

THE STANDARD

Bearer

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME XXXIV

APRIL 1, 1958 — GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

NUMBER 13

MEDITATION

THE CRUCIFIXION

"And it was the third hour, and they crucified Him."

Mark 15:25

The Preacher tells us that there is an appointed time for everything that happens under the sun. And that is correct. When a lowly sparrow dies, and falls out of a tree, it was the appointed time from all eternity for that little insignificant (?) beastie to die.

And as it is with that little sparrow, so it is with everything in this whole great universe.

However, there is a difference. We speak of important and unimportant things, events, persons and relationships.

Moreover, there is always the most important thing, theme, thought, etc. Music lovers know that there is one theme in every piece of music, composition, opera, etc. There is one main thought running through a book, play, composition of any kind.

In the opening paragraph of an essay, as well as in the closing paragraph, there should be a summation of all that is written in such essay.

Architects tell us that in great buildings, cathedrals, houses of parliament, etc., there is one thought expressed. That was especially so in the middle ages.

The same idea you find in sculpture, paintings, etc.

And that this is so, is because of God.

There is one focal point in time; there is one Man among the billions; there is one place in the universe; there is one event in the affairs of men, angels and devils that stands out, that is most important, which draws really all the attention. That one point of time, that one affair, that one Man, that one place, that one event stands in the center of all things. And you may even say that all the other times, affairs, men (and, for that matter, angels, devils, men, both wicked and

good), events and places, serve the central, fundamental and most important of all.

Such it was in anno Domini 33½.

* * * *

It was the third hour; it was Jesus; it was Golgotha; it was the crucifixion.

It was the hour of God, but also of the devil. It was the hour of the Church, but also of Antichrist. The whole universe had its hour, and the hour was the great THIRD.

You will naturally ask me for proof.

Here it is: Do you have any idea how long eternity is? Can you form a conception of everlasting presence before the throne of God and the Lamb? Did you ever ponder on the idea that you will stand there before the throne, and did you ask yourself then how you will be occupied for all eternity?

God gave the answer: You will be looking at a little Lamb, standing as if slain. Billions and billions of years after you first arrived in heaven you will still look at that little Lamb, standing with its throat cut, the blood oozing through the fleecy wool. And the sight of it will make heaven musical forever. Ever and ever your song will arise before that throne, and addressing that little Lamb, you will say: "Thou hast redeemed us unto God by Thy blood!"

Why?

Because that Lamb, slain from before the foundation of the world, is and ever was the *most important* of God's revelation. It is because Golgotha is the most important place, the Crucifixion the most important event, the affair the most important happening in all history.

What happened in the 4000 years before led up to that hour, event, place and Man. And what happened since then is flowing from that Cross, Man, hour and event.

Oh yes, it is for that very reason that this question is paramount among absolutely all other questions: "What think ye of the Christ?"

Simeon saw this clearly: "that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed."

Let's look at the place.

It is Golgotha.

It is near Jerusalem.

It is a little ways without the "camp."

Jerusalem is the most important place in the universe.

It is the City of the great King.

It is the City of Peace.

In heaven there will not be a city by the name of New York, London, Berlin, Tokyo, etc.

But there will be *a* — no — *the* Jerusalem.

There is the sound of heavenly music in that name.

Men have searched in the English language for the most beautifully sounding word. One body of linguists chose the word *melody*.

They are mistaken. It is Jerusalem.

Allow me a figure. Jerusalem is the place where the Triune Covenant God kissed the earth and the human race. But that is not the most important.

The most important about that place is that there the great mystery of Godliness appeared.

It is both terrible and beautiful.

It is terrible according to the text which I wrote above this little meditation.

At the THIRD HOUR something happened which beggars description. There is only One who could adequately describe it. Oh yes, He did describe it in the whole of the Bible. I would almost say: "especially in the four Gospels," but I hesitate. How about Psalm 22, 25, 44, 69, 77, 88? Or Isaiah 53, the books of Jonah and Job? Or for that matter "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in *all the Scriptures* the things concerning Himself."

In order to make you feel the real terror of that most important place of the whole universe, I will characterize it as follows: At Golgotha, a little without the camp, hard by Jerusalem, you see and hear the worst of hell! God touched that little spot, and His tornados began to howl, as they never will in the place which is created for the devil and his angels.

And that is true for more than one reason.

It was the worst hell, because a Man suffered there all the individual hells of billions of people. What would have come on each head individually, a billion times multiplied, came upon His dear Head *alone*.

But that is not the most terrible. I must now speak of a terror, of an anguish which I can but tell with stammering tongue.

Attend to this fact:

When devils and wicked men enter hell, and when they look into the future, they see only the blackness, the despair of an everlasting torture. There is not one speck of light, of hope, of release.

If I would have to go to hell (God have mercy on me!), and if God would say to me at my entrance into the pit which burns with fire and brimstone: "You will stay here and suffer the torture of the damned for one billion, times one billion, times one billion of years! And at the expiration of that awful period of time I will release you; I will dry your tears, and I will let you enter the abode of the blessed!" If God would so speak to me, I could enter hell with a smile. Because all through those weary years I would see a speck of light. I would ever hear the echo of that promise. And every day of my untold suffering I would tell myself: There will be a day of which you will say: "This is the last! Tomorrow I will go to heaven!"

Now attend to this: Jesus had to suffer everlasting punishment; everlasting hell on earth; everlasting death for His sheep.

But I hear you say: But Jesus arose the third day! And He lived only 33½ years! How do you explain that?

Then here is the answer: Jesus suffered an eternity of horrors through the concentration of all the fury of God's eternal wrath in the short space of time. Again *concentration*. Do you not see that Jesus' hell is worse than any other hell, even of Beelzebub?

When I think on that, I am dazzled, and am amazed with great amazement.

And now in the third place:

When I would have to go to hell, and if I would have to bow and writhe under the terrible torment of God's wrath, there would be a constant voice which would testify within me: "Serves you right! You get what is coming to you! This wrath is perfectly commensurate with all the filth and wickedness you have perpetrated!"

But now look once more at Jesus!

He is the Holy One of Israel! He is *L'Innocence* Himself! There is absolutely no guilt in Him!

Can you imagine what suffering Jesus underwent? His soul and body and spirit fitted in heaven and in the Bosom of God. But He found Himself in a very special hell!

Oh yes, we begin to understand His terrible cry *at about the ninth hour*: "*My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me!*"

Perhaps you will agree now when I said that the hour, the place, the Man, the event were paramount in the Counsel, the History, the Universe.

* * * *

But why? What is the sense of all this horror?

The answer, dear reader, sings of the beauty of Jerusalem, Golgotha, the Third Hour, the Man and the God Jesus Christ.

When you stand before the cross of Jesus, and when it grows very dark around that cross, and when your cheeks blanch at the cry of the Lamb of God, I ask you to look above that cross and beyond that cross. And if you have the faith of God, and know the Holy Scriptures, then you will hear the sound of a beautiful melody: it is Jehovah singing His eternal song of the Covenant. And here is one of the strains: "This cross and this suffering Jesus is the love of My Heart!" God *commendeth* His love towards us in that Christ died for us!

What does that mean: He *commendeth* His love?

It means this: God is love. Even the little catechism children know that. And Adam and Eve knew of it in Paradise. If you could have asked our first father: Does God love you, Adam? He would have said: Oh yes, God loves me. My heart tells me. And I can read His love in every throbbing moment of time. Every creature around me, and the blue heavens above me have but one story to tell: God loves me!

But now stand again before the cross. And then God again says to you and me: I love you! But now He *commendeth* His love towards us. It means that He writes in italics. It means that He underscored that love. It means that He places the verb *to love* in quotation marks.

Ah me! What more shall I say, my brother! If you do not understand my last sentence, I cannot help you. And here it is:

God loves you and me so much that He went to hell for you, so that you and I might go to heaven! Amen.

G.V.

IN MEMORIAM

The Men's Society of the Doon Protestant Reformed Church hereby wishes to express its sincere sympathy to one of its fellow members, Mr. Henry Kuiper and his family, in loss of his brother,

MR. JOHN KUIPER

May the Lord sustain the bereaved in their sorrow and comfort them with the assurance that He does all things well and that there remaineth a rest for the people of God.

Rev. G. J. Van Baren, President
Mr. Minard Van Den Top, Secretary

Eastern Ladies' League

The Eastern Ladies' League will hold their Spring meeting, D.V., on April 24 at First Protestant Reformed Church. Rev. C. Hanko will be our speaker.

Ladies, keep this date in mind.

Mrs. H. Velthouse, Vice Secretary

THE STANDARD BEARER

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

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

Editor — REV. HERMAN HOEKSEMA

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

All matters relative to subscriptions should be addressed to Mr.
G. Pipe, 1463 Ardmore St., S. E., Grand Rapids 7, Mich.

Announcements and Obituaries must be mailed to the above
address and will be published at a fee of \$1.00 for each notice.

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

Subscription price: \$5.00 per year

Entered as Second Class matter at Grand Rapids, Michigan

CONTENTS

MEDITATION —	
The Crucifixion	289
Rev. G. Vos	
EDITORIALS —	
The Declaration of Principles	292
Rev. H. Hoeksema	
OUR DOCTRINE —	
The Book of Revelation	294
Rev. H. Hoeksema	
THE DAY OF SHADOWS —	
The Prophecy of Zechariah	297
Rev. G. M. Ophoff	
FROM HOLY WRIT —	
Exposition of I Corinthians 7 (8)	300
Rev. G. Lubbers	
FEATURE ARTICLE —	
The Jesuits	302
Rev. G. Van Baren	
CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH —	
The Church and the Sacraments	304
Rev. H. Veldman	
THE VOICE OF OUR FATHERS —	
The Canons of Dordrecht	306
Rev. H. C. Hoeksema	
DECENCY AND ORDER —	
Prayer in Ecclesiastical Assemblies	308
Rev. G. Vanden Berg	
ALL AROUND US —	
Christ's Death and Its Significance	310
The Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah	311
Rev. M. Schipper	
CONTRIBUTIONS —	
Calvinism — The Truth	312
Rev. Robert C. Harbach	

EDITORIALS

The Declaration of Principles

In our last editorial on the above mentioned subject we stated that it is not the Declaration of Principles that was the cause of the schism in our churches and the reason why the schismatics left us, but the fact that the latter did not want to maintain the Protestant Reformed truth.

For that declaration is the truth.

And that truth the schismatics rejected.

They, principally, rejected it because they want to maintain their conditional theology.

This the Declaration strongly condemns. It emphasizes throughout that salvation is God's work from beginning to end and that, therefore, it is and must be unconditional.

What is meant by the term "condition" or "conditional"? Let us consult Webster's dictionary. Webster defines condition as "that which must exist as the occasion or concomitant of something else; that which is requisite in order that something else should take effect; an essential qualification; stipulation; terms specified." And the adjective "conditional" he defines "containing, implying, or depending on, a condition or conditions; not absolute; made or granted on certain terms; as, a conditional promise."

This idea of condition is applied to salvation by many and also by the schismatics. It is applied by them particularly to the promise of God so the meaning of the promise is that God says to the sinner: I promise unto thee salvation, eternal life and glory on condition that thou repentest and believest in Christ.

If this were true, if the terms of the promise of God were such that repentance and faith were required as conditions which man must fulfill in order that God may fulfill or realize His promise, the promise of God would be exactly and entirely out of reach of the sinner. He cannot, will not, and cannot will to repent and to believe. He is wholly dead in sin. Hence, if the promise of God unto salvation depends in any measure upon a condition which that sinner must fulfill, the case is hopeless and the promise of God is absolutely impossible.

I realize, of course, that those who maintain and preach this conditional theology often add that God Himself fulfills all the conditions. This, however, is merely done in order to give the fundamentally Arminian doctrine of conditions an appearance of being Reformed. Usually, you will discover that those who believe in conditions also preach the Arminian doctrine of free will. The statement, moreover, that God fulfills all the conditions is sheer nonsense. Either there are conditions which the sinner must fulfill to obtain the promise of salvation or the promise is absolutely unconditional.

The latter is the truth of Scripture, of the Confessions, and also of the Declaration of Principles.

Let us consider for a moment what is implied in the promise of God unto salvation, in order to see whether any part of this promise is or can possibly be conditional.

There is first of all the fact that the promise of God is eternal in God and is rooted in election. God determined, sovereignly, from before the foundation of the world who should receive the promise of salvation. Is this election conditional? In other words, did God merely, in His eternal counsel, determine that they who would fulfill the condition of faith and repentance would receive the promise of salvation? No Reformed man would dare or would be willing to maintain this. Every one knows that this is contrary to Scripture and the Reformed confessions. Election is absolutely sovereign and unconditional. But if we confess this truth, the matter of conditions is already determined at the same time. Salvation is the realization of the counsel of election in time, and if that counsel is unconditional salvation, the application of the promise in time is also unconditional.

But there is more.

Perhaps, someone will object that, after all the counsel of God is a deep mystery and that we may not, in determining the character of salvation and the realization of the promise, proceed from the counsel of election. Now, personally I deny this. Scripture everywhere gives us to understand that salvation has its source in God's eternal counsel of election, and, therefore, there can be nothing wrong in following its teaching.

