

THE STANDARD

Bearer

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME XXXIV

NOVEMBER 15, 1957 — GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

NUMBER 4

MEDITATION

IN THE MIDST OF THE THRONE

"And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain" — Rev. 5:6a

If you stood by the side of the pearly gates and would look towards the centre of heaven, you would see a strange spectacle; strange to your earthy vision. Is it not strange that millions of saints and the four beasts as well as millions of angels are singing in beautiful melody about a slain lambkin?

On earth we read that the foremost of God's saints had determined to know nothing but the Cross of Jesus. But it seems as if that Cross will be the sum total of adoration in heaven also.

We read that a throne was set in heaven, and One sat on the throne. And He that sat was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone; and there was a rainbow round about the throne like unto an emerald.

I would say, that there we have a beautiful picture. It would be worth our while to see it. But a bleeding lambkin, its woolly fleece painted red because of the cruelly slashed throat! How passing strange it seems to us that the throngs would sing and sing again, repeating in every chorus: Oh Lambkin: Thou art worthy to receive blessing, honor, glory, power.

I glean the strange vision from the Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto Him, to show unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass; and He sent and signified it by His angel unto His servant John. You may read of it in Rev. 5:6. That is, a portion of the text. And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne . . . stood a Lamb as it had been slain It is not even a lamb, for the original calls it a lambkin; in the Greek it says: "een lammetje."

Let us visualize it if we can. Suppose you saw a little

lamb with its throat cut. The blood has saturated its crinkly woolen fleece. The wound is open, showing its cruel slashing. And there it stands. Are you going to sing? They do in heaven. Why not you? I seem to see a look of pity on your face. Why, we would almost weep when viewing such a picture. Is it possible to paint a picture that will portray in more poignant lines very injured innocence? Yes, we can imagine that you would weep, but sing? Nay, it seems more than strange: it seems an abnormality.

Yes, the mind that is of the earth earthy will weep about that slain Lambkin; while the heavenly minded will sing because of it as the day is long. "Weep not for me, ye daughters of Jerusalem!"

And why not? Because that slain Lamb is God revealed in the flesh; because it is Immanuel, Jesus Christ the Saviour. He is not the object of pity but the fitting object of admiration, of wonder, of adoration. It is the strong Arm of the Lord.

The Apostle John saw this little lamb in the heavens but he had also seen Him on earth, bleeding out of many wounds. "As it had been slain" is the heavenly echo of earthly Calvary, the accursed tree, where Jesus bled and poured out His soul unto death.

It is the heavenly culmination of the deep way of sorrows that John views when standing as it were by the side of the pearly gates. No longer is the fiery red on the woolen fleece a token of present suffering. From then on it will be the token of honor, power, but also adoration. For in it we see somewhat of the unutterable love of God and His manifold wisdom.

The Lambkin stood in the midst of the throne.

That tells me that He is God. For the throne John speaks of is the throne of God. And properly no one can be in the midst of it than very God Himself. That truth was evident even on earth. Standing on two feet with two arms, that is, while in the likeness of men, I hear Thomas pray: My Lord and my God! That Lamb is God revealed in the flesh. And that God-man had come through the way of terror such as no man or angel shall ever taste. He stood

as slain. All the fiery darts of the devil and devils were aimed at Him and these darts had found their mark. All the taunts and jibes of puffed up humanity were and had been His lot: and He bowed the head: received them all. All the burden of the wrath of God pressed Him down to the very bottom of hell and standing, nay, crawling there in the dust of death, He said: I love Thee so, My only Father! "As it had been slain." But in the midst of the throne. Because He humbled Himself He was highly exalted. And according to His Divinity He belonged in that throne. In the very midst of it.

Secondly, He is in the midst of the throne. It tells me that the whole program of untold and eternal sufferings of that woolly Lamb were through God, to be praised forever. No, my brother, do not *continue* to stare at weak Pilate, pompous Herod, raving Pharisee and wildly seething mobs of Jews. For they all are the agents, even though willing agents, agents still of the Triune God who counselled. "For of a truth against Thy holy Child Jesus, Whom Thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever Thy hand and Thy counsel determined before to be done." The Lambkin stood in the midst of the throne. It stood there also as to its idea while the howling mob cried into the ears of Pilate: Crucify Him, crucify Him! For by His hand and by His counsel the things happened. It is the threading forth of that counsel which you saw in anno 33 or 34. And the Lamb was fully conscious of it. "Weep not, that is, weep not for Me, oh, ye daughters of Jerusalem! Because of Me in My suffering, the angels have sung in the fields of Bethlehem. At last they have understood the wonder of the mercy seat. Peace on earth toward men of eternal goodwill! Weep not! And if you are to weep at all: weep for yourselves. For ye are sinners. I am in the midst of the throne, standing as I had been slain. I am a Divine wonder of love and goodness. So lovable and so good that throngs such as cannot be numbered shall sing and play eternally: Oh Lamb, Thou art worthy to receive power, riches, wisdom, strength, honor, glory, blessing. (5:12) When Jesus cried out: Why, o why forsakest Thou Me, My Father? then the Father must have said: I slay Thee, My Lamb, because I will glorify Myself in the throng of redeemed children. I forsake Thee, in order that I may draw nigh to Thine own, sheep. Indeed, the Lamb is in the midst of the throne.

Thirdly, it is in the midst of the throne. That is, it is in the very heart and the mind of God. Now we know that the throne was set in heaven and we also know that God sat on that throne. But God, Triune God, cannot be comprehended in the heaven of heavens. Properly speaking, God cannot even dwell in the heavens that shall be born again. For He inhabiteth eternity.

Our Father had this slain Lamb with Him even in eternity. It is the mind and the will and the heart of the Father to so reveal Himself as John saw it on Patmos. That

Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world. Always, yes, always even in the wakes of that still eternity before the mountains were brought forth or ever the fountains were heavy with water, did God delight in that slain Lambkin. For He is also the very Wisdom of God. When God counselled (and when was this?) He counselled the best and the most glorious Way to reveal Himself unto sons and daughters. God knows that He is lovable and good. But He wished to reveal it unto sons. Adam did know that God was good, the very songs of created things told him so. His own heart thrilled to the Divine touch of love and lovingkindness. But Adam did not stand by the side of the pearly gates to view the Lambkin as it had been slain. Oh, for God so loved the world

The Lamb is in the midst of the throne with all His wounds and all His blood. It is a revelation of love that will be the cause of rapturous singing. The bleeding Lamb tells me how lovable and how good God is.

Imagine the throng of the sons and daughters of God as they have become through sin and guilt. They are all ugly, all filthy: abominable things are in their vessels. Speak to them of God, nay, I warn you, do it not: they will rend you. They have become enemies of God. Is that God revealed to them, I mean to the elect as they are born in sin and deceit, if they may see God in the works of His hands or in the Holy Scriptures, then they will go to the trouble to send messengers to Him and say: Depart from us, for in the knowledge of Thy ways we have no pleasure. If God persists and shows Himself in the garb of a weak and defenseless man, they will turn out of their way and crucify Him. And in the midst of the roaring, cursing, blaspheming throng of the elect, God says in the Lord Jesus: Father, forgive them for they know not what they do! Can you grasp such love? And yet they do not listen. So, against their will, He regenerates them and pours His love and lovingkindness in their hearts so that they by irresistible grace begin to weep because of their filth and crookedness. Then they receive eyes to see the bleeding Lamb and they begin to see that He bled for their sin and guilt. And behind the Cross; beyond the hill of Golgotha they behold the Love of God. And they begin to sing with tremulous lips: "Unchanging is the love of God!" He loved us even while we were yet sinners. Christ died in that sense for the ungodly. And He did so as the realization of the Divine Idea of the bleeding Lambkin. For He stood in the midst of the throne as He had been slain.

Finally, He is in the midst of the throne. That is, eternity shall never end. So that He shall continue to stand there. Always, oh always, we shall be able to sing and singing we shall ask: Why are Thy robes so spotted with the fiery color of blood? And singing the Lamb will answer: I am the bleeding heart of love of the Father. Alone, all alone I have trodden the winepress. Alone I went down, ever downward in the pit that burneth of fire and brimstone. For there you

were, My sons and My daughters. And coming there in your captivity I gathered you in eternal arms. Underneath are the everlasting arms. Is it then a wonder that the arms of Jesus are very safety? But doing it I gave My blood. It is the good pleasure of My Father to shed My blood for all of you and you and you. And His loving eyes will see you. Although there are millions, He will know every one of us.

And when all is said and done the elders will fall down before the throne of God and while the four beasts say: Amen, they shall worship Him that sits upon the throne and He holds in His bosom the bleeding Lamb.

If you stood by the side of the pearly gates you would see a lovely and glorious spectacle in the centre of the heavens. You would see a throne and He that sits upon it. And seeing Him you would see the eternal version of Golgotha. And, no, you will no longer pity the Lambkin whose woolly fleece is red. I notice that your lips open to the song that is born in your heart. And as the beasts and the elders and the angels vie in heavenly song, you will vie with them. Herein you agree with them: no honor or majesty is too high for such love.

And we that are on the earth? We are privileged to cast a shadow of that Calvary in the midst of a pack of ravening wolves. When we are cursed we will bless; when we are revile again, we will do good unto them that spitefully use us. Doing it we shall be bearers of the eternal Idea of the Suffering Lambkin.

G.V.

IN MEMORIAM

The Martha Ladies' Aid of the Protestant Reformed Church of Hull, Iowa, expresses its sincere sympathy to our members, Mrs. Albert Vogel, Mrs. Frank Vogel and Mrs. Tom De Jong in the loss of their husband and father,

MR. ALBERT VOGEL

on October 17, 1957.

May the God of all grace give the comforting knowledge that all His doings are for the good of His own.

Rev. J. Heys, President
Mrs. T. Hoekstra, Secretary

IN MEMORIAM

The Ladies' Aid Society of the Protestant Reformed Church of Edgerton, Minnesota, herewith extends its sympathy to one of its members, Mrs. Joe Brummel, in the death of her father,

MR. ALBERT VOGEL

May our Heavenly Father comfort the bereaved and grant us the blessed assurance that to die in Christ is gain.

Rev. H. Veldman, President
Mrs. G. Gunnink, 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: \$4.00 per year

Entered as Second Class matter at Grand Rapids, Michigan

CONTENTS

MEDITATION —	
In the Midst of the Throne.....	73
Rev. G. Vos	
EDITORIALS —	
The Standard Bearer and Our Future.....	76
Daane's Distortion of Reformed Truth.....	77
Rev. H. Hoeksema	
QUESTION BOX	78
Rev. H. Hoeksema	
OUR DOCTRINE —	
The Book of Revelation	78
Rev. H. Hoeksema	
THE DAY OF SHADOWS —	
The Prophecy of Zechariah.....	81
Rev. G. M. Ophoff	
FROM HOLY WRIT —	
Exposition of I Corinthians 12-14	84
Rev. G. Lubbers	
IN HIS FEAR —	
Spiritually Sensitive	86
Rev. J. A. Heys	
CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH —	
The Church and the Sacraments	88
Rev. H. Veldman	
THE VOICE OF OUR FATHERS —	
The Canons of Dordrecht.....	90
Rev. H. C. Hoeksema	
DECENCY AND ORDER —	
Sovereignty Denied (??).....	92
Rev. G. Vanden Berg	
REPORT OF EASTERN LADIES' LEAGUE.....	93
Elsie Kuiper	
ALL AROUND US —	
Notes from the Baptist Examiner.....	94
A brief but Beautiful Meditation	95
Rev. M. Schipper	
REPORT OF WESTERN LADIES' LEAGUE.....	96
Mrs. G. Broekhouse	

EDITORIALS

The Standard Bearer and Our Future

The question now is: how is *The Standard Bearer* related to the history we have just related and, especially, to our deposition from office in the Christian Reformed Church? And what significance does it have in respect to the future of our churches?

Some of us will, probably, still remember *The Witness*, a paper which was first published after the synod of 1920, at the time of Janssen controversy. The purpose of this publication was chiefly to combat and expose the fallacy of the instruction of Dr. Janssen, not merely in a negative way but also in the way of positive development of the truth. We felt, at the time, that there was no room for this in *The Banner* or *De Wachter*, and because Dr. Janssen had been justified by the synod of 1920, and because, after that synod of 1920, new light had been shed on the instruction of Dr. Janssen by the student notes, it was considered advisable to organize a special publication. This, then, was *The Witness*. To the staff of this publication belonged, among others, the professors Berkhof and Volbeda, and also the Rev. H. Danhof and myself were members.

After Dr. Janssen had been deposed in 1922 there was little practical reason anymore for opposing his teaching and for continuing the publication of *The Witness*. However it was continued for some time. However, since the Janssen men in the Christian Reformed Church had determined to get the Rev. H. Danhof and undersigned out of the church on the basis of our denial of "common grace," they, i.e. the two ministers just mentioned, decided to inform the staff of *The Witness* that they intended to write on the question of "common grace" and to expose the fallacy of that theory in our publication. The rest of the staff, however, refused to let us write on the question, partly because they were afraid to stir up another controversy and disturb the peace of the church, partly, too, because they themselves believed in common grace. We then informed them that we resigned as members of the staff of *The Witness* and would write no more for it. The final result was the publication of our *Standard Bearer*.

