which do not please our flesh.

We must not and cannot be hypocritical before Him. We cannot come to Him with thanksgiving for things that make our hearts bleed and cause our bodies to be tormented with excruciating pains. We cannot sincerely come to Him, then, and tell Him how happy we are at these works of His hands and at these things which He was willed for us. No, but we can and should acknowledge before Him that HE has done these things, that He has a sovereign right to do these things unto us. And we can thank Him for the knowledge and faith that all these things "come not by chance but by His fatherly hand." The world does not know this, cannot confess this, attributes things to fate and luck and an impersonal providence. But he who has the fear of the Lord in his heart knows that these things come from God, knows that God works all these things — the things pleasant for the flesh but also the things that hurt the flesh — together for good to those that love Him. This believing child of God will, therefore, thank Him for sending these things for *that* reason. He will thank God for seeking his good. Though he cannot rejoice in the grief-promoting thing itself — for this is psychologically impossible — and though his flesh cries for things that are easier to bear, he can and will give thanks to God for seeking his good through these terrifying and pain-inflicting things. He does not speak of God's goodness only when the flesh can be happy. He speaks of God's goodness in ALL that which He wills to bring upon His people. He confesses that we live as the Lord wills and that the only good thing for us is that which the Lord wills to bring upon us.

We do live as the Lord wills. And we do die as the Lord wills. Whether we live or whether we die, what the Lord wills for us takes place. You and I cannot change that at all. No matter how much a man might want to change that — and all men by nature do want to change that — this is an unalterable principle: We live as the Lord wills.

Who can possibly change that?

Can a man change God? Can the clay change the potter?

Let us beware lest we allow our minds to revel in the lie of Paradise. Instead let us walk in His fear with these things that are His works and are so grievous to our flesh. In His fear we will reject the lie of Paradise and confess Him to be Lord of ALL. The fear of the Lord is the principle of all wisdom. Deny that He is God and you manifest hopeless folly. Then you will do all the foolishness of our first parents and eat of the forbidden fruits of this world. After

all, that is the folly that Satan brought into the heart and mind of man through his lie. He induced man to believe that he could be like God. He persuaded man to think that he could arrive at a point where he did not need to and would no longer fear God. He would be God's equal. He embraced the folly that God could be changed and that he could live as he willed rather than as the Lord willed. Let us beware lest we allow our minds to revel in the folly of the lie that God can be changed, that His will is not sovereign and that our lives are not completely under His everlasting, unchangeable and eternal will.

What a year in which to remember that we live as the LORD wills!

There are, no doubt, many "old timers" — we mean no disrespect by the term — who will be able to recall events in the realm of creation which overshadow what has happened this year of our lives. But it must be conceded that the Lord has willed some pretty startling things for us this year.

Floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, heat waves all came by His will.

Over eight hundred tornadoes recorded thus far this year! Not a few of them were of a very great magnitude. Lands were drenched with rain, day after day, week after week. The land could not be worked. Seed could not be committed to the soil till so late that it is a question whether it will bring forth a ripe crop before the freezing temperature put a stop to growth and destroys the crop. Farmers were hard hit by the drought. The rains came only to continue to come until the time for planting was almost past. The plants began to stand in their rows to give hope of a harvest. The floods came and overflowed the fertile growing fields. A ruined field. Replant it. Again the crops appear row upon row; and in the warm and agreeable weather begin to grow with cheering rapidity. The western sky darkens; the rains again come. But this time behold the white sheet bearing down and hear the continuous rumble of what sounds like thunder that does not cease. Hailstones, great big hailstones, big enough to break the back of a hog left out in the field, large enough to shred a tree of all its leaves in a very short time, heavy enough to make ugly dents in the steel top, hood and trunk of an automobile. And the whole crop is gone once again. And because of the drought for the last two years, the blow becomes that much the harder for the flesh to bear.

But we live as the Lord wills. And we receive crops and crop failures as He wills. We receive little rain; and we receive torrents of devastating rain that causes flood damage to homes and factories, to stores and hospitals as well as to crops in the field. And we receive both as the Lord wills.

We ask again, Who can change that?

Who has ever rendered the tornado harmless and made it disappear? Men have charted its course and warned those who lived in its path. But who has turned it aside and

nullified its power? Only God had it in His power to turn it where He willed, to lift it up over this building and make it swoop down and snatch this building and these frightened men, women and children. Men can predict the thunderstorm and add "the possibility exists of hail and locally severe storms." But upon whose will does it depend as to whether those locally severe storms come or not, whether the "rough weaher" hits your community or not? Surely not on man's. As the Lord wills these things come. As the Lord wills — that is, to the degree that He wills — they will strike and work their havoc and destruction.

And what shall we say to all these things?

Well, let us say exactly that: These things came as the Lord willed!

We distinguish — as we already did — between His ethical will and His determinative will. But remember that His ethical will is that you recognize His determinative will as being sovereign. Though we may distinguish between these two wills we may never, never separate them. What He sends us according to His determinative will, He demands that we receive as His will. And He demands that we receive it in the spirit of His ethical will. He demands of us that we have no god besides Him when He comes with these calamities according to His determinative will. He demands that we do not covet our neighbour's possessions which were not taken from him in that determinative will of God. Jealousy, envy of that which the neighbour has according to God's determinative will His ethical will forbid.

Living as the Lord wills means living in His fear.

It means that we continue to say that He is God and that there is no god besides Him. It means that we do not want another god besides Him, that we bow before His will and confess before Him that because He is God His will alone must be done. It means that we will His will.

It is pride that causes a man to rebel against God's will. Let us be careful that we do not murmur and complain, do not find fault and criticize the will of God. He still remains God. And He will make plain to all in the day of days that we live and die as He wills. Walk, then, in His fear.

J.A.H.