Be that as it may.

Let us turn to the realization of the promise in time.

We may distinguish salvation or the realization of the promise as objective and subjective salvation. To the former belongs all the work of Christ for us or in our behalf, to the latter all the work of Christ within us. To the former belong the coming of the Son of God in the flesh, His sojourn and public ministry among us, His suffering and atoning death on the cross, His resurrection on the third day, His ascension into heaven, His sitting at the right hand of God, His reception of the Holy Spirit of grace, and His coming again in the last day. To the latter belong such works of grace as regeneration, the effectual calling, the work of faith, the grace of repentance and justification, the grace of sanctification, of preservation unto the end and of final glorification.

Is any of this work of God conditionally determined, that is, so determined that it depends in any respect on man, on the sinner, whether it shall be realized or not?

We may perhaps say immediately that this cannot be true of the work of God in Christ in the objective sense of the word. God sent His Son into the world, and the Son came into our flesh unconditionally. This was the sovereign work of God alone and there were no possible conditions attached to it on our part. And the same is true of all the rest of the work of God in our Lord Jesus Christ. He was nailed to the

accursed tree and on that tree He bore our sins, that is, according to Scripture and as we all believe, the sins of all the elect. He atoned for them. He took them all away. They are removed for ever. This, too, is simply a fact, and an unconditional work of God in Christ. It would be absurd to say that our Lord bore our sins on the tree on condition that we would repent and believe. Nor is this any different in regard to the fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. No more than the death of the cross is the death of a mere individual, but the death of all that are in Him, whom the Father hath given Him, the death of the Head of all, the elect; no more is the resurrection of our Lord, on the third day, the resurrection of a mere man, but it is the resurrection of the representative as well as the organic Head of all the elect. And since His resurrection is the proof of our justification, we were all justified in Christ objectively on the day of His own resurrection from the dead. This is simply an indubitable fact. There are no possible conditions attached to it on our part. Christ was raised for our justification. We may say still more. Christ, as we said, is also the Head of His body in the organic sense of the word. This means that, principally, when He was raised from the dead we were all raised and quickened unto everlasting life. Also this, I say, is simply a fact. It is accomplished. It is finished by God in Christ. It is a matter of absolutely sovereign grace. It is, therefore, unconditional. The same may be said of His ascension into heaven and His sitting at the right hand of God. When the Lord went to heaven, we all ascended up into heavenly glory. According to Scripture, principally, we, that is all who are objectively in Christ, all the elect, are in heaven and we are partakers of His power and glory. Are there any possible conditions attached to this? The answer is, of course, entirely negative. In other words, the entire work of God in Christ in the objective sense of the word is entirely sovereign and absolutely unconditional.

But if this be true, as it is indeed, is it possible that there are conditions, some requirements which we must fulfill, attached to our salvation in the subjective sense of the word?

On the face of what we have written above, this appears absolutely impossible.

Nevertheless, we will examine this aspect of our subject, too.

Let us, first of all, turn to the language of our Baptism Form, which every Reformed minister reads when an infant is baptized but which he cannot conscientiously read if he believes in conditions.

There we read that "Holy baptism witnesseth and sealeth unto us the washing away of our sins through Jesus Christ. Therefore we are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. For when we are baptized in the name of the Father, God the Father witnesseth and sealeth unto us, that He doth make an eternal covenant of grace with us, and adopts us for his children and heirs, and therefore will provide us with every good thing, and avert all

evil or turn it to our profit. And when we are baptized in the name of the Son, the Son sealeth unto us, that he doth wash us in his blood from all our sins, incorporating us into the fellowship of his death and resurrection, so that we are freed from all our sins and accounted righteous before God."

All the preceding refers, of course, to our objective salvation. Nevertheless, do not fail to notice that all this is sealed unto us unconditionally.

The following, however, refers to our salvation in the subjective sense of the word: "In like manner, when we are baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, the Holy Ghost assures us, by this holy sacrament, that he will dwell in us, and sanctify us to be members of Christ, applying unto us that which we have in Christ, namely the washing away of our sins, and the daily renewing of our lives, till we shall finally be presented without spot or wrinkle in the assembly of the elect in life eternal."

All this is presented as the work of God absolutely. The very idea of conditions does not even fit into this language of our Baptism Form. The Holy Ghost simply assures us that he will apply unto us all the blessings of salvation in Christ Jesus our Lord.

It is true that, according to the Baptism Form, in all covenants there are contained two parts. Mark you well, two *parts*, not two parties. And our part of the covenant is the fruit of God's part. Only when and after God establishes His eternal covenant of grace with us, only when and after the Son has washed us in His blood from all our sins and ingrafted us into the fellowship of His death and resurrection, and only when and after the Holy Ghost has come to dwell in us, — only then can we possibly begin to do our part of the covenant. Hence, our part of the covenant can not possibly be a condition on our part for God to fulfill His part of the everlasting covenant of grace.

Indeed, in the covenant we have a sacred obligation to love the Lord our God and to walk in a new and holy life. But this is an obligation, not as a condition *to*, but as a calling *in* God's covenant.

H.H.

IN MEMORIAM

The Mary-Martha Society of the Protestant Reformed Church of Redlands, California, hereby wishes to express its sincere sympathy to two of its members, Mrs. Ed Mullenix, and Mrs. Thys Feenstra in the loss of their father and brother-in-law,

HERMAN DE VRIES

on March 5, 1958.

May the God of all grace comfort and sustain them in their sorrow.

Rev. H. H. Kuiper, President
Mrs. Harvey Sawyer, Secretary

OUR DOCTRINE

THE BOOK OF REVELATION

CHAPTER II

The Numberless Throng

Revelation 7:9, 13-17

The same truth is indicated in the palm branches which they hold in their hands. By these we are referred, no doubt, to the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles, when the children of Israel commemorated how they had been in the desert, and joyously thought of their being led out of bondage into the land of promise. So also this multitude: they have been in the wilderness of life, of sin and imperfection, of suffering and want and death. But they are all through; they are now in the land of promise. They celebrate their final deliverance and entrance into the land of glory.

Finally, this is also indicated by the place where they are now found. They stand before the throne and the Lamb. They are in the place where the glory of Almighty God and of the Lamb shines forth, where the elders worship, and all creation with the mighty angels praise the name of the God of their salvation. They are, in a word, in that new economy of things that has been pictured to us in the fourth chapter of this book, that new economy that was to replace the old dispensation of imperfection, the new economy of the perfected kingdom of glory. And there they stand, that is, they are ready for worship and service and praise. In a word, this portion permits us to cast a glance into the future, to see what will be the portion of the people of God when all shall have been accomplished and when the new heavens and the new earth shall have been realized. This numberless throng is the multitude of the people of God after they shall have been gathered in eternal glory in the new creation.

Finally, it is of importance that we notice their origin. For also that is expressly indicated in the text. The elder tells John that they have all come out of the great tribulation. To understand this clause fully, we must remember the general standpoint of the Book of Revelation. We have seen time and again that it pictures to us the events of this entire dispensation as they, under the control of Christ, must lead to the completion of the kingdom of God. These events cover this entire dispensation, as we have stated repeatedly. Nevertheless, they will increase in force and in number as the time draws near that the Lord shall return to establish the kingdom of glory forever. This must be remembered also with regard to this great tribulation. In the narrowest sense of the word this phrase calls to our mind the period immediately before the coming of Christ. There is no doubt in the light of Scripture that there shall be a period of persecution of the church, and a period of great tribulation for the people of God, as has never been before. When the power

of the antichrist shall develop and reach its climax, when the great apostasy shall take place and the few faithful shall stand over against a world that is filled with enmity against Christ and His people, then shall they be hated of all nations and shall be subjected to terrible persecution. To this particular period the phrase refers in its narrowest sense. Nevertheless, we must never conceive of this great tribulation as standing all by itself. For that is not the case. It is merely the climax, the ultimate manifestation of the power that always was filled with bitter hatred against the church of Christ in the world. And therefore we must not forget that this great tribulation is in process of formation all the time, throughout this entire dispensation. In a wider sense it includes also those minor persecutions, terrible enough in themselves, but minor in comparison to the final tribulation, to which the people of God have already been subjected. There was the persecution under the Roman emperors, — under Nero, under Domitian, — the persecution in the period immediately preceding the Reformation, as well as during the time of the Reformation. All these were in principle the same tribulation as the one that is still to some shortly before the coming of Christ. Only, they were not such fierce manifestations of it as the last one will be, according to the words of Jesus. We may understand this term, therefore, in the broadest sense, namely, as including the tribulation of the people of God of all ages. Principally the people of God from their spiritual point of view are always in this great tribulation. The power of antichrist was in the world already in the time of John, has been in the world ever since, and is never out of the world. That power of antichrist always is filled with enmity against God and His Christ and His people, always plans to hurt the children of God and to destroy the kingdom of Christ, now in one form, now in another. And therefore the children of God always have a battle to fight if they are faithful: the battle against sin within and the power of evil without. And always the word of Jesus is true, that we must take up our cross, deny ourselves, and follow Him in the path of tribulation if we would be His disciples. Hence, the picture we may form of this great tribulation is that of a great ocean, involving all history and every age. But in this great ocean there are higher and lower waves, while the great tribulation that is still to come is the highest of all and most threatening to the church of Christ and the people of God. Hence, when our text speaks of the great tribulation, it does no doubt refer especially to those times of persecution when the blood of the saints shall be shed for the testimony which they have and for the Word of God. Yet, in general it implies this entire dispensation to a greater or smaller degree.

We are now ready also to answer the further question: what is the relation between the one hundred forty-four thousand, those that were sealed, according to the first part of this chapter, and those that are in the numberless throng, standing before the throne of God and the Lamb, that have already entered into everlasting glory? There are, of course,

various possibilities, and also different interpretations. These different interpretations vary according to the explanation that is given of the first passage of this chapter. Those who claim that the first one hundred forty-four thousand are Jews in the national sense of the word also maintain that in our text there is a reference to an entirely different class of people. In support of this assertion, they point, in the first place, to the fact that in the former portion mention is made only of Israel, while this part speaks of people from all nations and peoples and tongues and tribes. In the second place, they point to the fact that in the first portion the people referred to are still in the midst of the battle, while this numberless throng in white robes and with palm branches in their hands evidently have already gained the victory. And in the third place, they especially point to the proof that the former consists of a definite number, while here there is mention made of a numberless throng. For all these reasons they claim that we must accept that these are not the same as the one hundred forty-four thousand, but are a radically different throng. We will not enter into details in regard to these interpretations. All we wish to do now is to make clear that essentially the numberless throng and the one hundred forty-four thousand are not a different class of people, but principally the same. This is shown, in the first place, by the fact that the great tribulation is one of the main ideas in both passages, the passage that speaks of the one hundred forty-four thousand and the one we are discussing now. In fact, both passages find their reason, the reason why they are revealed, in the coming of that great tribulation over the church. The purpose of both passages evidently is to reveal to the church their precarious position in the world, and nevertheless their safety over against that great tribulation. The only difference is that the one hundred forty-four thousand still confront that tribulation, while the numberless throng have already passed through it. It is very evident that it is the same throng: the one pictured as in the midst of the great tribulation, or rather, as standing on the verge of passing through it, and the other pictured as already having experienced it and having overcome. It is, therefore, the same multitude, only in different states, at different periods, and therefore from different points of view. In the first part they are upon the earth; in the second part they are already in glory in the new economy of the kingdom that is completed. In the first they are in tribulation; in the second they are already passed through that tribulation. And if you ask, then, but how must the difference in number be explained, then I ask you to recall our explanation of the one hundred forty-four thousand that were sealed. We found that they represented the people of God as they were upon earth at any period of history. *One hundred forty-four thousand* is the number of God's elect as they are in the world at any time. But the numberless throng represents the people of God of all ages added together. At the time of John the one hundred forty-four thousand of God's people existed. During the period of the early church there were

the one hundred forty-four thousand of God's people. At the time of the Reformation they were there. And they are there today. So remember: the one hundred forty-four thousand are all the elect existing at any time in the world. In every generation there are the complete number of God's elect on earth, symbolized by the number *one hundred forty-four thousand*. But this numberless throng represents all these one hundred forty-four thousands added together, of every generation. From the beginning of the world to the end of time, Christ Jesus gathers His church. Part of that church is always in the world. And that part is represented by the number *one hundred forty-four thousand*. It is the church militant. But at the end of time all these parts shall be gathered together before the throne and the Lamb. Is it surprising, then, that at the end of time we find no more the one hundred forty-four thousand, but nothing less than a numberless throng? Who then are these people? They are the people of God of all ages and climes and nations and tribes, gathered together in the new economy of things in the new creation. And if you ask, then: but why was it necessary that also this portion was revealed at the time, and what is the purpose of this passage, what is the comfort there is implied in it for the people of God in the world? we must place ourselves for a moment before the important question: what is the state of these people, and what is their present condition?