It was first published in Oct. 1924, the year, therefore, that the "Three points" were adopted. Its immediate purpose was to expose the fallacy of the "Three Points" and to develop positively the Reformed truth of the sovereign grace of God with respect to election and reprobation. You must remember that our paper was first published when we were still in the Christian Reformed Church. We were not deposed from office till Jan. 1925. The staff of *The Standard Bearer* consisted of the Revs. H. Danhof, G. M. Ophoff, Mr. G. VanBeek and myself. It was published, as we know, by the Reformed Free Publishing Association. The publishing

of our paper in which we, from the beginning, exposed the fallacy of the decisions of the synod of the Christian Reformed Church and the "Three Points," was, no doubt, one of the immediate causes of our deposition as ministers in the Christian Reformed Church.

Now the question is, as was announced in the subject on which I was asked to speak tonight: what does *The Standard Bearer* have to do with the future of our Protestant Reformed Churches? On the very face of it we would say that the two are intimately related. The future of our churches stands closely connected the continuance and well-being of our publication. We understand, of course, that *The Standard Bearer* is by no means the only factor that must be taken into account when we consider the well-being of our churches in the future. When we speak of the future of our churches we do not mean the mere existence of our churches as such regardless of their maintenance of the truth. On the contrary, we refer to the definite, continued existence of our churches as maintaining the Protestant Reformed truth. Shall we keep the faith and continue to confess it in all its purity in the midst of the churches and in the midst of the world? This is the question with which we are concerned. And this depends, of course, chiefly on the grace of our God Who only can make us faithful unto the end. But, in that grace of God, it also depends on many God-given means and factors even besides *The Standard Bearer*. Chief of these is always the pure and full preaching of the Word. Our ministers must be diligent and faithful in the searching of the Scriptures and in the proclamation of the truth as expressed in the Protestant Reformed faith. They must do this from the pulpit as well as in the catechism classes. Moreover, closely connected with this stands the instruction that is offered in our theological school where men are instructed and trained for the ministry of the Word of God. We must emphasize, as much as possible, the richness and purity of the Protestant Reformed truth over the radio. We must have our own schools and Protestant Reformed teachers as much as possible. We should teach the truth as we believe it in our Sunday schools and discuss it in our societies. All these means and others must be taken into account when we speak of our future, i.e. of the future of the Protestant Reformed Churches.

But also *The Standard Bearer* must be taken into account in considering our future. It will be and serve as a guide to ministers and laity together. This, we may say, is the purpose which our publication has served in the past. And I am also confident that from the volumes of *The Standard Bearer* that have been published thus far and which many of us still possess, both ministers and laity may and do still gain important information and instruction in the Word of God. Thus it may also be in the future. I say: it may be thus. If, however, it is to stand in the service of this important purpose, it stands to reason that it must remain faithful to the cause for which the Reformed Free Pub-

lishing Association was originally organized and our magazine was first published. That cause is the maintenance as well the development of the Protestant Reformed truth which we hold dear and the rejecting and combatting of all heresies that are in conflict with the truth. If *The Standard Bearer* thus remains faithful it will, no doubt, continue to be an important factor in the preservation and development of our churches in the future.

I must still discuss our future in the light of the promises of God.

But about this in our next issue, the Lord willing.

H.H.

Daane's Distortion of Reformed Truth

Daane, in his article in *The Reformed Journal*, so utterly distorts the truth of Reformed theology that the question arises in my mind whether he ever understood its teaching or even whether he ever read many works on the subject.

Fact is that he never substantiates his utterly false contentions and misrepresentations by literal quotations from Reformed authors. This, of course, he could not do. I challenge him to attempt it. All he does, in his article, is to present his own philosophy. He is an able writer as far as style and language is concerned, but the contents of his article I consider very unscholarly.

To prove my contentions let me quote, first of all, the following paragraph from his article:

"At this point in the process of theological reflection a transformation so subtle took place that it frequently escaped notice. Election and reprobation having been equated as equally definitive of divine sovereignty, election suffered distortion by being equated with reprobation. God's sovereignty was no longer expressed in terms of gracious election to salvation, but in terms of the sovereignty of reprobation which came to be regarded as the definitive key to the understanding of God's sovereignty. In actual fact, sovereignty defined in terms of the sovereignty of reprobation became the central doctrine. This may be illustrated by a reference to Christ. Sovereignty was not defined in terms of the Lordship of Christ, which looms so large in the New Testament teaching, and which is there described as God's triumph over sin and death and hell through the events of the cross and the resurrection, nor in terms of the Christ who will return at history's end to execute judgment, as Paul says, 'according to my gospel.' Rather, the Lordship of Christ was, within Reformed theology proper, defined, when it was considered at all, within the limits of the simple fact Christ, as the agent through whom God executed his sovereignty of election and reprobation, saved some and not others."

It is almost inconceivable that the above paragraph could have been written by one who poses as a Reformed theologian. There is, I make bold to say, not a word of truth in it.

Nor is there any proof of Daane's contentions either from

Scripture and the Reformed Confessions or from Reformed theologians.

The central idea of the paragraph is, no doubt, that Reformed theology equates, put on the same line as of equal value, without subordination of reprobation to election, the truths of election and reprobation. What is still worse, according to the above paragraph, "God's sovereignty was no longer expressed in terms of God's gracious election to salvation, but in terms of God's sovereignty of reprobation, which came to be regarded as the definitive key to God's sovereignty." Yea, Daane expresses himself still more boldly and also erroneously, when he writes: "In actual fact, sovereignty defined in terms of sovereign reprobation became the central doctrine."

I ask the Rev. Daane: Where, in Reformed theology, is reprobation ever equated with election, so that they are of the same value, and so that the former is not subordinated to the latter? I claim that this is a downright untruth. Let Daane prove the contrary which he can never do. I promise him, if he asks for it, that I will prove that in Reformed theology, regardless of the question of supra or infra, election and reprobation are never equated. Where, in Reformed theology, was God's sovereignty expressed only in terms of reprobation and not also in God's gracious election? My answer is: nowhere. The very opposite is true. This I am able to prove and will prove, provided that Daane first makes at least an attempt to prove his contention. Otherwise I do not even consider it worth while to prove my own contention so well and universally known it is by Reformed theologians that it is correct. Where, in Reformed theology did Daane ever read that sovereignty as defined in sovereign reprobation is the central doctrine? Again I say: nowhere. Let Daane prove his contention, which he does not, and I will answer him.

I have a sneaking suspicion that Daane, in the above paragraph, refers to me as he frequently does in the rest of the article. That is, he refers to me, not in my real self, nor in regard to my views as expressed in any of my writings and several publications, but from the viewpoint of his own philosophy and imagination. It is easy to prove that he is altogether mistaken if, at least, it is true that he also refers to me. For proof I will offer just one quotation. It is found in Vol. V of *The Triple Knowledge*, p. 39:

"There is only one answer to this question: not the original creation and human race are first in God's counsel, not these are the end He has in view; but the Church and all the glorified creation in Christ. The Church is not an afterthought of God, it is not the product of repair work: it is God's original design. He purposed to glorify Himself by realizing His everlasting covenant of friendship in Christ Jesus His son, and, through Christ, in the millions upon millions of elect that constitute His body, and in whom the glory of God in Christ must shine forth in the highest possible degree. That is the end. And all the rest, creation and

the fall, reprobation and all the powers of darkness, and all the history of the world, are, in the decree of God, but means unto the realization of that end."

I hardly suppose that Daane will agree with this.

Nor do I care whether he agrees or disagrees. All I wish to emphasize is that this quotation out of one of my works gives the lie to the entire paragraph of Daane which I quoted above.

I certainly do not put reprobation on a par with election, but place it in a subordinate position and that, too, for a definite purpose, the purpose of the redemption and glorification of all things.

Here I must stop for the time being.

H.H.

QUESTION BOX

As to the Bible-Text

On this I received the following question:

Dear Rev. Hoeksema:

I would like to have your judgment on the difference versions of the Bible. Which one do you prefer, what is the difference, and why do you prefer either one or all, please?

David J. Broek,
Steen, Minn.

Answer:

1. The different versions of the Bible are not merely different translations, but they represent different copies of the original manuscripts. The King James version is the oldest. Since that time many different copies of Scripture have been found. This refers, we must understand, especially to the Greek New Testament. It is by a critical comparison of all these original texts that the text is discovered and established which constitutes the basis for the revised versions.

2. It stands to reason that, in many respects, because of the labors of the science of what is called textual criticism, the revised versions are more accurate than the King James version, although in some instances I still prefer the latter.

3. Which do I prefer? In answer let me say:

a. At home I always use the King James Version. I prefer this especially because of the language. I like it very much when the very language of the Bible differs from every day English as is largely used in the other versions.

b. For the same reason, we still use the King James Version in our church, and I dare say, in our churches, both in the pews and on the pulpit.

c. For my own use, in my study, and also in our theological school, I always use the original and, if the original texts differ, I try to determine for myself what is the best text.

H.H.

OUR DOCTRINE

THE BOOK OF REVELATION

CHAPTER 13

THE FOUR HORSEMEN

Revelation 6:1-8

Nor is it difficult to see that the same general truth is applicable to the influence of the last three horses. Also these have a two-fold effect according as they meet with different objects. What is evil to the world is by no means evil to the children of God. The same adversity causes the one to rise in rebellion and curse God, the other to humble himself and be patient. The same affliction hardens the one, and brings the other to repentance and sanctifies him. The same tribulation that brings despair to the one causes the other to glorify his God. And therefore, we may be comforted as people of God from the outset. All these horses come into contact with all men, without discrimination. But they all will be beneficent in their influence and effect upon the people of God, while they are harmful to the children of evil. And thus we can already in a general way discern how they must ultimately bring the kingdom of Jesus Christ while at the same time they will lead to the defeat of the power of Satan and Anti-christ in the world. All things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are called according to His purpose.

What then is the effect of the first horse and its rider in the world? In general we may answer that it causes separation. This is not difficult to understand. If there never had been any operation of the power of grace in the hearts of men, if there never had been any influence of the Word and of the Spirit, is it evident that never a separation would have been accomplished between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. It has been alleged sometimes that sin is the factor that causes separation between man and man. And in a certain sense this is, of course, true. But we should never forget that without the power of grace operating in the world there would be no fundamental separation, would be no split in the ranks of humanity after all. Grace is the wedge that in this sinful world makes separation and divides all men into two principally different and opposing camps. This, then, is the general effect of the work of this first rider upon the world of men. On the one hand, a people of God is called into conscious existence in the midst of the world. The Spirit of God regenerates, so that the inmost being of man is placed in a new relationship to God and to the entire world. The Christian is a new man. Principally he has become a friend of God, and belongs to His party in the midst of the world. The Word calls and brings that new man to consciousness of his new life, of his new relationship to God and to the world.

so that he begins to live and manifest himself as a subject of the kingdom of God and a member of His covenant. The people that are thus formed in the midst of the world acknowledge again the highest sovereignty of the God of heaven and earth, and that too, in every sphere of life. They begin by recognizing the righteousness and holiness of God. They are conscious of their sins and transgressions, and confess them before the countenance of Him that sitteth upon the throne. And they acknowledge Jesus Christ as the representative of the righteousness of God, but also as their Savior and Redeemer in His atoning power. Hence, they stand in an entirely new relation to God and also to the world. Formerly they stood over against Him in rebellion, hating Him with all their heart and mind and soul and strength. Now they humbly bow before His throne, asking, "Lord, what wilt Thou have us do?" Formerly they imagined in the wickedness of their corrupt nature that all things existed for them, for man. And man, to them, was god. Now they realize that all things exist for the glory of God, and that the Lord of heaven and earth is God alone. Formerly they emphasized that all things should exist and be arranged according to their own evil imagination, and they did not ask for the ordinances of the Most High. Now they insist that all things must be based on the principles of God's Word, and that Christ is King. The result is that they come to the world with a principally different life-view and with a new demand. All things must be made subservient to the glory of God and His kingdom, and in every sphere of life the precepts of their King must be maintained. For all of life they have their own demands. The state, according to them, is an institution of God, established for the maintenance of justice and righteousness in the world, for the punishment of evil-doers and for the protection of the good, in order that God's people may have room to develop in the midst of a sin-cursed world. The church is essentially the body of Christ, and, as instituted, it exists for the upbuilding of the saints, a witness of God in the world to the extension and establishment of His kingdom. It must needs remain separate from the state. The two differ in character. They differ in purpose. And they must never amalgamate. The church is universal; the state is national. The church is eternal; the state is temporal. The church stands for the eternal and absolute righteousness of God in the world; the state maintains, or rather, is called to maintain, the righteousness of God in the present dispensation. The state fights with the sword; the church never does. Surely, her members in this dispensation are citizens of a certain country, and they are subject to authority. Neither do they refuse as such to go out and meet the enemy in battle. But the church as such does not fight the battles of the world. She has a spiritual warfare to accomplish. The church as such sings no national songs, but she sings of the country beyond, of the city that hath foundations. The church as such has no national emblem, but unfurls the banner of the cross. And thus the people of God have their own life-view with regard

to every sphere of life and every institution of the world. The home is an institution existing primarily for the perpetuation of God's covenant in the world. The school is an institution for the purpose of instructing the covenant children according to the principles of Holy Writ for every sphere of life. Society, with business and industry, art and science, and all things that exist, must, according to them, be controlled by the principles of the Word of God, and be made subservient to the idea of God's kingdom in the world. In a word, they have a new life-view. They are members of God's covenant, His friends in the world, subjects of His kingdom. And in principle at least, they want to live the life of that kingdom also in the present world.