THE CONFIDENCE OF FAITH

The Lord Almighty is my light,
He is my Saviour ever near,
And, since my strength is in His might,
Who can distress me or afright?
What evil shall I fear?

O Lord, regard me when I cry,
In mercy hear me when I speak;
Thou bidst me seek, Thy face, and I,
O Lord, with willing heart reply,
Thy face, Lord, will I seek.

Ps. 27:1, 2

Contending For The Faith

The Church and the Sacraments

VIEWS DURING THE THIRD PERIOD (750-1517 A.D.)

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE

GREGORY VII AND THE PAPACY (continued).

At the same time Henry wrote to the cardinals and the Roman people to aid him in the election of a new pope. Roland, a priest of Parma, brought the letter to Rome at the end of February, as Gregory was just holding a synod of a hundred and ten bishops, and concluded his message with the words, "I tell you, brethren, that you must appear at Pentecost before the king to receive from his hands a pope and father; for this man here is not pope, but a ravening wolf." This produced a storm of indignation. The prelates drew swords and were ready to kill him on the spot; but Gregory remained calm, and protected him against violence.

On the next day (February 22) the pope excommunicated and deposed Henry in the name of St. Peter, and absolved his subjects from their oath of obedience. He published the ban in a letter to all Christians. The sentence of deposition is as follows: "Blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, incline thine ear unto me, and hear me, thy servant, whom from childhood thou didst nurse and protect against the wicked to this day. Thou and my lady, the mother of God, and thy brother, St. Paul, are my witnesses that the holy Roman Church has drawn me to the helm against my will, and that I have not risen up like a robber to thy seat [we may recall from our preceding article that Henry IV, in his insulting letter to the pope of January 24, 1076, had declared that Gregory had won his power through craft, flattery, bribery, and force, and had despised the precept of the true pope, St. Peter. — H. V.J. Rather would I have been a pilgrim my whole life long than have snatched to myself thy chair on account of temporal glory and in a worldly spirit . . . By thy intercession God has intrusted me with the power to bind and to loose on earth and in heaven. Therefore, relying on this trust, for the honor and security of the Church, in the name of the Almighty Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, I do prohibit Henry, king, son of Henry the emperor, from ruling the kingdom of the Teutons and of Italy, because with unheard-of pride he has lifted himself up against thy Church; and I release all Christians from the oath of allegiance to him which they have taken, or shall take, and I forbid that any shall serve him as king. For it is fitting that he who will touch the dignity of the Church should lose his own. And inasmuch as he has

despised obedience by associating with the excommunicate, by many deeds of iniquity, and by spurning the warnings which I have given him for his good, I bind him in the bands of anathema; that all nations of the earth may know that thou art Peter, and that upon the rock the Son of the living God hath built His Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

The empress-widow was present when the anathema was pronounced on her son. At the same time the pope excommunicated all the German and Italian bishops who had deposed him at Worms and Piacenza.

This was a most critical moment, and the signal for a deadly struggle between the two greatest potentates in Christendom. Never before had such a tremendous sentence been pronounced upon a crowned head. The deposition of Childeric by Pope Zacharias was only the sanction of the actual rule of Pepin. Gregory threatened also King Philip of France with deposition, but did not execute it. Now the heir of the crown of Charlemagne was declared an outlaw by the successor of the Galilean fisherman, and Europe accepted the decision. There were not wanting, indeed, voices of discontent and misgivings about the validity of a sentence which justified the breaking of a solemn oath. All conceded the papal right of excommunication, but not the right of deposition. If Henry had commanded the respect and love of his subjects, he might have defied Gregory. But the religious sentiment of the age sustained the pope, and was far less shocked by the papal excommunication and deposition of the king than by the royal deposition of the pope. It was never forgotten that the pope had crowned Charlemagne, and it seemed natural that his power to bestow implied his power to withhold or to take away.

Gregory had not a moment's doubt as to the justice of his act. He invited the faithful to pray, and did not neglect the dictates of worldly prudence. He strengthened his military force in Rome, and reopened negotiations with Robert Guiscard and Roger. In Northern Italy he had a powerful ally in Countess Matilda, who, by the recent death of her husband and her mother, had come into full possession of vast dominions, and furnished a bulwark against the discontented clergy and nobility of Lombardy and an invading army from Germany. The excommunication of Henry in 1076 and again in 1080 called forth a controversial literature of some proportions, as did Gregory's attitude towards simony and clerical celibacy. The anti-Gregorians took the ground that the excommunication was unjust and even called in question the pope's right to excommunicate a king. Gregory's letters make reference to these objections. Writing to a certain Hermann of Metz, Gregory said that there were some who openly declared that a king should not be excommunicated. Gregory justified his act on the ground of the king's companionship with excommunicated persons, his refusal to offer repentance for crimes, and the rupture of

the unity of the Church which resulted from the king's course. The Council of Tribur, Oct. 16, 1076, discussed the question whether a pope might excommunicate a king and whether Gregory had acted justly in excommunicating Henry. It answered both questions in the affirmative. A hundred years after the event, Otto of Freising speaks of the sentence as unheard of before.

When Henry received the tidings of the sentence of excommunication and deposition, he burst into a furious rage, abused Gregory as a hypocrite, heretic, murderer, perjurer, adulterer, and threatened to fling back the anathema upon his head. William, bishop of Utrecht, had no scruples in complying with the king's wishes, and from the pulpit of his cathedral anathematized Gregory as "a perjured monk who had dared to lift up his head against the Lord's anointed." Henry summoned a national council to Worms on Whitsunday (May 15) to protest against the attempt of Gregory to unite in one hand the two swords which God had separated.

This was the famous figure for the spiritual and temporal power afterwards often employed by the popes, who claimed that God had given both swords to the Church, — the spiritual sword, to be borne by her; the temporal, to be wielded by the State for the Church, that is, in subjection and obedience to the Church.