Regarding this question, we read in the text, in the first place, that they are in the temple of their God. Thus we read in verse 15: "Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them." A moment's reflection will make it plain that in both parts of this verse the same idea is expressed: they shall serve Him in His temple, and He shall spread His tabernacle over them. The central idea of the temple, in the first place, is that it is the place where God dwells, the place where He makes His abode. And in the second place, it is the sanctuary of His holiness, where He is worshipped and served in the true sense of the word. In the old dispensation this was the building in Jerusalem, the type of the true temple which was in heaven, especially in the most holy place. The idea was, of course, that since sin came into the world, God's temple was no longer found everywhere, as it was in the beginning, before the fall; but the place where He dwelled was limited to a definite building. In the beginning, before the fall, all creation was His temple: in all creation He dwelled, and in all creation He was worshipped and praised and glorified. But through the fact of sin this was changed. God no longer dwelt in all creation. In the old dispensation He dwelled typically among His people in a definite, limited place, with the exclusion of the rest of creation. That was the meaning of the temple in Jerusalem. In the new dispensation, however, there is this development, that the idea of a definite place is removed and that since the Spirit is poured out, God now dwells in His people and makes His

abode in their hearts. He tabernacles among them and with them. However, still He does not dwell in all creation, and still all creation is not His temple. His temple in the new dispensation is the church of the living God in Christ Jesus our Lord; and with His people He dwells in the spiritual sense of the word. But this is not the end, and this is not the ideal situation. It is a step in advance of the old dispensation, and there is evidently progress. But although it is true that the time has come that the people of God worship no more at Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth, nevertheless, the ideal is not reached before all the world and all creation has again become the temple of the living God, and God not only tabernacles and dwells with His people, but spreads His tabernacle over them. This is the condition that is pictured in verse 15 of this chapter. In that new economy they are before the throne of God, and they serve Him day and night in His temple. God's temple shall again be all creation, heaven and earth. And wherever the redeemed in eternity shall turn, whether they shall rise up to heaven or shall dwell on the earth, whether they shall sit down at the streams of living water and dwell in all the glorified creation, — everywhere they shall see their God and be aware of His presence. All creation shall again spell the name of their God and reveal His glory, even as it was in the typical temple of Jerusalem. Thus God shall widen His tabernacle. He shall spread His tabernacle over them. He shall spread His tent over all the world. And in Him and in His presence we shall be in the literal sense of the word. In all creation He shall be revealed. By all creation He shall be glorified. In all creation shall be His temple. And the redeemed, walking constantly in the presence of God and in His fellowship through the Spirit of Christ in their heart, constantly enlightened by that Spirit, shall serve Him day and night in that new creation. Surely, day and night in the literal sense of the word: not only in the sense of always and continually, but literally day and night they shall serve Him in the new creation. The old creation shall again shine forth in all its beauty and purity, and the night as well as the day shall sing of the glory and of the power and wisdom of God Almighty.

In the second place, we read something about the personal condition of these saints of the numberless throng. Several details are mentioned here that all find their central idea in this, that they shall be perfectly delivered also from all the effects of sin. Thus we read in verse 16: "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat." This implies, in the first place, that the saints of this numberless throng shall never know any want. They shall lack nothing, absolutely nothing. Hunger and thirst are the most emphatic manifestations and expressions of dire need and want. When one has no bread wherewith to feed himself and no water to quench his thirst, he is in dire want, and lacks the very necessities of his existence. And therefore, hunger and thirst are here taken as the symbols of all need and want. Notice, it does not say that we shall have no more desires and no more needs; them we

shall surely have, even in glory. A life and existence without needs and without wants is inconceivable, and, in fact, would be no life at all. But this is the condition of the numberless throng in glory, that all their desires shall be completely satisfied. There shall be no more any vain desire; there shall no more be any need that is not immediately and completely fulfilled. No more hunger and thirst there shall be in the new creation. There shall be no hunger and thirst either in the physical or in the spiritual sense of the word. O, what a glorious contrast there is between this numberless throng as they are now in glory and that same throng as they existed throughout the ages of the world! These people came out of the great tribulation. They were in a state of imperfection. Often they were in suffering and tribulation. Often they were in want, physically and spiritually. Often their soul thirsted after God. Often they were in trouble and in affliction because of their many wants, spiritually as well as physically. Still more: they were the despised, they were hated and persecuted in the world, they were chased over all the world, homeless, breadless, miserable. They were shut up in dingy cells, behind prison bars. They were brought to the scaffold, and burned alive at the stake. They were poor, naked, hungry, despised. And no one there seemed to be that took pity on them in the whole world. But now, behold, they suffer no more want; there is no more lack of anything; but they dwell in the temple of their God, without fear and without any unfulfilled desire. They now serve Him perfectly, and have perfect fellowship with Him, according to the desire of their heart, and that too, constantly, day and night. The heat of the sun, nor any heat, shall strike them no more. There shall be nothing outside of them, not in nature nor in the world of men, that shall ever do them any harm. Nature shall be perfectly redeemed. All the evil forces of nature shall have disappeared. All that harms us now and that causes sickness and pain and suffering and death because of the disharmony in nature shall be forever removed. At the same time, all that harms and inspires us with fear and causes trouble and tribulation from the world of men shall also be removed, so that all is perfect and all adds to their bliss, both physical and spiritual. Their body and their soul and their spirit shall be in perfect harmony also with the world about them. And altogether they shall be in harmonious relation to the Lord God Almighty in Christ Jesus their Lord.

The reason for all this is expressed in the last words of our text: "For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." Is not this glorious and beautiful in the highest sense of the word? Does not this fulfill all the desires of our hearts even in the present world? Are there among the people of God to whom this does not appeal in the highest sense of the word? Human language could never say it more beautifully than it is expressed in this beautiful and rich symbolism of the Book of Revelation.

H.H.

THE DAY OF SHADOWS

The Prophecy of Zechariah

Final Conflict and Triumph of Jerusalem

Chapter 14:1-21

The prophet again beholds all the nations gathered against Jerusalem. Also 12:1-9 speaks of a conflict between Jerusalem and all the nations. But there the enemies are described as smitten, cut in pieces; no mention is made of an initial capture of the city by the adversary. But here the announcement is that "the city shall be taken, and the houses spoiled and the women raped and half of the city shall go forth into captivity." Only then will Jehovah appear for the salvation of the remnant and for the setting up of His kingdom (1-7). From Jerusalem, the dwelling place of Jehovah, two streams of living water will go forth covering the whole land with blessing and fertility (8-11). The nations that have come to war against Jerusalem will be destroyed, and their wealth will be given to the covenant people (12-15). Those who escape will turn to Jehovah in true worship; those who refuse to do so will be smitten with drought (16-19). Jerusalem and Judah and all that is in them will be holy unto Jehovah (20-21). Such is the gospel of this chapter.

In the first stages of the conflict success will go to the enemies of the holy city. Jerusalem will be taken. That 12:1-9 makes no mention of this, but speaks only of the victory of the church over her adversaries does not warrant the conclusion that Chapter 14 describes a new conflict and is, therefore, an independent piece. That the two conflicts are one and the same follows from this, namely, that both will take place in "that day," by which is to be understood this present Christian dispensation.

Capture and deliverance of Jerusalem, 1-5

Behold, the day cometh unto Jehovah, and the spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee. 2. For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem for battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses spoiled, and the women raped; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the remnant of the people shall not be cut off from the city. 3. Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. 4. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall be cleaved in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south. 5. And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal; yea, ye shall flee, like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king

of Judah; and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee.

1-3. These verses must be considered as a further expansion of 13:7-9. The Lord's loving concern is always toward the remnant, the one third that remains in the land after the cutting off of the two thirds. But the one part is not yet free from dross. In the church there is still so much that is of sin. And so the need of purgation continues. How the Lord is always at work refining the gold is described in these verses (14:1-3). The reach of the prophecy of these verses extends to the end of time. They set forth realities of this present dispensation of time but in a language borrowed from conditions and forms of the dispensation of shadows. The language, therefore, is figurative. It's the only language that our prophet knew; and it was the only language that the church of that day understood. "Behold," says the prophet, "a day is about to come to Jehovah." The day is the day of Jehovah so often mentioned by the prophets. It is the day appointed of Him for the manifestation of His power and majesty. In 1b Jerusalem is addressed, "And the spoil shall be divided *in the midst of thee*." The italicized expression denotes that the victory will be complete, the defeat overwhelming. The inhabitants of Jerusalem that died not in battle will be either in chains or in hiding. For the time being, therefore, they may be forgotten. So absolute is the mastery that will be gained, so thoroughly demoralizing. Such will be the magnitude of the calamity next to strike the holy city. And it will surely come to pass. For it is the Lord that speaks, saying what He will do. "For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem for battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses plundered, and the women raped; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the remnant of the people shall not be cut off from the city."

Gather He will the nations against Jerusalem for battle. Rightly considered, this the Lord had been doing through all the ages of the past — gathering the nations against Jerusalem for battle. For Jerusalem represented the church, and the church is the seed of the woman, centrally Christ. And the nations here are the brood of the serpent. And against this holy seed this brood was always gathered for battle — gathered of God for the first time as represented by Cain, then successively through the ages by the world that perished by the waters of the flood, the builders of the tower of Babel, the Egypt of the oppression, the Canaanites, the nations that dwelt on Israel's borders, and finally the world powers. At the time of the utterance of this prophecy the Lord had but recently gathered the nations against Jerusalem for battle — the nations represented by the Babylonian world power. Then, too, the city was taken, the houses plundered, the temple destroyed and the spoil divided in the midst of the city. And Judah had gone into exile. But after the seventy years the Lord had turned the captivity of His people. The remnant was again in God's country. A new temple had risen on the ruins of the old. But the breaches in the walls of the city had still to be mended and the gates repaired. Yet, notwith-

standing, the voice of prophecy was again proclaiming, "For I (the Lord) will gather all the nations against Jerusalem." How long, Lord? The reach of this prophecy extends to the end of time. The sufferings of which this prophecy speaks and foretells for the church are as actual in this last day as they have ever been. Surely, the antithesis is no longer Israel in contrast to the nations, as was the case when the church was still represented by the earthy Jerusalem, and was being gathered from the one nation only and this nation is the Jewish, and was limited to the earthy Canaan as the proper place of its abode. No, but Jerusalem, being but a shadow, the true worshippers were loosed from that city and sown among all the nations. And seeing that the blessings of Christ have now come unto the Gentiles, the nations themselves, principally the elect, are now the church. But there is still the world in the midst of which the church now dwells — the world, the reprobated portion of humanity, the Babylon of the Revelations of John; knowing not the Father, it knows not His people. Surely, the church is as much an object of hatred in this last day as it ever has been. That in this world the true believers have many tribulations, that men revile them, and persecute them, and say all manner of evil against them, falsely, for Christ's sake, is basically the thought of this prophecy, and, therefore, also, basically its fulfilment in this last day. But there have been times in this Christian dispensation in which the prophecy was fulfilled almost to the letter. Such a time was the first three centuries of our Christian era. The Christians were convicted and put to death simply on the charge of hatred of humanity, and on the charge of their being Christians. Nero conceived of the idea of converting the punishment of the Christians into an amusement for the populace. Christians, covered with pitch or some other combustible material and nailed to posts of pine, were lighted and burned for the entertainment of the mob. Christians were daily harassed, tracked out, surprised in their most sacred assemblies. Or they were sent into exile and their property confiscated. All the pains which iron and steel, fire and sword, rack and cross, wild beasts and beastly men could inflict, were employed to induce the Christians to renounce Christ and burn incense at the heathen altars.

But the prophecy contains also an only comfort. In the first place half of the city shall go forth into captivity. This half is the carnal seed in the church. The Lord has prepared His fire — the fire of tribulations. And the fire burns hot. The city is taken; the houses are plundered; and the women ravished. But this carnal seed cannot endure. For they are not of Christ's sheep. So they go forth from the presence of God and His people to serve in Baal's temples. The church father Cyprian was amazed and appalled at the sight of so many faithful members of the church rushing to the temples of the pagan gods to burn incense at the heathen altars to escape the loss of their goods or free themselves from the penalty of death.

But the other half remained in the city, the Jerusalem which is above. Made to choose between Christ and death,

they chose death. Being ingrafted in Christ by a faith that is living and indestructible, they could and can not will to do otherwise. So is the church always purified in God's fire. God's fire, mark you. For that it is. For, according to our prophet, it is He who gathers those nations against Jerusalem, the world against the church, for battle. It could not well be different, seeing that those nations exist, body, soul, and spirit, not otherwise but by His power. In Him they live and move and have their being. Can the rod shake itself? Can the staff lift up itself, as if it were not wood? Those nations are so in His power that without His will they cannot move. Persecutions come by His hand. Those strokes are strokes laid upon the church by Him. Collectively, those nations are only a rod — the rod in His hand. And He loves His people, so loves them that He gave His only begotten Son.