But this is not all. This, in fact, is only one side of the influence of the white horse and its rider in the midst of the world. And that white horse also has influence upon the ungodly and the reprobate. Upon the enemies of the kingdom it inevitably has this effect, that it enlightens them with regard to the idea of the kingdom, but at the same time it accentuates their hostility and embitters them all the more. They also learn to taste the powers of the age to come and to see the beauty of the kingdom of God. That this is true will be evident the moment you compare the Christian world in general with the world of heathendom. The Word of God has a general enlightening influence. There is what might be called even a civilizing influence of the Word and Spirit. Intellectually the children of evil understand the truth. But the principle of enmity against God remains unchanged. They do not come to repentance. They refuse to acknowledge the righteousness of God. They refuse to bow before Him as their Sovereign. They deny Christ, not indeed perhaps as a good man, but certainly as the representative of God's righteousness. They deny that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. They remain antichristian in their deepest principle. And thus they naturally come to this, that they also will establish a kingdom, in form like the kingdom of God, whose beauty they have learned to see. But it is a kingdom without Christ and without His atoning sacrifice. Instead of God, man is absolute sovereign in this kingdom. In that kingdom it is emphasized that the powers of this world must be brought to complete development and that man must have dominion over all things. Progress in business and industry and commerce, in art and science, is characteristic of this kingdom, — all without God and without His Christ. Still more: also in this kingdom they speak of righteousness and brotherly love, and only clean men and women can enter into it. They demand outward righteousness, and they insist upon brotherly love. They strive to realize the universal brotherhood of man. They struggle to arrive at the realization of a great international confederacy. And they want to establish universal peace. They want to abolish the effects of sin, and bring universal bliss to the world. In a word, they aim at nothing less than the consummation of what they call the kingdom of God in the world. For they are enlightened, and have come

into external contact with the white horse and its rider. But the principal trouble with them is that they deny that Jesus is the Christ. The old enmity, instilled in the hearts of men by the serpent in paradise, constitutes the principal motive of all their aspirations. They are not regenerated. They are children of evil. They do not stand in a new relation to God. And the result is that their so-called kingdom is after all no kingdom of God, but a kingdom of man, by man, and for man. The state must legislate men into this kingdom, and by force of law they are made to practice temperance and to manifest their love to the brother. The state, in combination with other states, will enforce universal peace. All the nations must unite. A great world-power must soon be established, controlled by a central committee, in order that war may be abolished and the kingdom of peace may presently be ushered in. For the establishment of this kingdom the cooperation of the church is also invited. The church must preach a social gospel. The old message of sin and guilt, of total depravity, of righteousness and holiness, of the necessity of atonement through blood and of regeneration by the Spirit of Christ has become antiquated, is no more adapted to the needs of the present time. Instead, a new gospel has come to the forefront, — the gospel of love and peace for all men, without Christ. Not that man is spiritually impotent, but rather that he is divine; not that he is guilty and condemned, but rather that he is by nature good and a child of God, must be emphasized with a view to the new era we are about to enter upon. And the church must also allow herself to become a powerful agency for the establishment of this universal kingdom of peace and righteousness. The school must serve the same purpose. It must not be separate. It must not be sectarian. It may not teach a definite religion. For that would not be in harmony with the idea of the universal brotherhood. But it must be general in its instruction, and inculcate the general principles of love to humanity. Society must be transformed according to the same principles. Differences must be removed. Competition must cease. The socialistic state of things must be established, to cover up the sore spots of covetousness and greed. And in as far as family life would obstruct the development and the ultimate realization of this idea, it also must be transformed. Free love will perhaps never be advocated on a large scale. And the form of the family will remain unchanged. But if the murder of children or the destruction of seed is advantageous to the establishment of this kingdom, its practice must be encouraged. Thus is the tendency of the present age. You may verify it with your own observation. The great aim is to establish a kingdom that it is outward form like the kingdom of God as it is pictured in Holy Writ. But the principal motive is enmity against God and against His Christ. In a word, under the influence of the same white horse that calls to life the covenant people of God in the world, also the kingdom of Antichrist reaches its development and consummation.

But if the case is thus, you will have no difficulty to understand that this white horse cannot run alone with its rider through the world of men. Just ask the question: what would be the result if this first horse were not followed by the red and the black and the pale, in other words, if there were no war, no social struggle, no death in all its forms? The answer is evidently: the result would be that the kingdom of Antichrist would reach the height of its development prematurely. The sinful world, striving to establish a world-kingdom, would soon succeed to organize into an international federation of nations, and thus constitute the formidable world-power that is pictured in the thirteenth chapter of this book of Revelation. Peace and happiness would reign supreme, and no more bloody wars would be fought. All things would be under the control of this world-power. It would employ by main force the powers of church and state, of home and school, of business and industry and commerce, and establish the antichristian order of things. Social contrast would cease to appear. All would enjoy equally much, or at least approximately so, all the products of the earth; and all competition, strife, and revolution would have an end. But this tremendous world-power, with all things under its own control in the most complete sense of the word, would naturally leave no standing room for the true church of God on earth. It would persecute and, if possible, destroy the kingdom of God in the world.

But this may not be. At least not yet. The time will come, indeed, when Christ will allow a partial realization of this antichristian world-power to maintain itself for a time. And that time will be most terrible for the children of the kingdom. These latter shall, according to Scripture, be able to buy or sell no more, that is, they will be social outcasts. And so terrible will be those latter days, that even the elect would not persevere were it not that those days were shortened. But as yet this order of things may not be realized. For these events the time is not yet ripe. The days may not yet be shortened. And, therefore, the formation of this tremendous world-power must be checked, must be prevented for the time being. And, therefore, Christ who possesses all power in heaven and on earth and who opens the book with its seven seals, sends war, sends the red horse into all the earth. Not as if Christ were the sinful cause of war. No, thus we never conceive of the matter. But the principle of sin exists and reigns in the heart of the world. This principle of sin must manifest itself in some way. And Christ so controls the sinful passions of individuals and nations that war ensues. He does this thru historical factors. If you peruse the pages of history you may observe that never any great and powerful nation was allowed to exist for any length of time as sole lord of the universe. No sooner has one nation ascended to the zenith of its power and apparently become undisputed lord of all the world, but another nation develops and becomes its competitor for world-power.

H.H.

THE DAY OF SHADOWS

The Prophecy of Zechariah

Chapter 11:1-14

1. *Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars. 2. Howl, fir tree, for the cedar has fallen, for the lofty are laid waste; howl ye oaks of Bashan, for the high forest has gone down. 3. There is a sound of the howling of the shepherds! For their glory is laid waste; a sound of the roaring of young lions! For the pride of Jordan is laid waste.*

Lebanon is the mountain range west of the Jordan in the northern territory of Canaan. The cedars were the glory of Lebanon. At one time they were very abundant. Next to the cedars the fir trees were the choicest trees of Lebanon. Cedars and fir trees were used for Solomon in the construction of the temple. Bashan is the most northerly part of Canaan west of the Jordan. At one time it was rich in oak forests.

Lebanon is to be visited by a great fire that will devour its trees. An identical catastrophe is in store for the oaks of Bashan and its rich pastures, the glory of the shepherds. The fire will spread to the Jordan and consume the thickets and reeds, the glory of Jordan, which grow so luxuriantly on its banks and afford so safe and convenient a lair for the lions. Shorn of all vegetation and with the soil of the ground blackened by the fire, the regions mentioned will be the scene of complete devastation. The voice of howling will everywhere be heard. The prophet hears the cry of shepherds over the loss of pastures. With this is mingled the roaring of the young lions driven from their haunts by the hot breath of the fire.

Viewing this representation in the light of its context, one perceives that in the final instance it is a prophecy of the overthrow of great ones in the earth, men of power and renown. Cedars, firs and oaks symbolize men as do also the lions of Jordan. Devoured by the wrath of God, they shall fall and be laid waste. And their glory shall depart from them.

It is plain from the context that the passage is prediction and not merely a description of what already has come to pass.

Of which powers is our prophet here speaking? According to one view these verses are the conclusion to the promise in chapter X that the dispersed Jews will be reestablished in Lebanon and Gilead (10:10), for they state what will become of the present heathen occupants of the land: they will be completely annihilated. The view is then that the judgment in these verses is a judgment upon the heathen and their rulers that now occupy the territory of the dispersed covenant people. But this is not correct. These verses are rather a figurative representation of the judgments foretold

in the subsequent verses (11:4ff), and that are to come upon the kingdom of Israel. This view is firmly supported by the accuracy of the expression "flock of slaughter" in the succeeding verse (11:4). That this flock is the kingdom and house of Israel is crystal clear from the context and is therefore disputed by no one. What is foretold by the imagery of these verses is the overthrow of Israel from the time of the utterance of this prophecy to the coming of Christ. Israel must go under, which it will through its own wickedness, the reason being that, when Christ will have come, kingdom and people will have served their purpose as a shadow of the kingdom of heaven. The typical Davidic kingdom will therefore be destroyed completely and vanish away forever. Only if it be allowed that the imagery of these verses refer to the fall of Israel will the flow of thought of the verses that follow be correctly discerned.

4. *Thus saith Jehovah, my God, Feed the flock of slaughter; 5. Whose buyers slaughter them and are not guilty, and their sellers say, Blessed be Jehovah, for I am getting rich, and their shepherds spared them not. 6. For I will no more spare the inhabitants of the land, saith the Lord: but, lo, I will deliver the men every one into his neighbor's hand, and into the hand of his king. And they shall smite the land, and out of their hand I will not deliver them. 7. And I fed the flock of slaughter therefore, the poor sheep, and I took to myself two staves; the one I called Beauty, the other I called Bands, and I fed the flock. 8. Three shepherds also I cut off in one month; and my soul was grieved because of them, and their soul also abhorred me. 9. Then said I, I will not shepherd you. That which dieth, let it die; and that which is to be cut off, let it be cut off, and let the rest eat every one the flesh of his neighbor. 10. And I took my staff, even Beauty, and cut it assunder, that I might break my covenant which I had made with all the people. 11. And it was broken in that day. And so the afflicted of the flock that waited upon me knew that it was the word of the Lord. 12. And I said unto them, If it be good in your eyes, give me my reward; and, if not forbear. So they weighed for my reward thirty pieces of silver. 13. And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a noble price at which I am valued of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast it into the house of the Lord, to the potter. Then I cut assunder mine other staff, even bands, that I might break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel.*

Our prophet sets out (verse 4) with presenting Jehovah as mandating that the flock of slaughter be shepherded. He does not say that the mandate comes to him. Yet it is plain from verse 7 that it is the prophet to whom the Lord is speaking. The pronoun *I* in this verse, "And I fed the flock," refers to our prophet. The task given him of the Lord is to shepherd the flock by which is to be understood Israel, the post-exilic covenant people. Regarding this people our prophet is commanded to perform the whole work of a shepherd, which includes besides feeding, guiding,

protecting and ruling the flock. The verse gives rise to two questions: 1) why is Israel called the flock of slaughter? 2) Why must the prophet shepherd the flock?

Verses 5-6. These verses are the answers to the above questions. The thought of verse 5 is this: There are those who buy and sell the covenant people. They make merchandize of the flock or sheep especially of the poor and the defenceless among them. These traders in men slaughter their victims, that is, they shamefully ill-treat them in every way. And they are not guilty in their own eyes, that is, They piously praise the Lord. They say, "Blessed be Jehovah, for I am getting rich." It shows that they regard their ill-begotten gain as His gracious gift to them, and that their vile imagining causes them to conclude that their act is in accord with His will, that it meet with His approval and that His blessing rests upon it. It seems that these rulers are Jews and not foreigners seeing that they take upon their lips the name of Jehovah. They say, "Blessed be Jehovah."

The shepherds of this verse are the rulers of the covenant people. Of the rulers it is stated that they spared them not. The pronoun *them* looks to the flock. Evil men slaughter the flock and the rulers resist them not. What is done to the sheep is of no concern to them. That it cannot be determined whether the rulers are Jews or foreigners is of little importance. It's their attitude toward the flock that is significant. Buyers and sellers, who must be the same people, are perhaps the powerful, rich and godless rulers in the community subject to the rulers but having nothing to fear from them seeing that rulers and nobles were alike wicked.

