

The Standard Bearer

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

IN THIS ISSUE:

Meditation: The Cry of Faith

Editorials: TRAGIC!

**About Theological Soundness
and Practical Application**

The Doctrine of Scripture in "The Confession of 1967"

Still "Fiddling"

THE STANDARD BEARER

CONTENTS

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

Published by the Reformed Free Publishing Association, Inc.

Editor-in-Chief: Prof. H. C. Hoeksema

Department Editors: Rev. David J. Engelsma, Mr. John M. Faber, Rev. Cornelius Hanko, Prof. Herman Hanko, Rev. Robert C. Harbach, Rev. John A. Heys, Rev. Jay Kortering, Rev. George C. Lubbers, Rev. Marinus Schipper, Rev. Gise J. Van Baren, Rev. Gerald Vanden Berg, Rev. Herman Veldman, Rev. Bernard Woudenberg

Editorial Office: Prof. H. C. Hoeksema
1842 Plymouth Terrace, S.E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

Church News Editor: Mr. John M. Faber
1123 Cooper Ave., S.E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49507

Editorial Policy: Every editor is solely responsible for the contents of his own articles. Contributions of general interest from our readers and questions for the Question-Box Department are welcome. Contributions will be limited to approximately 300 words and must be neatly written or typewritten. Copy deadlines are the first and the fifteenth of the month. All communications relative to the contents should be sent to the editorial office.

Business Office: Mr. James Dykstra, Bus. Mgr.
1326 W. Butler Ave., S.E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49507

Subscription Policy: Subscription price, \$5.00 per year. 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 and he will be billed for renewal. If you have a change of address, please notify the Business Office as early as possible in order to avoid the inconvenience of delayed delivery. Include your Zip Code.

Advertising Policy: The *Standard Bearer* does not accept commercial advertising of any kind. Announcements of church and school events, anniversaries, obituaries, and sympathy resolutions will be placed for a \$2.00 fee. These should be sent to the Business Office and should be accompanied by the \$2.00 fee. Deadline for announcements is the 5th or the 20th of the month, previous to publication on the 15th or the 1st respectively.

Bound Volumes: The Business Office will accept standing orders for bound copies of the current volume; such orders are filled as soon as possible after completion of a volume. A limited number of past volumes may be obtained through the Business Office.

Second Class Postage paid at Grand Rapids, Michigan

Meditation -

"The Cry of Faith" 482
Rev. J. Kortering

Editorials -

TRAGIC! 484
Prof. H. C. Hoeksema
About Theological Soundness and
Practical Application 485
Prof. H. C. Hoeksema

Heeding The Doctrine -

The Doctrine of Scripture in
"The Confession of 1967" 488
Rev. David Engelsma

The Lord Gave The Word -

Some Principles of Missions 491
Prof. H. Hanko

Examining Ecumenicalism -

Still "Fiddling" 494
Rev. G. Van Baren

A Cloud of Witnesses -

David, The Spear, and the Cruse of Water 496
Rev. B. Woudenberg

Trying The Spirits -

Dispensationalism and the
Perpetuity of the Law 498
Rev. R. C. Harbach

Pictorial News 500

Index To The Standard Bearer, Vol. 43 501
Rev. G. Vanden Berg

MEDITATION—

"The Cry of Faith"

by Rev. J. Kortering

"And Peter answered him, and said, Lord if it be thou, bid me come unto thee upon the waters. And he said, Come...but when he saw the wind, he was afraid and beginning to sink he cried out saying, Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and took hold of him, and saith unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt? And when they were gone up into the boat, the wind ceased.

Matthew 14:28-32

Self-confidence is like a gold filling in a tooth full of decay. It has its glamor, but it is so synthetic, it doesn't take very long and it is jarred loose and spit out altogether. Self-confidence has the same characteristics.

How evident this was in the life of Peter, especially in the event as narrated in our text.

Peter was a man of faith. The brilliance of it shone when Jesus and His disciples were in the area of Caesarea Philippi and Christ asked them, "Whom do

men say that I the son of man am?" Peter answered in that thrilling declaration of faith, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." To this Jesus responded, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Even though Peter was a man of faith, he had yet to contend with the weakness of his flesh. His self-confidence was part of that weakness. As a gold filling it had an aura of romantic glamor that assumed the form of boldness. It is soul-caressing to be around a bold person. This was true for the disciples as they marvelled at Peter's boldness. Recall for a moment those trying circumstances at Caesarea Philippi. Christ had directed a very pointed question to them, "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" They volunteered, "John the Baptist, Elias, or one of the prophets." Looking directly at them Christ asked, "But whom do ye say that I am?" Peter came to the rescue with his bold assertion, "Thou art the Christ!" With a sigh, I suppose, the rest nodded in consent. It was the same way at the Mount of Transfiguration. Peter, James and John were so scared they didn't know what to say, so Peter broke the embarrassing silence and blurted out, "Let us build three tabernacles, one for Moses, one for Elijah, and one for Christ." At the sober moment when Christ foretold His disciples that all would forsake Him and flee because the Shepherd would be smitten and the sheep would be scattered, Peter rebelled, "If all shall be offended in thee, I will never be offended." The rest of the disciples readily agreed. When it seemed time for action, for the soldiers with swords and staves surrounded Christ, Peter unsheathed the sword and swung blindly at Malchus, cutting off his ear. Self-confidence creates a certain air of assurance, and boldness produces action!

Yet, such self-confidence is like a gold filling in a decayed tooth. What followed Peter's bold confession of faith at Caesarea Philippi? Jesus began to tell them that He was going to suffer and die. Peter told Him not to talk that way, to which Jesus retorted, "Get thee behind me, satan!" That was quite a change. As the three disciples walked down from the Mount of Transfiguration Christ warned them not to tell anyone, a warning that quite deflated exalted Peter. After Peter boasted that all could deny Christ, he wouldn't, he had to eat his words, for later he went out and wept bitterly, his soul pierced by the crowing rooster.

Self-confidence is vain.

The incident in our text is but another example.

It was about the fourth watch. The disciples were on the sea, travelling from the desert, on the yonder side of Galilee, toward Gennesaret. The past day had been eventful, for at the desert retreat the multitude of over 5000 had come to hear Him preach and request Him to heal their sick. At evening He had fed them all with 5 loaves and 2 small fish. After the feast Jesus had dismissed the multitude, instructed His disciples to enter the ship and sail to the other side, and He went into the mountains to pray. At about dawn, for the fourth watch was the last one before day, Jesus walked out to His disciples. A storm had broken out

upon the sea, and the disciples were afraid. Suddenly in the vapor of the seething sea they saw a figure walking toward them upon the water. They thought it to be some sort of an apparition, a spirit, and they became even more afraid. Jesus calmed them by declaring, "Be of good cheer, it is I, be not afraid." Peter responded, "Lord if it be thou, bid me come unto thee upon the waters." Jesus said, "Come!" Boldly Peter climbed out of the boat and walked a little way upon the waters, but soon he saw the wind and waves and fear smote him and he began to sink with the wailing cry, "Lord save me!" Jesus reached down and drew him up rebuking him, "O ye of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?" As soon as they reached the boat they climbed in and the wind ceased. With one accord they marvelled, "Surely this is the Son of God."

The bold request, "Lord bid that I come," was replaced with the faltering plea, "Lord, save me!" That's what happens to self-confidence.

This event is part of sacred history recorded for us in the Scripture. Consequently each part of this narrative has a spiritual implication. Jesus taught His disciples not only with words, but even with actions. This holds true also for this event.

The stormy sea in Scripture pictures the wicked apart from Christ. Isaiah declared, "But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt." Isa. 57:20 According to Rev. 13 the beast that arises out of the sea represents the success of antichrist among the nations. If we put these ideas together, we can say that the troubled sea represents the ungodly with all their lusts and evil ambitions, even in so far that they join together and in defiance of the living God try to build an empire on the quicksands of human society.

As the disciples rode in the boat in the midst of the stormy sea, they thereby represented the church that is called upon to pass through this world. We are not exhorted to physical isolation. Our whole life is expended within the sphere of this world. We eat and drink, we work and play, we raise our families, we are busy as a church within the sphere of this world. The relationship between the church and the world is depicted by the storm. The boat was tossed about by the stormy sea. Similarly the world surrounds the church on every side and with mighty blows seeks to exterminate the church by breaking her to pieces and swallowing her up within her own depths. The evil men of our generation hate the faithful church as she witnesses. By violence and seduction the world strives to silence the voice of Christ as He calls to repentance and warns men of their evil way. Hence, the storm!

By faith we behold Christ walking upon the sea in the midst of the storm and hear Him calling, "Be of good cheer, it is I, be not afraid." He alone is the Lord of the storm! True, at the historical moment when He walked to His disciples, He had yet to ascend the hill of Calvary and seal the victory of His church over the world. Nevertheless, His message to His church is always the same, "I have overcome the world, peace I leave with thee, my peace I give unto thee." He could walk upon the heaving waves and

billows because He was about to face the "prince of this world" and bring him down in crushing defeat. This He did at the cross. Being appointed by the Father to make satisfaction for all His own, He took our place before the bar of divine justice and bore the condemnation which the righteous God would have meted out to us. While the terror of divine wrath came upon the obedient servant, He loved the Father even unto death. By that loving obedience He merited righteousness and life for us. To us He is known as the resurrection and the life.

By this work, Christ received all the power to cause all things to serve the royal purpose of redeeming His own out of the world and to bring them into the kingdom of heaven. He stripped every claim from the devil and emptied him of all power over the children of God. Instead, Christ now receives all the power to cause the devil to serve His purpose and be the means in His hand to bring many sons into glory. Only in this way can we begin to understand the sudden calm when Christ entered into the boat. This proves the absolute lordship of Christ over all the wicked, including the devil himself. The disciples responded, "Surely this is the Son of God."

Peter knew this power of Christ. By faith he declared, "If it be thou, bid that I come unto thee." By this request Peter showed his faith in the lordship of Christ. He knew that apart from Christ there was reason for fear, for the world is a terrible place, the ship was tossed by the storm. By faith he desired to be near to Christ. He knew that in Christ's arms he would be the most safe.

By faith Peter walked upon the water. He turned away from the storm and sought Christ. He renounced sin and self and sought the Savior. With the eye of faith shining brightly he looked upon Christ and triumphed.

Yet that faith was but a principle. Christ responded, "O ye of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?" As Peter walked toward Christ he turned his eye upon the wind blown waves and he became afraid. Suddenly he began to sink and the cry came from his fainting heart, "Lord, save me!"

Peter tried to rely upon himself. It was that old

self-confidence that clouded his faith. When he took his eye from Christ and looked at the storm he began to sink. While sinking he realized his helplessness and again turned to Christ with the plea for help.

What a lesson this is for us to learn with Peter. If we direct our eyes to the terrible times in which we live, and see nothing but the world and the terrible plight the church has in the midst of this world, we surely will doubt and our faith will grow lean and we too will begin to sink beneath the terrible billows of fear and hopelessness. If we think we can stand of self in this evil day and direct our eye to ourselves, we are sure to be disappointed, and when the hour of trial becomes our portion we are going to learn that as man we cannot attain the victory, for we are weak, and this finding will bring doubt to brood within our soul. Self-confidence brings one down into the waves and evokes the terrifying cry, "Lord save me."

May we learn with Peter that faith requires us to keep our eye upon Jesus Christ the Lord of the church and true Conqueror of Israel. In the midst of the storms of life there is only One Who is our safety and retreat and that is Jesus Christ. The Babe of Bethlehem became the Man of Sorrows, Who has climbed the Hill of Golgotha and has risen from the dead and ascended into heaven and now sits at the right hand of God the Father Almighty. He alone is worth looking to.

Apart from Him there is doubt, fear, tears, loneliness, rebellion, need, care, and a horrible restlessness. With our eye of faith upon Him there is assurance, peace, comfort, friendship, contentment, an abundant supply of all our needs, joy, and the calm of a soul that knows the living God.