The council at Worms was attended by few bishops and proved a failure. A council in Mainz, June 29, turned out no better, and Henry found it necessary to negotiate. Saxony was lost; prelates and nobles deserted him. A diet at Tribur, an imperial castle near Mainz, held Oct. 16, 1076, demanded that he should submit to the pope, seek absolution from him within twelve months from the date of excommunication, at the risk of forfeiting his crown. He should then appear at a diet to be held at Augsburn on Feb. 2, 1077, under the presidency of the pope. Meanwhile he was to abide at Spire in strict privacy, in the sole company of his wife, the bishop of Verdun, and a few servants chosen by the nobles. The legates of Gregory were treated with marked respect, and gave absolution to the excommunicated bishops, including Siegfried of Mainz, who submitted to the pope.

Henry spent two dreary months in seclusion at Spire, shut out from the services of the Church and the affairs of the State. At last he made up his mind to seek absolution, as the only means of saving his crown. There was no time to be lost; only a few weeks remained till the Diet of Augsburn, which would decide his fate.

Canossa. 1077.

The winter of 1076-1077 was one of the coldest and longest within the memory of men — the Rhine being frozen to a solid mass from November till April — and one of the most memorable in history — being marked by an event of typical significance. The humiliation of the head of the German Empire at the feet of the bishop of Rome at Canossa

means the subjection of the State to the Church and the triumph of the Hildebrandian policy.

A few days before Christmas, Henry IV left Spire on a journey across the Alps as a penitent, seeking absolution from the pope. He was accompanied by his wife with her infant son Conrad (born August, 1071) and one faithful servant, Bertha, daughter of the margrave Odo of Turin and Adelheid of Susa, was betrothed to Henry in 1055 at Zurich, and married to him, July 13, 1066. She was young, beautiful, virtuous, and amiable; but he preferred to live with mistresses; and three years after the marriage he sought a divorce, with the aid of the unprincipled archbishop Siegfried of Mainz. The pope very properly refused his consent. The king gave up his wicked intention, and became attached to Bertha. She was born to love and to suffer, and accompanied him as a comforting angel through the bitter calamities of his life.

The royal couple passed through Burgundy and Susa under the protection of Count William and the mother of Bertha, and crossed Mont Cenis. The queen and her child were carried up and lowered down the icy slopes in rough sledges of oxhide; some horses were killed, but no human lives lost. When Henry reached the plains of Lombardy, he was received with joy by the anti-Hildebrandian party; but he hurried on to meet the successor of Peter, who alone could give him absolution.

He left his wife and child at Reggio, and, accompanied by his mother-in-law and a few friends, he climbed up the steep hill to Canossa, where Gregory was then stopping on his journey to the Diet of Augsburn, waiting for a safe-conduct across the Alps.

Canossa, now in ruins, was an impregnable fortress of the Countess Matilda, south of Reggio, on the northern slope of the Apennines, surrounded by three walls, and including a castle, a chapel, and a convent. This castle was destroyed by the inhabitants of Reggio in 1255. The site affords a magnificent view of the Apennines towards the south, and of the plain of the Po towards the north, and the cities of Parma, Reggio, and Modena. An excursion from Reggio to Canossa and back can be made in eight hours.

The pope had already received a number of excommunicated bishops and noblemen, and given or promised them absolution after the case of the chief sinner against the majesty of St. Peter should be decided.

Henry arrived at the foot of the castle-steep, Jan. 21, 1077, when the cold was severe and the ground covered with snow. He had an interview with Matilda and Hugo, abbot of Cluny, his godfather, and declared his willingness to submit to the pope if he was released from the interdict. But Gregory would only absolve him on condition that he would surrender to him his crown and forever resign the royal dignity. The king made the last step to secure the mercy of the pope: he assumed the severest penances which the Church

(Continued on page 454)

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CANDLESTICK

The golden candlestick was an article of furniture in the tabernacle and temple of Israel. Both the tabernacle and the temple were built after the same pattern — they were divided into three main sections, the Outer Court, the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies. Each section of this building had its articles of furniture, and the candlestick was found in the Holy Place.

We learn the description of the candlestick from Exodus 25:31-40. From this passage we may describe the candlestick as being a tube or pipe with arms or branches coming out of it near the top. These arms were set in a row and their tops were even. They were graduated in such a way however, that each arm came from the central tube and formed a quarter-circle. There were six such arms — seven places in all for the lamps to be placed. The tops were so formed that lamps could be fitted in them in which oil could be burned. The candlestick was made of one talent of pure gold and decorated with "knops and flowers." Because the tops of the candlestick were almond shaped, it is sometimes said that the whole article of furniture resembled an almond tree with the major pipe representing the trunk, the branches decorated with knops or fruit and flowers or buds. And there are some who maintain that this almond tree was typical of spiritual wakefulness and alertness — the ardor of Jehovah and the haste with which He accomplishes His purpose. This explanation is based upon Jeremiah 1:11, 12. It is perhaps difficult to determine whether this explanation is correct or not.

Even as the temple, so also the candlestick had a history. In the original tabernacle which Moses built there was one. It was on the south side of the Holy Place overagainst the table of shewbread. If one would enter the Holy Place from the East, the altar of incense would be directly before him against the veil which divided the Holy Place from the inner sanctuary. To the right would be the table of shewbread, and to the left, the golden candlestick. When Solomon built his glorious temple on the heights of Zion, then he put ten candlesticks in the Holy Place instead of one. And they were moved closer to the veil with five on each side of the altar of incense. This temple with the candlestick was destroyed at the time of the Babylonian captivity. When the temple was rebuilt by Zerubbabel, one candlestick was again placed in the Holy Place; but this candlestick was taken away by Antiochus Epiphanes who sacked the temple and polluted it. It was later replaced by Judas Macabeus, the one shining light in Israel's dark history between Malachi and Christ. Later Herod built a new temple and put one candlestick in the Holy Place; but this was taken away by Titus when Jerusalem was destroyed in 70 A.D.