The argument of these verses (4-7) leaves no doubt that the subject treated in verse 5 is the same as that treated in verse 6, namely the slaughter of the covenant people. But there is this difference to be noticed. In verse 5 the slaughter of the flock is set forth solely as the act of godless men, while in verse 6 it is set before our eye as willed also of the Lord and as a work of His that He accomplishes through the wicked as His agents. The doleful message of verse 6 is this: "For I will no longer spare . . ." The pronoun *I* denotes the Lord. The speaker here is He saying what He will do. He will no more spare the inhabitants of the land but will deliver them one and all into the hand of their neighbors and into the hand of their kings, and they shall smite the land, and out of their hand the Lord will not deliver them. This is doubtless the thought of this verse which reads literally, "And I will no more spare the inhabitants of the land, saith Jehovah, but, behold, I will deliver *the men each into the hand of his neighbor and into the hand of his king.*" The meaning cannot be that for every individual man there is going to be a different pair of kingly hands for him to be delivered into in the sense of: as many men, so many kings, a king for each man. According to some, the expression *each man* denotes a distinct heathen nation, so that what, according to this view is being foretold in this verse (6) is the overthrow of the kingdoms of the world through the

agency of its own kings as involved in mortal combat the one with the other. But that in this verse the prediction is that of the slaughter of Israel and not of the heathen nations is plain from the main line of thought of the verses 4-6 which is this: Shepherd the flock of slaughter (4a) . . . because I will no longer spare the inhabitants of the land (6a). Surely in this reasoning *the inhabitants of the land* is Israel, *the flock of slaughter* of verse 4. And the very reason that the covenant people are called the flock of slaughter is that it is going to be slaughtered. In the language of verse 6 the reason is that the Lord will no longer spare His covenant people but will give them up into the hands of their neighbors and of their kings. Whether these kings and neighbors are foreigners or Jews cannot be determined. It is not improbable that the reference is to the total of godless rulers and men of violence, both foreign and Jewish, by which the flock will be afflicted and killed through the years.

Statements occur in the succeeding verses forbidding the view that limits the expression "flock of slaughter" to the reprobated Israel. Denoted is the whole flock, the carnal seed and the spiritual seed alike. The sufferings in store for the flock will engulf also God's believing people, the spiritual Israel. But they have the victory over all their enemies. (See the promises to the flock contained in the previous chapters). Then the Lord will deliver out of all their troubles. They are the little flock that will be given the kingdom. But the others will not be delivered out of the hands of their kings.

The flock of slaughter, then, contains within itself as within a shell a spiritual seed. And therefore the mandate to the prophet: Shepherd the flock of slaughter. Take oversight over it. Protect and guide it. Exhort it. Proclaim to it God's Gospel and the promises thereof. Tell it all that the Lord will do. Withhold nothing. For the flock of slaughter houses a spiritual seed. And this seed has ears to hear and hearts to understand.

7. So the prophet, as did all the prophets before him, shepherded *the flock of slaughter, therefore the afflicted sheep.* So reads the italicized part of this sentence in the original text. In verse 11 the *afflicted sheep* are plainly the true believers in the flock, so that the meaning of the italic words seems to be: I shepherded the flock of slaughter, I shepherded therefore the afflicted sheep, that is, the true people of God in the flock. Though the prophet shepherds the whole flock of slaughter, the carnal as well as the spiritual Israel, his concern is with the true believers. They alone were capable of being shepherded. They alone have ears to hear and hearts to understand.

The shepherd is in need of a stave. So the first act of the prophet is his taking to himself not one but two staves to which he gives names. The one he calls *Beauty* and the other *Bands*. They are not therefore ordinary staves such as any shepherd might bear but staves with a special significance such as for example the bread of holy communion. Jointly

they signify the office of spiritual shepherd, the duties that belong thereto, the right to perform these duties and the spiritual qualifications that go with this right. But more must be said. With the names given them of the prophet imposed upon them — *Beauty* and *Bands* — they jointly symbolize, as appears from the succeeding verses, the spiritual beauty and unity of the redeemed and glorified flock of God. They also stand for the functioning of our prophet in his office of spiritual shepherd of the flock of God. For the very next statement the prophet makes, after having taken to himself these two staves, is, "And so I shepherded the flock of slaughter."

8. The only act of his as shepherd to which the prophet points is his cutting off in one month three worthless shepherds of the flock. He tells us that his soul had been sorely grieved by these rulers. This is cited to shed light on the character of the prophet's rule as shepherd. He was fearless in his devotion to the cause of his God. But it is also cited to explain the attitude of the reprobated Israel, the carnal sheep, toward the prophet. They abhorred and despised him, so we read in this verse. It may well imply that they tried to do away with him. That it is not revealed who those three cut-off shepherds were, makes no essential difference. And therefore it is futile trying to make out who they were. It is also more than likely that the three shepherds were cut off not actually before the eyes of men but that the events and actions of which these verses speak took place in vision, as was the case with the prophesying of Ezekiel and the resultant shaking and coming together of the dead bones in the midst of the valley (Ezekiel 37:1ff). What is important is that it be understood why the doings reported in the verses under consideration were made to take place be it perhaps in vision. The purpose was to expose the house of Israel in its loathing and hatred of God as revealed in the face of all the prophets and finally in the face of Christ in order that it might be seen that God was fully justified in destroying this house. There will be for the house of Israel a final judgment in which it will pass away as an organized nation. The house of the Jerusalem that kills the prophets and stones them that are sent unto her will be left desolate unto her (Luke 13:34, 35).

9. Such being the reaction of the flock, the carnal Israel, to His ministry, the prophet resolves no longer to shepherd the flock, and gives it over to destruction. "I will not shepherd you," he says to them, and further, "That which dieth, let it die; and that which is cut off, let it be cut off, and let every one eat the flesh of his neighbor." This is not an idle wish that originated in the sinful flesh of the prophet and to which he gives utterance moved by carnal anger that was kindled by the reaction of wicked men to his ministry. The prophet curses because he must curse. The Spirit of prophecy is upon him demanding and foretelling through him as His organ the destruction of the haters of God and the despisers of His name. God's Word is here being spoken, a word, therefore, that always accomplishes what it says.

10. The prophet now takes his staff of Beauty and breaks it in halves. This action with the staff is symbolical. It denotes the Lord's breaking, annulling His covenant with *all the people*. As the Lord made no covenant with the heathen, the expression, "all the people," denotes Israel. But how can the verse speak of the Lord's annulling His covenant with Israel? The covenant is the Lord's. He establishes it in the hearts of His people by a grace that is irresistible. And He keeps covenant trust forever. Never will He become unfaithful to His promises. What therefore the prophet means is that when the Lord will have drawn all His elect out of the carnal house of Israel of the old dispensation, He will take His covenant away from that house. This He will do, because His covenant is only with His elect. It includes only them. Unto them alone are all its promises. And in their hearts alone is it established. This was told this house by Christ, namely, that the kingdom of God is taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof (Matt. 21:43).

11. This verse states, "And it was broken in that day." The reference is to the covenant. It was not already in that day broken actually. It was broken figuratively by the action of the prophet whereby he cut assunder His staff of beauty. To say that this staff with the name beauty imposed upon it symbolized the beauty of the redeemed flock of God is but to say that it symbolized the beauty of God's covenant with the flock. Therefore the breaking of the staff symbolized the annulling of the covenant in the sense just explained.

In this verse mention is made of the afflicted of the flock that gave heed to the Lord and His prophet. The reference is to God's believing people in the flock. They knew, spiritually discerned that it was the Word of the Lord, all that the prophet spake, and foretold, made known to them by word and symbol.

G.M.O.

IN MEMORIAM

On October 17, 1957, it pleased our Heavenly Father to take from us and unto Himself our beloved husband, father and grandfather,

ALBERT VOGEL,

at the age of 68 years.

Although it is for us a loss, we trust in His promises. "For we know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," II Corinthians 5:1.

Mrs. A. Vogel
Mr. and Mrs. Frank Vogel
Mr. and Mrs. Joe Brummel
Mr. and Mrs. Adrian Buren
Mr. and Mrs. Tom G. De Jong
Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Leusing
and 31 grandchildren

Hull, Iowa.

FROM HOLY WRIT

Exposition of I Corinthians 12-14

XIV.

(I Corinthians 14:33-40)

In this section of the 14th Chapter of Corinthians Paul rebukes a few women in the congregation, who did not, evidently, understand their God-ordained place in relationship to the male members in the church. Fact is, that they were those who did not understand this place in the church because they did not know these first principles in the home, in the marital relationship of husband and wife!

It seems quite likely that the Corinthian women were rather free and bold in their conduct so that Paul had occasion in Chapter 11:1-16 to instruct, correct and admonish them in their conduct in the services, coming with their hair shorn, assuming masculine mannerisms, hair-do and dress!

Surely what Paul has to say to the Corinthians is also applicable in our day for the women in the church.

The passage here in I Corinthians 14:34-36 reads as follows, "*Let your woman keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak: but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for woman to speak in the church. What? came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?*"

Now surely this passage is still concerned with the "spiritual gifts" in the church, be it then by way of a sort of an appendage. It calls a halt to the sinful emancipation of the woman in the church, which simply must lead to the wife ruling over the husband. That is against the "law" of God, God's created ordinances as they are "from the beginning!" It destroys the mystery of God as portrayed in the relationship of Christ to the church. See Ephesians 5:22-33. Such conduct of women betrays a lack of spiritual sensitiveness of what is right and proper in sight of God. And a husband, who allows his wife to rule over him, too, shows a lack of spiritual manhood, reflecting the headship of Christ over the church. And a consistory which allows women to rule in the church also shows that it is composed of men, who do not know how to rule their own houses well; such members should not be in office! I Tim. 3:1-13.

Surely Paul is not militating against the spiritual equality that a woman (female) has the man (the male) in Christ as a living member by faith in Christ. In the spiritual body of Christ there is really no prerogative which the male has over the female. For in Christ all are one. And presently in heaven the distinction is really wholly gone between male and female. For there we shall be like the angels in heaven,

neither marrying nor given in marriage, Matt. 22:31. And does not Paul write in Gal. 3:27-29, "For as *many of you* as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There shall be neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are *all* on in Christ Jesus . . ." Certainly, if words have meaning, Paul here places the woman (female) on a par with the man (male) in Christ Jesus. As image-bearers of God in their soul and spirit and body women are not inferior creatures. She too was created in the image of God *in the beginning* (Gen. 1:27).

And many of the "gifts" spoken of in I Corinthians 12:1 through I Corinthians 13 are given to the woman in the church, as the Spirit wills, counsels to do. Many a sister in the Lord has received great gifts of faith, knowledge, wisdom, patience, meekness, etc.

Paul, however, is not speaking of the latter in this passage!

He is speaking of their place "in the church," that is, in the *congregational worship*. Here there was speaking with tongues, prophesying, all to the edification of the church; also for the edification of the "women" in the church, as living members of God's church!

The fact that a woman (female) has equality in Christ with the man (male) does not imply that they have *equality in this life* in the institutional life of the church. Also here the *natural* is first; *afterwards that which is spiritual*! (See I Cor. 15:46). A woman has no more equality in the institutional life of the church than what she has in the marital relationship with her husband. Her's is the place of obedience to her husband!

Thus it is written in the "law." "For it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law." Hence, this is not simply a rule which must be applied to a few unruly women in the church at Corinth; it is a universal rule layed down for all climes and ages, and which has always been practiced by godly women, true daughters of Sara. I Peter 3:1-4.

And this is a rule which the consistory in Corinth must practice, and which must be insisted upon by all christian husbands in the Corinthian congregations! Not to do so would demonstrate even the consistory and the husbands as such, who do not understand the very A-B-C of God's ordinance. Paul does not address the "women" here in this section, but addresses the congregation, that is, the Consistory to this effect. Says he: Let *your* women keep silence in the churches.

For surely the "law" here does not simply refer to the Decalogue (although the principle of the priority of the "father" is suggested in the fifth commandment) but refers to the entire Word of God, as this Word is the norm of faith and life in the home and in the church. Fact is, that this is the rule layed down by God in the first wedding, namely, that of Adam and Eve in Paradise. Seen Gen. 1:27; Gen. 2:7 and

22. And we know how ill it fared with Eve when she did not stay in her role, but was in the transgression by speaking with Satan in the form of the serpent; without consulting her husband. She spoke out of turn. See I Timothy 2:11 where we read, "Let the woman (female) learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in transgression"

Two principles are here to be remembered. The first is the principle of the fact that Adam was first created, and that the woman was taken out of the man. The second is, that the woman sinned first, exactly because she usurped a place over the husband! And, we may add, that Christ has come to establish the original order of creation, and, therefore, good order (rank) and decency is that a woman shall not teach in the congregation, shall in no wise *rule* over the man!