Thank God that such a faith is not conditional upon our free will. If it were, Peter would have drowned. Though Peter took His eye from Jesus, Jesus never took His eye from Peter. When Peter cried for help, Jesus lifted Him up and carried Him into the boat. All marvelled at the calm.

We too will continue to marvel at the calm that shall endure unto all eternity when we shall be brought through the portals of perfect peace and abide with our faithful Lord forever.

Faith is the victory that overcomes the world.
Praise God from whom all blessings flow!

EDITORIALS—

TRAGIC!

by Prof. H. C. Hoeksema

This, in one word, is the outcome of the Dekker Case in the Christian Reformed Church.

It is impossible to report in this issue the details of what took place at the reconvened Synod on August 29 and 30. These details will be reported in our next

issue, and at that time editorial comment will also be forthcoming, D.V. But here is a brief account of what took place since we last reported to you:

1. Synod's advisory committee succeeded in drawing up a rather lengthy unified report after the Synod

recessed. This report was distributed to the delegates prior to the time Synod reconvened.

2. When Synod reconvened, the recommendations of the Study Committee took precedence; Synod, therefore, was again confronted by a motion which, in effect, declared Prof. Dekker's teachings to be contrary to Scripture and the confessions. After about a half day of fruitless discussion, the recommendations of the Study Committee were tabled by a vote of 76 to 59.

3. Synod then turned to the unified report of the Advisory Committee. Most of Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning were devoted to discussion of a motion to warn against certain dangers in the use of Prof. Dekker's statements. An attempt was made to table the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, but this failed by a vote of 68 to 66.

4. Toward noon on Wednesday, August 30, at the instigation of President William Haverkamp, a motion was passed to have the Advisory Committee and the members of the Study Committee meet and try to draw up something which would be acceptable to Synod. This meeting took all of Wednesday afternoon.

5. On Wednesday evening Synod reconvened. Well-nigh unbelievable as it may seem, here is Synod's decision:

That Synod admonish Professor Dekker for the

ambiguous and abstract way in which he has expressed himself in his writing on the love of God and the atonement:

Grounds:

a. His writings have resulted in considerable misunderstanding and confusion within the churches concerning the doctrine of the atonement.

b. His presentation of his views has resulted in widespread uncertainty concerning his adherence to the creeds.

The above decision was taken by an overwhelming majority; there was a very thin scattering of negative votes.

Mark well, this is the only substantive decision taken on the entire Dekker Case!

For the time being, I will leave it to the reader to consider this and draw his conclusions.

On the floor of Synod, Dr. Henry Stob, a faculty advisor and staunch supporter of Prof. Dekker, called this a miracle! Another delegate declared that the mountain labored and brought forth a mouse, — a remark which brought forth laughter.

But this is Synod's decision. It is the total outcome of the Dekker Case!

Synod was in travail and brought forth the wind!

But it is in one word: TRAGIC!

About Theological Soundness and Practical Application

by Prof. H. C. Hoeksema

The editor of "Men and Missions" in *Missionary Monthly* (July-August, 1967) seems inevitably to think about the Protestant Reformed Churches whenever he writes about matters having to do with Calvinism versus Arminianism. In fact, I almost get the impression, — although Dr. De Jong does not quite state this or imply this, — that whenever he thinks about theological soundness (be it, to him, of an impractical sort), there looms up before his mind's eye the spectre of the Protestant Reformed Churches, apparently representing the quintessence of a theological soundness that is somehow rather abhorrent to him.

Be that as it may, he mentions us as an example of something, — I do not quite understand of what or why. But I think I understand what the doctor has in mind in his article; and if my understanding is correct, then

Dr. De Jong is seriously in error, — not only about the Protestant Reformed Churches (and they are *churches*, not *church*), but also as to the main thrust of his article. In fact, he draws a false contrast (perhaps more than one) which is very commonly, but very mistakenly, drawn.

Let me, first of all, briefly summarize his article about "Theological Soundness and Practical Application" and make a few quotations. (By the way, Dr. Jerome De Jong, for those of our readers who do not know, is pastor of the Immanuel Reformed Church in Grand Rapids, and is generally considered, I think, to represent the conservative wing in the R.C.A.)

By way of introduction, we are told that this article was occasioned by the writer's reading about the "Dekker Case" in the *Agenda* of the Christian Reformed

Synod. However, Dr. De Jong's concern is not to enter into the issue of that case, but to address himself to an important implication involved in that case. His fear is "that in our concern for doctrinal and theological preciseness we have neglected the practical aspects of the presentation of the gospel." At this point he quotes Matthew 23:23, which certainly is not pertinent, but speaks rather of pharasaic legalism in which there was no love of God.

In explaining his fear, Dr. De Jong professes to find himself in "a rather peculiar position." On the one hand, he believes that "one of the great problems of our age has been doctrinal vagueness and heterodoxy." He goes on to state:

...There is abroad in the world today the feeling that in the final analysis it does not matter much what you believe as long as you believe something. I am, of course, dead set against such attitudes within the circle of credal Christendom. We, as Reformed Churches, have a clear definition of our understanding of Christian truth. When we take the attitude that it makes little difference whether you believe creeds or not we have a chaotic condition. The Consultation on Church Union has expressed itself as aware of "the divisive danger of verbal confessions and intellectual formulations."

The above sounds rather encouraging. But now comes a "however." It begins as follows:

Having said all this, however, I think we ought to be aware that there are dangers on the other side of the coin too. We have tried to fit all our theological thinking into neat, theological patterns. When we approach the exegesis of the Bible it must fit the pattern we have set for it. We ought to remember that as long as we are in this world we are human and confined to a limited, fallible, yes, even at times, erroneous understanding of truth.

Here, therefore, we seem to have a first danger that Dr. De Jong fears. Just what the danger is, it is difficult to say. Nor does Dr. De Jong say who he means by "we" in this paragraph. For my part, I would say:

1) There is no danger in fitting theological thinking into neat, theological patterns, provided those patterns are theological sound patterns, Reformed patterns. In fact, the ecclesiastical scene would be improved by a little more Reformed thinking.

2) It is certainly wrong to let theological patterns rule exegesis. This, however, is not the fault of theological soundness, but of theological poverty. It is theologically sound to let exegesis rule dogmatics. And if we proceed exegetically, this will certainly lead to theological soundness also.

3) The test of a potentially erroneous understanding of truth is perspicuous Scripture. In this era of relativism and pseudo-tolerance, however, the great danger is not that we forget that we are human, limited, and fallible; it is rather that the church forgets and despises its creeds, repudiates its heritage, forgets and despises the guidance of the Spirit in the church of the past. An example of this is the fact that our

theologically sound Canons of Dordrecht are unknown, ignored, and sneered at.

The second danger, it seems, which the writer fears is that of categorizing people and condemning them. It is rather confusedly stated, as follows:

How neatly we categorize people! There are saved and lost. There are Calvinists and Arminians. There are strict Calvinists and impure Calvinists. The Arminians, of course, are all wrong. Granted! Now what? Are they lost? Are they condemned to hell? Isn't it a good thing that God does not count success purely in terms of numbers? There can be no doubt but that historically such men as Dwight Moody, Charles Finney, Billy Sunday, and others (Billy Graham, perhaps? H.C.H.) were more Arminian than Calvinistic and yet God richly used them in the winning of souls.

Now I do not follow Dr. De Jong's reasoning here completely, I must confess. And I utterly fail to see that what he states in this paragraph is "the other side of the coin" of theological soundness. But this much I know:

1) There certainly is nothing wrong in recognizing people for what they are, — Calvinists or Arminians, especially when such people are preachers and teachers.

2) It is well that Dr. De Jong grants that the Arminians are all wrong. It would be better yet if he would stick to this position consistently. This would be consistent with theological soundness.

3) We may safely leave the judgment of the salvation or condemnation of men to God and to His Word. Certainly, His Word condemns false teachers; and His Word condemns those who believe the lie. But the question of the ultimate salvation of any soul is one for the Judge of heaven and earth.

4) By the same token, Dr. De Jong is not in a position to judge how richly God used certain men in the winning of souls. Frankly, I am very sceptical both about mass evangelism and about its fruits. But that is not the question. This I do know, however: if God richly used these men, and if "Arminians are all wrong," then it certainly could not have been the Arminianism in their preaching that God richly used. This is theologically sound too. God does not save His people by means of the lie, but by means of the truth of the gospel.

5) It is indeed the calling of the church and of its members to pass judgment as to theological soundness. One, — in fact, the chief, — mark of the true church is the pure preaching of the Word. Where there is no theological soundness there can be no pure preaching of the Word. But where the Word is purely preached, there is the true church manifested. And there the children of God must join themselves. Where that Word is not preached, there the church is not. And where that Word is adulterated in the preaching, there the church must either repent or perish.

The next little paragraph is a puzzler:

Let me make it abundantly clear that I am not in favor of doctrinal looseness but I am in favor of being careful in our condemnation lest we destroy that which basically builds up the kingdom of God.

This puzzles me, especially when I place it in the context of the "Dekker Case," which is, after all, very plainly a case of the very Arminianism which De Jong concedes is all wrong. But again, certain things must be plain:

1) Dr. De Jong cannot here be speaking of "the other side of the coin" of which theological soundness constitutes one side. For theological soundness does not condemn and destroy that which basically builds up the kingdom of God.

2) Theological soundness belongs to that which basically builds up the church. It is precisely the doctrinal vagueness and heterodoxy which Dr. De Jong professes to abhor which does not build up, but breaks down, a church.

Another danger is supposed to be that of becoming "heresy-hunters." Writes Dr. De Jong:

We are also in danger, at this point, of becoming heresy-hunters. Many times in preaching men are given to emphasize one point rather than another. Suppose someone in the pew hears you say, "Come to Christ. Trust in Him. Accept Him. He loves you with an eternal love. He has promised salvation. Come, be saved!" Immediately someone may accuse you of Arminian tendencies. You have spoken of God's love and have not properly defined it and you are subject to classical censure. Suppose, on the other hand, you preach for theological soundness. "Come to Christ, but of course, you will have to be moved by sovereign grace. Trust in Him, but you will need the sovereign Spirit. He loves you, but you understand, of course, this is His redemptive love if you are of the elect and general love if you are reprobate." By this time you say, "How ridiculous," and you are right! In preaching we must first emphasize one truth and then another and, over a period of time, a full-orbed understanding will characterize the church.

Now Dr. De Jong does not define a heresy-hunter. This is one of those terms that is rather freely bandied about by those who are usually not interested in theological soundness and who are not themselves theologically sound. It is a term, too, that is frequently used of those who are theologically sound by those who are theologically less sound when the former insist on theological soundness, i.e., insist on the truth according to Scripture and the confessions. But certain things are obvious in the above paragraph:

1) The first example of preaching which is mentioned is indeed Arminianism if by the love of God is meant every individual in that preacher's audience, and if by the promise of salvation is meant a general promise.

2) Dr. De Jong does not evince much interest in theological soundness by attempting a *reductio ad absurdum* in his example of preaching for theological soundness. This is not a true example, but a caricature; it betrays either an intense dislike of Reformed preaching or a total ignorance of what constitutes theologically sound preaching. Besides, of course, it is not theologically sound to speak of a redemptive love for the elect and a general love for the reprobate.

3) Dr. De Jong certainly does not give an example here of first emphasizing one truth and then another. Surely, it is true that in one sermon one does not

emphasize *all* truths; one must preach his text. But it is essential that whichever specific "truth" one emphasizes in a given sermon, that truth be in harmony with the whole of *the truth*, according to Scripture and the confessions. I get the distinct impression that Dr. De Jong has in mind something like being a little Arminian in one sermon and a little more Reformed in another sermon, or something like emphasizing "human responsibility" in one sermon and "divine sovereignty" in another, but in such a way that the two contradict each other.

4) The "Dekker Case," which is the occasion of Dr. De Jong's article is not a case of heresy-hunting, but it is an obvious case of blatant Arminianism.