There is one other candlestick mentioned in Scripture. And that is the candlestick which the prophet Zechariah saw in his vision recorded in Zechariah 4. This is the candlestick of the new temple which God would build when His promise

would be fully realized in the day of Jesus Christ. This candlestick was similar in all respects to the one which had been in the temple, except for the fact that it had a bowl above it; and the bowl was connected to the bowls of the arms of the candlestick by forty-nine pipes — seven pipes to each branch of the candlestick. Furthermore, this bowl was connected to two olive trees by two golden pipes, so that the oil of the olive trees flowed directly into the bowl and then into the candlestick where it was burned.

The candlestick in the tabernacle and temple was lit at the time of the evening oblation and burned all through the night until the morning when the oil presumably was gone. Then it was not again lit until the oil was replenished in the evening by the High Priest. Thus we read in I Samuel 3:3, 4: "And ere the lamp of God went out in the temple of the Lord, where the ark of God was, and Samuel was laid down to sleep; That the Lord called Samuel; and he answered, Here am I."

The question is now, What is the significance of this golden candlestick?

The temple itself was also a type of a spiritual reality and had significance for Israel's ecclesiastical life. For it was in the Most Holy Place that the Lord dwelt between the wings of the cherubim of the ark of the covenant. The Lord dwelt in the midst of His people. And when He came into the midst of His people, then He gathered His people into His covenant fellowship under one roof to commune with them and tell them the secrets of His eternal purpose. But the people could not enter into the temple. They had to remain in the outer court; so that if they desired to meet with Jehovah their God, they had to come with sacrifices so that blood could be shed to cover their sins and make it possible for them to commune in God's tabernacle with Jehovah. The temple was the place where these sacrifices were made. And the priests always had to stand between the people and God in order to make intercession for them. Besides, the priests themselves were not holy, but very wicked. And so once a year the High Priest had to enter into the Most Holy Place with blood to pour upon the mercy seat of the ark of the covenant for an offering for the sins of the people and of the priests.

But this all was a picture of a profound truth. Christ is the temple of the Lord. And He is the temple because He is God and man united in the person of God's eternal Son. It is in Him therefore, that the covenant of grace, the closest possible union between God and man is established. And He realized that covenant by making the perfect sacrifice for sin and carrying His own blood into the holy presence of God. And therefore in Him the covenant of God is realized with the elect who are chosen in Him from before the foundation of the world. And when the elect church of Christ is engrafted into His body by faith, then the temple of God — the perfect and glorious realization of God's everlasting covenant of grace is realized. There the temple signified the body of

Christ with the church of all ages as His body. And apart from this temple, the candlestick could never be understood.

For each article of furniture in that temple signified the church from a particular point of view. And the question is, What is the point of view of the candlestick?

The oil which burned in the candlestick was typical of the Holy Spirit, as oil always symbolized the Holy Spirit in Scripture. Those who were anointed with oil in the Old Dispensation — the prophets and priests and kings — were anointed as a sign of the Holy Spirit Which qualified them to perform the duties of their office, and ordained them so that they had the right to function. To quote but one text to substantiate this is perhaps sufficient. In Isaiah 61:1, the prophet refers to the work of Christ to which He was ordained and qualified. And Christ later quotes this same passage in the synagogue of Nazareth as fulfilled in Himself. It reads: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound."

Besides this, light has also symbolic significance in Scripture. It is probably impossible to discuss this in detail, but a few general remarks may be sufficient. The light of the sun which sends its rays upon our planet serves its purpose in this creation. It is first of all the means of heat and therefore also of life. Without the warming rays of the sun, life could not exist. Besides, it is the light of the sun that makes it possible for man to stand in contact with the creation about him. If there were absolute darkness, he could not know anything at all. For it is by means of the light of the sun which is reflected from the various parts of the creation and which enters his eye that he can know the things of this world in which he lives. When light strikes a tree and is reflected from it, entering into man's eye, he knows the tree because he sees it.

There is however, a spiritual reality which corresponds to this natural phenomenon. God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all. And the light that is God the radiation, profound and glorious, of all the infinite perfections of His divine being. He is light because He is infinitely holy and good, because in Him there is no imperfection or incompleteness, because He is all His infinite attributes from eternity to eternity. But He has chosen to reveal Himself. He has chosen to reveal His own infinite perfection and shining light. And the highest revelation of God is in Jesus Christ, for He is the light of God which was sent into a world of darkness and sin. He is the "brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person." He is the full revelation of the infinite grace and goodness and perfection of His Father. Revelation is in Jesus Christ. Revelation is in Jesus Christ through the work of Christ performed on this earth — through His suffering and death and burial; but also through His resurrection

and ascension and the glory which He now possesses and will possess when His kingdom is fully realized.

Therefore darkness is always spiritual depravity. Darkness is the inability to know the things of God or of His Christ. Darkness is spiritual corruption of the heart and of the mind so that the natural man cannot possibly see the kingdom of heaven. When man fell, he became dark. He lost the ability to know the revelation of God. He lost the light which was within Him and He could not perceive any longer spiritual things. Darkness is therefore also moral and spiritual corruption and degradation. It is the state of the sinner in the depths of depravity and the condition of evil. In short, it is the loss of the image of God — true knowledge, righteousness and holiness.