Turning to the pages of Scripture, one might cite the example of Deborah in the days of the judges, and that of Hulda, the prophetess in the days of King Josiah. (See Judges 5 and 6 and II Kings 22:14 and II Chron. 34:22). Both of these woman were prophetesses. And one of them, Deborah, even ruled over all Israel. For we read in Judges 4:4, "And Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel at that time. And she dwelt under the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in mount Ephraim: and the children of Israel came up to her for judgment."

Now, what must be said of this?

We are certain that in all cases where a woman rules, it was always in very abnormal times in the church, when the very foundations were about to be destroyed. It is the exception to the rule in Scripture, and, therefore, in each case establishes the rule layed down in the law. At such a time men did not quit themselves like men. It was not a case of a woman ruling over a man, but it was rather a case that the foundations of righteousness and the service of God should stand. Such was the case in the days of Deborah. What courage(?) did Barak exhibit to fight the battles of Jehovah when he said, "If thou wilt go with me, then will I go!" And why did the glory of this battle go to a woman by name of Jael? Why must Sisera lay prostrate at her feet?

Surely this is an indictment against the men in Israel in Deborah's day.

And what about the days of King Josiah? Was that too not a time when the teachers in Israel had utterly failed to instruct the people in the law? Was the scroll of the law not found by the workmen in the temple? Truly that the prophetess, Hulda, must be inquired after by the very leaders in Israel is an indictment against Israel! It was the exception that confirmed the rule.

In the church women are to be silent.

They are not to climb the pulpit; neither are they to rule the "roost" at home! The latter type of woman would surely

climb the pulpit betimes were she in a position to do so. How well a minister of some twenty-five years of experience knows this!

Is she then in no wise to be a prophet? Has the Holy Spirit not also anointed the believing mother with the office of believer, prophetess, priestess and — ah, queen?

Her place is in the home. She speaks in relationship to the children. She is to be honored as such by them — next to and under the father! And what a beautiful place she graces in the home.

She is the very picture of Christ in her "silence" toward her husband. She is beautiful as was Sara of old.

When she grows old she must teach the young women, the daughters by example and precept to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the Word of God be not blasphemed! Titus 2:3-5.

Yes, I have anticipated the question of our christian school teachers, our Sunday school teachers, who are sisters in the Lord? Does this then mean that we should not teach? I answer: Paul is speaking of the offices in the church. Ministers, elders and deacons. These must be men. He is not speaking of the school as an extension of the home. Such are our day schools, are they not? Are they not ruled and governed by the "Board." Men, they are. Let the teachers remember. And our Sunday Schools? Here woman do not teach men, do they? They teach classes of *children*. In a sense, they are helpers of the Ministers. But in so doing they often receive instruction at the teacher's meeting from ministers, either in the Instructor or personally.

If any in Corinth would desire it different, and insist on having women speak, have their own confusion of speaking with tongues and prophesying, Paul asks in effect with Job, "Has wisdom died with you?" Did the Word of God go forth from you? Are you the very archetype of wisdom and knowledge? The whole army of the saints is out of step, except ye Corinthians, says Paul ironically! Or did the Word of God only come to you. You alone know, what is right?

Well, be assured, that what I tell you in this letter is the "commandment of the Lord."

If a man is too ignorant to learn, let him be ignorant and suffer the consequences.

Meanwhile let all things be done decently and in order.

And last but not least: in the love of Christ Jesus!

G.L.

IN MEMORIAM

The Martha Ladies Aid of the Protestant Reformed Church of Hull, Iowa, expresses its sincere sympathy to one of our members, Mrs. Nick Kooiker, in the loss of her sister

MRS. JOHN VIS

on October 20, 1957.

May our triune God comfort and sustain her in her sorrow.

Rev. J. Heys, President

Mrs. T. Hoekstra, Secretary

IN HIS FEAR

Spiritually Sensitive

In five ways our souls come in contact with the world in which we live.

Or if you will, that world that is all around us enters our souls in a five-fold way.

We have contact with that world by the sensation of sight. We see the world. There is a sensation of its color, size, shape, height, length and depth. The blazing color of the bed of flowers, the clear blue of the sky, the soft green of the field, the brilliant whiteness of the snow, the beauty of the rainbow all enter our souls through the eye. The lofty mountain peak, the depth of the canyon, the broad expanse of the desert all become known to us and make an impression upon our souls through that sensation of sight. No power shines forth out of the eye as the beam of light that emanates out of your flashlight. The eye is rather like the camera with its lens and sensitive film. The light that radiates from an object enters through the lens and strikes the sensitive film upon which it makes an impression. So the color, size and shape of the things in this world enter into our souls through the eye.

We hear the world. Sound waves are constantly moving through this world in which we live. They are picked up by the ear; and we hear music, singing and laughter. Or we hear crying and moaning. The sound of the bird's singing, the roar of the jet plane flying overhead all make an impression upon our souls. We are moved to laugh and to sing. We are brought to tears and grief by these sound waves that reach our souls through the sensation of hearing. In our ears are spoken the words of sudden death and bereavement, to our souls come the message of impending war and of the enemies approach; and fear grips us, sorrow floods our souls. So it is also with sounds that bring joy and laughter. Through our ears the things in the world round about us are brought into our souls; and we react one way or another to that which is brought into our souls.

We taste the world and that which is in it. We delight in what we taste or else we spew it out of our mouths in disgust. But whether the taste is pleasing or not, it is through our tongues and the sensation of taste that we further explore the world in which we live and come in contact with that which it contains. Similarly we smell the world; and its aromas touch our souls with pleasure or with sickening displeasure. We interpret that which we experience through the sensation of smell as a stench or as a fresh, exhilarating smell. But he who cannot smell that which is in the world — both the perfumes of the flowers and the stench of decomposing matter — is cut off from much of that which is in this world.

And, of course, we touch the world with the sensation of feeling. We are able to feel — as well as see — whether the things in the world are rough or smooth. But we also experience whether they are wet or dry, whether they are cold or hot. And, for one who has lost his faculty of sight, this sense of feeling serves to acquaint him with the size and shape of the things near him.

Marvelously were we made!

What atheistic philosophy to believe that all these delicate sensations and valuable faculties came into being by an evolutionistic process as man evolved from creatures — plants for example — which do not have these abilities! What atheistic nonsense that man, who, even by the evolutionist, is considered to be the acme of earthly creatures, should evolve into a being in which these faculties are far less keen than in the beasts from which they evolved. Indeed there must be some "*devolution*" along with the evolution. Who can deny that the sense of smell, of hearing of sight and of taste are far more delicate in many beasts than it is in man? Nay, but we were made by an ALL-wise God and made in His image.

Of Him we read frequently that He sees, hears, tastes and smells. The first two, no doubt, will not be questioned. But let us quote a few verses of Holy Writ to substantiate this claim that we so read of Him. Genesis 1:31, "And God saw every thing that He had made, and, behold, it was very good." Or again in Psalm 33:13, "The Lord looketh from heaven; He beholdeth all the sons of men." In that same vein in Genesis 6:5, "And God saw that the wickedness of man was very great in the earth. That He hears is stated in such passages as Psalm 116:1, "I love the Lord, because He hath heard my voice and my supplication." Were that not the case, that God hears us, all prayer would indeed be folly. But Solomon prays to God, "If any man trespass against his neighbour, and an oath be laid upon him to cause him to swear, and the oath come before thine altar in this house: Then hear Thou in heaven, and do and judge Thy servants." I Kings 8:31, 32.

That He tastes and smells are also mentioned although not so frequently. These sensations are not presented literally (that is, of tasting) nor as clearly, therefore, as those of sight and hearing. We do read in Revelation 3:14-16, "And unto the angel of the Church of the Laodiceans write: . . . I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou were cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth." The implication of tasting that they are neither hot nor cold is strongly made here. And, of course, with God these experiences are not as with man. He does not see, hear, feel, smell and taste as man does. Nevertheless these expressions indicate that He knows the whole of His creation fully, experiencing all that which He causes to take place in it. As far as smelling is concerned, we do have the literal state-

ment, "And the Lord smelled a sweet savour; and the Lord said in His heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake" Genesis 8:21.

But what interests us especially, as we consider this matter of being *spiritually* sensitive, is that Scripture speaks thus of us as far as our spiritual life is concerned. We see, hear, taste, smell and touch spiritual things. And we have spiritual sensations. We would, therefore, call your attention to a few passages of Holy Writ that express these things.

A combination of two of these spiritual experiences when the things of spiritual world enter our souls is found in Psalm 34:8, "O taste and see that the Lord is good: blessed is the man that trusteth in Him," the psalmist declares. Note that by the word "trust" he indicates that it is the act of faith whereby we taste and see that God is good. Similarly in the Netherlands confession, article XXXV, we read that faith "is the hand and mouth of our soul." This matter of seeing is again presented in John 3:3 where Jesus says, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." That kingdom is a spiritual reality, and those who have not been born again have no spiritual eye. They, therefore, cannot see this spiritual reality and cannot believe that there is such a kingdom. Spiritually they are blind; and to them it is as though there were no such kingdom.

In Hebrews 6:4-6, we read of "tasting the good word." The author writes, "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, And have tasted the good Word of God . . . if they shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame."

In Hebrews 5:11 the author speaks of being "dull of hearing" and in Hebrews 5:14, he speaks of those who "by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil."

In Philippians 1:9, 10 the apostle Paul has this to say, "And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and all judgment; That ye may approve things that are excellent (or as in the original, things that differ); that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ."

There is, therefore, a certain spiritual sensitivity.

This is not something that is peculiar to the child of God. Also amongst the unregenerated there is a certain experience of spiritual things. Only the reaction is the opposite in the regenerated from what it is in the unregenerated. That is true even of us as far as our physical sensitivity is concerned. What to the eye of one may be a breathtaking scene, full of color and grandeur, may leave another cold. What may be a very pleasing and stimulating flavor to one, may be ex-

tremely distasteful to others. One likes his steak well done; the other prefers it rare. The one relishes an onion or even garlic flavor; the other would find his food spoiled by this addition. The one finds this perfume too sweet and sickening; the other finds it just what his nostrils desire. The one likes it hot; the other likes it cold. The one is moved to tears by music that makes no impression at all on others. And so it goes. It is not strange, then, when there are those who feel as the Psalmist when in Psalm 119:136 he declares, "Rivers of water run down mine eyes, because they keep not Thy law," while there are others who rejoice and celebrate when God's law is not kept. The one is a regenerated child of God who has the eye, the ear, the tongue of faith which delights only in that which is good in God's sight and to His glory. The other's heart and mind is under the power of Satan and of sin so that his eye, his ear, his tongue, his nose and hand can reach out only toward wickedness.

And you . . . ? How spiritually sensitive are you?

Does the lie have to be presented in its strongest form before you can smell that it is a lie? Does a work have to be one of bold, blunt and extremely obvious wickedness before you can see that it is not according to God's law? Can you hear things that insult the Living God and not realize that such is the case?

And does wickedness cause you to shudder or to laugh? Are you attracted to the lie or do you wish to stop up your ears when it is proclaimed and propagated?

We wish to say more about these things next time, the Lord willing, and to point out that we and our children can be and should be trained in our spiritual sensitivity that we be not "dull of hearing" as the author of the epistle to the Hebrews states but instead those "who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil."

J.A.H.

IN MEMORIAM

We hereby wish to express our sympathy with our fellow member, Mrs. Harriet Lubbers, in the death of her Father,

GERRIT KLOMP, aged 86 years.

May the Father of all mercies comfort the bereaved by pointing them to His faithful promises of the resurrection from the dead.—I Cor. 15:55-57.

The Ladies' Society of the Hudsonville
Protestant Reformed Church:

Rev. Gerrit Vos, President
Mrs. Peter J. Lubbers,
Assistant Secr.-treasurer

Contending For The Faith

The Church and the Sacraments

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

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE

INNOCENT AND THE PAPACY (1198-1216 A.D.)

In Germany, Innocent became the umpire of the imperial election. The electors were divided between two aspirants to the throne, Philip of Swabia, the brother of Henry VI, who was crowned at Mainz, and Otto, the son of Henry the Lion, who was crowned at Aachen by Adolf, archbishop of Cologne. Otto was the nephew of Richard Coeur de Lion and John of England, who supported his claims with their gold and diplomacy. Both parties made their appeal to Rome, and it is not a matter of surprise that Innocent's sympathies were with the Guelf, Otto, rather than with the Hohenstaufen. Moreover, Philip had given offence by occupying, as duke of Tuscany, the estates of Matilda.

Innocent made the high claim that the German throne depended for its occupant "from the beginning and ultimately" upon the decision of the papal see. Had not the Church transferred the empire from the East to the West? And had not the Church itself conferred the imperial crown, passing by the claims of Frederick and pronouncing Philip "unworthy of empire?" Innocent decided in 1201 in favor of Otto, "his dearest son in Christ who was himself devoted to the Church and on both sides was descended from devout stock." The decision inured to Rome's advantage. By the stipulation of Neuss, subsequently repeated at Spire, 1209, Otto promised obedience to the pope and renounced all claim to dominion in the State of the Church and also to Naples and Sicily. This written document was a dangerous ratification of the real or pretended territorial rights and privileges of the papacy from Constantine and Pepin down.