At this point Dr. De Jong retreats from his position in favor of theological soundness into a position of broad and vague fundamentalism. It becomes obvious that the "T.U.L.I.P." truths, (that is, the position of the Canons of Dordrecht,) are too narrow for him. To him the "distinctiveness of Reformed truth" consists in the inspiration of Scripture, the deity of our Lord, His blood-bought atonement, His physical resurrection, and His second return, — the well-known broad base of Fundamentalism, — "*as well as* distinctive truths." The final impression is, in the first place, that of a false contrast between theological soundness and practical application of the Gospel; and, in the second place, a false contrast between the general body of the truth of the Gospel and the so-called distinctive truths. What he fails to see is that if the true gospel is to be proclaimed, then our theological soundness must be reflected in and must permeate the preaching, that is, the practical application of the gospel to a lost world. This he could profitably have told his readers. What he fails to emphasize, too, is that it is easy to talk in general terms about the deity of our Lord and about His blood-bought atonement, etc., but that it is precisely at the point of the "T.U.L.I.P. truths" that it becomes plain whether one really proclaims the truth, the Scriptural, the Reformed gospel of salvation. There are not two gospels, an Arminian and a Reformed, but only one gospel. And in an age of "doctrinal vagueness and heterodoxy" which is also afflicting the Reformed community, Dr. De Jong would have done better to keep the following in his pen:

We need to be careful in making a practical application of the Gospel to a lost world. In all our discussion of "T.U.L.I.P." truths we forget that the Gospel that we preach is far more extensive than that. What is the distinctiveness of Reformed truth? Is it not the inspiration of Scripture, the deity of our Lord, His blood-bought atonement, His physical resurrection and second return as well as distinctive truths?

The same is true of the next question that he raises and answers negatively: "Have our distinctive truths made us soul-winners? The pioneers in missions?" This is an old and worn-out hue and cry. In regard to it, it should again be remembered that proper mission endeavor must needs be characterized by theological soundness, and that our Reformed heritage, the faith once delivered to the saints, must not be left at

home by missionaries who depart for foreign fields. It should also be remembered that a goodly measure of "doctrinal vagueness and heterodoxy" has originated on the mission field and from thence found its way into the home churches. And it may also be remembered that the modern ecumenical movement had its origin on the mission field. This is not stated to belittle true mission zeal, but to warn that also with respect to mission zeal all is not gold that glitters!

But in his last paragraph Dr. De Jong reveals beyond a shadow of a doubt that he casts his vote in favor of what he calls "practicality" rather than in favor of genuine theological soundness. Writes he:

My hope for the Christian Reformed Church is that in its deliberations it will not bog down in logic and forget practicality. It is my conviction that the Protestant Reformed Church was born out of this kind of logic. This denomination continues to exist in a conviction of its absolute, pure, and unadulterated concept of Reformed truth. Yet that whole group numbers only 2,000. What of the billions still unreached? Maybe we will have to be willing to allow others to carry the torch with us even though their approach is not as Calvinistic as we might like it to be.

Notice that theological soundness has undergone a metamorphosis: it is now equated with *logic*. Moreover, it is a logic of a certain kind, though we are not told what kind. Well, let me assure Dr. De Jong:

1) That, his conviction to the contrary notwithstanding, we were not born out of logic, but out of a very serious controversy which involved theological soundness. Just how serious that controversy was is clearly illustrated in the "Dekker Case" which today is plaguing the Christian Reformed Church. What was *implicit* in 1924 and its Three Points has now become

explicit in Prof. Dekker's teachings, — and it is rank Arminianism.

2) That this "logic" bit is another old saw. What is wrong with logic, pray tell, provided that logic is Scripturally oriented? Is Scripture illogical perhaps? Is the truth of the gospel illogical? And is logic impractical? I say that the Christian Reformed Church could use a goodly measure of believing, sanctified, Scripturally-oriented logic. Then they would neither bog down nor forget practicality.

3) That we do indeed continue to exist in a conviction of our absolute, pure, and unadulterated concept of Reformed truth. Is that wrong? If so, on what ground? Does not a church principally forfeit its very right of existence if it does not have the conviction that it holds the truth?

4) That he has his statistics wrong, — by more than 33 per cent. But then, "Isn't it a good thing that God does not count success purely in terms of numbers?"

5) That he would do well to take a good hard look at his own denomination, the R.C.A., which shelters not only a Reformed man like the Rev. Gordon Girod but also rank liberals, — take a good hard look at it in terms of "theological soundness and practical application," as well as in terms of "doctrinal vagueness and heterodoxy." Perhaps he will find that there is work to be done in the denomination for whose "theological soundness," — or should I say: unsoundness, — he, especially as an officebearer, is co-responsible!

6) That as far as carrying *the torch* is concerned, those who carry the torch (that is, the torch of the truth of the gospel) *with* us must not only be Calvinistic in their approach, but Calvinistic (I prefer to say: Reformed) in their theology. Otherwise we do not carry the same torch!

HEEDING THE DOCTRINE—

The Doctrine of Scripture in "The Confession of 1967"

by Rev. David Engelsma

At its General Assembly this summer, the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America formally incorporated into its constitution a new confession of faith called "The Confession of 1967." This confession resulted from a decision made by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in 1958: "that the united Church prepare a brief contemporary Statement of Faith to become a part of the Constitution." An explanation of this decision described the intended "Statement of Faith" as follows:

A short Statement of Faith written in these times, dealing with the great verities of the Word of God and facing today's burning issues, should be of interest and value to church officers and church school teachers, to new members of our churches, and to any among us who wish to give plain answers about the faith we hold. It should bring to all members of our Church some sense of participation in the thrilling revival of theology. (quoted in the brochure, "The Proposal to Revise the Confessional Position of The United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," p. 11

— after this the brochure will be referred to as “The Proposal”.

Apart from the content of the new confession, the adoption of the “Confession of 1967” was of great significance for the United Presbyterian Church, a church of some three million members whose tradition is that of the Reformed faith. Adoption of the Confession included a radical change of the confessional basis of the Presbyterian Church. In the past the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. subscribed to the Reformed Westminster Confession and its companion documents, The Shorter and Larger Catechisms. At their ordination, candidates for the ministry had to answer affirmatively the question: “Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of this Church, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scripture?” The radical change which the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. has effected consists not only of the addition to the Westminster Confession and the Shorter Catechism of “The Confession of 1967” and six other creeds (The Nicene Creed, The Apostles’ Creed, The Scots Confession, The Heidelberg Catechism, The Second Helvetic Confession and The Theological Declaration of Barmen) but also of its relegation of all creeds, including these nine, to the status of mere mementos of the past and of ecclesiastical guidelines. In reality, the United Presbyterian Church no longer has any creeds, especially not the Westminster Confession. This Church now declares that she “accepts and is guided by” the nine documents in her creedal melange. Candidates for the ministry now merely state that they will perform their duties “(under) the guidance of the confessions of this Church” (“The Proposal,” p. 45).

Behind the United Presbyterian Church’s change of her confessional position lies the widespread, pernicious rejection of the historic Reformed confessions as documents that once were useful for their times but are now hopelessly outdated, not only valueless for the “modern” Church but positively detrimental. Implied in this notion is the relativity of truth: The Reformed confessions “spoke the truth to their times” but speak the truth no longer. At bottom, the rejection of the Reformed confessions stems from a hatred of the Reformed faith, especially, the truths of election and reprobation, limited atonement and sovereign grace. There can be no doubt that the desire of those who masterminded the change in the Presbyterian Church was: Get rid of the staunchly Reformed Westminster Confession. They effectively accomplished the removal of the Westminster Confession, not by openly repudiating it as mostly a lie, mistakenly embraced for some three hundred years by Presbyterians, but by lumping it with other historical relics, all of which are from now on to be admired by the Church as monuments of by-gone eras. Then, to seal Westminster’s tomb, they saw to it that a new confession was adopted which contradicts the Westminster Confession throughout.

That “The Confession of 1967” contradicts the Westminster Confession is easily shown. Of the Bible, the Westminster Confession says, “God (is) ... the

author thereof; and therefore it is to be received because it is the Word of God.” (Chapter I, 4. “The Confession of 1967” calls the Scriptures “the words of men.” (Part I, Section C, 2) The Westminster Confession declares that “by the decree of God...some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.” (Chapter III, 3) Also, “As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.” (Chapter III, 6) In flat, universalistic contradiction, “The Confession of 1967” declares, “The risen Christ is the savior for all men,” (Part I, Section A, 1) “God expressed his love for all mankind through Israel...” (Part I, Section B) and “The gift of God in Christ is for all men.” (Part II, Section A, 3)

That the change of the confessional position of the Presbyterian Church involves a rejection of the binding character of the creeds and the assertion that the historic Reformed creeds are little more than mementos can also be proved. The Preface of “The Confession of 1967” states: “The United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America acknowledges itself aided in understanding the gospel by the testimony of the church from earlier ages and from many lands. More especially it is guided by the Nicene and Apostles’ Creeds...” Confessions merely “aid in understanding” and “guide”; they do not have binding authority upon the Church, its officebearers or its members. In an article included in the brochure, “The Proposal to Revise the Confessional Position of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,” Edward A. Dowey, Jr., chairman of the committee that composed “The Confession of 1967,” writes: “A statement that is appropriate and powerful in its own day may fail to guide the church after some decades or centuries have gone by. It comes to resemble a monument marking the past more than a tool for present work.” (pp. 20, 21) This is the verdict upon the historic Reformed creeds. De Bres and the other martyrs spilled their life’s blood for the sake of — “monuments!” And a certain Trinterud, also a member of the committee that drafted the Confession, complains that for some men “The Westminster documents had come to have the character of timeless truth rather than the truth for the times.” (“The Proposal,” p. 17) It is a typical characteristic of all those who advocate the jettison of the Reformed creeds that they will not answer the simple question: Do the historic Reformed confessions express the (timeless, eternal) truth or the lie?

But it is the content of the new Confession that now concerns us, particularly, the Confession’s doctrine of Holy Scripture. That which Dowey notes of the Westminster Confession, “The Westminster teaching about the Bible itself, on which the whole document de-

pend...," ("The Proposal," p. 19) holds true of "The Confession of 1967" also: A confession of faith depends upon its view of Scripture.

The very membership of the committee appointed to compose the Confession puts one on his guard. Among the members were a woman "Ruling Elder," in violation of Scripture's injunction against women officebearers, and Markus Barth, son of the famed German theologian, Karl Barth, who fully shares his father's estimation of Scripture as an error-filled, human book.

This estimation of Scripture is the doctrine of "The Confession of 1967."¹ In Part I, Section C, 2, under the heading, "The Bible," the Confession reads:

The Scriptures, given under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, are nevertheless the words of men, conditioned by the language, thought forms, and literary fashions of the places and times at which they were written. They reflect views of life, history, and the cosmos which were then current. The church, therefore, has an obligation to approach the Scriptures with literary and historical understanding. As God has spoken his word in diverse cultural situations, the church is confident that he will continue to speak through the Scriptures in a changing world and in every form of human culture.

Whereas the Westminster Confession and all the historic Reformed creeds call Scripture the Word of God and never call it the words of men, "The Confession of 1967" calls the Bible "the words of men." As "the words of men," the Bible is "conditioned by the...literary fashions of the places and times at which they were written," that is, the writers of the Bible used the technique of myth in Genesis 1-3 to express spiritual ideas about the beginning of the world and the corruption of mankind. The use of myth, disguised as genuine happening, was a "literary fashion" in the times of the writing of the Bible. The Scriptures "reflect views of...history...which were then current," that is, the Bible writers did not know that history consists of actual facts and real events so that they presented as historical things that never happened.