In the second place, He goes forth to fight against those nations, as when He fought in the day of battle. This fight of the Lord against those nations must, surely, not be conceived of as having anything in common with a life and death struggle between two humans with the outcome uncertain. All those nations before Him are as nothing; and they are counted to Him less than nothing, and vanity, counted less than a drop in the bucket, small dust on the balance. They have no strength in themselves by reason of which they can shove God around, force Him in a corner. He takes away their breath, and they die, and return to their dust. He sends forth His spirit, and they are created. His fighting against those nations can only mean that He raises them up to show His great power in them in order that they may be destroyed of Him and thereby His people delivered and His name declared throughout all the earth. The reference is particularly to the kings of those nations. An outstanding example is the Pharaoh of the oppression. The Lord created Pharaoh. He caused him to be born, seated him in the throne of Egypt, turned his heart to hate Israel (Ps. 105), and sovereignly hardened his heart, so that he refused to let the people go. In a word, the Lord raised him up. And then He fought against Pharaoh. He multiplied His plagues in the land of Egypt. He sent the plagues upon Pharaoh's heart. And Pharaoh was sore afraid, even confessing at one time that the Lord is righteous and that he and his people were wicked. Yet when there was respite, he again refused to release his hold upon Israel. And so, in the way of his persistent rebellion — for the Lord continued to harden his heart — he was cut off from the earth, he and his host, as the Lord had said, and said also to him, so that he was without excuse. And for this cause did the Lord raise him up, for to show him His power and that His name might be declared throughout all the earth.

So did the Lord go forth to fight against Egypt, representative of "those nations." Such was the mercy of the Lord upon His people, however ill-deserving. In the words of the psalmist, He saved them for His name's sake, that He might make His power to be known. He rebuked the Red Sea also, and it was dried up; so he led them through the

depth, as through a wilderness. Then believed they (His people) his words; and they sang his praise" (Ps. 106). And the name of the Lord was declared throughout all the earth. And the Canaanites were terrified. For also upon their hearts the Lord sent the word of these same wonders. And they, too, were sore afraid. Their hearts did melt, neither did there remain any courage in them, because of the Lord's people; for they perceived that Israel's God is God in heaven above, and in earth beneath (Jos. 2:11). But they did not, so we read, make peace with the children of Israel, save the Gibeonites. For it was of the Lord to harden their hearts, that they should come against Israel in battle, that He might destroy them utterly, and that they might have no favor, but that He might destroy them, as the Lord commanded Moses (Jos. 11:20).

It is to this warfare of God — His war against Egypt and the Canaanites of that day — that doubtless our prophet chiefly has reference when he says, "As when he fought in the day of battle."

4. As he had in that day gone forth and fought against "those nations," so will He again go forth and fight against "those nations" gathered of Him against Jerusalem. Needless to say, "those nations" are not literally anymore the Egyptians and the Canaanites of old. They are different nations. In this last day they are the world that lies in darkness. Yet, being one in spirit with the Egyptians and Canaanites of old, they are still, in this point of view, "those nations." Always their striving is to destroy the church from the face of the earth. But it shall not happen. The Lord will go forth and fight against them, as when He fought in the day of battle. Besides, He will provide for the remnant a place of refuge.

Since Jerusalem is in the hands of the hostile nations Jehovah cannot be represented as coming from mount Zion (compare Amos 1:2); He will come from His heavenly dwelling place (Joel 3:16), and take His stand upon the mount of Olives, east of the city. The mount will cleave in halves as soon as Jehovah steps upon it. It will cleave from east to west; as a result the northern and the southern portions will be separated, and when they recede, the one to the north, the other to the south, a valley is formed that will serve as a way of escape for the remnant that is still in the city. The valley shall reach unto Azal. This is an obscure word. If it is the name of a place, which is not certain, it may be identified with Beth-ezel (Mic. 1:2), whose location is not known.

Whether the valley is to serve as a way of escape or a place of refuge is not clear. It is obvious that the whole description is figurative. If it was meant to be understood literally, the mount would have been made to undergo the described cleaving before the expiration of the Old Testament dispensation, seeing that Jerusalem is now above. But the mount has stood whole and entire unto this day. Besides, the valley that would result from its being thus worked upon would be much too small to serve the refugees either as a way of escape or as a place of refuge. For it is but a small hill.

And would the refugees not be pursued by the enemy? What then may be the Gospel of this imagery? Is not the Lord through this figurative language declaring unto His people: I am thy God. Though from human standpoint your plight is hopeless, with me there is power to save. Fear not, therefore, I will surely deliver you out of all your troubles. This is here His word, His promise to His afflicted and distressed people. And of this promise Christ in His suffering and dying on the cross for His people was the fulfilment. For thereby He blotted out all their sins and delivered them from all His and their enemies. And being raised from the dead, with His people, and being set with them in the heavenly at the right-hand of the throne, and having received of the Father the promise of the Spirit, and having thereby been made of God for them sanctification and righteousness and redemption, is He not the way, their way of escape by which they come to, take refuge to, the Father, His Father and their Father in heaven? — the God of their salvation in Him.

5. "And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains." They flee for refuge to lay hold upon the hope that is set before them. They hide themselves in Christ and through Christ in God. And here they safely dwell. For here the enemy cannot pursue. And knowing the terror of the Lord, the judgments of God by which the city is being overtaken, they flee as they fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah. This earthquake is again mentioned in Amos 1:1, but nothing more is known concerning it. But it must have been a serious calamity, a terrible manifestation of the wrath of God, or else the memory of it would not have remained alive after so many centuries.

Yes, the remnant flees to the valley of the mountains, as did the men of Judah, pricked in their hearts at hearing of Peter that "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." They said to Peter and to the rest of the apostles, "Men and brethren, what must we do?" "Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," was Peter's answer to them.

But in the meantime the Lord continues to lead "those nations" against His church, persists in bringing the remnant into the fire of tribulation. How long? Until Christ come and all His angels with Him to judge the quick and the dead. And then shall He once more go forth and for the last time fight against "those nations." The earth shall be permanently cleansed of them, and to His little flock He will give the kingdom. And this little flock includes, surely, all the nations. For the nations, principally the elect, are blessed in Abraham, in Christ.

G.M.O.

IN MEMORIAM

The Adult Bible Class of the Randolph Protestant Reformed Church in Randolph, Wisconsin, wishes to express its sincere sympathy to its fellow members: Mrs. H. DeVries, in the loss of her mother, and Mr. H. Rutgers, in the loss of his sister.

May the Lord of all grace comfort our sister and brother in their bereavement.

The Adult Bible Class
Randolph, Wisconsin

FROM HOLY WRIT

Exposition of I Corinthians 7

VIII.

(I Corinthians 7:36-40)

In the last essay we noticed that Paul speaks of the last class of persons to be noticed under the matters of marriage and its related problems. He emphasizes that in regard to this matter he has no particular command from Christ. Thus he did have in regard to the matter of those married. Any one who is married must remain in the marriage state. The ordinance of God from creation, as reiterated by Jesus in Matthew 5:32 and 19:1-12 stands!

What Paul gives here is his "opinion." It is an opinion, a judgment of one who has received mercy to be faithful! When he, therefore, gives his opinion he surely gives a ripe judgment, based on a wide experience; it is an opinion in which we see wisdom of one who has not merely observed much of life, but who himself lives by the principles here enunciated! One cannot take the opinion of such lightly.

It should further be once more observed that Paul is giving a very considered opinion here. He gives this judgment by keeping in mind, on the one hand, what our liberty is in Christ to enter into the marriage state, since it is an ordinance of God. Celibacy is not a higher or holier form of life and morality than the marriage state. On the other hand, Paul knows that not all can sanctify God in the marriage state. Each is to work out his salvation with fear and trembling. There are special temptations in the marriage state for our flesh in which dwells no good. Hence, there is, from this viewpoint, a distinction between the interests of the married woman and of the virgin. Certain temptations are present in the marriage state, both for the husband and for the wife.

That Paul points out these difficulties in the marriage state is not that he would place a snare upon the believers, limit them once more with a false dualism between good and evil, that is, as if he would advocate celibacy as something necessarily good and the marriage state as something necessarily evil. God forbid. He is only interested that the church, whether in the marriage state or outside of wedlock, live with undivided attention upon the Lord!

Here too there is a certain indulgency. Not a hard and fast rule for every case. Nor do we have here enunciated the principle of casuistry, the determining of duty in doubtful cases. The latter is the application of the principle of being under law, with its distinction of a separate "law" for every particular case and contingency! Rather the rule here is: let every man work out his own salvation with a free and good conscience in his life, fighting against sin and the

devil and afterwards reigning with Christ over all creatures. Paul will not put a noose about the neck of the Christians. He will not rob them of their liberty. He strives to have them walk at liberty by avoiding licence!

Hence, Paul introduces two possible and different instances, in which he demonstrates the principle of walking so as to be in good spiritual decorum in relationship to Christ. Also here Paul does not lay down a "rule," but he does give two "case studies" in which he demonstrates the proper motivation which must enter into a given decision in connection with either "allowing a daughter to be married," or "not to give in marriage" a virgin daughter!

The text here in question is as follows: "*But if any man think that he behaveth himself uncomely toward his virgin, if she pass the flower of her age, and need so require, let him do what he will, he sinneth not: let them marry. Nevertheless he that standeth stedfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin, doeth well. So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well: but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better.*" Verses 36-38.

In this passage Paul keeps the following factors in view.

In the first place marriage is not outlawed. It is maintained as holy ordinance of God. If such were not the case Paul could not write, "So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well." Verse 38. It is only because of the "present need" and the presence of sin in our members that his advice is as it is.

In the second place, Paul gives permission to a woman or man to remarry only *after* the death of one of the parties. Even then it is this time to be "only in the Lord."

Thirdly, it is even then true, that the one who marries not, "even in the Lord," is happier than one who marries in the Lord!

Let us look at each of these factors a bit more closely.

We notice in the two "cases" cited by Paul, that in each of these cases it is presupposed that the father or the guardian has the *authority* over his virgin daughter in respect to her entering into the marriage state. Marriage in the argument of Paul, and as a factor in his "opinion" is not simply a *personal* agreement; it is more than a mutual agreement between a given young man and the virgin whose hand he seeks. No marriage was legal or could be solemnized without the consent of the father or guardian.

In passing we may observe that this is too often forgotten in our day of loose morals, a day when it is "marriage often in haste and a repentance at leisure!" Too often marriage is viewed as a *personal* agreement, which can be enacted and broken at the will of the parties in marriage. However, this is not only contrary to the accepted standards of Paul's day, but it is also in conflict with the expressed view and accepted standards of the Statutes of the land in which we live. The

writer of these lines happens to have studied the Statutes of the State of Colorado in the matter of Marriage, Divorce, etc. It is expressly stated by these Statutes and taught by competent authorities that marriage is a *Civil* contract, in which the State is always a third and interested party. When we keep in mind that all authority is basically that of the father in the family, it is not difficult to see why the State as the outgrowth of the family, would be a third and interested party.

It should be more than a mere formality at a "nice wedding" that the father *publicly* states that he gives his daughter in marriage!

This is sound decorum in God's church and it is according to Statute Law!

Now it is left to the christian discretion of a believing father or guardian whether he will give his virgin daughter in marriage or not. Is there a hard and fast rule here given by Paul? Not at all!

It all depends upon the circumstances, and what a father is assured in his heart is for the real, lasting and spiritual well-being of his daughter. Paul presupposes that the father is a *wise* man; that he has spiritual wisdom to deal according to the *facts* in the case.

In case number one, of which Paul speaks in verse 36, the facts are postulated as being as follows:

1. The virgin daughter is no longer a young girl. She is one who has passed the bloom and spring-time of her life. She desires marriage. If she waits longer she will have passed the time of life that it is proper for marriage, and will fall into a new temptation on that account. To prevent her to marry will drive her possibly to give in to the approaches of her lover. This poses a new problem in such a case of sin and shame!

2. The father, a wise man, sees this very real temptation. He is convinced in his heart, that, in spite of the present political urgency of the times and the affliction which married life then entails, it is the part of spiritual wisdom and prudence that "it ought to be marriage" for his virgin. Surely such a man "sins not" when he allows the virgin daughter, who is well eligible and ripe for marriage to have her desire. Let them marry!

Such is Paul's judgment in such cases!

In case number two the conditions and facts are different. Here the facts are as follows, with the correspondingly different judgment:

1. There is here no "need," that is, the daughter has not passed the bloom of life. Hence, the "necessity" of case number one is not present.

2. The father, who is also a wise man, having spiritual

wisdom and having the spiritual and eternal well-being of his daughter at heart, is fully persuaded in his own heart that he should not give his virgin daughter in marriage under the existing political circumstances of the times.

3. There is nothing in the circumstances which makes it impossible or spiritually indiscreet not to give his daughter in marriage. He has power over his own will. In his *own* (idiai kardiai) heart he is fully persuaded that such is the proper course.

4. Such a parent or guardian does well in so deciding. It is a wise decision under the existing circumstances in the world and in the life of his virgin!

Forsooth this is not a "rule" in the church, but rather an "opinion" of Paul in which he applies the wisdom of grace to a particular circumstance of life! What a far cry this is from a rule for monarchism in every form!

Paul ends this chapter by reflecting on the "case" of a woman whose husband has died. Of course, the rule is that what God has joined together let no *man* put asunder. This dissolving the tie of matrimony is solely the prerogative of God. When he has cut the tie in the death of a husband, the wife is free to marry another. But not until or unless God had dissolved the tie.