But nevertheless, God continues to reveal Himself. And He reveals Himself to His church throughout all the ages of time. He causes His light to shine in the world of sin and darkness which cannot perceive the light of God's holiness. But very little good that would still do if man remained in his depraved state. So God also causes that same light of His holiness and infinite perfection to shine in the hearts of the elect enlightening their minds and their hearts. He does so by the Spirit of Jesus Christ, for all revelation of God is always in the Son and through the Spirit. But this Spirit He "powerfully illuminates their minds . . . that they may rightly understand and discern the things of the Spirit of God." Canons III and IV, 11. He renews their hearts so that they are given the righteousness and holiness of Jesus Christ their Lord. In short, He causes His light to shine in them and renews in them the image of the only Son of God. And then He brings to them the light of His gospel so that they receive the full revelation of God in Jesus Christ. They receive the light of revelation so that God is revealed in Jesus Christ, but also in His elect church which becomes the body of Jesus Christ by faith. And thus they live spiritually and walk in the world of sin and darkness revealing the perfections of their God which He has wrought within their hearts. And when finally that church is brought to heaven and all darkness is banished into hell, then the redeemed and glorified church in Jesus Christ shall be the perfect and full revelation of God to His glory forever and ever. It is all the revelation of God in Jesus Christ that God may be glorified when His perfections are realized in the culmination of His everlasting covenant. For knowing God, the elect live unto all eternity. Light is knowledge and life and holiness and righteousness.

Let me quote a few Scripture passages. In John 1:1-5 we read, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not."

And again in verse nine of the same chapter: "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Or, as proof of the revelation of the Light through the gospel, we may well refer to II Corinthians 4:4-6: "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them. For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." This is a most beautiful passage of Scripture to prove what I have just said. Besides, we may turn to Ephesians 5:8 where we read, "For we were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of the light."

But to return now to the golden candlestick, we find that the candlestick signifies the church from the point of view of the light of God. In the midst of a world of darkness they are the body of Christ and therefore the revelation of God in Christ of all the glorious virtues of their Father. And this is realized in the eternal covenant which God has established in Christ with His elect. For they know God, for God has revealed Himself unto them by the Spirit of Christ and the gospel of the light. And knowing God, they live. "For this is eternal life: that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John 17:3. And living, they enjoy the blessings of God's eternal fellowship and communion. And thus they shine as a light which cannot be hid in the midst of darkness. They are shining light of the glory of their God in the image of Jesus Christ. And in the age to come, they shall shine forever in the kingdom of their Father when the Sun of Righteousness shall come to take them home into the blessings of God's eternal tabernacle. Then shall they know God and live in perfect righteousness and holiness. And the revelation of God to His eternal glory shall be perfectly realized.

This is the glorious vision also that Zechariah saw as recorded in the fourth chapter of his prophecy. The candlestick which he saw in his vision was fed directly by two olive trees. There was a day when the priests had to fill the lamps. But in the perfect temple of God this is no more necessary. The oil flows directly into the candlestick through the pipes. Therefore the two olive trees represented according to the angel, Zerubbabel who was the governor and who stood in the royal line of David, and Joshua the high priest of the line of Aaron. But this vision was fulfilled when the two offices of Zerubbabel and Joshua were united in the BRANCH, Jesus Christ. For as the oil is a symbol of His Spirit, so also does the Spirit of God flow through Jesus Christ and into the church in order that they may shine to the everlasting glory of God the Father! And therefore the interpretation of this vision is, "Not by might nor by

power, but by my Spirit saith Jehovah of Hosts." All that the candlestick pictured in this age and in the age to come is accomplished not by might, not by power, but by the Spirit of Jesus Christ. The church is gathered, redeemed and perfected, the covenant of God is realized, the full glory of God is revealed and all is accomplished not by might, nor by power, but by the Spirit of Jesus Christ!

H. Hanko

GOD OUR RESORT IN TROUBLE

In Thee, O Lord, I put my trust,
I call upon Thy Name;
O save me in Thy righteousness,
Nor let me suffer shame.

Bow down Thy ear to my request,
And swift deliverances send;
Be Thou to me a rock of strength,
A fortress to defend.

Since Thou my rock and fortress art,
My leader be, and guide;
From all temptation rescue me,
Thou dost my strength abide.

To Thee my spirit I commend;
Redemption is with Thee,
O Thou Jehovah, God of truth,
Who has delivered me.

I hate all those that love the false,
My trust is in the Lord;
I will be glad, and joyfully
Thy mercy will record.

For my affliction Thou hast seen,
And known my many woes;
Thou hast not let me be enslaved,
But freed me from my foes.

Show mercy, Lord, to me distressed,
And send my soul relief;
My life is spent with bitterness,
My strength consumed with grief.

I mourn and fail because of sin,
Friends turn in dread away;
Reproached am I and terrified,
While foes conspire to slay.

But, Lord, in Thee is all my trust,
Thou art my God, I cried;
My life, my times are in Thy hand,
I in Thy strength confide.

Psalms 31:1-9

DECENCY and ORDER

Major and Minor Assemblies

Last time we concluded our article with a quotation from "The Church Order Commentary" which touched upon the matter of the distinction between major and minor ecclesiastical assemblies. As we stated then, we intend, D.V., to discuss this matter more fully in connection with another article of our Church Order but we desire to make just a few remarks in the present connection.

First, the quotation expresses the proper relation of major and minor ecclesiastical assemblies and, insofar as it goes, it is correct. Such statements, for example, as: "But Reformed Church Polity does not hold that Consistories have a lower and more limited degree of authority, and Classis and Synod a higher or more extensive degree . . . In fact Reformed Church polity knows of only one type and degree of authority; that vested in the local congregation or its ruling body, the Consistory . . . The real unit is, therefore, the individual church. And the local churches do not exist for the sake of the denomination, but the denomination exists for the sake of the local and individual churches," express the Reformed view; the view always maintained by our Protestant Reformed Churches.