The committee makes plain that, in the confession, they are repudiating the doctrine of the infallible inspiration of Scripture (maintained by the Westminster Confession) and are contending for the Barthian view that the Bible is a fallible human book. In his article, "Confessions of the Church: Types and Functions," included in the brochure, "The Proposal," Dowey writes: "The Westminster teaching about the Bible itself...is notably a seventeenth-century formulation." (p. 19)² This is an ominous statement. But the committee becomes explicit. Speaking of the section on "The Bible" in the Confession, the committee boldly declares:

This section is an intended revision of the Westminster doctrine, which rested primarily on a view of inspiration and equated the Biblical canon directly with the Word of God. By contrast, the preeminent and primary meaning of the word of God in the Confession of 1967 is the Word of God incarnate. The function of the Bible is to be the instrument of the revelation of the Word in the living church. It is not a witness among

others but the witness without parallel, the norm of all other witness. At the same time questions of antiquated cosmology, diverse cultural influences, and the like, may be dealt with by careful scholarship uninhibited (sic!) by the doctrine of inerrancy which placed the older Reformed theology at odds with advances in historical and scientific studies. ("The Proposal", p. 29)

According to the Confession, Jesus Christ is the Word of God, in distinction from Scripture; Scripture, the words of men, merely bears witness to Jesus Christ, the Word of God. This is from beginning to end the theology of Karl Barth. "The Confession of 1967" embodies the doctrine of Scripture of Karl Barth and makes that theology the credo of the Church.

The Confession's denial that Scripture is God's Word is not mitigated by an insertion that so-called conservatives managed to make, over the objections of the committee that composed the document. The insertion adds to the words, "Holy Scriptures," the words, "which are received and obeyed as the word of God written." In the light of the entire section on Scripture and in light of the committee's open explanation of the significance of the section on Scripture, the insertion is not only meaningless and indicative of a pitiful attempt to camouflage stark reality but also outright deception. For, first, the inserted phrase merely says that the Scriptures "*are received and obeyed* as the word of God written." It does *not* say that the Bible *is* the Word of God written.³ Secondly, how this insertion is to be understood, the committee itself indicates: "By extension of the meaning of the Word to which the Bible witnesses, the Bible as well may be called the word of God." ("The Proposal", p. 42) This means, following Karl Barth, that Scripture really is not the Word of God. Only Jesus is the Word of God. But because the Bible witnesses to Jesus, you may — if you insist! — call the Bible the Word of God. In reality, as "The Confession of 1967" plainly states, the Bible is the words, the fallible words of men.

It does not surprise us that the Confession, having such a view of Scripture, corrupts other truths also. It denies election and reprobation, teaching a universal love of God. It denies limited atonement, teaching a death of Christ for all men. By implication, it denies total depravity and sovereign, irresistible grace, when it suggests that some men reject the offered Christ and go lost to the frustration of God's intentions. It adopts a form of syncretism when it maintains that "The Christian finds parallels between other religions and his own and must approach all religions with openness and respect." It calls the church to the labor of social improvements as she "strives for a better world."

It also follows that the vows of ordination must be changed. In place of the previous "Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?" the committee recommended: "Do you accept the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the normative witness to Jesus Christ in the Church catholic, and by his Spirit God's Word to you?" ("The

Proposal", p. 45) This quotation from the dogmatics of Karl Barth means that the Holy Spirit takes the human, fallible Bible, the words of men, and causes men, now and again, to hear the Word of God through that Bible.

If it is true, as *Christianity Today* reported, that "conservatives" found "a patch of common ground" on which to stand with the "liberals" to adopt the Confession and if it is true that "a delicate liberal-conservative balance" was achieved by which the Confession was almost unanimously adopted, then it is also true that the love of the so-called conservatives has long since waxed cold, that the so-called conservatives are little less enemies of the Church than the "liberals" and that the so-called conservatives share the blame for this Confession with those that drew it up (see *Christianity Today*, June 10, 1966, p. 44).

In his article, "Confessions of the Church: Types and Functions," Edward Dowey complains that the Church that produced the Westminster Confession was trying "to hold back the dawn of modern natural science and philosophy." ("The Proposal", pp. 19, 20) He implies that the Church today must open herself to "modern natural science and philosophy," by banishing the Reformed creeds and adopting "The Confession of 1967." This, the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. has now done. May God have mercy on her.

¹ It may now be laid down as a general principle that every attack upon the authority of the creeds, although made in the name of the unique authority of Scripture, heralds and goes hand-in-hand with a denial of the inspiration and authority of Scripture. One who undermines the creeds is one who also denies the authority of Scripture, by rejecting its infallible in-

spiration. On the other hand, it can safely be said that one who stoutly defends the authority of the creeds (which after all he has sworn to defend) is one who also maintains the full authority of Scripture. In the light of these rules, James Daane's jab at Herman Hoeksema in the May-June 1967 issue of *The Reformed Journal* is revelatory of both Hoeksema and Daane: "he (Hoeksema) viewed (the Reformed creeds - DE) with an almost blind, uncritical loyalty, accepting them as not-to-be-questioned truth, not as historical documents."

² This brings to mind what C.S. Lewis put into the mouth of the demon Screwtape in *The Screwtape Letters*: "We have...(inculcated) the Historical Point of View. The Historical Point of View, put briefly, means that when a learned man is presented with any statement in an ancient author, the one question he never asks is whether it is true. He asks who influenced the ancient writer, and how far the statement is consistent with what he said in other books, and what phase in the writer's development, or in the general history of thought, it illustrates ..." The one question Mr. Dowey never asks about Westminster's doctrine of Scripture is "whether it is true."

³ Contrast this statement, as everyone in the Presbyterian General Assembly and Church must have done, with that which the Westminster Confession says. It also speaks of "receiving" Scripture and its authority but fundamentally differently than does "The Confession of 1967": "therefore it is to be received, *because it is the Word of God.*" (Chapter I, 4 - my emphasis, DE).

THE LORD GAVE THE WORDPsalm 68:11

Some Principles of Missions

by Prof. H. Hanko

Up to this point, we have been busy drawing some broad lines of principles with respect to mission work. It remains, in this concluding article, to bring these principles to bear upon actual mission work as it is conducted in our day and as it ought to be conducted by all who engage in this noble task.

It is not amiss to review briefly the points we have made so that our readers may recall to mind what has already been written. The chief point we have been making is that the preaching of the gospel is a funda-

mental and principal sign of the return of Christ upon the clouds of heaven to usher in the end of this age and the beginning of the everlasting kingdom of heaven. All the other signs clearly are caused by the sign of the preaching of the gospel.

We have pointed out especially that it is the worldwide preaching of the gospel which is the cause of the division of the world into two camps: the camp of anti-christianity and the camp of Gog and Magog. We have noted that this division is of fundamental importance,

that a chasm is created between these two camps which no earthly power can bridge. It is this division which plays such an important role in the events of the end.

But we must turn to our conclusions.

First of all, there stands out the all-important principle that, because of the unique relationship in which mission work stands to the end of the world, mission work is the work of God Almighty which He performs through Jesus Christ and by His Holy Spirit. Our beautiful Heidelberg Catechism, in question 54, answers the question, "What believest thou concerning the 'holy catholic church' of Christ?" in these unforgettable words: "That the Son of God from the beginning to the end of the world, gathers, defends, and preserves to himself by his Word and Spirit, out of the whole human race, a church chosen to everlasting life, agreeing in true faith; and that I am and forever shall remain, a living member thereof." Thus puts the word of missions where it belongs — in the hand of the Son of God.

This implies some important truths which we can only briefly mention, but which deserve more detailed treatment.

In the first place, the power of the gospel is always the power of God Himself through Jesus Christ. God chose a people from all eternity which He has destined to be His. He chose these people in Jesus Christ and sent Christ into the world to die for their sins — and for their sins alone. The salvation which God ordained as the inheritance of His church is purchased in the blood of the cross. It is Christ therefore, Who causes His gospel to be preached — the gospel of His cross. And it is by this gospel that the purpose of God determined in election and realized in the cross is accomplished. The gospel is the power of God whereby His elect, redeemed people are called irresistibly out of darkness into the fellowship of the kingdom of heaven. Always the gospel is God's power. It accomplishes God's purpose. It does all that God determines it to do. All the elect are saved by the gospel; none are lost. None of the reprobate are saved; all are lost through the way of their unbelief and rejection of the gospel. It is all as God wants it to be.

In the second place, this means that salvation is the sovereign work of God's grace. You can readily perceive what this means for all Arminianism. It is a sad and hopeless travesty of the gospel to make it into an offer or an invitation by which God invites all men to accept salvation with the power of their own free will. It is destructive of the very gospel itself to alter its character so that it is no more God's power, but a mere presentation of a possibility for man to save himself. God is effectively ruled out of mission work by such a teaching. Yet, much of mission work today is carried on along these lines. But it is hopeless. Through this kind of preaching the church will never be gathered. The work of missions is then not done. Better to stay at home than to go to a foreign or domestic field with such caricatures of the gospel. How much mission work must be condemned on this basis is hard to tell; but it is a great percentage. God will not use

the arrogant philosophies of men to accomplish His purpose.

We must insist that it is only by sovereign grace that the gospel is the power of salvation. And this must also form the content of the gospel which is preached. This message must be proclaimed on the missionfield, that God is the sovereign Lord Who does all His good pleasure and saves His elect people through the power of the cross and by an irresistible work of the Spirit.

In the third place, this work of missions is therefore performed by the church. Much of what is done today is not; and there can be no positive fruit produced by it. It is done by boards, agencies, organizations, individuals, etc., but not by the church as part of her official calling. This means that the work of missions must be done by ordained ministers who are called to proclaim the gospel by the church and therefore by Christ. We must protest against the current idea that anyone who has a mind to preach can simply go forth to perform the work of missions. This is not true. Even Billy Graham stands condemned on this basis alone. Although he is an ordained minister, he is not *sent* and called to *this* task which he now performs by the church, but simply operates under the sponsorship of an organization. The work of missions is the work of the church of Christ through her called and ordained ministry. Indeed, while pamphlets, gospel tracts, Bibles, personal witnessing, etc., may all aid the work of missions and be a supplementary means of reaching the lost, it is only the officially proclaimed gospel which finally is God's power to save the elect and bring them into the fellowship of the body of Christ. To ignore this principle or to cast it aside and abandon it is to cut the heart out of the mission work of the church.

This is our first conclusion then. Let the church which wants to engage in this mission calling rest in the assurance that it does not take man's work to do mission labors; the work of God is sufficient and God will use a faithful church to gather those who are His people. Let her not become impatient with the gospel and destroy her very work with human inventions.

In the second place, all of what we have said means that mission work comes to an end. As one elder once put it quite long ago: "God puts the roof on His house some day." This may sound axiomatic, and many may protest that, of course, it comes to an end with the end of the world; but this is not what we mean, and the point is of no little importance. It seems as if this simple truth is consistently ignored.

Let us look at this a bit more closely and see the implications. Positively, this means that there comes a time when the last elect is born, called by the gospel into the consciousness of his salvation in Christ, and that, therefore, mission work has been finished. Jesus says, in Matthew 24, referring, no doubt, to this point: "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and *then* shall the end come." The end does not come at an arbitrary time; it comes when the purpose of God is realized. Christ's coming is not simply an "end"; it is a "telos" — a goal attained, a purpose realized, a

counsel accomplished. The end has got to come then; it cannot be delayed another moment. All the church is ready for heaven.

And this also means that the gospel has accomplished all its purpose in the wicked. The gospel has been God's sovereign power by which the wicked have grown in sin and filled the cup of iniquity. The world has become ripe for judgment when evil men, under Satan's leadership, have set up their anti-christian kingdom and destroyed the church and killed the people of God. But this too is brought about by the gospel.

Now, what does all this mean?

It means that one aspect of present mission work at least, is not very important and is often misinterpreted. I refer to mission work that is geared to revival in the church. So-called "crusades" are part of this. It is just possible, of course, that the established church does need revival once in a while. It may grow lethargic and indifferent. Revival may be necessary to wake up the established church from her spiritual sleep. Even the Psalmist prays: "Revive us again." But to make this part of mission work and give it the interpretation given it today is depressingly hopeless. A church that stands in constant need of revival is in a bad way. And the trouble is that there is no end to this need for revival. It has to be done over and over again. And if one makes revival an integral part of mission work, one never quite reaches the end. One can always return another time to an apostatizing church to try to revive people once more. God can never, apparently, bring this work to a successful conclusion.