That is the rule! That is the command of Christ.

But even though all things are permissible yet all things are not convenient or wise.

It is the judgment of Paul that even when a husband has died, a woman is more happy and blessed in the Lord if she remain unmarried, and be a widow indeed! Let no one take this advice lightly! There is a saying: no fool like an old fool. Paul's advice is here no mere practical wisdom from the viewpoint of utility. It is spiritual wisdom. He too thinks to have received the Holy Spirit.

Then too there is a limitation added. It is that when a woman remarries: it is to be in the Lord! This was not the case with the Corinthians in the case of the first marriage. Both were quite likely *outside* of the Lord. The Kingdom of God was not in their thoughts.

But now they must not marry a *non-christian*. Shall they put their feet under the kitchen table together, it must be that they have first sat around the same table of the Lord, whether they be Jew or Gentile, bond or free. Let no one be a profane person as was Esau. The first marriage was not a mixed marriage. Let this one not become such!

Let it be remembered: to the pure all things are pure, but to the defiled all things are impure, they are reprobate to every good word.

Let these things sink deeply into our hearts!

G.L.

THE JESUITS

"It is lawful to kill a man who gives you a box on the ear, or a blow with a stick, if you cannot get justice otherwise."

— Lessius

"It is lawful to steal, not only in extreme necessity, but also in such necessity as is hard to be endured, though not extreme." — Lessius.

"When a man has received money to do a wicked act, is he obliged to return it? We must distinguish: if he has not done the action for which he was paid, he ought to return it; but if he has done it, he is not obliged to any restitution."

— Escobar

"It is lawful for a son to rejoice at the murder of his parent committed by himself in a state of drunkenness, on account of the great riches thence acquired by inheritance."

— Fagundez

"We may wish harm to our neighbors without sin when we are pushed upon it by some good motives."

— Father Bauny

"I shall never consider that man to have done wrong, who, favoring the public wishes, would attempt to kill him (a heretic prince or a Romish prince not favorable to the Romish interests)." — John Mariana

These quotations, taken from the book *The Jesuits: A Historical Sketch* which is put out by the American Sunday-School Union, reveal somewhat the principles which have guided this particular organization within the Roman Catholic Church. It is this body (the Jesuits) of whom it has often been maintained that they taught that "the end justifies the means." Concerning this, one of their own writers states: "These and other charges have been repeatedly disproved, yet writers of romance, and even writers of history, never fail to find readers credulous enough to accept them as true." The reason for such charges is surmised by the same writer: "Though many died as martyrs on the scaffolds, and in the prisons of England and elsewhere, yet their skill in evading detection as well as their courage in living in the midst of their enemies and their great success in winning converts well explain the hatred with which they were regarded in Protestant countries from the beginning, while it gives us the historical origin of the tradition of cunning and deceit which has always been associated with the name Jesuit" (T. J. Campbell, S.J., in the *Encyclopedia Americana*).

There are thousands of books written by and concerning the Jesuits. Many of their thousands of members have attained prominence in history since the Reformation. An article such as this, therefore, can necessarily present only a brief sketch of this "Society of Jesus."

Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit order, was born in Spain on Christmas night, 1491, at the castle of Loyola. During his early life chivalry, rather than the church, was his passion. In his youth he entered the army, undoubtedly seeing in that the possible fulfillment of the desire for chivalry within himself. It is reported that the year 1521 was one during which a great change took place in his life.

During May of that year he had been severely wounded at the battle of Pampeluna — one leg had been broken, and the other one dangerously damaged. During the months as an invalid, which were spent at his father's castle, he at first had sought reading material concerning the great men in secular history. His idea of chivalry had not changed immediately. It is said that, unable to find sufficient material on this subject to satisfy himself, he had taken and read a life of Christ which had come into his hands. From that time there had been a remarkable change in the man. Now with avidity he sought out histories of the great saints of the past within the Romish Church. Within his heart began to burn the desire to emulate them. Upon his recovery he traveled to the monastery of Manresa where he hung his military accessories before an image of the Virgin Mary. There also he wrote the *Spiritual Exercises* which were later to bear great influence on the Jesuits as well as the entire Romish Church.

At the age of thirty-three, realizing that he could accomplish little without the formal education which he lacked, he began learning the fundamentals of Latin with a class of school boys. Within two years he was admitted to the University of Alcala and the following year to the University of Salamanca. In both of these places he met with little favor because he tried to induce students to follow what he had written in his *Spiritual Exercises*. From here he went to the University of Paris where he received instruction for seven more years.

It was at Paris that a nucleus for the future Society of Jesus was formed. Most notable of his followers were Peter Faber, Francis Xavier, and Jacob Lainez. In 1534 seven of them vowed "on completion of their studies to enter on hospital and missionary work in Jerusalem, or, opportunity failing, to go without questioning wherever the pope might direct." They did find themselves unable to go to Jerusalem.

In 1537 Pope Paul III, upon hearing of their zeal in their purposed endeavors, called these men from Venice, gave them a commendation, and permitted them to be ordained as priests. In Rome during the next two years they were highly regarded and charges of heresy which had been leveled against them were almost forgotten. In the light of their favorable reception, they confidently requested Paul III to be confirmed as a special order. This took place in 1540. Although their membership was limited at first to sixty, three years later this restriction was removed. Loyola was elected its first general.

The society is divided into four classes. There is first of all the *professed* who take four vows: of perfect obedience, of voluntary poverty, of perpetual chastity, and of absolute submission to the pope with respect to missions on which they might be sent. The second class is called the *coadjutors*. These are either ecclesiastics or lay members. They aid in realizing the designs of the society, but are bound only by the vows of obedience, poverty, and chastity. The third class, the *scholars*, have a position determined by their own qualifications. They too are bound by the first three oaths, but are allowed to

take the last with the consent of their superiors. *The novices*, the last group, are the candidates on trial. These are on trial for two years before they can become *coadjutors*, and a third year before they can become one of the *professed*.

Concerning the four vows taken, perfect obedience is understood to imply complete submission to the will of the superior. There are no doubts permitted whatsoever. Voluntary poverty means that the members hand over all they possess and receive their subsistence from the Society. The chastity is such that marriage is never allowed. The submission is to the pope under whom the members so place themselves that they must go wherever he sends them.

About their history only a few remarks need be made. Their history is entwined with that of nearly every nation of the world, for its members as missionaries went throughout the world. Very briefly their history could be summarized as turbulent. They have been charged by Protestants with attempted and successful assassinations particularly of Protestant kings or queens, with meddling in affairs of government, and with intrigue in financial matters in spite of their vows of poverty. And although the Jesuits deny guilt, yet there appears to be much basis of fact in these charges. In fact, their history within the bosom of the Romish church was by no means always peaceful. Many times they had to struggle with the pope himself for the right of continued existence. At one time in their history they were officially disbanded, but this ban was later lifted. At various times they were barred from nearly all of the several nations to which they had gone.

Their purported purpose was primarily mission work and instruction especially in schools of higher learning. The pioneer missionary was Xavier, one of the original members of the Society. Called the missionary of India, he performed much of his mission work there as well as in Japan and neighboring islands. According to his testimony, thousands each month were converted by him. Baptism, which was given at once, was the basis for determining the numbers of "converts"—so possibly the figures given are correct. In some places, it is said, his very appearance caused many to fall on their knees in confession of sin before Xavier even uttered a word. Many miracles were also ascribed to him.

From the time of Xavier many missionaries were sent out. A number of them were sent also to North America in the early days of settlement. One of the better known was Marquette, the explorer of the Mississippi River. Mission stations were also established in the territory of California.

But that which by far was of greater importance with regard to their influence over others was the establishment of many colleges and universities. These they began founding almost from the beginning of their history. Many of the schools for higher learning even today are controlled or were begun by Jesuits. In these schools, of course, their own men taught. The thousands of students who came from these schools, although most never became Jesuits, nevertheless were instructed thoroughly in their principles. This fact

also explains the great amount of influence the Jesuits have in the Romish Church — and even outside of it — today as well as in the past.

The teachings of the Jesuits are probably of greater interest to us than their history, particularly because of the strangeness of their doctrines to us. Generally speaking, their views are those of the Romish Church. Possibly this could be stated more correctly that the views of the Jesuits more and more were taken over by the Romish Church. The most famous of these in recent years was the doctrine of the immaculate conception (that Mary was born without the guilt or pollution of sin) adopted in 1854. This was a victory for the Jesuits, many of whom had long maintained the view.

Another of the more famous, or infamous, views of the Jesuits was what is called *probabilism*. According to this view, one could determine a particular course to follow if he could find support in any one of the Romish writers. Needless to say, one could almost surely find someone who had maintained some moral principle which agreed with the proposed action. If, for instance, a man wished to commit robbery and could find one Jesuit author who maintained that under certain circumstances robbery is morally right, then he could rob without being guilty of sin. If two writers differed on this question, one could choose the moral judgment which best suited his intent. As one of their writers stated: "An opinion may be deemed probable, when it is grounded on the opinion of one grave doctor. When two learned men differ, both their opinions are probable. A man may do what he conceives lawful, according to a probable opinion, though the contrary may be more safe. For this, the opinion of one learned individual is sufficient." In the eighteenth century, because of opposition arising against this view, this was modified to three types: (1) one of two moral opinions may be followed if both are equally probable; (2) if the probabilities are not equal, the one which is more probable must determine the course of action; (3) or the safest, rather than the more probable, ought to be followed.

A second more humorous, but equally serious, view is what is called mental reservation. It was a method of lying without being guilty of sin — according to their opinion. It worked something like this. Suppose I had robbed a bank and had been put in prison for suspicion of robbery. Several days later I would be taken to court and asked under oath if I had committed the crime. I could truthfully answer, "No," provided I added silently in my mind, "I did not commit this robbery today." Filliucius, a Jesuit, writes of a case where one is questioned concerning his eating of something forbidden. In such a case, says he, "When we begin to say 'I swear,' we must insert, in a subdued tone, the mental restriction 'that today,' and then continue aloud, 'I have not eaten such a thing.'" I say such a view seems humorous, yet it is the height of corruption, reminding one of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees of old. I would almost think that today this view is yet maintained, also among non-catholics, when those

(Continued on page 309)

Contending For The Faith

The Church and the Sacraments

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

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE

THE PAPACY FROM THE DEATH OF INNOCENT III
TO BONIFACE VIII. 1216-1294.

(continued)

The elevation of Rudolf inaugurated a period of peace in the relations of the papacy and the empire. Gregory X had gained a brilliant victory. The emperor was crowned at Aachen, Oct. 24, 1273 (his furthering of the election of Rudolf of Hapsburg to the imperial throne). The place of the Hohenstaufen was thus taken by the Austrian house of Hapsburg, which has continued to this day to be a reigning dynasty and loyal to the Catholic hierarchy. In the present century its power has been eclipsed by the Hohenzollern, whose original birth seat in Wurttemberg is a short distance from that of the Hohenstaufen. The ancient seat of the Hapsburgs was in Aargau, Switzerland, scarcely one hundred miles away from Zollern. The establishment of peace by Rudolf's election is celebrated by Schiller in the famous lines:—

"Then was ended the long, the direful strife,
That time of terror, with no imperial lord."

Rudolf was a man of decided religious temper, was not ambitious to extend his power, and became a just and safe ruler. He satisfied the claims of the papacy by granting freedom to the chapters in the choice of bishops, by promising to protect the Church in her rights, and by renouncing all claim to Sicily and to the State of the Church. In a tone of moderation Gregory wrote: "It is incumbent on princes to protect the liberties and rights of the Church and not to deprive her of her temporal property. It is also the duty of the spiritual ruler to maintain kings in the full integrity of their authority."

The emperor remained on good terms with Gregory's successors, Innocent V, a Frenchman, Adrian V, a Genoese, who did not live to be consecrated, and John XXI, the only priest from Portugal who has worn the tiara. Their combined reigns lasted only eighteen months. John died from the falling of a ceiling in his palace in Viterbo.

The second Council of Lyons, known also as the Fourteenth Ecumenical Council, was called by Gregory and opened by him with a sermon. It is famous for the attempt made to unite the Greek and Western Churches and the presence of Greek delegates, among them Germanus, formerly patriarch of Constantinople. His successor had temporarily been placed in confinement for expressing himself as opposed to ecclesiastical union. A termination of the schism seemed to be at hand. The delegates announced the Greek emperor's full acceptance of the Latine creed, including the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son and the primacy of the bishop of Rome.

The Apostles' Creed was sung in Greek and Latin. Papal delegates were sent to Constantinople to consummate the union; but the agreement was rejected by the Greek clergy. It is more than surmised that the Greek emperor, Michael Palaeologus, was more concerned for the permanency of the Greek occupation of Constantinople than for the ecclesiastical union of the East and the West upon which the hearts of popes had been set so long.

Other important matters before the council were the rule for electing a pope, and the reception of a delegation of Mongols who sought to effect a union against the Moham-medans. Several members of the delegation received baptism. The decree of the Fourth Lateran, prohibiting new religious orders, was reaffirmed.