Secondly, although, as the Introductory Preface to the commentary indicates, this book "is not an official, that is, synodically approved, commentary on the Church Order," we wonder whether the authors of this work at least would be ready to concede that the principles they establish in their writings were flagrantly violated by their church in connection with the sad history of 1924. That it is so has been shown many times in the past in our *Standard Bearer* and we are convinced that many leaders in the Christian Reformed Church also know it is true but until the injustices are rectified in the way of confession and repentance, the guilt remains with them and God judges also the history of His church.

Finally, the statement, ". . . at major assemblies, a larger measure of authority is present than at minor assemblies, even as ten men are stronger than one alone," touches a very vital matter. It is this matter that Article 36 treats when it speaks of "jurisdiction" of the synod over the classis and the classis over the consistory. What is this "jurisdiction?" What is this "larger measure of authority" spoken of in this quotation? The matter here is left undefined but we shall give attention to it; only this must wait until later, for first there are some other matters we wish to take up yet in connection with Article 30.

Matters Treated 'In An Ecclesiastical Manner'

Article 30 states that "ecclesiastical matters only shall be transacted and that in an ecclesiastical manner." What is

meant by this last phrase? The church order does not define "ecclesiastical manner" but we may, nevertheless, say a few things about it.

It certainly implies, first of all, that to treat things in an "ecclesiastical manner" is the very opposite from doing the same in a "worldly manner." Our Synods and Classes are not the same as the assemblies of civil government such as Congress or the Senate or, for that matter, any worldly assembly. That should always be evident in the very atmosphere in which the assemblies meet. Wordly assemblies are ruled by worldly and selfish aims and principles. Frequently legislators will resort to unjust practices simply to gain sufficient support to pass a certain bill in which they have personal interests or which has special importance for the section of the country they represent. Such practices must not be found in the assemblies of the church. Self-interests is forbidden. The will of Christ Jesus must be the sole criterion of all things and, consequently, since that will is to be determined from the Word of God, it must be the aim of every member of the assembly and with respect to everything that is to be decided to show and to convince the assembly from the Word of God what is right and good. Only then can it be said, "For it seemed good unto us and the Holy Spirit" (Acts 15:25).

Hence, ecclesiastical assemblies also are not governed by involved and complicated Rules of Order. This is not because the church does not have and need rules to maintain decency and good order in her assemblies. These she certainly should have but these should not be so involved that they become a hindrance rather than a help. The result of such rules is that freedom of expression is often curtailed for fear that one will violate some technical rule and be called out of order by the president. This should not be. Rules should be simple and easily understood so that there may be unhampered but orderly discussion of all issues for the objective of any ecclesiastical assembly must not be simply to arrive at a decision but rather to arrive at the truth. When the members of the assembly labor in that attitude the activities of the assembly will be performed in an ecclesiastical manner. It is when there is no more concern for the truth and there is striving toward other objectives that things begin to be done "unecclesiastically!"

In this connection a word may also be written about the "majority rule." In worldly assemblies as well as in the assemblies of the church it is generally recognized that a majority vote decides a given matter. And this is undoubtedly correct. However, it should be borne in mind that in ecclesiastical assemblies there should be a diligent and sincere effort put forth to reach agreement, as much as possible, on the various matters that are presented for consideration and decision. Matters should not be rushed through as soon as there is reasonable assurance that one more than half is in favor of the motion before the body. Matters must be thoroughly discussed and the members of the assembly must labor

patiently with one another to convince each other from the Word of God in order that the outcome, if at all possible, may be a united opinion. This, of course, does not mean that a minority of the assembly may endlessly prolong discussion as is sometimes done. The filibuster does not belong in ecclesiastical assemblies. It is not an ecclesiastical way of conducting business. When nothing new is brought forth in the discussion, it is time to call for a vote and then the rule of the majority prevails.

Matters Legally Before the Assembly

When a certain matter is not legally before an assembly, it is evident that it cannot be treated "in an ecclesiastical manner." All things must be done legally, i.e., according to law. Now it often happens in the ecclesiastical meetings that the question arises as to whether or not a certain matter has "legal status." In our churches, to the best of my knowledge, there are no set rules governing the matter although these will undoubtedly be introduced in the near future since a committee has been appointed by the Synod this year to look into this matter. Generally in the past all matters that appear on the agenda and that conform to a few general rules of the church order were regarded as legal. In Classis East, unless this has been changed of late, a prepared agenda is not provided in advance of the meeting. Matters are simply brought directly to the Classis up to the time that Classis convenes. In Classis West and in the Synodical assemblies matters must be submitted to the Stated Clerk within a certain deadline in order to appear on the agenda and anything that does not appear there can be treated only by special action of the body. This is the preferred way. It is not only more orderly but it gives the members of the assembly time in advance to deliberate upon matters to be decided which is without question advantageous.

The Christian Reformed Church has seven rules with respect to matters legally before the Synod. These are:

"1. Only certain kinds of ecclesiastical matters. D.K.O. Art. 30.

"2. Not matters already considered unless necessary. D.K.O. Art. 46.

"3. Appeals or protests by Consistories or individual members who cannot yield to classical decisions and who have given notice of such appeals or protests to the Classes concerned. If a member of the Church presents a communication to Synod when he has been unable first to present it to his Consistory and Classis, such a communication shall be received as information, provided that the stated clerk of Synod receive evidence that it was impossible for the communicant to present his matter to Consistory and Classis; Synod shall decide whether it shall act upon such matters received for information. Protestants and appellants shall as a rule not be permitted to plead their cases before Synod but before the Advisory Committee on Protests and Appeals unless their matter is taken up by Synod directly.

"4. Reports by special committees and boards appointed by previous Synods.

"5. Overtures by Classes.

"6. Overtures which though unsuccessfully submitted to a Classis for adoption are considered by their authors to be of such importance as to require synodical action.