And so there is a deeper principle at stake here — a principle which must not be forgotten. There is no space in this concluding article to develop this; we can only briefly draw the main lines. But the principle is that God always works *organically*; i.e., in the line of continued generations. This is true as far as election is concerned, first of all. The elect are gathered in the line of generations, from father to son, to son's son, etc. It is true that new lines are brought into the covenant of God so that the covenant is established in every nation and tribe and tongue, and the church becomes catholic. But the covenant is continued in succeeding generations. God does not gather His people from one generation only in one place, then to abandon succeeding generations to go elsewhere to gather one generation in another place. This is not God's way of salvation.

But if election is in the line of generations, so also is reprobation. The sins of the fathers are indeed visited upon the sons unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate God. When those who are in covenant lines apostatize, neglect their covenant obligations, fail to instruct the children of the covenant, walk in ways of error, depart from the path of righteousness, this has the most serious consequences for generations to come. For children walk in the ways of their fathers and depart still more. Wickedness increases as sin develops with each succeeding generation.

Hence, to return again and again to generations who

have departed from the ways of God is hopeless — yes, is flying in the face of what God Himself has revealed as the way He works. As generations depart, nations as a whole, once Christianized, become anti-christian, of the camp of Satan. They always perhaps retain a remnant of the religion they once professed (even the God-is-dead theologians insist they belong to the established and Christian church); but their religion is apostate christianity, and they are lost for all time. It is not the calling of the church to go back again and again to these generations to bring about revival. Branches pruned off the olive tree are not grafted back in some later day.

Does this mean that nothing can and must be done in this area of mission work? Indeed not. But the work that must be done is the work of calling out of apostatizing generations those who are still numbered among God's elect. They are the lost sheep *of the house of Israel*. And notice that they belong to Israel's house. If they remain in their churches which run the road of apostasy, they too shall see their generations lose their place in God's covenant. If they come out to join with those who stand fast for the truth, the covenant will be continued among them.

Apparently this is an urgent calling in our present day when so many churches are enthralled with the enticing and beckoning teachings of modernism, and chase the siren call of false doctrine. Let the church then get busy with her task. This will not spell worldwide or even national revival so that a country of the whole world turns to God. This will mean only that the faithful in many places, suffering under a great deal of pressure from evil men, will abandon a hopeless cause and stand with all the faithful everywhere in the cause of the truth of the gospel. They will be few in number, but the church of Christ is only ever a remnant; and — we are not postmillennial.

This is the teaching of Paul in Romans 11: "For if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches. And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well, because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear: For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off."

Finally, it is evident in our time that mission work is indeed reaching its conclusion. The gospel has been brought to every nation. The work goes on in many fields and is being rapidly completed. And indications are that the work is all but over. Many foreign fields are being closed — especially in communistic countries and pagan Africa. This is something to be expected. We wrote before that these are the nations that are never brought under the influence of the gospel as the

"Christian" nations are. The elect have been saved there, the church established, but the nations themselves, considered organically, are bitter against "Christianity" and the church. Now, as they rise to nationhood, they turn out the missionaries and close their doors to the preaching of the gospel.

In other lands the church is being established indigenously and is prepared to stand on its own. The work there, as far as its being *foreign* is concerned, is about over.

In Christian lands there remains an urgent calling. It can be called mission work, but in a more restricted sense of the word. It is the calling to call forth from the church which wants the truth no more the sheep

of Israel's house. This calling presses upon us as the false church develops more rapidly into its final goal — the right hand of Antichrist.

Let the church then get on with her task. Let her be busy in this work. But above all, the hope is that the church which has abandoned the principles of Scripture will return to them; clean out the boards and agencies which have done so much to direct mission work in wrong channels; and be busy with the task of true mission work. There is much that needs doing. And while on the distant horizon of history already grumbles the thunders of Christ's return, let us be spurred on to our task in the confidence that if we are faithful, God will use us to accomplish His purpose.

EXAMINING ECUMENICALISM—

Still "Fiddling"

by Rev. G. Van Baren

In a former article of this rubric was quoted a minister of the Christian Reformed Church who pointed out that failure of his denomination to join the W.C.C. was equivalent to "fiddling while Rome burns." The decision of the last Synod of the Christian Reformed Church indicates that this denomination intends for the time being to continue "fiddling."

I consider it commendable that in this day of much false ecumenism that our "mother" denomination is ready yet to state that they MAY NOT join the W.C.C. as it is presently constituted. At the same time, the decision as taken, and the strong opposition to this decision, gives real reason for grave concern with respect to the future for that denomination. There are obviously many in the denomination who advocate joining the W.C.C. And those who oppose such union are not ready to take a firm stand against such union — possibly because of a fear of offending the proponents of the W.C.C. in the C.R.C.; possibly too because of a fear of being labeled "anti-ecumenical."

THE MINORITY REPORT

I have in my possession the minority report of the advisory committee of the C.R.C. Synod. This in turn favorably reacts to a minority report which was presented to the Synod by a committee appointed last year to consider this matter of the possibility of Reformed churches joining the W.C.C. This report the Synod did NOT adopt — but it does reflect the trends within the C.R.C. toward W.C.C. affiliation. The minority advisory committee recommended the adoption of the recommendations of the minority study committee. These are as follows:

a. Synod recognizes, on the basis of Scripture, that the Church of Jesus Christ is one, and that this unity ought to come to visible expression as a witness to Christ.

b. Synod reaffirms the position adopted by the Synod of 1944, that the Christian Reformed Church bears a responsibility to all other Christian Churches "to gain and to keep our ecclesiastical brethren in the measure in which it is possible for us to do so." (Resolution 8, Acts 1944, p. 359)

c. Synod judges that the basis, nature, and purpose of the World Council of Churches, as defined by its Constitution, are such as to permit a Reformed Church to seek membership in it. Ground:

These constitutional provisions do not violate the requirements of Scripture, nor are they in conflict with the Reformed Confessions.

d. Synod recognizes weighty problems involved in World Council membership, with respect to the actual functioning of the Council, the trends within the Council, and the implications of Council membership for relations with other churches.

e. Synod urges the Gereformeerde Kerken to give due consideration, before applying for membership in the World Council of Churches to the following matters:

- 1) The preservation of their own internal unity;
- 2) The question whether their total witness to the world, singly or in conjunction with other Reformed Churches, will be aided or impeded by World Council membership;
- 3) The implications of the actual functioning of the World Council, judged by the best information available.

f. Synod communicates these decisions and the text of this report to the Gereformeerde Kerken as its response to their request for advice.

g. Synod decides not to commit the Christian Reformed Church to membership in the World Council of Churches at this time.

Grounds:

- 1) Further information regarding the actual functioning of the World Council and the implications of membership is needed before a responsible judgment on membership can be made.
- 2) The readiness of the Christian Reformed Church to undertake further ecumenical responsibilities needs further exploration.

h. Synod instructs its Committee on Inter-Church Relations to seek ways and means of arriving at a fuller understanding and riper judgment with respect to the World Council of Churches, to provide for the presence of observers at principal meetings of the World Council and its subsidiaries, to encourage study of this matter by the churches, and to keep Synod informed of its findings.

Just a few comments. The report and the recommendations are very cautious. Obviously the recommendations were drawn up so that both pro- and anti-W.C.C. forces could accept them. There is the general statement concerning a desire for the unity and oneness of the church of Christ. With this all could agree. There is the recollection that the C.R.C. in the past had already recognized its ecumenical calling.

Now the committee suggests that on the basis of the Constitution a Reformed church can seek membership in the W.C.C. However, the committee suggests that there are "weighty problems" connected with membership. This does not yet say much. Specifically, what are these "weighty problems?" There are certain "problems" which would make membership in an organization impossible; on the other hand, to belong to any organization can involve one in "weighty problems." The committee appears ready to declare that though there are obviously problems connected with membership in the W.C.C., a Reformed church can definitely belong to such an organization.

But especially was it the desire of Synod to express itself with respect to the decision of the Gereformeerde Kerken in the Netherlands concerning the permissibility of Reformed churches to join the W.C.C., and the possibility that the Gereformeerde Kerken might do so. Interesting is the advice of the Minority Committee in this regard. Read it again in "e" above. Note that there is neither a "yes" or "no" answer given to the problem. The answer suggested is hardly clear and definite advice to a sister church. The

recommendation simply points out several "problems" which have doubtless already been considered by the Gereformeerde Kerken. The committee suggests that their sister denomination consider first of all their own internal unity. What this specifically means, I am not sure. Two things come to mind: 1) that joining the W.C.C. might cause a "split" in the Gereformeerde Kerken — in which case they ought to think twice about joining the W.C.C.; or whether they might not lose their distinctiveness as a denomination in joining the W.C.C. The other two questions posited by the committee are indeed serious questions worthy of careful consideration — but hardly constitute advice to their sister denomination concerning whether they should join W.C.C. or not.

Finally, the minority committee advises that Synod of the C.R.C. do not commit the denomination to the W.C.C. *at this time*. Those last words point to the crux of the advice of the committee. The committee apparently realizes that there are many in the C.R.C. who are not *yet* ready for the step of seeking membership in the W.C.C. They present two grounds for their advice (see "g" above). The first ground suggests that the C.R.C. ought to obtain further information on the W.C.C. If the C.R.C. does lack sufficient information before a responsible judgment on membership can be made, it would truly be a good ground for not joining *at this time*. However, the question might well be asked: is not sufficient information presently available on the W.C.C. — and have not responsible, capable members of the C.R.C. already considered this information? What more is required before a "responsible judgment on membership" could be made? Or is this ground a means of delaying a decision (which might be unfavorable) until a favorable decision is comparatively certain?

The second ground to the recommendation indicates that the above conclusion is correct. The committee indicates that they themselves are not yet certain whether the C.R.C. is ready "to undertake further ecumenical responsibilities." This is just another way of stating that the committee fears that action to join the W.C.C. at this time would arouse too much public opposition. Give the churches another five or ten years, and then they may be ready for "further ecumenical responsibilities."

But the C.R.C. Synod did not adopt this advice. Rather, it approved the majority report which I hope, D.V., to consider next time.

ATTENTION: R.F.P.A. MEMBERS

Annual meeting of the Reformed Free Publishing Association will be held, Thursday, Sept. 21, D.V., in the Southeast Protestant Reformed Church, at 8:00 p.m. Rev. J. Kortering will be the speaker. Three Board members are to be elected from the following nomination: George De Vries, D. Kooienga, G. Schimmel, H. Kamphuis, H. Velthouse, and R. Teitsma.

The R.F.P.A. Board

A CLOUD OF WITNESSES—

David, The Spear, and The Cruse of Water

by Rev. B. Woudenberg

And David cried to the people and to Abner the son of Ner, saying, Answerest thou not, Abner? Then Abner answered and said, Who art thou that criest to the king?

And David said to Abner, Art not thou a valiant man? and who is like to thee in Israel? wherefore then hast thou not kept thy lord the king? for there came one of the people in to destroy the king thy lord.

This thing is not good that thou hast done. As the Lord liveth, ye are worthy to die, because ye have not kept your master, the Lord's anointed. And now see where the king's spear is, and the cruse of water that was at his bolster.

And Saul knew David's voice, and said, Is this thy voice, my son David? And David said, It is my voice, my lord, O king.

For a time it seemed that David's life had passed its most severe crisis and that things would be a little easier for him now. After David had spared Saul's life in that cave at Engedi, Saul had withdrawn his forces and no threatening gestures had been met from him for many months. Furthermore, after Abigail dissuaded him from wreaking his vengeance upon her husband Nabal, God took his part and smote Nabal so that he died. Admiring Abigail as an extremely sensible woman, David soon took her to be his wife, affording him a companionship such as he had not had since fleeing from his home in the royal city. Yet, in itself we cannot but conclude that David's action here was a grievous mistake. He was already a married man, whether his wife Michal presently lived with him or not, and to take to himself another wife was only to act contrary to the original ordinance of marriage and to lay the ground work for what was to become the greatest misery in his later life, and in his children's lives also. Very soon the fruits of his action began to reveal themselves. Having two wives, he was not yet satisfied and married a third, Ahimolam of Jezreel. Meanwhile, Saul, hearing of his polygamy and being dissatisfied, took his daughter Michal, David's first wife, and gave her to another. It was surely the beginning of the most bitter page in David's life.