The firm and statesmanlike administration of Nicolas III checked the ambition of Charles of Anjou, who was plotting for the Greek crown. He was obliged to abjure the senatorship of Rome, which he had held for ten years, and to renounce the vicariate of Tuscany. Bologna for the first time acknowledged the papal supremacy. Nicolas has been called the father of papal nepotism (favoritism, especially governmental patronage, extended toward nephews or other relatives), and it is partly for his generosity to his relatives that, before the generation had passed, Dante put him in hell:

"To enrich my whelps, I laid my schemes aside,
My wealth I've stowed, — my person here."

Again, in 1281, the tiara passed to a Frenchman, a man of humble birth, Martin IV. Charles was present at Viterbo when the election took place and was active in securing it. Martin showed himself completely complaisant to the designs of the Angevin house and Charles was once more elected to the Roman senatorship. Seldom had a pope been so fully the tool of a monarch. In Southern Italy Frenchmen were everywhere in the ruling positions. But this national insult was soon to receive a memorable rebuke.

In resentment at the hated French regime, the Sicilians rose up, during Easter week, 1282, and enacted the bloody massacre known as the Sicilian Vespers. All the Normans on the island, together with the Sicilian wives of Normans, were victims of the merciless vengeance. The number that fell is estimated at from eight to twenty thousand. The tragedy gets its name from the tradition that the Sicilians fell to their work at the ringing of the vesper bell. Charles' rule was thenceforward at an end on the Panormic isle. Peter of Aragon, who married Constance, the daughter of Manfred and the granddaughter of Frederick II, was crowned king. For nearly two hundred years thereafter the crowns of Sicily and Naples were kept distinct.

Not to be untrue to Charles, Martin hurled the anathema at the rebels, placed Aragon and Sicily under the interdict, and laid Christendom under a tribute of one-tenth for a crusade against Peter. The measures were in vain, and Charles' galleys met with defeat off the coast of Calabria. Charles and Martin died the same year, 1285, the latter, like Gregory X, at Perugia.

After an interregnum of ten months, Nicolas IV ascended the papal throne, the first Franciscan to be elevated to the office. His reign witnessed the evacuation of Ptolemais or Acre, the last possession of the Crusaders in Syria. Nicolas died in the midst of futile plans to recover the Holy Places.

Another interregnum of twenty-seven months followed, April 4, 1292 to July 5, 1294, when the hermit Peter de Murrhone, Coelestin V, was raised to the papal throne, largely at the dictation of Charles II of Naples. His short reign forms a curious episode in the annals of the papacy. His career shows the extremes of station from the solitude of the mountain cell to the chief dignity of Europe. He enjoyed the fame of sanctity and founded the order of St. Damian, which subsequently honored him by taking the name of Coelestines. The story ran that he had accomplished the unprecedented feat of hanging his cowl on a sunbeam. At the time of his elevation to the papal throne Coelestine was seventy-nine.

An eye-witness, Stefaneschi, has described the journey to the hermit's retreat by three bishops who were appointed to notify him of his election. They found him in a rude hut in the mountains, furnished with a single barred window, his hair unkempt, his face pale, and his body infirm. After announcing their errand they bent low and kissed his sandals. Had Peter been able to go forth from his anchorite solitude, like Anthony of old, on his visits to Alexandria, and preach repentance and humility, he would have presented an exhilarating spectacle to after-generations. As it is, his career arouses pity for his frail and unsophisticated incompetency to meet the demands which his high office involved.

Clad in his monkish habit and riding on an ass, the bridle held by Charles II and his son, Peter proceeded to Aquila, where he was crowned, only three cardinals being present. Completely under the dominance of the king, Coelestin took up his residence in Naples. Little was he able to battle with the world, to cope with the intrigues of factions, and to resist the greedy scramble for office which besets the path of those high in position. In simple confidence Coelestin gave his ear to this counsellor and to that, and yielded easily to all applicants for favors. His complaisance to Charles is seen in his appointments of cardinals. Out of twelve whom he created, seven were Frenchmen, and three Neapolitans. It would seem as if he fell into despair at the self-seeking and worldliness of the papal court, and he exclaimed, "O God, while I rule over other men's souls, I am losing the salvation of my own." He was clearly not equal to the duties of the tiara. In vain did the Neapolitans seek by processions to dissuade him from resigning. Clement I had abjured his office, as had also Gregory VI though at the mandate of an emperor. Peter issued a bull declaring it to be the pope's right to abdicate. His own abdication he placed on the ground "of his humbleness, the quest of a better life and an easy conscience, on account of his frailty of body and want of knowledge, the badness of men, and a desire to return to the quietness of his former state." The real reason for his resigning is obscure. The story went that the ambitious Cardinal Gaetani, soon to

become Coelestin's successor, was responsible for it. He played upon the hermit's credulity by speaking through a reed, inserted through the wall of the hermit's chamber, and declared it to be heaven's will that his reign should come to an end. As the Italians say, the story, if not true, was well invented.

The author of the suggestion that Coelestin should abdicate has given rise to a good deal of controversy in recent years. Was Benedict Gaetani (Boniface VIII) the author, or did the suggestion come from the senile old pope himself? Hans Schulz, a Protestant, has recently called in question the old view that laid the blame on Benedict, and regards it as probable that Coelestin was the first to propose abdication, and that Benedict being called in gave the plan his sanction. He says, however, that in the whole matter "Benedict's eye was directed to the papal crown as his own prize." Certain Roman Catholic historians have adopted the same position. The contemporary historians differ about the matter, but upon the whole are against the cardinal. The charge that he was at the bottom of the abdication and the main promoter of it was one of the chief charges brought against him by his enemy, Philip the Fair of France. One of the measures for humiliating Boniface proposed by the king was the canonization of Coelestin as one whom Boniface had abused. A tract issued by one of Boniface's party attempted to parry this suggestion by declaring that Boniface, who was then dead, had merits which entitled him to canonization above Coelestin. The author declares that "Coelestin's canonization is asked because he profited himself and died in *sua simplicitate*; Boniface's ought to be asked for because he profited others and died for the freedom of the Church." Coelestin was canonized 1313 by Clement V.

In abandoning the papacy the departing pontiff forfeited all freedom of movement. He attempted to flee across the Adriatic, but in vain. He was kept in confinement by Boniface VIII in the castle of Fumone, near Anagni, until his death, May 19, 1296. What a world-wide contrast the simplicity of the hermit's reign presents to the violent assertion and ambitious designs of Boniface, the first pope of a new period!

Coelestin's sixth centenary was observed by pious admirers in Italy. Opinions have differed about him. Petrarch praised his humility. Dante, with relentless severity held him up as an example of moral cowardice, the one who made the great renunciation.

H.V.

IN MEMORIAM

The Consistory of the Randolph Protestant Reformed Church hereby wishes to express its sincere sympathy to one of its fellow consistory members, Harry Rutgers, in the loss of his sister,

MRS. JAKE FISHER

May the Lord strengthen and comfort him with the assurance that His work is perfect and always done in love to His children.

Rev. E. Emanuel, President
Jake Fisher, Secretary

Randolph, Wis.

The Voice of Our Fathers

The Canons of Dordrecht

PART TWO

EXPOSITION OF THE CANONS

THIRD AND FOURTH HEADS OF DOCTRINE

OF THE CORRUPTION OF MAN, HIS CONVERSION TO GOD,

AND THE MANNER THEREOF

REJECTION OF ERRORS

Article 5 (continued)

We must still investigate the significance of this article in as far as it touches on the common grace question. As we said before, this is the only place where our Reformed confessions use the term *common grace*. And this, of course, at once attracts the attention. As we also indicated previously, it must at once be granted that in this article the matter of common grace enters in rather incidentally. The article as such deals not with the common grace doctrine, but with the general grace doctrine of the Arminians. However, this does not mean that we can learn nothing from this article as to the doctrine of common grace. On the contrary, the very fact that in this sole instance of the term in our confessions it is placed in the mouth of the Arminians already indicates that we can learn something of importance as to the view which our confessions maintain as to this doctrine.

At the outset we may observe that not all find in this paragraph a contradiction of the common grace theory. This is not surprising, but it is a fact worth noting as we investigate this matter. There are those who find in our *Canons* no contradiction of the common grace theory whatsoever, but who find, in fact, that the *Canons* maintain the doctrine of common grace. We have had occasion to note this previously in connection with *Canons* III, IV, A, 4. And it might be expected, therefore, that also with regard to this fifth article of *Canons* III, IV, B, the claim is made that the fathers do not oppose the common grace theory, but on the contrary, grant its validity. And this is exactly the claim that is made. It is maintained that our *Canons* do not condemn the theory of common grace as such, but rather condemn the wrong use of this doctrine. Thus, for example, T. Bos writes in his "The Canons of Dordt Explained," the following comments concerning this very article, p. 187:

"Er liggen op het veld der theologische wetenschap over de gemeene gratie voetangels en klemmen, zoodat er met een oordeel des onderscheids over gedacht en gelezen moet worden. De leer der Remonstranten, door de Gereformeerden verworpen, kan ons daarin van nut zijn. Zij toch spreken ook van 'de gemeene genade,' of de gaven, na des menschen val hem nog gelaten. Daar over is dan ook geen verschil. Er zijn van het beeld Gods, in ruimeren zin genomen, nog enkele sporen over gebleven. Dat zegt onze Belijdenis ook.

"Dat die gemeene genade van groot belang is, wordt ook door de Gereformeerden niet ontkend; zelfs niet, dat zij in verband staat met des menschen zaligheid.

"Ook staat de gemeene genade in verband met de mogelijkheid om maatschappelijk samen te kunnen leven, en dat maatschappelijk samenleven staat weer in verband met het christianiseeren van volken en staten.

"De vraag is echter, of de gemeene gratie een gave is, door den mensch zoo te ontwikkelen en te gebruiken, dat hij er door komt tot zaligheid. En dan verwerpen de Gereformeerden de dwaling der Remonstranten, die beweren van wel. Neen, noch de ware kennis van den waren God, noch de kennis van den eenigen Zaligmaker, noch de genade der rechtvaardiging, noch een beginsel van de heiligmaking ontwikkelt zich uit die gaven, den mensch na den val nog overgelaten, omdat het geen zaligmakende genade is. Die gaven zijn wel oorzaak dat de mensch niet te verontschuldigen is en ontwikkelen den natuurlijke aanleg in den mensch; doch omdat de grond dier gaven niet ligt in het nieuwe leven, brengen zij ook nooit vruchten voort van geloof en bekeering waardig. Als natuurlijke gaven laten zij den natuurlijke mensch in den staat der ellende, waarin hij van nature neerligt: onbekwaam tot eenig goed, en geneigd tot alle kwaad."

By way of a brief summary for our readers who do not understand the Holland language, the author maintains the following in the above paragraphs:

1) That in the field of theological thought concerning common grace there are pitfalls to be avoided, necessitating a discerning judgment in our thinking and reading on the subject, and that the Arminian doctrine rejected by the Reformed can serve a useful purpose in this regard.

2) That both Arminians and Reformed speak of common grace, or the gifts left to man after the fall, and that concerning this point there is no difference, as the Confession speaks of this too.

3) That this common grace is of great importance is not denied by the Reformed, and that it is not even denied that it stands in connection with man's salvation.

4) That common grace stands in connection with the possibility of living together socially, and that this social living together stands again in connection with the christianizing of peoples and states.

5) That the question is whether this common grace is a gift so to be developed and used by man that by it he comes to salvation, and that while the Arminians maintain this, the Reformed reject it emphatically, and maintain that all man's natural gifts leave him after all in the state of misery in which he lies by nature: incapable of any good, and inclined to all evil.

Now we may note at once that this is a far cry from the position of the Three Points of 1924, and especially from the position of the First Point. But we shall return to this matter presently. At this juncture we want to investigate the question whether the above position is actually in harmony with

the position of our *Canons*. And then we would call attention to the following.

In the first place, there is the fact that this is the only place in our Reformed confessions where the term *common grace* is used. What is the significance of this fact, however? It certainly means that it is nothing but loose talk to maintain that both Reformed and Arminians speak of common grace, if by Reformed you mean the Reformed fathers speaking officially in our Reformed creeds. It is, of course, true that Reformed theologians have spoken of common grace. And it may be granted that their speech has a certain weight, and that it must be considered. But if you have in mind the official expression of the Reformed faith, then it must be maintained that the confessions do not mention common grace with so much as a breath. And the reasoning that would make of the confessional speech concerning the remnants of man's original gifts (not: remnants of the image of God) a confessional reference to common grace is entirely faulty. In fact, it is not even true, as the Rev. Bos asserts, that the Confession also says that there are remnants left of the image of God in the broader sense. This is not confessional language. In this we heartily agree, therefore, that concerning the subject of common grace one must think and read with a discerning judgment.