"7. All other matters which Synod by a majority vote declares acceptable. As much as possible the rule shall be adhered to that no proposals of importance shall be presented to Synod that have not appeared on the Agenda, so that Consistories and Classes may have opportunity for previous deliberation."

We cite these rules not because we are in agreement with all of them but to illustrate what determines the legality of matters presented to ecclesiastical assemblies. Sometimes a layman will present a matter illegally to a major assembly and it has to be declared out of order but the assembly is hesitant to do so because it is consciously aware of the fact that the party involved didn't understand the technical procedure. Of course, ignorance is no excuse. Advice can always be sought. Nevertheless, it is difficult to turn one away on those grounds and so it is well to observe and remember some of these points for, although we have as yet no *written rules*, many of the ideas expressed in the above rules are observed and practiced in the assemblies of our churches.

* * * *

P.S. — Undersigned is aware of a series of Articles currently appearing in "The Contender" and written by Rev. M. MacKay reflecting upon a former series written in the *Standard Bearer* by the undersigned on "The Church and State." We will, however, give Rev. MacKay time to finish his writings before making comment.

G.V.D.B.

CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH

(Continued from page 449)

requires from a sinner, as a sure way to absolution. For three days, from the 25th to the 28th of January, he stood in the court between the inner walls as a penitent suppliant, with bare head and feet, in a coarse woollen shirt, shivering in the cold, and knocked in vain for entrance at the gateway, which still perpetuates in its name, "Porta di penitenza," the memory of this event. During the night the king was under shelter.

H.V.

IN MEMORIAM

The Ladies' Society of the Oak Lawn Protestant Reformed Church herewith expresses its sympathy to three of its members, Mrs. E. Rutgers, in the loss of her mother and Mrs. J. Regnerus and Mrs. W. Buiter in the loss of their grandmother,

MRS. T. VEGTER

who passed away on July 6, 1957.

"Here we have no continuing city but we seek one to come."

Heb. 13:14

Mrs. G. Vanden Berg, Vice-President
Mrs. N. Haak, Secretary

ALL AROUND US

The Reformed Faith and Arminianism.

Such is the title of a paper written by the Rev. Joseph A. Hill, for the reception of which I am indebted to Pastor Arthur F. Brown of Pottstown, Pa. Because it clearly sets forth the Arminianism of Billy Graham and other evangelicals, and therefore coincides with our judgment of Graham and others like him, a judgment we have expressed on more than one occasion in this department, I thought our readers would appreciate what he has to say.

Because of lack of space, I will have to condense his paper considerably. Rev. Hill, in the first part of his paper, gives a brief historical background of the life and doctrine of James Arminius. He tells us that the teachings of Arminius "were a revival of the old heresies of Pelagius, in a modified form." He explains how the heresy of Arminius became the occasion for the great synod of Dordt in 1618 and the Canons of Dordt, otherwise known as the Five Points of Calvinism, namely, Total Depravity, Unconditional Election, Limited Atonement, Irresistible Grace, Perseverance of the Saints. Concerning these five points, Rev. Hill writes: "The five points together form the Calvinistic doctrine of salvation as over against the Arminian doctrine of salvation. The basic point at issue here is whether salvation is a work of God alone or whether man can at some point take the initiative in the matter of his salvation. Otherwise expressed, Calvinism DOES while Arminianism DOES NOT hold that God by his counsel controls whatsoever comes to pass.

"In considering this basic question we are not dealing with a dead issue taken from a musty old theological volume; we are not concerned only with certain heretics who have been dead for more than three centuries. For the errors they propagated did not die with them. Indeed, these errors are held more widely today than ever before and together with modern liberalism almost completely dominate the religious thought of the present day. Common 'evangelical' Christianity is predominately Arminian in character; for this reason non-Calvinistic Protestants are frequently called Evangelicals.

"The evangelistic movement which is sweeping the country is effectively spreading the false teachings of Arminius. BILLY GRAHAM, the chief spokesman for Evangelical Protestantism, is an Arminian evangelist. In all his preaching and writing Billy Graham insists that in the last analysis it is man's decision that determines whether he will be saved. God has provided salvation for all men, but each person must decide whether or not he will accept it.

"At this point someone will say: 'But isn't that what ALL Christians believe and isn't that what the Bible teaches? I always just supposed that God has made salvation through Christ available for everybody who will believe on him.'

Here we come to the heart of the matter. For it is at this point that the difference between the Reformed view of man's will and the Arminian notion of free will comes into the picture. According to Calvinism and the Bible men as sinners WILL not believe on Christ. They are dead in trespasses and sin and are unable to believe or accept salvation. Jesus himself made this point clear when he said to the Jews, 'Ye WILL not come to me that ye might have life' (John 5:40). That Jesus believed in the TOTAL INABILITY of men to take the initiative in the matter of their salvation is also evident from his own words in John 6:44 — 'No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him.' Jesus says that God must decide all the issues with respect to men's salvation. Billy Graham says that MEN can decide to repent, believe on Christ and be born again. Jesus believed that the whole nature of the sinner — intellect, emotions and will — is in bondage to sin. Billy Graham believes that part of man's nature — the will — has not been disabled by sin. He says, 'It is actually the WILL that makes the final and lasting decision' (PEACE WITH GOD, p. 131).