Civil war broke out, and when the tide of success turned in Philip's favor, the pope released him from the sentence of excommunication and was about to acknowledge him as emperor. (The very archbishop of Cologne who had crowned Otto now put the crown on Philip's head) when the murderous sword of Otto of Wittelsbach, in 1208, brought Philip's career to a tragic end. The year following Otto was crowned in St. Peter's, but he forgot his promises and proceeded to act out the independent policy of the rival house of the Hohenstaufen (Otto had sought to join the fortunes of the two houses by marrying Philip's daughter, Beatrice, who died soon after the nuptials). He laid heavy hand upon Central Italy, distributing rich estates and provinces among his vassals and sequestering the revenues of the clergy. He then marched to Southern Italy, the territory of Frederick, and received the surrender of Naples.

All that Innocent had gained seemed in danger of being

lost. Prompt measures showed him equal to the emergency. He wrote that the stone he had erected to be the head of the corner had become a rock of offence. Like Rachel he mourned over his son whom he lamented to have made king Otto was excommunicated and a meeting of magnates at Nurnberg, 1211, declared him deposed, and, pronouncing in favor of Frederick, sent envoys to Palermo to convey to him the intelligence. Otto crossed the Alps to reclaim his power, but it was too late. Frederick started north, stopping at Rome, where Innocent saw him for the first and last time, April, 1212. He was elected and crowned king at Frankfurt, December, 1212, and was recognized by nearly all the princes at Eger the year following. Before setting out from Italy he had again recognized Sicily as a fief of Rome. At Eger he disavowed all imperial right to the State of the Church.

Otto joined in league with John of England and the Flemish princes against Philip Augustus of France; but his hopes were dashed to the ground on the battlefield of Bouvines, Belgium, 1215. His authority was thenceforth confined to his ancestral estate. He died 1218. Innocent had gained the day. His successors were to be defied by the young king, Frederick, for nearly half a century. (The Roman Catholic Church claims that the power of the pope is spiritual, that he ruled over the nations of the world also by his spiritual power as the vicar of Christ upon this earth. However, how often is it not true that the pope's power and influence upon and control of worldly monarchs did not lie in his spiritual power but in the fact that he could exercise over them the sword power of this world? This was true of Gregory VII and also of Innocent III. And, incidentally, this lies in the nature of the case. It is simply a fact that he could not have received from Christ his authority and power to rule over earthly monarchs, and this for the simple reason that Christ did not delegate to the pope such powers. Hence, the pope's power was simply a power which he usurped unto himself and which he therefore could never exercise except with the force of arms. — H.V.).

With equal spirit and decision, Innocent mingled in the affairs of the other states of Europe. In France, the controversy was over the sanctity of the marriage vow. Philip Augustus put away his second wife, a Danish princess, a few months after their marriage, and took the fair Agnes of Meran in her stead. The French bishops, on the plea of remote consanguinity, justified the divorce. But Innocent, listening to the appeals of Ingeborg, and placing France under the interdict, forced the king to take her back. (Notice, once more, that the power of the pope, also in this case, was purely external).

The Christian states of the Spanish peninsula felt the pontiff's strong hand. The kingdom of Leon was kept under the interdict five years till Alfonso IX consented to dismiss his wife on account of blood relationship. Pedro, king of Aragon, a model of Spanish chivalry, received his crown at Rome in 1204 and made his realm a fief of the Apostolic see.

Sancho, king of the newly risen kingdom of Portugal, was defeated in his effort to break away from the pope's suzerainty.

In the North, Sweden accepted Innocent's decision in favor of the house of Schwerker, and the Danish king, who was attempting to reduce the tribes along the Baltic to Christianity, was protected by the pope's threat of interdict upon all molesting his realm. The king of England was humbled to the dust by Innocent's word. To the king of Scotland a legate was sent and a valuable sword. Even Iceland is said to have been the subject of Innocent's thought and action.

In the Southeast, Johannitus of Bulgaria received from Innocent his crown after bowing before his rebuke for having ventured to accept it from Philip of Swabia. Ottoker, prince of Bohemia, was anointed by the papal legate, and Emmeric of Hungary made a vow to lead a crusade, which his brother Andrew executed. Thus all the states of Europe west of Russian were made to feel the supremacy of the papal power. The conquest of Constantinople and the Holy Land, as we shall see, occupied an equal share of attention from this tireless and masterful ruler, and the establishment of the Latin Empire of Constantinople, 1205, was regarded as a signal triumph for the papal policy.

Innocent and King John of England.

Under Innocent, England comes, if possible, into greater prominence in the history of the papacy than during the controversy in the reign of Alexander III, a generation before. Then the English actors were Henry II and Thomas à Becket. Now they are Henry's son John and Becket's successor Stephen Langton. The pope was victorious, inflicting the deepest humiliation upon the English king; but he afterwards lost the advantage he had gained by supporting John against his barons and denouncing the Magna Charta of English popular rights. The controversy forms one of the most interesting episodes of English history.

John, surnamed Sansterre or Lackland, 1167-1216, succeeded his brother Richard I on the throne, 1199. A man of decided ability and rapid in action but of ignoble spirit, low morals, and despotic temper, he brought upon his realm such disgrace as England before or since has not suffered. His reign was a succession of wrongs and insults to the English people and the English church.

John had joined Richard in a revolt against their father, sought to displace his brother on the throne during his captivity after the Third Crusade, and was generally believed by contemporaries to have put to death his brother Geoffrey's son, Arthur of Brittany, who would have been Richard's successor if the law of primogeniture had been followed. He lost Normandy, Anjou, Maine, and Aquitaine to the English. Perjury was no barrier to the accomplishment of his plans. He set aside one wife and was faithless to another. No woman was too well born to be safe against his advances. He

plundered churches and convents to pay his debts and satisfy his avarice, and yet he never undertook a journey without hanging charms around his neck. The contemporary annalists know no words too black to describe John's character. Lingard says, "John stands before us polluted with meanness, cruelty, perjury, murder, and unbridled licentiousness." Green, after quoting the words "foul as hell is, hell itself is defiled with the foul presence of John," says, "in his inner soul John was the worst outcome of the Angevins . . . But with the wickedness of his race he inherited its profound abilities." Hunt uses these words, "He was mean, false, vindictive, abominably cruel, and scandalously immoral."

Innocent came into collision with John over the selection of a successor to Archbishop Hubert of Canterbury, who died 1205. The monks of Canterbury, exercising an ancient privilege, chose Reginald one of their number. With the king's support, a minority proceeded to another election and chose the king's nominee, John de Grey, bishop of Norwich. John was recognized by the suffragan bishops and put into possession by the king.

An appeal was made by both parties to Rome, Reginald appearing there in person. After a delay of a year, Innocent set aside both elections and ordered the Canterbury monks, present in Rome, to proceed to the choice of another candidate. The choice fell upon Stephen Langton, cardinal of Chrysogonus. Born on English soil, Stephen was a man of indisputable learning and moral worth. He had studied in Paris and won by his merits prebends in the cathedral churches of Paris and York. The metropolitan dignity could have been intrusted to no shoulders more worthy of wearing it. His scholarly tastes are attested by his sermons, poems, and comments on books of the Bible which still exist in the libraries of Oxford, Cambridge, Lambeth, and of France. He is falsely credited by some with having been the first to divide the entire Bible into chapters. While he has no title to saintship like à Becket, or to theological genius like Anselm, Langton will always occupy a place among the foremost of England's primates as a faithful administrator and the advocate of English popular liberties.

The new archbishop received consecration at the pope's own hand, June 17, 1207, and held his office till his death, 1228. Innocent, in his letter to John of May 26, 1207, declared he would turn neither to the right nor to the left in confirming the election. The English king met the notification with fierce resistance, confiscated the property of the Canterbury chapter, and expelled the monks as guilty of treason. Innocent replied with the threat of the interdict. The king swore by God's teeth (one of John's favorite forms of ob-jurgation) to follow the censure, if pronounced, with the mutilation of every Italian in the realm appointed by Innocent, and the expulsion of all the prelates and clergy. The sentence was published by the bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester, March 22, 1208. They then fled the kingdom.

H.V.

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

Article 16 (continued)

Before proceeding with our exposition of this article, we want to call attention to the fact that this accusation, that Reformed doctrine makes of man a stock and block, has come to be used as a sort of bogey-man, and that too, rather successfully in some cases. For some reason, possibly because of a faulty understanding of this accusation and of the truth over against it, there are those who are rather easily frightened out of their Reformed position by this charge. Instead of standing their ground and gainsaying the charging of the enemy, they give up the battle when this charge is brought against them rather easily, and soon acknowledge that after all there remains some good in man and that this good is a contributing factor in his salvation, more specifically in his regeneration and conversion. They admit then that natural man can seek, desire, long for, and even pray for his salvation. They will grant that man must walk in the covenant way in order to be received into God's covenant, and that the former is prior to the latter. Thus they beat a hasty retreat from the sound Reformed position. And thus they adopt the Arminian position, which, of course, is the very purpose of those who bring this accusation.

Let us notice, however, by way of general comment on this article, that it is not the purpose of our fathers whatsoever to retreat from their Reformed position. They neither change their teaching concerning the corruption of the natural man, nor compromise their doctrine concerning the strictly sovereign and efficacious operation of the grace of God unto the conversion of the totally depraved sinner. And on the other hand, they refuse to grant that there is any truth whatsoever in the accusation that they by their doctrine make of man a stock and block. They completely deny that the charge has any validity at all. In fact, at the very basis of the fathers' answer to this charge in Article 16 is the fact that the charge is an impossible one. The terms "man" and "stock and block" are in the fathers' view mutually exclusive. There is no such thing as a man that is a stock and block. And finally, the fathers make it plain that anyone who brings such a charge either against the Reformed doctrine of man's total depravity or against the Reformed doctrine of regeneration and conversion is guilty of a misunderstanding and misconstruction of those doctrines, either wilfully or inadvertently. With that in mind, let us look at some of the details of this paragraph a bit more closely.

Probably the first question we ought to ask is: what is

meant by the expression "stock and block"? The very expression has come to carry a certain derogatory connotation when applied to one's doctrine concerning man. And while it may be granted perhaps that the meaning of the term is rather self-evident, it is nevertheless well that we give careful account of its meaning. The expression, as is also plain from this article by inference, denotes a creature without intellect and will, one without any self-consciousness and without any self-determination. A creature that is utterly and passively subject to the will of another, so that it is in its very nature incapable of any rational and volitional activity, incapable of thinking and willing, incapable of any self-determined activity, — that is a stock and block. The terms that are used in the Latin refer in the first instance to a log or trunk or stem of a tree. Hence, we may conclude that when this charge is registered against the Reformed truth concerning man's fallen state and his conversion, it means that according to the Reformed view, fallen man is really without intellect and will, without the power to think and to determine and to choose, without the power of any self-conscious activity, just as a log is without such power or just as a tree is devoid of any such power. And it also means that in the whole work of his regeneration and conversion man is also incapable of any self-conscious activity and self-determination, any thinking and willing action, just as such a log or tree. When man, — such is the idea, or rather, the caricature of the Reformed truth which this charge intends to convey, — is translated out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son, that whole work is to be compared in every respect to the moving of a log from one place to another. When man is converted and brings forth the fruit of faith and repentance and good works, then he does that just as a tree brings forth fruit, without any conscious and volitional and purposeful activity.

Now what is the fallacy of this charge?

It is this, that it simply assumes that the creature man can be changed as a creature into a stock and block. Or rather, it assumes that such a change of man from one kind of creature (rational and moral) into another kind of creature (non-rational and non-moral) is even conceivable. And it wildly charges our Reformed fathers with that same impossible assumption. That, in the first place. In the second place, it simply assumes that a creature upon whom God operates sovereignly and efficaciously must needs be a stock and block, — that a stock and block is the only kind of creature that can be the object of grace that is absolutely sovereign and efficacious. It is indeed passing strange that men will grant that the existence and activity of a stone or a tree or any other brute creature can be subject to God's sovereign control and direction, but that a man, just because he is a creature with mind and will, cannot be subject to such sovereign control and direction of the Almighty. But such is indeed the assumption of this charge of the Arminians. And in the third place, it is obvious that the Arminians wilfully

confuse man's essential nature as creature with the spiritual, moral state and condition of that nature. They confuse the formal with the spiritual. In their view, it is impossible that a thinking and willing creature can be a creature of totally evil mind and will, a creature incapable in that very mind and will of thinking, willing, or doing the good. In their view, it is also impossible that a creature with mind and will can be so totally corrupt in his mind and will that the only way out for him is that his totally corrupt mind and will be sovereignly and efficaciously changed into a good mind and will. But we may well ask: where is the conflict in the Reformed conception? Where is the problem? If it is conceivable that a tree, a creature without mind and will, exists, grows, produces fruit, and undergoes all the changes attendant upon a tree's existence should exist and develop strictly within the confines of God's sovereign determination and operation, why should that not also be conceivable of a man, a creature with mind and will? Why should that be thought a thing impossible, — except it be, of course, that sinful man does not want the absolutely sovereign God? This is the very crux of the matter. This charge of the Arminians is as sinful as it is absurd! And in this case the fathers answer the fool according to his folly.