Now this may be an argument *e silentio* (out of silence), but it is nevertheless a striking fact that while several Reformed theologians spoke rather freely of common grace, this idea did not find a place in any of our creeds. And this is especially striking in regard to the *Canons*, which are of a later date than our other confessions. One would say that the fathers had several opportunities to speak of common grace in the *Canons* without going out of the way to do so, *if they had wanted to*, and that they could very easily have expressed, if such was their view, that they did not disagree with the Arminians as to common grace and as to the significance of man's natural gifts. But they did not do so.

In the second place, in close connection with the above, we should note that not only is the term *common grace* placed in the mouth of the Arminians in this one instance in which it appears in our creeds, but the definition of this common grace is also attributed to the Arminians. The fathers do not say, as they could have if they agreed with the Arminians: "by which *we* understand the light of nature." But they say very pointedly: "by which *they* understand the light of nature." Hence, it is the Arminian understanding of this light of nature that it constitutes common grace. This is very telling. It is telling, first of all, because while it may be true that the fathers nowhere in our confessions expressly state that this light of nature is not common grace, it is equally true that they nowhere state that it is common grace, and, on the contrary, everywhere indicate that there is no element of grace in this natural light whatsoever. We stated previously that in this fifth article the fathers say nothing about the common grace aspect of the Arminian error. But we emphasized that while elsewhere they do not mention the term common

grace, they nevertheless make it abundantly plain that the common-grace man is pure fiction. Think how they emphasize that not the favor of God, but the wrath of God is upon man outside of Christ. Think of the fact that they emphasize even in regard to the light of nature that the natural man cannot use it aright even in the sphere of things natural and civil, III, IV, A, 4. Consider too how they steadfastly reject in III, IV, A, 1-4, and B, 1-4, the idea that there is any capability of good left in man whatsoever after the fall. In this light it becomes indeed important that they say in the present article, ". . . common grace, which to themselves is the light of nature" But in the second place, this is important because there is exactly a striking similarity between the so-called Kuyperian common grace and the Arminian theory of common grace on this point. There may be a difference of understanding, in a degree, as to the contents of this natural light. But on this they agree, that common grace, becoming operative at the moment of the fall, preserved in man a remnant of original goodness.

And this, in the third place, stands in close connection with the fact that the Arminian and so-called Calvinistic theories of common grace both agree ultimately in their denial of total depravity. They may disagree, again, as to the significance of this common grace, as to the question whether common grace is a starting-point and a connecting link for saving grace. But they agree on this, that "total depravity" is only a description of *what man would have been* had not God's common grace intervened. And if it is true, as the Rev. Bos avers in his comments on this article, that these natural gifts (which he also calls common grace) leave the natural man in the state of misery in which he lies by nature, that is, incapable of any good, and inclined to all evil, then he would be hard-pressed indeed to show where there is any element of grace, favor, in this so-called common grace.

Finally, we must give our attention to the matter of the First Point, with its general, well-meant offer of salvation, in connection with this article. This, after all, is much more serious than the whole matter of common grace. Here the question is not whether man by using his common grace can climb to the level of saving grace, but the question is exactly the main one of the Rejection of Errors in this article. The Arminians maintain that "God on his part shows himself ready to reveal Christ to all men." And on this matter the First Point of 1924 tragically agrees. The question is not that of the external preaching of the gospel. The question is as to the significance of that preaching. Point One teaches that its significance is that God on His part is ready to save all to whom the gospel is preached, that the preaching of the gospel is a general, gracious offer of salvation. The Arminians also teach that God shows Himself ready to reveal Christ to all. And our Reformed fathers tell us: "For the experience of all ages and the Scriptures do both testify that this is untrue." 1924, therefore, stands condemned by 1618-19.

H.C.H.

DECENCY and ORDER

Prayer in Ecclesiastical Assemblies

"If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." — James 1:5

"The proceedings of all assemblies shall begin by calling upon the Name of God and be closed with thanksgiving."

— Article 32, D.K.O.

It would seem as though a provision such as this in the Church Order is really quite unnecessary. The matter of prayer before and after ecclesiastical assemblies is so commonplace that its general acceptance would seemingly preclude the necessity of expressing it as a binding rule. No gathering worthy of the name of the church of Jesus Christ would think of performing its work without first calling upon the Name of God for guidance nor could it properly bring its labors to a conclusion without giving Him due praise and thanks.

Yet, it is not wholly redundant to express this. No, not any more than it is that the Scriptures repeatedly admonish the saints in Christ to pray always. All ecclesiastical rules need not govern only those matters concerning which there are or may arise differences of opinion. Also those matters concerning which there is complete unanimity may properly be expressed in the form of an established rule. In fact, it would be an excellent thing if there could be the same unanimity of conviction concerning all ecclesiastical rules as there is with respect to this one. Such then is the matter treated in this article. One would hardly dare to conceive of an overture requesting the alteration or rescinding of this rule. No one will rise before an ecclesiastical assembly to question its propriety. Even though a direct or literal command enjoining this practice cannot be found in the Word of God, all are agreed that the matter expressed is thoroughly Scriptural. We do not have to do here merely with an ordinance of man, an ecclesiastical precept, but rather with a practice which, from the very nature of things, is self-evidently necessary for the reason that God Himself requires it. Quite proper, therefore, it is that the church expresses this revealed will of God and, further, in doing so, that she understands the reason it is mandatory.

Prayer is not something that can be legislated. The mere fact that an assembly is begun and concluded formally with prayer is no guarantee that all that transpires during the course of the gathering meets with Divine approval and carries with it a blessing. In this respect let us remember that many worldly gatherings are also opened with so-called prayer. If and when prayer is rendered simply as an external formality or as compliance with certain established regulations, the spirit of our Church Order has not been observed. The essence of the rule of Article 32 is deeply spiritual and its observance can only follow from the spiritual consciousness of its need. By nature man is filled with carnal pride

that exalts itself in the thought that man is capable of building the church and properly performing all the labor attendant to it without God. He does not want God in his labor. He is ignorant of the truth that the church and all that pertains to it is immanently spiritual so that in the final analysis only God and God alone can and does perform that work that is conducive to the well-being of His church. *"Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it."* — Ps. 127:1. In the performance of this work, God uses human instruments but these in turn, to be useful and to labor constructively, must be filled with Divine grace and the Holy Spirit. Prayer then, at the beginning of the assemblies wherein the work of the church is to be administered, must be rendered in the consciousness of this utter dependence upon God! Only then will the meeting draw to its proper conclusion wherein thanksgiving may be rendered to God for the evidence of His grace and Spirit in the manner in which the work has been performed and in the decisions that have been taken. To this end prayer is indispensable since, as expressed in our Heidelberg Catechism, *"God will give His grace and Holy Spirit to those only, who with sincere desires continually ask them of Him, and are thankful for them"* (Lord's Day 45). And the requisites of that prayer which is acceptable to God and which He will hear are, according to the same Lord's Day: *"First, that we from the heart pray to the one true God only, Who hath manifest Himself in His Word, for all things, He hath commanded us to ask of Him; secondly, that we rightly and thoroughly know our need and misery, that so we may deeply humble ourselves in the presence of His divine majesty; thirdly, that we be fully persuaded that He, notwithstanding that we are unworthy of it, will for the sake of Christ our Lord, certainly hear our prayer, as He has promised us in His Word."*

All this we cite to emphasize that the thrust of the article we are dealing with is not that it establishes a certain formal procedure that ecclesiastical assemblies must follow, but rather that God requires us to approach Him in the consciousness of our needs and dependency upon Him. Always and in every circumstance this is the case but it is especially imperative when a gathering is called to engage in labors that pertain directly to His Cause, the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ.

From the Church Order Commentary we learn of the origin of this regulation of our Church Order. We quote the following:

"The incorporation of this provision in our Church Order goes back to the first regular Synod of our mother churches, i.e., the Synod of Emden, 1571, which ruled: 'When thus assembled, the Minister of the church where the meeting is held, or if the church is vacant, the president of the former meeting, shall lead in prayer with a view to the election of a president, an assistant and a clerk . . . The president, having been appointed, shall then lead in prayer with a view to all the work before the gathering.'

"But in 1581, at the Synod of Middelburg, the provision for two distinct prayers was altered. The provision, namely

for a separate prayer regarding the election of directors for the meeting, was dropped, and the wording of a ruling pertaining to the second prayer was retained so that we now read: *'The proceedings of all assemblies shall begin by calling upon the Name of God . . .'* Dutch: *'De handeligen aller samenkomsten . . .'* Originally the word *'proceedings'* in this article therefore referred to the actual questions requiring action on the part of the assembly. Later the term was taken to refer to all work performed, including the opening and closing of the meetings. And thus matters stand today."

Liturgical Prayers

Though seldom used today, there appear in the back of the Hollandsche Psalm Boeken various prayers for usage in the churches and in the christian homes. These prayers, as translated into the English language, appear also in the Psalter Hymnal. We do not have them in our Psalter. There are prayers to be used for various occasions, such as: *At the beginning of public worship, A prayer for all the needs of christendom to be used on Sabbath after the first sermon, For public confession of sins and prayer before the sermon, Prayer after the sermon, Prayer before the explanation of the catechism, Prayer after the explanation of the catechism, Prayer before meals, Thanksgiving after meals, Prayer for the sick and the spiritually distressed, Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, Opening Prayer for ecclesiastical assemblies, Closing Prayer for ecclesiastical assemblies, and Opening prayer for the meetings of the deacons.*

Something can undoubtedly be said both in favor of and against the use of these liturgical prayers. In favor of it is the fact that sometimes matters are brought under consideration which directly involve persons or things concerning which there is a rather sharp difference of opinion so that debate and discussion result in the creating of a rather tense atmosphere in which it is difficult, if not virtually impossible, to remain objective in prayer. Then prayer may become offensive rather than edifying and where this is the case and it can be avoided it is better to use a proper liturgical prayer. Or a brother may be called upon to lead an assembly in prayer whose ability to do so is very limited. It may then be advisable to use a prayer that has been prepared for the occasion. There are, however, also various factors that are against this practice except in cases of real or extreme necessity. Firstly, liturgical praying has a tendency toward becoming mechanical rather than real. In all our praying we need to guard against this danger and, therefore, should not engage in practices that readily contribute toward it. Secondly, in ecclesiastical assemblies where each session is opened and closed with prayer, the use of the same prayer repetitiously is not good. There are times when the same prayer can properly be used over and over again. Thus, for example, the Lord's Prayer or the prayers which form part of our regularly used liturgical forms. However, in ecclesiastical gatherings it is better to avoid needless repetition. Thirdly, to choose one's own words and to express one's own thoughts is better because

such prayer can be so composed as to more appropriately fit the particular circumstances. Liturgical prayers must necessarily be general in content and this is not always the best. Finally, we believe that free-prayer expresses more fully the spiritual consciousness of the gathering and this is an essential element in prayer. The Lord, to whom we pray, does not determine the validity of our prayers by their polished form, grammatical accuracy, length or well-composed phraseology but He looks upon the heart. This is evident from the Parable of the Publican and the Pharisee. And this is the most important matter!

But we have a few more things to say about the liturgical prayers. That these have not been preserved in our Psalter is not a serious loss. Were these prayers today to be again put into general use, we would advocate that they be recomposed before adopted by our churches. In their present form we do not feel them to be wholly acceptable. To show this more fully, we will, D.V., quote some of them in our next article and express a critical evaluation of them. G.V.D.B.

THE JESUITS

(Continued from page 303)

insisting that they walk according to God's Word can lie with what they say is a clear conscience.

Much more could be written of the doctrines and history of the Jesuits; what we have here is but a sample. Certainly their motto, "To the greater glory of God" is blasphemy. That such can take upon themselves the name "Society of Jesus" is almost beyond comprehension. Yet that is the case. It should open our eyes to the fact, particularly in these last days, that many there are who take upon themselves the name of Christ and propagate the lie. And many more gladly follow that lie also in the name of Christ.

G. J. Van Baren

WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

1908 - 1958

On March 19, 1958, our beloved parents,

MR. and MRS. TIM KOOIMA (nee Groeneweg)
celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary.

We are deeply grateful to our covenant God for all the blessings He has bestowed upon them and us; and we trust and pray that according to His will they may be spared for each other and for us unto fulness of years, and that they may continue to experience Jehovah's loving kindness all the days of their pilgrimage.

Their children:

Mr. and Mrs. Sam T. Kooima
Mr. and Mrs. Albert Harmsen
Mr. and Mrs. Paul Kooima
Mr. and Mrs. Edward Kooima
Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Kooima
Mr. and Mrs. Henry Rozeboom
Mr. and Mrs. Ted Ribbens
26 Grandchildren
5 Great-Grandchildren

Rock Valley, Iowa

ALL AROUND US

Christ's Death and Its Significance.

We are coming to the close of the season of Lent, that season of the year in which the church more than at any other time meditates upon and preaches about the suffering and death of our Savior on Calvary's Cross. In fact, just three days after you are supposed to receive this issue of *The Standard Bearer*, most of the Christian churches will conduct special Good Friday services which, of course, will be followed with special Easter services on the following Sunday.