"Thus we see that Arminianism has too high a view of the unregenerate self-consciousness. The Arminian view of the nature of man is essentially the same as the Roman Catholic view as worked out by the Romanist theologian Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century. Thomas taught that man was created as an autonomous being; that is, man was free to plan for himself, independently of the plan of God. This autonomy is part of man's makeup as a creature of God and is essential to his manhood. Billy Graham writes from this Roman Catholic viewpoint when he says: 'We do not know Christ through the five senses, but we know him through the sixth sense that God has given to every man — which is the ability to believe' (PEACE WITH GOD, N.Y., Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1953, p. 146. This book is a fairly typical sample of the Evangelical type of theology). Here we see that Billy Graham differentiates between the physical sense and believing as a 'spiritual sense, but it is clear that for him believing is a NATURAL ability in the same sense that hearing and seeing are natural abilities of man as a creature of God. Hearing, seeing and believing are all essential aspects of man's makeup. In this, Billy Graham confuses things metaphysical and ethical. True, there is a kind of faith which does belong to the nature of man as man, — that is, for example, the certainty that the sounds we hear and the objects we see are not mere illusions, but are REAL sounds and REAL objects. This psychological certainty is a meta-physical aspect of faith and is correlative to the metaphysical 'senses.' But RELIGIOUS faith is an ETHICAL bias and when we speak of this aspect of faith we must not consider man as a creature of God merely, but a FALLEN creature."

Rev. Hill goes on to show how that before the fall man had faith supernaturally imparted to him. After the fall,

"man was still a man and he could still think and 'believe,' but his thinking and believing were now pointed AWAY from God. It was the ETHICAL aspect of man's faith that was destroyed by sin . . . It is this 'ability' that must be restored through regeneration before man can find his way back to God . . . If he has the natural ability to believe then he can believe on Christ WITHOUT regeneration . . . Billy Graham, in agreement with Romanism, mixes temporal and eternal categories."

"According to Billy Graham and all Arminians man as a fallen creature has not lost the ability to exercise his faith in God. He does not need to be born again in order to believe. He is born again WHEN he believes. 'You must open your heart and let Him (Christ) come in. At that precise moment the Holy Spirit performs the miracle of the new birth' (p. 108). Here we touch the pivotal point of the Arminian scheme of salvation. According to Arminianism regeneration DEPENDS UPON and FOLLOWS the action of man in permitting God to perform his work. Man first acts by his 'free will'; then God gets his chance to act. 'The whole matter of receiving new life (regeneration) is like a coin. A coin has heads and tails. The receiving of new life has a divine side and a human side. We have seen the human side in our chapter on conversion, we have seen what man must do (that is, repent and believe, JAH). Now let's see what God does' (p. 136). In line with this order of God's work following man's decision, the chapters in Graham's book entitled 'Repent' and 'Faith' PRECEDE the chapter on 'The New Birth' because in the Arminian scheme of salvation one can repent and believe, without the new birth. One MUST repent and believe BEFORE he can be reborn."

Rev. Hill goes on to show how that the Arminian view of Graham and others is a plain denial of God's absolute sovereignty in his decrees as well as the denial of God's incommunicable attributes of independence, immutability and eternity. He tells us that although Graham speaks about the "mighty" God, Graham's God is not the *Almighty* God of Christianity.

"The point we stress is that if you have a non-biblical view of man you cannot have a biblical view of God. If you hold that man has absolute freedom in any area of life, you cannot at the same time believe in the God of Christianity who by his counsel controls whatsoever comes to pass . . .

"If we are to be consistent Christians we must have a view of free will that is taken from the Bible. As Reformed (Calvinistic) Christians we believe that God by his counsel controls whatsoever comes to pass. We stress this point when we speak of the Bible doctrine of divine sovereignty. Only if we also take our doctrine of man from the Bible can we have a view of human free will that is consistent with our view of divine sovereignty. It is better not to speak of FREE will unless you understand that man's will is free only in the

sense that it acts freely according to the ethical bias of his personality. This means that the natural man chooses sin freely and willingly because he delights in it, but is not free to choose to love God or believe on Christ because his will is also in BONDAGE to his sinful nature. This is what Billy Graham and all Arminians deny, however loudly they may talk about sin as 'the thing God hates.' Man is not free to do the IMPOSSIBLE. According to the Bible it is impossible for the natural man to love God since God is 'the things man hates' as a sinner. The carnal mind is enmity against God. How then can it be at 'peace with God' unless it FIRST be renewed unto the knowledge (Col. 3:10)? Billy Graham says, 'You must open your heart and let Christ come in.' The Bible way of salvation is exactly the reverse of this. Lydia, for example, is spoken of as one "Whose heart THE LORD OPENED to give heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul' (Acts 16:14). Billy Graham's persistent appeal to people to make a 'decision' for Christ is based on his own belief, that man as a sinner is able to do of his own ability what the Bible says man cannot do except he first be born anew by the Spirit who works INDEPENDENTLY of man (John 3:6-8).

"Can we as Reformed Christians agree with Billy Graham when he says, 'You can decide right now that you want to be born again. You can decide right now to wipe out your sinful past and make a new start, a fresh start, a right start' (p. 133-4)? We can agree with Billy Graham on this point only if we also agree with him that man has not fallen as far in sin as the Bible says he has and that man has a measure of sovereignty over against the 'mighty' God.

"The point has just been stressed that we cannot hold a Reformed or Biblical view of divine sovereignty and an Arminian or non-biblical view of free will. Many Christians have not clearly understood this. During my days in college I heard the wife of a Fundamentalist pastor explain their church's position thus: 'We take the best out of Calvinism and the best out of Arminianism and combine them.' More recently a minister of a Reformed Church stated that although we must always emphasize God's sovereignty, we can at least learn something about man's responsibility and free will from the Arminians. These statements are virtually the same and both are based on the assumption that the difference between Calvinism and Arminianism is only a matter of emphasis — that Calvinism emphasizes divine sovereignty while Arminianism emphasizes human responsibility. If this were true, then of course the truth would lie somewhere between Calvinism and Arminianism, and to have the whole truth we would have to hold both Calvinism and Arminianism. Actually, Arminianism implicitly denies divine sovereignty and thereby also falsifies its own doctrine of human responsibility and free will."

Rev. Hill wrote more. But our space is filled. To what he did write above, we say Amen. M.S.