In the first place, they maintain that man through the fall did not cease to be, but remained man, a creature endowed with intellect and will. Sin is a spiritual, ethical reality. And therefore sin, when it pervaded the entire human race, did not deprive man of his essential nature as man. All that sin could do was to affect man from a spiritual, ethical point of view. And this it did: that man, with a man's nature, sin depraved and spiritually slew, so that he, with all his heart and mind and soul and strength, was changed from a good and righteous and holy man to an evil and guilty and corrupt man. The result was therefore not that man could no more think and will and act at all, but that he could only think and will and act the evil. All this we have observed before, even as the *Canons* have treated this subject in connection with man's natural light.

Hence, the first proposition in the answer of this article may be briefly formulated as follows: Sin indeed operates in men as a spiritual, ethical power unto depravity and spiritual death; but it operates as in men, not as in stocks and blocks.

From this the second proposition follows: The divine grace of regeneration operates in elect men efficaciously (irresistibly) and sovereignly; but when it operates, it operates as in men, not as in stocks and blocks.

The principle is that through all the spiritual, ethical changes which a man undergoes he always remains a man. When he stands in original righteousness in Paradise, he does so as a rational, moral creature. When he falls into total depravity and spiritual death, he does so as a rational, moral creature. And when he is restored and raised unto life in Christ through sovereign grace, also this change comes upon him as a rational, moral creature.

What is implied in this operation as far as man's rational, moral nature itself is concerned? The following:

1. The will and its properties are not taken away. When God's grace operates, man is not deprived of his will. Nor is he deprived, even temporarily of the properties of his will, that is, the power to determine and to choose. The very opposite is true. Man's will and its properties remains very much in the picture. It is exactly that will that is the object of God's gracious and efficacious work. And because it is the will itself that is the object of God's operation, it can never be said that God forcibly compels the will of man against its own desire. The power of God's grace is not compelling, but impelling. God's grace does not act as an obstruction or blockade on the path of man's will; it operates internally, changing the will.

2. The nature of that change is such that in the spiritual, ethical sense of the word that will is quickened, healed, corrected, and powerfully turned from within. Hence, the change of conversion is never unpleasant, though it is efficacious. Unpleasant it would indeed be if God's grace treated man as a creature without will and intellect when he had a will and mind. Unpleasant in the extreme would conversion be if man's will were not touched by the power of God's grace while he was nevertheless forced to go in the way of God's commandments. But now God changes the sinner out of his unwillingness and perverseness into a willing and docile and humble and obedient and believing child of His. Mark you well, God changes him. And He does it alone! Man contributes absolutely nothing toward that change. But God always deals with His creatures according to the nature which He Himself gave that creature in creation. He deals with man as with a man, whether in the state of rectitude, or in his fallen state, or in grace. And when in absolutely sovereign grace God deals with the rational, moral creature, man, and converts him, then he attains to the true and spiritual renewal and freedom of the will. In deed, if one would speak of a free will, then he must not only speak of that formal and psychological freedom of the will which is spiritually bondage, but he must speak of the true spiritual freedom, the liberation from the power of sin and death.

Finally, the article calls attention to the crucial importance of this truth. It as it were places us before the alternative of this blessed truth of free and sovereign grace or utter hopelessness as far as any way out of the bondage of sin and death is concerned. In other words, one may talk about stock and blocks, and bring all kinds of objections against the truth of God's sovereign grace. But when he stands face to face with the stark reality of his own total depravity and the hopelessness of his spiritual death, then there is only one way out, and he shall have to acknowledge it. He plunged himself into ruin through a free will. But he can never extricate himself from that ruin by the same free will. Unless the admirable Artificer of every good deals in this manner with us, there is no hope.

H.C.H.

DECENCY and ORDER

Sovereignty Denied (??)

In concluding our answer to the writings of Rev. M. MacKay, we desire to briefly comment upon his last article, appearing in the September, 1957 issue of the *Contender*, and in which he attempts to show that those who maintain the principle of separation between church and state are guilty of denying the Sovereignty of God!

This is a very serious charge!

If this indictment had any truth in it, a complete revision of our position on church and state would be mandatory and a change of our Confession demanded at the earliest possible moment. Just that serious is the matter!

However, we hasten to add that the writings in the *Contender* attempting to prove these charges are far from convincing. They are a big disappointment. McKay writes:

"Furthermore, those who believe in the separation of church and state (for example the Chr. Reformed Church and the Protestant Reformed Church(es) whose 1910 statement is chiefly devoted to criticising the historic Presbyterian and Reformed doctrine of church and state, and then briefly contradicts itself by inserting the remark that it believes that the state has an obligation to the first table of the Ten Commandments) *do not believe in the absolute sovereignty of God* for they would limit the acknowledgement which the state is morally bound to render to God." (italics ours).

Not only does the author fail to prove this charge but the charge itself is based on a false inference and interpretation of the 1910 statement and, therefore, cannot be proven. For this our readers may refer to our previous article.

Then, too, the author veers from the main point in question (which is whether the church, by maintaining that church and state are separate institutions, each sovereign in their own sphere and morally responsible in that sphere, denies the absolute sovereignty of God) and devotes the largest share of his article to discussing the question of the relationship between the sovereignty of God and human responsibility. In connection with this discussion he does us serious injustice and places us in an altogether wrong light before the readers of *The Contender*.

Unjustly he charges us with "*fatalism*" when he writes: "We were not questioning or denying the fact that GOD IS GOD, as Mr. Vanden Berg puts it, that is, God's absolute sovereignty over men and nations. Now what does this mean if it does not mean that Mr. Vanden Berg is veering sharply in the direction of fatalism? If not, why would he make such a statement? As we said before, we do not question the fact of God's sovereignty, — we are concerned only with

man's *denial* of the fact. What can be taken out of Mr. Vanden Berg's reasoning but that he would make man's experience to be of no significant account? This is the essence of fatalism, whether it be that of Mohammedanism or of a perversion of Christianity."

Then again he charges: "The tendency of Mr. Vanden Berg to veer off in the direction of fatalism is seen in still another way. This is in connection with the acknowledged fact that sin has rendered man from the time of Adam onward *unable* to do what he ought to do, that is, what God commands him to do in His eternal law, the Ten Commandments. Now there is no disagreement between Mr. Vanden Berg and *The Contender* on the fact of such inability. Mr. Vanden Berg's fatalism is seen — not in stating the fact itself — but in his attitude toward this fact."

Still later MacKay, although he lacks the courage to do so outrightly, feigns to charge us with Barthianism. We quote: "We cannot help but see a certain philosophical resemblance between Barthianism and the way Mr. Vanden Berg's position reveals itself. The Bible tells us that it is sin, and sin alone, which has separated man from God, and set up the woeful train of consequences which has plagued this planet since Adam. However, Barthianism, in its professed zeal to maintain God as the *Altogether-Other* One, — His transcendent greatness — has tried to portray the gulf that separates man from God as a metaphysical gulf rather than a moral (sin-caused) gulf. That is to say, Barthianism tries to make out that the distance between man and God is one of creation or nature rather than of morality. Now Mr. Vanden Berg veers off somewhat — though not altogether — in the same direction. This tendency is seen in fatalism as in Barthianism. This is, it would teach that God is so *great* that what separates Him from man is man's *natural smallness* as well as his sin. This is found also in the fatalism of Mohammedanism. Of course, Mr. Vanden Berg does not deny at all that sin has separated man from God. But this other '*angle*' is also at work in Mr. Vanden Berg's thinking And it is dangerous too."

The author then continues to assert that our position fails "to give due consideration to what the Bible says about the condescension of God" and that it tends "to disparage man, putting him in an unnecessary bondage." Then he concludes by saying, "It only goes to show that where there is an *imbalance* in the doctrines of God and man, and their relationships, the net result is a sure loss in that true spiritual freedom wherewith Christ came to set us free."

Space does not permit us to quote more of *The Contender*. For those of our readers who may be interested, a year's subscription to *The Contender* can be had for only one dollar. Undersigned will gladly furnish you with the address.

The allegations contained in the above writings we emphatically deny and we are also convinced that MacKay puts us in a wrong light when he so falsifies our position before

the mind of his readers. We are not interested in answering all these charges since that would involve endless repetition of what we have already written in this series. Our former articles speak for themselves and we are satisfied to leave *The Standard Bearer* readers judge for themselves the validity of these accusations.

We are interested in bringing this discussion to a conclusion in order that we may proceed with our treatment of the articles of our church order. In doing this we wish to present a brief summation of the issue here:

1. Both *The Contender* and we are in agreement with respect to the matter of the *fact of the sovereignty of God*.

2. I believe that we are also basically agreed on the matter of *acknowledging that fact* and that if MacKay would correctly evaluate our position instead of drawing from it false inferences and conclusions, he would also see that. No where did we ever write that the state, the civil authorities, are *not obliged* to acknowledge the fact of God's absolute sovereignty and, this implies of course, to conduct the affairs of the state in harmony with that acknowledgment. We are agreed with *The Contender's* criticism of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the U.S.A., which, in substance, asserts that the state is to be neutral in things pertaining to God. Of course there is no Scriptural basis for that position. However, our contention with MacKay does not arise on this point but rather commences when he attempts to read the same interpretation into the Statement of 1910, appended to Art. 36 of our Confession, as he reads in the U.S. Constitution. Our previous article treated this matter and we need not repeat here. The Constitution and the Statement of 1910 are not the same and it is unjust to read them as though they were. Here MacKay is in error!

3. In the main we can agree with MacKay when he writes that the "relationship between God's Sovereignty and man's responsibility is an awesome and insolvable mystery." We have sent him a copy of a lecture on the subject, delivered by the Rev. R. Veldman, and will await his reaction. For the rest, our particular department in *The Standard Bearer* is not the proper place to elaborate upon this subject. Much has been said and written about this within our circles in the past and most of our readers, we assume, are familiar with the views we have always taken on the matter. Though it is true, as MacKay writes, that a wrong emphasis on "man's responsibility" results in Arminianism and a false emphasis on "Divine Sovereignty" leads to fatalism, we deny that our position is either Arminian or fatalistic. That MacKay misinterprets our position and then proceeds to ascribe fatalistic conclusions to this interpretation does not make us fatalists!

4. MacKay's conclusion that we deny moral obligation on the basis of man's inability is entirely unwarranted. He argues that we reason away God's demand upon the sinner from the fact of man's inability to keep that demand. We

refer him to Lord's Day 4 of our Heidelberg Catechism and also to our article in the November 1, 1957 issue of *The Standard Bearer*.

5. In conclusion, we must say that we hope to hear again from MacKay on this matter and, particularly: (a) of his defence of the position of church and state expressed in the Westminster Confession and, (b) of his admission that he has publicly falsified our position on the subject when he read into it heresies it never expressed.

Next time then, D.V., we will begin to discuss the 31st Article of our Church Order.

G.V.D.B.

Report of Eastern Ladies' League

The Fall meeting of the Eastern Ladies League was held at our Hudsonville Prot. Ref. Church the evening of October 24, 1957.

The meeting was opened by singing Psalter No. 88 and Psalm 89:1, after which our president, Mrs. M. Jonker, read Proverbs 4 and lead us in prayer. She extended a word of welcome to all the ladies present. Mrs. E. Cammenga from our Holland church favored us with a vocal solo entitled, "Great is Thy Faithfulness."

The president then introduced our speaker, Rev. R. Veldman, who following a suggestion from the Delegate Board, spoke on the subject he had treated at the Young People's Convention, "Obedience in the Home." He spoke from the viewpoint of the child, and asked that we together take the position that we are talking to our Covenant young people.

He called our attention to the fact that this is a timely subject, since there is much disrespect, adolescent conceit, and back talk in the home, as well as in the school.

We parents are also far from perfect, often too carnal, money-minded, and pleasure mad to be concerned about obedience from our children. But despite failings of parents, children are called upon to obey. Disobedience to parents and superiors is forbidden in many places in Scripture, and our Communion Form forbids the disobedient to come to the Lord's Table, as well as murderers and drunkards. "Honor thy father and thy mother" is the first commandment with promise.

Authority implies the right to command discipline. Christian discipline is so difficult. It is subject to God's law. Parents must love. They must not be abusive; but a cool head, a warm heart and much prayer is required. Parents need the forgiveness of their children too at times. Parents must also be obedient, faithful to their calling, so that their children are able to respect them. If parents cannot obey their superiors, they cannot expect obedience from their children.

(Continued on page 96)

ALL AROUND US

Notes from the Baptist Examiner.

A brother, colleague in the ministry, sent me several samples of the publication called *The Baptist Examiner*, a paper published in Kentucky and edited by Bob L. Ross and John R. Gilpin. Our sincere thanks for this kindness.