This same theme is carried out in most of the religious periodicals we receive. All, with few exceptions, contain at least one or two articles dealing with some phase of the passion and death of Christ. It is with mixed feeling that we read them. On the one hand, we rejoice in the fact that, at least in the more conservative literature we read, the cross of Christ receives its deserved attention. But, on the other hand, we are greatly disappointed in the contents of most of these articles. This is especially true when the writers of these articles attempt to explain the significance of Christ's death, and particularly the redemptive purpose of that death. Oh, they will admit the vicarious character of Christ's passion and death. Indeed, according to them, Christ's death was substitutionary, but He was a substitute for all sinners. He is therefore a Savior for all. All sinners may go free because Christ died for them.

A good illustration of this presentation is to be found in the March 17th issue of *Christianity Today*. We refer to the article of Herschel H. Hobbs under the title: *The Meaning of the Death of Christ*. After a brief introduction the writer divides the rest of his article under the following headings: A Voluntary Death, A Vicarious Death, A Votive Death, and A Victorious Death. We are primarily concerned with what he writes under: A Vicarious Death. This is what he writes:

"A vicarious death simply means a substitutionary death. In his crucifixion Jesus was our substitute, bearing the penalty for our sins. This is seen in Jesus' becoming the substitute for Barabbas. According to Roman custom, the Jews had the privilege of selecting one prisoner to be released for them at the season of the Passover. Knowing this, and hoping thus to release Jesus, Pilate asked the crowd whom they would have released unto them, Barabbas, a notable prisoner accused of insurrection, murder, and robbery, or Jesus. At the instigation of the chief priests and elders, the people chose Barabbas and called for the crucifixion of Jesus (Matt. 27:15-22). Thus, when our Lord died between two thieves he was actually a substitute for the sinner, Barabbas.

"In actuality, of course, Jesus died not merely as the substitute for one man, but for all men (I Tim. 2:6). This truth

is clearly taught in the Bible. More than seven hundred years before that event Isaiah spoke of One who 'hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows,' of One who was 'wounded for our transgressions . . . bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes (bruises) we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray . . . and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all' (53:3-6). Literally, the Lord '*hath made the iniquity of us all to meet on him.*'

"Jesus' vicarious death is the theme also of John 1:29: 'Behold the Lamb of God, the One bearing away the sins of the world' (literal translation). The words 'bearing away' mean to take upon one's self and carry that which has been raised by another. Thus Jesus became the scapegoat of the New Testament as he took upon himself the sins of the world.

"Every man, were he to bear to his own death his own sins, would fall under the weight of the burden and be unable to carry them away. For this reason God mercifully raises our sins off from us and places them upon Jesus, the Lamb of God, who in turn carries them for us in death as our Substitute.

"It is significant that a few weeks before Jesus' death, Caiaphas, the high priest, had pointed out to his colleagues that it was expedient that 'one man should die *for* (author's italics) the people, and that the whole nation perish not' (John 11:50). John comments that Caiaphas had unknowingly 'prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad' (11:51f.). This word *for* is indeed significant, for Jesus uses it in explaining the purpose of his death: 'I lay down my life *for* (author's italics) the sheep' (John 10:15), that 'whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life' (John 3:16). Had the *justice* of God prevailed Barabbas, not Jesus, would have been crucified. But because his judgment is wielded in *mercy*, Barabbas and all other sinners may go free.

"Jesus Christ was our Substitute. And as we lift our eyes to see him hanging on a tree, we must avow, 'But for the grace of God, there hang I'."

It cannot escape the reader's attention how the writer of the above lines leaves the atonement of Christ general, i.e., how Christ is said to be a substitute for all sinners. I find no particular atonement here at all. Instead I find a studied attempt to present a Christ for all. And in my judgment this destroys the very idea of vicarious atonement. A Savior for all, is really a Savior for none.

How much better it would be and truer to the Scriptures to say that Christ died in the place of His people, His sheep, His elect. But it seems there are only a few who dare to say this.

Even the editor of *Christianity Today* in his editorial

"Preaching the Cross" in the same issue of this periodical makes similar statements as the writer referred to above. I quote three of these statements at random. "The Scriptures present the sacrifice on the cross as once and for all accomplished for the sin of the world." "True biblical preaching of the cross must therefore set forth Christ as the great High Priest 'offering himself a sacrifice for the sins of the world' — a sacrifice that procures pardon and eternal life." "A true preacher of the cross will point out that Christ gave his life a ransom for many, that he bare our sins in his own body on the tree, and is the propitiation for sin. Setting forth that truth, therefore, is the direct and only way of calming the troubled conscience and putting men in possession of peace."

I submit that there is nothing distinctive in that kind of preaching, and no Arminian will ever object to it. I also fail to see how any man's conscience will be calmed, nor that he will ever come into the possession of peace with that kind of preaching.

But Christianity today, it appears, wants what *Christianity Today* says it is. It also appears that they know nothing of what our Reformed fathers aver in Canons of Dordt II, 8: "For this was the sovereign counsel, and most gracious will and purpose of God the Father, that the quickening and saving efficacy of the most precious death of his Son should extend to all the elect, for bestowing upon them alone the gift of justifying faith, thereby to bring them infallibly to salvation: that is, it was the will of God, that Christ by the blood of the cross, whereby he confirmed the new covenant, should effectually redeem out of every people, tribe, nation, and language, all those, and those only, who were from eternity chosen to salvation, and given to him by the Father; that he should confer upon them faith, which together with all the other saving gifts of the Holy Spirit, he purchased for them by his death; should purge them from all sin, both original and actual, whether committed before or after believing; and having faithfully preserved them even to the end, should at last bring them free from every spot and blemish to the enjoyment of glory in his own presence forever."

That is what must be preached, and this preaching is the only kind that can calm the troubled conscience and give abiding peace.

The Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah.

Edward J. Young, professor of Old Testament at Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia, writes an interesting and informative article in the March 17th issue of *Christianity Today* under the above title. Professor Young is reputed to be an eminent scholar in Old Testament studies, and has written several books and commentaries in his field. He has obviously also given a rather thorough review of the latest archaeological findings respecting the prophecy of Isaiah.

To the reader who may not know what is meant by "The Dead Sea Scrolls," a subject which has received considerable

attention in most of the religious periodicals recently, it might be well to give a word of explanation. Dead Sea Scrolls refer to manuscripts of the Old Testament Scriptures which have recently been discovered near the northwestern end of the Dead Sea in Palestine where archaeologists searched the caves and discovered the monastery of Qumran in which these valuable ancient documents had been preserved.

Professor Young tells us that "of all the manuscripts discovered none can compare in importance and significance with the great scroll of the prophet Isaiah." He describes it as "written in a beautiful Hebrew hand on 17 sheets of leather sewed together," and consisting "of 54 columns. It is about a foot in height and 24 feet long. The clearly written text is not divided into chapters as is the case in our English Bibles, but into paragraphs." As to its antiquity, we are informed that "There now seems to be fairly widespread agreement that the scroll of the prophet Isaiah comes from the late second century B.C."

The writer continues: "What is of importance to note is that the Isaiah scroll from the Dead Sea is without question the earliest known extant entire copy of any book of the Bible. It is about one thousand years earlier than the earliest portion of any copies of the Hebrew Old Testament now extant. In the light of this fact we may well ask, What light does this important manuscript throw upon the text of the Old Testament?" He answers: "The answer to this question is that for the most part the Isaiah scroll agrees remarkably with the text of the Hebrew Bible already in our possession, the so-called Masoretic text . . . There are, however, more important divergencies from the Masoretic text. In certain instances the scroll shows a preference for the reading of the Septuagint rather than for the Masoretic Hebrew. Thus, to take an example, in Isaiah 53:11 the scroll reads, 'he shall see light,' and thus follows the Septuagint, 'to show him light.' There are also other minor variations." Professor Young is not ready to accept the theory that the monks who lived in the monastery at Qumran were of the sect of the Essenes, but he does say that apparently it was a sect that did not vigorously maintain all the tenets of Judaism.

The important point in the article of Professor Young, it seems to me, is to be found in the following quotation from his article: "The Isaiah scroll is a wonderful testimony to the accuracy of the Masoretic text, and its divergencies are very few and minor. Here then is further witness to the fact that the text of the Old Testament is one upon which we may rely and whose teachings we accept with confidence." And in answer to the higher criticism, which denies that Isaiah is the secondary author of the entire prophecy, the Professor writes: "On the other hand, those who believe the Bible to be the infallible Word of God and hence believe the witness of the New Testament to the authorship of Isaiah, may rest assured that in this new manuscript there is further support for their position . . ."

M.S.

CONTRIBUTIONS

CALVINISM — THE TRUTH

(Arminianism the Lie)

As Based on the Canons of Dordt, Popularly known as the Five Points of Calvinism.

by REV. ROBERT C. HARBACH

Total Depravity

(Continued)

Man, therefore, after the Fall not only has power to do good, but can so resist God (Ac. 7:51) that he can entirely prevent his (conditional) regeneration, since it is in his power to be regenerated or not. For first before regenerating grace can work efficaciously in man's new birth, the will of man must first move, and determine to comply with the conditions of regeneration, e.g., "I have set before you life and death . . . therefore choose life . . ." (Dt. 30:19). To be sure, God must give the grace to conform to the prescribed prerequisites, as we ourselves can do nothing. Nevertheless regeneration is a work of God in harmony with the free agency of man and performed on conditions required of man. "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God" (Jn. 1:12).

CALVINISM confesses the Scripture truth that man is wholly gone from original righteousness, has in his sinful flesh "no good thing" (Ro. 7:18), and that "there is none righteous, no, not one" (3:10). Man is totally depraved, totally deprived of all spiritual ability, "dead thru trespasses and sins" (Eph. 2:1-3), and this death passed upon all men (Ro. 5:12). "We ourselves had the sentence of death within ourselves" (II Co. 1:9). Calvinism alone takes man's spiritual death seriously. For man is dead, not merely half-dead; he is drowned, not simply drowning. By the Fall man lost all power unto good, or to better himself. He is "wise to do evil, but to do good he has no knowledge" (Jer. 4:22). He can do no good when it is his nature only and continually to do evil (Jer. 13:23). Freedom of will for fallen man is the ability to act according to his nature. What is his nature? One totally corrupt; for "the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it? I the Lord search the heart" (Jer. 17:9, 10). His "carnal mind is enmity against God. It is not subject to the law of God; neither indeed can be. So then, they that are in the flesh (unregenerate nature) cannot please God" (Ro. 8:7, 8). This being true, unregenerate man cannot and will not believe. "Ye believe not" (Jn. 5:38), "How *can* ye believe . . .?" (5:44), and, "they *could not* believe" (12:37, 39). And we never will until "we believe according to the working of the strength of His power" (Eph. 1:19); for we "believe thru grace" alone (Ac. 18:27), i.e., our believing is the result "of the operation of God" (Col. 2:12). Why is this? Because

faith is the gift of God, an exotic something, not something native to man. Not all men have it. When Paul speaks of "they which *are* of faith" (Gal. 3:7), he implies that some are *not* of faith: "all men have not faith" (II Th. 3:2). Again, why? Faith is "the grace given" (Ro. 12:3, 6), not to all, but "was once *delivered* unto the saints" (Jude 3). Furthermore, in regeneration and the receiving of faith, man is passive, as an infant in physical birth (and has all done *to* it and *for* it — no co-operation!), and as in the initial work of salvation. Then it is not, "save yourselves," but as in the original, "be saved" (aorist passive), and indicates that God permanently makes alive the sinner dead in trespasses and sins. Then he acts and lives Godward. Thus the "receiving" and "believing" are acts of the regenerated who already "*were* born of God" (Jn. 1:12), and so believed *as born* again, and *because* regenerated. It is never true that one believes and so is for that regenerated; but is regenerated so that one may and does believe: "he that heareth . . . and believeth . . . *hath* eternal life" (5:24). *Why* he hears and believes is because he "*hath* passed out of death, into life" (Gr.). He had to be in life before he could believe! For believing is evidence of regeneration.

Unconditional Election

3. ARMINIANISM pretends to believe in the doctrine of election. "Election is of such persons as believe and persevere in faith. For God has chosen the act of faith as a condition of salvation, which condition is a prerequisite unto the final establishment of man's election: 'repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ' are everywhere presented as the conditions. If then, some men do not fulfill the conditions, they may possibly have an election unto faith, but not an election unto salvation. They may once have had faith, but unless they also fulfill the condition of perseverance, they at last are lost: 'lest . . . when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway (reprobated)' (I Co. 9:27). Thus their election can be unto a justifying faith, without being a decisive election unto salvation. For it is necessary to "give diligence to make your calling and election sure" (II Pe. 1:10). God elects believers, then, because He foresaw their faith, their holiness, obedience and turning to Him in final perseverance. These good qualities, therefore, do not have their source in sovereign, immutable election. But where the Scripture says, "as many as were ordained to eternal life believed" (Ac. 13:48) we are to understand that it means, "as many as believed to eternal life were ordained." Or, if the familiar order be retained, we are to understand "ordained" to mean, "those who were ready" (Twentieth Century NT), or "those disposed," i.e., "those who felt led to exercise faith." Arminianism takes the basic virtues of salvation and makes them previously necessary causes of election, foreseen as being fulfilled by the finally faithful.

(To be continued)