At the same time, although Saul had refrained from further pursuit of David, it did not mean that his hatred for David had been overcome. In fact, through the years of David's banishment, there had arisen within the royal court a group of men who were determined not to let it be so. These were ambitious men who saw in the displacing of David an opportunity for them to vie for the position of importance he had filled. Furthermore, even Jonathan, Saul's own son, was drawing more and more into the background. His father no longer trusted him, and he no longer had any heart for the policies his father was following. This left an even higher goal for which the ambitious of the court might aim.

Months went by in which Saul refrained from all overt acts in opposition to David. His last shameful departure from the cave of Engedi had been too embarrassing for him to allow it to be repeated. But with the ambitious men of Saul's court, the pursuit of David had become a passion. They loved to spend lengthy days together devising plans by which David might be captured or killed; and they were constantly exerting pressure upon Saul to put them into practice. Moreover, Saul's own heart was basically in sympathy with this all. He knew now full well that God had ordained that David should receive the throne of Israel after him. His own son Jonathan had long acknowledged this and advocated it as a good thing. But to Saul the thought was bitter, and he could not escape the conviction that, if only something could be done to destroy David, even these plans of Israel's God would have to come to naught.

Thus it was that after a time, Saul once again gathered his forces together to resume the pursuit of David. Once again it was occasioned by the Ziphites. They remembered how close they had come to earning the royal favor by preparing a trap for David in the wood of Hachilah. Now once again David had come into their territory, and they were quick to try to repeat the same trick. Quickly they sent the message to Saul, "Doth not David hide himself in the hill of Hachilah, which is before Jeshimon?"

Neither had Saul forgotten that place. It was the closest he had ever come to capturing David; and the temptation to try to repeat it was too great. He must try it once more.

David, however, was much too clever a strategist to allow himself to be caught twice in the same trap. Long before Saul and his army came near, he had his spies out following his every move. Thus by the time Saul came to Hachilah, David's men had withdrawn to another portion of the wilderness. But all of the time David's spies were watching the camp of Saul, and he knew exactly what Saul was about. He had his plan

also. David remembered how effective his previous encounter with Saul had been when he had spared Saul's life at the cave of Engedi, and he was determined to repeat the same move once again.

Thus it was that, no sooner had Saul set up his base camp at Hachilah, than David with two of his men, Ahimelech the Hittite and Abishai the brother of Joab, came personally to examine the camp. From the hilltop overlooking the camp they were able to examine its whole outlay while keeping themselves completely hidden. This he did, taking particular note of the tent in which Saul slept and the position of Abner, the long time captain of Saul's army. David knew Abner well, often he had fought with him, and it hurt him to think that Abner would cooperate with Saul in pursuing him now.

It was when night was finally beginning to fall that David turned to his two companions to ask of them which would go down with him into the very camp itself and which one would remain behind to watch from the hillside. It was Abishai that volunteered to go along.

There was something unusually quiet about the camp of Saul when David and Abishai approached it. God was with them, and He had caused a deep sleep to fall upon the army just as He had done for Gideon years before under similar circumstances. The guards who should have been watching the camp were all dozing heavily at their posts. Even the lightest sleeper and insomniac had no trouble sleeping that night. The whole camp was perfectly quiet and still. Carefully and without notice David and Abishai made their way into the very heart of the camp, where were the tents of Saul and Abner. Into the tent of Saul they entered.

Once they had entered the tent, the sight of the sleeping king was too much for Abishai. He knew David's attitude and intentions full well; but the impulse was almost irresistible. Earnestly he turned to David and whispered, "God hath delivered thine enemy into thine hand this day; now therefore let me smite him, I pray thee, with the spear even to the earth at once, and I will not smite him the second time."

But David would have none of it. Through long hours of prayer and meditation he had come to the firm conviction that he should do nothing himself that would ever serve to inflict harm upon the king which God had anointed; and from this he was not about to be moved. Quickly he whispered back, "Destroy him not; for who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's anointed, and be guiltless? As the Lord liveth, the Lord shall smite him; or his day shall come to die; or he shall descend into battle, and perish. The Lord forbid that I should stretch forth mine hand against the Lord's anointed; but, I pray thee, take thou now the spear that is at his bolster, and the cruse of water, and let us go." This was David's only desire — to prove to Saul that he had been there and that there was not bitterness or hatred or desire to hurt the king in his heart.

The departure from the camp went even more easily and swiftly than their entrance. Soon Abishai and David were back with Ahimelech on the ridge overlooking the camp. Patiently David waited until the first rays of dawn were lighting the sky, and then he stepped forth

and began to speak with all of the power of his voice. The morning air was still and clear so that every word he spoke carried clearly into the very heart of the camp. Now the men were sleepy no longer. At the very first sound of David's voice, it seemed that the whole camp was awake and out of their tents waiting to hear what this voice had to say. It was strange, almost mystical, and an awesome chill of fear seemed to pass through the camp as they detected the note of ridicule and scorn that the voice seemed to convey. The voice was addressed to them, but even more to their king and to Abner their captain, calling him by name and tauntingly asking, "Answerest thou not, Abner?"

It was an embarrassment to Abner, first awakened and then singled out by this early morning voice that he did not recognize or understand. But it seemed that there was nothing else to do but to answer it; and so, seeking to turn attention away from himself he answered "Who art thou that criest to the king?"

But now the voice was ready. This was what it was waiting for. Loudly and clearly it began to speak, addressing itself still primarily to Abner but plainly desiring everyone to hear. "Art not thou a valiant man," it tauntingly went on, "And who is like to thee in Israel? wherefore then hast thou not kept thy lord the king? for there came one of the people in to destroy the king thy lord. This thing is not good that thou hast done. And the Lord liveth, ye are worthy to die, because ye have not kept your master, the Lord's anointed. And now see where the king's spear is, and the cruse of water that was at his bolster."

To Abner and the people it was all still a mystery, accusing them of something they did not clearly understand. It was Saul who first recognized the voice, and its sound struck into his heart with a new flood of guilt and humiliation. With an anguished, almost despairing voice, he stepped forward to cry out and answer, "Is this thy voice, my son David?"

These words struck home, and now suddenly the taunt was gone from the voice. Still clearly, but with a new tone of meekness and sadness, it answered back, "It is my voice, my lord, O king." And then after a painful pause, "Wherefore doth my lord thus pursue after his servant? for what have I done? or what evil is in mine hand? Now therefore, I pray thee, let my lord the king hear the words of his servant. If the Lord have stirred thee up against me, let him accept an offering; but if they be the children of men, cursed be they before the Lord; for they have driven me out this day from abiding in the inheritance of the Lord, saying, Go, serve other gods. Now therefore, let not my blood fall to the earth before the face of the Lord; for the king of Israel is come out to seek a flea, as when one doth hunt a partridge in the mountains."

The words beat like a hammer upon the head of the king causing him to cry out in admission of that which his whole nature didn't want to admit. There was anguish written all over his face as he answered back, "I have sinned: return, my son David: for I will no more do thee harm, because my soul was precious in thine eyes this day: behold, I have played the fool, and have erred exceedingly."

These words must surely have pulled at David's heart, for there was nothing that he could have desired more than to return to the joy of serving Saul as he had in former years. But he knew the changeableness of Saul's nature too well to yield to even such an appeal. There was a new calmness in his voice as he only answered, "Behold the king's spear! and let one of the young men come over and fetch it. The Lord render to every man his righteousness and his faithfulness: for the Lord delivered thee into my hand today, but I would not stretch forth mine hand against the Lord's anointed. And, behold, as thy life was much set by this day in

mine eyes, so let my life be much set by in the eyes of the Lord, and let him deliver me out of all tribulation."

The answering words of Saul were the last that David would ever hear from those lips, and they sounded as a final seal upon his life, coming as they did from the lips of his most hateful enemy. Saul's parting words were these, "Blessed be thou, my son David: thou shalt both do great things, and also shalt still prevail." It was not what he wanted to say. To his dying day he would himself refuse to believe them. But such was the power of God that his lips were forced to speak it.

TRYING THE SPIRITS—

Dispensationalism and the Perpetuity of the Law

by Rev. R. C. Harbach

Appeal is made by Dispensationalists to "Christ is the end of the law" in support of their error that Christ came to make an end of the law. But this is to forget what had been prophesied of Him centuries before, that "He will *magnify* the law, and make it honorable." (Isa. 42:21) It is to forget, as we showed last time, that there cannot be made an end of that which stands fast forever and ever (Ps. 111:7, 8). In spite of this undeniable fact it is objected that the ten commandments are not a sufficiently high rule of duty for the Christian; they do not contain the whole duty of man. But the Lord revealed the sum of them in the words, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." (Mt. 22:37-40) The ten commandments are by the Lord reduced to two, love to God and love to the neighbor, which may be reduced to one, namely, love, which certainly embraces every duty that may be required of and performed by man. Let love to God motivate the heart, and not only will love to the neighbor follow, but God will be obeyed in every aspect of His revealed will. God's commandment is exceedingly broad (Ps. 119:96), that is, it is thoroughly comprehensive, so much so that the whole of Christian doctrine and obedience is essentially expressed therein, and throughout all the remainder of Scripture is materially expounded. For on the command of love there hangs all the law and the prophets. All the doctrinal, admonitory and exhortatory portions of Scripture are an exposition of the law. The ten commandments are the main roots from which all the trunks and branches of doctrine and duty found in Scripture are drawn.

Now we know that the love of God is from ever-

lasting to everlasting; and since divine love is the heart of the law of God, then it remains the eternal rule of His righteousness which He has given to man. Since, too, the law is a transcript of the nature of God, then the law can neither be repealed, changed nor modified. Love cannot be done away. It abides (I Cor. 13:13). It is the immutable will of God that we should love Him with all the heart. Nothing less than such love is due to God. How can such a law be set aside? Impossible! The ground of the law is love. How then can it be annulled? How can the law ever be altered? Will God *ever* release His subjects from the requirement of loving Him and loving the neighbor? How could God absolve His creatures from doing right? He would then give them license to do wrong!

Proof that the law as the standard of truth, life and conduct was not put away, we have in the fact that the last of the ten commandments was indelibly impressed upon the apostle some years after the cross. He testified, "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." (Rom. 7:7) How does one come to this knowledge of sin? by the law (see also Rom. 3:20)! How is the law brought to bear upon our conscience? by the operation of the Holy Spirit upon us. Paul had the Spirit-wrought experience of the searchlight of the law revealing his sins. Would the Spirit of God apply an abrogated or superseded principle? Would the Spirit inspire the apostle to record this relation of the Christian to the law if it in this New Testament dispensation has been set aside? If the cross abrogated the law, then the Spirit would have made no more use of it than He would have of the Levitical sacrifices now forever passed away.

As God always maintains His covenant (it is called

an everlasting covenant, Gn. 17:7), so He always maintains His law. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first; and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou breakest." (Ex. 34:1) "The treaty that was on foot between God and Israel being broken off abruptly, by their worshipping the golden calf, when peace was made, all must be begun anew, not where they left off, but from the beginning. Thus backsliders must 'repent and do the first works,' Rev. 2:5. Moses must prepare for the renewing of the tables. Before, God himself provided the tables and wrote on them. Now Moses must hew out the tables, and God would only write upon them. Thus, in the first writing of the law upon the heart of man in innocency, both the tables and the writing were the work of God; but when those were broken and defaced by sin, and the divine law was to be preserved in the Scriptures, God therein made use of the ministry of man, and Moses first. But the prophets and apostles did only hew the tables, as it were; the writing was God's still, for 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God.' Observe, when God was reconciled to them, he ordered the tables to be renewed, and wrote his law in them, which plainly intimates to us: 1. That even under the gospel of peace and reconciliation by Christ (of which the intercession of Moses was typical) the moral law should continue to bind believers. Though Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, yet not from the command of it, but still we are 'under the law to Christ;' when our Saviour in the Sermon on the Mount expounded the moral law, and vindicated it from the corrupt glosses with which the scribes and Pharisees had broken it (Mt. 5:19), he did in effect renew the tables, and made them like the first, that is, reduce the law to its primitive sense and intention. 2. That the best evidence of the pardon of sin and peace with God is the writing of the law in the heart. The first token God gave of His reconciliation to Israel was the renewing of the tables of the law; thus the first article of the new covenant is 'I will write My law in their heart' (Heb. 8:10)." This quotation is, again, from Matthew Henry. His works were neither much in evidence, nor well recommended in the Bible school founded by C. I. Scofield where this writer became ingrained with the inconsistencies of Dispensationalism in his youth.