The papers which we read contained several remarkable articles, all of which clearly indicate the position of the writers as being strongly opposed to every semblance of Arminianism. A striking example of this we noticed in an editorial written by Bob L. Ross. The editorial contained the following sub-titles: Salvation By The Grace of the Devil, Unconditional Salvation, Good Works Necessary, and God Saves Against the Old Will. We are republishing the editorial exactly as it was written, and trust that our readers will appreciate what is good in it. Here follows the editorial:

SALVATION BY THE GRACE OF THE DEVIL

The BIBLE TEACHES salvation by the grace of God (Ephesians 2:8-10). The Arminians teach that salvation is by the grace of the Devil, and here is how:

The Arminians teach that God does all He can possibly do to save all men without an exception; but the Devil's power holds a great number from God, and they go to Hell. In the words of the rank Arminian, Noel Smith, "God Almighty Himself couldn't save them! He did all He could. He failed."

Now, if the Devil can keep sinners from being saved, then his power is certainly greater than God's and he could keep everybody from being saved, if he so desired. But some men get saved and go to Heaven, so the Devil must have permitted their salvation, for he could have blocked it. This simply means that all that get saved are saved by the grace of the Devil, and they go to Heaven, evidently because the Devil wouldn't have them in Hell.

That is certainly some "salvation" which the Arminians preach. The Bible teaches us of a great salvation, however. It teaches us of salvation by the sovereign, eternal, immutable, elective grace of God. This grace brings salvation and gives it unto the elect of God. (II Thessalonians 2:13, 14). How would you rather be saved: by the grace of the Devil, or by the grace of God?

* * * *

UNCONDITIONAL SALVATION

There ARE NO meritorious acts whereby salvation is gained. God is not in the business of peddling His grace upon certain conditions. Merit-mongers despise salvation by grace, and the God of all grace equally despises the doctrine of salvation by human effort.

There are no meritorious conditions to salvation. God does not say, "I will save you, if you perform such and such an act." That would be salvation by works.

Furthermore, it would be a denial of man's total depravity and inability (John 6:44, Ephesians 2:1). Grace *brings* salvation to the spiritually helpless sinner. Some Baptists refer to repentance and faith as "conditions" of salvation. But if salvation is conditioned upon the sinner in the very beginning, then why not all the way to the end? Repentance and faith are not *conditions* to salvation; they are the means of God in bringing His people from sin unto Christ. I say the "means of God," for repentance and faith are "inseparable graces, wrought in our souls by the *regenerating Spirit of God*." (Baptist Confession of Faith, New Hampshire). The elect do not of themselves perform repentance and faith, but the Spirit produces these graces in the elect, "in connection with divine truth."

Our salvation is conditioned upon one only, even our God. If we, as helpless sinners, are to be saved, it depends entirely upon Him. We are what we are "by the grace of God." (I Corinthians 15:10).

* * * *

GOOD WORKS NECESSARY

Works ARE NOT necessary to *obtain* salvation, for salvation is the gift of grace (Ephesians 2:8, 9). But works are necessary as an *evidence* of election and salvation.

The person who professes to be elect or to be a Christian, yet has no works, and no hunger for righteousness, has no evidence of his election or salvation. Without repentance and faith, no one can lay claim to salvation through Christ. Without a holy walk in life, no one can lay claim to having repented and believed. Understand, these things do not obtain or merit salvation; they simply evidence salvation. They are the fruits of the Word sown in "good ground." The seed was first sown, then came the fruits.

The free-willers and merit-mongers reverse this order; they have the fruits before the seed. They are endeavoring to merit or gain salvation by works. But John the Baptist taught that "fruits" were an evidence. Paul said we are created "unto good works" (Ephesians 2:10). All *good* works are the fruit of the Spirit's work. No good thing can come from the flesh. Thus, every good work is of God. If we do it, it was wrought in us by Him. All praise goes back to His throne, no flesh can glory!

* * * *

GOD SAVES AGAINST THE OLD WILL

The WILL is nothing more than the expression of one's nature. Man's nature is sinful, so he wills to sin. Since man's **nature is void of any spiritual good** ("no good thing in the flesh" — Romans 7:13), then man cannot have a will to do that which is spiritually good. He will never have a will to

repent, nor a will to believe; he has only a will to sin, for his nature is totally depraved by sin.

When God saves the sinner, the Spirit quickens to life (Ephesians 2:1, John 6:63). This imparts to the sinner a *new nature*. This new nature is a divine nature, being given by God. Thus, the person will have a *new will*. His will will then be to love godliness and hate iniquity. This will opposes the old nature's will. This will leads to repentance of sin, and faith in Christ. It continues to cry out for righteousness, and there is a continual warfare between the two natures — the old and the new. (Romans 7:14-25). The old remains unchanged. The new wars against the old nature's lusts, and puts them down.

What has happened? God has saved a sinner *against* his old nature's will. God has "made" one willing, by imparting to him a new nature. The old nature "will not come" to Christ; but by giving a sinner a new nature, God works in "him both to will and to do His good pleasure." (Philippians 2:14).

* * * *

Though we would express ourselves quite differently than the writer of the editorial above, we nevertheless appreciate the studied attempt to negate the Arminian argument.

A Brief but Beautiful Meditation.

The Rev. L. Greenway in the November, 1957 issue of *Torch and Trumpet* writes a brief but beautiful meditation based on Ephesians 1:3-5, and entitled: Blessed Be God!

When we say that the meditation is beautiful we are not speaking of it or judging it in the formal sense. The beauty to which we refer is the vibrant Reformed tone that is sounded throughout.

"Blessed be God!" the writer says, is "the keynote of this epistle and particularly of the grand doxology that begins with verse 3 and extends through verse 14."

"To bless," we are told, "literally means 'to speak well.' When God blesses us, he speaks well of us and to us. When we bless God, we speak well of him and to him. However, this is not a reciprocal action. It is not an exchange of favors. *We can never confer a benefit on God!* The creature never remunerates the Creator. Man can never obligate God. It is well to keep that in mind when we talk about doing something for the Lord. Always God is *the* Giver, and we the receivers.

"God blesses. We bless. But when he speaks well to us, he speaks with power — creative power, transforming power. When we speak well of him and to him, we declare that he is good and gracious. He blesses in word and deed, and thereby enables us to proclaim his Name and to acknowledge that he is what he reveals himself to be. We taste that he is good, but he was good before we tasted. Thirsty, we drink of the Fountain. Never does the Fountain drink of us."

That is part of the vibrant Reformed tone to which I referred above and which our Protestant Reformed people love to hear. God is everything. Man nothing. This is indeed a far cry from the anthropocentric presentations so prevalent in the writings even of so-called Reformed men today.

The Reverend Greenway then by way of contrast points out the vast difference between the Scriptural appraisal of goodness and that of the appraisal of modern man. Writes he:

"In this great doxology the apostle recognizes that the most desirable of all blessings are such as are in their nature spiritual, heavenly, and eternal. He speaks of 'every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ.' It is not the fashion of our age to evaluate benefits that way. The modern man is taught to find his supreme god (I presume this is a typographical error of the printer, and should be "good" — M.S.) in things that are physical, earthly, and for this life alone. Much of modern education is geared to that principle. The thing that counts in most class rooms is getting ahead and doing well in this life. The *here* and not the *hereafter* receives the attention. That is all wrong according to the apostle Paul. *The Christian's chief good is his spiritual bounty in Christ.* That is where his happiness lies.

"The Christian has been chosen in Christ. The choice was God's and he made it with the view of conferring benefits such as sinful man does not naturally care for, namely, 'that we should be holy and without blemish before him in love.' Holy means *separated, consecrated, devoted* to God. For this end we were elected. Our selection by God was unto our sanctification before God. We are to be his in the fullest sense of the word — his husbandry, his building, his temple, his living sacrifice, his fruitbearing vine. This was not our choice. It was his!"

The Reverend Greenway then proceeds to show what it means that the divine choice was made "before the foundation of the world," and "according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace." His closing sentence is: "Here, as in all Holy Scripture, God is all and in all."

It was a beautiful meditation, but very brief. Personally I would have liked to have him say more in the following paragraph, which I quote: "Why did he choose us? Was his election a selection of the best? Emphatically not! There is no 'best' among unworthy sinners. Paul's answer is that God chose us 'according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace.' Here, as in all Holy Scripture, God is all and in all." The question that arose in my mind was: Is Rev. Greenway *supra* or *infra* lapsarian? The above paragraph which I quoted makes me suspicious that he is the latter. If this is so, what will he do with the rest of chapter 1 of Ephesians which to my mind thoroughly supports the *supra* view?

M.S.

REPORT OF EASTERN LADIES' LEAGUE

(Continued from page 93)

Young people are still children in relation to parents. Their calling is to honor and obey, not because of fear of punishment, and not only as long as parents are reasonable and right in their actions, but because their authority is from God. The only time we must not obey is when what they require involves us in sin.

Children must love and obey their parents, not only with a natural love, but for God's sake and out of love for God. Show your love in special ways now while they are still with you. Don't be impatient and rebellious or look down on them if they were not able to get the education they work so hard to give you. Uneducated parents sometimes have 1,000 per cent more common sense than their college educated children. Love proves itself best in obedience. We love and honor them more as we get older, and we care for them.

Who can heed this divine command? Not the natural man, but only the children of God redeemed by Him. That is the second part of the Covenant. We are obliged to new obedience, to walk in a new and holy life. If you have transgressed this command and dishonored your parents, confess now and ask God for forgiveness. Do not let them go to the grave with that grief. Pray that yours may be the promise, the heavenly Canaan. Jesus says, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."

A collection for *The Standard Bearer* was taken while we sang Psalter No. 215. The business of the evening was taken care of, after which Mrs. G. Spruyt gave a report on the activities of Eunice Society. of First Church of Grand Rapids. Miss Erma Kortering, from our Holland church, gave a vocal solo entitled "God Hath Not Promised."

The new Board members were introduced, and our president extended a word of thanks to the retiring officers. Mrs. Jonker also thanked the Host Society and all who took part in the program. Psalter No. 373 was sung, and Mrs. M. Schipper led us in a prayer of thanks to God for a spiritually beneficial and enjoyable evening.

Refreshments were served in the church basement.

Elsie Kuiper, Reporter

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST
Zion, on the holy hills,
God, thy Maker, loves thee well;
All thy courts His presence fills,
He delights in thee to dwell.
Wondrous shall thy glory be,
City, blest of God, the Lord;
Nations shall be born in thee,
Unto life from death restored.

Psalms 87:1

Report of Western Ladies' League

On the afternoon of October 4th, 1957, the Western Ladies' League gathered for their fall meeting in the Protestant Reformed Church of Doon, Iowa.

Our meeting was called to order by Vice President, Mrs. G. Van Baren and we opened with the singing of Psalter numbers 251 and 73 and the reading of Psalm 27. Rev. J. A. Heys led in prayer. Our secretary, Mrs. T. Kooiman, read the minutes of the previous meeting and our treasurer, Mrs. S. Broekhuis, gave the treasurer's report. During the singing of number 106 an offering was taken for the Reformed Witness Hour.

Rev. Heys was introduced as the speaker for the afternoon. The theme of the meeting and Rev. Heys text was taken from Isaiah 40:31, "Wait upon the Lord." As children of God we wait upon the Lord for everything — for all of our physical needs and spiritual needs. They that wait *upon* the Lord also wait *for* the Lord, and they trust Him and believe Him and are renewed in their strength and are carried up with wings as eagles. Six texts were quoted which contain words related to and contained in the idea of waiting, namely, Micah 7:7 look unto; Ezekiel 19:5 to see; Psalm 39:7 hope; Psalm 62:5 be silent; I Chronicles 6:33 stand still; Numbers 8:24 serve; and Acts 10:7 persevere. Therein we have a beautiful picture of waiting upon the Lord. We look intently unto our God for salvation, we see God's revelation, our hope and trust is in Him, we are reverently silent, we stand still that we may hear His Word, we serve Him always and we persevere unto the end. Further to wait upon the Lord means first of all to believe and be sure that Christ is coming and this confidence comes from Him. Then it means that our trust and confidence comes from Him. Then it means that our trust and confidence is in Him *alone*. And lastly our whole attention is focused on that which we expect, namely, His coming, and therefore we walk obediently. As a result those that wait cannot fall away and they *shall* receive that for which they wait, they do not wait in vain. They shall be joyfully satisfied.

Rev. Van Baren answered questions from and in explanation of Ecclesiastes 11:1, Revelation 18:18, Matthew 27:34, I Timothy 2:4 and I Timothy 4:10.

Doon rendered a vocal duet from the Psalms and Edgerton a vocal solo, "Seek Ye the Lord." We closed with the singing of number 213 and Rev. Van Baren offered prayer. The ladies from Hull were our hostesses and served a most delicious lunch during which we enjoyed a social hour.

And so through this meeting also God has renewed our strength and certainly has carried us up with wings in the assurance that we are His and we may wait upon Him for everything.

Mrs. G. Broekhouse, Reporter