From what we have so far reviewed, the law, then, does not change. Being a reflection of the nature of God, it is immutable. Its demands are not in the Christian dispensation reduced one iota. Neither is its penalty withdrawn by the cross of Christ. The demand of the law is upheld by the cross, and the penalty of it is executed upon the cross. Where change occurs is in the Christian's relation to the law. He does not stand before the law in himself, on his own responsibility, as before the Judge, for then he would be condemned. He stands before the law as in a Saviour, who became responsible for his sins, took upon Himself the condemnation of the law, and substituted His obedience lacking in the Christian. So he is delivered not from the law, but from the curse of the law. The relation that therefore exists between the Christian and the

law is that it is to him an instructor in holiness, especially in that it conveys the knowledge of his natural misery and sin. It is also his standard of life, especially for a life of thanksgiving. Then if our position before the law is in Christ, what is His attitude toward the law, which, of course, ought to be ours? This, "I delight to do Thy will, O My God; yea, Thy law is within My heart." (Ps. 40:8) As Matthew Henry pointed out, that is the new covenant relation to the law.

In view of all stated above, it certainly cannot be maintained that the law of God is superseded by the divine declaration, "Love is the fulfilling of the law." (Rom. 13:10) We have shown that love is the sum and genius of the law. Therefore this divine statement has always been true. From the beginning love has always been the fulfilling of the law. Where love is lacking, although there be an outward conformity to the law, there is no acceptable fulfilling of it. For the law commands love, to God and to the neighbor. The law itself is the *rule* of life; love is the *principle* of life. The law reveals what we are to do; love empowers to the doing of it. True, "love is the fulfilling of the law," but that is not the same as saying as dispensationalists seem to think, that "love is a *substitute* for the law." *Love* and *law* are not synonymous, but they are harmonious. The law is the track; love is the engine which draws along the train. The track commands and controls the engine. The engine is exalted and free as long as it remains on the track. The engine cannot say, I will pull, but where and when I please, I will not be hampered. Nor dare the Christian say, I love God, and will do as He says, but will not be commanded!

It is often objected that the law is a matter of duty, whereas the Christian lives by privilege, in the liberty of forgiveness and sonship. But duty is simply what is owed to God. Deliverance from the curse and penalty of the law does not leave free of debt and duty to God. Love cancels the law's sentence of wrath, because Love bore the sentence, but it does not remove the law. Nor because now the Christian has besides duty, privilege, does duty become bondage. Thus, the Christian lives by privilege. What is and has ever been the believer's privilege, but to love God and do His will? That brings us back to the law, for it is the revealed will of God. The privilege of liberty in Christ does not relieve us from conformity to His will. Duty is love owed. Privilege is love enjoyed. Love is holiness, yea, goodness constraining. "The love of Christ constraineth us." The law is a matter of more than duty — of privilege! and of more than privilege added to duty — of love! It is "Love the Lord thy God!" No, love and law, or grace and law are not antithetical. It is impossible that the attributes of God conflict. It is therefore impossible that the law of God and the love of God be opposed. The law reveals God as the *light* (1 John 1:5) and love reveals that "God is *love*." (4:8) The prayer of the enlightened Christian is not that he may be free of the law, but it is like this, "It is time for Thee, Lord, to work, for they have made void Thy law." (Ps. 119:126)

PICTORIAL NEWS—



This is a photo of the Protestant Reformed Church of Kalamazoo, Mich. This new place of worship is about ten years old and was used for a Mission until it was sold to Kalamazoo's congregation in 1965. Needless to say, it is greatly appreciated by the membership, who were wont to worship in rented quarters since they lost their original church in the defection of 1953. It is situated in the north end of the city at 623 Stassen Avenue. It has a seating capacity of eighty, with additional room for expansion when necessary.

The congregation was organized in 1927 and received their first pastor, Rev. W. Verhil, in 1932. In

their forty years of existence they suffered many setbacks due to doctrinal strife, but this staunch little group remained faithful to the truth of Sovereign Grace as we are privileged to maintain it. Now, after weathering many waves of membership expansion and contraction, they number twelve families of forty-two souls, of which twelve are of catechetical age. Kalamazoo is thriving under the leadership of Rev. R. C. Harbach in the enjoyment of a full ecclesiastical life in our denomination, considering it their calling to engage in the sturdy defense of the Truth of God's Word in the way which is faithful to our Reformed heritage.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Priscilla Society of First Protestant Reformed Church expresses its sympathy to one of its members, Mrs. Henry Veltman, in the loss of her mother,

MRS. ANNA DE JONG

"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." II Corinthians 5:1.

Mrs. J. Oomkes, Pres.
Mrs. R. Kamminga, Vice-Secy.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Priscilla Society of the First Protestant Reformed Church extends its sympathy to one of its members, Mrs. Henry Velthouse, in the death of her mother-in-law

MRS. JENNIE VELTHOUSE

Our prayer is that our heavenly Father may comfort the bereaved family.

Mrs. J. Oomkes, Pres.
Mrs. R. Kamminga, Sec'y.

ANNIVERSARY

On Sept. 25, 1967 our beloved parents,

MR. AND MRS. JAMES BLANKESPOOR

will commemorate their 25th wedding anniversary. We give thanks to our covenant God for sparing them for each other and us these years. Our earnest prayer is that they may continue to experience God's loving kindness in their remaining years.

Their children:

Mr. and Mrs. Pete Poortenga, Jr.
and 3 grandchildren

MEN'S LEAGUE

The Men's League will hold its Fall Meeting Monday, October 9, 1967 at the Hudsonville Protestant Reformed Church at 8:00 p.m., D.V. Rev. J. Heys will speak on "What is the Function of an Evangelist, and What Has Happened to His Office."

Men, you are invited to meet with us for an evening of Christian fellowship.

H. Dykstra, Sec'y.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Mary-Martha Society and the Men's Society of the Hope Protestant Reformed Church of Redlands, California join in expressing their heartfelt sympathy to its members, Mr. and Mrs. Adrian Van Meeteren, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Van Meeteren and Mr. and Mrs. John Feenstra, in the loss of their father and grandfather,

MR. BERT HASPER

May they experience the comfort that only our Heavenly Father can give in this time of grief.

The Mary-Martha Society

Donna Huiskens, Sec'y.

The Men's Society

Everett Van Voorthuysen, Sec'y.

ANNIVERSARY

On September 9, 1967, our beloved parents,

REV. AND MRS. HERMAN VELDMAN

commemorated their 35th wedding anniversary.

We are thankful to our Heavenly Father for keeping them in His loving care these many years.

We pray that God will continually bestow His grace upon them in their remaining years.

Their children:

Mr. and Mrs. Cornie Den Ouden

Mr. and Mrs. Jack Van Dyke

Mr. and Mrs. Jon Huiskens

and 8 grandchildren

ATTENTION: R.F.P.A. MEMBERS

Annual meeting of the Reformed Free Publishing Association will be held, Thursday, Sept. 21, D.V., in the Southeast Protestant Reformed Church, at 8:00 p.m. Rev. J. Kortering will be the speaker. Three Board members are to be elected from the following nomination: George De Vries, D. Kooienga, G. Schimmel, H. Kamphuis, H. Velthouse, and R. Teitsma.

The R.F.P.A. Board

Index To The Standard Bearer, Vol. 43

TEXT INDEX

SUBJECT	Author	Page
Genesis 47:8, 9	M.S.	122
Deuteronomy 8:18	M.S.	74
I Samuel 17:10, 26	B.W.	37
I Samuel 17:42-46	B.W.	58
I Samuel 18:7-9	B.W.	90
I Samuel 18:10	B.W.	131
I Samuel 18:28, 29	B.W.	156
I Samuel 20:16, 17	B.W.	230
I Samuel 20:37, 38	B.W.	279
I Samuel 22:1, 2	B.W.	323
I Samuel 23:14	B.W.	369
I Samuel 24:4-6	B.W.	444
I Samuel 25:10, 11, 38	B.W.	475
II Chronicles 33:13b	M.S.	26
Psalms 24:3-5	J.K.	338
Psalms 34:17-19	B.W.	296
Psalms 54	B.W.	392
Psalms 59:1-3	B.W.	187
Psalms 125:1, 2	J.K.	242
Psalms 139:23, 24	J.K.	434
Proverbs 3:5, 6	M.S.	146
Proverbs 18:24	B.W.	206
Daniel 3:24, 25	M.S.	170
Daniel 3:25	J.K.	386

Matthew 14:28-32	J.K.	482
Luke 1:78b, 79	M.S.	98
Luke 24:17, 32, 35	J.K.	290
John 10:1-39	G.C.L.	19
John 10:1-39	G.C.L.	43
John 19:1-5	M.S.	194
John 19:14-16a	M.S.	218
John 19:30	J.K.	266
Acts 4:13	J.K.	362
I Timothy 6:1	J.H.	135
II Timothy 3:14, 15	J.K.	458
I Thessalonians 4:13, 14	M.S.	50
Hebrews 1:1-4	G.C.L.	116
Hebrews 1:1-4	G.C.L.	129
Hebrews 1:5-14	G.C.L.	154
Hebrews 1:7-14	G.C.L.	178
Hebrews 2:1-4	G.C.L.	179
Hebrews 2:2-4	G.C.L.	223
Hebrews 2:8, 9	G.C.L.	300
Hebrews 2:11-13	G.C.L.	325
Hebrews 2:14-18	G.C.L.	355
Hebrews 3:1-6	G.C.L.	381
Hebrews 3:3-6	G.C.L.	424
Hebrews 3:5-15	G.C.L.	465
Hebrews 11:4	J.K.	410
James 1:12	M.S.	2
I Peter 3:12	J.K.	314

SUBJECT INDEX

- A
- Abel's More Excellent Sacrifice J.K. 410
- A Merging, Emerging Church G.V.B. 41
- "And Islands of the Sea" J.H. 467
- Annual Report of R.F.P.A. G.B. 45
- Another Kind of Resurrection H.H. 81
- A Saint Recounting His Life M.S. 122
- Ascending The Hill Of The Lord J.K. 338
- Association of Christian Reformed
Laymen, Bothersome H.C.H. 7
- Assurance A Phantasm In Modernism R.H. 81
- Atonement, The Committee on the H.C.H. 365
- Atonement, The Committee on the H.C.H. 390
- Atonement, The Nature of the H.C.H. 5
- Atonement, The Nature of the H.C.H. 31
- Atonement, The Nature of the H.C.H. 53
- Atonement, The Nature of the H.C.H. 77
- Atonement, The Nature of the H.C.H. 101
- Atonement, The Nature of the H.C.H. 125
- Atonement, The Nature of the H.C.H. 174
- Atonement, The Nature of the H.C.H. 245
- B
- Barth's Doctrine of Scripture D.E. 143
- Barth's Doctrine of Scripture D.E. 162
- Beautiful Feet J.H. 440
- Billy Graham's Answers R.H. 66
- Billy Graham — The Rebutted Dilemma R.H. 10
- Blessedness of the Tried M.S. 2
- Book Reviews:
A Serious Call To A Devout And
Holy Life H.H. 334
- Acts of the Apostles H.C.H. 167
- Barnes' Notes
on the New Testament H.C.H. 95
- Calvinism, Its History, Principles
and Perspectives H.H. 334
- Christian Reflections H.H. 478
- Church Growth In Central and
Southern Nigera H.H. 23
- Faith and The Physical World H.H. 478
- God With Us H.H. 334
- Heaven: A Place, A City, A Home H.H. 478
- Herman Bavinck
En Zijn Tijdgenoten H.C.H. 334
- Hymns For Youth H.C.H. 191
- John Calvin, A Collection of
Distinguished Essays H.H. 118
- Religion and the Schools H.H. 478
- Slavery, Segregation and Scripture H.H. 23
- The Church Between The Temple
and the Marque H.H. 478
- The Grace of Law H.H. 95
- The Minor Prophets H.H. 334
- The Plight of the Man and
The Power of God H.H. 23
- The Soul of the Symbols H.H. 23
- The Theology of the English Reformers... H.H. 478
- What About Tongue Speaking? H.H. 118
- Why Scientists Accept Evolution H.C.H. 119
- C
- Calvinism Unpopular But Right R.H. 104
- Calvinistic, Premillennial, and
Dispensational? H.C.H. 461
- Calvin, Thus Spake John H.C.H. 295
- Christ's Mock Coronation M.S. 194
- Christian Reformed Church
Synodical Agenda H.H. 395
- Confessional Change Among Presbyterians. H.H. 379
- Confessions, The Battle Over H.H. 258
- Consistency, Thou Art A Jewel H.C.H. 148
- Contribution on Baptism W.D.J. 310
- Contribution on Hymns H.H. 238
- Contribution on Hymns H.H. 309
- Controversy on Abortion H.H. 448
- COCU H.H. 15
- COCU G.V.B. 17
- COCU G.V.B. 41
- COCU G.V.B. 110
- COCU, The Southern Presbyterians and ... H.H. 16
- Creeds, The Present Day Relevancy of D.K. 416
- Cry of Faith, The J.K. 482
- D
- David and Goliath B.W. 37
- David and Goliath B.W. 58
- David and Jonathan B.W. 206
- David and Nabal B.W. 475
- David and Saul - Enemies B.W. 156
- David and the Piece of Skirt B.W. 444
- David and the Ziphites B.W. 392
- David Discovers Hatred B.W. 187
- David In Exile B.W. 323
- David In Flight B.W. 296
- David In Hiding B.W. 369
- David, The Spear, And The Cruse
of Water B.W. 496
- Dayspring From On High M.S. 98
- Deacon, Office of G.V.D.B. 451
- Dekker Case H.H. 396
- Dekker Case at the C.R. Synod H.C.H. 437
- Did You Know? H.C.H. 272
- Dispensationalism A Blind Legalism R.H. 234
- Dispensationalism A Carnalizing System .. R.H. 200
- Dispensationalism A Minus-Proof
Speculation R.H. 277
- Dispensationalism A Modern Thief R.H. 176
- Dispensationalism A Mutilated
Ecclesiology R.H. 250
- Dispensationalism An Ancient Error R.H. 165
- Dispensationalism and The Christian
Under The Law R.H. 442
- Dispensationalism And The Gentile
Remnant R.H. 371
- Dispensationalism And the Law Before
Sinai R.H. 426
- Dispensationalism And The True Zion R.H. 401
- Dispensationalism And The Two Israels ... R.H. 353
- Dispensationalism and the Perpetuity
of the Law R.H. 498

Dispensationalism, More On	R.H.	421	Israel Rejects Their King	M.S.	218
Dispensationalism, More Questions On	R.H.	350		J	
Dispensationalism On Israel and			Jonathan and David	B.W.	206
The Church	R.H.	298	Jonathan's Arrows	B.W.	279
Dispensationalism, Questions On	H.C.H.	286	Jonathan's Covenant	B.W.	230
Doctrine of Scripture in "The			Jehovah's Vigilance	J.K.	314
Confession of 1967," The	D.E.	488		K	
Doing Good Unto Our Enemies	J.H.	204	Kosmos, An Undifferentiated Totality?	R.H.	420
Doing Good Unto Our Enemies	J.H.	227		L	
Does "Realism" Justify Sin?	H.H.	281	Letter From A Reader	F.V.B.	420
Dordt, A Repudiation of	H.H.	186	Liberalism In The Netherlands	H.H.	347
	E			M	
Ecumenical News Items	H.H.	306	Manasseh, Sinner-Saint	M.S.	26
Ecumenical To The Extreme	H.C.H.	127	Marriage Paving The Way To Unity	H.H.	212
Ecumenism and Mergers	H.H.	447	Mideast Crisis	H.H.	471
Editor's Notes	H.C.H.	4	Ministry, The Task of the	G.V.D.B.	180
Editor's Notes	H.C.H.	28	Ministry, The Task of the	G.V.D.B.	202
Editor's Notes	H.C.H.	102	Ministry, The Task of the	G.V.D.B.	225
Editor's Notes	H.C.H.	296	Miracles	H.V.	137
Elder's Task	G.V.D.B.	375	Miracles	H.V.	160
Elder's Task	G.V.D.B.	403	Miracles	H.V.	189
Elder, The Office of	G.V.D.B.	357	Miracles	H.V.	208
Endurance	J.K.	242	Miracles	H.V.	273
Evangelism, World Congress On	G.V.B.	158	Miracles	H.V.	307
Evangelism, World Congress On	G.V.B.	141	Mission Preaching, Faith and	C.H.	35
Evidence of the Holy Spirit	J.K.	362	Missions, Some Principles of	H.H.	112
Evil Spirit Returns	B.W.	131	Missions, Some Principles of	H.H.	151
Evolution, The Question of	H.H.	395	Missions, Some Principles of	H.H.	232
Excommunication, The Form of	G.V.D.B.	12	Missions, Some Principles of	H.H.	331
Excommunication, The Form of	G.V.D.B.	39	Movie Attendance, As To	H.C.H.	463
Excommunication, The Form of	G.V.D.B.	62	Movies, In Support Of	H.C.H.	271
Exhortation and Prayer	G.V.D.B.	62		N	
Exhorted Unto Faithfulness	J.K.	458	Nature Still Boss	H.H.	69
	F		News Briefs	H.H.	283
Faith and Mission Preaching	C.H.	35	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	24
Fall, Effects of the	H.V.	397	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	48
Federal Control of State Aid	H.H.	305	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	71
Fiddling While Rome Burns	G.V.B.	453	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	96
	G		News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	120
God-Is- Dead Men Are Serious	H.H.	212	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	144
Good Counsel For The Future	M.S.	146	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	168
Good Shepherd of Israel	G.C.L.	19	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	192
Good Shepherd of Israel	G.C.L.	43	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	216
Gospel, The Importance of the	H.H.	112	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	240
Government	H.V.	21	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	264
Government	H.V.	33	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	288
	H		News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	312
Hearts Transformed By			News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	336
The Living Lord	J.K.	290	News Fgom Our Churches	J.M.F.	359
Hebrews, The Book of	G.C.L.	83	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	384
Hebrews, The Book of	G.C.L.	116	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	408
Hell, Why?	H.H.	108	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	432
High School, A Grand Rapids Area	H.C.H.	103	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	456
Holiday or Holy Day?	J.H.	8	News From Our Churches	J.M.F.	480
Honour To Whom Honour	J.H.	64		O	
Honour To Whom Honour	J.H.	85	Offer, The Banner and		
Honour To Whom Honour	J.H.	114	Limited Atonement	H.C.H.	294
Honour To Whom Honour	J.H.	135	"Offer", The Committee and the	H.C.H.	269
Honour To Whom Honour	J.H.	182	"Offer", The Committee and the	H.C.H.	293
	I		"Offer", The Committee and the	H.C.H.	317
Intended Comfort For The Bereaved	M.S.	50	"Offer", The Committee and the	H.C.H.	342

Open Letter From The Board of the R.F.P.A.	333	Report of the Doctrinal Committee	H.C.H.	390
Order of Worship, As To A Common	H.C.H.	462	Reprobation, Conditional	H.H.
Ordination, Ceremony of	G.V.D.B.	254	R.E.S. And Its Ecumenism	G.V.B.
Ordination, The Prayer of	G.V.D.B.	321	R.E.S. And The Union Question	G.V.B.
Ordination To The Ministry of the Word	G.V.D.B.	133	R.E.S. And The Union Question	G.V.B.
Other Matters of Interest	H.H.	397	S	
P			Satan, The Worship of	H.H.
Period Theory Again	H.H.	139	Saul and David - Enemies	B.W.
Pictorial News	J.M.F.	94	Saul's Jealousy	B.W.
Pictorial News	J.M.F.	500	Search Me, O God	J.K.
Pike On Trial	H.H.	79	Seminary Graduation	H.C.H.
Pike's Trial	H.H.	109	Sin, The Doctrine of	H.V.
Pons Assinorum In Signo Ecclesiae!	H.C.H.	389	Sin, The Doctrine of	H.V.
Prayer Amendment, Death of the	H.H.	68	Sin, The Doctrine of	H.V.
Preaching, The Importance of	H.H.	232	Sin, The Doctrine of	H.V.
Preaching, The Importance of	H.H.	413	Some Principles of Missions	H.H.
Prediction Fulfilled	H.C.H.	172	Standard Bearer, A Plan for Its Future .G.V.B.	60
Principles of Church Union	G.V.B.	110	Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation	J.D.
Protest, A Loud Clear	H.H.	185	Still "Fiddling"	G.V.B.
Protestant Reformed Primary Education .H.C.H.	319		Story of An Ass and A Bridge	H.C.H.
Providence and Sin, God's	H.V.	56	Synod, Report of the 1967	H.H.
Providence and Sin, God's	H.V.	88	T	
Providence of God	H.V.	21	Theological Soundness and Practical Application, About	H.C.H.
Providence of God	H.V.	33	Three Forms of Unity, Importance of Maintaining	J.K.
Providence of God	H.V.	56	Three Forms of Unity, Importance of Maintaining	J.K.
Providence of God	H.V.	88	TRAGIC!	H.C.H.
Providence of God	H.V.	137	Treasurer's Report of R.F.P.A.	R.B.
Providence of God	H.V.	160	Trouble Among Roman Catholics	H.H.
Providence of God	H.V.	189	Troubles From Vatican II	H.H.
Providence of God	H.V.	208	V	
Providence of God	H.V.	273	Victoriously Finished	J.K.
Providence of God	H.V.	307	Virgins For Christ's Sake	J.H.
Publication Plans - Progress Report	H.C.H.	220	Virgins For Christ's Sake	J.H.
Q			Virgins For Christ's Sake	J.H.
Questions About the Ten Plagues	H.C.H.	106	Virgins For Christ's Sake	J.H.
Question Box:			Virgins For Christ's Sake	J.H.
Must We Love God's Enemies	H.C.H.	222	Virgins For Christ's Sake	J.H.
Why Is The Law Read Every Sunday ...	H.C.H.	221	Virgins For Christ's Sake	J.H.
Question Concerning The Coming of Christ	H.C.H.	287	Virgins For Christ's Sake	J.H.
Question On Hating God's Enemies.....	H.C.H.	311	W	
R			Walking In The Midst of the Fire	J.K.
Races In the World, Significance of	R.H.	213	W.C.C. - And Its Conference on Church and Society	G.V.B.
Races In the World, Significance of	R.H.	236	W.C.C. In Geneva.....	H.H.
Races In the World, Significance of	R.H.	256	What Chaplains Believe	H.H.
Readmittance	G.V.D.B.	92	Willing To Come To Grips?	H.C.H.
Reformed Ecumenical Synod, The	G.V.B.	248	Winds of Doctrine From the Netherlands ..	H.C.H.
Remembering The Source of our Wealth	M.S.	74	With The Fourth Man in the Furnace	M.S.
Report of the Doctrinal Committee	H.C.H.	196	World Council of Churches, Position On....	H.H.
Report of the Doctrinal Committee	H.C.H.	269	World Congress on Evangelism	H.H.
Report of the Doctrinal Committee	H.C.H.	293	World Congress on Ewngelism	G.V.B.
Report of the Doctrinal Committee	H.C.H.	317	Z	
Report of the Doctrinal Committee	H.C.H.	342	Ziphites, David and the	B.W.
Report of the Doctrinal Committee	H.C.H.	365	Index by Rev. G. Vanden Berg	